

# **Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Misconduct**

Center for the Study of Student Life

2016 Results



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	2
Introduction .....	3
Methodology .....	3
Survey Instrument .....	3
Terminology.....	3
Survey Procedures.....	4
Sample and Incentives .....	4
Response Rates.....	5
Weighting Procedure .....	5
Demographics .....	6
Considerations of Climate Surveys.....	6
Results.....	7
Campus Climate around Sexual Misconduct .....	8
Perceptions of Responses to a Report.....	8
Bystander Intervention .....	9
Perceptions of Prevalence and Perceptions of Personal Risk .....	9
Resources Related to Sexual Misconduct .....	10
Frequency and Nature of Victimization by Physical Force or Incapacitation.....	11
Frequency and Nature of Victimization due to Coercion or Absence of Affirmative Consent..	14
Sexual Assault by Any Tactic.....	15
Frequency and Nature of Sexual Harassment, Intimate Partner Violence and Stalking .....	16
Sexual Harassment.....	16
Intimate Partner Violence.....	18
Stalking.....	19
References .....	21
Appendix A: Consent and Recruitment.....	22
Appendix B: Resource List.....	26
Appendix C: Survey Instrument.....	30
In Separate Document.....	30
Appendix D: Data Tables .....	30
In Separate Document.....	30

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of the 2016 Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Misconduct at The Ohio State University. The goal of the survey is to provide data to guide action on Ohio State's campus around the issue of sexual misconduct and relationship violence. The survey is one part of Ohio State's comprehensive plan to combat sexual misconduct and relationship violence through Buckeyes ACT (Action, Counseling, Training). The overall response rate was 21.1%; 62,291 students were invited to take the survey and 13,152 responded.

### Perceptions of Response to Reporting

- 67% of respondents report that it is very or extremely likely that a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct would be taken seriously by officials; 10.7% report that it is not at all or a little likely to be taken seriously
- 61.8% report that it is very or extremely likely that the safety of those reporting incidents of sexual assault or sexual misconduct would be protected by university officials

### Perceptions of Prevalence and Personal Risk

- 22.1% report that sexual assault or sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic at Ohio State; 37.1% report it is not at all or a little problematic; 40.1% report it is somewhat problematic
- 78.4% report that it is not at all or a little likely that they will experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus; 6.4% report that it is very or extremely likely

### Prevalence of Sexual Assault

- Percentage of respondents who reported being victims of nonconsensual sexual intercourse (penetration/oral sex) or sexual touching by physical force, threats of physical force, or incapacitation since enrolling at Ohio State:

<i>Undergraduate</i>	<i>Graduate/Professional</i>
-Female – 20.6%	-Female – 8.7%
-Male – 5.5%	-Male – 3.6%
-TGQN <sup>1</sup> – 24.3%	-TGQN – data not available <sup>2</sup>
- Percentage of respondents who reported being victims of nonconsensual sexual intercourse involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolling at Ohio State:

<i>Undergraduate</i>	<i>Graduate/Professional</i>
-Female – 13.7%	-Female - 5.6%
-Male – 3.1%	-Male – 2.8%
-TGQN – 20.8%	-TGQN – data not available <sup>2</sup>

### Prevalence of Sexual Harassment, Stalking and Intimate Partner Violence

- Respondents were asked if they experienced one of five different sexual harassment behaviors perpetrated by someone in the university community. The least frequently reported harassment behavior was someone sending offensive remarks, videos, pictures, etc. electronically (7.7%) and the most frequently reported behavior was someone making inappropriate or offensive comments about them or someone else (39.3%)
- 14.1% report experiencing intimate partner violence since enrolling at Ohio State
- 3.9% report being the victim of stalking since enrolling at Ohio State

<sup>1</sup> Transgender man, transgender woman, Genderqueer, Gender non-conforming, questioning or not listed

<sup>2</sup> Data not available due to small sample sizes

## INTRODUCTION

This report presents results of the 2016 Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Misconduct at The Ohio State University. The survey was designed to assess three main areas of concern: 1) the prevalence of nonconsensual misconduct and relationship violence, 2) student views of the climate surrounding sexual misconduct on campus and 3) students' knowledge and evaluation of resources for responding to sexual misconduct and relationship violence. The goal of the survey is to provide data to guide action on Ohio State's campus around the issue of sexual misconduct and relationship violence. The survey is one part of Ohio State's comprehensive plan to combat sexual misconduct and relationship violence through Buckeyes ACT (Action, Counseling, Training). For more information on Buckeyes ACT, please visit [www.osu.edu/buckeyesact](http://www.osu.edu/buckeyesact).

## METHODOLOGY

### SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The 2016 survey instrument was adapted from a survey developed in 2015 by the Association of American Universities (AAU), which was administered to Ohio State students in 2015 by Westat, a social science research firm. The AAU survey design team included a multi-disciplinary group of experts on issues of sexual assault, gender, health and student affairs (AAU, 2015). For more details on the development of the AAU survey instrument, please see the 2015 campus climate report for Ohio State (Cantor, Fisher, Chibell, Bruce, Townsend, Thomas & Lee, 2015a). The AAU survey is in the public domain (AAU 2015). The Buckeyes ACT committee, comprised of faculty, staff and students, reviewed the AAU survey and revised the survey to better tailor it to the context of Ohio State students and campuses.

The survey instrument includes ten sections, measuring the following: 1) student demographic and academic backgrounds, 2) perceptions of risk, 3) knowledge of campus resources, 4) experiences of sexual harassment, 5) stalking, 6) intimate partner violence, for those reporting they had been in a partnered relationship since enrolling in the university, 7) sexual assault, including nonconsensual sexual intercourse and/or touching, 8) perceptions of institutional responses to reporting, 9) bystander behavior and 10) debriefing questions about the survey instrument. To see the full survey instrument, see Appendix C.

### TERMINOLOGY

The Campus Climate Survey was developed and administered by AAU in 2015 and in order to allow for direct comparability over time, much of the same language used by AAU was kept in the 2016 survey. Due to this, there may be differences in the language used throughout this report and the language used in Ohio State's Sexual Misconduct Policy.

Ohio State's Sexual Misconduct Policy clearly defines sexual misconduct as:

“Conduct of a sexual nature or conduct based on sex or gender that is nonconsensual or has the effect of threatening, intimidating or coercing a person. Includes sexual harassment, sexual violence, relationship violence and stalking. “

Throughout this report, **sexual misconduct** is used to refer to conduct of a sexual nature of conduct based on sex or gender that is nonconsensual or has the effect of threatening, intimidating or coercing a person. **Sexual assault** refers to specific incidents of nonconsensual sexual intercourse, including penetration or oral sex, and nonconsensual sexual touching. Within Ohio State's Sexual Misconduct policy, sexual assault is included within the definition of sexual misconduct.

In this report, **sexual touching** is defined as including kissing, groping or touching someone's breast, chest, crotch, groin or buttocks in a sexual way, even if the touching is over clothing. Please note that Ohio State's Sexual Misconduct policy includes similar types of behavior within the definition of sexual contact, but the term sexual touching is used in this report for comparability with last year's AAU survey.

In the survey and this report, the term **intimate partner violence** is used to describe violence or threats of violence in partnered relationships, including casual relationships, steady/serious relationships, and marriage, domestic partnerships, civil unions and/or cohabitation. Though Ohio State's sexual misconduct policy refers to relationship violence, the term intimate partner violence is used in this report for comparability with last year's AAU survey. For more information on Ohio State's Sexual Misconduct policy, please visit <https://hr.osu.edu/public/documents/policy/policy115.pdf>

For more information on definitions related to Ohio State's Sexual Misconduct policy, please visit: <https://hr.osu.edu/public/documents/policy/resources/115faq-general.pdf>

## **SURVEY PROCEDURES**

The survey was administered by the Center for the Study of Student Life in the Office of Student Life after review and approval by Ohio State's Institutional Review Board. Students who participated in the survey were asked to consent to participation. The consent form outlined that survey participation was voluntary, responses would be kept confidential, students' rights, risks and benefits of participation and who to contact with questions or concerns. Only students aged 18 or over could consent to participate in the survey. The consent form is in Appendix A.

Students were sent email invitations requesting their participation in the survey by Dr. Javaune Adams-Gaston, Senior Vice President of Student Life (email invitations are in Appendix A) and provided with a custom link to the survey via Qualtrics survey software. Custom invitation links ensured that students could only take the survey one time, but no individually identifying information was connected to the custom link to ensure that students' responses were anonymous. Email invitations were sent to students on March 23, 2016, and the survey closed on April 26, 2016. Email reminders to take the survey were sent on March 29, April 4, April 13 and April 19.

On each page of the survey, students were provided a link to a list of community and Ohio State support resources available to them related to sexual misconduct. These support resources were customized for each campus, including information on how to report an incident to the police and the university (see Appendix B).

## **SAMPLE AND INCENTIVES**

All students who were 18 years of age or older (on the date of the survey administration) and who were enrolled in a class at Ohio State during the spring 2016 semester were invited to participate in the survey. To encourage participation in the survey, participants were eligible to win the following Amazon gift cards: 10-\$500, 75-\$100, and 500-\$25 gift cards. To be entered to win the drawing for a gift card, students could opt-in to the drawing at the end of the climate survey. Those who opted into the drawing were routed to a separate survey, where they provided their name and contact information. This was done so that students' identifying information could not be connected to their responses on the climate survey. Students were not required to complete the survey in order to opt-in to the drawing.

## RESPONSE RATES

The overall response rate was 21.1%; 62,291 students were invited to take the survey and 13,152 responded. Any student who answered at least one question on the survey past the initial questions on students' demographic background was included in the analysis. This criterion were used in order to honor as many student responses as possible. The majority of students who started the survey completed the survey (88%). The median amount of time it took to complete the survey was 13 minutes.

## WEIGHTING PROCEDURE

The responses were weighted to address differences between the demographic characteristics of survey respondents compared to those of the student population. A base weight of 1 was assigned to each student because the survey was sent to the entire student population. The base weight was adjusted to reflect non-response. A raking procedure adjusted the base weight to the demographic data available on the sampling frame using gender, race/ethnicity, campus, academic rank and age so the sum of adjusted weights of the survey respondents for a subgroup is equal to the frame total for that subgroup (see table below for a description of the variables used in the raking procedure). The raking procedure is based on the method used by Westat for the 2015 Campus Climate survey (for more details, see Cantor et al., 2015a).

Replication-based variance estimation techniques were used to create a set of weights, adjusting the sampling weights to reproduce the full-sample totals (Wolter, 1985). Students were assigned to one of 60 random groups to serve as primary sampling units (PSU) with 219 or 220 members in each group. Sixty jackknife replicate weights (unstratified delete-one jackknife) were created. One PSU was deleted while the weights of those in the remaining PSUs were adjusted (Winter, n.d.).

To create the weights, complete data were required for variables in the sampling frame. Missing values for these demographic variables were imputed using a series of single variable imputations with appropriate regression models. An option to relax the assumption of multivariate normality on the distribution of regression coefficients was used (Royston, n.d.). Only three variables, campus (for 3 cases), gender (for 137 cases) and academic rank (for 253 cases) included missing data and were imputed to create the weights. Imputed data were not used in further analyses.

The sampling frame was sourced from Ohio State's Student Information System for all students who were invited to take the survey, and the following variables were used in the raking procedure:

### Variables Used in Raking Procedure

Variable	Description	Variable Value
Gender	Three-category gender variable. The frame data only had three categories (male, female, unknown), while the survey instrument had 8 response options. To make the frame and the survey data compatible, transgender males were coded as male, transgender females were coded as female, students who selected "prefer not to state" were coded as unknown, and other categories missing gender were imputed for the purposes of weighting, not reporting.	1: Male 2: Female 3: Unknown

Age Group	Student's age was grouped into four categories, 18-20, 21-23, 24-26, and 27+.	1: 18-20 2: 21-23 3: 24-26 4: 27+
Academic Rank	This is a combined variable of student affiliation (Undergraduate/Graduate/ Professional/Visiting and/or Other) and year of study or year in program. Visiting and other includes students who were not enrolled in a formal program or degree plan.	1: Undergraduate first year (1 <sup>st</sup> year) 2: Undergraduate sophomore (2 <sup>nd</sup> year) 3: Undergraduate junior (3 <sup>rd</sup> year) 4: Undergraduate senior (4 <sup>th</sup> year or more) 5: Graduate 6: Professional 7: Visiting and/or other
Race/ Ethnicity	This variable has 9 categories. Survey response options from the ethnicity (Hispanic or Latinx) and race variables were combined to reflect how race/ethnicity is reported in the Student Information System for the purpose of weighting, but not reporting.	1: American Indian or Alaskan Native 2: Asian 3: African American 4: Hispanic 5: Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander 6: Non-resident alien 7: None or race unknown 8: Two or more races 9: White
Campus	The six campuses of The Ohio State University were used.	1: ATI/OARDC 2: Columbus 3: Lima 4: Newark 5: Mansfield 6: Marion

## DEMOGRAPHICS

Table A presents the weighted and unweighted distributions of respondents who completed the survey. Among the unweighted respondents, 57.1% identified as female, 41.3% identified as male and 1.6% identified as transgender, genderqueer or nonconforming, questioning or not listed (TGQN). Female students were overrepresented amongst respondents. The weighted data corrects for this over-representation by “counting” female responses less and male responses more. In the weighted data, females represented 49.6% of respondents, males were 49.3% and TGQN students were 1.1%. This more accurately represents the population of invited students, who, according to data from the Student Information System (which does not include a category of TGQN), 49.8% of the population was female, 50.1% was male and 0.1% had an unknown gender. Using the survey weights, 78.4% of the respondents were undergraduates, 90.6% attended the Columbus campus, 10.6% identified with a sexual orientation other than heterosexual, 5.5% identified ethnically as Hispanic or Latino (hereafter referred to as Latinx) and 72% identified racially as white.

## CONSIDERATIONS OF CLIMATE SURVEYS

Campus climate surveys can provide valuable information about perceptions, knowledge, attitudes and incidences of sexual misconduct on campus, but there are both strengths and limitations to the approach used nationally by campus climate surveys. Strengths



include that data are collected via an anonymous survey to allow for students to provide honest opinions on the climate on sexual misconduct on campus. Incidence rates provide insights into the extent of the problem of sexual misconduct. Data can and will be used to tailor education, prevention and response efforts on campus.

The response rate for the study was 21.1%, which is similar to the 2015 administration response rate of 18.1% and similar to other student surveys conducted at Ohio State. As noted by the 2015 AAU survey, the response rate is only one indicator of data quality (Groves & Petycheva, 2008; Cantor et al. 2015b). Another important consideration is non-response bias. Non-response bias may result in estimates that overstate the actual prevalence of sexual misconduct if individuals who have not experienced these types of incidents are less likely to participate in the survey. Similarly, it is possible that victims may be less likely to respond, resulting in estimates being too low. Results of the prior 2015 survey suggest that it is possible that responders tended to be more likely to report victimization, therefore, estimates related to victimization and attitudes items may be biased upward, but evidence suggested that the bias was not large (Cantor et al., 2015b).

### Comparisons over Time

If surveys are administered over time, changes in perceptions, knowledge and incidence rates can be detected. This is the second year that Ohio State has conducted a campus climate survey; however, changes from one year to the next, especially in incident rates, should be interpreted with caution. Apparent year to year differences in perceptions and incidences could reflect natural fluctuations in incidences or variations in the characteristics of students who took the survey from one year to the next. To determine changes or trends over time, or to measure the impact of campus-wide interventions, longitudinal data should be examined over the course of many years.

## RESULTS

The results are organized around five key issues:

1. The campus climate around sexual misconduct
2. Students' knowledge and assessment of resources related to sexual misconduct
3. The prevalence and nature of sexual assault involving physical force or incapacitation
4. The prevalence and nature of sexual assault involving coercion or in the absence of affirmative consent
5. The prevalence and nature of sexual harassment, intimate partner violence and stalking

The remainder of this report is organized around these five areas. The majority of results are examined by gender and enrollment status. Students were asked to identify their gender and provided response options of female, male, transgender female, transgender male, genderqueer or nonconforming gender, questioning and prefer not to answer. Results are summarized for students identifying as a) female, b) male and c) transgender, genderqueer or nonconforming, questioning or not listed (TGQN). Collapsing groups into TGQN maintains an adequate sample to generate estimates.

When interpreting the tables, please note the following:

- An "s" indicates that the cell was suppressed because there were not enough responses to report. This was done to maintain participant confidentiality.
- A "--" indicates there were no responses for that cell.
- If comparisons are discussed as "significantly different" in the report, those differences were statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Significance tests were conducted using chi-



square test of independence.

- Both frequencies and percentages reported are weighted using analytic weights.
- Not every table is discussed in the results section.

## **CAMPUS CLIMATE AROUND SEXUAL MISCONDUCT**

To assess the campus climate around sexual misconduct, three concepts are examined: 1) students' perceptions of the likelihood of response to a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct by Ohio State and other students, 2) bystander intervention, and 3) students' perceptions of their personal risk of victimization.

### **Perceptions of Responses to a Report**

Students were asked to provide their perceptions of what would happen if someone were to report an incident of sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus (Table 1.1). Respondents were asked how likely it is students would support the person making the report. Overall, 56.4% of respondents indicated it would be very or extremely likely that other students would support the person making report. Among undergraduate students, 50.7% of females, 63.1% of males and 39.1% of TGQN students indicated it would be very or extremely likely for a student to support the person making the report. Among graduate and professional students, 51.9% of females, 58.7% of males and 58.7% of TGQN students indicated it would be very or extremely likely for another student to support the person making the report.

Students were asked how likely it would be for the alleged offender(s) or their associates to retaliate against the person making the report. Overall, 31.6% of respondents believed retaliation would be very or extremely likely. Among undergraduates, 38.9% of females, 26.3% of males and 48.1% of TGQN students believe retaliation would be very or extremely likely. The corresponding percentages for graduate and professional students are 30.1% of females, 22.2% of males and 33.0% of TGQN students.

When asked if campus officials would take a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct seriously, the majority of students believed this would be very or extremely likely (67%). Male students were the most likely to believe campus officials were very or extremely likely to take the report seriously (74.9% of undergraduates and 71% of graduate and professionals), followed by female students (59.3% of undergraduates and 63.4% of graduate and professionals). Students who identified as TGQN were less likely to believe campus officials were very or extremely likely to take the report seriously (49% of undergraduates and 51.4% of graduate and professionals).

Students were asked whether they believed campus officials would protect the safety and the privacy of the person making the report. Overall, 61.8% of respondents believed it would be very or extremely likely for officials to protect the safety of the student and 67.6% believed it would be very or extremely likely for officials to protect the privacy of the student. For questions of both privacy and safety, higher percentages of male respondents believed officials would protect students, followed by female students and TGQN students.

When asked how likely it was that campus officials would conduct a fair investigation, 53.8% of students stated it would be very or extremely likely. Students identified as TGQN were less likely to believe it would be very or extremely likely that campus officials would conduct a fair investigation. Sixteen percent of undergraduate TGQN students and 33.2% of TGQN graduate and professional students believed that a fair investigation would be very or extremely likely, compared to between 51.9% and 56.4% of undergraduate or graduate/professional male and females students.

When asked if campus officials would take action against the alleged offender(s), 51.9% of respondents report it would be very or extremely likely that officials would take action. Among undergraduate students, 42.4% of females, 61.9% of males and 27.5% of TGQN students reported it would be very or extremely likely that campus officials would take action. Among graduate and professional students, 45.1% of females, 57.5% of males and 38.4% of TGQN students reported it would be very or extremely likely for campus officials to take action against the alleged offender(s).

When asked if campus officials would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual assault or misconduct, 47.4% of respondents reported that this would be very or extremely likely. Students identifying as TGQN were the least likely to believe campus officials would take action (35.3% of undergraduates and 36.1% of graduate and professional students), followed by female students (44.4% of undergraduates and 42.3% of graduate and professional students), with male students being the most likely to believe campus officials would take action to address the factors that may have led to the sexual assault or misconduct (50.9% of undergraduates and 49.9% of graduate and professional students).

### **Bystander Intervention**

Students were asked a series of questions about whether they had been in situations where they suspected or saw sexual misconduct or sexual assault occurring since enrolling as a student at Ohio State and, if so, whether and how they intervened (Table 1.2). Overall, 17.5% of respondents reported that they suspected a friend had been sexually assaulted. Among those who had this suspicion, 56% reported they spoke to their friend or someone else to seek help and 9.3% took action in another way. Almost 12% reported that they did nothing because they were not sure what to do, while 22.7% did nothing for another reason.

Overall, 42.3% of respondents reported they had “seen a drunk person heading off for what looked like a sexual encounter.” Among students who reported seeing this, 10.9% directly intervened to stop it, 6% spoke to a friend or someone else to seek help and 8.1% took action in another way. However, 75% of respondents reported that they did nothing; 27.2% reported they did nothing because they weren’t sure what to do, while 47.8% did nothing for another reason.

Students were asked if they had seen or heard someone acting in a sexually violent or harassing way; 19% of respondents report witnessing this behavior. Among respondents reporting witnessing the behavior, almost 23% reported that they directly intervened to stop the behavior, 16% spoke to a friend or someone else to seek help and 12.9% took action in another way. Almost half of respondents reported doing nothing; 23.8% did nothing because they were not sure what to do and 24.4% did nothing for another reason.

If a student responded that they did nothing for “another reason” despite suspecting a friend of being sexually assaulted, seeing a drunk person “heading off for what looked like a sexual encounter,” or seeing or hearing someone acting in a sexually violent or harassing way, additional questions were asked about their reasons for doing nothing. Overall, 32.4% of these respondents said they did nothing because they did not think it was their business, 11.6% reported that they did not feel safe intervening, and 1.5% said they thought someone else would do something. Less than 1% of respondents (0.2%) said they did nothing because they thought their friend(s) would make fun of them.

### **Perceptions of Prevalence and Perceptions of Personal Risk**

Students were asked a series of questions about their perceptions of how problematic sexual assault or sexual misconduct are at Ohio State and their perceived risk of being a victim of sexual assault or sexual misconduct (Table 1.3). Overall, 22.1% of respondents stated that

sexual assault or sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic at Ohio State, while 37.1% stated it was not at all or a little problematic. Undergraduates identifying as TGQN were the most likely to report that sexual assault or sexual misconduct was very or extremely problematic (43.4%), followed by female undergraduates (29.2%) and female graduate or professional students (20.6%). Male students were less likely to believe that sexual assault and sexual misconduct was very or extremely problematic (16.4% of undergraduates and 15.1% of graduate and professional students).

When asked to estimate their personal likelihood of experiencing sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus, 6.4% of all respondents reported it was very or extremely likely, while 78.4% reported it was not at all or a little likely. Higher percentages of female respondents reported it was very or extremely likely that they would experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct than male students (12.4% of female undergraduates v. 1.4% of male undergraduates and 4.8% of female graduate/professionals v. 2.1% of male graduate/professionals). Undergraduate students identifying as TGQN were the most likely to report it was very or extremely likely that they would experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus (28%).

Students were also asked the likelihood that they would experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct in other contexts, such as during off-campus university-sponsored events or off-campus events not sponsored by the university. Overall, 5.2% of respondents believed it was very or extremely likely that they would experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct during off-campus university sponsored events, compared to 77.7% of respondents who reported it was not at all or a little likely. In comparison, 14% of respondents believed it was very or extremely likely that they would become a victim of sexual assault or misconduct during off-campus, non-university sponsored events (62.5% stated this was not at all or a little likely).

When asked about the likelihood that other students at Ohio State would intervene if they witnessed someone being a victim of sexual assault or sexual misconduct, 30.5% of respondents reported it would be very or extremely likely, 38.9% reported it would be somewhat likely, and 30.6% reported it would be not at all or a little likely that an Ohio State student would intervene.

## **RESOURCES RELATED TO SEXUAL MISCONDUCT**

Students were asked a series of questions regarding their awareness of services and resources offered by Ohio State for those affected by sexual assault and sexual misconduct. First, students were asked about their awareness of specific programs or services available on their campus. Due to variations in the services available and the names used to refer to these services, students on each campus were provided with a customized list of programs. Second, students were asked about their knowledge of policies and perceptions of resources related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct.

The programs and services with the greatest awareness among students included Ohio State Newark's Counseling Services (84.7%; Table 2.1), Ohio State University Police/The Office of Public Safety (82.8%; on all campuses), Ohio State Marion's Office of Counseling and Wellness (76.8%), Ohio State Newark's Office of Student Life (74.6%), and the Office of Student Life's Counseling and Consultation Service (72.8%; available on Columbus and Lima campuses). The programs with the lowest awareness included Sexual Violence Support Coordinators (15%) and the Title IX Coordinator (16%).

When asked to estimate their knowledge of how sexual assault and sexual misconduct are defined at Ohio State, 24.6% of respondents selected very knowledgeable, 55.4% selected somewhat knowledgeable and 20% selected not at all knowledgeable (Table 2.2). Overall, 27.5% of respondents report that they were very knowledgeable about where to get help at Ohio State if they were a victim of sexual assault or sexual misconduct, while 21.8% report they were not at all knowledgeable.

When asked to estimate their knowledge about where to make a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct, 23.9% of respondents report that they were very knowledgeable, 44.1% were somewhat knowledgeable and 32% were not at all knowledgeable. Undergraduate students identifying at TGQN report the highest proportion of being knowledgeable about where to make a report (35%) while TGQN graduate and professional students have the lowest proportion of being very knowledgeable (12.5%). Female undergraduate students were the most likely to state they are not at all knowledgeable about where to make a report (38%), compared to 27.8% of male undergraduates and 33% of female graduate/professional students.

Overall, only 12.2% of respondents report that they were very knowledgeable about what happens when a student reports an incident of sexual assault or sexual misconduct at Ohio State; 48.2% report that they were not all knowledgeable about what happens and 39.6% were somewhat knowledgeable. Similarly, 12.2% of respondents report that they were very knowledgeable about Ohio State's policies on Title IX and sexual misconduct, while 55.9% were not at all knowledgeable and 31.9% were somewhat knowledgeable.

## **FREQUENCY AND NATURE OF VICTIMIZATION BY PHYSICAL FORCE OR INCAPACITATION**

The survey asked a series of questions about experiencing nonconsensual sexual intercourse or sexual touching involving several tactics: physical force or threats of physical force, incapacitation due to voluntary/involuntary consumption of drugs or alcohol, coercion and the absence of affirmative consent. This section summarizes the frequency of nature of nonconsensual sexual assault (both sexual intercourse and sexual touching) by physical force or incapacitation.

Sexual intercourse was defined as sexual penetration (a penis, finger or object inside someone else's vagina or anus) and oral sexual intercourse (a mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else's genitals). Sexual touching was defined as when one person kisses another; or touches someone's breast/chest, crotch/groin or buttocks; or grabs, gropes or rubs against another in a sexual way even if the touching occurs over the other person's clothes. Attempted sexual intercourse involving physical force was also measured, and combined with estimates of sexual intercourse by physical force.

Physical force included incidents that involved force or threats of force. This was defined as including "someone holding you down with his or her body weight, pinning your arms, hitting or kicking you or using a weapon or threatening to use a weapon against you." Incapacitation was defined as "incidents when you were unable to provide consent or stop what was happening because you were passed out, asleep, incapacitated or substantially impaired due to drugs or alcohol." To address the possibility of under-reporting of incidents involving incapacitation, respondents were asked to include incidents even if they were not sure what had happened.

If a respondent reported an event of sexual intercourse or sexual touching, they were asked a series of follow-up questions about when it occurred. Consistent with the 2015 data analysis, if the event occurred before the respondent was a student at Ohio State, the event was excluded from the analysis. If the event was part of another reported victimization on the survey, the respondent was asked to identify which victimization. Events were only counted once. Following the definitions outlined by the AAU Design Team, which align with counting rules established by the FBI and Clery statistics (Cantor et al., 2015a), if both sexual intercourse and sexual touching were part of the same incident, sexual intercourse was counted.

Table 3.1 presents the prevalence and incidences of sexual intercourse (penetration or oral sex) and sexual touching by enrollment status and gender. Estimates are reported based on when the incidents occurred: since enrolling at Ohio State, and/or within the 2015-2016 academic year. Since enrolling at Ohio State, 20.6% of undergraduate female respondents report being victims of sexual assault (intercourse or sexual touching) by physical force or incapacitation; 12.3% report being victims during the current academic year. Since entering Ohio State, 13.7% of undergraduate female respondents report being the victim of sexual intercourse by physical force or incapacitation and 13.4% report being the victim of sexual touching by physical force or incapacitation. Percentages for graduate and professional female respondents are lower: 8.7% report sexual intercourse or sexual touching by physical force of incapacitation since entering Ohio State and 3.2% report experiencing these in the current academic year.

Overall, 5.5% of undergraduate male respondents report being the victim of sexual intercourse or sexual touching by force or incapacitation since enrolling at Ohio State, and 3.6% report being victimized in the current academic year. Since entering Ohio State, 3.1% of undergraduate male respondents report being victims of sexual intercourse by physical force or incapacitation and 4.3% report being victims of sexual touching by force or incapacitation. Among graduate and professional male respondents, 3.6% report being victimized by sexual intercourse or sexual touching by force or incapacitation since enrolling at Ohio State and 2.7% report being victimized in the current academic year.

Among TGQN undergraduate students, 24.3% of respondents report being victims of sexual assault involving physical force or incapacitation since entering Ohio State and 16.5% report being victimized in the current academic year. Data were not available for graduate and professional students identifying as TGQN due to small sample sizes.

Prevalence of sexual assault victimization involving physical force or incapacitation differ significantly by gender and enrollment status. Undergraduate female respondents were significantly more likely to report these types of victimizations than males and graduate and professional females. Victimization rates do not significantly differ between undergraduate female and TGQN respondents.

#### *Victim Characteristics*

Table 3.2 presents the demographic characteristics of respondents who report being the victim of nonconsensual sexual intercourse or sexual touching since enrolling in college. Among all respondents, students identifying as heterosexual were significantly less likely to be victimized than non-heterosexual students (10.3% v. 23.4%). Respondents identifying as Hispanic or Latinx were more likely to be victimized than non-Hispanic or Latinx peers, but the difference was not statistically significant (15.2% v. 11.5%). Students identifying as Asian or Asian American were significantly less likely to report being victimized (5.5%), while white students were significantly more likely to report being victimized (12.9%) than students of other racial backgrounds. Twenty-one percent of respondents with disabilities report being victimized,



significantly more than the 10.9% of respondents without disabilities. There were significant differences in victimization rates by marital status; respondents who had never been married were significantly more likely to report being victimized (12.7%) than other respondents.

Results are also presented examining respondents' year in school and the timing of incidents (current year or since enrolling in college). In the current academic year, second year undergraduate students reported significantly higher victimization rates (10.8%) than first years (8.1%), third years (7.7%) and respondents in their fourth year or older (6.7%). Among graduate and professional students, 4.3% of first year students reported being victimized in the current academic year, compared to 2% of second year students and 1.9% of students in their third year or higher.

### *Location of Victimization*

Table 3.5 examines the location of types of victimizations of sexual intercourse and sexual touching by physical force and by incapacitation for female and male respondents.<sup>3</sup> Higher percentages of female respondents reported victimizations that occur off campus or at non-university affiliated properties than on campus or at university affiliated properties. Off-campus incidents accounted for 62% of sexual intercourse by physical force, 54.3% of sexual intercourse by incapacitation, 56.1% of sexual touching by force and 58.6% of sexual touching by incapacitation. Of sexual assaults occurring on campus or on university affiliated properties, the majority occurred in university residence halls (64.3% of sexual intercourse by force and 57.5% of sexual intercourse by incapacitation). The most frequently reported locations of sexual touching by force that occurred on campus included a non-residential building (41.1%), other university affiliated property (30.6%) and a university residence hall (23.1%). Sexual touching by incapacitation was reported to occur most frequently in university residence halls (39.9%) or other university affiliated properties (26.4%).

Among respondents who reported sexual assaults that occurred off campus or at non-university affiliated properties, 81.3% of sexual intercourse by force and 79.4% of sexual intercourse by incapacitation reported they the incident(s) occurred at a house or apartment. Sexual touching was more frequently reported to have occurred at a house or apartment (47.9% by force and 54.5% by incapacitation) or a restaurant, bar or club (54.4% by force and 41.5% by incapacitation).

### *Offender Characteristics*

Table 3.6a presents the reported characteristics of the offenders of sexual intercourse by force or incapacitation for females and males.<sup>4</sup> Among female respondents, 96.7% of offenders of sexual intercourse by physical force were male and 99% offenders of sexual intercourse by incapacitation were male. Among male respondents who were victims of sexual intercourse by force, 76.3% report the offender was male and 27.2% report the offender was female. Male victims of sexual intercourse by incapacitation report 21.7% of offenders were male and 81.2% of offenders were female.

The majority of respondents reported that their offenders were students at Ohio State. Among females, 67.5% of victims of nonconsensual sexual intercourse by force reported the offender was another student and 79.3% of victims of nonconsensual sexual intercourse by incapacitation reported the offender was another student. Comparable numbers for males are 67.8% by force and 82.3% by incapacitation. The second most common response was that the

---

<sup>3</sup> Results are not presented for TGQN respondents due to small sample sizes.

<sup>4</sup> Results are not presented for TGQN respondents due to small sample sizes.

offender(s) was not affiliated with the university (between 14.5% and 32.8% based on gender and tactic).

### *Reporting and Reasons for Not Reporting*

Victims were asked if they reported the sexual assault to a university program, and if not, why they did not report (Table 3.9a). Among female respondents, 23.5% of victims of sexual intercourse by force and 11.5% of victims of sexual intercourse by incapacitation reported assault to a university program. Among male respondents, 17.9% of victims of sexual intercourse by force reported and 6.2% of victims of sexual intercourse by incapacitation reported.

When asked why they did not report to a university a program, the most frequent response among female victims was that they did not think it was serious enough to report (51.7% of victims of sexual intercourse by force and 59.1% of victims of sexual intercourse by incapacitation). Twenty percent or more of female victims stated they did not report because they felt embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult, that they did not want to get the person in trouble, that they fear negative social consequences, that they did not think anything would be done, that they feared a lack of control in their case or that the incident did not occur on campus or was not associated with the school. Among male victims of sexual intercourse by force, 60.5% of selected that they did not report to the university because they did not know where to go or who to tell. The most frequent response among male victims of sexual intercourse by incapacitation was that they did not think it was serious enough to report (45.0%).

## **FREQUENCY AND NATURE OF VICTIMIZATION DUE TO COERCION OR ABSENCE OF AFFIRMATIVE CONSENT**

This section summarizes the frequency of nature of sexual intercourse or sexual touching due to coercion or absence of affirmative consent.

Coercion was defined as incidents when someone coerced you by threatening serious non-physical harm such that you felt you must comply. Examples of coercion included: threatening to give you bad grades or cause trouble for you at work; promising good grades or to give you a promotion at work; threatening to share damaging information about you with your family, friends or authority figures; threatening to post damaging information about you online or threatening to leave or abandon you in an area where you feel unsafe.

Students were asked about incidents that occurred without their affirmative consent. Examples of absence of affirmative consent included: someone initiated sexual activity despite your refusal or disinterest; someone ignored your cues to stop or slow down; went ahead without checking in or while you were still deciding; or otherwise failed to obtain your active, ongoing voluntary agreement.

If a respondent reported an event of sexual intercourse or sexual touching, they were asked a series of follow-up questions about when it occurred. Like results for sexual assault due to physical force or incapacitation, if the event occurred before the respondent was a student at Ohio State, the event was excluded from the analysis. If the event was part of another reported victimization on the survey, the respondent was asked to identify which victimization. Events were only counted once. If both sexual intercourse (penetration or oral sex) and sexual touching were part of the same incident, the incident of sexual intercourse was counted.



Table 4.1 presents the percentage of respondents experiencing nonconsensual sexual intercourse or sexual touching due to coercion or the absence of affirmative consent during the current academic year or since enrolling in college. Overall, 1.7% of respondents reported experiencing sexual assault due to coercion during the current academic year and 2.8% reported experiencing sexual assault due to coercion since enrolling at Ohio State. Since enrolling at Ohio State, 2.5% of undergraduate females reported victimization due to coercion compared to 1.4% of undergraduate males and 0.6% of graduate and professional males. Results for TGQN students and graduate and professional females were not disclosed for confidentiality reasons.

Overall, 4.1% of respondents reported being the victim of sexual intercourse or sexual touching due to the absence of affirmative consent during the current academic year and 7.3% reported this type of victimization since enrolling at Ohio State. Since enrolling at Ohio State, 12.6% of undergraduate and 6.9% of graduate and professional females reported experiencing sexual assault due to the absence of affirmative consent, compared to 3.1% of undergraduate and 4.0% of graduate and professional males. Results for TGQN students were not disclosed for confidentiality reasons.

Female respondents were significantly more likely to experience sexual assault due to absence of affirmative consent than male respondents, and female undergraduates were significantly more likely to experience this than female graduate and professional students.

Table 4.3 presents the demographic characteristics of students who reported being victims of sexual assault due to absence of affirmative consent. Students who identified with a sexual orientation other than heterosexual were significantly more likely to report being victims (16.2%) than heterosexual students (6.3%). White students were significantly more likely to report being a victim of sexual assault (7.9%) than students of other racial backgrounds, while students who identified as Asian American or Asian were significantly less likely to report being a victim (3.6%). Students with disabilities were significantly more likely to report being a victim of sexual assault due to the absence of affirmative consent (12%) than students without disabilities (6.9%). There were significant differences in victimization by marital status, with respondents who were never married being significantly more likely to be victimized (8.1%). There were not significant differences in victimization due to absence of affirmative consent by class rank for undergraduates or graduate and professional students during the current academic year or since enrolling in college with one exception. For undergraduate females, there were statistically significant differences in victimization rates since enrolling in college; victimization rates increased by each academic rank from the first year to fourth year.

Table 4.5a and 4.5b present the characteristics of offenders of sexual intercourse or sexual touching due to coercion or absence of affirmative consent for female and male victims, respectively. Among female victims, the vast majority identified their offender or offenders as male (between 98% and 100% depending on type of assault and tactic). Among male victims, reported offenders' genders varied; between 40.1% and 70.4% of offenders were identified as female and the rest male depending on the type of assault and tactic. The majority of female and male victims reported that the offender or offenders were students at Ohio State (between 48.4% and 88.0% depending on assault and tactic type).

### **Sexual Assault by Any Tactic**

To estimate the overall prevalence of sexual assault, Table 4.6 presents the percentage of respondents who reported experiencing sexual intercourse and sexual touching by any of the four tactics measured: physical force, incapacitation, coercion or absence of affirmative consent since enrolling at Ohio State. Overall, 16.4% of respondents reported being a victim of either

sexual intercourse or sexual touching using physical force, incapacitation, coercion or absence of affirmative consent since enrollment at Ohio State. For undergraduate females, 27.7% reported they have been victims of one of the four tactics, compared to 13.9% for graduate or professional females, 8.4% for undergraduate males and 6% for graduate and professional males. Among TGQN students, 29.8% of undergraduate and 15.4% of graduate and professional respondents reported experiencing either sexual intercourse or sexual touching by at least one of the four tactics.

In the current academic year, 10.1% of respondents experienced sexual touching or sexual intercourse by physical force, incapacitation, coercion or absence of affirmative consent (Table 4.7). TGQN respondents reported the highest rates: 22.6%, followed by undergraduate females (17.5%), graduate and professional females (6.6%), undergraduate males (5.1%) and graduate and professional males (4.2%).

## **FREQUENCY AND NATURE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT, INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE AND STALKING**

The survey asked about other forms of sexual misconduct: sexual harassment, stalking and intimate partner violence. This section examines the prevalence, incidence and characteristics associated with these forms of sexual misconduct.

### **Sexual Harassment**

Students were asked about situations in which someone in the university community (e.g. student, faculty or staff) said or did something that interfered with their academic or professional performance, limited their ability to participate in an academic or co-curricular program or activity or created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment. Specifically, students were asked if the following had occurred since they were a student at Ohio State:

- Someone made sexual remarks or told jokes or stories that were insulting or offensive
- Someone made inappropriate or offensive comments about your or someone else's body, appearance or sexual activities
- Someone said crude or gross sexual things to you or tried to get you to talk about sexual matters when you didn't want to
- Someone emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned, or instant messaged offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures, or videos to you that you didn't want
- Someone has continued to ask you to go out, get dinner or have drinks, or have sex even though you said, "No"

The definition of sexual harassment used in the survey aligns with Ohio State policies and federal definitions of a "hostile environment" used by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the US Department of Education (Cantor et al., 2015a). The specific behaviors were taken from several different scales that measure harassment when developed for the 2015 AAU survey (Cantor et al., 2015a).

Table 5.1 presents the percentage of respondents who reported experiencing each type of harassment. Overall, 35% of respondents reported someone in the university community made sexual remarks or told jokes or stories that they found to be insulting or offensive. Almost 40% of respondents reported that someone made inappropriate or offensive comments about their or someone else's body, appearance or sexual activities. Fewer respondents reported

other harassment behaviors: 15.4% reported someone said crude or gross sexual things to them or tried to get them to talk about sexual matters when they didn't want to; 7.7% reported someone emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned or instant messaged offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures or videos that they did not want and 12% reported someone had continued to ask them to go out, get dinner or have drinks or have sex even though they said, "No."

Patterns of harassment varied by gender and enrollment status. Undergraduate students identifying as TGQN reported the highest percentage of experiencing someone making sexual remarks or told sexual jokes or stories that they found insulting or offensive (53.6%), followed by female undergraduates (48.4%), TGQN graduate and professional students (46.7%) and female graduate and professional students (35.5%). Male students were less likely to report experiencing this type of harassment (25% of undergraduate and 21.9% of graduate and professionals). The patterns by gender and enrollment were similar for the other specific types of harassment; female undergraduates and TGQN undergraduates reported the highest percentages of experiencing harassment behaviors.

Students were asked how many times each type of harassment occurred, how many different people harassed them, the offenders' association with the university and the offender's relationship with the victim during the current school year for each harassment behavior (Table 5.1a presents results for female students, Table 5.1b presents results for male students). Due to small sample sizes, results are not presented for TGQN students. Among female respondents, 30.6% reported that they experienced someone making sexual remarks or jokes that they found inappropriate or offensive at least once during the current school year and 34.5% experienced someone making inappropriate or offensive comments. Almost 15% of female respondents reported someone said crude or gross things about their or someone else's body, appearance or sexual activities, 12.8% had someone continue to ask them out or to have sex when they said "No" and 7.2% had someone electronically send them offensive remarks, jokes, stories, etc. Among male students, 22.6% reported someone made inappropriate or offensive comments about their or someone else's body, appearance or sexual activities and 14.4% reported someone made sexual remarks or jokes during the current school year. Almost 4% of male respondents reported someone continued to ask them to go out or have sex even though they said "No" during the current school year and 3.1% report someone electronically harassed them. Among female respondents who reported experiencing harassment, between 23.4% and 43.1% reported three or more persons treated them this way, depending on the harassment behavior. Results were similar among male respondents.

The majority of respondents experiencing harassment reported that the offender was another student at Ohio State (between 77.8% and 87.8% among females and between 82.6% and 91.7% among males). Thirteen percent of female respondents and 9.5% of male respondents reported that a faculty member or instructor made sexual remarks or told jokes that they found to be insulting or offensive. Fewer than 1% of female and male respondents reported that the offender was a coach or trainer or a non-academic advisor. When asked about their relationship with the offender(s), the majority of female respondents reported that the offender was a friend or acquaintance (between 57% to 66.5%) or a stranger (33.9% to 50.6%). The majority of male respondents stated the offender was a friend or acquaintance (between 67% and 74.5%).

Table 5.1c presents whether victims of harassment reported their harassment to a university program or service. Overall, 9.1% of respondents reported to a university program or service; 30.7% of TGQN undergraduates reported the harassment compared to between 6.6% and 10% of male and female students. Students who did not report to a program were asked

why they did not contact a program. The majority of students (77.2%) stated that they did not think it was serious enough to report.

Table 5.1e presents the demographic characteristics of students who reported being victims of sexual harassment. Students who identified with a sexual orientation other than heterosexual were significantly more likely to experience harassment than students identifying as heterosexual. Overall, 68% of non-heterosexual respondents reported experiencing at least one harassment behavior since enrolling at Ohio State compared to 52.7% of heterosexual students. African American students were significantly more likely to report being a victim of harassment (49.6%) than students of other racial backgrounds, as were white students (57.3%) while students identifying as Asian American or Asian were significantly less likely to report being a victim of harassment (39.0%). Students with disabilities were significantly more likely to report being a victim of harassment (67.9%) than students without disabilities (53.2%). Married students were significantly less likely to report being a victim of harassment (33.7%) than students of other marital statuses.

### **Intimate Partner Violence**

At the beginning of the survey students were asked whether they had been in one or more partnered relationships since they had been a student at Ohio State. Partnered relationships were defined as casual relationships or hook-ups, steady or serious relationships, or marriage, civil unions, domestic partnerships or cohabitation. If students responded yes, they were asked a series of questions about whether they had experienced intimate partner violence (IPV). The question wording in the IPV section were developed by AAU based on a combination of wording used in a 2012 survey by the University of New Hampshire and the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (Cantor et al., 2015a).

The IPV questions asked whether a partner had done any of the following since a student had been enrolled at Ohio State:

- Exert control or control you? Examples could be when someone kept you from going to classes or pursuing your educational goals, did not allow you to see or talk with friends or family, made decisions for you such as, where you go, what you wear or eat, threatened to “out” you to others
- Threatened to physically harm you, someone you love or themselves?
- Used physical force against you? Examples of this could be bent your fingers or bit you, hit/slapped, punched, pushed, or kicked you, hit you with something other than fist, attacked you with a weapon or otherwise physically hurt or injured you, held you against your will

Since enrolling at Ohio State, 14.1% of respondents reported experiencing at least one type of IPV and 7.8% experienced IPV during the current school year (Table 5.2). Eighteen percent of undergraduate female respondents experienced IPV since enrolling at Ohio State, compared to 9.3% of graduate or professional females, 12.7% of undergraduate males and 7.8% of graduate and professional males. Undergraduate students identifying as TGQN were significantly more likely to experience IPV since enrolling at Ohio State (38.1%) than other respondents. Since enrolling at Ohio State, the most frequently reported type of IPV was a partner trying to exert control or control (8.5%), followed by a partner using physical force (6.2%) and a partner threatening to physically harm the student, someone else or themselves (5.9%). Over 90% of respondents reporting IPV said that one partner had treated them this way (93.4%; Table 5.2a).

Victims of IPV were asked whether they reported the incident(s) of IPV to a university program and, if not, why they did not contact a program (Table 5.2a).<sup>5</sup> Among all IPV victims, 13.5% stated that they reported to a program and 86.5% had not. Reporting to a program was most common among TGQN undergraduates (26.9%) and female graduate and professional respondents (23.8%); 13.4% of female undergraduates, 12.6% of male undergraduates and 4.0% of male graduate and professional students reported to a program.

Among those who did not report to a program, 56.5% did not contact a program because they did not think it was serious enough to report. Twenty-two percent did not want to get their partner in trouble, 18.3% felt embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult to report. Twenty-eight percent of respondents did not report because the incident did not occur on campus or was not associated with Ohio State.

Table 5.2c presents the demographic characteristics of students who report being victims of IPV. Heterosexual students were significantly less likely to be a victim of IPV (13.1%) compared to non-heterosexual students (22.3%). Students identifying as Asian or Asian American were significantly less likely to report that they have been a victim of IPV than students from other racial backgrounds (10%). Students with disabilities were significantly more likely to report being a victim of IPV (23.1%) than students without disabilities (13.3%). Married students were significantly less likely to report being a victim of IPV (6.2%) than students of other marital statuses who had been in a partnered relationship since enrolling at Ohio State.

## Stalking

Questions on stalking behaviors were based on definitions and behaviors used in the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, National Crime Victimization Survey and the National Violence Against Women's Survey (Cantor et al., 2015a). Respondents were asked whether the following happened since enrolling at Ohio State and, if so, whether it was done in a way that made them *afraid for their personal safety*:

- Someone sent unwanted phone calls, emails, voice, text, or instant messages or posted messages, pictures, or videos on social networking sites
- Someone showed up somewhere – your residence, classes, lab, studio, or work – or waited for you when you did not want them to be there
- Spied on, watched, or following you, either in person or using devices or software

Table 5.3 presents the percentages of respondents who reported experiencing each of these behaviors at least once since enrolling at Ohio State and in the current school year. To be considered stalking, the respondents had to state that these behaviors, either singly or in combination, occurred more than once and were done by the same person. The bottom of Table 5.3 presents these statistics, and Tables 5.3a to 5.3d present statistics for only the respondents who reported experiencing stalking behaviors more than once by the same person.

Since enrolling in at Ohio State, 3.9% of students reported that they experienced stalking and 2.1% experienced stalking during the current school year. Since enrolling at Ohio State, 13.5% of undergraduate TGQN students reported experiencing stalking compared to 6.4% of undergraduate females, 4.6% of graduate and professional females, 1.4% of undergraduate males and 1.5% of graduate or professional males.

Respondents most frequently reported that the offender was another student(s) (55.2%; Table 5.3a) or that the offender was not affiliated with the university (36.6%). Overall, 2.9% of

---

<sup>5</sup> Students were asked if they reported to a customized list of 8 – 10 programs available on their specific campus. Table 5.2b presents results evaluating the usefulness of each program by students who reported.



offenders were identified by victims as faculty or instructors, 2.7% were other staff or administrators and 1.9% had some other association with the university. When asked about the offenders' relationship to the victim, 37.2% of respondents said the offender was a friend or acquaintance, 29.9% stated the offender was a stranger and 24.6% said the offender was someone that the victim had been previously intimate with or involved with.

Respondents who were victims of stalking were asked if they reported to a university program and, if not, why they did not contact a university program (Table 5.3b).<sup>6</sup> Overall, 21.8% of respondents stated that they reported the stalking to a program on campus, while 78.2% did not report. When asked why they did not contact a program, 59.8% selected that they did not think it was serious enough, 35.6% said they did not think anything would be done and 23.2% said the incident did not occur on campus or was not associated with Ohio State.

Table 5.3d presents the demographic characteristics of respondents who report being victims of stalking. Students identifying with a sexual orientation other than heterosexual were significantly more likely to report being a victim of stalking (8.5%) compared to heterosexual students (3.3%). Students identifying as Hispanic or Latinx were significantly more likely to experience stalking (5.7%) than non-Hispanic/Latinx students (3.7%). Students identifying as Asian or Asian American were significantly less likely to experience stalking (3.6%) than students of other racial backgrounds. Students who identified as having a disability were significantly more likely to report experiencing stalking (10.8%) than students without a disability (3.3%). Married respondents were significantly less likely to experience stalking (1.9%) and respondents who reported "other" marital statuses were significantly more likely to experience stalking (10.6%) than never married, divorced or separated and respondents who were not married but living with a partner.

---

<sup>6</sup> Students were asked if they reported to a customized list of 8 – 10 programs available on their specific campus. Table 5.3c presents results evaluating the usefulness of each program by students who reported.

## REFERENCES

- American Association of Universities (AAU). (2015). *Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct: Frequently Asked Questions*. Retrieved from: [https://www.aau.edu/uploadedFiles/AAU\\_Publications/AAU\\_Reports/Sexual\\_Assault\\_Campus\\_Survey/AAU%20Climate%20Survey%20FAQ%20-%2009-21-15.pdf](https://www.aau.edu/uploadedFiles/AAU_Publications/AAU_Reports/Sexual_Assault_Campus_Survey/AAU%20Climate%20Survey%20FAQ%20-%2009-21-15.pdf)
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Bruce, C., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., & Lee, H. (2015a). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct: The Ohio State University*. Rockville, Maryland: Westat. Retrieved from <http://titleix.osu.edu/PDFs/AAUsurveyreport>
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Bruce, C., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., & Lee, H. (2015b). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct*. Rockville, Maryland: Westat.
- Groves, R. M., and Peytcheva, E. (2008). The impact of nonresponse rates on nonresponse bias: A meta-analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72(2), 167-189.
- Royston, Patrick. (n.d.). *Multiple imputation by the MICE system of chained equations (uvis STATA command help)*. Retrieved from <http://fmwww.bc.edu/repec/bocode/i/ice.html>
- Winter, Nick. (n.d.). *Survey sampling weights: Adjustment and replicate weight creation (survwgt STATA command help)*. Retrieved from <http://faculty.virginia.edu/nwinter/progs/survwgt.hlp.shtml>
- Wolter, K. M. (1985.) *Introduction to Variance Estimation*. New York: Springer-Verlag.



## APPENDIX A: CONSENT AND RECRUITMENT

### Student Consent Form

Before you take the survey, consider allowing the university to use your responses for research purposes. While we urge you to consider participating in the research, you do not have to consent to sharing your data for research purposes in order to take the survey. Even if you choose not to allow us to use your responses for research purposes, they may still be reported for institutional quality improvement purposes.

The data collected in this survey will be used for a research study examining sexual assault and sexual misconduct. Your participation will help us better understand the climate around sexual assault at Ohio State. This survey should take most students approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. You must be at least 18 years old to participate in the research study.

#### **Participation is voluntary.**

You do NOT have to participate in this survey, and if you do choose to participate, you may skip any question you are not comfortable answering and may exit the survey at any time. Refusal to participate in or withdrawing from this study will not compromise your standing in any program at Ohio State. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled and you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

#### **Your responses are confidential.**

We want to assure you that your responses to this survey will be protected to ensure your privacy; your personal identification will not be linked to your responses in any way and data will never be reported in a way that can potentially identify individuals. To mitigate the risk of anyone identifying your responses, the survey has been programmed to strip all identifiers, including email addresses and IP addresses, from the data. The results will be presented in summary form so no individual can be identified. The only risk of any breach of your confidentiality could occur if someone is monitoring your computer or internet activity via your IP address as you complete the survey. While the survey uses HTTP SSL Authorization and 128-bit SSL encryption, there is a small chance that your IP address could be used to identify your responses.

#### **Risks and benefits of participation.**

Participants will not directly benefit from participating in this study. However, the Ohio State University community will benefit from a deeper understanding of the climate around sexual assault and misconduct on campus. These results will be used to inform educational efforts, programming, and services on campus.

Participating in this study is not believed to present greater risks than those faced in daily life. Potential risks of participation in the study include psychological stress as a result of the sensitive nature of some of the questions, which ask about experiences with sexual harassment and assault. You can discontinue participation at any time or elect to skip any questions that may make you uncomfortable. Furthermore, a list of local and national resources and referrals will be provided for your use if you have questions or experience distress while taking the survey.

Breaches of confidentiality, risks to reputation, and/or social risks could occur in the unlikely event that your responses are traced back to you. However, as described above, personal identifiers (e.g., your name, email address, and IP address) will be stripped from the data, and

data will be collected and stored using devices that are password-protected and encrypted to mitigate the risk of this occurring.

**Questions?**

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant contact Sandra Meadows at The Office of Responsible Research Practices, 1-800-678-6251 or 1-614-688-4792.

For questions regarding the survey, or if you feel you have been harmed as a result of study participation, feel free to contact Dr. Anne McDaniel, Associate Director of Research and Data Management in the Center for the Study of Student Life at [mcdaniel.145@osu.edu](mailto:mcdaniel.145@osu.edu).

You must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

If you consent to participate in the research study, please select yes.

## Email Invitation

Subject line: A message from Vice President of Student Life, Dr. Javaune Adams-Gaston: important campus climate survey

Dear Student,

For the second year, Ohio State is conducting a climate survey on sexual misconduct and relationship violence. I write to ask that you take part in this important survey, which is open to all students across our campuses. The results will help inform and further enhance Buckeyes ACT (Action, Counseling, Training) — the university’s comprehensive plan to confront sexual misconduct and relationship violence.

To begin the survey, which takes approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete, please click the below link:

- XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

**Note that individual responses are confidential.** Each student response is important to achieving an overall picture of the experiences and opinions of Ohio State’s student body. It is important to hear from you, even if you believe these issues do not directly affect you. As a token of appreciation and to encourage participation, all students who complete the survey will be entered to win an Amazon gift card; there are 10 \$500 cards, 75 \$100 cards and 500 \$25 cards available.

The survey will be available until April 20. If you have questions about the survey or have difficulty accessing it, you can respond to this email or call the Center for the Study of Student Life at 614-247-6220.

Learn more about the programs and services available through [Buckeyes ACT](#). Our top priority is to ensure a safe and healthy climate for our students and the entire university community.

Working together as Buckeyes, we can make a difference.

Javaune Adams-Gaston, PhD

Vice President for Student Life

## Sample Reminder Email

Subject line: Your input is important

Dear Student,

Over the past weeks, I have invited you to participate in a climate survey focused on sexual misconduct and relationship violence. If you are one of the more than 4,500 students who have already completed the survey, thank you very much.

Because no identifying information is linked with the survey, we are unable to identify whether you, individually, have completed the survey. This process is part of a larger commitment to keeping responses confidential.

We have had strong response to the survey so far, but everyone's voice is important. If you have not completed the survey, we would like to hear from you.

The survey is only taking between **10 to 15 minutes to complete**, and remember, all students who complete the survey will be entered to win an Amazon gift card; there are

- 10 \$500 Amazon gift cards
- 75 \$100 Amazon gift cards
- 500 \$25 Amazon gift cards available.

**If you have not completed the survey, please do so by April 25.** To begin, click the below link:

- XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Individual responses are confidential, and your participation is important to achieving an overall picture of the experiences and opinions of the student body. Your responses will also help enhance Buckeyes ACT, Ohio State's comprehensive plan to confront sexual misconduct and relationship violence.

If you have questions about the survey or have difficulty accessing it, you can respond to this email or call the Center for the Study of Student Life at 614-247-6220.

Please join us in ensuring a safe and healthy climate for students and the entire university community.

Javaune Adams-Gaston, PhD

Vice President for Student Life

## **APPENDIX B: RESOURCE LIST**

### **Selected Community Resources**

#### *Sexual Assault Response Network of Central Ohio (SARNCO)*

The SARNCO 24-Hour Rape Helpline is staffed by trained volunteers who can provide information about options, provide appropriate referrals, and offer emotional support

SARNCO also provides emergency room advocacy, long-term advocacy and recovery resources.

614-267-7020

#### *Buckeye Region Anti-Violence Organization (BRAVO)*

BRAVO provides comprehensive programs for survivor advocacy/support for LGBTQI survivors of hate and bias violence, discrimination, intimate partner violence, stalking, and/or sexual assault. Individuals can contact BRAVO anonymously to explore their options.

The BRAVO helpline is staffed weekdays 9am – 5pm, and Sunday – Thursday 6pm to 10pm  
Columbus: 614-294-7867

Toll Free Helpline: 1-866-862-7286

#### *CHOICES for Victims of Domestic Violence (614-224-4663)*

The hotline sponsored by CHOICES is staffed by individuals with expertise on relationship abuse and also provides a direct way for those needing emergency shelter to access it.

614-224-4663

#### *Suicide Prevention Services 24-Hour Hotline*

614-221-5445

#### *Reporting an Incident to the Police*

Students, faculty and staff can report incidents of sexual assault, stalking, domestic or dating violence to the law enforcement in the jurisdiction in which the incident(s) occurred.

If individuals would like assistance with the process of reporting an incident to the police, they can use of the Ohio State resources on the next pages. The immediate/primary contact for reporting is Kellie Brennan, our Title IX Coordinator, who can walk them through their options for reporting

For regional campus contacts for reporting – see below.

For coordination of support services, contact Sexual Civility and Empowerment program (pg. 4)

### **Ohio State Resources: Reporting**

If a caller wants to report an incident to someone at Ohio State, their first contact is Kellie Brennan, who can help them ascertain where and how to best report the incident. Additional Contacts are listed in case a student wants them.

### Ohio State Title IX Coordinator: Kellie Brennan

General Title IX concerns, including questions about where to go or with whom to speak  
Office: 1534 N. High St. in the South Campus Gateway (near the movie theater)  
Phone: (614) 247-5838  
Email: [titleix@osu.edu](mailto:titleix@osu.edu)

### Reporting to Deputy Title IX Coordinators

Additional contacts for general Title IX concerns, including questions about where or how to report an incident

For students: Matt Page, Associate Director of Student Conduct  
550 Lincoln Tower  
(614) 292-0748  
[Page.324@osu.edu](mailto:Page.324@osu.edu)

For faculty/staff: Tom Ramey, Interim Director of Employee Relations  
300 Gateway Building C, 1590 N High St  
(614) 688-3280  
[Ramey.22@osu.edu](mailto:Ramey.22@osu.edu)

### Reporting to Student Conduct

Investigates complaints against OSU students and student groups  
Call to arrange a meeting with a hearing officer regarding complaints  
Phone: (614) 292-0748  
Office: 550 Lincoln Tower

### Reporting to Human Resources

Investigates complaints against Ohio State faculty or staff members  
(614) 292-1050  
1590 N High Street, Suite 300

### Regional Campus Contacts

Students can still contact the above resources, but if they would like to speak with someone on their own campus, they should contact one of the individuals listed for their campus.

#### ATI/OARDC at Wooster

Ruth Montz, Chief Student Life Officer  
(330) 287-1247  
[montz.11@osu.edu](mailto:montz.11@osu.edu)

Elayne Siegfried, Human Resources Director  
(330) 263-3932  
[siegfried.20@osu.edu](mailto:siegfried.20@osu.edu)

#### Lima Campus

For students: Shane McCrory, Director of Student Life  
(419) 995-8266  
[mccrory.6@osu.edu](mailto:mccrory.6@osu.edu)

For faculty/staff: Melissa Coldiron, Human Resources Generalist  
(419) 995-8436  
[coldiron.25@osu.edu](mailto:coldiron.25@osu.edu)

### **Mansfield Campus**

For students: Dr. Donna Hight, Chief Student Life Officer  
(419) 755-4317  
[hight.6@osu.edu](mailto:hight.6@osu.edu)

For faculty/staff: Cathy Stimpert, Chief Human Resources Officer  
(419) 755-4047  
[stimpert.9@osu.edu](mailto:stimpert.9@osu.edu)

### **Marion Campus**

For students: Shawn Jackson, Director of Student Life  
(740) 725-6219  
[jackson.368@osu.edu](mailto:jackson.368@osu.edu)

For faculty/staff: Maryjo Munday, Human Resources Manager  
(740) 725-6397  
[munday.2@osu.edu](mailto:munday.2@osu.edu)

### **Newark Campus**

For students: Holly Mason, Director of Student Life, Ohio State Newark and Central Ohio Technical College  
(740) 364-9578  
[mason.536@osu.edu](mailto:mason.536@osu.edu) or [hmason@cotc.edu](mailto:hmason@cotc.edu)

For faculty/staff: Jackie Parrill, Director of Human Resources, Campus Relations, & Planning Support  
(740) 366-9407  
[parrill.9@osu.edu](mailto:parrill.9@osu.edu)

## **Ohio State Resources: Selected Support Services**

### *Student Advocacy Center, Sexual Civility and Empowerment (SCE) Program*

Student Advocacy works with students dealing with sexual violence, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking. Advocates can provide assistance with academic, housing, transportation, and other related issues.

SCE provides support/advocacy, such as determining one's medical or legal options and for support through criminal or OSU conduct proceedings.

[sce.osu.edu](http://sce.osu.edu)

(614) 292-1111

### *Counseling and Consultation Service (CCS) – confidential reporting resource*

CCS provides counseling and consultation to all enrolled OSU students, along with spouses/partners covered under the Student Health Insurance plan.

[www.ccs.osu.edu/](http://www.ccs.osu.edu/)

(614) 292-5766



### *Student Health Services*

The Wilce Student Health center can provide a variety of outpatient services; all Ohio State students can use these services regardless of whether they are covered under Student Health Insurance.

[shc.osu.edu/](http://shc.osu.edu/)  
(614) 292-4321

### *Student Legal Services*

Student Legal Services is a non-profit law office providing legal services to eligible OSU students, including assistance with landlord-tenant disputes, obtaining civil protection orders, and crime victims compensation.

[studentlegal.osu.edu](http://studentlegal.osu.edu)  
614-247-5853

**APPENDIX C: SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

**IN SEPARATE DOCUMENT**

**APPENDIX D: DATA TABLES**

**IN SEPARATE DOCUMENT**