

**Sexual Violence on College Campuses:  
The Effects of State Sexual Violence Laws on University  
Reporting Rates**

by

Maya Chamra

A THESIS

Submitted to

The University of Michigan

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

HONORS BACHELOR OF ARTS

Department of Political Science

March 26, 2021

Advised by Dr. Charles Shipan

# Table of Contents

<i>Table of Tables</i> .....	<i>iv</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i> .....	<i>vi</i>
<i>Introduction</i> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Background</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<i>Literature Review</i> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Reasons for Underreporting of Sexual Violence</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Demographic Factors</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Situational Factors</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Psychological Factors</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Factors that Facilitate Reporting</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Benefits of Reporting</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Approaches to Sexual Violence Laws</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Policy Effectiveness at Increasing Reporting</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Literature Review Summary</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<i>Theoretical Model</i> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>Concept: Reporting Rates</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>Concept: Sexual Violence Laws</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>Type #1: Trauma-Informed Laws</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Type #2: Due Process Laws</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>The Process of State Legislation’s Impact of Reporting Rates</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>My Hypothesis</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Effects of Trauma-Informed Laws</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Effects of Due Process Laws</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Theoretical Model Summary</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<i>Data Collection</i> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>State Sexual Violence Laws</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Case Selection</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Data Collection</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Formal Reporting Rates</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>Case Selection</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>Data Collection</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Online Experiment</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>Reasoning</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>Survey Design</b> .....	<b>30</b>
<b>Data Collection Summary</b> .....	<b>35</b>

<i>State Laws and University Reporting Rates Data Analysis</i> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>Aggregate Findings</b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>Analysis of Individual States</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Michigan</b> .....	39
<b>Ohio</b> .....	43
<b>Pennsylvania</b> .....	45
<b>University Pairings</b> .....	<b>48</b>
<b>Ohio State University and Pennsylvania State University</b> .....	49
<b>Pennsylvania State University and University of Michigan</b> .....	51
<b>Ohio State University and University of Michigan</b> .....	52
<b>State Laws and University Reporting Rates Data Analysis Summary</b> .....	<b>54</b>
<i>Survey Data Analysis</i> .....	<b>56</b>
<b>Themes Across All Three Treatments</b> .....	<b>56</b>
<b>Differences Between the Three Treatments</b> .....	<b>57</b>
<b>According to Participant Demographics</b> .....	58
<b>According to Personal Experience</b> .....	62
<b>Survey Data Analysis Summary</b> .....	<b>65</b>
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	<b>66</b>
<i>References</i> .....	<b>68</b>
<i>Appendix A</i> .....	<b>71</b>
<i>Appendix B</i> .....	<b>78</b>
<i>Appendix C</i> .....	<b>84</b>
<i>Appendix D</i> .....	<b>88</b>

## Table of Tables

Table 1. A comparison of Ohio State University and Pennsylvania State University across five university characteristics in order to establish a proper university pairing. ....	27
Table 2. The language of the vignette for each treatment and the differences between each vignette.....	31
Table 3. List of states and corresponding universities involved in my data analysis. ....	37
Table 4. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and three years after sexual violence laws were passed in 2013, for selected universities in Michigan.....	40
Table 5. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and three years after sexual violence laws were passed in 2015, for selected universities in Michigan.....	41
Table 6. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and one year after sexual violence laws were passed in 2017, for selected universities in Michigan. ....	42
Table 7. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students between 2010 and 2018 for selected universities in Ohio. ....	44
Table 8. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and three years after sexual violence laws were passed in 2011, for selected universities in Pennsylvania.46	
Table 9. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and three years after sexual violence laws were passed in 2013, for selected universities in Pennsylvania.47	
Table 10. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and three years after sexual violence laws were passed in 2015, for selected universities in Pennsylvania. ....	47
Table 11. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and one year after sexual violence laws were passed in 2017, for selected universities in Pennsylvania. 48	
Table 12. The type of state sexual violence law passed in Ohio and Pennsylvania and the corresponding percent change in moving average of reporting rates at Pennsylvania State University and Ohio State University. ....	50
Table 13. The type of state sexual violence law passed in Michigan and Pennsylvania and the corresponding percent change in moving average of reporting rates at Pennsylvania State University and University of Michigan. ....	52

Table 14. The type of state sexual violence law passed in Michigan and Ohio and the corresponding percent change in moving average of reporting rates at Ohio State University and University of Michigan. ....	54
Table 15. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment. ....	57
Table 16. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected gender. ....	59
Table 17. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected race or ethnicity. ....	60
Table 18. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected sexuality. ....	62
Table 19. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected answer to "Have you ever reported an assault to the university? ....	63
Table 20. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected answer to "Did you receive any sexual violence prevention training. ....	64

## **Acknowledgements**

To all survivors, this study would not be possible without your resilience. Thank you.

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Charles Shipan, for his guidance and expertise as I navigated the process of researching and writing a thesis. Thank you so much for your continued patience, your words of encouragement, and for pulling me out of the weeds.

Thank you to Sara Morell for answering my questions and providing me with amazing advice. And thank you to Dr. Brian Min for offering direction and giving us pep talks each week.

Thank you to the Gerstein Grant for funding the administration of my online experiment.

I want to thank all my friends for listening to me talk, vent, and cry about my thesis. I appreciate all your support and encouragement! Special shoutout to my POLSCI 493/494 colleagues, especially Jordyn (roomie/bestie), for the comradery.

Shoutout to Spotify for the musical motivation.

I would also like to thank SAPAC and my previous college professors for not only fostering my interest in the prevalence of sexual violence and sexual violence prevention, but for also actively working to reduce sexual violence and support survivors, either through academic research or frontline advocacy.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to extend my deepest thanks to my family. To my parents, Roufaida and Louay, thank you for always supporting me through my academics and my journey as I find my path. To my brothers, Nabil and Hadi, thank you for the love and laughter. I love y'all.

## Introduction

One in four female college students experience some form of sexual violence, and one in seventeen male college students experience sexual violence (Sabina and Ho 2014). These staggering statistics, in addition to high-profile incidents of sexual assault and administrative cover-ups, have prompted public pressure on politicians to enact policies aimed at reducing the prevalence of sexual violence on college campuses (Boyle, Barr and Clay-Warner 2017). We have seen political action in the form of new guidance and regulations from the U.S. Department of Education, federal courts, and state sexual violence laws. The types of sexual violence laws enacted at the state level vary across the country. Although every state has at least one policy related to sexual violence in some form, only about half of US states define “sexual conduct” while 36% of states define “sexual assault” (DeMatteo, et al. 2015). Since the variation of sexual violence statutes across states is significant, more research must be done to learn the relevance, accessibility, and effectiveness of statewide sexual violence policies (DeMatteo, et al. 2015).

My research project aims to identify why reporting numbers of sexual violence vary across college campuses. Sexual violence on college campuses is of particular importance because of the extremely high rate of incidents among college students. Additionally, college students uniquely have access to two adjudication processes: university and criminal justice systems. However, sexual violence, especially on college campuses is systemically underreported, especially across race, gender, and class. One of the main goals of sexual violence laws should be to increase reporting rates of sexual violence to formal institutions. As survivors

are encouraged to report, we can better understand the extent of the sexual violence, the reasons for the violence, and effectively learn strategies to decrease rates of violence in the future.<sup>1</sup>

In my study, I seek to analyze the extent to which state sexual violence laws affect reporting rates on college campuses. My main research question is: Why are some state-level policy changes to sexual violence laws more effective at increasing reporting of sexual violence on college campuses than others? I am interested in understanding whether certain types of state sexual violence laws influence changes in reporting rates of sexual violence.

I hypothesize that state-level policy designed at making the reporting process more trauma-informed is more likely to result in more cases of sexual violence being reported to the university than due process policies that do not accommodate survivors. If my hypothesis is correct, then policymakers can learn from the effectiveness of certain past policy changes in order to pass laws that are more likely to significantly reduce the prevalence of sexual violence on college campuses. If my hypothesis is incorrect, then future approaches to increasing reporting and decreasing sexual violence may be more effective through other avenues, such as individual university policy changes or community and cultural reform.

To explore this question, I conducted a comparative analysis between similar states and universities to examine whether policy changes in sexual violence laws cause any variation in reporting rates on college campuses. I specifically analyzed how changes in university reporting rates related to changes in state sexual violence. I also compared changes in formal reporting rates between similar universities. Additionally, I administered an online experiment to college students to test how different types of university policies affect a student's decision to report an

---

<sup>1</sup> I use survivor to refer to anyone who has experienced any form of sexual violence, which I define in my Theoretical Model section. I also use survivor and victim interchangeably because other sources may use the term victim instead of survivor.



incident of sexual violence to the university. Through both methods of research, I gained a deeper understanding of how different types of state sexual violence policies influence a student's decision to report and ultimately affect university reporting rates of sexual violence.

My thesis is divided into six sections to provide a thorough understanding of state sexual violence laws. I begin with a background about the history of legal reforms related to sexual violence on college campuses at the federal level and state level. Following the background is a review of literature regarding sexual violence on college campuses. I present a variety of reasons for underreporting of sexual violence, factors that facilitate reporting, the benefits of reporting, approaches to sexual violence policy, and policy effectiveness at increasing reporting. The third section introduces my theoretical model, in which I explain the connection between state sexual violence laws and reporting rates on college campuses. This section also features my theory that trauma-informed policies are more effective at increasing reporting rates than due process policies. In the fourth section, I outline the process behind the case selection and data collection of state sexual violence laws and formal reporting rates as well as the reasoning and design of the online experiment. I present my findings of the state law and reporting rates analysis in the fifth section. In the sixth and final section, I offer an analysis of my online experiment results.

## **Background**

Sexual assault and harassment on college campuses became a responsibility of colleges and universities in the 1980s and 1990s with the rise of legal arguments related to sexual harassment. Catharine MacKinnon (1979) developed a very extensive legal theory that sexual harassment constitutes sex discrimination. Because sexual harassment in the workplace contributes to the continued oppression of women and hurts women's social status, MacKinnon

(1979) argues that sexual harassment is gendered discrimination. This theory paved the way for sexual harassment in the workplace to become illegal under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in the workplace (MacKinnon 1979). Her argument also implicates that sexual violence on college campuses is a violation of Title IX in Education Amendments of 1972, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in educational programs that receive federal aid. Therefore, Title IX assigns colleges and universities the responsibility to address sexual violence on campus.

A second significant federal policy is the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act of 1990 (Clery Act), which focuses on providing accessible information about campus safety to current and future campus community members. One study found that the Clery Act served more as symbolic reform to acknowledge the issue of crime on college campuses, especially the issue of sexual violence (Fisher, Hartman, et al. 2002). However, the act does not achieve the substantive goal of providing accurate campus crime statistics (Fisher, Hartman, et al. 2002). Several crimes, including sexual violence, are drastically underreported to official university processes and many universities are not compliant with the act (Fisher, Hartman, et al. 2002). The Clery Act is important for mandating universities and colleges to release official reporting rates of sexual violence, but the act also demonstrates the pervasive issues of underreporting and noncompliance on college campuses. Although legitimate issues with the Clery Act have been raised, the Clery Act remains the best source for reporting rates, which I explain further in the Data Collection section.

The most recent reforms about sexual assault on college campuses have been guided by the federal Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights (OCR). In 2011, the OCR released the Dear Colleague Letter (DCL) which clarified Title IX standards and offered guidance for

compliance with Title IX for colleges and universities (Caldwell 2017). As a result, several universities and colleges altered their student sexual misconduct policy (Caldwell 2017). However, there has been much confusion surrounding the legitimacy and legality of the DCL, leading to drastic variation in the implementation of federal law on college campuses (Caldwell 2017). Moreover, the Department of Education planned to release new regulations related to sexual assault on college campuses in 2017, but the regulations were delayed until 2020. The types of policies at the federal level are important to understand because they can have a wide-reaching impact, especially shaping the formulation of state sexual violence policy. Since the federal-level policies can also be vague and confusing, states and universities attempt to create their own sexual violence policies to fill the gaps. As a result, there is wide variation in the types of sexual violence policies at the state and university level.

At the statewide level, many sexual violence laws were significantly reformed in the 1970s, but updates to these laws have varied across states since then. As of 2015, the number of sexual violence statutes in each state ranges from one statute to 26 statutes (DeMatteo, et al. 2015). The main variation related to definitions of consent and sexual conduct and the prevalence of gender-neutral language. Only about 25% of states define the meaning of consent, with several states differing on the requirements of mental capacity necessary to give consent (DeMatteo, et al. 2015). Moreover, 14 states explicitly state the requirements of an illegal act, and 17 states vary the punishment depending on the type of sexual violence (DeMatteo, et al. 2015). The type of sexual violence laws at the state level may alter a survivor's decision to report, especially if the requirements for an incident to be sexual violence differs across states. There is little research on the influence of statewide sexual violence laws on reporting rates on college campuses.

## **Literature Review**

In this literature review, I present demographic, situational, and psychological reasons that contribute to the underreporting of sexual violence. Moreover, I consider factors that facilitate reporting and how these factors can be included in state-level policies. I also differentiate between the broader categorization of violent crime laws in order to theorize in the following section which type of crime laws can increase reporting. Furthermore, I consider the policy effectiveness of increasing reporting for crimes similar to sexual violence, such as hate crimes. Overall, policy changes at the state level can affect reporting rates on college campuses depending on if the changes consider other factors that influence reporting.

### **Reasons for Underreporting of Sexual Violence**

A representative survey of female college students found that only about 20% of sexual violence incidents are reported to the police and 5% are reported to campus authorities (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). Survivors are more likely to employ informal disclosure means, such as telling a friend, in order to receive validation or acknowledgment (Sabina and Ho 2014). In fact, about 70% of incidents are disclosed to someone other than the police, most often a friend (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). Understanding the extent to which sexual violence is underreported and possible reasons for underreporting enables policymakers to strategize to increase reporting rates of sexual violence. These research-informed policies may more effectively address the pervasiveness of sexual violence (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). I explain how three different types of factors, demographic, situational, and psychological, are correlated with the underreporting of sexual violence. (DeMatteo, et al. 2015)

## **Demographic Factors**

The identities held by the survivor and perpetrator can dramatically shape the likelihood of reporting. For instance, nearly a third of men who are sexually assaulted tell no one about the assault, whereas only about 15% of women tell no one about an assault (Sabina and Ho 2014). In addition, survivors who share the same race or ethnicity as the perpetrator are less likely to report than survivors who had a different race or ethnicity from the perpetrator (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). Socioeconomic status also impacts a survivor's likelihood to report, with survivors of lower socioeconomic status being less likely to report to the police (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). Finally, incidents of sexual violence in which the survivor is Black are more likely to be reported to the police than incidents in which the survivor is White. These demographic factors illustrate that the identity of a survivor can influence a survivor's decision to report an assault. Across lines of gender, race, ethnicity, and class, we find that survivors have very different likelihoods of reporting an assault. Policies aimed at addressing sexual violence can take into consideration the intersectionality behind reporting, but little research explores which types of policies can effectively mitigate these specific barriers to reporting.

## **Situational Factors**

Several situational factors can also influence a survivor's decision to not report an incident of sexual violence. Common reasons for not reporting to the police include uncertainty that the incident was a crime or lack of proof (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). The involvement of drugs and alcohol during an assault is also a top reason to not report an incident (Sabina and Ho 2014). Furthermore, greater familiarity with the perpetrator can decrease a survivor's likelihood to report (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). Familiarity with campus resources can also factor into a

survivor's decision to report an assault. Less than half of the students in one study were not completely aware of the resources offered on campus related to addressing sexual violence, thereby reducing the likelihood of reporting (Sabina and Ho 2014). One analysis demonstrated that the types of sexual misconduct policies at the university level varied greatly, and often students did not know what to expect if they participated in formal disclosure of sexual violence (Sabina and Ho 2014). State sexual violence laws can work to address concerns about the connection between drug use and assault as well as lack of familiarity with campus resources and university policies. However, we must analyze exactly which policies are enacted at the state level to examine if and how these policies respond to situational reasons for underreporting.

### **Psychological Factors**

Several psychological factors can contribute to a survivor's decision to not formally report a case of sexual violence as well. A common reason for not reporting to the police is the fear of publicity, likely because survivors of sexual violence are often blamed for the incident (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). Survivors also report that they fear retaliation for reporting to the police, either from the perpetrator themselves or other community members (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). Sabina and Ho (2014) also highlighted that fear of victim-blaming is a prominent reason to not report an incident to the police. If a survivor feels shame and embarrassment, these feelings can contribute to the decreased likelihood of reporting (Sabina and Ho 2014). The common theme among the top psychological reasons for not reporting to the police relates to the concerns about the safety of survivors and the stigma surrounding sexual violence. State sexual violence laws can address psychological obstacles to reporting by funding educational training of

professional staff and law enforcement to better support survivors of sexual violence. More research must be conducted to learn if legislatures are passing these types of policies.

### **Factors that Facilitate Reporting**

Several factors can promote reporting by survivors and overall increase reporting rates on college campuses. Facilitators to reporting cases of sexual violence include expanded and free health service offices, confidential reporting, and crisis responses (Sabina and Ho 2014). When survivors are aware of their access to these resources, they are more likely to report incidents of sexual violence as well (Sabina and Ho 2014). Since there is variation in the resources offered to survivors across college campuses, states can create uniformity by mandating the types of resources that universities must offer (Sabina and Ho 2014). These types of policies would provide support to survivors as they navigate their healing and the reporting process.

Additionally, the characteristics of a college campus community can influence reporting rates of sexual violence (Stotzer and MacCartney, *The Role of Institutional Factors on On-Campus Reported Rape Prevalence 2015*). The prevalence of more competitive sports programs, permissive alcohol policies, and the presence of law enforcement employees are associated with higher reporting rates of sexual violence (Stotzer and MacCartney, *The Role of Institutional Factors on On-Campus Reported Rape Prevalence 2015*). Furthermore, campuses that are primarily residential have higher reporting rates of sexual assault than campuses that are primarily commuters (Stotzer and MacCartney, *The Role of Institutional Factors on On-Campus Reported Rape Prevalence 2015*). While these correlations are necessary for understanding which communities are more likely to have higher rates of reporting, it does not fully explain variations in reporting across campuses. I address these factors by including states with colleges

and universities that have similar characteristics, such as commuter or residential universities and the presence or absence of competitive sports programs.

### **Benefits of Reporting**

Reporting brings many benefits to survivors, including encouraging recovery and access to resources. Survivors are more likely to employ informal disclosure means, such as telling a friend, in order to receive validation or acknowledgment (Sabina and Ho 2014). Simple acknowledgment of a survivor's experience can assert agency for survivors, empowering them to report to formal systems. It is important to increase reporting rates of sexual violence on college campuses in order to expand access to resources for survivors. Of the students surveyed in one study, about half of the survivors sought help from a professional, and students were more likely to use on-campus resources than off-campus resources (Sabina and Ho 2014). Another study suggests that women who reported an incident of rape were more likely to receive medical services than women who did not report (Wolitzky-Taylor, et al. 2011). Additionally, women who reported their case of sexual violence were more likely to have access to other services such as mental health resources (Wolitzky-Taylor, et al. 2011). Overall, increased reporting is beneficial to expand resources to survivors and promote their recovery and healing.

### **Approaches to Sexual Violence Laws**

One approach to formulating sexual violence laws is from the perspective of trauma-informed social policymaking. Trauma-informed policies take into account the practice and lived experiences of trauma survivors and groups which are highly susceptible to trauma (Bowen and Murshid 2016). For a policy to be trauma-informed, it must foreground principles of safety,



trustworthiness, empowerment, choice, and collaboration (Bowen and Murshid 2016). By prioritizing these principles, trauma-informed policies can better address the needs of trauma survivors. Trauma-informed policies can also contribute to institutional equity and equality by uplifting marginalized groups (Bowen and Murshid 2016). In theoretical model section, I further explain how trauma-informed policymaking applies to sexual violence laws specifically.

The creation of sexual violence laws from a perspective of due process rights is another approach. Due process rights are guaranteed under the Constitution and enable accused individuals to use the functions of the legal system to their fullest extent before being convicted of a crime (Triplett 2012). The most common examples of due process rights include the right to counsel, to subpoena witnesses, to be tried by a jury, and to cross-examine witnesses (Triplett 2012). At the state level, due process laws can be passed in order to clarify the rights and treatment of perpetrators charged or convicted of a crime. Due process laws may also define the rights of victims of a crime. I apply due process policymaking to sexual violence laws later in the theoretical model section.

### **Policy Effectiveness at Increasing Reporting**

Analyzing the effectiveness of state-level policies that increase reporting in crimes similar to sexual violence can help predict which policies would be effective at increasing reporting of sexual violence. One such type of crime is hate crimes. Hate crimes are similar to crimes of sexual violence because they are often underreported for reasons such as lack of proof or fear of retaliation (Wong and Christmann 2008). There have been significant efforts to implement hate-crime policy at the state level. For LGBTQ+ related hate crimes, one study found that colleges and universities with anti-discrimination policies in states with hate crime

laws had higher levels of hate-crime reporting than schools not located in states with hate crime laws (Stotzer, *Sexual Orientation-Based Hate Crimes on Campus: The Impact of Policy on Reporting Rates* 2010). The same study also found that colleges and universities in states with mandatory law enforcement training for hate crimes had higher levels of reporting rates. The type of hate crime policies associated with higher rates of reporting, such as anti-discrimination statutes and mandatory training, are trauma-informed because they prioritize the safety of victims. Therefore, these findings about hate crime policy indicate that similar sexual violence policies of victim-protection and mandatory training can potentially increase reporting. Policymakers can learn from the effectiveness of certain hate crime laws and apply similar approaches when addressing sexual violence.

### **Literature Review Summary**

Overall, sexual violence has been historically underreported to formal processes for a variety of reasons, from demographic factors to situational and psychological factors. Research also suggests that certain factors, such as the availability of resources and the characteristics of a college campus, can facilitate reporting and increase reporting rates. Furthermore, due process and trauma-informed policies are two main concepts that can be utilized to create sexual violence policies. Analyses of hate crimes laws have indicated that trauma-informed policies have increased hate crime reporting, so similar types of policies can also increase sexual violence reporting. In the following section, I theorize that trauma-informed policies can better address the concerns of survivors and therefore increase the likelihood of reporting as opposed to due process policies.

## **Theoretical Model**

In this section, I offer a theoretical explanation of how sexual violence policies can have downstream effects on college campuses, specifically on formal reporting rates. I first explain my conceptualizations of reporting rates and sexual violence laws. Next, I formulate my typology of sexual violence laws with two classifications: trauma-informed policies and due process policies. I then lay out how these sexual violence laws change university policies and ultimately affect reporting rates. Finally, I theorize how these two types of sexual violence laws can impact reporting rates of sexual violence to universities.

### **Concept: Reporting Rates**

I conceptualize reporting rates at the college level as the number of sexual violence incidents reported by students at a particular college or university. A reported incident will be considered an incident of sexual violence if it falls under the stated definition of sexual violence, which I describe in the next subsection. In this study, I specifically consider reporting rates drawn from reports to formal processes. Formal processes of reporting involve reporting cases of sexual violence to the university, which can include anonymous or non-anonymous reporting (Sabina and Ho 2014).

### **Concept: Sexual Violence Laws**

In order to conceptualize sexual violence laws, I must first conceptualize sexual violence. The term sexual violence is purposefully vague, as opposed to terms such as sexual assault or sexual misconduct. While the word “violence” has harsher connotations than “misconduct,” I use sexual violence as an umbrella term that encompasses non-consensual and unwanted sexual acts,

such as sexual harassment, sexual assault, and intimate partner violence.<sup>2</sup> I conceptualize sexual violence as defined by the World Health Organization (2002): “any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic, or otherwise directed, against a person’s sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work.” This definition is broad enough to interpret a wide range of acts. It is also gender-neutral, acknowledging that any person, regardless of gender, can experience sexual violence. I intentionally use an extensive definition because the inclusion of more acts can allow us to understand the full scope of violence being perpetuated.

I conceptualize sexual violence laws as laws aimed at addressing sexual violence. I looked at state-level policies that generally address sexual violence as well as laws that focus specifically on sexual violence on college campuses. Laws related to sexual violence can involve a variety of themes and goals, such as granting rights to the accused or protecting survivors of sexual violence. While there is no formal distinction of sexual violence laws, I developed a typology of sexual violence laws with two categories: trauma-informed and due process.

### **Type #1: Trauma-Informed Laws**

Sexual violence laws that have a trauma-informed approach take into account the practice and lived experiences of sexual violence survivors by promoting principles of safety, trustworthiness, empowerment, choice, and collaboration (Bowen and Murshid 2016).

Approaching sexual violence laws from the perspective of trauma-informed care is especially important to survivors of sexual violence (Bowen and Murshid 2016). Trauma-informed sexual

---

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this study, I use sexual violence and sexual assault interchangeably. I also use intimate-partner violence, domestic violence, and domestic abuse interchangeably.

violence laws acknowledge the experiences of survivors and ideally reduce the chances of retraumatizing survivors (Bowen and Murshid 2016). Moreover, these types of sexual violence laws enable survivors to assert agency because they provide survivors with more choices that accommodate survivors' individual needs. Some common themes of trauma-informed sexual violence policies include mandating sexual violence prevention or response training, funding for sexual violence prevention programs, or victims' confidentiality.

One example of a trauma-informed law is Wisconsin A.B. 808, enacted in 2015 (Appendix A). This law states that a college disciplinary board may not issue certain disciplinary measures as a result of underage drinking if the student was a crime victim or bystander of a crime victim, called for emergency assistance, and cooperated with emergency assistance (Lexis Nexis 2021). This policy is considered trauma-informed because it promotes safety and collaboration, two of the principles essential to a trauma-informed approach. Students who have experienced or were a bystander to sexual violence may normally hesitate to call emergency assistance because they fear repercussions for breaking university policy against consuming alcohol under the age of twenty-one years old. Because incidents of sexual violence often overlap with the consumption of alcohol, fear of consequences discourages a significant number of students from reporting (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). Enacting a law that bars universities from punishing students for alcohol policy violations if they have experienced or witnessed sexual violence is helpful for many students. This policy acknowledges students' concerns with potential disciplinary measures. If students know that they will not face consequences for seeking help as it relates to sexual violence, they will feel more comfortable pursuing university support and resources.

## **Type #2: Due Process Laws**

On the other hand, sexual violence laws about due process address the rights and treatment of survivors and the accused during the campus reporting and adjudication process as well as the criminal justice system (Morse, Sponsler and Fulton 2015). Due process rights become relevant to the issue of sexual violence on college campuses because students have the option to be involved in multiple disciplinary systems: the university's formal processes or the criminal justice system. While the criminal justice system can address criminal misconduct at the local, state, or federal level, the university adjudication process can respond to university policy violations, some of which may not qualify as criminal misconduct, such as sexual harassment.

Because there is a separate adjudication process available to college students, the question of due process has become of great controversy (Triplett 2012). Due process laws related to the criminal justice system are well established, but due process laws about the university adjudication system are more recent and less consistent. Several court cases and state laws have sought to clarify, expand, or limit the due process rights of students involved in university formal processes (Triplett 2012). Due process laws about sexual violence on college campuses usually relate to the standard of evidence or burden of proof, allowing attorneys to represent the accused or survivors, or access to specific procedures.

One example of a due process sexual violence law is Ohio H.B. 86, which was enacted in 2011 (Appendix A). This law describes a victims' bill of rights for crime victims, including victims of sexual violence or domestic violence (Lexis Nexis 2021). The bill of rights includes the right to attend legal or criminal proceedings, the right to be familiar with the legal or criminal process, progress, and result of proceedings, the right to maintain civil action against the perpetrator, and the right of claimant to be compensated for care or counseling as a result of the

crime (Lexis Nexis 2021). This law is considered a due process policy because it specifically establishes the rights of crime victims if they were to be involved in the criminal legal system. It also clarifies the rights of crime victims if they choose to pursue action through the civil legal system. Because sexual violence victims are considered crime victims in Ohio, this law is especially a sexual violence due process law.

### **The Process of State Legislation's Impact of Reporting Rates**

Enacted state legislation passes a series of steps before resulting in changes to reporting rates. The first step is that state legislatures must enact sexual violence laws that are relevant to institutions of higher education (IHE). While state legislatures pass a variety of laws that are related to sexual violence, many of these laws can be irrelevant to students at IHE, such as child sexual abuse laws or laws related to the licensing of employees and professional workers. Therefore, only laws that are specifically related IHE will possibly have any change on current university policies.

The second step is that university sexual misconduct policies must adapt to changes in state laws related to sexual violence. I do not specifically analyze how universities implement enacted state legislation that requires change to university policy of sexual misconduct. Although a university may already have these policies implemented such that any change in state legislation will not require any change in university policy, universities are very attuned to relevant changes to state sexual violence laws. Based on anonymous background interviews with university administrators, throughout this study I maintain the assumption that universities usually change their sexual misconduct policies when new state legislation is passed. Another

assumption is that the types of changes made to university policies reflects the same type of laws passed at the state level.

Once university sexual misconduct policies are adapted to current state laws, I expect students to take these policy changes into consideration when deciding to report an incident of sexual violence to the university. For university policies to be a factor in a student's decision to report to the university, students must be aware of changes to university sexual misconduct policy. I briefly look into how aware students are of university policies related to sexual violence as well as state-level sexual violence laws through two questions in the online experiment.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, I have some insight into this step to understand whether students pay attention to changes in university policy. If they do not pay attention, then other major factors affect sexual violence reporting rates that do not include changes to university policies. I predict, however, that students pay attention to university policies, and they specifically pay attention to the types of changes made to sexual misconduct policies. Thus, students will change their decision to report to the university depending on the types of university policies present.

The final step is that individual decisions to report an incident of sexual violence to the university will ultimately change university reporting rates of sexual violence. Not only will a couple of students change their decision to report to the university as a result of university sexual misconduct policies, but consistently enough students will change their decision such that overall reporting rates are influenced. Depending on the type of changes to university policy, we can expect reporting rates over the years to change as a result.

The overall process of how changes to state legislation related to sexual violence affect reporting rates on college campuses can be represented with the following diagram:

---

<sup>3</sup> I describe this process in the Survey Design subsection of the Data Collection section.



*Enactment of new state legislation → Updated university sexual misconduct policies → Effect on students' decision to report to the university → Change in yearly formal reporting rates*

## **My Hypothesis**

I hypothesize that the passage of trauma-informed sexual violence laws at the state level are more likely to increase reporting rates to universities than due process sexual violence laws. Although due process laws may clarify the rights survivors as well as those accused of sexual violence, due process laws force the university investigative process to reflect the criminal justice system. Therefore, survivors are discouraged to report because their concerns are not met by due process laws. Unlike due process sexual violence laws, trauma-informed laws address a variety of demographic, situational, and psychological reasons for underreporting. Therefore, enacting trauma-informed policies will encourage more survivors to report to the university because their needs are met and they feel more comfortable in the reporting process. In the next two subsections, I specifically break down the impacts of both types of sexual violence policies.

## **Effects of Trauma-Informed Laws**

Trauma-informed policies would encourage survivors to report because they work to reduce the reasons that survivors may not feel comfortable reporting. If survivors feel as though policies address their needs and concerns, then they are more likely to report. For instance, trauma-informed sexual violence policies can address demographic factors related to reporting. Since there are significant disparities in reporting based on gender, race, and class, trauma-informed policies can offer opportunities to counter the potential causes of these disparities. For instance, confidential or anonymous reporting options could ameliorate concerns of male

survivors who may fear stigma for being assaulted. Consideration of how a policy may impact different demographics is important to developing and implementing policies that benefit the widest range of survivors. Thus, these types of trauma-informed policies could encourage survivors of various identities to report.

Since many reasons to not report stem from uncertainty about the law, state-level sexual violence policies that clarify the definition of sexual violence and whether survivors may face charges for underage drinking or illegal drug use can help survivors make more informed decisions about reporting. Policies that promote more education about state law, university resources, and the formal university processes can also encourage reporting because students have more information about their options considering their individual situations. Moreover, policy at the state level can address concerns about safety and stigma surrounding sexual violence. For example, the state-level policy can assert the safety of the survivor by ensuring that survivors will not face repercussions for reporting an assault. Additionally, the presence of sexual violence policies that are accommodating to survivors can signal greater support of survivors in the community, which may make survivors more comfortable in reporting.

### **Effects of Due Process Laws**

Due process policy may be effective in guaranteeing the rights of students involved in sexual violence cases, but I argue that they risk retraumatizing survivors. Some due process policies may clarify the rights of survivors and the accused in the criminal justice system or the university system. On the one hand, due process policies that are specific to the criminal justice system may seem to benefit survivors of sexual violence as they present the rights of survivors and clarify the process. In fact, these policies do not actually address the major needs of survivors and come at a serious cost to survivors. On the other hand, survivors may choose to

pursue cases in the university system rather than the criminal justice system to lower the stakes of the case and avoid actions such as cross-examination or subpoenas. In general, the university adjudication process is meant to have lower standards for proof and less severe disciplinary measures than the criminal justice process. However, a recent movement to pass due process policy at the state-level makes the university adjudication process more similar to the criminal justice system.

While it might seem like these policies make the university process fairer for both sides, these policies discourage survivors from reporting. Making the university process more similar to the criminal justice system does not address the needs and concerns of survivors. It limits the choices of survivors and their potential paths for healing and justice. Survivors are well aware of how the criminal justice system treats survivors poorly by systemically failing to convict perpetrators and denying them justice. Due process policies that make the university process more similar to the criminal justice system means the university adjudication process can become a long, excruciating process that questions a survivor's lived experiences and motivations. Survivors may be more inclined to avoid these retraumatizing experiences, and thus will be less likely to report an assault. Therefore, due process policy would likely be less effective at increasing reporting rates because survivors' concerns are not taken into account.

### **Theoretical Model Summary**

To summarize, my dependent variable is reporting rates, which I conceptualize as the number of incidents of sexual violence perpetrated against students. I specifically use reporting rates formally reported to the university as my data set. Additionally, my independent variable is sexual violence laws, which are policies aimed at addressing sexual violence and can be classified as either trauma-informed or due process. To connect the passage of state sexual

violence laws to formal reporting rates, I theorize the following process: the enactment of new state legislation results in updated university sexual misconduct policies, which affects students' decision to report to the university and then changes yearly formal reporting rates. Finally, I hypothesize that trauma-informed sexual violence laws will be more effective at increasing formal reporting rates on college campuses than due process sexual violence laws. I lay out the process of data collection for state sexual violence laws and reporting rates in the next section.

## **Data Collection**

I outline the process of data collection for state sexual violence laws, reporting rates, and the online experiment in this section. I first walk through my reasoning behind the case selection of states and explain how I searched for laws and coded them according to three different scales. Then, I describe the process I followed to choose universities within each state and pair universities together for comparative analysis. I also address the data collection of formal reporting rates, including why I chose the Clery Act dataset despite its disadvantages. Lastly, I explain the reasoning for and design of the online experiment.

## **State Sexual Violence Laws**

### **Case Selection**

I decided to study the state sexual violence laws of seven states: Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. These seven states are highly similar to each other based on state demographics and state characteristics. For state demographics, I compared each state's percentages of the population that is white, non-white, female, hold a high school degree, and hold a bachelor's degree (United States Census Bureau 2010). For state characteristics, I compared each state's percentage of the population below the poverty level and level of civic engagement, which I measure by voting turnout in the 2012 presidential election (McDonald n.d.). I chose to control for each of these variables when choosing states because I wanted to reduce confounding variables, such as different demographics, when comparing state laws. Each of these demographic and characteristic variables is associated with the types of state laws generally passed at the state level. Therefore, I wanted to minimize the differences between states besides actual state-level policy.

## Data Collection

In order to collect data on state sexual violence laws, I used to the Nexis Uni database (Lexis Nexis 2021). This database enabled me to sort through all necessary state-level laws. First, I searched for statutes and legislation with the following terms: “sexual assault” or “rape” or “sexual misconduct” or “sexual harassment” or “domestic abuse.” I searched these specific terms because they covered the range of terms likely to be used by legislators to write legislation related to sexual violence. I also only searched for laws enacted between 2011 and 2017 because there was little federal policy change during these six years. Therefore, I can eliminate an alternative explanation that any change in reporting rates was due to changes in federal legislation. Finally, I was able to narrow the results down to each state’s results.

To record each state law, I measured it on three different scales: level of trauma-informed policy, level of due process policy, and relevance to IHE.<sup>4</sup> Each scale had a rating from one to three, with one being not related, two being somewhat related, and three being very related. I chose to rate each law on three different scales because some laws would involve a variety of statutes that could be classified as both due process and trauma informed. Moreover, some laws were not related to IHE, such as addressing issues of child sexual abuse, so I needed a scale to sort out laws unrelated to my own research.<sup>5</sup>

An example of a law that I rated as completely due process and relevant to IHE is Indiana H.B. 1526, passed in 2017 (Appendix A). This law states that the statute of limitations to press

---

<sup>4</sup> Appendix A features every law I read and how I coded it.

<sup>5</sup> An example of a sexual violence law that is not relevant to IHE is Ohio H.B. 493, passed in 2015. This law describes policies related to legal and criminal proceedings of sexual abuse perpetuated against minors under 18 years old. Therefore, this law is irrelevant to IHE, in which students are most likely over 18 years old.

charges for rape is five years (Lexis Nexis 2021). I rate this law 3/3 for the level of due process policy because it is directly about the criminal justice system (Appendix A). It also receives a rating of 1/3 for the level of trauma-informed policy because this statute of limitations does not allow the survivor much time to pursue charges within the criminal justice system (Appendix A). For a policy to be trauma-informed, it must be accommodating to the survivor. Because this statute of limitations is restricting, it is not responding to survivors' needs, so it is considered 1 with regards to a trauma-informed approach. Finally, this law is 3/3 for relevance to IHE because it directly impacts the time limit that students have to report an incident of rape (Appendix A). If a student survivor chooses to pursue criminal charges against their perpetrator, they must do so within only five years.

An instance of a law that I rated as completely trauma-informed and relevant to IHE is Minnesota S.B. 943 (Appendix A). This law specifically appropriates funding for sexual assault reporting and prevention training in post-secondary institutions and funding to implement sexual assault policies at post-secondary institutions (Lexis Nexis 2021). I code this law as 1/3 for the level of due process policy because it does not mention any aspects related to rights, the university adjudication process, nor the criminal justice system (Appendix A). This law is rated 3/3 for the level of trauma-informed policy because it grants funding to promote the prevention of sexual violence (Appendix A). This education is trauma-informed because it teaches the principles of safety, empowerment, choice, and collaboration to those affiliated with the university to reduce the prevalence of sexual violence on college campuses. Lastly, this law is rated 3/3 for relevance to IHE because it precisely states this funding is for IHE (Appendix A).

Many laws also have statutes that can be classified as both trauma-informed and due process, such as Minnesota H.B. 859, enacted in 2013 (Appendix A). This law states that victims

of sexual violence may terminate their rental agreement before the end of their lease and must provide a qualifying document from a health care professional, domestic abuse advocate, or sexual assault counselor to their landlord in order to terminate the agreement (Lexis Nexis 2021). I code this law as 3/3 for level of due process because it explains the right of a victim of sexual violence as it relates to lease agreements (Appendix A). Moreover, this law is rated as 3/3 for level of trauma-informed policy because it takes into consideration the needs and concerns of survivors of sexual violence (Appendix A). Some survivors may need to immediately move in order to protect their safety, and this law enables survivors to make that decision. Prioritizing the choice and safety of survivors is central to trauma-informed policy. This law is also rated 3/3 for relevance to IHE because many college students sign lease agreements to live in rental housing near campus (Appendix A).

## **Formal Reporting Rates**

### **Case Selection**

I selected one to four universities from each state to analyze university formal reporting rates. All universities are public four-year institutions with student populations of 20,000 students or more. Because reporting rates at the college level vary along the lines of race, gender, and socioeconomic status of the student, I chose these aspects of university demographics to compare universities and ultimately pair universities together (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). One's likelihood to experience sexual violence is influenced by each of these characteristics. Therefore, I compared each university's percentage of the undergraduate student population that is white, percentage of the undergraduate population that non-white, and percentage of the undergraduate population that is female (College Factual n.d.). I also compared each university's median family yearly income, residential program, and competitiveness of the sports program (The New York



Times 2017). I measure the residential program according to the 2015 Carnegie Classification of universities, with a university being considered primarily residential or primarily non-residential (Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research 2018). I also measure the competitiveness of the sports program by the university's respective NCAA sports division (National Collegiate Athletic Association 2020). Below, I explain how I followed this process to pair Ohio State University and Pennsylvania State University.

As seen in Table 1, Ohio State University and Pennsylvania State University have similar statistics across all university characteristics. Both universities have around 68% of the student population that is white, 31% of the population that is non-white, 47% of the population that is female. Additionally, both universities are primarily residential and NCAA Division 1 sports universities. Since these two universities are similar along each of these characteristics, I can pair them together. Therefore, When I compare these universities' reporting rates, I can eliminate alternative explanations for changes to these rates and consider any correlation to state laws.

	University Characteristics					
University	% White	% Non-White	% Women	\$ Median Family Yearly Income	Residential Program	Sports Division
Ohio State University	69.3	30.7	48.1	104,100	Primarily Residential	Division 1
Pennsylvania State University	67.2	32.8	46.5	101,800	Primarily Residential	Division 1

*Table 1. A comparison of Ohio State University and Pennsylvania State University across five university characteristics in order to establish a proper university pairing.*

## Data Collection

I collected data on reported cases through formal processes. Reported cases through formal processes can measure survivors' comfort with reporting to formal institutions such as

law enforcement or the university. It is important to recognize that the formal reporting rates will not measure the true number of incidents experienced by college students because incidents of sexual violence are historically underreported, especially by college students (Fisher, Daigle, et al. 2003). Despite the underreporting of sexual violence, reporting rates of sexual violence are significant because they can indicate survivors' level of comfort when they choose to report or not report an incident (Sabina and Ho 2014). In general, formal reporting rates are more easily accessible and consistent than reporting cases through other processes.

I identified reported cases of sexual violence on a college campus through university reports of violent crimes as mandated by the Clery Act. The Clery Act data has a number of limitations and flaws, but I chose this dataset because it was the most consistently reliable and easily accessible (United States Department of Education 2020). While some universities release their own detailed reports about student sexual misconduct, not enough universities release these reports for me to rely on this data. As for the Clery Act dataset, any university that receives federal funding is mandated by federal law to submit a safety and security report to the U.S. Department of Education (Fisher, Hartman, et al. 2002). Each university's safety and security report found on the university's website contains the same statistics as the Clery Act reports found on the Department of Education website. This yearly safety and security report includes statistics on crime incidents, arrests, and disciplinary referrals for the past three calendar years as well as information efforts to improve campus safety (United States Department of Education 2020). Because all universities must follow the same requirements under the Clery Act, there is no variation in definitions of the data. The Clery Act data for each university that was included in my case selection was downloaded from the U.S. Department of Education website.

It is necessary to acknowledge the shortcomings of the Clery Act dataset. The Clery Act only requires universities to report crimes committed by students each year, as opposed to policy violations. Therefore, certain acts of sexual violence reported to the university that would be university policy violations may not be counted under the Clery Act because they are not considered a crime, such as sexual harassment. Moreover, the Clery Act only requires universities to distinguish between on-campus crimes and non-campus crimes. Incidents of sexual violence that happened near campus but not in on-campus facilities, are not reported in the safety and security report. The exclusion of incidents that happened near campus, such as at fraternities or sororities, means that many incidents of sexual violence against students are overlooked because a significant number of incidents happen near campus, but not on campus. The Clery Act does not require universities to report more detailed information about university processes either, such as how many students go through the adjudication process, or how many students are disciplined as a result of the investigative process. In summary, the Clery Act does not cover the entire scope of sexual violence incidents reported to universities, but it is the most easily accessible and reliable set of formal reporting rates.

## **Online Experiment**

### **Reasoning**

In addition to comparing state sexual violence laws to formal reporting rates on college campuses, I also sought to understand whether the type of sexual violence law changes a college student's decision to report an incident of sexual assault to the university. Several steps occur between when a relevant sexual violence law is enacted at the state level and when an incident of sexual violence is formally reported to the university. Specifically, universities may be mandated

to change to their own sexual misconduct policies and these policy changes may affect an individual's decision to report. I focused on how university policies may influence an individual's decision to report an incident of sexual violence to the university.

In order to study this possible relationship, I conducted an online experiment survey. An experiment is a useful method to explore how university policies may affect a student's decision to report because I could test each type of university policy on respondents. An online experiment enabled me to collect information on how respondents may change their answers based on the treatment given. Additionally, I could ask participants follow-up questions about their experiences with the reporting process. Overall, an online experiment allowed me to gauge exactly how students respond to different types of university policies in order to bridge the connection state sexual violence laws and changes in formal reporting rates.

### Online Experiment Design

To analyze how one might change their decision to report to the university as a result of different sexual misconduct policies, I designed an online experiment in which respondents were asked to read a scenario and give their suggestions. I created three different scenarios to one of which respondents were randomly assigned. Table 2 provides the language of the vignette for the control group, the due process treatment, and the trauma-informed treatment.

Treatment	Vignette	Difference Between Vignettes
Control	You are a student at a Wisconsin State University, a large, public university. A fellow student, who is a friend of yours, discloses to you that they have been recently sexually assaulted by another student on campus. They are considering reporting the assault to the university, and they ask you for advice.	No specific reference to the type of university policy that is mandated by state law.

Due Process	You are a student at a Wisconsin State University, a large, public university. A fellow student, who is a friend of yours, discloses to you that they have been recently sexually assaulted by another student on campus. They are considering reporting the assault to the university, and they ask you for advice. As mandated by the state law, the university's policy states that students who report an assault and students who are accused of an assault both have the right to a lawyer during the investigative process.	Specific reference to a due process policy that is present in university policy: "As mandated by the state law, the university's policy states that students who report an assault and students who are accused of an assault both have the right to a lawyer during the investigative process."
Trauma-Informed	You are a student at a Wisconsin State University, a large, public university. A fellow student, who is a friend of yours, discloses to you that they have been recently sexually assaulted by another student on campus. They are considering reporting the assault to the university, and they ask you for advice. As mandated by the state law, the university's policy states that students who report an assault may agree to each step or withdraw from the reporting process before moving forward with the next step.	Specific reference to a trauma-informed policy that is present in university policy: "As mandated by the state law, the university's policy states that students who report an assault may agree to each step or withdraw from the reporting process before moving forward with the next step."

*Table 2. The language of the vignette for each treatment and the differences between each vignette.*

To begin, I chose a fake university name in order to make the situation appear more realistic and relate to a large state school. Moreover, I framed the vignette around a friend disclosing an assault of sexual violence to the respondent rather than the respondent being hypothetically assaulted. It is not ethical to ask a participant to consider how they would respond to their own assault, even if theoretical. Sexual assault is already a very sensitive and personal issue, and it is not appropriate to ask respondents to place themselves into a heinous crime. Furthermore, considering that it would be plausible for respondents to have already experienced sexual assault, I wanted to minimize any retraumatization for respondents reading the vignette. Conversely, respondent is more likely to have encountered a disclosure from a friend in real life, since survivors are more likely to disclosure to informal sources, such as friends (Sabina and Ho 2014). Responding to a friend's disclosure also provides a degree of separation from the incident of sexual violence such that respondents will not be so disturbed by the vignette. It is important

to note that there is a selection bias present because some respondents chose to not participate in the experiment because of the subject matter of sexual violence.

The main point of the control vignette was to explain that a student at Wisconsin State University recently discloses to the respondent that they have been sexually assaulted, without any mention of the type of university policy presently enacted. The two test scenarios have the same premise but introduced the university's policy on sexual misconduct as mandated by state law. Test scenario #1 represented a due process university policy. The due process policy is that students who report an assault and students who are accused of an assault both have the right to a lawyer during the investigative process. I chose this example of a due process sexual violence policy because it reminds the respondent of one of the most well-known aspects of the justice system: the right to a lawyer. Test scenario #2 represented a trauma-informed policy. The trauma-informed policy is that students who report an assault may agree to each step or withdraw from the reporting process before moving forward with the next step. This is an example of a trauma-informed policy because this policy indicates respect towards the survivor and provides the survivor with choice and agency during the reporting and adjudication process, each three characteristics of a trauma-informed approach.

This design of three scenarios tests the effect of the type of university policy because the scenarios are completely the same except for the statement of the university sexual misconduct policy. I was able to compare the answers to each scenario in order to analyze any similarities or differences. I could also conclude any differences in answers between the three scenarios is attributable to the type of university policy.

At the start of the online experiment, respondents were sorted into three different groups: a control group, test group #1, and test group #2.<sup>6</sup> Respondents were asked to read the scenario, and then they were asked whether they would recommend that the student report the sexual assault to the university. Respondents were also asked to explain why they recommended or did not recommend the student to report to the university. If a respondent answered that they would recommend the student report, they were asked to whom within the university the student should report. I asked this follow-up question because there are usually several offices to which students can report incidents of sexual assault, including confidential and non-confidential sources. By asking respondents this question, I could analyze if the type of source that respondents choose correlates with the type of university policy present.

After respondents answered the questions related to the specific scenario, I asked respondents a series of follow-up questions in order to acknowledge and eliminate alternative explanations. I asked the follow-up questions after respondents respond to the specific scenario to ensure that respondents are only primed by the vignette. I did not want respondents to be primed by follow-up questions that mention gender, sexual identity, or other personal experiences because I wanted to minimize any factors that could influence respondents' decisions to recommend reporting aside from the type of university policy. Respondents were not required to answer these follow-up questions.

I first asked respondents if they or someone they knew has ever been involved in the reporting or investigative process. These questions are important because one's personal experience or hearing anecdotal experience about the reporting or investigative process could have affected their responses to the scenarios. Thus, I could break down the overall results by the

---

<sup>6</sup> I outline the online experiment questions in Appendix C.

respondents' answers to these personal experience questions in order to establish how personal experience is related to likeliness to recommend reporting.

Moreover, I asked respondents if they were familiar with their state's or university's current laws regarding sexual violence. I especially prefaced these questions with the following phrase, "Some students are aware of their university and on-campus resources related to sexual violence while other students are not aware." This phrase helps to eliminate response bias because it reminds respondents that it is acceptable to not be familiar with policies even if they believe that they should be familiar. Thus, participants are more likely to respond truthfully rather than how they anticipate I wanted them to respond. These questions also served as supplemental evidence to the responses to the scenarios. If the type of university policy did influence respondents' answers, I was interested to know how applicable these differences were to real life. If respondents are familiar with current policies, then the results are more supportive of my theory than if respondents are not familiar.

The next set of questions asked respondents about their gender identity, ethnic or racial identity, and sexual identity. Because students may be less likely to report depending on their answers to each of these identities, I had to control for these identities. These identification questions were necessary so that I could eliminate the alternative explanation that the survey results are due to the respondent's identity. The last set of questions were related to general university experiences. Greek life involvement, university population size, university residential status, and class standing are all correlated with varying presence and understanding of sexual assault. The ability to control for each of these variables enabled me to better narrow down the survey results to a possible correlation between the type of university policy and the likeliness to recommend reporting.



Finally, I distributed the survey on Amazon Mechanical Turk. My targeted demographic was current college students from across the United States, a population I could best reach on this platform. I paid each respondent \$2 for completing the survey because I wanted to properly compensate them for their time. Also, I could attract enough respondents and incentivize them to complete the survey with a decent reward. Because of the Gerstein Grant, which awarded me \$500, I was able to fully pay 250 people to respond to my survey. This survey was also fully anonymous. An anonymous survey helps to limit respondent bias and encourage honesty, especially because I ask about a sensitive topic.

### **Data Collection Summary**

Overall, I chose to read and code state sexual violence laws in seven states that were similar along eight different characteristics in order to reduce the number of confounding variables. I coded these state laws according to three different scales: level of due process policy, level of trauma-informed policy, and relevance to IHE. I also provided examples of how I coded a completely due process law, a completely trauma-informed law, and a law with elements of both types of policy. Next, I outlined the case selection of universities such that I can pair universities along six characteristics for comparative analysis. I then explained that I specifically chose the Clery Act dataset to analyze formal reporting rates because this dataset is easily available and consistent among each university. Additionally, I reasoned that an online experiment could help me better understand whether the type of university policy influences a student's decision to formally report an incident of sexual violence. I detailed the online experiment design and explained my decisions regarding the design. In the following section, I analyze the collected data in order to evaluate my hypothesis and answer my research question.

## **State Laws and University Reporting Rates Data Analysis**

In this section, I explain my findings after analyzing state law data and yearly formal reporting rates on college campuses. I first present my aggregate findings. Then, I analyze the datasets in two ways: universities within selected states and comparatively between universities. I first looked at which types of state laws are passed in given years and whether there are any changes to reporting rates on college campuses within those states after those laws are passed. I calculated the moving average for yearly reporting rates in order to better gauge overall trends. I also paired universities across states to understand if there is a correlation between changes in reporting rates and the types of sexual violence laws passed in each state. I will present my results about laws and university reporting rates within individual states and then present my findings with university pairings.

### **Aggregate Findings**

I looked at state sexual violence laws for a total of seven states and analyzed reporting rates of 18 universities, which are all listed in Table 3. Between 2011 and 2017, these states enacted 325 laws related to sexual violence, with 103 laws being rated most relevant (3/3) to IHE (Appendix A). Therefore, nearly one in three of all sexual violence laws passed were most relevant to IHE. Of the sexual violence laws most relevant to IHE, 36 laws were completely due process laws, 22 laws were completely trauma-informed laws, and 45 laws had elements of both due process and trauma-informed policies, which I identify as mixed laws (Appendix A). In general, states passed a vast majority of due process and mixed laws, with 78.6% of all sexual violence laws falling in these two categorizations. Many states tended towards passing due process and mixed laws, with few states focusing on enacting completely trauma-informed policies. Two states, Ohio and Wisconsin, did not pass any completely trauma-informed policies.

between 2011 and 2017, and two more states, Indiana and Minnesota, only passed one trauma-informed policy each. As a result, there were less opportunities to test my theory that trauma-informed laws are more effective at increasing reporting rates of sexual violence on college campuses than due process laws.

State	University
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indiana University</li> <li>• Purdue University</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Iowa State University</li> <li>• University of Iowa</li> </ul>
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Michigan University</li> <li>• Grand Valley State University</li> <li>• Michigan State University</li> <li>• University of Michigan</li> </ul>
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University of Minnesota</li> </ul>
Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kent State University</li> <li>• Ohio State University</li> <li>• University of Cincinnati</li> <li>• University of Toledo</li> </ul>
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pennsylvania State University</li> <li>• University of Pittsburgh</li> <li>• University of Toledo</li> </ul>
Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University of Wisconsin–Madison</li> <li>• University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee</li> </ul>

*Table 3. List of states and corresponding universities involved in my data analysis.*

After mapping changes in the reporting rates to enacted state laws, there were not necessarily any clear trends on a large scale. For each year that a majority of due process laws were passed, reporting rates increased at six universities, decreased at 12 universities, and did not change for nine universities. For each year that a majority of trauma-informed laws were enacted, nine universities had an increase in reporting rates, two universities had a decrease in reporting rates, and ten universities did not see any significant change in reporting rates. Although reporting rates increased at more universities when a majority of trauma-informed laws

were passed than a majority of due process laws, more universities did not see any important change in reporting rates when a majority of trauma-informed were enacted. It was difficult to discern whether changes to reporting rates can be attributed to a specific type of state sexual violence law on the aggregate level. However, we can break down the data into intra-state analysis and inter-university comparisons in order to gain additional insight.

### **Analysis of Individual States**

I take a deeper dive into specific states to better test my theory and understand any correlation between the types of state laws enacted and changes in reporting rates. For each state, I identified which types of laws were passed in a given year between 2011 and 2017. Next, I compared the moving averages of reporting rates two years before the laws were enacted and three years after the laws were enacted. For instance, if one law was passed in 2013, then I considered 2012 and 2013 as the two years before the law was passed, and I considered 2014, 2015, and 2016 as the three years after the law was passed. I then analyzed these changes to understand if positive changes in reporting rates correlated with the passage of trauma-informed laws and if negative changes or no change in reporting rates correlated with the passage of due process laws.

Below, I specifically describe this process for three states, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. In Appendix B, I also provide the process for the four other states. I decided to closely analyze Michigan because the laws passed related to sexual violence were very unique and focused heavily on trauma-informed policies. Moreover, the findings in Michigan supported my hypothesis because reporting rates increased as trauma-informed policies were enacted. I also selected Ohio because the state only enacted mixed and due process laws. Ohio also provided evidence of my theory that reporting rates did not increase with the passage of due-process laws.

Lastly, I chose Pennsylvania because the state passed both trauma-informed and due process laws, but the findings do not support my theory.

## **Michigan**

Between 2011 and 2017, 37 laws related to sexual violence were enacted. Of those laws, 15 laws, or 40%, between 2013 and 2017 were passed that are most relevant to IHE, with no laws in 2011 passed that were relevant to IHE (Appendix A).<sup>7</sup> Michigan passed more trauma-informed laws, but a significant percentage of laws had a mainly due process policy focus. Both Central Michigan University and University of Michigan had a general increase in the moving average of reporting rates until 2017, and then the moving average suddenly decreased in 2018. For Grand Valley State University and Michigan State University, the moving average of reporting rates increased in general between 2010 and 2018.

In 2013, two due process laws, two mixed laws, and one trauma-informed law were passed (Appendix A). Although the laws passed this year leaned more towards due process than trauma-informed policy, we see a clear increase in the moving average of reporting rates for Central Michigan University and the University of Michigan, as seen in Table 4. For instance, Central Michigan University had a moving average of 5.7 incidents per 10,000 students in 2012 and 6.6 incidents per 10,000 students in 2013, prior to the passage of the 2013 laws. After the 2013 laws were enacted, Table 4 shows the moving average increased to 7.4 incidents per 10,000 students in 2014, 14.1 incidents in 2015, and 12.2 incidents in 2016. For Grand Valley State University and Michigan State University, there is not a clear increase in the reporting rates because the moving average in 2014 is lower than either the 2012 or 2013 moving average.

---

<sup>7</sup> No sexual violence laws related to IHE were passed in 2011.

However, the reporting rates in 2015 and 2016 are clearly higher than before the law was passed, so we can conclude the moving average generally increased for Michigan State University and Grand Valley State University. Overall, this year is not consistent with my hypothesis because reporting rates increased on average even though more due process policies were passed.

	Yearly Moving Average of Incidents per 10,000 Students				
	Prior to the 2013 laws		After the 2013 laws		
University	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Central Michigan University	5.7	6.6	7.4	14.1	12.2
Grand Valley State University	8.1 <sup>8</sup>	10.3	9.2	12.5	16.1
Michigan State University	8.5	6.6	8.1	9.3	13.8
University of Michigan	4.9	4.5	7.8	9.1	9.7

*Table 4. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and three years after sexual violence laws were passed in 2013, for selected universities in Michigan.*

In 2015, four trauma-informed policies, two mixed policies, and one due process policy were passed (Appendix A). For Michigan State University and Grand Valley State University, the moving averages of reporting rates increased significantly, according to Table 5. Initially, these findings suggest a correlation between a passage of trauma-informed policies and an increase in reporting rates on average. The correlation is less clear for Central Michigan University and University of Michigan. At the University of Michigan, Table 5 shows a slight increase in the moving average in 2016, but then the moving average decreases in 2017 and 2018. Similarly, Central Michigan University has higher moving averages in 2016 and 2017 than in 2014, but then the moving average decreases drastically in 2018, per Table 5. I address these

---

<sup>8</sup> The lack of trend for Grand Valley State University is most likely due to the fact that they reported 0 incidents total for 2010 and 2012.

decreases later in this section. Despite these caveats, there is evidence that trauma-informed policies are correlated with an increase in reporting rates.

	Yearly Moving Average of Incidents per 10,000 Students				
	Prior to the 2015 laws		After the 2015 laws		
University	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Central Michigan University	7.4	14.1	12.2	12.4	5.3
Grand Valley State University	9.2	12.5	16.1	17.6	18.6
Michigan State University	8.1	9.3	13.8	22.1	104.7
University of Michigan	7.8	9.1	9.7	6.5	2.4

*Table 5. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and three years after sexual violence laws were passed in 2015, for selected universities in Michigan.*

It is important to note that these trauma-informed policies were unique compared to the trauma-informed policies in other states. In H.B. 4115, the policy state that any independent university or college participating in the tuition grant program or receiving state funds shall report to the state legislature the development and implementation of sexual assault response training for anyone responsible with responding to on-campus incidents (Appendix A). Thus, general state funding to universities was conditional on the implementation of this policy. Although other states passed laws that appropriated funding to universities specifically to promote trauma-informed policies, Michigan was the only state to pass a law with conditional funding. It is possible that this specific type of trauma-informed policy was more effective in increasing reporting rates on college campuses. However, I cannot definitively determine a causal relationship between the conditional funding and a rise in the moving average of reporting rates.

In 2017, one mixed law and one due process law were enacted (Appendix A). At Central Michigan University and University of Michigan, there were decreases in the moving averages

of reporting rates, as seen in Table 6. Grand Valley State University had a slight increase in the moving average, but this is not significant enough for a substantial change in the moving average. On the other hand, Michigan State University had a significant increase in the moving average of incidents per 10,000 students, per Table 6. However, in 2017 and 2018, the reported crimes of sexual violence by Larry Nasser, a former employee of Michigan State University, were included in the official yearly reports, even if all crimes did not occur in those years (Dunlap 2017). Therefore, Michigan State University's increase in the moving average is most likely not due to the types of laws passed in Michigan. If we only look at Central Michigan University, Grand Valley State University, and University of Michigan, the moving average not increasing is correlated with the lack of trauma-informed policies passed this year. This year provides further support that the trauma-informed policies passed in 2015 may have influenced the increase in the moving average of each university after 2015.

	Yearly Moving Averages of Incidents per 10,000 Students		
	Prior to the 2017 laws		After the 2017x laws
University	2016	2017	2018
Central Michigan University	12.2	12.4	5.3
Grand Valley State University	16.1	17.6	18.6
Michigan State University	13.8	22.1	104.7
University of Michigan	9.7	6.5	2.4

*Table 6. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and one year after sexual violence laws were passed in 2017, for selected universities in Michigan.*

To summarize, state sexual violence laws passed in Michigan provide very interesting results. Although the changes in the moving averages and the types of laws passed in 2013 does not support my hypothesis, the laws passed in 2015 tell a different story. Since there was a great



majority of trauma-informed policies in 2015, then perhaps a heavy emphasis on trauma-informed policies as well as conditional funding can have a significant effect on reporting rates. Moreover, the decrease in moving averages for three universities after no clearly trauma-informed laws were passed in 2017 indicate that only trauma-informed laws are correlated with increases in reporting rates.

## **Ohio**

Ohio passed 45 laws related to sexual violence between 2011 and 2017. However, only nine of those laws were most relevant to IHE (Appendix A). Not a single enacted law was purely trauma-informed. Every law was either completely due-process focused or a mix of trauma-informed and due process policies. The University of Cincinnati, University of Toledo, and Kent State University had moving averages of reporting rates that remained pretty similar between 2012 and 2017. Then in 2018, the moving averages of reporting rates for all three universities decreased. As for Ohio State University, the moving average of reporting rates between 2012 and 2018 was stagnant, with little change upwards or downwards.

In 2011, one due process law and one mixed law were passed, while two due process laws and one mixed law were enacted in 2013 (Appendix A). All four universities did not show any important trends with regards to incidents per 10,000 students. Moreover, the moving average of reporting rates for each university remained the same, as seen in Table 7. These results are consistent with my hypothesis because I predicted that the enactment of due process policies would not result in an increase of reporting rates. Although there are some elements of trauma-informed policy in the mixed laws that were passed, these trauma-informed policies may not have been strong enough to substantially influence reporting rates. All four universities also had no change in the moving averages of reporting rates even though three mixed laws and one

due process law were passed in 2015. These findings again demonstrate that a lack of clearly trauma-informed policies is correlated with no increase in the moving averages.

University	Yearly Moving Averages of Incidents per 10,000 Students								
	2010 <sup>9</sup>	2011 <sup>9</sup>	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Kent State University	4.1	9.0	7.3	9.6	8.4	9.4	9.4	8.2	5.1
Ohio State University	2.7	6.5	3.8	4.3	3.3	4.6	3.9	5.6	6.1
University of Cincinnati	0.7	10.8	6.4	7.7	5.7	8.4	9.1	7.8	4.0
University of Toledo	5.2	16.3	8.7	7.8	7.5	9.1	9.4	11.8	9.1

*Table 7. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students between 2010 and 2018 for selected universities in Ohio.*

In 2017, only one mixed law was enacted (Appendix A). Kent State University, University of Cincinnati, and University of Toledo all showed a decrease in the moving average of reporting rates, according to Table 7. Ohio State University did not display any important changes in the moving average of reporting rates. I hypothesized that the enactment of due process policies would result in no increase of reporting rates on college campuses. Since only one sexual violence law related to IHE was passed this year, the decrease in the moving average is consistent with my hypothesis.

In general, the Ohio legislature passed very little legislation related to a trauma-informed approach and sexual violence on college campuses as a whole. Most laws leaned heavily towards being due process. The lack of trauma-informed policies is correlated with no change and a decrease in the moving averages of reporting rates for all four universities. These findings support my hypothesis that due process laws do not encourage survivors to report more, resulting in stagnant or decreasing reporting rates.

---

<sup>9</sup> The reporting rates for 2010 and 2011 are not moving averages.

## Pennsylvania

Thirty-nine laws related to sexual violence were passed between 2011 and 2017. Of those laws, 28% or 11 laws were most relevant to IHE (Appendix A). Pennsylvania mainly passed trauma-informed laws and mixed laws, with only one law being completely due process. However, Pennsylvania passed less laws each year between 2011 and 2017. For Pennsylvania State University and University of Pittsburgh, the moving averages varied during this time period but ultimately increased by 2018. Temple University did not demonstrate a specific trend with regard to incidents reported per 10,000 students, and the moving average remained stagnant between 2013 and 2018.

In 2011, two trauma-informed laws, one due process law, and one trauma-informed law were passed (Appendix A). As noted in Table 8, Pennsylvania State University showed a slight increase in the moving average for reporting rates. Temple University also displayed a more significant increase in the moving average. However, University of Pittsburgh has a slight decrease in the moving average of reporting rates. Although the University of Pittsburgh does not support my hypothesis, Pennsylvania State University and Temple University have increases in reporting rates that are correlated with the passage of a couple of trauma-informed policies. It is also important to note that two 2011 trauma-informed laws, H.B. 101 and H.B. 1485, specifically mandated sexual assault prevention on college campuses and funding for sexual assault prevention (Lexis Nexis 2021). It is possible that these types of laws may have promoted an increase in reporting rates, but I cannot specifically pinpoint which laws influenced reporting rates.

	Yearly Moving Averages of Incidents per 10,000 Students	
	Prior to the 2011 laws	After the 2011 laws

<b>University</b>	2010 <sup>10</sup>	2011 <sup>10</sup>	2012	2013	2014
Pennsylvania State University	7.8	3.8	7.3	5.9	6.1
Temple University	1.1	2.4	3.9	5.8	7.3
University of Pittsburgh	1.9	10.6	4.2	5.9	3.2

*Table 8. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and three years after sexual violence laws were passed in 2011, for selected universities in Pennsylvania.*

In 2013, two trauma-informed laws and one mixed law were passed (Appendix A).

Temple University shows a small increase in the moving averages of reporting rates. Conversely, Pennsylvania State University and University of Pittsburgh did not have any clear changes in moving averages when comparing before and after these laws were passed. As noted in Table 9, the moving average of Pennsylvania State University seems to decrease in 2014 and 2015, but then it jumps suddenly in 2016. As for the University of Pittsburgh, we see an initial decrease in the moving average in 2014, an increase in 2015, but then another decrease in 2016, where the moving average is equal to the 2014 moving average. I expected the two trauma-informed policies to affect reporting rates such that we would have seen a clearer increase in reporting rates. Since these results are not consistent with my hypothesis, perhaps not enough trauma-informed policies were passed to substantially influence reporting rates.

	<b>Yearly Moving Averages of Incidents per 10,000 Students</b>				
	Prior to the 2013 laws		After the 2013 laws		
<b>University</b>	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Pennsylvania State University	7.3	5.9	6.1	5.2	10.1
Temple University	3.9	5.8	7.3	6.6	7.4
University of Pittsburgh	4.2	5.9	3.2	6.3	4.2

<sup>10</sup> The reporting rates for 2010 and 2011 are not moving averages.

*Table 9. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and three years after sexual violence laws were passed in 2013, for selected universities in Pennsylvania.*

In 2015, two trauma-informed policies and one mixed policy were once again enacted. Temple University displayed mainly stagnant moving averages before and after these laws were passed (Appendix A). University of Pittsburgh also did not have a clear trend in the moving average of reporting rates, but there seems to be a general increase, as noted in Table 10. While there is a decrease in the moving averages in 2016, the moving average does increase in 2017 and 2018. Pennsylvania State University, however, displayed a clear increase in the moving average in Table 10. According to my hypothesis, Temple University should have shown an increase in its moving average as well. Since Pennsylvania State University and University of Pittsburgh did not show increases in the moving averages in 2013, it is possible that it took longer for these trauma-informed laws to significantly influence reporting rates. However, these findings are less conclusive. Even though one university does not show an increase, two universities show an increase in the moving average, consistent with the passage of two trauma-informed policies.

	<b>Yearly Moving Averages of Incidents per 10,000 Students</b>				
	Prior to the 2015 laws		After the 2015 laws		
<b>University</b>	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Pennsylvania State University	6.1	5.2	10.1	10.5	9.9
Temple University	7.3	6.6	7.4	5.5	6.2
University of Pittsburgh	3.2	6.3	4.2	8.0	7.8

*Table 10. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and three years after sexual violence laws were passed in 2015, for selected universities in Pennsylvania.*

In 2017, only one mixed law was passed (Appendix A). Table 11 shows that Pennsylvania State University and Temple University did not demonstrate any significant change

in the moving averages of reporting rates. Additionally, University of Pittsburgh showed a slight decrease in the moving average. These findings seem to support my hypothesis. No completely trauma-informed laws being passed this year correlates with stagnant and decreasing moving averages.

	Yearly Moving Averages of Incidents per 10,000 Students		
	Prior to the 2017 law		After the 2017 law
University	2016	2017	2018
Pennsylvania State University	10.1	10.5	9.9
Temple University	7.4	5.5	6.2
University of Pittsburgh	4.2	8.0	7.8

*Table 11. Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students for two years before and one year after sexual violence laws were passed in 2017, for selected universities in Pennsylvania.*

In general, we observed some increases in reporting rates with the passage of a majority of trauma-informed policies, but the moving averages of reporting rates remained stagnant in a few cases. It could be possible that the influence of the trauma-informed policies may not be reflected until more than 3 years after the law is passed, such in the case of Pennsylvania State University and University of Pittsburgh. However, I do not think enough trauma-informed policies were passed to establish a clear correlation or influence a change in reporting rates.

### University Pairings

We can also pair similar universities from different states in order to narrow down how specific types of laws may affect reporting rates on college campuses. I organized pairings by universities that most closely aligned with the following characteristics: percentage of the student population that is white, percentage of the population that is non-white, percentage of the

population that is female, median family yearly income, residential or non-residential, and competitiveness of the sports program. As I explained in my literature review, each of these aspects affect a student's likelihood of reporting an incident of sexual violence. In order to minimize confounding variables, I thus compare universities that are most similar along these characteristics.

To conduct each university comparison, I examined which types of laws are passed in the university's respective state and whether the university saw a percentage increase, decrease, or no change in the moving average of reporting rates. Then, I compared each university's results to better understand if any changes in reporting rates can be attributed to differences in the types of laws enacted in both states. For several university pairings that I identified, there was not enough variation in the types of state laws passed to establish any interesting results. However, I describe this process of university analysis for three pairings: Ohio State University and Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania State University and University of Michigan, Ohio State University and University of Michigan. I chose these pairings because there was enough variation in the types of state laws passed and changes in reporting rates to conduct a thorough analysis.

### **Ohio State University and Pennsylvania State University**

First, we can examine the pairing of Pennsylvania State University and Ohio State University in order to establish a correlation between the type of state sexual violence laws enacted and changes in reporting rates. In 2015, Ohio enacted one due process law and three mixed laws, whereas Pennsylvania enacted two trauma-informed policies and one mixed law (Appendix A). As noted in Table 12, Pennsylvania State University saw the greatest increase in

the moving average of reporting rates in 2015, correlated with the passage of the trauma-informed policies. Ohio State University also demonstrated a slight increase in reporting rates in 2015, but generally the moving averages remained stagnant after the passage of due process policy. Although both states passed mixed laws, Ohio did not pass any completely trauma-informed laws. Conversely, Pennsylvania did not enact any completely due process laws in 2015. Hence, the passage of trauma-informed policies in Pennsylvania is associated with a greater increase in reporting rates than the passage of due process policy in Ohio. This university pairing supports my claim that trauma-informed policies are more effective at increasing reporting than due process policies.

<b>Years</b>	<b>Types of Sexual Violence Laws Passed in Ohio</b>	<b>% change in moving average of reporting rates at Ohio State University</b>	<b>Types of Sexual Violence Laws Passed in Pennsylvania</b>	<b>% change in moving average of reporting rates at Pennsylvania State University</b>
2011	1 Due Process 1 Mixed	-17.4	1 Due Process 1 Mixed 2 Trauma-Informed	9.0
2013	2 Due Process 1 Mixed	-4.1	1 Mixed 2 Trauma-Informed	8.1
2015	1 Due Process 3 Mixed	30	1 Mixed 2 Trauma-Informed	78.4
2017	1 Mixed	28.4	1 Mixed	-3.9

*Table 12. The type of state sexual violence law passed in Ohio and Pennsylvania and the corresponding percent change in moving average of reporting rates at Pennsylvania State University and Ohio State University.*

In 2017, both states only passed one law, which had a mix of trauma-informed and due process policies (Appendix A). The moving average of reporting rates at Pennsylvania did not



shift at all, with barely a four percent change once the law was passed. While the moving average at Ohio State University increased slightly, it is not a great enough increase to be significant. This year supports my theory because the lack of trauma-informed policies means the mixed law was ineffective at changing reporting rates on college campuses.

### **Pennsylvania State University and University of Michigan**

The university pairing of Pennsylvania State University and University of Michigan also offers fascinating insight into whether state sexual violence laws affect formal university reporting rates. In 2011, Michigan did not pass any sexual violence laws relevant to IHE, but Pennsylvania enacted two trauma-informed policies, one due process policy, and one mixed policy (Appendix A). As shown in Table 13, Pennsylvania State University saw little change in reporting rates, despite the passage of trauma-informed policies. The formal reporting rates at University of Michigan, on the other hand, increased dramatically even though no relevant laws were passed in 2011. These findings are contrary to my theory, as they suggest that reporting rates can change for reasons unrelated to the passage of sexual violence laws. For 2011, there is an alternative factor that explains University of Michigan's increase in reporting.

<b>Years</b>	<b>Types of Sexual Violence Laws Passed in Michigan</b>	<b>% change in moving average of reporting rates at University of Michigan</b>	<b>Types of Sexual Violence Laws Passed in Pennsylvania</b>	<b>% change in moving average of reporting rates at Pennsylvania State University</b>
2011	No laws relevant to IHE passed	121	1 Due Process 1 Mixed 2 Trauma-Informed	9.0
2013	2 Due Process	88.7	1 Mixed	8.1

	2 Mixed 1 Trauma-Informed		2 Trauma-Informed	
2015	1 Due Process 2 Mixed 4 Trauma-Informed	-27.1	1 Mixed 2 Trauma-Informed	78.4
2017	1 Due Process 1 Mixed	-70.4	1 Mixed	-3.9

*Table 13. The type of state sexual violence law passed in Michigan and Pennsylvania and the corresponding percent change in moving average of reporting rates at Pennsylvania State University and University of Michigan.*

In 2015, Pennsylvania passed two trauma-informed policies and one mixed policy. Michigan, on the other hand, passed four trauma-informed laws, two mixed laws, and one due process law (Appendix A). After the passage of mainly trauma-informed state laws, Pennsylvania State University had a 78.4% increase in the moving average of reporting rates, as shown in Table 13. For the University of Michigan, although Table 13 indicates a decrease in the reporting rates in 2015, it is important to remember that the moving average of reporting rates increased in 2016, one year after the passage of four trauma-informed laws.<sup>11</sup> The increase in reporting rates at both universities correlates with the enactment of trauma-informed policies. Since a majority of sexual violence laws enacted in each state was trauma-informed, these findings support my hypothesis that trauma-informed policies are more effective at increasing reporting rates on college campuses than due process laws.

### **Ohio State University and University of Michigan**

---

<sup>11</sup> Under subsection Michigan, which is earlier in this section, I address that the University of Michigan reporting rates decrease after the passage of certain laws in 2017.

The final pairing is Ohio State University and University of Michigan. In 2013, Ohio passed two due process laws and one mixed law, while Michigan enacted two due process laws, two mixed laws, and one trauma-informed law (Appendix A). Consequently, Ohio State University had a negative percentage change of reporting rates, as noted in Table 14. The University of Michigan, saw a significant increase in reporting rates after the passage of sexual violence laws in 2013. The main difference between the sexual violence laws passed in Ohio and the sexual violence laws passed in Michigan is that Michigan passed one trauma-informed law, whereas Ohio did not pass any trauma-informed laws. Thus, we can associate the increase in reporting rates at University of Michigan with the passage of the one trauma-informed law in 2013. Conversely, no trauma-informed policies were passed in Ohio, and therefore reporting rates did not increase. These results provide further evidence for my theory because trauma-informed policy enacted in Michigan seems to effectively increase reporting rates.

<b>Years</b>	<b>Types of Sexual Violence Laws Passed in Michigan</b>	<b>% change in moving average of reporting rates at University of Michigan</b>	<b>Types of Sexual Violence Laws Passed in Ohio</b>	<b>% change in moving average of reporting rates at Ohio State University</b>
2011	No laws relevant to IHE passed	121	1 Due Process 1 Mixed	-17.4
2013	2 Due Process 2 Mixed 1 Trauma-Informed	88.7	2 Due Process 1 Mixed	-4.1
2015	1 Due Process 2 Mixed 4 Trauma-Informed	-27.1	1 Due Process 3 Mixed	30
2017	1 Due Process 1 Mixed	-70.4	1 Mixed	28.4

*Table 14. The type of state sexual violence law passed in Michigan and Ohio and the corresponding percent change in moving average of reporting rates at Ohio State University and University of Michigan.*

Lastly, we can look at the percent changes in the moving average of reporting rates in 2017. During this year, Ohio passed one mixed law and Michigan passed one mixed law and one due process law (Appendix A). According to Table 14, Ohio State University saw a slight increase in the percent change of moving averages in 2017, but this increase is not significant enough to actually shift the reporting rates. For the most part, the moving average of reporting rates at Ohio State University remained stagnant, even through 2017. The University of Michigan actually saw a drastic decrease in reporting rates in 2017, as noted in Table 14. When we contrast the state laws passed in Michigan and Ohio, the greatest difference is that Michigan passed one due process sexual violence law, but Ohio did not pass any due process laws. Therefore, the decrease in reporting rates at the University of Michigan is associated with the passage of the due process law in Michigan. This finding illustrates that not only are due process laws less effective at increasing reporting rates than trauma-informed laws, but it also suggests that due process laws may be correlated with a decrease in reporting rates of sexual violence.

### **State Laws and University Reporting Rates Data Analysis Summary**

To conclude, I presented my findings on state sexual violence law data and university formal reporting rates. Although we do not see any clear trends at the aggregate level, I examined three states individually to assess changes to policy and reporting rates. Both the results in Michigan and Ohio support my hypothesis that trauma-informed policy is more effective at increasing reporting rates of sexual violence on college campuses. On the other hand, the findings of Pennsylvania suggest that state sexual violence laws may not directly affect changes in reporting rates. Comparing universities in three different pairings, I find that specific

types of laws can be associated with changes in reporting rates. Most notably, trauma-informed laws are clearly tied to increases in reporting rates, which corroborates my theory. Additionally, due process policies are connected to no increase, and in one case, a decrease, in reporting rates on college campuses. Generally, the findings of state law and reporting rates analysis provide support for my theory, despite some years being contrary to my hypothesis. In the next section, I detail how the results of my online experiment also provide evidence for my hypothesis.

## **Online Experiment Data Analysis**

This experiment was administered online to 210 people over the course of one week. According to my hypothesis, I expected more people to recommend reporting when given the trauma-informed vignette than for both the control vignette and due process vignette. Likewise, I did not expect more people to recommend reporting when given the due process vignette than when given the trauma-informed vignette. This hypothesis is consistent with my overall theory that trauma informed policies encourage more survivors to report an incident than due process policies.

### **Themes Across All Three Treatments**

Overall, respondents are overwhelmingly likely to recommend reporting to the university across all three treatments. As seen in Table 15, the recommendation reporting rate is at least 85% for each treatment, which I find to be surprisingly high. When asked, “Why do you recommend that they report their assault to the university?”, respondents commonly answered that the assault is a serious crime and wrong and the assaulter should be punished for their actions. For instance, one participant replied, “The perpetrator does not deserve to go unpunished.” Another reason often given to recommend reporting is to prevent future assaults and harm to other people. Ensuring accountability and receiving justice are common themes in respondents’ answers to this question, with one respondent explaining, “It’s important that people are held accountable for their actions.” These responses suggest that morality and moral justice are reoccurring motivators for participants to recommend reporting. Two participants specifically cited their own experiences for their reasons to recommend reporting. One respondent stated, “I was sexually assaulted and did not report my assault, and I have always been regretful of that. I would recommend that they report so that the person who perpetrated the assault could

potentially face criminal charges.” In this case, personal experience with sexual assault and not reporting influenced this participant’s decision to recommend reporting. Therefore, a majority of participants recommend reporting to the university despite the type of university policy presented to participants.

<b>Treatment</b>	<b>% Who do not recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who recommend reporting</b>
Control	90.3%	9.7%
Due Process	87.4%	12.6%
Trauma-Informed	95.9%	4.1%

*Table 15. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment.*

### **Differences Between the Three Treatments**

There are notable differences between the percentages of respondents that recommend reporting for each treatment.<sup>12</sup> As shown in Table 15, 95.9% of participants who received the trauma-informed treatment recommend reporting to the university, which is 5.6% more than the percentage of participants in the control group who recommend reporting and 8.5% more than the percentage of participants who received the due process treatment and recommend reporting. The greater percentage of participants who recommend reporting in the trauma-informed treatment directly supports my hypothesis that trauma-informed policies encourage students to report to the university more than due process policies. When comparing the trauma-informed treatment to the due process treatment, the results are statistically significant ( $p = 0.03$ ).<sup>13</sup> The comparison between the control group and the trauma-informed treatment is also statistically significant ( $p = 0.07$ ) if we apply a more lenient level of  $p \leq 0.10$ .

<sup>12</sup> Additional tables of survey results are in Appendix D.

<sup>13</sup> The level for statistically significant results is  $p \leq 0.05$ .

Moreover, 90.3% of respondents in the control group recommend reporting to the university, whereas only 87.4% of respondents in the due process group recommended reporting to the university. This 3% difference in the recommendation rate suggests that due process policies may discourage students from reporting to the university. While it is necessary to note that the comparison between the due process treatment and the control group is not statistically significant ( $p = 0.29$ ), this does not conflict with my hypothesis because my hypothesis is regarding the comparison with the trauma-informed treatment and the due process treatment. We can break down these results further according to the participants' demographics, familiarity with state laws and university policies, and personal experience to better understand the driving factors.

### **According to Participant Demographics**

When we break down the participants' responses to each treatment according to gender, we can gain a better understanding of the resulting percentages.<sup>14</sup> According to Table 16, men's recommendation to report shows a starker difference between each treatment than the overall recommendation rates. Ninety-eight percent of men who were given the trauma-informed treatment recommend reporting to the university, which is 10.2% more than the percentage of men in the control group who recommend reporting and 13.4% more than the percentage of men who received the due process treatment and recommend reporting. The differences in these recommendation reporting rates are significantly higher than the differences in the overall recommendation reporting rate. When comparing the trauma-informed group to both the due

---

<sup>14</sup> Although participants could identify as agender, gender non-conforming, female, or male, I only consider the survey results for participants who responded as male or female. No participants responded as gender non-conforming and only one participant identified as agender.



process treatment and the control group, each result comparison is statistically significant ( $p = 0.01$  and  $p = 0.04$ , respectively).

	<i>Male</i> ( <i>N=129</i> )		<i>Female</i> ( <i>N=85</i> )	
<b>Treatment</b>	<b>% Who do not recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who do not recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who recommend reporting</b>
<b>Control</b>	12.2	87.8	6.5	93.5
<b>Due Process</b>	15.4	84.6	6.7	93.3
<b>Trauma-Informed</b>	2.0	98.0	8.3	91.7

*Table 16. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected gender.*

It is important to note that men are oversampled in this survey, with 60% of respondents being male. On the other hand, women are under-sampled in this survey, with only about 40% of respondents being female. Only about 20 women were placed into each treatment, so the differences between each group are statistically insignificant ( $p \geq 0.40$ ). Therefore, we see minimal variation in the recommended reporting rates across the three treatments for just women, even though women generally recommend reporting to the university at higher rates than men. I was especially surprised that men are more likely to recommend reporting to the university than women who received the trauma-informed treatment. In general, the overall recommended reporting rate is likely in part driven by the oversampling of men in the survey. The sharp differences in the recommended reporting rates for male respondents is reflected in the overall recommended reporting rate in each treatment.

We can also look at the recommended reporting rates according to race and ethnicity to gain better insight of the driving factors behind the total results. Of the participants who took this

survey, the sample size comprised of 50.5% of White people, 28.7% of Asian people, and 13% of Black people, with only a couple participants in the other categories. Therefore, the responses of White people and Asian people mainly contributed to the overall recommended reporting rates. Asian participants' answers are consistent with my hypothesis, with 89.5% of those in the control group, 81.0% of those receiving the due process treatment, and 95.5% of those receiving the trauma-informed treatment recommending reporting to the university, as noted in Table 17.

<b>Treatment</b>	<i>American Indian or Alaskan Native (N=7)</i>		<i>Asian (N=62)</i>		<i>Black or African American (N=28)</i>		<i>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (N=4)</i>		<i>Middle Eastern or North African (N=2)</i>		<i>White (N=109)</i>	
	% No	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	% Yes
<b>Control</b>	0	100	10.5	89.5	0	100	0	100	0	100	10.5	89.5
<b>Due Process</b>	0	0	19.0	81.0	0	100	0	100	0	0	8.7	91.3
<b>Trauma-Informed</b>	0	0	4.5	95.5	18.2	81.8	0	0	0	100	0	100

*Table 17. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected race or ethnicity.*

When considering just White participants, slightly more recommend reporting when given the due process treatment as compared to the control group. While this result is not consistent with the overall results, it does not hurt my hypothesis. One hundred percent of White people recommend reporting to the university when given the trauma-informed treatment, which is 10.5% greater than the number of white participants who recommend reporting in the control group. Since my main prediction was that the trauma-informed policies would encourage more students to report to the university, the responses from White participants still support my hypothesis.

It is also important to note the discrepancy between the overall results and results for Black participants in Table 17. When looking at only Black participants, the number of people who recommend reporting to the university significantly decreases for those in the trauma-informed treatment. However, only 28 Black participants participated in the entire survey, so there are not enough participants for this specific finding to discredit my hypothesis.

Another way of understanding the driving factors behind the overall results is a breakdown of participants' response by selected sexuality. A vast majority of participants identify as bisexual, pansexual, fluid or heterosexual, with 36% of participants identifying as bisexual, pansexual, or fluid and 56% of participants identifying as heterosexual. These demographics greatly influence the overall recommended reporting rates. When looking specifically at the population of participants that identifies as bisexual, pansexual, or fluid, we find that there is no significant change in the number of participants who recommend reporting in the control group compared to the due-process treatment. However, 8% more participants who identify as bisexual, pansexual, or fluid recommend reporting to the university when given the trauma-informed treatment than the control group or the due process treatment. Therefore, this population offers more evidence for my hypothesis that trauma-informed policies encourage more students to report to the university.

	<i>Asexual or Aromantic (N=10)</i>		<i>Bisexual, Pansexual, or Fluid (N=78)</i>		<i>Heterosexual (N=122)</i>		<i>Lesbian (N=1)</i>		<i>Gay (N=3)</i>	
<b>Treatment</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>
<b>Control</b>	0	100	8	92	11.6	88.4	0	0	0	100
<b>Due Process</b>	20	80	8	92	13.5	86.5	0	100	0	100

<b>Trauma-Informed</b>	0	100	0	100	7.1	92.9	0	0	0	100
------------------------	---	-----	---	-----	-----	------	---	---	---	-----

*Table 18. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected sexuality.*

For heterosexual participants, the differences in recommended reporting rates across the three treatments are consistent with the overall results. Heterosexual participants given the trauma-informed treatment recommend reporting to the university 92.9% of the time, as seen in Table 18, as opposed to 88.4% of participants in the control group and 86.4% of participants given the due process treatment. For the results of participants who identify as asexual or aromantic, lesbian, or gay, not enough participants identify with these groups to draw any conclusions.

### **According to Personal Experience**

We can also break down the overall results in terms of how respondents answered questions about their personal experience with sexual violence. In response to the question, "Have you ever reported an assault to the university?", 56.7% of respondents have never reported an assault to the university, whereas 43.2% of respondents have reported an assault to the university. Regardless of the respondent's answer, the difference in the rate of participants who recommend reporting to the university followed the general trends of fewer people recommending reporting if given the due process treatment and more people recommending reporting if given the trauma-informed treatment.

	<i>"Have you ever reported an assault to the university?"</i>	
	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>

<b>Treatment</b>	<b>% Who do not recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who do not recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who recommend reporting</b>
<b>Control</b>	10.9	89.1	7.7	92.3
<b>Due Process</b>	14.3	85.7	11.4	88.5
<b>Trauma-Informed</b>	7.32	92.7	0	100

*Table 19. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected answer to "Have you ever reported an assault to the university?"*

However, participants who have experience reporting an assault to the university are overall more likely to recommend reporting to the university regardless of the treatment. Moreover, the difference in percentage of participants who recommend reporting to the university between the control group and the trauma-informed treatment is greater for participants who have reported an assault to the university before than respondents who have not reported an assault. For respondents who have not reported an assault to the university before, 3.6% more respondents recommend reporting to the university when given the trauma-informed treatment than the control group, as shown in Table 19. However, for respondents who have reported an assault to the university before, 7.7% more respondents recommend reporting to the university when given the trauma-informed treatment than the control group. Consequently, experience with reporting to the university seems to affect not only the likelihood of recommending reporting to the university, but also suggests that trauma-informed policies are generally more preferable.

Understanding the overall trends with regard to whether participants received any sexual violence prevention training in college offers some interesting insights as well. A majority of participants have received some sort of sexual violence prevention training in college, with 60.5% of participants receiving training and 39.5% of participants not receiving training.

Respondents who have received sexual violence training during their college career are significantly more likely to recommend reporting to the university across all three treatments than respondents who have not received sexual violence training. This result most likely stems from the fact that sexual violence training in college emphasizes reporting incidents of sexual violence to the university.

	<i>“Did you receive any sexual violence prevention training in college?”</i>			
	<i>No</i>		<i>Yes</i>	
<b>Treatment</b>	<b>% Who do not recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who do not recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who recommend reporting</b>
<b>Control</b>	16.1	83.9	4.9	95.1
<b>Due Process</b>	29.2	70.8	4.4	95.6
<b>Trauma-Informed</b>	6.7	93.3	2.3	97.7

*Table 20. Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who do not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant’s selected answer to “Did you receive any sexual violence prevention training.”*

As shown in Table 20, there is no significant difference for participants to recommend reporting between the control group and the due process treatment if they have received sexual violence training. However, 2.6% more participants recommend reporting to the university when given the trauma-informed treatment than the control group. For respondents who have not received sexual violence prevention training, the results followed the overall trend regarding the differences in recommended reporting rates across treatments. Thus, sexual violence prevention training influences respondents’ likeliness to recommend reporting. These findings still support my hypothesis.

## **Online Experiment Data Analysis Summary**

In general, this survey offers interesting insight into whether the type of sexual violence policy affects a student's decision to report to the university. On the whole, participants overwhelmingly recommend reporting to the university regardless of the treatment they received. However, participants are more likely to recommend reporting when given the trauma-informed treatment than when given the due process treatment, which was statistically significant. These findings support my hypothesis that trauma-informed policies are more effective at increasing reporting rates than due process policies. Even we break down the results by participant demographics and personal experiences, my hypothesis still holds. However, this deeper examination also reveals more about the driving forces behind the results and how personal experience can affect participants' answers.

## Conclusion

Overall, current research about reporting rates of sexual violence focuses on demographic, situational, and psychological reasons that account for underreporting and possible facilitators for increasing reporting. While existing research offers policy recommendations based on these reasons for underreporting and methods to facilitate reporting, little research exists that analyzes the effectiveness of statewide policies at increasing reporting on college campuses. There are two main approaches to forming sexual violence laws, due process and trauma-informed perspectives, but there is a wide variation in the types of sexual violence laws enacted at the state-level (DeMatteo, et al. 2015).

I sought to understand if statewide policies contribute to the variation in reporting rates on college campuses. I evaluated the type of sexual violence laws enacted at the state-level and compared policy changes to variation in reporting rates in seven states. My hypothesis was that trauma-informed policies are more effective at increasing reporting rates of sexual violence on college campuses because trauma-informed policies are more likely to address the variety of reasons for underreporting. After analyzing state law data, formal reporting rates data, and online experiment data, I believe my hypothesis was generally accurate.

According to my survey results, participants are more likely to recommend reporting an assault to the university when presented with trauma-informed university policies than due process policies. Although participants are very likely to recommend reporting regardless of the policy, the survey results strongly suggest that trauma-informed policies can be more effective at increasing reporting rates on college campuses than due process policies. Even though state law data findings did not provide a completely clear conclusion, this analysis indicates that the enactment of trauma-informed policies are correlated with increases in formal reporting rates.



On the aggregate, states passed more due process laws than trauma-informed laws. Although there was not a clear trend at the aggregate level, an examination of a couple individual states provided a correlation between trauma-informed policies and an increase in formal reporting rates. One state, however, provided evidence against my hypothesis. Furthermore, comparisons within university pairings also suggested a correlation between the enactment of trauma-informed policies and an increase in reporting rates and a correlation between the enactment of due process policies and no increase in reporting rates.

The policy implication of my research is that state legislators should prioritize the passage of trauma-informed policies related to sexual violence on college campuses. Policies about sexual violence on college campuses should shift from a due process focus since these policies do not benefit survivors. Politicians can learn from the effectiveness of past trauma-informed sexual violence laws in order to craft new laws aimed at decreasing the prevalence of sexual violence. Overall, trauma-informed policies are more encouraging to survivors and enacting more trauma-informed policies will be ultimately more helpful to survivors.

Now that this research has established these important findings, future research can build on it in several ways. One way to expand on this research is to examine exactly which trauma-informed policies would be more effective at increasing reporting rates by dissecting state laws and coding the function of each state law. Since this study only focuses on some Midwestern states, future studies can also apply this method of state law research to other regions of states in order to find if these conclusions still hold. Research on smaller universities or liberal arts colleges may also yield different results, as I only focused on large public universities. Finally, a comparative analysis of majority Democrat and majority Republican states can reveal more information about the types of sexual violence policies being passed.

## References

- Bowen, Elizabeth, and Nadine Murshid. 2016. "Trauma-Informed Social Policy: A Conceptual Framework for Policy Analysis and Advocacy." *American Journal of Public Health* 106 (2): 223-229.
- Boyle, Kaitlin, Ashley Barr, and Jody Clay-Warner. 2017. "The Effects of Feminist Mobilization and Women's Status on Universities' Reporting of Rape." *Journal of School Violence* 16 (3): 317-330.
- Caldwell, Sheridan. 2017. "OCR's Bind: Administrative Rulemaking and Campus Sexual Assault Protections." *Northwestern Law Review* 112 (3): 453-486.
- College Factual. n.d. *Student Population Statistics*. Media Factual. Accessed 2020.  
<https://www.collegefactual.com>.
- DeMatteo, David, Meghann Galloway, Shelby Arnold, and Unnati Patel. 2015. "Sexual assault on college campuses: A 50-state survey of criminal sexual assault statutes and their relevance to campus sexual assault." *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 21 (3): 227-238.
- Dunlap, James. 2017. "Annual Security and Fire Safety Report." Department of Police, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 59.
- Fisher, Bonnie, Jennifer Hartman, Francis Cullen, and Michael Turner. 2002. "Making Campus Safer for Students: The Clery Act as a Symbolic Legal Reform." *Stetson Law Review* 61-89.
- Fisher, Bonnie, Leah Daigle, Francis Cullen, and Michael Turner. 2003. "Reporting Sexual Victimization To The Police And Others: Results From a National-Level Study of College Women." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 30 (1): 6-38.

- Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research. 2018. "Downloads." *Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. Center for Postsecondary Research. Accessed 2020. <https://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/downloads.php>.
- Krug, Etienne. 2002. *World Report on Violence and Health*. World Health Organization, World Health Organization, 147–181.
- Lexis Nexis. 2021. *Nexis Uni Search*. Lexis Nexis. Accessed 2020-2021. <https://advance-lexis-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/bisacademicresearchhome?crd=5f34abaf-1db4-4a48-96cc-11f50e359703&pdmfid=1516831&pdisurlapi=true>.
- MacKinnon, Catharine. 1979. *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- McDonald, Michael. n.d. "Voter Turnout." *United States Election Project*. University of Florida. Accessed 2020. <http://www.electproject.org/home/voter-turnout/voter-turnout-data>.
- Morse, Andrew, Brian Sponsler, and Mary Fulton. 2015. "State Legislative Developments on Campus Sexual Violence: Issues in the Context of Safety." Policy Brief, Education Commission of the States, NASPA Research and Policy Institute.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. 2020. *Our Three Divisions*. National Collegiate Athletic Association. Accessed 2020. <https://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/ncaa-101/our-three-divisions>.
- Sabina, Chiara, and Lavina Y Ho. 2014. "Campus and College Victim Responses to Sexual Assault and Dating Violence: Disclosure, Service Utilization, and Service Provision." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 15 (3): 201-226.
- Stotzer, Rebecca. 2010. "Sexual Orientation-Based Hate Crimes on Campus: The Impact of Policy on Reporting Rates." *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 7 (3): 147–154.

- Stotzer, Rebecca, and Danielle MacCartney. 2015. "The Role of Institutional Factors on On-Campus Reported Rape Prevalence." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 31 (16): 2687-2707.
- The New York Times. 2017. *Economic Diversity and Student Outcomes at America's Colleges and Universities: Find Your College*. The New York Times. Accessed 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/projects/college-mobility/>.
- Triplett, Matthew. 2012. "Sexual Assault on College Campuses: Seeking the Appropriate Balance Between Due Process and Victim Protection." *Duke Law Journal* 62 (2): 487-527.
- United States Census Bureau. 2010. *2010 Decennial Census*. Census Data Set, Washington D.C.: U.S. Cennsus Bureau.
- United States Department of Education. 2020. "The tools you need for Campus Safety and Security analysis." *Campus Safety and Security*. Office of Postsecondary Education. Accessed 2020. <https://ope.ed.gov/campussafety/#/>.
- Wolitzky-Taylor, Kate, Heidi Resnick, Ananda Amstadter, Jenna McCauley, Kenneth Ruggiero, and Dean Kilpatrick. 2011. "Reporting Rape in a National Sample of College Women." *Journal of American College Health* 59 (7).
- Wong, Kevin, and Kris Christmann. 2008. "The role of victim decision-making in reporting of hate crimes." *Safer Communities* 7 (2): 19-35.

## Appendix A

A table of each law coded for seven states: Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin:

State	Law	Year	Due Process	Trauma-Informed	Relevance to IHE
IN	H.B 1340	2011	3	2	1
IN	S.B. 1	2011	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1001	2011	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1083	2011	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1102	2011	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1210	2011	3	2	2
IN	H.B. 1211	2011	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 57	2011	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 331	2011	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 363	2011	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 465	2011	3	2	2
IN	S.B. 582	2011	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 590	2011	3	1	3
IN	H.B. 1416	2011	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 4	2012	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1009	2012	3	2	2
IN	S.B. 286	2012	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1080	2012	3	1	2
IN	H.B. 1196	2012	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1270	2012	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1049	2012	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1200	2012	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 26	2012	3	1	2
IN	S.B. 257	2012	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 262	2012	3	2	1
IN	S.B. 287	2012	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 190	2012	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 85	2013	3	1	2
IN	H.B. 1108	2013	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 371	2013	3	2	2
IN	H.B. 1006	2013	3	2	2
IN	S.B. 1	2013	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 536	2013	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1001	2013	1	3	3
IN	H.B. 1053	2013	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1084	2013	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1135	2013	3	2	2
IN	H.B. 1393	2013	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1494	2013	3	1	2
IN	H.B. 1546	2013	3	1	1

IN	H.B. 1123	2013	3	2	3
IN	S.B. 292	2014	3	2	2
IN	S.B. 421	2014	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1006	2014	3	2	2
IN	H.B. 1269	2014	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 138	2014	3	2	3
IN	S.B. 255	2014	2	2	3
IN	H.B. 1279	2014	3	1	3
IN	S.B. 171	2015	2	2	3
IN	S.B. 94	2015	3	1	3
IN	S.B. 175	2015	3	1	3
IN	S.B. 433	2015	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 199	2015	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 329	2015	3	2	2
IN	S.B. 420	2015	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1304	2015	3	1	3
IN	S.B. 8	2015	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 174	2015	3	1	3
IN	S.B. 415	2015	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1001	2015	3	2	2
IN	S.B. 522	2015	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 532	2015	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 559	2015	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1064	2016	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1069	2016	3	2	3
IN	H.B. 1105	2016	3	1	3
IN	H.B. 1199	2016	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1233	2016	3	3	3
IN	S.B. 14	2016	3	1	3
IN	S.B. 17	2016	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 141	2016	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 160	2016	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 350	2016	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1005	2016	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1337	2016	3	2	2
IN	S.B. 42	2017	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 64	2017	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 100	2017	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1181	2017	3	1	1
IN	S.B. 332	2017	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1526	2017	3	1	3
IN	H.B. 1079	2017	3	1	1
IN	H.B. 1001	2017	1	3	2
IA	H.B. 195	2011	3	1	1
IA	S.B. 525	2011	3	1	1
IA	S.B. 533	2011	1	2	1
IA	S.B. 510	2011	1	3	1
IA	S.B. 2285	2011	0	0	1
IA	S.B. 2203	2011	0	0	1

IA	S.B. 508	2011	3	1	2
IA	H.B. 2335	2011	1	3	2
IA	H.B. 467	2011	1	2	3
IA	S.B. 93	2011	3	1	3
IA	S.B. 2336	2011	1	3	3
IA	H.B. 556	2013	0	0	1
IA	S.B. 2311	2013	3	1	1
IA	S.B. 2118	2013	3	1	1
IA	S.B. 2239	2013	3	1	1
IA	H.B. 614	2013	2	2	2
IA	S.B. 447	2013	1	3	2
IA	H.B. 2450	2013	1	3	2
IA	H.B. 185	2013	1	3	3
IA	S.B. 446	2013	1	3	3
IA	H.B. 2463	2013	1	3	3
IA	S.B. 2297	2013	1	2	3
IA	H.B. 258	2015	3	1	1
IA	S.B. 497	2015	1	3	1
IA	H.B. 2359	2015	0	0	1
IA	S.B. 2233	2015	3	1	1
IA	H.B. 2458	2015	1	3	1
IA	H.B. 630	2015	2	2	2
IA	S.B. 510	2015	3	2	2
IA	H.B. 585	2015	3	3	3
IA	S.B. 505	2015	1	3	3
IA	H.B. 2460	2015	1	3	3
IA	H.B. 253	2017	3	1	1
IA	S.B. 509	2017	1	3	1
IA	S.B. 498	2017	2	2	2
IA	H.B. 263	2017	3	1	3
IA	S.B. 401	2017	3	2	3
IA	H.B. 653	2017	1	3	3
MI	H.B. 4325	2011	3	1	1
MI	H.B. 4526	2011	3	2	2
MI	H.B. 4074	2011	3	1	1
MI	H.B. 4445	2011	3	1	1
MI	H.B. 5372	2011	3	1	1
MI	S.B. 316	2011	3	1	1
MI	H.B. 5365	2011	3	2	2
MI	S.B. 1056	2011	3	1	2
MI	H.B. 5267	2011	3	1	1
MI	H.B. 5711	2011	2	3	2
MI	S.B. 1307	2011	3	1	1
MI	H.B. 4050	2013	3	1	1
MI	H.B. 4228	2013	3	1	1
MI	H.B. 4328	2013	3	2	2
MI	H.B. 4112	2013	3	1	3
MI	H.B. 4229	2013	3	1	1
MI	S.B. 581	2013	3	1	1

MI	H.B. 5314	2013	3	1	1
MI	H.B. 5445	2013	3	1	3
MI	H.B. 5313	2013	3	2	2
MI	S.B. 998	2013	3	2	3
MI	S.B. 1004	2013	3	3	3
MI	S.B. 1021	2013	1	3	3
MI	H.B. 4115	2015	1	3	3
MI	S.B. 133	2015	3	2	3
MI	S.B. 134	2015	3	1	1
MI	H.B. 4790	2015	3	1	1
MI	S.B. 216	2015	3	1	1
MI	H.B. 4480	2015	3	1	1
MI	S.B. 801	2015	1	3	3
MI	H.B. 5294	2015	3	3	3
MI	S.B. 95	2015	1	3	3
MI	S.B. 868	2015	3	1	3
MI	H.B. 4313	2015	1	3	3
MI	H.B. 4323	2017	3	3	3
MI	S.B.253	2017	3	1	3
MI	S.B. 180	2017	3	1	1
MN	H.B. 2128	2011	3	1	1
MN	S.B. 2224`	2011	3	1	1
MN	S.B. 1675	2011	3	1	1
MN	S.B. 882	2011	3	1	2
MN	H.B. 2149	2011	3	1	2
MN	H.B. 2160	2011	3	1	2
MN	S.B. 887	2013	3	1	1
MN	H.B. 1233	2013	3	2	1
MN	S.B. 745	2013	3	1	1
MN	H.B. 1389	2013	3	1	1
MN	S.B. 827	2013	3	2	1
MN	H.B. 2722	2013	3	2	1
MN	H.B. 760	2013	3	2	2
MN	H.B. 729	2013	1	3	2
MN	H.B. 3017	2013	3	2	2
MN	H.B. 3238	2013	3	1	2
MN	H.B. 3172	2013	3	2	2
MN	H.B 283	2013	3	3	3
MN	S.B. 769	2013	3	2	3
MN	H.B. 1400	2013	3	1	3
MN	H.B. 580	2013	3	3	3
MN	H.B. 161	2013	3	1	3
MN	H.B. 2141	2013	3	1	3
MN	H.B. 859	2013	2	3	3
MN	H.B. 2536	2013	3	2	3
MN	H.B. 2576	2013	3	1	3
MN	H.B. 1863	2013	3	2	3
MN	H.B. 1226	2013	3	1	3
MN	H.B. 2402	2013	3	2	3



MN	S.B. 1218	2015	0	0	0
MN	S.B. 3113	2015	0	0	0
MN	S.B. 1191	2015	3	1	1
MN	S.B. 1025	2015	3	1	1
MN	S.B. 1535	2015	3	2	1
MN	S.B. 1458	2015	3	1	1
MN	H.B. 2749	2015	3	3	2
MN	S.B. 578	2015	3	1	3
MN	S.B. 5	2015	3	3	3
MN	S.B. 878	2015	3	3	3
MN	S.B. 2713	2015	3	2	3
MN	H.B. 2552	2015	3	1	3
MN	H.B. 2955	2015	3	1	3
MN	S.B. 1549	2017	3	1	2
MN	S.B. 2A	2017	3	2	2
MN	H.B. 1542	2017	3	1	3
MN	H.B. 470	2017	3	1	3
MN	S.B. 943	2017	1	3	3
OH	H.B. 78	2011	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 292	2011	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 386	2011	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 487	2011	3	1	1
OH	S.B. 316	2011	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 262	2011	3	1	1
OH	S.B. 301	2011	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 62	2011	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 247	2011	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 251	2011	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 481	2011	3	1	1
OH	S.B. 160	2011	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 341	2013	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 483	2013	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 314	2013	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 394	2013	3	1	1
OH	S.B. 207	2013	3	1	1
OH	S.B. 250	2013	3	1	1
OH	S.B. 276	2013	3	1	1
OH	S.B. 110	2015	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 523	2015	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 60	2015	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 110	2015	3	1	1
OH	S.B. 97	2015	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 158	2015	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 493	2015	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 127	2015	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 471	2015	3	1	1
OH	H.B. 290	2015	3	1	1
OH	S.B. 227	2015	3	1	1
OH	S.B. 319	2015	3	1	1

OH	H.B. 93	2011	3	1	2
OH	H.B. 5	2011	3	1	2
OH	S.B. 337	2011	3	1	2
OH	H.B. 234	2013	3	1	2
OH	H.B. 63	2017	3	1	2
OH	H.B. 86	2011	3	1	3
OH	HB. 490	2011	3	3	3
OH	S.B. 143	2013	3	1	3
OH	S.B. 316	2013	3	2	3
OH	H.B. 64	2015	3	1	3
OH	H.B. 6	2015	3	2	3
OH	H.B. 359	2015	3	2	3
OH	S.B. 293	2015	3	2	3
OH	H.B. 49	2017	2	3	3
PA	S.B. 699	2010	3	1	2
PA	H.B. 101	2010	3	3	3
PA	H.B. 1352	2011	3	1	1
PA	H.B. 1901	2011	3	1	1
PA	H.B. 75	2011	3	1	1
PA	S.B. 449	2011	2	3	1
PA	S.B. 850	2011	3	1	1
PA	H.B. 396	2011	3	1	2
PA	H.B. 1264	2011	3	2	2
PA	S.B. 1263	2011	1	3	2
PA	S.B. 100	2011	3	1	2
PA	H.B. 1121	2011	3	1	2
PA	H.B. 1794	2011	3	1	2
PA	H.B. 2400	2011	3	1	2
PA	H.B. 1485	2011	1	3	3
PA	S.B. 1183	2011	3	1	3
PA	S.B. 1466	2011	1	3	3
PA	H.B. 726	2013	3	1	1
PA	S.B. 34	2013	3	2	1
PA	S.B. 1024	2013	3	1	1
PA	H.B. 316	2013	2	2	1
PA	H.B. 436	2013	3	1	1
PA	H.B. 112	2013	3	1	1
PA	S.B. 75	2013	3	3	1
PA	H.B. 435	2013	3	1	1
PA	H.B. 1816	2013	3	1	1
PA	H.B. 1985	2013	3	1	2
PA	S.B. 1197	2013	3	1	2
PA	H.B. 1437	2013	1	3	3
PA	S.B. 681	2013	3	2	3
PA	H.B. 2328	2013	1	3	3
PA	S.B. 663	2015	3	1	1
PA	H.B. 272	2015	3	2	3
PA	H.B. 1460	2015	1	3	3
PA	S.B. 1073	2015	1	3	3

PA	S.B. 260	2017	2	1	1
PA	S.B. 8	2017	3	1	2
PA	S.B. 651	2017	1	3	2
PA	H.B. 218	2017	3	3	3
WI	S.B. 284	2011	0	0	0
WI	S.B. 285	2011	0	0	0
WI	S.B. 127	2011	3	1	1
WI	A.B. 563	2013	3	1	1
WI	S.B. 561	2013	3	1	1
WI	A.B. 620	2013	3	1	1
WI	S.B. 451	2013	3	1	1
WI	S.B. 104	2011	3	2	2
WI	S.B. 350	2011	3	1	2
WI	A.B. 40	2013	1	3	2
WI	A.B. 707	2013	3	1	2
WI	S.B. 287	2015	3	1	2
WI	A.B. 440	2015	3	1	2
WI	S.B. 97	2015	3	1	2
WI	S.B. 488	2015	2	3	2
WI	S.B. 396	2017	3	1	2
WI	S.B. 23	2011	3	1	3
WI	A.B. 40	2011	3	1	3
WI	S.B. 306	2011	3	2	3
WI	A.B. 263	2011	3	3	3
WI	A.B. 552	2011	3	1	3
WI	S.B. 206	2013	3	2	3
WI	S.B. 179	2013	3	3	3
WI	A.B. 641	2013	3	1	3
WI	A.B. 176	2013	3	2	3
WI	A.B. 464	2013	3	1	3
WI	S.B. 160	2013	3	2	3
WI	A.B. 10	2015	3	1	3
WI	S.B. 21	2015	2	3	3
WI	S.B. 179	2015	3	2	3
WI	S.B. 170	2015	3	1	3
WI	A.B. 808	2015	2	3	3
WI	S.B. 323	2015	3	3	3
WI	A.B. 64	2017	2	3	3

## Appendix B

### Indiana

I coded 85 laws related to sexual violence between 2011 and 2017. Out of 85 laws, only 16 laws, or about 19% of laws, were most relevant to IHE. In general, not many of the sexual violence laws passed in Indiana during this period were directly related to IHE, but more relevant to child sexual abuse or human sex trafficking. Of the laws most relevant to IHE, these laws tended to lean more due process than trauma-informed, even as the years progressed. For Purdue University, the moving average of reporting rates stayed stagnant around 7 incidents reported per 10,000 students, with a small dip in the moving average in 2014 and 2015. Indiana University had a general increase in the moving average of reporting rates until about 2016 and then had a decrease in the moving average.

	Yearly Moving Averages of Incidents per 10,000 Students								
University	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Indiana University	7.8	7.3	7.1	5.3	8.2	12.0	12.9	10.3	6.1
Purdue University	2.3	12.1	7.5	7.9	4.0	3.4	7.4	8.0	7.7

*Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students between 2010 and 2018 for selected universities in Indiana.*

In 2011, one due process law was passed. For both Indiana University and Purdue University, the moving average of reporting rates decreased after the passage of this law. Initially, these two universities fit into my hypothesis that reporting rates will decrease with the enactment of a due process law. However, this is only for one year so we cannot draw a definitive conclusion.

In 2013, one trauma-informed law and one mixed law was passed. We see an increase in the moving average of reporting rates at Indiana University. This increase is consistent with my hypothesis that trauma-informed policies would be correlated with an increase in reporting rates. However, I found that there was not a significant change for the moving average at Purdue University after these two laws were passed. Thus, I cannot conclude whether these state laws have any influence on reporting rates when I include the findings of Purdue University.

In 2014, two mixed laws and one due process law were enacted at the state level. Both Indiana University and Purdue University saw an increase in the moving averages of reporting rates. These results do not support my hypothesis because reporting rates increase after the passage of due process policy. However, I cannot discern whether this increase is due to a specific policy passed during this period.

In 2015, one mixed law and four due process laws were passed. Indiana University did not demonstrate any important change in the moving average of reporting rates. This finding is consistent with my hypothesis, as I predicted that due process laws would not increase reporting rates on college campuses. However, the moving average of reporting rates actually increased at Purdue University. The results of Purdue University are not supportive of my hypothesis. These results may indicate that the type of sexual violence law may not matter or that state laws do not affect reporting rates.

While two mixed laws and two due process laws were passed in 2016, only one due process policy was passed in 2017. For both years, the moving average for Indiana University decreased. Similarly, the moving average at Purdue University remained the same. The results for both of the years are consistent with my hypothesis since the passage of due process laws did not increase the moving averages.

In general, Indiana only passed one trauma-informed law and had a heavier focus on due process policies between 2011 and 2017. For some years, the changes in reporting rates did fit my hypothesis and correlated to the type of sexual violence law enacted at the state level. On the other hand, the changes in reporting rates during other years were not consistent with my hypothesis. Therefore, I cannot come to a conclusion about my hypothesis through Indiana.

## **Iowa**

Thirty-eight laws passed between 2011 and 2017 were related to sexual violence, with 13 laws most relevant to IHE. Therefore, 35% of sexual violence laws passed were related to students attending colleges and universities. Overall, these sexual violence laws had a heavier focus on trauma-informed policy. Between 2011 and 2018, University of Iowa had an increase in yearly reporting rates, with a maximum of 37 incidents reported per 10,000 students in 2018. On the other hand, Iowa State University did not indicate any type of trend with yearly reporting

rates between 2011 and 2018. When we consider the moving average of reporting rates between 2012 and 2018, it remained stagnant at Iowa State University.

	<b>Yearly Moving Averages of Incidents per 10,000 Students</b>								
<b>University</b>	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Iowa State University	13.7	16.0	11.1	13.6	8.3	11.1	10.5	11.5	9.9
University of Iowa	3.6	1.3	8.5	12.6	23.6	21.3	16.8	9.0	16.7

*Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students between 2010 and 2018 for selected universities in Iowa.*

In 2011, one due process law and two trauma-informed laws were passed. Iowa State university had no change in the moving average of reporting rates before and after the law was passed. On the other hand, University of Iowa had an increase in the moving average when comparing two years before the laws were passed to three years after.

In 2013, four trauma-informed laws were passed. While Iowa State university did not have a change in the moving average, University of Iowa had an increase in the moving average. For this year, I would have especially expected Iowa State University to also have an increase in the moving average, as according to my hypothesis. It is possible that there was another factor that caused the variability in the reporting rates at Iowa State University that is unrelated to state sexual violence laws. As for University of Iowa, the passage of a majority of trauma-informed laws in 2011 and 2013 is correlated with an increase in yearly reporting rates of sexual violence.

In 2015, one mixed law and two trauma-informed laws were passed. Once again, Iowa State university did not suggest a certain trend in the moving average after these laws were passed. For University of Iowa, the moving average of reporting rates decreased when comparing before and after these laws were passed. The results for both Iowa State University and University of Iowa indicate that the enactment of the type of state sexual violence laws is not correlated with the changes in reporting rates for this certain year.

One law of each due process, mixed, and trauma-informed was passed in 2017. Iowa State University and University of Iowa did not have changes in the moving average of reporting rates. Because an equal number of each type of sexual violence law was passed this year, it is hard to explain these findings or discern any correlation.

Overall, University of Iowa demonstrated a general increase in reporting rates for the first couple of years that sexual violence laws were passed. Thus, there was some sort of correlation between the passage of trauma-informed policy and an increase in reporting rates. Iowa State University, however, had major variety in yearly reporting rates, with a mainly stagnant moving average of reporting rates between 2010 and 2018. At Iowa State University, there was most likely another explanation for these findings in reporting rates that is probably unrelated to state sexual violence laws.

### **Minnesota**

Minnesota passed 47 laws related to sexual violence between 2011 and 2017, with 21 of these laws, or 45%, being directly relevant to IHE. While many of the enacted laws were a mix of due process and trauma-informed aspects, the state generally leaned towards passing due process policies. At the University of Minnesota, reported incidents per 10,000 students increased yearly until 2013. Then the reported incidents per 10,000 students became stagnant between 2014 and 2018.

	<b>Yearly Moving Averages of Incidents per 10,000 Students</b>								
<b>University</b>	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
University of Minnesota	2.7	8.8	5.9	10.1	11.2	13.8	12.1	12.5	12.3

*Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students between 2010 and 2018 for selected universities in Minnesota.*

In 2011, Minnesota did not pass any laws directly related to sexual violence at IHE. However, 12 laws were enacted in 2013 that were most relevant to IHE. At this time, University of Minnesota had an increase in the moving average of reporting rates. The correlation between an increase in the moving average and the passage of mainly due process leaning policies is not consistent with my hypothesis. In 2015, three due process laws and three mixed laws were enacted whereas one due process law and one trauma-informed law were passed in 2017. For both years, the University of Minnesota did not really have any significant changes in neither incidents per 10,000 students nor the moving average of reporting rates. Reporting rates being stagnant between 2014 and 2018 may indicate that a lack of more trauma-informed policies is

correlated with no increase in reporting rates. However, it is difficult to come to any conclusions about the effects of sexual violence laws on college reporting rates in this state.

### Wisconsin

Wisconsin passed 34 laws between 2011 and 2017 related to sexual violence, with 18 of these laws being most relevant to IHE. This state is unique in that over half of these laws passed were relevant to IHE, meaning that the legislature placed a greater emphasis on the issues of sexual violence on college campuses. Of these laws that were relevant to IHE, all were either due process policy or mixed. None of the laws passed were completely trauma-informed. University of Wisconsin–Madison had an increasing moving average of reporting rates from 2010 to 2014, and then it dropped significantly in 2015. As for University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee, the moving average remained stagnant from 2012 until 2016 and then continuously decreased beginning in 2017.

	<b>Yearly Moving Averages of Incidents per 10,000 Students</b>								
<b>University</b>	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
University of Wisconsin–Madison	2.3	7.3	6.7	11.8	16.5	14.3	8.6	2.6	4.6
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee	4.3	11.1	6.2	7.0	8.3	8.0	7.4	2.4	1.2

*Yearly moving averages of incidents per 10,000 students between 2010 and 2018 for selected universities in Wisconsin.*

In 2011, three due process laws and two mixed laws were passed. University of Wisconsin–Madison had an increase in the moving average after these laws were passed, which does not support my hypothesis. For this university, there is not a correlation between the passage of trauma-informed policies and an increase in reporting rates. It is likely that there is another reason for the increase in yearly reporting rates. On the other hand, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee saw a decrease in the moving average of reporting rates. The decrease in the moving average of reporting rates correlating with the passage of due process laws is consistent with my hypothesis.



In 2013, four mixed laws and two due process laws were enacted by the legislature. Once again, University of Wisconsin–Madison showed an increase in the moving average of the reporting rates. This finding is not supportive of my hypothesis, so it is possible that there is another factor contributing to the increase in the moving average. For University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee, the moving average did not change significantly. Although some trauma-informed policies were passed this year, as included in the mixed laws, these policies do not seem to be strong enough to affect the reporting rates at University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. The lack of only trauma-informed policy seems to be correlated with no increase in reporting rates at this university.

In 2015, two due process laws and four mixed laws were passed. Both University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee and University of Wisconsin–Madison displayed a decrease in the moving averages of reporting rates. For this year, the decrease in reporting rates seems to be correlated with enactment of due process policies. However, there is not enough evidence to consider whether these policies caused the decrease in reporting rates.

In 2017, only one mixed law was passed that was most related to sexual violence at IHE. University of Wisconsin–Madison did not demonstrate any change in the moving average of reporting rate after this law was enacted. However, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee showed a decrease again in the moving average. Since this law was not completely trauma-informed, then I would have expected these findings according to my hypothesis.

To summarize, Wisconsin did not pass any clearly trauma-informed policies between 2011 and 2017. Although University of Wisconsin–Madison had an increase in moving averages after laws were enacted in 2011 and 2013, the university's decrease in the moving average in 2015 and lack of change in 2017 could be correlated to the types of laws passed in 2015 and 2017. Moreover, the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee stagnant reporting rates seems to support my hypothesis. In general, the lack of clearly trauma-informed policies is correlated with no increases in reporting rates.

## Appendix C

### Online Experiment Outline

1. Introduction
  - a. Content Warning
  - b. Confidentiality
  - c. Consent
2. Filter
  - a. Are you currently an undergraduate student at a four-year institution of higher education in the United States? [Y/N]
3. Sort into three test groups—Random sorting into A/B/C
  - a. Control Group
  - b. Treatment #1: Due Process
  - c. Treatment #2: Trauma-informed
  - d. Questions for each group:
    - i. Do you recommend that they report their assault to the university? [Y/N]
    - ii. If yes, why? [Short Answer]
    - iii. To whom do you recommend they report? [Multiple Choice]
      1. Their residential advisor
      2. The Office of Institutional Equity and Title IX
      3. The Sexual Assault Confidential Resource Center
    - iv. If no, why not? [Short Answer]
4. Follow-up Questions
  - a. Have you ever reported an assault to the university? [Y/N]
  - b. Have you ever been involved in the university investigative process? [Y/N]
  - c. Do you know someone who has been involved in the university reporting process? [Y/N]
  - d. Some students are aware of their state's current laws related to sexual violence while other students are not aware. Are you aware of your state's current laws related to sexual violence? [Multiple Choice]
    - i. Not at all

- ii. A little
  - iii. Somewhat
  - iv. Very
  - v. Extremely
- e. Some students are aware of their university's current policies related to sexual violence while other students are not aware. Are you aware of your university's current policies related to sexual violence? [Multiple Choice]
- i. Not at all
  - ii. A little
  - iii. Somewhat
  - iv. Very
  - v. Extremely
- f. Some students are aware of their university and on-campus resources related to sexual violence while other students are not aware. Are you aware of the university and on-campus resources related to sexual violence? [Multiple Choice]
- i. Not at all
  - ii. A little
  - iii. Somewhat
  - iv. Very
  - v. Extremely
- g. Did you receive any sexual violence prevention training in college? [Y/N]
- h. Are you involved in sexual violence prevention programs on campus? [Y/N]
- i. What is your gender?
- i. Agender
  - ii. Female
  - iii. Gender Non-Binary/Non-Conforming
  - iv. Male
  - v. Other: [Short Answer]
- j. Do you identify as Transgender? [Y/N]
- k. Which of the following describes your racial or ethnic heritage? [Choose all that apply]

- i. American Indian or Alaska Native
  - ii. Asian
  - iii. Black or African American
  - iv. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
  - v. Middle Eastern or North African
  - vi. White
- l. What is your sexual identity? [Multiple Choice]
- i. Asexual or Aromantic
  - ii. Bisexual or Pansexual or Fluid
  - iii. Heterosexual
  - iv. Lesbian
  - v. Gay
  - vi. Queer
  - vii. Other:
- m. Have you ever joined a social fraternity or sorority?
- i. Never joined a social fraternity/sorority
  - ii. Formally in a social fraternity/sorority
  - iii. Actively in a social fraternity/sorority
- n. What is the size of the student population at your current university?
- i. Less than 1,000
  - ii. Between 1,000 and 4,999
  - iii. Between 5,000 and 9,999
  - iv. Between 10,000 and 14,999
  - v. Between 15,000 and 19,999
  - vi. 20,000 and greater
- o. Which of the following best describes the percentage of undergraduate students who live in on-campus housing at your current university?
- i. Less than 25%
  - ii. 25% to 49%
  - iii. Greater than 50%
- p. What is your current college standing?

- i. First year
- ii. Second year
- iii. Third year
- iv. Fourth year
- v. Fifth year

## Appendix D

Additional Tables of Survey Results:

	<i>Some students are aware of their state's current laws related to sexual violence while other students are not aware. Are you aware of your state's current laws related to sexual violence?</i>									
	<i>Not At All</i>		<i>A Little</i>		<i>Somewhat</i>		<i>Very</i>		<i>Extremely</i>	
<b>Treatment</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>
<b>Control</b>	20	80	12.3	85.7	10	90	0	100	20	80
<b>Due Process</b>	0	100	23.1	76.9	7.4	92.6	16.7	83.3	0	100
<b>Trauma-Informed</b>	0	100	7.7	92.3	8.3	91.7	0	100	0	100

*Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who did not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected familiarity with their current state's laws related to sexual violence.*

	<i>Some students are aware of their university's current policies related to sexual violence while other students are not aware. Are you aware of your university's current policies related to sexual violence?</i>									
	<i>Not At All</i>		<i>A Little</i>		<i>Somewhat</i>		<i>Very</i>		<i>Extremely</i>	
<b>Treatment</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% Yes</b>
<b>Control</b>	0	100	15.4	84.6	11.1	88.9	0	100	25	75
<b>Due Process</b>	0	100	33.3	66.7	16.7	83.3	5	95	0	100
<b>Trauma-Informed</b>	0	100	7.14	92.8	9.09	90.9	0	100	0	100

*Percentages of participants who recommended reporting and percentages of participants who did not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected familiarity with their current university's policies related to sexual violence.*

	<i>Are you involved in sexual violence prevention programs on campus?</i>			
	<i>No</i>		<i>Yes</i>	
<b>Treatment</b>	<b>% Who do not recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who do not recommend reporting</b>	<b>% Who recommend reporting</b>
<b>Control</b>	13.9	86.1	5.6	94.4
<b>Due Process</b>	22.6	77.4	5.1	94.9
<b>Trauma- Informed</b>	5.7	94.3	2.6	97.4

*Percentages of participants who recommend reporting and percentages of participants who did not recommend reporting to the university for each treatment, according to participant's selected answer to "Are you involved in sexual violence prevention programs on campus?"*