YOUR EXPERIENCE ON YOUR TERMS:

A survivor-based analysis of the impact caused by the miscommunication surrounding sexual

violence on college campuses

by

Lea Marie Vedovelli

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
In partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Auburn, Alabama
May 7, 2022

Keywords: Social Support Theory, Communication Privacy Management Theory, Sexual
Assault, College Campuses

Approved by

Virginia Sanchez, Chair, Assistant Professor of Communication
Justin Blankenship, Co-chair, Assistant Professor of Journalism
Brigitta Brunner, Co-chair, Professor of Public Relations

Abstract

This thesis explores the perspectives of female survivors of campus sexual violence as they shed light on their disclosure and support seeking processes. Through the lens of communication privacy management (CPM) and social support theory, it is possible to understand the flaws in communication between the survivor and source of support as perceived by the survivor. An anonymous survey was conducted to gather primarily quantitative data as well as supplemental qualitative data regarding survivors' disclosure and support seeking processes, and the data was utilized to identify frequencies and relationships between the communicative efforts of formal sources of support and those of informal sources of support. The main findings indicate that formal sources of support co-manage disclosure of sexual violence and provide support at a lower level of satisfaction than informal sources of support, though there is room for improvement for both forms of support. The findings support a variety of suggestions for future research, theoretical contributions, and practical contributions such as the recommendation for communications-based training that can improve support efforts of both formal and informal sources of support, thus improving survivors' recovery experiences.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I want to express my most sincere gratitude and love to my grandfather and mother for their endless love, support, and belief in my success.

Additionally, I want to thank my thesis committee, especially Dr. Sanchez, for their commitment to guiding me through this process and helping me succeed.

Lastly, I want to thank Safe Harbor at Auburn University for the ways in which they support survivors of sexual violence and bring them together.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

Roughly 25 percent of female college students experience sexual violence or sexual assault (Cantor et al., 2020). However, desensitization due to the normalization of sexual assault as an unfortunate yet perpetual issue has made this statistic less impactful. Without thought to the harm caused to survivors, universities and their communities have adopted this desensitized perception, and in result have greatly underrepresented the issue of sexual violence on their campuses. In fact, 89 percent of 11,000 college campuses disclosed zero reported incidents of rape in 2016 (Schools are Still Underreporting Sexual Harassment and Assault, 2018). This information was reported under the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act), which mandates universities and colleges that participate in federal funding to disclose campus crime and security statistics and information (Schools are Still Underreporting Sexual Harassment and Assault, 2018). Especially because of the Clery Act, the dissonance between the percentage of campus sexual violence and percentage of schools that failed to disclose even one incident of sexual violence for an entire academic year raises concern as it sheds light on both the lack of formal reporting by survivors and the misrepresentation of sexual violence by academic institutions.

Furthermore, there have been a variety of incidents where public universities have been exposed for being dishonest in their reporting of campus sexual violence, which lends even more support to the idea that there is underrepresentation through formal communication. For example, Texas State University San Marcos underreported cases of campus sexual assault for 2016 and 2017, only stating that there were eight rapes during the 24-month time period (Najmabadi, 2019). However, a release of revised data indicated that there were actually 38 instances of rape during that two-year span, and the incorrect numbers were attributed to errors

6

in the institution's "old crime reporting system" (DeGeurin, 2019). The Department of Education offered guidance on campus security reporting efforts, but according to the Clery Act could have imposed fines on Texas State University for their failure to communicate honest statistics regarding campus safety (Najmabadi, 2019). Unfortunately, it is widely believed that this is a nationwide issue for academic institutions as they do not want to be involved in or associated with sexual violence despite the legal responsibility to monitor, disclose, and respond to campus sexual violence (DeGeurin, 2019). Penn State University and the University of Montana have also been fined for misrepresenting campus sexual assault statistics, a direct violation of the Clery Act. Overall, the gap between the actual number of female college students who experience sexual violence or sexual assault and the number of reported incidents creates a perception that allows college campuses to come across as safe and secure for all college students when the reality is much different.

Additionally, the statistic that about 20 percent of college-aged female survivors receive assistance from a victim service agency (Cantor et al., 2020) raises concern about survivors' perceptions of these organizations. Survivors should feel comfortable disclosing to organizations that exist in their communities to provide support after experiences of sexual violence; therefore, it is alarming that the majority of college-aged female survivors choose to find support elsewhere. Given that friends, family, and internet searches can all refer survivors to a formal source of support such as a victim service agency, reputation and personal experiences can play a factor in a survivors' decision to utilize certain support options. Overall, the miscommunication surrounding sexual violence on college campuses does more harm than good as it masks the perpetuating issue of sexual assault and sends a message to assailants as well as past, present and future victims and survivors. This is a direct disservice to the college community.

Not only does the contrast between the frequency of sexual assault and how many incidents are actually reported send a conflicting message to survivors, but the range of sanctions enacted upon assailants by universities displays a lack of seriousness in handling acts of sexual violence as well as a lack of prioritization of campus safety.

First, consequences for sexual assault at a public institution vary for a multitude of reasons, diminishing the seriousness of these violent acts and communicating a lack of severity to both survivors and perpetrators. For example, the University of Kansas imposed sanctions on 72 students for violations of their sexual harassment policy between May 2012 and September 2021, an average of just eight reported incidents per year (Sanctions for Violation of Sexual Harassment Policy, 2021). Twenty six of the 72 students faced expulsion for their violations; however, 11 were able to re-enroll after their suspensions ranging from one semester to two years, and 35 students were put on probation or only given warnings. One of the most interesting sanctions implemented by the University of Kansas was a reflective paper assignment because of its leniency in comparison to other possible punishments (Sanctions for Violation of Sexual Harassment Policy, 2021). Additionally, over a five-year period at Princeton University, 113 formal complaints were filed under the sex discrimination and sexual misconduct policy (The Trustees of Princeton University, 2021). Only 69% of those cases found the respondent responsible for violating University policy. Out of those 78 cases, only six students were expelled, 11 were suspended, and two were withheld their degrees (The Trustees of Princeton University). That is a mere five percent of assailants facing expulsion for some form of sexual misconduct on a prestigious college campus. It is ironic that universities want to be and appear safe, yet not all assailants face extreme consequences such as expulsion for sexual assault.

Second, the varying gravity of these punishments communicates the potential for future assailants to face lenient sanctions. Without a consistent, serious example of the consequences that assailants face, those committing acts of sexual violence may not feel discouraged from doing so. Especially because up to 35 percent of rapists are repeat offenders (The Criminal Justice System, 2020), lax punishment for sexual violence is a direct threat to campus safety. The lack of consistent sanctions from universities in conjunction with the low possibility of the legal consequences creates an environment where repeat offenders are welcome to remain in society as predators. According to the Department of Justice's National Crime Victimization Survey for the years 2015-2019, 25 of 1,000 perpetrators of sexual assault face incarceration (The Criminal Justice System, 2020). Furthermore, there is a five percent chance that assailants will be arrested for sexual assault (The Criminal Justice System, 2020). The low odds of facing legal punishment sends the same message that lenient sanctions do- assailants are more likely to remain in their communities than they are to face serious punishment such as incarceration or expulsion from their institutions.

The varying levels of support survivors receive from those they disclose to can be attributed partially to the instability in society's understanding of sexual assault as a frequent, pervasive issue on campuses. The lack of consistency and transparency in management practices from formal institutions such as law enforcement officers and universities translates into individuals' support practices. With the impact of trauma from sexual violence spanning far beyond the initial act, it is important to also consider the impact of different levels of support survivors receive from those in whom they confide. A key part of the support process is deciding who to trust with the information and determining what source of support can provide the help that the survivor is seeking. Social Support Theory divides sources of support into two groups,

formal and informal sources, based on their relationship to the survivor and their roles in the community. For example, formal sources of support include law enforcement officers, health care providers, and rape counseling services while friends and family members are considered to be informal sources of support. While support can differ on an individual basis, it is valuable to understand the main differences between formal and informal types of support as well as what they can offer survivors. For example, retraumatization, or the experience of symptoms attributed to post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) due to the recollection of a traumatic experience, is likely to occur when a survivor chooses to report an incident of sexual assault to a formal support source. Starzynski et al. (2005) found that women who utilized formal and informal sources of support experienced more PTSD symptoms, less self-blame, and received more negative social reactions than women who chose to only disclose to informal sources of support. They suggested that law enforcement and healthcare workers are able to offer help, but are not dependable when it comes to offering positive support and positive trauma experiences for survivors. Similarly, Ullman and Filipas (2001) found that disclosing to formal sources results in more negative social reactions, ultimately contributing to lower levels of social support. The knowledge of these potential impacts and the daunting possibility of experiencing retraumatization may be enough to steer a survivor away from disclosing to a formal source of support, even if they do want to file a formal report.

On the other hand, even though past research reveals a variety of ways in which seeking support from formal sources can negatively impact a survivor's recovery process, it is important to consider the ways in which these sources of support are beneficial as well. For example, a friend cannot provide medical assistance or conduct a legal interview the same way that trained professionals can. It is also possible that a family member or friend does not believe the survivor

or makes them question their experience. With the variety of pros and cons between each source of support, it is reasonable to expect that survivors decide from whom to seek support based on their individual needs and goals at the time.

Because survivors must recover from the trauma of sexual violence, it is extremely valuable to first focus on survivors' perceptions of their interactions with and support offered from the sources of support they disclosed. Before it is possible to point out flaws in formal reporting processes, it is necessary to identify where survivors' needs are and are not being met by formal sources of support. Ultimately, this research will act as the first step in working toward changing the perception of sexual assault on campuses by giving survivors the opportunity to pinpoint the positives and negatives of their disclosure and support processes with various sources of support.

The misrepresentation of sexual assault on college campuses, the inconsistencies in sanction severity on assailants, and the trauma and retraumatization experienced by survivors all make sexual assault a difficult topic to study. Unfortunately, it makes sense that there is a large gap in this small body of research due to the nature of the topic. There is truly no way to know the precise amount of sexual assault cases at any given university or during a specific amount of time because survivors are not mandated to report their incidents and not every survivor decides that formal reporting is the right option for their situation. Therefore, this project has two goals focused on survivors' perspectives of the formal support they receive. First, to describe the extent of the miscommunication that occurs between survivors and the sources of support they disclose to; and second, to highlight voices of survivors by calling attention to the ways in which they are not supported, which ultimately perpetuates the stigma surrounding the lack of acknowledgement of sexual assault as a prominent issue on campuses.

Two theories will guide this project. Communication privacy management theory (CPM) is primarily utilized to understand how people make decisions about sharing and concealing private information. It identifies boundaries that are created by the owner and co-owner(s) of the private information once it is shared, and how these boundaries can be broken, resulting in turbulence (Petronio, 2015). Additionally, social support theory focuses on how support is (or is not) received through interpersonal relationships of varying dynamics, strengths, and durations (Albrecht and Goldsmith, 2003).

Through the lens of CPM and social support theory, it is possible to study the communicated efforts of formal sources of support and their impact on survivors of sexual assault, in order to better understand the impact of miscommunication surrounding sexual violence. CPM provides a way of understanding privacy management and information control regarding the decision to report sexual assault. Because the decision to report involves taking a risk of disclosing sensitive, private information, it is important to understand that survivors strategically choose a confidant that they feel will best coordinate and adhere to the privacy boundary rules that they establish. Additionally, CPM is fit to aid in understanding the turbulence that occurs between the survivor and source of support as they co-manage the private information. Furthermore, social support theory will help in explaining the psychological distress experienced due to a traumatic experience such as sexual assault. Survivors choose to disclose to an individual that they feel will meet their support needs; however, these support needs are not always met. Because trauma related to the survivor's experience of sexual assault can worsen depending on received support, it is extremely important to understand the impact of received and unreceived support from universities, local law enforcement officers and other formal sources of support.

In addition to contributing to literature surrounding sexual assault, there are several unique contributions offered through this research. First, CPM and social support theory have not been studied together extensively. Using these two theories together for this study will provide insight as to how decisions about confidant selection and disclosure are made and if those choices resulted in the reception of the support they expected. Second, most literature regarding CPM focuses on existing relationships like those within families. This research will broaden the use of CPM by applying it to new relationships that are created because of one's experience of sexual assault. For example, a survivor may choose to disclose to local law enforcement, thus sparking a relationship with the law enforcement officer in which he or she has a role in navigating co-ownership of sensitive information as well as established privacy and boundary rules. Because the relationship develops due to a survivor's need to receive support, there is more room for turbulence to arise due to miscommunication of boundary rules, and more of a potential for negative support experiences.

Third, social support theory has not been applied to experiences of sexual assault. Some of its most common applications are rooted in health and psychology; therefore, it is reasonable to extend this theory to better understand how social support is perceived and enacted after an experience of sexual assault. This study will form a foundation for this area of literature by pointing out where negative support can come into play due to the miscommunication of sexual violence on public campuses. Lastly, this research will provide implications for how formal sources of support can provide survivors with support that aids their recovery process. Instead of protecting reputations of universities and giving assailants leniency through lax consequences, this research will shift the narrative to account for how the words and actions of university officials and local law enforcement impact survivors. Overall, the contributions of this research

will address gaps in academia regarding CPM, social support theory, and sexual assault. Additionally, it will identify shortcomings in current support practices–especially those that lead to less accountability for universities and local law enforcement officers for their decisions in managing sexual assault cases and the support they offer to survivors. Ultimately, this study emphasizes the importance of positive, enacted support from formal sources of support.

To learn about the advantages and limitations of disclosing to formal sources of support after experiencing sexual assault, this manuscript begins by describing CPM and social support theory as individual theories that guide this research. Additionally, connections are drawn between the theories to highlight their applicability to the topic of sexual assault disclosure and miscommunication. The reporting processes that survivors may encounter when disclosing to a specific source of support are then explained to reveal the variability between how sources operate, indicating areas where turbulence may occur. Next, is an overview of the main argument that survivors experience turbulence in their efforts to receive support from formal sources of support, resulting in the mismanagement of their private information related to their experience of sexual assault. Three research questions central to privacy management and social support are presented, along with proposed methods and measures designed to complete this research.

<center>Literature Review</center>

Communication Privacy Management Theory

Communication privacy management (CPM) "argues that individuals regulate communication boundaries around private information because disclosure to others involves certain risks" (Petronio & Flores, 1997, p. 103). Sexual assault is a sensitive, intimate topic that is tied to a variety of emotions that make it difficult to disclose. Past research has discovered that

<center>14</center>

survivors decide against disclosure due to a desire to keep personal matters private, feelings of

embarrassment and shame, fear of the informal support source's reaction, and concern that others

would try to take control of the situation (Sylaska & Edwards, 2014). Therefore, CPM is apt to

analyze survivors' disclosure processes because of the weight these interactions hold.

Additionally, while focused on the owner of the sensitive information, CPM revolves around

interpersonal communication and the limbo between the information owner's establishment of

privacy rules and the co-owner's navigation of these rules (Petronio & Child, 2020). Thus, CPM

will be utilized in efforts to understand survivors' experiences with formal sources of support,

particularly focusing on how their sensitive information is received and managed by those they

disclose to.

CPM breaks down the transmission and management of sensitive information. Under the

first interactional dimension, creating shared privacy boundaries, an individual chooses to share

private information to a select individual. This transmission of information produces a

transformation in ownership called "co-ownership formation" as the receiver now has some

control over the information (Petronio, 2015). In the case of sexual assault, the survivor chooses

to disclose to an individual that they consider to be helpful and supportive (Sylaska & Edwards,

2014). Whether they choose to talk to an informal source of support, such as a friend or family

member, or a more formal source, such as a law enforcement officer, sharing this information

transfers ownership to that party and establishes them as a co-owner. However, co-ownership is

not always an equal relationship, and oftentimes there is a power imbalance between owner and

co-owner depending on the specific support source.

The second dimension, coordinating privacy boundaries, suggests that boundaries and

rules should be mutually agreed upon so that co-owners are aware of the level of privacy

expected of them. Under this dimension, it is expected that owners and co-owner(s) coordinate three issues in order to establish clear boundaries: privacy boundary inter-linkages, privacy boundary permeability, and private information co-ownership rights. (Petronio, 2015). Considering privacy boundary inter-linkages aids in the clarification of "who besides the authorized co-owner is permitted to know the information" (Petronio, 2015, p. 5). Privacy boundary permeability addresses how much information the owner is allowing the co-owner(s) to share with a third party. Private information co-ownership rights refers to the level of control the co-owner has in making decisions regarding the owner's shared private information (Petronio, 2015). By establishing these boundaries and rules, it is expected that they are to be mutually agreed upon and adhered to by the owner and all co-owners. In the case of sexual assault, it is implied that the co-owner is specially selected because of the survivor's belief that they would be able to coordinate and adhere to the established privacy boundary rules. However, oftentimes there is no dialogue regarding privacy boundaries and expectations of how the co-owner will use this information. Therefore, privacy boundaries and rules may not be existent and therefore cannot be not considered in co-owners' decision making processes regarding the private information. Additionally, when there is a control and power imbalance between owner and co-owner(s) in which survivors do not have agency in establishing privacy rules, turbulence can arise in the communication privacy management process and in the survivor's overall recovery process.

Third, coping with the consequences of privacy turbulence addresses unwanted disclosure of private information. While establishing boundaries and rules are intended to guide co-owners as they navigate management of the private information, there are times when these boundaries and rules are not successful in preventing unwelcomed dissemination (Petronio,

2015). Unwanted disclosure by a co-owner can be intentional or accidental, but a violation of privacy is in most cases likely to cause a shift in any relationship. This shift can be attributed to turbulence, a direct effect of information mismanagement, which often results in consequences for both the owner and the co-owner, as well as their relationship. The most relevant error is a decrease in trust within a valuable interpersonal relationship (Petronio, 2015). While it is important to consider that most relationships established with formal sources of support after sexual assault are not as strong as relationships with family members or friends (Starzynski, 2015), there is still an expected level of trust that can be violated if a co-owner does not follow the privacy boundaries and rules. In consideration of experiences of sexual assault, turbulence in this sense is even more concerning as it can cause harmful consequences for the survivor that can lead to retraumatization. For example, if the survivor's boundaries and rules are not respected, they may feel disrespected or unsupported. On a larger scale, the misreporting, misrepresentation, and failure to meet survivor expectations by co-owners reveals a perpetual issue of communication turbulence. Because of these severe consequences, it is extremely important that co-owners, in this case sources of support, understand and respect the owner's privacy boundaries and rules.

Social Support Theory

Social Support Theory describes the "availability of components of support from interpersonal relationships" (Fowler & Hill, 2004, p. 1273). Survivors have the opportunity to seek support from formal and/or informal sources of support, from which there is a potential to receive the help they are looking for after experiencing sexual assault. Albrecht and Goldsmith's (2003) social support theory divides the need for help, comfort and assistance into the ideas of perceived and enacted social support. Perceived support is the belief that support is available if

17

and when it is needed through a specific channel. Enacted support occurs when an individual actually receives the support they are seeking from the intended source. However, when enacted support does not align with the survivor's perceived support, turbulence can occur. Therefore, enacted support is categorized as either positive or negative based on the survivor's perspective of the source's respect, clarity, transparency, belief, and sensitivity (Heninger et al., 2019). The potential misalignment between enacted and perceived support may also indicate negative experiences when survivors engage in communication intended to seek support.

Research into social support theory has found that social support positively impacts health and reduces physiological reactions to trauma (Albrecht & Goldsmith, 2003). According to Fowler and Hill (2004), there are four explanations for why social support has these buffering effects: responses from support sources inform survivors about unhealthy behavior, suggest information about where to seek formal support, provide tangible assistance and help when coping and recovering. These explanations demonstrate ways in which confidants can support survivors; however, it is important to understand specifically how universities and local law enforcement employees can respond to and positively impact a survivor's recovery experience.

Synthesis of CPM and Social Support Theory

CPM and social support theory work together to understand the process survivors engage in when disclosing to a source of support. Turbulence and negative support both contribute to negative health impacts. In particular, retraumatization may occur for a variety of reasons related to privacy turbulence resulting from disclosure and negative support from support sources. Retraumatization is the "significant increase in the frequency of posttraumatic stress reactions to the original trauma, thus as an exacerbation of PTSD" (Orth & Maercker, 2004, pg. 213). Retraumatization effects from events such as reporting sexual assault to a formal source can be

both short-term and long-term, and other negative psychological effects like loss in social trust are common (Orth & Maercker, 2004). The weight of these experiences does not decrease throughout the reporting process; however, there are several choices survivors can make in efforts to take control of the reporting process and choose the recovery process that they feel is the best fit for them.

Together, these two theories highlight several communicative practices and work to draw a connection between the survivor's control of their private information and their control over their post-sexual assault experiences. Because sexual assault is such an intimate violation, negative social reactions to disclosure can have a powerful negative impact on a survivor's recovery process (Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014). So not only can a lack of control over one's own private information due to poor information management by a co-owner be explained by CPM; but a survivor's control over their own post-sexual assault experience can also be explained by CPM and social support theory together. One's sense of control is a significantly powerful factor that fluctuates throughout the sexual assault recovery process. Because during sexual assault there is a "significant loss of control over one's body" (Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014, p. 498), survivors are likely to experience heightened feelings of vulnerability and lower perceived control over their own recovery (Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014). Therefore, it is important for survivors to be in charge of deciding who is allowed to know about their experience and make choices that guide their recovery process. For example, one decision presented to some survivors is the option to seek medical treatment anonymously or not (Reporting requirements related to rape of competent adult victims, 2016). This decision gives the survivor power in their recovery process, and can also be attributed to less social withdrawal and distress (Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014). Unfortunately, it is not guaranteed that the co-

owner will respect the survivor's decision or other privacy boundaries and rules, putting the survivor in a position to once again feel a lack of control over their own life and body. Therefore, it is important to recognize that control of one's private information and control of one's personal experiences go hand-in-hand, and negative social reactions (potentially present during the disclosure process) as well as the mismanagement of information can cause survivors to experience heightened symptoms of retraumatization and PTSD.

Furthermore, CPM and social support theory work together in this context because turbulence can occur when perceived social support and enacted support are not aligned. When survivors choose to disclose their experience to an individual, they consider what that person can offer them in terms of support and their level of comfort with that individual. Expectations, or perceptions, of social support are created by the survivor and only sometimes communicated to the other party, partially through privacy boundaries and rules. Therefore, when enacted support does not meet the expectations of the survivor, turbulence is likely to be present. Furthermore, turbulence between co-owners can be contributed to by the lack of training from those in charge of handling sexual assault cases like hospital workers and law enforcement officers. While the process of going through the criminal justice system to obtain a legal determination of guilt, or innocence, can be a grueling process and there are a lot of steps between reporting and seeing a rapist be sentenced to jail time, the survivor heavily relies on the law enforcement officer(s) to guide them through and facilitate this process. The first step to the legal process for sexual assault is making an initial report to law enforcement, and from there the victim and the law enforcement officer(s) both have the power to choose to move forward with the investigation and press charges, thus equalizing the power that owners and co-owners of this information have (Edmonton Police Services, 2019). Currently, data suggests that 69 percent of

victims that report sexual assault are discouraged by law enforcement to make a formal report (Campbell, 2012). This statidtic is compelling because law enforcement officers have the opportunity to negotiate privacy rules with the survivor, providing them an opportunity to take power away from the survivor by dictating what is done with the disclosed information or disregarding the survivor's established privacy rules. Furthermore, "51 percent of the time, law enforcement officers tell victims that what happened to them is not serious enough to pursue through the criminal justice system" (Campbell, 2012, para. 19). Judgment calls made by formal sources of support like perception of credibility and interpretation of severity are just two of many ways in which their individual bias can exacerbate symptoms of retraumatization for the survivor (Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014). Additionally, because Spencer et al. (2020) found that known sexual assault training, a law enforcement branch's positive reputation, and a positive campus climate contributed heavily to a survivor's decision to report an assault at their university, it can be deduced that a lack of sexual assault training, negative reputation, and negative campus climate are significant perceived contributors to a survivor's decision to formally report or not. Therefore, it is important to know about the various reporting processes that survivors may go through to understand how, when and where turbulence can arise.

The Reporting Process

When college students report an incident of sexual assault, they have a variety of formal sources of support they can choose to disclose to. Local law enforcement, Title IX coordinators at the university, institution specific resources, and local medical personnel (particularly Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners) are all resources that survivors can reach out to after an experience of sexual assault. In most cases, these organizations are connected in a way that results in the development of relationships with a variety of sources of support; however, the sharing of

information between these sources of support has the potential to establish or disregard privacy boundaries and rules established by the survivor. Formal sources of support like Title IX, universities, law enforcement, and medical personnel have a protocol they are required to follow when information regarding a sexual assault is disclosed to them–these processes are described next.

Universities receiving federal funding are required to follow the Title IX laws issued by the United States of America's Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights as part of the Education Amendments of 1972. As part of Title IX, the Clery Act was added to mandate that public academic institutions report crime, including instances sexual violence. If an institution is found to be in violation of the Clery Act, they can face substantial fines issued by the Department of Education. Title IX specifically protects students from sexual harassment and outlines the process that universities must follow when a report of sexual assault is received (Know Your Title IX, n.d.). Additionally, under Title IX, universities are required to investigate all reports independently, regardless of if local law enforcement is also involved in their own investigation. Unlike law enforcement officers, universities are required to follow-up on reports and see them through the adjudication process with consideration of the survivor's preferences. Reporting sexual assault through a university's Title IX office is also different from reporting to law enforcement because universities can offer resources to survivors that aid in the continuation of their education (Know Your Title IX). For example, universities can instate a no-contact directive between the survivor and the assailant and offer academic accommodations. However, one main drawback from the Title IX system is how cases are executed. Throughout the university's investigation and adjudication process, current legislation requires the survivor and assailant to interact. This can be a deterrent to reporting to a university as survivors may not feel

comfortable reading or hearing their assailant's account of the incident or having further contact with them in any form. While Title IX does take into consideration the rights and preferences of the survivor, there are still points during the grievance process that can cause turbulence between the survivor and the Title IX coordinator as the course of action may not align with what the survivor intended on pursuing. Furthermore, negative support can be received when survivors go through the Title IX grievance process and do not receive the support they expected. Another form of negative support in this process would be certain outcomes of the process in which assailants are not determined responsible or are given inadequate punishments for their actions.

There are a variety of similarities and differences between the Title IX reporting process and the legal reporting process. When a survivor reports an incident of sexual assault to a law enforcement officer, they are required to follow strict protocol up until a specific point, but then get to choose whether or not to press charges based on their opinion of if the case would withstand the criminal prosecution process (Edmonton Police Services, 2019). If it is decided that the case is solid enough to stand a chance, it is still not promised that the case will continue on to the prosecutor's office and then into a courtroom. Turbulence can occur at any point in this process as it is up to law enforcement officers to make decisions regarding the legitimacy and strength of one's report. Additionally, it is common for survivors to receive negative support through this process as there are a variety of checkpoints at which law enforcement officers and legal officials may decline to proceed with prosecution. Furthermore, not all law enforcement officers receive the same training regarding sexual assault, so location and reputations factor into the support survivors receive during this process.

Regardless of whether a survivor chooses to report to a formal source of support like law enforcement officers or their university's Title IX department, it is a long, grueling process that

can result in heightened experiences of retraumatization (Starzynski et al., 2015). This retraumatization can exacerbate symptoms of post-traumatic stress like anxiousness, trouble sleeping, social isolation, negative emotions, causing more harm to the survivor even long after their experience of sexual assault (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2017). Therefore, it is important to understand the protocol different sources of support are required to adhere to in order to better comprehend the importance of positive enacted social support. Furthermore, this develops the connection between social support theory and communication privacy management as it emphasizes the significance of the survivor's decision to disclose information to a specific individual, taking into consideration the potential confidant's role and duties as well as the relationship between the survivor and the confidant.

Argument

The primary effort of this research is to highlight the voices of survivors of sexual assault. Validating their experiences by emphasizing the importance of how their incidents are managed by the sources of support they disclose to will prioritize survivors and hold these formal sources of potential support accountable for how they handle disclosure of sexual assault. Focusing on survivors who may remain unsupported and underrepresented by their institutions will draw questions regarding the impact of this miscommunication on their recovery processes. Short- and long-term effects of sexual assault can vary depending on the support survivors expect and receive. Therefore, identifying points in communication with sources of support where survivors do not receive the support they seek may inform survivor-focused changes to the formal reporting system and common support practices. Thus, the following questions will be answered through this research:

Research Question 1: How do survivors manage their private information?

Research Question 2: How do survivors perceive the management of their private information by the source of support they disclose to?

Research Question 3: How do perceptions of enacted support compare among survivors that disclose to formal sources and those who disclose to informal sources?

Methodology

Participants and Recruitment

Female college students at public colleges and universities were asked to fill out a survey about their experiences disclosing sexual assault. To participate, the students must have experienced what they believe to be sexual assault while enrolled at a public institution. While male and nonbinary victims are of equal importance, this research focuses on women to eliminate any additional variability. Additionally, it is important that participants were enrolled in a public college or university within the last 10 years because federally funded schools are required to adhere to Title IX while private institutions may have different policies. Timeliness of participants' experiences indicated by their graduation year was considered to eliminate references to outdated legislation or practices, focusing on more recent experiences of sexual assault and interactions with sources of support. Therefore, screening questions were included to ensure respondents are part of this specific demographic. The survey was administered entirely online and did not ask for any identifying information in order to protect participants in their disclosure of intimate, personal information. Convenience sampling was utilized in this study to source willing participants. Additionally, participants were recruited through social media outreach; specifically, through personal social media platforms, national and campus-specific survivor-based accounts such as @campus.survivors, @itsonus and @explaintheasterisk, and

anti-sexual assault organizations like RAINN and *It's On Us*. Along with social media, the survey was distributed through word-of-mouth and contact with professors in hopes of sharing the survey opportunity with classes full of students. Survey participants were informed that for each of the first one hundred participants, a $1 donation would be made to RAINN, a national anti-sexual violence organization. Out of 102 people who took the survey, the final sample size was 36 qualifying participants. This stark change in sample size is attributed to the number of responses that did not satisfy the screening questions, completed less than 50 percent complete, did not indicate the source of support they disclosed to (i.e., making it difficult to analyze their experiences based on the source of support they first disclosed to), or indicated that they did not want to be included in the final sample size.

To minimize the risk of retraumatization, a survey combining both open- and close-ended questions was filled out by participants. As opposed to an interview, the survey gives participants control over how much information they share and many questions require a check, yes, no, or enumeration rather than phrases or sentences, limiting the amount of elaboration but also providing space for optional expansion. This set of questions will quantitatively measure the frequency and extent of potential issues survivors have experienced when disclosing to formal sources of support. The quantitative approach to this research also aids in gathering a wider pool of responses from a larger sample and offer anonymity that cannot be achieved through qualitative research methods. With quantitative data it is possible to identify commonalities, generalize findings, and recreate this study. However, to account for variability in participants' experiences, open-ended questions offered space for survivors to provide details that the close-ended questions may not be able to capture. It is impossible to provide participants with exhaustive lists of variables that may serve as answers to close-ended questions; therefore, open-

ended questions created an opportunity for survivors to elaborate and account for variables that may otherwise not be addressed. Additionally, this study considers the security, confidentiality, and safety of survivors through its voluntary participation, freedom to withdraw at any time, and minimal collection of demographics and other identifiers. The last question of the survey acts as a validation question, offering participants an option to not have their responses included in the data set. Furthermore, with concerns of COVID-19, this mixed methods distribution and data collection can be done remotely to mitigate health concerns due to the virus.

Measures

The Sexual Assault Services Evaluation Survey–Survivor (SASES-S) primarily informed the survey created for this study (Henninger et al., 2020). The SASES-S was developed with consideration of the input of members of a sexual assault response team, victim advocates, and a survivor of sexual assault with the goal of understanding the survivor's experience of sexual assault and experience with relevant personnel, referred to as sources of support in this study (Henninger et al., 2020). Therefore, it serves as a strong framework for this survey because of its focus on survivors and their interactions with sources of support. The key difference between SASES-S and this survey is that this survey has fewer questions regarding the specifics of their experience and the offender and focuses more on the disclosure and support processes. Questions related to satisfaction with each source of support were informed by SASES-S. Specifically, the four variables tested for in SASES-S: respectful treatment, explanation of procedures, belief in account, and cultural sensitivity, guided the creation of more precise variables for this study that connected more clearly to both CPM and social support theory. Some of the developed variables are establishment of trust, which ties back to respectful treatment; trauma-informed discourse, which relates to cultural sensitivity; clear expression of support efforts, which is similar to

27

explanation of procedures; and lastly honest communication, which can be related to several of the four SASES-S variables. Additionally, more explicit yes-no questions were created based on the SASES-S variables. For example, participants were required to indicate if they were at any time questioned for any reason and if they were specifically questioned regarding inconsistencies in their account, both informed by the SASES-S variable "belief in account". Additionally, less demographic information is collected in this survey than in SASES-S as an extra measure to protect the anonymity of participants. Questions were added to the SASES-S foundation for this survey to account for the identification of symptoms of retraumatization and PTSD and gather details regarding their support expectations, communication with the source of support, and received support.

This survey begins with screening questions that determine eligibility to complete the three-section survey, which can vary in length depending on the number of sources of support that were disclosed to. At minimum, this survey has 39 items. The response format for this survey includes open-ended questions, multiple choice questions and Likert-type scale. Based on the organization of SASES-S, the three sections of this survey focus on: (a) demographic information about the survivor and basics about the survivor's choice to disclose to a source of support; (b) details regarding each disclosure experience; (c) impact of disclosure experience(s).

Demographic Information

The screening questions filter potential participants to ensure they are all female college students who have experienced sexual assault while enrolled. The initial questions of the survey aim to gather additional demographic information such as age and year in college. Starting with these questions should ease participants into the more challenging questions regarding their experience disclosing to sources of support.

Details

After collecting brief demographic data, participants are asked to respond to a series of

questions regarding their disclosure choices as previously indicated. From there, the questions

dive deeper into details about their experience with the source of support that they disclosed to.

Similar to Dworkin & Allen (2014)'s survey measures regarding contact with responders,

participants are asked to respond regarding their overall experience with the source of support

including the quality of the sources' responses, how helpful they were, and how supportive they

were. Additionally, participants are provided with a variety of questions about the specifics

regarding the source of support (did the source believe you, did the source question you, did you

experience any symptoms of retraumatization or PTSD because of your interaction with this

source, would you recommend this source of support). Questions revolving around symptoms of

retraumatization are directly informed by data presented in the Substance Abuse and Mental

Health Services Administration (2017) brochure regarding retraumatization. Furthermore,

several questions are specifically designed to address information privacy management by

inquiring about trustworthiness, transparency, collaboration, and respect of the survivors' goals

in seeking support.

Impact

Lastly, the survey addresses overall feelings regarding the long-term impact of disclosing

to one or more sources of support. These questions ask the participant to indicate their opinions

on if the sources of support they disclosed to provided them with the support they expected, if

the support received was valuable to the recovery process, and if they felt they were in charge of

their journey to seeking support as part of the recovery process. The final question is replicated

from Henninger et al. (2020)'s SASES-S and asks the participant to indicate if they feel their

responses are truthful and should be included in the data set. While this can be perceived as a question of truthfulness, it is included as an additional opportunity for participants to opt-out of being included in this study.

Data Analysis

Based on the responses to the Likert-scale type questions, it will be possible to determine the average experience with disclosing to a source of support shared among all participants. These averages can then be broken down to determine experiences with specific sources of support, ultimately allowing for the ranking of sources of support based on a variety of factors measured in the survey such as their information management efforts, treatment of the survivor, and overall supportiveness. Additional trends regarding the connections between two factors such as source of support and how soon after the sexual assault they were disclosed to can be identified by using t-tests. The open-ended questions provide space for participants to indicate details that the survey questions may not clearly address. Not only does the variation within these responses provide implications for future research, but they also serve as primary examples that support the quantitative results and provide insight into survivors' perspectives. This information can all aid in identifying weaknesses in social support as well as weaknesses in management of private information. Lastly, this data aids in determining if the level of support received and appropriate management of information made survivors feel most comfortable and supported during their recovery process. If so, this information can be used to shed light on the importance of positive, enacted social support and adherence to privacy boundaries and rules among different sources of support, hopefully encouraging change among sources of support that lack in these areas.

Results

Research Question One

Research question one asks how survivors manage their private information regarding experiences of campus sexual violence. Frequency tests were conducted to determine that 60% of survivors asked the source of support they disclosed to to keep them anonymous (see Table 1.1), and 85.3% of survivors asked that the source of support keep their information confidential (see Table 1.2). Additionally, frequency tests indicated that 64.7% of survivors engaged in the boundary-setting practice of sharing their expectations for support (see Table 1.3). Furthermore, 70.6% of survivors indicated feeling in control of the information they shared with the particular source of support, and 63.6% of survivors indicated feeling that they were considered in all of the decisions made throughout the support process with this particular source of support (see Tables 1.4 and 1.5). Together, these findings indicate that in order to manage their private information, survivors often attempt to establish boundaries with the source of support they disclose to.

Research Question Two

Research question two asks how survivors perceive the management of their private information by the source of support they disclose to. To answer this, frequency tests explored different communication and support practices of the various sources of support. It was determined that 57.1% of survivors felt that the source of support they disclosed to made them aware of the ways in which they planned to support them (see Table 2.1). Additionally, 57.1% of survivors indicated that they had a say in how the source of support proceeded with providing them with support (see Table 2.2). Furthermore, three survivors indicated that the source of support contacted other resources without consent, six survivors indicated that source of support

revealed their identity without consent, and seven survivors indicated that the source of support contacted one of their friends or family members without consent (see Tables 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5). In addition to frequency tests, an independent samples T-test was conducted to compare the average levels of satisfaction with both types of sources of support: formal and informal (see Tables 2.7.1, 2.7.2, and 2.7.3). The Sig. one-sided p value for this data is .058. This value is greater than .05, and therefore indicates that there is not a statistically significant difference between the average level of satisfaction between those who disclosed to formal and informal sources of support, though it did approach significance. Since the mean satisfaction level of formal sources of support (M= 2.6, SD = 1.578) was less than the mean satisfaction level of informal sources of support (M= 3.5, SD = 1.327); $t(29)$= -1.618, p= $\leq$ .05), it lends support to the idea that those who disclosed to formal sources of support had statistically worse experiences than those who disclosed to informal sources of support.

Research Question Three

Lastly, research question three asks how perceptions of enacted support compare among survivors that disclose to formal sources and those who disclose to informal sources. Independent samples T-tests and were conducted and frequencies were calculated based on questions in the form of five-point Likert scales to evaluate survivors' experiences receiving support after campus sexual violence based on the source of support they first disclosed to. Informal sources of support were reported to have higher satisfaction rates than formal sources of support for their respect of the survivors' support expectations (informal mean= 3.53, formal mean= 3.00), establishment of trust (informal mean= 3.77, formal mean= 2.70), trauma informed discourse (informal mean= 3.15, formal mean= 3.09), collaboration to determine next steps (informal mean= 2.85, formal mean= 2.73), clear establishment of their plan to support the

survivor (formal mean= 2.73, informal mean= 3.05), and honest communication (informal

mean= 3.73, formal mean= 3.00) (see table 3.1.2).

Based on the T-test, establishment of trust as an indicator of satisfaction with a source of

support is nearly statistically significant (see tables 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3). The mean satisfaction

with establishment of trust among formal sources of support (M= 2.70, SD= 1.829), is less than

the mean satisfaction with establishment of trust among informal sources of support (M= 3.77,

SD= 1.602); $t(30)= 1.090$ p= $\leq$ .05). These results are also exemplified in open-ended responses

that explain that survivors selected their source of support based on previously established and

perceived levels of trust. For example, Respondent 25 reasoned that she selected to disclose to an

informal source of support, stating "I trusted my friend and knew he would be able to support

me". Respondent 33, who also disclosed to an informal source of support, similarly stated "she is

the person I trust the most and I know she would not judge me". This contrasts with survivors

who disclosed to formal sources of support who specifically indicated more action-related needs,

dismissing trust as a luxury that not all survivors can factor in when seeking help. For example,

respondent 3 (formal) indicated disclosing to a university official, detailing that it was an effort

"to avoid classes with [her] abuser".

Other T-tests for this data indicated less statistically significant findings; however, the

frequencies and averages are still important to consider as they indicate a presence of various

acts of perceived information mismanagement and dissatisfaction with enacted support. In some

instances where T-tests were not statistically significant, open-ended responses provide insight as

to how experiences with formal and informal sources of support can be similar. For instance,

survivors who indicated low levels of satisfaction with a source of support's trauma-informed

discourse practices (informal mean= 3.15, formal mean= 3.09) explained how it impacted their

recovery. Respondent one, who reported to a local law enforcement officer, states "I was blamed and offended by the way I was treated by the detective". This aligns with the lack of trauma-informed discourse experienced by respondent 32 as she stated disclosing to a friend resulted in "nothing, she didn't believe me and thought I was dramatic". This indicates that survey items with similar averages and insignificant T-test findings cannot be dismissed as there still is practical significance attached to survivors' experiences disclosing with the expectation of receiving support that fits their needs.

Finally, research question three was answered through the presentation of frequencies related to trauma-related discourse and symptoms of retraumatization. Over 25.7% of survivors were discouraged by their source of support to continue speaking about their experience. About 23% of survivors were doubted by their source of support. Forty percent of survivors were questioned by their source of support. Twenty percent of survivors were specifically questioned regarding inconsistencies in their account of their experience, and 57% percent of these instances were with formal sources of support. Additionally, survivors were asked to indicate if they experienced symptoms of retraumatization after disclosing to the particular source of support. The most common symptoms of retraumatization among respondents were flashbacks (80.6%), self doubt (69.4%), anxiousness (69.4%), negative emotions (66.7%), and stress (63.9%). The least common symptom of retraumatization, the inability to control emotions, was experienced by 30.6% of survey participants. Furthermore, frequency tests found that overall 38.2% of participants felt that disclosing to the particular source of support made their recovery more challenging and 35.3% of participants felt that disclosing to this source of support hindered their recovery. Those who disclosed to formal sources of support were less willing to seek further support than those who disclosed to informal sources (formal mean= 2.18, informal mean= 2.70)

and less comfortable disclosing to another source of support (formal mean= 2.27, informal mean= 2.75). Lastly, 39.4% of survey participants indicated that they would not recommend the type of source of support that they disclosed to to other survivors of sexual assault.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of survivors' experiences disclosing and seeking support after sexual violence on college campuses. A primarily quantitative survey was created and utilized to gather information specific to the sharing of survivors' private information in a support-seeking effort. This research, which ties together CPM and social support theory through the exploration of sexual assault disclosure, found that while survivors generally have a less satisfactory experience with formal sources of support, informal sources of support are also far less than perfect at providing survivors with the support they expect to receive. Overall, these findings inform several theoretical and practical contributions.

Theoretical Contributions

This is the first study using CPM to look at disclosure about sexual assault on campus. Previous literature utilizes CPM when analyzing communication within existing relationships; however, this study broadens the use of CPM as it applies to both existing relationships or newly formed relationships at the time of disclosure, particularly when disclosing to a formal source of support. When a survivor discloses to a source of support, both parties become co-owners of that information (Petronio, 2015). Undiscovered by previous studies, this research sheds light on the co-ownership of traumatic information related to sexual violence. Seventy percent of survivors indicated feeling in control of the private information they shared, and 63.6% of survivors indicated feeling that they were considered in all decisions made by the source of support

35

regarding the disclosed information. While these percentages reflect the majority of participants, there is still a significant percentage of survivors who did not feel in control or considered as co-owners of their sensitive information, also known as turbulence. This finding is relevant because after the loss of control in instances of sexual violence, it is important to survivors' health that they feel in control of their recovery (Orth & Maercker, 2004). Therefore, when survivors are not respected as co-owners and do not feel as if they are active in the management of their private information, it can cause negative health effects linked to retraumatization (Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014). This research found that not all survivors establish boundaries, but oftentimes those who do quickly lose control of their private information. However, in comparison, fewer co-owners (sources of support) establish and adhere to communication boundaries.

Perceived versus enacted support as expressed through social support theory is an example of turbulence as understood through CPM. Sources of support engage in communication tactics that can either adhere to or neglect a survivor's privacy boundaries and information management preferences. Similarly, as this study finds, when a survivor's perceived support is not enacted by the support source, turbulence can occur. In this study, turbulence was assumed to occur when survivors did not receive the support they expected from the source of support they disclosed to. Therefore, it is necessary to identify ways in which sources of support cause turbulence in their relationships with survivors to understand when and where in the support process they break privacy boundaries. Twenty percent of survivors indicated that the source of support shared their experience without consent, 70.1% of survivors indicated that the source of support revealed the survivor's identity without consent, 8.8% of survivors indicated that the source of support contacted a family member or friend of the survivor without consent, and 17.6% of survivors indicated that the source of support interacted with their assailant without

consent. These instances are all cause for turbulence between the survivor and the source of support they disclosed to. Additionally, some of these instances indicate incongruence between survivors' perceived support and the enacted support. While 85.3% of survivors established the boundary that the source of support keep their information confidential, 20% of support sources shared the survivor's experience without consent. Similarly, speaking to the survivor's desire to remain anonymous, 60% established the boundary that they remain anonymous; however, 20% of sources of support contacted the survivor's family or friends without consent. Ideally, each source of support should have respected the survivor's boundary rules; so while these percentages are not high, they still indicate that many sources of support caused turbulence in their relationships with survivors by breaking established privacy rules. These findings, which focus greatly on specific communicative practices, strengthen social support theory by providing an explanation for how sensitive, private information can be mismanaged by a co-owner after disclosure. This is significant as it brings together factors of CPM and social support theory through the lens of trauma disclosure.

Practical Contributions

After experiencing the initial trauma of sexual violence, survivors may also experience short- and long-term trauma-related symptoms that can be exacerbated by a variety of situations. One instance when survivors may experience these symptoms is when turbulence occurs between the survivor and the source of support they disclose to. Turbulence is possible in these relationships because the co-owners of the private information (the survivor and the support source) are guided by explicit and implicit privacy boundaries and rules. However, when these boundaries and rules are broken, turbulence becomes present. Therefore, in order to determine if communication-based issues with support sources cause turbulence and in turn cause symptoms

of retraumatization, participants were asked to indicate the symptoms they experienced after disclosing. The collected data indicates that the majority of survivors experienced flashbacks (80.6%), self doubt (69.4%), anxiousness (69.4%), negative emotions (66.7%), and stress (63.9%). These percentages indicate that the majority of survivors who disclose are likely to experience retraumatization, or exacerbated reactions to the original trauma. These numbers are significant because they link communication to retraumatization. Overall, the satisfaction is not where it needs to be (for both formal and informal). Even low rates of dissatisfaction are not ideal. Therefore, in this section I highlight what formal and informal sources can do to improve their communication privacy management and support.

In order to improve their communication privacy management and offer more effective support, formal sources of support such as academic institutions need trauma-informed education and to further develop effective, survivor-centered communication practices. This education can primarily come in the form of communication-based training that works to eliminate a stereotypical reaction (i.e., doubting or questioning the survivor) when disclosure of sexual assault, though some will develop naturally through experience. Eliminating a stereotypical approach and shifting to a more open-minded, supportive approach will allow those who serve as sources of support to realize that sexual violence occurs in a much wider variety of instances than what is often assumed. Furthermore, understanding sexual violence at a community level will work to eliminate the common response of doubting, questioning, or not believing the survivor in general as the incident will be perceived by the source of support as more probable. Because disbelief is a reaction that can trigger retraumatization, learning about these triggers can aid in one's ability to provide trauma-informed care.

Additionally, through stronger oversight and pressure from individuals in positions of power such as Title IX coordinators and Presidents of Student Affairs, accountability and pressure to manage disclosure of sexual violence appropriately would increase. One way to strengthen accountability is through climate surveys that explore students' understandings of what is and is not sexual assault. Questions in these surveys could be broad and ask students to express their understanding of sexual assault, or be specific and ask students to estimate the percentage of college students that experience sexual violence so that their response can be compared to the actual percentage of 25 percent as reported in Cantor et al., 2020's campus climate survey. By learning about the perspectives of those within a community, it is possible for the institution to implement educational initiatives and support programs that better align with their publics rather than following a generalized approach. This information would inform a communal shift in perspective and acceptance that survivors should be supported and perpetrators should be recognized and rejected rather than protected and accepted—thus, shifting the communicative practices surrounding sexual assault. Another way to improve educational efforts regarding campus sexual violence is that in addition to bystander intervention programs, which are often the focus of institutional trainings, institutions should offer training that provides guidance for confidants. This form of training will ensure that all individuals within a community can learn to become effective sources of support if they ever serve as a survivor's confidant, regardless of if they are a friend, therapist, law enforcement officer, or a teacher.

Accountability is a crucial and central factor when looking to improve the management of disclosures of sexual violence by sources of support. When there is higher acceptance of having conversations regarding sexual assault and more honest and transparent reporting of sexual violence at institutions, this open communication becomes a deterrent to perpetrators.

When there is transparency and accurate representation of campus climates, levels of trust increase between institutions and individuals within their communities. In turn, this increase in trust may help survivors feel supported and make it more likely that survivors consider and feel comfortable disclosing to a university, ultimately increasing disclosure rates to formal sources of support.

There are also steps informal sources of support can take to learn about managing disclosure of sexual violence from a confidant's perspective. First, by being part of the community that rejects the stereotype and begins to accept sexual violence for what it truly is, friends and family members can learn how to communicate about sexual violence in a way that is less likely to cause retraumatization. This growth includes the development of trauma-informed discourse skills through individual research or other resources such as training courses. This development may also lead to the establishment of respect for survivors, including direction for navigating privacy rules and boundaries that a survivor may establish during the disclosure process. In turn, this respect will result in fewer instances of turbulence within the communication that occurs between a survivor and their source of support, likely increasing a survivor's satisfaction with and effectiveness of the support they receive.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

Because this study is of exploratory nature, there are several limitations. However, over time, these limitations could serve as indications for future research. The first limitation relates to the particular demographic targeted by this survey. While male and nonbinary individuals are also survivors of sexual violence, including them with female survivors for the purposes of this survey would have made it more difficult to draw initial conclusions regarding disclosure and support. This survey should and could be conducted again to focus on other groups of survivors

of sexual violence, but for its first attempt it made sense to eliminate as many external variables as possible and focus on just female survivors as they are stereotypically more accepted than others (Scarduzio et al., 2017). Along with gender, it would be interesting to see how results vary if data was collected regarding participants' sexual orientation. Furthermore, demographic characteristics like age and household income could be included as well to determine if sources of support interact with survivors differently based on demographics. This study only looked at female survivors of sexual violence at public universities and colleges; however, future research should expand into other communities and institutions.

Another limitation is the sensitive nature of the topic of this research. All survivors are at different places in their recovery, have different sensitivities and triggers, and have varying comfort levels with being open about their experience with sexual violence. Methodologically, this makes it difficult as a researcher to collect data in a way that makes survivors feel safe. While steps were taken to ensure participants experienced the least amount of harm and distress as possible, it still was difficult to ensure participants would complete the entire survey. Similarly, the sensitive nature of the content made it difficult to receive help with participant recruitment. Oftentimes when reaching out through social media, other organizations and support accounts were hesitant to share the survey as they did not want their community of survivors to feel uncomfortable, exploited, or used. While this was remedied with further explanation of how the survey informs this research that has the potential to make an impact on how survivors are are supported by those they disclose to, it was a large hindrance in what was already a limited period of time for data collection. Additionally, partially attributed to the nature of the topic is also the narrowing down of the sample size from 102 to 36 qualifying responses. Many responses were not included in the final data set because they were less than half complete, left

out critical pieces of data such as the selected source of support, or did not satisfy the screening questions. This small sample size makes achieving significance for statistical tests such as t-tests very difficult. Fortunately, qualitative data was also collected so there was data to support differences in averages despite the lack of statistical significance.

Similarly, relying heavily on social media recruitment was a limitation to this research. While it was the most convenient and practical way to reach a variety of survivors of campus sexual violence in a limited time period, it excluded a population of survivors who may not be active on social media or following accounts that support survivors. With more time and funding, it is possible to branch out and work within communities to share this survey to a broader range of survivors. Along with this, the time constraints of this survey also limited the number of survivors who were recruited. Reaching a larger number of survivors would have garnished more survey responses, making the data even more adequate for generalizing.

Lastly, survivors were the focus of this study and therefore responded on behalf of their support source. While this survey was strategically constructed to be survivor-based so that survivors felt comfortable sharing their perspectives, it limits the accuracy of the data as it does not account for the efforts of the source of support, but rather just how their efforts were perceived by the survivor. This study could be broadened to incorporate sources of support in order to understand how their efforts are intended compared to how they are perceived by the survivor. Gathering both the perspective of the survivor and the perspective of the source of support would fill in gaps in understanding where turbulence occurs in their communicative relationship and could even answer questions regarding the dissonance between perceived and enacted support.

With consideration of these limitations, it is possible to develop various plans for future research. One suggestion for future research is to plan recruitment strategies ahead of time and to begin communicating with those who can help distribute the survey well before the survey is open to participants. This effort will allow for the survey to be distributed without delay once it is activated, as well as provide researchers with a clear idea of which accounts and organizations will be helping with recruitment. Similarly, researchers should connect with offline resources such as local rape counseling organizations as an attempt to reach a wider variety of survivors. Another option for future research is to recreate this study with a qualitative foundation. While talking about experiences of sexual violence may be more difficult for some survivors than answering questions in a survey, it will provide much more detail regarding individual experiences seeking support. The expansion into the qualitative realm will broaden the body of research and build on this primarily quantitative foundation by sharing more complete personal accounts of survivors' disclosure choices and support-seeking endeavors. Overall, these implications for future research will strengthen the body of research that weaves trauma, CPM and social support theory together.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

This study served as a survivor-based analysis of their experiences disclosing to and seeking support from a variety of individuals as an effort to make sense of the miscommunication of campus sexual violence. Because sexual assault is a pervasive issue on college campuses, it is necessary to determine where and when survivors do and do not receive the support they expect from different sources within their communities. The goals of this research were to identify communicative work that survivors and sources of support do individually and collectively when co-managing private information. Additionally, it aimed to

learn about the support that survivors receive from their initial source of support as an effort to determine the shortcomings primarily of formal sources of support, so that suggestions for trauma-informed improvements can be made. With this information, formal sources of support such as academic institutions can instate or redesign their approaches to trauma disclosure management as a step toward supporting survivors in a way that facilitates a smooth recovery process.

References

Albrecht, T. L., & Goldsmith, D. J. (2003). Social support, social networks, and health. In T. L.

Thompson, A. M. Dorsey, K. I. Miller, & R. Parrott (Eds.), *Handbook of health*

communication (p. 263–284). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Campbell, R., (2012). The neurobiology of sexual assault: Implications for law enforcement,

prosecution, and victim advocacy [Speech transcript]. *National Institute of Justice*.

https://nij.ojp.gov/media/video/24056#transcript--0

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Harps, S., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., Lee, H., Kranz, V.,

Herbison, R., & Madden, K. (2020). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on*

sexual assault and misconduct. [PDF] Association of American Universities.

https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/AAU-Files/Key-Issues/Campus-Safety/AAU-

Campus-Climate-Survey-FINAL-10-20-17.pdf

DeGeurin, M. (2019). *A Texas University reported 8 rapes on campus in 2016-17, but now*

admits there were 38. Experts say this problem is happening nationwide. Insider.

Retrieved from https://www.insider.com/texas-state-university-underreporting-rape-

cases-is-a-national-problem-2019-10

Dworkin, E. R., & Allen, N. (2018). Correlates of disclosure cessation after sexual assault.

Violence against women, *24*(1), 85-100. DOI: 10.1177/1077801216675743

Edmonton Police Services. (2019). What you can expect when reporting a sexual assault.

Retrieved January 21, 2022, from

https://www.edmontonpolice.ca/CommunityPolicing/PersonalPropertyCrimes/SexualAss

ault/ReportingSexualAssault

Fowler, D.N., and Hill, H.M. (2004). Social support and spirituality as culturally relevant factors in coping among African American women survivors of partner abuse. *Violence Against Women*, (*10)*11, 1267–1282. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801204269001

Henninger, A. L., Iwasaki, M., Carlucci, M. E., & Lating, J. M. (2020). Reporting sexual assault: Survivors' satisfaction with sexual assault response personnel. *Violence Against Women*, *26*(11), 1362–1382. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219857831

Know Your Title IX. *Supporting survivors of trauma: How to avoid re-traumatization*. Title IX. Retrieved January 18, 2022, from https://www.knowyourix.org/college-resources/title-ix/

Najmabadi, S. (2019). *Texas state dramatically under-reported the number of sexual assaults on campus in 2016 and 2017.* The Texas Tribune. Retrieved April 19, 2022, from https://www.texastribune.org/2019/09/30/texas-state-dramatically-under-reported-number-sexual-assaults-campus/

Orth, U., & Maercker, A. (2004). Do trials of perpetrators retraumatize crime victims? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *19*(2), 212–227. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260503260326

Petronio, S. (2015). Communication privacy management theory. In *The International Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Communication* (eds C.R. Berger, M.E. Roloff, S.R. Wilson, J.P. Dillard, J. Caughlin and D. Solomon). https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1002/9781118540190.wbeic132

Petronio, S., & Child, J. T. (2020). Conceptualization and operationalization: utility of communication privacy management theory. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *31*, 76–82. https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.08.009

Petronio, S., & Flores, L. A. (1997). Locating the voice of logic: Disclosure discourse of sexual

    abuse. *Western Journal of Communication*, *61*(1), 101–113. https://doi-

    org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1080/10570319709374565

Reporting requirements related to rape of competent adult victims. (2016, June). National

    District Attorney Association. Retrieved January 26, 2022, from https://ndaa.org/wp-

    content/uploads/Rape-Reporting-Requirement-for-Competent-Adult-

    Victims_Compilation.pdf

Sanctions for violation of sexual harassment policy. Student Affairs, University of Kansas.

    (2021, September 29). Retrieved October 27, 2021, from

    https://studentaffairs.ku.edu/sanctions-violation-sexual-harassment-policy.

Scarduzio, J. A., Carlyle, K. E., Harris, K. L., & Savage, M. W. (2017). "Maybe She Was

    Provoked": Exploring Gender Stereotypes About Male and Female Perpetrators of

    Intimate Partner Violence. *Violence Against Women*, *23*(1), 89–

113. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801216636240

Schools are still underreporting sexual harassment and assault. (2018). AAUW. Retrieved

    October 27, 2021, from https://ww3.aauw.org/article/schools-still-underreporting-sexual-

    harassment-and-assault/.

Spencer, C., Stith, S., Durtschi, J., & Toews, M. (2020). Factors related to college students'

    decisions to report sexual assault. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, *35*(21-22), 4666-

    4685. DOI: 10.1177/0886260517717490

Starzynski, L., Ullman, S., Filipas, H., & Townsend, S. (2005). Correlates of women's sexual

    assault disclosure to informal and formal support sources. *Violence and Victims 20*(4),

    417-432. DOI:10.1891/0886-6708.20.4.417

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2017). *Tips for survivors of a disaster or other traumatic event: coping with retraumatization* [Brochure]. https://store.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/d7/priv/sma17-5047.pdf

Sylaska, K. M., & Edwards, K. M. (2014). Disclosure of Intimate Partner Violence to Informal Social Support Network Members: A Review of the Literature. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 15(1), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838013496335

The Criminal Justice System: Statistics. *Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN).* (2020). Retrieved November 07, 2021, from https://www.rainn.org/statistics/criminal-justice-system

The Trustees of Princeton University. (2021, January). *Information regarding sanctions in sexual misconduct cases*. Princeton University. Retrieved November 9, 2021, from https://sexualmisconduct.princeton.edu/reports/sanctions.

Ullman, S. E., Filipas, H. H. (2001). Correlates of formal and informal support seeking in sexual assault victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence. 16*(10), 1028-1047. DOI: 10.1177/088626001016010004

Ullman, S. E., & Peter-Hagene, L. (2014). Social reactions to sexual assault disclosure, coping, perceived control, and PTSD symptoms in sexual assault victims. *Journal of community psychology, 42*(4), 495-508. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21624

Appendix A
Survey

Your Experience on Your Terms: A survivor-based analysis

1 Do you identify as female?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

○ Prefer not to answer (3)

2 Are you 18 years old or older?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

3 Have you experienced what you would consider to be a sexual assault while enrolled at a public college or university?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

4 Was this experience in the last ten years?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

5 Have you told anyone about your experience?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

6 What is your age?

○ 18 (1)

○ 19 (2)

○ 20 (3)

○ 21 (4)

○ 22 (5)

○ 23 (6)

○ 24 (7)

○ 25 (8)

○ 26 (9)

○ 27 (10)

○ 28 (11)

7 Are you still a student at the institution where you experienced sexual violence?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

8 At the time of your experience of sexual assault, what year were you in?

○ Freshman (1)

○ Sophomore (2)

○ Junior (3)

○ Senior (4)

○ Fifth Year (5)

○ Other (6)

9 If you are willing, please state the name of the institution you attend(ed): (This question is optional, but the information gathered would be important for implications for future research and to identify patterns)

_____

10 After sexual assault, it is common that individuals keep their experiences to themselves. However, many people choose to disclose to a source of support, either formal (law enforcement, medical professionals, university officials or support organizations) or informal (friends, family members), to receive some form of support. Your participation thus far indicates that you have disclosed to at least one source of support. Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge.

11 Approximately how much time passed between your experience and first disclosure?

○ Up to three months (1)

○ 3-6 months (2)

○ 6 months-1 year (3)

○ 1 year or more (4)

12 Who did you first disclose to?

○ Law enforcement officer (1)

○ University official (2)

○ Medical professional (3)

○ Support organization (4)

○ Other formal source of support (5)

○ Family member (6)

○ Friend (7)

○ Co-worker (8)

○ Other informal source of support (9)

13 Did you ask to be kept anonymous?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

14. Did you ask that they keep your information confidential?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

15 Why did you choose to disclose to this source of support first?

_____

16 What did you expect from the source of support you disclosed to: (Select all that apply)

☐ Emotional support (1)

☐ Legal action (2)

☐ Medical treatment (3)

☐ Transportation (4)

☐ Locate resources (5)

☐ Advocacy (6)

☐ Other (7) _____

17 When you disclosed to this source of support…

	Yes (1)	No (2)
Were you made aware of how they planned to support you? (1)	○	○
Did you have a say in how they proceeded with providing you with support? (2)	○	○
Did you share your expectations for support/what support you were hoping they could provide? (3)	○	○

18 Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A)

	Not satisfied (1)	Slightly satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Very satisfied (4)	Extremely satisfied (5)	N/A (6)
Establishment of your support expectations (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Recognition of your support expectations (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Respect of your support expectations (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Establishment of trust (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Trauma-informed discourse (consideration of tone, language choice…) (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Collaboration to determine next steps (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Clear establishment of their plan to support you (7)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Clear expression of their efforts to support you (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Honest communication (9)	○	○	○	○	○	○

19 Did the source of support you disclosed to do any of the following:

	Yes (1)	No (2)
Share your experience without your consent (1)	○	○
Contact other resources without your consent (2)	○	○
Contact one of your friends or family members without your consent (3)	○	○
Interact with your assailant without your consent (4)	○	○
Reveal your identity without your consent (5)	○	○

20 Indicate the level of which your expectations for support from this source were met:
1-did not meet any expectations, 5- exceeded my expectations

	1	2	3	4	5

Indicate the level of which your expectations for support from this source were met: ()	▬▬▬▬▬▬|▬▬▬▬▬

21 Elaboration regarding the above question (indicate the level of which your expectations for support from this source were met) is optional:

_____

22 Were you at any time...

	Yes (1)	No (2)
questioned by this source of support for any reason? (1)	○	○
specifically questioned regarding inconsistencies in your account of your experience? (2)	○	○
doubted by this source of support? (3)	○	○
discouraged by this source of support to continue speaking about your experience? (4)	○	○

23 What were the outcomes of disclosing to this source of support? What was accomplished? What support did you receive?

_____

24 Indicate how you felt after disclosing to this source of support:
1-not at all, 5-extremely

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Willing to seek further support (1)	○	○	○	○	○
Encouraged to disclose to another source of support (2)	○	○	○	○	○
Comfortable with disclosing to another source of support (3)	○	○	○	○	○

25 Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support:

☐   Self-doubt (1)

☐   Flashbacks (2)

☐   Nightmares (3)

☐   Difficulty concentrating (4)

☐   Trouble sleeping (5)

☐   Fatigue (6)

☐   Social isolation (7)

☐   Overall negative emotions (8)

☐   Inability to control emotions (9)

☐   Stress (10)

☐   Anxiousness (11)

☐   Fear (12)

☐   Feeling on edge (13)

☐   Physical reactions to triggers (14)

26 On a scale from 1-5, rate your overall experience disclosing to this source of support:
 1-horrible, 5-as good as possible

                                    1   2   3   4   5

Overall experience ()	

27 Based on your experience, would you recommend this <u>particular source of support</u> (**the individual**- ex. Officer John) to other survivors of sexual assault?

◯ Yes (1)

◯ No (2)

28 Based on your experience, would you recommend this <u>type of source of support</u> (**type of source**- ex. law enforcement officer) to other survivors of sexual assault?

◯ Yes (1)

◯ No (2)

End of Block: Survey Part Two

Start of Block: Survey Part Three

29 Overall, do you feel that the source of support you initially disclosed to provided you with the support you needed to heal from your experience?

◯ Yes (1)

◯ No (2)

30 Do you feel that disclosing to this source of support made your recovery more or less challenging to navigate?

◯ More challenging (1)

◯ Less challenging (2)

31 Do you feel that disclosing to this source of support hindered or helped your recovery?

○ Hindered (1)

○ Helped (2)

32 Do you feel that throughout your experiences with this source of support you were in charge of the information you shared with them?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

33 Do you feel that throughout your experiences with this source of support you were considered in all of the decisions that were made?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

34 Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience(s) with formal sources of support? (If no, leave blank)

_____

35 Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience at all? (if no, leave blank)

_____

36 Based on the truthfulness of your responses, should we consider your data?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

End of Block: Survey Part Three

Appendix B
Tables

Table 1.1

Did you ask to be kept anonymous?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	21	58.3	60.0	60.0
	No	14	38.9	40.0	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 1.2

Did you ask that they keep your information confidential?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	29	80.6	85.3	85.3
	No	5	13.9	14.7	100.0
	Total	34	94.4	100.0	
Missing	System	2	5.6		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 1.3

When you disclosed to this source of support… - Did you share your expectations for support/what support you were hoping they could provide?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	22	61.1	64.7	64.7
	No	12	33.3	35.3	100.0
	Total	34	94.4	100.0	
Missing	System	2	5.6		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 1.4

Do you feel that throughout your experiences with this source of support you were in charge of the information you shared with them?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	24	66.7	70.6	70.6
	No	10	27.8	29.4	100.0
	Total	34	94.4	100.0	
Missing	System	2	5.6		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 1.5

Do you feel that throughout your experiences with this source of support you were considered in all of the decisions that were made?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	21	58.3	63.6	63.6
	No	12	33.3	36.4	100.0
	Total	33	91.7	100.0	
Missing	System	3	8.3		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 2.1

When you disclosed to this source of support… - Were you made aware of how they planned to support you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	20	55.6	57.1	57.1
	No	15	41.7	42.9	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 2.2

When you disclosed to this source of support… - Did you have a say in how they proceeded with providing you with support?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	20	55.6	57.1	57.1
	No	15	41.7	42.9	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 2.3

Did the source of support you disclosed to do any of the following: - Share your experience without your consent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	7	19.4	20.0	20.0
	No	28	77.8	80.0	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 2.4

Did the source of support you disclosed to do any of the following: - Contact other resources without your consent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	3	8.3	8.8	8.8
	No	31	86.1	91.2	100.0
	Total	34	94.4	100.0	
Missing	System	2	5.6		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 2.5

Did the source of support you disclosed to do any of the following: - Contact one of your friends or family members without your consent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	7	19.4	20.0	20.0
	No	28	77.8	80.0	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 2.6

On a scale from 1-5, rate your overall experience disclosing to this source of support: 1-horrible, 5-as good as possible - Overall experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	6	16.7	19.4	19.4
	2.00	4	11.1	12.9	32.3
	3.00	6	16.7	19.4	51.6
	4.00	8	22.2	25.8	77.4
	5.00	7	19.4	22.6	100.0
	Total	31	86.1	100.0	
Missing	System	5	13.9		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 2.7.1

Group Statistics

	source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
On a scale from 1-5, rate your overall experience disclosing to this source of support: 1-horrible, 5-as good as possible - Overall experience	Formal	10	2.6000	1.57762	.49889
	Informal	21	3.4762	1.32737	.28966

Table 2.7.2

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
							Significance		Mean Differen ce	Std. Error Differ ence	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p			Lower	Upper
On a scale from 1-5, rate your overall experience disclosing to this source of support: 1-horrible, 5-as good as possible - Overall experience	Equal variances assumed	.740	.397	-1.618	29	.058	.117	-.87619	.54166	-1.9840	.23163
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.519	15. 308	.075	.149	-.87619	.57688	-2.1036	.35125

Table 2.7.3

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer[a]	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
On a scale from 1-5, rate your overall experience disclosing to this source of support: 1-horrible, 5-as good as possible - Overall experience	Cohen's d	1.40979	-.622	-1.386	.153
	Hedges' correction	1.44761	-.605	-1.350	.149
	Glass's delta	1.32737	-.660	-1.432	.128

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 3.1.1

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum*	Maximum**	Mean	Std. Deviation
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Recognition of your support expectations	30	4	1	5	3.10	1.398
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Establishment of trust	32	4	1	5	3.44	1.722
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Trauma-informed discourse (consideration of tone, language choice…)	31	4	1	5	3.13	1.384

Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Collaboration to determine next steps	31	4	1	5	2.81	1.376
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Clear expression of their efforts to support you	34	4	1	5	3.26	1.639
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Honest communication	33	4	1	5	3.48	1.642
Valid N (listwise)	26					

*Minimum response of 1= lowest satisfaction

**Maximum response of 5= highest satisfaction

Table 3.1.2

Group Statistics

	source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Establishment of your support expectations	Formal	11	2.64	1.362	.411
	Informal	20	3.00	1.556	.348
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Recognition of your support expectations	Formal	10	3.20	1.476	.467
	Informal	20	3.05	1.395	.312
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Respect of your support expectations	Formal	11	3.00	1.549	.467
	Informal	19	3.53	1.541	.353
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Establishment of trust	Formal	10	2.70	1.829	.578
	Informal	22	3.77	1.602	.341
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Trauma-informed discourse (consideration of tone, language choice…)	Formal	11	3.09	1.640	.495
	Informal	20	3.15	1.268	.284
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Collaboration to determine next steps	Formal	11	2.73	1.737	.524
	Informal	20	2.85	1.182	.264
	Formal	11	2.73	1.902	.574

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Clear establishment of their plan to support you	Informal	22	3.05	1.397	.298
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Clear expression of their efforts to support you	Formal	11	2.73	1.794	.541
	Informal	23	3.52	1.534	.320
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Honest communication	Formal	11	3.00	1.844	.556
	Informal	22	3.73	1.518	.324
Were you at any time... - questioned by this source of support for any reason?	Formal	11	1.64	.505	.152
	Informal	24	1.58	.504	.103
Were you at any time... - specifically questioned regarding inconsistencies in your account of your experience?	Formal	11	1.64	.505	.152
	Informal	24	1.88	.338	.069
Were you at any time... - doubted by this source of support?	Formal	11	1.73	.467	.141
	Informal	24	1.79	.415	.085
Were you at any time... - discouraged by this source of support to continue speaking about your experience?	Formal	11	1.64	.505	.152
	Informal	24	1.79	.415	.085
Indicate how you felt after disclosing to this source of support:1-not at all, 5-extremely - Willing to seek further support	Formal	11	2.18	1.250	.377
	Informal	24	2.46	1.318	.269
Indicate how you felt after disclosing to this source of support:1-not at all, 5-extremely - Encouraged to disclose to another source of support	Formal	11	2.45	1.635	.493
	Informal	24	2.50	1.216	.248
Indicate how you felt after disclosing to this source of support:1-not at all, 5-extremely - Comfortable with disclosing to another source of support	Formal	11	2.27	1.794	.541
	Informal	24	2.75	1.327	.271
	Formal	6	1.00	.000[a]	.000

Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Self-doubt	Informal	19	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Flashbacks	Formal	10	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	19	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Nightmares	Formal	7	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	9	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Difficulty concentrating	Formal	4	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	9	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Trouble sleeping	Formal	6	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	13	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Fatigue	Formal	5	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	9	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Social isolation	Formal	5	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	13	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Overall negative emotions	Formal	7	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	17	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000

		N	Mean		
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Inability to control emotions	Formal	4	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	7	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Stress	Formal	6	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	17	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Anxiousness	Formal	7	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	18	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Fear	Formal	4	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	14	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Feeling on edge	Formal	4	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	13	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Indicate if any of these symptoms of retraumatization were heightened or experienced for the first time after disclosing to this source of support: Physical reactions to triggers	Formal	5	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
	Informal	14	1.00	.000ᵃ	.000
Do you feel that disclosing to this source of support made your recovery more or less challenging to navigate?	Formal	11	1.36	.505	.152
	Informal	23	1.74	.449	.094
Do you feel that disclosing to this source of support hindered or helped your recovery?	Formal	11	1.36	.505	.152
	Informal	23	1.78	.422	.088

a. t cannot be computed because the standard deviations of both groups are 0.

Table 3.2.1

Group Statistics

	source	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Establishment of trust	Formal	10	2.70	1.829	.578
	Informal	22	3.77	1.602	.341

Table 3.2.2

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
							Significance				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						One-Sided	Two-Sided	Mean Differ	Std. Error Differ		
		F	Sig.	t	df	p	p	ence	ence	Lower	Upper
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A): Establishment of trust	Equal variances assumed	1.090	.305	-1.681	30	.052	.103	-1.073	.638	-2.376	.230
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.597	15.558	.065	.130	-1.073	.672	-2.500	.354

Table 3.2.3

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer[a]	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval Lower	Upper
Indicate your satisfaction with the source of support's achievement of each of the following items: (If you do not feel the item applies to the experience you had, select N/A) - Establishment of trust	Cohen's d	1.673	-.641	-1.401	.129
	Hedges' correction	1.716	-.625	-1.366	.125
	Glass's delta	1.602	-.670	-1.437	.112

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.