Bucknell University

Bucknell Digital Commons

Honors Theses Student Theses

Spring 2022

Blacking Out, Hooking Up, and Sexual Assault on Bucknell's Campus

Lily Shorney lcs025@bucknell.edu

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



Part of the Community Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Shorney, Lily, "Blacking Out, Hooking Up, and Sexual Assault on Bucknell's Campus" (2022). Honors Theses. 600.

https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/honors_theses/600

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses at Bucknell Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Bucknell Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcadmin@bucknell.edu.

BLACKING OUT, HOOKING UP, AND SEXUAL ASSAULT ON BUCKNELL'S CAMPUS

by

Lily C. Shorney

A Thesis Submitted to the Honors Council

For Honors in Psychology

April 1, 2022

Approved by:

Advisor: Bill Flack, Ph.D.

Second Reader: Erica Delsandro, Ph.D.

Chair, Department of Psychology: T. Joel Wade

Acknowledgements

My deepest gratitude goes out to my two incredible advisors, Dr. Bill Flack and Dr. Erica Delsandro, without whom this research would not have been possible. It has been an amazing experience working with them both, as well as the rest of the research team, and I am so thankful for their consistent support over the past few years. I would like to thank Dr. Bill Flack for guiding me with continual patience and for offering thoughtful advice and criticism throughout this process. I would like to thank Dr. Erica Delsandro for serving as a role model for me throughout my years at Bucknell and for always cultivating a positive, safe space in which I can find joy in learning.

Additionally, I want to thank my truly outstanding research partner: Megan Kopitsky. I am so grateful to have worked with Megan over the past two years and to have shared many monumental moments with her, including both challenges and accomplishments. I would like to thank her for being a constant source of support, inspiration, and encouragement throughout this process. On top of that, I would like to thank her for being an incredible friend.

I would like to thank Megan Mulligan for being so encouraging, optimistic, and affirming in our weekly work sessions. I have loved getting to know her and deeply appreciate the thoughtful comments and criticisms that she made throughout this process.

Lastly, I would like to thank my parents for their unwavering support and for reminding me that I can accomplish anything I set my mind to. I would not be the student, or the person, that I am today without them.

Table of Contents

Abstract	4
Introduction	5
Focus of This Study	19
Methods	20
Results	28
Discussion	37
Limitations and Future Directions	43
References	49
Appendix A. Demographic Characteristics of Sample	60
Appendix B. Bucknell Campus Climate Survey '21-22	62
Appendix C. Correlations Between Hooking Up Frequency, Blackout Frequency, and C	CSA 170

Abstract

Sexual assault is a prominent issue on college campuses across the United States with detrimental impacts for individuals as well their surrounding communities. Two prominent risk factors for campus sexual assault (CSA) identified in the literature are alcohol use and partaking in hookup culture. However, existing research fails to address the specific role of alcohol-induced blackouts within hookups and how this phenomenon is related to CSA. The present study explored the prevalence of alcohol-induced blackouts as well as the relationship between blacking out, hooking up, and CSA. Based on quantitative survey data from 445 university students, analyses indicated that alcohol-induced blackouts, ranging from fragmentary to en bloc, are prevalent within the context of hookups, specifically among women. Regressions indicated that instances of CSA were predicted by both blacking out and hooking up, with blacking out functioning as a slightly stronger predictor variable. These findings highlight the significance of alcohol-induced blackouts as a risk factor for CSA and shed light on the relationship between blacking out and hooking up in reference to CSA risk. Suggestions for future research and practical implications of these findings are offered.

Blacking Out, Hooking Up, and Sexual Assault on Bucknell's Campus

Gender-based violence is a pervasive issue across the globe. The term refers to any type of violence that is rooted in unequal power dynamics among genders and it encompasses a plethora of forms including, stalking, rape, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual coercion, genital mutilation, and trafficking for sexual exploitation (UNHCR, 2020). Based on the current literature, gender-based violence has harmful impacts on victims, including poor reproductive and mental health. In response to the trauma, survivors might experience post-traumatic stress, anxiety, sexual dysfunction, the onset of an eating disorder, a sexually transmitted disease, an unwanted pregnancy, and/or pregnancy complications (Heise et al., 2002). These effects are harmful not only to the individual, but also to communities around the world as victims are often subsequently unable to contribute to society in the ways that they may have otherwise. While it is important to recognize that men can and do suffer from gender-based violence, given the discrepancy in power that exists between men and women in many societies around the world, gender-based violence tends to largely be inflicted upon women. Based on an analysis of prevalence data from 2000-2018 across 161 countries conducted by the World Health Organization, approximately 1 in 3 women aged 15 or older worldwide experienced physical and/or sexual violence by an intimate partner or a non-partner, illustrating the breadth of the issue (World Health Organization, 2021).

Gender-Based Violence in the United States

Although this is a worldwide issue, gender-based violence, and specifically sexual violence which includes any completed or attempted sexual act by force, violence, or coercion, has come to the forefront in the United States in the past 6 years as a result of the rise of the #MeToo movement (World Health Organization, 2019). #MeToo is a social movement started in

2006 by Tarana Burke, a survivor and activist from The Bronx, in which survivors publicize their experiences of sexual violence and harassment through social media to foster solidarity amongst victims and demand justice. Given the number of women who participated in and came out with their own stories as a result of this movement, the extent of the issue is vast. The pervasiveness of sexual violence in the U.S. is further emphasized through prevalence rates. When looking specifically at sexual violence in the U.S., almost half, 43.6%, of American women experienced a form of contact sexual violence in their lifetime as reported in 2015 (Smith et al., 2018). This number only represents instances that were reported. The number is likely higher because of the various reasons that may deter an individual from labeling or reporting an experience including shame, fear of not being believed, self-blame, or the difficulty of retelling and reliving a traumatic experience from which they may be trying to move forward (Zinzow & Thompson, 2011). Given the range of mental and reproductive health effects that result from gender-based and sexual violence, it is vital to work towards eradicating the issue. This begins with an understanding of the various factors that contribute to one's risk of victimhood.

Ecological Model of Sexual Violence

Risk factors can best be understood through a socio-ecological lens based on Bronfenbrenner's ecological model. Urie Bronfenbrenner, a Russian-born American psychologist, originally created this model to present a holistic view on how a child's environment impacts their growth on different levels. His model is visualized through concentric circles and begins in the center with the individual level, or the factors that are characteristic of the individual such as their age and gender. Among others, these personal characteristics influence the development of a person. The first circle past the individual is the microsystem, or a person's immediate environment including influences such as family and peers. Direct

interactions with other individuals also influence a child's development. The next circle is the mesosystem, or interactions between others, such as the interaction between the school and the child's parents which also has influence on the child. The final two levels are the exosystem which includes one's larger community and the media, and the macrosystem which refers to broader cultural values (Bronfenbrenner, 1977).

The model is useful for application to sexual violence because it allows for a consideration of the interplay of multiple levels of influences and risk factors. The benefit of this model for understanding sexual violence can be seen through Rebecca Campbell et al.'s employment of the model in their 2009 analysis of the impact of sexual assault on the mental health of victims. They find that factors operating on different levels of Bronfenbrenner's model greatly contribute to how an individual experiences sexual violence and its aftereffects. Specifically, the researchers touch on self-blame as a response to sexual violence and how this reaction is formed by multiple levels on the ecological system. For instance, at the individual level, a person may place blame on themselves for their own actions. Self-blame may result from victim-blaming pressures at the exo/mesosystem level. This might include the legal system refusing to grant justice to a victim in court (Campbell et al., 2009). In a more recent review article, Khan et al. demonstrate a broader understanding of sexual assault through the use of an ecological model based on Bronfenbrenner's model. For example, they discuss identifying as bisexual and being a first-year college student as two individual-level factors that influence likelihood of sexual assault. At the cultural level, or the macrosystem, they identify toxic masculinity as an influence (Khan et al., 2020). These two models highlight the usefulness of the model for providing a full picture of the issue, its various risk factors, and their interactions.

Sexual Assault on College Campuses

Sexual violence, or assault, can occur in a variety of contexts, locations, and times throughout one's life. However, some environments have been identified as riskier than others. One context in which sexual violence tends to be particularly concentrated is university campuses. When considering Bronfenbrenner's ecological model, university campuses can be understood as a student's larger community, including their close friends and acquaintances, placing it within the mesosystem and exosystem. The community reflects its own cultural values meaning that it also operates within the macrosystem. For the purposes of this study, campus sexual assault (CSA) includes any completed or attempted sexual act by force, violence, or coercion experienced since enrolling at the university.

As a result of a variety of studies focused on the prevalence of the issue, it is widely accepted that approximately 1 in 5 college women will experience sexual assault at least once during their four years on campus (Mellins et al., 2017a; Muehlenhard et al., 2017). A study published in 2022 updating the scope of rape victimization found that 33.4% of college women across national samples reported attempted rape or completed rape at some point since the age of 14 in 2015 (Koss et al., 2022). These numbers are likely lower than the actual rate given the barriers that keep victims in college from reporting incidents of CSA in addition to the more general reasons identified previously. Some of the barriers include post-trauma memory loss, desire to retain relationships and group affiliation, and fear of ruining future career or academic goals (Khan et al., 2018). Furthermore, universities face conflicting incentives to encourage and discourage students from reporting instances of CSA because of the possible counterintuitive effects on the school's public image (Cantalupo, 2014). A greater number of CSA reports could reflect successful reporting, or alternately, an unsafe college environment. Because of these

deterrents, prevalence rates are not only likely skewed, but also survivors are not getting the assistance that they need post-assault if they do not feel comfortable reporting and seeking help.

Alcohol as a Risk Factor

The context of a college campus carries with it certain characteristics that make CSA a particularly pressing threat. One of the most salient factors that has been found to be closely associated with increased risk on university campuses is alcohol (Flack et al., 2016; Testa & Livingston, 2009). The use of alcohol is widespread on U.S. campuses, despite the fact that it is illegal for nearly half of undergraduate students (Calnan & Davoren, 2021). Social life often revolves around alcohol-use, especially when Greek life is prominent on campus as fraternity houses provide an accessible venue for partying and underage drinking (Jozkowski & Wiersma-Mosley, 2017). While alcohol is involved in many consensual sexual experiences, it also tends to co-occur with CSA.

Based on a 2016 review of the literature on alcohol-related sexual assault, about half of all instances involve alcohol use by the victim, perpetrator, or both prior to the assault. When considering this association for victims, the researchers suggest that alcohol places women at greater risk because of the physiological effects and risky situations, such as fraternity parties, that involve the substance (Lorenz & Ullman, 2016). A 2007 study adds to this with the finding that impaired judgement from alcohol intoxication was the most frequently endorsed reason for incidents of unwanted sexual acts among students at a small, east coast college (Flack et al., 2007). Therefore, alcohol is not only often involved in CSA, but it is also cited by students as a common reason for it. Alcohol is known to lead to impulsive behavior and reduced inhibitions, representing a decrease in a victim's perception of risk which may be taken advantage of by a perpetrator. Use of the drug is also consistently associated with acquiescent forms of responding

in situations that are conducive to sexual assault (Jozkowski & Wiersma, 2015; Melkonian & Ham, 2018). All of these impacts of alcohol enlighten the ways in which the substance functions as a risk factor for victimization of CSA.

In addition, alcohol has been found to influence perpetrators in instances of CSA. In the 2022 study conducted by Koss et al. cited previously, 9 out of the 10 men who reported rape perpetration indicated so through alcohol-related measures (Koss et al., 2022). A review of the literature on alcohol consumption and sexual aggression perpetuation shows that there is a direct positive association not only between frequency of intake in sexual situations and CSA perpetration, but also between alcohol intake in the past month or year. When drinking, a person may be more likely to read cues from another person incorrectly and positively (Abbey et al., 2014). If someone is misreading bodily cues, they may make an assumption about consent when consent is not given. They may also display more aggression as a result of alcohol's impairing and loosening effects (Melkonian & Ham, 2018). Not only does alcohol itself impact a perpetrator's perception of a situation, but also the contexts associated with drinking in college have been found to predict CSA perpetrated by men. In a 2017 study, researchers found a positive association between frequency of party and bar attendance and sexual assault perpetration. College men who frequent these contexts more than others were found to be more likely to perpetrate sexual assault. Sexual assault perpetration was more likely for men during semesters when they frequented these spaces more than usual (Testa & Cleveland, 2017). Because of the prevalence of alcohol on college campuses and its impact on both victims and perpetrators, college campuses are a particularly risky space for sexual assault.

While alcohol in general has been found to be a significant risk factor, specific uses of alcohol place individuals at even greater risk. For example, the number of drinks an individual

consumes is associated with their level of risk. In a study conducted in 2017 by Tyler et al., higher levels of alcohol consumption increased the sexual victimization risk of college women, suggesting that the association between number of drinks consumed and risk for CSA is positive (Tyler et al., 2017). Therefore, heavier drinking and binge drinking, a common engagement on college campuses, places individuals at higher risk for CSA. As seen through a study focused on substance use in relation to victimization, almost 62% of rape victims in the study were heavy drinkers prior to the incident and had higher drinking scores than nonvictims (Messman-Moore et al., 2008). This further emphasizes the association between alcohol use and risk for sexual violence and adds to it by highlighting the correlation between number of drinks consumed and risk for CSA. An understanding of the correlation between more drinks and heightened risk is offered in Neilson et al.'s article in which they established that a higher number of reported weekly drinks are positively associated with the length of time it takes for a person to leave a hypothetical risky scenario for sexual assault (Neilson et al., 2018). Furthermore, binge drinking has been found to be associated with less active consent communication than those who do not binge drink (Marcantonio et al., 2021). Those who engage in binge drinking experience heightened effects of the drugs in comparison to those who drink less, increasing their overall risk for CSA.

In college, when engaging in heavy drinking behavior, incapacitation is an important outcome that has been considered in reference to CSA. Incapacitation can function as a perpetrator tactic in cases when a victim is taken advantage of when they cannot give consent because they are too drunk, passed out, unconscious or otherwise incapacitated (Walsh et al., 2021). In a recent study analyzing data from 9,616 participants, incapacitation was identified as the most common perpetration tactic with about two thirds of all experiences of penetrative

assaults identified involving the tactic (Mellins et al., 2017a). A broad term that encompasses multiple states, incapacitation includes an outcome of heavy drinking that has received far less attention in the field as a separate mechanism of CSA: alcohol-induced blackouts (Gilmore et al., 2018; Wetherill & Fromme, 2016). There is a clear difference between passing out and blacking out, however, the two terms are often used interchangeably in allegations of alcohol-involved sexual assault (Schneider, 2020). Passing out refers to when a person is unconscious as a result of alcohol use. Blackouts refer to periods of alcohol-induced anterograde amnesia. They can range from fragmentary blackouts in which a person experiences partial memory loss that can be recovered later, to "en bloc" blackouts in which a person experiences complete memory loss of events that occurred while impaired (Miller et al., 2019). Additionally, they can occur at blood alcohol count (BAC) levels far below the level of incapacitation and are perceived by many in college as common and acceptable (Merrill et al., 2021; Schneider, 2020).

In one of the few studies that has attended to blacking out separately from incapacitation, results showed that 51% of college students who had ever consumed alcohol experienced a blackout at some point in their lives and 24.8% of those participants reported later learning that they had engaged in some form of sexual activity while blacked out (White et al., 2002). A study from 2018, focused on youth as a whole rather than just college students, found that blackout frequency was positively correlated with incapacitated sexual assault victimization. Men also had a higher frequency of blackouts than women and of all participants, college students in Greek life reported the highest frequency of blackouts (Voloshyna et al., 2018). Another study from 2018 adds to this with the finding that sexual coercion victimization was predicted by frequency of blackouts over the past 3 months (Wilhite et al., 2018). Furthermore, a study from 2015 found that blackout drinking over the past 3 months predicted incapacitated CSA revictimization

among women who were victimized during adolescence (Valenstein-Mah et al., 2015). The previous three studies indicate an association between a history of blacking out and CSA, however, they are limited in that they do not consider blacking out during the actual instance of victimization. Another limitation is that most of the studies that address blacking out, including White et al. and Wilhite et al., do not encompass the range of fragmentary blackouts to complete blackouts in their methods. Rather, many ask one simple question such as "did you forget what happened the night before?" which could be interpreted in multiple ways and fails to address the complexities of alcohol-induced memory loss.

Because of the importance of memory in understanding and analyzing a scenario, instances of CSA that occur while an individual is blacked out are difficult to examine for a multitude of reasons. When a person is unable to remember all or certain parts of an encounter, they may not remember whether they gave consent or not (Schneider, 2020). However, physical evidence may be used to indicate what occurred when an individual experiences a complete blackout. With fragmentary blacking out, which is more common than en bloc blackouts, it is easier to establish whether consent was given due to partial memory. Incapacitation refers to instances when a person cannot consent because of drug/alcohol use, but in some cases when a person is blacked out, they are fully functioning and their state may be unclear to those around them (Wetherill & Fromme, 2016). Others may perceive them as intoxicated, but it might be difficult to discern if the individual is incapacitated. A victim may not label an experience as assault because of their inability to ascertain what occurred and whether they consented. Victims may also be more inclined to blame themselves for the incident because of their drinking and the blackout may be held against them in court as a way of discounting charges, causing the incident to fail to meet legal definitions of rape (Schneider, 2020). These complications revolving around

memory make blacking out a challenging factor to research, which might serve to explain why there are so few studies attending to the phenomenon. This makes the factor and its different forms all the more important to explore.

Hooking Up as a Risk Factor

Another important factor present on college campuses that is necessary to consider in reference to CSA is hookup culture. "Hooking up" is a rather new term in the literature used to describe a rise in a phenomenon across college campuses in relation to sexual activity. While the term has been operationalized in many ways, most definitions emphasize a non-committal nature, meaning that there are no acknowledged expectations of a relationship after hooking up. Most also emphasize ambiguity as the type of contact indicated by the term can range from kissing to penetrative sex (Bible et al., 2022; Garcia et al., 2019). According to a 2010 study, only 27% of reported hookups involved oral or vaginal sex, highlighting the range of sexual activity indicated by the term (Fielder & Carey, 2010). As of 2016, researchers focused on hookup culture have identified the prevalence rate of hooking up in college as falling somewhere between 60% and 80% (Flack et al., 2016). Hookups occur in a variety of pairings including with strangers, acquaintances, friends, or previous partners and can occur just once or more than once with the same person (Fielder & Carey, 2010). They are often followed by a performance of aloofness between partners in order to maintain a lack of significance and emotional involvement (Wade, 2021). Furthermore, hooking up has been found to be deeply intertwined with the heteronormative social scene and associated with Greek life settings such as fraternity parties (Paul et al., 2000; Pham, 2017). While many college students willingly engage in the culture and have positive experiences, negative consequences are common as well. As seen through the results of a 2016 study, 77.4% of the participants experienced at least one negative consequence

of a hookup in the past few months. These consequences include regret, embarrassment, loss of respect, and a negative impact on the relationship with the hookup partner (Lewis et al., 2012; Napper et al., 2016).

In addition, hooking up has been identified as a risk factor for CSA (Duval et al., 2020; Mellins et al., 2017b; Tyler et al., 2017). The results of a 2016 study showed that 78% of the sexual assaults reported at an east coast college took place during hookups (Flack et al., 2016). The prevalence of CSA within this context can be understood through the way that hookup culture normalizes engaging in sexual activity for individualistic purposes and sustains traditional sexual scripts. Because hookups lessen interpersonal obligations through an emphasis on a lack of expressed commitment, men feel free to pursue their own pleasure with less concern for their partner. In heterosexual hookups, women can be objectified and viewed by men as functioning solely for their personal pleasure, allowing traditional, sexist sexual scripts to play out in this context (Lovejoy, 2015). This phenomenon is further emphasized through the experiences of LGBTQ+ individuals partaking in heteronormative hookup culture with cis men and women. According to the results of two studies that consider this perspective, heterosexual cis men are the source of problematic hookup behaviors that are conducive to rape culture as they tend to conform to traditional gendered roles and dominate within hookups (Jaffe et al., 2020; Lamont et al., 2018). From the start, men hold the power in hookup culture given that partners are often sought out at social gatherings, such as fraternity parties, that are controlled by men and this seems to continue into the context of hookups (Lamont et al., 2018). Sexual scripts in hookup culture may also perpetuate rape myths as college men who view hookup culture as harmless are more likely to accept rape myths that blame the victim (Reling et al., 2018).

Therefore, hookup culture can be understood as a risk factor for CSA in part through its creation of an individualistic, gendered, heteronormative space that supports traditional sexual scripts.

Hooking Up and Alcohol Use

In addition, the established association between alcohol use and hookup culture in the literature can help to illuminate hooking up as a risk factor. A survey administered to 1,468 undergraduate students showed that most of the participants (60.9%) reported drinking alcohol during their most recent hookup and another study found that approximately 65% of women drank alcohol before hooking up (LaBrie et al., 2014; Lewis et al., 2012). A recent review of the literature on uncommitted sexual behavior and alcohol use among young adults in the U.S. corroborates these findings by stating that the number of college students who drink before a hookup falls somewhere between two-thirds and three-fourths (Garcia et al., 2019). Not only is drinking consistently associated with hooking up quantitatively, but as seen through the journal responses from 110 first-year college students, it is considered an "alien concept" to hook up without alcohol (Wade, 2021). The hookup scene itself, where college students seek partners, is often at bars or parties where one has easy access to the substance (Andrejek, 2021). Alcohol is a dominant characteristic of hookup culture as it helps foster and contribute to the sense of unseriousness and the lack of commitment that is inherent to hookup culture. Hooking up sober is perceived by many as meaning something more. Furthermore, it helps to enable the individualism of hooking up by lowering inhibitions and lessening forethought of repercussions (Lovejoy, 2015). Alcohol, a risk factor for CSA in itself, is tied to hookup culture through the places where students find a partner and the ways in which the substance helps to lessen the emotional and relational significance of hookups, therefore achieving the goal of a lack of commitment.

As discussed previously, specific drinking behaviors have been found to exacerbate the risk of CSA. This has been found to hold true in the context of a hookup. In a 2014 study, a greater number of drinks was associated with more advanced sexual activity in a hookup (LaBrie et al., 2014). Additionally, a more recent study published in 2019 analyzing data from the Online College Social Life Survey (OCSLS) found that first year students who reported heavy alcohol use were approximately 1.5 times more likely to have penetrative sex in a hookup compared to those who did not drink (Thorpe et al., 2019). Building upon the relationship identified in these two studies between the number of drinks and level of activity in a hookup, results of a 2017 study found that the risk of physically forced intercourse during a hookup became significant only after women consumed nine drinks (Ford, 2017). As suggested before when reviewing the literature on alcohol as a risk factor, the substance can serve to heighten miscommunication of intentions between partners and effects of alcohol increase with the number of drinks. The combination of heightened miscommunication and other psychological and physiological effects of heavy drinking, including forms of incapacitation, may cause a person to be unable to leave or resist unwanted sexual acts. Miscommunication and lack of communication of intent is especially prominent in the context of hookups because of the individualistic nature of the culture as well as the ambiguity of the sexual acts indicated by "hookup."

As seen through the results of a 2017 study, intending to hook up later on might lead to heavier drinking, but only when that person does not intend to have intercourse. This may be because non-intercourse hookups are perceived as less risky, so students might feel more comfortable drinking heavily (Beckmeyer, 2017). However, if a person is drinking more heavily, they are at greater risk of CSA and their original intentions may be ignored by the perpetrator or surpassed in a hookup due to one's lack of ability to resist. When a person does not intend to

engage in more advanced sexual activity during a hookup, they may choose to drink more, which subsequently places them at greater risk for CSA. This illustrates one pathway through which heavy drinking serves to increase risk for CSA within hookups. Another study published in 2019 offers another pathway through which heavy episodic drinking (HED), or drinking 4 or more drinks on an occasion, may serve to exacerbate risk for CSA. The researchers hypothesized that hookups would mediate the relationship between these two variables suggesting that heavy drinking might lead to hookups which lead to risk for CSA. Results showed that HED was positively associated with hookups and that hookups significantly predicted reports of CSA. Furthermore, HED was correlated with increased likelihood of sexual victimization and severity. Finally, it was established that the effect of HED on sexual victimization severity was mediated through hookups, primarily hookups involving alcohol (Testa et al., 2019). While alcohol has been found to serve as a risk factor outside of hookups, these studies suggest that the relationship between heavy drinking and CSA may be best understood through its association with generally sexually risky behaviors such as hooking up.

As noted previously in this review, with heavy drinking comes the possibility of incapacitated CSA. This has been attended to in the literature on hooking up in addition to alcohol through Ford's analysis of data from the OCSLS between 2005 and 2011. Findings showed that college women who drank three of more drinks were more likely to have experienced incapacitated CSA compared to those who did not drink in their most recent hookup (Ford, 2017). Once again, incapacitation is a broad term and few studies in the literature have attended to the phenomenon of blacking out as separate from incapacitation as an outcome of heavy drinking. This is especially true in reference to hookup culture. One study found that 6% of those who reported hooking up and 14% of those who indicated having intercourse during a

hookup indicated that they "relied on their friends' stories the next day to piece together what had happened during the hookup" (Paul et al., 2000) While this suggests that they may have blacked out from alcohol, it is unclear because the term "blackout" was not used and the use of alcohol was not indicated. Another study that considers blacking out in the context of hookup culture has the same limitation as studies identified previously; the researchers fail to ask about the full spectrum of alcohol-induced memory loss, including both fragmentary and en bloc blacking out (Winkeljohn Black et al., 2019).

While it is important to research the prevalence of incapacitation in hookup culture, it would also be valuable to further research the prevalence of blacking out within college hookups given the complications that arise from issues with memory. Hookup culture provides a unique context for blacking out and CSA in that it is oriented around certain rules of unseriousness, a lack of commitment, and aloofness. In order to stay in line with these rules, a student may be deterred from asking their previous partner what happened if they blacked out during a hookup. Students are subsequently less likely to report the incident, creating a significant gap in the understanding of CSA in relation to blacking out in the context of hookup culture.

Focus of This Study

Sexual assault is a pressing issue on college campuses across the United States exacerbated by both alcohol and hookup culture. The purpose of this study is to examine the alcohol-induced blackouts within hookup culture in relation to CSA on Bucknell University's campus. In the study, I analyzed survey responses from a sample of college students focused on topics related to alcohol use, hookup culture, and sexual violence experiences in order to investigate the relationship between these variables. Based on the current literature and the Bucknell student population, which is primarily cis gender and heterosexual with a prominent

Greek life, I hypothesized that blacking out from alcohol would be prevalent in the sample and that more participants who identified themselves as men would indicate one or more instances of blacking out than those who identified themselves as women. Furthermore, I hypothesized that more participants who identified as a member of a Greek organization would indicate one or more experiences of blacking out since enrolling at Bucknell than those who did not identify themselves as a member of a Greek organization.

In the specific context of a hookup, I hypothesized that more participants who identified themselves as women would indicate one or more experiences of blacking out than those who identified themselves as men. I also hypothesized that more participants who identified themselves as a member of a Greek organization would indicate one or more experiences of blacking out in the context of a hookup since enrolling at Bucknell than those who did not identify themselves as a member of a Greek organization. Lastly, I hypothesized that there would be a positive association between frequency of blacking out, frequency of hooking up, and rates of CSA.

Methods

Participants

The sample in this study included 445 Bucknell students, 63.6% (n = 283) of whom identified themselves as women, 33.5% (n = 149) as men, and 3.6% (n = 16) identified as trans/gender non-conforming/gender questioning. Within the sample, 79.3% (n = 353) identified as heterosexual, 2.7% (n = 12) as homosexual, 13.5% (n = 60) as pan/bi-sexual, 3.8% (n = 17) identified as queer, 2.5% (n = 11) as asexual spectrum, and 2.0% (n = 9) indicated "I'm not sure." In terms of class year, 32.6% (n = 145) of the participants were first year students, 26.5% (n = 118) were sophomores, 18.4% (n = 82) were juniors, and 22.2% (n = 99) were seniors.

Most of the sample identified as White (81.3%, n = 362), with 7.4% (n = 33) of the sample identifying as Black/African, 11.7% (n = 52) as Asian or Asian-American, 6.1% (n = 27) as Latinx, and 2.2% (n = 10) as a race not listed.

Age of participants ranged from 18-22+, however, most participants fell between the ages of 18 and 21 (89.2%, n = 397). Many participants (29.2%, n = 130) identified as members of Greek life and 23.6% (n = 105) identified members of varsity sports teams. Annual combined parental incomes of less than \$50,000 were reported by 10.1% (n = 45), less than \$100,000 by 13.5% (n = 60), less than \$150,000 by 15.7% (n = 70), less than \$200,000 by 10.6% (n = 47), less than \$250,000 by 10.3% (n = 46), and the rest (26.5%, n = 118) more than \$250,000.

The final sample was similar to the student population at Bucknell University in relation to race (white: 75.2% of population vs. 81.3% of sample), gender identity (women: 50.72% of population vs. 63.6% of sample), and Greek life affiliation (37.9% of population vs. 29.2%). See Appendix A for a table of the demographic characteristics of the final sample.

Materials

This study was conducted through an online survey created in Qualtrics Survey Software. See Appendix B for the full survey and formatting.

The Administration-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative Survey formed the basis for the survey and was adapted for present purposes (ARC3; Swartout et al., 2019). The ARC3 evaluates experiences on campus at the individual level through 19 different modules in order to gather information about the community as a whole. The following measures from the ARC3 were included in the broader campus climate survey: Demographics, Possible Outcomes, Alcohol Use, Perceptions of Campus Climate Regarding Sexual Misconduct, Sexual Harassment by Faculty/Staff, Sexual Harassment by Students, Stalking Victimization, Dating Violence

Victimization, Sexual Violence Victimization, Institutional Responses C and Additional Information. The following measures were removed: Peer Norms, Stalking Perpetration, Dating Violence Perpetration, Sexual Violence Perpetration, Institutional Responses A, Peer Responses, Consent, Bystander Intervention, and Campus Safety.

The following measures were analyzed for the purposes of the present study:

Demographics. This measure was located at the beginning of the survey and asked participants to provide demographic information in order to compare data across different identities on campus. Age, gender, sexual orientation, race, class year, activity involvement, and caregiver's approximate annual income were assessed in the present study. Language was modified to be more inclusive in reference to gender and sexuality in order to increase response rates from the LGBTQIA+ community.

AUDIT-C. Problematic drinking behavior was measured through the Alcohol Use
Disorders Identification Test-Consumption (AUDIT-C) which includes the first three items from
the original AUDIT (Bush et al., 1998). The first question addresses frequency of drinking, the
second addresses the number of standard drinks consumed on a typical day, and the third
addresses frequency of heavy, or binge drinking. Questions were slightly modified to match the
language for the alcohol measure from the ARC3. The modified first question was "How often
do you have a drink containing alcohol?" The second was "How many standard drinks
containing alcohol do you have on a typical day? A standard drink is defined as a 12 oz. beer; 5
oz. glass of wine; or 1.5 oz. shot of hard liquor either straight or in a mixed drink." The third was
"How often do you have six or more drinks on one occasion?" Responses for each question were
scored from 0-4 and total scores were calculated by summing the scores of the individual
questions to create a possible total score of 12. For the first question which attended to

frequency, the last two responses "2 to 3 times a month" and "4 or more times a week" were dropped. The remaining 5 responses were coded 0-4 for further analyses. In the current study, the AUDIT-C score was found to be highly reliable ($\alpha = 0.825$).

Alcohol-induced blackout measure. (ABOM, Miller et al., 2019). En bloc and fragmentary blacking out frequency was measured through an adapted version of the Alcohol-Induced Blackout Measure (ABOM), which assesses alcohol-induced memory impairment over the past 30 days. Rather than reporting on the past 30 days, participants were asked: "Since you have been enrolled at Bucknell, as a result of alcohol use and/or co-use with other drugs, how often have you:" followed by the 5 statements listed in the ABOM. This modification was made to measure frequency of blackouts "since enrolled at Bucknell" in order to encompass a greater period of time and to capture overall experiences as some students may have blacked out more frequently during a specific period of time other than the past 30 days. Furthermore, given the time period in which the survey was administered, the past thirty days likely encompassed winter break; a time during which students were not on campus. Responses were changed to "never," "once or twice," "sometimes" or "often" to align with the time reference shift. These modified responses were based off of those from the Revised Sexual Experiences Survey (RSES, Koss et al., 2007).

The measure was also altered to include the possibility of co-use with other drugs in order to account for instances of blacking out in which alcohol was involved, but the participant attributes their blackout to another substance. An overall ABOM score was created by summing the 5 items to create a blackout composite. Dichotomous sum scores were also calculated to determine prevalence of blacking out across the sample. As seen through an initial assessment of the scale, the 5 items showed strong internal consistency at baseline (α =.91) and follow-up

(α =.89). Scores also showed construct validity as drinking scores were positively correlated with higher scores on the ABOM (Miller et al., 2019). In the present study, the ABOM score was found to be highly reliable (α = 0.918). In addition, items related to blacking out were added to the following measures. When adding those items to the items of the original measure, the internal consistency of all ABOM-related items across the entire survey was high (α = 0.913).

Hooking up self-report survey. This questionnaire was created by a student research team led by Dr. Bill Flack at Bucknell University in order to gather information about student experiences within hookup culture. It was incorporated into the 2019-2020 annual campus climate survey conducted at Bucknell. The questionnaire is an expanded version of the Hookingup Questions (HUQ) scale published in a 2016 study utilized to measure the frequency of engagement in different types of hookups, such as acquaintance and stranger hookups (Flack et al., 2016). This questionnaire was chosen instead of the HUQ because it examines a broader array of characteristics. The scale was updated for the purposes of this study in a few ways. First, the definition of "hooking up" indicated at the beginning of the scale was changed to reflect the fact that some students may have expectations for a hookup even if they are not expressed (Garcia et al., 2019). The altered definition was the following: "some type of physically intimate/sexual activity with another person without expressed or acknowledged expectations of commitment to a further relationship." The phrasing of the final question was also changed from "unwanted sex" to "unwanted sexual acts" in order to capture more instances of sexual assault. Gendered language was modified across the scale to be more inclusive and accurate.

In addition to these alterations, 2 new questions based off of the ABOM were added to the Hooking Up Self-Report survey to measure experiences of blacking out within the context of hookups. In the first question, the revised ABOM items were prefaced with "have you ever" and

in the second they were prefaced with "how often," followed by the 5 statements in order to capture both prevalence and frequency of blackouts within hookup culture. Overall ABOM scores were calculated by summing the 5 items for each question and dichotomous variables were created to analyze prevalence.

Sexual violence victimization. This scale measured participants' sexual experiences that may have been unwanted since they enrolled at Bucknell. It was extracted from a revised version of the Sexual Experiences Survey-Short Form Victimization (SES-SFV; Koss et al., 2007) and included behaviorally-oriented statements that measure experiences of and attempts at unwanted sexual contact, oral, anal, and vaginal sex through coercion and/or force. The responses were expanded from "0 times, 1 time, 2 times, 3+ times" to "0 times, 1 time, 2-5 times, 6-9 times, 10+ times" to capture more instances of unwanted sexual experiences (Anderson & Cuccolo, 2021).

A new perpetrator tactic was also added to the measure to increase inclusivity: forced penetration. This includes attempts at trying to make a victim put an object or another person's penis into their butt or vagina and making someone put their penis or another object into another person's butt or vagina. These additions were separated into four items and were informed by a recent article focused on the topic of forced penetration (Anderson et al., 2020). Gendered phrasing such as "A woman MADE ME put my penis into her vagina" was altered to "Someone MADE ME put my penis into her vagina" in order to be more inclusive and factually correct. A question about the frequency of stealthing, or condom removal without consent and/or knowledge, was also added to the measure, however, it was not analyzed for the present study.

Originally consisting of 6 follow up questions, 2 follow up questions were added to the second section which was based off of the one situation reflected in the sexual violence measure that had the greatest impact on the participant. One addition was placed after the last question

about participant use of drugs or alcohol prior to the incident and was contingent on the response to that question. If a respondent indicated that they were drinking or were using both alcohol and drugs, the final follow-up question would appear. If the respondent did not indicate this, they would not see the final question. The final question was once again based on the revised ABOM items and was included in order to measure experiences of fragmentary and en bloc blacking out in the context of unwanted sexual experiences at the event level. Phrasing was therefore altered to "As a result of alcohol use and/or co use with other drugs, did you:" followed by the 5 statements. Responses were also slightly altered to match the context of the question. Another addition was placed after the question about location. The question asked about the timing of the incident and was inserted in order to gain a better understanding of the context of the experience; however, it was not analyzed for the purpose of this study.

Procedure

This study and survey were approved by Bucknell University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the start of the Spring 2022 semester. Email addresses for 1714 randomly-selected Bucknell undergraduate students were retrieved from the registrar, and the link to the web-based survey was sent out to all of these students on January 30th. The email including the link to the survey gave a brief description of the survey, an estimated time of completion, an explanation of participant anonymity, and informed participants of the possibility of winning 1 of 10 \$50 Amazon gift cards for their participation. Data was collected over the course of three weeks and reminders were sent out on February 3rd, 6th, 9th, 13th, and 14th to those who had not yet completed the survey. The reference period ranged from a little over 1 semester (for first years) to a little over 7 semesters (for seniors). A total of 520 students responded to the email

invitation to participate in the present study, and 445 students completed at least 20% of the overall survey.

At the start of the survey, participants were asked to provide their informed consent, confirming that they are over the age of 18 and willing to partake in this study. Through this form, the purpose and plan of the research, the time it should take to complete the survey, voluntary participation, benefits of participation, and participant anonymity were all explained. Risks and possible discomforts were indicated as well. At the end of the survey, participants were asked to indicate their email address if they wanted to be entered into the lottery to win an Amazon gift card and/or if they were willing to partake in an interview or a focus group regarding the previous topics in the future. They were then shown a debriefing form that provided them with the number of the Counseling & Student Development Center if they experienced distress while completing the survey.

Responses were collected through Qualtrics software and the results of the survey were analyzed through SPSS statistical software. Data was compared across those who identified as women and those who identified as men as well as those who identified as a member of a Greek organization and those who did not identify in this way. Prior to the performance of statistical analyses, the data file was cleaned to delete any identifying information so as to maintain the confidentiality of the participants. While there were students in the sample that identified themselves outside of the male-female gender binary, these students were not included in the analyses because of the statistically small number and the risk of compromising their anonymity. Data with any less than 20% survey completion was also deleted. This included 75 responses. Lastly, in cases where a participant responded to at least one item in a measure, missing data for other items within that measure were filled in with zeros in order to capture all responses. This

was necessary given that SPSS fails to preserve responses if there is missing data across a measure.

Results

Campus Sexual Assault Prevalence

To assess the data collected, the distribution of scores was analyzed across all measures. After establishing that scores were normally distributed and without outliers, the prevalence of sexual contact, attempted rape, completed rape, and total rape across the sample was investigated.

Sexual contact. The overall prevalence of sexual contact victimization across the sample was 30.2% (n = 92). A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between gender and sexual contact was significant, X^2 (1, n = 294) = 12.910, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 16.5% of those who identified as male reported one or more incidents of sexual contact victimization and that 37.4% of those who identified as female reported one or more incidents of sexual contact victimization. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between Greek membership and sexual contact victimization was significant, X^2 (1, n = 305) = 24.072, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 50.6% of those who were members of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of sexual contact victimization compared to 22.0% of those who were not.

A further post-hoc chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between female gender and sexual contact victimization was significant among those who identify as a member of a Greek organization, X^2 (1, n = 203) = 11.690, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 53.6% of women who identified as a member of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of sexual contact victimization compared to 29.1%

of those who did not identify as a member. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between male gender and sexual contact victimization among those who identify as a member of a Greek organization was significant, X^2 (1, n = 91) = 9.259, p = .002. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 41.2% of men who identified as a member of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of sexual contact victimization compared to 10.8% of men who did not identify as a member.

Attempted rape. The overall prevalence of attempted rape victimization, which included attempted oral, vaginal, and anal rape, and attempted forced vaginal and anal penetration across the sample was 21.8% (n = 66). A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between gender and attempted rape was significant, X^2 (1, n = 292) = 27.614, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 3.3% of those who identified as male reported one or more incidents of attempted rape and that 31.2% of those who identified as female reported one or more incidents of attempted rape. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between Greek membership and attempted rape victimization was significant, X^2 (1, n = 303) = 11.554, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 34.5% of those who were members of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of attempted rape victimization compared to 16.7% of those who were not.

A further post-hoc chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between female gender and attempted rape victimization was significant among those who identify as a member of a Greek organization, X^2 (1, n = 202) = 5.739, p = .017. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 42.0% of women who identified as a member of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of attempted rape victimization compared to 25.6% of those who did not identify as a member. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that

the relationship between male gender and attempted rape victimization among those who identify as a member of a Greek organization was not significant, X^2 (1, n = 90) = .423, p = .516. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 5.9% of men who identified as a member of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of attempted rape victimization compared to 2.7% of men who did not identify as a member.

Completed rape. The overall prevalence of completed rape victimization, which included completed oral, vaginal, and anal rape, and completed forced vaginal and anal penetration across the sample was 18.2% (n = 55). A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between gender and completed rape victimization was significant, X^2 (1, n = 292) = 20.451, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 3.3% of those who identified as male reported one or more incidents of completed rape victimization and that 25.7% of those who identified as female reported one or more incidents of completed rape. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between Greek membership and completed rape victimization was significant, X^2 (1, n = 303) = 21.908, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 34.5% of those who were members of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of completed rape victimization compared to 11.6% of those who were not.

A further post-hoc chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between female gender and completed rape victimization was significant among those who identify as a member of a Greek organization, X^2 (1, n = 202) = 14.541, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 42.0% of women who identified as a member of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of completed rape victimization compared to 17.3% of those who did not identify as a member. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that

the relationship between male gender and completed rape victimization among those who identify as a member of a Greek organization was not significant, X^2 (1, n = 90) = .423, p = .516. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 5.9% of men who identified as a member of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of completed rape victimization compared to 2.7% of men who did not identify as a member.

Total rape. The overall prevalence of total rape victimization, which included both completed and attempted rape across the sample was 25.7% (n = 78). A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between gender and total rape victimization was significant, X^2 (1, n = 292) = 29.746, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 5.6% of those who identified as male reported one or more incidents of total rape victimization and that 36.1% of those who identified as female reported one or more incidents of total rape victimization. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between Greek membership and total rape victimization was significant, X^2 (1, n = 303) = 17.989, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 42.5% of those who were members of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of total rape victimization compared to 19.0% of those who were not.

A further post-hoc chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between female gender and total rape victimization was significant among those who identify as a member of a Greek organization, X^2 (1, n = 202) = 9.661, p = .002. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 50.7% of women who identified as a member of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of total rape victimization compared to 28.6% of those who did identify as a member. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between male gender and total rape victimization among those who identify as a member of a

Greek organization was not significant, X^2 (1, n = 90) = 1.540, p = .215. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 11.8% of men who identified as a member of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of total rape victimization compared to 4.1% of men who did not identify as a member.

Problematic Drinking

The mean AUDIT-C sum score for this sample was 3.912 (SD = 2.900). An independent-samples t-test revealed that there was a significant difference in the mean frequency of problematic drinking for men (M = 4.483 SD = 3.406) and for women (M = 3.6915 SD = 2.553), t(273.889) = 2.491, p = .013. Levene's test indicated unequal variances (F = 26.075, p < .001), so degrees of freedom were adjusted from 429 to 273.889. An independent-samples t-test revealed that there was a significant difference in the mean frequency of problematic drinking for those who identified as a member of a Greek organization (M = 5.554 SD = 2.500) and for those who did not (M = 3.230 SD = 2.782), t(441) = -8.240, p < .001. Levene's test indicated equal variances (F = 3.280, p =), so degrees of freedom were reported as 441.

Blacking Out

The overall prevalence of blacking out since enrolled at Bucknell, which included fragmentary and en bloc blacking out across the sample was 64.3% (n = 279). An independent-samples t-test revealed that there was not a significant difference in the mean frequency of blacking out for men (M = 3.500 SD = 4.0144) and for women (M = 3.350 SD = 3.539), t(270.613) = .381, p = .704. Levene's test indicated unequal variances (F = 4.814, p = .029), so degrees of freedom were adjusted from 420 to 270.613. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between gender and blacking out was not significant, X^2 (1, n = 422) = .906, p = .341. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 62.2% of those who

identified as male reported one or more incidents of blacking out and that 66.8% of those who identified as female reported one or more incidents of blacking out. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between Greek membership and blacking out was significant, X^2 (1, n = 434) = 55.392, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 91.2% of those who were members of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of blacking out compared to 53.4% of those who were not.

Blacking out in hookups. The overall prevalence of blacking out in the context of hookups, which included fragmentary and en bloc blacking out, was 35.4% (n = 137). An independent-samples t-test revealed that there was not a significant difference in the mean frequency of blacking out for men (M = 1.095 SD = 2.723) and for women (M = 1.598 SD = 3.119), t(375) = -1.537, p = .125. Levene's test indicated equal variances (F = 3.792, p = .052), so degrees of freedom were reported as 375. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between gender and blacking out within hookups was significant, X^2 (1, n = 377) = 4.620, p = .032. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 28.6% of those who identified as male reported one or more incidents of blacking out in a hookup and that 39.8% of those who identified as female reported one or more incidents of blacking out in a hookup. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between Greek membership and blacking out in a hookup was significant, X^2 (1, n = 387) = 61.115, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 65.2% of those who were members of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of blacking out compared to 23.3% of those who were not.

A further post-hoc chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between female gender and blacking out in a hookup was significant among those who identify as a member of a Greek organization, X^2 (1, n = 251) = 48.672, p < .001. Analysis of the

contingency table demonstrated that 70.2% of women who identified as a member of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of blacking out within the context of a hookup compared to 24.6% of those who did not identify as a member. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between male gender and blacking out in a hookup among those who identify as a member of a Greek organization was significant, X^2 (1, n = 126) = 9.126, p = .003. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 51.9% of men who identified as a member of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of blacking out compared to 22.2% of men who did not identify as a member.

Blacking out in instances of sexual violence. The overall prevalence of blacking out in incidents of sexual violence, which included fragmentary and en bloc blacking out, was 56.9% (n = 37). An independent-samples t-test revealed that there was not a significant difference in the mean frequency of blacking out for men (M = .833 SD = 1.169) and for women (M = 1.525 SD = 1.169)1.745), t(63) = -.946, p = .348. Levene's test indicated equal variances (F = 3.030, p = .087), so degrees of freedom were reported as 63. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between gender and blacking out in incidents of sexual violence was not significant, X^{2} (1, n = 65) = .129, p = .719. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 50.0% of those who identified as male reported one or more incidents of blacking out in incidents of sexual violence and that 57.6% of those who identified as female reported one or more incidents of blacking out in incidents of sexual violence. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between Greek membership and blacking out in an incident of sexual violence was also not significant, X^2 (1, n = 65) = 1.577, p = .209. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 50.0% of those who were members of a Greek organization reported one or more incidents of total rape victimization compared to 65.5% of those who were not.

Hooking Up

The overall prevalence of hooking up across the sample was 53.7% (n = 233). An independent-samples t-test revealed that there was not a significant difference in the mean frequency of hooking up for men (M = .959 SD = 1.140) and for women (M = 1.076 SD = 1.183), t(420) = -.982, p = .327. Levene's test indicated equal variances (F = .178, p = .673), so degrees of freedom were reported as 420. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between gender and hooking up was not significant, X^2 (1, n = 422) = 1.235, p = .266. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 50.3% of those who identified as male reported one or more incidents of hooking up and that 56.0% of those who identified as female reported one or more instances of hooking up. A chi-square analysis of independence revealed that the relationship between Greek membership and hooking up was significant, X^2 (1, n = 434) = 41.588, p < .001. Analysis of the contingency table demonstrated that 78.5% of those who were members of a Greek organization reported one or more instances of hooking up compared to 44.1% of those who were not.

Blacking Out, Hooking Up, and Campus Sexual Assault

After establishing that scores were normally distributed and without outliers, intercorrelations were examined between the frequency of hooking up, the frequency of blacking out, and measures of CSA (sexual contact, attempted rape, completed rape, and total rape).

Pearson correlation coefficients revealed that frequency of hooking up, frequency of blacking out, and many of the CSA measures were significantly intercorrelated with one another (p < 0.05). See Appendix C for the correlation matrix.

Blacking out. Frequency of blacking out was significantly intercorrelated with problematic drinking scores as measured through the AUDIT-C (r(434) = .670, p < .001)

frequency of hooking up (r(430) = .396, p < .001), sexual contact (r(302) = .376, p < .001), attempted rape victimization (r(300) = .289, p < .001), completed rape victimization (r(300) = .300, p < .001), and total rape victimization (r(300) = .369, p < .001).

Hooking up. Frequency of hooking up was significantly intercorrelated with frequency of blacking out, sexual contact (r(305) = .293, p < .001), attempted rape victimization (r(303) = .228, p < .001), completed rape victimization (r(303) = .268, p < .001), and total rape victimization (r(303) = .287, p < .001).

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict prevalence rates of sexual contact based on the participant's reporting of hooking up and blacking out; the result was significant (F(2, 299) = 29.673, p < .001) with an R^2 of .166. Analysis of the contingency table indicated that both frequency of hooking up (p = .004) and blacking out (p < .001) were significant predictors of sexual contact victimization.

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict prevalence rates of attempted rape based on the participant's reporting of hooking up and blacking out; the result was significant (F(2, 297) = 16.115, p < .001) with an R^2 of .098. Analysis of the contingency table indicated that both frequency of hooking up (p = .029) and blacking out (p < .001) were significant predictors of attempted rape victimization.

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict prevalence rates of completed rape based on the participant's reporting of hooking up and blacking out; the result was significant (F(2, 297) = 19.304, p < .001) with an R^2 of .115. Analysis of the contingency table indicated that both frequency of hooking up (p = .004) and blacking out (p < .001) were significant predictors of completed rape victimization.

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict prevalence rates of total rape based on the participant's reporting of hooking up and blacking out; the result was significant (F(2, 297) = 27.946, p < .001) with an R² of .158. Analysis of the contingency table indicated that both frequency of hooking up (p = .005) and blacking out (p < .001) were significant predictors of total rape victimization.

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to analyze alcohol-induced blacking out in relation to hookup culture as a risk factor for CSA on Bucknell University's campus. It was hypothesized that students who identified as men would experience alcohol-induced blackouts at a higher rate than those who identified as women. However, in the context of hookups, it was hypothesized that more participants identifying as women would indicate one or more experiences of blacking out than those who identify as men. It was also predicted that blacking out would be prevalent and that participants who identify as a member of a Greek organization would have a higher prevalence rate of blacking out in general and in the context of hooking up than those who do not identify as a member. Finally, it was hypothesized that frequency of hooking up, frequency of blacking out, and CSA rates would all be positively associated.

In reference to CSA rates, the present study found that the overall prevalence of sexual contact victimization was 30.2%, with 37.4% of those identifying as women indicating one or more instances of unwanted sexual contact and 16.5% of men. This is in line with previous research conducted at the same college in 2007. Results from 2007 indicated a rate of 29.2% for unwanted fondling with more participants identifying as women (36.8%) than men (18.3%) (Flack et al., 2007). Of the total sample, 25.7% reported one or more instances of total rape, which included victimization of both attempted and completed rape. Those who identified as

women (36.1%) were more likely than men (5.6%) to report one or more incidents of total rape. This rate is consistent with previous research that has updated the accepted statistic for the scope of rape victimization to 1 in 3 college women (Koss et al., 2022). In previous years, rates at Bucknell were interpreted to be higher than the accepted rate of victimization across colleges, however, with this updated statistic, it is more likely that Bucknell's campus reflects others across the country. The prevalence rate for men is also in line with previous findings that indicate that 11.6% of those identifying as men reported sexual victimization, with 2.8% reporting rape (Conley et al., 2017).

The rates reported in this study are likely lower than the actual rates given that many victims do not report for a variety of reasons including fear of social repercussions such as breaking group affiliation or other significant relationships on campus and/or fear of ruining future academic and career goals (Khan et al., 2018). Additionally, CSA rates in this study may vary from rates reported in other studies as a result of operationalizations of CSA. For the purposes of this study, total rape and sexual contact were analyzed separately as modeled by Koss et al. because of the different experiences that come with each of these types of sexual violence (Koss et al., 2022). These baseline CSA statistics establish campus sexual assault in the form of sexual contact victimization, attempted rape, completed rape, and total rape, and provide important context for the hypotheses of the present study in relation to hooking up, blacking out, and instances of CSA.

In reference to the occurrence of alcohol-induced blackouts among college students, the present study found that over half (64.3%) of the sample indicated experiencing one or more instances of blacking out since enrolling at Bucknell. The scores on the ABOM were found to be positively correlated with scores on the AUDIT-C, suggesting that the rate of blacking out is

consistent with problematic drinking behavior across the sample. Given that the ABOM is a relatively new scale as it was developed in 2019 and the reference period for the ABOM was altered in the present study to encompass experiences since one has enrolled in college rather than just over the course of the past 30 days, these results are not easily comparable to other prevalence rates indicated in previous studies (Miller et al., 2019). However, in a 2002 assessment of the prevalence of blacking out, White et al. determined that 51% of college students reported having blacked out at one point in their lives (White et al., 2002). Because college social life is arguably oriented around alcohol to a greater extent than other periods of life beforehand, the lifetime rate indicated in this 2002 study may serve as a solid comparison for the rate identified in the present study.

It is possible that the prevalence rate of blacking out in the present study was higher than White et al.'s rate because of the use of the ABOM to measure blackout prevalence and frequency, which encompasses both fragmentary and en bloc blackouts. In White et al.'s study, blackouts were measured with the following question: "Have you ever awoken after a night of drinking not able to remember things that you did or places that you went?" (White et al., 2002). This sheds light on the benefit of using the ABOM to measure blacking out as it encompasses a range of blackout experiences rather than just one form, ultimately yielding a higher, more accurate rate. Alternatively, it is possible that the prevalence rate of blacking out was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. As seen through an analysis of American tweets referencing blackouts in 2019 and 2020, more alcohol-related blackout tweets were written in 2020 in comparison to 2019, suggesting that rates of blacking out could have been impacted by COVID-19 (Ward et al., 2021). It is also possible that college students black out more frequently today than they did in the early 2000s as a result of cultural shifts as a whole. Future research should

address these possibilities in an effort to determine the cause of this increase in overall prevalence of blackouts amongst college students.

Those who identified as men and women in this study did not differ significantly in reference to prevalence of blackouts. This finding is inconsistent with previous research focused on prevalence of blackouts among youth (Voloshyna et al., 2018). It is likely that the lack of gender difference in this study results from the present study's focus on college students rather than youth as a whole. Given the prevalence of alcohol use on U.S. college campuses, the rate may even out across gender identity during this period of time. Those who identified as a member of a Greek organization were significantly more likely to indicate one or more experiences of blacking out than those who did not. This is consistent with the results of the same 2018 study that identified a correlation between blackout frequency among youth (14-20) and involvement in Greek life, insinuating that Greek life membership is a risk factor for alcohol-induced blackouts (Voloshyna et al., 2018). All in all, experiencing one or more instances of alcohol-induced blacking out during one's time in college seems to be prevalent for many of the participants in this sample. While this in itself establishes an important issue, it is important to also consider the prevalence of blacking out within the context of a hookup: a previously established risk factor for CSA.

In the current study, the prevalence of hooking up was 53.7%, with no significant difference in the frequency of hooking up for those identifying as men and women. Interestingly, this rate falls slightly below the range that was identified by the authors of a 2016 study focused on different types of hookups. The prevalence rate of hooking up in college was identified by those researchers as falling somewhere between 60% and 80% (Flack et al., 2016). Definitions of "hooking up" vary across studies which may have led to this discrepancy in prevalence rates

(Bible et al., 2022). Additionally, it is possible that COVID-19 mitigations on campus, such as social distancing and limits on social gatherings, may have lessened the prevalence of hookup culture. Most students also spent the last half of the Spring 2020 semester at home because of the pandemic, although some of those living off-campus remained in town. This may have also impacted the prevalence rate of hooking up as COVID-19 has been found to reduce sexual activity (Lehmiller et al., 2021; Luetke et al., 2020). The relationship between hooking up and Greek life membership was significant, with more of those identifying as a member of a Greek organization indicating one or more instances of hooking up than those who did not identify in this way. This is consistent with previous research which has established a correlation between hooking up and Greek life settings (Paul et al., 2000). Given that fraternity parties often serve as a site for identifying hookup partners, it is logical that those who identify as members of Greek organizations, and who likely frequent these spaces, hook up more often than those who are not members (Lamont et al., 2018).

In the specific context of hookup culture, the prevalence of blacking out across the sample was 35.4%. There has been a lack of attention to the prevalence of blacking out within hookup culture as a risk factor for CSA in the previous literature. However, a study focused on hooking up from 2000 found that 6% of participants who indicated hooking up and 14% of those who indicated engaging in intercourse during a hookup in the sample reported that they "relied on their friends' stories the next day to piece together what had happened during the hookup," suggesting that the participants may have experienced a blackout (Paul et al., 2000). Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine if the blackout resulted from alcohol-use. The rate identified in the present study is much higher which may be due to an expanded understanding of

blacking out through the use of the ABOM. It is also once again possible that college students today experience more blackouts than those in the early 2000s.

Chi square analyses found a significant difference between the prevalence of blacking out in a hookup for those who identify as men and those who identify as women. As seen through the results, 28.6% of those who identified as men reported one or more incidents of blacking out in a hookup as compared to 39.8% of those who identified as women. This is an important finding because there was not a significant difference in general prevalence of blacking out for those who identify as men and women. However, more students identifying as women indicated experiences of blacking out in the context of a hookup than men, highlighting an interaction between blacking out and hooking up that may serve to exacerbate CSA within hookups.

Members of Greek life also reported more instances of blacking out in hookups than those who did not indicate membership. Greek parties serve as prominent sites for identifying hookup partners as established previously, and hookup culture and alcohol use are tightly linked (Andrejek, 2021; Wade, 2021).

While it is novel and important to establish the prevalence of blacking out and hooking up across the sample as well as blacking out within the context of hookups, it is also imperative to examine blacking out and hooking up specifically in reference to CSA. Of the 37 incidents of sexual violence reported in this study, 56.9% of the incidents involved a victim blacking out from alcohol use, with no significant differences across gender or Greek life membership. These findings are consistent with previous research that indicates that those who indicate a higher frequency of blacking out in general are more likely to report sexual assault victimization or revictimization (Valenstein-Mah et al., 2015; Voloshyna et al., 2018). Indicating that one has blacked out in an incident of sexual violence may lead the victim to blame themselves for their

drinking choices and/or may lead to a discounting of charges in court contexts (Schneider, 2020). This can lead to a failure to gain justice for the victim. Approximately half of the incidents of sexual violence indicated in this study involved a victim blacking out, emphasizing the breadth of the issue.

Intercorrelations revealed that frequency of blacking out, frequency of hooking up, and many CSA measures were significantly related to one another. Regressions further illuminated that hooking up and blacking out were both significant predictors of sexual contact victimization, attempted rape, completed rape, and total rape, with blacking out holding slightly more significance as a predictor in each CSA measure. While both blacking out and hooking up frequency are predictors on their own, alcohol-induced blackouts may be somewhat more strongly related to incidents of CSA than hookups. This is a novel finding that sheds light on the significance of alcohol-induced blackouts as a risk factor for instances of CSA. In addition to this, findings indicate that blacking out is a common occurrence within the context of hookups, especially for women. This further illuminates the nature of the relationship between hooking up and blacking out, specifically as risk factors for CSA. Overall, the results of this study are consistent with prior hypotheses through their indication of the prevalence of blacking out both in general and within the context of hookups, and the identification of a relationship between hooking up, blacking out and CSA.

Limitations

One of the primary limitations of this study is that the findings reflect responses solely from Bucknell University, a small liberal arts college on the East Coast. The student population at Bucknell is primarily white, heterosexual, and cis gender with a prominent Greek life on campus. Because of this, the results of this study may only be generalizable to universities with

similar demographics. Therefore, the findings of this study may not reflect college campuses across the United States. Additionally, the participants included in this study were self-selected. While the survey was sent out to a randomly selected group of students, the final sample included only those who chose to complete the survey. It is possible that some students may have read the consent form which indicates that participants will be asked about alcohol consumption and unwanted sexual- and gender-based experiences and chosen purposefully whether or not to participate as a result of their own personal experiences.

Along with this, while 445 students completed at least 20% of the survey, people had the opportunity to skip questions or drop out of the survey at any time. When looking at the data file, responses seem to drop off as the survey goes on. The ABOM and the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance scale, which was not utilized for the present study, was placed before the sexual violence victimization measures. It is possible that these two scales may have negatively triggered participants and caused them to choose to drop out before reaching the CSA sections in the survey. Optimal organization of scales and questionnaires should be considered when constructing future surveys to prevent this from happening. Missing data may also serve as a limitation. When cleaning the data, in instances where at least one item in a measure was addressed, missing data within the same measure was replaced with a zero in order to capture the recorded response. If this was not done, the cases indicated would be dropped by SPSS. This was a conservative analysis approach that may have caused rates to be lower than they actually are given that participants might skip questions for other reasons that would not warrant filling the item in with a zero. Someone who finds a certain question triggering might skip it because they have had the experience rather than because they have not.

Another important limitation to identify is the interconnectedness of alcohol-induced blackouts and memory. Because blackouts involve a partial or complete loss of memory, the phenomenon is difficult to research. In this study, findings rely upon self-reports of blackouts. It is possible that the data may be skewed by a lack of memory of what actually happened or blurry memories of details of a blackout or incident. Also, while intended to measure specifically alcohol-induced blackouts, it is possible that participants attributed experiences of blackouts to alcohol even though they may have occurred for other reasons. Specifically in reference to blacking out at the event-level in instances of sexual violence, it is possible that a loss of memory occurred because of the trauma of the event rather than because of alcohol use.

Implications

Further research. CSA is a prominent and complex issue that impacts many university students, their families, and friends. The interconnectedness of CSA with alcohol-induced blackouts and the ambiguity of hookups makes the issue all the more complicated. As established in the literature review, it is helpful to conceptualize CSA through the use of Bronfenbrenner's ecological model, which explores risk factors for the issue on multiple, intersecting levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Campbell et al., 2009; Walsh et al., 2021). University campuses can be understood as a student's larger community and the campus community holds its own unique cultural values that may have an effect on the risk of CSA for students. Interactions among others within the college community also influence the risk of CSA for students. Therefore, university campuses can be understood as working within and between the mesosystem, the exosystem, and the macrosystem as a risky location for CSA. Blacking out in college in the context of hookups operates as a risk factor at the individual level for students given that the present study has established blackouts as a significant predictor of CSA and

blacking out within hookup culture as a prominent occurrence, especially for those who identify as women. While blacking out is a risk factor, it is important to keep in mind that it is not a cause. A victim is never to blame for an incident of CSA, only the perpetrator.

The quantitative research conducted in this study is an important step forward in better understanding how these factors are related and what this means for victims, however, qualitative research has the potential to offer further insight into what the numbers and correlations fail to show as well as into other influential factors on the ecological model. Conducting research with a feminist lens through interviews, focus groups, or fieldwork would further illuminate the relationships identified between risk factors in the current study. Further research should also be conducted at universities of various sizes and with demographics different than Bucknell in order to determine the generalizability of the results. Additionally, the present study did not parse out fragmentary and en bloc blacking out in analyses because of the suggested scoring of the ABOM (Miller et al., 2019). Future research should attend to this as it would be beneficial to know which of the two forms are more prevalent within the context of hookups. While the current study provides novel research about the relationship among blacking out, hooking up, and CSA, a greater attendance to the specifics of this relationship is vital. It is possible that just like within the relationship among heavy episodic drinking, hooking up, and CSA, hooking up serves as a mediator for the relationship between blacking out and CSA (Testa et al., 2019). Future research should investigate this as well.

Practical implications. The findings of this study illuminate an important and complicated aspect of many incidents of CSA: a partial or complete loss of memory within hookups through alcohol-induced blackouts. Resulting from this, one can infer that the prevalence of CSA may be substantially higher than previously thought considering that

instances of CSA may be lost to blackouts. It is probable that students who experience a blackout in a hookup do not know the extent to which they engaged in sexual activity and/or whether they consented to the acts. Furthermore, given the social rule of aloofness post-hookup, it is possible that many individuals might refrain from asking their previous hookup partner what happened during the hookup (Wade, 2021). Rather than breaking the rules of hookup culture to ascertain what occurred the previous night, many students are likely to try to move on from the hookup without further investigation because they are at a loss of how to move forward in a socially acceptable way.

In addition to this, blacking out within the context of a hookup may lead to victim-blaming. Victims may blame themselves for drinking to the point of blacking out. They may feel that it is their fault for drinking so much and that whatever happened during the hookup, even if they did not consent to it, was their fault. Furthermore, alcohol-induced blackouts may keep victims from reporting incidents out of fear of not being believed. A lack of memory from alcohol use may lead one to recognize that others may discredit their claims on the basis of a blackout. Ultimately, they may choose not to come forward because of this. Additionally, if victims do choose to come forward, they may find that others, including those in court, dismiss their claims based on the fact that they experienced a blackout during the incident (Schneider, 2020).

Given these possibilities, it is vital to provide support to survivors post-assault and foster belief-oriented communities that recognize the complexity of the issue of CSA and do not victim-blame. Sexual assault is prevalent across American college campuses and specifically on Bucknell University's campus. In order to work towards alleviating this detrimental issue, communities need to become more informed about the ways in which hookup culture and

drinking to the point of blacking out serve as risk factors for CSA and have conversations about these complicated issues. The prevalence of blacking out within the context of hookups, a risk factor for CSA, needs to be acknowledged so that community support for survivors can be better informed and more effective in the future.

References

- Abbey, A., Wegner, R., Woerner, J., Pegram, S. E., & Pierce, J. (2014). Review of survey and experimental research that examines the relationship between alcohol consumption and men's sexual aggression perpetration. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 15*(4), 265-282. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1524838014521031
- Anderson, R. E., & Cuccolo, K. (2021). An experimental test of the impact of varying questionnaire response format on prevalence rates for sexual violence victimization and perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 08862605211064239. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211064239
- Anderson, R. E., Goodman, E. L., & Thimm, S. S. (2020). The assessment of forced penetration:

 A necessary and rurther step toward understanding men's sexual victimization and
 women's perpetration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *36*(4), 480–498.

 https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986220936108
- Andrejek, N. (2021). Girls' night out: The role of women-centered friendship groups in university hookup culture*. *Sociological Forum*, *36*(3), 758–775. https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12720
- Beckmeyer, J. J. (2017). Non-intercourse and intercourse hookup intentions, drinking expectancies, and college students' heavy drinking. *Substance Abuse*, *38*(3), 245–248. https://doi.org/10.1080/08897077.2016.1214212
- Bible, J., Matera, K., & van Eeden-Moorefield, B. (2022). An empirical examination of hookup definitions across the literature, 2000–2019. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-02115-4
- Boadle, A., Gierer, C., & Buzwell, S. (2021). Young women subjected to nonconsensual condom

- removal: Prevalence, risk factors, and sexual self-perceptions. *Violence Against Women*, 27(10), 1696–1715. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801220947165
- Bonar, E. E., Ngo, Q. M., Philyaw-Kotov, M. L., Walton, M. A., & Kusunoki, Y. (2021).

 Stealthing perpetration and victimization: Prevalence and correlates among emerging adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *36*(21–22), NP11577–NP11592.

 https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519888519
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 32(7), 513–531. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.32.7.513
- Bush, K., Kivlahan, D. R., McDonell, M. B., Fihn, S. D., Bradley, K. A., & for the Ambulatory

 Care Quality Improvement Project (ACQUIP). (1998). The AUDIT alcohol consumption
 questions (AUDIT-C): An effective brief screening test for problem drinking. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 158(16), 1789–1795. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.158.16.1789
- Calnan, S., & Davoren, M. P. (2021). College students' perspectives on an alcohol prevention programme and student drinking A focus group study. *Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 14550725211007078. https://doi.org/10.1177/14550725211007078
- Campbell, R., Dworkin, E., & Cabral, G. (2009). An ecological model of the impact of sexual assault on women's mental health. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 10, 225–246. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838009334456
- Cantalupo, N. C. (2014). Institution-specific victimization surveys: Addressing legal and practical disincentives to gender-based violence reporting on college campuses. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 15*(3), 227–241.
- Conley, A. H., Overstreet, C. M., Hawn, S. E., Kendler, K. S., Dick, D. M., & Amstadter, A. B. (2017). Prevalence and predictors of sexual assault among a college sample. *Journal of*

- American College Health: J of ACH, 65(1), 41–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2016.1235578
- Czechowski, K., Courtice, E. L., Samosh, J., Davies, J., & Shaughnessy, K. (2019). "That's not what was originally agreed to": Perceptions, outcomes, and legal contextualization of non-consensual condom removal in a Canadian sample. *PLOS ONE*, *14*(7), e0219297. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0219297
- Duval, A., Lanning, B. A., & Patterson, M. S. (2020). A systematic review of dating violence risk factors among undergraduate college students. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 21*(3), 567–585. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018782207
- Fielder, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2010). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual hookups among first-semester female college students. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, *36*(4), 346–359. https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2010.488118
- Flack, W. F., Daubman, K. A., Caron, M. L., Asadorian, J. A., D'Aureli, N. R., Gigliotti, S. N., Hall, A. T., Kiser, S., & Stine, E. R. (2007). Risk factors and consequences of unwanted sex among university students: Hooking up, alcohol, and stress response. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(2), 139–157. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506295354
- Flack, W. F., Hansen, B. E., Hopper, A. B., Bryant, L. A., Lang, K. W., Massa, A. A., & Whalen, J. E. (2016). Some types of hookups may be riskier than others for campus sexual assault. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 8(4), 413–420. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tra0000090
- Ford, J. V. (2017). Sexual assault on college hookups: The role of alcohol and acquaintances. *Sociological Forum*, 32(2), 381–405. https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12335
- Garcia, T. A., Litt, D. M., Davis, K. C., Norris, J., Kaysen, D., & Lewis, M. A. (2019). Growing

- up, hooking up, and drinking: A review of uncommitted sexual behavior and its association with alcohol use and related consequences among adolescents and young adults in the United States. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 1872. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01872
- Gilmore, A. K., Bountress, K. E., Selmanoff, M., & George, W. H. (2018). Reducing heavy episodic drinking, incapacitation, and alcohol-induced blackouts: Secondary outcomes of a web-based combined alcohol use and sexual assault risk reduction intervention.

 Violence Against Women, 24(11), 1299–1313.

 http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077801218787934
- Heise, L., Ellsberg, M., & Gottmoeller, M. (2002). A global overview of gender-based violence.

 *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics, 78(S1), S5–S14.

 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7292(02)00038-3
- Jaffe, A. E., Blayney, J. A., Lewis, M. A., & Kaysen, D. (2020). Prospective risk for incapacitated rape among sexual minority women: Hookups and drinking. *Journal of Sex Research*, 57(7), 922–932. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2019.1661949
- Jozkowski, K. N., & Wiersma, J. D. (2015). Does drinking alcohol prior to sexual activity influence college students' consent? *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 27(2), 156–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/19317611.2014.951505
- Jozkowski, K. N., & Wiersma-Mosley, J. D. (2017). The Greek system: How gender inequality and class privilege perpetuate rape culture. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 66(1), 89–103. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/fare.12229
- Khan, S., Greene, J., Mellins, C. A., & Hirsch, J. S. (2020). The social organization of sexual assault. *Annual Review of Criminology*, *3*(1), 139–163. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-

- criminol-011518-024456
- Khan, S., Hirsch, J., Wamboldt, A., & Mellins, C. (2018). "I didn't want to be 'that girl'": The social risks of labeling, telling, and reporting sexual assault. *Sociological Science*, *5*, 432–460. https://doi.org/10.15195/v5.a19
- Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., Ullman, S., West, C., & White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(4), 357–370. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00385.x
- Koss, M. P., Swartout, K. M., Lopez, E. C., Lamade, R. V., Anderson, E. J., Brennan, C. L., & Prentky, R. A. (2022). The scope of rape victimization and perpetration among national samples of college students across 30 years. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *37*(1–2), NP25–NP47. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211050103
- LaBrie, J. W., Hummer, J. F., Ghaidarov, T. M., Lac, A., & Kenney, S. R. (2014). Hooking up in the college context: The event-level effects of alcohol use and partner familiarity on hookup behaviors and contentment. *Journal of Sex Research*, *51*(1), 62–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2012.714010
- Lamont, E., Roach, T., & Kahn, S. (2018). Navigating campus hookup culture: LGBTQ students and college hookups. *Sociological Forum*, *33*(4), 1000–1022. https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12458
- Lehmiller, J. J., Garcia, J. R., Gesselman, A. N., & Mark, K. P. (2021). Less sex, but more sexual diversity: Changes in sexual behavior during the COVID-19 coronavirus pandemic.

 Leisure Sciences, 43(1-2), 295-304.
- Lewis, M. A., Granato, H., Blayney, J. A., Lostutter, T. W., & Kilmer, J. R. (2012). Predictors of

- hooking up sexual behaviors and emotional reactions among U.S. college students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41(5), 1219–1229. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-011-9817-2
- Lorenz, K., & Ullman, S. E. (2016). Alcohol and sexual assault victimization: Research findings and future directions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *31*, 82–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2016.08.001
- Lovejoy, M. C. (2015). Hooking up as an individualistic practice: A double-edged sword for college women. *Sexuality & Culture*, *19*(3), 464–492. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-015-9270-9
- Luetke, M., Hensel, D., Herbenick, D., & Rosenberg, M. (2020). Romantic relationship conflict due to the COVID-19 pandemic and changes in intimate and sexual behaviors in a nationally representative sample of American adults. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 46(8), 747-762.
- Marcantonio, T. L., Willis, M., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2021). Effects of typical and binge drinking on sexual consent perceptions and communication. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, $\theta(0)$, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2021.1986445
- Melkonian, A. J., & Ham, L. S. (2018). The effects of alcohol intoxication on young adult women's identification of risk for sexual assault: A systematic review. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors: Journal of the Society of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors*, 32(2), 162–172. https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000349
- Mellins, C. A., Walsh, K., Sarvet, A. L., Wall, M., Gilbert, L., Santelli, J. S., Thompson, M.,Wilson, P. A., Khan, S., Benson, S., Bah, K., Kaufman, K. A., Reardon, L., & Hirsch, J.S. (2017a). Sexual assault incidents among college undergraduates: Prevalence and

- factors associated with risk. *PLOS ONE*, *12*(11), e0186471. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186471
- Mellins, C. A., Walsh, K., Sarvet, A. L., Wall, M., Gilbert, L., Santelli, J. S., Thompson, M.,
 Wilson, P. A., Khan, S., Benson, S., Bah, K., Kaufman, K. A., Reardon, L., & Hirsch, J.
 S. (2017b). Sexual assault incidents among college undergraduates: Prevalence and factors associated with risk. *PLOS ONE*, *12*(11), e0186471.
 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186471
- Merrill, J. E., Boyle, H. K., López, G., Riordan, B. C., Marie Ward, R., Rosen, R. K., & Carey,
 K. B. (2021). Recent alcohol-induced blackouts among heavy drinking college students:
 A qualitative examination of intentions, willingness, and social context. *Experimental*and clinical psychopharmacology. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pha0000513
- Messman-Moore, T. L., Coates, A. A., Gaffey, K. J., & Johnson, C. F. (2008). Sexuality, substance use, and susceptibility to victimization: Risk for rape and sexual coercion in a prospective study of college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *23*(12), 1730–1746. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508314336
- Miller, M. B., DiBello, A. M., Merrill, J. E., & Carey, K. B. (2019). Development and initial validation of the alcohol-induced blackout measure. *Addictive Behaviors*, *99*, 106079. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2019.106079
- Muehlenhard, C. L., Peterson, Z. D., Humphreys, T. P., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2017). Evaluating the one-in-five statistic: Women's risk of sexual assault while in college. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *54*(4–5), 549–576. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1295014
- Napper, L. E., Montes, K., Kenney, S. R., & LaBrie, J. W. (2016). Assessing the personal negative impacts of hooking up experienced by college students: Gender differences and

- mental health. *Journal of Sex Research*, *53*(7), 766–775. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2015.1065951
- Neilson, E. C., Bird, E. R., Metzger, I. W., George, W. H., Norris, J., & Gilmore, A. K. (2018).

 Understanding sexual assault risk perception in college: Associations among sexual assault history, drinking to cope, and alcohol use. *Addictive Behaviors*, 78, 178–186.

 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.11.022
- Paul, E. L., McManus, B., & Hayes, A. (2000). "Hookups": Characteristics and correlates of college students' spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *Journal of Sex Research*, 37(1), 76–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490009552023
- Pham, J. M. (2017). Beyond hookup culture: Current trends in the study of college student sex and where to next. *Sociology Compass*, 11(8), e12499. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12499
- Reling, T. T., Barton, M. S., Becker, S., & Valasik, M. A. (2018). Rape myths and hookup culture: An exploratory study of U.S. college students' perceptions. *Sex Roles*, 78(7), 501–514. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0813-4
- Smith, S. G., Zhang, X., Basile, K. C., Merrick, M. T., Wang, J., Kresnow, M. J., & Chen, J. (2018). The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey: 2015 data brief—updated release. https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/60893
 Swartout, K. M., Flack, W. F., Cook, S. L., Olson, L. N., Smith, P. H., & White, J. W. (2019). Measuring campus sexual misconduct and its context: The Administrator-

- Researcher Campus Climate Consortium (ARC3) survey. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, *11*(5), 495–504. https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000395
- Testa, M., & Cleveland, M. J. (2017). Does alcohol contribute to college men's sexual assault perpetration? Between-and within-person effects over five semesters. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 78(1), 5–13. https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2017.78.5
- Testa, M., & Livingston, J. A. (2009). Alcohol consumption and women's vulnerability to sexual victimization: Can reducing women's drinking prevent ape? *Substance Use & Misuse*, 44(9–10), 1349–1376. https://doi.org/10.1080/10826080902961468
- Testa, M., Livingston, J. A., & Wang, W. (2019). Dangerous liaisons: The role of hookups and heavy episodic drinking in college sexual victimization. *Violence and Victims*, *34*(3), 492–507. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-18-00075
- Thorpe, S., Tanner, A. E., Kugler, K. C., Chambers, B. D., Ma, A., Jenkins Hall, W., ... & Wyrick, D. L. (2019). First-year college students' alcohol and hookup behaviours: Sexual scripting and implications for sexual health promotion. *Culture, health & sexuality*, 23(1), 68-84. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2019.1688868
- Tyler, K. A., Schmitz, R. M., & Adams, S. A. (2017). Alcohol expectancy, drinking behavior, and sexual victimization among female and male college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(15), 2298–2322. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515591280
- UNHCR. (2020). UNHCR policy on the prevention of, risk mitigation and response to gender-based violence. UNHCR. https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/publications/brochures/5fa018914/unhcr-policy-prevention-risk-mitigation-response-gender-based-violence.html
- Valenstein-Mah, H., Larimer, M., Zoellner, L., & Kaysen, D. (2015). Blackout drinking predicts

- sexual revictimization in a college sample of binge-drinking women: Blackout drinking predicts revictimization. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *28*(5), 484–488. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.22042
- Voloshyna, D. M., Bonar, E. E., Cunningham, R. M., Ilgen, M. A., Blow, F. C., & Walton, M. A. (2018). Blackouts among male and female youth seeking emergency department care.
 The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 44(1), 129–139.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/00952990.2016.1265975
- Wade, L. (2021). Doing casual sex: A sexual fields approach to the emotional force of hookup culture. *Social Problems*, 68(1), 185–201. https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spz054
- Walsh, K., Sarvet, A. L., Khan, S., Choo, T.-H., Wall, M., Santelli, J., Wilson, P., Gilbert, L., Reardon, L., Hirsch, J. S., & Mellins, C. A. (2021). Socio-ecologically constituted types of sexual assault. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 45(1), 8–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684320964452
- Ward, R. M., Riordan, B. C., Merrill, J. E., & Raubenheimer, J. (2021). Describing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on alcohol-induced blackout tweets. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 40(2), 192–195. https://doi.org/10.1111/dar.13186
- Wetherill, R. R., & Fromme, K. (2016). Alcohol-induced blackouts: A review of recent clinical research with practical implications and recommendations for future studies. *Alcoholism:* Clinical and Experimental Research, 40(5), 922–935. https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.13051
- White, A. M., Jamieson-Drake, D. W., & Swartzwelder, H. S. (2002). Prevalence and correlates of alcohol-induced blackouts among college students: Results of an e-mail survey.

 Journal of American College Health: J of ACH, 51(3), 117–119, 122–131.

 https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480209596339

- Wilhite, E. R., Mallard, T., & Fromme, K. (2018). A longitudinal event-level investigation of alcohol intoxication, alcohol-related blackouts, childhood sexual abuse, and sexual victimization among college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors : Journal of the Society of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors*, 32(3), 289–300. https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000353
- Winkeljohn Black, S., Kaminsky, G., Hudson, A., Owen, J., & Fincham, F. (2019). A short-term longitudinal investigation of hookups and holistic outcomes among college students.

 *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 48(6), 1829–1845. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1330-4
- World Health Organization. (2019). Violence against women: intimate partner and sexual violence against women: evidence brief (No. WHO/RHR/19.16). World Health Organization.
- World Health Organization. (2021). Violence against women prevalence estimates, 2018: global, regional and national prevalence estimates for intimate partner violence against women and global and regional prevalence estimates for non-partner sexual violence against women.
- Zinzow, H. M., & Thompson, M. (2011). Barriers to reporting sexual victimization: prevalence and correlates among undergraduate women. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 20(7), 711–725. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2011.613447

Appendix A

Table 1Demographic Characteristics of Sample

Demographics	All Participants	
	n	%
Gender		
Men	149	33.5
Women	283	63.6
Trans/Gender Non-	16	3.6
Conforming/Gender		
Questioning		
Sexual Orientation		
Heterosexual	353	79.3
Homosexual	12	2.7
Pan/Bisexual	60	13.5
Queer	17	3.8
Asexual Spectrum	11	2.5
I'm not sure	9	2.0
Class Year		
First Year	145	32.6
Sophomore	118	26.5

Junior	82	18.4
Senior	99	22.2
Race		
White	362	81.3
Black/African	33	7.4
Asian/Asian-American	52	11.7
Latinx	27	6.1
Race not listed	10	2.2
Involvement		
Greek Life	130	29.2
Athletics	105	23.6
Parental Income		
< \$50,000	45	10.1
< \$100,000	60	13.5
< \$150,000	70	15.7
< \$200,000	47	10.6
< \$250,000	46	10.3
> \$250,000	118	26.5

Appendix B

Bucknell Campus Climate Survey '21-22

Start of Block: Consent Form

Q172 Consent Form

Project title: Social Behavior and Related Factors Survey 2021-2022

Purpose of the research: The purpose of this survey study is to obtain information from students about campus climate and related social behaviors at Bucknell. The study is being conducted by Professor Bill Flack (Department of Psychology) and his Bucknell student research team. It is not being conducted by Bucknell University for institutional purposes.

General plan of the research: You are being asked for your consent to participate in a survey in which you will be asked about your and your peers' social behaviors and attitudes, including alcohol consumption, unwanted sexual- and gender-based experiences, and current social issues. Your answers to all survey questions will be completely anonymous. Any information from the survey reported publicly in professional conference papers or publications will describe groups, not individuals.

Estimated duration of the research: We expect the survey to take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete.

Estimated total number of participants: We expect to collect survey data from approximately 600 Bucknell students.

Questions? If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, you can contact the Principal Investigator, Professor Bill Flack, wflack@bucknell.edu, 570-577-1131, Department of Psychology. For general questions about the rights of human participants in research, you can contact Professor Matthew Slater, Chair of the Institutional Review Board at Bucknell, matthew.slater@bucknell.edu, 570-577-2767. In addition, a debriefing follows this survey regardless of whether or not you choose to submit your results.

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

Benefits of participation: You may benefit from knowing that your participation could help to expand our understanding of student social behavior. If you choose, you can enter your email at the end of the survey to be entered into a lottery for a chance at winning one of ten \$50 Amazon gift cards.

Anonymity: Your answers to all of the survey questions will be completely anonymous, meaning that there is no way that your answers can be connected to your identity. You will not be asked to reveal any information that could be used to identify you as a participant in this study. All of the information that you provide will be stored in a secure datafile, and that datafile will be accessed only by Professor Flack and student members of his research team.

Discomforts: Some of the survey questions could cause you some temporary, unpleasant emotional reactions.

Risks: Aside from the risk of discomfort, there are no other known risks from participating in this research. In the event that you become uncomfortable or upset, and feel the need to speak with a professional counselor, you may contact the Counseling & Student Development Center at 570-577-1604.

Q1 Consent

I am over 18 years old and I consent to take this survey after reading all of the terms above.

End of Block: Consent Form

Start of Block: Introduction

Q202 Every student at Bucknell has a right to an education free from discrimination and the opportunity to fully benefit from the school's programs and activities. Sexual violence, sexual harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence can interfere with a student's academic performance and emotional and physical well-being. Preventing and remedying sexual misconduct at Bucknell is essential to ensuring a safe environment in which students can learn.

You have been randomly selected to give important information to the faculty-student research team conducting this study at Bucknell about your experiences while you have been a student at the university. The overall goal of the survey is to provide the researchers with important information on campus sexual misconduct prevalence and responses.

Your voice is extremely important, and we want you to feel comfortable in answering these questions freely and honestly. Your confidentiality is a priority, and whatever information you share on this survey cannot be identified: we cannot access your IP address or link your survey to your name or student ID. If you include your email at the end of the survey to enter the lottery for a chance of winning a \$50 Amazon gift card, we will remove your email from the rest of the information you've provided in this survey.

Thank you so much for your time, and we look forward to better understanding your experiences

at Bucknell.

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Survey Description

Q219 Please remember, in answering these questions, we want to know about your experiences since you enrolled at Bucknell. These experiences could occur on or off campus, when school is in session or when you are on a break.

Throughout the survey:

Faculty refers to the academic or teaching staff at Bucknell.

Staff refers to those who are employed by the institution for any jobs other than teaching (e.g. public safety, residential and teaching assistants, food service staff, student affairs staff, etc.)

Student refers to those who are studying at Bucknell and are actively enrolled in an undergraduate or graduate program.

End of Block: Survey Description

Start of Block: Demographics

Demo inst

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

Age How old are you?
○ 18
O 19
O 20
○ 21
O 22+
Sex What was your assigned sex at birth?
○ Male
○ Female
○ Intersex
O Do not know/I'm not sure
$X \rightarrow$

Gender In reg	gards to gender, how do you describe yourself? Please check all that apply.
	Man
	Woman
	Trans
	Non-binary/Genderqueer/Gender Nonconforming/Gender-Fluid
	An identity not listed
	I'm not sure

Sexual Orienta all that apply.	ation In regards to sexual orientation, how do you describe yourself? Please check
	Gay/Lesbian/Homosexual
	Pansexual
	Bisexual
	Asexual Spectrum
	Heterosexual/Straight
	Queer
	An identity not listed
	I'm not sure
Sexual Activity all that apply.	In regards to gender, who do you seek sexual experiences with? Please check
	Men
	Women
	Non-Binary/Genderqueer/Gender Nonconforming/Gender-Fluid
	None
	I'm not sure

Page Break ——

Race Describ	e your race/ethnicity. Please check all that apply.
	Black/African
	American White/Caucasian
	Asian or Asian American
	Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
	Native American or Alaskan Native
	Hispanic or Latino/a
	A race not listed here:
X→	
Inter_St Are y	ou an international student?
O Yes	
○ No	
Q203 Are you college/univer	a first-generation college student (i.e., first in your family to attend rsity)?
O Yes	
○ No	

X
Year What is your class year?
O 2022
○ 2023
O 2024
O 2025
Other
Demo_time1 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#

Page Break —

Q204 Which college are you enrolled in?			
O Arts & S	O Arts & Sciences		
O Engine	ering		
O Manage	ement		
<i>X</i> →			
	e you've been a student at Bucknell University, have you been a member or any of the following? Please check all that apply.		
	Honor society or professional group related to your major, field of study		
	Fraternity or sorority (pledge or member)		
	Intercollegiate athletic team		
	Intramural or club athletic team		
	Political or social action group		
	Student government		
	Media organization (e.g., newspaper, radio, magazine)		
	Other student organization or group:		

Housing Which of the following best describes your living situation at Bucknell?
On-campus residence hall/dormitory
Other on campus housing (apartment, house)
Fraternity or sorority house
Off-campus university-sponsored apartment/house
Off-campus housing non-university sponsored
O At home with parent(s) or guardian(s)
Other off campus
Demo_time2 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#

Q220 What is your parent's/caregivers' approximate total annual income?
○ \$0-\$49,999
○ \$50,000-\$99,999
\$100,00-\$149,999
\$150,000-\$199,999
\$200,000-\$249,999
\$250,000-\$299,999
\$300,000-\$499,999
○ \$500,000+
○ N/A
End of Block: Demographics
Start of Block: Module 1 - Possible Outcomes
$X \rightarrow X \rightarrow$
x→ x→ Satis1 I would recommend attending Bucknell University to others.
Satis1 I would recommend attending Bucknell University to others. O Strongly Disagree
O Strongly Disagree
Strongly DisagreeDisagree
Strongly DisagreeDisagreeNeutral

Satis2 If I had to	do it over again, I	would still atte	nd Bucknell.						
Strongly	Disagree								
ODisagree	•								
O Neutral									
O Agree									
Strongly	O Strongly Agree								
at Bucknell? Rei	many times have y								
see them.	Almost Never				Almost Always				
Missed class	0	\circ	\circ	\circ	0				
Made excuses to get out of class	0	\circ	0	\circ	0				
Been late for class	0	0	0	\circ	\circ				
Done poor work	0	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ				
Attended class intoxicated or "high"	0	0	\circ	0	\circ				
Slept in class	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ				
Thought about dropping a class	0	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ				

Thought about quitting school

PO_time1 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, Timing #QuestionText, Timing	•		
Page Break ———			



LifeSatis Below are five statements that you may agree or disagree with. Using the scale below, indicate your agreement with each item. Please be open and honest in your responding.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
In most ways, my life is close to ideal.	0	0	0	0	0
The conditions of my life are excellent.	0	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
I am satisfied with life.	0	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.	0	0	0	0	0
If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.	0	0	0	0	0



MentalHlth How much of the time during the past 4 weeks have you...

	All of the time	Most of the time	A good bit of the time	Some of the time	A little of the time	None of the time
Felt calm and peaceful?	0	0	0	0	0	0
Been a very nervous person?	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
Felt so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer you up?	0	0	0	0	0	0
Felt down- hearted and blue?	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
Been a happy person?	0	0	0	0	0	0
$X \rightarrow X \rightarrow$						
GenWell I wou	ıld rate my he	ealth overall as	S:			
OPoor						
○ Fair						
O Averag	е					
O Above	Average					
O Excelle	ent					



GenSafe I feel safe on campus at Bucknell.
Strongly Disagree
Obisagree
O Neutral
Agree
Strongly Agree
PO_time2 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#
End of Block: Module 1 - Possible Outcomes
Start of Block: AUDIT-C
OftDrink1 How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?
Never (I don't drink any alcohol at all)
O Monthly or less
2-4 times a month
2-3 times a week
O 4 or more times a week
Page Break ————————————————————————————————————



TypicalDay How many standard drinks containing alcohol do you have on a typical day? A standard drink is defined as a 12 oz. beer; 5 oz. glass of wine; or 1.5 oz. shot of hard liquor either straight or in a mixed drink.
O (none)
○ 1 or 2
○ 3 to 4
○ 5 to 6
○ 7 to 9
O 10 or more
$X \rightarrow X \rightarrow$
Binge How often do you have six or more drinks on one occasion?
O Daily or almost daily
○ Weekly
O Monthly
C Less than monthly
○ Never
Alc_time Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#

End of Block: AUDIT-C

Start of Block: ABOM

Q223 Since you have been enrolled at Bucknell, as a result of alcohol use and/or co-use with other drugs, how often have you:

	Never	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Often
Had fuzzy memories of events that occurred while you were drinking?	0	0	0	0
Had memories that became clear only when someone/something gave you cues or reminded you later?	0	0	0	0
Been unable to remember what happened the night before?	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
Not been able to remember large stretches of time while drinking heavily?	0	0	0	0
Suddenly found yourself in a place you don't remember getting to?	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ

Start of Block: Hooking Up Self-Report Scale

End of Block: ABOM

Q226 Definition of "hooking up": some type of physically intimate/sexual activity with another person without expressed or acknowledged expectations of commitment to a further relationship.

Q224
How often do you hook up with someone?
O Never
O About once/semester
O About once/month
O About once/week
O More than once/week
Q228 In general, how often do you think most students at Bucknell hook up?
O Never
O About once/semester
O About once/month
O About once/week
O More than once/week
Q260 How has COVID-19 impacted the frequency of your hookups?
less frequent
more frequent
about the same frequency

Q263 How has	COVID-19 impacted the monogamy of your hookups?
O less mo	nogamous
O more m	onogamous
O about th	ne same degree of monogamy
Q229 If you havall that apply)	ve hooked up with someone, what did you perceive their genders to be? (check
	Man
	Woman
	Trans
	Non-binary/Genderqueer/Gender Nonconforming/Gender-Fluid
	I don't know
Q230 If you have STD prevention	ve hooked up with someone, how often have you used birth control that includes n?
O Never	
O Sometir	mes
O Usually	
O Always	
Page Break -	

Q231 How many standard drinks of	do you have before a typical hoo	kup?
O none (0)		
O 1 or 2		
○ 3 or 4		
○ 5 or 6		
O 7 to 9		
O 10 or more		
Q235 Since you enrolled at Buckn have you ever: Had fuzzy memories of events	ell, as a result of alcohol use an	d/or co-use with other drugs,
that occurred while you were hooking up?	0	\circ
Had memories of a hookup that became clear only when someone/something gave you cues or reminded you later?	\circ	
became clear only when someone/something gave you	0	0
became clear only when someone/something gave you cues or reminded you later? Been unable to remember what happened during a hookup the	0	
became clear only when someone/something gave you cues or reminded you later? Been unable to remember what happened during a hookup the night before? Not been able to remember large		

Q232 Since you enrolled at Bucknell, as a result of alcohol use and/or co-use with other drugs, how often have you:

	Never	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Often
Had fuzzy memories of events that occurred while you were hooking up?	0	0	0	0
Had memories of a hookup that became clear only when someone/something gave you cues or reminded you later?	0	0	0	0
Been unable to remember what happened during a hookup the night before?	0	0	0	0
Not been able to remember large stretches of time of a hookup?	0	0	0	0
Suddenly found yourself hooking up in a place you don't remember getting to?	0	0	0	0

Page Break ——

Q237 Indicate which of the following actions you have engaged in during hookups with each of the following types of partners while at Bucknell (check all that apply).

A **stranger** is defined as someone you'd never met before hooking up with them.

An **acquaintance** is someone you know but would not consider a friend.

A **friend** is someone with whom you have a relationship that is not romantic or exclusive.

A **romantic partner** is someone with whom you have an exclusive, monogamous relationship.

	Stranger	Acquaintance	Friend	Previous romantic partner
Cuddling				
Kissing				
Touching				
Oral sex				
Vaginal sex				
Anal sex				

	of the following have happened during your hookups? (check all that apply)
	Companionship
	Physical Intimacy
	Sleeping over/staying the night
	Emotional Intimacy
	Sex
	Orgasm
	of the following have you wanted, <u>but did not happen</u> , during or following your eck all that apply)
1 1	
	Companionship
	Companionship
	Companionship Physical Intimacy
	Companionship Physical Intimacy Sleeping over/staying the night

Q241 Has one or more of your hookups resulted in an ongoing relationship after the hookup?
○ Yes
○ No
Q242 Has anyone ever pressured you to hook up with someone else?
○ Yes
○ No
Q243 Have you ever experienced unwanted sexual acts during a hookup?
○ Yes
○ No
Q264 Have you ever felt pressured to engage in unwanted sexual acts during a hookup?
○ Yes
○ No
Q244 Have you ever experienced sexual acts without your consent during a hookup?
○ Yes
○ No
End of Block: Hooking Up Self-Report Scale

PCC_instr <u>Sexual Misconduct</u> refers to physical contact or other non-physical conduct of a sexual nature in the absence of clear, knowing and voluntary consent. Examples include sexual or gender-based harassment, stalking, dating violence, and sexual violence.



InstResp The following statements describe how Bucknell might handle it if a student reported an incident of sexual misconduct. Using the scale provided, please indicate the likelihood of each statement.

	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely	Very Likely
The institution would take the report seriously.	0	0	0	0	0
The institution would maintain the privacy of the person making the report.	0	0	0	0	0
The institution would do its best to honor the request of the person about how to go forward with the case.	0	0		0	0
The institution would take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report.	0	0	0	0	0
The institution would support the person making the report.	0	0	0	0	0
The institution would provide accommodations to support the person (e.g., academic, housing, safety).	0	0	0	0	0
The institution would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct.	0	0	0	0	0
The response to this item will be "Neutral" to indicate attention.	0	0	0	\circ	0

0
0
0

ndicate attention."
Please be careful in providing answers to these questions.
Page Break

Attend1 On the previous page, you did not provide a correct response to an item meant to ensure you were paying attention. The item was: "The response to this item will be "Neutral" to



KnowRes Using the scale provided, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
If a friend or I experienced sexual misconduct, I know where to go to get help on campus.	0	0	0	0	0
I understand what happens when a student reports a claim of sexual misconduct at Bucknell	0	0	0	0	0
I would know where to go to make a report of sexual misconduct.	0	0		0	0
X→ X→ INFO_EDU1 Be not come from B				formation or ed	ducation (that did
YesNo					



INFO_EDU2 Sall that apply.	Since you came to Bucknell, which of the following have you done? Please check
	Discussed sexual misconduct/rape in class
	Discussed the topic of sexual misconduct with friends
	Discussed sexual misconduct with a family member
sexual mis	Attended an event or program about what you can do as a bystander to stop sconduct
assault	Attended a rally or other campus event about sexual misconduct or sexual
defining se	Seen posters about sexual misconduct (e.g., raising awareness, preventing rape, exual misconduct)
	Seen or heard campus administrators or staff address sexual misconduct
	Seen crime alerts about sexual misconduct
	Read a report about sexual violence rates at \${e://Field/INSTITUTION}
misconduc	Visited a \${e://Field/INSTITUTION} website with information on sexual ct
	Volunteered or interned at an organization that addresses sexual misconduct
	Seen or heard about sexual misconduct in a student publication or media outlet
	Taken a class to learn more about sexual misconduct

CC_time2 Timing	
irst Click	
ast Click	
QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit#	
QuestionText, TimingClickCount#	
Page Break ————————————————————————————————————	



INFO_EDU3 Since coming to Bucknell, have you received written (e.g., brochures, emails) or verbal information (e.g., presentations, training) from anyone at Bucknell about the following? Please check all that apply.

The definitions of types of sexual misconduct
How to report an incident of sexual misconduct
Where to go to get help if someone you know experiences sexual misconduct
Title IX protections against sexual misconduct
How to help prevent sexual misconduct
Student code of conduct or honor code

INFO_EDU4 Please use the following scale to indicate how aware you are of the function of the campus and community resources specifically related to sexual misconduct response at Bucknell listed below.

	Not at all aware	Slightly aware	Somewhat aware	Very aware	Extremely aware
Title IX Coordinator	\circ	0	0	\circ	0
Interpersonal Violence Prevention Coordinator	0	0	0	\circ	0
Student Counseling Center	0	0	\circ	0	\circ
Dean of Students	0	\circ	0	\circ	\circ
SpeakUp Peers	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
Public Safety	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
Transitions of PA	\circ	\circ	\circ	0	\circ
Local/State Police	0	\circ	\circ	0	\circ
District Attorney	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
Bucknell Faculty/Staff	\circ	0	\circ	\circ	\circ

PCC_time3 Timing
First Click
Last Click
#QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit#
#QuestionText, TimingClickCount#

Q205 Are you aware that if you tell a Bucknell faculty or staff member that you've been sexually violated, that faculty or staff member is required to inform the Title IX Coordinator by giving them your name? This is called mandatory reporting.
○ Yes
○ No
Q206 Do you think that mandatory reporting makes it more or less likely that students would tell faculty or staff members that they've been sexually violated?
O More likely
O Less likely
O Neither more nor less likely
End of Block: Module 4 - Perceptions of Campus Climate Regarding Sexual Misconduct
Start of Block: uIRMA 2011

Q247 Using the scale below, please indicate how much you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree (0)	1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree (5)
If a girl is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.	0	0	0	0	0	0
When girls go to parties wearing slutty clothes, they are asking for trouble.	0	0	\circ	\circ	0	0
If a girl goes to a room alone with a guy at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped.	0	0	0	0	0	0
If a girl acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble.	0	0	0	\circ	0	0
When girls are raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was unclear.	0	0	0	0	0	0
If a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a guy assumes she wants to have sex.	0	0	0	0	0	0
When guys rape, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex.	0	0	\circ	\circ	0	0

Guys don't usually intend to force sex on a girl, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape happens when a guy's sex drive gets out of control.	0	0	0	0	0	0
If a guy is drunk, he might rape someone unintentionally.	0	0	0	0	0	0
It shouldn't be considered rape if a guy is drunk and didn't realize what he was doing.	0	0	0	0	0	0
If both people are drunk, it can't be rape.	0	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ	0
If a girl doesn't physically resist sex— even if protesting verbally—it can't be considered rape.	0	0	0	0	0	0
If a girl doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was rape.	0	0	0	0	0	0
A rape probably didn't happen if the girl has no bruises or marks.	0	0	0	0	0	0

0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	\circ
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0

End of Block: uIRMA 2011

Start of Block: Module 5 - Sexual Harassment by Faculty/Staff



SHFacStaff Since you enrolled at Bucknell, have you been in a situation in which a faculty member, instructor or staff member:

	Never (0)	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Often	Many Times
Treated you "differently" because of your sex?	0	0	0	0	0
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials?	0	0	0	0	0
Made offensive sexist remarks?	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex?	0	0	\circ	0	0
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?	0	0	0	0	0
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters?	0	0	0	0	0
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?	0	0	0	0	0
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you?	0	0	0	0	0

Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?	0	0	0		0
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No"?	0	0	0	0	0
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?	0	0	0	0	0
Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you?	0	0	0	0	0
Made you feel like you were being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual behavior?	0	0	0	0	0
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative?	0	0	0	0	0
Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?	0	0	0	0	\circ
Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative?	0	0	0	\circ	\circ

FSH_time1 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#
End of Block: Module 5 - Sexual Harassment by Faculty/Staff
Start of Block: Module 5 - Sexual Harassment by Faculty/Staff Follow Up Questions
FSH_instr Think about the situations that happened to you that involved the behaviors you marked on the last screen. Now think about the ONE SITUATION that had the greatest effect on you and answer the following questions.
$X \rightarrow X \rightarrow$
FSH_situat The situation involved (check all that apply):
Sexist or sexually offensive language, gestures or pictures
Unwanted sexual attention
Unwanted touching
Subtle or explicit bribes or threats
X→

FSH_gender Please describe the gender of the person(s) who committed the behavior.
○ Man
○ Woman
Other
χ_{\rightarrow}
FSH_Status Please describe the status of the person(s) who committed the behavior.
O Faculty member
○ Staff member
Graduate student instructor
Other
$X \rightarrow X \rightarrow$
FSH_Campus Did this happen on campus?
○ Yes
○ No

Q255 When did this happen?
O Spring 2021
O Fall 2021 - before fall break
O Fall 2021 - after fall break
O Spring 2022
O Another time not listed
$X \rightarrow X \rightarrow$ FSH_React Please tell us how you reacted to the situation (check all that apply).
I ignored the person and did nothing.
I avoided the person as much as possible.
I treated it like a joke.
I told the person to stop.
I reported the person.
I asked someone for advice and/or support.
FSH_time2 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#
End of Block: Module 5 - Sexual Harassment by Faculty/Staff Follow Up Questions

Start of Block: Module 6 - Sexual Harassment by Students



StuSH Since you enrolled at Bucknell, have you been in a situation in which a student:

	Never (0)	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Often	Many Times
Treated you "differently" because of your sex?	0	0	0	0	0
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials?	0	0	0	0	0
Made offensive sexist remarks?	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex?	0	0	0	0	0
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?	0	0	0	0	0
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters?	0	0	0	0	0
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?	0	0	0	0	0
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you?	0	0	0	0	0

Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?	0	0	0	0	0
A choice that indicates attention for this item would be, "Never."	0	0	0	\circ	0
Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, jokes or pictures by text, email, Facebook or other electronic means?	0	0	0	0	0
Spread unwelcome sexual rumors about you by text, email, Facebook or other electronic means?	0	0	0	0	0
Called you gay or lesbian in a negative way by text, email, Facebook or other electronic means?	0	0	0	0	0

SH_time1 Timing
st Click
st Click
uestionText, TimingPageSubmit#
uestionText, TimingClickCount#
ige Break

Attend 4 On the previous page, you did not provide a correct response to an item meant to ensure you were paying attention. The item was: A choice that indicates attention for this item would be, "Never". Please be careful in providing answers to these questions. **End of Block: Module 6 - Sexual Harassment by Students** Start of Block: Module 6 - Sexual Harassment by Students Follow Up Questions SSH inst Think about the situations that happened to you that involved the behaviors you marked in the last set of questions. Now think about the ONE SITUATION that had the greatest effect on you and answer the following questions. SSH inv The situation involved (check all that apply): Sexist or sexually offensive language, gestures or pictures Unwanted sexual attention Unwanted touching Subtle or explicit bribes or threats SSH gender Please describe the gender of the person(s) who committed the behavior. O Man ○ Woman

$X \rightarrow X \rightarrow$
SSH_stat1 Was the other person an undergraduate student at Bucknell?
○ Yes
○ No
O Don't know
$X \rightarrow X \rightarrow$
SSH_stat2 Was the other person a graduate or professional student at Bucknell?
○ Yes
○ No
O Don't know
X
SSH_campus Did this happen on campus?
○ Yes
○ No

Q256 When did this happen?
O Spring 2021
O Fall 2021 - before fall break
O Fall 2021 - after fall break
O Spring 2022
Another time not listed
SSH_react Please tell us how you reacted to the situation (check all that apply).
I ignored the person and did nothing.
I avoided the person as much as possible.
I treated it like a joke.
I told the person to stop.
I reported the person.
I asked someone for advice and/or support.
SSH_time2 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#
End of Block: Module 6 - Sexual Harassment by Students Follow Up Questions

Start of Block: Module 7 - Stalking Victimization



StalkVict How many times have one or more people done the following things to you since you enrolled at Bucknell?

	None (0)	1-2	3-5	5-8	More than 8
Watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS [global positioning system]?	0	0	0	0	0
Approached you or showed up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you didn't want them to be there?	0		0	0	0
Left strange or potentially threatening items for you to find?	0	0	0	0	0
Sneaked into your home or car and did things to scare you by letting you know they had been there?	0	0	0	0	0
Left you unwanted messages (including text or voice messages)?	0	0	0	0	0
Made unwanted phone calls to you (including hang up calls)?	0	\circ	0	0	0

Sent you unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through social media apps?	0		0	0	0
Left you cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew you didn't want them to?	0	0	0	0	0
Made rude or mean comments to you online?	0	0	0	0	0
Spread rumors about you online, whether they were true or not?	0	0		\circ	0
#QuestionText,	ng TimingPageSubm TimingClickCount odule 7 - Stalking	#			
Start of Block: N	Module 7 - Stalkin	g Victimization	Follow Up Ques	tions	
marked on the la	about the situation ast screen. Now the the following ques	nink about the O	-		

χ→

StkIV_gend Please describe the gender of the person(s) who committed the behavior.
○ Man
○ Woman
Other
$X \rightarrow$
StlkV_rela What was your relationship to the other person?
○ Stranger
O Acquaintance
O Friend
O Romantic Partner
O Former Romantic Partner
O Relative/Family
○ Faculty/Staff
$X \rightarrow$
StlkV_camp Did this happen on campus?
○ Yes
○ No

Q257 When did this happen?
O Spring 2021
O Fall 2021 - before fall break
O Fall 2021 - after fall break
O Spring 2022
O Another time not listed
X÷
StlkV_stud Was the other person a student at Bucknell?
○ Yes
○ No
O Don't know
X→
StlkV_alc1 Had the other person been using alcohol or drugs just prior to the incident?
O They had been using alcohol
O They had been using drugs
They had been using both alcohol or drugs
They had not been using either alcohol or drugs
○ I don't know

StlkV_alc2 Had you been using alcohol or drugs just prior to the incident?
O I had been using alcohol
O I had been using drugs
O I had been using both alcohol or drugs
O I had not been using either alcohol or drugs
StlkVtime2 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#
End of Block: Module 7 - Stalking Victimization Follow Up Questions

Start of Block: Module 9 - Dating Violence Victimization



DV_V Answer the next questions about any hookup, significant other, spouse, or partner you have had, including exes, regardless of the length of the relationship since you enrolled at Bucknell.

Bucknell.	Never (0)	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Often	Many Times
Not including horseplay or joking around, the person threatened to hurt me and I thought I might really get hurt.	(e)	0	0	0	0
Not including horseplay or joking around, the person pushed, grabbed, or shook me.	0	0	0	0	0
Not including horseplay or joking around, the person hit me.	0	0	0	0	0
Not including horseplay or joking around, the person beat me up.	0	\circ	0	0	0
Not including horseplay or joking around, the person stole or destroyed my property.	0	0	0	0	0
Not including horseplay or joking around, the person can scare me without laying a hand on me.	0	0	0	0	0

DV_V_time Timing First Click
Last Click
#QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit#
#QuestionText, TimingClickCount#
End of Block: Module 9 - Dating Violence Victimization
Start of Block: Module 9 - Dating Violence Victimization Follow Up Questions
DV_V_inst Think about the situations that have happened to you that involved the experiences you marked on the last screen. Now think about the ONE SITUATION that had the greatest effect on you and answer the following questions.
X+
DV_V_gen Please describe the gender of the person(s) who committed the behavior.
○ Man
○ Woman
Other
$X \rightarrow X \rightarrow$
DV_V_rel What was your relationship to the other person?
○ Stranger
O Acquaintance
○ Friend
O Romantic Partner
O Former Romantic Partner
○ Faculty/Staff

$X \rightarrow$
DV_V_stu Was this person a student at Bucknell?
○ Yes
○ No
O Don't know
X÷
DV_V_Camp Did this happen on campus?
○ Yes
○ No
Q259 When did this happen?
O Spring 2021
O Fall 2021 - before fall break
O Fall 2021 - after fall break
O Spring 2022
O Another time not listed

DV_V_alc1 Had the other person been using alcohol or drugs just prior to the incident?
They had been using alcohol
They had been using drugs
They had been using both alcohol and drugs
They had not been using either alcohol or drugs
O I don't know
<i>X</i> →
DV_V_alc2 Had you been using alcohol or drugs just prior to the incident?
○ I had been using alcohol
○ I had been using drugs
I had been using both alcohol and drugs
I had not been using either alcohol or drugs

Q245 As a result of alcohol use and/or co-use with other drugs	, did yo	ou
--	----------	----

	Yes	No
Have fuzzy memories of the incident?	0	0
Have memories of the incident that became clear only when someone/something gave you cues or reminded you later?	0	0
Find yourself unable to remember what happened during the incident?		\circ
Find yourself unable to remember large stretches of time of the incident?	0	0
Suddenly find yourself in this situation without remembering how you got there?	0	0
,		

DV_V_time2 Timing
First Click
Last Click
#QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit#
#QuestionText, TimingClickCount#

End of Block: Module 9 - Dating Violence Victimization Follow Up Questions

Start of Block: Module 11 - Sexual Violence Victimization

SV_V-inst The following questions concern sexual experiences that you may have had that were unwanted. We know that these are personal questions, so we did 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. Fill the bubble 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 lies and had sex with you when you were drunk, you should indicate both. We want to know about your experiences since you enrolled at Bucknell. These experiences could occur on or off campus, when school is in session or when you are on a break.

Page Break ————



SV_V_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:

	0 times	1 time	2-5 times	6-9 times	10+ times
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.					
Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.	0	0			
Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	0	0	0	0	0
Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.	0	0	0	0	0
Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.	0	0	0	0	

SV_V_time1	Timing									
First Click										
Last Click										
#QuestionTe	-	-								
#QuestionTe	xt, Timing	gClickCo	ount#							
Page Break										



SV_V_2 Someone had oral sex with me or made me perform oral sex on them without my consent by:

conscrit by.					
	0 times	1 time	2-5 times	6-9 times	10+ times
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.	0	0	0		
Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.		0	0		
Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	0	0	0	0	0
Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.	0	0	0	\circ	0
Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.		0			

SV_V_time2 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#								
Attempted SES-S	SFV Even thoug 0 times	jh it didn't happ 1 time	en someone TRI 2-5 times	ED to MAKE ME 6-9 times	≣: 10+ times			
Put their penis into my butt, or someone tried to MAKE ME stick in objects or fingers without my consent	0	0	0	0	0			
Put their penis into my vagina, or someone tried to MAKE ME stick in objects or fingers without my consent (Skip if you do not have a vagina)		0		0				

Completed SES-SFV Skip the following items if you do not have a penis:

	0 times	1 time	2-5 times	6-9 times	10+ times
Someone MADE ME put my penis into their vagina, or MADE ME insert my fingers or objects into their vagina without my consent	0	0	0	0	0
Someone MADE ME put my penis into their butt, or someone MADE ME insert my fingers or objects into their butt without my consent	0				
Page Break —					

Page Break -



SV_V_3

Skip the following items if you do not have a vagina:

Someone put their penis, fingers, or other objects into my vagina without my consent by:

	0 times	1 time	2-5 times	6-9 times	10+ times
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.	0	0			0
Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.	0	0			
Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	0	0	0	0	0
Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.	0	0	0	0	0
Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.	0	0			

SV_V_tin First Click Last Click #Questio #Questio	< nText, T	imingPa	•			
Page Bre	 ak —			 	 	



SV_V_4 Someone put their penis, fingers, or other objects into my butt without my consent by:

	0 times	1 time	2-5 times	6-9 times	10+ times
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.				O	O O
Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.	0	0	0	0	
Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	0	0	0	0	
Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.	0	\circ	0	\circ	0
Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.	0	0	0	0	

Ĭ	0 times	rtner, during (o	2-5 times	6-9 times	10+ times
Removed the condom without your consent?	0	0	0	0	0
Removed the condom without your knowledge?	0	0	0	0	0
SV_V_time4 Tim First Click Last Click #QuestionText, 1					



SV_V_5 Even though it didn't happen, someone TRIED to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with me without my consent by:

ma managa my a	0 times	1 time	2-5 times	6-9 times	10+ times
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.					0
Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.	0	0		0	0
Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.	0	0	0	0	0
Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.	0	0	0	0	0
Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.	0	0	0	0	0

SV_V_time5 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#
End of Block: Module 11 - Sexual Violence Victimization
Start of Block: Module 11 - Sexual Violence Victimization Follow Up Questions (Rape)
V_SR_R1 On the last several pages of the survey, you reported that someone had oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent, either multiple times or using multiple strategies since you enrolled at Bucknell.
All of the experiences were with the same person.
O These experiences were with more than one person. (If you choose this, please enter the number of people in the box below.)
X÷
V_SR_R2 On how many different days did someone have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent since you enrolled at Bucknell?
▼ 1 9 or more
End of Block: Module 11 - Sexual Violence Victimization Follow Up Questions (Rape)
Start of Block: Module 11 - Sexual Violence Victimization Follow Up Questions (Both)

V_SR_B1 On the last several pages of the survey, you reported that since you enrolled at Bucknell someone had oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent.

Λ	n	d
н	11	()

Even though it didn't happen, that someone TRIED TO have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent.
All of the experiences were with the same person.
These experiences were with more than one person. (If you choose this, please enter the number of people in the box below.)
X÷
V_SR_B2 On how many different days did someone either try to or have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent since you enrolled at Bucknell?
▼ 1 9 or more
End of Block: Module 11 - Sexual Violence Victimization Follow Up Questions (Both)
Start of Block: Module 11 - Sexual Violence Victimization Follow Up Questions
SV_V_inst2 Think about the situations that have happened to you that involved the experiences you marked on the last several screens. Now think about the ONE SITUATION that had the greatest effect on you and answer the following questions.
$X \rightarrow$
SV_V_gend The other person was a:
○ Man
○ Woman
Other

SV_V_rel What was your relationship to the other person?
○ Stranger
O Acquaintance
○ Friend
O Romantic Partner
O Former Romantic Partner
O Relative/Family
○ Faculty/Staff
X÷
SV_V_stu Was this person a student at Bucknell?
○ Yes
○ No
O Don't know
χ_{\rightarrow}
SV_V_camp Did this happen on campus?
○ Yes
○ No

Q258 When did this happen?
O Spring 2021
○ Fall 2021 - before fall break
○ Fall 2021 - after fall break
O Spring 2022
O Another time not listed
X \rightarrow
SV_V_alc1 Had the other person been using alcohol or drugs just prior to the incident?
They had been using alcohol
They had been using drugs
They had been using both alcohol and drugs
They had not been using either alcohol or drugs
O I don't know
X \rightarrow
SV_V_alc2 Had you been using alcohol or drugs just prior to the incident?
I had been using alcohol
O I had been using drugs
I had been using both alcohol and drugs
I had not been using either alcohol or drugs

Q246 As a result of alcohol use and/or co-use with other	drugs, di	d you:
--	-----------	--------

			Yes	1		
Have fuzzy memories of the incident? Have memories of the incident that became clear only when someone/something gave you cues or reminded you later?		OO			0	
ind yourself unable to remember what happened during the incident?					\circ	
d yourself una large stretches incid			0		\bigcirc	
Suddenly find y ituation withou how you g	ıt remembering		0		\circ	
<i>X</i> →						
X→ _V_feel Durin	ng the incident, to	o what extent d	id you feel: Somewhat	Very	Extremely	
X→ _V_feel Durin Scared	_		-	Very	Extremely	
	_		-	Very	Extremely	

SV_V_time6 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#
End of Block: Module 11 - Sexual Violence Victimization Follow Up Questions
Start of Block: Module 13 - Institutional Responses C
Tell_1 Did you tell anyone about the incident before this questionnaire?
○ Yes
○ No

Tell_2 Who did you tell (check all that apply)? Roommate Close friend other than roommate Romantic partner Parent or guardian Other family member Doctor/nurse Religious leader Off-campus rape crisis center Off-campus counselor/therapist **Local Police** Campus security or police department Institution health services On-campus counselor/therapist Resident advisor or Residence Life staff Office of student conduct Institution faculty or staff

IR_C_time1 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#
X→
Useful_1 How useful was the on-campus counselor/therapist in helping you deal with the incident?
O Very useful
Moderately useful
○ Somewhat useful
○ Slightly useful
O Not at all useful
Useful_2 How useful were the instituion health services in helping you deal with the incident?
O Very useful
O Moderately useful
○ Somewhat useful
○ Slightly useful
O Not at all useful

Useful_3 How useful was the campus security or police department in helping you deal with the incident?
O Very useful
O Moderately useful
○ Somewhat useful
○ Slightly useful
O Not at all useful
X÷
Useful_4 How useful was the Office of Student Conduct in helping you deal with the incident?
O Very useful
O Moderately useful
○ Somewhat useful
○ Slightly useful
O Not at all useful
X→

Useful_5 How useful was the Resident Advisor or Residence Life Staff in helping you deal with the incident?
O Very useful
O Moderately useful
○ Somewhat useful
○ Slightly useful
O Not at all useful
χ_{\Rightarrow}
Useful_6 How useful was the University faculty or staff in helping you deal with the incident?
O Very useful
O Moderately useful
○ Somewhat useful
○ Slightly useful
O Not at all useful
IR_C_time2 Timing First Click Last Click #QuestionText, TimingPageSubmit# #QuestionText, TimingClickCount#
End of Block: Module 13 - Institutional Responses C
Start of Block: BRPO-R

participate in this study. Your responses will be used to help us understand more about what it is like to be a research participant.
Q209 From the list below, please rank the top three reasons why you decided to participate by
dragging them to the top (1 = most important, 2 = second most important, 3 = third most
important).
I was curious
To help others
To help myself
I don't know
Thought it might improve my access to health care
Felt I had to
I didn't want to say no
Other (please explain)

Q210 The following questions deal with your reactions to participating in this study. Please click on the option that best describes your response.

	Strongly disagree (No)	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree (Yes)
I gained something positive from participating	0	0	0	0	0
Knowing what I know now, I would participate in this study if given the opportunity.	0	0		0	
The research raised emotional issues for me that I had not expected.	0	0	0	0	0
I gained insight about my experiences through research participation.	0	0	0	0	0
The research made me think about things I didn't want to think about.	0	0	0	0	0
I found the questions too personal.	0	0	0	\circ	0
I found participating in this study personally meaningful.	0	0	0	0	0
I believe this study's results will be useful to others.	0	0	0	0	0
I trust that my replies will be kept private.	0	0	0	0	0

I experienced intense emotions during the research session and/or parts of the study.	0				0
I think this research is for a good cause.	0	0	0	0	0
I was treated with respect and dignity.	0	0	0	0	0
I found participating beneficial to me.	0	0	0	0	0
I was glad to be asked to participate.	0	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
I like the idea that I contributed to science.	0	0	0	0	\circ
I was emotional during the research session.	0	0	0	0	0
I felt I could stop participating at any time.	0	0	0	0	\circ
I found participating boring.	0	\circ	0	\circ	\circ
The study procedures took too long.	0	\circ	0	\circ	\circ
Participating in this study was inconvenient for me.	0	0	0	0	0
Participation was a choice I freely made.	0	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ

Had I known in advance what participating would be like I still would have agreed to participate.	0	0		0	0
I understood the consent form.	0	\circ	\circ	\circ	\circ
Page Break —					

Q265 If there is any additional information you would like to provide about Bucknell's climate related to sexual misconduct, please use the box below. Like the rest of your responses to this survey, any information you provide is anonymous and will only be reported grouped with all other comments. The information you provide will be used to inform and improve support, policies, and practices at Bucknell and will not be used to investigate specific individuals. Disclosing an incident here does not constitute reporting the incident to Bucknell and will not result in any action, disciplinary or otherwise. Please do not identify anyone by name in your survey responses. If you identify anyone by name, the names will be removed before we analyze the data.

End of Block: RRPQ-R
Start of Block: Debriefing
Q218 If you wish to be entered into the lottery for the possibility of winning one of the \$50 Amazon gift cards, please type your email address here:
Q254 If you would be willing to participate in an interview or focus group regarding the previous topics, please type your email address here:
Q217 You have now completed this survey. Thank you very much!

We encourage you to read the following information:

We want to express our sincere appreciation for your help with this research. This project is aimed at furthering our understanding of campus climate issues related to gender-based violence, including experiences of sexual- and gender-based harassment and sexual misconduct. We know that questions about these matters can be difficult to consider, and we thank you for your willingness to do this. We also want to remind you that your answers to all of the questions will be kept anonymous, and that you will never be identified as someone who participated in this research. All public reports of the project will be based on group statistics,

never on information given by a single individual.

We are conducting this research in the hope that the information will be useful here at Bucknell, and on many other college campuses, in eventually eliminating harassment and other sexual-and gender-based misconduct.

Please note that this research is an example of faculty-student collaboration. It is not being conducted by Bucknell University for institutional purposes.

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

Heldman, C., Ackerman, A.R., & Breckenridge-Jackson, I. (2018). The new campus anti-rape movement: Internet activism and social justice. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

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 the Counseling & Student Development Center at 570-577-1604. Many college students find speaking with a professional counselor helpful.

Again, thank you very much for the information you have provided, and for your help with our research.

End of Block: Debriefing

Appendix C

Table 2

Correlations Between Hooking Up Frequency, Blackout Frequency, and CSA

	Hooking Up	ABOM	Sexual	Attempted	Completed	Total
	Frequency		Contact	Rape	Rape	Rape
Hooking Up Frequency	_					
ABOM	.396*	_				
Sexual Contact	.293*	.376*	_			
Attempted Rape	.228*	.289*	.514*	_		
Completed Rape	.268*	.300*	.555*	.643*	_	
Total Rape	.287*	.369*	.575*	.896*	.800*	

^{*}denotes statistical significance, p < 0.001