HHS Public Access
Author manuscript
J Interpers Violence. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2018 September 01.

Published in final edited form as:
J Interpers Violence. ; : 886260517696870. doi:10.1177/0886260517696870.

College Sexual Assault and Campus Climate for Sexual- and Gender-Minority Undergraduate Students

Robert W. S. Coulter, MPH[1] and **Susan R. Rankin, PhD**[2]

[1]University of Pittsburgh, PA, USA

[2]Rankin & Associates Consulting, Howard, PA, USA

Abstract

Sexual- and gender-minority (e.g., lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) undergraduate students are at greater risk for sexual assault victimization than their cisgender (i.e., nontransgender) heterosexual peers. However, few studies have examined how social environments affect sexual assault victimization among sexual- and gender-minority undergraduate students. Nevertheless, this research area was identified as a priority by the Institute of Medicine as well as President Barack Obama's White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault. Therefore, we tested the association between college campuses' inclusion of sexual- and gender-minority people and experiences of sexual assault victimization. Cross-sectional surveys were completed by sexual- and gender-minority undergraduate students ($N = 1{,}925$) from higher education institutions in all 50 U.S. states in 2010. Our dependent variable was experiencing sexual assault victimization at college. Our primary independent variable was campus climate, measured with items assessing perceived inclusion of sexual- and gender-minority people and witnessing sexual- or gender-minority harassment. We used multivariable logistic regression with generalized estimating equations (accounting for the clustering of students within schools) to estimate the association between campus climate and experiencing sexual assault victimization. Overall, 5.2% of the sample reported ever being victims of sexual assault at college. Controlling for sexual orientation, gender identity, race/ethnicity, and year in school, greater perceived inclusion of sexual- and gender-minority people on campus was associated with significantly lower odds of experiencing sexual assault victimization. Our study suggests that improving campus climate for sexual- and gender-minority individuals may reduce their prevalence of college sexual assault, which has potential implications for college practitioners and administrators as well as sexual assault prevention programs and policies.

Reprints and permissions: sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Corresponding Author: Robert W. S. Coulter, Department of Behavioral and Community Health Sciences, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, 130 De Soto Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15261, USA. robert.ws.coulter@pitt.edu.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests
The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Authors' Note
R.W.S.C. conceptualized this article's investigation, conducted the data analyses, and led the article writing. S.R.R. led the parent study's data collection, helped with the writing of the article, and approved the final draft. The research presented in this article is that of the authors and does not reflect the official policy of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) or any funding agencies. The Pennsylvania State University Office of Research Protections (IRB 30289) approved all study procedures.

Keywords

sexual assault; campus climate; lesbian; gay; bisexual; transgender; undergraduate students

Introduction

Sexual assault is a major public health problem among undergraduate students (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2007; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Although the prevalence of sexual assault among undergraduate students varies (from 2.2% to 14.8% depending on measurement and sampling; American College Health Association [ACHA], 2012; Cantor et al., 2015), studies have consistently shown that sexual assault disproportionately burdens certain undergraduate populations. For example, cisgender (i.e., nontransgender) women have long been known to be at significantly greater risk of sexual assault than cisgender men (ACHA, 2012, 2013, 2014; Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs et al., 2016; Sinozich & Langton, 2014). Emerging research shows that, compared with cisgender undergraduate students, sexual assault is significantly more prevalent among transgender students (Cantor et al., 2015; Coulter et al., 2015; Coulter et al. 2017; Krebs et al., 2016), and compared with heterosexuals, sexual assault is significantly higher among gay/lesbian and bisexual undergraduates (Blosnich & Bossarte, 2012; Blosnich & Horn, 2011; Coulter et al., 2017; Krebs et al., 2016; Martin, Fisher, Warner, Krebs, & Lindquist, 2011). With sexual- and gender-minority students (e.g., lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender [LGBT] people) comprising a substantial size of the undergraduate population (estimates range from 9.9% to 19.9% for sexual-minority populations, and 0.2% to 1.8% for gender-minority populations; ACHA, 2012, 2016b; Cantor et al., 2015), sexual assault among these populations is a substantial public health concern worthy of further research.

Despite the well-established sexual-orientation and gender-identity disparities in sexual assault, little is known about what puts sexual- and gender-minority people at greater risk for sexual assault victimization on college campuses. In particular, social environments may impact sexual assault victimization among sexual- and gender-minority individuals. Drawing on stigma theory (Goffman, 1963; Link & Phelan, 2001), environments that are more homophobic, biphobic, transphobic, or sexist may create norms promoting the devaluation of sexual- and gender-minority people, resulting in greater violence—including sexual assault—against these populations. Inversely, campus climates that are more inclusive of sexual- and gender-minority people may be associated with lower sexual assault victimization. Examples supporting this hypothesis can be found in research on youth: Students at schools with more inclusive curriculum were less likely to witness homophobic or transphobic remarks and more likely to feel safe at school (Kosciw, Greytak, Bartkiewicz, Boesen, & Palmer, 2012). It is likely that sexual- and gender-minority inclusive college campuses create safer, more welcoming, and supportive environments for these individuals, thereby reducing their likelihood of sexual assault—but research is needed to confirm this hypothesis.

Research about the impact of social environments on LGBT well-being and sexual assault has been identified as a priority by the Institute of Medicine (2011) as well as President

Barack Obama's White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault (2014). To address these recommendations, we used a sample of sexual- and gender-minority undergraduate students to test the association between college campuses' inclusion of sexual- and gender-minority people and experiences of sexual assault victimization. We hypothesized that greater inclusion of sexual- and gender-minority people on campus would be associated with lower odds of sexual assault.

Method

Study Population and Sampling Procedure

The parent study collected cross-sectional survey data as part of the *2010 State of Higher Education for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People* report (Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld, & Frazer, 2010). In 2010, researchers used purposive and snowball sampling procedures to recruit lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans-gender, queer (LGBTQ; that is, an alternative minority sexual orientation), questioning (i.e., people questioning their gender of sexual orientation), and allies (i.e., cisgender heterosexual people) from postsecondary education institutions, including undergraduate students, graduate students, staff, and faculty members (n = 5,149). Participants were recruited from institutions across the United States via LGBT-focused websites (e.g., Consortium of Higher Education LGBT Resource Professionals, National LGBTQ Task Force), direct mail marketing (e.g., press releases sent to organizations including National Association of Student Personnel Administrators), national conferences (e.g., American College Personnel Association convention), and listservs (e.g., Human Rights Campaign). Because undergraduate students have a significantly higher risk of sexual assault than graduate students (ACHA, 2016a, 2016b; Cantor et al., 2015), the current study examined college sexual assault among undergraduate students only (n = 2,384). Participants in the current study were from 478 post-secondary higher education institutions, located in all 50 U.S. states. Participants completed online surveys, which took 20 to 30 min. The Pennsylvania State University Office of Research Protections approved all study procedures.

Measures

All survey items and scales were constructed based on prior work by Rankin (2003) and with input from the research team, comprised of LGBT faculty, students, staff, and community activists.

Campus climate—Ten items assessed two aspects of perceived campus climate relevant to sexual- and gender-minority people. The first aspect of campus climate pertained to the perceived inclusion of sexual- and gender-minority people on campus, and was measured with six items. Three items asked participants to rate the overall climate on campus using 5-point Likert-type scales that ranged from *not at all* to *completely homophobic*, *not at all* to *completely sexist*, and *positive* to *negative* for people who identify as LGBT. The other three items asked students to rate (on 5-point Likert-type scales from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*) the classes they took as accepting of the following groups: women who are gay/lesbian/bisexual/queer, men who are gay/lesbian/bisexual/queer, and people who are gender variant.

The second aspect of campus climate pertained to witnessing sexual- or gender-minority harassment on campus. Participants were asked how often in the past year they had observed the following four events on campus: Men who are not heterosexual harassed due to their sexual identity, women who are not heterosexual harassed due to their sexual identity, people who are gender variant harassed due to their gender identity, and people who are gender variant harassed due to their gender expression. Response options included *never*, *1–2 times*, *3–5 times*, *6–9 times*, and *10 or more times*.

We conducted a factor analysis on the 10 items using principal axis factoring. Two factors emerged, which mapped onto the constructs of campus climate described above. The first factor—perceived inclusion of sexual- and gender-minority people on campus—explained 71.9% of the variance, and Cronbach's alpha was .90, showing excellent internal consistency. We averaged responses to the questions (ranging from 1 to 5), where higher values indicated a more inclusive campus climate for sexual- and gender-minority people. The second factor—witnessing sexual- or gender-minority harassment on campus—explained 24.4% of the variance, and Cronbach's alpha was .88, showing good internal consistency. Because these variables were highly skewed, we created a binary variable: We coded those who *had witnessed* any of these forms of harassment in the past year as 0, and those who *had not witnessed* any of these forms of harassment as 1. These factors were moderately correlated ($r = .37$, $p < .01$), but failed to present problems with collinearity.

College sexual assault—Sexual assault was defined as "intentional physical contact, such as sexual intercourse or touching, of a person's intimate body parts by someone who did not have permission to make such contact." This definition aligns with the U.S. Department of Justice's (2016) definition. Participants were asked, "Have you ever been a victim of sexual assault while on your campus?" Response options were dichotomous (yes/no).

Demographics—We mitigated potential confounding by controlling for demographic variables empirically associated with sexual assault victimization and theoretically associated with campus climate (ACHA, 2012, 2013, 2014; Blosnich & Bossarte, 2012; Blosnich & Horn, 2011; Cantor et al., 2015; Coulter et al., 2015; Coulter et al., 2017; Krebs et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2011; Sinozich & Langton, 2014). Sexual identity was operationalized via the following question: "Which term best describes your sexual identity?" Response options included asexual, bisexual, gay, genderqueer, heterosexual, lesbian, man loving man, pansexual, queer, questioning, woman loving woman, and other. Those who marked "other" were asked to specify. When appropriate, we coded participants' responses into their respective categories (e.g., "girl who likes girls" was coded as "woman loving woman"); otherwise, we coded responses into two new categories: (a) "multiple sexual identities" for those who wrote in that they identified with more than one category (e.g., "queer and asexual"), and (b) "something else" for those who identified as something other than aforementioned options (e.g., "heteroflexible"). We then collapsed response options into following categories: bisexual, gay/lesbian (i.e., gay, lesbian, man loving man, woman loving woman), queer, pansexual (i.e., people who are attracted to people of all gender identities), heterosexual, and other. The "other" category included participants who identified as asexual (*n* = 31), genderqueer (*n* = 17), questioning (*n* = 47), having multiple identities (*n* = 16), or something else (*n* = 22); we combined these groups because of small sample size, and the prevalence of sexual assault did not significantly differ among these groups. (As we describe below in our "Analyses" section, we fully removed cisgender heterosexual people to effectively create a sample of sexual- and gender-minority undergraduate students. After doing so, there remained 12 gender-minority participants who identified as heterosexual. We kept these 12 participants because they were gender minorities, but we coded them into the "other" sexual orientation category to avoid small cell size and because their prevalence of sexual assault did not significantly differ among the subgroups included in the "other" category.)

Gender identity was operationalized using two questions about current gender identity and sex assigned at birth. Current gender identity ("What is your current gender identity?") was captured with the following responses: man, woman, transgender, and other. Birth sex ("What is your birth sex?") was captured with the following response options: male, female, intersex, and other. For both questions, participants who selected "other" were asked to specify, and we categorically recoded their responses. From these two variables, we created a four-category variable: cisgender man, cisgender woman, transgender, and gender nonconforming individuals. Cisgender men were participants who currently identified as a man and were assigned male sex at birth. Cisgender women were participants who identified as a woman and were assigned female sex at birth. Transgender people were operationalized as any of the following: (a) someone who identified as transgender, (b) someone whose assigned sex at birth (male or female) differed from their current gender identity (e.g., assigned male sex at birth and currently identified as woman), or (c) someone who selected the "other" gender identity category and identified on the transmasculine or transfeminine spectrum (e.g., female-to-male, male-to-female, transman, transwoman). Gender nonconforming people were operationalized as any of the following: (a) those assigned intersex at birth, or (b) those who selected "other" as their current gender identity and specified themselves to be genderqueer, gender neutral, androgynous, fluid, two-spirit, bigender, or anything else (excluding those who specified being on the transmasculine or transfeminine spectrum).

Race/ethnicity was dichotomized as "White" and "people of Color." Although recognizing the vastly different experiences of people of various racial/ethnic identities (e.g., Chicano[a] vs. African American vs. Asian American), and even within these identity categories (e.g., Hmong vs. Chinese), we combined these categories to conduct the analyses because of the small numbers of respondents in the individual racial/ethnic categories.

Year in school was asked with the following question: "What is your current status?" Response options included first-year student, second-year student, third-year student, fourth-year student, and other. If participants responded with "other," they were asked to specify. We coded responses from this category, and categorized them appropriately into one of the other four categories (e.g., "1st school year but sophomore by hours" went into the first-year-student category), created a new category titled "fifth year or later" (e.g., "Seventh year, changed majors"), and left the remaining as "other" (e.g., "returning adult," "nontraditional"). We included year in school as a control variable because the longer students are in college, the greater their exposure time for college sexual assault.

Analyses

We described the overall sample using descriptive statistics, and examined the bivariate associations of sexual assault using chi-square tests or Fisher's exact test (when expected cell sizes were less than 5) for categorical variables and independent-sample t tests for continuous variables. We regressed sexual assault victimization on demographic and campus climate variables using logistic regression with generalized estimating equations (GEE) to adjust for the clustering of students within schools.

Of the 2,384 undergraduate participants, we removed 317 cisgender heterosexual participants (because we aimed to estimate effects among LGBT populations) as well as six heterosexual participants who did not specify their birth sex or current gender identity. Remaining participants had complete data on sexual assault. We then removed 91 participants missing data for campus climate variables and 45 participants missing data for other demographic variables. Overall, we removed 6.9% of sexual- and gender-minority participants who were missing data, creating a final analytic sample size of 1,925 participants. Participants with missing data did not significantly differ from participants included in our analyses on any included variables. We conducted analyses using Stata Version 14 (College Station, Texas), and set statistical significance at $p < .05$.

Results

Overall, 5.2% of the sample reported college sexual assault (Table 1). Gender identity and the campus climate variables were associated with sexual assault victimization (ps < .05). Students who witnessed the harassment of sexual- or gender-minority people on campus were more likely to be sexual assault victims than those who did not witness this kind of harassment (6.2% vs. 3.2%; $p = .005$). Perceived inclusion of sexual- and gender-minority people on campus was lower among sexual assault victims than nonvictims ($p < .001$).

Table 2 shows the multivariable associations of campus climate on sexual assault, controlling for demographics. Perceived inclusivity of sexual- and gender-minority people on campus was associated with significantly lower odds of sexual assault (odds ratio [OR] = 0.73; 95% confidence interval [CI] = [0.57, 0.93]). Students who *did not* observe sexual- or gender-minority harassment on campus had lower odds of being sexual assault victims compared with people who *did* view this type of harassment (OR = 0.68; 95% CI = [0.40, 1.14]), though this association failed to reach statistical significance.

Discussion

Our study directly addressed recommendations put forth by both the White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault (2014) and the Institute of Medicine (2011) on the health of LGBT individuals. Our study suggests that one possible mechanism for reducing college sexual assault among sexual- and gender-minority individuals is increasing inclusion of these vulnerable and marginalized populations. We found that greater inclusion of sexual- and gender-minority people on campus was robustly associated with lower sexual assault on campus. Furthermore, witnessing sexual- or gender-minority harassment was significantly associated with lower college sexual assault victimization in the bivariate model but not the multivariable model when controlling for perceived inclusivity. Nevertheless, more inclusive campus climates are negatively associated with college sexual assault for sexual- and gender-minority undergraduate students.

Inclusive campus climates may influence sexual assault via several pathways. Based on stigma theory (Goffman, 1963; Link & Phelan, 2001), in accepting and inclusive campus cultures, perpetrators may be less likely to target LGBT populations. Another pathway may be that people at more inclusive campuses are more likely to stop (or attempt to stop) sexual assault against LGBT people, thereby serving as active and responsible bystanders. In addition, inclusive campus climates may empower LGBT individuals to engage in more self-protecting behaviors (e.g., harm reduction strategies when drinking) that reduce their likelihood of sexual assault victimization. Future research can explore the mechanisms through which inclusive environments protect sexual- and gender-minorities from sexual assault.

Sexual- and gender-minority people are at great risk for sexual assault victimization (Blosnich & Bossarte, 2012; Blosnich & Horn, 2011; Cantor et al., 2015; Coulter et al., 2015; Coulter et al., 2017; Krebs et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2011), but no college sexual assault prevention interventions have been evaluated among sexual- and gender-minority populations (DeGue et al., 2014). Our study can directly inform college sexual assault prevention—and research—efforts. Colleges can implement programs that create safer and more inclusive environments for sexual- and gender-minority students. For example, the Safe Space/ Zone program trains people on how to be allies for sexual- and gender-minority people (Finkel, Storaasli, Bandele, & Schaefer, 2003). This program encourages personnel to place Safe Space/Zone stickers in their offices, which helps create a more welcoming and inclusive campus climate. There also exists a variety of other ways to create inclusive environments. Examples include creating centers and student groups for sexual- and gender-minority students, creating and enforcing antidiscrimination policies that protect sexual- and gender-minority students, and offering training opportunities to faculty, staff, and students on sexual orientation and gender identity issues. However, to our knowledge, climate change and inclusive policy interventions have not been rigorously evaluated in college populations, limiting our knowledge about how effective they are in achieving targeted outcomes.

In recent years, national laws have placed heavy emphasis on the roles colleges play in preventing sexual assaults. Per federal recommendations (White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault, 2014), institutions nationwide are conducting campus climate surveys to identify the scope of college sexual assaults. By including measures that identify sexual- and gender-minority populations in these surveys, as well as measures about campus climate inclusion, colleges can better understand how well they are protecting and including sexual- and gender-minority students. Furthermore, President Obama signed the Campus Sexual Violence Act into law (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, 2013), and this act requires sexual violence prevention education for all incoming college students, faculty, and staff. This mandate requires colleges to train personnel about issues of sexual assault, and it would be a missed opportunity if their training programs exclude issues pertaining to sexual orientation and gender identity.

Our study is not without limitations. Data were not drawn from a probability sample of students, and may be prone to sampling bias, thereby limiting generalizability. Students were, however, recruited from a large number of higher education institutions in all 50 U.S. states, and our statistical methods controlled for the clustering within schools. Data were also cross-sectional, and therefore our findings cannot be interpreted as causal associations. For example, this study was not free from recall bias: Sexual assault victims may perceive their campus climate differently than nonvictims due to their sexual assault experiences. Nevertheless, this is a common limitation in cross-sectional studies examining how perceptions of school environment relate to individual behaviors (Birkett, Espelage, & Koenig, 2009), and we attempted to remediate this limitation by using an item that measures explicit events of harassment—as opposed to perceptions only. Finally, we collapsed people of Color into a single group (due to small sample sizes and a low-prevalence outcome) and also collapsed transgender people into a single group, though there may be differences between individuals on the transmasculine and transfeminine spectrums. Future studies with more people of Color and a larger sample should explore intersectionality between race/ ethnicity, sexual orientation, and gender on sexual assault (e.g., Coulter et al., 2017), as recommended by the Institute of Medicine (2011).

We may also have measurement error. Sexual assault was measured with a single item that does not differentiate between various types of assault (e.g., completed rape vs. unwanted sexual touching) and measures on-campus assaults. Although the psychometrics of this variable are unknown, the item has good face validity and aligns with other definitions of sexual assault (e.g., U.S. Department of Justice, 2016). The prevalence of sexual assault in our sample was lower than some recent studies (Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs et al., 2016). This could be the result of different sampling frames and measurements. Furthermore, our data were from 2010; since 2010, awareness of sexual assault victimization on college campuses has increased substantially, which may in turn increase people’s awareness and self-reporting of their own victimization. The campus climate variables’ psychometrics properties are unknown and were derived from self-report. Future studies should use more externally validated measures of campus climate, such as presence of sexual- and gender-minority inclusive policies and educational efforts. There may also be residual confounding in our study. Although we controlled for demographic variables, the survey did not ascertain information about other variables associated with sexual assault—for example, alcohol use (Abbey, 2002; Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2009; Testa & Hoffman, 2012; Testa et al., 2015) or prior sexual assault (Classen, Palesh, & Aggarwal, 2005). Despite this limitation, future research can examine the role that campus climate, alcohol use, and other factors play in the role of sexual assault. Nonetheless, our study suggests proof of concept whereby negatively perceived campus climates are associated with college sexual assault for sexual- and gender-minority individuals.

In addition, this study used novel measures to identify sexual- and gender-minority populations. Because participants were provided the option to write-in their specific identities, we tried our best to honor participants’ identities while still maintaining adequate cell size. In some instances, we collapsed participants with different identities into a single category (e.g., genderqueers, asexuals), thereby limiting our knowledge about these specific groups. We recognize that labeling is powerful, and we do not presume that people in the same category have the same experiences or would want to be placed in the category we assigned to them. Nevertheless, we based our coding schema on previous research (Grant et al., 2011) and aggregated participants' identities as best as we could, given the quantitative nature of the current study.

Conclusion

If colleges and universities are to reduce college sexual assault among all students, as recommended by the White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault (2014), then their focus must include sexual- and gender-minority populations. Sexual- and gender-minority people disproportionally experience sexual assault victimization (Blosnich & Bossarte, 2012; Blosnich & Horn, 2011; Cantor et al., 2015; Coulter et al., 2015; Coulter et al., 2017; Krebs et al., 2016; Martin et al., 2011), and colleges may be one step closer to eliminating sexual-orientation and gender-identity disparities in college sexual assault by creating inclusive campus climates.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank John R. Blosnich for his comments on an earlier draft.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This article was partially funded by the National Institutes of Health (F31DA037647 to R.W.S.C.) and Campus Pride.

References

Abbey A. Alcohol-related sexual assault: A common problem among college students. Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs. 2002; (14):118–128.

American College Health Association. American College Health Association–National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA) II: Reference group executive summary, fall 2011. Hanover, MD: Author; 2012.

American College Health Association. American College Health Association–National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA) II: Reference group executive summary, fall 2012. Hanover, MD: Author; 2013.

American College Health Association. American College Health Association–National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA) II: Reference group executive summary, fall 2013. Hanover, MD: Author; 2014.

American College Health Association. American College Health Association–National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA) II: Graduate reference group executive summary, spring 2016. Hanover, MD: Author; 2016a.

American College Health Association. American College Health Association–National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA) II: Undergraduate reference group executive summary, spring 2016. Hanover, MD: Author; 2016b.

Birkett M, Espelage DL, Koenig B. LGB and questioning students in schools: The moderating effects of homophobic bullying and school climate on negative outcomes. Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 2009; 38:989–1000. [PubMed: 19636741]

Blosnich JR, Bossarte R. Drivers of disparity: Differences in socially based risk factors of self-injurious and suicidal behaviors among sexual minority college students. Journal of American College Health. 2012; 60:141–149. [PubMed: 22316411]

Blosnich JR, Horn K. Associations of discrimination and violence with smoking among emerging adults: Differences by gender and sexual orientation. Nicotine & Tobacco Research. 2011; 13:1284–1295. [PubMed: 21994344]

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., Thomas, G. Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct assault and sexual misconduct. Rockville, MD: Westat; 2015.

Classen CC, Palesh OG, Aggarwal R. Sexual revictimization a review of the empirical literature. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse. 2005; 6:103–129.

Coulter RWS, Blosnich JR, Bukowski LA, Herrick AL, Siconolfi DE, Stall RD. Differences in alcohol use and alcohol-related problems between transgender-and nontransgender-identified young adults. Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 2015; 154:251–259. [PubMed: 26210734]

Coulter RWS, Mair C, Miller E, Blosnich JR, Matthews DD, McCauley HL. Prevalence of past-year sexual assault victimization among undergraduate students: Exploring differences by and intersections of gender identity, sexual identity, and race/ethnicity. Prevention Science. 2017; :1–11. DOI: 10.1007/s11121-017-0762-8 [PubMed: 27699620]

DeGue S, Valle LA, Holt MK, Massetti GM, Matjasko JL, Tharp AT. A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence perpetration. Aggression and Violent Behavior. 2014; 19:346–362.

Finkel MJ, Storaasli RD, Bandele A, Schaefer V. Diversity training in graduate school: An exploratory evaluation of the Safe Zone project. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice. 2003; 34:555–561.

Goffman, E. Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity. New York, NY: Touchstone; 1963.

Grant, JM., Mottet, L., Tanis, JE., Harrison, J., Herman, J., Keisling, M. Injustice at every turn: A report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey. Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality; 2011.

Institute of Medicine. The health of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgen-der people: Building a foundation for better understanding. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2011.

Kosciw, JG., Greytak, EA., Bartkiewicz, MJ., Boesen, MJ., Palmer, NA. The 2011 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools. New York, NY: Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network; 2012.

Krebs, CP., Lindquist, C., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., Peterson, K., Planty, M., … Stroop, J. Campus climate survey validation study final technical report. 2016. Retrieved from http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5540

Krebs, CP., Lindquist, CH., Warner, TD., Fisher, BS., Martin, SL. The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) study: Final report. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice; 2007.

Krebs CP, Lindquist CH, Warner TD, Fisher BS, Martin SL. College women's experiences with physically forced, alcohol-or other drug-enabled, and drug-facilitated sexual assault before and since entering college. Journal of American College Health. 2009; 57:639–649. [PubMed: 19433402]

Link BG, Phelan JC. Conceptualizing stigma. Annual Review of Sociology. 2001; 27:363–385.

Martin SL, Fisher BS, Warner TD, Krebs CP, Lindquist CH. Women's sexual orientations and their experiences of sexual assault before and during university. Women's Health Issues. 2011; 21:199–205. [PubMed: 21521622]

Rankin, SR. Campus climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people: A national perspective. New York, NY: The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute; 2003.

Rankin, SR., Weber, GN., Blumenfeld, WJ., Frazer, S. 2010 state of higher education for lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender people. Charlotte, NC: Campus Pride; 2010.

Sinozich, S., Langton, L. Rape and sexual assault among college-age females, 1995–2013. 2014. Retrieved from http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5176

Testa M, Hoffman JH. Naturally occurring changes in women's drinking from high school to college and implications for sexual victimization. Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs. 2012; 73:26–33. [PubMed: 22152659]

Testa M, Parks KA, Hoffman JH, Crane CA, Leonard KE, Shyhalla K. Do drinking episodes contribute to sexual aggression perpetration in college men? Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs. 2015; 76:507–515. [PubMed: 26098025]

Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N. Prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the national violence against women survey. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice; 1998.

U.S. Department of Justice. Sexual assault. 2016. Retrieved from https://www.jus-tice.gov/ovw/sexual-assault

Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, Pub. L. No. 113–4, 127 Stat. 54. (2013).

White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault. Not alone. 2014. Retrieved from https://www.notalone.gov/assets/report.pdf

Biographies

Robert W. S. Coulter is a PhD candidate at the University of Pittsburgh's Graduate School of Public Health in the Department of Behavioral and Community Health Sciences. He earned his MPH in social and behavioral sciences from Boston University School of Public Health. His research focuses on the well-being of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) populations, including assessing LGBT health inequities in violence, substance use, and mental health, and investigating causes of such inequities. He has a National Institutes of Health (NIH)–funded F31 to investigate sexual-orientation differences in tobacco and alcohol use trajectories in young adults, and the antecedents and outcomes of those trajectories.

Susan R. Rankin got retired from the Pennsylvania State University in 2013 where she most recently served as an associate professor of education and associate in the Center for the Study of Higher Education. She has presented and published widely on the intersections of identities and the impact of sexism, genderism, racism, and het-erosexism. Her recent publications include the *2010 State of Higher Education for LGBT People*, *The Lives of Transgender People*, and the *2016 United States Transgender Survey*. She has collaborated with over 170 institutions/organizations in implementing climate assessments and developing strategic initiatives.

Table 1

Demographics and Campus Climate for the Total Sample and Stratified by College Sexual Assault (*N* = 1,925).

			College Sexual Assault				
	Total		Nonvictim		Victim		
Characteristic	***n***	**%**[a]	***n***	**%**[b]	***n***	**%**[b]	***p* Value**
Total	1,925	100.0	1,825	94.8	100	5.2	
Demographics							
Sexual orientation							
Gay/lesbian	1,059	55.0	1,016	95.9	43	4.1	.096
Bisexual	333	17.3	308	92.5	25	7.5	
Queer	285	14.8	266	93.3	19	6.7	
Pansexual	116	6.0	110	94.8	6	5.2	
Other	132	6.9	125	94.7	7	5.3	
Gender identity							
Cisgender man	769	39.9	750	97.5	19	2.5	<.001
Cisgender woman	915	47.5	846	92.5	69	7.5	
Transgender	149	7.7	140	94.0	9	6.0	
Gender nonconforming	92	4.8	89	96.7	3	3.3	
Race/ethnicity							
White	1,429	74.2	1,355	94.8	74	5.2	.956
People of Color	496	25.8	470	94.8	26	5.2	
Year in school							
First	352	18.3	339	96.3	13	3.7	.363
Second	461	23.9	440	95.4	21	4.6	
Third	470	24.4	447	95.1	23	4.9	
Fourth	506	26.3	471	93.1	35	6.9	
Fifth year or later	88	4.6	83	94.3	5	5.7	
Other	48	2.5	45	93.8	3	6.3	
Campus climate							
Witnessed sexual- or gender-minority harassment on campus							

			College Sexual Assault				
	Total		**Nonvictim**		**Victim**		
Characteristic	***n***	**%**[a]	***n***	**%**[b]	***n***	**%**[b]	***p* Value**
Yes	1,274	66.2	1,195	93.8	79	6.2	.005
No	651	33.8	630	9,687	21	3.2	
Perceived inclusion of sexual- and gender-minority people on campus, *M* (*SD*)	3.50	(0.89)	3.53	(0.88)	3.19	(0.88)	<.001

[a] Column percentage.

[b] Row percentage.

Table 2

Multivariable ORs and 95% CIs of College Sexual Assault Victimization (*N* = 1,925).

	Sexual Assault Victimization		
Characteristic	**OR**	**95% CI**	***p* Value**
Campus climate			
Witnessed sexual- or gender-minority harassment on campus			
Yes	1.00	(referent)	
No	0.68	[0.40, 1.14]	.140
Perceived inclusion of sexual- and gender-minority people on campus (*continuous*)	0.73	[0.57, 0.93]	.010
Demographic control variables			
Sexual orientation			
Gay/lesbian	1.00	(referent)	
Bisexual	1.30	[0.75, 2.24]	.354
Queer	1.19	[0.65, 2.17]	.576
Pansexual	0.80	[0.32, 2.02]	.638
Other	1.13	[0.48, 2.68]	.775
Gender identity			
Cisgender man	1.00	(referent)	
Cisgender woman	3.03	[1.72, 5.34]	<.001
Transgender	2.18	[0.89, 5.32]	.088
Gender nonconforming	1.27	[0.36, 4.49]	.713
Race/ethnicity			
White	1.00	(referent)	
People of Color	1.18	[0.74, 1.89]	.495
Year in school			
First	1.00	(referent)	
Second	1.15	[0.57, 2.35]	.696
Third	1.25	[0.62, 2.53]	.530
Fourth	1.74	[0.90, 3.39]	.101
Fifth year or later	1.47	[0.49, 4.39]	.486
Other	1.50	[0.41, 5.49]	.537

Note. OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval.