

2022 PENN STATE SEXUAL MISCONDUCT CLIMATE SURVEY

SUMMARY REPORT: BEAVER

This report highlights the major findings for the Beaver campus from the Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey conducted University-wide in spring 2022.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Methodology	1
Survey Instrument	1
Sampling and Distribution	1
Response Rates and Characteristics	1
Results	2
Perceptions of Campus Climate	2
Student Perceptions of How the University Would Handle a Report of Sexual Misconduct	2
Overall Feeling of Safety	4
Knowledge of Resources	6
Offensive Behaviors and Potential Harassment	8
Offensive Behavior/Harassment by Faculty/Staff	8
Offensive Behavior/Harassment by Other Students	10
Stalking Behaviors	13
Intimate Partner and Dating Violence	14
Non-consensual Sexual Contact and Sexual Assault Victimization	15
Victimization Rates of Any Non-consensual Sexual Contact	16
Victimization Rates of Sexual Assault	16
Victimization Rates of Non-consensual Sexual Touching, Fondling, or Kissing	17
Context of Any Non-consensual Sexual Contact Victimization	18
Reporting	19
Bystander Intervention Behavior	22
Perpetration	24

Introduction

The 2022 Penn State Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey was created with the primary goal of gathering data regarding student perceptions of sexual misconduct, prevalence rates of such misconduct, University response, and knowledge of resources available regarding sexual misconduct at the University. The data are meant to inform policy, programming, and educational efforts across the University aimed at reducing sexual misconduct and improving the experience of all Penn State students.

This report focuses on the Beaver campus with comparisons made across gender identities. Future reports and dashboards will provide insights into other demographic categories.

Methodology

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The survey used was a modified version of the Administrator Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3) survey. This effort brought together academics who focus their research on topics of sexual assault and sexual misconduct as well as administrators from institutions across the country. More information on ARC3 and the process of creating the survey can be found at: <http://campusclimate.gsu.edu/>.

SAMPLING AND DISTRIBUTION

Penn State contracted with DatStat, Inc. to distribute the survey and host the data. This enabled a distribution that ensured anonymity of responses but allowed for tracking of individuals who completed the survey for the purpose of reminder emails and incentive drawings. DatStat also provided the technical support and reporting tools essential for this project.

At Beaver, a census of 456 undergraduate students received the survey via email. All undergraduate students were 18 years of age or older and part- or full-time, degree-seeking students enrolled in spring 2022.

During the week prior to the survey launch, students selected to receive the survey were sent an email from the Vice President for Student Affairs to inform them of their selection and to encourage them to take the time to complete the survey. The survey was then open for three weeks with two reminder emails sent each week to non-respondents. Those who completed the survey were entered into a random drawing for the incentive items, which were LionCash rewards ranging from \$10 to \$75.

RESPONSE RATES AND CHARACTERISTICS

Overall, 22.8% (N = 104) of undergraduate students at Beaver completed the survey. Responses were considered complete if at least 90% of the survey questions were answered. The confidence interval was +/- 0.43% for the University-wide administration, +/-3.85% for Beaver. Table 1 illustrates some of the demographic characteristics of respondents.

Table 1. Selected demographics in percentages.

		Undergraduate
Gender	Women	59.6
	Men	36.5
	Gender Diverse	3.8
Sexual Orientation	Sexually Diverse	26.9
	Straight	73.1
Race/International Status	Domestic White	81.7
	Domestic BIPOC	16.3
	International	1.9
Living Situation	On Campus	26.0
	Off Campus	74.0

Note: Percentages do not add to 100 when some students selected “other” or “prefer not to answer.”

Results

The following sections summarize some of the most important pieces of data from the survey administration, as well as pieces of data that are commonly points of focus for studies regarding sexual misconduct at colleges and universities. Data points are split by gender in addition to overall figures. (Note: Gender diverse and sexually diverse student data are not reported for Beaver because there were not a sufficient number of responses from these students at this campus.)

PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS CLIMATE

Students were asked to report their perceptions regarding the campus climate in relation to sexual misconduct, including their perception of how the University would handle a report of sexual misconduct, their overall feeling of safety from various forms of sexual misconduct on or around campus, and their own self-efficacy and action as it relates to sexual misconduct on campus. These results are highlighted below.

Student Perceptions of How the University Would Handle a Report of Sexual Misconduct

When students were asked about how the University would respond to instances of sexual misconduct, perceptions varied considerably by gender, orientation, and student level. Table 2 summarizes these variations.

Table 2. Percentages of students who responded “likely” or “very likely” to various institutional responses to claims of sexual misconduct by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
The University would take the report seriously.	75.8	79.0	76.0
The University would maintain the privacy of the person making the report.	85.5	81.6	83.7
The University would do its best to honor the request of the person about to go forward with the case.	75.8	73.7	74.0
The University would take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report.	74.1	84.2	76.0
The University would provide accommodations to support the person (e.g., academic, housing, safety).	66.1	63.2	63.5
The University would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct.	69.3	68.4	66.4
The University would handle the report fairly.	75.8	65.8	71.2

Overall Feeling of Safety

Students rated how safe they felt on campus from various forms of sexual misconduct, specifically harassment, dating violence, sexual violence, and stalking. Responses are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Percentages of students who “agree” or “strongly agree” that they feel safe from various forms of sexual misconduct by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
On or around this campus, I feel safe from sexual harassment.	85.5	91.6	87.3
On or around this campus, I feel safe from dating violence.	90.3	94.5	91.2
On or around this campus, I feel safe from sexual violence.	88.7	94.4	90.2
On or around this campus, I feel safe from stalking.	87.1	91.7	88.2

Students were asked five questions about their own attitudes regarding sexual misconduct on campus, including whether they think: sexual misconduct is a problem on campus, they can do anything about sexual misconduct on campus, they should think about the issue of sexual misconduct while in college, if they’ve taken part in activities focused on ending sexual misconduct on campus, and if they have heard or seen Penn State students making jokes about sexual misconduct. These results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Percentages of students who “agree” or “strongly agree” with items regarding sexual misconduct being a problem at Penn State by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
I don't think sexual misconduct is a problem at Penn State.	56.5	69.4	60.8
I don't think there is much I can do about sexual misconduct on this campus.	35.5	47.2	40.2
There isn't much need for me to think about sexual misconduct while at college.	16.1	55.5	31.4
I have recently taken part in activities or volunteered my time on projects focused on ending sexual misconduct on campus.	22.6	11.1	17.7
I have heard comments or seen online posts from Penn State students that make jokes about dating violence, sexual assault, or rape.	17.7	11.1	15.7

KNOWLEDGE OF RESOURCES

Students were asked several questions about their awareness regarding various resources and information available in connection with issues of sexual misconduct, including if they understand where to go for help/reporting and whether they are aware of various University offices and websites related to sexual misconduct. Table 5 summarizes what information students recall receiving from the University since arriving at their campus.

Table 5. Percentages of students indicating they know where to get help regarding or to report sexual misconduct by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
If a friend or I experienced sexual misconduct, I know where to go to get help on campus.	64.5	57.9	59.6
I understand what happens when a student reports sexual misconduct at Penn State.	54.8	57.9	54.8
I would know where to go to make a report of sexual misconduct.	61.3	55.3	56.7

Respondents were also asked to rate their level of awareness regarding offices/resources available to students at Beaver in connection with issues of sexual misconduct. Table 6 summarizes the percentage of students reporting that they were either “very aware” or “extremely aware” of the resource in question.

Table 6. Percentages of students responding “very aware” or “extremely aware” of resource by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
Office of Student Conduct	27.9	23.7	25.2
Office of Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response (Title IX Compliance)	27.9	31.6	28.1
Affirmative Action Office (Title IX Compliance)	23.0	23.7	22.3
Title IX reporting website	26.2	31.6	27.2
Gender Equity Center	11.5	29.0	17.5
Center for Gender and Sexual Diversity	13.3	29.0	18.6
Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)	45.9	39.4	42.8
University Health Services (UHS)	47.5	65.8	54.4
Local sexual violence crisis center (e.g., Centre Safe)	19.7	29.7	22.5
Penn State Police	67.2	81.6	71.9
Local Police Department	63.9	63.1	61.2
National Domestic Violence Hotline	42.6	44.8	41.8
Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network (RAINN) National Hotline	31.2	34.2	31.1
Trevor Project Hotline	24.6	32.4	28.4
Sexual assault forensic examination at local hospital	31.7	36.9	32.4

OFFENSIVE BEHAVIORS AND POTENTIAL HARASSMENT

The survey included a number of questions regarding offensive behaviors that could potentially constitute harassment. Given the limitations of questionnaires in gathering rich, nuanced data, the items in this section do not fit a legal definition of harassment nor do they fit the student conduct policy definition of harassment. Students were asked in separate sections of the survey if any students or faculty/staff members exhibited any of the following behaviors:

- Treated you “differently” because of your sex.
- Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials.
- Made offensive sexist remarks.
- Put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex.
- Told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you.
- Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters.
- Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities.
- Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you.
- Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, jokes, or pictures.
- Spread unwelcome sexual rumors about you.
- Used language about sexual orientation and/or gender identity in a negative way.
- Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it.
- Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said “no”.
- Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable.
- Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you.
- Made you feel like you were being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual or romantic behavior.
- Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually or romantically cooperative.
- Treated you badly for refusing to have sex.
- Implied better treatment if you were sexually or romantically cooperative.

Offensive Behavior/Harassment by Faculty/Staff

When asked specifically about offensive/harassing acts committed by faculty or staff, students reported an overall rate of 35.6%, with 40.3% of women and 28.9% of men reporting at least one of the 19 offensive or harassing behaviors were committed against them.

Tables 7a-b break down responses regarding offensive behaviors committed by faculty/staff based on the specific behaviors delineated in the survey. Any report of those behaviors (ranging from “once or twice” to “many times”) is counted in tables 7a-b. Table 7a looks at all items that involve being treated differently based on sex or verbally offensive remarks and Table 7b looks at items that involve trying to engage the student in an unwanted romantic or sexual relationship.

Table 7a. Percentages of students by gender identity reporting specific offensive behaviors by faculty/staff.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
Treated you “differently” because of your sex	30.6	15.8	25.0
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials	14.5	13.2	13.5
Made offensive sexist remarks	22.6	10.5	18.3
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex	14.5	13.2	13.5
Told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you	17.7	10.8	14.6
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters	6.5	2.6	4.8
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities	8.1	0.0	4.8
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you	8.1	0.0	4.8
Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, jokes, or pictures	0.0	2.6	1.0
Spread unwelcome sexual rumors about you	0.0	0.0	0.0
Used language about sexual orientation and/or gender identity in a negative way	6.6	2.6	5.8

Table 7b. Percentages of students by gender identity reporting specific behaviors to attempt to engage in unwanted romantic or sexual relationships by faculty/staff.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it	3.2	2.6	2.9
Asked you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said “No”	3.2	0.0	1.9
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable	3.2	2.6	2.9
Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you	3.2	0.0	1.9
Made you feel like you were being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual behavior	3.2	0.0	1.9
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually or romantically cooperative	4.8	0.0	2.9
Treated you badly for refusing to have sex	1.6	0.0	1.0
Implied better treatment if you were sexually or romantically cooperative	3.3	0.0	1.9

Offensive Behavior/Harassment by Other Students

Students were also asked about offensive or harassing behaviors that were committed by other students. Students reported an overall rate of 50.0%, with 56.5% of women and 39.5% of men reporting that at least one of the 19 offensive or harassing behaviors were committed by another student or students.

Tables 8a-b break down responses of student offensive behaviors and harassment based on the specific behaviors delineated in the survey. Any report of those behaviors (ranging from “once or twice” to “many times”) is counted in tables 8a-8b. Table 8a looks at all items that involve being treated differently based on sex or verbally offensive remarks. Table 8b looks at items that involve trying to engage the student in an unwanted romantic or sexual relationship.

Table 8a. Percentages of students by gender identity reporting specific offensive behaviors by students.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
Treated you “differently” because of your sex	39.3	23.7	34.0
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials	23.0	13.2	18.4
Made offensive sexist remarks	34.4	15.8	27.2
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex	28.3	10.5	22.5
Told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you	30.0	10.5	22.5
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters	21.3	7.9	15.5
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities	26.2	7.9	18.4
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you	19.7	2.6	12.6
Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, jokes or pictures	11.3	2.6	7.7
Spread unwelcome sexual rumors about you	12.9	2.6	8.7
Used language about sexual orientation and/or gender identity in a negative way	21.0	5.3	16.3

Table 8b. Percentages of students by gender identity reporting specific behaviors to attempt to engage in unwanted romantic or sexual relationships by students.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it	23.0	7.9	16.5
Asked you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said “No”	13.1	5.3	9.7
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable	16.1	10.5	13.5
Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you	12.9	2.6	8.7
Made you feel like you were being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual behavior	11.3	2.6	7.7
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually or romantically cooperative	12.9	5.3	9.6
Treated you badly for refusing to have sex	14.5	2.6	9.6
Implied better treatment if you were sexually or romantically cooperative	14.5	0.0	8.7

STALKING BEHAVIORS

Students were asked if they have experienced one or more of the following behaviors since enrolling at Penn State:

- Has anyone watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS (global positioning system)?
- Has anyone approached you or showed up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you didn't want them to be there?
- Has anyone left gifts or other items for you to find that made you feel uncomfortable?
- Has anyone sneaked into your home or car and did something to let you know they had been there?
- Has anyone communicated with you through letters, phone calls, messages, emails, or other means that was unwanted?

Students were also asked a series of questions related to the context of the incident of stalking behavior that had the greatest effect on them. Data related to this question set are also presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Percentages of students reporting at least one incident of stalking and context of the incident with the greatest effect on them by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
Experienced at least one stalking behavior	22.6	10.5	18.3
Perpetrator was a stranger	13.3	-	15.0
Perpetrator was a PSU student	86.7	-	75.0
Perpetrator was faculty/staff	0.0	-	0.0
Perpetrator was a man	86.7	-	75.0
Location (On campus)	86.7	-	75.0

Note: Cells are left blank when five or fewer respondents answered a question.

INTIMATE PARTNER AND DATING VIOLENCE

Students also responded to a series of questions referencing intimate partner and dating violence (IPV/DV). Questions in this section of the survey asked respondents to think about any hook-up, boyfriend, girlfriend, husband, or wife they have had – including ex-partners, and regardless of length of relationship – since enrolling at Penn State, before indicating whether they had experienced the following specific behaviors:

- The person threatened to hurt me and I thought I might really get hurt.
- The person pushed, grabbed, or shook me.
- The person hit me.
- The person beat me up.
- The person stole or destroyed my property.
- The person can scare me without laying a hand on me.
- The person tried to convince my family, children, or friends that I am crazy or tried to turn them against me.
- The person told me I was crazy, stupid, or not good enough.
- The person blamed me for causing their violent behavior.
- The person kept me from seeing or talking to my friends.
- The person confined or locked me in a room or other space.
- The person kept me from having access to a job, money, or financial resources.

As can be seen in Table 10, responses varied by gender identity. Also included in Table 10 is the context for the IPV/DV incident that had the greatest effect on the respondents.

Table 10. Percentages of students reporting at least one incident of IPV/DV and context of the incident with the greatest effect on them by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
Victim of at least one act of Dating/IPV Violence	19.4	13.2	16.3
Perpetrator was a PSU student	58.3	-	47.1
Perpetrator was faculty/staff	0.0	-	0.0
Perpetrator was a man	83.3	-	64.7
Location (On campus)	41.6	-	35.3

Note: Cells are left blank when five or fewer respondents answered a question.

NON-CONSENSUAL SEXUAL CONTACT AND SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMIZATION

Students were also asked to report their experiences related to specific forms of non-consensual sexual contact, including:

- Fondling, kissing, or rubbing up against the private areas of the respondent's body (lips, breast/chest, crotch, or butt), or removing clothes without consent;
- Having oral sex with the respondent or making the respondent perform oral sex without consent;
- Putting the penis, fingers, or other objects into the respondent's vagina without consent¹;
- Putting the penis, fingers, or other object into the respondent's butt without consent;
- Attempting (unsuccessfully) to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex without the respondent's consent.

For each form of non-consensual sexual contact, respondents were asked to report the method by which non-consensual sexual contact was obtained, including:

Acts of Coercion

- Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about the respondent, making promises the respondent knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring the respondent after they said they did not want to continue;
- Showing displeasure, criticizing the respondent's sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force after the respondent said they did not want to continue;

Incapacitation

- Taking advantage of the respondent when they were too drunk or out of it to know what was happening;

Force or Threats of Force

- Threatening to physically harm the respondent or someone close to the respondent;
- Using physical force, for example: holding the respondent down, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.

¹ This question was asked only to respondents who indicated that a vagina was an appropriate body part in relation to their body.

Victimization Rates of Any Non-consensual Sexual Contact

Table 11 shows the percentage of students by gender who reported experiencing any type of non-consensual sexual contact.

Table 11. Percentages of students reporting any non-consensual touching, penetration, or attempted penetration by gender identity.

Undergraduate			
	Women	Men	Overall
Victim of at least one instance of unwanted touching, penetration, or attempted penetration	21.0	10.5	16.3

Victimization Rates of Sexual Assault

Sexual assault is defined here as any of the non-consensual acts that involve completed or attempted sexual penetration. Therefore, these numbers exclude behaviors that involve non-consensual touching/kissing/fondling. Table 12 summarizes the reported victimization data for incidents that meet this definition of sexual assault.

Table 12. Percentages of students reporting sexual assault involving penetration or attempts at penetration (excludes non-consensual touching/kissing/fondling) by gender identity.

Undergraduate			
	Women	Men	Overall
Victim of at least one instance of completed or attempted oral, vaginal, or anal sexual assault	19.4	5.3	13.5

Sexual assault can be further broken down into the tactics used by the perpetrator to commit the offenses without consent including coercion, incapacitation, and force or threats of force as defined above. The rates of each of these tactics is found in Table 13.²

² Note that, because a student could report that multiple tactics were used in any instance of sexual assault, adding the rates pertaining to any individual tactic results in a percentage that is greater than the overall number presented in Table 12.

Table 13. Percentages reporting sexual assault involving penetration or attempts at penetration (excludes non-consensual touching/kissing/fondling) by tactic and by gender identity.

Undergraduate			
	Women	Men	Overall
Coercion	14.5	2.6	9.6
Incapacitation	6.5	0.0	3.8
Force or threats of force	9.7	5.3	7.7

Victimization Rates of Non-consensual Sexual Touching, Fondling, or Kissing

Respondents were asked a series of questions regarding their experiences with incidents of non-consensual sexual touching. The category of non-consensual sexual touching excludes acts of sexual assault that involve penetration or attempted penetration. Table 14 details response rates related to this question set.

Table 14. Percentages of students reporting non-consensual touching (excludes assault by penetration or attempted penetration) by gender identity.

Undergraduate			
	Women	Men	Overall
Victim of at least one act of non-consensual sexual touching/fondling/kissing	12.9	10.5	11.5

Table 15. Percentages of students reporting non-consensual touching (excludes assault by penetration or attempted penetration) by tactic and by gender identity.

Undergraduate			
	Women	Men	Overall
Coercion	11.3	5.3	8.7
Incapacitation	3.2	0.0	1.9
Force or threats of force	4.8	7.9	5.8

Context of Any Non-consensual Sexual Contact Victimization

Respondents who reported experiencing at least one incident of non-consensual sexual contact since being enrolled at Penn State were further asked to provide the following information regarding the details of the incident that had the greatest effect on them:

- Whether the perpetrator was a stranger or known to the victim;
- Whether the perpetrator was a Penn State student;
- The gender of the perpetrator;
- Where the incident occurred (on or off campus);
- Whether alcohol or drugs were present or used by any parties involved in the incident.³

Table 16 details the responses of students who indicated that they had experienced at least one incident of non-consensual sexual touching.

Table 16. Percentages of students indicating context of any non-consensual contact victimization by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
Perpetrator was a stranger	7.7	-	5.9
Perpetrator was a PSU student	61.5	-	58.8
Perpetrator was a faculty/staff	7.7	-	5.9
Perpetrator was a man	92.3	-	82.4
Location (on campus)	69.3	-	64.7
Any presence of drinking or drugs by parties involved	7.7	-	5.9
Victim: Use of alcohol and/or drugs just prior to the incident	7.7	-	5.9
Perpetrator: Use of alcohol and/or drugs just prior to the incident	7.7	-	5.9

Note: Cells are left blank when five or fewer respondents answered a question.

³ Note that the survey assured students they were not at fault for the incident if they were under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

REPORTING

Students who reported experiencing any type of sexual misconduct were asked if they told anybody about the incident or incidents. Of undergraduates who reported any stalking, IPV/DV, or non-consensual sexual contact, an overall rate of 39.7%, with 46.7% of women and 25.0% of men reported telling someone about the incident or incidents. Students indicating they had told someone about the incident were then asked whom they told (see Table 17). Note that percentages in Table 17 are only for those students that reported telling someone about their experience.

Table 17. Percentages of students who spoke with someone about an incident of stalking, IPV/DV, or non-consensual sexual contact by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
Roommate	23.8	-	22.2
Close friend other than roommate	85.7	-	85.2
Romantic partner	28.6	-	37.0
Parent or Guardian	23.8	-	18.5
Other family member	9.5	-	7.4
Doctor/nurse	0.0	-	0.0
Religious leader	9.5	-	7.4
Off-campus rape crisis center staff	4.8	-	3.7
Off-campus counselor/therapist	4.8	-	3.7
On-campus counselor/therapist	9.5	-	7.4
University Health Services	0.0	-	0.0
Campus security or police department	4.8	-	3.7
Local police	0.0	-	0.0
Office of Student Conduct	14.3	-	11.1
Office of Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response	4.8	-	3.7
Resident Advisor or Residence Life staff	4.8	-	3.7
University faculty or staff	4.8	-	3.7

Note: Cells are left blank when five or fewer respondents answered a question.

Students who reported to a non-confidential official were asked how timely warnings impacted their reporting of sexual misconduct. Because of the low rates of reporting to officials, these data are not presented.

Table 18. Percentages of students indicating timely warnings influenced their reporting of sexual misconduct (percent indicating “yes” to each item).

	Undergraduate
	Overall
I was confident the University would act because of the timely warnings.	-
I wanted a timely warning to be posted.	-
I delayed reporting because I was worried about it resulting in a timely warning.	-

Note: Cells are left blank when five or fewer respondents answered a question.

Students who reported to a non-confidential official were also asked about how useful they felt each resource was. Because of the low rates of reporting to officials, these data are not presented.

Table 19. Percentages of students indicating that a resource was “moderately” or “very” useful” in helping to deal with the reported incident.

	Undergraduate
	Overall
On-campus counselor/therapist	-
University Health Services	-
Campus Police	-
Office of Student Conduct	-
Office of Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response (Title IX Compliance)	-
Resident adviser or Residence Life staff	-
University faculty or staff	-

Note: Cells are left blank when five or fewer respondents answered a question.

Students who indicated they did not report the incident to a non-confidential resource were asked what prevented them from reporting to those officials. Table 20 presents the percentages for each reason presented in the survey. (Note that students could check all reasons that apply. Therefore, columns add to greater than 100%.)

Table 20. Percentages of students indicating reasons why they did not report incidents of stalking, IPV/DV, or non-consensual sexual contact to an authority by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
I was too embarrassed.	24.4	15.0	20.3
I didn't think they would believe me.	2.4	15.0	6.3
It would cause more trouble than it was worth.	43.9	25.0	37.5
I didn't want to get the person who did it in trouble.	12.2	15.0	14.1
I thought I would be punished.	4.9	5.0	4.7
I didn't think I would be taken seriously.	9.8	20.0	12.5
People who do these things don't get brought to justice anyway.	12.2	15.0	14.1
Events like this seem common.	14.6	15.0	14.1
Alcohol or other drugs were present.	2.4	5.0	3.1
I feared negative social, professional, or academic consequences.	19.5	20.0	18.8
My body showed involuntary arousal.	2.4	5.0	3.1
Because of the person's gender I thought it would be minimized or misunderstood.	4.9	10.0	6.3
I was not injured or hurt.	31.7	30.0	31.3
The event happened in a context that began consensually.	26.8	5.0	18.8
I could handle it myself.	51.2	50.0	51.6
It was not serious enough to contact any of these resources.	51.2	35.0	48.4
I felt it would be too emotionally difficult to report.	9.8	5.0	7.8
I didn't think these resources would give me the help I needed.	7.3	15.0	9.4
I didn't want it to result in a timely warning.	2.4	15.0	6.3

BYSTANDER INTERVENTION BEHAVIOR

Students were asked a number of questions about how they behaved when they were in situations during which sexual misconduct was occurring or was likely to occur. In addition, they were asked about their motivations for intervening as a bystander — and the barriers that can prevent them from acting as a bystander — when in situations during which sexual misconduct was occurring or was likely to occur.

Table 21 shows the percentage of students reporting that they intervened “most of the time” or “always” in situations during which sexual misconduct was occurring or was likely to occur.

Table 21. Percentages of students reporting that they acted “most of the time” or “always” when a bystander in each situation by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
Walked someone who had too much to drink home from a party, bar, or other social event.	8.0	5.4	6.8
Talked to the friends of a drunk person to make sure they don’t leave him/her behind at a party, bar, or other social event.	14.5	8.1	11.6
Spoke up against sexist jokes.	13.0	8.1	10.7
Tried to distract someone who was trying to take a drunk person to another room or trying to get them to do something sexual.	9.7	2.7	6.8
Asked someone who looks very upset at a party if they were okay or needed help.	21.0	10.8	16.5
Intervened when someone was being physically abusive to another person.	8.1	5.4	6.8
Intervened with someone who was being verbally abusive to another person.	14.5	8.1	11.7

Students were also asked to select the top three reasons they did not act when they were in a situation in which they felt sexual misconduct might occur or be occurring. Table 22 shows the rates at which students indicated these barriers. (Note that because up to three items could be selected, columns add to more than 100%).

Table 22. Percentages of students indicating barriers as one of the top three reasons for not acting in a situation where sexual misconduct could occur or was occurring by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
You didn't notice the situation at the time because you were intoxicated.	24.2	39.5	28.8
No one else seemed to think it was an issue.	9.7	10.5	9.6
You didn't have enough information to determine if it was concerning enough to intervene.	58.1	65.8	61.5
It's not your place to tell them what to do.	6.5	5.3	6.7
You didn't know how to intervene.	46.8	34.2	41.3
You thought you would make the situation worse.	38.7	47.4	43.3
You were concerned for your own safety.	53.2	31.6	44.2
You didn't want to embarrass yourself or others.	4.8	10.5	6.7
You worried about the long-term social repercussions of intervening.	4.8	2.6	3.8
You assumed someone else would intervene.	1.6	0.0	1.0
You didn't know the person well enough.	8.1	13.2	12.5

PERPETRATION

Students were asked if they had done any of the behaviors included in the stalking, IPV/DV, and non-consensual sexual contact modules to determine if they had perpetrated any sexual misconduct themselves. While these data are being included in this report for transparency in Table 23, there are reasons to question the validity of these numbers given how low some are in comparison to national estimates of rates of perpetration. It is also worth noting that the validity of these data have been questioned by some involved with maintaining the ARC3 survey. Consideration should be given as to whether these questions are appropriate to include in future iterations of this survey.

Table 23. Percentages of students indicating perpetrating sexual misconduct by gender identity.

	Undergraduate		
	Women	Men	Overall
Stalking Perpetration	3.2	0.0	1.9
Intimate Partner/Dating Violence Perpetration	0.0	13.2	4.8
Nonconsensual Sexual Contact Perpetration	3.2	2.6	2.9



For further information, please visit www.studentaffairs.psu.edu/assessment or contact saraoffice@psu.edu, 120 Boucke, University Park, PA 16802, (814) 863-1809.

This publication is available in alternative media on request. Penn State is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer, and is committed to providing employment opportunities to all qualified applicants without regard to race, color, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, disability or protected veteran status. UEd. STA 23-305