

6-2012

The Role of the Bystander Effect on Domestic Violence Within College Relationships

Caitlin Gallagher

Union College - Schenectady, NY

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalworks.union.edu/theses>



Part of the [Domestic and Intimate Partner Violence Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gallagher, Caitlin, "The Role of the Bystander Effect on Domestic Violence Within College Relationships" (2012). *Honors Theses*. 819.
<https://digitalworks.union.edu/theses/819>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at Union | Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Union | Digital Works. For more information, please contact digitalworks@union.edu.

Running Title: The Role of the Bystander Effect on Domestic Violence Within College Relationships

The Role of the Bystander Effect on Domestic Violence
Within College Relationships

By

Caitlin Gallagher

* * * * *

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
Honors in the Department of Sociology

UNION COLLEGE

June, 2012

ABSTRACT

GALLAGHER, CAITLIN The Role of the Bystander Effect on Domestic
Violence within College Relationships.
Department of Sociology, June 2012

ADVISOR: Linda Relyea

This current study evaluates what factors contribute to bystander intervention when dealing with sexual assault and abuse on college campuses. Bystander intervention is a concept that is still in its infancy, concerning research and development. Through unsuccessful trials of spreading rape awareness on college campuses by focusing on the victims, the focus has shifted to educating the bystander, or college students as a whole.

Factors that appear to be a major influence are drinking and going out more than twice a week. When alcohol is put in the mix, decision-making is impaired; therefore consent cannot be given. The collected data also reveals that many students do not know what is considered consent during sexual activities, whether alcohol is involved or not. Educating students to look for particular situations would clear up a lot of grey area.

In this study, different factors that would potentially prevent bystander intervention are presented through a short questionnaire, handed out to 67 students through convenient sampling. A case study has also been made to discuss the University of Virginia lacrosse player, Yearly Love. Both aid in exploring the different reason as to why bystander intervention does not always happen. Additional research should be made to further the factors that prevent bystander intervention through colleges throughout the country for clearer results.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii-iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literary Review	5
Definition of a Bystander	6
Bystander and Intervention	7
Intervention Protocol	8
Bystander Support	10
Foreseeability Testing	10
Bystander Law	11
Bystander Attitudes	13
Good Samaritan Law	14
Bad Samaritan Law	15
Hook-Up Culture	17
Hook-Up Culture and Gender	18
Consequences of Violence	19
Mental Health	21
Gender Role Consequences on College Campuses	22
Chapter 3: Case Study: Yearly Love and George Huguely	25
Background	25
The Relationship	27
Violence and Bystanders	28

Discussion	29
Chapter 4: The Presence of Sexual Assault on a Collage Using Survey	31
Questionnaire Design and Sample	31
Chapter 5: Results and Analysis	34
Frequency	35
Crosstab	46
Conclusion	60
Chapter 6: Conclusion	66
Appendix A: Sexual Assault Survey	70
Appendix B: Male and Female Respondents Reference Tables	73
References	85

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Sexual assault affects millions of people. College students in particular, are at a high risk for this occurring, for example 25% of women on college campuses are survivors of rape or other types of sexual abuse (Burns 2008). This percentage is not something to take lightly. As generations pass, students are becoming more comfortable with speaking out, finding a voice. However, there is still much work to be done, and a center for that work is college campuses. It was found in 2007 that most predators on college campuses of rape were male (Foubert, Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. 2010).

For many college students, living in such close vicinities, away from home for the first time, is a big adaptation. Students go to eat when they want to, wash their clothes, and clean up after themselves. They have to lean on themselves, and trust their choices without begin guided by parents, guardians, or older friends and family. This is the time in their lives dedicated to discovering and changing themselves into who they want to be, and where they want to be going. However, as exciting as that all can be, we also must know there are other dangers that we were not prepared for. No one ever wants to be taken advantage of. Not by a friend, teacher, roommate, or lover, but especially not by someone who will not just abuse them mentally, but physically.

Sex. It's been talked about it, it's all been heard, and some individuals do have sexual intercourse by the time they arrive at college. On the other hand, at home, students might not realize how sheltered they are. At college, students are

invited to college parties, and do not always realize that they are not in a safe, sheltered environment anymore (Foubert et al. 2010). It is important that there is more awareness when entering into this kind of self-exploratory community so that students feel they have all the information to make the appropriate decisions on their own. And if rape and sexual assault does occur, the students need to know that there are people they can talk to.

Sexual assault is a social problem that needs to be talked about and brought into the light. These victims are everywhere, and we just do not see them. There are these social expectations and norms within the hook-up culture that the new generation has created. It is acceptable to hook-up with someone after only just meeting him or her because it is exciting and scandalous. Individuals believe they enter into a one-night relationship on the premise it might make them look cooler to their peers (Freitas 2008). What they do not realize is the emotional baggage that can come out of being so lighthearted and carefree. This experience is not like trying a new food but rather penetration into ones own personal space, both physically and emotionally.

The bystander can be a key factor in all of this. When we witness fun events seen on campus, we are constantly gossiping. Students are constantly talking, trying new things, getting involved and starting to speak their minds. However, when we are talking about negative things, such as sexual assault, students are not willing to discuss or stand up against them. Sexual advances constantly surround students with this hook up culture. There are a number of common sense safety questions that should be poised: why are students letting

their friends go home with strangers: to what point is this unwanted touching acceptable: where is the line and how do we draw it: how do we know we are not misconstruing what we see: there is a lot of doubt when dealing with sexual assault and a lot of confusion between the social norm of hooking up with a stranger and the assault (whether it be between someone the student knows or a stranger). Specifically, how should peers know if the hook-up experience of a friend is, wanted or unwanted. The underlying question asks, what factors play into peer's unwillingness to intervene when witnessing sexual assault.

Unfortunately, sexual assault and rape is not something new and has been going on for years. The only difference as to why it might seem more prevalent now than at other points in history is because people are now standing up. They are speaking out and trying to let the communities around them know that it is not okay and there will be consequences. There are personal thresholds and parameters that allow us to draw the line between unwanted advances and one that is welcome. The only issue with this is, not everyone knows these boundaries to what is socially acceptable, and not everyone will become aware until the awareness is promoted. Research is still going to find more information and understanding of rape on college campuses.

To help aid in the efforts, I have made a survey to which I will be handing out to the campus community of Union College. This survey is an exploration of the bystander effect, and why students are still afraid to intervene when they know something not right is occurring before them. This short quantitative questionnaire will be broken up into different types of factors, and end with situational

experiences, asking the respondent to think about a particular circumstance, and how to react. There are many suggested reasons as to why bystanders of sexual abuse do not intervene such as, safety of their own wellbeing, misinterpreting a situation, or not understand what sexual consent is. There are also factors that might prevent or aid in bystander intervention such as drinking, partying and participating in Greek-life. It is my assumption that students who drink more are more likely to be caught up in their own agenda then realize what is going on with others. I am curious to determine if Greek-life members are believed to help out their community over that of non-Greek life members. Before furthering on with just a survey, it is important to recall other works of literature researching the same topics, as I would like to in my study. The focus of these literary reviews will be on the bystander effect, the hook up culture and college relationships and end with the consequences of violence.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to examine abuse within college relationships, and the extent to which a bystander student will go to speak out. There are morals that tell each person what they should be doing while witnessing a violent situation, but our brain can be telling us another. Breaking the silence is making huge leeway on college campuses, but what is it that is holding back the masses in deciding not to report or to intervene?

The main focus of this study is to see what is making people shy away from helping another student in need. The silent bystander can be as dangerous as the abuser; they are letting what is going on continue instead of stopping the act. The person being abused is in a much more vulnerable state, and most likely not able to help one selves. However, when you live within the college campus, it is a hard choice to expose another that you reside so closely with.

When dealing with witnessing harmful acts, one of the biggest dilemmas bystanders will face is deciding if their own life could be in danger when trying to intervene. It is one thing to try and help another, but when it could involve getting hurt themselves people are more inclined to take a self-interested view, staying as far away from the situation as possible. The research will be focused on why college students do or do not respond.

With sexual abuse becoming a more prevalent issue on college campuses, it is still a mystery as to why bystanders do not speak out. With all the media and television that we have access to, as well as normal observations at college parties,

or the night scene, we are shown how women enjoy attention from men, and use it as a self-esteem booster. On the other hand men use the attention to obtain sex, which they then can brag to their friends about and get some popularity points, especially if it is a well-desired woman (Foubert et al. 2010). However, “research has further shown that women are expected to be appreciative of men’s hospitality in deference to men’s often older age and fraternity membership. These gendered roles can place women in vulnerable positions, making sexual assault a possibility, should men choose to exploit their power” (Foubert et al. 2010: 814).

Definition of the Bystander

To understand the position of a bystander, first it must be defined. The “bystander” must have seen or noticed an event, and interpreted it as something that needed their immediate help or involvement (Foubert et al. 2010). To take action as a bystander would then be up to them. When witnessing another in need of help it is up to the principles of another to come in and intervene. A college campus survey proved that a lot of students believe in college myths about sexual abuse between domestic partners (McMahon 2010). Answers such as, “He didn’t mean to”, and “she lied”, had some of the highest scores in belief within rape questions (McMahon 2010). Even though there is more widely available information on sexual abuse, and awareness on college campuses, it still is an issue that bystanders do not want to face. They might see and or witness an event, but since it is not happening to them, they are less inclined to do anything about it.

Victim blaming tends to be a very common occurrence. In the same study, the highest means were found in questions that had to do with victim blaming

myths (McMahon 2010). Over 53% of the student body believed that if a girl acts or dresses like a “slut”, she is eventually going to have to deal with the consequences (McMahon 2010). It seems what many students do not understand is the mere fact that no one is ever asking to be raped. There is never an excuse for such a violent act against one’s free will. That being stated, no one should steer away from helping someone who needs it just because of promiscuous attire. A bystander should never assume that the victim is ‘asking for it’, or ‘deserves it’, just because they dress a certain way.

Bystander and Intervention

Twenty-five percent of all women on college campuses are survivors of a rape crime, with two-thirds of the predators being someone they have known or have been in a relationship with (Burn 2008). Most of the time, alcohol or drug use is involved during times of sexual abuse causing disorientation with a victim (Burn 2008). Bystanders are usually around during the pre-assault phase when certain indications of sexual assault risks are present (Burn 2008; Cummings et al. 2011). The bystander determines whether or not to take action him or herself, because there is no universal line on whether or not someone is in danger of sexual abuse. This is where everything becomes fuzzy.

Once a bystander identifies an intervention is needed between a victim and attacker, the next step would be to take responsibility for the intervention and decide to help that person in need (Burn 2008). It might seem like morally that is what the right thing to do is. However, there are many situational barriers that tend to get in the way of helping and end up halting the bystander from further

proceeding in helping out. “Other variables from the social-psychological research literature on gender, helping behavior, and perceptions of sexual assault survivors are applied to further our understanding of sexual assault bystander intervention and potentially inform prevention programming” (Burn 2008: 780).

Intervention Protocol

There are several steps to what a bystander needs to do in order to help out during an event. The first being to actually acknowledge that some sort of abuse is happening because at college parties especially, it is difficult to understand what is going on around you with all the barriers like loud music and intoxication (Burn 2008). It is also distracting to be indulged in your own social activity, and not realize that a friend or person is in need of help (Burn 2008). After taking notice of an activity of possible sexual violence or abuse, one must make sure that there is no misconstruing of what is actually is happening. It might be a little unclear if the man/woman touching or talking to the intoxicated “victim” is actually a danger (Burn 2008). One of the biggest mistakes in not understanding what constitutes as sexual consent, and what the line of sexual assault is. This would then make it harder for a bystander to make a judgment call when they’re unsure of what is really happening (Burn 2008).

Women do not always realize that when at a college party or bar, it is not safe, and if left alone can put a friend at risk. When this happens, it makes it easier for a man to escort her to a private location, unable to be assisted if she was in serious danger (Burn 2008). On the other hand, men might not realize that their friend is at risk for sexually assaulting because anyone who is intoxicated cannot

under any circumstance consent to anything sexual (Burn 2008). In a nationwide study done in 2007, it was found that mostly all predators of rape were men on college campuses (Foubert et al. 2010). What was found most prevalent, were men who consumed alcohol more than a few times a week and who might have stronger pulls of peer pressure will act out in an emotionally violent manner toward women. In doing this, they will be ten times more physically and sexually violent (Foubert et al. 2010).

It also makes a big difference if people are dating, over the ambiguity between the victim and the perpetrator, especially when it comes to the bystander interfering (Burn 2008). If a bystander believes or knows that the two people involved are dating, or in some sort of domestic relationship, the bystander is less likely to intervene (Burn 2008). It could be assumed this is because the bystander does not think that it is their place to deal with someone else's personal business, especially since they chose to be in the partnership in the first place (Burn 2008). On the flip side to that, when the situation is ambiguous, bystanders rely on other's responses to really see what they should do. The worst possible outcome that can come of this is when ignorance is something found within all the bystanders, and no one takes action (Burn 2008). When this occurs, the person in need will end up falling victim to the predator because no assistance is made available because no bystander has assist the situation and decided to take action.

Responsibility plays a huge role in the bystander effect. If the witness does recognize that another is at risk, and in need of help, it is their choice whether or not to intervene. Failure to intervene happens a lot when there is more than one

bystander around to witness an event, diffusing the responsibility level on that one individual, and an individual will feel less responsible, therefore less likely to take action (Burn 2008). The relationship with the bystander and the victim also plays an important role. If the bystander is friends with the victim and feels that their “worth” is great enough to intervene, then they are more likely to help in a sexual assault situation (Burn 2008). However, if the bystander does not have any relationship or ties with the victim, they are less likely to feel responsible for that individual, and most likely will not intervene when the victim truly does need it (Burn 2008).

Bystander Support

A concern for the bystander taking part as a third party in a domestic dispute is the emotional distress that can come out of helping out a victim. However, there is now an assessment that can be made on a bystander called negligent infliction of emotional distress or NIED (Baren 2004). Knowing that this test is extended to bystander recovery if anything were to go wrong in their attempts to help might make people more inclined to help in such a scenario. If a bystander felt that they were being threatened during an intervention, or while intervening, and in result, felt like they were in danger of their own life, they can seek compensation and support (Baren 2004).

Foreseeability Testing

However, to measure the amount a bystander feels threatened in a situation of intervention is not easy. Courts decided that it was too difficult to decide who felt like their life was actually being threatened and who did not feel that way, so

they adopted the foreseeability test to determine who should have recovery support for NIED (Baren 2004). “Foreseeability was the chosen standard because ‘[i]t is just as foreseeable that an individual outside of the zone of danger will suffer genuine distress as a result of seeing a loved one seriously injured’” (Baren 356:2004). Foreseeability was a way in which the government could assess if the persons, who were watching a victimization or crime take place, could anticipate the next move of the abuser or criminal and potentially stop it from occurring.

With the new foreseeability test to guide the way, there became a few elements in determining who would actually suffer from NIED, and who would truly need help from the trauma caused. If the bystander was close with the victim that was abused, killed, raped, etc, it is more likely that they would be extremely affected (Baren 2004). Next, if the bystander had a direct emotional impact when the incident happened because they were physically there and having to deal with it (Baren 2004). If the emotional damage is not clearly manifested, the bystander will not have a good chance of getting any sort of compensation for the potential emotional distress they could encounter from aiding victims (Baren 2004). However, it is necessary to keep in mind the difficulty of actually proving emotional distress for the bystander (Baren 2004).

Bystander Law

The most studied type of crime, are those that include offenders who are actively behaving badly and committing illegal acts. What are not focused upon nearly as much is the crimes that are made in absence of such behaviors (Time and Payne 2010). When faced in a situation that deals with domestic violence, it is

suspected that most people, under moral obligation, would take it upon themselves to intervene. It is, however, another story to require individuals to step into a somewhat dangerous situation, without knowing exactly what is going on (Time et al. 2010). In order to make not helping individuals in a time of need “illegal”, society needs to first declare a set of standards guidelines. That way when someone fails to meet the set of rules, it is clear.

In the media today, there are constant stories on how innocent lives could have been saved if someone was just there to help, intervene, or assist. Why some people look away is usually dependent on the nature of the emergencies, and where it takes place (Time et al. 2010). Intervening can be as simple as placing a 911 emergency call to the police before a victim ends up severely hurt or dead. However, having government being able to force on society these coercive powers over situations that technically would fall under moral duties or options, would be taking away from civil liberties (Time et al. 2010). It is important to keep in mind that when a bystander’s own life is endangered, those are the situations in which they are most likely to walk away and not help out a victim in need. That being stated, when the bystanders do help out in dangerous scenarios, society sees their praise on headline news because of its rarity (Time et al. 2010). Though it might be in the government’s best interest to force moral obligation, it would bring huge controversy over free will of the people, even if it was to a limited extend.

In determining why enforcing legal punishment on those bystanders who do walk away without helping a victim in need, a few claims have been made. The first being, if moral obligation and conscience is not stepping in when witnessing

some sort of act of violence, the bystander may not register it as crime. This is a big possibility because not everyone views abuse in the same context (Time et al. 2010). Next, the court systems are already swamped with cases. To add the cases of the bystander with all the other cases that need to be prosecuted, it will overwhelm the system (Time et al. 2010). Lastly, we cannot force people to be Good Samaritans. We are not all built in the same way, have had the same experiences, or believe in the same things. There will always be bad with the good, and it is not practical that the United States will find itself in a Utopian society, where everyone is programmed to act out the greater good of helping each other (Time et al. 2010). Back in 1967, there was a count of 38 people who were aware of the attack of Kitty Genovese. Not one of the 38 who heard Kitty's screams went to her aid or intervened in the situation, even after the attacker left her for about 5-10 minutes (Time et al. 2010). None of them were charged with any legal responsibility to help her, even though the number was so high.

Bystander Attitudes

Examining bystander's attitudes towards moral duty helps in finding out why it is that people who tend to be more helpful and interactive will help over the people who avoid situations (Time et al. 2010). A bystander is not just a position in a situation, but is more like an accusation of someone who stood by and either helped or did nothing. By assessing why someone is likely to help, it is first needed to define crime. Usually, there are 3 different categories when discussing crime. They include, crime as a law violation, crime as a social construction, and crime as natural law (Time et al. 2010). When discussing crime as a law violation,

what is really means is the behavior of a person is violating some law set by the state. When dealing with social construction, society is declaring a certain act inappropriate, which results in criminal definition. Natural law is more about moral perception and conviction that crimes are the root of all evil (Time et al. 2010). When trying to decide on Good Samaritan Laws, it needs to take into consideration if the act is a violation, socially inappropriate, and morally corrupt. Just becomes someone believes an act is morally unacceptable, does that mean that there should be consequences if someone does not intervene, and if so, how harsh is the punishment (Time et al. 2010)?

Good Samaritan Law

Every state enforces their Good Samaritan Law differently. For instant, both Virginia and Maryland do not enforce helping out a victim in need, but if someone does choose to intervene in a violent act, there are guidelines as to what to avoid (Time et al. 2010). When informing bystanders to ‘avoid certain situations’ does that make it fair in enforcing the law at all, or should people just have the right to intervene when they feel is right, or most comfortable. When creating Good Samaritan Laws, there is a lot of immunity for different types of liabilities that could happen in civil suits after the intervening and crime has been committed (Time et al. 2010). With intervening and trying to help someone in need, especially when not every bystander is a fully trained professional, there are several things that can go wrong. In this instance, a bystander might not feel comfortable intervening in a situation they do not think they can handle (Time et

al. 2010). If we help we can get sued, but if we do not help, we can also be held accountable.

In 2009, a study was done in Virginia, trying to assess the number of people who would support the laws of Good Samaritans. They ranged from people without college educations, to those on college campuses, people with graduate degrees and diverse range of ages (Time et al. 2010). The study proved that most people are willing to help a person in need if they were a witness to the situation. Almost 100% agreed that it would not take a law to pressure them into helping someone in trouble, but rather the moral calling would be there motivating drive (Time et al. 2010). When focusing on age and education of those who participated, people who are younger are over 50% more likely to support the laws of Good Samaritan's than people who are over 30 (Time et al. 2010). What was most interesting was the results of the people who had acquired graduate degrees were least in favor of the Bad Samaritan Law's, which enforce bystanders to act or be punished by law (Time et al. 2010).

Bad Samaritan Law

If Bad Samaritan Laws, or laws that enforce punishment for those who do not aid in helping victims that need it, were to be endorsed, there would be some resistance getting everyone to agree and support the new laws. Based on the survey, not everyone believes that the laws are necessary because morality is something that cannot be forced, because each person holds a different opinion as to what their moral standard is. In the 1980's in Florida, laws like the Bad Samaritan Laws were being talked about and attempted legislation (Time et al.

2010). During that time, many criminals were using this for their advantage, and luring vulnerable women by pretending their car had broken down and they needed help (Time et al. 2010). This would in turn, contradict the legislation by putting those bystanders, or Good Samaritans, in danger.

The attitudes of people helping out individuals in need are difficult to determine by survey. Just because someone says they would help someone in need does not mean they will actually go through with it while witnessing the events. It is a lot easier to say they will follow through with something than actually having to do it when the situation arises (Time et al. 2010). The questions were not formatted in such a way that gave the person a neutral option, or an undecided option, when determining whether or not they would help in a certain situation (Time et al. 2010). This being stated, it is impossible to know if they would have been more in a gray zone than just picking such a black or white answer. Another difficulty with this survey is that it consisted of just people in the state of Virginia instead of a nation wide survey to provide a more realistic view for the society as a whole.

The value of life is placed on a pedestal. Most everyone values their life and does whatever they can in terms to keep preserving it. With that comes protection. There is an extent to which we are willing to put another's life before that of our own. When Kitty Genovese was screaming for help as she was raped, stabbed and eventually murdered, 38 neighbors heard and witnessed, but did nothing to stop it (Time et al. 2010). Criminologist research proves that there is no way to determine set guidelines to what can constitute as moral procedure for

when to help a bystander, and because of that Good and Bad Samaritan Laws will always be challenged (Time et al. 2010).

Hook-Up Culture

The hook-up culture is defined as the sexual activities that are going on in almost all colleges around the nation. It can be something as innocent as kissing, but can also include sexual relations (Freitas 2008). What makes this culture so defined is not what the college students are doing, but how they are doing it. These hook-ups are not with intimate partners, but rather very casual, no commitment necessary, and most of the time, take place when alcohol is involved (Freitas 2008). This idea of hooking-up with no strings, no stress, no relationship attached is not entirely new, but the numbers increasing in this type of activity have grown drastically throughout the years (Fretias 2008). There have always been people looking to hook up with strangers, but never as aggressive as the growing numbers of college students on college campuses in this new generation (Fretias 2008).

Greek life acts as one of the leading nightlife outlets on many college campuses today (Frietas 2008). These parties are themed, where men usually pick powerful leader roles to dress up as, while the women dress in costumes cut too short, too tight, and made to look on the promiscuous side (Frietas 2008). Since these parties are not closed to just Greek life, it is easy to get involved in the scene, and mingle with a bunch of people the same age looking for the same thing; casual sex (Frietas 2008). A study done by John Heagle and Fran Ferder, took 500 students across the nation, including some Ivy League schools, and surveyed them to find most students use casual sex as an outlet to ease the stress of academics

and other strains going on in their life (Ferder 2008). It was what seemed to relax the students most before a big test or project, a way to escape for a while (Ferder 2008).

The most interesting part of the survey done by Heagle and Ferder was the discovery that most of these students, were waiting until after graduation to find “true love” (Ferder 2008). For them, college was a time to let loose, get by academically, and meet new friends while trying and experimenting with new things, and people. The casual sex that was occurring on campuses had little to no intimacy, and communicating (Ferder 2008). The point of the hook up was to pull away from the psychological stresses, and meet their physical needs without long term obligation (Ferder 2008). Donna Freitas, a professor at St. Michaels College in Vermont, did face to face interviews with her students while researching the topic of the hook-up culture as well. When asked about what kinds of things they want in a relationship, they still talked about this old fashion, courting way of wooing another. They wanted communication; date nights, someone to woo them with the big gestures (Freitas 2008). In the hook up culture, they don’t find this because everything is more about the physical aspect, and less about the communication and long-term romance.

Hook-Up Culture and Gender

There is definitely a stigma when it comes to the hook-up culture and gender. Women are thought of as more sexual than ever, and unlike in earlier time periods, enjoy a lot of sex, including but not limited to, casual sex (Freitas 2008). Men have used casual sex as a way to feel masculine. They are thought of as

viewing sex more as a business transaction, no strings attached, and less like an intimate encounter (Freitas 2008). However, men and women can both feel uncomfortable by the hook up culture, and it is very common for people to lie about their sexual experiences (Freitas 2008). Misrepresenting how many people you have slept with can help aid in your reputation on campus. Instead of being embarrassed by the fact someone is still a virgin, they might lie and say they've slept with a bunch of people so they don't feel outcast amongst friends (Freitas 2008). Conversely, it can be very damaging long term for people to get so used to separating emotions from sex. After disassociating the two for too long, it can be harder to put them back together when you are ready to settle down in a relationship, but do not know how to (Ferder 2008).

Though the hook-up culture has been around for a long time, its dominance, and commonality of today's world is shocking (Raber 2008). The attitudes towards the way college students even talk to each other have changed. When referring to women on college campuses the words, "bitch", "slut", and "whore" are predominately used (Raber 2008). And women are using these terms just as often, if not more than men are to degrade other women on campus. The language of the hook-up culture has taken a turn for the worst, using the phrase "yes girls" to the women on campus who will do anything sexual for a guy on command (Raber 2008). The students who might be against this keep their mouths shut because they don't want to be the ones to ruin their reputation and be thought of as a prude.

Consequences of Violence

There are many serious consequences of intimate violence within college relationships. The psychological abuse is most common between college dating relationships, and can be the most hurtful long term (Gormley et al. 2011). With psychological manipulation, the abuser can start taking control of the victim mentally, and bending their will to do and feel whatever the abuser wants (Gormely et al. 2011). Most commonly, the abuser will isolate their supposed significant other, as well as use verbal threats to break them down, and feel their victim needs them or will not be able to survive (Gormely et al. 2011). To have such control over a life that is not your own is dangerous for the other person involved. At Georgia State University, a study was done asking female students questions on their relationships they've had thus far. Overwhelming three thirds of those women who attended the college have had manipulation in their relationship that would be considered psychological abuse from a sexual partner (Gormely et al. 2011).

It is extremely alarming to find that such a high percentage of women on college campuses face these risks. Psychological abuses within these romantic relationships usually lead to physical abuse as well (Gormely et al. 2011). In the same study at George State University, it was found that over half of those in psychologically abusive relationships had some sort of physical violence present eventually (Gormely et al. 2011). What is most dangerous; those in psychologically abusive romantic relationships might not leave. Abusers make their victims feel so worthless and insignificant; that the only thing that makes these victims feels somewhat confident is the person who is in fact taking their

securities away from them. The consequence of these types of romantic relationships needs serious attention (Gormely et al. 2010). That being said, interventions within friends, family and the victims need to be done in order to cease the abuse (Gormely et al. 2010).

Mental Health

The victim's fulfillment within romantic relationships and its impact on victim's mental health are the two most common consequences of dating violence (Kaura et al. 2007). Some research even states that domestic violence within college relationships is more dangerous than marital violence that goes on in today's society. That being said, it is vital that more awareness is being brought up on victimization between romantic dating relationships (Kaura et al. 2007). The mental health of the victims involved in these dating violence brings unwanted anxiety and depression (Kaura et al. 2007). Many studies have provided research that shows how much of violence within dating relationships impacts a person's mental health, however the factors that restrained the relationship are not as well known (Kaura et al. 2007).

Acceptability is thought of to be a variable in dating violence. The victim and those bystanders that surround the victim have a certain attitude toward the relationship (Kaura et al. 2007). By justifying or tolerating violent actions of an abuser, the acceptability of the relationship increases for both the victim and/or bystander. Depending on the social norms of the people witnessing or enduring the violence, decides the acceptability of the violent acts, which can enable the abuser to keep doing what they are doing (Kaura et al. 2007). What has yet to be tested is

if the acceptability of violence is high and a social norm for the victim, they would be less likely to become mentally ill with depression (Kaura et al. 2007). In this case, the victim would not see the violence as a negative victimization, but rather a standard element.

Gender Role Consequences on College Campuses

A study was done to examine the gender similarities and differences between college female and males when it came to treatment of psychological abuse in most recent dating relationships. It was found that men in college were more stressed out about their role in being masculine. If the men felt their masculinity being threatened they would use aggression and physical violence in these dating relationships (Gormely et al. 2010). Vulnerability and emotions that are needed to deal with certain stressing in relationships can add up to be too much for a man to handle. Physical outbursts are most common when the male wants to rid the weakness they feel and take control of the situation, like a true alpha male would (Gormely et al. 2010). Another big factor in physical abuse among college students can occur if some huge life change were to occur for the worst, more likely seen in men than in women (Gormely et al. 2010).

At a large Midwestern University, a survey was given out to 155 male and 417 female undergraduate students who have been in or are currently in some sort of heterosexual dating relationship (Kaura et al. 2007). The questions asked dealt with their intimate relationships, including length of time they've been dating. Approximately 24.9% of the students said they'd been dating their significant other for over a 2-year span of time (Kaura et al. 2007). The 137 questions asked

on the survey were relating to one of three categories; mental health, relationship satisfaction, and the tolerability of violence. What the results showed was that more women than men become depressed and anxious when dating victimization occurs (Kaura et al. 2007). Both men and women seemed to agree that violence acceptability, whether it is female-to-male or male-to-female, it is not acceptable. Their average number of acceptability was 3% for either side (Kaura et al. 2007). Finally, men with 25% and women with 27% believe that relationship satisfaction is decreased when violence is involved (Kaura et al. 2007).

The psychological abuse that happens within these abusive relationships is the primary reason these victims won't let go of their dating partner. There is a correlation between attachment magnitude and psychological abuse (Gormley et al. 2010). There are some gender differences that occur within this explanation. Generally, when high levels of anxiety are present, women are more likely than men to let the abuse happen in fear of losing their partner (Gormley et al. 2010). However, with men, when outside stressors were present in their lives, college men are more likely to endure the psychological abuse with their female partners, much more than female-to-male (Gormley et al. 2010). Depending on the stressors and strains in the relationship, the gender dimensions can change.

After researching, it is found that the bystander effect can be related to college campus violence as well. When it comes to reputation, worth of a person involved, or being afraid for one's own life becomes a variable, people are less inclined to intervene in a situation of abuse. With the hookup culture being so prominently found on college campuses, it is not wonder we find sexual advances

so acceptable. Because there is much more casual sex than ever before, one is unaware if the two people involved are in any danger. The consequences for this kind of behavior can be serious, but to what extent someone draws the line on intervening still remains unclear.

The topic of dating or acquaintance violence within college relationships is important to study because while away from home, each individual is living in close quarters with all different types of people with all different backgrounds. Violence should never be tolerated, but not everyone has the same standpoint on the definition of violence. Speaking out is not ideal for most people trying to fit in. It requires a student to go against the student body, and damage another person's reputation and life. When students attend small colleges, it makes it even more difficult to want to speak out, when their reputation is potentially on the line.

What individuals decide to do when they witness abuse is extremely important. If they walk away from a dangerous situation, it puts the life of another person in jeopardy, if not physically, mentally as well. The phone call that can help save another can be anonymous and harmless for the individual bystander, so the question remains to what extent will you help another. Using a case study and questionnaires to measure how and why a person will intervene will answer that question, and determine what tactics can be made in order to make people feel confident to act sooner.

CHAPTER 3

CASE STUDY: YEARDLY LOVE and GEORGE HUGUELY

There is much to say about romance in college. Some believe one shouldn't get into a serious relationship until after the four years have ended, and graduated. Others believe great loves can start as early as adolescence. At 22 years old, Yeardeley Love, a senior at the University of Virginia, was found murdered on May 3, 2010. Her boyfriend, George Hugueley, also 22, was the prime suspect (Smolowe 2010). They were suppose to graduate May 23, 2010, and both of their lacrosse teams were expected to compete in the NCAA tournaments coming up during that time (Timanus 2010).

Background

Love and Hugueley's life before college were very similar. Both grew up in the Maryland/DC area and had parents that went through divorce. They both attended private schooling, and were both thought of as outstanding athletes. They not only had this, but they both happen to be very attractive people with personalities to match. Their classmates and teachers from back then had always said how upbeat and personable both students were (Hunt 2011). Hugueley's private school was all boys. His school believed that men and women learn differently, and there they could be tailored to learn the way boys needed to. It was a small school and all the boys did everything together. They went to the same classes, played on the same teams, and considered each other brothers instead of just friends (Hunt 2011). This intense bond that the students shared at this private school was unlike that found at public school.

Love was extremely gifted at lacrosse. In high school, she was the only freshman on the Varsity team. She stood out so much she was recruited to the UVA lacrosse team. But during her senior year, her friends and teammates, whom which she lived with, found her dead in a pool of blood (Smolowe 2010). When detectives first arrived at the scene around 2:15 am, they believed that this could have been an alcohol-induced accident, however when looking further, there was noticeable bodily damage on Love (Timanus 2010).

Sunday night for the lacrosse team was something of a social scene. It was a time where the players were able to go out and have a good time with friends, relaxing from their long week of practice. They called it, Sunday Funday (Wertheim 2010). Love was seen at a popular burger joint, but when her roommates eventually came home later that night they found her unresponsive in bed. The investigators went straight to George Huguely, player on the men's lacrosse team at UVA, and recently ex-boyfriend (Wertheim 2010).

This came at a time where everyone on campus was studying for the final exams. Nevertheless, once news spread of the horrific incident, the shock of it all put the campus into a daze (Wertheim 2010). When you lose the comfort of knowing your friends, the people you consider family, are not always there keeping you safe, but can in fact turn and be violent and aggressive, is terrifying. It is difficult to deal with death; it is more difficult to come to terms with how the person might have died, in this case murder. Love learned to rely on her friends and teammates at college, and they did the same for her. It is a deep hurt that the friends of Love had to undergo, after such an event.

The Relationship

Love and Huguely were both exceptionally attractive, popular, excellent lacrosse-playing students at UVA. They were in the same grade, and met during their freshman year (Smolowe 2010). It came as no shock that the two would end up together; they were seen all over campus jointly. What she and other teammates and friends started to realize was Huguely had a very aggressive side. This aggression would come out when alcohol came into the picture (Smolowe 2010).

Huguely was about 6'2, weighing in at about 209 pounds, according to the UVA lacrosse roster before they retracted Huguely from the team (Hunt 2011). This was close to double what Love weighed. He was double the size of her and could have overpowered her without question. There had been many disputes between the two recently. After there long-term relationship had ended, Love was ready to move, but Huguely was not so quick to the draw. He would text her obsessively, keep tabs on her while she was out with her friends, and even went so far as to punch another lacrosse teammate of his when he heard rumors the teammate walked Love home one night (Hunt 2011).

As much as friends saw the violence and verbal abuse, they weren't too concerned that anything that terrible would happen. A friend recalls on the night before Love died, someone had asked her how her and Huguely's relationship was. Her responses would always be vague, insinuating that the two of them would always have this back and forth relationship and nothing would change (Hunt 2011). The friends assumed this meant they were part of the typical on again off

again relationship often seen in college relationships. Huguely was charged with first-degree murder merely four hours after Love's body was discovered.

Violence and Bystanders

Love's friends knew that she ended her relationship with Huguely because he was too violent when he would drink alcohol. He tended to be verbally abusive, screaming obscenities, and could not control himself (Hunt 2011). Alcohol and lacrosse goes hand and hand, said UVA men's lacrosse coach Starsia to the Washington Post (Hunt 2011). Since the players liked to celebrate with drinks, or go out after long practices, Starsia made a rule that they could only drink once a week, to limit the abuse. Starsia made a follow up rule that if any of the players were caught drinking more, they would be suspended from the team. If they broke the rule a second time, they would be kicked off the team indefinitely (Hunt 2011). After Love's death, it came out that eight of the forty-one players on the men's lacrosse team had some sort of charges on their record due to alcohol (Hunt 2011).

Two years prior to Love's death, Huguely went to visit some friends at a nearby institute, Lee University. One night while he was there, a 911 call was placed, and detectives found Huguely stumbling into traffic. When Officer Moss got to the scene, she informed him that he would have to be placed under arrest for public drunkenness, but he should call some of his friends he was staying with to pick him up so he didn't have to spend the night in jail (Hunt 2011). At this point, Huguely becomes belligerent, screaming racist and sexist slurs, becoming extremely aggressive and resisted arrest. It became so bad that Moss had to use a taser, which sent an electrical current through his body and relaxes his muscles.

After, she handcuffed him and took him to the station. When he came to, he was shouting things like “I will kill you!” to Moss (Hull 2011). When questioned about the events the next day, Huguely claimed he did not remember a thing about the intoxicated brawl with the police officer.

Though violence seemed to be persistent in Huguely’s life Love stayed with him for years. Less than three months prior to her death, they went to a party filled with their friends. While there, reports were made that Huguely jumped on Love and started choking her (Hunt 2011). Two lacrosse friends and teammates had to pull Huguely off of her. Love was so upset by the events and wanted to leave the party, so one of the players drove her all the way to her parent’s house in Maryland so that she could escape Huguely. When he woke up the next morning, he could not recall the events from the night, and once he found out, punched the window in his car while driving to Love’s apartment (Hunt 2011). This became the reason for Love’s initiation to their final break-up.

Conclusion

Why didn’t anyone pick up any the red flags? Why didn’t Love do it herself? Why couldn’t she stay away? Huguely was clearly a violent person. He continuously misbehaved when intoxicated, which seemed to happen frequently, and has no control over his body. Friends and teammates all came forward after Love’s death, confessing they had known he was a violent person. Nevertheless, no one ever contacted a teacher, coach, or councilor to intervene in the matter (Hunt 2011). No one thought the abuse would get so far as severe injury, never mind death. The biggest problems with domestic violence on college campuses are

students don't seem to be equipped with enough knowledge about intervention and the line between a fight and abuse.

The message of the UVA murder case sends a strong message to student's nation wide. The publicity it has brought to everyone's attention will stick for years to come. Hopefully, the situation can act as a catalyst to enable confidence in bystanders to take action, and spread awareness on the dangers of domestic and sexual abuse throughout college campuses. The gut feelings that something is going wrong within students witnessing violence, might be backed strongly enough by this incident to make these bystanders standout. This atrocious tragedy can hopefully shed light onto such a horrendous subject matter, making speaking out more established and acceptable.

CHAPTER 4

The Presence of Sexual Assault on a College Using Survey

To fully measure the degree of sexual assault and intervention prevalent on a college campus, a survey was handed out in a convenience sampling. By determining the extent of sexual assault on campus, and the normality of those actions, can help in better understanding what circumstances students will intervene. By handing out situational questions of night life and drinking, it will help to better understand what students are witnessing when they go out, and what they believe is normal behavior. In doing so, one can discover the frequency of bystanders who are not taking action and why.

Questionnaire Design and Sample

The survey method is convenience sampling because it will be handed out to three selected classes, as well as a sorority and fraternity executive board and everyone will not have equal opportunity to take it. I will be finding classes with a good distribution of students from all different class years, hoping to get a better range of ages to participate. The class sizes will range from small, around 12 people, to larger, of about 25. One of the classes I will be using will be an introduction class because knowing the roster of the other classes, there are not enough first year students who are participating, and I want more of a range. I will be using a history class, introduction sociology class, and theater class as a sample. The history class that I have selected also has two Union graduate male students in it. Otherwise, the students will range between the ages of 17-23. Since Union college is made up of a little over 2,000 students, it would be more ideal to

have more participants in the study to get better results. However, it would have a much slower response rate to try to get everyone to take part.

Though my classes selected are all different departmentally, they are still similar in that they all lean toward social science interests. I did not acquire any results from a math or science class. Some would argue that this would put a limitation on my results, because those that choose the social science fields might think differently than those students who have enrolled in other departments. Being a social science major myself, and knowing the professor a little bit better, made me more inclined to ask them to take time out of their classes to help me out. The survey I have created does take a good 10 minutes of the class time to take, so it was most convenient to approach professor who knew what my thesis entailed, and more inclined to take the class time. The questionnaire was made up of the following questions on 5-Scale based answers:

1. Year of Graduation
2. Sex
3. I drink more than twice a week.
4. I go out to a bar or party more than twice a week.
5. It is normal for strangers at a party to hook-up.
6. Sexual encounters without consent are sexual assaults.
7. Women who are incoherent because of drinking are still capable of giving consent to have sexual activities.
8. Members in Greek life are more concerned about getting in trouble and keeping up their reputations than non-Greek life members.
9. When out, I have 3 or more drinks if Female, or 5 or more drinks if Male.
10. With our set of social norms, “no often means yes, and women tend to act coy.
11. A female has to struggle or yell for sexual assault to occur.
12. I wouldn’t want to intervene if I saw a sexual assault because I may be misinterpreting the situation.
13. I wouldn’t want to intervene if I saw sexual assault because I wouldn’t want to put myself into a harmful situation that could risk my own safety.

14. You think you see a guy slip something in another girls drink out one night. You're not positive, and have known they've been dating for a while, so you're not too concerned. Later, the girl is not standing steadily and is leaning on the same guy. He's trying to help her get her jacket on and leave together. Not being sure it was definitely a drug he slipped in her drink, you figure she probably just had too much to drink. Everyone has those nights, so you don't say anything.
15. You see a couple outside in front of a dorm. The girls screaming, what seem like cries for help, but something you can't fully understand, she's clearly intoxicated. A guy is pulling her, trying to bring her inside. There is a bunch of other people outside not doing anything, but you think this is really odd. You start to approach the couple, yelling at the guy to leave her alone.

The beginning questions, 3-5 and 9, were to get a good sense of the nightlife of the student respondent. Questions 6, 7, 10 and 11 were to assess what the student respondent understands about sexual assault and how to categorize it. Then questions 12 and 13 determine the factors in which we would not intervene. Lastly, I have set up two situational questions on whether or not the student respondent would feel it was necessary to intervene in different circumstances. The survey does have a bias and refers only to sexual assault that happens within the nightlife at Union College. There is of course, the chance that sexual assault can be going on throughout the campus at all times during the day. It also questions to see how much of a factor drinking is when out at night.

Once collecting the survey's it is my hope to find out correlations between the factors that contribute to students not intervening, and the situational questions that I have placed at the end. I will then use the computer program SSPS so that I can use descriptive analysis and cross tabulations to help me with my findings. The results will than prove in percentages what the main factors to not intervening with sexual assaults are. This will then be able to help us target a way in which to make intervention more acceptable and happen more frequently.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

More college campuses today are starting up outlet programs, where students can go to someone when they feel like they have witnessed or been through any kind of sexual assault. Here at Union, we have “Safe Space”, a program with a hotline that you can call any point in the night to report sexual abuse. They also hold events on campus for people to not be afraid to speak out against rape or unwanted sexual advances. It has become common for people to accept what happens to them, and not know how to deal correctly with the situation at hand. Programs like “Safe Space” are able to make it socially acceptable for people to speak out against the violence. In order for me to find out why some students still do not feel comfortable enough to intervene about sexual assault, a survey was passed out with factors that could contribute to these factors.

Before I could distribute the survey, I contacted all of the teachers to make sure I could take some of their class time and pass them out. I also got in touch with a sorority and fraternity to make sure I could stop by and schedule a time. The class and Greek members have a mixed age range keeping up with the idea of convenient sampling. From each class that I have selected, I got a 100% completion rate. This consisted of a sample size of 67 students, which was a lot smaller number than I would have liked to have, but with time being of the essences, it was sufficient to get results. There were approximately 25 males and 42 females. However great the amount of completion succession, this is not the best representation of the student body. Union College’s male to female ratio is

nearly even, with a somewhat higher male population. The sample does not represent this accurately for I have more females that ended up taking the survey than men by almost double.

Frequency

Using the SPSS program, this is what I came up with when it came to the frequencies of my survey. The first table illustrates the graduation year of the 67 students taking the surveys.

Table 1: Frequency of graduation year of respondent

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid 2012.00	12	17.9	17.9
2013.00	20	29.9	29.9
2014.00	21	31.3	31.3
2015.00	14	20.9	20.9
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 1 shows that there were 31.3% of the people filling out this survey in the sophomore class. Closely behind that there was 29.9% in the junior class, filling out this survey. I was fortunate enough to have no missing surveys. Right behind the juniors was the freshman class at 20.9%, and then lastly at 17.9% the seniors.

Table 2: Frequency in which the respondent drinks more than twice a week.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent

Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	13.4	13.4
	Disagree	12	17.9	17.9
	Neutral	12	17.9	17.9
	Agree	30	44.8	44.8
	Strongly Agree	4	6.0	6.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0

This next chart illustrates the respondents that drink more than twice a week. Table 2 demonstrates how 44.8% of people who answered this survey go out and drink more than twice a week. There were 17.9% that stayed neutral, and 17.9% that also disagreed. The bulk however, did believe that going out twice a week was a norm in their weekly schedule. The hook up culture is strongly based around alcohol-induced individuals looking for a good time. This chart shows that majority of the respondents agree they go out a couple of times a week and drink.

Table 3: Frequency of respondents that go out to a bar or party more than twice a week.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	11.9	11.9
Disagree	24	35.8	35.8
Neutral	11	16.4	16.4
Agree	22	32.8	32.8
Strongly Agree	2	3.0	3.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 3 then, illustrates the frequency of respondents that are out at a bar or party more than twice a week. The answers here were very close in numbers when it came down to the 35.8% that disagreed, and the 32.8% that agreed. There is a 16.4% of people that were neutral and 11.9% that said they strongly disagree, where as only 3% said they strongly agree. This means that the 44.8% that are out

drinking more than twice a week are doing it other places than at the local hot spots. This could potentially be a factor that there are not enough people around at the time of a sexual assault incident to help out a potential victim.

Table 4: Frequency of respondents who believe it is normal for strangers at a party to hook-up.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	1	1.5	1.5
Disagree	4	6.0	6.0
Neutral	21	31.3	31.3
Agree	36	53.7	53.7
Strongly Agree	5	7.5	7.5
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Going onto Table 4, are the percentages in which people believe it is normal to hook up with strangers when out at night. Here we see that more than half of the respondents, 53.7% agree with this statement. 31.3% have stayed neutral, 7.5% strongly agree, whereas 6.0% disagree. Finally, there is a mere 1.5% that strongly disagrees with this statement. This goes back to the social acceptance of this newfound hookup culture in this generation. You don't need to spend a whole lot of time getting to know someone anymore if the relationship could be based on sexual encounters with no personal strings attached, shown to us by Freitas (2008) research.

Table 5: Frequency that any type of unwanted touching is unacceptable.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	6.0	6.0
	Disagree	9	13.4	13.4
	Neutral	2	3.0	3.0
	Agree	15	22.4	22.4
	Strongly Agree	37	55.2	55.2
	Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 5 deals with unwanted touching and its acceptability. This questions starts to define what sexual assault is considered, to see if students can characterize it. Majority, 55.3% strongly agreed that this is never acceptable. There was a 22.4% that agree that it is never acceptable, but there was a concerning 13.4% that disagreed with this statement. This means that the third most common belief was that unwanted touching is acceptable sometimes. It is alarming that something like that could be thought of as unobjectionable.

Table 6: Frequency of sexual encounters without consent is sexual assaults.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Disagree	5	7.5	7.5
	Neutral	2	3.0	3.0
	Agree	23	34.3	34.3
	Strongly Agree	37	55.2	55.2
	Total	67	100.0	100.0

Again, Table 6 deals with the idea of defining what sexual assault is. 55.2% of respondents said that they strongly agree with the statement that sexual encounters that are made without consent are considered sexual assaults. 34% of the respondents said that they agree with this statement. There was however 7.5% of respondents who did disagree with this statement. No respondent strongly

disagreed, and 3% stayed neutral on the matter. However small the percentage that disagrees, it is still alarming that some people do not know what is considered giving consent when having sexual intercourse with other individuals and what is not. These are the kinds of factors that will prevent an intervention, because respondents do not believe they are witnessing assault.

Table 7: Frequency of respondents who believe women who are incoherent because of drinking are still capable of giving consent to have sexual activities.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	19	28.4	28.4
Disagree	20	29.9	29.9
Neutral	13	19.4	19.4
Agree	13	19.4	19.4
Strongly Agree	2	3.0	3.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Moving on to Table 7, we find that 29.9% of respondents disagree with the statement that women who are incoherent because of drinking are still capable of giving consent to sexual activities. Following closely behind that, there are 28.4% of students who disagree with this statement. Neutral respondents, and those that agree are both at a 19.4% rate, and finally 3% strongly agree. Though the majority of the respondents disagree on this statement, 19% is high enough to be concerned as to what individuals justify as consent again.

Table 8: Frequency for members in Greek life are more concerned about getting in trouble and keeping up their reputations than non-Greek life members.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	6	9.0	9.0
Disagree	20	29.9	29.9
Neutral	21	31.3	31.3
Agree	19	28.4	28.4
Strongly Agree	1	1.5	1.5
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 8 shows how much influential pull people believe Greek life to be when it comes to reputation. This question is asking students if they believe that Greek life students will try and help out other Greek life member's more than non-Greek members would in a situation where someone's reputation can be ruined. There is something to say about "brotherhood" and "sisterhood" and the bonds ones shares in these types of communities. That being said, it could be assumed one who partakes in Greek-life would be more inclined to keep up reputation for their House. Majority of the people, 31.3%, are neutral when it came down to this question. There was 29.9% of people do not believe this, and said they disagree. However, right behind them at 28.4% are the people who do agree with this statement.

Table 9: Frequency of respondents who, when out, have 3 or more drinks if Female, or 5 or more drinks if Male.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	11.9	11.9
Disagree	2	3.0	3.0
Neutral	8	11.9	11.9
Agree	33	49.3	49.3
Strongly Agree	16	23.9	23.9
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 9 shows the frequency of respondents, who drink 3 or more drinks if female, and 5 or more drinks if male. This is enough to become impaired by alcohol. There were 49.3% of people who agreed with this statement. 23% of the people strongly agreed. There was 11.9% that stayed neutral as well as strongly disagreed. Finally, a mere 3% disagreed. This shows that the majority of the people do in fact drink a lot of alcohol when they go out and usually are not in the state of mind to make executive decisions.

Table 10: Frequency of respondents that believe with our set of social norms, "no" often means yes, and women tend to act coy.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	9	13.4	13.4
Disagree	29	43.3	43.3
Neutral	17	25.4	25.4
Agree	11	16.4	16.4
Strongly Agree	1	1.5	1.5
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 10 questions women's intentions; believe they might act like they don't want something when they really do. There were 43.3% of people who disagree. They do not think that even with our set of social norms, "no" does not mean yes. There are 25.4% of respondents who stayed neutral with this question.

There was 16.4% who believed that women do tend to act coy, and “no” sometimes does mean yes. And there were 13.4% of respondents who strongly disagreed, whereas a mere 1.5% strongly agreed. This shows that majority of the people know that “no” will always mean no, and that you can not take from it anything else but what the word actually means.

Table 11: Frequency if a female has to struggle or yell for sexual assault to occur.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	38	56.7	56.7
Disagree	25	37.3	37.3
Neutral	2	3.0	3.0
Agree	2	3.0	3.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0

When it comes to struggling and yelling, Table 11 questions if that is the only thing that can define sexual assault. An overwhelming 56.7% of respondents believe that that is not the only way a situation can be labeled as sexual assault. 37% also disagreed with it leaving only 3% for both neutral and agree respondents and no one responded with they strongly agree. This is the kind of answer that we hope to see when facing a question like this. Sexual assault takes on many different kinds of forms, not limited to victims struggling or yelling.

Table 12: Frequency of respondents that wouldn't want to intervene if they saw sexual assault because they may be misinterpreting the situation.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	17	25.4	25.4
Disagree	34	50.7	50.7
Neutral	12	17.9	17.9
Agree	4	6.0	6.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0

This Table 12 shows the frequency of respondents that wouldn't want to intervene because they would be worried they're misconstruing the situation at hand. 50.7% of respondents disagree, and would still intervene. 25.4% of respondents strongly disagree with this statement, and 17.6% remained neutral. There were only 6% of students who believed they don't think they would intervene because of being unsure. This means that if people were aware of sexual assault, they would without question take action.

Table 13: Frequency of which respondents wouldn't want to intervene if they saw sexual assault because they wouldn't want to put themselves into a harmful situation that could risk their own safety.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	25	37.3	37.3
Disagree	23	34.3	34.3
Neutral	14	20.9	20.9
Agree	4	6.0	6.0
Strongly Agree	1	1.5	1.5
Total	67	100.0	100.0

When it came down to the question, which asked respondents if they wouldn't want to intervene because they thought they might be risking their own safety, Table 13 shows the percentiles. Majority of the respondents at 37.3% believed that they strongly disagree, and would intervene even if it meant risking

their life. There was 34.3% that also disagreed, 20.9% that stayed neutral, and only 6% that agreed, and 1.5% that strongly agreed. When it comes to the safety of that individual, it is more than likely they will save themselves than someone else. This chart goes against that theory. This sample could have been lead to answer the question in this way because some students might not like to think of themselves not putting others first when we are taught at an early age not to be selfish.

Table 14: Frequency of situational question. You think you see a male slip something in another female's drink out one night. You're not positive and have known they've been dating for a while, so you're not too concerned. Later, the girl is not standing steadily and leaning on the same guy. He's trying to help her get her jacket on and leave together. Not being sure it was definitely a drug he put in her drink, you figure she probably just had too much to drink. Everyone has those nights, so you don't say anything.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	10.4	10.4
	Disagree	31	46.3	46.3
	Neutral	15	22.4	22.4
	Agree	14	20.9	20.9
	Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 14 is the first situational question on the survey. It asks students to put themselves in a scenario and see if they would agree to the actions described. Here we are shown a situation in which, the bystander is watching a girl get drugged at a bar or party, but they're not sure if they saw everything correctly. After watching a guy help her up and put on her jacket, the bystander still does nothing to stop this man from taking the girl home. No intervention is made, the

bystander just thinks the girl is having one of those drunken nights everyone has them. After reading the scenario and responding, 46.3% of respondents disagree. They believe they would have stopped the man from leaving the bar with this belligerent girl. There were 22.4% of respondents who stayed neutral in this situation and 20.9% of people that agreed on doing nothing, unsure of how to act. There were a 10.4% of people who strongly disagreed, and would have without a doubt intervened before the couple left the bar. No one strongly agreed with this scenario. This is to say that majority of the people do believe they would intervene when out at a bar or party if they saw something like this happening.

Table 15: Frequency of situational question. You see a couple outside in front of a dorm. The female's screaming, what seem like cries for help, but something you can't fully understand, she's clearly intoxicated. A male is pulling her, trying to bring her inside. There is a bunch of other people outside not doing anything, but you think this is really odd. You start to approach the couple, yelling at the male to leave her alone.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Disagree	2	3.0	3.0
Neutral	18	26.9	26.9
Agree	39	58.2	58.2
Strongly Agree	8	11.9	11.9
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 15 represents the second situational question in my survey. This question does the opposite as the last situational question. Instead of no intervention, the bystander ends up intervening. The situation is placed outside with a lot of people around, not doing anything. The bystander sees a couple fighting and the girl is unmistakably belligerent. The guy is pulling her into the

dorm and she's clearly resisting. The bystander takes a stand and starts yelling at the guy to stop while walking towards them, getting ready to take action. 58% of the respondents said they agree and would do the same thing. 26.9% of the respondents say that they are neutral to the situation, while 11.9% strongly agree and only 3% disagree. No one strongly disagreed in this scenario. This means that people are without a doubt willing to help, once again, in a situation where someone is in risk of being assaulted.

Crosstab

After looking at the descriptive analysis and frequencies, I used the method of cross tabulation to detect if there was direct correlation between the factors and the scenarios. I was hoping that some of the factors would be statistically significant by using Pearson's Chi-Squared analysis, but knew that considering the size of my sample size, there would be a slim chance that anything would be proven statistically. However, even though the sample size might have been too small for statistically significant data, it still shows how the respondents view sexual assault on campus, making it significant to Union College. I chose the top factors from my survey that were most relevant and compared them to the two scenario questions at the end of my survey.

When I talk about the outside scenario, I am referring to the situation in which the bystander sees a couple fighting outside in front of a dorm. The girl is screaming, what seems to be cries for help, clearly intoxicated. A guy is pulling her to get her inside. Although there is a bunch of people outside, no one is doing anything, however the bystander approaches the couple, yelling at the guy to leave her alone. When referring to the indoor bar scenario, I am talking about the other

situational question on my survey that has the bystander at a bar, and sees a guy slip something into another girl at the bars drink. They're not positive what they saw, and have known the couple to be dating before, so they're not too concerned. Later, the girl can barely stand by herself and is leaning on the same guy. Not being sure if the bystander slipped something in her drink, they figure she probably just had too much to drink, everyone gets that way, so they leave it alone. Here is what I found.

Table 16: Students who drink more than twice a week by outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	3.0%
Neutral	33.3%	25.0%	8.3%	36.7%	0.0%	26.9%
Agree	55.6%	58.3%	83.3%	50.0%	50.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	11.1%	8.3%	8.3%	13.3%	25.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 15.596, df = 12, p= 0.210. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

In Table 16, I tested out if drinking more than twice a week would play a role in intervention. The outcome shows that people do agree they go out and drink more than twice a week. It also shows that the respondents also would want to intervene if they saw this scenario while out more than twice a week. The bystander in this case has been drinking, and alcohol can play a factor when it comes to confidence levels. This is the belief that alcohol intake can boost confidence and enable said person to act a way they would not normally do while sober. The results show that the respondents that go and drink are more likely to help out in the outside scenario. Though they might believe they would do it at the time, it is a lot easier said then done. However, if they are intoxicated, there might

be a chance of them intervening because they might have a stronger sense of confidence (Time 2011).

Table 17: Students who drink more than twice a week by inside bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	22.2%	0.0%	8.3%	10.0%	25.0%	10.4%
Disagree	55.6%	41.7%	50.0%	46.7%	25.0%	46.3%
Neutral	11.1%	33.3%	16.7%	26.7%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	11.1%	25.0%	25.0%	16.7%	50.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 8.921 df = 12, p= 0.710. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

In Table 17, I am comparing again, the factor of drinking more than twice a week to the other inside bar scenario. The responds believe that when faced in this scenario they would disagree. The majority would not be drinking more than twice a week, and would not just let a male put something in a females drink without saying something. This might seem like a black and white answer, but there are a lot of grey areas that, while taking my survey, I don't think the respondent was aware of. Time's 2010 article that I've previously mentioned in my literary review, talks about how it is impossible to know for sure what someone would do in a situational moment. We would like to believe that we are all good humans and we would intervene when seeing someone is being taken advantage of, nevertheless many things play into the individual standing by and not doing anything about it.

Table 18: Students who believe it is normal for strangers to hook up by outside scenario.

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Total
--	----------	----------	---------	-------	----------	-------

	Disagree				Agree	
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	20.0%	3.0%
Neutral	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	22.2%	40.0%	26.9%
Agree	0.0%	75.0%	52.4%	63.9%	40.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	25.0%	14.3%	11.1%	0.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.421, df = 12, p = .412. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

In Table 18, I've compared the factor of random hook ups between strangers and the outside scenario where the male is trying to get the girl to go inside with her, even though she is yelling and struggling. The outcome of this was that most students believe they would help the victim in need. The respondents also agree that it is normal for people to go out, meet someone that night, and hook up with them. This goes back to the hook-up culture and its social normality's it has brought with it. In his findings, Feder (2008) mentions how students think of sexual encounters as a way to release tension, stress, and escape from the academic pressures that surround them. This is probably why the students believe it is okay for strangers to hook up.

Table 19: Students who believe it is normal for strangers to hook up by the inside bar scenario.

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Total
--	----------	----------	---------	-------	----------	-------

	Disagree				Agree	
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	13.9%	0.0%	10.4%
Disagree	100.0%	25.0%	52.4%	50.0%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	11.1%	0.0%	28.6%	19.4%	4.0%	22.4%
Agree	11.1%	25.0%	19.0%	16.7%	60.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 19.277, df = 12, p = .080. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 19 is showing the same belief for hooking up with strangers to be normal, with the other scenario of inside the bar and the male slipping something into the females drink. The majority of the respondents believe that when faced in this situation, they would not let the male get away with it, even though it is a majority belief that you can just leave and hook up with a random stranger. Though it is not significantly significant, it comes very close. This scenario is trying to show how even though respondents can socially accept hooking up with strangers, respondents do not accept it if they are being drugged or taken advantage of.

Table 20: Students who believe women who are incoherent because of drinking are still able to give consent to sexual activities by outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	5.3%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Neutral	10.5%	35.0%	30.8%	38.5%	0.0%	26.9%
Agree	73.7%	45.0%	61.5%	53.8%	50.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	10.5%	20.0%	0.0%	7.7%	50.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.749, df = 12, p = .388. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

In Table 20, I am comparing the factor of what is considered women's consent with that of the outside scenario. For women to give consent when

intoxicated actually is no consent at all. The majority of my respondents said women can not give consent while intoxicated, but many stayed neutral on the fact, and another close number agreed that women can in fact give consent. This is concerning because students should be taught the difference between sober consent and intoxicated consent. The relationship is not statistically significant; nevertheless the results show that the student body does not really understand the limits and restrictions to consent, which then can lead to sexual assault.

Table 21: Students that believe that women who are incoherent because of drinking are still able to give consent to sexual activities by the inside bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	10.5%	5.0%	7.7%	15.4%	50.0%	10.4%
Disagree	36.8%	70.0%	30.8%	46.2%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	31.6%	15.0%	23.1%	23.1%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	21.1%	10.0%	38.5%	15.4%	50.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 14.074, df = 12, p = .296. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 21 depicts how the respondents felt toward the factors of consent for sexual activities under the influence, with that of the inside bar scenario. Again, majority of the students said they disagree and would not let a male put anything in a females drink without them intervening and saying something. However, when it came to consent while under the influence, many people said they disagreed, and women cannot do that. On the other hand, there is a large number following that disagreeance, with a good portion that believe it is okay to give consent while intoxicated. This is worrisome that college students do not know what is considered actual consent.

Table 22: Students that drink more than 3 drinks if female, or more than 5 drinks if male by outsider scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	6.3%	3.0%
Neutral	12.5%	0.0%	37.5%	30.3%	25.0%	26.9%
Agree	75.0%	100.0%	62.5%	54.5%	50.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	12.1%	18.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 5.856, df = 12, p = .923. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

In Table 22 I am comparing the factors of drinking enough to become intoxicated (for both male and female) to going to intervene in the outside scenario. The respondents believe that they would intervene in a situation like this, and they also show mixed results all coming very close within one another. The bulk of respondents agree that they do drink that amount while out. This could again contribute to the overwhelming sensation that they need to help another. If they have this confidence from alcohol, they might feel more comfortable in a fight to help the victim (Time 2010).

Table 23: Students that drink more than 3 drinks if female, or more than 5 drinks if male by inside bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------	-------

Strongly Disagree	0.0%	5.0%	9.5%	15.8%	100.0%	10.4%
Disagree	66.7%	35.0%	61.9%	36.8%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	16.7%	35.0%	14.3%	21.1%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	16.7%	25.0%	14.3%	26.3%	0.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.090, df = 12, p = .438. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

With Table 23, I am again using drinking enough to become considered intoxicated (levels for both male and female) and intervention with that of the inside bar scenario. The majority of the respondents believe that they would not walk away from situation where an individual's drink was tampered with. That being stated, majority of respondents stayed neutral when it came to drinking enough for intoxication and blurred view. If the bystander were intoxicated at the time they witnessed the male slipping something in the female drink, they would be more likely to misconstrue the situation.

Table 24: Students who believe with our set of social norms, “no” often means yes, and women act coy by the outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	3.0%
Neutral	33.3%	34.5%	17.6%	18.2%	0.0%	26.9%
Agree	44.4%	55.2%	64.7%	63.6%	100.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	11.1%	10.3%	17.6%	9.1%	0.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 8.192, df = 12, p = .770 This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 24 is taking the factor of social norms of today and comparing them to the outside scenario. Women sometimes tend to act coy, play hard to get. Men can misinterpret a “no” to mean yes, and think they have the green light for sexual

advances, when in reality no really meant no. However, according to my results a lot of people stayed neutral when faced with the social norm of the word “no” and its actual meaning. My respondents do believe they would still intervene regardless of how neutral they feel about the word no. When discussing the hook up culture, Freitas (2008), talks about how women today are portrayed as more sexual than ever. Men have always had this extreme sex drive, but now women too, are being put in this category. Because of this new perception of women being more sexual, I believe my respondents were unsure of how to answer, because they might still have the image of women we are taught to be innocent, conservative people, but also see how sexual they have become once in college.

Table 25: Students who believe with our set of social norms, “no” often means yes, and women often tend to act coy by the inside bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	22.2%	3.4%	17.6%	9.1%	0.0%	10.4%
Disagree	44.4%	62.1%	35.3%	27.3%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	22.2%	17.2%	23.5%	36.4%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	11.1%	17.2%	23.5%	27.3%	100.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.255, df = 12, p = .425. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

In Table 25, I am again taking the factor of women acting coy, and using the word no lightly, playing a little hard to get with the second scenario inside of the bar when the male slips something into the females drink. Majority of the respondents do not believe that women act coy, and use words like no to tease men. They also don’t agree that they’d leave the male with the drink alone with the female, without intervention. This then goes back to Time’s (2010) point of

how well our “moral responsibility” kicks in during this time of need. It is a lot easier to say something, then to act upon it. If a male is using drugs to overtake a female, he clearly has no respect for her or her body if he is giving her something harmful. What is to say he wouldn’t do the something just as gruesome to the bystander if need be.

Table 26: Students that believe you need to struggle for it to be considered sexual assault by the outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Neutral	23.7%	24.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	26.9%
Agree	57.9%	64.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	18.4%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.426, df = 9, p = .190. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 26 is showing the results with the factor of struggling being the only way to determine sexual assault against the outside scenario. Again, most people agree they would intervene in the outdoor scenario, but they do not believe that yelling and struggling is the only way. In this outdoor scenario, I portrayed a girl fighting off a guy that was forcing her into a dorm. The respondents do believe they would help the girl in need, but they do not feel limited to just this situation. The respondents think they would respond with intervention regardless of the physical struggle. This goes against what I originally thought. Like the research Burns has done in 2008, bystanders are usually around during pre-assault and witness the signs that eventually will evolve into sexual assault. Knowing this, it might make more sense for the bystander to intervene before the victim is

attacked, or even has to yell and struggle. Nonetheless, the respondents in my study claim they would still intervene once they witnessed the assault, but not limited to yelling and struggling.

Table 27: Students that believe you need to struggle for sexual assault to occur by the inside bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	15.8%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
Disagree	52.6%	44.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	13.2%	32.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	18.4%	20.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 10.244, df = 9, p = .331. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

In Table 27, I again am comparing the belief you need to struggle for sexual assault to occur against the inside bar scenario. When dealing with the male that put the something in the female's drinks, intervention is the majority of what respondents would do. The respondents also strongly disagree that a struggle has to be made in order for it to be sexual assault. These go hand in hand because within this scenario, the female is not struggling, she doesn't even know what is going on because of the drugs that were in her drink.

Table 28: Students who wouldn't want to intervene if they saw sexual assault because they may be misinterpreting the situation by outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	25.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Neutral	17.6%	23.5%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	26.9%
Agree	64.7%	64.7%	33.3%	50.0%	0.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	17.6%	11.8%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 15.006, df = 9, p = .091. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

In Table 28, I use the factor of being nervous the bystander was misinterpreting the situation to the outside scenario. The respondents disagree in not wanting to help intervene if they saw sexual assault because they would be misinterpreting it. They still think, if placed in the situation, they would continue to help out the victim. This again goes against what I believe, which is the bystander would not be as willing to intervene when they're not sure what they saw, especially if they are out at a bar or party and have had some alcohol themselves. Time's 2010 article considers that even though people believe that they will help a victim in a situation like this, they will not actually go through with it when the situation is placed in front of them. It is a lot easier to believe that we as human beings would be willing to help another when they are in need of it, but it's a lot harder to act on these beliefs.

Table 29: Students who wouldn't want to intervene because they believe they are misinterpreting the situation by the inside bar situation.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	23.5%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%

Disagree	52.9%	44.1%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	11.8%	17.6%	41.7%	50.0%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	11.8%	29.4%	8.3%	25.0%	0.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.516, df = 9, p = .186. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

In Table 29, I'm using the same factor of misinterpreting the situation but in the inside bar situation. The majority of the respondents will intervene when they see the male slip something inside of the females drink. When cross-tabulated, they do not believe they would be misinterpreting any situation and would not hesitate to intervene. This is uplifting because that means regardless of the situation, the respondent would go with their gut instinct that they saw something that wasn't right and go in and check out the situation by intervention.

Table 30: Students who believe they would not intervene because they are afraid for their own safety by outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0.0%	4.3%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Neutral	20.0%	26.1%	42.9%	0.0%	100.0%	26.9%
Agree	64.0%	56.5%	50.0%	75.0%	0.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	16.0%	13.0%	0%	25.0%	0.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 10.515, df = 12, p = .571. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

In Table 30, I am comparing the belief that students are worried for their own safety so they choose not to intervene by that of the outside scenario. Here the respondents have again chosen they will be willing to intervene outside, because majority disagree that they are worried about their own safety when they see someone else in danger. Again, this goes back to Time's (2010) important

point where we as humans want to believe that we will be willing to help others in the time of need. However, it is a lot more unlikely for us to follow through when put in that situation and having to make a choice.

Table 31: Students who believe they would not intervene because they are afraid for their own safety by inside the bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	20.0%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
Disagree	52.0%	56.5%	28.6%	25.0%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	12.0%	13.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%	22.4%
Agree	16.0%	21.7%	21.4%	50.0%	0.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 18.437, df = 12, p = .103. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 31, again, is comparing the belief that bystanders would be too afraid to risk endangering their own life, so they do not intervene when they are put in potentially violent situations. The chart shows the respondents would not let the male put something in the drink of the female without going over to say something, even if they believe they were risking their own life. This, again, is a great outcome because that means regardless of the risks involved, these respondents are more concerned with the wellbeing's of others than making sure they are okay first. The value of life is placed on a pedestal, and usually everyone puts his or her own before anyone else (Time 2010). It is difficult to tell if this factor with this scenario would actually ring true if the respondent was actually placed in this situation for real.

Discussion

Fretias (2008) research on the hook-up culture has led to my belief that we as a society accept a lot more sexual advances then ever before. In doing so, it enables a

higher risk for sexual assault. Because the hook-up is not with intimate partners, and usually take place when alcohol is involved, there is no consent that can be made. Once impaired by alcohol, an individual loses all ability to commit to consent with another individual for sexual activities. There have always been a number of people looking to hook up with a stranger, however, none like the growing numbers of college students (Fretias 2008).

I found in my study, most students agree that they go out more than twice a week and drink to a point of intoxication for both male and females. Boekeloo's (2010) research shows that there is a common link between college drinking and sexual advances, yet students still go out and drink heavily knowing they are putting themselves at risk. When cross tabulating the amount of alcohol that is consumed in a night (3 or more for women, 5 or more for men), and the situation questions, it was proven that people who get intoxicated will help out someone in need. It was also proven that majority of my respondents believe hooking up with a stranger is commonly done. The attitudes about sexual activities have become very casual. It is not thought of as such an intimate act anymore as it is more of an urge for drunken college students to let loose and stress free, like Raber 2008 research suggested. When using sex as a tool for escaping the academic world, and a means for relaxing, it is taken less seriously. Sexual acts are still emotionally damaging if not done under the proper consent. There is still something very personal about sexual encounters that invades with personal space and can be psychologically harmful if done incorrectly (Gromley et al 2011).

When it came to questions of consent, my results showed some problematic outcome. While majority of respondents believed that any type of wanted touching was

unacceptable, and majority also believed that sexual encounters without consent are considered forms of sexual assault, they did not share such strong points of view when it turns situational. When asking students if they believed that women could consent to sexual activities while intoxicated, I received very mixed results back. There were 29.9% of people, who disagreed, but there were 19.4% that stayed neutral and 19.4% that also agreed, that incoherent women can in fact give sexual consent. I believe that students don't understand how consent can be given and under what context. When coming to college, every student has to take an alcohol education test online. It would be beneficial to add questions about consent for sexual activities while under the influence of alcohol to start opening up their minds on what is acceptable and what is not.

I brought up the impact of being apart of Greek life. I wanted to see if being apart of that community on campus would generate a larger desire to keep up appearance and reputation. Frietas (2008) research points out that Greek life is the leading nightlife outlet at many colleges, and I believe the same goes for Union. Students in Greek life are invited to participate in themed parties, where many of the themes happen to shed light on bad stereotypes. Men get to dress up in powerful leader roles, while women are made out to dress promiscuous, which seems as if they are asking for trouble. On the other hand, if a sorority or fraternity were to get in trouble, this form of nightlife would be closed down. My theory was that students who take part would want to uphold their image so that this does not occur. When I got my results, I found that it was split in half. 29.9% did not think that people in Greek life were not more concerned then the students not in Greek-life with reputation, where 28.4% agreed saying they do believe the Greek community thinks this.

In the movies, there are many different portrayals of women. In popular romantic comedies women seem to be coy, sometimes the word “no” means “try harder to win my attention because I want to say yes”. With different ideas of how stable the word no is, in both these party and bar situations, I asked respondents about women’s behavior and the belief of no always meaning no. I was, however, surprised with their results. Majority of my respondents did believe that when a woman says no, they mean no, never yes, and is not just being reserved. However, it is important to keep in mind that majority of the people taking my survey turned out to be female, which could make this more bias. There were 16.4% that believe women do act coy, and no can sometimes mean yes, which is a larger percentile than it should be.

Misreading signals between individuals can lead to unwanted sexual advances. The results prove that the majority of the respondents do know that no always means no, helps them to realize that women do not always need to struggle or yell for sexual assault to occur. Saying no, but persisting and going ahead with sexual advances are another form. When asking respondents if they believe this is the only way an act can be considered sexual assault, the majority strongly disagreed with 56.7%.

After examining my results, I believe that because so many believe they understand sexual assault, they answered the survey questions in such a way to show they know the difference between right and wrong. 50.7% of my respondents disagree when questioned if they wouldn’t want to intervene if they saw sexual assault because they may be misinterpreting the situation. This goes against what I originally believed. Because of the societal normality’s that are given today, I believed people would be more inclined to misread situations, and not realize sexual assault was happening when it was in front of

them. However, due to more awareness and education on sexual assault, people may recognize it, and believe they would intervene (Time 2010). This does not however, mean that once faced in this situation they would actually go through with it.

When witnessing sexual assault, it is important to realize that the situation can be very dangerous. It is already dangerous to be forcing someone against their will to take place in some sort of sexual act, but the bystander can also be fearful to proceed in intervention because they can be putting themselves in harms way. When faced in a situation that can be harmful, some individuals will freeze up (Time 2010). Even though there can be a strong sense of guilt or shame for not helping out when it was needed, something might pull them back. People become considerably uncomfortable in situations where they see violence or aggressive sexual behavior. However, when questioning the respondents, 37.3% said they strongly disagree with no intervention because of worrying about their own safety and would intervene. There was another 34.4% that said that they disagree as well. Nevertheless, there were still 20.9% of respondents who stayed neutral to the question. This again goes back to the idea that we as human beings would like to believe we would be strong in the face of danger, but it doesn't always pane out that way when the situation is in front of you.

Both situational questions proved that students believe they would intervene when placed in the circumstances. After cross tabulating different factors with the situations, I found that students who go out and drink more than twice a week, majority of those respondents believe they would definitely help out a victim in both the inside bar scenario and the outside scenario. Referring back to Boekeloo's 2010 study found alcohol gives that extra confidence, liquid courage, to be more assertive in social situations. When

feeling as if the bystander can do anything, there is the assumption they might intervene despite the fact that they might be hurt in the process. Even though it is assumed that the respondents were sober while taking my survey, they can recall feelings of strength and boldness while drinking from previous occasions to make them answer this way.

It was also a common belief in both the inside bar situation and outside scenario that people frequently hook up with random people so it would not be a surprise that the victims in either scenario would be seen walking home or leaving a bar with someone they did not originally come with. When cross tabulating the scenarios with the belief that women who are incoherent because of drinking are still able to give consent to sexual activities, I received alarming results. While the largest group did answer by saying they strongly disagree women can give consent while intoxicated, the second largest group believed that could in fact give consent while under the influence of alcohol. This was one of my biggest concerns with a factor. It is difficult to judge if a person is being sexually assaulted if the bystander cannot identify with what is considered legal consent.

It would be most informative to issue out a nation wide survey to college campuses questioning sexual assault. It would make for much more concrete numbers, and potentially help out determining the factors that keep bystanders away from intervention. My survey has helped shed light on the issues at Union college, but it would be very interesting to find out what is going on throughout the country. It would also be interesting to do more of a comparison with what males to females think and how it might differ. With such a small sample size, it was difficult for me to do so, but it would be less problematic on a larger scale.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

With more and more people speaking out about domestic violence on college campuses, awareness is being spread. The research into the factors behind whether

or not the bystander is intervening during witnessing acts of violence is still in its infancy. Like the case of the University of Virginia lacrosse player who was killed by her boyfriend, George Hugueley, her friends and teammates all new of how violent of a person Hugueley was. The information on sexual abuse is out there, but the bystander does not always realize their bystander status until it is too late. The purpose of my study was to determine why it is bystanders do not intervene when they are given the opportunity. In college we are placed in situations, whether at bars or parties, that are breeding grounds for sexual assault. The societal normality's that present us today, along with some personal factors, were compared in order to test what stop the bystander from intervention.

To attain data, a case study was done and a short questionnaire was handed out to two three classes that I had selected. Like the findings of Freitas (2008), the hook up culture does exist within Union College. It was revealed that majority of respondents believe that hooking up with strangers is commonly accepted. The results also show that the respondents go out more than twice a week and are drinking to the point of intoxication (3 drinks for female, 5 drinks for male). Students drink for a variety of reasons, and one being socially accepted into this new form of nightlife and college scene, which can be difficult to adjust to (Gormley 2010). This factor can lead to a strong sense of immortality, where the student can feel like they are capable managing the impossible, while intoxicated. Similar to my findings, the majority of the respondents believe they would in fact intervene in dangerous situations to help a victim from being sexually assaulted. The scenarios I used were set at a time when students would be out at a bar or party. Knowing that

they would be drinking, according to my results, it could result in having the confidence to help out.

The most concerning, and biggest factor of all would be sexual consent when intoxicated. A lot of students, according to my results, were unclear as to what is considered to be sexual consent. What students need to realize is that consent is not the absent of saying no, but rather, one must soberly say yes in order to proceed in further activity. My survey included questions regarding women being coy, as well as giving consent under the influence. Associating back to Gormley's studies in 2010, the psychological damages that can happen when sexual encounters are abused can be detrimental. As much as students might like to use it as a tool to relax, there must be more awareness of the harmful effects that can occur. The anxiety, depression, and fear of domination that is sparked by sexual abuse can stay with a student for years (Gormley 2010). The majority of the respondents did believe that "no" is not interchangeable with "yes", the responses for consent under the influence were not so concrete. Too many students do not understand that an individual cannot give consent if they are under any form of intoxication.

I originally predicted that students wouldn't want to intervene due to blocking factors. Students who felt that they were more at risk for harm if they were to intervene, I believed, were more likely to walk away from the situation. I also thought that, like the Kitty Genovese case, there would be a diffusion of the bystander effect, meaning if there were multiple people outside at the time of an incident of sexual assault, no one would take the responsibility for intervention, thinking another person would do it. My results proved otherwise. Students believe

that regardless of the number of people outside, they would still take initiative and intervene. They also proved that even though a situation might be putting the bystander in harms way, they would still take the risk and intervene. The only contradiction I can find with my results would be what I took from Time's study. It is difficult to determine how individuals will react in a situation, and even harder to determine it by survey. While taking my survey they had time to evaluate the situation, and decide the best way to handle it. It is a lot easier to right down what one believes to be the right answer, and that they would follow through on helping out a victim, it is another thing to do it (Time 2010). Overall my results showed that bystander intervention would occur on campus when witnessed. It also shows that drinking and sexual assault intervention go hand in hand.

There were several limitations to my survey. There were a total of 67 respondents, which restricted my results. With having such a small number of students take the survey, when there are a little over 2,000 at Union College, it is not representing the campus in the best way possible. Though I would have loved to survey the entire school, it would have been much more difficult to get my responses back in time, with only two terms to complete my thesis. I also had inequality in gender, with 62.7% of my respondents being female, and only 37.3% being male. This could then put a bias on my research when it came to the question on women acting coy, and no sometimes meaning yes. It would also put a bias on some of the sexual consent questions. The classes I chose to survey were not at random, also limiting my findings. It would be very beneficial to conduct more research and the factors that aid or prevent bystander intervention.

Appendix A

Intervention Questionnaire

The aim of this study is to find out why students react the way they do when witnessing a suspected sexual assault. If intervention is not prevalent on campuses with suspected sexual abuse, the goal then would be finding out what factors might stop them. Your responses will be kept completely confidential. However, your participation with this

survey is completely voluntary, and you may choose not to contribute. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact me at gallaghc@garnet.union.edu.

Graduation Year: ____ 2012 ____ 2013 ____ 2014 ____ 2015

Please Circle One: FEMALE MALE

Please read and check your responses:

I drink more than twice a week.

- ____ Strongly Disagree
- ____ Disagree
- ____ Neutral
- ____ Agree
- ____ Strongly Agree

I go out to a bar or party more than twice a week.

- ____ Strongly Disagree
- ____ Disagree
- ____ Neutral
- ____ Agree
- ____ Strongly Agree

It is normal for strangers at a party to hook-up.

- ____ Strongly Disagree
- ____ Disagree
- ____ Neutral
- ____ Agree
- ____ Strongly Agree

Any type of unwanted touching is unacceptable.

- ____ Strongly Disagree
- ____ Disagree
- ____ Neutral
- ____ Agree
- ____ Strongly Agree

Sexual encounters without consent are sexual assaults.

- ____ Strongly Disagree
- ____ Disagree
- ____ Neutral
- ____ Agree
- ____ Strongly Agree

Women who are incoherent because of drinking are still capable of giving consent to have sexual activities.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

Members in Greek life are more concerned about getting in trouble and keeping up their reputations than non-Greek life members.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

When out, I have 3 or more drinks if Female, or 5 or more drinks if Male.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

With our set of social norms, “no” often means yes, and women tend to act coy.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

A female has to struggle or yell for sexual assault to occur.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

I wouldn't want to intervene if I saw a sexual assault because I may be misinterpreting the situation.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree

_____ Strongly Agree

I wouldn't want to intervene if I saw sexual assault because I wouldn't want to put myself into a harmful situation that could risk my own safety.

_____ Strongly Disagree

_____ Disagree

_____ Neutral

_____ Agree

_____ Strongly Agree

You think you see a guy slip something in another girls drink out one night. You're not positive, and have known they've been dating for a while, so you're not too concerned. Later, the girl is not standing steadily and is leaning on the same guy. He's trying to help her get her jacket on and leave together. Not being sure it was definitely a drug he slipped in her drink, you figure she probably just had too much to drink. Everyone has those nights, so you don't say anything.

_____ Strongly Disagree

_____ Disagree

_____ Neutral

_____ Agree

_____ Strongly Agree

You see a couple outside in front of a dorm. The girls screaming, what seem like cries for help, but something you can't fully understand, she's clearly intoxicated. A guy is pulling her, trying to bring her inside. There is a bunch of other people outside not doing anything, but you think this is really odd. You start to approach the couple, yelling at the guy to leave her alone.

_____ Strongly Disagree

_____ Disagree

_____ Neutral

_____ Agree

_____ Strongly Agree

Appendix B

All Tables are based on the 67 respondents with no missing data.

Table 1: Frequency of graduation year of respondent

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid 2012.00	12	17.9	17.9
2013.00	20	29.9	29.9
2014.00	21	31.3	31.3
2015.00	14	20.9	20.9
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 2: Frequency in which the respondent drinks more than twice a week.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	9	13.4	13.4
Disagree	12	17.9	17.9
Neutral	12	17.9	17.9
Agree	30	44.8	44.8
Strongly Agree	4	6.0	6.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 3: Frequency of respondents that go out to a bar or party more than twice a week.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	11.9	11.9
Disagree	24	35.8	35.8
Neutral	11	16.4	16.4

Agree	22	32.8	32.8
Strongly Agree	2	3.0	3.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 4: Frequency of respondents who believe it is normal for strangers at a party to hook-up.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	1	1.5	1.5
Disagree	4	6.0	6.0
Neutral	21	31.3	31.3
Agree	36	53.7	53.7
Strongly Agree	5	7.5	7.5
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 5: Frequency that any type of unwanted touching is unacceptable.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	4	6.0	6.0
Disagree	9	13.4	13.4
Neutral	2	3.0	3.0
Agree	15	22.4	22.4
Strongly Agree	37	55.2	55.2
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 6: Frequency of sexual encounters without consent is sexual assaults.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Disagree	5	7.5	7.5
Neutral	2	3.0	3.0
Agree	23	34.3	34.3
Strongly Agree	37	55.2	55.2

Table 6: Frequency of sexual encounters without consent is sexual assaults.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Disagree	5	7.5	7.5
Neutral	2	3.0	3.0
Agree	23	34.3	34.3
Strongly Agree	37	55.2	55.2
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 7: Frequency of respondents who believe women who are incoherent because of drinking are still capable of giving consent to have sexual activities.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	19	28.4	28.4
Disagree	20	29.9	29.9
Neutral	13	19.4	19.4
Agree	13	19.4	19.4
Strongly Agree	2	3.0	3.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 8: Frequency for members in Greek life are more concerned about getting in trouble and keeping up their reputations than non-Greek life members.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	6	9.0	9.0
Disagree	20	29.9	29.9
Neutral	21	31.3	31.3
Agree	19	28.4	28.4
Strongly Agree	1	1.5	1.5
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 9: Frequency of respondents who, when out, have 3 or more drinks if Female, or 5 or more drinks if Male.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	11.9	11.9
Disagree	2	3.0	3.0
Neutral	8	11.9	11.9
Agree	33	49.3	49.3
Strongly Agree	16	23.9	23.9
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 10: Frequency of respondents that believe with our set of social norms, "no" often means yes, and women tend to act coy.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	9	13.4	13.4
Disagree	29	43.3	43.3
Neutral	17	25.4	25.4
Agree	11	16.4	16.4
Strongly Agree	1	1.5	1.5
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 11: Frequency if a female has to struggle or yell for sexual assault to occur.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	38	56.7	56.7
Disagree	25	37.3	37.3
Neutral	2	3.0	3.0
Agree	2	3.0	3.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 12: Frequency of respondents that wouldn't want to intervene if they saw sexual assault because they may be misinterpreting the situation.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	17	25.4	25.4
Disagree	34	50.7	50.7
Neutral	12	17.9	17.9
Agree	4	6.0	6.0
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 13: Frequency to which respondents wouldn't want to intervene if they saw sexual assault because they wouldn't want to put myself into a harmful situation that could risk their own safety.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	25	37.3	37.3
Disagree	23	34.3	34.3
Neutral	14	20.9	20.9
Agree	4	6.0	6.0
Strongly Agree	1	1.5	1.5
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 14: Frequency of situational question. You think you see a guy slip something in another girls drink out one night. You're not positive and have known they've been dating for a while, so you're not too concerned. Later, the girl is not standing steadily and leaning on the same guy. He's trying

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	7	10.4	10.4
Disagree	31	46.3	46.3
Neutral	15	22.4	22.4
Agree	14	20.9	20.9
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 15: Frequency of situational question. You see a couple outside in front of a dorm. The girls screaming, what seem like cries for help, but something you can't fully understand, she's clearly intoxicated. A guy is pulling her, trying to bring her inside. There is a bunch of other people outside

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Disagree	2	3.0	3.0
Neutral	18	26.9	26.9
Agree	39	58.2	58.2
Strongly Agree	8	11.9	11.9
Total	67	100.0	100.0

Table 16: Students who drink more than twice a week by outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	3.0%
Neutral	33.3%	25.0%	8.3%	36.7%	0.0%	26.9%
Agree	55.6%	58.3%	83.3%	50.0%	50.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	11.1%	8.3%	8.3%	13.3%	25.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 15.596, df = 12, p= 0.210. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 17: Students who drink more than twice a week by inside bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	22.2%	0.0%	8.3%	10.0%	25.0%	10.4%
Disagree	55.6%	41.7%	50.0%	46.7%	25.0%	46.3%
Neutral	11.1%	33.3%	16.7%	26.7%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	11.1%	25.0%	25.0%	16.7%	50.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 8.921 df = 12, p = 0.710. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 18: Students who believe it is normal for strangers to hook up by outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	20.0%	3.0%
Neutral	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	22.2%	40.0%	26.9%
Agree	0.0%	75.0%	52.4%	63.9%	40.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	25.0%	14.3%	11.1%	0.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.421, df = 12, p = .412. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 19: Students who believe it is normal for strangers to hook up by the inside bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	13.9%	0.0%	10.4%
Disagree	100.0%	25.0%	52.4%	50.0%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	11.1%	0.0%	28.6%	19.4%	4.0%	22.4%
Agree	11.1%	25.0%	19.0%	16.7%	60.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 19.277, df = 12, p = .080. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 20: Students who believe women who are incoherent because of drinking are still able to give consent to sexual activities by outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	5.3%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Neutral	10.5%	35.0%	30.8%	38.5%	0.0%	26.9%
Agree	73.7%	45.0%	61.5%	53.8%	50.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	10.5%	20.0%	0.0%	7.7%	50.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.749, df = 12, p = .388. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 21: Students that believe that women who are incoherent because of drinking are still able to give consent to sexual activities by the inside bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	10.5%	5.0%	7.7%	15.4%	50.0%	10.4%
Disagree	36.8%	70.0%	30.8%	46.2%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	31.6%	15.0%	23.1%	23.1%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	21.1%	10.0%	38.5%	15.4%	50.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 14.074, df = 12, p = .296. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 22: Students that drink more than 3 drinks if female, or more than 5 drinks if male by outsider scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	6.3%	3.0%
Neutral	12.5%	0.0%	37.5%	30.3%	25.0%	26.9%
Agree	75.0%	100.0%	62.5%	54.5%	50.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	12.1%	18.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 5.856, df = 12, p = .923. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 23: Students that drink more than 3 drinks if female, or more than 5 drinks if male by inside bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	5.0%	9.5%	15.8%	100.0%	10.4%
Disagree	66.7%	35.0%	61.9%	36.8%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	16.7%	35.0%	14.3%	21.1%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	16.7%	25.0%	14.3%	26.3%	0.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.090, df = 12, p = .438.

Table 24: Students who believe with our set of social norms, “no” often means yes, and women act coy by the outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	3.0%
Neutral	33.3%	34.5%	17.6%	18.2%	0.0%	26.9%
Agree	44.4%	55.2%	64.7%	63.6%	100.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	11.1%	10.3%	17.6%	9.1%	0.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 8.192, df = 12, p = .770 This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 25: Students who believe with our set of social norms, “no” often means yes, and women often tend to act coy by the inside bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	22.2%	3.4%	17.6%	9.1%	0.0%	10.4%
Disagree	44.4%	62.1%	35.3%	27.3%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	22.2%	17.2%	23.5%	36.4%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	11.1%	17.2%	23.5%	27.3%	100.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.255, df = 12, p = .425. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 26: Students that believe you need to struggle for it to be considered sexual assault by the outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Neutral	23.7%	24.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	26.9%
Agree	57.9%	64.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	18.4%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.426, df = 9, p = .190. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 27: Students that believe you need to struggle for sexual assault to occur by the inside bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	15.8%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
Disagree	52.6%	44.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	13.2%	32.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	18.4%	20.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 10.244, df = 9, p = .331. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 28: Students who wouldn't want to intervene if they saw sexual assault because they may be misinterpreting the situation by outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	25.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Neutral	17.6%	23.5%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	26.9%
Agree	64.7%	64.7%	33.3%	50.0%	0.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	17.6%	11.8%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 15.006, df = 9, p = .091. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 29: Students who wouldn't want to intervene because they believe they are misinterpreting the situation by the inside bar situation.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	23.5%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
Disagree	52.9%	44.1%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	11.8%	17.6%	41.7%	50.0%	0.0%	22.4%
Agree	11.8%	29.4%	8.3%	25.0%	0.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 12.516, df = 9, p = .186. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 30: Students who believe they would not intervene because they are afraid for their own safety by outside scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disagree	0.0%	4.3%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
Neutral	20.0%	26.1%	42.9%	0.0%	100.0%	26.9%
Agree	64.0%	56.5%	50.0%	75.0%	0.0%	58.2%
Strongly Agree	16.0%	13.0%	0%	25.0%	0.0%	11.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 10.515, df = 12, p = .571. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

Table 31: Students who believe they would not intervene because they are afraid for their own safety by inside the bar scenario.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	20.0%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
Disagree	52.0%	56.5%	28.6%	25.0%	0.0%	46.3%
Neutral	12.0%	13.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%	22.4%
Agree	16.0%	21.7%	21.4%	50.0%	0.0%	20.9%
Strongly Agree	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi Square = 18.437, df = 12, p = .103. This relationship according to Pearson Chi-Square chart is not statistically significant.

References

- Baren, K. B. 2004. "BYSTANDER EMOTIONAL DISTRESS." *The Journal of legal medicine* 25(3):351-367.
- Burn, S. M. 2009. "A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention." *Sex roles* 60(11):779-792.
- Ferder, Fran, Dacon R. Warren, Tom Fields and Michael G. Groshong. 2008. "Serious talk about casual sex." *U.S.Catholic* 73(12):5-6.
- Foubert, J. D., J. Langhinrichsen-Rohling, H. Brasfield and B. Hill. 2010. "Effects of a rape awareness program on college women: increasing bystander efficacy and willingness to intervene." *Journal of community psychology* 38(7):813-827.
- , 2010. "Effects of a rape awareness program on college women: Increasing bystander efficacy and willingness to intervene." *Journal of community psychology* 38(7):813-827.
- Freitas, Donna. 2008. "Sex, lies, and hook-up culture." *U.S.Catholic* 73(11):12-16 (<https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=35390764&site=ehost-live>).
- Gormley, B. and F. G. Lopez. 2010. "Correlates of Psychological Abuse Perpetration in College Dating Relationships." *Journal of College Counseling* 13(1):13.
- , 2010. "Psychological Abuse Perpetration in College Dating Relationships." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 25(2):204-218.
- Hunt, A. 2011. *All-American Murder*. St. Martin's True Crime.
- Kaura, S. A. and B. J. Lohman. 2007. "Dating violence victimization, relationship satisfaction, mental health problems, and acceptability of violence: A comparison of men and women." *Journal of Family Violence* 22(6):367-381.
- , 2007. "Dating violence victimization, relationship satisfaction, mental health problems, and acceptability of violence: A comparison of men and women." *Journal of Family Violence* 22(6):367-381.
- Muller, R. J. 2011. "Failing Narcissistic Defenses Can Turn Love Toxic." *The Humanistic Psychologist* 39(4):375-378.
- PhD, S. M. M. 2011. "Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students." *Journal of American College Health* 59(1):3-11.
- Raber, Jean H. 2008. "Faith & the Hook-up Culture." *Commonweal* 135(9):32-33.

-----, 2008. "Faith & the Hook-up Culture." *Commonweal* 135(9):32-33.

Smolowe, Jill. 2010. "A Deadly Romance." *Time Inc.* Vol. 73, Issue 20

Timanus, Eddie. 2010. "UVA Lacrosse Player Charged with Murder." *USA Today*.

Time, V., B. K. Payne and R. R. Gainey. 2010. "Don't help victims of crime if you don't have the time: Assessing support for Good Samaritan laws." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38(4):790-795.

Wertheim, L. J. 2010. "Why did Yeardley Love have to die?" *Sports Illustrated* 17.