1990

INTERGENERATIONAL ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS ABOUT SEXUAL ASSAULT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Susan Williams-Quinlan
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss

Recommended Citation

Williams-Quinlan, Susan, "INTERGENERATIONAL ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS ABOUT SEXUAL ASSAULT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT" (1990). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 1051.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/1051

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

W33
1970

INTERGENERATIONAL ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS ABOUT
SEXUAL ASSAULT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT

BY

SUSAN WILLIAMS-QUINLAN

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1990

F. 1234629

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to many individuals who have provided me with the support and guidance needed to complete this research. I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my major professor, Dr. Bernice Lott, whose scholarly presence, uncompromising principles, and knowledge of the influence of socialization on women's lives has had a major impact on both my thinking and my work. As a mentor, she is without comparison. I would like to thank my committee members as well: Dr. Lawrence Grebstein, for all of the clinical knowledge I have gained from him, and for his unfailing sense of humor amidst the rigors of life in graduate school, Dr. Ruthe Eshleman, for sustaining me with her encouragement, nurturance and help, all of which have been invaluable, and Drs. Judith Anderson and J. Eugene Knott, whose support and calming influence during the final weeks prior to my defense was greatly appreciated.

Other individuals in the psychology department have also been very helpful. My thanks to Drs. John Stevenson and Dominic Valentino for their willingness to take time out, at a moment's notice, for informal chats that were both intellectually stimulating and encouraging of my work, and to the late Dr. Stan Berger, who officially accepted me into this program and gave of his time to communicate his faith in my abilities. I am also grateful to Ms. Colleen Redding for her statistical consultation.

In addition, much gratitude goes to my present colleagues at the University of Scranton who have cheerfully endured with me through my final days as an ABD.

On a more personal note, I am indebted to my parents, Dorothy and Grady Williams, for their encouragement, support, patience, and humor. As they have noted on occasion, "We always knew you could do it; we just didn't know if we'd be alive to see it!" Thanks, too, to my sister, Janet, and my friends (especially "O.B.," Gayné, and "Carlotta") who have listened tirelessly to my tales of woe. Most importantly, I am forever appreciative of my husband, Tom, for understanding me and giving me the confidence and push to succeed, and to my daughter, Melissa, who makes this work all the more meaningful.

To all of the above individuals, my deepest gratitude for your patience, caring, and support. I share this accomplishment with you.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to compare intergenerational attitudes and beliefs about sexual assault and sexual harassment. This study evaluated the relationship between level of similarity in attitudes and beliefs between intergenerational dyads and level of family communication (open, average, problem) and gender composition (same vs. different) of intergenerational (parent-student) pairs. It was predicted that: 1) there would be significantly greater differences in the attitudes and beliefs of parent-student dyads in problem communication families than in average and open communication families, and in average communication families than in open communication families, and 2) across all levels of family communication, there would be significantly greater differences in attitudes and beliefs for different gender (mother-son and father-daughter) dyads compared with same gender (mother-daughter and father-son) dyads.

Participants consisted of 320 university undergraduates (198 women and 122 men) and their parents (261 mothers and 229 fathers). Each participant completed the Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale (PACS), Sex Role Stereotyping Scale (SRS), Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory (TSHI), Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMA), and read and answered questions about a date rape vignette (DRV). Intergenerational dyads were compared by analyzing their

difference scores on the previously mentioned measures in two 2 x 3 MANOVA analyses. Level of family communication did not prove to be a significant factor in determining similarities or differences in attitudes between parent-student dyads. Gender composition was a significant variable, but not always in the predicted direction. Daughters scored significantly lower in SRS than mothers, while sons scored significantly higher in TSHI and RMA than their mothers. Compared with their fathers, sons scored significantly higher in TSHI, while daughters scored significantly lower in RMA. Additional one-way ANOVA analyses exploring gender differences within each generation indicated that female students scored significantly lower on the SRS, TSHI, and RMA measures than did male students, and mothers scored significantly lower on the SRS, TSHI, and RMA scales than did fathers, which suggests that overall, female students and mothers endorsed fewer sex role stereotypes, were less tolerant of sexual harassment and less accepting of rape myths than were their male counterparts. This finding suggests the importance of gender as a cultural variable over all levels of family communication. The lack of significance of family communication level suggests that with respect to certain beliefs and attitudes, the larger community is a more powerful influence on the individual than is the family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	vi
Introduction	1
Method	16
Participants	16
Instruments	20
Procedure	26
Results	29
Discussion	41
References	51
Tables	61
Appendix A	101
Appendix B	104
Appendix C	105
Appendix D	107
Appendix E	109
Appendix F	111
Appendix G	113
Appendix H	114
Appendix I	115
Appendix J	117
Appendix K	119
Appendix L	121
Appendix M	122

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Appendix N	123
Appendix O	124
Appendix P	125
Appendix Q	126
Appendix R	127
Appendix S	128
Appendix T	129
Appendix U	131
Bibliography	133

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table	
1. Description of Student Sample	61
2. Description of Parent Sample	72
3. Means and Standard Deviations on all Measures: Student Sample	82
4. Means and Standard Deviations on all Measures: Parent Sample	83
5. 2 x 3 MANOVA: Mother-Student Sample	84
6. One-Way ANOVA: SRS x Dyad Composition (Mother-Student Sample)	85
7. One-Way ANOVA: TSHI x Dyad Composition (Mother-Student Sample)	86
8. One-way ANOVA: RMA x Dyad Composition (Mother-Student Sample)	87
9. 2 x 3 MANOVA: Father-Student Sample	88
10. One-Way ANOVA: TSHI x Dyad Composition (Father-Student Sample)	89
11. One-Way ANOVA: RMA x Dyad Composition (Father-Student Sample)	90
12. One-Way ANOVA: SRS Total x Student Sample	91
13. One-Way ANOVA: TSHI Total x Student Sample	92
14. One-Way ANOVA: RMA Total x Student Sample	93
15. One-Way ANOVA: DRV4 x Student Sample	94
16. One-Way ANOVA: DRV5 x Student Sample	95
17. One-Way ANOVA: SRS Total x Parent Sample	96

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table	
18. One-Way ANOVA: TSHI Total x Parent Sample	97
19. One-Way ANOVA: RMA Total x Parent Sample	98
20. One-Way ANOVA: DRV1 x Parent Sample	99
21. One-Way ANOVA: DRV4 x Parent Sample	100

INTRODUCTION

Sexual assault has been commonly defined as forced sexual intercourse without the partner's consent (Lott, 1987). As Lott has noted, "The full meaning of rape is more complex because it is an act primarily performed by men against women. Rape, therefore, symbolizes women's vulnerability and in cultures where rape occurs frequently (as in our own), girls grow up fearful of the possibility that they will be overpowered and sexually violated" (p. 148).

The incidence of rape in our culture is on the increase (Benshoff, 1978). Johnson (1980) projected conservative "lifelong rape probabilities" (p. 139) from reports of confirmed and alleged rapes and noted that 20-30 percent of girls who were twelve years old in 1980 would suffer a violent sexual attack during their lifetimes. According to Johnson, "The average American woman is just as likely to suffer a sexual attack as she is to experience a divorce" (p. 139). Clearly, the pervasiveness of violence toward women in America impacts upon all of our lives and deserves continued attention from researchers. Various agencies such as Division 35 of the American Psychological Association (APA), the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) have set research priorities to further investigate this phenomenon (Benshoff, 1978).

In 1985, 87,340 cases of rape were reported to the police (FBI, 1986). These figures are generally recognized as greatly underestimating the true extent of this crime against women because they are derived only from reports made to the police. By government estimates, there are approximately 3-10 times more sexual assaults committed than are reported (LEAA, 1975).

Numerous researchers have attempted to study the prevalence of rape within the general population as well as in the college population. Russell (1984) studied sexual victimization experiences via personal interviews with women. She found that 24% of a probability sample of 930 women aged 18 and over who resided in San Francisco had been victims of a rape, and 31% had experienced an attempted rape. When these categories were combined, a total of 44% of women interviewed reported at least one attempted or completed rape. Less than 1 in 12 women (approximately 8%) had reported these assaults to the police. Kilpatrick and associates (Kilpatrick, Best, Veronen, Amick, & Ruff, 1985; Kilpatrick, Veronen & Best, 1984) assessed rates of victimization via a random telephone survey of 2,004 female residents in Charleston County, South Carolina and found that 14.5% of their respondents admitted to experiencing a rape or an attempted rape. Of those who were raped, only 29% reported the crime to the police.

Similar figures regarding sexual victimization rates have been disclosed from various studies conducted on

college campuses. Approximately 20-25% of college women studied over a 25 year time span have indicated they have experienced forceful attempts at intercourse by their dates (Kanin, 1957; Kanin & Purcell, 1977; Kirkpatrick & Kanin, 1957; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). Koss and colleagues (Koss, 1985; Koss, Leonard, Beezley, & Oros, 1985; Koss & Oros, 1982) surveyed 2,016 female and 1,846 male Midwestern university students regarding their sexual experiences and found that 13% of the females had been victims of rape and 4.6% of the males admitted committing a sexual assault which conformed with the legal definition of rape. Rapaport and Burkhart (1984) found that 15% of a sample of college men indicated having forced dates into sexual intercourse against their will. Yegidis (1986) sampled a non-random group of 648 college students and found that 10% of the women had experienced some form of forced sexual encounter within the past year, and 22% of the women indicated that they had previously experienced a forced sexual encounter while dating.

Lott, Reilly and Howard (1982) investigated the broader topic of sexual harassment on a college campus and noted that 13% of 927 student, faculty and staff respondents knew at least one person who had been the victim of a sexual assault on campus, and a total of 29.4% of the women admitted having experienced a sexual assault at some time in their lives. Only 7% of the respondents who indicated a history of sexual assault had reported it to the police.

Meuhlenhard and Linton (1987) surveyed 341 female and 294 male college students regarding their sexual experiences and found that "77.6% of the women and 57.3% of the men had been involved in some form of sexual aggression; 14.7% of the women and 7.1% of the men had been involved in unwanted intercourse" (p. 186).

Most recently, Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987) surveyed an approximately representative sample of 6,159 higher education students and found that, "Since the age of 14, 27.5% of college women reported experiencing and 7.7% of college men reported perpetrating an act that met the legal definitions of rape, which includes rape attempts" (p. 168). Virtually none of these victims or perpetrators had reported the incidents or been arrested for their actions. From these data, Koss, et al. (1987) estimate that the victimization rate for college students is 10-15 times greater than rates based on National Crime Statistics (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 1984), and the men's rates of admitting perpetrating such assaults are 2-3 times greater than the National Crime Statistics estimates of the risk of rape for women between the ages of 16-24.

Based on the above mentioned findings in the literature, it is clear that rape occurs with alarming frequency in the United States, and that college students are particularly vulnerable to this act of violence in their dating relationships.

In attempts to further delineate factors that are

involved in this phenomenon, numerous researchers (Barnett & Feild, 1977; Benshoff, 1978; Dull & Giacomassi, 1987; Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987; L'Armand & Pepitone, 1982; Plane, 1987; Sanberg, Jackson, & Petretic-Jackson, 1987; Shotland, 1985; Tetreault & Barnett, 1987) have investigated attitudes toward and beliefs about rape, and more specifically, the variables which lead an observer to conclude that a rape has happened. The bulk of the research to date has been done with college students. Among the groups of people who have been studied, they comprise the highest risk for sexual assault by age group (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Fewer studies have investigated attitudes and beliefs about rape of older samples (Burt, 1980; Dietz, Blackwell, Daley & Bentley, 1982). Typically, these college studies have utilized methods such as videotaped scenarios of actors portraying rape victims and discussing their experiences (Mazelan, 1980; Tetrault & Barnett, 1987) or written rape vignettes in which forced sexual intercourse is depicted under various conditions (Check & Malamuth, 1983; Collier & Resick, 1987; Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987; L'Armand & Pepitone, 1982; Malamuth & Feshbach, 1980; Muehlenhard, 1988; Tetrault & Barnett, 1987), combined with self-report attitudinal, belief, and personality measures. Results from these studies have shown that there are situational considerations in one's attribution of rape blame and ratings of rape justifiability as well as attitudinal, and personality correlates which contribute to a respondent's acceptance of

rape myths. In addition, gender differences in reactions to depictions of rape and on attitudinal and belief measures have been widely documented.

A summary of recent research findings (all of which investigated heterosexual situations) reveals the following:

1. Situational variables which increase the risk of sexual aggression in a heterosexual dating situation include: the man's initiating and paying for the date; the man being responsible for driving on the date; the use of alcohol and drugs; "parking" during the date; and miscommunication about sex between the dating partners (Muehlenhard, Freidman, & Thomas, 1985; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987). A more general underlying feature of the above mentioned variables is the establishment of a scenario in which the man is in control and has acquired power over the woman (e.g. by either paying for the date, or making decisions regarding drug and alcohol intake during the date, or choosing where to go during the date).

2. Situational variables which lead respondents to attribute greater blame to the rape victim and/or increase their acceptance of the rape include: knowledge of the victim's previous sexual history (whether described as limited or extensive was related to more blame of the victim than when this information was unknown [L'Armand & Pepitone, 1982]); type of victim-offender relationship depicted, i.e.,

stranger versus acquaintance, with acquaintance rape frequently being seen as less serious in nature (L'Armand & Pepitone, 1987; Plane, 1987; Tetrault & Barnett, 1987); the woman's initiating the date; the dating partners going to the man's apartment; the use of alcohol or drugs (Plane, 1987); and the man paying all of the dating expenses (Muehlenhard, 1988; Muehlenhard, Freidman & Thomas, 1985).

3. Research which has examined attitudinal, belief, and personality characteristics of the respondents has shown that traditional persons i.e., those scoring high on such measures as sex role stereotyping, acceptance of interpersonal violence and adversarial sexual beliefs (Burt, 1980), and those scoring high on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (ATWS) (Spence & Helmreich, 1972), tend to endorse a greater acceptance of rape myths and are more likely to blame the victim (Burt, 1980; Check & Malamuth, 1983; Collier & Resick, 1987; Fischer, 1986a, 1986b, 1987; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Shotland & Goodstein, 1983). In addition, Peterson and Franzese (1987) found a positive relationship between the tendency for men to abuse women and "the acceptance of rape myths, downplaying of sexual assault as a problem, and rather traditional views of women's role in American society" (p. 227).

4. Gender differences have been noted on various measures, with men: condoning more rape myths (Barnett &

Feild, 1977; Jenkins & Dambrot; 1987; Malamuth & Check, 1981; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987), condoning aggressive sexual behavior (Dull & Giacomassi, 1987; Peterson & Franzese, 1987), being more accepting of violence toward women (Malamuth & Check, 1981), being less likely to interpret a situation of forced sexual intercourse as rape (Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987), having higher sex-willingness ratings for the victim of a forced sexual encounter, and viewing rape as more justifiable (Muehlenhard, 1988), having more traditional attitudes toward women (Muehlenhard, 1988; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987), reporting more sexual arousal to both written depictions of rape and consenting intercourse (Malamuth & Check, 1980; Malamuth, Haber, & Feshbach, 1980), and being lower in rape empathy ratings (Dietz, et al., 1982), and self-reporting more tolerance for sexual harassment (Lott, Reilly, & Howard, 1982; Reilly, et al., 1986; Reilly, et al., 1989) than women.

Sex role stereotyping has been shown to positively correlate with measures of rape myth acceptance, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and adversarial sexual beliefs in both genders (Burt, 1980; Malamuth & Check, 1983; Lott, Lott, & Fernald, 1990). Some researchers (Malamuth & Check, 1983; Weis & Borges, 1973) have argued that traditional sex roles have had an impact on both men's and women's behaviors in that they socialize men to be offenders and women to be victims. Brownmiller (1976) underscores this point as well in discussing the dynamics of date rape. She notes that

dating relationships in which rape occur contain "elements of coercive authority that militate against decisive resistance. Here the authority takes the form of expected behavior. In a dating situation an aggressor may press his advantage to the point where pleasantness quickly turns to unpleasantness and more than the woman bargained for, yet social propriety and the strictures of conventional female behavior that dictate politeness and femininity demand that the female gracefully endure, or wriggle away if she can, but a direct confrontation falls outside of the behavioral norms" (p. 284).

Clearly, women's risk of sexual assault may be influenced by the attitudes and beliefs that we are brought up with and that permeate our society at large. To date, no studies have been done comparing intergenerational attitudes toward and beliefs about sexual assault. In studies which have sampled both older persons and younger persons, it has been found that younger and better educated respondents, regardless of gender, show less proviolence, adversarial and stereotypic attitudes, and less acceptance of rape myths than older respondents (Burt, 1980).

While there are no studies of intergenerational attitudes toward and beliefs about sexual assault, many researchers have compared parents and their children on other attitudinal and behavioral variables, with contradictory results. Some investigators have found significant differences between parents and their children

(Connell, 1972; Gallagher, 1974; Payne, Summers, & Stewart, 1973; Tedin, 1974), while others have found high levels of similarity between the two generations (Acock & Bengston, 1977, 1978; Aldous & Hill, 1965; Bengston, 1975; Hill, Foote, Aldous, Carson, & MacDonald, 1970; Kandel & Lesser, 1972; Lerner & Knapp, 1975; Thomas, 1974; Troll, Neugarten & Kraines, 1969).

A review of more recent research in related areas indicates that findings are still equivocal. Meier (1972) investigated the relationship of college students' attitudes toward social equality for women to parental characteristics and socialization influences. He found that there was a marked positive correlation between students' egalitarian attitudes towards women's roles and the salience of mothers (but not fathers) in attitudinal socialization. Mothers were reported to have more influence in shaping their children's attitudes and general outlook on life than did fathers. Other variables which were related to students' social equality attitudes were: religious faith (with students who professed no faith being more egalitarian in their attitudes towards women's roles than students who described themselves as religious), ethnic background (with hispanic students having significantly more traditional attitudes towards women's roles than did non-hispanic students), mother's educational status (with students whose mothers were highly educated scoring higher in egalitarian attitudes towards women's roles than students whose mothers

were less educated), and mother's occupational status (with students whose mothers were in high status occupations scoring higher in egalitarian attitudes towards women's roles than students whose mothers were in lower status professions, and students whose mothers worked outside of the home, regardless of mothers' occupational status, scoring higher in egalitarian attitudes than students whose mothers were homemakers).

In a study of intergenerational differences in attitudes toward feminism, Roper and Labeff (1977) compared data collected on students and their parents in 1934 with data from students and their parents collected in 1974. Overall, respondents in the 1974 sample were more favorable towards feminism than those in the 1934 sample, and there was a trend toward women endorsing more egalitarian relations and men endorsing more traditional attitudes about female sex roles. Their findings suggest that women in both generations scored higher in feminist attitudes than men, in both the 1934 and 1974 samples. In addition, students in both the 1934 and 1974 samples showed greater gender differences in their feminism scores than did their parents.

More recently, Slevin and Wingrove (1983) compared a sample of three generations of women on responses to the ATWS (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). Major intergenerational differences were noted, with younger generations endorsing more profeminist attitudes. Intergenerational influence was found for mothers and daughters, with significant

correlations between their scores on the dimensions of: 1. dating, courtship and etiquette, and 2. marital relationships and obligations. Grandmothers' scores were significantly and positively correlated with their daughters' and granddaughters' scores on the dimensions of freedom and independence.

Various researchers have studied the relationship between parental sexual attitudes and the sexual attitudes and behaviors of their college-age children, with inconsistent findings. Daugherty and Burger (1984) found that women students' general attitudes about sexuality and sexual behaviors were correlated most strongly with perceived attitudes of their peers, rather than with those of their parents or church. The sexual attitudes and some of the sexual behaviors of men were correlated most highly with perceived attitudes of their parents, rather than peers or church. Yarber and Greer (1986) found that mothers' sexual attitudes were more influential than fathers' sexual attitudes in predicting their offsprings' sexual attitudes and behaviors, particularly for daughters. In contrast, McNab (1976) found that both fathers' and mothers' sexual attitudes had an influence on the sexual attitudes of their college sons and daughters. In general, parents' actual sexual attitudes were more predictive of sons' sexual attitudes than of daughters' sexual attitudes.

It is important to note that none of the above mentioned studies included any measure of the quality of

parent-child communication within the family, which could be an important factor in assessing intergenerational similarities and differences in attitudes (Bennett & Dickinson, 1980). This lack of information serves as a methodological limitation in interpretation of the findings.

Fisher (1986, 1987) has attempted to address this problem by investigating the relationship between parent-child communication about sex and adolescents' sexual attitudes. Two studies found that late adolescents (ages 18-20) from high sexual communication families reported sexual attitudes that were significantly correlated with their parents, while those from low sexual communication families did not. In the 1987 study, Fisher also utilized a general family communication measure (the Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale [PACS], developed by Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Larsen, Muxen, & Wilson, 1982) which was found to be unrelated to the extent of family discussions about sex. However, parents' reports on the general quality of family communication were predictive of adolescents' sexual behaviors. Fisher noted that, "Communication with mothers seems more closely related to similarity in sexual attitudes than does communication with fathers, especially for daughters," and that, "Communication between fathers and daughters typically does not occur at a level sufficient to warrant a relationship with the daughters' sexual attitudes" (p. 143). She concluded that parents are still capable of exerting influence over their late adolescents in the area

of sexuality, and that the quality of family communication is an important factor to include in future research.

While it is assumed that parents can have an influence on their offsprings' attitudes, the extent of parental influence may be affected by the specific attitude being studied. None of the intergenerational literature reviewed asked respondents about attitudes toward or beliefs about sexual assault.

Given the widely documented evidence of gender differences in attitudes toward sexual assault in the college student population, it is likely that these differences in attitudes are influenced within the family through the following processes: 1) identification with the same-gender parent, through which Chodorow (1978) has argued that boys learn to devalue women as a means to establish an identity separate from their mothers, and 2) the pervasive influence of early socialization experiences which contribute to adversarial relationships between men and women, in which men assume the traditional sex role stereotypic "aggressive-offender" stance, and women assume the traditional sex role stereotypic "passive-victim" stance. In addition, the quality of family communication may influence the degree to which family members feel free to discuss their attitudes and beliefs with one another. Thus, it may also have an impact on intergenerational similarities and differences in attitudes.

The present study is designed to investigate the extent

to which intergenerational similarities and differences in attitudes toward sexual assault, tolerance for sexual harassment, sex role stereotyping and acceptance of rape mythology are related to the level of family communication and gender composition of the parent-student dyad. It is hypothesized that similarities in response will be greater in mother-student dyads and father-student dyads, when the level of family communication is greater, and when the gender of the pair is the same rather than different. It is predicted that:

1. There will be significantly greater differences on each measure for mother-student and father-student dyads in problem communication families than in average and open communication families, and in average communication families than in open communication families.

2. Across all family communication levels, there will be significantly greater differences on each measure for mother-son dyads (different gender) compared with mother-daughter dyads (same gender), and father-daughter dyads (different gender) compared with father-son dyads (same gender).

The present investigation differs from previous research by expanding the scope of the assessment of attitudes toward and beliefs about sexual assault and

sexual harassment into the family domain. To date, no other published investigation has compared intergenerational attitudes toward, and beliefs about, sexual assault and provided information regarding the relationship between familial communication among college students and these attitudes and beliefs. One objective of the present study was to provide sexual assault educators and rape crisis counselors with a new source of empirical information about the role of families' views on sexual assault and sexual harassment. In addition, the results could prove helpful in elementary, secondary and college educational programs, as well as community educational programs on rape awareness and rape prevention, while also having clinical implications for the treatment of rape victims and their families.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 320 University of Rhode Island students (122 men and 198 women) between the ages of 18-23, and their parents (261 mothers and 229 fathers) who volunteered to participate in this study during the Summer sessions and Fall semester of 1989. In order to allow for the broadest range of participation, this study included

students from single-parent, divorced, and step-parent families as well as those from intact two-parent families. The mean age of the students was 19.6 years old. Approximately 28.8% percent of the students were freshman, 21.9% were sophomores, 22.2% were juniors, and 24.7% were seniors. The remaining 1.6% were non-matriculated or in graduate school. The students represented a wide variety of majors within the following general areas: business (9.4%), education (10.0%), humanities (16.9%), natural sciences and quantitative studies (16.9%), social sciences (23.4%), undecided (17.8%), and other (2.2%). Most of the students were European American (87.2%), while 6.3% were African American, 2.8% were Hispanic American, 1.3% were Native American, .3% were Asian American, and 2.2% were from other ethnic backgrounds. The predominant religious background of the students was Catholic (55.9%), with 24.1% being Protestant; 10.0% were Jewish, 4.4% were Atheist/Agnostic, .3% were Islamic, and 5.0% were other religions.

Approximately 46.6% of the students lived in residence halls, while 11.2% resided in Greek Houses, 14.1% lived with their parents, and 27.2% lived off campus. Most of the students were single (97.2%). while 1.9% were cohabiting and .9% were married. Complete student sample characteristics are described in Table 1.

The mean age of the mother sample was 46.3. The mothers were also predominantly European American (90.0%), while 2.3% were African American, 1.9% were Hispanic

American, 1.9% were Asian American, and 3.1% were from other ethnic backgrounds. Seventy-two percent of the mothers were married, 11.5% were divorced, 9.2% were remarried, 2.7% were widowed, 2.3% were separated, 1.5% were cohabiting, and .8% were never married. Catholicism was the religion practiced by 53.6% of the mothers, while 28.4% were Protestant, 11.9% were Jewish, 1.9% were Atheist/Agnostic, .4% were Islamic, and 3.8% were other religions. Among the mothers: 1.1% had doctoral degrees, 10.7% had Master's degrees, 22.2% had bachelors degrees, 36.4% had some college education, 25.3% were high school graduates, and 4.2% didn't complete high school. The predominant occupations of the mother sample included: business management and staff (14.2%), sales (8.9%), clerical work (13.1%), teaching (14.2%), nursing (8.4%), homemaking (15.3%), and service professions (5.3%). Their median combined family income was in the \$50,001-\$60,000 range.

The mean age of the father sample was 48.5. Most of the fathers were European American (92.6%), while 1.7% were Hispanic American, 1.3% were African American, .9% were Native American, and 2.6% were from other ethnic groups. The majority of the fathers were married (78.6%), while 9.2% were divorced, 9.2% were remarried, 1.7% were separated, and 1.3% were widowed. Their predominant faith was Catholicism (55.4%), while 25.8% were Protestants, 10.9% were Jewish, 3.5% were Atheist/Agnostic, and 3.9 % were from other religious backgrounds. The father sample was somewhat more

educated than the mother sample, with 10.9% of fathers holding doctoral degrees, 21.8% with Master's degrees, 27.1% with bachelors degrees, 21.0% with some college, 16.2% with high school degrees, and 2.1% with less than a high school education. The major occupations of the father sample included: business owner or executive (17.9%), business management and staff (18.8%), teaching (12.2%), medical or legal professions (6.0%), government service (6.0%), and skilled labor (16.2%). Their median combined family income was in the \$60,001-\$70,000 range. The discrepancy between mothers' and fathers' combined median income is due to the fact that the mothers who were presently not married (i.e., divorced, separated, etc.) generally earned less income than their male counterparts. Complete parent sample characteristics are detailed in Table 2.

A total of 86.9% of the parents surveyed returned their questionnaires. Within that group, 66.3% of the returns came from both parents, 15.3% of the returns came from mothers only, and 5.3% of the returns came from fathers only. The high parental return rate may be attributed to: 1) the incentive of participating in a gift certificate drawing and/or helping their sons or daughters earn extra class credit, and 2) the relevance and importance of this topic to their lives, especially as it relates to their sons and daughters. (Both parents and students wrote comments on their surveys about the research being very interesting and timely in addressing a serious societal issue.)

Instruments

Student and Parent Background Questionnaires

(Appendices A and B). These instruments contain questions about age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, religious background, political affiliation, educational and occupational status, socioeconomic status, year in school and type of residence (for students), and previous coursework in sex-role issues (for students).

Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale (PACS)

(Appendices C, D, and E). The PACS is a 20-item rating scale developed by Olsen, McCubbin, Barnes, Larsen, Muxen, & Wilson, 1982), that measures both positive and negative aspects of communication between adolescents (in both high school and college age ranges) and their parents. There are two subscales: Open Family Communication, which measures positive aspects of parent-adolescent communication such as: freedom or free flowing exchange of factual as well as emotional information, degree of understanding and satisfaction experienced in their interactions, and lack of constraint in communication. The second subscale, Problems in Family Communication, measures the more negative aspects of parent-adolescent communication such as: feeling selective, cautious or hesitant about what is shared, and expressing negative modes of interaction.

An initial pool of 35 items constructed on the basis of

a review of relevant literature were piloted on a group of 433 high school and college students. These data were factor analyzed by both principal factoring with iterations and varimax rotation. The minimum eigen value was 1.0. On the basis of the factor analyses, the PACS was reduced from 35 to 20 items, with three factors: Factor I: Open Family Communication, Factor II: Problems in Family Communication, and Factor III: Selective Family Communication. The final scale was reduced to two subscales by combining the items from the Problems in Family Communication and Selective Family Communication subscales under the title of Problems in Family Communication. This was done because they both focused on negative aspects of communication and they fit well together conceptually. A sample of 1,841 adults and adolescents was analyzed using the final 20 item version of the scale. (The sample was divided into two groups in order to allow for replication.) An unrestricted varimax rotation continued to define the three original factors, but when restricted to only two factors, the first scale remained as a separate factor and the second and third scales collapsed into one factor. The internal consistency reliability for the final factors and scales from the total sample is as follows: Open Family Communication = .87, Problems in Family Communication = .78, and the Total Scale = .88.

In the present study, each student filled out two communication scales: one for communication with mother and one for communication with father. The order of

presentation of these scales was counterbalanced. The parents each filled out one form for communication with their daughter or son. Each family (with the exception of single-parent or non-responding families) had two final communication scores: one for mother-student level of communication, and one for father-student level of communication. These scores were derived by averaging the mother's communication score with the student's communication score for mother, and averaging the father's communication score with the student's communication score for father. These scores were averaged together in order to be a more reliable measure which took into account both parents' and students' perceptions of family communication.

The PACS is scored on a 5 point Likert scale. The range of scores for this measure is 20-100. For purposes of this study, respondents' scores were grouped into three categories: Open (scores in the upper third of the range), Average (mid-range scores), and Closed (scores in the bottom third of the range). These ranges were based on the distribution of scores of the present sample.

Date Rape Vignette (DRV) (Appendix F). This is a paragraph depicting a college couple (Bob and Cathy) who go out for the evening and later return to the woman's dorm room where a rape occurs. The reader is then asked to respond to five questions assessing reactions to the vignette. The items are similar in content to questions

asked in previous studies (Coller & Resick, 1987; Muehlendard & MacNaughton, in press) and are scored on a 7 point Likert scale. The items ask the respondents to rate each partner's responsibility for the sexual encounter which occurred, the extent to which Bob was justified in his actions, Cathy's level of enjoyment of the sexual encounter, and whether or not they believed that a rape did occur.

Responses were coded so that tolerance of rape produced a higher score than non-tolerance. The order of the first four items was systematically changed in order to counteract any influence of order effects. In all cases, the final item was the question assessing whether or not a rape had occurred, with a follow-up question asking them to briefly explain their response. Prior to conducting the research, the vignette and follow-up questions were submitted to four judges (two psychologists, a social worker, and a counselor) with expertise in the area of rape and sexual harassment. Their suggestions were followed to maximize content validity and clarity of the items. Scores on each item range from 1 to 7.

Sex Role Stereotyping Scale (SRS) (Appendix G). This 9 item scale, developed by Burt (1980), assesses the degree to which respondents endorse sex role stereotypes. Burt (1980) found a correlation of .45 for women between scores on the SRS and the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS), and a correlation of .52 for men on these measures. The scale was

developed from pretests using large item pools. From results of the pretests, an initial interview form was developed with approximately twice as many items as were desired for the final scale. An item analysis was conducted on the initial interview form, which resulted in nine items being retained for the final scale. The Cronbach alpha reliability for this scale = .80, based on an administration to a random sample of 598 adults (aged 18 years and older) residing in Minnesota.

The items on this scale are scored on a 7 point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. For scoring purposes, response scores were coded so that a high score indicated a greater acceptance of sex role stereotypes. Scores on this measure range from 9 to 63.

Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory (TSHI).

The TSHI, shown in Appendix H, was developed by Lott, Reilly, and Howard (1982). It is a ten item scale which measures acceptance of sexually harassing behaviors. Scores on this scale have been found to correlate positively for men with self-reported assaultive behavior and endorsement of a likelihood to rape question, and for both men and women, with acceptance of rape myths and adversarial sexual relations (Reilly, Lott, Caldwell, & DeLuca, in press).

Each item is scored on a seven point Likert Scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree). Responses were coded so that low scores indicated

nonacceptance of harassment and high scores indicated tolerance of harassment.

The scale was initially tested on 927 male and female undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, staff and employees at the University of Rhode Island. It was utilized again in a follow-up study (Reilly, Lott & Gallogly, 1986) which assessed the sexual harassment experiences of 393 male and female undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Rhode Island by male and female professors, staff, and graduate assistants. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale, derived from this sample, is .78. The Guttman split-half reliability coefficient is .83. In addition, a principle components analysis with varimax rotation revealed three factors (with eigen values greater than 1.0) designated as: flirtations are natural, provocative behavior, and feminist beliefs. Scores on this measure range from 10 to 70.

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS) (Appendix I). Burt (1980) utilized the same procedure and data base to develop the RMAS scale as was done for the SRS scale, described above. The RMAS consists of 19 items which are designed to measure the degree to which one endorses common rape myths. For purposes of this study, only the first 11 items were included. Each item is scored on a seven point basis ranging from (1) strongly agree to (7) strongly disagree. The Cronbach alpha reliability for this scale = .875. Scores

on this measure range from 11 to 77.

Procedure

Following approval by the Institutional Review Board, student participants were recruited from various psychology, sociology, speech, and human development counseling and family studies courses. No remuneration was offered for their participation, but all students and parents who volunteered were entered into drawings for \$25.00 gift certificates to the University Bookstore. In addition, some instructors gave their students extra credit for their participation. Extra credit consisted of extra points towards a final grade, with the specific number of points being determined by each instructor. The sample was accidental in type. The investigator chose to survey social science classes, where this topic would be of interest and relevance to the students' course of study. Also, these classes provided access to student participants who represented a wide range of majors and class levels.

Prior to participation in the study, respondents were given the following brief description: "This is a study which is designed to explore: 1) attitudes and beliefs about the behavior of young men and women toward each other in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. In addition, your parents will be surveyed

so that we may learn more about their attitudes and beliefs as well." Respondents from intact families were asked to invite both of their parents to participate in the study. Respondents from single-parent families were asked to invite the parent with whom they have lived over the last five years, and those from non-intact families were asked to invite the two parents (either both parents or one parent and one step-parent) with whom they have had the most contact over the last five years. Respondents were informed that their participation or non-participation in the study would not affect their status with their professors. They were assured that their responses, as well as those of their parents, would remain confidential, and that anyone would be allowed to withdraw from the study at any time. In addition, they were asked not to discuss their responses with their parents until after all family responses had been completed and returned.

Student respondents were then asked to fill out a data packet which included: two informed consent forms (see Appendices J and K), and a questionnaire containing: demographic items, communication, attitudinal and belief measures described above, and one date rape vignette. These forms were completed during pre-arranged appointment times, in a group administration in a classroom setting. The questionnaires took about 20-25 minutes to complete, and the investigator remained in the room during the administration to answer any questions. Included on the student's copy of

the informed consent form which they kept were the names and telephone numbers of resource persons who could be contacted if someone wished to discuss any issues raised in the study. All respondents were asked to sign their names on the informed consent sheets. (Students were also asked to include the names of their parents, and parents were asked to include the names of their children, for the purpose of keeping a record of names of students who received extra credit for their participation, and for coding of each parent-student pair.) No identifying data were included in the body of the questionnaire. To ensure confidentiality of responses, the researcher's copy of the informed consent sheet was separated from each questionnaire, and each was coded with a matching identification number. Upon completion and return of their data packets, the students furnished the investigator with the names and addresses of their parents so that research packets could be mailed to them for individual completion at their home(s).

The parents' research packet included a form letter signed by their daughter or son requesting their cooperation (see Appendices L-O,) as well as a letter from the investigator describing the study and requesting their participation (see Appendices P-S). In addition, parents received informed consent forms (see Appendices T and U), and the same questionnaire (using the Parent Form of the Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale) given to the students. Parental research forms were returned directly to

the investigator in pre-addressed, postage-paid envelopes. Parents' packets also included the previously mentioned list of names and telephone numbers of the investigator and other resource persons in the event they wished to discuss any issues raised in the study. None of the parents or students called in with any questions. In order to encourage parents to return their questionnaires, a follow-up postcard was mailed out as a reminder if the questionnaires had not been received within two weeks.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Cronbach alpha reliabilities were calculated for the student sample and parent sample for the PACS, SRS, TSHI, and RMA scales. The alpha coefficients for the student sample were as follows: PACS-Mother = .90, PACS-Father = .90, SRS = .65, TSHI = .77, and RMA = .80. The alpha coefficients for the parent sample were: PACS = .87, SRS = .71, TSHI = .74, and RMA = .78. Since the RMA scale utilized in this research was shorter than the original 19 item version, the Spearman Brown prophecy formula was calculated to assess the theoretical reliability of the 11 item version. The results indicated that Spearman Brown = .80, which equals the RMA alpha coefficient for the student

sample, and is very close to the RMA alpha coefficient for the parent sample.

Assessment of Order Effects. A series of five one-way ANOVAS was performed to determine if there were any significant order effects regarding the presentation of the date rape vignette questions, which were systematically varied in four orders. (The item ordering for purposes of data analysis was as follows: DRV item 1 assessed Bob's responsibility, DRV item 2 assessed Cathy's responsibility, DRV item 3 assessed the justifiability of Bob's actions, DRV item 4 assessed Cathy's level of enjoyment of the encounter, and DRV item 5 asked whether or not a rape occurred.) Four of the analyses were non-significant at the .05 level. For DRV item 1, $F(3, 805) = .43$, $p = .74$. For DRV item 3, $F(3, 805) = 1.35$, $p = .26$. For DRV item 4, $F(3, 805) = 1.16$, $p = .33$. For DRV item 5, $F(3, 805) = 2.02$, $p = .11$. An order effect was noted for DRV item 2, $F(3, 805) = 2.82$, $p < .04$, but a Tukey A follow-up procedure indicated that no two groups were significantly different at the .05 level. (Ranges for the .05 level were: 3.65, 3.65, and 3.65). It does not appear, then, that the initial finding of an order effect is meaningful in this case. Cochran's C test for homogeneity of variance was calculated for each of the above analyses. (For DRV 1, Cochran's C = .27, $p = .54$. For DRV 2, Cochran's C = .29, $p = .10$. For DRV 3, Cochran's C = .27, $p = .78$. For DRV 4, Cochran's C = .28, $p = .26$. For DRV 5,

Cochrans C = .34, $p < .001$.) The only significant finding (DRV 5) was most likely due to the large number of degrees of freedom (808) in this design rather than to an actual violation of homogeneity of variance. (Other significant Cochrans C test results, which will be mentioned below, also may be attributed to the large number of degrees of freedom in each of the analyses.)

In order to assess any significant order effects from the presentation of the PACS-Mother and PACS-Father scales, two one-way ANOVAS were calculated. For the PACS-Mother analysis, $F(1, 302) = .82, p = .37$. For the PACS-Father analysis, $F(1, 302) = .03, p = .87$. Due to the non-significant findings, it can be noted that the counterbalancing of these communication scales was effective in offsetting any potential response bias due to order effects. Cochrans C test was calculated for both of these analyses with non-significant results. (For the PACS-Mother analysis, Cochrans C = .52, $p = .63$. For the PACS-Father analysis, Cochrans C = .54, $p = .39$.)

Comparison of Students With and Without Parental Responses. In order to assess whether or not there were any significant differences in students' ratings of parent-student communication between students whose parents did not return their questionnaires (13.1% of the sample) and those who did, two two-way ANOVAS were performed to compare students' gender x parent category on their PACS-Mother and

PACS-Father communication scores, respectively. Results of the two-way ANOVA comparing gender x parent category on the PACS-Mother scores revealed a significant main effect for parent category, $F(3, 309) = 3.51, p < .02.$, while the main effect for gender was non-significant, $F(1, 309) = .03, p = .86$, and there were no significant interactions, $F(3, 309) = 1.47, p = .22$. The Tukey A follow-up test indicated that there were no significant differences between groups at the .05 level. (Ranges = 3.66, 3.66, and 3.66.) As such, the differences noted in mean scores between the four parent category groups do not appear to be meaningful. Results from the two-way ANOVA (gender x parent category) on the PACS-Father scores were not significant, $F(4, 299) = 1.43, p = .23$. Cochrans C test was calculated for both of the above two-way analyses. Results for the PACS-Mother analysis were non-significant at the .01 level, Cochrans C = .35, $p = .02$. For PACS-Father, Cochrans C = .30, $p = .32$, also a non-significant finding.

In order to assess any significant differences in SRS, TSHI, RMA, and DRV scores between students whose parents participated in the study and those whose parents did not participate, a series of one-way ANOVAS was calculated. The one-way ANOVA comparing SRS scores by parent category was significant, $F(3, 316) = 2.65, p < .05$, but follow-up testing indicated no significant group differences at the .05 level. (Tukey A ranges = 3.66, 3.66, and 3.66.) Cochrans C test of homogeneity of variance was also

calculated, with significant findings (Cochrans C = .45, $p < .001$). The one-way ANOVA comparing TSHI scores by parent category was not significant, $F(3, 316) = 1.17$, $p = .32$. Cochrans C test was also non-significant, (Cochrans C = .29, $p = .42$). The one-way ANOVA comparing RMA scores by parent category was significant, $F(3, 316) = 3.02$, $p < .03$, and the Tukey A follow-up test indicated that the RMA scores of students with no parents responding ($\bar{x} = 20.6$) were significantly lower (at the .05 level) than the scores of students with fathers only responding, ($\bar{x} = 28.36$). This finding may be due to the fact that the number of students in both of these groups were very small ($N = 17$ and $N = 42$, respectively), rather than reflecting any meaningful differences between these two groups. There were no significant differences noted between students with no parental responses and those with mothers only responding or those with both parents responding. Cochrans C test was non-significant at the .01 level, Cochrans C = .34, $p = .02$. There were no significant differences noted between students without parental participation and those with parental participation on their DRV scores. For DRV 1, $F(3, 316) = 1.43$, $p = .23$. (Cochrans C = .47, $p < .001$.) For DRV 2, $F(3, 316) = 1.86$, $p = .14$. (Cochrans C = .51, $p < .001$.) For DRV 3, $F(3, 316) = 2.16$, $p = .09$. (Cochrans C = .43, $p < .001$.) For DRV 4, $F(3, 316) = 1.78$, $p = .15$. (Cochrans C = .40, $p < .001$.) For DRV 5, $F(3, 316) = .32$, $p = .81$. (Cochrans C = .31, $p = .14$.)

Overall, then, the above preliminary analyses indicated that there were no significant order effects for the PACS-Mother and PACS-Father scales, or for the DRV items 1-5. In addition, there were no significant differences between students with parental participation and students without parental participation.

Analyses of Predictions

The means and standard deviations for students' and parents' total scores on the PACS, DRV, SRS, TSHI, and RMA scales are presented in Tables 3-4.

The PACS scores were grouped into open, average, and problem communication categories according to the distribution of scores for the present sample. In order to insure that each category (open, average, and problem) had an equal percentage of mother-student or father-student scores, each sample was divided into equal thirds. The distribution of scores for the mother-student sample was slightly different from the father-student sample, which resulted in a slight difference in ranges for each sample. The grouped categories for Student and Mother-PACS average scores were: Open (scores from 49-75, in the upper third of the range, $\bar{x} = 57.3$), Average (scores from 38-48.5, in the mid-range, $\bar{x} = 42.8$), and Problem (scores from 20-37.5, in the bottom third of the range, $\bar{x} = 33.7$). The grouped categories for Student and Father-PACS average scores were:

Open (scores from 52-78.5, in the upper third of the range, $\bar{x}$ = 59.8), Average (scores from 42-51.5 in the mid-range, $\bar{x}$ = 46.5), and Problem (scores from 20-41.5, in the bottom third of the range, $\bar{x}$ = 36.3).

In order to test the predictions that 1) there would be significantly greater differences on each measure for mother-student and father-student dyads in problem communication families than in average and open communication families, and in average communication families than in open communication families, and 2) across all communication levels, there would be greater differences in attitudes and beliefs between different-gender dyads compared with same-gender dyads, two MANOVAS were calculated to analyze the mother-student and the father-student data separately. Each MANOVA was a 2 x 3 analysis (composition of dyad: same vs. different gender x level of family communication: open, average, and problem). Each analysis utilized parent-student difference scores on the DRV, SRS, TSHI, and RMA measures. This design was chosen over a single MANOVA design which would include both the mother-student and father-student data due to the fact that sons and daughters provided scores for both of their parents, and the sample size was too small for the larger design. In addition, the single design would be confounded by having two scores from some students (those with both parents participating) and one score from other students. The weakness inherent in the two independent MANOVAS design is

that interactions between mother and father dyads could not be assessed.

Mother-Student Dyads. The 2 (dyad composition: same vs. different gender) x 3 (level of family communication) MANOVA calculated on the mother-student difference scores on the DRV, SRS, TSHI, and RMA measures revealed no significant differences for the main effect of communication level ($F [16,490] = 1.21, p = .26$) or for the interaction effect between dyad composition and communication level ($F [16,490] = .55, p = .92$). Thus, the general prediction that attitude and belief differences between mother-student dyads would be related to level of family communication was not supported. There was, however, a significant main effect for dyad composition ($F [8,245] = 4.24, p < .001$). Results from this analysis are described in Table 5. Follow-up one-way ANOVAS revealed significant dyad composition differences on the SRS ($F [1,252] = 23.51, p < .001$), TSHI ($F [1,252] = 16.36, p < .001$), and RMA ($F [1,252] = 17.36, p < .001$) measures. Mothers and daughters differed significantly on the SRS measure, ($\bar{x}$ difference score = 3.38), with daughters scoring significantly lower in SRS than mothers. This finding did not support the prediction that same gender pairs would be more similar in attitudes and beliefs than different gender pairs. On the TSHI and RMA measures, mothers and sons showed significant differences ($\bar{x}$ difference score for TSHI = -8.74, $\bar{x}$ difference score for

RMA = -4.22) with sons scoring significantly higher in TSHI and RMA than their mothers. This finding did support the above mentioned prediction. These results are shown in Tables 6-8.

There were no significant differences between mothers and students on any of the DRV variables. For DRV1, $F(1,258) = 1.76, p = .18$. For DRV2, $F(1,258) = 4.21, p = .18$. For DRV3, $F(1,258) = .15, p = .70$. For DRV4, $F(1,258) = .52, p = .47$. For DRV5, $F(1,258) = 3.4, p = .07$. Cochran's C univariate homogeneity of variance tests were non-significant at the .01 level for all variables with the exception of DRV3. (Cochran's C [85,3] = .32, $p < .001$.) These findings indicated that both mother-daughter and mother-son dyads were similar (showed no significant differences) in their responses to the date rape vignette.

Father-Student Dyads. The 2 (dyad composition) x 3 (level of family communication) MANOVA calculated on the father-student difference scores on the DRV, SRS, TSHI, and RMA measures revealed no significant differences for the main effect of communication level ($F[16,428] = 1.13, p = .32$) or the interaction effect between dyad composition and communication level ($F[16,428] = .76, p = .73$). Consistent with the mother-student analysis, this analysis also did not provide support for the prediction of father-student differences in attitudes and beliefs related to level of family communication.

As was true for the mother-student sample, the main effect for dyad composition was significant ($F [8,214] = 2.88, p < .005$). These results are seen in Table 9. Follow-up one-way ANOVAS revealed significant differences on the TSHI ($F [1,221] = 17.59, p < .001$) and RMA ($F [1,221] = 7.66, p < .006$) measures. Fathers and sons differed significantly on the TSHI measure, ($\bar{x}$ difference score = -4.68) with sons scoring significantly higher in TSHI than their fathers. This finding did not support the prediction of more similarity in same gender pairs than opposite gender pairs. On the RMA measure, however, this prediction was supported. There were significant differences noted between fathers and daughters ($\bar{x}$ difference score = 2.97) with daughters scoring significantly lower in RMA than their fathers. These results are shown in Tables 10-11.

There were no significant differences found between fathers and students on any of the DRV variables. For DRV1, $F (1,226) = .16, p = .69$. For DRV2, $F (1,226) = 1.23, p = .27$. For DRV3, $F (1,226) = .34, p = .56$. For DRV4, $F (1,226) = .45, p = .50$. For DRV5, $F (1,226) = .74, p = .39$. Cochran's C tests were non-significant at the .01 level for all variables with the exception of DRV4 (Cochran's C $[37,6] = .33, p < .001$) and DRV5 (Cochran's C $[37,6] = .29, p = .005$). Consistent with the mother-student DRV analyses, these findings indicated that both father-son and father-daughter dyads were similar (showed no significant differences) in their responses to the date rape vignette.

Additional Analyses: Gender Differences

A series of one-way ANOVAS assessed differences in family communication as well as attitudes and beliefs between male and female students. No significant differences were found on ratings of family communication on the PACS-Mother ($F [1,315] = .15, p = .70$) and PACS-Father scales ($F [1,305] = .0001, p = .97$), but significant differences were found on the SRS ($F [1,318] = 31.44, p < .0001$), TSHI ($F [1,318] = 71.58, p < .0001$), and RMA ($F [1,318] = 37.64, p < .0001$) measures. In each of these measures, women students scored significantly lower than the men, indicating that they endorsed fewer sex role stereotypes, evidenced less tolerance for sexual harassment, and were less accepting of rape myths. These analyses are shown in Tables 12-14. There were no significant differences between male and female students on their responses to the first three questions on the date rape vignette. (For DRV1, $F [1,318] = 1.55, p = .21$. For DRV2, $F [1,318] = 2.69, p = .10$. For DRV3, $F [1,318] = .001, p = .99$.) However, significant differences were found for DRV4, ($F [1,318] = 6.28, p < .01$) and DRV5 ($F [1,318] = 11.46, p < .0008$). In both instances, women disagreed more strongly than men that Cathy had enjoyed the sexual encounter, and agreed more strongly that a rape had occurred. These results are shown in Tables 15-16. Hartley's Fmax tests for unequal N were calculated for each of the above analyses,

with non-significant results at the .01 level.

A series of one-way ANOVAS was also calculated to compare differences between mothers' and fathers' total sum scores on the PACS, DRV, SRS, TSHI, AND RMA measures. No significant differences were found between mothers' and fathers' level of communication with either their sons or daughters. ($F [1,488] = 2.93, p = .09$.) Significant differences were noted between mothers and fathers on the SRS ($F [1,487] = 20.05, p < .0001$), TSHI ($F [1,487] = 31.05, p < .0001$), and RMA ($F [1, 487] = 3.95, p < .05$) measures. Mothers scored consistently lower than fathers on these scales, which indicates that they endorsed fewer sex role stereotypes, were less tolerant of sexual harassment, and less accepting of rape myths. These results are shown in Tables 17-19. Significant differences were also noted on the DRV1 ($F [1,487] = 3.89, p < .05$), and DRV4 ($F [1,487] = 5.31, p < .02$) measures. Mothers rated Bob with a greater degree of responsibility for the sexual encounter than did fathers, and rated Cathy as having more dislike for the sexual encounter. These results are shown in Tables 20-21. Hartley's F_{max} tests for unequal N were calculated for each of the above analyses, with non-significant findings on all variables at the .01 level, with the exception of DRV3 (Hartley's $F_{max} [2,260] = 1.00, p < .01$. This significant finding may be attributed to the large number of degrees of freedom in this design.

DISCUSSION

The present study found no support for the significance of level of family communication (open, average, or problem) in relation to intergenerational similarities and differences in attitudes and beliefs about sexual assault and sexual harassment. This finding was true for both same-gender and different-gender intergenerational dyads. It is instructive that the present sample admitted to having generally less open communication than the normative sample reported by Olson, et al. (1982), which should increase the confidence we can have in the present findings, since the sample used in this study had a greater range of responses. The conclusion that there is not a relationship between level of family communication and the particular attitudes studied in this investigation is supported by other findings. Heck (1986) surveyed 197 male and female college students using only the RMA and PACS scales and found no significant relationship between the students' RMA scores and their perceived communication level with their parents. Parents were not included in Heck's research.

The present findings regarding the influence of dyad composition (same versus different gender) of intergenerational pairs on attitudes and beliefs about sexual assault and sexual harassment are noteworthy on various levels. First, for both the mother-student and father-student analyses, the intergenerational pairs

(regardless of gender composition) were similar (showed no significant differences in their scores) on most of the measures being studied, which argues in favor of the idea that parents may have some influence over their sons' and daughters' formation of attitudes and beliefs in this domain.

In looking at intergenerational differences in beliefs and attitudes based on dyad composition, it is interesting to note that where differences were significant, female students always scored significantly lower in the attitude being measured than did their parents (females were significantly lower in SRS than their mothers and significantly lower in RMA than their fathers), while males scored significantly higher in the measured attitudes than did their parents (significantly higher in TSHI and RMA than their mothers, as well as significantly higher in TSHI than their fathers). These results are consistent with Roper and Labeff's (1977) intergenerational research which found that women (from both of the generations studied) were higher in their endorsement of feminist attitudes and egalitarian relationships than were men, who tended to endorse more traditional attitudes about female sex roles. In addition, it also supports Slevin and Wingrove's (1983) intergenerational research which found that women in the younger generation tended to endorse more profeminist attitudes than did their mothers or grandmothers. The finding that men students were less profeminist than their

fathers in tolerance for sexual harassment is noteworthy. While previous research (Lott et al., [1982]) has indicated that older respondents were less tolerant of sexual harassment than were younger respondents, these differences have not been assessed previously with intergenerational pairs. Perhaps fathers are less tolerant of sexual harassment than their sons due to the amount of time they have spent in the work force, where they may have become aware of problems with sexual harassment on the job. Also, fathers may be more concerned about this issue as it can potentially impact their own daughters or sons.

The prediction that same-gender pairs would be more similar in attitudes and beliefs than opposite-gender pairs was only partially supported. While mothers were more similar to their daughters than their sons, differing only on one variable (SRS) compared with daughters, while differing on two variables (TSHI and RMA) compared with sons, fathers only differed on one variable for both sons (TSHI) and daughters (RMA).

Compared with the parent-student dyads, more significant differences emerged in attitudes and beliefs about sexual assault and sexual harassment when analyzing total scores for mother-father dyads and female-male student dyads. Within each generation, gender appears to be a more salient variable in determining attitudes and beliefs in this domain than it is for the intergenerational analyses. In all instances, the present results were consistent with

previous research on gender differences in SRS, TSHI, and RMA scores. Both mothers and female students endorsed fewer sex role stereotypes, evidenced less tolerance for sexual harassment, and were less accepting of common rape myths than were their male peers (fathers and students, respectively). In addition, the mother-father differences, as well as the female-male student differences in response to the date rape vignette, were always in the direction of the women being less victim blaming, a finding that is also consistent with previous research. In this study, female students said they were more certain that a rape occurred than did male students, and viewed the victim as disliking the sexual encounter more than did the male students. Mothers viewed Bob as more responsible for the sexual encounter than did fathers, and they also believed that Cathy disliked the sexual encounter more than did fathers.

It is important to note that while the above gender differences on these attitudinal and belief measures were found to be statistically significant, the women and men from both generations generally attributed most of the responsibility for the sexual encounter to Bob, while viewing Cathy as minimally responsible. Most respondents also rated Cathy as disliking the sexual encounter, viewed Bob as not being justified in his actions, and agreed that a rape occurred. The gender differences, while small, still suggest that, in general, men continue to be more traditional, conservative and sexist than women in their

attitudes and beliefs about sexual assault and sexual harassment. These small gender differences were noted in the participants' written responses to the item asking respondents to explain their answer to the question, "In your opinion, did a rape occur?" The following gender differences in comments were tabulated:

1. Respondents who stated that a rape had occurred without any qualification of their judgement included 87% of the female students, compared to 78.5% of the male students, and 71% of the mothers, compared to 68.4% of the fathers.

2. Respondents who indicated that a rape occurred, but also stated that Cathy had used poor judgement included 7.5% of the female students, compared to 8.3% of the male students, and 10.8% of the mothers, compared to 9.3% of the fathers.

3. Respondents who indicated that a rape occurred, but added that Cathy should have fought or resisted Bob more adamantly included 3% of the female students, compared to 3.3% of the male students, and 3.9% of the mothers, compared to 5.8% of the fathers.

4. Respondents who did not believe that a rape occurred included 1% of the female students, compared to 4.1% of the male students, and 2.3% of the mothers, compared to 3.6% of the fathers.

5. Responses that attributed some blame to the victim

were given by 12% of the female students, compared to 19% of the male students, and 21.2% of the mothers, compared to 21.3% of the fathers.

Some methodological issues need to be mentioned as a context for consideration of the significant findings in the present study. First, the sample was accidental in type and, as such, does not reflect a representative sampling of the general population. It was appropriate to utilize college students (as well as their parents) for this research, as they are part of an age group which is at high risk for experiencing sexual violence in their dating relationships (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). However, college students may well be different in attitudes and beliefs than their non-college educated peers, and their parents may differ from their lesser-educated peers' parents as well, limiting the generalizability of these findings. In addition, the sample consisted solely of volunteer participants, who could be different in attitudes and beliefs from those who did not choose to participate in this study, (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1975). Another methodological consideration involves the wording of the date rape vignette. Although this vignette was judged by four experts in the area of sexual assault and sexual harassment to be appropriately and realistically worded, there were some comments from both students and parents that the scenario was too strictly worded, or that it may have been too

obvious that a rape had occurred. On the one hand, these comments may reflect a positive change in attitudes and understanding of the serious nature of date rape. On the other hand, it would be interesting to compare the present scenario with a second scenario which omits the evidence of physical force on Bob's part, but retains Cathy's level of protest against the rapeo (This second vignette has been used in a follow-up study by the present investigator, but the results are not yet analyzed.)

Given these methodological concerns, the results of the present research need to be interpreted cautiously. However, the results can also provide investigators with tentative important information regarding intergenerational comparisons of attitudes and beliefs about sexual assault and sexual harassment which have not previously been assessed.

The present findings support the need for continued education in the area of raising community awareness regarding the prevalence of sexual assault and sexual harassment, as well as understanding and challenging the attitudes and beliefs that support this type of violence. Fischer (1986a) has shown that appropriate education of students (i.e., taking a human sexuality course which includes in its content discussions about rape, and the negative attitudes toward women that continue to promote this form of violence) can result in significant changes in attitudes, so that students of both genders in her study

became more rejecting of date rape, more certain that date rape was considered to be rape, and slightly more liberal in their attitudes toward women. More recently, Jacqueline Kukuchi, coordinator of the Cranston Rape Crisis Center Adolescent Awareness Program, has noted that the assault awareness workshops given to students at both private and public elementary and high schools in Rhode Island have helped in changing younger students' attitudes about sexual assault (Banks, 1988).

Summary and Conclusions

The present study compared intergenerational attitudes and beliefs about sexual assault and sexual harassment. These attitudes and beliefs were assessed by comparing respondents scores regarding: 1) the level of family communication (open, average, and problem) of intergenerational dyads, and 2) the gender composition (same versus different) of intergenerational dyads. It was predicted that there would be significantly greater differences in attitudes and beliefs on the SRS, TSHI, RMA, and DRV measures in families with problem communication than in families with average and open communication, and in average communications families than in open communication families. This prediction was not supported. Level of family communication did not prove to be a significant variable in determining similarities and differences in

intergenerational dyads. This finding suggests the importance of gender as a cultural variable over all levels of family communication.

It was also predicted that across all communication levels, same-gender intergenerational dyads would be more similar in attitudes and beliefs about sexual assault and sexual harassment than different-gender dyads. There was only partial support for this prediction. Mother-daughter dyads were slightly more similar (only differing on SRS) in attitudes and beliefs than mother-son dyads (differing in TSHI and RMA). However, father-daughter and father-son dyads both differed on only one variable. (Sons were significantly higher in TSHI than their fathers, while daughters were significantly lower in RMA than their fathers.) It is noteworthy that regardless of the gender composition of the intergenerational pairs, parents and students tended to be similar in most of the variables measured, which suggests that parents may have some influence over their sons' and daughters' attitudes and beliefs in this domain in a manner which is not assessed by level of family communication.

Additional analyses comparing gender differences within each generation on all variables found that both mothers and women students endorsed significantly fewer sex role stereotypes, were less tolerant of sexual harassment, and less accepting of rape myths than were their male peers. In addition, women in both generations were more certain

that Cathy disliked the sexual encounter than were their male counterparts. In general, the gender differences seen in the present study support previous findings in this area, and suggest that men still tend to be more traditional in their attitudes and beliefs about sexual assault and sexual harassment than women. With regard to tolerance for sexual harassment, men students were less profeminist than their fathers, which suggests that they are more traditional in this domain than their fathers and do not view sexual harassment as a serious problem.

These findings support the need for continued education for all age levels in the area of sexual assault and sexual harassment. In particular, it is important to continue to look at gender as well as parental and societal influences as important variables in the transmission of attitudes and beliefs in this domain.

REFERENCES

- Acock, A.C., & Bengston, V.L. (1977). Opinions within the family: What parents think and what children think they think. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association (March).
- Acock A.C., & Bengston, V.L. (1978). On the relative influence of mothers and fathers: A covariance analysis of political and religious socialization. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 519-530.
- Aldous, J. & Hill, R. (1965). Social cohesion, lineage type, and intergenerational transmission. Social Forces, 43, 471-482.
- Banks, A.M. (1988, May 1). Is rape sometimes ok? Providence Journal-Bulletin, p. A-29.
- Barnett, N.J., & Feild, H.S. (1977). Sex differences in university students' attitudes toward rape. Journal of College Student Personnel, 18, 93-96.
- Bengston, V.L. (1975). Generation and family effects in value socialization. American Sociological Review, 40, 358-371.
- Bennett, S.M., & Dickinson, W.B. (1980). Student-parent rapport and parental involvement in sex, birth control, and venereal disease education. The Journal of Sex Research, 16, 114-130.
- Benshoff, D.L. (1978). A comparison of types of college students and their attitudes toward the phenomenon of

- rape. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 4533B.
(University Microfilms No. 78-336)
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1984). Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1982. (Publication No. NCJ-92820). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Burt, M.R. (1980). Cultural myths and support for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 217-230.
- Check, J. V. P., & Malamuth, N. M. (1983). Sex role stereotyping and reactions to depictions of stranger versus acquaintance rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 344-356.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coller, S.A. & Resick, P.A. (1987). Women's attributions of responsibility for date rape: The influence of empathy sex-role stereotyping. Violence and Victims, 2, 115-125.
- Connell, R. W. (1972). Political socialization in the American family: The evidence re-examined. Public Opinion Quarterly, 36, 321-333.
- Daugherty, L.R. & Burger, J.M. (1984). The influence of parents, church, and peers on the sexual attitudes and behaviors of college students. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 13, 351-359.
- Dietz, S.R., Blackwell, K.T., Daley, P.C., & Bentley, B.J. (1982). Measurement of empathy toward rape victims and rapists. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43,

372-384.

- Dull, T.R. & Giacomassi, D.J. (1987). Demographic correlates of sexual and dating attitudes. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 14, 175-193.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1986). Crime in the United States: Uniform Crime Reports. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Fischer, G.J. (1986a). College student attitudes toward forcible date rape: Changes after taking a human sexuality course. Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 12, 42-46.
- Fischer, G.J. (1986b). College student attitudes toward forcible date rape: I. Cognitive predictors. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15, 457-466.
- Fischer, G.J. (1987). Hispanic and majority student attitudes toward forcible date rape as a function of differences in attitudes toward women. Sex Roles, 17, 93-101.
- Fisher, T.D. (1986). An exploratory study of parent-child communication about sex and the sexual attitudes of early, middle and late adolescents. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 147, 543-557.
- Fisher, T.D. (1987). Family communication and the sexual behavior and attitudes of college students. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16, 81-495.
- Gallagher, B.I. (1974). An empirical analysis of attitude differences between the kin-related generations. Youth and Society, 4, 327-349.

- Heck, P. L. (1986). College students' perceptions of communication as related to rape myths. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 47A. (University Microfilms No. 8709718)
- Hill, R., Foote, N., Aldous, J., Carlson, R., & MacDonald, R. (1970). Family Development in Three Generations. Cambridge: Schenkman.
- Hyman, H. (1969). Political Socialization. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Jenkins, M.J., & Dambrot, F.H. (1987). The attribution of date rape: Observer's attitudes and sexual experiences and the dating situation. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17, 875-895.
- Kandel, D., & Lesser, G. (1972). Youth in Two Worlds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kanin, E.J. (1957). Male aggression in dating-courtship relations. American Journal of Sociology, 63, 197-204.
- Kanin, E.J., & Parcell, S.R. (1977). Sexual aggression: A second look at the offended female. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 6, 67-76.
- Kilpatrick, D.G., Best, C.L., Veronen, L.J., Amici, A.E., Villeponteaux, L.A., & Ruff, G.A. (1985). Mental health correlates of criminal victimization: A random community Survey. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53, 866-873.
- Kilpatrick, D.G., Veronen, L.J., & Best, C.L. (1984). Factors predicting psychological distress among rape

- victims. In C.R. Figley (Ed.), Trauma and its Wake: The Study and Treatment of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (pp. 113-141). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Kirkpatrick, G. & Kanin, E.J. (1957). Male sexual aggression on a university campus. American Sociological Review, 22, 52-58.
- Koss, M.P. (1985). The hidden rape victim: Personality, attitudinal, and situational characteristics. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 193-272.
- Koss, M.P., Gidycz, C.A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 162-170.
- Koss, M.P., Leonard, K.E., Beezley, D.A., & Oros, C.J. (1985). Non-stranger sexual aggression: A discriminant analysis of the psychological characteristics of undetected offenders. Sex Roles, 12, 981-992.
- Koss, M.P. & Oros, C.J. (1982). Sexual experiences survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50, 455-457.
- L'Armand, K. & Pepitone, A. (1982). Judgements of rape: A study of victim-rapist relationship and victim sexual history. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8, 134-139.
- Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. (1975). Criminal

- Victimization Surveys in 8 American Cities. (Publication No. SD-NCS-C-5). Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Education.
- Lerner, R.M., & Knapp, J.R. (1975). Actual and perceived intrafamilial attitudes of late adolescents and their parents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4, 17-36.
- Lott, B. (1987). Women's Lives: Themes and Variations in Gender Learning. Monterey: Brooks/Cole.
- Lott, B., Lott, A.J., & Fernald, J. (1990). Individual differences in distancing responses to women on a photo choice task. Sex Roles, 22, 97-110.
- Lott, B., Reilly, M.E., & Howard, D.R. (1982). Sexual assault and harrassment: A campus community case study. Signs, 8, 296-319.
- Malamuth, N., Haber, S. & Feshbach, S. (1980). Testing hypotheses regarding rape: Exposure to sexual violence, sex differences, and the "normality" of rapists. Journal of Research in Personality, 14, 121-137.
- Malamuth, N.M., Heim, M., & Feshbach, S. (1980). Sexual responsiveness of college students to rape depictions: Inhibitory and disinhibitory effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 399-408.
- Mazelan, P.M. (1980). Stereotypes and perceptions of the victims of rape. Victimology: An International Journal, 5, 121-132.
- McNab, W.L. (1976). Sexual attitude development in children and the parents' role. Journal of School Health, 46,

537-542.

- Meier, H.C. (1972). Mother-centeredness and college youths' attitudes toward social equality for women: Some empirical findings. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 115-121.
- Muehlenhard, C. (1988). Misinterpreted dating behaviors and the risk of date rape. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 6, 20-37.
- Muehlenhard, C.L., Friedman, D.E., & Thomas, C.M. (1985). Is date rape justifiable? The effects of dating activity, who initiated, who paid, and men's attitudes toward women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 297-310.
- Muehlenhard, C.L., & Linton, M.A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 186-196.
- Muehlenhard, C.L., & MacNaughton, J.S. (in press). Women's beliefs about women who "lead men on." Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology.
- Olson, D.H., McCubbin, H.I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M. & Wilson, M. (1982). Family Inventories. University of Minnesota, St. Paul.
- Payne, S., Summers, D.A., & Stewart, T. (1973). Value differences across three generations. Sociometry, 36, 20-30.
- Peterson, S.A., & Franzese, B. (1987). Correlates of college men's sexual abuse of women. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 223-228.

- Plane, T. (1987). The effects of the victim-offender relationship on attribution of rape blame. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 2106-B. (University Microfilms No. 8715872)
- Rapaport, K. & Burkhart, B.R. (1984). Personality and attitudinal characteristics of sexually coercive college males. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93, 216-221.
- Reilly, M.E., Lott, B., Caldwell, D., & DeLuca, L. (in press). Tolerance for sexual harassment related to self-reported sexual victimization. Gender & Society.
- Reilly, M.E., Lott, B., & Gallogly, S. (1986). Sexual harassment of university students. Sex Roles, 15, 333-358.
- Roper, B.S., & Labeff, E. (1977). Sex roles and feminism revisited: An intergenerational attitude comparison. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 113-119.
- Rosenthal, R. & Rosnow, R.L. (1975). The Volunteer Subject. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Russell, D.E.H. (1984). Sexual Exploitation: Rape, Child Sexual Abuse and Workplace Harassment. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sandberg, G., Jackson, T.L., & Petretic-Jackson, P. (1987). College students' attitudes regarding sexual coercion and aggression: Developing educational and preventative strategies. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 302-311.
- Slevin, K.F., & Wingrove, R.C. (1983). Similarities and

- differences among three generations of women in attitudes toward the female role in contemporary society. Sex Roles, 9, 609-624.
- Shotland, R.L. (1985). A preliminary model of some causes of date rape. Academic Psychology Bulletin, 7, 187-200.
- Shotland, R.L., & Goodstein, L. (1983). Just because she doesn't want to doesn't mean it's rape: An experimentally based causal model of the perception of rape in a dating situation. Social Psychology Quarterly, 46, 220-232.
- Spence, J.T., & Helmreich, R. (1972). The attitudes toward women scale: An objective instrument to measure the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 2, 66.
- Tedin, K. L. (1974). The influence of parents on the political attitudes of adolescents. American Political Science Review, 68, 1579-1592.
- Tetrault, P.A., & Barnett, M.A. (1987). Reactions to stranger and acquaintance rape. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 353-358.
- Thomas, W.I. (1972). The definition of the situation. In J.G. Mannis & B.M. Metlzer (Eds.), Symbolic Interaction, (rev. ed., pp. 239-252). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Troll, L.E., Neugarten, B.L., & Kraines, R.J. Similarities in values and other personality characteristics in college students and their parents (1969). Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 15, 32333-32336.
- Weis, K. & Borges, S.S. (1973). Victimology and rape: The

case of the legitimate victim. Issues in Criminology, 8, 71-115.

Winer, B.J. (1971). Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Yarber, W.L., & Greer, J.M. (1986). The relationship between the sexual attitudes of parents and their college daughters' or sons' sexual attitudes and sexual behavior. Journal of School Health, 56, 68-72.

Yegidis, B.L. (1986). Date rape and other forced sexual encounters among college students. Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 12, 51-54.

Table 1

Description of Student Sample (N = 320)

Characteristic	Females' Frequency (Percent)	Males' Frequency (Percent)	Total Frequency (Percent)
<u>Age</u>			
18	57 (28.8%)	31 (25.4%)	88 (27.5%)
19	44 (22.2%)	34 (27.9%)	78 (24.5%)
20	47 (23.7%)	21 (17.2%)	68 (21.3%)
21	33 (16.7%)	19 (15.6%)	52 (16.3%)
22	11 (5.6%)	11 (9.0%)	22 (6.9%)
23	6 (3.0%)	6 (4.9%)	12 (3.7%)
$\bar{x}$ =	19.6	19.7	19.6
S.D. =	1.4	1.5	1.4
<u>Gender</u>			
Female	198 (61.9%)		198 (61.9%)
Male		122 (38.1%)	122 (38.1%)
<u>Ethnicity</u>			
European American	175 (88.4%)	104 (85.2%)	279 (87.2%)
African American	10 (5.1%)	10 (8.2%)	20 (6.3%)
Asian American	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)
Hispanic American	5 (2.5%)	4 (3.3%)	9 (2.8%)

Table 1 (Continued)

Description of Student Sample (N = 320)

Characteristic	Females' Frequency (Percent)	Males' Frequency (Percent)	Total Frequency (Percent)
<u>Ethnicity</u>			
Native American	2 (1.0%)	2 (1.6%)	4 (1.3%)
Other	5 (2.5%)	2 (1.6%)	7 (2.2%)
<u>Marital Status</u>			
Single	192 (97.0%)	119 (97.5%)	311 (97.2%)
Cohabiting/Unmarried	4 (2.0%)	2 (1.6%)	6 (1.9%)
Married	2 (1.0%)	1 (0.8%)	3 (0.9%)
<u>Marital Status of Parents</u>			
Never Married	4 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.3%)
Separated	3 (1.5%)	4 (3.3%)	7 (2.2%)
Widowed	8 (4.0%)	5 (4.1%)	13 (4.1%)
Cohabiting/Unmarried	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.8%)	2 (0.6%)
Married	137 (69.2%)	83 (68.0%)	220 (68.8%)
Divorced	20 (10.1%)	12 (9.8%)	32 (10.0%)
Divorced, Mother Remarried	11 (5.6%)	6 (4.9%)	17 (5.3%)

Table 1 (Continued)

Description of Student Sample (N = 320)

Characteristic	Females' Frequency (Percent)	Males' Frequency (Percent)	Total Frequency (Percent)
<u>Marital Status of Parents</u>			
Divorced, Father Remarried	8 (4.0%)	5 (4.1%)	13 (4.1%)
Divorced, Both Remarried	6 (3.0%)	6 (4.9%)	12 (3.8%)
<u>Religion</u>			
Catholic	112 (56.6%)	68 (55.7%)	180 (55.9%)
Agnostic/Atheist	8 (4.0%)	6 (4.9%)	14 (4.4%)
Jewish	17 (8.6%)	14 (11.5%)	31 (10.0%)
Islamic	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.3%)
Protestant	52 (26.3%)	25 (26.4%)	77 (24.1%)
Other	8 (4.0%)	8 (6.6%)	16 (5.0%)
Missing Data	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)
<u>Mother's Religion</u>			
Catholic	110 (55.6%)	69 (56.6%)	179 (55.9%)
Agnostic/Atheist	2 (1.0%)	4 (3.3%)	6 (1.9%)
Jewish	18 (9.1%)	14 (11.5%)	32 (10.0%)

Table 1 (Continued)

Description of Student Sample (N = 320)

Characteristic	Females' Frequency (Percent)	Males' Frequency (Percent)	Total Frequency (Percent)
<u>Mother's Religion</u>			
Islamic	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.3%)
Protestant	59 (29.8%)	27 (22.1%)	86 (26.9%)
Other	6 (3.0%)	5 (4.1%)	11 (3.4%)
Missing Data	3 (1.5%)	2 (1.6%)	5 (0.3%)
<u>Father's Religion</u>			
Catholic	105 (53.0%)	67 (54.9%)	172 (53.7%)
Agnostic/Atheist	6 (3.0%)	2 (1.6%)	8 (2.5%)
Jewish	17 (8.6%)	11 (9.0%)	28 (8.7%)
Islamic	1 (0.5%)	2 (1.6%)	3 (0.9%)
Protestant	52 (26.3%)	27 (22.1%)	79 (24.7%)
Other	6 (3.0%)	4 (3.3%)	10 (3.1%)
Missing Data	11 (5.6%)	9 (7.4%)	20 (6.2%)
<u>Political Affiliation</u>			
Democrat	51 (25.8%)	32 (26.3%)	83 (25.9%)

Table 1 (Continued)

Description of Student Sample (N = 320)

Characteristic	Females' Frequency (Percent)	Males' Frequency (Percent)	Total Frequency (Percent)
<u>Political Affiliation</u>			
Republican	38 (19.2%)	32 (26.3%)	70 (21.9%)
Independent	45 (22.7%)	18 (9.0%)	63 (19.7%)
None	57 (28.8%)	36 (29.5%)	93 (29.1%)
Other	6 (3.0%)	3 (2.4%)	9 (2.8%)
Missing Data	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.8%)	2 (0.6%)
<u>Mother's Political Affiliation</u>			
Democrat	69 (34.9%)	40 (32.8%)	109 (34.1%)
Republican	38 (19.2%)	18 (14.7%)	56 (17.5%)
Independent	55 (27.8%)	30 (24.6%)	85 (26.6%)
None	24 (12.1%)	23 (18.8%)	47 (14.7%)
Other	1 (0.5%)	4 (3.3%)	5 (1.6%)
Missing Data	11 (5.5%)	7 (5.7%)	18 (5.6%)
<u>Father's Political Affiliation</u>			
Democrat	56 (28.3%)	35 (28.7%)	91 (28.4%)

Table 1 (Continued)

Description of Student Sample (N = 320)

Characteristic	Females' Frequency (Percent)	Males' Frequency (Percent)	Total Frequency (Percent)
<u>Father's Political Affiliation</u>			
Republican	53 (26.8%)	27 (22.1%)	80 (25.0%)
Independent	45 (22.7%)	28 (22.9%)	73 (22.8%)
None	25 (12.6%)	18 (14.7%)	43 (13.4%)
Missing Data	19 (9.6%)	14 (11.5%)	33 (10.3%)
<u>University Status</u>			
Freshman	57 (28.8%)	35 (28.7%)	92 (28.8%)
Sophomore	40 (20.2%)	30 (24.6%)	70 (21.9%)
Junior	47 (23.7%)	24 (19.7%)	71 (22.2%)
Senior	52 (26.3%)	27 (22.1%)	79 (24.7%)
Graduate Student	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.3%)
Non-matriculated	1 (0.5%)	3 (2.4%)	4 (1.3%)
Missing Data	1 (0.5%)	2 (1.6%)	3 (0.9%)
<u>Major in School</u>			
Business			30 (9.4%)

Table 1 (Continued)

Description of Student Sample (N = 320)

Characteristic	Females' Frequency (Percent)	Males' Frequency (Percent)	Total Frequency (Percent)
<u>Major in School</u>			
Education			32 (10.0%)
Humanities			54 (16.9%)
Natural Sciences and Quantitative Studies			54 (16.9%)
Social Sciences			75 (23.4%)
Undecided			57 (17.8%)
Other			7 (2.2%)
Missing Data			11 (3.4%)
<u>Residence</u>			
Residence Hall	90 (45.4%)	59 (48.4%)	149 (46.6%)
Greek House	23 (11.6%)	13 (10.6%)	36 (11.2%)
Parental Home	29 (14.6%)	16 (13.1%)	45 (14.1%)
Off Campus	55 (27.8%)	32 (26.2%)	87 (27.2%)
Missing Data	1 (0.5%)	2 (1.6%)	3 (0.9%)

Table 1 (Continued)

Description of Student Sample (N = 320)

Characteristic	Females' Frequency (Percent)	Males' Frequency (Percent)	Total Frequency (Percent)
<u>Mother's Highest Level of Education</u>			
Doctoral Degree	2 (1.0%)	1 (0.8%)	3 (0.9%)
Master's Degree	17 (8.6%)	12 (9.8%)	29 (9.1%)
Bachelor's Degree	54 (27.3%)	26 (21.3%)	80 (25.0%)
Some College	58 (29.3%)	41 (33.6%)	99 (30.9%)
High School Graduate	54 (27.3%)	33 (27.0%)	87 (27.2%)
Some High School	8 (4.0%)	6 (4.9%)	14 (4.4%)
Junior High School Graduate	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)
Less Than 7th Grade	2 (1.0%)	1 (0.8%)	3 (0.9%)
Missing Data	2 (1.0%)	2 (1.6%)	4 (1.3%)
<u>Father's Highest Level of Education</u>			
Doctoral Degree	18 (9.1%)	8 (6.6%)	26 (8.1%)
Master's Degree	45 (22.7%)	18 (14.7%)	63 (19.7%)
Bachelor's Degree	51 (25.7%)	37 (30.3%)	88 (27.5%)

Table 1 (Continued)

Description of Student Sample (N = 320)

Characteristic	Females' Frequency (Percent)	Males' Frequency (Percent)	Total Frequency (Percent)
<u>Father's Highest Level of Education</u>			
Some College	29 (14.6%)	25 (20.5%)	54 (16.9%)
High School Graduate	38 (19.2%)	23 (18.8%)	61 (19.1%)
Some High School	6 (3.0%)	3 (2.5%)	9 (2.8%)
Junior High School Graduate	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)
Less Than 7th Grade	1 (0.5%)	2 (1.6%)	3 (0.9%)
Missing Data	8 (4.0%)	6 (4.9%)	14 (4.4%)
<u>Holds Job During School Year</u>			
Yes, Full-time	10 (5.0%)	6 (4.9%)	16 (5.0%)
Yes, More Than 20 Hours	34 (17.2%)	23 (18.8%)	57 (17.8%)
Yes, Less Than 20 Hours	74 (37.4%)	36 (29.5%)	110 (34.4%)
No	78 (39.4%)	55 (45.1%)	133 (41.5%)
Missing Data	2 (1.0%)	2 (1.6%)	4 (0.3%)
<u>Holds Job During Summer</u>			
Yes, Full-time	98 (49.5%)	67 (54.9%)	165 (51.6%)

Table 1 (Continued)

Description of Student Sample (N = 320)

Characteristic	Females' Frequency (Percent)	Males' Frequency (Percent)	Total Frequency (Percent)
<u>Holds Job During Summer</u>			
Yes, More Than 20 Hours	66 (33.3%)	36 (29.5%)	102 (31.9%)
Yes, Less Than 20 Hours	14 (7.1%)	11 (9.0%)	25 (7.8%)
No	19 (9.6%)	8 (6.6%)	27 (8.4%)
Missing Data	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)

Percent of College Education
Paid for by Student

0%	108 (54.5%)	50 (41.0%)	158 (49.4%)
Up to 25%	57 (28.8%)	40 (32.8%)	97 (30.3%)
Up to 50%	12 (6.1%)	13 (10.6%)	25 (7.8%)
Up to 75%	8 (4.0%)	6 (4.9%)	14 (4.4%)
100%	12 (6.1%)	11 (9.0%)	23 (7.2%)
Missing Data	1 (0.5%)	2 (1.6%)	3 (0.9%)

Taken Coursework Dealing
with Sex-Role Issues

Yes	90 (45.4%)	53 (43.4%)	143 (44.7%)
-----	---------------	---------------	----------------

Table 1 (Continued)

Description of Student Sample (N = 320)

Characteristic	Females' Frequency (Percent)	Males' Frequency (Percent)	Total Frequency (Percent)
<u>Taken Coursework Dealing with Sex-Role Issues</u>			
No	107 (54.0%)	69 (56.6%)	176 (55.0%)
Missing Data	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)
<u>Parents Responding to Questionnaire</u>			
Both Parents	137 (69.2%)	75 (61.5%)	212 (66.3%)
Mothers Only	26 (13.1%)	23 (18.9%)	49 (15.3%)
Fathers Only	10 (5.1%)	7 (5.7%)	17 (5.3%)
No Parent Response	25 (12.6%)	17 (13.9%)	42 (13.1%)

Table 2

Description of Parent Sample (N = 490)

Characteristic	Mothers' Frequency (Percent)	Fathers' Frequency (Percent)
<u>Age</u>		
33	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)
35	3 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)
36	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.4%)
37	3 (1.1%)	3 (1.3%)
38	4 (1.5%)	3 (1.3%)
39	5 (1.9%)	3 (1.3%)
40	5 (1.9%)	2 (0.9%)
41	13 (5.0%)	6 (2.6%)
42	16 (6.1%)	5 (2.2%)
43	26 (10.0%)	15 (6.5%)
44	19 (7.3%)	10 (4.3%)
45	20 (7.7%)	16 (7.0%)
46	35 (13.4%)	22 (9.6%)
47	20 (7.7%)	18 (8.3%)

Table 2 (Continued)

Description of Parent Sample (N = 490)

Characteristic	Mothers' Frequency (Percent)	Fathers' Frequency (Percent)
<u>Age</u>		
48	14 (5.4%)	22 (9.6%)
49	9 (3.4%)	15 (6.5%)
50	13 (5.0%)	10 (4.3%)
51	12 (4.6%)	12 (5.2%)
52	9 (3.4%)	15 (6.5%)
53	5 (1.9%)	13 (5.7%)
54	4 (1.5%)	6 (2.6%)
55	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)
56	3 (1.1%)	3 (1.3%)
57	3 (1.1%)	4 (1.7%)
58	3 (1.1%)	6 (2.6%)
59	4 (1.5%)	2 (0.9%)
60	2 (0.8%)	2 (0.9%)
61	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)

Table 2 (Continued)

Description of Parent Sample (N = 490)

Characteristic	Mothers' Frequency (Percent)	Fathers' Frequency (Percent)
<u>Age</u>		
63	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.4%)
64	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)
65	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)
67	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)
Missing Data	6 (2.3%)	3 (1.3%)
$\bar{X}$ =	46.3	48.5
S.D. =	5.1	5.7
<u>Gender</u>		
Female	261 (53.3%)	
Male		229 (46.7%)
<u>Ethnicity</u>		
European American	235 (90.0%)	212 (92.6%)
African American	6 (2.3%)	3 (1.3%)
Asian American	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Hispanic American	5 (1.9%)	4 (1.7%)

Table 2 (Continued)

Description of Parent Sample (N = 490)

Characteristic	Mothers' Frequency (Percent)	Fathers' Frequency (Percent)
<u>Ethnicity</u>		
Native American	5 (1.9%)	2 (0.9%)
Other	8 (3.1%)	6 (2.6%)
Missing Data	2 (0.8%)	2 (0.9%)
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Never Married	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Separated	6 (2.3%)	4 (1.7%)
Widowed	7 (2.7%)	3 (1.3%)
Cohabiting/Unmarried	4 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Married	188 (72.0%)	180 (78.6%)
Divorced	30 (11.5%)	21 (9.2%)
Remarried	24 (9.2%)	21 (9.2%)
<u>Religion</u>		
Catholic	140 (53.6%)	127 (55.4%)
Agnostic/Atheist	5 (1.9%)	8 (3.5%)
Jewish	31 (11.9%)	25 (10.9%)

Table 2 (Continued)

Description of Parent Sample (N = 490)

Characteristic	Mothers' Frequency (Percent)	Fathers' Frequency (Percent)
<u>Religion</u>		
Islamic	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Protestant	74 (28.4%)	59 (25.8%)
Other	10 (3.8%)	9 (3.9%)
Missing Data	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)
<u>Political Affiliation</u>		
Democrat	86 (32.9%)	59 (25.8%)
Republican	50 (19.2%)	62 (27.1%)
Independent	93 (35.6%)	73 (31.9%)
None	24 (9.2%)	34 (14.8%)
Other	5 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Missing Data	3 (1.1%)	1 (0.4%)
<u>Annual Combined Family Income</u>		
\$5,001-\$10,000	4 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
\$10,001-\$20,000	11 (4.2%)	4 (1.7%)
\$20,001-\$30,000	21 (8.0%)	8 (3.5%)

Table 2 (Continued)

Description of Parent Sample (N = 490)

Characteristic	Mothers' Frequency (Percent)	Fathers' Frequency (Percent)
<u>Annual Combined Family Income</u>		
\$30,001-\$40,000	41 (15.7%)	26 (11.3%)
\$40,001-\$50,000	41 (15.7%)	44 (19.2%)
\$50,001-\$60,000	26 (10.0%)	27 (11.8%)
\$60,001-\$70,000	25 (9.6%)	23 (10.0%)
\$70,001-\$80,000	19 (7.3%)	20 (8.7%)
Over \$80,000	62 (23.7%)	69 (30.1%)
Missing Data	11 (4.2%)	8 (3.5%)
<u>Estimated Median Combined Family Income</u>	\$50,001- \$60,000	\$60,001- \$70,000
<u>Highest Level of Education Completed</u>		
Doctoral Degree	3 (1.1%)	25 (10.9%)
Master's Degree	28 (10.7%)	50 (21.8%)
Bachelor's Degree	58 (22.2%)	62 (27.1%)
Some College	95 (36.4%)	48 (21.0%)
High School Graduate	66 (25.3%)	37 (16.2%)

Table 2 (Continued)

Description of Parent Sample (N = 490)

Characteristic	Mothers' Frequency (Percent)	Fathers' Frequency (Percent)
<u>Highest Level of Education Completed</u>		
Some High School	9 (3.4%)	4 (1.7%)
Junior High School Graduate	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)
Less Than 7th Grade	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.9%)
<u>Occupation</u>		
<u>Business:</u>		
Independent Business Owner	4 (1.5%)	14 (6.1%)
Executive	1 (0.4%)	27 (11.8%)
Administration	2 (0.8%)	2 (0.9%)
Managerial	20 (7.7%)	27 (11.8%)
Staff	17 (6.5%)	16 (7.0%)
Sales	23 (8.8%)	7 (3.1%)
Clerical	34 (13.0%)	2 (0.9%)
<u>Education:</u>		
Professor	5 (1.9%)	10 (4.3%)
Psychologist/Counselor	1 (0.4%)	3 (1.3%)

Table 2 (Continued)

Description of Parent Sample (N = 490)

Characteristic	Mothers' Frequency (Percent)	Fathers' Frequency (Percent)
<u>Education:</u>		
Teacher	26 (10.0%)	18 (7.9%)
Administration	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.7%)
Translator	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)
Teaching Assistant/Aide	6 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Student	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)
<u>Medical/Legal:</u>		
Physician	1 (0.4%)	6 (2.6%)
Attorney	0 (0.0%)	6 (2.6%)
Pharmacist	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)
Physical/Occupational Therapist	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Dental Hygienist	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Nurse	22 (8.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Nurse's Aid	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Medical Staff	5 (1.9%)	1 (0.4%)

Table 2 (Continued)

Description of Parent Sample (N = 490)

Characteristic	Mothers' Frequency (Percent)	Fathers' Frequency (Percent)
<u>Government/Community Service:</u>		
State/City Employee	2 (0.8%)	4 (1.7%)
Social Worker	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)
FBI/Police/Firefighter	0 (0.0%)	10 (4.3%)
<u>Other Professional:</u>	2 (0.8%)	15 (6.5%)
<u>Arts Related:</u>	4 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
<u>Skilled Labor:</u>		
Supervisor/Manager	1 (0.4%)	11 (4.8%)
Union/Trades	3 (1.1%)	24 (10.5%)
Factory Worker	3 (1.1%)	2 (0.9%)
<u>Unskilled Labor:</u>	2 (0.8%)	4 (1.7%)
<u>Homemaker:</u>	40 (15.3%)	0 (0.0%)
<u>Service Profession:</u>		
Waitress/Waiter	4 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Seamstress	4 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Day Care Provider	3 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)

Table 2 (Continued)

Description of Parent Sample (N = 490)

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Mothers'</u> <u>Frequency</u> <u>(Percent)</u>	<u>Fathers'</u> <u>Frequency</u> <u>(Percent)</u>
<u>Service Profession:</u>		
Other	3 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)
<u>Other Self-Employed:</u>	3 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)
<u>Retired:</u>	2 (0.8%)	6 (2.6%)
<u>Unemployed:</u>	6 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)
<u>Missing Data:</u>	2 (0.8%)	8 (3.5%)

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations on all Measures: Student Sample

Name of Scale	Females' Mean (S.D.)	Males' Mean (S.D.)
PACS-Mother	48.59 (16.39)	49.49 (10.58)
PACS-Father	53.10 (16.24)	53.33 (13.48)
DRV-Item 1	1.54 (1.16)	1.71 (1.28)
DRV-Item 2	6.17 (1.00)	5.99 (1.09)
DRV-Item 3	6.67 (1.06)	6.67 (0.75)
DRV-Item 4	6.72 (0.66)	6.48 (1.01)
DRV-Item 5	1.25 (0.72)	1.56 (0.92)
SRS	23.09 (6.48)	27.52 (7.45)
TSHI	30.97 (7.65)	38.70 (8.37)
RMA	23.49 (8.39)	29.70 (9.41)

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations on all Measures: Parent
Sample

Name of Scale	Mothers' Mean (S.D.)	Fathers' Mean (S.D.)
PACS	41.37 (12.20)	43.28 (12.37)
DRV-Item 1	1.68 (0.99)	1.86 (1.06)
DRV-Item 2	5.80 (1.20)	5.68 (1.23)
DRV-Item 3	6.71 (0.80)	6.65 (0.80)
DRV-Item 4	6.52 (0.94)	6.31 (1.14)
DRV-Item 5	1.50 (0.98)	1.70 (1.30)
SRS	25.91 (7.45)	29.12 (8.40)
TSHI	28.90 (7.99)	33.15 (8.88)
RMA	25.36 (8.73)	26.93 (8.75)

Table 5

2 x 3 MANOVA: Mother-Student Sample

Test Name	Value	F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	F Prob.
-----------	-------	---	------------	----------	---------

Interaction Effect: Dyad Composition x Level of Communication

Wilks	.96	.55	16.00	490.00	.92
-------	-----	-----	-------	--------	-----

(Effect Size = .02, Power at the .05 Level = .38)

Main Effect: Dyad Composition

Wilks	.89	4.24	8.00	245.00	.001
-------	-----	------	------	--------	------

(Effect Size = .12, Power at the .05 Level = .99)

Main Effect: Level of Communication

Wilks	.92	1.21	16.00	490.00	.26
-------	-----	------	-------	--------	-----

(Effect Size = .04, Power at the .05 Level = .79)

Table 6

One-Way ANOVA: SRS x Dyad Composition (Mother-Student Sample)

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	1885.04	1885.04	25.82	.0001
Within Groups	258	18836.32	73.01		
Total	259	20721.36			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	98	-2.17	8.89
Grp 2	162	3.38	8.33
Total	260	1.29	8.94

Table 7

One-Way ANOVA: TSHI x Dyad Composition (Mother-Student
Sample)

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	1985.06	1985.06	16.64	.0001
Within Groups	258	30771.32	119.27		
Total	259	32756.38			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	98	-8.74	11.36
Grp 2	162	-3.04	10.65
Total	260	-5.19	11.25

Table 8

One-Way ANOVA: RMA x Dyad Composition (Mother-Student
Sample)

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	2222.56	2222.56	18.22	.0001
Within Groups	258	31472.13	121.98		
Total	259	33694.69			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	98	-4.22	10.97
Grp 2	162	1.81	11.08
Total	260	-.46	11.41

Table 9

2 x 3 MANOVA: Father-Student Sample

Test Name	Value	F	Hypoth. DF	Error DF	F Prob.
-----------	-------	---	------------	----------	---------

Interaction Effect: Dyad Composition x Level of Communication

Wilks	.95	.76	16.00	428.00	.73
-------	-----	-----	-------	--------	-----

(Effect Size = .03, Power at the .05 Level = .53)

Main Effect: Dyad Composition

Wilks	.90	2.89	8.00	214.00	.005
-------	-----	------	------	--------	------

(Effect Size = .10, Power at the .05 Level = .95)

Main Effect: Level of Communication

Wilks	.92	1.13	16.00	428.00	.32
-------	-----	------	-------	--------	-----

(Effect Size = .04, Power at the .05 Level = .75)

Table 10

One-Way ANOVA: TSHI x Dyad Composition (Father-Student Sample)

<u>Source</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>	<u>F Prob.</u>
Between Groups	1	2317.42	2317.42	16.49	.0001
Within Groups	226	31750.00	140.49		
Total	227	34067.42			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	82	-4.67	11.16
Grp 2	146	1.97	12.22
Total	228	-.42	12.25

Table 11

One-Way ANOVA: RMA x Dyad Composition (Father-Student
Sample)

<u>Source</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>	<u>F Prob.</u>
Between Groups	1	1079.23	1079.23	7.86	.0055
Within Groups	226	31038.08	137.34		
Total	227	32117.31			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	82	-1.56	10.37
Grp 2	146	2.97	12.41
Total	228	1.34	11.89

Table 12

One-Way ANOVA: SRS Total x Student Sample

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	1481.79	1481.79	31.44	.0001
Within Groups	318	14986.01	47.13		
Total	319	16467.80			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	122	27.52	7.45
Grp 2	198	23.09	6.48
Total	320	24.77	7.18

Table 13

One-Way ANOVA: TSHI Total x Student Sample

<u>Source</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>	<u>F Prob.</u>
Between Groups	1	4507.12	4507.12	71.58	.0001
Within Groups	318	20023.60	62.97		
Total	319	24530.72			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	122	38.70	8.37
Grp 2	198	30.97	7.65
Total	320	33.92	8.77

Table 14

One-Way ANOVA: RMA Total x Student Sample

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	2911.08	2911.08	37.64	.0001
Within Groups	318	24590.87	77.33		
Total	319	27501.95			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	122	29.70	9.41
Grp 2	198	23.49	8.39
Total	320	25.86	9.28

Table 15

One-Way ANOVA: DRV4 x Student Sample

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	4.12	4.12	6.28	.01
Within Groups	318	208.63	0.66		
Total	319	212.75			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	122	6.48	1.01
Grp 2	198	6.72	0.66
Total	320	6.63	0.82

Table 16

One-Way ANOVA: DRV5 x Student Sample

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	7.40	7.40	11.46	.0008
Within Groups	318	205.35	0.65		
Total	319	212.75			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	122	1.56	0.92
Grp 2	198	1.25	0.72
Total	320	1.37	0.82

Table 17

One-Way ANOVA: SRS Total x Parent Sample

<u>Source</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>	<u>F Prob.</u>
Between Groups	1	1254.23	1254.23	20.05	.0001
Within Groups	487	30467.60	62.56		
Total	488	31721.83			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	261	25.91	7.45
Grp 2	228	29.12	8.40
Total	489	27.41	7.89

Table 18

One-Way ANOVA: TSHI Total x Parent Sample

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	2200.74	2200.74	31.05	.0001
Within Groups	487	34517.14	70.88		
Total	488	36717.88			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	261	28.90	7.99
Grp 2	228	33.15	8.88
Total	489	30.88	8.40

Table 19

One-Way ANOVA: RMA Total x Parent Sample

<u>Source</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>	<u>F Prob.</u>
Between Groups	1	301.30	301.30	3.95	.05
Within Groups	487	37188.74	76.36		
Total	488	37490.04			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	261	25.36	8.73
Grp 2	228	26.93	8.75
Total	489	26.09	8.74

Table 20

One-Way ANOVA: DRV1 x Parent Sample

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	4.09	4.09	3.89	.05
Within Groups	487	512.39	1.05		
Total	488	516.48			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	261	1.68	0.99
Grp 2	228	1.86	1.06
Total	489	1.76	1.02

Table 21

One-Way ANOVA: DRV4 x Parent Sample

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	5.75	5.75	5.31	.02
Within Groups	487	527.46	1.08		
Total	488	533.21			

<u>Group</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Grp 1	261	6.52	0.94
Grp 2	228	6.31	1.14
Total	489	6.42	1.03

APPENDIX A

STUDENT BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age _____ years old
2. Sex (Please check one) Male _____ Female _____
3. Ethnicity (Please check one)

_____ White American	_____ Hispanic American
_____ African American	_____ Native American
_____ Asian American	_____ Other (Please Specify) _____
4. Marital Status (Please check one)

_____ Never Married	_____ Married
_____ Separated	_____ Divorced
_____ Widowed	_____ Remarried
_____ Cohabiting/Unmarried	
5. Marital Status of your parents

_____ Never Married	_____ Married		
_____ Separated	_____ Divorced		
_____ Widowed	_____ If divorced, is either parent remarried?		
_____ Cohabiting/Unmarried		Mother	Father
	Yes	_____	_____
	No	_____	_____
6. Religion of self

_____ Catholic	
_____ Agnostic/Atheist	
_____ Jewish	
_____ Buddhist	
_____ Hindu	
_____ Islamic	
_____ Protestant	
_____ Other (Please specify) _____	
7. Parent's Religion (Please check one for each parent)

	Mother	Father
Catholic	_____	_____
Agnostic/Atheist	_____	_____
Jewish	_____	_____
Buddhist	_____	_____
Hindu	_____	_____
Islamic	_____	_____
Protestant	_____	_____
Other (Please Specify) _____	_____	_____
8. Political Affiliation

_____ Democrat	_____ None
_____ Republican	_____ Other (Please Specify) _____
_____ Independent	

9. Parents' Political Affiliation
(Please check one for each parent)

	Mother	Father
Democrat	_____	_____
Republican	_____	_____
Independent	_____	_____
None	_____	_____
Other (Please specify)_____	_____	_____

10. What is your university status?

☐ Freshman
☐ Sophomore
☐ Junior
☐ Senior
☐ Graduate Student
☐ Non-matriculated

10a. What is your major in school?

11. What is your residence?

☐ Residence Hall ☐ Parental Home
☐ Graduate Apartments ☐ Off Campus
☐ Greek House

12. What is the highest level of education completed by your mother? (Please check one)

☐ Doctoral Level Degree (e.g. M.D., Ph.D.)
☐ Master's Level Degree (e.g. M.A., M.S.)
☐ Bachelor's Degree (college graduate)
☐ Some College
☐ High School Graduate
☐ Some High School
☐ Junior High School Graduate
☐ Less Than 7th Grade

13. What is your mother's current occupation?
(Please be specific)

14. What is the highest level of education completed by your father? (Please check one)

☐ Doctoral Level Degree (e.g. M.D., Ph.D.)
☐ Master's Level Degree (e.g. M.A., M.S.)
☐ Bachelor's Degree (college graduate)
☐ Some College
☐ High School Graduate
☐ Some High School
☐ Junior High School Graduate
☐ Less Than 7th Grade

APPENDIX B

PARENT BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age _____ years old
2. Sex (Please check one) Male _____ Female _____
3. Ethnicity (Please check one)

_____ White American	_____ Hispanic American
_____ African American	_____ Native American
_____ Asian American	_____ Other (Please specify) _____
4. Marital Status (Please check one)

_____ Never married	_____ Married
_____ Separated	_____ Divorced
_____ Widowed	_____ Remarried
_____ Cohabiting/Unmarried	
5. Religion

_____ Catholic	_____ Hindu
_____ Agnostic/Atheist	_____ Islamic
_____ Jewish	_____ Protestant
_____ Buddhist	_____ Other Please specify) _____
6. Political Affiliation

_____ Democrat	_____ None
_____ Republican	_____ Other (Please specify) _____
_____ Independent	
7. Annual family income

_____ Under \$5,000	_____ \$40,001-\$50,000
_____ \$5,001-\$10,000	_____ \$50,001-\$60,000
_____ \$10,001-\$20,000	_____ \$60,001-\$70,000
_____ \$20,001-\$30,000	_____ \$70,001-\$80,000
_____ \$30,001-\$40,000	_____ Over \$80,000
8. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

_____ Doctoral Level Degree (e.g. M.D., Ph.D.)
_____ Master's Level Degree (e.g. M.A., M.S.)
_____ Bachelor's Degree (college graduate)
_____ Some College
_____ High School Graduate
_____ Some High School
_____ Junior High School Graduate
_____ Less Than 7th Grade
9. What is your current occupation? (Please be specific)

APPENDIX C

PARENT-ADOLESCENT COMMUNICATION

STUDENT FORM FOR MOTHER

Please use the following response scale to complete this questionnaire. Place the number of the response which most closely matches your opinion in the space provided next to each question.

RESPONSE CHOICES

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

1. _____ I can discuss my beliefs with my mother without feeling restrained or embarrassed.
2. _____ Sometimes I have trouble believing everything my mother tells me.
3. _____ My mother is always a good listener.
4. _____ I am sometimes afraid to ask my mother for what I want.
5. _____ My mother has a tendency to say things to me which would be better left unsaid.
6. _____ My mother can tell how I'm feeling without asking.
7. _____ I am very satisfied with how my mother and I talk together.
8. _____ If I were in trouble, I could tell my mother.
9. _____ I openly show affection to my mother.
10. _____ When we are having a problem, I often give my mother the silent treatment.
11. _____ I am careful what I say to my mother.
12. _____ When talking to my mother, I have a tendency to say things that would be better left unsaid.
13. _____ When I ask questions, I get honest answers from my mother.

RESPONSE CHOICES

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

14. _____ My mother tries to understand my point of view.
15. _____ There are topics I avoid discussing with my mother.
16. _____ I find it easy to discuss problems with my mother.
17. _____ It is very easy for me to express all my true feelings to my mother.
18. _____ My mother nags/bothers me.
19. _____ My mother insults me when she is angry with me.
20. _____ I don't think I can tell my mother how I really feel about some things.

APPENDIX D

PARENT-ADOLESCENT COMMUNICATION

STUDENT FORM FOR FATHER

Please use the following response scale to complete this questionnaire. Place the number of the response which most closely matches your opinion in the space provided next to each question.

RESPONSE CHOICES

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

1. _____ I can discuss my beliefs with my father without feeling restrained or embarrassed.
2. _____ Sometimes I have trouble believing everything my father tells me.
3. _____ My father is always a good listener.
4. _____ I am sometimes afraid to ask my father for what I want.
5. _____ My father has a tendency to say things to me which would be better left unsaid.
6. _____ My father can tell how I'm feeling without asking.
7. _____ I am very satisfied with how my father and I talk together.
8. _____ If I were in trouble, I could tell my father.
9. _____ I openly show affection to my father.
10. _____ When we are having a problem, I often give my father the silent treatment.
11. _____ I am careful about what I say to my father.
12. _____ When talking to my father, I have a tendency to say things that would be better left unsaid.
13. _____ When I ask questions, I get honest answers from my father.

RESPONSE CHOICES

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

- 14._____My father tries to understand my point of view.
- 15._____There are topics I avoid discussing with my father.
- 16._____I find it easy to discuss problems with my father.
- 17._____It is very easy for me to express all my true feelings to my father.
- 18._____My father nags/bothers me.
- 19._____My father insults me when he is angry with me.
- 20._____I don't think I can tell my father how I really feel about some things.

APPENDIX E

PARENT-ADOLESCENT COMMUNICATION

PARENT FORM

Please use the following response scale to complete this questionnaire. Place the number of the response which most closely matches your opinion in the space provided next to each question. The child referred to is your daughter or son who is participating in this study.

RESPONSE CHOICES

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

1. _____ I can discuss my beliefs with my child without feeling restrained or embarrassed.
2. _____ Sometimes I have trouble believing everything my child tells me.
3. _____ My child is always a good listener.
4. _____ I am sometimes afraid to ask my child for what I want.
5. _____ My child has a tendency to say things to me which would be better left unsaid.
6. _____ My child can tell how I'm feeling without asking.
7. _____ I am very satisfied with how my child and I talk together.
8. _____ If I were in trouble, I could tell my child.
9. _____ I openly show affection to my child.
10. _____ When we are having a problem, I often give my child the silent treatment.
11. _____ I am careful about what I say to my child.
12. _____ When talking to my child, I have a tendency to say things that would be better left unsaid.
13. _____ When I ask questions, I get honest answers from my child.

RESPONSE CHOICES

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

14._____My child tries to understand my point of view.

15._____There are topics I avoid discussing with my child.

16._____I find it easy to discuss problems with my child.

17._____It is very easy to for me to express all my true
feelings to my child.

18._____My child nags/bothers me.

19._____My child insults me when she/he is angry with me.

20._____I don't think I can tell my child how I really feel
about some things.

APPENDIX F

DATE RAPE VIGNETTE

Please read the following brief story and then answer the questions asked below.

Cathy and Bob are college students who have been dating for one month. One Saturday evening, they went out with a group of their friends to a local club. A well-known local band was playing there, and they had a good time dancing and talking with people they knew. Afterwards, Cathy and Bob ordered some take-out pizza and soda. They decided to take their food back to Cathy's dormitory room where they could hear some music on her new CD player. Cathy's roommate was gone for the weekend, so they thought this would give them some private, relaxed time together. Over pizza, they listened to a recording of a new rock group which they both enjoyed. Then, they made plans for the next weekend, and began to kiss. After kissing for a few minutes, Bob made further sexual advances toward Cathy. She became uncomfortable and asked him to please stop. He ignored her request, and responded, "It's okay," while continuing his advances. Despite Cathy's continued verbal protests and attempts to physically resist him, Bob pushed her down onto the bed, pinned her wrists so that she couldn't move, and proceeded to have intercourse with her.

Please use the response keys listed below each item to answer the following questions regarding the above story. Place the number of the response which most closely matches your opinion in the space provided next to the question.

1. _____ In your opinion, how responsible was Bob for the sexual encounter which occurred?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely	Almost	Mostly	Equally	Somewhat	Minimally	Not
	Completely					At
						All

2. _____ In your opinion, how responsible was Cathy for the sexual encounter which occurred?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely	Almost	Mostly	Equally	Somewhat	Minimally	Not
	Completely					At
						All

3. _____ In your opinion, do you think Cathy enjoyed the sexual encounter?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Enjoyed	Enjoyed	Enjoyed	Neither	Disliked	Disliked	Disliked
Very		Somewhat	Enjoyed	Somewhat	Very	
Much			Nor		Much	
			Disliked			

4. _____ In your opinion, was Bob justified in his actions?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly
Agree		Somewhat	Agree	Somewhat		Disagree
			Nor			
			Disagree			

5. _____ In your opinion, did a rape occur?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly
Agree		Somewhat	Agree	Somewhat		Disagree
			Nor			
			Disagree			

6. Please briefly explain your answer to item 5 in the space provided below.

APPENDIX G

SEX ROLE STEREOTYPING SCALE

Please use the following response scale to complete this questionnaire. Place the number of the response which most closely matches your opinion in the space provided next to each question.

RESPONSE CHOICES

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly
		Somewhat	Agree	Somewhat		Disagree
			Nor			
			Disagree			

1. _____ A man should fight when the woman he's with is insulted by another man.
2. _____ It is acceptable for the woman to pay for the date.
3. _____ A woman should be a virgin when she marries.
4. _____ There is something wrong with a woman who doesn't want to marry and raise a family.
5. _____ A wife should never contradict her husband.
6. _____ It is better for a woman to use her feminine charm to get what she wants rather than ask for it outright.
7. _____ It is acceptable for a woman to have a career, but marriage and family should come first.
8. _____ It looks worse for a woman to be drunk than for a man to be drunk.
9. _____ There is nothing wrong with a woman going to a bar alone.

APPENDIX H

TOLERANCE FOR SEXUAL HARRASSMENT INVENTORY

Please use the following response scale to complete this questionnaire. Place the number of the response which most closely matches your opinion in the space provided next to each question.

RESPONSE CHOICES

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree Somewhat	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

1. _____ Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act, or dress.
2. _____ An attractive woman has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.
3. _____ Most men are sexually teased by many of the women with whom they interact on the job or at school.
4. _____ A man must learn to understand that a woman's "no" to his sexual advances really means "no".
5. _____ It is only natural for a woman to use her sexuality as a way of getting ahead in school or work.
6. _____ An attractive man has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.
7. _____ I believe that sexual intimidation is a serious social problem.
8. _____ It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive.
9. _____ Innocent flirtations make the workday or school day interesting.
10. _____ Encouraging a professor's or a supervisor's sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to improve their work situation.

APPENDIX I

RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCALE

Please use the following response scale to complete this questionnaire. Place the number of the response which most closely matches your opinion in the space provided next to each question.

RESPONSE CHOICES

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree Somewhat	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

1. _____ A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.
2. _____ Any woman can get raped.
3. _____ One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.
4. _____ Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.
5. _____ When women go around braless or wearing short skirts and tight tops, they are just asking for trouble.
6. _____ In the majority of rapes, the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.
7. _____ If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her.
8. _____ Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.
9. _____ A woman who is stuck-up and thinks she is too good to talk to guys on the street deserves to be taught a lesson.
10. _____ Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to be attacked.

RESPONSE CHOICES

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly
Agree		Somewhat	Agree	Somewhat		Disagree
			Nor			
			Disagree			

- 11._____ If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she's just met there, she should be considered "fair game" to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants to or not.

APPENDIX J

The University of Rhode Island
Department of Psychology
Kingston, RI 02881

Intergenerational Attitudes and Beliefs

STUDENT INFORMED CONSENT FORM: STUDENT'S COPY

I understand that:

1. I am being asked to participate in a research project conducted by a graduate student in Psychology at the University of Rhode Island. The researcher will explain the project to me. I should feel free to ask questions. If I have more questions later, Susan Williams-Quinlan, M.S., the person mainly responsible for this study, will be available to discuss them with me at 792-2193.
2. This study is designed to explore: 1) the attitudes and beliefs of students and parents about the behavior of young men and women toward each other in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. The study involves voluntary completion of a questionnaire which will be administered in a classroom setting and will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. When I have completed and returned my questionnaire, I will furnish the names and address(es) of both of my parents, if available, or the name of one parent if living in a single-parent family, or the names of one parent and one step-parent with whom I have had the most contact with over the last five years, to the researcher so that she may mail them a research packet to fill out at home and return by mail.
3. It is anticipated that no harm will come to me as a result of participating in this study, although I may be asked some questions that will make me feel uncomfortable.
4. This research could yield important information that might be of help to others.
5. This project has received the approval of the I.R.B. and other appropriate university officials. All information gathered in this study will be kept strictly confidential and private. My name (and the names of my parents) only appear on this research consent form, which will be separated from the questionnaire as soon as I have completed it. A code number will be assigned to the questionnaire for record-keeping purposes. All answers will be tabulated, analyzed, and reported anonymously.

6. If I have any concerns regarding this study, I should write or call the University of Rhode Island's Director of Research, 70 Lower College Road, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI. 02881, telephone: (401) 792-2635. If I have other complaints, I can discuss them with Susan Williams-Quinlan (792-2193) or Professor Bernice Lott (792-4248).

The decision whether or not to participate in this study is entirely up to me, and I may withdraw from the study at any time. I can refuse to answer any questions that I do not wish to answer. My status in the university and grade in the course will in no way be affected.

I have read this Consent Form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I understand the above information and agree to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant

Signature of Researcher

Printed Name

Printed Name

Date

Date

RESOURCE NUMBERS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

1. Susan Williams-Quinlan
Principle Investigator
Psychology Department
University of Rhode Island
792-2193
2. Theodora Zubrinski
Counseling Center
University of Rhode Island
792-2288
3. Carolyn Sovet
Office of Student Life
University of Rhode Island
792-2097

PLEASE KEEP THIS COPY FOR YOUR RECORDS

APPENDIX K

The University of Rhode Island
Department of Psychology
Kingston, RI 02881

Intergenerational Attitudes and Beliefs

STUDENT INFORMED CONSENT FORM: RESEARCHER'S COPY

I understand that:

1. I am being asked to participate in a research project conducted by a graduate student in Psychology at the University of Rhode Island. The researcher will explain the project to me. I should feel free to ask questions. If I have more questions later, Susan Williams-Quinlan, M.S., the person mainly responsible for this study, will be available to discuss them with me at 792-2193.
2. This study is designed to explore: 1) the attitudes and beliefs of students and parents about the behavior of young men and women toward each other in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. The study involves voluntary completion of a questionnaire which will be administered in a classroom setting and will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. When I have completed and returned my questionnaire, I will furnish the names and address(es) of both of my parents, if available, or the name of one parent if living in a single-parent family, or the names of one parent and one step-parent with whom I have had the most contact with over the last five years, to the researcher so that she may mail them a research packet to fill out at home and return by mail.
3. It is anticipated that no harm will come to me as a result of participating in this study, although I may be asked some questions that will make me feel uncomfortable.
4. This research could yield important information that might be of help to others.
5. This project has received the approval of the I.R.B. and other appropriate university officials. All information gathered in this study will be kept strictly confidential and private. My name (and the names of my parents) only appear on this research consent form, which will be separated from the questionnaire as soon as I have completed it. A code number will be assigned to the questionnaire for record-keeping purposes. All answers will be tabulated, analyzed, and reported anonymously.

6. If I have any concerns regarding this study, I should write or call the University of Rhode Island's Director of Research, 70 Lower College Road, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881, telephone: (401) 792-2635. If I have other complaints, I can discuss them with Susan Williams-Quinlan (792-2193) or Professor Bernice Lott (792-4248).

The decision whether or not to participate in this study is entirely up to me, and I may withdraw from the study at any time. I can refuse to answer any questions that I do not wish to answer. My status in the university and grade in the course will in no way be affected.

I have read this Consent Form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I understand the above information and agree to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant

Signature of Researcher

Printed Name

Printed Name

Date

Date

Names and Address(es) of parents:

IMPORTANT: THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION MUST BE COMPLETED IN ORDER TO OBTAIN EXTRA CREDIT:

COURSE NAME/NUMBER: _____

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME: _____

IF ENROLLED IN PSYCH 113, PLEASE FILL OUT THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

RECITATION NUMBER: _____

NAME OF T.A.: _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS COPY WITH YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX L

FORM LETTER FROM STUDENT TO PARENTS
(EXTRA CREDIT/DRAWING OPTION)

Dear

I am volunteering to participate in an approved research study at U.R.I. which is being conducted by a doctoral level graduate student in psychology. The study involves an exploration of: 1) attitudes and beliefs about behavior involving young men and women in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. As part of the research, the investigator is also interested in your opinions about these issues. I will receive extra credit in my psychology class for my participation and your participation, so I would appreciate it very much if both of you could take some time individually to read and fill out these forms. In addition, for your participation in this study, your names will be entered into a drawing for a \$25.00 gift certificate to the University Bookstore. (My name has already been submitted for a separate drawing for students.) When your forms are returned, the investigator will submit my name to my professor for extra credit. Your responses will be kept confidential and private, and only the investigator will have access to them.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Name of Student

Name of Investigator

APPENDIX M
FORM LETTER FROM STUDENT TO SINGLE PARENTS
(EXTRA CREDIT/DRAWING OPTION)

Dear

I am volunteering to participate in an approved research study at U.R.I. which is being conducted by a doctoral level graduate student in psychology. The study involves an exploration of: 1) attitudes and beliefs about behavior involving young men and women in their everyday lives including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. As part of the research, the investigator is also interested in your opinions about these issues. I will receive extra credit in my psychology class for my participation and your participation, so I would appreciate it very much if you could take some time by yourself to read and fill out these forms. In addition, for your participation in this study, your name will be entered into a drawing for a \$25.00 gift certificate to the University Bookstore. (My name has already been submitted for a separate drawing for students.) When your forms are returned, the investigator will submit my name to my professor for extra credit. Your responses will be kept confidential and private, and only the investigator will have access to them.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Name of Student

Name of Investigator

APPENDIX N
FORM LETTER FROM STUDENT TO PARENTS
(DRAWING OPTION)

Dear

I am volunteering to participate in an approved research study at U.R.I. which is being conducted by a doctoral level graduate student in psychology. The study involves an exploration of: 1) attitudes and beliefs about behavior involving young men and women in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. As part of the research, the investigator is also interested in your opinions about these issues. For your participation in this study, your names will be entered into a drawing for a \$25.00 gift certificate to the University Bookstore. (My name has already been submitted for the drawing.) I would appreciate it very much if both of you could take some time individually to read and fill out these forms. When they are returned, the investigator will submit your names for the bookstore drawing. Your responses will be kept confidential and private, and only the investigator will have access to them.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Name of Student

Name of Investigator

APPENDIX O

FORM LETTER FROM STUDENT TO SINGLE PARENTS

(DRAWING OPTION)

Dear

I am volunteering to participate in an approved research study at U.R.I. which is being conducted by a doctoral level graduate student in psychology. The study involves an exploration of: 1) attitudes and beliefs about behavior involving young men and women in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. As part of the research, the investigator is also interested in your opinions about these issues. For your participation in this study, your name will be entered into a drawing for a \$25.00 gift certificate to the University Bookstore. (My name has already been submitted for the drawing.) I would appreciate it very much if you could take some time by yourself to read and fill out these forms. When they are returned, the investigator will submit your name for the bookstore drawing. Your responses will be kept confidential and private, and only the investigator will have access to them.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Name of Student

Name of Investigator

APPENDIX P

REQUEST FORM FOR PARENTAL PARTICIPATION

(EXTRA CREDIT/DRAWING OPTION)

Dear

I am a doctoral level graduate student in psychology at the University of Rhode Island. I would like to request your participation in an approved research project exploring: 1) attitudes and beliefs about behavior involving young men and women in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. Your U.R.I. daughter or son has volunteered to participate in this study as well, and will receive extra credit in a psychology course for his or her participation as well as your participation. In addition, if you choose to participate your names will be entered into a drawing for a \$25.00 gift certificate to the University Bookstore. (Your son's or daughter's name has already been submitted for a separate bookstore drawing for students.)

Since this is a study of students' as well as their parents' opinions, I'm asking that both you and your spouse complete and return these forms. I am interested in each of your individual opinions, and as such, I'd like to ask that you fill out your forms separately without discussion of your responses with each other or your daughter or son until after all forms have been returned.

To ensure confidentiality, please place the completed questionnaires and consent forms in the envelope provided, making sure that the envelope is sealed, and then drop it in the mail (postage will be paid by addressee). Please be sure to sign the informed consent forms, keeping one copy for yourself and sending the other copy back with the questionnaires. Your responses will remain confidential.

If you have any questions about this project, please feel free to contact me directly either by telephone or letter.

Your responses are needed, valued, and appreciated. Thank you for participating.

Sincerely,

Susan Williams-Quinlan, M.S.
Psychology Department
University of Rhode Island
792-2193

APPENDIX Q

REQUEST FORM FOR SINGLE PARENT PARTICIPATION

(EXTRA CREDIT/DRAWING OPTION)

Dear

I am a doctoral level graduate student in psychology at the University of Rhode Island. I would like to request your participation in an approved research project exploring: 1) attitudes and beliefs about behavior involving young men and women in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. Your U.R.I. daughter or son has volunteered to participate in this study as well, and will receive extra credit in a psychology course for his or her participation as well as your participation. In addition, if you choose to participate your name will be entered into a drawing for a \$25.00 gift certificate to the University Bookstore. (Your son's or daughter's name has already been submitted for a separate bookstore drawing for students.)

Since this is a study of students' as well as their parents' opinions, I'm asking that you complete and return these forms. I am interested in your individual opinion, and as such, I'd like to ask that you fill out your forms separately without discussion of your responses with your daughter or son until after all forms have been returned.

To ensure confidentiality, please place the completed questionnaire and consent form in the envelope provided, making sure that the envelope is sealed, and then drop it in the mail (postage will be paid by addressee). Please be sure to sign the informed consent forms, keeping one copy for yourself and sending the other copy back with the questionnaire. Your responses will remain confidential and private.

If you have any questions about this project, please feel free to contact me directly either by telephone or letter.

Your responses are needed, valued, and appreciated. Thank you for participating.

Sincerely,

Susan Williams-Quinlan, M.S.
Psychology Department
University of Rhode Island
792-2193

APPENDIX R

REQUEST FORM FOR PARENTAL PARTICIPATION

(DRAWING OPTION)

Dear

I am a doctoral level graduate student in psychology at the University of Rhode Island. I would like to request your participation in an approved research project exploring: 1) attitudes and beliefs about behavior involving young men and women in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. Your U.R.I. son or daughter has volunteered to participate in this study as well, and as a result, has entered his or her name into a drawing for a \$25.00 gift certificate to the University Bookstore. If you decide to participate, your names will be entered into the drawing as well.

Since this is a study of students' as well as their parents' opinions, I'm asking that both you and your spouse complete and return these forms. I am interested in each of your individual opinions, and as such, I'd like to ask that you fill out your forms separately without discussion of your responses with each other or your daughter or son until after all forms have been returned.

To ensure confidentiality, please place the completed questionnaires and consent forms in the envelope provided, making sure that the envelope is sealed, and then drop it in the mail (postage will be paid by addressee). Please be sure to sign the informed consent forms, keeping one copy for yourself and sending the other copy back with the questionnaires. Your responses will remain confidential and private.

If you have any questions about this project, please feel free to contact me directly either by telephone or letter.

Your responses are needed, valued, and appreciated. Thank you for participating.

Sincerely,

Susan Williams-Quinlan, M.S.
Psychology Department
University of Rhode Island
792-2193

APPENDIX S

REQUEST FORM FOR SINGLE PARENT PARTICIPATION
(DRAWING OPTION)

Dear

I am a doctoral level graduate student in psychology at the University of Rhode Island. I would like to request your participation in an approved research project exploring: 1) attitudes and beliefs about behavior involving young men and women in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. Your U.R.I. son or daughter has volunteered to participate in this study as well, and as a result, has entered his or her name into a drawing for a \$25.00 gift certificate to the University Bookstore. If you decide to participate, your name will be entered into the drawing as well.

Since this is a study of students' as well as their parents' opinions, I'm asking that you complete and return these forms. I am interested in your individual opinion, and as such, I'd like to ask that you fill out your forms separately without discussion of your responses with your daughter or son until after all forms have been returned.

To ensure confidentiality, please place the completed questionnaire and consent form in the envelope provided, making sure that the envelope is sealed, and then drop it in the mail (postage will be paid by addressee). Please be sure to sign the informed consent forms, keeping one copy for yourself and sending the other copy back with the questionnaire. Your responses will remain confidential and private.

If you have any questions about this project, please feel free to contact me directly either by telephone or letter.

Your responses are needed, valued, and appreciated. Thank you for participating.

Sincerely,

Susan Williams-Quinlan, M.S.
Psychology Department
University of Rhode Island
792-2193

APPENDIX T

The University of Rhode Island
Department of Psychology
Kingston, RI 02881

Intergenerational Attitudes and Beliefs

PARENT INFORMED CONSENT FORM: PARENT'S COPY

I understand that:

1. I am being asked to participate in a research project conducted by a graduate student in Psychology at the University of Rhode Island. The researcher will explain the project to me. If I should have any questions, I should feel free to contact Susan Williams-Quinlan, M.S., the person mainly responsible for this study, who will be available to discuss them with me at 792-2193.

2. This study is designed to explore: 1) the attitudes and beliefs of students and parents about the behavior of young men and women toward each other in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. This study involves voluntary completion of a questionnaire which will take about 30 minutes and will be done at home. When I have completed the questionnaire, I will return it to the researcher in the pre-paid envelope which has been provided for me.

3. It is anticipated that no harm will come to me as a result of participating in this study, although I may be asked some questions that will make me feel uncomfortable.

4. This research could yield important information that might be of help to others.

5. This project has received the approval of the I.R.B. and other appropriate university officials. All information gathered in this study will be kept strictly confidential and private. My name (and the name of my daughter or son) only appear on this research consent form, which will be separated from the questionnaire as soon as I return it. A code number will be assigned to the questionnaire for record-keeping purposes. All answers will be tabulated, analyzed, and reported anonymously.

6. If I have any concerns regarding this study, I should write or call the University of Rhode Island's Director of Research, 70 Lower College Road, Kingston, RI 02881, telephone: (401) 792-2635. If I have other complaints, I can discuss them with Susan Williams-Quinlan (792-2193) or

Professor Bernice Lott (792-4248).

7. The decision whether or not to participate in this study is entirely up to me, and I may withdraw from the study at any time. I can refuse to answer any questions that I do not wish to answer. Whatever I decide will in no way affect my son's or daughter's status in the university or grade in his or her course.

I have read this Consent Form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I understand this information and agree to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant

Signature of Researcher

Printed Name

Printed Name

Date

Date

Name of daughter or son participating in this study.

RESOURCE NUMBERS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

1. Susan Williams-Quinlan
Principle Investigator
Psychology Department
University of Rhode Island
792-2193
2. Theodora Zubrinski
Counseling Center
University of Rhode Island
792-2288
3. Carolyn Sovet
Office of Student Life
University of Rhode Island
792-2097

PLEASE KEEP THIS COPY FOR YOUR RECORDS

APPENDIX U

The University of Rhode Island
Department of Psychology
Kingston, RI 02881

Intergenerational Attitudes and Beliefs

PARENT INFORMED CONSENT FORM: RESEARCHER'S COPY

I understand that:

1. I am being asked to participate in a research project conducted by a graduate student in Psychology at the University of Rhode Island. The researcher will explain the project to me. If I should have any questions, I should feel free to contact Susan Williams-Quinlan, M.S., the person mainly responsible for this study, who will be available to discuss them with me at 792-2193.
2. This study is designed to explore: 1) the attitudes and beliefs of students and parents about the behavior of young men and women toward each other in their everyday lives, including their romantic and sexual behavior, and 2) communication between young adults and their parents. This study involves voluntary completion of a questionnaire which will take about 30 minutes and will be done at home. When I have completed the questionnaire, I will return it to the researcher in the pre-paid envelope which has been provided for me.
3. It is anticipated that no harm will come to me as a result of participating in this study, although I may be asked some questions that will make me feel uncomfortable.
4. This research could yield important information that might be of help to others.
5. This project has received the approval of the I.R.B. and other appropriate university officials. All information gathered in this study will be kept strictly confidential and private. My name (and the name of my daughter or son) only appear on this research consent form, which will be separated from the questionnaire as soon as I return it. A code number will be assigned to the questionnaire for record-keeping purposes. All answers will be tabulated, analyzed, and reported anonymously.
6. If I have any concerns regarding this study, I should write or call the University of Rhode Island's Director of Research, 70 Lower College Road, Kingston, RI 02881, telephone: (401) 792-2635. If I have other complaints, I can discuss them with Susan Williams-Quinlan (792-2193) or

Professor Bernice Lott (792-4248).

7. The decision whether or not to participate in this study is entirely up to me, and I may withdraw from the study at any time.

I can refuse to answer any questions that I do not wish to answer. Whatever I decide will in no way affect my son's or daughter's status at the university or grade in his or her course.

I have read this Consent Form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I understand this information and agree to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant

Signature of Researcher

Printed Name

Printed Name

Date

Date

Name of daughter or son participating in this study.

PLEASE RETURN THIS COPY WITH YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acock, A.C., & Bengston, V.L. (1977). Opinions within the family: What parents think and what children think they think. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association (March).
- Acock A.C., & Bengston, V.L. (1978). On the relative influence of mothers and fathers: A covariance analysis of political and religious socialization. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 519-530.
- Aldous, J. & Hill, R. (1965). Social cohesion, lineage type, and intergenerational transmission. Social Forces, 43, 471-482.
- Amick, D.J. & Walberg, H.J. (Eds.). (1975). Introductory Multivariate Analysis. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishers.
- Banks, A.M. (1988, May 1). Is rape sometimes ok? Providence Journal-Bulletin, p. A-29.
- Barnett, N.J., & Feild, H.S. (1977). Sex differences in university students' attitudes toward rape. Journal of College Student Personnel, 18, 93-96.
- Bart, P.B. & O'Brien, P.H. (1985). Stopping Rape: Successful Survival Strategies. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Bengston, V.L. (1975). Generation and family effects in value socialization. American Sociological Review, 40, 358-371.
- Bennett, S.M., & Dickinson, W.B. (1980). Student-parent

- rapport and parental involvement in sex, birth control, and venereal disease education. The Journal of Sex Research, 16, 114-130.
- Benshoff, D.L. (1978). A comparison of types of college students and their attitudes toward the phenomenon of rape. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 4533B. (University Microfilms No. 78-336)
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1984). Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1982. (Publication No. NCJ-92820). Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Burgess, A.W. (1988). Rape and Sexual Assault II. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Burt, M.R. (1980). Cultural myths and support for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 217-230.
- Check, J.V.P., & Malamuth, N.M. (1983). Sex role stereotyping and reactions to depictions of stranger versus acquaintance rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 344-356.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coller, S.A. & Resick, P.A. (1987). Women's attributions of responsibility for date rape: The influence of empathy and sex-role stereotyping. Violence and Victims, 2, 115-125.
- Connell, R.W. (1972). Political socialization in the

- American family: The evidence re-examined. Public Opinion Quarterly, 36, 321-333.
- Daugherty, L.R. & Burger, J.M. (1984). The influence of parents, church, and peers on the sexual attitudes and behaviors of college students. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 13, 351-359.
- Dietz, S.R., Blackwell, K.T., Daley, P.C., & Bentley, B.J. (1982). Measurement of empathy toward rape victims and rapists. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 372-384.
- Dull, T.R. & Giacomassi, D.J. (1987). Demographic correlates of sexual and dating attitudes. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 14, 175-193.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1986). Crime in the United States: Uniform Crime Reports. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Fischer, G.J. (1986a). College student attitudes toward forcible date rape: Changes after taking a human sexuality course. Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 12, 42-46.
- Fischer, G.J. (1986b). College student attitudes toward forcible date rape: I. Cognitive predictors. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15, 457-466.
- Fischer, G.J. (1987). Hispanic and majority student attitudes toward forcible date rape as a function of differences in attitudes toward women. Sex Roles, 17, 93-101.
- Fisher, T.D. (1986). An exploratory study of parent-child

- communication about sex and the sexual attitudes of early, middle and late adolescents. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 147, 543-557.
- Fisher, T.D. (1987). Family communication and the sexual behavior and attitudes of college students. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16, 81-495.
- Gager, N. & Schurr, C. (1976). Sexual Assault: Confronting Rape in America. New York: Grosset & Dunlap.
- Gallagher, B.I. (1974). An empirical analysis of attitude differences between the kin-related generations. Youth and Society, 4, 327-349.
- Griffin, S. (1986). Rape. The Politics of Consciousness. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Heck P.L. (1986). College students' perceptions of communication as related to rape myths. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 47A. (University Microfilms No. 8709718)
- Hill, R., Foote, N., Aldous, J., Carlson, R., & MacDonald, R. (1970). Family Development in Three Generations. Cambridge: Schenkman.
- Hyman, H. (1969). Political Socialization. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Jenkins, M.J., & Dambrot, F.H. (1987). The attribution of date rape: Observer's attitudes and sexual experiences and the dating situation. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17, 875-895.
- Kandel, D., & Lesser, G. (1972). Youth in Two Worlds.

- San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Kanin, E.J. (1957). Male aggression in dating-courtship relations. American Journal of Sociology, 63, 197-204.
- Kanin, E.J., & Parcell, S.R. (1977). Sexual aggression: A second look at the offended female. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 6, 67-76.
- Katz, S. & Mazur, M.A. (1979). Understanding the Rape Victim: A Synthesis of Research Findings. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kilpatrick, D.G., Best, C.L., Veronen, L.J., Amicl, A.E., Villeponteaux, L.A., & Ruff, G.A. (1985). Mental health correlates of criminal victimization: A random community survey. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53, 866-873.
- Kilpatrick, D.G., Veronen, L.J., & Best, C.L. (1984). Factors predicting psychological distress among rape victims. In C.R. Figley (Ed.), Trauma and its Wake: The Study and Treatment of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (pp. 113-141). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Kirkpatrick, C. & Kanin, E.J. (1957). Male sexual aggression on a university campus. American Sociological Review, 22, 52-58.
- Koss, M.P. (1985). The hidden rape victim: Personality, attitudinal, and situational characteristics. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 193-272.
- Koss, M.P., Gidycz, C.A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual

- aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 162-170.
- Koss, M.P., Leonard, K.E., Beezley, D.A., & Oros, C.J. (1985). Non-stranger sexual aggression: A discriminant analysis of the psychological characteristics of undetected offenders. Sex Roles, 12, 981-992.
- Koss, M.P. & Oros, C.J. (1982). Sexual experiences survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50, 455-457.
- L'Armand, K. & Pepitone, A. (1982). Judgements of rape: A study of victim-rapist relationship and victim sexual history. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8, 134-139.
- Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. (1975). Criminal Victimization Surveys in 8 American Cities. (Publication No. SD-NCS-C-5). Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Education.
- Lerner, R.M., & Knapp, J.R. (1975). Actual and perceived intrafamilial attitudes of late adolescents and their parents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4, 17-36.
- Lott, B. (1987). Women's Lives: Themes and Variations in Gender Learning. Monterey: Brooks/Cole.
- Lott, B., Lott, A.J., & Fernald, J. (1990). Individual differences in distancing responses to women on a photo choice task. Sex Roles, 22, 97-110.

- Lott, B., Reilly, M.E., & Howard, D.R. (1982). Sexual assault and harrassment: A campus community case study. Signs, 8, 296-319.
- Malamuth, N., Haber, S. & Feshbach, S. (1980). Testing hypotheses regarding rape: Exposure to sexual violence, sex differences, and the "normality" of rapists. Journal of Research in Personality, 14, 121-137.
- Malamuth, N.M., Heim, M., & Feshbach, S. (1980). Sexual responsiveness of college students to rape depictions: Inhibitory and disinhibitory effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 399-408.
- Mazelan, P.M. (1980). Stereotypes and perceptions of the victims of rape. Victimology: An International Journal, 5, 121-132.
- McNab, W.L. (1976). Sexual attitude development in children and the parents' role. Journal of School Health, 46, 537-542.
- Medea, A. & Thompson, K. (1974). Against Rape. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Meier, H.C. (1972). Mother-centeredness and college youths' attitudes toward social equality for women: Some empirical findings. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 115-121.
- Muehlenhard, C. (1988). Misinterpreted dating behaviors and the risk of date rape. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 6, 20-37.
- Muehlenhard, C.L., Friedman, D.E., & Thomas, C.M. (1985). Is

date rape justifiable? The effects of dating activity, who initiated, who paid, and men's attitudes toward women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 297-310.

Muehlenhard, C.L., & Linton, M.A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 186-196.

Muehlenhard, C.L., & MacNaughton, J.S. (in press). Women's beliefs about women who "lead men on." Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology.

Olson, D.H., McCubbin, H.I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M. & Wilson, M. (1982). Family Inventories. University of Minnesota, St. Paul.

Payne, S., Summers, D.A., & Stewart, T. (1973). Value differences across three generations. Sociometry, 36, 20-30.

Peterson, S.A., & Franzese, B. (1987). Correlates of college men's sexual abuse of women. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 223-228.

Plane, T. (1987). The effects of the victim-offender relationship on attribution of rape blame. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 2106-B. (University Microfilms No. 8715872)

Rapaport, K. & Burkhart, B.R. (1984). Personality and attitudinal characteristics of sexually coercive college males. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93, 216-221.

Reilly, M.E., Lott, B., Caldwell, D., & DeLuca, L. (in press). Tolerance for sexual harassment related to

- self-reported sexual victimization. Gender & Society.
- Reilly, M.E., Lott, B., & Gallogly, S. (1986). Sexual harassment of university students. Sex Roles, 15, 333-358.
- Roper, B.S., & Labeff, E. (1977). Sex roles and feminism revisited: An intergenerational attitude comparison. Marriage and the Family, 39, 113-119.
- Rosenthal, R. & Rosnow, R.L. (1975). The Volunteer Subject. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Russell, D.E.H. (1975). The Politics of Rape: The Victim's Perspective. New York: Stein and Day.
- Russell, D.E.H. (1984). Sexual Exploitation: Rape, Child Sexual Abuse and Workplace Harassment. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sandberg, G., Jackson, T.L., & Petretic-Jackson, P. (1987). College students' attitudes regarding sexual coercion and aggression: Developing educational and preventative strategies. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 302-311.
- Schwendinger, J.R. & H. (1983). Rape and Inequality. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Slevin, K.F., & Wingrove, R.C. (1983). Similarities and differences among three generations of women in attitudes toward the female role in contemporary society. Sex Roles, 9, 609-624.
- Shotland, R.L. (1985). A preliminary model of some causes of date rape. Academic Psychology Bulletin, 7, 187-200.

- Shotland, R.L., & Goodstein, L. (1983). Just because she doesn't want to doesn't mean it's rape: An experimentally based causal model of the perception of rape in a dating situation. Social Psychology Quarterly, 46, 220-232.
- Spence, J.T., & Helmreich, R. (1972). The attitudes toward women scale: An objective instrument to measure the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 2, 66.
- Tedin, K.L. (1974). The influence of parents on the political attitudes of adolescents. American Political Science Review, 68, 1579-1592.
- Tetrault, P.A., & Barnett, M.A. (1987). Reactions to stranger and acquaintance rape. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 353-358.
- Thomas, W.I. (1972). The definition of the situation. In J.G. Mannis & B.M. Metlzer (Eds.), Symbolic Interaction, (rev. ed., pp. 239-252). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Troll, L.E., Neugarten, B.L., & Kraines, R.J. Similarities in values and other personality characteristics in college students and their parents (1969). Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 15, 32333-32336.
- Walker, M.J. & Brodsky, S.L. (Eds.) (1976). Sexual Assault. Lexington, MA.: D.C. Heath.
- Weis, K. & Borges, S.S. (1973). Victimology and rape: The case of the legitimate victim. Issues in Criminology, 8, 71-115.
- Winer, B.J. (1971). Statistical Principles in Experimental

Design. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Yarber, W.L., & Greer, J.M. (1986). The relationship between the sexual attitudes of parents and their college daughters' or sons' sexual attitudes and sexual behavior. Journal of School Health, 56, 68-72.

Yegidis, B.L. (1986). Date rape and other forced sexual encounters among college students. Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 12, 51-54.