Experience with Nonconsensual Sexual Contact (NCSC) at MIT

The 2019 AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Misconduct asked questions to provide separate estimates for incidents involving two types of nonconsensual sexual contact (penetration\(^1\) and sexual touching\(^2\)) through the use of four tactics (perpetrator’s use of physical force\(^3\); victim’s inability to consent to sexual contact or stop what was happening\(^4\); coercion\(^5\) of the victim; or contact which continued without active, ongoing, voluntary agreement\(^6\) from the victim).

- One in 14 (7.2%) of MIT students experienced nonconsensual sexual contact (penetration or sexual touching) by physical force or inability to consent or stop what was happening since entering MIT. The highest rates in this category are seen among undergraduate women (18.4%), non-heterosexual students\(^7\) (13.9%), TGQN\(^8\) students (11.9%). Students who indicated they have a disability had a prevalence rate of 14.4%.
  
  [MIT Tables 3.1-3.5, 4.3]

- One in nine (11.0%) MIT students experienced nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force, inability to consent, coercion, or without voluntary agreement. The highest rates are for undergraduate women (26.7%), TGQN students (19.3%), and graduate women (13.5%). [MIT Table 4.6]

---

1 Penetration: Putting a penis, finger, or object inside someone else's vagina or anus; someone's mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else's genitals. If the student reported both penetration and sexual touching in the same incident, the penetration was counted in the estimates.

2 Sexual Touching: Kissing; Touching someone’s breast, chest, crotch, groin, or buttocks; Grabbing, groping, or rubbing against the other in a sexual way, even if the touching is over the other's clothes.

3 Physical force: Incidents that involved force or threats of force against the victim. Force could include someone using their body weight to hold another person down, pinning their arms, hitting or kicking them, or using or threatening to use a weapon against them.

4 Inability to consent or stop what was happening: Incidents where the person was passed out, asleep, or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol. Survey instructions include, “Please include incidents even if you are not sure what happened.”

5 Coercion: Incidents when someone coerced the victim by threatening serious non-physical harm or promising rewards. Examples include threatening to give someone bad grades or cause trouble for them at work; promising good grades or a promotion at work; threatening to share damaging information about them with their family, friends, or authority figures; or threatening to post damaging information about them online.

6 Without voluntary agreement: Incidents that occurred without the person’s active ongoing voluntary agreement. Examples include someone initiating sexual activity despite the other person’s refusal; ignoring their cues to stop or slow down; went ahead without checking in or while they were still deciding; otherwise failed to obtain their consent.

7 Non-heterosexuals include Gay or lesbian; Bisexual; Asexual; Queer; Questioning; Other categories

8 TGQN: Trans woman or man, nonbinary or genderqueer, questioning, not listed
Nonconsensual Sexual Contact, AAU Aggregate for All Participating Schools

The AAU aggregate survey found significant levels of sexual misconduct on campus and disparities in the prevalence of sexual misconduct among different categories of students. The overall rate of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or inability to consent since the student enrolled at the school was 13.0 percent, with the rates for women, TGQN, and undergraduate students being significantly higher than for men and graduate/professional students.

For the 21 schools participating in both the 2015 and 2019 surveys (MIT did not), the rate of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or inability to consent went up in 2019 by 3.0 percentage points (to 26.4 percent) for undergraduate women; by 2.4 points for graduate and professional women (to 10.8 percent); and by 1.4 points for undergraduate men (to 6.9 percent). The changes for TGQN students were not statistically significant (which were 23.1 percent in 2019 and 14.6 percent in 2019 for undergraduate and graduate/professional students, respectively).

Comparing MIT’s 2014 and 2019 Surveys

The questions about unwanted sexual behaviors from MIT’s 2014 Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault (CASA) survey are not directly comparable to questions about nonconsensual sexual contact from the AAU 2015 and 2019 surveys because the questions in the two surveys were different.

Both surveys asked students behavioral questions about experiencing sexual assault. In the AAU and CASA surveys, however, the behaviors (completed penetration, attempted penetration, sexual touching) and the tactics (force, inability to consent, coercion, etc.) that were asked about were not the same. Moreover, the AAU 2019 results are computed using a weighting procedure to account for different response rates among different demographics, while the CASA results are unweighted. As a result of these and other differences, the results from 2014 and 2019 are not directly comparable.

With this as context, 6.5% of CASA 2014 survey respondents reported an experience of unwanted sexual behaviors involving use of force, physical threat, or incapacitation while at MIT, with 16.6% of undergraduate women; 8.3% of graduate women; 4.6% of undergraduate men; and 1.2% of graduate men experiencing this. 11.7% of non-heterosexual respondents and 6.2% of heterosexuals experienced this.

Figure 2: Nonconsensual Sexual Contact, AAU Aggregate

Characteristics of students who experienced nonconsensual sexual contact by force or inability to consent in AAU aggregate
What were some characteristics of the offenders of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or inability to consent at MIT? [MIT Table 3.9, AAU Table 18]

- **Gender identity of the offender.** Of the women who experienced this, 98% indicated a man was involved in doing this to them. Of the men, 68.5% indicated a woman was involved, 32.7% said a man was involved.

- **Offender association with MIT.** Of the women who experienced this, 67.4% indicated an MIT student was involved; 3.2% said MIT alumni were involved; 3.0% said Research staff were involved; 28.2% said a person not associated with MIT was involved. Of the men who experienced this, 64.0% indicated an MIT student was involved; 26.9% said a person not associated with MIT was involved.

- **Relationship to you.** Of the women who experienced this: 33.5% said it was a friend; 31.3% said it was someone they knew or recognized, but was not a friend; 18.8% said it was someone they were involved or intimate with at the time; 18.3% said they did not know or recognize the person; 11.7% said it was a classmate; 9.1% said it was someone they previously had been involved or intimate with; and 3.5% said it was a co-worker.

For men: 43.0% said it was a friend; 30.1% said it was someone they knew or recognized, but was not a friend; 20.6% said it was someone they were involved or intimate with at the time; 15.1% said they did not know or recognize the person; 12.7% said it was a classmate; and 12.4% said it was someone they previously had been involved or intimate with.

What are some of the impacts and consequences for MIT respondents who experienced NCSC by force or inability to consent? [Table 3.12]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoided or tried to avoid the person(s)</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of interest in daily activities...hopelessness</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling numb or detached</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearfulness or being concerned about safety</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal from interactions with friends</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased drug or alcohol use</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty concentrating on studies, assignments, or exams</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased class attendance</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty going to work</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty concentrating on thesis, research or lab duties</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ emotional, academic or physical consequence</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do MIT students who experience NCSC contact a resource about their experience? If they didn’t, why not? [Table 3.14]

- Of the women who experienced penetration involving physical force or inability to consent, 40.0% contacted a program or resource.  
  In this group, among respondents who didn’t contact a program or resource: 48.5% of respondents reported they could handle it themselves; 48.1% reported the incident was not serious enough, and 31.7% reported being embarrassed, ashamed, or that it would be too emotionally difficult.

- Of the women who experienced sexual touching by physical force or inability to consent, 22.7% contacted a program or resource.  
  In this group, among respondents who didn’t contact a program or resource: 57.2% reported it was not serious enough and 56.8% of women did not contact a program or resource because they could handle it themselves.

- About 10% of men who experienced penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or inability to consent contacted a program or resource.

- The top resources contacted were MIT Student Mental Health and Counseling; MIT Violence Prevention & Response; and MIT Title IX & Bias Response (T9BR), including Title IX Coordinators.

---

9 AAU aggregate: 29.4% of women contacted a resource after experiencing penetration by physical force or inability to consent
10 AAU aggregate: 12.3% of women contacted a resource after experiencing sexual touching by physical force or inability to consent
11 AAU aggregate: 17.7% of men contacted a resource after experiencing penetration by physical force or inability to consent; 9.8% of men who experienced sexual touching
In addition to nonconsensual sexual contact, the survey helped us understand student experience of stalking behaviors and intimate partner violence (IPV).

Among all MIT students, 11.7% experienced one or more stalking behaviors; 5.1% of MIT students experienced these behaviors by the same person more than once and feared for their safety or experienced substantial emotional distress. In the AAU aggregate, 15.8% of students experienced stalking behavior, and 5.8% experienced stalking.

### 11.7% experienced one or more stalking behaviors
- Spied on, watched, or followed you in person, or monitored your activities or tracked your location using devices or your phone or computer?, 2.0%
- Showed up somewhere uninvited or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there?, 6.7%
- Made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text, or instant messages to you, or posted unwanted messages, pictures, or videos on social media to or about you or elsewhere online?, 6.6%

### 7.3% experienced these behaviors from their partner
- Used any kind of physical force against you or otherwise physically hurt or injured you?, 1.8%
- Threatened to physically harm you, someone you love, or him/herself?, 3.3%
- Controlled or tried to control you?, 5.3%

Overall, 71.6% of students reported they had been in a partnered relationship (i.e., marriage or civil union, domestic partnership or cohabitation, steady or serious relationship, or other ongoing relationship involving physical or sexual contact) since entering MIT. Among those in a partnered relationship, 7.3% of students indicated that they had experienced at least one type of intimate partner violence. (MIT Table 5.5) In the AAU aggregate data for all schools, 10.1% experienced IPV.