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Intimate Partner Violence: Youth and Young Adults

Figure 4.5
Age at Time of First IPV\(^1\) Experience Among Women Who Experienced Rape, Physical Violence, and/or Stalking by an Intimate Partner — NISVS 2010

- 11-17 years: 22.4%
- 18-24 years: 47.1%
- 25-34 years: 21.1%
- 35-44 years: 6.8%
- 45+ years: 2.5%

\(^1\)IPV includes physical violence, all forms of sexual violence, stalking, psychological aggression, and control of reproductive or sexual health.
Sexual Violence: Youth and Young Adults

Figure 2.2
Age at Time of First Completed Rape Victimization
In Lifetime Among Female Victims — NISVS 2010

- 11-17 years: 29.9%
- 18-24 years: 37.4%
- 35-44 years: 4.5%
- 45+ years: 1.7%
- 10 years and under: 12.3%
- 25-34 years: 14.2%

1 The reported age is the youngest age reported across all perpetrators.
2 All percentages are weighted to U.S. population.
Unique context of college campuses

• Large numbers of youth away from family and home for the first time
• Shared living facilities
• Often designed as “bubbles” with all of the necessary services
• Students can operate in isolation from the broader community
  – Intended to protect them and their education
  – Can backfire
• Substance use widely tolerated in many settings
Campus Climate Surveys by the Association of American Universities (AAU)

- Administered spring 2015 at 27 universities
- Nonconsensual sexual contact:
  - Sexual penetration
  - Sexual touching
- Via one of four tactics:
  1. physical force or threat of physical force
  2. incapacitated because of drugs, alcohol, or being unconscious, asleep, or passed out
  3. coercive threats of non-physical harm or promised rewards
  4. failure to obtain affirmative consent
Nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolling
From campus mixers to......
College Students: Online Harassment and Cyberstalking

• “Four Square or Facebook where you can check in is a great tool to track people down and so it can be dangerous. People use it for fun like, “I’m going here,” but you have to be careful because you could have a stalker that wants to see every location you are going to.”

• “He usually uses Facebook as a way to meet girls or whatever. And he’s actually gotten a girl’s class schedule and would be at every classroom that she got out of just to try and talk for a few minutes.”

• “I had a long-term bad relationship that took literally until this year to end. I had to literally re-friend the person, see how many friends she shared with me, it took me a week of just sorting this out and to block all those people, groups, and networks until I could finally know that she wasn’t looking at my stuff.”
Digital dating abuse (DDA)

- A pattern of behaviors that control, pressure, or threaten a dating partner using a cell phone or the Internet
  - Looking at partner’s private information on a computer or cell phone without permission
  - Monitoring partner’s whereabouts
  - Threatening to end a relationship on a cell phone or the Internet
  - Monitoring who partner talk(s) to and who they are friends with

- Past-year DDA prevalence (n=321 students)
  - Victimization 69%
  - Perpetration 63%

Violence Against Women. 2016 Feb 23. pii: 1077801216630143. [Epub ahead of print]
Snooping and Sexting: Digital Media as a Context for Dating Aggression and Abuse Among College Students.
Reed LA\textsuperscript{1}, Tolman RM\textsuperscript{2}, Ward LM\textsuperscript{2}.
Does tech violence co-occur with violence in real life?

- Study with 885 undergraduates (men=301, women=584), 40% had experienced some type of coercion.

- Like sexual coercion “in real life”, sexting coercion creates risk for poor mental health and other forms of dysfunction.

---

Sexting coercion only: 8%

Sexual coercion only: 11%

Both: 21%
Priorities & principles for prevention & response

- Safety (primary and secondary prevention)
- Connection to necessary health care, support services
- Access to justice

Key principles
- Empowerment
  - Self-directed response vs. externally imposed response
- Confidentiality
  - Victim control over if, when, how to share information
Prevention & response

• Safety & prevention
  – Engaging bystanders to prevent and intervene
  – Basic knowledge, definitions
  – Self-defense training

• Connection to necessary health care, support services
  – Knowledge and use of support services is low

• Access to justice
  – Reporting rates are low
  – Reflect lack of confidence in response as well as confidentiality concerns, shame, stigma
Immediate Safety & Connection to Security

- Users notify campus police rapidly for safety concerns
- Some also send tips to campus police (including GPS locations and photos)
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Immediate safety: engaging friends

- Users engage contacts/friends to track their journey and can send alerts in situations of danger
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Anonymous Access to Resources

- Resource links including crisis hotlines, medical care and support services

Here For You

Uask
Anonymous Reporting

REPORTING SEXUAL VIOLENCE & SEXUAL ASSAULT

Johns Hopkins University is committed to ensuring that students, staff, and faculty feel safe in reporting sexual assault or other sexually violent offenses. There are several ways to file your complaint. Choose the method that feels most comfortable for you.

CONTACT CAMPUS SECURITY

- Students, faculty, and staff are encouraged to report sexual assault to the security department of their primary campus or HSC.
- Homeland Security: 410-516-2977
- Johns Hopkins Medical Institute Security: 410-502-3536
- University Security: 410-516-4820
- For Security assistance at all locations: A.S. 302, 410-516-2977, and will be provided with the requested contact information.

File a Complaint Online

Use the online form to electronically file a complaint through the Office of Institutional Equity. Once submitted, your complaint will be reviewed by an investigator in the Office of Institutional Equity (OIE), and you will be contacted for a follow-up discussion.

Anonymous Report Form

Anonymous Reporting Form

Report an incident anonymously by filling out the Google Form here: SAAP Anonymous Report Form.

Information included in the form shown goes privately to Charlotte Strauss Swanson, SAAP coordinator at Vassar College. No further action will be taken after receiving the form unless requested. Anonymous reports are used to gather information about incidences of sexual assault, dating/romantic violence, stalking, and sexual harassment at Vassar College, and compiled data are used to inform the community about our campus climate.

If you would like to speak privately to a Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) advocate now, please call (942) 437-7333 and ask for SART. Advocates are on call 24/7 and can provide information, support, and resources.

All students are encouraged to formally report any incidences to Vassar College Safety and Security (942-437-7333) or to Kelly Graig, Title IX coordinator (942-437-7924), as well as to the Town of Poughkeepsie Police (911 or 942-485-3666) if they wish to do so. A SART advocate can accompany anyone wishing to report an incident.
• Technology is simultaneously
  – a context for violence perpetration/victimization
  – a tool for prevention, connection to service and accountability

• Significant unmet needs exist in prevention and connection to care on college campuses!
## Other campus climate surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>Overall prevalence of unwanted sexual behavior while at JHU</td>
<td>15% (n=613)</td>
<td>n=3,977</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unwanted sexual behavior</td>
<td>14% (n=542)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7% reported sexual violence as a labeled experience</td>
<td>7% (n=281)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reported sexual violence as a described behavior</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Experiencing at least one unwanted sexual experience</td>
<td>Female undergraduates=52% Male undergraduates=20.5% Female graduates=18.2% Male graduates=8.1%</td>
<td>n=3,955</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Experiencing sexual harassment, rape, sexual assault, and other unwanted sexual behaviors while at MIT (one or more)</td>
<td>Female undergraduates=35% Male undergraduates=14% Female graduates=16% Male graduates=5%</td>
<td>n=3,844</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Labeled” unwanted sexual experiences including sexual harassment, sexual assault and/or rape</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unwanted sexual behaviors, involving force, physical threat, or incapacitation.</td>
<td>6.5% (n=208)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Experienced sexual assault (according to Stanford’s definition of sexual assault which is based on California’s criminal rape and sexual offense statutes)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>n=9,067</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicated having experiences categorized as meeting Stanford’s definition of sexual misconduct since starting their degree programs at Stanford, including acts ranging from sexual touching to penetration</td>
<td>14.2 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Berkeley</td>
<td>Had experienced unwanted sexual contact (including forcible rape, use of drugs to incapacitate, forcible sodomy, gang rape, sexual assault, sexual assault with an object, and forcible fondling) while at UC Berkeley</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>n=13,102</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Context matters: distinguishing digital behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean score for female participants</th>
<th>Mean score for male participants</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive reactions to “sending a sexually suggestive/nude photo of you to a dating partner”</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>14.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative reactions to “sending a sexually suggestive/nude photo of you to a dating partner”</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>37.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive reactions to “receiving a sexually suggestive/nude photo of your dating partner”</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>70.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative reactions to “receiving a sexually suggestive/nude photo of your dating partner”</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>64.94***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive reactions to “having a dating partner call and/or text you repeatedly on your cell phone (on a normal day)”</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative reactions to “having a dating partner call and/or text you repeatedly on your cell phone (on a normal day)”</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive reactions to “having a dating partner message/post/Tweet several times a day on your social networking site”</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative reactions to “having a dating partner message/post/Tweet several times a day on”</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *** indicates statistical significance at the p < 0.001 level.*