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The effect of crime on victims has become an issue of national importance over the last few decades. Studies on crime victimization became particularly focused when President Johnson established the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1965. Although the methodology and specific content of such studies have varied over the years, at least one result has remained constant: the general public is afraid of crime. National polls of representative samples show that fear of crime and perceptions of danger on the streets has risen steadily since 1965 in all sectors of the population (Erskine, 1974). The fear of crime seems to be greatest among women and urban dwellers. This is not surprising, as rates of crime are higher in cities than in rural areas, and the "high risk" category for victimization includes non-whites, the elderly and women.

Women in general seem to feel more vulnerable to potential victimization (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981). One researcher suggests that the fear of crime in women is three times as great as fear in men.
(Stanko, 1985). Although national rates of victimization are not substantially higher for women than for men, the percentage of women involved in "non-stranger assaultive violence" is considerably greater than the percentage of men involved in similar incidents (Hindelang, 1976). Recent evidence also points to an increase in violent crime against women while related figures for men have dropped (National Crime Survey, Justice Department, 1983). Further, a 1973 United States Census Bureau survey indicated that male victims felt "less insecure" after a victimization experience than did female victims. Female victims were twice as afraid of potential future victimization than were female non-victims. The census surveys also found that female victims were less likely to perceive their neighborhood as safe and more likely to report changes in behavior after their victimization experience than were non-victims (Skogan, 1977).

National crime statistics indicate that a rape takes place "every six minutes" and some form of assault takes place "every forty-eight seconds" somewhere in the United States (Uniform Crime Reports, 1981). Violent crimes account for sixteen percent of total criminal victimizations, while assault is the most "common" violent crime, comprising twelve percent of total crime victimizations (APA Task
figures show that rape comprised 4.5% of violent crime and some form of assault comprised 55.1% of violent crime in Massachusetts for 1980. Those figures indicate that one out of every three hundred inhabitants in Massachusetts was a victims of some violent, physical crime in 1980 (Erskine, 1980). These figures are remarkable similar to those reported by the University of Massachusetts at Amherst Campus Security for 1984. Five rapes, six other sex offenses and seventy assaults were reported on campus for that calendar year (Personal communication, 1986). Although information about gender of the victim was not available, given national rates of at least equal victimization of men and women, it is highly likely that more than half of these victims were women. With a total population of about 13,000 graduate and undergraduate women on campus, using a 50% estimate of female victims, the rate of reported victimization at the university for 1984 was approximately one out of every 308 women. Statistics from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst Everywoman’s Center, which handles many of these cases through a crisis hotline suggest that the rate of actual victimization of women is much higher than the reported rate (Personal communication, 1985). These
statistics clearly demonstrate the reality of victimization, particularly for women. However, there is a consequence to victimization almost as distressing as actual rates of crime, namely fear of crime.

One national survey of eight major cities found that 45% of those interviewed felt it was not safe to be out alone in their neighborhood at night (Garofalo, 1977), while another found that over 40% of urban dwellers are afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night (Skogan, 1981). More importantly, national statistics on fear of crime seem to indicate that more people are afraid of victimization than are actually victims. Taking into consideration that the actual incidence of victimization is probably higher than reported still does not account for the overall high rate of fear. Instead, people seem to learn fear through hearing about the victimization experiences of others.

Fear developed through the shared experience of others and not directly through actual experience can be described as "secondary victimization". Often people will share their victimization experiences with close friends and family members, resulting in a "secondary" experience of victimization and increased fear in the friends and relatives. These type of social networks (i.e. speaking
with close friends and family members) seem to be a major factor that influences perceptions of risk of victimization (Tyler, 1984). It appears that secondary victimization is related to the impact of the assault on the victim, and the victims willingness to share that information with a close friend or relative. When an individual with no personal experience of violence is suddenly confronted with the victimization of a close friend or relative, it is highly likely that that individual will identify with the victim and perceive her/his own risk of victimization to be increased (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981). One study of victims showed that eighty percent of the victims relatives, close friends and neighbors experienced some effects of secondary victimization, such as increased fear or anxiety (APA Task Force, 1984).

This same effect of secondary victimization does not appear to hold true for reports of crime and violence in newspapers or television news reports. Through analyzing daily newspaper and television news reports of crime, as well as personal interviews, Tyler (1980; 1984) has found that "citizens do not find media reports of crime informative and they do not find them upsetting". Newspapers and television news reports of violence apparently lack the immediacy of
shared personal experience. The individual is not able to associate news reports with personal experience, and so the individual does not experience secondary victimization. However, those with some sort of secondary experience of crime are far more likely to express fear and alter their behavior to prevent victimization (Tyler, 1984).

In general, although individuals are aware of potential victimization, they do not personally seem to fear victimization unless they have been directly involved, or know someone who has been victimized. Those with no experience of victimization typically overestimate their ability to avoid, or underestimate their likelihood of, being victimized. Also, estimates of the general crime rate appear to be unrelated to a personal fear of crime, unless one has ben a victim (Nisbett and Borgida, 1975; Tyler, 1980). People tend to believe in the "law of small numbers" (Tversky and Kahneman, 1971), where assumptions made from a very small sample are assumed to be representative of the larger population. Individuals seem generally unwilling to deduce the particular from the general, but rather to infer the general from the particular (Nisbett and Borgida, 1975; Hansen and Donoghue, 1977).

Without personal or secondary experience with victimization,
individuals have little evidence to warrant a fear of victimization. Drawing from their sample of close friends, family and personal experience, individuals who follow this line of reasoning believe it highly unlikely that they will be victimized. Although aware of victimization, such reasoning suggests that "it won't happen to me", primarily because there is no prior experience with violence and no indication that victimization could occur to "someone like me". A similar phenomena occurs, for example, with the lottery. Although any one individual has a very low probability of winning the lottery, when an individual sees "someone like me" winning the lottery, that individual often overestimates her/his chances of winning since it happened to someone with whom s/he can identify.

The phenomena of "it won't happen to me" is often referred to as the "illusion of validity", where an individual places unwarranted confidence in fallible assumptions (Einhorn and Hogarth, 1978). Further, the illusion of validity is often reinforced by large amounts of positive feedback. For example, if someone has no personal or secondary experience with assault and commonly walks alone at night, it is highly likely that each time they are not victimized will serve to reinforce their belief that they will not be victimized. Studies have
also documented that giving subjects "target-case information" (the
"laboratory" equivalent of secondary victimization) has an effect on
people's perceptions of their own vulnerability (Hansen and Donoghue,
1977). In these cases subjects were given an explicit written
first-person account of victimization, which had a greater impact on
fear of victimization than did newspaper or television reports of
violence (Hansen and Donoghue, 1977). Thus, when an individual can
identify victimization with somone s/he knows, or who is like
her/him, the individual feels her/himself to be more at risk. If one
does not encounter any disconfirming information, (e.g. no personal or
secondary experience of violence) one has no reason to doubt one's
"invulnerability" to victimization.

Similarly, Tyler and Rasinski (1984) argue that "availability" of
experience has an important effect on personal risk judgments.
Availability refers to the ease with which specific instances of an
event are recalled. If an individual has no experience with an event,
there is no specific memory to be "available" for recall. Tyler and
Rasinski found that perceived risks are mediated by the availability of
risk judgments. Thus, if one has no experience with victimization,
there are no instances of such an experience to be "available" in
memory that might moderate perceptions of invulnerability or behavior. Further, Tyler suggests that information about victimization (through secondary experience) has a greater impact on fear of victimization than on preventive behavior (Tyler, 1980). According to Tyler, the general effect of being a crime victim is to "heighten estimates of the future probability of victimization, raise the level of worry about future victimization and increase the level of crime preventive behavior undertaken" (Tyler, 1984).

Weinstein has looked at personal risk judgments as an "unrealistic optimism", which is supported by the illusion of validity. Weinstein cites surveys of auto accident victims, disease and crime victims which suggest that people believe others will be the victims of misfortune, and believe that their risk of misfortune is less than average (Weinstein, 1980). According to Weinstein, the more undesirable an event, the greater one's tendency to believe one's chances are less than average of experiencing the event. Weinstein also believes that if an event is seen as "controllable", the individual is less likely to believe s/he's at risk. The greater the perceived control, the less likely the risk (Weinstein, 1980; 1984).

Another factor in personal risk estimates is seen in the contrast
between personal and comparative judgments, or perceptions of "self" and "other". People often have stereotyped conceptions of the "type of person" to whom an event is likely to happen. If the individual does not fit the stereotype s/he holds for the event in question, s/he then feels the event will not happen to her or him. For example, Weinstein (1980) found that subjects would compare themselves to a stereotypic victim and conclude their own risk for the event was less than average. In general, Weinstein found that people were very poor at recognizing the relationship between actions and risk. Specifically, he found no relationship between reported actions and perceptions of vulnerability to harm in regard to fear of "mugging". Although subjects reported that they felt they were at risk, this had no effect on their behavior (Weinstein, 1984). While recognizing the possibility of victimization, subjects apparently did not feel that they were at any personal risk for victimization.

Although personal and secondary experience of victimization appear to have the greatest effect on personal risk judgments, recent research in the field of communications suggests that the amount of "violent" television viewed may also impact upon perceptions of vulnerability (Morgan, 1981). This differs from prior studies of the
media, which have been primarily concerned with news broadcasts (Hughes, 1980). The more recent television studies define violence as "any overt expression of physical force (with or without a weapon, against self or others), compelling action against one's will on pain of being hurt and/or killed or threatened to be so victimized as part of the plot" (Morgan, 1979). Subjects are divided into "heavy" and "light" viewers based on the amount of television watched per day. These studies have found that those who are heavy viewers are more likely to feel they may be involved in violence than those who watch less television (Doob and MacDonald, 1979; Hughes, 1980; Morgan, 1983). Heavy viewers seem to experience an "unwarranted amount of generalized fear, reflected in excessive precautions against violence" (Hughes, 1980). However, the studies to date on the effect of amount of television viewing are not conclusive, as there is also disconfirming evidence which suggests fear of victimization is related to factors other than heavy television viewing.

The purpose of the present study is to ascertain more definitively the effects a history of personal and secondary victimization has on an individual's attitudes and behavior in respect to possible violence. The specific form of victimization being studied is experience with
assault, defined for this study as "any undesired, forcible physical contact, including undesired sexual contact". Although other studies have been conducted on attitudes and behaviors in relation to victimization experiences, these studies have primarily focused on crime as a whole, rather than on a specific form of crime, such as assault. Additionally, subjects for these studies have included both males and females (U.S. Census Bureau, 1973; Hindelang, 1976; Garofalo, 1977; Erskine, 1980; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981). Since this study is examining the effects of victimization of perceived risks and risk-avoidant behaviors, the focus is on some sort of direct personal experience (self, or secondary victimization), rather than on experiences that may not include physical contact. Also, it appears that victims of violence may have different reactions to their experience than victims of other types of crime (APA Task Force, 1984). As assault is the most common form of violent crime and by definition involves physical contact of some sort; that is the form of crime upon which this study will focus.

For purposes of the present study, subjects will be female college students. As noted previously, women seem to be more vulnerable to fear of crime. It appears that the rate of violent crime against women
is rising, even given the low percentage of women who report their experience of victimization. Women seem to feel at greater risk of victimization than do men, and may be more likely to engage in behaviors to lessen their risk of victimization. Further, women are less likely than men to be the perpetrators of violent crime. As this study is concerned with victimization and consequent effects on attitudes and behaviors, only women will be used as subjects. To analyze the data, subjects will be divided into three groups, ex post facto. The first will consist of subjects who have some history of assault. The second will be subjects who report an assault of a close friend or relative. The third will be a control group who have no history of personal assault and report no experience of assault for close friends or relatives. Subjects will be given a questionnaire of fifty items focused on specifics of experience with assault, perceptions of risk and precautionary behaviors to avoid victimization.

In the present study it is expected that individuals who have had personal or secondary experience of victimization will believe themselves to be at further risk of victimization, in contrast with those who have no history of personal or secondary experience of violence. Specifically, women with personal or secondary experience
of assault will show a greater likelihood of potential victimization; feel less safe on campus, particularly during "high risk" times, such as at night; and will believe that the risk of victimization for women in general is higher than that reported by individuals with no personal experience of assault. It is expected that those individuals who have had some personal or secondary experience of assault will engage in a number of specific behaviors to avoid such risk, such as calling an escort; not walking alone at night; carrying a "rape whistle" or mace; carrying keys or some similar item in the hand as protection; or will be more likely to take a course in self defense techniques than will those subjects with no personal experience of violence. It is expected that those subjects with no personal or secondary experience of assault will show the least perception of personal risk and the fewest behaviors to avoid victimization. It is hypothesized that these effects will be strongest in the group of those with personal experience with assault, less strong with those subjects who have only secondary experience, and will be weakest in those subjects with no personal or secondary experience of assault.

Further, it is hypothesized that there will be an overall difference among heavy and light television viewers in the areas of both behavior
and attitudes, as seen in the three groups previously mentioned.

Specifically, heavy television viewers in general will be more likely to feel themselves at risk; will feel less safe on campus during "high risk" times, such as at night; will believe that the incidence of victimization of women is higher than will light television viewers. Also, heavy television viewers will be more likely than light television viewers to engage in preventive behaviors, such as not walking alone; calling for an escort; carrying mace or a "rape whistle"; or taking a course in self defense.
Subjects

Subjects for this study were one hundred and forty undergraduate women at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Subjects were recruited from Introductory Psychology classes and through signs posted in the Psychology Department. Subjects received one experimental credit for participation in this study. They were informed that this was a study of university women's experiences with and perceptions of assault and safety on campus. Subjects were given several referral sources (Student Mental Health; Everywoman's Center; Psychological Services Center; University Health Services) to contact if they had questions or concerns regarding the material covered in the questionnaire.

Survey Instrument

The questionnaire used for this study deals primarily with issues of personal and secondary experiences of assault. For the purposes of this study, assault is defined as "any undesired, forcible physical
contact, including undesired sexual contact”.

The questionnaire consists of fifty-eight items, encompassing specifics of assault experiences, behavioral trends and general attitudes, as well as some biographical data (see Appendix). Specifically, questions cover personal perceived risk of assault; perceived safety on campus, and in the individual’s hometown; perceived risk of women in general; as well as specific details of experience with assault, including number of assaults, time frame and age at which assault occurred; nature of assault and locale of assault. Items dealing with behavioral effects include calling home ahead; having an escort; not walking alone on campus; carrying mace or a “rape whistle”; taking courses in self defense or weight training. The questionnaire is based on the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration/Census National Crime Panel (LEAA/CNP) survey of 1972. The Census Bureau has a long history of administering crime victimization surveys, which have been refined to their present state through numerous pre-test and large sample analyses and subsequent modifications. Most (approximately forty) of the items on this questionnaire were taken from the LEAA/NCP survey and modified through interviews and pilot testing to meet the needs of this study.
Face validity of this questionnaire was derived by distributing the questionnaire to ten graduate students in Clinical Psychology for comments and suggestions.

Six initial interviews with undergraduates in psychology at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst were conducted to ascertain the type of language and expressions commonly used in this subject population (University of Massachusetts at Amherst) to refer to experiences with assault. Further, a first draft of the questionnaire was given to ten undergraduate students to complete and then comment upon any confusing or misleading items. A brief personal follow-up was done with these students, to answer any questions that might have been raised by completing the questionnaire.

**Experimental Procedure**

After signing the informed consent form, subjects were given a copy of the survey instrument. Subjects were allowed as much time as was necessary to complete the questionnaire, generally twenty to thirty minutes. When subjects returned the questionnaire to the researcher, they were given a debriefing from, detailing the aims and expected findings of this study.
Sample Characteristics

Demographic All subjects in this study were women between the ages of eighteen and thirty. The majority (95 out of 140) were eighteen or nineteen years old. The mean age was nineteen. As a whole, the group of women studied were primarily Caucasian (122 out of 136 respondents), with seven Black, three Asian and four Native American respondents. Almost half (45%) of the women were in their first year of college. A further 28% (39 out of 138) were in their second year, with 22 and 14 in their third and fourth years, respectively, of college studies.

The question on annual family income indicated that 37.1% were from families who earned over $50,000. 23 (16.4%) of the women were from families with an annual income of $40,000 – $49,999, and 20.7% (29) were from families with a yearly income of $30,000 – $39,999. The remainder (29%) reported yearly incomes of less than $30,000. (See Table 1)

Over half (57.1%) of the women studied live in Massachusetts and
**TABLE I**

Demographic Characteristics of Subjects: Income

(N = 140)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>1.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Postsecondary Education</td>
<td>1.879</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Television Watched Per Day</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $50,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the remaining 42.9% (39 out of 119 respondents) were from eleven different states, ranging from Maine to California. One third (44) of the women come from hometowns of 5,000 - 20,000. Another third of the sample (49) come from hometowns of 20,000 - 50,000 and 7% (10 out of 138) were from towns of under 5,000. The remaining 20% were from hometowns of over 50,000. (See Table 2)

Almost three-quarters of the women (102) live with one other person. Approximately half of the women (47.1%) live in the Southwest dorm complex, with 4.3% living in Central, 12.2% living in off-campus apartments and the other 26.5% in various dorms on the University of Massachusetts campus.

In regard to major, one third (31.4%) of the women are Psychology majors, 14.3% are in the School of Management, 40% are approximately evenly distributed among the humanities, sciences and business majors. The remaining 14.3% are still undecided as to major.

**Nature of Victimization Experience** When asked about personal and secondary experience of assault, 22 women (15.7%) reported personal experience and another 27.9% (39) reported some secondary experience of victimization. 10% of the sample (14) reported
### TABLE 2

Demographic Characteristics of Subjects: Population

(N = 140)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population of Hometown</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 20,000</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 50,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 - 500,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 - million</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over a million</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
experience of both personal and secondary victimization. Of the 22 women who have personal experience of victimization, two-thirds (63.6%) have been assaulted once. Over half (59.1%; 13 out of 22) were assaulted longer than a year ago, but within the last five years and were 15-20 years old at the time of the assault. 40.9% (9 out of 22) were assaulted by someone well-known to them and 27.4% of the assaults occurred in the victim’s hometown. Over three-quarters of the assaults (81.8%) were “sexual assault, other than rape”. (This was defined as “any undesired, forcible physical contact of a sexual nature”.)

When asked to whom they reported the assault, 81.8% told a friend, 5 told their parents (22.7%) and one person reported the incident to the police. Reasons for not reporting the incident to the police were: 50% felt it was a private or personal matter; 40.9% felt nothing could be done; 40.9% did not want other people to know; 31.8% felt they had a lack of proof and 22.7% were afraid of public embarrassment. Of women with personal experience of assault, two-thirds (63.6%) said that, if assaulted in the future, they would report the incident to the police.
The first hypothesis of the present study predicted that women with personal or secondary experience of victimization will feel they are at greater risk of future victimization than will non-victims, and they will be more likely to engage in preventive behaviors as a result of this belief. A number of analyses were conducted to examine this supposition.

**Safety on Campus**

When asked how safe they feel on campus during the day, over three-quarters (80%) of the women in the sample feel "very safe". Over half (55.7%) feel "somewhat unsafe" at night. 82.9% feel "very safe" in the vicinity of their dorm during the day, and almost half (48.6%) feel "reasonably safe" in the vicinity of their dorm during the night. More than half of the women in this sample (81 out of 140) perceive other women as feeling "somewhat unsafe" on campus at night.

**Experience with Assault** A scale measuring perceptions of safety on campus was devised by adding scores for questions 14 - 19 of the questionnaire for each individual. The range of possible scores was
from 0 - 24. Higher scores on this scale indicate that the individual feels "very unsafe" on campus. Mean scores for all three groups (personal, secondary and no experience of assault) were computed, and an analysis of variance showed no significant differences. (See Table 3).

**Knowledge of Assailant (personal experience)** Results of a t-test (9.00 vs. 8.5, F(1,18)=3.83, p<0.068) suggested that women who were assaulted by a stranger (n=10) tended to feel less safe on campus than those women who had been assaulted by someone they knew well (n=9). Although not significant, a trend toward significance is apparent.

**Knowledge of Assailant (secondary experience)** Results of a t-test showed a significant difference (10.077 vs. 8.167, F(1,44) = 2.68, p<0.023) in feelings of safety on campus for women who had a close friend assaulted by a stranger. Those women with secondary victimization by a stranger (n=25) felt less safe than those women who had a close friend assaulted by someone well known to the victim (n=20).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Experience</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.091</td>
<td>2.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Experience</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.051</td>
<td>2.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9.684</td>
<td>2.183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population of Hometown  In testing the relationship between perceived safety at night on the University of Massachusetts campus compared to perceived safety at night in the individual's hometown (using item *13 from the questionnaire), a significant relationship was found. The Chi-Square analysis \( \chi^2(14, N=140) = 28.05324, \ p<.014 \) indicates that women from larger hometowns tend to feel less safe out alone at home at night than out alone at night on the University of Massachusetts campus.

Likelihood of Assault

Two-thirds \( (87 \text{ women out of } 138 \text{ respondents}) \) feel that "0 - 5" women in their dorm will be assaulted, and 98 women \( (70\%) \) feel it is "not very likely" that they will be assaulted at some point during the next academic semester. Over half of the sample \( (77 \text{ women}) \) feel that their chances of being assaulted have "gone up" in the past few years, and over three-quarters \( (108 \text{ out of } 139 \text{ respondents}) \) feel that the frequency of assault is more serious than the newspapers report.

A Chi-Square analysis \( \chi^2(6, N=53) = 22.727, \ p<.0009 \) for secondary victims shows a significant relationship between an
individual's perceptions of the likelihood that she will be assaulted and of the likelihood that others in her dorm will be assaulted. (Results are in the direction of the possibility of assault being less likely to occur, either to self or others.)

**Limitations on Behavior**

Three-quarters of the sample (104 out of 140 respondents) feel that people in general limit their activities from fear of assault. Two thirds of the women (91) feel that they have greatly limited their behavior as a result of this fear. Almost all (88 out of 92) of the women who have changed their behavior out of fear of victimization report that they feel they can no longer walk alone at night.

Questions 28 and 29 of the questionnaire were added together to give a measure of the extent to which subjects felt others limited their behavior as a result of fear of assault. Mean scores for degree of experience with assault (personal, secondary, none) were computed. No significant differences were found. (See Table 4).

A Pearson R correlation was completed between perceptions of
### TABLE 4

**Mean Scores for Behavioral Limitations Variable by Degree of Experience with Assault**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Experience</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.409</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Experience</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.974</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.203</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
safety on campus and the belief that people tend to limit their activities from fear of assault. Correlations were computed for each degree of experience with assault. A significant correlation \((R = -0.346, p < 0.006)\) was found for secondary victims of assault, indicating that the less safe women feel on campus, the more likely they are to believe that other people do not limit their daily behavior out of fear of assault.

A t-test between Caucasian women and women of color on beliefs that other people tend to limit daily activities from fear of assault showed a significant difference \((4.40 \text{ vs. } 4.14, F(1,139) = 3.48, p < 0.001)\). Women of color feel that people in general are more likely to limit their behavior from fear of assault than do Caucasian women.

Use of Preventive Behaviors

When alone on campus at night, 116 of the women in this sample will not walk alone, and 113 report always being aware of their surroundings. Further, 45\% (63 out of 140) of the women carry keys or a similar item in their hands as protection at night.
Four scales were devised to measure use of preventive behaviors. For questions 41, 42, 43 and 44, each subset of eight scores were added together, to give a single total for each individual for each of the four questions. Mean scores on each scale were computed for each degree of experience with assault. An analysis of variance showed no significant differences. (See Table 5) An analysis of variance was separately run for the 32 individual behaviors listed, using experience with assault as the independent variable. No significant differences were found.

The second hypothesis predicted that heavy television viewers will feel themselves at greater risk of victimization than will light television viewers and will engage in more preventive behaviors as a result of this belief.

Effect of Television Viewing

Light television viewing was defined as "0 - 2" hours of television a day, while heavy television viewing was defined as "4 or more" hours of television watched per day. (This was determined by a median
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior I</th>
<th>Campus, Day</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td></td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td></td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior II</th>
<th>Campus, Night</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.682</td>
<td></td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.615</td>
<td></td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.418</td>
<td></td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior III</th>
<th>Dorm, Day</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td></td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td></td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td></td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior IV</th>
<th>Dorm, Night</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.727</td>
<td></td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td></td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5

Mean Scores on Preventive Behavior Scales for Degree of Experience with Assault
split, where the overall mean hours of television watched per day was 2.5, with a median of three hours of television viewing a day).

Mean scores were determined for perceptions of safety on campus, extent to which subjects feel others limit their daily activities from fear of assault and for each of the four preventive behavior scales. Analyses of variance were run for each of these variables. There were no significant differences found between light and heavy television viewers for any of these variables. (See Table 6).

A two-way analysis of variance was completed to examine differences in perceptions of safety on campus for heavy and light television viewing and degree of experience with assault. Although the interaction effect was not significant, the main effect of assault approached significance (N=140, F(1,139) = 3.092, p<.081). Overall women feel “reasonably safe” on campus, both during the day and at night, regardless of amount of television viewing.
TABLE 6

Mean Scores for Heavy and Light Television Viewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions of Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light tv</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.745</td>
<td>2.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy tv</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.083</td>
<td>2.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Limitations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light tv</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.078</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy tv</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus,Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light tv</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy tv</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus,Night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light tv</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.686</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy tv</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorm,Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light tv</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy tv</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorm,Night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light tv</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.686</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy tv</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis #1 states that women with personal or secondary experience of victimization will feel they are at greater risk of victimization than will non-victims, and will engage in more preventive behaviors as a result of this belief. No significant main effects or interaction effects were found among women with personal or secondary experience of assault regarding beliefs in further risk of victimization. There was however, a trend for women with personal experience of victimization to report feeling slightly less safe on campus overall than women with secondary or no experience of assault. This trend is stronger for women who have been assaulted by a stranger. Women who have been assaulted by someone well known to them do not indicate as much fear about safety on campus as do women who have been the victim of assault by a stranger. This same trend is also evident among women with secondary experience of victimization. Women who had a close friend or relative who has assaulted by someone well known to the victim feel significantly more safe on campus than women who had a close friend who was assaulted by a
stranger. However, in all of the above instances, the feeling of unsafety is relatively small. In general, all women in this study, regardless of experience with assault, feel "reasonably safe" on campus.

Further, women in this study feel that it is "not very likely" that they will be assaulted and that it is "not very likely" that women on this campus will be assaulted. This finding is true regardless of experience with assault. While there is a significant relationship among women with secondary experience of victimization between the perceived likelihood of assault of self and the likelihood of assault of others, this relationship is weighted on the side of "not very likely". This suggests that women with secondary experience of victimization feel that it is most likely that neither they, nor women on campus, will assaulted. Additionally, there were no significant differences found in preventive behaviors for either women with personal or secondary experience of assault.

There may be several important factors in explaining this lack of differences. In general, women in this study do not feel at risk of victimization. While research findings indicate that female victims are significantly more afraid of assault and apt to limit their behavior
than female non-victims, there is also considerable evidence of denial among victims and non-victims alike in regard to future victimization. The "unrealistic optimism" demonstrated by the women in this sample may be a result of the phenomena of "it won't happen to me." This phenomena appears to be a very powerful belief and may overshadow actual knowledge of the likelihood of assault. People seem to be reluctant to acknowledge their vulnerability, particularly as it relates to their daily functioning. Rather than feel incapacitated by fear of assault, the women in this sample may instead choose to believe that they, personally, are not at risk of victimization. By extension, these women may also feel that people they know, or are in contact with, will not be victimized, as reinforcement of their own invulnerability.

By denying the possibility of assault, these women are also not responsible for altering their behavior or challenging their beliefs regarding safety on campus. While a student is in college, in many ways her dorm, and thus the campus, become her "home" and hometown. It is possible that feeling unsafe or vulnerable to assault on campus would result in feeling unsafe in one's "home", leaving the student with no safe "refuge" from the world. By believing that assault on campus is "not very likely" the student is able to create a safe place
for herself.

A significant correlation was found between perceptions of safety on campus and the belief that others limit their behavior as a result of fear of assault. As women feel more safe on campus, they are more likely to see others as limiting their behavior. Conversely, as women feel less safe on campus, they are more likely to believe that others do not limit their activities from fear of assault. Thus, the safer one feels, the more willing one is to perceive others as being vulnerable to fear of victimization. However, once again the feeling of "unsafety" appears to be rather small, in the realm of "reasonably safe" as opposed to "very unsafe". Possibly, the safer one feels personally, the easier it is to feel others are at risk, particularly as this follows the reasoning of "it may happen to others; this won't happen to me".

Following a similar line of reasoning, it was hypothesized that "heavy" television viewers would feel at greater risk of victimization than "light" television viewers, and further that heavy television viewers would be more likely to engage in preventive behaviors as a result of this belief. Presumably, women who watch more television are exposed more often to the possibility (and reality) of assault, would identify more closely with similar "victims" on television and
would perceive themselves as more vulnerable to victimization than would women who watch very little television. No main effect for television viewing was found, and there was no interaction effect for television viewing and experience with assault concerning perceptions of safety on campus. There were no significant effects of heavy television viewing in any of the analyses. In fact, light television viewers seem to feel the least safe on campus. This seemingly contradictory finding may be due to an "unfamiliarity" with victimization on the part of light television viewers. It is possible that those women who watch more television may be accustomed to seeing violence and assault and feel it is a common occurrence. Alternately, heavy television viewers may view assault on television as "less real" and feel it is "only on t.v., not in real life", allowing them to feel less vulnerable, while light television viewers are more aware of the reality of potential victimization.

In looking at various demographic variables, only ethnic background and population of hometown showed significant results. Women of color were significantly different from caucasian women in their perceptions of the degree to which people have changed their activities as a result of fear of assault. Women of color believe that
people are more likely to change their behavior than do caucasian women. The percentage of women of color who have been assaulted is approximately the same as the percentage of women of color with no history of victimization in this sample. Thus it does not seem likely that a history of assault accounts for the perceived differences between women of color and caucasian women. Possibly women of color are more aware of the potential for victimization, although this cannot be ascertained in the present study.

In examining the variable population of hometown, it was found that women from a larger hometown are more likely to feel safer out alone at night on the University of Massachusetts campus than they feel out alone at night in their hometown. The larger the population of one's hometown, the greater the likelihood (and frequency) of assault. Thus, women from larger hometowns may be more used to or more aware of assault at home than they are at UMASS, particularly for those who come from hometowns significantly larger than the UMASS community.

In summary, the expected results of greater fear of victimization and participation in preventive behaviors for victims of personal and secondary assault were not found. It seems likely that this lack of
differences is a result of denial or "unrealistic optimism" on the part of the women in this study, both victims and non-victims alike. Although some differences were found between personal and secondary victims of assault, overall people in this study feel "reasonably safe" to "somewhat unsafe" on campus. The most often used preventive behavior is "not walking alone at night", closely followed by "being aware of (my) surroundings" and the practice of carrying keys in the hand as protection. Although the majority of women use these precautions, they do not feel that it is likely that they, or people they know, will be assaulted. Amount of television viewing also does not seem to have an effect on perceived risk of victimization or preventive behaviors.

Methodological Limitations

This study was only administered to one hundred and forty women. It is possible that a larger sample would show greater effects. In specific, only 15.7% (22) of the sample had some personal experience of victimization. A larger number of subjects with personal experience of assault would quite possibly give more significant results.
Further, all subjects were recruited through the Psychology Department subject pool. A more broad based subject pool would probably give a higher percentage of women who have been personally assaulted, as well as giving a more random selection of subjects. Psychology students who chose to participate in this study are a self-selected group and may differ from the population in general in their perceptions and beliefs. Although there was a fairly wide range of majors represented in this sample, one third of the sample are Psychology majors, which argues against this sample being a random selection of college students.

Perhaps most importantly, the survey instrument used for this study may not have been the most appropriate method of gathering the necessary data. Although this survey was based on the LEAA Census Board crime surveys, it is possible that an interview format would be better adapted to the purposes of this study. This survey may have been too "threatening" or overwhelming for women who have not thought extensively about the issue of potential victimization before. For those with personal or secondary experience of assault, the amount and depth of questions relating to specifics of their experience with assault may have had an effect on their responses, especially
considering that at least half of those women with personal experience of assault did not report the incident because it was a "private matter" or they "did not want anyone to know".

Implications for Future Research

Further research in this area is clearly indicated. Specifically, large, random samples of women would be beneficial in ascertaining further the effects of personal and secondary victimization. Also, a less threatening interview format is indicated, as a way of getting information in a more personal way, while allowing the interviewer to probe more closely into actual perceptions and beliefs. As surveys are, by nature, forced-choice instruments, a method that allowed for greater exploration would be helpful in differentiating beliefs, while avoiding a "response set" in subjects. Additionally, the literature and current findings on the impact of television viewing need more investigation, as it remains unclear what effect, if any, amount of television viewing has on perceived vulnerability and fear of assault. While the results of this study are not conclusive, the differences which did arise between degree of experience with assault and perceptions of risk deserve further exploration.
APPENDICES
Informed Consent

This study involves women's perceptions of their safety and their experiences with physical assault. The purpose of this study is to assess how safe women feel at this University and what methods they use to keep themselves safe. You will be asked to complete a questionnaire dealing with the issues of experiences with assault, perceptions of risk and types of preventive behaviors. You are free to withdraw consent at any time and you will still receive credit for your participation. All responses will be strictly anonymous and confidential. There will be an opportunity to ask any questions after the experiment.

I have read the above and agree to participate in this study.

Name

Date
Written Feedback

The purpose of this study is to assess how safe women feel at the University of Massachusetts and to discover what methods (if any) they use to keep themselves safe. Often women who have had some personal experience with physical assault engage in more "preventive behaviors" than do women with no experience of assault. These women also seem to feel more at risk for future experiences with assault than do those without any personal knowledge of assault.

This study was conducted to discover how safe women at this University perceive themselves to be, what their sense of "personal risk" is, and what behaviors women here engage in to feel safe on campus and in the dorms. It is expected that those women with personal experience of assault will be more likely to feel themselves at risk for future attack and will be more likely to take "preventive measures" while out alone on campus than those women without any personal experience with assault. If this is true, then there is an obvious implication for the need for more extensive "awareness campaigns" to alert women without personal experience of assault of ways in which they can make themselves more safe on campus, and better avoid the possibility of assault. The results of this study will be shared with Everywoman's Center, as a means of addressing the safety concerns of women on campus.

If you are interested in the results of this study, the findings will be available in writing at the end of the semester. Thank you for your participation.
This part of the questionnaire refers to experiences with assault/attack. Many people have not considered these issues this way before, and are not used to thinking about the possibility of assault. Please be as honest as possible in your responses. For the purposes of this questionnaire, assault/attack is defined as:

UNDESIRED, FORCIBLE PHYSICAL CONTACT, INCLUDING UNDESIRED SEXUAL CONTACT.

Please read each question carefully and check all responses that apply to you for each question.

Some people find thinking about these issues upsetting. If filling out this questionnaire is upsetting to you and you feel it might be helpful to talk to someone about your concerns, people who would be able to help are available in the following places:

Everywoman's Center 545-000 Rape Crisis, Counselor Advocate Program: 545-0883 Educator Advocate Program
University Health Services 549-2671
Student Mental Health 545-2337
Psychological Services Center 545-0041

1. Have you ever been assaulted/attacked?
   ____ Yes  ____ No
   If you answered NO to question #1, skip to question #10.

2. If you have been assaulted/attacked, how many times has this happened?
   ____ 1  ____ 2  ____ 3  ____ 4  ____ 5  ____ more than 5

3. When were you assaulted/attacked? (If more than once, indicate all incidents)
   # of occurrences
   ____ within the last year
   ____ longer than a year ago, within the last five years
   ____ longer than five years ago, within the last ten years
   ____ longer than ten years ago

4. At what age were you assaulted?
   ____ less than five years ago
   ____ five to ten years old
   ____ ten to fifteen years old
   ____ fifteen to twenty years ago
   ____ over twenty years old

5. Who were you assaulted/attacked by? (Check all that apply and circle the most recent incident)
   ____ a stranger
   ____ an acquaintance (someone you have met or know by sight)
   ____ a date (someone other than a steady boyfriend)
   ____ a person well-known by you (boyfriend; friend; teacher; boss; co-worker)
   ____ someone from your extended family (uncle; cousin;
step-parent; grandparent)
   ___ someone from your immediate family (father; mother; brother; husband)

6. Where were you assaulted/attacked? (Check all that apply and circle the most recent incident)
   ___ in your dorm
   ___ on campus at UMASS (not in your dorm)
   ___ in your home
   ___ in your hometown
   ___ other (please specify __________________________)

7. What was the nature of the attack? (Check all that apply and circle the most recent incident)
   ___ hit, beaten up
   ___ threatened with a deadly weapon
   ___ knifed or attacked with some other weapon
   ___ raped
   ___ sexually assaulted (other than rape)
   ___ other (please specify __________________________)

8. Have you told anyone at all about being assaulted? (Check all that apply)
   ___ RA
   ___ Crisis Hotline
   ___ Houseparent
   ___ Friend
   ___ Parent
   ___ Teacher
   ___ Counselor
   ___ Police
   ___ Other (please specify __________________________)

9. If you have been assaulted/attacked and did not report the incident to the police, what was (were) your reason(s)?
   (Check all that apply and circle the most important reason)
   ___ nothing could be done
   ___ lack of proof
   ___ did not want to take the time--too inconvenient
   ___ lack of sensitivity of police
   ___ prior history in working with police
   ___ police would not want to be bothered
   ___ private or personal matter -- did not want to report it
   ___ afraid of public embarrassment
   ___ family did not want it reported
   ___ did not want other people to know
   ___ did not want to get involved
   ___ afraid of reprisal
   ___ other reasons __________________________

10. If you were to be assaulted/attacked (in the future), to whom would you report the incident? (Check all that apply)
    ___ RA
    ___ Crisis Hotline
    ___ Houseparent
    ___ Friend
11. If you would not report the incident to the police, what would be your reason(s)? (Check all that apply)

- nothing could be done
- lack of proof
- did not want to take the time--too inconvenient
- lack of sensitivity of police
- prior history in working with police
- police would not want to be bothered
- family did not want it reported
- did not want other people to know
- other reasons

12. How safe do you feel being out alone in your home town compared to being out alone at UMASS DURING THE DAY?

- more safe in home town
- about the same
- less safe in home town

13. How safe do you feel being out alone in your home town compared to being out alone at UMASS DURING THE NIGHT?

- more safe in home town
- about the same
- less safe in home town

Note: On campus refers to anywhere on the UMASS Amherst campus except the immediate vicinity of your dorm (e.g. once you have moved the distance of a building away, you are out of the immediate vicinity of your dorm).

14. How safe do you feel being out alone on campus DURING THE DAY?

- Very safe
- Somewhat unsafe
- Reasonably safe
- Very unsafe

15. How safe do you feel being out alone on campus DURING THE NIGHT?

- Very safe
- Somewhat unsafe
- Reasonably safe
- Very unsafe

16. How safe do you feel being out alone in the vicinity of your dorm DURING THE DAY?

- Very safe
- Somewhat unsafe
- Reasonably safe
- Very unsafe

17. How safe do you feel being out alone in the vicinity of your dorm DURING THE NIGHT?

- Very safe
- Somewhat unsafe
- Reasonably safe
- Very unsafe

18. How safe do you feel inside your dorm DURING THE DAY?
19. How safe do you feel inside your dorm DURING THE NIGHT?

- Very safe
- Somewhat unsafe
- Reasonably safe
- Very unsafe

20. Has anyone you know well (such as a close friend or family member) ever been assaulted/attacked?

- Yes
- No

If No, skip to question #27.

If you know more than one person who has been assaulted/attacked please answer the following five questions about the person you feel closest to

21. If someone you know well has been assaulted/attacked, when were they assaulted? (If more than once, indicate all incidents)

- # of occurrences
  - within the last year
  - longer than a year ago, within the last five years
  - longer than five years ago, within the last ten years

22. Who was this person assaulted/attacked by? (Check all that apply and circle the most recent incident)

- a stranger
- an acquaintance (someone she has met or knows by sight)
- a date (someone other than a steady boyfriend)
- a person well-known by her (boyfriend; friend; teacher; boss; co-worker)
- someone from her extended family (uncle; cousin; step-parent; grandparent)
- someone from her immediate family (father; mother; brother; husband)

23. Where was this person assaulted/attacked? (Check all that apply and circle the most recent incident)

- in her dorm
- on campus at UMass (not in her dorm)
- in her home
- in her hometown
- other (please specify)

24. What was the nature of the attack? (Check all that apply and circle the most recent incident)

- hit, beaten up
- threatened with a deadly weapon
- knifed or attacked with some other weapon
- raped
- sexually assaulted (other than rape)
- other (please specify)

25. To whom was the assault reported? (If reported to anyone)

- RA
- Crisis Hotline
26. If the incident was not reported to the police, to the best of your knowledge, what was (were) her reason(s)? (Check all that apply and circle the most important reason)

- nothing could be done
- did not want to take the time -- too inconvenient
- lack of proof
- prior history in working with police
- police would not want to be bothered
- private or personal matter -- did not want to report it
- afraid of public embarrassment
- family did not want it reported
- did not want other people to know
- did not want to get involved
- afraid of reprisal
- other reasons

27. If you have a close friend or relative who was assaulted but not by a stranger, do you know anyone at all who was assaulted by a stranger?

- Yes  
- No

28. To what extent do you believe PEOPLE IN GENERAL have limited or changed their activities in the past few years because they are afraid of assault/attack?

- Very limited
- Not very limited
- Somewhat limited
- Not at all limited

29. To what extent do you believe MOST WOMEN ON THIS CAMPUS have limited or changed their activities in the past few years because they are afraid of assault/attack?

- Very limited
- Not very limited
- Somewhat limited
- Not at all limited

30. In general, have YOU limited or changed your activities in any way in the past few years because of the possibility of assault/attack?

- Yes  
- No

31. If YES, in what way have you limited or changed your activities?

- 

32. Do you believe that assaults committed on campus are committed by:

- people living here (on campus or in the Amherst community)
- outsiders (people from outside the Amherst area)
33. Do you believe that assaults in the vicinity of our dorm are committed by:
   ____ people living here (on campus or in the Amherst community)
   ____ outsiders (people from outside the Amherst area)
   ____ equally by people living here and outsiders
   ____ don't know
   ____ there are no assaults on campus

34. How safe do you feel women at UMass feel being out alone on campus DURING THE DAY?
   ____ Very safe  ____ Reasonably safe
   ____ Somewhat unsafe  ____ Very unsafe

35. How safe do you feel women at UMass feel being out alone on campus DURING THE NIGHT?
   ____ Very safe  ____ Reasonably safe
   ____ Somewhat unsafe  ____ Very unsafe

36. Out of a random 100 women on campus, how many do you think will be assaulted/attacked this semester?
   ____ 0-5  ____ 5-15  ____ 15-25  ____ 25-35  ____ 35-45  ____ 45-55  ____ more than 55

37. How many women in your dorm/apartment complex/neighborhood do you think will be assaulted/attacked this semester?
   ____ 0-5  ____ 5-15  ____ 15-25  ____ 25-35  ____ 35-45  ____ 45-55  ____ more than 55

38. What is the likelihood that YOU will be assaulted/attacked this semester?
   ____ Very likely  ____ Somewhat likely
   ____ Not very likely  ____ Not at all likely

39. With which of the following statements do you most agree?
   ____ My chances of being assaulted/attacked have gone up in the past few years
   ____ My chances of being assaulted/attacked have gone down in the past few years
   ____ My chances of being assaulted/attacked have not changed in the past few years

40. With which of the following statements do you most agree?
   ____ the frequency of assault/attack is less serious than the local newspapers report
   ____ the frequency of assault/attack is more serious than the local newspapers report
   ____ the frequency of assault/attack is as serious as the local newspapers report

41. Are there any particular behaviors that you use when on campus DURING THE DAY? (Check all that apply)
   ____ I call home ahead
   ____ I call an escort
I note call boxes, am aware of their location
I try not to walk alone
I am aware of my surroundings and other people near me
I carry a "rape whistle"
I carry mace
I carry keys (or similar item) in my hand as protection
other precaution
___ I take no particular precautions

42. Are there any particular behaviors that you use when on campus DURING THE NIGHT? (Check all that apply)
___ I call home ahead
___ I call an escort
___ I note call boxes, am aware of their location
___ I try not to walk alone
___ I am aware of my surroundings and other people near me
___ I carry a "rape whistle"
___ I carry mace
___ I carry keys (or similar item) in my hand as protection
___ other precaution
___ I take no particular precautions

43. Are there any particular behaviors that you use DURING THE DAY in the vicinity of your dorm? (Check all that apply)
___ I call home ahead
___ I call an escort
___ I note call boxes, am aware of their location
___ I try not to walk alone
___ I am aware of my surroundings and other people near me
___ I carry a "rape whistle"
___ I carry mace
___ I carry keys (or similar item) in my hand as protection
___ other precaution
___ I take no particular precautions

44. Are there any particular behaviors that you use DURING THE NIGHT in the vicinity of your dorm? (Check all that apply)
___ I call home ahead
___ I call an escort
___ I note call boxes, am aware of their location
___ I try not to walk alone
___ I am aware of my surroundings and other people near me
___ I carry a "rape whistle"
___ I carry mace
___ I carry keys (or similar item) in my hand as protection
___ other precaution
___ I take no particular precautions

45. Have you taken any other special precautions to protect yourself?
___ weight lifting
___ assertion training
___ self-defense course
___ other
___
46. If you DO NOT take any special precautions/behaviors, what is (are) your reason(s)? *(Check all that apply)*
   ___ It is not necessary, my dorm is safe
   ___ It is not necessary, the campus is safe
   ___ I never thought about it before
   ___ I feel that I can take care of myself
   ___ There is nothing I can really do to protect myself; if
   something happens, it happens
   ___ There is no possibility of assault/attack at UMASS
   ___ There is no possibility of assault/attack in my dorm/
   apartment complex/neighborhood
   ___ I don't expect that I would be assaulted/attacked
   ___ other (please specify)________________________

47. What is your birth date? __________

48. What is your race? ___ Caucasian ___ Black ___ Asian
   ___ Hispanic ___ Native American ___ Other

49. Where do you live at UMASS? Please be specific and name
dorm area __________________________

50. Do you live ___ alone ___ with one other ___ with two or
    more others

51. Where did you spend most of your time growing up?
   _______ City or Town _________ State

52. How big is the population of your hometown?
   ___ less than 5,000 ___ 5,000-20,000 ___ 20,000-50,000
   ___ 50,000-100,000 ___ 100,000-500,000
   ___ 500,000-million ___ more than a million

53. What is the average yearly income of your family?
   ___ under 10,000 ___ 10,000-19,999 ___ 20,000-29,999
   ___ 30,000-39,999 ___ 40,000-49,999 ___ over 50,000

54. How many hours of television do you watch per day?
   ___ 0-1 ___ 1-2 ___ 2-3 ___ 3-4 ___ 4-5
   ___ 5-6 ___ more than 6

55. What types of television shows do you watch?
   ___ soaps ___ sit coms ___ news ___ crime dramas
   ___ sports ___ movies ___ other ______________________

56. How many hours of television do you watch per week?
   ___ 0-2 ___ 2-4 ___ 4-6 ___ 6-8 ___ 8-10
   ___ 10-12 ___ 12-14 ___ more than 14

57. Year in school? ______________________

58. What is your major? ______________________


Hills, CA., Sage.


