

Northern Michigan University

NMU Commons

[All NMU Master's Theses](#)

[Student Works](#)

12-2015

RAPE PERCEPTION BASED ON RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION, GENDER, AND LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP

Julie A. Herweyer

Northern Michigan University, julieherweyer@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.nmu.edu/theses>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Herweyer, Julie A., "RAPE PERCEPTION BASED ON RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION, GENDER, AND LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP" (2015). *All NMU Master's Theses*. 72.

<https://commons.nmu.edu/theses/72>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at NMU Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All NMU Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of NMU Commons. For more information, please contact kmcdonou@nmu.edu, bsarjean@nmu.edu.

RAPE PERCEPTION BASED ON RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION,
GENDER, AND LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP

By

Julie A. Herweyer

THESIS

Submitted to

Northern Michigan University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Office of Graduate Education and Research

December 2015

SIGNATURE APPROVAL FORM

Title of Thesis: RAPE PERCEPTION BASED ON RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION,
GENDER, AND LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP

This thesis by Julie A. Herweyer is recommended for approval by the student's Thesis Committee and Department Head in the Department of Psychology and by the Assistant Provost of Graduate Education and Research.

Committee Chair: Dr. Bradley Olson Date

First Reader: Dr. Mary Pelton-Cooper Date

Second Reader: Dr. Kevin Waters Date

Department Head: Dr. Paul Andronis Date

Dr. Brian D. Cherry Date
Assistant Provost of Graduate Education and Research

ABSTRACT

RAPE PERCEPTION BASED ON RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION, GENDER, AND LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP

By

Julie A. Herweyer

Rape victims face many difficulties after the traumatic event, one of these being inadequate social support. Victims frequently report apathetic, insensitive, or accusing reactions from support systems (Ahrens, 2006). Understanding how peers respond is essential for ensuring sufficient support is provided. This study explored how college students may perceive victims as predicted by participants' gender, religious orientation, attitudes toward permissiveness, and length of relationship between victim and perpetrator. Also, order in which participants were asked about their sex was examined as a predicting variable. Participants were randomly assigned to read a vignette featuring a couple that had been dating for either 3 months or 18 months. Each vignette depicted nonconsensual intercourse. Eight questions assessed rape supportive attributions and victim blaming; these were the criterion variables. Of the eight multiple linear regression models, five produced significant results. These results suggest a need for more victim support and less victim blaming.

Copyright by
Julie A. Herweyer
2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
METHODS	9
Participants.....	9
Stimuli.....	9
Instruments.....	10
Design	10
Procedure	10
Measures	11
Data Analysis and Preparation.....	14
RESULTS	16
DISCUSSION	19
REFERENCES	22
APPENDIX A: Vignette	29
APPENDIX B: Institutional Review Board Approval Notice.....	30
APPENDIX C: Religious Orientation Scale.....	31
APPENDIX D: Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale	33
APPENDIX E: Rape-Supportive Attributions Scale	35
APPENDIX F: Sex Role Stereotypical Victim Blame Attributions Scale	36

INTRODUCTION

It is estimated that between one in four or one in five women will become victims of completed or attempted rape during their lifetime (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). An accurate measurement is nearly impossible to attain considering 48.8% of women who have been victims of completed rape (defined as unwanted completed penetration by force or the threat of force) did not consider the incident rape. Women may fail to define their attack as rape due to many factors, including embarrassment and fear of being blamed (Fischer et al, 2000). The wide acceptance of rape myths may only perpetuate the fear of being blamed.

Religiosity has been found to positively correlate with rape myth acceptance (Rebeiz & Harb, 2010). Religious orientation and sexual attitudes have been related in various ways that could potentially influence how one views victims of rape. How participants would view a victim of rape based on religious orientation was examined in this study. Attitudes about sexual intercourse, specifically permissiveness, were also inspected as a predictor of rape perceptions.

For this experiment, the levels of relationship being examined are early dating and late dating. The early dating condition described the victim and perpetrator as having been in a relationship for three months opposed to the eighteen months in the late dating condition. Within each vignette, it was explicitly stated that the victim and perpetrator did have consensual intercourse with each other in the past. Monson et al. (2000) found more

negative attributions about the rapes when a history of consensual intercourse was mentioned in vignettes.

Relevance to College Population

Just a little more than half of the college-aged, completed rape victims recognized the attack as rape (Fisher et al., 2000). Of the victims who recognized their attacks as rape, only 11.5% reported the incident to the police (Kilpatrick, Resnick, Ruggiero, Conoscenti, & MacCauley, 2007). Due to underreporting, the approximated number of women who experience rape in college may be grossly underestimated. Sable, Danis, Mauzy, and Gallagher (2006) found shame, embarrassment, and fear of not being believed as some of the most salient barriers in reporting.

Anderson and Lyons (2005) conducted an experiment on undergraduate students to determine the role of social support on victim-blaming. Participants were given descriptions of rape victims that included whether or not the victim was receiving support from their peers, family, or their community. Victims who were supported by family and friends were blamed less for the rape compared to unsupported victims. Assessing how college students view rape and assign blame can have a large impact on ensuring victims receive the support they need and could encourage victims to report incidences of rape.

Rape Myths

Rape myths are defined by “attitudes and beliefs that are generally false but are widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women” (Lonsway and Fitzgerald, 1994, p.134). Some examples of rape myths provided by Rozee (1993) include believing a victim must be assaulted by a stranger, the victim never consented to intercourse with the perpetrator, and there needs to be physical

evidence the victim attempted to oppose the sexual advances in order to be considered rape. Other examples of rape myth that contribute to attributing the blame to the victim include the belief that women lie about being raped, and rape only occurs to certain kinds of women (Freymeyer, 1997).

McMahon (2010) discovered evidence that rape myths are still common. Males, those who participate in Greek life, athletes, and those who have never attended information sessions about rape are more likely to believe rape myths (McMahon, 2010). Mulliken (2004) and Rebeiz and Harb (2010) found men generally have a higher rape myth acceptance than women.

Rape Attributions

One of the main factors which can influence attribution of blame to rape victims is adherence to rape myths (Mason, Riger, & Foley, 2004). The level of relationship between the victim and perpetrator is positively related to rape-supportive and sex role stereotypical attributions (Monson et al., 2000). In other words, if the victim and perpetrator were strangers, participants reported less rape-supportive and sex role stereotypical attributions than if the victim and perpetrator were married.

Holding traditional sex role beliefs lead to attributing less blame on the perpetrator and more blame on the victim (Check & Malamuth, 1983). Assignment of responsibility is also impacted by traditional attitudes toward marriage. Whatley (2005) found people who have more traditional marital beliefs ascribe more of the blame to victims than participants who report having egalitarian beliefs.

Victim-Perpetrator Relationships

College students attributed the blame to the victim and rated the rape as less severe when the perpetrator was described to be the victim's husband (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Monson, 1998; Monson, Byrd, & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1996; Monson et al., 2000). Victim blame attributions and rape-supportive attributions increase with the level of relationship between the victim and perpetrator (Monson et al., 2000). Moreover, marital rape, in comparison to stranger rape and dating rape, is less likely to be perceived as rape by participants (Rebeiz & Harb, 2010; Simonson & Subich, 1999). In addition, marital rape is perceived as less psychologically harmful and less in violation of the victim's rights (Simonson & Subich, 1999).

Religiosity and Rape

Research has yet to reach a clear conclusion as to whether or not there is a relationship between religiosity and rape perception. Rebeiz and Harb (2010) found that religiosity positively correlated with rape myth acceptance in Lebanese college students. Those authors used methodology similar to the one being used in this study, although the participants were from a different culture. Freymeyer (1997) found more religious males believed that women who had survived a rape should accept at least a portion of the blame. In contrast, Mulliken (2005) was not able to detect a correlation with religiosity and adherence to rape myths. Although, Mulliken (2005) found that participants who had more traditional gender role beliefs and fundamentalist religious beliefs were more supportive of rape myths and held more negative views of victims of rape.

Aiding the understanding between religiosity and how it influences people's beliefs on rape victims is meaningful and important. Hite-Corrie (2012) explains that a

secondary wounding (an emotional scar that is either directly or indirectly caused by the trauma of intimate partner sexual violence) can be caused by several things, including internalized stereotypes about rape and religious beliefs. These secondary wounds can originate from peers, religious leaders, and family. Pritt (1998) demonstrates how religious beliefs can cause additional trauma to victims of intimate partner violence and sexual abuse. Mormon women with a history of sexual abuse compared to Mormon women who had not experienced abuse felt more distant from God and felt less loved by God (Pritt, 1998).

Sheldon and Parent (2002) uncovered attitudes of clergy who had experience counseling victims of sexual abuse. Fundamentalism, sexism, and a negative attitude toward victims were associated with greater blame being attributed to victims. The majority of clergy surveyed did blame the victim, but they also had a high rape myth acceptance. Furthermore, religious leaders with high fundamentalist beliefs discouraged people in their church from seeking counseling outside of the church.

Sexual Attitudes in Relationship with Religiosity and Rape Attributions

The relationship between religious orientation, permissiveness, and rape perceptions were examined in the present study. Specifically, the difference between extrinsically religious students and intrinsically religious students were examined. Allport and Ross (1967) best explain, “the extrinsically motivated person *uses* his religion, whereas the intrinsically motivated *lives* his religion” (p. 434). In other words, those who are more extrinsically religious tend to use their religion for self-serving purposes or to get something. People who are more intrinsically religious see their religion as something

that guides their whole life and they are not concerned with profiting from their religious involvement.

Individuals who are intrinsically religious have been found to be less permissive in their dating lives (Haerich, 1992). An intrinsic religious orientation has also been negatively correlated with acceptance of premarital sex (Leak, 1993). Furthermore, intrinsic religiousness is associated with less positive views of sexual behaviors in general (Bassett et al., 2002). This could lend support for expecting more intrinsically religious people to make more negative rape attributions. Intrinsically religious individuals may perceive the victim to be more interested in sexual intercourse simply because the victim had consented to this behavior previously. In contrast to the intrinsic orientation, people who have extrinsic religious orientations tend to have greater participation in sexual intercourse and more positive views of sexual behaviors compared to intrinsically religious people (Rowatt & Schmitt, 2003; Woodroof, 1985). In line with this research, it could be presumed that extrinsic religious students may have a more positive view of the victim compared to intrinsically religious students.

Religious people, according to Beckwith and Morrow (2005), have been shown to have conservative, less permissive attitudes toward intercourse. Luquis, Brelsford, and Rojas-Guyler (2012) discovered that permissiveness is less prevalent in religious males. These researchers also found engaging in sexual intercourse is less frequent in females who attend church often. A greater knowledge of sexual intercourse has been negatively correlated with rape myth acceptance; greater permissiveness is positively correlated with higher acceptance of rape myths (Aronowitz, Lambert, & Davidoff, 2012). Because extrinsically religious people are more sexually active than intrinsically religious

individuals (Rowatt & Schmidt, 2003; Woodroof, 1985), it may stand to reason that they have greater sexual knowledge. Conversely, it could also stand to reason that they are more permissive, as studies such as Haerich (1992) have suggested.

Sex Differences and Presentation of Measures

Other factors studied as predictors of rape perception were participants' sex and order in which measures were presented. When participants are reminded of their sexual identity during an experiment, there have been significant changes in how they respond (Steele & Ambady, 2006). Priming can produce substantial changes in response, which is why it is important to be aware of how measures are presented. Many studies have shown that males and females view rape and victims of rape differently (Bell, Kuriloff, & Lottes, 1994; Hayes, Lorenz, & Bell, 2013). Considering how influential participants' gender can be on rape perception, priming effects needed to be taken into account. The first wave of participants were asked to report their gender in the beginning of the survey while the second wave of participants reported their gender at the end of the study. This was included as a predicting variable to examine if presentation of measures influenced how participants perceived the victim and the rape.

Goals and Hypotheses

This study aims to clarify the relationship between religiosity and rape perceptions. Rebeiz and Harb (2010) found religiosity to be positively correlated with rape myths. Their study differed from the current study in the population that was studied and the measures utilized. Looking at college students in the United States and using different measures could yield different results and contribute to a better understanding of attitudes toward victims of rape. Mulliken (2005) also examined the relationship between

religiosity and rape attitudes, but she did not use the same measures nor did she employ the use of vignettes. Reading a vignette may cause participants to answer in a way that is different than answering survey questions explicitly containing the labels ‘victim’ and ‘perpetrator’. The underlying goal of this research was to inform the care and support for victims of rape, regardless of their previous consensual sex or relationship to the perpetrator.

In regards to victim-perpetrator relationships, it was predicted based on past research that participants would place more responsibility of the rape on victims who have larger degrees of relationship with the perpetrator, such that dating condition would be a predictor of RAPE-SUPPORT and BLAME scales. It was also hypothesized that participants’ sex would be a significant predictor of RAPE-SUPPORT and BLAME scale scores. Religious orientation and scores on the BSAS permissiveness subscale were hypothesized to be significant predictors for each of the eight criterion variables.

METHODS

Participants

The sample included two hundred and six undergraduate students (62 males and 144 females) from Northern Michigan University. They were recruited from psychology courses at the university and given extra credit for participating. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board and the treatment of participants adhered to American Psychological Association ethical standards. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the two victim-perpetrator relationship conditions.

Stimuli

Vignettes between conditions (early dating and late dating) did not differ in any way except the described length of time the victim and the perpetrator had been in a relationship. Rape in the early dating relationship was described as perpetrated by someone the victim had been dating for three months. In contrast, the late dating rape was described as committed by a man the victim had been dating for eighteen months.

Consistent with Monson et al. (2000), specific names (e.g. Joanna and Dylan) were used in lieu of 'victim' and 'perpetrator'. In vignettes, the woman was described as "persistently resisting the sexual interaction" in order to indicate that the interaction was nonconsensual. Furthermore, the perpetrator was described as "completing the act of sexual intercourse." This was done with the intention of avoiding bias attached with the terms 'rape' and 'sexual assault.' Vignettes were constructed with the guidance and inspiration from the Monson, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, and Binderup (2000) and Ferro, Cermele, and Saltzman (2008) articles. Vignettes read similarly to this and victim-

perpetrator relationships were added into the vignette as appropriate. The vignette can be found in Appendix A.

Instruments

Surveys were accessed through Qualtrics, an online survey software service. The use of an online survey is supported because it can decrease social desirability distortions (Richman, Kiesler, Weisband, & Drasgow, 1999). Furthermore, the greater sense of anonymity the Internet can provide may elicit more honest answers from participants.

All analyses were be conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 23.0.

Design

A between-subject factor design was used for the victim-perpetrator relationship (early dating and late dating). Participants were randomly assigned to one of the relationship conditions. A history of consensual sexual intercourse between the victim and the perpetrator was mentioned in the vignettes.

Procedure

Participants were recruited from a pool of undergraduate psychology students. They received extra credit for participating in the study. Instructors who agreed to reward extra credit sent students an email with a link to the online survey. The research was introduced to participants as a study of the perceptions of heterosexual social interactions. Participants were assured of their anonymity and confidentiality before beginning the study. The study was submitted to the IRB for an expedited review. A copy of the approval notice from the Human Subject Research Review Committee can be found in Appendix B.

The online survey was set up to ensure that participants were randomly assigned to one of the two victim-perpetrator relationship conditions. They received a vignette that pertained to their assigned condition. In the Monson et al. (2000) study, vignettes and the RAPE-SUPPORT and BLAME scales were the only items participants were presented with. In the first wave of the present study, participants were first asked about their sex and relationship status. Then they were presented with the Religious Orientation Scale (ROS). Next, participants answered the permissive subscale of the Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale (BSAS). Finally, vignettes were presented and participants were asked to answer the RAPE-SUPPORT and BLAME scale questions based on the vignette they read. In the second wave of the present study, the order in which measures were presented was altered to assess if priming would be a significant predictor of rape perception. Participants in this wave were first asked to read the vignette and then answer rape perception questions. The ROS and BSAS permissive subscale were then presented. Finally, participants were asked to report their relationship status and sex.

Measures

In addition to being asked to identify their gender and relationship status, each participant completed an online survey that included a vignette; Religious Orientation Scale (see Appendix C); the Permissiveness subscale of the Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale (see Appendix D), Rape-Supportive Attributions Scale (RAPE-SUPPORT) (see Appendix E); and Sex Role Stereotypical Victim Blame Attributions Scale (BLAME) (See Appendix F).

Religiosity in this study was measured by the Religious Orientation Scale (ROS) (Allport & Ross, 1967). The ROS is a 20-item questionnaire that is designed to measure

extent of extrinsic versus intrinsic religiousness in individuals. There has been a revised version of this scale (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989) that divides the extrinsic subscale into personally oriented and socially oriented. Items are scored using an 11-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Scores on the scale range from 0-200. A high score on the scale would indicate a more extrinsic religious orientation while a low score would indicate a more intrinsic religious orientation. On the intrinsic subscale, Trimble (1997) found good internal reliability (Chronbach Alpha = .83). Internal reliability for the external subscale have usually fallen in the .70s (e.g., Donahue, 1985). The ROS has been shown to correlate with other common measures of religious faith (Bassett et al., 1991; Donahue, 1985). This scale has been acknowledged (Donahue, 1985) as one of the most common measures of religiosity. Other studies, such as Jones (2014), have used the revised version of the Religious Orientation Scale to assess how college students' religiosity can influence sexual attitudes. Haerich (1992) used the original ROS to look at the relationship between religiousness and permissiveness. Some of the items on this scale were re-worded in an attempt to be more clear and concise. For example, "Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in my life" was changed to "There are many more important things in my life than religion."

Permissiveness was measured by the permissiveness subscale on the Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale (BSAS) (Hendrick, Hendrick, & Reich, 2006). This subscale consists of 10 statements that are ranked on an 11-point Likert scale which ranges from strongly disagree to strongly agree. An example of one of the statements is "casual sex is acceptable". Higher scores indicate more permissive sexual attitudes. Hendrick et al.

(2006) report an alpha coefficient of .93 for the permissive subscale. The BSAS has been used to investigate relationships between religiosity and sexual attitudes in college students (Jones, 2014; Luquis et al., 2012).

Rape-Supportive Attributions Scale (RAPE-SUPPORT) (Monson, Byrd, & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1996) was used to assess attributions that are rape-supportive. It is a 4 item scale. Items are scored on an 11-point rating scale in which 0= minimum intensity and 10= maximum intensity. This scale is designed to measure participants' false beliefs about rape. A high score would indicate greater endorsement of rape-supportive attributions. Monson et al. (1996) found an alpha reliability coefficient for this scale to be .82. This scale has been used in studies on college students' rape perceptions (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Monson, 1998; Monson et al., 1996; Monson et al., 2000). Some of the items on the scale have been modified to be more clear and concise. For example, 'How certain are you that this incident would be considered rape?' was changed to 'This situation is rape'. Participants were then be able to rate how much they agree on a scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree). This scale was reverse scored.

The Sex Role Stereotypical Victim Blame Attributions Scale (BLAME) (Monson et al., 1996) was used to measure the amount of blame placed on the victim. Participants rated each item on an 11-point scale in which 0=minimum intensity, whereas 10= maximum intensity. A high score would reveal greater sex role stereotypical victim blame attributions. An alpha reliability coefficient of .64 (Monson et al., 2000) was found for this scale. Other studies (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Monson, 1998; Monson et al., 1996; Monson et al., 2000) have used this scale to investigate how college students view rape. Some items on this scale have been modified to be more concise. The questions

have not been altered to change the meaning. For example, ‘How obligated was “Joanna” to engage in sexual relations in this case?’ was changed to ‘How obligated was “Joanna” to engage in sexual relations?’. Participants were then be able to rate how much they thought Joanna was obligated on a scale from 0 (no obligation at all) to 10 (complete obligation).

Data Analysis and Preparation

A Little’s Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) test was conducted to analyze missing values. This test yielded a chi-square of 451.350 at a significance level of 0.332. Little (1988) explains that it is best to have missing values that are absent at random rather than missing due to the variables within the experiment. Results of this test indicate that the missing values within the current study were MCAR because it was above the significance level of 0.05. Since the missing data was MCAR, it was permissible to run an expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm in SPSS to fill-in the seven missing data values. This method has been shown to be a more effective way to handle missing values compared to the typical methods of pair-wise or list-wise deletion (Lin, 2010; Pigott, 2001).

Normality was checked for by running skewness and kurtosis statistics. In accordance with the advice of Brown (1997), if the skewness and kurtosis values were two or more times greater than their respective standard errors, there were issues with the normality of the data. There were significant problems with each of the criterion variables, or all of the scores on the eight questions that followed the vignette. To address this problem, scores for each criterion variable were collapsed based on how they were distributed. For example, the original data from the question asking about victim’s rights

shows that 88.1% of participants strongly agreed (scored as 1) that the victim's rights had been violated, while 3.4% scored 2; 4.5% scored 3; 2.3% scored 4; 0.6% scored 5; and 1.1% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed (scored as 6). When the scores were recoded, the participants that scored a 1 remained the same and the other scores were amalgamated. After recoding all of these variables, the skewness and kurtosis statistics were ran again and normality had greatly improved.

RESULTS

Multiple linear regressions were conducted to assess how well the five predicting variables (BSAS scores, ROS scores, participants' sex, dating condition, and order measures were presented) predicted rape perception. The eight rape perception questions (taken from the RAPE-SUPPORT and BLAME scales) were criterion variables.

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict perception of the victim's rights based on BSAS scores, ROS scores, participants' sex, dating condition, and order of measures. A significant regression equation was found ($F(5, 201) = 2.451, p < .05$), with an R^2 of .057 and standard error of regression of .337. The analyses shows that sex did significantly predict perception of the victim's rights (Beta = -.17, $t(206) = -2.367, p < .05$). An interaction effect was found for participants' sex and ROS scores (Beta = -.18, $t(206) = -2.029, p < .05$).

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the situation being perceived as rape based on BSAS scores, ROS scores, participants' sex, dating condition, and order of measures. A significant regression equation was found ($F(5, 201) = 3.028, p < .05$), with an R^2 of .070 and standard error of regression of .405. The analyses shows that sex did significantly predict the situation being perceived as rape (Beta = -.15, $t(206) = -2.013, p < .05$). An interaction effect was found for participants' sex and ROS scores (Beta = -.21, $t(206) = -2.488, p < .05$).

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict perception of the victim's interest based on BSAS scores, ROS scores, participants' sex, dating condition, and order of measures. A significant regression equation was found ($F(5, 201) = 3.299, p < .01$),

with an R^2 of .076 and standard error of regression of .396. The analyses shows that gender of participants did significantly predict perception of the victim's interest (Beta = -.21, $t(206) = -2.869$, $p < .01$). Also, ROS scores significantly predicted perception of the victim's interest (Beta = -.155, $t(206) = -2.070$, $p < .05$). An interaction effect was found for participants' gender and ROS scores (Beta = -.24, $t(206) = -2.772$, $p < .01$).

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict perception of the victim's control based on BSAS scores, ROS scores, participants' sex, dating condition, and order of measures. A significant regression equation was found ($F(5, 201) = 2.950$, $p = .01$), with an R^2 of .068 and standard error of regression of .757. The analyses shows that sex did significantly predict perception of the victim's control (Beta = -.18, $t(206) = -2.473$, $p = .01$). Order in which measures were presented also significantly predicted perception of the victim's control (Beta = .14, $t(206) = 1.991$, $p < .05$).

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict perception of the victim's enjoyment based on BSAS scores, ROS scores, participants' sex, dating condition, and order of measures. A significant regression equation was found ($F(5, 201) = 3.966$, $p < .01$), with an R^2 of .090 and standard error of regression of .432. The analyses shows that sex did significantly predict perception of the victim's enjoyment (Beta = -.297, $t(206) = -4.161$, $p < .01$).

Each model in these analyses were screened for the possible existence of multicollinearity and the collinearity statistics of tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) were assessed. All of the tolerance levels were above 0.70. Also, none of the VIF levels were above 1.30. These statistics suggests that multicollinearity was not a significant problem within the data.

A power analysis for each significant regression model was conducted using a post-hoc statistical power calculator for multiple regression (Soper, 2015). For all significant models, observed statistical powers ranged between 0.78 and 0.95.

DISCUSSION

Perception of the victim's rights, interest, control, enjoyment and perceiving the situation as rape were all significantly influenced by the five predicting variables. There was a main effect for participants' gender in each significant regression, which is consistent with many other studies. Bell, Kuriloff, and Lottes (1994) and Hayes, Lorenz, and Bell (2013) found differences in how males and females perceive rape. Order of measures only had a main effect in perceiving the amount of control the victim had in the situation. Although priming the participants by asking about their sexual identity could have accounted for the effect, it is also likely that asking the participants to read the vignette and answer rape perception questions first attributed to the effect. Religious orientation was found as a significant predictor of perception of the victim's interest in having intercourse. Furthermore, a significant interaction effect was found for sex and ROS scores in perception of victim's rights and interest as well as in correctly identifying the situation as rape.

It is important to note that religious orientation predicted the level in which participants thought the victim was interested in the sexual advances of the perpetrator. Intrinsically religious individuals may have believed the victim would be interested simply because she had previously engaged in sexual intercourse with the perpetrator. It may have been assumed if the victim was interested in the past she may be interested in the present situation. Although the victim was described as "persistently resisting", participants may not have been certain or convinced of her desire to escape the interaction.

Dating condition did influence the regression models, but no significant main effect was found in any of the models. The purpose of this study was to predict how college students would respond if their peer became a victim of rape. Because most undergraduate college students are not married, the dating conditions were set at 3 months and 18 months. These were presumed to be typical lengths of time for college students to have been in a relationship. If the victim and perpetrator were described as strangers or a married couple, the significance of this predictor may have been more substantial.

The criterion variables that did not produce significant regression results, were perceptions of how violent the situation was, how damaged the victim was, and how obligated the victim was to engage in sexual intercourse. Ambiguity may have contributed to the lack of significant results. The vignette was intentional in not describing the violence with the intention of placing more importance on the nonconsensual nature. This was also done to distinguish between rape and physical abuse. Although this was intentional, it is acknowledged as a limitation because participants may have not been given enough information to decide how violent the situation was or how damaged the victim was. The perpetrator did help the victim carry in groceries. For some participants, this seemed to warrant some obligation of the victim to engage in sexual intercourse. If the favor had been something requiring more effort or expense, it may have been more likely to find a significant result.

Results indicate 78.8% of participants strongly agreed that the situation described in the vignettes was rape. The victim “repeatedly asked” the perpetrator to stop the sexual advances and she incessantly battled the perpetrator’s efforts. Despite the lack of

ambiguity, 21.2% of participants were not confident enough to strongly agree that the situation was rape. This indicates that while the majority could correctly identify rape, a considerable group may have difficulty recognizing rape. If peers are not able to recognize rape from a friend's account, it could lead to victim blaming or even the victim doubting that what happened to them was rape.

Previous exposure to these class discussions and rape education was not a variable in this study, but it could have provided valuable insight as to why some students were able to identify the rape and others were not. It is possible that these students may have encountered class discussions on victim blaming. Also, participants may have attended awareness events designed to bolster education, prevention, and support for rape victims. Future researchers should consider including previous practice or previous education as predicting variables of rape perception.

Religious orientation, beliefs about permissiveness, participants' sex, dating conditions, and order of measures produced significant regression models in this study. The majority of participating students exhibited victim support, but results indicate that the degree and commitment of support does have room for improvement. Until everyone is able to agree that having intercourse without consent is rape, there will remain a need for education for the frontline supporters, or victims' peers. Continuing the improvement of care and compassion for victims commands research. Creating a healing environment for victims starts by educating peers how to respond more compassionately.

REFERENCES

- Ahrens, C. E. (2006). Being silenced: The impact of negative social reactions on the disclosure of rape. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 38*(3), 263-274.
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*(4), 432. doi: 10.1037/h0021212
- Anderson, I., & Lyons, A. (2005). The effect of victims' social support on attributions of blame in female and male rape. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*(7), 1400-1417. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02176.x
- Aronowitz, T., Lambert, C. A., & Davidoff, S. (2012). The role of rape myth acceptance in the social norms regarding sexual behavior among college students. *Journal of Community Health Nursing, 29*(3), 173-182. doi: 10.1080/07370016.2012.697852
- Bassett, R. L., Camplin, W., Humphrey, D., Dorr, C., Biggs, S., Distaffen, R., ... Thompson, H. (1991). Measuring Christian maturity: A comparison of several scales. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 19*(1), 84-93.
- Bassett, R. L., Mowat, G., Ferriter, T., Perry, M., Hutchinson, E., Campbell, J., & Santiago, P. (2002). Why do Christian college students abstain from premarital sexual intercourse? *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 21*, 121-132.
- Beckwith, H. D., & Morrow, J. A. (2005). Sexual attitudes of college students: The impact of religiosity and spirituality. *College Student Journal, 39*(2), 357-366.
- Bell, S. T., Kuriloff, P. J., & Lottes, I. (1994). Understanding attributions of blame in stranger rape and date rape situations: An examination of gender, race,

- identification, and students' social perceptions of rape victims. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24(19), 1719-1734.
- Brown, J. D. (1997). Skewness and kurtosis. *Shiken: Japanese Association for Language Teaching Testing and Evaluation SIG Newsletter*, 1(1), 20-23.
- Check, J. V., & Malamuth, N. M. (1983). Sex role stereotyping and reactions to depictions of stranger versus acquaintance rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(2), 344. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.45.2.344
- Donahue, M. J. (1985). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(2), 400. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.48.2.400
- Ferro, C., Cermele, J., & Saltzman, A. (2008). Current perceptions of marital rape: Some good and not-so-good news. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(6), 764-779. doi: 10.1177/0886260507313947
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). The Sexual Victimization of College Women. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. doi: 10.1037/e377652004-001
- Freiheit, S. R., Sonstegard, K., Schmitt, A., & Vye, C. (2006). Religiosity and spirituality: A psychometric evaluation of the Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire. *Pastoral Psychology*, 55(1), 27-33. doi: 10.1007/s11089-006-0029-y
- Freymeyer, R. H. (1997). Rape myths and religiosity. *Sociological Spectrum*, 17(4), 473-489. doi: 10.1080/02732173.1997.9982179

- Gorsuch, R. L., & McPherson, S. E. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E-revised and single-item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 348-354. doi: 10.2307/1386745
- Haerich, P. (1992). Premarital sexual permissiveness and religious orientation: A preliminary investigation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 31(3), 361-365. doi: 10.2307/1387127
- Hayes, R. M., Lorenz, K., & Bell, K. A. (2013). Victim blaming others: Rape myth acceptance and the just world belief. *Feminist Criminology*, 8(3), 202-220. doi: 10.1177/1557085113484788
- Hendrick, C., Hendrick, S. S., & Reich, D. A. (2006). The brief sexual attitudes scale. *Journal of Sex Research*, 43(1), 76-86. doi: 10.13072/midss.230
- Hite-Corrie, C. (2012). Intimate partner sexual violence: A review of current literature and consideration of possible future research directions. Retrieved from aphroditewounded.org
- Jones, A. E. (2014). *Moderating effects of religious orientation on the relationship between sexual self-discrepancies and guilt and anxiety* [PDF document] (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://scholars.indstate.edu>
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Resnick, H. S., Ruggiero, K. J., Conoscenti, L. M., & McCauley, J. (2007). *Drug-facilitated, incapacitated, and forcible rape: A national study*. Charleston, SC: Medical University of South Carolina, National Crime Victims Research & Treatment Center. Retrieved from <http://www.niccsa.org/downloads/elders/DRUGFACILITATEDINCAPACITATEDANDFORCIBLERAPE.pdf>

- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Monson, C. M. (1998). Marital rape: Is the crime taken seriously without co-occurring physical abuse?. *Journal of Family Violence*, *13*(4), 433-443. doi: 10.1023/A:1022831421093
- Leak, G. K. (1993). Relationship between religious orientation and love styles, sexual attitudes, and sexual behaviors. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, *21*, 315-318.
- Lewis, C. A., Shevlin, M., McGuckin, C., & Navrátil, M. (2001). The Santa Clara strength of religious faith questionnaire: Confirmatory factor analysis. *Pastoral Psychology*, *49*(5), 379-384. doi: 10.1023/A:1010370728546
- Lin, T. H. (2010). A comparison of multiple imputation with EM algorithm and MCMC method for quality of life missing data. *Quality & Quantity*, *44*(2), 277-287. doi: 10.1007/s11135-008-9196-5
- Little, R. J. (1988). A test of missing completely at random for multivariate data with missing values. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *83*(404), 1198-1202. doi: 10.1080/01621459.1988.10478722
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1994). Rape myths in review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *18*(2), 133-164. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1994.tb00448.x
- Luquis, R. R., Brelsford, G. M., & Rojas-Guyler, L. (2012). Religiosity, spirituality, sexual attitudes, and sexual behaviors among college students. *Journal of Religion and Health*, *51*(3), 601-614. doi: 10.1007/s10943-011-9527-z
- Mason, G. E., Riger, S., & Foley, L. A. (2004). The impact of past sexual experiences on attributions of responsibility for rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *19*(10), 1157-1171. doi: 10.1177/0886260504269094

- McMahon, S. (2010). Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students. *Journal of American College Health, 59*(1), 3-11. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2010.483715
- Monson, C. M., Byrd, G. R., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1996). To have and to hold: Perceptions of marital rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11*(3), 410-424. doi: 10.1177/088626096011003007
- Monson, C. M., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Binderup, T. (2000). Does “no” really mean “no” after you say “yes”? Attributions about date and marital rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(11), 1156-1174. doi: 10.1177/088626000015011003
- Mulliken, B. L. (2005). *Rape myth acceptance in college students: The influence of gender, racial and religious attitudes* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest.com
- Pigott, T. D. (2001). A review of methods for missing data. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 7*(4), 353-383. doi: 1076/edre.7.4.353.8937
- Pritt, A. F. (1998). Spiritual correlates of reported sexual abuse among Mormon women. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 27*3-285. doi: 10.2307/1387527
- Rebeiz, M. J., & Harb, C. (2010). Perceptions of rape and attitudes toward women in a sample of Lebanese students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(4), 735-752. Retrieved from <http://ezpolson.nmu.edu:5745/content/25/4/735.full.pdf+html>
- Richman, W. L., Kiesler, S., Weisband, S., & Drasgow, F. (1999). A meta-analytic study of social desirability distortion in computer-administered questionnaires,

- traditional questionnaires, and interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(5), 754. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.84.5.754
- Rowatt, W. C., & Schmitt, D. P. (2003). Associations between religious orientation and varieties of sexual experience. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 42(3), 455-465. doi: 10.1111/1468-5906.00194
- Rozee, P. D. (1993). Forbidden or forgiven?. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 17(4), 499-514. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1993.tb00658.x
- Sable, M. R., Danis, F., Mauzy, D. L., & Gallagher, S. K. (2006). Barriers to reporting sexual assault for women and men: Perspectives of college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 55(3), 157-162. doi:10.3200/JACH.55.3.157-162
- Sheldon, J. P., & Parent, S. L. (2002). Clergy's attitudes and attributions of blame toward female rape victims. *Violence Against Women*, 8(2), 233-256. doi: 10.1177/10778010222183026
- Simonson, K., & Subich, L. M. (1999). Rape perceptions as a function of gender-role traditionality and victim-perpetrator association. *Sex Roles*, 40(7-8), 617-634. doi: 10.1023/A:1018844231555
- Soper, D.S. (2015). Post-hoc Statistical Power Calculator for Multiple Regression [Software]. Available from <http://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc3>
- Steele, J. R., & Ambady, N. (2006). "Math is Hard!" The effect of gender priming on women's attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42(4), 428-436
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings From the National Violence*

Against Women Survey: Research Report. National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/183781.pdf>

Trimble, D. E. (1997). The religious orientation scale: Review and meta-analysis of social desirability effects. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57*(6), 970-986. doi: 10.1177/0013164497057006007

Whatley, M. A. (2005). The effect of participant sex, victim dress, and traditional attitudes on causal judgments for marital rape victims. *Journal of Family Violence, 20*(3), 191-200. doi: 10.1007/s10896-005-3655-8

Woodroof, J. T. (1985). Premarital sexual behavior and religious adolescents. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24*, 343-366. doi: 10.2307/1385987

APPENDIX A

Joanna was unloading a trunk full of groceries from her car when Dylan, [her boyfriend of 3 months/ her boyfriend of 18 months], offered to carry a few of her groceries up to her apartment. Joanna, with arms already full of groceries accepted the offer and handed Dylan the remaining bags. After entering her apartment, Joanna instructed Dylan to place the bags on the counter and she thanked him. They have engaged in consensual intercourse in the past. On this occasion, Dylan asked if she wanted to have intercourse and Joanna strongly declined. However, Dylan continued to make sexual advances toward Joanna. She repeatedly asked him to stop and she persistently resisted the sexual interaction. Dylan was not deterred. Eventually, he got on top of Joanna and completed the act of sexual intercourse.

APPENDIX B

Institutional Review Board Approval Notice

TO: Julie Herweyer
Department of Psychology

CC: Bradley Olson
Department of Psychology

DATE: May 6, 2015

FROM: Brian Cherry, Ph.D.
Assistant Provost/IRB Administrator

SUBJECT: IRB Proposal HS15-666
IRB Approval Dates: 5/6/2015-5/6/2016**
Proposed Project Dates: 5/6/2015-12/31/2015

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed your proposal and has given it final approval. To maintain permission from the Federal government to use human subjects in research, certain reporting processes are required.

APPENDIX C

Religious Orientation Scale (Allport & Ross, 1967)

0: Strongly Disagree 10: Strongly Agree

Extrinsic Subscale:

1. There are many more important things in my life than religion.

0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

2. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.
3. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.
4. The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships.
5. What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike.
6. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.
7. Although I am a religious person I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.
8. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity.
9. Occasionally, I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.
10. One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.
11. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.

Intrinsic Subscale:

1. It is important for me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and mediation.
2. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church.
3. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.
4. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services.
5. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being.
6. I read literature about my faith (or church).
7. If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join a Bible study group rather than a social fellowship.
8. My religious beliefs are really what lie behind my whole approach to life.
9. Religion is especially important because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.

APPENDIX D

Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale (Hendrick, Hendrick, & Reich, 2006)

Listed below are several statements that reflect different attitudes about sex. For each statement fill in the response on the answer sheet that indicates how much you agree or disagree with that statement. Some of the items refer to a specific sexual relationship, while others refer to general attitudes and beliefs about sex. Whenever possible, answer the questions with your current partner in mind. If you are not currently dating anyone, answer the questions with your most recent partner in mind. If you have never had a sexual relationship, answer in terms of what you think your responses would most likely be.

For each statement, please circle one number:

0: Strongly Disagree 10: Strongly Agree

1. I do not need to be committed to a person to have sex with him/her.
0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
2. Casual sex is acceptable.
3. I would like to have sex with many partners.
4. One-night stands are sometimes very enjoyable.
5. It is okay to have ongoing sexual relationships with more than one person at a time.
6. Sex as a simple exchange of favors is okay if both people agree to it.
7. The best sex is with no strings attached.

8. Life would have fewer problems if people could have sex more freely.
9. It is possible to enjoy sex with a person and not like that person very much.
10. It is okay for sex to be just good physical release.

APPENDIX E

Rape-Supportive Attributions Scale (RAPE-SUPPORT)

(Monson, Byrd, & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1996)

Directions: Please circle the number you feel corresponds with the question or statement.

1. How violent did you feel this situation was?

0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

Not violent at all

Extremely violent

2. How psychologically damaged do you feel Joanna will be?

0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

Not damaged at all

Extremely damaged

3. Dylan's actions violated Joanna's rights.

0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

4. This situation is rape.

0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

APPENDIX F

Sex Role Stereotypical Victim Blame Attributions Scale (BLAME)

(Monson, Byrd, & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1996)

Directions: Please circle the number you feel corresponds with the degree of intensity for the following items. The scale ranges from 0 (minimal intensity) to 10 (maximum intensity).

1. How interested was Joanna in having sexual relations?

0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

Not interested at all

Extremely interested

2. How much control did Joanna have?

0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

No control at all

Complete control

3. How much enjoyment did Joanna have?

0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

No enjoyment at all

Complete enjoyment

4. How obligated was Joanna to engage in sexual relations?

0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

No obligation at all

Complete obligation