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Does the Stigma of Hooking Up Predict Sexual Assault at College?

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between the stigma of hooking up and reported sexual assault. Guided by Goffman’s (1963) social stigma theory and Gagnon and Simon’s (1973) sexual script theory, I propose that 1) the more strongly the respondent agrees he or she would disrespect women who hook up frequently, the fewer times he or she reports nonconsensual sex; 2) the more strongly the respondent agrees he or she would disrespect for men who hook up frequently, the fewer times he or she reports nonconsensual sex; and 3) the more strongly the respondent agrees he or she would be less interested in someone who hooks up frequently as a boyfriend/girlfriend, the fewer times he or she reports nonconsensual sex. Using the Online College Social Life Survey data collected between 2005 and 2011, I analyze the attitudes about and reports of sexual behaviors in a non-probability sample of 16,914 students at 21 U.S. colleges and universities. Controlling for sex, age, current religion preference, and Greek affiliation, disrespect towards women who hook up frequently is positively and significantly related to fewer reports of nonconsensual sex. However, the results do not support the second and third hypotheses as there is no statistically significant relationship between disrespect towards men who hook up frequently as well as the lack of interest in people who hook up frequently and the incidents of reported nonconsensual sex. The findings suggest that the efforts to reduce the stigma of hooking up should be taken into consideration in rape prevention programming.
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Does the Stigma of Hooking Up Predict Sexual Assault at College?

The definition and representation of sexuality has undergone major changes in the past few decades in Western society. Today, young people have a wide variety of ways to express their sexuality and one of the most prevalent examples would be the causal relationship, or hookup. As hookups becomes a normative part of the college culture, is the traditional heterosexual script still applicable in this new form of relationship? Considering that sexual activities within traditional committed relationships are seldom stigmatized, this study’s focus is whether there is stigma associated with casual sexual behaviors and how the stigma affects the ways college students perceive themselves when engaging in hookup.

In addition to being associated with stigma, hookup is one of the risk factors of sexual assault (Walker, Messman-Morre, and Ward 2011). Studies (Littleton et al. 2009; Reling et al. 2018) have shown that the rates of sexual violence, especially sexual assault on college campuses, remain relatively high in recent years. There are numerous existing literatures about sexual assault and its risk factors (Flack et al. 2007; Krebs et al. 2009; Littleton et al. 2009; Lovejoy 2015; Murnen and Kohlman 2007; Sanday 1996; Walker, Messman-Morre, and Ward 2011); but only a few focus on the attitudes towards causal relationship and their predictors. For example, Allison and Risman (2013) studied attitudes towards casual sex affected by individual characteristics, including age, religion, sexual orientation, race, and mother’s education. England and Bearak (2014) explored the gender difference in attitudes towards casual sex. No prior research concentrates on the connection between sexual assault and attitudes towards casual sex. This study aims to add to the current literature by examining the role of perception of casual sex on reported rate of sexual assault.
In this study, the conceptualization of sexual assault contains verbal coercion, incapacitated sex, and attempted rape. Verbal coercion is the psychological pressure that leads to unwanted sex. Incapacitated sex occurs when victims are drunk or drugged and unable to resist effectively. Attempted rape should be taken into account; some might argue that the act of rape is not completed, yet the psychological outcome victims suffer is similar to those who suffer from verbal coercion and incapacitated sex. The stigma of hookup is measured by how college students view other students who hook up a lot. Social stigma theory (Goffman 1963) and sexual scripting theory (Gagnon and Simon 1973) serve as the theoretical tools in this analysis. I hypothesize that the more strongly the respondent agrees that he or she has less respect for women who hook up “a lot”, the fewer times he or she reports verbal coercion, incapacitated sex, or attempted rape. In order to see whether the stigma attached to hooking up is gendered, the second hypothesis is that the more strongly the respondent agrees that he or she has less respect for men who hook up “a lot”, the fewer times he or she reports verbal coercion, incapacitated sex, or attempted rape. People who hook up “a lot” can also be negatively perceived as less desirable potential dating partners. Such perception stigmatizes hooking up and reinforces the rape script. Thus, the third hypothesis is that the more strongly the respondent agrees that he or she has less interest in someone who hooks up “a lot” as a boy/girlfriend, the fewer times he or she reports verbal coercion, incapacitated sex, or attempted rape.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Social Stigma Theory

Erving Goffman's social stigma theory (1963) argues that stigma is “the situation of the individual who is disqualified from full social acceptance”. Stigma is the quality of individuals which is considered undesirable, and is thus rejected by society. The stigma attached to
heterosexual hookup are perceived in many forms, such as sexual health problem, bad sexual reputation (slut shaming), etc. People are divided into three categories in relation to stigma: the stigmatized, the normals, and the wise. The stigmatized are those who carry the stigma. The normals are those who do not carry the stigma. The wise are those who are among the normal, but “treat the stigma as a neutral matter to be looked as in a direct, off-hand way” (Goffman 1963: 31). The wise usually have some understanding of the situation of the stigmatized.

Stigma also represents the special relationship between individuals and society. On one hand, the recognition of stigma in the society reinforces the preexisting social norms. On the other hand, the stigmatized have some knowledge about what others in the society think about them and they internalize the social norms to which they fail to conform, and reshapes their social identities; the normal gain self-esteem and sense of control by stigmatizing others.

*Sexual Script Theory*

Sexual script acts as a guidance for certain social roles of the individuals involved and the plot of events in the sexual situation (Gagnon and Simon 1973). The practices of sexual behaviors and interactions are learned in society (Monto and Carey 2014). Sexual scripting theory asserts that the sexual behaviors in a heterosexual relationship tend to follow a certain social script (England and Bearak 2014; Rudman et al. 2017; Sanchez, Fetterolf and Ruman 2012). In a traditional sexual script, men are expected to be dominating and controlling in sexual interactions while women are expected to be more submissive and prioritize men's pleasure above their own (Flack et al. 2007; Armstrong et al. 2010; Wright, Norton, and Matushek 2010; Lovejoy 2015). The endorsement of heterosexual sexual script reinforces sexual hegemony by normalizing male sexual aggression and undermining female sexual agency (Wright et al. 2014). In addition, sexual scripts affect how individuals understand unwanted sexual experiences.
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(Littleton et al. 2009). If the students are concerned about social stigma associated with causal relationship, they may avoid reporting sexual assault even when they encounter one. The students who internalize the stigma of hookup, in this case, endorse the rape scripts, and give little thought to the outcome of sexual assault.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Informed by social stigma theory and sexual script theory, the goal of the study is to understand the connection between stigma of hooking up and sexual assault. Various literatures emphasize the increasing reported rate of sexual assault and investigate different risk factors of sexual assault (Allison and Risman 2013; Kratzer 2016; Murnen and Kolman 2007; Rudman et al. 2017). Additionally, other studies focus on hookup culture and the stigma associated with hooking up (England and Bearak 2014; Hamilton and Armstrong 2009; Kratzer and Aubrey 2015; Rudman et al. 2017). In this following section, the respective themes of sexual assault and hookup culture and sexual double standard bridges the two of them will be discussed.

Sexual Assault

Sexual assault refers to nonconsensual sexual experiences. Unwanted sexual experience on college campuses becomes a common problem for both men and women, and such issues raised the attention of the academics and administration (Murnen and Kolman 2007; Allison and Risman 2013; Kratzer 2016; Rudman et al. 2017). However, much literature addresses the fact that women are more likely to experience unwanted sex than men (Flack et al. 2007; Rudman et al. 2017). 23 percent of women compared to 7 percent of men reported at least one time of unwanted sexual intercourse (Flack et al. 2007). Women fear rape more than any crime, and fear of rape constrains women in various social aspects, such as types of social activities, accommodations, clothing style, and daily commute (Pryor and Hughes 2013). When rape
victims report but do not gain sufficient support from legal services, police, clergy, health care providers, they may suffer in post-rape trauma (Suarez and Gadalla 2010).

A couple of accounts may contribute to the unreported cases of sexual assault. First, victims are less likely to report the assault when they consume alcohol or drug during the time of the assault (Wolitzky-Taylor et al. 2011). College students, especially first year students, who consume substances are underage and they are worried about being punished by authorities or the school if they report the assault. Second, victims are less likely to report if they show little trust in the legal system or the authority (Pryor and Hughes 2013). Third, victims are afraid of potential retaliation by the predators.

Risk Factors of Sexual Assault

Sexual assault usually occurs in fraternities and sororities which are the major suppliers of alcohol and drug for underage students (Flack et al. 2007; Murnen and Kolman 2007; Kalish 2013). Fraternity members have a stronger belief in male dominance (Flack et al. 2007), and are more likely to report attitudes associated with sexual aggression (Murnen and Kolman 2007). Another risk factor of sexual assault is substance use such as alcohol and drugs. Murnen and Kolman (2007) indicated that the fueling factor of substance use on sexual assault may result in male’s sexual aggression. In addition, substance use increases women’s vulnerability in risky sexual situations (Flack et al. 2007; Krebs et al. 2009; Littleton et al. 2009). Last but not least, Cranney (2015:3136) notes that first year students, especially female first year students, are at a higher risks of sexual assault because of “their lack of informal knowledge regarding tacit rules for avoiding sexual assault.” Using a large sample size ($N = 16,000$) of Online College Social Survey, the author finds that first year students are vulnerable in sexual victimization in a party context rather than in a non-party context and there is no statistically significant relationship
between being a sophomore student and sexual victimization. Therefore, one can assume that as the students get older, they are at lower risks of sexual assault.

**Hookup Culture**

Hookups appear to gain growing normative acceptance on college campus (Lambert, Kahn, and Apple 2001; Kratzer and Aubrey 2015). Though the definition of hookup is ambiguous, the key features are freedom from commitment, spontaneity, and flexibility (Kratzer and Aubrey 2015). Hookup fulfils the need for students’ sexual expression and not as much cost of efforts and time invested in dating or romantic relationships. Bradshaw, Kahn and Saville (2010) argue that hook up is a more egalitarian relationship than traditional dating. They find that “60 percent of college students believed that either a man or a woman could initiate a hook up” (p.663). However, Bradshaw, Kahn and Saville (2010) point out that female students’ benefits more from dating than hooking up and men benefit more from hooking up than dating. Though hookup allows women to express their sexuality more freely compared to their last generation, they still face sexual double standard in hookup scene.

**Sexual Double Standard**

As discussed in the section of theoretical framework, traditional heterosexual script and gender norms, also known as double standards for sexual interaction, encourage men to actively seek sexual partners, thus sexual hunt is deemed socially desirable. While women are labelled as “sluts” if they have similar sexual histories (Hamilton and Armstrong 2009; Kratzer and Aubrey 2015). The risk of the “sluts” stigma confines women's sexual decision and behaviors (Hamilton and Armstrong 2009). In the interviews Hamilton and Armstrong (2009) conduct, some complain that “they would make out with more guys but did not because ‘I don’t want to be a
slut.” Hamilton and Armstrong (2009) also suggest that women did not feel respect from men in casual relationship as men endorsed the traditional sexual script.

A numbers of studies (England and Bearak 2014; Hamilton and Armstrong 2009; Kratzer and Aubrey 2015; Rudman et al. 2017) indicate that the traditional double standard is still relevant on college campus. Moreover, the different rule for sororities and fraternities also reflect the sexual double standard on college campus. That sororities are forbidden from hosting parties and overnight male guests reveals appropriate feminine behaviors (Hamilton and Armstrong 2009). By contrast, fraternity is usually attached to “hyper masculinity,” the toxic belief that violence is a symbol of masculinity, and men by nature are aggressive in sexual relationship (Murnen and Kolman 2007).

Contradictory to majority of studies, Allison and Risman (2013) find that double standard has been replaced by an egalitarian standard in which men and women are judged equally for involving in similar sexual behaviors and some students even endorse reversing the sexual double standard to judge men more harshly than women.

This research may provide evidence supporting one side or the other on this debate about whether the double standard persists in hookup culture. Moreover, drawing from the literatures and theories, controlling for sex, age, religion, and Greek life, this study examines whether the stigma rooted in the traditional sexual script influences how college students define their nonconsensual experience.

METHODS

Data

I analyze the Online College Social Life Survey (OCSLS), a survey collected online from 2005 to 2011 at 21 four-year colleges and universities in the United States, and investigate the
connection between stigmatization of hookup and sexual assault. The survey asked men and women a series of questions about experiences and attitudes in the context of dating, hooking up, and relationship (England 2005). The survey took place in an introductory class in sociology, though only 10.8 percent of the respondents reported majoring in sociology. The students got credits by taking the survey or they had the option of an alternate assignment; most students elected to complete the survey, leading to a 99 percent to 100 percent response rate in most classes (Armstrong, England, and Fogarty 2012). However, the sample is not randomly selected and unable to generalize in other groups of people who did not take the survey. Allison and Risman (2013) argue that due to its large sample size and variety of colleges, it captures a diverse cross-section of U.S. student population. In the sample, the unit of analysis is college students. The population is the students from these 21 four-year colleges and universities who took the survey in sociology class (N=24,131). For this analysis, I use a subset of students whose age ranges from 18 to 22 years old, which is the traditional age-range for undergraduate students. I exclude the respondents who identified as gay, bisexual, unsure, and did not answer the question of sexual orientation since my analysis concerns heterosexual respondents. I also exclude respondents who did not answer all the questions asked for the variables. After eliminating all the missing cases, the sample size is 16,914. For further information on how the data were collected, see http://www.nyu.edu/projects/england/ocsls/codebook/.

Variables

To examine the first and second hypothesis, I present my independent variables with two attitudinal items: “If women hook up or have sex with lots of people, I respect them less” (Disrespect women) and “If men hook up or have sex with lots of people, I respect them less” (Disrespect men). To examine the third hypothesis, my third independent variable is measured
by asking respondents’ attitudes on following statement, “If someone has hooked up a lot, I'm less interested in this person as a potential girl/boyfriend” (Less interest). The respondents can choose from strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree in these three questions. The answers are coded as 1 for strongly disagree, 2 for disagree, 3 for agree, 4 for strongly agree.

As for dependent variable, I conduct a sexual assault index by adding up three sexual items; verbal coercion (“Since you started college, have you had sexual intercourse that you did not want because someone verbally pressured you?”), incapacitated sex (“Since you started college, has someone had sexual intercourse with you that you did not want when you were drunk, passed out, asleep, drugged, or otherwise incapacitated?”), and attempted rape (“Since you started college, has someone tried to physically force you to have sexual intercourse, but you got out of the situation without having intercourse?”). The response options in these three questions included no (0), once (1), and more than once (2). Each are given the values scale from 0 to 2; by adding the three questions in sexual assault, the scores range from 0 to 6. Though the three variables score relatively low in Cronbach's reliability test ($\alpha < 0.5$), this index is still valid considering that it measures the numbers of times respondents encountered different types of nonconsensual sex experiences.

Guided by previous research on the predictors of sexual assault, control variables include respondents’ sex, age, religion (Atheist and Roman Catholic), and Greek life. The answers for sex is binary and I coded men as 1 and women as 0. The age ranges from 18 to 22 years old which represents traditional age for undergraduate college students. The question for religion is stated as “What is your current religion preference”. The answers categories include Buddhist, Catholic, Evangelical, Hindu, Jewish, Mormon, Muslim, Protestant, None, and Other. I created two dummy variables for religion: Atheist (None) and Roman Catholic (Catholic) as they are two
of the largest groups. Atheist (None) is coded as 1 and other groups are coded as theist; Roman Catholic (Catholic) is coded as 1 and other groups are coded as non- Roman Catholic. The question for Greek life asked, “Are you in a fraternity or sorority?” The answers are yes (1) or no (0).

FINDINGS

Univariate Results

According to Table 1, the mean and median of the independent variable s disrespect towards women who hook up frequently and disrespect towards men who hook up frequently are both 3. The standard deviations for disrespect towards women and men who hook up a lot are similar (.834 and .853, respectively), meaning that approximately three fourth of the respondents are likely to answer between “disagree” and “strongly agree” in the questions of to what degree they disrespect (wo) men who hook up a lot; thus, people agree, on the average, that they have less respect for men and women who hook up frequently and have less interest in someone who hook up frequently as a boyfriend/girlfriend.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of the independent variables disrespect towards women who hook up frequently and disrespect towards men who hook up frequently. Both frequency distributions are skewed to the left. However, higher percentage (46 percent) of respondents agree to disrespect women who hook up frequently than to disrespect men who hook up frequently (42.9 percent) while higher percentage (20.6 percent) strongly agree to disrespect men who hook up frequently.
Table 1 also suggests the mean of the independent variable less interest in people who hook up frequently as potential boyfriend or girlfriend is 3. The standard deviation for this measure is .792, meaning that approximately three fourth of the respondents fall between the category of “disagree” and “strongly agree” in the question of to what degree they have less interest in people who hook up frequently as boyfriend or girlfriend.

In figure 2, the frequency distribution is skewed to the left. Most respondents (47.3 percent) agree to have less interest in people as potential boyfriend or girlfriend.

Table 1 shows the means of the verbal coercion, incapacitated sex, and attempted rape are .08, .08, and .14, respectively. The low means indicate that these cases are rare. The mean of the dependent variable nonconsensual sex index is .3. The standard deviation of verbal coercion, incapacitated sex, and attempted rape are .339, .319, and .422, respectively, meaning that most respondents report zero case in these three forms of nonconsensual sex. The median of verbal coercion, incapacitated sex, attempted rape, and nonconsensual sex is zero. The mean of dependent variable nonconsensual sex is .3; and its standard deviation is .751, meaning that most respondents report zero to at least one incident of nonconsensual sex.

Figure 3 suggests that 18 percent of the respondents report that they encounter at least one incident of nonconsensual sex. Figure 4 further explains that among the reported nonconsensual sex, percentage of answering “once” (8 percent) and “more than once” (3 percent) in the item of reported attempted rape is higher than the two other items of reported nonconsensual sex: “once” (5 percent) and “more than once” (1 percent) in incapacitated sex; “once” (4 percent) and “more than once” (2 percent) in verbal coercion.
Table 1 shows the mean of the control variable, sex (men) is .3, meaning that 30 percent of the respondents are men. The standard deviation of men is .5. Figure 5 shows the distribution of the control variable, respondent’s sex.

Table 1 shows the mean of the respondent’s age is 20 years old. The standard deviation of age is 1.276, meaning that approximately four fifth of the respondents are between the age of 18 to the age of 21. Figure 6 shows the distribution of the control variable, respondent’s age. The distribution is slightly skewed to the right and most respondents (29.3 percent) are in the age of 19.

Table 1 shows the mean of the Atheist and Roman Catholic is 0.37 and 0.28, respectively, meaning that 37 percent of respondents are Atheist and 28 percent of respondents are Roman Catholic. The standard deviation of Atheist is .482 and standard deviation of Roman Catholic is .449. Figure 7 shows the distribution of the control variable, respondent’s current religion preference. Respondents who answer “no” in the question of current religion is the largest group in the sample (36.8 percent); the second highest group is the respondents who answer “Catholic” (27.9 percent); the third highest group is the respondents who answer “Other” (13.6 percent).

Table 1 shows the mean of respondent’s Greek Life is .13, meaning that 13 percent of the respondents has a Greek affiliation. Figure 8 shows the distribution of respondent’s Greek life. The standard deviation of Greek Life is .341.
Bivariate Results

Table 2 shows the correlations between all variables. There is no evidence of multicollinearity because none of the correlations is greater than 0.7. Only statistically significant correlations at the p < .001 level are discussed here.

In the first row of the table, there is a very weak negative relationship between disrespect women and nonconsensual sex, meaning that the more strongly the respondent agrees to disrespect for women who hook up frequently, the fewer times he or she reports nonconsensual sex ($r = -.068^*$). There is a very weak negative relationship between less interest and nonconsensual sex, meaning that the more strongly the respondent agrees to be less interested in someone who hooks up frequently as boyfriends/girlfriends, the fewer times he or she reports nonconsensual sex ($r = -.043^*$). There is a very weak positive relationship between men and nonconsensual sex, meaning that on the average, men report fewer incidents of nonconsensual sex ($r = -.105^*$). There is a very weak positive relationship between age and nonconsensual sex, meaning that an increase in respondent's age is linked to an increase in incidents of reporting nonconsensual sex ($r = .110^*$). There is a very weak positive relationship between Greek Life and nonconsensual sex, meaning that respondents who participate in Greek life, on the average, report more incidents of nonconsensual sex ($r = .063^*$).

For the correlations among all independent variables, there is a moderate positive relationship between disrespect men and disrespect women, meaning that the more strongly the respondent agrees to disrespect for women who hook up frequently, they also agree more strongly to disrespect men who hook up frequently ($r = .479^*$). There is a weak to moderate positive relationship between less interest and disrespect women, meaning that when respondents
agree to have less interest in people who hook up frequently as boyfriends or girlfriends, they are more likely to agree to disrespect women who hook up frequently \((r = .418*)\). There is a weak to moderate positive relationship between less interest and disrespect men, meaning that more strongly the respondent agrees to be less interested in someone who hooks up frequently as boyfriends/girlfriends, they also agree more strongly to disrespect men who hook up frequently \((r = .440*)\).

For the correlations between independent variables and control variables, there is a very weak positive relationship between men and disrespect women, meaning that on the average, men are more likely to agree to disrespect women who hook up frequently \((r = -.105*)\). There is a weak negative relationship between men and disrespect men \((r = -.311*)\), between men and less interest \((r = -.024*)\), meaning that on the average, men are less likely to disrespect men who hook up frequently and agree to have less interest in people who hook up frequently as boyfriends or girlfriends. There is a very weak negative relationship between age and disrespect women \((r = -.105*)\), between age and disrespect men \((r = -.064*)\), between age and less interest \((r = -.033*)\), meaning that as respondents get one year older, the less strongly they agree that they would disrespect women and men who hook up frequently, and have less interest in people who hook up frequently as boyfriends or girlfriends. There is a very weak negative relationship between Atheist and disrespect women \((r = -.141*)\), between Atheist and disrespect men \((r = -.110*)\), between Atheist and less interest \((r = -.096*)\), meaning that on the average, Atheist is less likely to agree to disrespect women and men who hook up frequently, and agree to have less interest in people who hook up frequently as boyfriends or girlfriends. There is a very weak positive relationship between Roman Catholic and disrespect women \((r = .071*)\), between Roman Catholic and disrespect men \((r = .033*)\), between Roman Catholic and less interest \((r = .063*)\).
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= .064*), meaning that on the average, Roman Catholic is more likely to agree to disrespect women and men who hook up frequently, and agree to have less interest in in people who hook up frequently as boyfriends or girlfriends.

For the correlations among control variables, there is a very weak positive relationship between men and age, meaning that if respondents are older in age, they are more likely to be men ($r = .045*$). There is a very weak positive relationship between Atheist and men, meaning that if respondents are Atheist, they are more likely to be men ($r = .042*$). There is a very weak positive relationship between Roman Catholic and age, meaning that if respondents are Roman Catholic, they are more likely to be older ($r = .031*$). There is a moderate negative relationship between Roman Catholic and Atheist, meaning that if respondents are Roman Catholic, they are not Atheist ($r = -.475*$).

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Multivariate Results

According to Table 3, 3.1 percent of variance in numbers of nonconsensual sexual experiences reported can be explained by the variability in all other variables. The regression equation is statistically significant at the $p < .001$ level. After controlling for all other variables, disrespect towards women who hook up frequently is negatively and significantly related to nonconsensual sex, meaning that the more strongly the respondent agrees to that he or she would disrespect women who hook up frequently, the fewer times he or she reports nonconsensual sex; for every additional point on the four-point-scale measuring disrespect for women who hook up frequently, the respondents report approximate .029 fewer incidents of nonconsensual sex. After controlling for all other variables, sex (men) is negatively and significantly related to nonconsensual sex, meaning that on the average, men report fewer incidents of nonconsensual
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sex; on the average, men report approximate .187 fewer incidents of nonconsensual sex. After controlling for all other variables, age is positively and significantly related to nonconsensual sex, meaning that an increase in respondent’s age is linked to an increase in incidents of nonconsensual sex; for every additional year in age, respondents report approximate .063 more incidents of nonconsensual sex. After controlling for all other variables, Greek life is positively and significantly related to nonconsensual sex, meaning that respondents who participate in Greek life, on the average, report more incidents of nonconsensual sex; on the average, respondents who participate in Greek Life report approximate .132 more incidents of nonconsensual sex. Controlling for all other variables, sex (men) is the largest predictor of nonconsensual sex among all variables because its standardized coefficient is the highest ($\beta = -.114$); the second largest predictor is age ($\beta = .107$).

DISCUSSION

The bivariate results support the first and third hypotheses, but the multivariate results reject the second and third hypotheses as there is no statistically significant relationship between disrespect towards men who hook up frequently as well as the lack of interest in people who hook up frequently and the incidents of reported nonconsensual sex. The statistically insignificant relationships imply that stigma of hooking up does not apply to men which is consistent with previous findings as sexual double standard based on sexism continues to affect women disproportionately as compared to men (England and Bearak 2014; Hamilton and Armstrong 2009; Kratzer and Aubrey 2015; Rudman et al. 2017).

The bivariate results also suggest that men, on the average, agree more strongly to disrespect women who hook up frequently, but disagree more strongly to disrespect men who
hook up frequently and to have less interest in someone who hook up a lot as a boyfriend/girlfriend. The findings confirm Gagnon and Simon’s social script theory (1973) as men tend to believe in heterosexual script and stigmatize women who hook up a lot, suggesting that double standard is an ideology endorsed by men, rather than women.

According to the bivariate and multivariate results, the confirmed first hypothesis, the more strongly respondent agrees that he or she would disrespect women who hook up frequently, the fewer incidents of nonconsensual sex he or she would report, reveals that stigma of hooking up remains to be primarily associated with women. Such findings support the Goffman’s social stigma theory (1963) because women prefer not to report nonconsensual sex in order to avoid the anticipated stigma, which mostly invoked by men, such as public humiliation. While men do not bear the stigma of hooking up and feel more comfortable in engaging in hooking up behaviors which is consistent with previous findings (Bradshaw et al. 2010).

Moreover, the finding of men, on the average, report fewer incidents of nonconsensual sex is consistent with prior findings that women are more vulnerable than men in sexual victimization (Flack et al. 2007; Rudman et al. 2017). However, according to Goffman’s social stigma theory (1963), stigma of not being “masculine” enough may prevent male victims from reporting nonconsensual sex.

Age and reported incidents of nonconsensual sex is significantly and positively correlated. It is partially contradictory to previous finding that higher year of schooling is related to lower risk of sexual victimization (Cranney 2015) because the age cannot be a precise determinant of current school year. Some first year students could be older than sophomore or junior students due to personal reasons, such as taking a gap year, joining the army, etc.
Greek life and reported incidents of nonconsensual sex is significantly and positively correlated. It is consistent with the previous studies is that the involvement of Greek life puts the students at higher risks of experiencing nonconsensual sex since fraternities provide substances for first year students and fraternity members are usually related to male sexual aggression and “hyper masculinity” (Flack et al. 2007; Murnen and Kolman 2007; Kalish 2013).

CONCLUSION

The study seeks to understand the relationship between the stigma of hooking up and reported sexual assault. Using a sample of 16,914 respondents from the 2005-2011 OCSLS, first, I hypothesize that the more strongly the respondent agrees he or she would disrespect women who hook up frequently, the fewer times he or she reports nonconsensual sex. Second, I predict that the more strongly the respondent agrees he or she would disrespect for men who hook up frequently, the fewer times he or she reports nonconsensual sex. Third, I propose that the more strongly the respondent agrees he or she would be less interested in someone who hooks up frequently as a boyfriend/girlfriend, the fewer times he or she reports nonconsensual sex. Controlling for sex, age, current religion preference, and Greek affiliation, the first hypothesis is confirmed by data. Multivariate results show that disrespect towards women who hook up frequently is positively and significantly related to fewer times of reported nonconsensual sex. The findings present general support for Goffman’s social stigma theory (1963) and Gagnon and Simon’s social script theory (1973) that the fear of expected stigma of hookup may prevent college students from reporting nonconsensual sex and the endorsement of traditional sexual script minimizes the understanding of nonconsensual sex.

Limitations, Future Research, and Policy Implications
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The findings are limited by the use of non-random sampling method and cannot be generalizable to a larger population. Thus, a random sampling technique can be used for future research.

Nevertheless, the dataset used in this study is from 2005 to 2011 and the results may not reflect accurately the recent change in ideology and discourse of gender norms and sexual assault since the emergence of Metoo Movement. Future studies should use a more recent sample to better present the change of climate in gender and sexuality.

In addition, more control variables could have examined in the research, considering the variables in this study only contribute to 3.1 percent of variance in numbers of nonconsensual sexual experience reported. A possibility for future research is to control for race, region, and substance use (Cranney 2015; Flack et al. 2007; Kalish 2013; Krebs et al. 2009; Littleton et al. 2009).

The study is primarily based on a heteronormative framework; whether these dynamics will play out amongst people outside of this framework is unknown. Therefore, future research can test the findings with a focus on LGBTQ groups. The definitions and experiences of hooking up and nonconsensual sex differs in groups with different educational level, and people from other countries, future research can test the results with a more diverse sample.

As the findings suggest that stigma of hooking up is a key predictor of reported sexual assault, they can influence college and universities when assessing and reducing sexual victimization in rape prevention and intervention programming. More specifically, the results encourage the schools to educate students with greater commitment to reduce stigma. For example, the schools can provide programs including sexual education and open discussion regarding to broader understanding of hookup culture and sexual assault.
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Table 1. Means, Medians, and Standard Deviations for Variables (N= 16,914)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect women</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect men</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less interest</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressured</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incapacitated</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted rape</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconsensual sex</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Life</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Correlations ($r$) between Nonconsensual Sex and Eight Variables (listwise deletion, two-tailed test, $N = 16,914$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Disrespect women</th>
<th>Disrespect men</th>
<th>Less interest</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Atheist</th>
<th>Roman Catholic</th>
<th>Greek Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonconsensual sex</td>
<td>-.068*</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.043*</td>
<td>-.105*</td>
<td>.110*</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.063*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect women</td>
<td>.479*</td>
<td>.418*</td>
<td>.059*</td>
<td>-.105*</td>
<td>-.141*</td>
<td>.071*</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect men</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.311*</td>
<td>-.064*</td>
<td>-.110*</td>
<td>.033*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.024*</td>
<td>-.033*</td>
<td>-.096*</td>
<td>.064*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.045*</td>
<td>.042*</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.031*</td>
<td>.049*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.475*</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001
### Table 3. Regression of Nonconsensual Sex on All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect women</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect men</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less interest</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>-.187</td>
<td>-.114*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.107*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Life</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.060*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = .031; F(8, 16905) = 67.652; p < .001 \)

*\( p < .001 \)
"If a woman/man hooks up a lot, I respect her/him less."

Figure 1. Bar Graph of How Respondent Perceives (Wo)men Who Hook Up A Lot
Figure 2. Bar Graph of How Respondent Perceives People Who Hook Up A Lot in Dating Context.
Figure 3. Bar Graph of Cases of Nonconsensual Sex Reported
Figure 4. Bar graph of Respondent Who Answered Once and More Than Once in the Question of Incapacitated Sex, Pressured Sex, and Attempted Rape
Figure 5. Bar Graph of Respondent’s Sex
Figure 6. Histogram of Respondent’s Age
Figure 7. Bar Graph of Respondent’s Religion Preference
Figure 8. Bar Graph of Respondent’s Greek Affiliation