

Early Identification of Grooming and Targeting in Predatory Sexual Behavior on College Campuses

Brian Van Brunt, EdD,¹ Amy Murphy, PhD,² Lisa Pescara-Kovach, PhD,¹ and Gina-Lyn Crance, EdD³

Abstract

Institutions of higher education have an opportunity through prevention programs, education, and early intervention to reduce the occurrence of sexual violence within their student population. This article outlines grooming and targeting behaviors used in sexual predation in an effort to better inform those working in student conduct, the student affairs department, law enforcement, prevention education, and counseling/health services.

Keywords: grooming, sexual assault, college sexual assault, rape

Introduction

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IS a broad term used to describe sexual abuse and sexual assault. Issues of sexual violence on college campuses are certainly not a new topic. Multiple U.S. agencies such as the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Center for Disease Control, and the Department of Defense (Centers for Disease Control 2016a, 2016b; Department of Defense 2015; Morrison et al. 2004; O'Toole 2000; U.S. Department of Education 2001) have addressed sexual violence education, intervention, and prevention in many forms.

The AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct (Cantor et al. 2015) reported that 11.2% of undergraduate and graduate students experience sexual assault or rape that involves violence, incapacitation, or physical force. Other studies have found approximately 30% of college-aged men self-report the use of physical violence with an intimate partner, beginning at the age of 14 (Edwards et al. 2013); 1/2–2/3 of sexual assault incidents are associated with alcohol or other drugs (Abbey, 2002; Abbey et al. 2001; American College Health Association, 2008; Knight et al. 2002; Krebs et al. 2007; Little et al. 2009; Zapp 2014), with verbal coercion as one of the most frequent tactics used by college-aged males who perpetrate sexual assaults. Research suggests that 67–83% of these men admit to using coercion as a tactic (DeGue and DiLillo 2004; Kosson et al. 1997).

In recent years, sexual violence on college campuses has been the focus of increased scrutiny and resulting prevention efforts (Murphy and Van Brunt 2016; Van Brunt et al. 2015).

Given the vast scope of the problem, additional research and exploration on the motivations and causes of sexual assault would be helpful to reduce predatory behavior. One facet is understanding the rise of sexual predation on campus, namely those individuals who prey on others to meet their own sexual needs and/or exert a sense of power and control through sexual assault and rape.

Predators use coercion and grooming behaviors to lower the defenses of the target and increase their vulnerability to sexual violence (Armstrong et al. 2006; Humphrey and Kahn 2000; LaViolette and Barnett 2000; Meloy and Fisher 2005; Sokolow et al. 2015). Predators seek to lessen a victim's ability to advocate for personal safety and disempower them from bringing concerns forward to authorities (LaViolette and Barnett 2000; Teranishi-Martinez 2014). These behaviors also occur in social settings where the targets are softened through environmental factors such as unrestricted access to mass quantities of alcohol, parties with limited exits or lacking quiet, safe places to check in with supportive friends, and the saturation of misogynistic or sexually charged posters, music, or visual displays (Armstrong et al. 2006; Humphrey and Kahn 2000; LaViolette and Barnett 2000).

Understanding the motivation, tactics, and techniques used by predators is critical to focusing prevention efforts to be more effective moving forward. In terms of narrowing down these efforts, Fedina, Holmes, and Backes (2018) indicate the "high prevalence of unwanted sexual contact and coercion suggests that prevention efforts focus on the dynamics of these two forms of victimization" (p. 90). In this next section, we will explore some of the motivation and tactics used by predators.

¹Center for Education in Targeted Violence and Suicide, University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio.

²Department of Curriculum & Instruction, Angelo State University, San Angelo, Texas.

³Harrisburg Area Community College, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

A Predation Model

There are a variety of models that consider steps a predator takes on the pathway to sexual violence (Lanning 2010; Olson et al. 2007). While most of these models are based on studies of child molestation, the stages offer insight into sexual predation for the purposes of this study. First, perpetrators of sexual violence are intentional in the selection of a victim based on perceived vulnerabilities and access (Armstrong et al. 2006; Lanning 2010). Next, they develop a deceptive trust with the victim, and in some cases, the victim's family or friends, through the exchange of personal information, shared activities, and positive comments (LaViolette and Barnett 2000; Teranishi-Martinez 2014).

Grooming continues by desensitizing the victim to negative attitudes and behaviors such as vulgar sexual language, pornographic images (Carr and VanDeusen 2004; Sinkovic et al. 2013), the use of substances to lower defensiveness and negatively impact protective thinking (EverFi, 2013; Schwartz and DeKeseredy 1997), and dismissive and misogynic treatment of women to create an unsafe environment (Armstrong et al. 2006; LaViolette and Barnett 2000). Activities are often reframed to place a positive spin on what has occurred and/or the victim is isolated physically and mentally from those who would offer safety and support (Humphrey and Kahn 2000; Teranishi-Martinez 2014). These steps either expand access to the victim so that sexual activity can occur or alter how the victim views the sexual behavior, so it is not recognized as sexual violence or abuse.

Motivation: Power and Control or Sexual Gratification?

While there is a temptation in the field of sexual assault prevention and victim advocacy to assert that sexual assault is not about sex, but rather about power and control, we would suggest this applies a limiting view of what many conduct or student affairs offices are experiencing. Title IX offices and counseling centers, as well as feminist and social justice frameworks, have often cited societal norms, gender roles, and issues related to power and oppression as root factors of sexual violence (Davis et al. 2006). Attackers disregard the agency of others and seek to achieve sexual gratification. In the same way, a person may steal because they desire something, some rape to find sexual gratification, although with a nonconsenting other. Cahill (2001) points out the paradox of rape "that is the assailant has had sex with the victim, but the victim has not had sex with the assailant, and the experience is sexual, but it is not sex itself" (McPhail 2016, p. 320).

This rather myopic end, achieving sexual gratification from those who they feel are easiest to obtain it from (Murphy and Van Brunt 2016; Seegers 2010; Van Brunt et al. 2015; Zuckerman 1994, 2007), necessitates additional research and exploration. It would be reasonable to theorize the desire for sexual gratification may become an addictive drive for the student, leading to an increase in assaultive behavior.

Research suggests that perpetrators of sexual violence are influenced by stimuli in the environment that trigger a pleasurable neurochemical response similar to the experiences of drug addicts (Toates et al. 2015). Sussman and colleagues (2011) describe process addictions as those that comprise a series of potentially pathological behaviors that expose individuals to "mood altering events" by which they

achieve pleasure and become dependent. These process addictions can impact those with or without pathology. Those who trend toward pathology or psychopathy are more vulnerable to these addictive processes than the general student population. These experiences are repetitive in nature and the individual often ruminates on the topic with little success redirecting focus on other topics (Gordon 2002; Grant et al. 2006; Sussman et al. 2011). These patterns of behavior follow a path of least resistance to meet their sexual needs.

An additional motivation may be an underlying insecurity and clinging to the desperate short-sighted "need" for sexual gratification and great fear at the prospect of not getting it (Healey and Beauregard 2015; Sussman et al. 2011; Zuckerman 2007). In more extreme scenarios, "findings suggest that both persistent deviant sexual interests and persistent low self-esteem are important predictors of sexual homicide" (Healey and Beauregard 2015; p. 1225). There is additional evidence that violent sexual fantasy and low self-esteem are related to sexual homicide (Arrigo and Purcell 2001; Hickey 1997). A current example of this phenomenon can be found in the growth of the involuntary celibate, or "incel," movement, which has provided examples of misogynistic ideologies and horrific assaults and shootings.

A recent article describes some of these thoughts of young males who are unsuccessful at finding sex, "They berate themselves for not feeling like they're dateable and become highly angry at the stereotypical, attractive men and women (Chads and Stacys) who seemingly are able to effortlessly date and mate" (Louie 2018, p. 1). These individuals feel as if sex is owed to them. They express a desire to take it any way they can find it, including sexual assault. This further highlights the power of group influence and how these dominant group norms become shared ideologies. "Groups do not just inherit worldviews or suffer indoctrination. They also fantasize together. Ideology is group dream, the interaction of individuals suffering with shared traumas and fantasmic resolutions to inner crisis" (Piven 2017, p. 116).

This assertion that sexual predatory behavior is sometimes simply about achieving an orgasm should not be seen as diminishing the heinous, cruel, and devastating impact of the crime. While a controversial and new concept in need of future research and more data, there is evidence that this understudied phenomenon could be driving a larger percentage of motivations for attacks than previously indicated (Abbey and Jacques-Tiura 2011; Franklin et al. 2012; Marshall and Barbaree 1990; McKibbin et al. 2008; Murphy and Van Brunt 2016; Ward and Beech 2006).

Violence and ecstasy have historically been linked across various studies of violence (Piven 2017). The experiences of those in violent conflicts often include descriptions sexual in nature and describing the pleasure of harm as orgasmic. While tightly interwoven with issues of misogyny, aggression, and power, Piven points out that "remorse does not cancel out pleasure and in some cases even heightens it. The forbidden makes pleasure more alluring, more seductive" (2017, p. 110). McPhail (2016) describes "rape as a sexual act, upon and by specific bodies, with sexual consequences for the survivor... However, acknowledging rape as a sexual act in no way blames the victim." P. 321.

The authors concede this is not the only way sexual predatory behavior occurs. The driving force in some cases may be the desire to exert power and control over others. There may be a sexual gratification in the embarrassment, degradation, and harming of another person. In this study, the nonconsensual nature of taking something from someone becomes the motivating factor and the sexual assault or orgasm is simply a secondary outcome. To follow the theft analogy, there are times when people steal things when monetary gain is not the motivating factor, but instead the thrill of the act, the thwarting of societal values, or the illicit nature of breaking a rule or hurting another person becomes the central motivation (Cahill 2001; McPhail 2016).

It is essential to more fully understand the motivations of those who commit sexual assault to more effectively target these behaviors, thoughts, and ideas for reduction. Our intention is not to simply argue against the common conception that sexual assault is about power and control and not about sex, but rather to more fully understand the motivations of those who seek to take from others and leave harm and devastation in their wake. There is debate among criminology, psychology, and the feminist perspectives. There seems to be a willingness to consider sexual predators outside of the college environment as committing crimes for the sake of their own sexual gratification, but there seems to be less willingness to acknowledge the behaviors of college students as criminal in the same way. Thus, interrelated to issues of privilege and power and control, it is important that we not disregard the criminal nature of the behaviors and the motivation of sexual gratification in our work with college students.

For example, if a college male rapes an unconscious college female at a party, who is incapacitated by alcohol, it may very well be the motivation for this behavior is simply obtaining sexual gratification in the easiest way possible. It may also be that the student is not primarily interested in having an orgasm, but rather is excited by the prospect of the degradation, dominance, and the theft of something from someone without their consent. An example of this can be found as the level of pornography has become more acceptable, both legally and culturally, the level of brutality toward, and degradation of women has intensified (Jensen 2004).

The degree of habitualization, increased novelty, and sensation seeking becomes a larger concern in terms of increased violence in pornography. In other words, the power and control differential in the scenario may be the primary factor rather than the sexual fulfillment (Murphy and Van Brunt 2016; Sanday 2007). Understanding the motivation, whether about power and control or sexual gratification, is essential to informing prevention, Title IX investigation, and conduct processes moving forward.

Four research-based risk factors emerged from our study that are useful to those working in the college areas of law enforcement, conduct, counseling, health services, and prevention education to better identify and intervene to prevent sexual assault. The list of factors is not meant to indicate the ability to predict that an individual will be sexually violent, but rather the list of factors is provided to outline behaviors and attitudes that are related to sexual violence as behaviors of concern to be addressed (Murphy and Van Brunt 2016).

Methodology

In the development of these four risk factors, the authors conducted a literature review across the fields of criminology, psychology, and education related to sexual assault, predation, and sexual violence. This literature review attends to one central research question: What risk factors related to grooming and targeting attitudes and behaviors are prevalent in the research on sexual violence? Two primary sources were used to guide the literature review and develop key search terms: *Uprooting Sexual Violence in Higher Education: A Guide for Practitioners and Faculty* (Murphy and Van Brunt 2016) and *The Dirty Dozen: Twelve Risk Factors for Sexual Violence on College Campuses* (Van Brunt et al. 2015).

To augment the research, the authors conducted an online literature search for key phrases, including “sexual assault,” “sexual gratification,” “college rape,” “alcohol and sexual assault,” “sexual violence,” “sexual perpetration,” “bystander intervention,” “college sexual assault statistics” and “motivation for rape.” A sample of the literature reviewed from a variety of fields included the following: psychology (Mouilso et al. 2013; Osland et al. 1996; Seto and Barbaree 1997), criminology (Craissati et al. 2002; Harris et al. 2003; Helmus and Hanson 2007), and education (Carr and Van-Deusen 2004; Murphy and Van Brunt 2016; Van Brunt et al. 2015). Searches for literature occurred in several electronic databases, specifically JSTOR, PsycINFO, PsycARTICLES, Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection, SAGE Journals Online, Wiley Online Library, Academic Search Complete, ERIC, Project MUSE, and SocINDEX.

The authors conducted a thematic analysis of 150 articles and books from the literature review. They found four common areas of overlap with more than 30 articles or books supporting each as a risk factor for sexual assault. These four factors are as follows: males using alcohol to facilitate sexual assault, a misogynistic and objectifying worldview, obtaining a vulnerable target, and group support for this culture (primarily all-male organizations such as fraternities and athletic teams).

Risk Factors

When exploring risk factors, it is helpful to identify patterns or constellations of behaviors to better understand personality and the tendency to act violently. There are perpetrators who prefer intoxicated, incapacitated victims. Others master the art of coercion and yet others rely on force to subdue the victim (Zinzow and Thompson 2015). Understanding the varied root causes and motivations for those who engage in sexual assault provides insight and targeted guidance on how and where to identify, intervene, and prevent violence.

As a cautionary statement, the manifestation of a single behavior is not particularly useful. It is patterns of behavior, such as inappropriate or out-of-control anger, repeated rule breaking, poor coping skills, equal opportunity hating, and prior use of violence, which should be considered in any risk assessment for sexual violence (Van Brunt et al. 2015). The central research goal of this article was to develop a set of risk factors related to the motivations, techniques, and behaviors related to sexual predation.

- (1) *The interplay between males and alcohol.* Men make up the majority of perpetrators (Jewkes et al. 2002;

Zapp 2014). This is not to say that women cannot be sexual perpetrators, but more to clarify that the vast majority of sexual assaults occur at the hands of men. The broadness of this risk factor certainly impacts its overall utility in terms of application; it would not be feasible to round up half the campus population as potential sexual predators. However, it is useful to understand that the majority of these crimes occur with men being the aggressor and women being assaulted when allocating limited prevention and education resources. In addition, members of all-male organizations such as fraternities and athletic teams have less healthy attitudes and behaviors related to sexual assault regarding victim blaming, rape myth acceptance, and consent (Bleeker and Murnen 2005; Forbes et al. 2006; Jewkes et al. 2002; Zapp 2014).

Most of the incidents of sexual assault in the college environment, 50–75%, are associated with alcohol or other drugs (Abbey et al. 2001; American College Health Association, 2008; Krebs et al. 2007; Zapp 2014). When looking at alcohol as a correlative factor in sexual assault, it is useful to understand that alcohol and other drugs may be used directly by the perpetrator to reduce the victim's defenses, impact their memory and recall, or work as a psychological pre-emptive defense against the perpetrator's own shame and guilt (Grazian 2007; West 2001).

In fact, male perpetrators often engage in victim blaming as a rationale for the assault and to reduce reporting (Bieneck and Krahe 2011; Krahe et al. 2007). These data around sexual assault and drugs and alcohol may also provide evidence of the 'crime of opportunity' argument, that finding an unconscious woman can be seen as similar to the theft of something valuable because it was left unattended. To avoid similar victim blaming implications in this article, allow us to be very clear: anyone, whether clothed or naked, intoxicated or inebriated, is not responsible for a violent attack. This responsibility lies solely on the perpetrator.

- (2) *The predator worldview.* Sexual assault perpetrators are identified as having higher levels of anger and hostility toward women, lower levels of empathy, and are more likely to hold traditional gender-role stereotypes (Seto and Barbaree 1997). In addition, perpetrators demonstrate "cognitive distortions about women's motives that support rape myths, and the desire to dominate and control women" (Abbey and Jacques-Tiura, 2011). These hardened perspectives related to traditional gender roles create justifications and entitlements, foster anger and hostility toward victims, and create a fertile ground for predatory behavior. When an attacker lacks empathy for a victim and instead sees the target as something "less than" or in a subservient, obedient, and compliant role, the assault is justified in the predator's mind. This becomes a moral disengagement from responsibility.

Perpetrators of assault often possess hardened points of view around themes of control and jealousy, possess objectification and depersonalization toward the target, and hold hostile and misogynistic beliefs about women (1998; Teranishi-Martinez 2014). They

see others as property and express the need to control others' behaviors, social environment, and access to information (Teranishi-Martinez 2014). Violence against women is seen as permissible, reasonable, and a justified action given their status as less-than, second-class objects or property, as if sex is something owed to the perpetrator.

These attitudes and beliefs are reinforced and nurtured with toxic masculinity (Carr and VanDeusen 2004; Kilmartin 2000; Rozee and Koss, 2001). These traits embolden the attacker and provide justification for their behavior, allowing them to become further distanced from alternative perspectives, critical thinking, and taking responsibility for their actions. Their behavior becomes morally justified to account for their conduct and they see their actions as serving a worthy purpose or attributing blame for their negative behavior to the other party (Bandura 1999; Kohlberg 1973). They defend their actions with statements such as "I am just giving her what she wants" or "She asked for it." These red flag phrases are examples of moral disengagement and justification to better rationalize their behavior.

Frequent consumption of sexually explicit material reinforces these traits and contributes to the predator's understanding of the world around him (Carr and VanDeusen 2004; Jewkes et al. 2002; Malamuth et al. 2000; Oddone-Paolucci et al. 2000). In the research, this exposure is moderately correlated with a variety of negative outcomes, including increased sexual violence perpetration and endorsement of rape myths (Carr and VanDeusen 2004; Jewkes et al. 2002; Malamuth et al. 2000; Oddone-Paolucci et al. 2000). Jensen (2004) shows that as pornography has become more acceptable in society, both legally and culturally, the level of brutality toward, and degradation of, women has intensified. This consumption bolsters the perpetrator by feeding into misogynistic ideologies, objectification and the depersonalization of women as solely objects of sexual gratification.

While these studies are compelling and useful to understand how repetitive reviewing of material reinforces negative and degrading views of others, pornography consumption does not cause rape (Jensen 2004). The argument here is frequent consumption of pornography that depicts women as objects and deserving of degradation and brutality further strengthens the predatory mindset.

- (3) *Vulnerability and devaluing of target.* In research on grooming and child sexual abuse, the identification and selection of a target are often based on perceived vulnerabilities and ease of access along with attractiveness and appeal (Lanning 2010). On the college campus, vulnerable populations include those who are at risk for loss of status or opportunity if they report or challenge the offender (Boswell and Spade 1996; Godenzi et al. 2001; Sanday 2007).

Power differentials contribute to this dynamic where refusal of sexual advances or negative attitudes to reporting can increase the vulnerability of the target population. Examples include students participating in elite activities and receiving scholar-

ships, faculty competing for tenure or appointments, international students relying on student status for a visa, or members of selective social organizations. In these cases, the perpetrator knows that participation in these selective types of programs and activities is critically important to the target and can be used to gain access to targets as well as to manipulate what is required of the target to maintain status.

Here, the predator may also seek to make the target more vulnerable by attacking their self-esteem and access to safety and support. This may occur through the use of disparaging remarks, infantilizing behavior, or insulting or objectifying language to reduce the target's humanity and sense of self (Armstrong et al. 2006; LaViolette and Barnett 2000; Teranishi-Martinez 2014). The term in popular culture here is "negging." The predator may seek to use physical threats, social shaming, or intellectual insults to create a sense of power and control.

Researchers have shared examples of statements demonstrating the entitlement of perpetrators and the desire to link themselves permanently to their partner such as "I'll never let you go" and "If I can't have you, no one will." (Teranishi-Martinez 2014). This limits the individual's ability to make safe choices. This isolation of the target has long been seen as a mechanism to decrease their access to help and support and create such a sense of fear and danger that compliance becomes a more likely outcome (Teranishi-Martinez 2014).

The development of the #metoo movement is a positive example of how to reduce the vulnerability of the victims and increase awareness of predatory behavior by identifying offenders and creating safety for victims to be supported more broadly at a societal level. The moment began with Tarana Burke, a civil rights activist who coined the phrase in 2006 (Chuck 2017). It was revitalized by the October 2017 hashtag #metoo on Twitter and the publication of the December Time Magazine person of the year (Time 2017).

- (4) *Building coalitions and seeking a favorable community.* Grooming behaviors have often been conceptualized as a process one individual does to another. Some research has found that perpetrators of sexual violence also identify environments (families, groups, and institutions) where vulnerabilities make it easier to perpetrate sexual violence (McAlinden 2006). The predatory behavior includes identifying elements within the environment that serve to legitimize the sexually abusive activities and reduce the defenses of community members by decreasing their sensitivity to what they observe or experience (Jozkowski and Wiersma-Mosley 2017).

The norms of the group begin to reflect less healthy activities and experiences, or the group may have a legacy of behaviors where sexually violent activities are more accepted (Grazian 2007; Menning 2009). The perpetrator may have special status within the group or community that increases their access and influence, fostering the process of icon intimidation (O'Toole and Bowman 2011). Icon intimidation occurs when a person's status, fame, or power

may influence how their actions are seen. The perpetrator's status allows them to further manipulate the norms and rules within the community in their favor to continue their predation. This can result in settings where reporting is discouraged or even disregarded.

Grooming behaviors for sexual assault may also be seen in the social settings created by high-risk fraternities as documented in a study by Boswell and Spade (1996). Environments are created with an unequal mix of gender participating in events, gender segregation throughout the event, and men treating women less respectfully with degrading jokes and conversations. The climate of a party nurtured by the host creates a fertile hunting ground for predators by limiting access to safe and quiet locations that thereby constrain bystander intervention opportunities and access to support and safety (Humphrey and Kahn 2000; Murphy and Van Brunt 2016). As stated earlier, extreme alcohol use in group settings increases conformity to group norms by reducing inhibitions and individual judgment, and by increasing group bonding (Jewkes et al. 2002). In more extreme cases, an individual or group uses substances to facilitate sexual assaults and to excuse the perpetrator's behavior.

Discussion and Application

As college personnel become more familiar with behavioral and situational risk factors for sexual predation, the opportunity to design or strengthen prevention education and intervention exists. These prevention efforts should foster early awareness and identification of predatory behaviors, include social norming campaigns to address myths and misconceptions, and serve to inform sanctions as part of the Title IX or student conduct process.

Understanding the common threads of alcohol and substance use, vulnerable populations, and predatory attitudes and behaviors across prevention and wellness issues is an important strategy for improving and sustaining prevention efforts. For example, a program related to hazing prevention has implications for the organizational environment in which students participate, and the vulnerability to other predatory behaviors. Unfortunately, prevention programming and activities on campus are often decentralized and span across a number of departments and units, including alcohol and drug prevention offices, student organization units, wellness departments, human resource functions, and other student activity areas.

The lack of strategic coordination across the institution can result in disparate initiatives to educate community members and missed opportunities for these intersecting issues of concern. Efforts to better collaborate and cooperate with programming such as bystander intervention and empowerment, mental health awareness, orientation to college, hazing prevention, risk mitigation, and critical thinking development could be achieved without additional staff or resources. In fact, an argument could be made that these collaborations and partnerships could actually save costs and valuable staff time.

Prevention education programs must begin early in the college experience at new student orientation or before.

Engaging new students in a prevention education program that both makes them aware of these risk factors and provides training in how to identify the behaviors is critical as students acclimate to their new environments. Creating and delivering curriculum focused on these risk factors, applicable in and outside of formal programs, serve to change campus climate and identify targeted interventions for populations most at risk. Working with new student orientation staff, prevention educators may use the risk factors to introduce concepts and behaviors and revisit these risk factors through programming, outreach, and education over the course of the student lifecycle. Particular attention should be paid to student development theory and the intersection between students' lived experiences, capacity to absorb and accept the prevention education information, and ability to act on the information presented, either in their own behaviors or as a bystander.

Campus police training should include awareness and deep dive work into the risk factors presented. Investigations into conduct violations and socially inappropriate behavior allow campus police to identify potential hotspots of predatory behavior. There is a long history in the sexual violence literature of past behaviors indicating future behavior (1994, 1995; Kropp et al. 1998). Working with campus police to identify patterns larger than any involved in a single violation provides an opportunity to assess individuals and groups for risk behaviors and then, further, to collaborate with other student affairs professionals to develop targeted programs to address the behaviors. Partnerships with student activities professionals and Greek advisors can strengthen prevention education for affinity groups that display grooming behaviors.

Student Conduct officers play an important role in both adjudicating violations of conduct and training panels and hearing boards in decision making and sanctioning. Competent officers and boards will be trained in the broad range of sexual violence and underlying behaviors and attitudes that promulgate predatory behaviors. The use of the risk factors presented above will assist professionals in attaining a deeper understanding of the root elements that can be observed in reports presented by victims and respondents.

Conduct officers and hearing boards may be privy to details of incidents occurring in the campus environment that may not immediately present as sexual violence, but, in fact may involve students using similar or parallel behaviors in different settings. Conduct officers may use the factors outlined, as present in their own campus community, to build a foundation of work beyond any individual hearing, sanction, or remedy. Targeted work with a specific population is critical for changing campus cultures that tolerate sexual misconduct.

College health and counseling services serve students best through integrated wellness initiatives that address mental health and physical wellness. Early intervention and counseling upon presentation of these risk factors may have a high impact in reducing sexual violence. Particularly helpful is understanding how the risk factors link in presenting symptomology when students present with other related concerns. Risky dating and alcohol behaviors combined with lack of empathy and other grooming behaviors are a strong indicator of future paraphilia.

Campus leaders in medical and psychological health services would be well served by developing treatment

modalities that address sexual health and wellness from the perspective of exposure to or presentation of the risk factors outlined above. Approaches should address thoughts, behaviors, and perspectives of both victims and respondents, which may help individuals gain greater self-understanding, compassion, and self-care. These may include Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Dialectical Behavioral Therapy (DBT), and Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) (Ellis 2007; Linehan 1993; Luong and Wor-mith 2006; Shapiro, 2001).

Future Research

To better understand predation on the college campus, additional research is needed.

A critical, but challenging area to explore would be developing interviews with those who have sexually assaulted in the college population to better understand the motivations driving the perpetrator to an assault. Some challenges of this type of research would include access to those who have perpetrated sexual violence, assessing the validity and potential deception (either implicit or explicit) of those being interviewed, and the anonymity or the responses for those who may be currently incarcerated or under legal or criminal probation or sanctions.

Another option may be a quantitative survey of college students asking a more direct question to those who have sexually assaulted others. The challenge of this methodology would certainly be the triggering nature of the questions to victims of sexual assault and the perception of pushing against the long-held belief that sexual assault is about power and control, rather than ease of sexual gratification. In addition, finding a college or university willing to survey its students who commit a crime would likely experience negative push back from public relations and the admissions office. While the data would be useful, the "Not in My Backyard" issue of location would be a significant hurdle to overcome.

Another area of study would be addressing the challenge that most research on grooming behaviors is situated in the context of child abuse and online activities of child molesters. The various stages of grooming appear to have implications for predation on the college campus, but research should examine the unique nature of college environments and how the various stages of grooming differ. The use of alcohol and other drugs in the grooming process, the role of affinity groups, and the interplay with different college settings would offer better insight into predation on the college campus. A better understanding of the contexts and climates in which sexual predation is able to grow and take hold is an important element of consideration.

Prevention activities related to predatory behavior can also be enhanced with more research on protective factors. For example, the role of empathy development in student development programming may offer a protective factor against the predatory worldview risk factor. Research that considers vulnerability among various populations on the college campus and the corresponding protective elements can decrease the ability of predators to identify and select victims. These efforts could be focused on bolstering the sense of community and support within populations new to the college setting and those presenting with increased vulnerability. Efforts such as

bystander empowerment and intervention (Burn 2009) and social norming campaigns (Berkowitz 2004) would be examples of these prevention and education efforts.

Conclusion

Sexual predatory behavior is a complicated, diverse topic with a rich research base within criminology, education, and psychology. The behaviors and attitudes of the sexual predator should be seen as a varied typology rather than a singular construct. There are some who seek out victims to exert their own power and control cravings; others simply seek the path of least resistance when it comes to sexual gratification by identifying vulnerable populations and using grooming behaviors to reduce defensiveness. The goal of this article is to help the reader better understand the risk factors associated with sexual assault and develop a broader awareness of those individuals who manipulate the definitions of personal agency and consent, and use alcohol to blur the lines between consensual sexual interactions and rape. Our intent is not to create an apology or lessen the heinousness of these motivations, but rather shine light on the motivations of those who manipulate and take from others.

It is with appreciation, comradery, and a shared vision that we support the viral spread of the #metoo movement. We recognize and applaud those silence-breakers, who have experienced sexual assault, harassment, stalking, and manipulative behaviors, and their strength coming forward to share their stories and shed light into the darkness of sexual predatory behaviors, whether these be particularly egregious, as with rape and domestic violence, or those behaviors that create a fertile ground for toxic masculinity and misogyny, reducing victim confidence or shaming those who speak out.

We share the societal concern about those icons in our community, acting from positions of power and popularity, who abuse their status and intimidate others into submission and silence. It is our hope that this research brings awareness and continues the work done by others in the field to better reduce sexual predation on the college campus and in the wider community.

Author Disclosure Statement

No competing financial interests exist.

References

- Abbey, A. (2002). Alcohol-Related Sexual Assault: A Common Problem among College Students. *J Stud Alcohol*, Supplement No. 14, 118–128.
- Abbey A, Jacques-Tiura AJ. (2011). Sexual assault perpetrators' tactics: Associations with Their Personal Characteristics and Aspects of the Incident. *J Interpers Violence*. 26, 2866–2889.
- Abbey A, Zawacki MA, Buck PO, et al. (2001). Alcohol and sexual assault. *Alcohol Res Health*. 25, 43–51.
- American College Health Association. (2008). Shifting the paradigm: Primary prevention of sexual violence. Retrieved from https://www.acha.org/documents/resources/ACHA_PSV_toolkit.pdf (accessed September 4, 2018)
- Armstrong E, Hamilton L, Sweeny B. (2006). Sexual assault on campus: A multilevel, integrative approach to party rape. *Soc Stud Soc Probl*. 53, 483–499.
- Arrigo BA, Purcell CE. (2001). Explaining paraphilias and lust murder: Toward an integrated model. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*. 45, 6–31.
- Bandura A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev*. [Special issue on evil and violence]. 3, 193–209.
- Belfrage H, Strand S. (2008). Validation of the stalking assessment and management checklist (SAM) in law enforcement: A retrospective study of 153 cases of stalking in two Swedish police counties. *Int J Police Sci Manage*. 11, 67–76.
- Berkowitz AD. (2004). An overview of the social norms approach. In *Changing the Culture of College Drinking: A Socially Situated Prevention Campaign*. L Lederman, F Stewart, Goodhart, et al. eds. (Hampton Press, Cresskill, NJ), pp. 187–208.
- Bieneck S, Krahe B. (2011). Blaming the victim and exonerating the perpetrator in cases of rape and robbery: Is there a double standard? *J Interpers Violence*. 26, 1785–1797.
- Bleeker ET, Murnen SK. (2005). Fraternity membership, the display of degrading images and rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles J Res*. 53, 487–496.
- Boswell A, Spade J. (1996). Fraternities and collegiate rape culture: Why are some fraternities more dangerous places for women? *Gend Soc*. 10, 133–147.
- Burn S. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*. 60, 779–792.
- Cahill AJ. (2001). *Rethinking Rape*. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- Cantor D, Fisher B, Chibnall S, Townsend R, et al. (2015). Association of American Universities (AAU), Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct. Rockville, Maryland: Weststat.
- Carr J, VanDeusen K. (2004). Risk factors for male sexual aggression on college campuses. *J Fam Violence*. 19, 279–289.
- Centers for Disease Control. (2016a). The public health approach to violence prevention. Retrieved from www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/overview/publichealthapproach.html. (accessed February 22, 2016).
- Centers for Disease Control. (2016b). The social-ecological model: A framework for prevention. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/overview/social-ecologicalmodel.html> (accessed February 22, 2016).
- Chuck E. (October 16, 2017). “#MeToo: Alyssa Milano promotes hashtag that becomes anti-harassment rallying cry”. NBC News. Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20171016153401/https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/metoo-hashtag-becomes-anti-sexual-harassment-assault-rallying-cry-n810986> (accessed February 21, 2018).
- Craissati J, McClurg G, Browne K. (2002). Characteristics of perpetrators of child sexual abuse who have been sexually victimized as children. *Sex Abuse* 14, 225–239.
- Davis R Parks LF, Cohen L. (2006). *Sexual Violence and the Spectrum of Prevention: Towards a Community Solution*. (National Sexual Violence Resource Center, Enola, PA).
- DeGue S, DiLillo D. (2004). Understanding perpetrators of nonphysical sexual coercion: Characteristics of those who cross the line. *Violence Vict*. 19, 673–688.
- Department of Defense. (2015). Report to the President of the United States on Sexual Assault Prevention and Response. (DOD, Washington, DC).
- Edwards KM, Dixon KJ, Gidycz CA, Desai AD. (2013). Family-of-origin violence and college men's reports of intimate partner violence perpetration in adolescence and young adulthood: The role of maladaptive interpersonal patterns. *Psychol Men Masculinity*. 15, 234–240.
- Ellis A. (2007). *The Practice of Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy*. (W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York).

- EverFi. (2013). The relationship between alcohol and sexual assault on the college campus. Insight Report, August 2013. (EverFi, Washington, DC).
- Franklin CA, Bouffard LA, Pratt TC. (2012). Sexual assault on the college campus: Fraternity affiliation, male peer support, and low self-control. *Criminal Justice Behav.* 39, 1457–1480.
- Fedina L, Holmes JL, Backes BL. (2018). Campus sexual assault: A systematic review of prevalence research from 2000 to 2015. *Trauma Violence Abuse.* 1, 76–93.
- Forbes GB, Adams-Curtis LE, Pakalka AH, et al. (2006). Dating aggression, sexual coercion, and aggression-supporting attitudes among college men as a function of participation in aggressive high school sports. *Violence Against Women.* 12, 441–455.
- Godenzi A, Schwartz MD, DeKesedery WS. (2001). Toward a gendered social bond/male peer support theory of university woman abuse. *Critic Criminol.* 10, 1–16.
- Gordon W. (2002). Sexual obsessions and OCD. *J Sex Relationship Ther.* 17, 343–354.
- Grant J, Pinto A, Gunnip M, et al. (2006). Sexual obsessions and clinical correlates in adults with obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Compr Psychiatry.* 47, 325–329.
- Grazian D. (2007). The girl hunt: Urban nightlife and the performance of masculinity as collective activity. *Symbolic Interact.* 30, 221–243.
- Harris A, Phenix A, Hanson K, Thornton, D. (2003). *STATIC-99 Coding Rules Revised—2003*. Retrieved from www.static99.org/pdfdocs/static-99-coding-rules_e.pdf (accessed January February, 20th, 2018).
- Healey J, Beauregard E. (2015). The Impact of Persistent Deviant Sexual Interests and Persistent Low Self-Esteem on Sexual Homicide. *J Crim Justice Behav.* 42, 1225–1242.
- Helmus LMD, Hanson RK. (2007). Predictive validity of the Static-99 and Static-2002 for sex offenders on community supervision. *Sex Offender Treatment.* 2, 1–14.
- Hickey E. (1997). *Serial Murderers and Their Victims*. (Wadsworth, Belmont, CA).
- Humphrey S, Kahn A. (2000). Fraternities, athletic teams, and rape: Importance of identification with a risky group. *J Interpers Violence.* 15, 1313–1322.
- Jewkes R, Sen P, Garcia-Moreno C. (2002). Sexual violence. In *World Report on Violence and Health*. EG Krug, LL Dahlberg, JA Mercy, et al., eds. (World Health Organization, Switzerland), pp. 147–181.
- Jensen R. (2004). Pornography and Sexual Violence. (VAWnet, a project of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence/Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Harrisburg, PA). Retrieved from www.vawnet.org (accessed May 18, 2015).
- Jozkowski K, Wiersma-Mosley J. (2017). The Greek System: How Gender Inequality and Class Privilege Perpetuate Rape Culture. *Family Relations.* 66, 89–103.
- Kilmartin C. (2000). *Sexual Assault in Context: Teaching College Men About Gender*. (Learning Publications, Homes Beach, FL).
- Knight JR, Wechsler H, Kuo M, et al. (2002). Alcohol abuse and dependence among U.S. college students. *J Stud Alcohol.* 63, 263–270.
- Kohlberg L. (1973). The claim to moral adequacy of a highest stage of moral judgment. *J Philos.* 70, 630–646.
- Koss M, Gidycz C, Wisniewski N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *J Couns Clin Psychol.* 35, 162–170.
- Kosson DS, Kelly JC, White JW. (1997). Psychopathy-related traits predict self-reported sexual aggression among college men. *J Interpers Violence.* 12, 241–254.
- Krahe B, Temkin J, Bieneck S. (2007). Schema-driven information processing in judgments about rape. *Appl Cogn Psychol.* 21, 601–619.
- Kropp PR, Hart SD, Webster CW, Eaves D. (1994). *Manual for the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide*. (British Columbia Institute on Family Violence, Vancouver, BC).
- Kropp PR, Hart SD, Webster CW, Eaves D. (1995). *Manual for the Spousal Assault Risk Assessment Guide (2nd edition.)*. (British Columbia Institute on Family Violence, Vancouver, BC).
- Kropp PR, Hart SD, Webster CW, Eaves D. (1998). *Spousal Assault Risk Assessment: User's Guide*. (Multi-Health Systems, Toronto, ON, Canada).
- Krebs CP, Lindquist CH, Warner TD. (2007). *The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study: Final Report*. (National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC).
- LaViolette A, Barnett O. (2000). *It Could Happen to Anyone: Why Battered Women Stay*. (Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA).
- Lanning KV. (2010). *Child molesters: A behavioral analysis for professionals investigating the sexual exploitation of children (5th ed)*. Alexandria, VA: National Center for Missing & Exploited Children.
- Linehan M. (1993). *Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of Borderline Personality Disorder*. (Guilford Press, New York, NY).
- Little H, Grills-Taquechel A, Axsom D. (2009). Impaired and incapacitated rape victims: Assault characteristics and post-assault experiences. *Violence Vict.* 24, 439–457.
- Louie S. (2018). The Incel (Involuntary Celibacy) Problem. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved on from www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/minority-report/201804/the-incele-involuntary-celibacy-problem (accessed June 5, 2018).
- Luong D, Wormith SJ. (2006). The Effectiveness of Psychological Sex Offender Treatment: A Meta-Analysis. (University of Saskatchewan, Department of Psychology, Saskatoon, Canada).
- Marshall WL, Barbaree HE. (1990). An integrated theory of the etiology of sexual offending. In *Handbook of Sexual Assault: Issues, Theories, and Treatment of the Offender*. WL Marshall, DR Laws, & HE Barbaree, eds. (Plenum, New York, NY), pp. 257–275.
- McKibbin WF, Shackelford TK, Goetz AT, Starratt VG. (2008). Evolutionary psychological perspectives on rape. In *Evolutionary Forensic Psychology: Darwinian Foundations of Crime and Law*. JD Duntley & TK Shackelford, eds. (Oxford University Press, New York, NY), (pp. 101–120).
- McPhail BA. (2016). Feminist framework plus: Knitting feminist theories of rape etiology into a comprehensive model. *Trauma Violence Abuse.* 17, 314–329.
- Malamuth NM, Addison T, Koss M. (2000). Pornography and sexual aggression: Are there reliable effects and can we understand them? *Annu Rev Sex Res.* 11, 26–91.
- Menning CL. (2009). Unsafe at any house? Attendees' perceptions of microlevel environmental traits and personal safety at fraternity and nonfraternity parties. *J Interpers Violence.* 24, 1714–1734.
- McAlinden A. (2006). 'Setting' em up': Personal, familial and institutional grooming in the sexual abuse of children. *Social Legal Stud.* 15, 339–362.
- Meloy J, Fisher H. (2005). Some thoughts on the neurobiology of stalking. *J Forensic Sci.* 50, 1–9.
- Mouilou E, Calhoun K, Rosenbloom T. (2013). Impulsivity and sexual assault in college men. *J Violence Vict.* 28, 429.
- Morrison S, Hardison J, Mathew A, O'Neil J. (2004). *An Evidence-Based Review of Sexual Preventive Intervention Programs (U.S. DOJ Publication No. 207262)*. (National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC).
- Murphy A, Van Brunt B. (2016). *Uprooting Sexual Violence in Higher Education: A Guide for Practitioners and Faculty*. (Rutledge Publications, New York: NY).

- Oddone-Paolucci E, Genius M, Violato C. (2000). A meta-analysis of published research on the effects of pornography. In *The Changing Family and Child Development*. C Violato, E Oddone-Paolucci, M Genius, eds. (Ashgate, Aldershot, United Kingdom), pp. 48–59.
- Olson L, Daggs J, Ellefvold B, Rogers T. (2007). Entrapping the innocent: Toward a theory of child sexual predators' luring communication. *Commun Theory*. 17, 231–251.
- Osland J, Fitch M, Willis E. (1996). Likelihood to rape in college males. *Sex Roles*. 35, 171–183.
- O'Toole ME. (2000). *The School Shooter: A Threat Assessment Perspective*. (National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime, FBI, Quantico, VA).
- O'Toole ME, Bowman A. (2011). *Dangerous Instincts: How Gut Feelings Betray*. (Hudson Street Press, New York, NY).
- Piven JS. (2017). Terror, sexual arousal, and torture: The question of obedience or ecstasy among perpetrators. In *Terrorism, Political Violence, and Extremism: New Psychology to Understand, Face, and Defuse the Threat*. CE Stout, ed. (Praeger, Santa Barbara, CA), pp. 103–124.
- Rozee P, Koss M. (2001). Rape: A Century of Resistance. *Psychol Women Quarterly*. 25, 295–311.
- Sanday PR. (2007). *Gang Rape: Sex, Brotherhood, and Privilege on Campus* (2nd edition). (New York University Press, New York).
- Seegers J. (2010). The prevalence of sexual addiction symptoms on the college campus. *Sex Addict Compulsivity* 10, 247–258.
- Seto M, Barbaree H. (1997). Sexual aggression as antisocial behavior: A developmental model. In *Handbook of Antisocial Behavior*. DM Stoff, J Breiling, JD Maser, eds. (Wiley, New York, NY), pp. 524–533.
- Shapiro F. (2001). *Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing: Basic Principles, Protocols and Procedures* (2nd ed.). (Guilford Press, New York).
- Sinković, M., Štulhofer, A. Božić, J. (2013). Revisiting the Association between Pornography Use and Risky Sexual Behaviors: The Role of Early Exposure to Pornography and Sexual Sensation Seeking. *J Sex Research*. 50, 633–641.
- Sokolow B, Swinton D, Morris, L, et al. (2015). *Investigation in a Box: A Toolkit from the Association of Title IX Administrators*. (Berwyn, PA, ATIXA).
- Sussman S, Lisha N, Griffiths M. (2011). Prevalence of the addictions: A problem of the majority or the minority? *Eval Health Profess*. 34, 3–56.
- Schwartz MD, DeKeseredy WS. (1997). *Sexual Assault on the College Campus: The Role of Male Peer Support*. (SAGE, Thousand Oaks, CA).
- Teranishi-Martinez C. (2014). Engendered expressions of aggression: The role of gender, proprietary behaviors, and jealousy in intimate partner violence. *Violence Gend*. 2, 112–118.
- Time Magazine (December, 2017). 'The Silence Breakers' Retrieved from <http://time.com/time-person-of-the-year-2017-silence-breakers> (accessed February 21, 2018).
- Toates F, Smid W, Willem van den Berg J. (2015). A framework for understanding sexual violence: Incentive-motivation and hierarchical control. *Aggression Violent Behav*. 34, 239–253.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *Revised sexual harassment guidance: Harassment of students by school employees, other students, or third parties*. (U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, Washington, DC).
- Van Brunt B, Murphy A, O'Toole M. (2015). The Dirty Dozen: Twelve Risk Factors for Sexual Violence on College Campuses (DD-12). *J Violence Gend*. 2, 145–160.
- Ward T, Beech T. (2006). An integrated theory of sexual offending. *Aggression Violent Behav*. 11, 44–63.
- West LA. (2001). Negotiating masculinities in American drinking subcultures. *J Men's Stud*. 9, 371–392.
- Zapp D. (2014). *What Have We Learned About Sexual Assault from Over Half a Million Incoming College Students?* (EverFi Coalition, Washington, DC).
- Zinzow H, Thompson M. (2015). A longitudinal study of risk factors for repeated sexual coercion and assault in U.S. College men. *Archiv Sex Behav*. 44, 213–22.
- Zuckerman M. (1994). *Behavioral Expressions and Biosocial Bases of Sensation Seeking*. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom).
- Zuckerman M. (2007). *Sensation Seeking and Risky Behavior*. (American Psychological Association, Washington, DC).

Address correspondence to:

Brian Van Brunt, EdD

Center for Education in Targeted Violence and Suicide

University of Toledo

Toledo, OH 43606

E-mail: brian@nchem.org