

379
N81d
No. 3206

PERCEIVED INFLUENCE OF SINGLE-PARENT SEXUAL
BEHAVIOR ON QUALITY OF PARENTING AND
SEXUAL DEVELOPMENT OF OFFSPRING

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Michael G. Castillo, B.S., M.S.

Denton, Texas

August, 1990

201

Castillo, Michael G., Perceived Influence of Single-Parent Sexual Behavior on Quality of Parenting and Sexual Development of Offspring. Doctor of Philosophy (Counseling Psychology), August 1990, 307 pp., 66 tables, references, 6 titles.

Double standard effects in inferences about quality of parenting and adult sexual outcomes for children were investigated under five conditions of single-parent sexual behavior. The sample comprised six hundred married parents from three major metropolitan areas in Texas. Subjects were administered a scenario about a hypothetical single parent family. The scenario varied with respect to parent gender, child gender, and type of parental sexual activity (e.g., abstinence, limited affairs away from home, involvement with a live-in lover, frequent partners spending the night, and a control condition containing no sexual message). Subjects were asked to rate a parent from the scenario on quality of parenting and predict the adult sexual behavior of the child.

Hypothesized double standard effects did not emerge. A double standard in judgments about sexually active single parents and parenting did appear. Main effects were found

for child gender and sexual lifestyle of the parent (e.g., parents with boys rated less favorably than parents with girls; promiscuous fathers were rated lower than promiscuous mothers). Several interaction effects among parent gender, child gender, and sexual lifestyle condition were also found (e.g., promiscuous parents were rated lower as parents and seen as negatively influencing the child's sexual development).

Recommendations for future research include refining the two scales used in this study; extending the study to include data from single parents; examining whether the judgments of sexually active single parents affect the quality and quantity of interactions others have with either the parent or child.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
II. METHOD.	36
Subjects	
Instruments	
Procedure	
III. RESULTS	44
IV. DISCUSSION.	68
APPENDICES	86
REFERENCES	300

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
A-1. Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Data Entry	87
H-2. Summary of Significant Results on the Parent Scale.	125
I-3. ANOVA Summary Table of Parent Scale Ratings . .	127
J-4. Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Parent-Script Interaction Effects on the Parent Scale	129
J-5. Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Parent-Child Interaction Effects on the Parent Scale	131
J-6. Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis for Script Effects on the Parent Scale	132
K-7. Summary of Significant Results on the Child as Adult Scale.	134
L-8. MANOVA Summary Table of Child as Adult Scale Ratings	137
M-9. Univariate F-tests Summary Table for the Child Variable on the Child as Adult Scale.	139
M-10. Univariate F-tests Summary Table for the Script Variable on the Child as Adult Scale.	140
N-11. Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on the Sincere CAD Scale Item	142
N-12. Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on the Careful CAD Scale Item	143
N-13. Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on the Passive CAD Scale Item	144
N-14. Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on the Impulsive CAD Scale Item	145
N-15. Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on the Conventtional CAD Scale Item . .	146

LIST OF TABLES--continued

N-16.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on the Monogamous CAD Scale Item. . . .	147
N-17.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on the Reserved CAD Scale Item. . . .	148
N-18.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on the Responsible CAD Scale Item . . .	149
N-19.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on the Seductive CAD Scale Item	150
N-20.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on the Unconventional CAD Scale Item. .	151
N-21.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on the Promiscuous CAD Scale Item . . .	152
O-22.	Factor Structure for the Parent Scale	154
P-23.	Description and Item Loadings on PS Factor 1. .	156
P-24.	Description and Item Loadings on PS Factor 2. .	157
Q-25.	Summary of Significant Results on PS Factor 1 .	159
Q-26.	Summary of Significant Results on PS Factor 2 .	160
R-27.	ANOVA Summary Table for PS Factor 1 Ratings . .	162
S-28.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Parent-Child Interaction Effects on PS Factor 1.	164
S-29.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Parent-Script Interaction Effects on PS Factor 1.	165
S-30.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on PS Factor 1.	167
T-31.	ANOVA Summary Table for PS Factor 2 Ratings . .	169
U-32.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Parent-Child Interaction Effects on PS Factor 2.	171
U-33.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Parent-Script Interaction Effects on PS Factor 2.	172

LIST OF TABLES--continued

U-34.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on PS Factor 2.	174
V-35.	Factor Structure for Child as Adult Scale . . .	176
W-36.	Description and Item Loadings on CAD Factors. .	178
X-37.	Summary of Significant Results on CAD Factor Scores	180
Y-38.	ANOVA Summary Table for CAD Factor 1 Scores . .	183
Z-39.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on CAD Factor 1	185
AA-40.	ANOVA Summary Table for CAD Factor 2 Scores. .	187
BB-41.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on CAD Factor 2.	189
CC-42.	ANOVA Summary Table for CAD Factor 3 Scores. .	191
DD-43.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on CAD Factor 3.	193
EE-44.	ANOVA Summary Table for CAD Factor 5 Scores. .	195
FF-45.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Parent-Child Interaction Effects on PS Factor 5	197
FF-46.	Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis of Script Effects on CAD Factor 5.	198
GG-47.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Parent Scale	200
GG-48.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Sincere CAD Scale Item	205
GG-49.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Careful CAD Scale Item	210
GG-50.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Passive CAD Scale Item	215

LIST OF TABLES--continued

GG-51.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Impulsive CAD Scale Item	220
GG-52.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Conventional CAD Scale Item.	225
GG-53.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Monogamous CAD Scale Item.	230
GG-54.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Reserved CAD Scale Item.	235
GG-55.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Homosexual CAD Scale Item.	240
GG-56.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Cold CAD Scale Item.	245
GG-57.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Responsible CAD Scale Item	250
GG-58.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Seductive CAD Scale Item	255
GG-59.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Unconventional CAD Scale Item.	260
GG-60.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on the Promiscuous CAD Scale Item	265
GG-61.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on PS Factor 1.	270
GG-62.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on PS Factor 2.	275

LIST OF TABLES--continued

GG-63.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on CAD Factor 1	280
GG-64.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on CAD Factor 2	285
GG-65.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on CAD Factor 3	290
GG-66.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child, and Script Variables on CAD Factor 5	295

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The past decade has been a time of rapid transition for the American family. Many new and alternative family lifestyles have emerged and are rapidly becoming a highly visible and significant part of today's society. One of the most important changes in family composition is the single-parent family. The rate of growth for this family structure has continued to increase since the late 1950's (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1989). Between 1970 and 1988 alone, the number of single-parent families more than doubled from 3.8 million to 9.4 million. Of those one-parent families identified, the majority maintained an independent single-parent family household, 3.2 million to 7.3 million respectively, (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1989).

The significance of the single-parent family phenomenon is evidenced further by its increased proportion of all family situations with children. This proportion has more than doubled, from 13% in 1970 to 27% in 1988 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1989). While the vast majority of single-parent families continue to be headed by mothers (87%) the number of households headed by single fathers has increased from 10% in 1970 to 13% in 1988, and currently includes an estimated 1.2 million families. While it is unlikely that

the number of single-parent families will ever equal or surpass the number of conventional two-parent households, current estimates suggest that the rate of growth for the single-parent family will continue to increase (Glick & Spanier, 1980; Hofferth, 1985; Stein, 1983; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1989).

The number of children affected by this type of living arrangement also indicates the kind of impact the single-parent family is having on today's society. Of the estimated 63.2 million children under the age of 18 in 1988, 15 million were living with only one parent (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1989). The overall percentage of children living with one parent has risen dramatically from 12% of all children under 18 in 1970 to 24%, or almost one of every four children, in 1988 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1989). It has been estimated that of the children under 18 years of age, 50 to 70% will spend at least part of their lives in a single-parent home (Hofferth, 1985; Norton & Glick, 1986, 1979; Weiss, 1979).

The single-parent family is said to have been on the rise in recent years because of the high divorce rate. While divorce and separation remain the most common factors leading to the single-parent family situation, the ways in which this family structure has evolved are quite varied (Thompson & Gongla, 1983). Other factors contributing to the development of the single-parent family include

desertion or death of a spouse, adoption of a child by a single person, and having a child out of wedlock (Doughtery, 1978; Grow, 1979; Kadushin, 1970; Shireman & Johnson, 1976).

Despite the various circumstances contributing to the single-parent situation, the families headed by one parent are often seen as sharing a number of common experiences and problems (Billingsley & Govannoni, 1971; Gongla, 1982). In addition to frequently facing major reductions in family income (Bane & Weiss, 1980; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1989), members of the single-parent family often experience a sense of isolation and loneliness (Greenberg, 1979; Katz, 1979; Nock, 1981; Smith, 1981), role overload (Glasser & Navarre, 1965; Weiss, 1979), and a reduced access to material and social resources more readily available to members of the two-parent family (Cherlin, 1981; Gongla, 1982; Schorr & Moen, 1979).

Single parents, both male and female, are also often faced with conflicts and situations not found in the more traditional two-parent family. Such problems, among others, include providing for their own emotional, physical and social needs, as well as those of their children (Gongla, 1982; Greenberg, 1979). While the literature has focused to some extent on the larger social aspects of single parenting (e.g., the lack of child care options, social services, and occupational opportunities), scarce attention has been paid to the individual or face-to-face aspects of being a single

parent (Gongla, 1982). One such aspect of single parenthood receiving minimal attention is the problem single parents face in pursuing and satisfying their needs and desires for intimacy and sex while maintaining their households.

Since much of their daily home life revolves around caring for their children, the sexual activity of single parents is said to be greatly affected by the mere presence of children in the home (Greenberg, 1979; Hetherington, Cox, & Cox, 1978; Weiss, 1979). Unlike childless single adults, single parents voice a number of complaints associated with their roles as single adults and with their adjustments to dating and sexual activities (Greenberg, 1979).

Recent studies have attempted to address some of the problems facing the single parent. Greenberg (1979) conducted 38 "in-depth" interviews averaging one and one-half hours with 19 mothers and 19 fathers each in a large metropolitan area between October 1977 and May 1978. The study participants ranged in age from the mid-20's to the mid-50's, had children ranging from toddlers to college students, and maintained an average yearly income of 15,000 to 20,000 dollars. The interviews were said to have followed a survey guide suggested by a review of the literature and focused on parenting and single adult activities including autonomy, sexual standards, intrarole conflicts, intimacy, and institutional supports.

All but two of the single parents Greenberg (1979) surveyed accepted "sexual activity" for singles as appropriate and "most" admitted to being sexually active themselves. Nevertheless the "majority" of the parents saw single parenting as directly constraining their sexual activities. The constraints included having to change locations away from home, reducing amounts of sexual activity, and reducing the quality as a result of tiredness or intrusion by children.

The "majority" of parents interviewed saw their roles as single parents necessitating a different set of sexual standards or expectations than for childless single adults. This was said to be due to the perceived negative effects which the single parents interviewed felt their "sexual activity" might have had if made apparent to their children. Those effects reportedly could have caused emotional trauma to the child, created a negative image of the parent, or provided a role model giving sexual license to the child (Greenberg, 1979).

Not all the single parents in Greenberg's (1979) study endorsed separate standards for single parents and single nonparents. The responses provided by those individuals, however, still suggested there was concern about the consequences for the "sexual activity" of single parents. Even of those parents expressing a more liberal philosophy about their sexual behavior, "most" qualified their

positions with stipulations such as the need for the child to know the person, for the parent to avoid engaging in a series of "one night stands." In addition, only 12 of the 15 individuals endorsing a single standard for all single adults actually had a date spend the night. This, Greenberg suggested, was indicative of a discrepancy between the attitudes and actual behaviors of those parents surveyed.

In a similar survey of single parents (Simenauer & Carroll, 1982) "most" identified fewer constraints being single parents than did those who participated in Greenberg's (1979) study. Most indicated that their children were "not troubled" by the presence or awareness of their dates. Only a minority of the single parents surveyed (15% of fathers and 9% of mothers) admitted to rarely bringing home their dates. In addition, only 3% of the single fathers and 9% of the single mothers stated their children reacted with "resentment or aggressive anger" when they brought their dates home.

Although the single parents in the Simenauer and Carroll (1982) survey indicated that their children were not troubled by their dates, they still expressed some concern about the possible effects of their own behaviors on their children. When questioned about children and a live-in lover, most singles surveyed stated they would not want to live with a single parent on an unmarried basis. This reportedly was because of the possible tension or turmoil

the relationship might cause the child, and because of questions concerning the morality of such living arrangements. Many of the singles surveyed also indicated they were concerned about proper role models for children. They expressed the belief that living together out of wedlock under any circumstances was wrong and that it conveyed an unethical message to the child by "legitimizing" such living arrangements.

For quite some time, the overall lifestyle of the formerly married has been said to be vastly different from that of the broader culture (Hunt, 1966). It has been viewed as being quite permissive and supportive of sexual experiences. Hunt (1966) indicated in his early work that the formerly married remain sexually active. In fact, less than 1% of the men and only about 20% of the women he surveyed had had no sexual experience since their marriages had ended. In addition, 80% of the formerly married admitted that they had sexual intercourse during the first year after their divorce, most with more than one partner. Nearly all the men and a large number of women in Hunt's (1966) survey indicated that their sex life was more intense, less inhibited, and more satisfying than it had been during their marriages.

It has been suggested, however, that with regards to societal norms, the same set of values and standards defining appropriate sexual behavior for premarital and

extramarital activity applies to the sexual behavior of the formerly married (Bell, 1966, 1976; Bernard, 1956). While it is generally accepted that divorced individuals were sexually active and experienced because of their previous marriages, once their marriages have ended, they were expected to conform once again to the sexual values that operated for them before they were married (Bell, 1976).

The decision to engage in and the consequences for the sexual activity of a single parent may thus be influenced by the standards espoused by society as a whole. One question that remains unanswered, however, is the nature of that societal standard. Debate continues about whether there is a single or a double standard regarding one's behavior.

Regardless of the kind of standard espoused by society, single parents appear to struggle to meet their own needs of intimacy and sexual gratification. When entering into their first post-marital sexual encounter, many of the formerly married experience a great deal of anxiety (Hunt, 1966). Women, however, reportedly had greater anxiety than men with their first sexual encounter. This anxiety was also said to be greater for those who were married for a long time. Even when adjusted to extramarital activity, women more often felt it necessary to hide their sexual activities from their friends, parents, and children (Bell, 1976; Greenberg, 1979).

Some evidence suggests that post-marital women are also more likely to report experiencing sexual constraints as a result of societal standards which view single parenting and at-home sexual activity as incompatible (Greenberg, 1979). This tendency towards increased constraint by women may be the result of a sexual double standard within American society. In other words different sets of expectations are placed on the sexual attitudes and behavior of females and males.

Two interpretations of the double standard are implicit in a number of studies within the literature. The first interpretation focuses on the personal standard of sexual behavior that men and women adopt. The second, however, focuses on societal norms. While both interpretations are important, the second one is of particular interest in the current study. Inherent in the latter interpretation is that if people endorse the double standard as a societal norm, they will not only see different bounds of sexual activity as appropriate for males and females, they will also judge negatively those who violate that norm (Mark & Miller, 1986).

Many have suggested that the double standard gives males more latitude and freedom in their sexual behavior and attitudes (Carns, 1973; Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote, & Foote, 1985; Sack, Keller, & Hinkle, 1981). If true, females who exhibit sexual permissiveness will be evaluated

more negatively than those males who behave in an identical manner (Mark & Miller, 1986). The key question, which currently remains unanswered, is whether the double standard does in fact exist. Many studies have suggested that the empirical evidence strongly supports the notion that the sexual double standard is in decline (Athanasidou, Shaver, & Travis, 1970; Bell & Chaskes, 1970; Curran, 1975; DeLamater & MacCorquodale, 1979; Hunt, 1974).

Hunt (1974), for example, has suggested that there has been a dramatic increase in the frequencies with which most Americans engage in various sexual activity. He also goes on to suggest that the increase in sexual behavior appears to be especially true for females. Females were said to be reaching parity with males with regard to certain sexual behaviors such as premarital sex and oral sex.

In another study (Curran, 1975), the relationship between college students' sexual experiences and certain attitudinal and experiential factors was examined. Curran (1975) utilized responses from 88 male and 76 female students from a large, relatively conservative midwestern university which had previously participated in a "computer dating" study. The subjects completed a sexual experience questionnaire, the Heterosexual Behavior Questionnaire, as well as an attitudinal and experiential questionnaire devised by the author.

Results from Curran's study indicated that for females, commitment to a relationship is becoming less important in deciding whether to engage in "sexual activities." Data also suggested that while a greater percentage of males than females experienced the "less advanced" forms of sexual behavior (e.g., manual manipulation of genitals over and under clothes), the percentage of the females who had participated in the "more advanced" types of sexual behavior (e.g., oral manipulation of genitals to ejaculation and mutual oral-genital manipulation) equaled and sometimes exceeded the percentages of the males who had participated in similar behaviors. The parity in sexual behavior reported by the male and female subjects in the Curran (1975) study lead him to conclude that there is a convergence toward a single sexual standard.

While Curran's conclusion is consistent with other studies in the literature, a significant number of other studies have reached a different conclusion, namely that there continues to be little change in the double standard (Abbey, 1982; Burgess & Wallin, 1953; Christensen & Gregg, 1970; Darling, Kallen, & VanDusen, 1984; Davis, 1971; Robinson & Jedlicka, 1982; Sack, Keller, & Hinkle, 1981). Curran (1975) himself alluded to the continued existence of a double standard when he attempted to explain differences between male and female experiences in "less advanced" sexual behavior.

The female subjects in his 1975 study indicated they experienced fellatio and cunnilingus before coitus. This pattern, however, was reversed for males subjects. Curran hypothesized that this pattern might represent an attempt by females to enjoy sexual satisfaction while technically remaining a virgin. With that statement Curran appears to concede that there may be some value for females to refrain from some type of sexual behavior. The question remains then as to why the females in Curran's (1975) study felt a need to remain virgins and to what extent they felt they were being judged by a different set of standards than were males.

Several early works have suggested that both teens and young adults (Ehrmann, 1959; Reiss, 1967) have more permissive premarital standards for male sexual behavior than for female sexual behavior. More recently, Ferrell, Tolone, and Walsh (1977) measured the maturational changes within individuals and the societal changes between individuals, regarding the presence of a single or double standard, in an attempt to clear up the conflicting results from many of the double standard studies. They designed their study so that it contained two sequential and partially overlapping panels of students at a midwestern state university. The first panel consisted of 250 unmarried white participants that completed a self-administered questionnaire in 1967 and in 1971. The second

panel consisted of 89 unmarried white students completing virtually the same questionnaire in 1970 and 1974.

Their findings suggest that behaviorally, there is general support for the existence of a sexual double standard. Attitudinally, however, there was more support for a single standard of sexual permissiveness, with some evidence of an orthodox double standard. The attitudinal double standard which did exist was held more by males than females, and was consistent with other male endorsements for a more permissive sexual standard for both themselves and females found in other studies (DeLamater & MacCorquodale, 1979; Hunt & Hunt, 1977). This highly permissive attitude, according to Ferrell et al., (1977), was said to allow the male greater opportunity for coitus.

Female participants on the other hand not only endorsed an attitudinal single standard, they endorsed one which would not allow males more sexual freedom. Instead, they endorsed a single standard of low permissiveness. Although females were said to be moving in the direction of more permissive attitudes and behaviors, their attitudes maintaining a single standard of low permissiveness are consistent with lower self-report participation in coitus than that of males. While the attitudes of males were consistent with male behavior and female attitudes were consistent with female behavior, Ferrell et al. (1977) indicated that male attitudes and behavior were not

consistent with female attitudes and behavior. These findings were said to suggest that two separate standards for self attitudes and behavior exist, one for males and another for females.

Other evidence has been identified which also suggests that the double standard persists. For instance, males are said to often have greater latitude than females for sex without affection and for promiscuity (Hunt, 1974; Kaats, & Davis, 1970). In addition, actual behavior and stated preferences are often inconsistent with verbal rejection of the double standard (Darling & Hicks, 1983; Greenberg, 1979). Such evidence suggests that the double standard does continue to influence behavior and perceptions, and that explicit endorsement of the double standard in surveys is rare because of social desirability effects (Mark & Miller, 1986).

Others (Sprecher, McKinney, & Orbuch, 1986) have also postulated that survey results indicating repudiation of the double standard may have been influenced by subjects' motivation to provide egalitarian responses because of perceived social approval for doing so. In addition, survey results were said to tap personal standards rather than normative standards and social sanctions. Thus alternative research methods were said to be needed to further investigate the extent to which the double standard persists.

One useful but often underused method of examining societal norms involves the utilization and presentation of "target" individuals (Mark & Miller, 1986). The use of target individuals could be used to assess norms indirectly. For instance, they could be employed so they present varying levels of sexual permissiveness and different gender. Others could then judge these target individuals on the basis of their behavior. This indirect or "back door" approach would allow attitudes to be examined in a less obvious manner and thus reduce the likelihood of social acceptance skewing test results. While employing a research method designed to evoke less socially acceptable responses, Sprecher et al. (1986) presented information to male and female subjects about a target individual's first coital experience. The researcher's manipulated two aspects of the context: the stage of the relationship and the age of the person. Results indicated that a target woman was evaluated more negatively if her first coital experience occurred at a younger age (age 16 as compared to age 21) or if it occurred in a more casual rather than a steady relationship. The age of first intercourse and the stage of relationship did not affect evaluations made of a target man to the same degree. Although the findings of Sprecher et al. (1986) support a standard of permissiveness with affection, they are indicative of a double standard since the target man was

less likely than the woman to receive disapproval for engaging in casual premarital intercourse at a young age.

Janda, O'Grady, and Barnhart (1981) also used a "back-door" approach by examining the effects of expressed sexual attitudes towards female "targets." Three hundred sixty undergraduate students (180 males and 180 females) were asked to rate target females with varying sexual attitudes (e.g., sexually restrictive, sexually permissive, and sexually neutral) on a number of characteristics. Each subject was given a folder containing an "autobiographical sketch" and a rating form. Two-thirds of the experimental packets also contained a photograph of the target female. The subjects were instructed to look at the enclosed photograph (if appropriate), read the autobiographical sketch, and complete a rating form.

The "sexually permissive" female targets reportedly received the lowest ratings on the "evaluation factor" which consisted of three Likert-type items, including good-bad, moral-immoral, and responsible-irresponsible. The "sexually permissive" female targets also received the lowest rating on the factor dealing with interpersonal attraction. The result indicate that neither the men nor the women subjects in the Janda et al. (1981) study were ready to accept women who were sexually permissive.

While the sexually permissive target females received the lowest scores on the "evaluation factor," they received

the highest score on the "personality factor." Thus, while these target women were rated as bad, immoral, and irresponsible, they were also rated as being warm, friendly, and likable. Janda et al. (1981) suggested that these results reflected the notion that the target women were perceived as being highly successful in attracting men and thus were more personable. At the same time these same subjects disapproved of using sex as a means of appearing warm, friendly, and personable.

It was also reported that while both females and males rated the permissive target women less favorably than the restricted target women, the female subjects rated the permissive targets significantly less favorably than did males. This is consistent with Hunt's (1974) earlier work which suggested that women were somewhat more harsh in their evaluations of sexually active women than were men. Thus it was said that the double standard was still alive in the minds of women. Unfortunately the Janda et al. study can not provide additional information concerning the sexual double standard. Since only female targets were used, it remains unclear to which extent the double standard is in operation or whether the use of male targets would lead to significantly different results.

In another study (Mark & Miller, 1986) subjects were asked to evaluate both male and female targets on varying levels of sexual permissiveness, with the permissiveness

manipulation embedded in other information about the target. Four hundred sixty seven subjects, 210 male and 257 female, at Pennsylvania State University were asked to read a six-page "transcript" of one of several interviews between a psychologist and a normal student recruited for research. Two variables were manipulated in the study: the gender of the target and the target's sexual permissiveness. The four levels of the sexual permissiveness variable included virginity (e.g., abstinence), relationship sex (e.g., sex with affection), casual sex (e.g. sex without affection), and a control condition containing no information about sexual permissiveness.

There was little evidence to suggest the raters gave more negative evaluations to female targets than to male targets at equal levels of permissiveness. While sexual permissiveness affected ratings, it generally affected the ratings of male and female targets equally. Male subjects did rate female targets as "more sexual" than male targets if they engaged in casual sex. They were said to be exhibiting a double standard. Male subjects also ascribed greater sexuality to female targets in the control condition. Mark and Miller (1986) suggested that male subjects assumed that control targets were at least somewhat permissive. In contrast, the female subjects' ratings of sexuality did not differ for male and female targets except in the "virginity condition." In that condition male targets

were seen as less sexual than female targets. While the results of this study were said to be highly limited and somewhat equivocal, they still provided evidence of a sexual double standard.

Other studies on the sexual double standard have been said to support its influence on the expectations about extramarital sexual behavior (Mendora & Burton, 1981; Spanier & Margolis, 1983; Thompson, 1983). Harper (1961) for example, has suggested that women in general are subject to a much more stringent code of sexual ethics than are men. Kinsey et al. (1953) have also indicated that wives were more tolerant of their husbands' extramarital affairs than husbands were of their wives' (regardless of their social level). In their survey, only 27% of the women indicated that their husbands' affairs were sufficient grounds for divorce. At the same time, 51% of the men indicated that their wives' infidelity would be totally destructive to their marriages. Even though the percentages have dropped in recent years, men continue to be more unforgiving of their partners' infidelity than are women (McCary, 1978).

The sexual double standard also appears to be evidenced in the interaction between parents and their children (Greenberg, 1979; Stockard & Johnson, 1980). For example, Johnson (1977) observed that even though both fathers and mothers reported to be concerned with the morality of their

sons and daughters, both tended to be more concerned for their daughters than for their sons.

Darling and Hicks (1983) focused specifically on parent-child sexual communication by investigating the kind of impact a parental messages had on the sexual attitudes and the sexual satisfaction of young adults. Data was collected from 80 students, 59 female and 21 male, from 18 to 23 years of age, at a large southern university. The self-report questionnaire used in the study was designed to obtain not only information regarding the subjects' sexual attitudes and satisfaction with their sexual lives, but also information on the direct and indirect sexual messages of their parents.

The double standard reportedly existed in parent-child sexual communication of those participants in the Darling and Hicks (1983) study. Male and female differences regarding the communication of five type of messages were identified. The nature of the messages include a sexual double standard existed (e.g., men need more sex; it is all right for males but not females to have sex before marriage), sex is bad (e.g., sex should be delayed), save sex until marriage, and love is a prerequisite for sex.

It was reported that while both males and females hear messages about the double standard, about saving sex for marriage, as well as about negative and restrictive attitudes, females more frequently than males assimilated

all five types of messages both verbally and nonverbally. In addition, significant sex differences were said to exist for two type of messages (sex should be delayed and love is a prerequisite for sex). The females were inundated with these restrictive type messages about sex with greater frequency than were males. Hence, Darling and Hicks (1983) concluded that in an era of reportedly changing sexual attitudes and sex roles, both males and females are being socialized to adhere to the sexual double standard.

In addition to a sexual double standard existing in parental messages to children, there appears to be a marked discrepancy between what parents themselves have experienced sexually and the code of sexual ethics they profess to their children. Wake (1969) has indicated that of the women he interviewed, 30% admitted to having experienced premarital coitus. Only 3% of them, however, held a permissive attitude toward premarital coitus for their daughters and only 9% for their sons. In the same study, just over 50% of the fathers reportedly engaged in premarital coitus. In contrast, when expressing their attitude about their daughters and sons experiencing premarital coitus, the percentages were less than 10% for their daughters and about 20% for their sons.

This dual value system, which appears to be alive and well, may directly relate to the struggle some single parents (especially single mothers) voice when attempting to

satisfy their own sexual needs without negatively affecting their children. In addition to dealing with the possible effects their sexual activity may have on their offspring, single parents are faced with the question of how others may view their parental ability in light of their sexual behavior. Unfortunately, the literature has paid little attention to the beliefs others hold regarding the sexual behavior of single parents and the perceived influences that activity is thought to have on the future attitudes and sexual behavior of their children. Additionally, no research has been completed with regards to those perceptions in light of the sexual double standard.

Currently there is little information in the literature concerning the existence of the sexual double standard either among single parents or in the judgements of single parents by others (Castillo & Johnson, 1988; Johnson, Castillo, & Hanselka, 1987). In the few studies that did directly examine the double standard among single parents, differences were identified in the way male and female single parents conducted their sexual activity and how they perceived it affected their children (Greenberg, 1979; Simenauer & Carroll, 1982)). In one study, (Greenberg, 1979), single fathers were more inclined than single mothers to predicate their own sexual behavior on personal standards of comfort and to view sexuality as being more healthy. The single fathers also reported less mediation in their own

sexual behavior than did mothers because of the potential unfavorable impact it might have had on their children.

In an attempt to explore the existence of the double standard in judgments made about single parents, Johnson, Castillo, and Hanselka (1987) examined the inferences college students made about single mother "targets" and their "target" daughters based upon the single parents' sexual behavior. The study involved 173 female and 73 male undergraduate students from a major university and two junior colleges in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex. Subjects were instructed to complete a sex role inventory, read a one-page script about a hypothetical single parent and her daughter, and then to complete two questionnaires about the characters in the script. The questionnaires were designed to assess the subjects' inferences regarding both the quality of parenting displayed by the target parent and the child's sexual behavior as an adult.

It was reported that the target single mother who did not engage in any sexual activity was perceived to be a better parent than the mother who frequently had friends spend the night. Additionally, it was suggested that the target daughter in the script in which the mother frequently had male friends spend the night was perceived to be less sincere, cautious, monogamous, and reserved, while being more assertive, unconventional, impulsive, and promiscuous in her adult sexual behavior than the daughter of less

sexually permissive target mothers, (e.g., those having occasional affairs outside the home or those having a live-in lover).

While the Johnson et al. (1987), study provided some significant information concerning the judgments made by college students about single mothers and their daughters, it did not entirely examine the existence of the double standard in the inferences made about target parents and their children. For instance, it did not investigate the inferences other parents made about the quality of parenting and the future sexual behavior of the child. It also did not investigate the differences in responses from male and female subjects with respect to a male and female target parent or child.

In an attempt to more deeply address in more depth some of the unanswered questions concerning the effects of sexual double standard in perceptions about single parents, Castillo and Johnson (1988) examined the judgments about single parents from 200 married parents (100 male and 100 female) from three major metropolitan areas in Texas. The design of the study was similar to an earlier study (Johnson et al., 1987) in which subjects were asked to make inferences about target parents and their daughters. The study specifically examined the differences in perceptions between male and female subjects concerning male and female

target parents and their daughters based on the target parents' sexual activity.

Subjects were randomly assigned to one of 10 possible groups. Each subject was given a research packet containing one of 10 different one-page scenarios about a hypothetical single father or single mother and his or her daughter. Once the scenario was read, each subject was instructed to complete a questionnaire rating the parental ability of the target parent and a questionnaire predicting the target child's adult sexual behavior. The scenarios were all identical with the exception of the parent's gender and the description of the parent's sexual behavior. The statements concerning the parent's sexual behavior ranged from total abstinence to marked promiscuity (e.g., frequently having sexual partners spending the night in the home).

Castillo and Johnson (1988) suggested that the sexual double standard did in fact exist within the inferences made about sexually promiscuous single parents. It was suggested that single mothers who frequently had sexual partners spend the night were judged as being significantly worse parents than single fathers who engaged in the same sexual behavior. It was concluded that in terms of what may be considered acceptable sexual behavior for target single parents, males were judged by a different, more lenient standard than were females.

Evidence of the sexual double standard was said to appear not only in comparisons made about male and female parents, but also in comparisons made between single parents of the same gender. The target single mothers who engaged in indiscriminate sexual behavior (e.g., those having multiple sexual partners spend the night) were viewed as being worse parents than other single mothers (Castillo & Johnson, 1988). This was true for the single mothers who abstained from all sexual activity, those who have occasional affairs outside the home, as well as those who had a live-in lover. In contrast, the evaluations regarding the quality of parenting for the target single fathers exhibited no significant differences, regardless of their level of sexual activity. Single father targets appeared able to engage in more unrestrained sexual behavior without being seen by other parents as being a "bad" parent. Single mothers, on the other hand, appeared to be judged more negatively by others if they engaged in sexually promiscuous behavior.

Castillo and Johnson (1988) also indicated that even though there was disapproval for casual, careless sexual activity for single mothers (e.g., having multiple partners spend the night), there was evidence of a general acceptance for discrete, less permissive sexual activity for both single mothers and single fathers. No significant differences were identified in the attitudes of parents

towards the less sexually "promiscuous" parents, regardless of gender. These findings were consistent with the Sprecher et al. (1986) study which also indicated that while there was a general standard of permissiveness for both sexes, women are still more likely than men to receive disapproval for engaging in casual sexual activity.

The Castillo and Johnson (1988) findings are not all that surprising when viewed in light of role expectations. The duties of both child care and the socialization of children have typically been associated with the role of being a parent (Nye, 1976). Although these may be difficult roles for any individual, they have been said to be especially difficult for women (Rossi, 1968). This is because mothers have traditionally been more closely associated with child rearing than have fathers, especially in those families with younger children (Nye, 1976). Nevertheless, society appears to place a different, if not a higher, set of expectations upon mothers, which in turn, may result in more difficulty and conflicts for women.

Lynn (1969) has suggested that the sex of the child was an important variable in parent-child relationships and in different societal expectations placed on male and female parents. Parents not only displayed a different set of expectations for boys and girls, they also defined their relationships with their children differently depending upon the child's gender. Fathers reportedly took more

responsibility for the socialization of boys than of girls (Nye, 1976). Mothers, on the other hand, appeared to have more behavioral involvement with the socialization of girls than of boys (Nye, 1976). Even though the relationships with children depended to some degree on the gender of the parent and child, mothers were still said to have had more behavioral involvement with both boys and girls than did fathers (Nye, 1976). Thus, in light of continuing norms said to espouse that child socialization and care remain the greater responsibility of the mother, it is not surprising that in terms of what might be acceptable sexual behavior, single mothers are expected to adhere to a different, more stringent standard than are single fathers.

While examining the predictions made about the effects of a target parent's sexual behavior on his or her daughter, Castillo and Johnson (1988) noted that a belief that "promiscuity breeds promiscuity" appeared to exist in the responses provided by those parents who participated in their study. This reportedly was evidenced by subjects' predictions that the daughters in the sexually "promiscuous" scripts would be more promiscuous in their adult sexual behavior than any of the other script daughters. In general, subjects appeared to judge the daughters of the sexually promiscuous parents more negatively than daughters of the other script parents. For instance, daughters of those target parents who had multiple partners spend the

night were said to be significantly more seductive than daughters of parents who either abstained from sexual activity all together or went outside the home to engage in sex.

The daughter of a sexually promiscuous parent was also said to be more unconventional, as well as less responsible than the daughter of a parent who went outside the home to meet his or her own sexual needs. One hypothesis for this result was said to be that the single parent who engaged in promiscuous sexual activity may be seen by other parents as presenting a role model to the child that legitimized and encouraged both irresponsible, as well as unconventional adult sexual behavior. On the other hand, remaining celibate or at least being discreet in one's sexual activity (i.e., going outside the home) was said to reflect a single parent's more conventional and/or responsible behavior.

Results also suggested the daughter of a target parent who had frequent partners spend the night was less sincere than daughters of parents who abstained from all sexual activity. In addition, these daughters were seen as being less sincere and less careful in their adult sexual behavior than daughters of parents who had limited sexual contact away from the home. This was said to reflect the notion held by parents that the daughters of sexually promiscuous parents were not presented with a role model promoting commitment and care in interpersonal relationships. Thus,

as adults, these daughters were predicted to be prone to repeat the same behaviors (e.g., reflecting a lack of care and sincerity) displayed by their role models.

While the Castillo and Johnson (1988) study provided additional information concerning the double standard as it applied to single parents and their daughters, it left many questions unanswered. For instance, it failed to include script conditions which included a male child. The study was therefore unable to address questions concerning the effects of sexual double standard on attitudes relating to the gender of the parent, the child, and the individual making the inferences. It remains unclear whether promiscuous single mothers would still be considered worse parents than promiscuous fathers if the child in the script were male rather than female, or if the person making the judgments were male or female. There are also questions remaining about the differences, if any, the parents' sexual behavior has on sons as opposed to daughters. A number of previous studies (Darling, Kallen, & VanDusen, 1984; Davis, 1971; Sack et al., 1981; Robinson & Jedlicka, 1982) suggest such comparisons would yield significant results.

The purpose of the current research was to address issues overlooked in previous studies concerning the double standard and single parent families. While demographic information is well documented in the literature, as is general knowledge about some of the problems often facing

single parent families (e.g., the reduction of resources, role overload, social isolation, and decreased economic status), little or no attention has been paid to how single parents and their children interact with or are affected by social norms. This study attempted to examine the double standard in relation to social norms. More specifically, it attempted to assess whether individuals (e.g., married parents) endorsed the double standard as a social norm, and if so, is it in such a way that they not only see different bounds of sexual behavior as being appropriate for males and female, but also judge more negatively those who violate that norm. The use of target individuals was used in an attempt to measure sexual standards in a more indirect fashion and thus avoid the likelihood of evoking socially acceptable responses.

The current study investigated the inferences both male and female parents make about the sexual behavior of male and female single parents in relation to both sons and daughters in two important factors of family life: the quality of caretaking provided by the parent; and the future sexual behavior and attitude of the child. The following questions were addressed in the current research:

- 1) Were target single mothers judged more harshly or viewed more negatively in their parenting ability than target single fathers as a result of their sexual behavior, even though their sexual behavior was identical?

2) Did the gender pairing between the target parent and child (e.g., mother-son, mother-daughter, father-son, or father-daughter) affect the inferences made by others about the parenting ability of the single parent?

3) Were the predictions made about the target child's future sexual attitudes and behaviors influenced by the gender pairing of the target parent and child (e.g., mother-daughter, mother-son, father-daughter, or father-son)?

4) Did male and female raters (e.g., married parents) judge target single parents and their children differently, regardless of the sexual behavior of the parent or gender pairing between targets?

Findings from this research should contribute to the currently small body of information about the sexual double standard and social norms. Results may also provide an empirical base upon which single parents can make more objective decisions about meeting their own needs in light of societal norms and the potential consequences for violating those norms. Finally, the data from this study should also facilitate additional research on the sexual double standard as a societal norm, the perceptions individuals have about the sexual and social lifestyle of single parents and their children, as well as on the potential influences the sexual double standard has on those perceptions.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were based on the empirical information provided in the literature.

Hypothesis 1. The perceptions concerning the parenting ability of sexually promiscuous target mothers (e.g., those who frequently have others spend the night, condition D) would be significantly more negative than those for target fathers exhibiting the identical behavior (e.g., those in condition D), regardless of the gender pairing of the targets (e.g., mother-daughter, mother-son, father-daughter, or father-son).

Hypothesis 2. The ratings of parenting ability for the promiscuous target mothers (e.g., those frequently having sexual partners spend the night, condition D) would be significantly lower than those for the target mothers displaying less promiscuous sexual behavior (e.g., those abstaining from all sexual activity, condition A; those having occasional affairs outside the community and away from the home, condition B; those attached to a steady partner living in the home, condition C; or those in the control group, condition E), regardless of the gender pairing of the targets.

Hypothesis 3. There would be no significant difference in the ratings of parenting ability for the target single fathers, regardless of the level of sexual activity for that father (e.g., those abstaining from all sexual activity,

condition A; those having occasional affairs outside the home, condition B; those attached to a steady partner living in the home, condition C; those frequently having sexual partners spend the night, condition D; or those in the control group, condition E) or the gender pairing of the targets.

Hypothesis 4. The ratings made by female subjects concerning the parental ability of the target parents would be significantly more negative than those ratings made by male subjects, regardless of the gender of the parent, the child, or the script condition.

Hypothesis 5. The adult sexual behavior of the target daughter paired with the sexually promiscuous mother (e.g., mother-daughter gender pairing, condition D) would be judged significantly more negative than the daughters paired with less promiscuous mothers (e.g., mother-daughter pairing, conditions A, B, C, or E).

Hypothesis 6. The adult sexual behavior of the target daughter paired with the sexually promiscuous mother (e.g., mother-daughter gender pairing, condition D) would be judged significantly more negative than the target daughter paired with the sexually promiscuous father (e.g., father-daughter pairing, condition D).

Hypothesis 7. The adult sexual behavior of the target daughters would be judged more negatively than that of the

target sons regardless of the gender of the parent, the gender of the subject, or the script condition.

Hypothesis 8. The ratings concerning the future sexual behavior of the target children (male or female) made by female subjects would be significantly more negative in nature than the ratings made by male subjects, regardless of the gender pairing (e.g., father-daughter, father-son, mother-daughter, or mother-son) or the script condition.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 600 married parents (300 fathers and 300 mothers) from intact families. All participating parents had at least one child under 18 years of age in the home. Volunteer participants were solicited from three major metropolitan areas in Texas (Dallas, Houston, and San Antonio). Recruitment of volunteers continued until 30 subjects (15 male and 15 female) were obtained and randomly placed in each of the 20 experimental/script groups created for this study.

Demographic information indicated that 83% of the participants were between 26 and 45 years of age. In addition, 96% of the subjects were married longer than two years, with the majority (80%) being married for at least five years. Most of the volunteers were from white middle-to upper-middle-class families, and held college degrees or had some college or technical school experience. Fewer than 20% of the subjects were previously divorced and fewer than 1% had experienced the death of a spouse. Finally, a large majority of subjects admitted to being Christian and saw their religious beliefs as being either important or very

important (see Table A-1, Appendix A for more detailed demographic information).

Fourteen individuals (nine male and five female) did not entirely complete the research packets they were given. When queried about their failure to do so, all suggested that inadequate information was provided to accurately make inferences about the parent or the child in the scripts. Since the packets were incomplete, they were not included in the total subject count or in the statistical analysis of the data.

Instruments

The instruments used in this study included the Hypothetical Parent-Child Script, the Parent Scale, and the Child as Adult Scale.

Hypothetical Parent-Child Script. A series of scenarios about a hypothetical single parent and his or her child were developed for use in this study. The scenarios were all identical except for the script parent's gender, the child's gender, and a two-line description of the parent's sexual behavior. A total of four different gender pairings were created, resulting in four separate script sets, each one varying on the parent-child pairing. Set 1, for instance, had a mother-daughter pairing, Set 2 a father-daughter pairing, Set 3 a mother-son pairing, and Set 4 a father-son pairing. Each of the four sets contained five script conditions. The difference between the five script

conditions was the brief description of how the script single parent conducted his or her sex life (see Appendix B). The scripts varied as follows: a) Condition A: The parent had learned during marriage that he or she has strong sexual needs, but currently denied them by remaining celibate, b) Condition B: The parent had occasional affairs (e.g., sexual contacts) outside the community and away from home, c) Condition C: The parent was attached to a live-in opposite-sex partner, d) Condition D: The parent frequently had opposite-sex partners spend the night with him or her in the home, e) Condition E: The control group had no sexual message included in the scenario.

The five conditions were devised with the intention of representing four potential lifestyle options available to the parent within three general descriptive categories of sexual intimacy. These were labeled as follows: abstinence (Condition A), hidden (Condition B), and open (Conditions C and D). In the "hidden" category, the parent had engaged in sexual behavior but made attempts to conceal his or her behavior from his or her child. In contrast, the "open" categories were characterized by an openness surrounding the parent's intimate or sexual relationships. No attempt had been made by the script parent to conceal his or her behavior from his or her child. Finally, a control condition, in which the statements regarding the sexual behavior of the parent were omitted, was included.

Parent Scale (PS). The Parent Scale, a measure of perceived quality of parenting, was constructed for use in this study and was developed with the assistance of 15 judges (the majority of which were graduate students in their second or third year in a counseling or clinical doctoral psychology program at the University of North Texas). Each judge was instructed to generate a list of behavioral statements that reflected qualities of good parenting. Only those items chosen by consensus were kept as potential items for the scale; all others were omitted. Once an initial draft was completed, it was again presented to the judges. Items unanimously agreed upon by the judges were used in the scale's final form. The result was an instrument containing 19 positive statements, in a five-point Likert-type scale format, that were generally said to reflect good parenting (see Appendix C). The subjects were required to indicate the extent to which they believed each of the 19 positive statements described the parent in the Hypothetical Parent-Child Script.

Factor analysis of the scale was accomplished using a sample of 246 undergraduates and yielded two factors which have been identified. One factor reflected direct participation and interaction by the parent in the child's life. Items proving to weigh most heavily on this factor included the following: the parent listens and responds to the child, the parent praises the child often, and the

parent is involved in the child's activities. The second factor included more passive or indirect aspects of the relationship between the parent and child. The following items weighted most heavily on this factor: the parent provides nutritional meals, the parent keeps an orderly home, and the parent assures the child's good health. Reliability of this scale, as estimated by coefficient alpha, was .96.

Child as Adult (CAD). The CAD constructed for use in this study consisted of 61 adjectives generated by the same group of judges that assisted in developing the PS Scale. The selected adjectives were placed under one of four arbitrarily selected headings: a) sexual behavior, b) political behavior, c) religious behavior, and d) work behavior. The adjectives were simply descriptors of behavior and were not intended to represent an integrated scale. Therefore, no reliability analysis was performed on this instrument.

Subjects were asked to indicate, on a five-point Likert-type scale, the extent to which they believed the adjectives in the CAD described how the child in the scenario would have behaved as an adult. The ratings were intended to reflect how the subjects believed the single parent's sexual behavior in the scenario would influence the child's future behavior. The current study, exploring issues concerning sexual behavior alone, focused only on the first 17

adjectives of the CAD, (e.g., those grouped under and relating to judgments about the child's sexual behavior, see Appendix D).

Procedure

Subjects were separated on the basis of gender, then randomly assigned to one of the 20 scenario conditions. The random assignment continued until 30 subjects (15 male and 15 female) were obtained for each of the four sets of gender-pairing scripts. These sets included the following: set 1, mother-daughter pairing; set 2, father-daughter pairing; set 3, mother-son pairing; and set 4, father-son pairing.

Subjects participated in a single 45-minute session. During the session, the experimenter began by briefly introducing the study and explaining the subjects' voluntary participation. The experimenter then distributed a research packet containing a cover sheet which provided a brief, written introduction to the study (see Appendix E), an informed consent form (see Appendix F), a demographic information sheet (see Appendix G), a randomly selected script, and the dependent measures (e.g., the PS Scale and the CAD).

Upon reading the one-page introductory statement and signing the informed consent form, each subject was requested to complete the demographic information sheet. They were then instructed to read their assigned script and

to complete the dependent measures: the Parent Scale and the Child as Adult Instrument. Once all instruments were completed, the packets were collected and the subjects were subsequently debriefed about the purpose of the study. Additional feedback about results was promised to those interested individuals once the study had been completed.

Data Analysis

This study utilized a 2 x 2 x 2 x 5 (gender of subject by gender of script parent by gender of script child by script condition) factorial design and employed both a univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) and a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Data relating to the Parent Scale was analyzed by way of a factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) to identify any main or interaction effects among the independent variables. All significant results were followed by post hoc comparisons using the Newman-Keuls procedure to determine which pairs of cell means differed significantly.

A factorial multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the 17 adjectives of "sexual behavior" in the Child as Adult instrument. Significance at the multivariate level was followed by corresponding univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA), and appropriate post hoc comparisons using the Newman-Keuls procedure.

For exploratory purposes, a factor analysis on both the Parent Scale and the Child as Adult instrument was

completed. Each scale was factor analyzed by a principal axis solution with unities in the diagonal. A varimax rotation was done on all factors with latent roots of 1.0 or greater. Particular items were included in any factor on which the associated loading value was greater than or equal to .450. The percentage of the scale variance for which each factor accounted was also reported.

Upon completion of the factor analysis, the initial statistical procedures described above were repeated. This included a factorial ANOVA on the Parent Scale and Child as Adult instrument across the four independent variables (e.g. sex, script child, script parent, and script condition). All significant results were followed up by post hoc comparisons using the Newman-Keuls procedure to determine which pairs of cell means differed significantly.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The first four hypotheses in this study addressed the subject's perceptions and judgments about the hypothetical script parents in relation to the script parents' sexual behavior. This study utilized a 2 x 2 x 2 x 5 factorial design. A factorial analysis of variance was performed on the Parent Scale across the four independent variables, including the gender of the subject, the gender of the hypothetical script parent, the gender of the hypothetical script child, and the five script conditions developed for this study. A summary of the significant results of all analyses completed on the Parent Scale is presented in Table H-2, Appendix H.

The initial hypothesis addressed the question of whether sexual double standard effects were present in the subjects' predictions about sexually promiscuous target parents (e.g., those single parents frequently having sexual partners spend the night, condition D). It was predicted that the ratings made concerning the quality of parenting for sexually "promiscuous" script mothers would be significantly lower than for those made about script fathers displaying the same type of behavior. While the analysis of variance performed on the Parent Scale yielded a significant interaction effect

for the script parent and script condition variables, $F(4, 560) = 2.94$, $p < .05$, the first hypothesis was rejected. In fact, results of the Newman-Keuls post hoc analysis indicated a result opposite to that predicted. The ANOVA summary table for the Parent Scale may be found in Table H-3, Appendix I.

The post hoc analyses indicated the mean Parent Scale score for the male script parent frequently having opposite-sex partners spend the night (condition D) was significantly lower than the female script parent within the same script condition. The "promiscuous" male script parent was also viewed less favorably than the female parent engaging in no sexual activity (condition A), having occasion affairs away from the home and outside the community (condition B), and the female parent in the control condition (condition E). Post hoc comparisons also suggested there was no significant difference in the mean Parent Scale score for the sexually "promiscuous" script mother (condition D) and the script fathers in all other script conditions.

While no significant difference was established between the mean Parent Scale score for the "promiscuous" script mother (condition D) and the script father in the same condition, a significant difference was found to exist between the mean Parent Scale score for the script mother living with her sexual partner (condition C) and mean scores for some of the target fathers in other script conditions.

More specifically, the target mother who was attached to a steady partner living in the home was rated less favorably than the target father who abstained from all sexual activity (condition A), who had occasional affairs outside the community and away from the home (condition B), and the target father in the control condition (condition E). No significant difference existed between the scores for the script mother in condition C and the script father in both the same script condition (condition C) and in the sexually "promiscuous" script condition (condition D). A summary of all post hoc comparisons completed on the Parent Scale may be found in Appendix J.

The second hypothesis predicted that the mean score on the Parent Scale for a sexually promiscuous script mother would be significantly lower than the mean score for the script mother in all other script conditions. As evidenced in the summary table found in Table J-4 (see Appendix J), the hypothesis was rejected. The post hoc analyses indicated that while the script mother having frequent sexual partners spend the night (condition D) was not seen any differently from any of the other script mothers in the other four script conditions, the script mother with a steady partner in the home (condition C) was rated significantly lower than the script mother in the script containing no message about the parent's sexual behavior (Condition E).

The third hypothesis stated there was no difference in the mean Parent Scale scores for script fathers regardless of the script condition. This hypothesis was also rejected. Subsequent post hoc analyses suggested that the mean parent Scale score for the male script parent displaying sexually "promiscuous" behavior (condition D) was significantly lower than mean scores for the male script parents in all the other script conditions.

The fourth hypothesis predicted that the overall ratings made by female subjects on the Parent Scale would be significantly more negative than the ratings made by male subjects. The hypothesis was rejected. There were no main effect for the gender of the subject or any interaction effects involving the subject gender variable in the factorial ANOVA completed on the Parent Scale (see Table H-3, Appendix I).

The first four hypotheses implied that the gender pairing between the script parent and the script child was of little significance. The factorial ANOVA performed on the Parent Scale, however, indicated that this was not entirely true. This was evidenced by a two-way interaction effect found between the script parent and script child variables $F(1, 560) = 3.96, p < .05$. Subsequent Newman-Keuls post hoc analyses indicated that the mean Parent Scale score for the female parent living with her male child (i.e., in the mother-son pairing) was significantly lower

than the mean score for the female parent living with her female child (i.e., in the mother-daughter gender pairing), the male parent living with his female child (i.e., in the father-daughter gender pairing), and the male parent living with his male child (i.e., in the father-son gender pairing). Table J-5 summarizes the results of the post hoc analysis completed on the parent-child interaction effects (see Appendix J).

As presented in the summary table (see Table I-3, Appendix I), additional results of the factorial ANOVA on the Parent Scale indicated that main effects exist for both the script child variable ($F = 6.17, p < .05$) and the script condition variable ($F = 6.76, p < .05$). The mean Parent Scale score for the script parent was significantly lower when the parent in the script was living with a male child rather than a female child. Newman-Keuls post hoc analyses also indicated that the mean Parent Scale score was significantly lower for the sexually "promiscuous" parent (condition D) than the parent abstaining from all sexual activity (condition A), the parent having occasional affairs outside the home (condition B), and the parent in the control condition (condition E). In addition, the mean score for the parent living with a steady partner (condition C) was also lower than the mean score for the parent abstaining from all sexual activity (condition A) and the parent in the control condition. A summary of the post hoc

analysis completed on the script main effect is presented in Table J-6 (see Appendix J).

The final four hypotheses in this study addressed the question of whether the sexual double standard is evident in subjects' predictions concerning the adult sexual behavior of the child in the scripts. The focus of attention centered primarily around the potential influence a single parent's sexual behavior had on the predictions about his or her child's adult sexual behavior. The $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 5$ multivariate analysis of variance was performed on all 17 adjectives which collectively made up the "Sexual Behavior" section of the Child as Adult scale across the four independent variables (e.g., gender of the subject, gender of the script parent, gender of the script child, and script condition). Table K-7, Appendix K provides a summary of the significant results of all analyses performed on the Child as Adult Scale.

The fifth hypothesis predicted that the script daughter living with a sexually "promiscuous" mother (e.g., having sexual partners frequently spend the night in the home) would be judged more negatively in her adult sexual behavior than the script daughter living with a less promiscuous mother (e.g., those in all other script conditions). The hypothesis was rejected. The interaction effects for the gender of the script parent, the gender of the script child, and the script condition did not reach significant levels.

The MANOVA on the Child as Adult Scale also provided no support for the sixth hypothesis which predicted that female script children living with "promiscuous" mothers would be judged more negatively than females living with "promiscuous" script fathers. Thus the sixth hypothesis was also rejected.

The seventh hypothesis predicted that in general, the female script child would be seen more negatively in her adult sexual behavior than the male child, regardless of the parent's gender or the level of parental sexual activity displayed. While a simple main effect for the script child was established by the MANOVA performed on the Child as Adult Scale (see Table L-8, Appendix L), the results of the subsequent univariate F-tests performed on the script child variable were not consistent with the seventh hypothesis. The seventh hypothesis was thus rejected. A significant main effect for the gender of the child in the hypothetical scripts was found to exist on 7 of the 17 Child as Adult Scale items.

As the summary of the univariate F-tests on the Child as Adult Scale items across the script child variable suggests (see Table M-9, Appendix M), the female script child was judged to be more sexually sincere, careful, monogamous, responsible, and passionate as an adult than her male counterpart. In contrast, the predictions about the male script child indicated he was judged to be more sexually

cold and homosexual as an adult than was the female script child.

Contrary to the prediction made in the eighth and final hypothesis, the ratings made by female subjects concerning the adult sexual behavior of the script child, were no more negative than the ratings made by male subjects. Thus the hypothesis was rejected. While a trend was noted on five of the Child as Adult Scale items, a main effect for the gender of the subjects did not reach significant levels. Although the final hypothesis was rejected, a significant main effect for the script condition variable was identified in the multivariate analysis of variance on the Child as Adult Scale.

Subsequent univariate F-tests suggested main effects for the script condition variable on 11 of the 17 Child as Adult scale items examined in this study (see Table 10, Appendix M). The univariate analysis of variance performed on the Sincere variable yielded a significant difference among the five script conditions, $F(4, 560) = 5.33, p < .05$. Newman-Keuls post hoc analyses suggested the child living with a sexually "promiscuous" parent (condition D) was judged to be significantly less sincere in his or her adult sexual behavior than the child living with a parent abstaining from all sexual activity (condition A), having occasional affairs away from the home (condition B), living with a steady partner (condition C), or in the control condition

(condition E). A summary of the Newman-Keuls post hoc analyses on all significant Child as Adult Scale items is presented in Appendix N (see Tables N-11 - N-21).

Univariate analysis on the Careful scale item also yielded significance across the five script conditions, $F(4, 560) = 9.07, p < .05$. Post hoc analysis suggested that the child living with a parent frequently having sexual partners spend the night in the home (condition D) was judged to be sexually less careful as an adult than the child of less sexually promiscuous parents (i.e., the child in script condition A, B, C, and E). A main effect for the script condition was also found for the Conventional CAD item $F(4, 560) = 8.36, p < .05$, and the Responsible CAD item $F(4, 560) = 7.39, p < .05$. The child living with a "promiscuous" parent (condition D) was seen as being less conventional and less responsible in his or her adult sexual behavior than the child living with a more sexually discreet parent (i.e., the child in any of the other four script conditions).

A significant main effect for script condition was also obtained for the Reserved scale item, $F(4, 560) = 2.64, p < .05$. Subsequent post hoc analysis revealed that the child living with a single parent and his or her live-in-lover (condition C) was said to be significantly less sexually reserved in adulthood than the child living with a parent that has occasional sexual contact outside the community and away from the home (condition B).

The univariate analysis performed on the Passive scale item also yielded a significant main effect for the script condition variable, $F(4, 560) = 2.57, p < .05$. Significant differences were obtained in the post hoc analysis which indicated subjects expected the child living with a "promiscuous" parent (condition D) to be less sexually passive as an adult than the child in which there was occasional dating by the parent outside the community and away from the home (condition B).

The analysis also yielded main effects for script condition on the Monogamous item, $F(4, 560) = 8.44, p < .05$. Newman-Keuls post hoc analysis suggested the child living with a parent who frequently had opposite-sex partners spend the night (condition D) was predicted to be less monogamous as an adult than the child of a more sexually discreet parent (i.e., the child in conditions A, B, and E). No significant difference was found between the child living with a "promiscuous" parent (condition D) and the child whose parent has a live-in-lover (condition C). In fact, post hoc analysis indicated that like the child living with a "promiscuous" parent, the child whose parent had a live-in-lover (condition C) was also thought to be less monogamous as an adult than the child whose parent abstained from all sexual activity (conditions A), had occasional affairs away from the home (condition B), and the child in the control condition (condition E).

A main effect was also obtained by way of the univariate F-tests for the script condition variable on the Promiscuous CAD item, $F(4, 560) = 17.87, p < .05$. Newman-Keuls post hoc analyses suggested the child living with a sexually unrestrained parent (condition D) was seen as significantly more promiscuous in his or her adult sexual behavior than was the child in any of the other four script conditions. Similarly, the child whose parent has a live-in-lover (condition C) was also seen as being significantly more promiscuous as an adult than was the child living with a more sexually discreet parent (i.e., the child in script conditions A, B, and E).

The univariate F-test on the Seductive scale item yielded a significant main effect for script condition variable, $F(4, 560) = 10.99, p < .05$. Post hoc analysis revealed significant differences between the child in condition D and the child in conditions A, B, and E. As was found with the child living with a "promiscuous" parent, the child whose parent had a steady partner in the home (condition C) was seen as being more seductive in adulthood than the child living with a parent having no sexual contact (condition A), having an occasional affair away from the home (condition B), and the child in the control condition.

The Impulsive CAD item also yielded a significant main effect for script condition, $F(4, 560) = 2.73, p < .05$. Subsequent Newman-Keuls post hoc analysis suggested a

significant difference between the predictions made regarding the child in script condition D and condition E. More specifically, the child living with a parent who frequently has sexual partners spend the night (condition D) was said to be significantly more sexually impulsive as an adult than the child in the control condition, where no comment was made about the sexual behavior of the parent.

Finally, the univariate analysis conducted on the Unconventional scale item yielded a main effect for the five script conditions, $F(4, 560) = 8.40, p < .05$. Post hoc analysis indicated the child whose parent frequently had sexual partners spend the night was viewed as being significantly more unconventional in his or her adult sexual behavior than the child whose parent had no sexual contact (condition A), had occasional affairs outside the community and away from the home (condition B), or the child in the control condition (condition E).

No significant difference was evidenced in the predictions made about the child whose parent had a live-in-lover (condition C) and the child whose parent had frequent sexual partners spend the night (condition D). The child whose parent had a steady partner in the home was seen, however, as being more sexually unconventional in adulthood than was the child of a more sexually restrained parent (i.e. the child in script conditions A, B, and E).

Factor Analysis of Parent Scale. The exploratory factor analysis performed on the Parent Scale yielded two factors with an Eigen value greater than or equal to 1.00. The two Parent Scale factors accounted for 64% of the variance on the Parent Scale. All 19 Parent Scale items were included in the factor analyses. The loading values of each of Parent Scale items onto the two resulting factors are presented in the Parent Scale Factor Matrix in Table O-22, Appendix O. A description of the Parent Scale items loading significantly onto PS Factor 1 are presented in Table P-23, Appendix P. All but two Parent Scale items had a loading value of .45 or higher on PS Factor 1. In addition, those items accounted for 58% of the variance on the Parent Scale. Ten items from the Parent Scale had a loading values equal to or greater than .45 on PS Factor 2. Only 6% of the variance on the Parent Scale was accounted for by the second factor. Table P-24 found in Appendix P describes the specific items loading significantly onto PS Factor 2.

An examination of the two factors obtained on the Parent Scale suggested that Factor 1 reflected more direct and active interaction or participation on the parent's part in the child's life. The following items proved to load most heavily on the first factor: the parent actively listens and responds to the child; the parent praises the child often; the parent is involved in the child's activities; and the parent shows affection for the child by kisses, hugs,

and words. While the second Parent Scale factor reflected parents meeting the child's basic needs, it also represented more indirect aspects of the parent-child relationship, or at least those aspects requiring less interaction between parent and child. The following items loaded most heavily on the second factor: the parent provides good nutritional meals; the parent keeps an orderly home; and the parent assures the child's good health.

The exploratory analysis of variance performed on the two Parent Scale Factor scores yielded a number of significant results. A summary of the significant results of all analyses performed on the two Parent Scale factor scores is presented in Table Q-25 and Table Q-26 (see Appendix Q). A two-way interaction effect on PS Factor 1 was identified for the script parent and the script child variables, $F(1, 560) = 4.37, p < .05$. The summary table of the ANOVA on PS Factor 1 is presented in Table R-27 (see Appendix R).

Subsequent Newman-Keuls post hoc analyses indicated that the female script parent living with a male child (e.g., in the mother-son pairing), received a significantly lower mean score on PS Factor 1 than both the female script parent living with female child (e.g., in the mother-daughter pairing) and the male parent living with either a male or female child. No significant difference in the mean score on the first factor was evidenced for the male script

parent. A summary of the post hoc analysis performed on the parent-child interaction effect on PS Factor 1 is detailed in Table S-28 (see Appendix S).

A significant two-way interaction effect was also noted on the first Parent Scale factor for the parent and script variables, $F(4, 560) = 2.80, p < .05$. Newman-Keuls post hoc comparisons indicated that the male parent who frequently had opposite-sex partners spend the night (condition D) was rated more negatively than both the male parent in all the other four script conditions and the sexually discreet female parent (e.g., in conditions A, B, and E). In contrast, the female parent with a live-in-lover (condition c) was rated lower in active participation in her child's life than the celibate male parent (condition A) and both the male and female parent in the control condition. The post hoc analysis on the parent-script interaction on PS Factor 1 is summarized in Table S-29 (see Appendix S).

The ANOVA completed on the PS Factor 1 yielded a main effect for the five hypothetical script conditions, $F(4, 560) = 6.53, p < .05$. The subsequent post hoc comparisons of the script condition variable (summarized in Table S-30, Appendix S) indicated that the mean score on PS Factor 1 for the "promiscuous" parent (condition D) was significantly lower than mean score on the first factor for the script parent exhibiting more sexually discreet behavior (e.g., the parent in script conditions A, B, and E). Similarly, the

script parent with a steady partner in the home (condition C) was also rated lower on PS Factor 1 than the parent in the control condition. No significant difference, however, existed between mean PS Factor 1 scores for the parents exhibiting more sexually open and permissive behavior (e.g., those in script conditions D and C). This suggests that the subjects believe that the sexually indiscreet parent has less direct interaction or active participation in his or her child's life than the parent with little or no sexual activity.

A main effect for the script child variable was also established in the ANOVA performed on the first Parent Scale factor, $F(1,560) = 5.85, p < .05$. The mean score on PS Factor 1 for the script parent living with a male child was significantly lower than the mean score for the parent living with a female child. This suggests that the parent of a male child is thought to have less direct interaction and exhibit less active participation in his life than if the child were female.

With respect to PS Factor 2, the ANOVA yielded a two-way interaction effect for the gender of both the child and the parent in the scripts, $F(1, 560) = 3.67, p < .05$ (see Table T-31, Appendix T). Newman-Keuls post hoc analysis yielded a significantly lower mean score for the female script parent living with a male child than for a male or female parent living with a female child. The mean score on the second

Parent Scale factor was also lower for the female script parent than for the male parent when living with a male child. This suggests that when living with her son, a single mother is thought to provide fewer of the child's basic needs than a single father. A mother living with her son is also said to provide less to her child than is either a mother or a father living with a daughter. The post hoc analysis of the parent-child interaction effects on PS Factor 2 is summarized in Table U-32, Appendix U.

A significant two-way interaction effect was also noted on the second Parent Scale factor for the gender of the script parent and the script condition, $F(4, 560) = 2.21, p < .05$. Newman-Keuls post hoc comparisons indicated that the "promiscuous" male parent (condition D) was seen more negatively than both the male parent in the four other script conditions and the celibate female parent (condition A). In contrast, the female parent with a steady partner in the home (condition C) was rated lower on PS Factor 2 than the more sexually restrained male parent (e.g., the parent in script conditions A, B, and E), as well as the female parent in the control condition (see Table U-33, Appendix U). The results suggest that a single father having frequent sexual partners spending the night and a single mother having a lover in the home are both said to have more difficulty meeting the basic needs of their children than are parents who display more sexually discreet behavior.

Similar to the analysis of first factor, the ANOVA performed on the PS Factor 2 also yielded a main effect for both the child variable [$F(1, 560) = 6.21, p < .05$], and the script condition variable [$F(4, 560) = 6.25, p < .05$]. In general, the rating on the second Parent Scale factor for the script parent living with a male child was lower than the rating for the parent living with a female child. The results imply that subjects believe that a parent living with a male child is providing fewer of the basic needs of life to that child than the parent living with a female child.

Newman-Keuls post hoc comparisons of the mean score on the script variable indicated that the mean score on PS Factor 2 for the script parent frequently having sexual partners spend the night in the home (condition D) was significantly lower than the mean score on the second factor for the script parent displaying more sexually discreet behavior (e.g., the parent in script conditions A, B, and E). In addition, the mean PS Factor 2 score for the script parent with a steady partner in the home (condition C) was also significantly lower than the mean score for the script parent in the control group (see Table U-34, Appendix U).

Factor Analysis of Child as Adult Scale. The exploratory factor analysis performed on all 17 "Sexual Behavior" items on the Child as Adult instrument indicated that 60% of the variance was accounted for by five factors.

The five factors are presented in the Child as Adult Scale Factor Matrix presented in Table V-35 (see Appendix V). In addition, the relative loading values and descriptions for each of the Child as Adult Scale items in all five CAD Factors are found in Table W-36 (see Appendix W).

The first factor obtained on the Child as Adult Scale accounted for 27% of the variance on the instrument itself. There were seven Child as Adult Scale items that had value loadings of .45 or higher on the CAD Factor 1. Examination of the specific items loading significantly on the first Child as Adult Scale factor suggested the factor reflected more immature or irresponsible sexual behavior.

Six items on the Child as Adult Scale also collectively made up the second factor. The factor accounted for 12% of the variance on the Child as Adult Scale and appeared to be reflective of more mature sexual behavior. The six adjectives with loadings equal to or greater than .45 on the second Child as Adult Scale factor included the Monogamous, Reserved, Careful, Responsible, Sincere, and Impulsive items. The specific loading values of those six items are presented in Table W-36 (see Appendix W).

The final three factors obtained on the Child as Adult Scale collectively accounted for 21% of the variance. The third factor alone accounted for 9% of that variance. Just 2 of the 17 "Sexual Behavior" items of the Child as Adult Scale loaded significantly on the third factor (see Table

W-36, Appendix W for specific loading values). Factor 3 appeared to reflect more sexually expressive or assertive behavior.

Only two items, Heterosexual and Homosexual, loaded significantly on CAD Factor 4. This factor accounted for 6% of the variance on the Child as Adult Scale, and appeared to be reflective of the child's sexual orientation as an adult. The fifth and final factor appeared to reflect more sexually inhibited behavior. It also accounted for 6% of the variance of the Child as Adult scale and was loaded significantly by only three of the 17 items of concern, Passive, Conventional and Assertive.

Since CAD Factor 4 was composed of just one Child as Adult Scale variable, it was not included in the exploratory analyses completed on the other four CAD factor scores. Results of the factorial ANOVA performed on the remaining four factor scores of the Child as Adult Scale yielded a number of significant findings. These significant results are summarized in Table X-37 (see Appendix X). With respect to the first CAD factor score, a main effect for the gender of subject variable was identified, $F(1, 560) = 5.74, p < .05$. Table Y-38 (see Appendix Y) provides a summary of the ANOVA completed on CAD Factor 1. An examination of the cell means of the subjects' rating on the first factor indicated that male subjects generally predicted that the child in the hypothetical scripts would be more immature and

irresponsible in his or her adult sexual behavior than did female subjects.

A main effect for the script condition variable was also established in the ANOVA performed on the first Child as Adult Scale factor, $F(4, 560) = 10.35, p < .05$. A summary of the Newman-Keuls post hoc analyses for the script effects on CAD Factor 1 is presented in Table Z-39, Appendix Z. The post hoc analysis indicated that the script child living with a parent frequently having opposite-sex partners spend the night (condition D) received a significantly higher score on CAD Factor 1 than did the script child in any of the other four script conditions. Similarly, the child living with a parent and his or her parent's live-in-lover (condition C) also had a higher mean score on CAD Factor 1 than the child living with a more sexually discreet parent (e.g., the child in conditions A, B, and E). This indicated that the child living with either a "promiscuous" parent or a parent with a live-in-lover was thought to exhibit more sexually immature or irresponsible behavior in adulthood than the child living with a parent who engages in little or no sexual activity.

The ANOVA on CAD Factor 1 also identified a main effect for the parent variable, $F(1, 560) = 4.19, p < .05$, and for the gender of the subject, $F(1, 560) = 5.74, p < .05$. An examination of the means for the parent variable indicated that the script child living with a male parent was said to

be more immature and irresponsible in his or her adult sexual behavior than the script child living with a female parent. At the same time, male subjects predicted that the child in the script would be more sexually immature and irresponsible in adulthood than did their female counterparts.

Analysis of CAD Factor 2 suggest main effects exist for the child variable $F(1, 560) = 15.40, p < .05$, as well as the script condition variable, $F(4, 560) = 9.39, p < .05$. A summary of the ANOVA completed on CAD Factor 2 is presented in Table AA-40 (see Appendix AA). In general, the female script child received higher mean scores on the second Child as Adult Scale factor than did the male script child. This indicates that the subjects predicted that the female script child was thought to exhibit more mature or responsible sexual behavior as an adult than did the male script child, regardless of the gender of the parent or the level of sexual activity of the parent.

As presented in Table BB-41 (see Appendix BB), post hoc analysis of the script variable indicates that the child living with a parent frequently having sexual partners spend the night in the home (condition D) and the child living with parent having a live-in-lover (condition C) both received a lower mean score on CAD Factor 2 than the child living with a parent abstaining from all sexual contact (condition A), having occasional affairs away from the home

(condition B), and the child in the control condition. This suggests that a child living with a "promiscuous" parent or a parent with a live-in-lover is thought to exhibit less mature or responsible sexual behavior in adulthood than a child living with a more sexually discreet parent.

The ANOVA performed on the third Child as Adult factor score yielded a significant main effect for the child variable, $F(1, 560) = 11.43, p < .05$, and the script condition variable, $F(4, 560) = 6.55, p < .05$ (see Table CC-42, Appendix CC). The mean score for the male script child was significantly lower on CAD Factor 3 than the mean score for the female script child. Thus the male child in the script was thought to be less sexually expressive as an adult than the female script child.

Post hoc analysis of the script variable indicated that the script child living with a parent frequently having partners spend the night (condition D) received a greater mean score on CAD Factor 3 than the script child living with a more sexually discreet parent (e.g., in script conditions A, B, and E). No significant difference was seen between the mean scores of the child living with a sexually indiscreet parent (condition D) and the child living with a parent and the parent's live-in-lover (condition D). In contrast, the child living with a parent and his or her steady partner also received a greater mean score on the third Child as Adult factor than the target child living

with a sexually celibate parent (condition A) or the child in the control condition (see Table DD-43, Appendix DD). This suggests that the more "promiscuous" a parent is the more his or her child will be thought to be more sexually expressive as an adult.

The summary Table for the ANOVA performed on the final Child as Adult Scale factor is presented in Table EE-44, Appendix EE. While the factorial analysis of variance performed on CAD Factor 5 yielded a two-way interaction effect between the script parent and script child variables, post hoc analysis indicated that this effect was not significant at the .05 level (see Table FF-45, Appendix FF). A main effect for the script condition variable was also indicated in the ANOVA performed on the fifth Child as Adult Scale factor, $F(4, 560) = 8.70, p < .05$. Subsequent Newman-Keuls post hoc analyses indicated that the child living with a "promiscuous" parent (condition D) received a significantly lower mean score on CAD Factor 5 than did the child in any of the other script conditions. The post hoc analysis on the script effects on the final factor score is summarized Table FF-46, Appendix FF. The results of the comparisons indicate that the child living with a "promiscuous" parent is thought to exhibit less conventional sexual behavior as an adult than the child of a more sexually discreet parent.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This study has investigated whether or not the presence of the sexual double standard exists in subject inferences concerning single parents and their children. It has examined whether a relationship exists between the gender of the subject, the gender of the hypothetical script parent, and the script child. If so, does this relationship impact judgments made about that script parent's parenting ability and predictions made about the adult sexual behavior of the child? This study's main objectives have been to (a) explore whether single mothers engaging in various levels of sexual activity are judged differently from single fathers engaging in the same type of sexual activity, (b) determine whether male and female subjects have significantly different attitudes about the impact of single parents' sexual behavior on their families, and (c) explore whether the gender pairing between the single parents and their children influences the perceptions made about those parents and their children's future behavior.

Examination of the demographic information obtained in this study suggests that the sample reflects a relatively young, well educated group of people. Most have been married only once and for at least five years to the same

individual. The racial and socioeconomic composition of the sample also suggests that the sample used in this study reflects a group of white, upper-middle class parents. A few minority parents, mainly Hispanic, have also been represented in this study. Thus, any generalizations drawn from the results of the current study are limited to the population reflected by its participants.

While the numerous hypotheses generated in this study were all rejected, the results still provide evidence suggesting that a sexual double standard of sorts does exist in the inferences made about sexually active single parents. It appears, however, that the sexual double standard concerning single parents' sexual behavior is somewhat different from the double standard that appears to exist for males and females in general. For instance, it has been demonstrated that single fathers who frequently have sexual partners spending the night are judged to be significantly worse parents than single mothers who engage in the same sexual behavior. The "promiscuous" single fathers are also thought to be worse parents than both mothers who abstain from all sexual behavior and those who have occasional affairs outside the community and away from the home. In contrast, mothers living a sexually "promiscuous" lifestyle (e.g., those having frequent partners spending the night), are not judged to be any worse parents than any of the single fathers displaying all levels of sexual activity.

While single mothers in general are not seen as being worse parents than single fathers, single mothers live-in lovers are seen in a much different light. In fact, the ratings for single mothers who have a steady partner living in the home are not thought to be significantly different from single fathers engaging in frequent sexual activity with opposite sex partners in the home. Those single mothers are judged to be worse parents than many single fathers, including those who abstain from all sexual activity and those who have occasional affairs away from the home.

When comparing the ratings of single fathers and single mothers with other single parents of the same gender, significant male-female differences have been identified. Single fathers who engage in indiscriminate sexual behavior (e.g., those having frequent partners spend the night) are viewed as being worse parents than other, less sexually permissive fathers. This is true for fathers abstaining from all sexual activity, those having occasional affairs outside community and away from the home, as well as those with a live-in lover. On the other hand, no differences have been noted in judgments made about the parenting ability of single mothers, regardless of their level of sexual activity.

Thus, in terms of what married parents consider to be acceptable sexual activity for single parents, it appears

that females are being judged by a different standard from males. As long as single mothers do not cohabit with a man out of wedlock, they appear to be able to engage in more unrestrained sexual behavior without the stigma of being labeled a "bad" parent. Single fathers, on the other hand, appear to be judged more negatively by others if they engage in similar sexually promiscuous behavior. This is in contrast to what one might have expected, given the current literature.

One explanation for these results may be that they reflect a biased opinion about the quality of one's parenting ability which favors women in general. Mothers may be seen as having good parenting abilities, regardless of the nature of their sexual behavior. They may be given the "benefit of the doubt" and their ability as parents is not questioned just because of their promiscuous sexual behavior. This biased opinion about parenting ability may provide single mothers with more flexibility, up to a point, in their sexual behavior.

With respect to single mothers, making a commitment outside of wedlock appears to give evidence to some that those single mothers are no longer providing their child with things typically viewed as reflective of good parenting. The specific factors contributing to the different opinions about single mothers and fathers remain unclear at this time. What is evident from the results of

this study, however, is the fact that a double standard does exist in the inferences made about the sexual behavior of male and female single parents.

One question that has not been addressed in the current study is whether single parents who are judged to be worse parents than others will be thought to be less likable or less attractive people. As earlier studies have suggested, people are likely to have very different opinions about sexually active single parents if they are judged on dimensions other than parenting ability. For example, it is plausible to assume that while single fathers engaging in indiscriminate sexual behavior are viewed as being worse parents than less sexually indiscreet parents, they may still be seen as being likable single adults. Future studies are needed to examine the nature and implications of the potential differences that may exist in attitudes about single parents.

The results of this study do suggest the existence of somewhat different attitudes about single parents based upon the gender pairings of the parents and their children. To begin with, parents with sons in the home have been judged to be worse parents than parents living with their daughters, regardless of their level of sexual activity. More specifically, single mothers living with male children have been viewed as being significantly worse parents than single mothers living with female children. These single

mothers have also been said to be worse parents than single fathers living with either their sons or daughters. When examining the differences more closely (e.g., using the results of the analyses completed on the factor scores), it has been said that single mothers living with their sons are less directly involved or interactive with their children and provide less of the basic needs of life than single mothers living with their daughters.

Even though single mothers may be seen as generally having better parenting skills than single fathers, they are still judged more harshly when living with their sons than with their daughters, regardless of their sexual behavior. It may be postulated that the single mothers are viewed in a more negative fashion because they are seen as not adhering to their expected societal roles. Earlier works have suggested that mothers have traditionally been more closely associated with child rearing and are expected to have more responsibility in caring for their daughters than for their sons. Mothers in general have also been thought to have more behavioral involvement and responsibility for the socialization of their children than have fathers. Thus, in light of norms espousing child socialization and care to remain the greater responsibility of the mother, single mothers may be expected to adhere to the societal preconception of caring more for daughters than for sons. If this norm is violated, it may not be not surprising that

mothers are viewed in a more negative fashion. Since fathers have not been socialized to be as involved with their children, whether sons or daughters, they may be held to a less stringent standard than are single mothers.

The results of the current study have also suggested that there is no significant difference in the attitudes of others toward more sexually discreet parents, regardless of the gender of those parents. On the other hand, parents displaying a more promiscuous sexual lifestyle are generally judged to be significantly worse parents than parents who abstain from all sexual activity or those who have occasional affairs outside the community and away from the home. Thus, there is evidence of a general acceptance for discreet, less permissive sexual activity for both single mothers and single fathers. These findings are in contrast to earlier studies which have indicated that while there is a general standard of permissiveness for both genders, women are still more likely than men to receive disapproval for engaging in casual sexual activity.

When examining the overall scores on the Parent Scale, no significant difference has been noted between the ratings made by male and female subjects. The male and female subjects both appear to have similar views concerning the implications of single parents' sexual activity. This finding is in contrast to previous research suggesting that males have more permissive sexual attitudes than females.

One explanation for the discrepancy in findings in this study may be the limitations of the Parent Scale itself. While the Parent Scale may indicate general attitudes about one's parenting ability, it may not provide more specific information about all aspects of good parenting. Future studies may thus need to develop a more sensitive or comprehensive instrument to evaluate the multiple dimensions of parenthood.

In addition, examining the two factors identified on the Parent Scale suggests there still may be some congruence between the views of male and female married parents about single parents. Both male and female subjects view those parents exhibiting sexually indiscriminate behavior as being significantly worse parents than those displaying more discreet sexual behavior. The parents having frequent partners spending the night are seen as being less directly involved with their children than parents abstaining from all sexual activity. These findings are also in contrast to earlier studies suggesting that males would have more permissive attitudes about sexual activity than females.

These discrepancies may be explained by the fact that in contrast to previous research focusing on premarital sexual behavior, the current research has specifically examined the postmarital sexual behavior of single parents. Perhaps because the subjects in this study have all been parents themselves, they may share common ideas and standards

concerning the roles and acceptable behavior for parents. This single standard in the attitudes of parents in general may overshadow any potential sexual double standard existing between males and females.

Results of the current study also provide some evidence of the double standard in judgments made concerning the impact of single parents' sexual behavior on their offspring. For instance, the female children of the single parents in the scripts are generally thought to be more responsible, sincere, careful, monogamous, and passionate in their adult sexual behavior than are male children. At the same time, the male children in the scripts are thought to be more sexually cold and homosexual as adults than are female children. These predictions are made regardless of the gender of the parents in the scripts or the level of the parents' sexual behavior.

An examination of the analyses of variance performed on the factor scores of the Child as Adult instrument also suggests that a different set of expectations exists for the male and female children in the scripts. Subjects indicate that regardless of the parents' gender or level of sexual activity, the female children in the scripts are likely to exhibit more mature sexual behavior as adults than are the male script children. At the same time, those same female children have are said to be more sexually expressive or passionate in adulthood than are males.

Gender differences are noted in the opinions of male and female subjects when making predictions about the future sexual behavior of the script children. Male subjects in general indicate that the children in the scripts are going to be more immature and irresponsible in their adult sexual behavior than do female subjects.

This is in contrast to results of previous research suggesting that males are more permissive in their attitudes and allow greater latitude in their sexual activity than do females. Unlike previous research, however, the current study focused on the indirect effects of a specific situation (i.e., living in a single-parent home) and the effects of the behavior of one individual on another (i.e., the effects of parents' sexual behavior on their children), rather than on the consequences of the individual's own behavior. The current findings suggest that males may tend to focus on the potential negative consequences for the children living with a single parent. In any case, the results provide evidence to indicate that gender differences persist in the attitudes of males and females.

While these gender differences may exist, the results of the current study also suggest that there are some aspects of parental attitudes that are more reflective of a single sexual standard. For instance, the sexual behavior of single parents has been said to impact the predictions made about the children in the script, regardless of the gender

of the parents or children. Both male and female offspring of the sexually indiscriminate parents are predicted to be more permissive and immature in their adult sexual behavior than children of more sexually discreet parents.

More specifically, children of parents frequently having partners spend the night are said to be less conventional, sincere, careful, and responsible than children living with parents abstaining from all sexual activity, those having occasional affairs outside the community and away from the home, as well as those having a steady partner living in the home. Those children are also said to be less sexually passive and monogamous as adults than children whose parents exhibited discreet sexual behavior by going away from the home to meet their sexual needs. This may be reflective of the notion held by parents that children of sexually indiscreet parents are not being presented with role models promoting adequate commitment and care in interpersonal relationships. Thus, these children are said to be more prone to, in adulthood, repeat behaviors which exhibit less care and sincerity as displayed by their parental role models.

In addition to inferring that promiscuity breeds promiscuity, evidenced by subjects' predictions that the children of sexually indiscreet parents are likely to be more promiscuous in their adult sexual behavior than the children of more sexually restrained parents, subjects

predict that a number of deleterious effects will also occur for the children of sexually active parents. For instance, it is said that the children of sexually indiscreet parents become less sexually passive and conventional as adults than children from less sexually permissive parents. Results also indicate that the children of sexually unrestrained parents will be more seductive and unconventional in adulthood than children of parents who either abstain from sexual activity totally or are discreet enough to go outside the home.

As with the case of children living with sexually indiscreet parents, children living with parents having a steady partner in the home are thought to display similar immature and permissive sexual behaviors as adults. These children are seen as being less monogamous in adulthood than children whose parents abstain totally from any type of sexual behavior or those who left the home on occasion to meet their sexual needs. They are also predicted to be less reserved in their adult sexual behavior than children living with parents who had occasional affairs outside the community and away from the home. At the same time, there is said to be more sexual seductiveness, unconventionality, and promiscuity in the adult behavior of children living with parents and their unwed partners than children living with celibate or sexually discreet parents.

It can be said that those single parents engaging in indiscreet sexual activity are thought to be presenting a role model to their children that legitimizes or at least encourages promiscuous, irresponsible, and unconventional adult sexual behavior. Remaining celibate or at least being discreet in one's sexual activity, on the other hand, may be viewed to reflect more conventional or appropriate behavior for the single parent. If true, then the children of more sexually unrestrained parents may understandably be thought to exhibit the same behaviors in adulthood that have been modeled to them earlier in their lives.

Several limitations of the present study are noted which may offer directions for future research. As with the case of the Parent Scale, the factor analysis performed on the Child as Adult Scale suggests that the nature of the instrument itself may have contributed to a lack of more significant results in this study. It appears that the information obtained from the analysis of variance completed on the factor scores provides more information concerning the attitudes about the future sexual behavior of the script children than does the analyses performed on the entire scale itself.

Thus, efforts should be made in future studies to better refine the Child as Adult Scale and the Parent Scale, or at least to focus more attention on the factor scores rather than the overall scale scores. The scales may also need

revision to exclude those items that either fail to weigh significantly on any one particular factor or fail to differentiate between the hypothetical parents and children in the various scripts. It seems plausible to assume that if the identified factor scores or revised scale scores are used, the discriminating power of the Child as Adult Scale, as well as the Parent Scale, will improve greatly, thus yielding additional information about the perceptions of single parents and their children.

If the perceptions and predictions about hypothetical single parents and children accurately reflect one's true attitudes, then the results of this study suggest that a sexual double standard of sorts does exist in the overall judgments made about sexually active single parents. The results also indicate that in terms of the predictions made about the adult sexual behavior of the children, there is evidence of sexual double standard effects. However, the use of hypothetical single parents and children as the stimulus for the subjects' judgments and predictions may be considered a limitation of the study. It is possible that the scripts themselves lack the realism of actual single parent families. While the use of real life individuals may result in a more accurate rating of their behavior, it is highly unlikely such a study could be conducted.

Another limitation of the present study may be the found in the selection and choice of subjects. While limiting

participants in the current study (e.g., married parents with children 18 years or younger living in the home) controls many extraneous variables, it also restricts the kinds of generalizations that can be made from the results. The selection of subjects also prevents any comparisons between the attitudes of married and single parents, couples without children, and single adults. Since one's attitudes may greatly depend on the level of one's involvement in a given situation or activity, as well as on one's experiences, it may prove worthwhile to explore these comparisons in future research.

Regardless of the limitations noted in this study, the findings provide significant information about gender differences in attitudes about single parent families. To begin with, when added to the general body of knowledge in the sexual double standard literature, the obtained results may lead to continued research within this content area. For, despite studies that provide some evidence for a collapsing double standard, the results of the present study indicate that the sexual double standard still remains a part of today's society.

The information from the current study may also have immediate applicability to single parents, as well as to counselors and other mental health professionals working with single parent families. This research establishes an empirical data base that may be drawn upon to assist single

parents with decisions concerning their own sexual activities. The data base may be utilized to evaluate a parent's own sexual behavior, the effects that behavior is seen to have on his or her child, as well as on his or her own reputation. More responsible decisions concerning the implications of one's actions may be reached by using the empirical information provided in this study rather than by relying on inaccurate or anecdotal information.

The current findings may also contribute to a better understanding of the perceived difficulty single parents have in meeting both the needs of their children as well as their own needs for intimacy and sexual gratification. In addition, the findings bring to light a number of issues involving the difficulty many children in single parent families may have in being judged as a result of their parents' behavior.

One issue raised involves how others may interact with the children of sexually active single parents. For instance, while the children of sexually indiscreet single parents are judged to be more sexually permissive and immature as adults, it remains unclear whether these judgments will significantly influence the way others interact with these children. If it is shown that attitudes do influence interactions, then there may be significant differences in the way others interact with these children. It may be that others may reinforce, attend to, or expect

the child to display certain behaviors which may in turn contribute to the child exhibiting those same behaviors. There is a need for further exploration into the potential implications of the expectations and interactions by others on these children and on the behaviors they display in adulthood.

Another question arising from the current study involves whether other parents' perceptions concerning the child of a sexually active parent will influence decisions to allow their own children to interact with, as well as to impact the nature of their own interactions with that child. In other words, if an individual predicts that a child will display sexually permissive behaviors as an adult, will he or she also view the child to be a "negative" influence on his or her own children? If so, will it influence the decision to allow his or her own children to socialize with such a "bad" child? In addition, will it influence the kind of contact allowed with that child? Further studies are thus needed to investigate these remaining questions, as well as to explore the many implications a parent's sexual behavior may have on the social and psychological development of their children.

As previously mentioned, future research should be directed toward exploring the many unresolved issues concerning single-parent families. This is especially true with regards to the nature of gender role expectations and

the sexual double standard itself. Research, then should continue to explore the potential implications which the sexual double standard has on the nature of parenthood for the single parent and the gender role expectations for all members of single-parent families, especially the children.

APPENDIX A
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA TABLE

Appendix A

Table A-1

Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Data

Age	Range	Frequency	Percent
	18-25	39	7
	26-35	298	50
	36-45	198	33
	46-55	58	10
	56-Over	7	1

Race	Source	Frequency	Percent
	White	490	82
	Black	25	4
	Hispanic	73	12
	Asian	7	1
	Other	5	1

Education	Level	Frequency	Percent
	Under HS	5	1
	HS/GED	59	10
	Some Col./Tech	248	41
	Bachelors	174	29
	Grad. Degree	114	19

Religion	Affiliation	Frequency	Percent
	Catholic	186	31
	Jewish	8	1
	Protestant	236	39
	NC Christian*	100	17
	Agnostic	16	3
	Atheist	4	1
	Other	50	8

* Non-Catholic Christian

(table continues)

Religion	Importance	Frequency	Percent
	Very Important	246	41
	Important	248	41
	Minimally	88	15
	Unimportant	17	3

Marriage	Length	Frequency	Percent
	Under 6 mos.	10	2
	6 mos.-2 yrs.	11	2
	2 yrs.-5 yrs.	103	17
	5 yrs.-10 yrs.	202	34
	Over 10 yrs.	273	46
	Not Applicable	1	.2

Prior Divorce	Number	Frequency	Percent
	1	97	16
	2	9	2
	3	2	.3
	Over 3	4	1
	Not Applicable	488	81

Spousal Death	Number	Frequency	Percent
	1	5	1
	Not Applicable	595	99

Income	Level	Frequency	Percent
	Under 10K	4	1
	10K-20K	47	8
	20K-35K	138	23
	35K-50K	188	31
	Over 50K	206	34
	Did Not Answer	17	3

Note. N = 600 Married Parents.

APPENDIX B
EXPERIMENTAL SCRIPTS

Appendix B

Experimental Scripts

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MARY ANN SIMONS
(Set 1, Condition A)

Mary Ann Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old mother who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. She has one child, a girl, Madelyn, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Mary Ann works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Mary Ann's marriage was quite a learning experience for her in many ways. Prior to her marriage, she was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that she had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, however, she has had no sexual contacts.

She also discovered that she enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for her friends. Her ex-husband taught her to play tennis and she plays whenever she gets a chance.

Mary Ann was reared in a middle class family and considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood. She is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MARY ANN SIMONS
(Set 1, Condition B)

Mary Ann Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old mother who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. She has one child, a girl, Madelyn, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Mary Ann works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Mary Ann's marriage was quite a learning experience for her in many ways. Prior to her marriage, she was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that she had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, however, her sexual contacts have been limited to occasional affairs outside the community and away from home.

She also discovered that she enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for her friends. Her ex-husband taught her to play tennis and she plays whenever she gets a chance.

Mary Ann was reared in a middle class family and considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood. She is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MARY ANN SIMONS
(Set 1, Condition C)

Mary Ann Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old mother who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. She has one child, a girl, Madelyn, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Mary Ann works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Mary Ann's marriage was quite a learning experience for her in many ways. Prior to her marriage, she was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that she had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, she has become attached to a man who lives with her and Madelyn most of the time.

She also discovered that she enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for her friends. Her ex-husband taught her to play tennis and she plays whenever she gets a chance.

Mary Ann was reared in a middle class family and considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood. She is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MARY ANN SIMONS
(Set 1, Condition D)

Mary Ann Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old mother who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. She has one child, a girl, Madelyn, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Mary Ann works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Mary Ann's marriage was quite a learning experience for her in many ways. Prior to her marriage, she was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that she had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, she has remained sexually active and frequently has male friends spend the night with her in the apartment.

She also discovered that she enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for her friends. Her ex-husband taught her to play tennis and she plays whenever she gets a chance.

Mary Ann was reared in a middle class family and considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood.

Mary Ann was reared in a middle class family and considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood. She is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MARY ANN SIMONS
(Set 1, Condition E)

Mary Ann Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old mother who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. She has one child, a girl, Madelyn, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Mary Ann works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Mary Ann's marriage was quite a learning experience for her in many ways. She discovered that she enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for her friends. Her ex-husband taught her to play tennis and she plays whenever she gets a chance.

Mary Ann was reared in a middle class family and considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood. She is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MICHAEL SIMONS
(Set 2, Condition A)

Michael Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old father who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. He has one child, a girl, Madelyn, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Michael works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Michael's marriage was quite a learning experience for him in many ways. Prior to his marriage, he was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that he had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, however, he has had no sexual contacts.

He discovered that he enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for his friends. His ex-wife taught him to play tennis and he plays whenever he gets a chance.

Michael was reared in a middle class family and considers himself to have had an average sort of childhood. He is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MICHAEL SIMONS
(Set 2, Condition B)

Michael Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old father who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. He has one child, a girl, Madelyn, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Michael works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Michael's marriage was quite a learning experience for him in many ways. Prior to his marriage, he was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that he had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, however, his sexual contacts have been limited to occasional affairs outside the community and away from home.

He also discovered that he enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for his friends. His ex-wife taught him to play tennis and he plays whenever he gets a chance.

Michael was reared in a middle class family and considers himself to have had an average sort of childhood. He is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MICHAEL SIMONS
(Set 2, Condition C)

Michael Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old father who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. He has one child, a girl, Madelyn, who is six years old.

Michael Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old father who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. He has one child, a girl, Madelyn, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Michael works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Michael's marriage was quite a learning experience for him in many ways. Prior to his marriage, he was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that he had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, he has become attached to a woman who lives with him and Madelyn most of the time.

He also discovered that he enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for his friends. His ex-wife taught him to play tennis and he plays whenever he gets a chance.

Michael was reared in a middle class family and considers himself to have had an average sort of childhood. He is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MICHAEL SIMONS
(Set 2, Condition D)

Michael Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old father who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. He has one child, a girl, Madelyn, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Michael works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Michael's marriage was quite a learning experience for him in many ways. Prior to his marriage, he was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that he had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, he has remained sexually active and frequently has female friends spend the night with him in the apartment.

He also discovered that he enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for his friends. His ex-wife taught him to play tennis and he plays whenever he gets a chance.

Michael was reared in a middle class family and considers himself to have had an average sort of childhood. He is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MICHAEL SIMONS
(Set 2, Condition E)

Michael Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old father who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. He has one child, a girl, Madelyn, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Michael works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Michael's marriage was quite a learning experience for him in many ways. He discovered that he enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for his friends. His ex-wife taught him to play tennis and he plays whenever he gets a chance.

Michael was reared in a middle class family and considers himself to have had an average sort of childhood. He is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MARY ANN SIMONS
(Set 3, Condition A)

Mary Ann Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old mother who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. She has one child, a boy, David, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Mary Ann works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Mary Ann's marriage was quite a learning experience for her in many ways. Prior to her marriage, she was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that she had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, however, she has had no sexual contacts.

She also discovered that she enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for her friends. Her ex-husband taught her to play tennis and she plays whenever she gets a chance.

Mary Ann was reared in a middle class family and considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood. She is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.
considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood. She is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MARY ANN SIMONS
(Set 3, Condition B)

Mary Ann Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old mother who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. She has one child, a boy, David, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Mary Ann works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Mary Ann's marriage was quite a learning experience for her in many ways. Prior to her marriage, she was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that she had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, however, her sexual contacts have been limited to occasional affairs outside the community and away from home.

She also discovered that she enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for her friends. Her ex-husband taught her to play tennis and she plays whenever she gets a chance.

Mary Ann was reared in a middle class family and considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood. She is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MARY ANN SIMONS
(Set 3, Condition C)

Mary Ann Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old mother who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. She has one child, a boy, David, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Mary Ann works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Mary Ann's marriage was quite a learning experience for her in many ways. Prior to her marriage, she was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that she had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, she has become attached to a man who lives with her and David most of the time.

She also discovered that she enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for her friends. Her ex-husband taught her to play tennis and she plays whenever she gets a chance.

Mary Ann was reared in a middle class family and considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood. She is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MARY ANN SIMONS
(Set 3, Condition D)

Mary Ann Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old mother who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. She has one child, a boy, David, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Mary Ann works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Mary Ann's marriage was quite a learning experience for her in many ways. Prior to her marriage, she was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that she had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, she has remained sexually active and frequently has male friends spend the night with her in the apartment.

She also discovered that she enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for her friends. Her ex-husband taught her to play tennis and she plays whenever she gets a chance.

Mary Ann was reared in a middle class family and considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood. She is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MARY ANN SIMONS
(Set 3, Condition E)

Mary Ann Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old mother who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. She has one child, a boy, David, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Mary Ann works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Mary Ann's marriage was quite a learning experience for her in many ways. She discovered that she enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for her friends. Her ex-husband taught her to play tennis and she plays whenever she gets a chance.

Mary Ann was reared in a middle class family and considers herself to have had an average sort of childhood. She is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MICHAEL SIMONS
(Set 4, Condition A)

Michael Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old father who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. He has one child, a boy, David, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Michael works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Michael's marriage was quite a learning experience for him in many ways. Prior to his marriage, he was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that he had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, however, he has had no sexual contacts.

He discovered that he enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for his friends. His ex-wife taught him to play tennis and he plays whenever he gets a chance.

Michael was reared in a middle class family and considers himself to have had an average sort of childhood. He is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MICHAEL SIMONS
(Set 4, Condition B)

Michael Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old father who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. He has one child, a boy, David, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Michael works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Michael's marriage was quite a learning experience for him in many ways. Prior to his marriage, he was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that he had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, however, his sexual contacts have been limited to occasional affairs outside the community and away from home.

He also discovered that he enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for his friends. His ex-wife taught him to play tennis and he plays whenever he gets a chance.

Michael was reared in a middle class family and considers himself to have had an average sort of childhood. He is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MICHAEL SIMONS
(Set 4, Condition C)

Michael Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old father who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. He has one child, a boy, David, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Michael works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Michael's marriage was quite a learning experience for him in many ways. Prior to his marriage, he was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that he had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, he has become attached to a woman who lives with him and David most of the time.

He also discovered that he enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for his friends. His ex-wife taught him to play tennis and he plays whenever he gets a chance.

He also discovered that he enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for his friends. His ex-wife taught him to play tennis and he plays whenever he gets a chance.

Michael was reared in a middle class family and considers himself to have had an average sort of childhood. He is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MICHAEL SIMONS
(Set 4, Condition D)

Michael Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old father who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. He has one child, a boy, David, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Michael works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Michael's marriage was quite a learning experience for him in many ways. Prior to his marriage, he was very inexperienced sexually, but during marriage discovered that he had strong sexual needs. Since the divorce, he has remained sexually active and frequently has female friends spend the night with him in the apartment.

He discovered that he enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for his friends. His ex-wife taught him to play tennis and he plays whenever he gets a chance.

Michael was reared in a middle class family and considers himself to have had an average sort of childhood. He is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the script below and base your answers to the questions which follow the script on your own opinions about the characters.

MICHAEL SIMONS
(Set 4, Condition E)

Michael Simons is an attractive, 29-year-old father who was divorced two years ago after eight years of marriage. He has one child, a boy, David, who is six years old. They live together in a two bedroom apartment to which they moved after the divorce. Michael works as an accountant for a local company and sometimes does extra work.

Michael's marriage was quite a learning experience for him in many ways. He discovered that he enjoyed cooking and still regularly cooks for his friends. His ex-wife taught him to play tennis and he plays whenever he gets a chance.

Michael was reared in a middle class family and considers himself to have had an average sort of childhood. He is politically moderate and regularly attends religious services.

APPENDIX C
PARENT SCALE

APPENDIX D
CHILD AS ADULT SCALE

Appendix D

Child as Adult Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: Please make predictions concerning how the CHILD is likely to behave when an adult in important areas of personal life. Adjectives describing personal behaviors in these areas are listed below. Please mark the extent to which you agree that the adjectives describe how the CHILD will behave when an adult.

SEXUAL BEHAVIOR

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree		
assertive	1	2	3	4	5	
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	
careful	1	2	3	4	5	
heterosexual	1	2	3	4	5	
passive	1	2	3	4	5	
impulsive	1	2	3	4	5	
conventional	1	2	3	4	5	
manipulative	1	2	3	4	5	
monogamous	1	2	3	4	5	
reserved	1	2	3	4	5	
homosexual	1	2	3	4	5	
cold	1	2	3	4	5	
responsible	1	2	3	4	5	
passionate	1	2	3	4	5	
seductive	1	2	3	4	5	
unconventional	1	2	3	4	5	
promiscuous	1	2	3	4	5	

POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree		
independent	1	2	3	4	5	
liberal	1	2	3	4	5	
active	1	2	3	4	5	
conservative	1	2	3	4	5	
inactive	1	2	3	4	5	
progressive	1	2	3	4	5	
radical	1	2	3	4	5	
moderate	1	2	3	4	5	
communistic	1	2	3	4	5	

Child as AdultRELIGIOUS BEHAVIOR

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
devout	1	2	3	4	5
spiritual	1	2	3	4	5
agnostic	1	2	3	4	5
reverent	1	2	3	4	5
righteous	1	2	3	4	5
doubting	1	2	3	4	5
hypocritical	1	2	3	4	5
fanatical	1	2	3	4	5
pious	1	2	3	4	5
blasphemous	1	2	3	4	5
atheistic	1	2	3	4	5
saintly	1	2	3	4	5
irreverent	1	2	3	4	5

WORK BEHAVIOR

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
dependable	1	2	3	4	5
lazy	1	2	3	4	5
industrious	1	2	3	4	5
productive	1	2	3	4	5
careless	1	2	3	4	5
punctual	1	2	3	4	5
irresponsible	1	2	3	4	5
steady	1	2	3	4	5
hustling	1	2	3	4	5
competent	1	2	3	4	5
efficient	1	2	3	4	5
undependable	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX E
INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Appendix E

Introductory Statement

Dear Participant,

During the recent past we have seen a great rise in the divorce rate. With the increase in divorce there has been an increase in the number of unmarried men and women who are rearing children alone. Many questions have arisen as to what the ultimate consequences of this "new" type of family will be for society and for the individuals involved. These are the issues which we are asking you to address in this research project.

This study will require that you to read a very brief description of a single parent and his/her child. Upon completing the short script you will be asked to complete some questionnaires. The questionnaires each contain instructions which are self-explanatory. Some will require you to make judgements about a parent, and to put yourself in the parent's place. Other questionnaires will ask you to predict how the child in the script will think and behave as you to make judgements about a parent, and to put yourself in the parent's place. Other questionnaires will ask you to predict how the child in the script will think and behave as an adult. We believe that you might find this task quite difficult because we are asking you to make judgements about the parents and children on the basis of very little information. Difficult as it may be, we think you can do it.

Some of the questions ask about your beliefs about family, marital, and work issues. Most of the questions, however, are about the personal, family, and work issues of the characters in the brief script which you will read. As you see it is complicated.

If you chose to participate in this study, your answers will be kept confidential. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions in the survey. We are interested in how groups as a whole responds, not your individual answers. Please answer as rapidly and as honestly as you can. If you choose to do so, you may withdraw from the study at any time. There will be no risks or discomforts involved in this study, and it is hoped that the results will aid clinicians and researchers in their understanding of single parent families.

Thank you for your participation.

APPENDIX F
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Appendix F

Informed Consent Form

NAME OF SUBJECT: _____
 (please print)

The purpose of this research is to study the perceptions which people hold concerning the effect on a child of being reared in a family with a single parent. I hereby give consent to participate in the investigational procedure, which will involve the following:

Completing questionnaires about my beliefs about family, marital and work issues and also about the personal, intimacy, family, and work issues of characters in a brief script which I will read.

I have heard/read a clear explanation and understand the nature of the procedure and any discomforts or risks involved. I have also heard/read a clear explanation and understand the benefits that might be expected. I understand that the procedure to be performed is investigational and that I may withdraw my consent for my participation at any time.

With my understanding of this, having received this information and satisfactory answers to the questions I have asked, I voluntarily consent to participate in the procedure designated above.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
 Subject

Signed: _____ Date: _____
 Witness

This research is being conducted under the supervision of Ray W. Johnson, Ph.D., Principal Investigator. Any questions pertaining to this study may be directed to him at the University of North Texas Psychology Department, (817) 565-2650.

APPENDIX G
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET .

Appendix G

Demographic Data Sheet

INSTRUCTIONS: On the line beside each statement, place the number that corresponds to the answer that best describes you. Please respond to all items.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p><u> </u> Sex</p> <p>1. Male</p> <p>2. Female</p> <p>3. 36-45</p> <p>4. 46-55</p> <p>5. 56-</p> | <p><u> </u> Age</p> <p>1. 18-25</p> <p>2. 26-35</p> <p>3. Hispanic</p> <p>4. Asian</p> <p>5. Other</p> | <p><u> </u> Race</p> <p>1. White</p> <p>2. Black</p> |
| <p><u> </u> Formal education</p> <p>1. Less than high school</p> <p>2. High school/GED</p> <p>3. Some college or tech school</p> <p>4. Bachelor's degree</p> <p>5. Graduate degree</p> | | |
| <p><u> </u> Religious Affiliation</p> <p>1. Catholic</p> <p>2. Jewish</p> <p>3. Protestant</p> <p>4. Non-Catholic Christian
(Denomination: _____)</p> <p>5. Agnostic</p> <p>6. Atheist</p> <p>7. Other</p> | <p><u> </u> How important are your
religious beliefs to your life?</p> <p>1. Very important</p> <p>2. Important</p> <p>3. Minimally important</p> <p>4. Unimportant</p> | |
| <p><u> </u> Marital Status</p> <p>1. Never married</p> <p>2. Married</p> <p>3. Divorced</p> <p>4. Widowed</p> <p>5. Widower</p> | <p><u> </u> If married, how long have you
been married to present spouse?</p> <p>1. Less than 6 months</p> <p>2. 6 months to 2 years</p> <p>3. 2 to 5 years</p> <p>4. 5 to 10 years</p> <p>5. Longer than 10 years</p> <p>6. Not Applicable</p> | |
| <p><u> </u> Number of prior marriages that ended in divorce?</p> <p>1. One</p> <p>2. Two</p> <p>3. Three</p> <p>4. More than 3</p> <p>5. Not Applicable</p> | | |

_____ Number of prior marriages that ended in death?

1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. More than 3
5. Not Applicable

_____ Approximate total number of years married to other partners?

1. Less than one year
2. 1 to 2 years
3. 2 to 5 years
4. 5 to 10 years
5. More than 10 years
6. Not Applicable

_____ Number of children, biologically or by legal adoption?

1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. More than 3
5. Not Applicable

_____ Number of children now living with you?

1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. More than 3
5. Not Applicable

_____ Counting what you and your spouse get from all sources, what was your total income last year?

1. Under \$10,000
2. \$10,000 to \$20,000
3. \$20,000 to \$35,000
4. \$35,000 to \$50,000
5. Over \$50,000

_____ If divorced, who received custody of the child(ren)?

1. I received custody.
2. My spouse received custody.
3. A close relative received custody.
4. A friend or someone other than a close relative received custody.
5. Not Applicable.

_____ Number of your children now living with your exspouse?

1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. More than 3
5. Not Applicable

_____ Are both your parents living?

1. Yes
2. No

_____ If no, which parent is deceased?

1. Both parents are deceased
2. Mother
3. Father
4. Not Applicable

_____ How old were you at the time of your mother's death?

1. 0-1 year
2. 2-3 years
3. 4-5 years
4. 6-12 years
5. 13-16 years
6. 17 years or older
7. Not Applicable

_____ How old were you at the time of your father's death?

1. 0-1 year
2. 2-3 years
3. 4-5 years
4. 6-12 years
5. 13-16 years
6. 17 years or older
7. Not Applicable

_____ Were your parents divorced?

1. Yes
2. No

_____ How old were you at the time of your parents' divorce?

1. 0-1 year
2. 2-3 years
3. 4-5 years
4. 6-12 years
5. 13-16 years
6. 17 years or older
7. Not Applicable

_____ If parents were divorced, who received custody of you?

1. Father
2. Mother
3. Grandparent
4. Aunt/Uncle
5. Other
6. Not Applicable

_____ Did your mother remarry?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not Applicable

_____ How old were you at the time of your mother's remarriage?

1. 0-1 year
2. 2-3 years
3. 4-5 years
4. 6-12 years
5. 13-16 years
6. 17 years or older
7. Not Applicable

_____ Did you approve of your mother's remarriage?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not Applicable

_____ Did your father remarry?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not Applicable

_____ How old were you at the time of your father's remarriage?

- | | |
|---------------|----------------------|
| 1. 0-1 year | 5. 13-16 years |
| 2. 2-3 years | 6. 17 years or older |
| 3. 4-5 years | 7. Not Applicable |
| 4. 6-12 years | |

_____ Did you approve of your father's remarriage?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not Applicable

_____ Were you reared by someone other than your natural (biological) parents?

1. Foster parents
2. Stepparent
3. Close friend or relative
4. Other
5. Not Applicable

APPENDIX H
SUMMARY OF PARENT SCALE ANALYSES

Appendix H

Table H-2

Summary of Significant Results on the Parent Scale

Effect	Results
Child	The parent living with a male child received a significantly lower mean Parent Scale score than the parent living with a female child.
Script	<p>The single parent frequently having opposite-sex partners spending the night in the home was rated lower on the Parent Scale than either the parent who remained celibate, had occasional affairs away from the home, or the parent in the control condition (e.g., having no message about the parent's sexual behavior).</p> <p>The parent who had a live-in-lover received a lower score on the Parent Scale than the parent having no sexual contact or the parent in the control condition.</p>
Parent x Child	The mother living with a male child had a lower Parent Scale score than the mother living with a female child and a father living with either a male or female child.
Parent x Script	<p>The mean Parent Scale score was lower for the male parent who frequently had opposite-sex partners spend the night in the home than the male parent having no sexual contact, having limited contact outside the home, living with a live-in-lover, or the male parent in the control condition.</p> <p>The promiscuous male single-parent received a significantly lower Parent Scale score than the female parent exhibiting any type of sexual behavior (e.g., within any of the five script conditions).</p> <p>A female parent living with an opposite-sex partner had a lower score on the Parent Scale than the male parent with no sexual activity, occasional affairs outside the home, the male parent in the control condition.</p>

APPENDIX I
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE ON PARENT SCALE

Appendix I

Table I-3

Summary of Analysis of Variance on Parent Scale

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	p
Main Effects				
Sex	1	132.54	0.80	.372
Parent	1	162.24	0.98	.323
Child	1	1024.42	6.17	.013*
Script	4	1121.82	6.76	.000*
2-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent	1	18.73	0.11	.737
Sex x Child	1	17.34	0.11	.747
Sex x Script	4	202.22	1.22	.302
Parent x Child	1	657.31	3.96	.047*
Parent x Script	4	487.92	2.94	.020*
Child x Script	4	214.21	1.29	.272
3-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent x Child	1	204.17	1.23	.268
Sex x Parent x Script	4	83.09	0.50	.735
Sex x Child x Script	4	36.86	0.22	.926
Parent x Child x Script	4	105.82	0.64	.636
4-way Interactions				
Sex x Par x Chld x Script	4	216.87	1.31	.266
Explained	39	310.05	1.87	.001
Residual	560	165.93		

Note. * = significant at .05 level

APPENDIX J
NEWMAN-KEULS ANALYSES ON PARENT SCALE

Appendix J

Table J-4

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Interaction Effects of Parent
and Script Variables on Parent Scale

Parent/Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
2/5-2/4	10.62*	10	7.42
2/5-1/3	7.82*	9	7.29
2/5-1/4	4.88	8	7.12
2/5-1/2	4.08	7	6.92
2/5-2/3	3.55	6	6.69
2/5-1/1	3.33	5	6.41
2/5-2/2	1.25	4	6.03
2/5-1/5	0.50	3	5.49
2/5-2/1	0.00	2	4.61
2/1-2/4	10.62*	9	7.29
2/1-1/3	7.82*	8	7.12
2/1-1/4	4.88	7	6.92
2/1-1/2	4.08	6	6.69
2/1-2/3	3.55	5	6.41
2/1-1/1	3.33	4	6.03
2/1-2/2	1.25	3	5.49
2/1-1/5	0.50	2	4.61
1/5-2/4	10.12*	8	7.12
1/5-1/3	7.32*	7	6.92
1/5-1/4	4.38	6	6.69
1/5-1/2	3.58	5	6.41
1/5-2/3	3.05	4	6.03
1/5-1/1	2.83	3	5.49
1/5-2/2	0.75	2	4.61
2/2-2/4	9.37*	7	6.92
2/2-1/3	6.57*	6	6.69
2/2-1/4	3.63	5	6.41
2/2-1/2	2.83	4	6.03
2/2-2/3	2.30	3	5.49
2/2-1/1	2.08	2	4.61
1/1-2/4	7.29*	6	6.69
1/1-1/3	4.49	5	6.41
1/1-1/4	1.55	4	6.03
1/1-1/2	0.75	3	5.49
1/1-2/3	0.22	2	4.61

(table continues)

Parent/Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
2/3-2/4	7.07*	5	6.41
2/3-1/3	4.27	4	6.03
2/3-1/4	1.33	3	5.49
2/3-1/2	0.53	2	4.61
1/2-2/4	6.54*	4	6.03
1/2-1/3	3.74	3	5.49
1/2-1/4	0.80	2	4.61
1/4-2/4	5.74*	3	5.49
1/4-1/3	2.94	2	4.61
1/3-2/4	2.80	2	4.61

Note. * significant at .05 level, $df = 560$, $r =$ number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** Pairing of parent and script variable as described in text.

1/1 = female/A, 1/2 = female/B, 1/3 = female/C,

1/4 = female/D, 1/5 = female/E, 2/1 = male/A, 2/2 = male/b

2/3 = male/C, 2/4 = male/D, 2/5 = male/E.

Table J-5

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Interaction Effects on Parent
and Child Variables on Parent Scale

Parent/Child**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
1/1-1/2	4.71*	4	3.81
1/1-2/2	1.57	3	3.48
1/1-2/1	1.05	2	2.91
2/1-1/2	3.66*	3	3.48
2/1-2/2	0.52	2	2.91
2/2-1/2	3.14*	2	2.91

Note. * significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** gender pairings of targets as described in text.

1/1 = mother/daughter, 1/2 = mother/son, 2/2 = father/son,
2/1 = father/daughter.

Table J-6

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on Parent Scale

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
5-4	7.42*	5	4.55
5-3	5.43*	4	4.28
5-2	2.42	3	3.96
5-1	1.42	2	3.26
1-4	6.08*	4	3.96
1-3	4.01*	3	3.26
1-2	1.00	2	3.26
2-4	6.08*	3	3.96
2-3	3.01	2	3.26
3-4	2.07	2	3.26

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

APPENDIX K
SUMMARY OF CHILD AS ADULT SCALE ANALYSES

Appendix K

Table K-7

Summary of Significant Results on Child as Adult Scale

Effect	Results
Child	<p>The female child was said to be more sexually monogamous, responsible, sincere, careful, and passionate in her adult sexual behavior than the male child.</p> <p>The male child in the scripts was said to be more sexually cold and homosexual as an adult than the female child.</p>
Script	<p>The child living with a parent frequently having opposite-sex partners spend the night in the home (condition D) was thought to be less sincere, careful, conventional, and responsible in his or her adult sexual behavior than the child in any of the other script conditions.</p> <p>The child living with a sexually "promiscuous" parent (condition D) and the child living with a parent and live-in-lover was seen as less monogamous in adulthood than the child whose parent had no sexual contact (condition A), limited sexual contact away from the home (condition B), and the child in the control condition.</p> <p>The child living with a sexually indiscreet parent (condition D) was seen as being less passive in his or her adult sexual behavior than the child living with a parent that has occasional affairs outside the community and away from the home (condition B).</p> <p>The child living with a parent and the parent's steady partner (condition C) was viewed as being less reserved sexually in adulthood than the child living with a parent having limited sexual contact (condition B).</p>

(table continues)

Effect	Results
Script	<p data-bbox="468 422 1364 615">The child living with a sexually "promiscuous" parent (condition D) and the child living with a parent having a live-in-lover was said to be more sexually seductive and unconventional as an adult than the child living with a more sexually discreet parent (condition A, B, & E).</p> <p data-bbox="468 642 1325 800">The child living with a parent frequently having partners spend the night (condition D) was said to be more promiscuous as an adult than the child in any of the other script conditions.</p> <p data-bbox="468 835 1364 1029">The child living with a parent and the parent's live-in-lover (condition C) was thought to be more promiscuous than the child whose parent had no sexual contact (condition A), limited contact away from the home (condition B), and the child in the control condition.</p> <p data-bbox="468 1060 1349 1161">The child living with a "promiscuous" parent was seen as being more sexually impulsive than the child in the control condition.</p>

APPENDIX L
MANOVA SUMMARY TABLE ON CHILD AS ADULT SCALE

Appendix L

Table L-8

Summary of Multivariate Analysis of Variance on Child as
Adult Scale using Wilks' Lambda

Source of Variation	df	F	p
Sex	1/582	1.58	.063
Parent	1/582	0.99	.473
Child	1/582	2.74	.000*
Script	4/2274	2.37	.000*
Sex x Parent	1/580	0.76	.743
Sex x Child	1/580	0.67	.838
Sex x Script	4/2255	0.94	.613
Parent x Child	1/580	1.58	.065
Parent x Script	4/2255	0.88	.739
Child x Script	4/2255	1.03	.404
Sex x Parent x Child	1/576	1.00	.460
Sex x Parent x Script	4/2216	1.08	.306
Sex x Child x Script	4/2216	1.00	.481
Parent x Child x Script	4/2216	1.14	.208
Sex x Par x Child x Script	4/2137	0.94	.615

Note. * = significant at .05 level

APPENDIX M
UNIVARIATE F-TESTS SUMMARY TABLE ON CAD SCALE

Appendix M

Table M-9

Summary of Univariate F-tests of Child Variable Effects on
Child as Adult Scale

Variable	SS	MS	F	p
Assertive	0.00	0.00	0.00	.961
Sincere	8.17	8.17	11.01	.001*
Careful	17.00	17.00	18.08	.000*
Heterosexual	3.08	3.08	3.47	.063
Passive	0.03	0.03	0.03	.859
Impulsive	0.01	0.01	0.01	.932
Conventional	0.81	0.81	0.93	.334
Manipulative	1.13	1.13	1.04	.309
Monogamous	8.88	8.88	7.61	.006*
Reserved	0.06	0.06	0.08	.782
Homosexual	2.54	2.54	4.13	.042*
Cold	7.48	7.48	7.02	.008*
Responsible	11.48	11.48	13.56	.000*
Passionate	16.48	16.48	21.75	.000*
Seductive	0.67	0.67	0.73	.393
Unconventional	0.11	0.11	0.10	.743
Promiscuous	4.34	4.34	3.15	.076

Note. DF = (4,560), * = significant at .05 level.

Table M-10

Summary of Univariate F-tests of Script Variable Effects on
Child as Adult Scale

Variable	SS	MS	F	p
Assertive	5.07	1.27	1.89	.111
Sincere	15.36	3.84	5.32	.000*
Careful	31.66	7.91	9.07	.000*
Heterosexual	4.37	1.09	1.23	.295
Passive	8.41	2.10	2.56	.037*
Impulsive	9.79	2.45	2.73	.029*
Conventional	27.87	6.96	8.36	.000*
Manipulative	9.48	2.37	2.21	.067
Monogamous	37.69	9.42	8.44	.000*
Reserved	8.23	2.06	2.64	.033*
Homosexual	3.73	0.93	1.52	.194
Cold	5.59	1.40	1.33	.255
Responsible	23.76	5.94	7.39	.000*
Passionate	2.92	0.73	0.99	.413
Seductive	38.11	9.52	10.99	.000*
Unconventional	32.87	8.22	8.40	.000*
Promiscuous	88.18	22.04	17.87	.000*

Note. DF = (4,560), * = significant at .05 level.

APPENDIX N
NEWMAN-KEULS ANALYSES ON CHILD AS ADULT SCALE

Appendix N

Table N-11

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on the Sincere
Child as Adult Scale Item

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
5-4	0.46*	5	0.31
5-3	0.40*	4	0.29
5-2	0.40*	3	0.26
5-1	0.06	2	0.21
1-4	0.40*	4	0.29
1-3	0.14	3	0.26
1-2	0.14	2	0.21
2-4	0.26*	3	0.26
2-3	0.00	2	0.21
3-4	0.26*	2	0.21

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

Table N-12

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on the Careful
Child as Adult Scale Item

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
5-4	0.67*	5	0.35
5-3	0.32*	4	0.32
5-1	0.18	3	0.30
5-2	0.12	2	0.24
2-4	0.55*	4	0.32
2-3	0.20	3	0.30
2-1	0.06	2	0.24
1-4	0.49*	3	0.30
1-3	0.14	2	0.24
3-4	0.35*	2	0.24

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

Table N-13

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on the Passive
Child as Adult Scale Item

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
2-4	0.35*	5	0.30
2-3	0.15	4	0.29
2-5	0.09	3	0.26
2-1	0.07	2	0.23
1-4	0.28	4	0.29
1-3	0.08	3	0.26
1-2	0.02	2	0.23
5-4	0.26	3	0.26
5-3	0.06	2	0.23
3-4	0.20	2	0.23

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

Table N-14

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on the Impulsive
Child as Adult Scale Item

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
4-5	0.38*	5	0.35
4-2	0.27	4	0.33
4-1	0.19	3	0.30
4-3	0.12	2	0.25
3-5	0.26	4	0.33
3-2	0.15	3	0.30
3-1	0.07	2	0.25
1-5	0.19	3	0.30
1-2	0.08	2	0.25
2-5	0.11	2	0.25

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

Table N-15

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on the
Conventional Child as Adult Scale Item

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
5-4	0.57*	5	0.30
5-3	0.25	4	0.29
5-2	0.03	3	0.26
5-1	0.03	2	0.23
1-4	0.54*	4	0.29
1-3	0.16	3	0.26
1-2	0.00	2	0.23
2-4	0.54	3	0.26
2-3	0.22	2	0.23
3-4	0.32*	2	0.23

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

Table N-16

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on the
Monogamous Child as Adult Scale Item

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
2-4	0.62*	5	0.39
2-3	0.40*	4	0.36
2-5	0.03	3	0.33
2-1	0.02	2	0.27
1-4	0.60*	4	0.36
1-3	0.38*	3	0.33
1-5	0.01	2	0.27
5-4	0.59*	3	0.33
5-3	0.37*	2	0.27
3-4	0.22	2	0.27

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

Table N-17

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on the Reserved
Child as Adult Scale Item

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
2-3	0.33*	5	0.30
2-4	0.25	4	0.29
2-1	0.12	3	0.26
2-5	0.08	2	0.23
5-3	0.25	4	0.29
5-4	0.17	3	0.26
5-1	0.04	2	0.23
1-3	0.21	3	0.26
1-4	0.13	2	0.23
4-3	0.08	2	0.23

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

Table N-18

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on the
Responsible Child as Adult Scale Item

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
2-3	0.50*	5	0.30
2-4	0.27	4	0.29
2-1	0.01	3	0.26
2-5	0.01	2	0.23
5-3	0.49*	4	0.29
5-4	0.27	3	0.26
5-1	0.00	2	0.23
1-3	0.49*	3	0.26
1-4	0.22	2	0.23
4-3	0.23*	2	0.23

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

Table N-19

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on the
Seductive Child as Adult Scale Item

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
4-5	0.63*	5	0.35
4-1	0.57*	4	0.33
4-2	0.45*	3	0.30
4-3	0.10	2	0.25
3-5	0.53*	4	0.33
3-1	0.47*	3	0.30
3-2	0.35*	2	0.25
2-5	0.18	3	0.30
2-1	0.12	2	0.25
1-5	0.06	2	0.25

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

Table N-20

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on the
Unconventional Child as Adult Scale Item

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
4-1	0.58*	5	0.35
4-5	0.57*	4	0.33
4-2	0.53*	3	0.30
4-3	0.20	2	0.25
3-1	0.38*	4	0.33
3-5	0.37*	3	0.30
3-2	0.33*	2	0.25
2-1	0.05	3	0.30
2-5	0.04	2	0.25
5-1	0.01	2	0.25

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

Table N-21

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on the
Promiscuous Child as Adult Scale Item

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
4-1	1.00*	5	0.39
4-5	0.95*	4	0.36
4-2	0.87*	3	0.33
4-3	0.44*	2	0.28
3-1	0.58*	4	0.36
3-5	0.51*	3	0.33
3-2	0.43*	2	0.28
2-1	0.13*	3	0.33
2-5	0.08	2	0.28
5-1	0.05	2	0.28

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

APPENDIX O
FACTOR STRUCTURE OF PARENT SCALE

Appendix O

Table O-22

Factor Structure of the Parent Scale

PS Item	Factor 1	Factor 2
PS1	.810*	.195
PS2	.841*	.256
PS3	.863*	.275
PS4	.526*	.370
PS5	.854*	.284
PS6	.722*	.284
PS7	.656*	.167
PS8	.653*	.481*
PS9	.161	.764*
PS10	.576*	.519*
PS11	.454*	.711*
PS12	.159	.808*
PS13	.635*	.549*
PS14	.584*	.532*
PS15	.734*	.391
PS16	.562*	.449*
PS17	.581*	.428
PS18	.547*	.536*
PS19	.595*	.451*

Note. Variables with factor loading of .45 were considered to principally define each factor, and are provided with asterisks.

APPENDIX P
DESCRIPTION AND ITEM LOADINGS OF PS FACTORS

Appendix P

Table P-23

Description and Items Loadings of Parent Scale Factor 1

Loading	Item
.863	3. The parent actively listens and responds to the child.
.854	5. The parent praises the child often.
.841	2. The parent is involved in the child's activities.
.810	1. The parent shows affection for the child by kissing, hugging and verbal expression.
.734	15. The parent enjoys playing with and having fun with the child.
.722	6. The parent disciplines the child when it is needed.
.656	7. The parent shows him/herself to the child (anger, sadness, happiness).
.653	8. The parent is patient with the child.
.635	13. The parent helps the child prepare for and participates in the child's educational experience.
.595	19. The parent loves the child.
.584	14. The parent sets limits on the child's behavior.
.581	17. The parent encourages the child to play with other children.
.576	10. The parent is available when needed by the child.
.562	16. The parent supports the child's efforts to achieve independence by encouraging the child to solve his/her own problems.
.547	18. The parent is honest with the child.
.526	4. The parent models the behavior and beliefs he/she wishes to instill in the child.
.454	11. The parent assures the child's good health.

Table P-24

Description and Items Loading on Parent Scale Factor 2

Loading	Item
.808	12. The parent provides good nutritional meals.
.764	9. The parent keeps an orderly house.
.711	11. The parent assures the child's good health.
.549	13. The parent helps the child prepare for and participates in the child's educational experience.
.536	18. The parent is honest with the child.
.532	14. The parent sets limits on the child's behavior.
.519	10. The parent is available when needed by the child.
.481	8. The parent is patient with the child.
.451	19. The parent loves the child.
.449	16. The parent supports the child's efforts to achieve independence by encouraging the child to solve his/her own problems.

APPENDIX Q
SUMMARY OF PS FACTOR SCORE ANALYSES

Appendix Q

Table Q-25

Summary of Significant Results on PS Factor 1

Effect	Results
Child	The parent living with a male child was said to have less active participation in or be less directly involved with his or her child than the parent living a female child.
Script	<p>The parent frequently having opposite-sex partners spend the night (condition D) was thought to be less directly involved in the child's life than the parent who had no sexual contact (condition A), limited sexual contact away from the home (condition B), and the parent in the control condition.</p> <p>The parent living with a live-in-lover was said to have less direct participation in his or her child's life than the sexually celibate parent (condition A) and the parent in the control condition.</p>
Parent x Child	The female parent living with a male child was said to be less directly involved in the child's life than the male parent living with a male child or a parent of either gender living with a female child.
Parent x Script	The male parent frequently having sexual partners spend the night (condition D) was judged to have less direct participation in his child's life than the female parent exhibiting similar sexual activity, the male parent displaying more discreet behavior (conditions A, B, C, and E), as well as the female parent having little or no sexual contact (condition A, B, and E).

Table Q-26

Summary of Significant Results on PS Factor 2

Effect	Results
Child	The parent living with a male child was said to provide less of the basic needs of the child than the parent living with a female child.
Script	<p>The sexually "promiscuous" parent (condition D) was thought not to meet the basic needs of the child as effectively as the parent having no sexual contact (condition A), having limited contact away from the home (condition B), and the parent in the control condition.</p> <p>The parent living with a steady partner also received a lower mean PS Factor 2 score than the parent in the control condition.</p>
Parent x Child	The female parent living with a male child was said to be less effective in meeting the basic needs of her child than the male parent living with a male child or a parent of either gender living with a female child.
Parent x Script	<p>The sexually "promiscuous" male parent (condition D) was said to have more difficulty meeting the basic need of his child than the more sexually discreet male parent (conditions A, B, C, and E), and the female parent in the control condition.</p> <p>The female parent living with a Live-in-lover (condition C) was also thought to be less effective in providing the basic needs to her child than the celibate male parent (condition A), the male parent having occasional affairs away from the home (condition B), and the female parent in the control condition.</p>

APPENDIX R
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE OF PS FACTOR 1

Appendix R

Table R-27

Summary of Analysis of Variance on Parent Scale Factor 1

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	p
Main Effects				
Sex	1	127.88	0.89	.347
Parent	1	120.60	0.84	.361
Child	1	842.54	5.85	.016*
Script	4	941.31	6.53	.000*
2-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent	1	43.20	0.30	.584
Sex x Child	1	15.68	0.11	.742
Sex x Script	4	163.07	1.13	.341
Parent x Child	1	630.38	4.37	.037*
Parent x Script	4	402.86	2.80	.026*
Child x Script	4	163.04	1.13	.341
3-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent x Child	1	173.88	1.21	.272
Sex x Parent x Script	4	76.58	0.53	.713
Sex x Child x Script	4	35.71	0.25	.911
Parent x Child x Script	4	102.34	0.71	.585
4-way Interactions				
Sex x Par x Child x Script	4	161.17	1.12	.347
Explained	39	259.94	1.80	.002
Residual	560	144.12		

Note. * = significant at .05 level

APPENDIX S
NEWMAN-KEULS ANALYSES ON PS FACTOR 1

Appendix S

Table S-28

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Interaction Effects of Parent
and Child Variables on Parent Scale Factor 1

Parent/Child**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
1/1-1/2	4.42*	4	3.56
1/1-2/2	1.49	3	3.24
1/1-2/1	1.16	2	2.72
2/1-1/2	3.26*	3	3.24
2/1-2/2	0.32	2	2.72
2/2-1/2	2.94*	2	2.72

Note. * significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** gender pairings of targets as described in text.

1/1 = mother/daughter, 1/2 = mother/son, 2/2 = father/son,
2/1 = father/daughter.

Table S-29

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Interaction Effects of Parent
and Script on Parent Scale Factor 1

Parent/Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
2/5-2/4	9.69*	10	6.93
2/5-1/3	7.19*	9	6.80
2/5-1/4	4.39	8	6.65
2/5-1/2	3.65	7	6.46
2/5-2/3	3.27	6	6.25
2/5-1/1	2.70	5	5.98
2/5-2/2	1.07	4	5.63
2/5-1/5	0.59	3	5.13
2/5-2/1	0.00	2	4.29
2/1-2/4	9.69*	9	6.80
2/1-1/3	7.19*	8	6.65
2/1-1/4	4.39	7	6.46
2/1-1/2	3.65	6	6.25
2/1-2/3	3.27	5	5.98
2/1-1/1	2.70	4	5.63
2/1-2/2	1.07	3	5.13
2/1-1/5	0.59	2	4.29
1/5-2/4	9.10*	8	6.65
1/5-1/3	8.62*	7	6.46
1/5-1/4	3.80	6	6.25
1/5-1/2	3.06	5	5.98
1/5-2/3	2.68	4	5.64
1/5-1/1	2.11	3	5.13
1/5-2/2	0.48	2	4.29
2/2-2/4	8.62*	7	6.46
2/2-1/3	6.12	6	6.25
2/2-1/4	3.32	5	5.98
2/2-1/2	2.58	4	5.63
2/2-2/3	2.20	3	5.13
2/2-1/1	1.63	2	4.29
1/1-2/4	6.99*	6	6.25
1/1-1/3	4.49	5	5.98
1/1-1/4	1.69	4	5.63
1/1-1/2	0.95	3	5.13
1/1-2/3	0.57	2	4.29

(table continues)

Parent/Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
2/3-2/4	6.39*	5	5.98
2/3-1/3	3.92	4	5.63
2/3-1/4	1.12	3	5.13
2/3-1/2	0.38	2	4.29
1/2-2/4	6.04*	4	5.63
1/2-1/3	3.54	3	5.13
1/2-1/4	0.74	2	4.29
1/4-2/4	5.30*	3	5.13
1/4-1/3	2.80	2	4.29
1/3-2/4	2.50	2	4.29

Note. * significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** Pairing of parent and script variable as described in text.

1/1 = female/A, 1/2 = female/B, 1/3 = female/C,

1/4 = female/D, 1/5 = female/E, 2/1 = male/A, 2/2 = male/b

2/3 = male/C, 2/4 = male/D, 2/5 = male/E.

Table S-30

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Variable Effects on
Parent Scale Factor 1

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
5-4	6.75*	5	4.25
5-3	4.94*	4	3.99
5-2	2.07	3	3.64
5-1	1.06	2	3.05
1-4	5.69*	4	3.99
1-3	3.88*	3	3.64
1-2	1.01	2	3.05
2-4	4.68*	3	3.64
2-3	2.87	2	3.05
3-4	1.81	2	3.05

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

APPENDIX T
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE OF PS FACTOR 2

Appendix T

Table T-31

Summary of Analysis of Variance on Parent Scale Factor 2

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	p
Main Effects				
Sex	1	38.00	0.90	.344
Parent	1	122.40	2.89	.089
Child	1	262.68	6.21	.013*
Script	4	264.25	6.25	.000*
2-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent	1	2.28	0.05	.816
Sex x Child	1	0.38	0.01	.925
Sex x Script	4	83.50	1.97	.097
Parent x Child	1	155.04	3.67	.056*
Parent x Script	4	118.89	2.21	.025*
Child x Script	4	65.30	1.54	.188
3-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent x Child	1	41.08	0.97	.325
Sex x Parent x Script	4	23.12	0.55	.701
Sex x Child x Script	4	3.26	0.08	.989
Parent x Child x Script	4	20.52	0.49	.747
4-way Interactions				
Sex x Par x Child x Script	4	83.26	1.97	.098
Explained	39	83.85	1.98	.000
Residual	560	42.29		

Note. * = significant at .05 level

APPENDIX U
NEWMAN-KEULS ANALYSES ON PS FACTOR 2

Appendix U

Table U-32

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Interaction Effects of Parent
and Child on Parent Scale Factor 2

Parent/Child**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
1/1-1/2	2.34*	4	1.92
1/1-2/2	0.42	3	1.75
1/1-2/1	0.11	2	1.47
2/1-1/2	2.23*	3	1.75
2/1-2/2	0.31	2	1.47
2/2-1/2	1.92*	2	1.47

Note. * significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** gender pairings of targets as described in text.

1/1 = mother/daughter, 1/2 = mother/son, 2/2 = father/son,
2/1 = father/daughter.

Table U-33

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Interaction Effects of Parent
and Script on Parent Scale Factor 2

Parent/Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
2/1-2/4	5.20*	10	3.75
2/1-1/3	4.08*	9	3.69
2/1-1/4	2.90	8	3.60
2/1-1/2	2.52	7	3.50
2/1-1/1	2.42	6	3.38
2/1-2/3	1.82	5	3.24
2/1-2/2	0.62	4	3.05
2/1-1/5	0.42	3	2.78
2/1-2/5	0.18	2	2.33
2/5-2/4	4.99*	9	3.69
2/5-1/3	3.99*	8	3.60
2/5-1/4	2.72	7	3.50
2/5-1/2	2.34	6	3.38
2/5-1/1	2.24	5	3.24
2/5-2/3	1.64	4	3.05
2/5-2/2	0.44	3	2.78
2/5-1/5	0.24	2	2.33
1/5-2/4	4.78*	8	3.60
1/5-1/3	3.66*	7	3.50
1/5-1/4	2.48	6	3.38
1/5-1/2	2.10	5	3.24
1/5-1/1	2.00	4	3.05
1/5-2/3	1.40	3	2.78
1/5-2/2	0.20	2	2.33
2/2-2/4	4.58*	7	3.50
2/2-1/3	3.46*	6	3.38
2/2-1/4	2.28	5	3.24
2/2-1/2	1.90	4	3.05
2/2-1/1	1.80	3	2.78
2/2-2/3	1.20	2	2.33
2/3-2/4	3.38*	6	3.38
2/3-1/3	2.26	5	3.24
2/3-1/4	1.08	4	3.05
2/3-1/2	0.70	3	2.78
2/3-1/1	0.60	2	2.33

(table continues)

Parent/Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
1/1-2/4	2.78	5	3.24
1/1-1/3	1.66	4	3.05
1/1-1/4	0.48	3	2.78
1/1-1/2	0.10	2	2.33
1/2-2/4	2.68	4	3.05
1/2-1/3	1.56	3	2.78
1/2-1/4	0.38	2	2.33
1/4-2/4	2.30	3	2.78
1/4-1/3	1.18	2	2.33
1/3-2/4	1.12	2	2.33

Note. * significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** Pairing of parent and script variable as described in text.

1/1 = female/A, 1/2 = female/B, 1/3 = female/C,

1/4 = female/D, 1/5 = female/E, 2/1 = male/A, 2/2 = male/b

2/3 = male/C, 2/4 = male/D, 2/5 = male/E.

Table U-34

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on
Parent Scale Factor 2

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
5-4	3.75*	5	2.28
5-3	2.65*	4	2.14
5-2	1.27	3	1.95
5-1	0.91	2	1.64
1-4	2.84*	4	2.14
1-3	1.74	3	1.95
1-2	0.36	2	1.64
2-4	2.48*	3	1.95
2-3	1.38	2	1.64
3-4	1.10	2	1.64

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

APPENDIX V
FACTOR STRUCTURE OF CHILD AS ADULT SCALE

Appendix V

Table V-35

Factor Structure of the Child as Adult Scale

Item	Factor				
	1	2	3	4	5
CAD Scale					
Assertive	.093	-.045	.421	.162	-.525*
Sincere	-.488	.470*	.381	.175	.006
Careful	-.333	.594*	.231	.063	.144
Heterosexual	-.010	.169	.211	.768*	-.042
Passive	.108	.138	.001	-.046	.773*
Impulsive	.456*	-.445*	.293	.139	.222
Conventional	-.562*	.140	.179	.033	.489*
Manipulative	.699*	-.110	.015	.085	.169
Monogamous	-.166	.663*	-.064	.177	-.001
Reserved	.158	.662*	-.142	-.007	.329
Homosexual	.221	-.037	.016	-.799*	.069
Cold	.599*	-.034	-.103	-.240	.226
Responsible	-.563*	.475*	.287	.023	-.000
Passionate	-.235	.101	.741*	.151	-.032
Seductive	.440	-.218	.631*	-.036	-.069
Unconventional	.740*	.044	.046	-.196	-.308
Promiscuous	.704*	-.310	.140	-.179	-.087

Note. Variables with factor loading of .45 were considered to principally define each factor, and are provided with asterisks.

APPENDIX W
DESCRIPTION AND ITEM LOADINGS OF CAD FACTORS

Appendix W

Table W-36

Description and Item loadings for all Five Child as
Adult Scale Factors

Factor	Loading	Item
1	.740	Unconventional
1	.704	Promiscuous
1	.699	Manipulative
1	.599	Cold
1	.456	Impulsive
1	-.563	Responsible
1	-.562	Conventional
2	.663	Monogamous
2	.662	Reserved
2	.594	Careful
2	.475	Responsible
2	.470	Sincere
2	-.445	Impulsive
3	.741	Passionate
3	.631	Seductive
4	.768	Heterosexual
4	-.799	Homosexual
5	.773	Passive
5	.489	Conventional
5	-.525	Assertive

APPENDIX X
SUMMARY OF CAD FACTOR SCORE ANALYSES

Appendix X

Table X-37

Summary of Significant Results on CAD Factor Scores

Factor	Effect	Results
1	Sex	Male subjects in general, indicated that the child in the hypothetical scripts would display more sexually immature behavior as adults than did female subjects.
	Parent	The child living with a male parent was thought to exhibit more sexual immaturity than the child living with a female script parent.
	Script	The child living with a "promiscuous" parent (condition D) was said to exhibit more sexually immature and irresponsible behavior in adulthood than the child in any of the other script conditions. The child living with a parent and his or her live-in-lover was thought to be more sexually immature and irresponsible as an adult than the child living with a parent having no sexual contact (condition A), a parent with limited sexual contact away from the home (condition B), and the child in the control condition.
2	Child	The female child was said to be more mature and responsible in her adult sexual behavior than the male child.
	Script	The child living with a parent frequently having opposite-sex partners spend the night (condition D) and the child whose parent has a steady partner in the home was said to exhibit less sexually mature and responsible behavior than the child living with a parent having little or no sexual contact (conditions A and B), as well as the child in the control condition.
3	Child	The female child was said to be more expressive in her adult sexual behavior than the male child.

(table continues)

Factor	Effect	Results
3	Script	<p>The child living with a parent frequently having sexual partners spend the night (condition D) was said to be more sexually expressive than the child in any of the other four script conditions.</p> <p>The child living with a parent and the parent's live-in-lover was thought to be more expressive in his or her sexual behavior than the child living with a parent having no sexual contact (condition A) and the child in the control condition.</p>
5	Script	<p>The child living with a "promiscuous" parent (condition D) was said to display less sexually inhibited behavior as an adult than the child in any of the other four script conditions.</p>

APPENDIX Y
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE OF CAD FACTOR 1

Appendix Y

Table Y-38

Summary of Analysis of Variance Performed on Child as
Adult Scale Factor 1

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	p
Main Effects				
Sex	1	70.73	5.74	.017*
Parent	1	51.63	4.19	.041*
Child	1	31.74	2.58	.109
Script	4	127.46	10.35	.000*
2-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent	1	1.13	0.09	.762
Sex x Child	1	10.67	0.87	.353
Sex x Script	4	20.19	1.64	.163
Parent x Child	1	37.50	3.04	.082
Parent x Script	4	17.88	1.45	.216
Child x Script	4	12.27	1.00	.409
3-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent x Child	1	0.03	0.00	.963
Sex x Parent x Script	4	4.41	0.36	.839
Sex x Child x Script	4	2.40	0.20	.941
Parent x Child x Script	4	27.53	2.24	.064
4-way Interactions				
Sex x Par x Child x Script	4	4.91	0.40	.810
Explained	39	27.48	2.23	.000
Residual	560	12.32		

Note. * = significant at .05 level

APPENDIX Z
NEWMAN-KEULS ANALYSES ON CAD FACTOR 1

Appendix Z

Table Z-39

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on Child as
Adult Scale Factor 1

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
4-5	2.43*	5	1.24
4-1	2.28*	4	1.16
4-2	2.18*	3	1.06
4-3	1.17*	2	0.89
3-5	1.26*	4	1.16
3-1	1.11*	3	1.06
3-2	1.01*	2	0.89
2-5	0.25	3	1.06
2-1	0.10	2	0.89
1-5	0.15	2	0.89

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

APPENDIX AA
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE OF CAD FACTOR 2

Appendix AA

Table AA-40

Summary of Analysis of Variance Performed on Child as
Adult Scale Factor 2

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	p
Main Effects				
Sex	1	4.34	0.53	.467
Parent	1	26.04	3.18	.075
Child	1	126.04	15.40	.000*
Script	4	76.84	9.39	.000*
2-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent	1	0.88	0.11	.743
Sex x Child	1	20.54	2.51	.114
Sex x Script	4	3.23	0.40	.812
Parent x Child	1	12.04	1.47	.226
Parent x Script	4	7.74	0.95	.437
Child x Script	4	3.99	0.49	.745
3-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent x Child	1	1.82	0.22	.638
Sex x Parent x Script	4	4.07	0.50	.738
Sex x Child x Script	4	9.04	1.11	.354
Parent x Child x Script	4	5.11	0.63	.645
4-way Interactions				
Sex x Par x Child x Script	4	9.09	1.11	.350
Explained	39	17.13	2.09	.000
Residual	560	8.18		

Note. * = significant at .05 level

APPENDIX BB
NEWMAN-KEULS ANALYSES ON CAD FACTOR 2

Appendix BB

Table BB-41

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on Child as
Adult Scale Factor 2

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
5-4	1.84*	5	1.00
5-3	1.24*	4	0.94
5-1	0.30	3	0.86
5-2	0.13	2	0.72
2-4	1.71*	4	0.94
2-3	1.11*	3	0.86
2-1	0.17	2	0.72
1-4	1.54*	3	0.86
1-3	0.94*	2	0.72
3-4	0.60	2	0.72

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

APPENDIX CC
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE OF CAD FACTOR 3

Appendix CC

Table CC-42

Summary of Analysis of Variance Performed on Child as
Adult Scale Factor 3

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	p
Main Effects				
Sex	1	0.43	0.21	.647
Parent	1	1.31	0.64	.423
Child	1	23.21	11.43	.001*
Script	4	13.29	6.55	.000*
2-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent	1	1.71	0.84	.360
Sex x Child	1	1.50	0.74	.390
Sex x Script	4	1.56	0.77	.545
Parent x Child	1	0.54	0.27	.606
Parent x Script	4	0.59	0.29	.883
Child x Script	4	1.66	0.82	.514
3-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent x Child	1	1.13	0.56	.457
Sex x Parent x Script	4	1.07	0.53	.716
Sex x Child x Script	4	0.78	0.38	.820
Parent x Child x Script	4	1.22	0.60	.662
4-way Interactions				
Sex x Par x Child x Script	4	1.00	0.49	.742
Explained	39	2.94	1.45	.042
Residual	560	2.03		

Note. * = significant at .05 level

APPENDIX DD
NEWMAN-KEULS ANALYSES ON CAD FACTOR 3

Appendix DD

Table DD-43

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on Child as
Adult Scale Factor 3

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
4-1	0.76*	5	0.50
4-5	0.69*	4	0.47
4-2	0.46*	3	0.43
4-3	0.14	2	0.36
3-1	0.62*	4	0.47
3-5	0.55*	3	0.43
3-2	0.32	2	0.36
2-1	0.30	3	0.43
2-5	0.23	2	0.36
5-1	0.07	2	0.36

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

APPENDIX EE
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE OF CAD FACTOR 5

Appendix EE

Table EE-44

Summary of Analysis of Variance Completed on Child as
Adult Scale Factor 5

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	p
Main Effects				
Sex	1	5.23	2.78	.096
Parent	1	0.06	0.03	.858
Child	1	1.13	0.60	.439
Script	4	16.33	8.70	.000*
2-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent	1	1.71	0.91	.341
Sex x Child	1	0.43	0.23	.634
Sex x Script	4	0.64	0.34	.849
Parent x Child	1	7.26	3.87	.050*
Parent x Script	4	3.11	1.66	.158
Child x Script	4	3.66	1.95	.101
3-way Interactions				
Sex x Parent x Child	1	1.71	0.91	.341
Sex x Parent x Script	4	2.13	1.14	.339
Sex x Child x Script	4	1.99	1.06	.375
Parent x Child x Script	4	0.65	0.35	.846
4-way Interactions				
Sex x Par x Child x Script	4	3.45	1.78	.131
Explained	39	3.72	1.98	.001
Residual	560	1.88		

Note. * = significant at .05 level

APPENDIX FF
NEWMAN-KEULS ANALYSES ON CAD FACTOR 5

Appendix FF

Table FF-45

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Interaction Effects of Parent
and Child on Child as Adult Scale Factor 5

Parent/Child**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
2/1-2/2	0.30	4	0.40
2/1-1/1	0.24	3	0.36
2/1-1/2	0.10	2	0.30
1/2-2/2	0.20	3	0.36
1/2-1/1	0.14	2	0.30
1/1-2/2	0.06	2	0.30

Note. * significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** gender pairings of targets as described in text.

1/1 = mother/daughter, 1/2 = mother/son, 2/2 = father/son,
2/1 = father/daughter.

Table FF-46

Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Script Effects on Child as
Adult Scale Factor 5

Script**	Mean Difference	r	SSR
2-4	0.89*	5	0.50
2-3	0.37	4	0.47
2-1	0.07	3	0.43
2-5	0.06	2	0.36
5-4	0.83*	4	0.47
5-3	0.31	3	0.43
5-1	0.01	2	0.36
1-4	0.82*	3	0.43
1-3	0.30	2	0.36
3-4	0.52*	2	0.36

Note. * = significant at .05 level, df = 560, r = number of ranks spanned by means, SSR = shortest significant range.

** = script condition as described in text.

APPENDIX GG
MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Appendix GG

Table GG-47

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Parent Scale

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	63.88	13.67	300
	Female	64.82	12.80	300
Parent	Female	63.83	12.67	300
	Male	64.87	13.79	300
Child	Female	65.65	13.40	300
	Male	63.04	12.97	300
Script	Script A	66.28	12.54	120
	Script B	65.28	11.92	120
	Script C	62.27	13.45	120
	Script D	60.20	14.57	120
	Script E	67.70	12.34	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	63.18	12.95	150
	Male	64.57	14.36	150
	Female			
	Female	64.47	12.38	150
	Male	65.16	13.24	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	65.01	13.05	150
	Male	62.74	14.21	150
	Female			
	Female	66.29	13.75	150
	Male	63.34	11.64	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	65.72	13.18	60
	Script B	66.23	12.10	60
	Script C	62.28	13.62	60
	Script D	60.02	16.07	60
	Script E	65.13	12.45	60
	Female			
	Script A	66.85	11.94	60
	Script B	64.33	11.76	60
	Script C	62.25	13.39	60
	Script D	70.27	11.78	60
Script E	64.35	13.24	60	

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Parent by Child	Female				
	Female	66.18	12.25	150	
	Male	61.47	12.68	150	
	Male				
	Female	65.13	14.47	150	
	Male	64.61	13.12	150	
Parent by Script	Female				
	Script A	64.62	13.23	60	
	Script B	63.87	12.81	60	
	Script C	60.13	12.00	60	
	Script D	63.07	12.91	60	
	Script E	67.45	11.61	60	
	Male				
	Script A	67.95	11.67	60	
	Script B	66.70	10.88	60	
	Script C	64.40	14.54	60	
	Script D	57.33	15.65	60	
	Script E	67.95	13.12	60	
	Child by Script	Female			
		Script A	68.30	12.63	60
Script B		62.23	11.46	60	
Script C		63.97	12.35	60	
Script D		60.20	15.81	60	
Script E		67.57	12.86	60	
Male					
Script A		64.27	12.21	60	
Script B		62.33	11.72	60	
Script C		60.57	14.36	60	
Script D		60.20	11.91	60	
Script E		67.35	13.24	60	
Sex by Parent by Child		Male			
		Female			
	Female	65.95	12.39	75	
	Male	60.41	12.99	75	
	Male				
	Female	64.08	13.70	75	
	Male	65.07	15.07	75	
	Female				
	Female				
	Female	66.41	12.19	75	
	Male	62.53	12.35	75	
	Male				
	Female	66.17	15.23	75	
	Male	64.15	10.91	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	63.73	14.17	30
	Script B	64.43	13.31	30
	Script C	59.00	12.82	30
	Script D	64.03	13.66	30
	Script E	64.70	10.48	30
	Male			
	Script A	67.70	12.03	30
	Script B	68.03	10.68	30
	Script C	65.57	13.81	30
	Script D	56.00	17.46	30
	Script E	65.57	14.32	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	65.50	12.41	30
	Script B	63.30	12.49	30
	Script C	61.27	11.22	30
	Script D	62.10	12.26	30
	Script E	70.20	12.20	30
Male				
Script A	68.20	11.50	30	
Script B	65.37	11.10	30	
Script C	63.23	15.39	30	
Script D	58.67	13.78	30	
Script E	70.33	11.55	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	66.87	13.01	30
	Script B	68.87	11.69	30
	Script C	64.07	12.53	30
	Script D	60.63	15.53	30
	Script E	64.63	11.23	30
	Male			
	Script A	64.57	13.47	30
	Script B	63.60	12.12	30
	Script C	60.50	14.63	30
	Script D	59.40	16.66	30
	Script E	65.63	13.73	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	69.73	12.29	30
	Script B	67.60	11.39	30
	Script C	63.87	12.39	30
	Script D	59.77	16.17	30
	Script E	70.50	13.87	30

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	63.97	11.03	30
	Script B	61.07	11.38	30
	Script C	60.63	14.34	30
	Script D	61.00	9.17	30
	Script E	70.03	9.47	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	67.60	12.60	30
	Script B	68.90	11.80	30
	Script C	61.43	10.24	30
	Script D	64.70	13.62	30
	Script E	68.27	11.95	30
	Male			
	Script A	61.63	13.38	30
	Script B	58.83	11.92	30
	Script C	58.83	13.58	30
	Script D	61.43	12.18	30
	Script E	66.63	11.40	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	69.00	12.84	30
	Script B	67.57	11.28	30
	Script C	66.50	13.86	30
	Script D	55.70	16.77	30
	Script E	66.87	13.87	30
	Male			
	Script A	66.90	10.49	30
	Script B	65.83	10.60	30
	Script C	62.30	15.13	30
	Script D	58.97	14.55	30
	Script E	69.03	12.47	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	68.27	13.46	15
	Script B	68.80	14.22	15
	Script C	59.40	11.51	15
	Script D	66.80	12.00	15
	Script E	66.47	9.52	15
	Male			
	Script A	59.20	13.81	15
	Script B	60.07	11.13	15
	Script C	58.60	14.41	15
	Script D	61.27	15.06	15
	Script E	62.93	11.41	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	65.47	12.87	15
	Script B	68.93	9.00	15
	Script C	68.73	12.07	15
	Script D	54.47	16.90	15
	Script E	62.80	12.78	15
	Male			
	Script A	69.93	11.12	15
	Script B	67.13	12.39	15
	Script C	62.40	15.90	15
	Script D	57.53	18.46	15
	Script E	68.33	15.65	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	66.93	12.13	15
	Script B	69.00	9.29	15
	Script C	63.47	8.73	15
	Script D	62.60	15.19	15
	Script E	70.07	14.09	15
	Male			
	Script A	64.07	12.94	15
	Script B	57.60	12.93	15
	Script C	59.07	13.20	15
	Script D	61.60	8.95	15
	Script E	70.33	10.48	15
	Male			
	Female			
Script A	72.53	12.21	15	
Script B	66.20	13.35	15	
Script C	64.27	15.55	15	
Script D	56.93	17.14	15	
Script E	70.93	14.13	15	
Male				
Script A	63.87	9.20	15	
Script B	64.53	8.68	15	
Script C	62.20	15.70	15	
Script D	60.40	9.66	15	
Script E	69.73	8.71	15	
For Entire Sample		64.35	13.24	600

Table GG-48

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on the Sincere CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	3.31	0.89	300
	Female	3.39	0.84	300
Parent	Female	3.28	0.85	300
	Male	3.41	0.88	300
Child	Female	3.46	0.89	300
	Male	3.23	0.83	300
Script	Script A	3.47	0.83	120
	Script B	3.33	0.89	120
	Script C	3.33	0.80	120
	Script D	3.07	0.90	120
	Script E	3.53	0.86	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	3.24	0.86	150
	Male	3.37	0.92	150
	Female			
	Male	3.33	0.85	150
Sex by Child	Female	3.45	0.84	150
	Male			
	Female	3.41	0.90	150
	Male	3.20	0.88	150
	Female			
Sex by Script	Female	3.51	0.89	150
	Male	3.26	0.78	150
	Male			
	Script A	3.37	0.90	60
	Script B	3.40	0.84	60
	Script C	3.27	0.86	60
	Script D	3.00	0.92	60
	Script E	3.50	0.87	60
	Female			
	Script A	3.57	0.75	60
Script B	3.27	0.94	60	
Script C	3.40	0.74	60	
Script D	3.13	0.87	60	
Script E	3.57	0.85	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	3.41	0.85	150
	Male	3.15	0.83	150
	Male			
	Female	3.51	0.93	150
	Male	3.31	0.82	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	3.30	0.85	60
	Script B	3.30	0.83	60
	Script C	3.22	0.78	60
	Script D	3.10	0.86	60
	Script E	3.50	0.91	60
	Male			
	Script A	3.63	0.78	60
	Script B	3.37	0.96	60
	Script C	3.45	0.81	60
	Script D	3.03	0.94	60
	Script E	3.57	0.81	60
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	3.53	0.89	60
	Script B	3.63	0.82	60
	Script C	3.47	0.89	60
	Script D	3.03	0.88	60
	Script E	3.65	0.86	60
	Male			
	Script A	3.40	0.76	60
	Script B	3.03	0.86	60
	Script C	3.20	0.68	60
	Script D	3.10	0.91	60
	Script E	3.42	0.85	60
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	3.37	0.84	75
	Male	3.12	0.86	75
	Male			
	Female	3.45	0.96	75
	Male	3.29	0.88	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	3.45	0.87	75
	Male	3.20	0.81	75
	Male			
Female	3.57	0.90	75	
Male	3.32	0.75	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Sex by Parent by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	3.10	0.92	30
		Script B	3.43	0.73	30
		Script C	3.13	0.90	30
		Script D	3.07	0.69	30
		Script E	3.47	0.97	30
		Male			
		Script A	3.63	0.81	30
		Script B	3.37	0.96	30
		Script C	3.40	0.81	30
		Script D	3.93	1.11	30
		Script E	3.53	0.78	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	3.50	0.73	30
		Script B	3.17	0.91	30
		Script C	3.30	0.65	30
		Script D	3.13	1.01	30
		Script E	3.53	0.86	30
	Male				
	Script A	3.63	0.77	30	
	Script B	3.37	0.96	30	
	Script C	3.50	0.82	30	
	Script D	3.13	0.73	30	
	Script E	3.60	0.86	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	3.37	0.85	30
		Script B	3.60	0.86	30
		Script C	3.37	0.96	30
		Script D	3.03	0.93	30
		Script E	3.70	0.79	30
		Male			
		Script A	3.37	0.96	30
		Script B	3.20	0.81	30
		Script C	3.17	0.75	30
		Script D	3.97	0.93	30
		Script E	3.30	0.92	30
		Female			
		Female			
	Script A	3.70	0.92	30	
	Script B	3.67	0.80	30	
	Script C	3.57	0.82	30	
	Script D	3.03	0.85	30	
	Script E	3.60	0.93	30	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	3.43	0.50	30
	Script B	2.87	0.90	30
	Script C	3.23	0.63	30
	Script D	3.23	0.90	30
	Script E	3.53	0.78	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.43	0.86	30
	Script B	3.60	0.72	30
	Script C	3.27	0.87	30
	Script D	3.07	0.87	30
	Script E	3.70	0.84	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.17	0.83	30
	Script B	3.00	0.83	30
	Script C	3.17	0.70	30
	Script D	3.13	0.86	30
	Script E	3.30	0.95	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.63	0.83	30
	Script B	3.67	0.92	30
	Script C	3.67	0.88	30
	Script D	3.00	0.91	30
	Script E	3.60	0.89	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.63	0.62	30
	Script B	3.07	0.91	30
	Script C	3.23	0.68	30
	Script D	3.07	0.98	30
	Script E	3.53	0.73	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.27	0.80	15
	Script B	3.60	0.74	15
	Script C	3.20	1.01	15
	Script D	3.07	0.59	15
	Script E	3.73	0.88	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.93	1.03	15
	Script B	3.27	0.70	15
	Script C	3.07	0.80	15
	Script D	3.07	0.80	15
	Script E	3.20	1.01	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	4.67	0.92	15
	Script B	3.60	0.99	15
	Script C	3.53	0.92	15
	Script D	3.00	1.20	15
	Script E	3.67	0.72	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.80	0.68	15
	Script B	3.13	0.92	15
	Script C	3.27	0.70	15
	Script D	3.87	1.06	15
	Script E	3.40	0.83	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.60	0.91	15
	Script B	3.60	0.74	15
	Script C	3.33	0.72	15
	Script D	3.07	1.10	15
	Script E	3.67	0.82	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.40	0.51	15
	Script B	3.73	0.88	15
	Script C	3.27	0.59	15
	Script D	3.20	0.94	15
	Script E	3.40	0.91	15
	Male			
	Female			
Script A	3.80	0.94	15	
Script B	3.73	0.88	15	
Script C	3.80	0.86	15	
Script D	3.00	0.54	15	
Script E	3.53	1.06	15	
Male				
Script A	3.47	0.52	15	
Script B	3.00	0.93	15	
Script C	3.20	0.68	15	
Script D	3.27	0.88	15	
Script E	3.67	0.62	15	
For Entire Sample		3.35	0.87	600

Table GG-49

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
Script Variables on Careful CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	3.38	0.97	300
	Female	3.44	1.00	300
Parent	Female	3.35	0.99	300
	Male	3.47	0.98	300
Child	Female	3.58	0.95	300
	Male	3.24	0.99	300
Script	Script A	3.49	0.93	120
	Script B	3.55	0.99	120
	Script C	3.35	0.91	120
	Script D	3.00	1.05	120
	Script E	3.67	0.91	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	3.25	0.97	150
	Male	3.51	0.95	150
	Female			
	Female	3.45	1.00	150
	Male	3.43	1.00	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	3.53	0.97	150
	Male	3.23	0.94	150
	Female			
	Female	3.63	0.93	150
	Male	3.25	1.03	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	3.42	1.01	60
	Script B	3.58	0.89	60
	Script C	3.35	0.86	60
	Script D	3.03	1.10	60
	Script E	3.53	0.89	60
	Female			
	Script A	3.57	0.83	60
	Script B	3.52	1.08	60
	Script C	3.35	0.97	60
Script D	3.97	1.01	60	
Script E	3.80	0.92	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	3.53	0.96	150
	Male	3.18	0.99	150
	Male			
	Female	3.63	0.94	150
	Male	3.31	0.98	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	3.45	1.02	60
	Script B	3.48	1.03	60
	Script C	3.17	0.92	60
	Script D	3.05	1.00	60
	Script E	3.62	0.89	60
	Male			
	Script A	3.53	0.83	60
	Script B	3.62	0.94	60
	Script C	3.53	0.87	60
	Script D	2.95	1.11	60
	Script E	3.72	0.94	60
	Child by Script	Female		
Script A		3.55	0.98	60
Script B		3.87	0.87	60
Script C		3.58	0.89	60
Script D		3.03	0.99	60
Script E		3.87	0.79	60
Male				
Script A		3.43	0.87	60
Script B		3.23	1.00	60
Script C		3.12	0.89	60
Script D		2.97	1.12	60
Script E		3.47	0.98	60
Sex by Parent by Child		Male		
	Female			
	Female	3.36	0.97	75
	Male	3.15	0.97	75
	Male			
	Female	3.71	0.96	75
	Male	3.32	0.92	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	3.69	0.93	75
	Male	3.21	1.02	75
	Male			
	Female	3.56	0.93	75
Male	3.29	1.05	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Sex by Parent by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	3.23	1.07	30
		Script B	3.57	0.86	30
		Script C	3.20	0.93	30
		Script D	2.87	1.04	30
		Script E	3.40	0.86	30
		Male			
		Script A	3.60	0.93	30
		Script B	3.60	0.93	30
		Script C	3.50	0.77	30
		Script D	3.20	1.16	30
		Script E	3.67	0.92	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	3.67	0.92	30
		Script B	3.40	1.19	30
		Script C	3.13	0.94	30
		Script D	3.23	0.94	30
		Script E	3.83	0.87	30
	Male				
	Script A	3.47	0.73	30	
	Script B	3.63	0.96	30	
	Script C	3.57	0.97	30	
	Script D	2.70	1.02	30	
	Script E	3.77	0.97	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	3.37	1.07	30
		Script B	3.90	0.89	30
		Script C	3.50	0.94	30
		Script D	3.10	1.09	30
		Script E	3.80	0.66	30
		Male			
		Script A	3.47	0.97	30
		Script B	3.27	0.79	30
		Script C	3.20	0.76	30
		Script D	2.97	1.13	30
		Script E	3.27	1.02	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	3.73	0.87	30
	Script B	3.83	0.87	30	
	Script C	3.67	0.84	30	
	Script D	2.97	0.89	30	
	Script E	3.93	0.91	30	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	3.40	0.77	30
	Script B	3.20	1.19	30
	Script C	3.03	1.00	30
	Script D	2.97	1.30	30
	Script E	3.67	0.92	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.63	1.03	30
	Script B	3.93	0.83	30
	Script C	3.37	0.93	30
	Script D	2.83	0.91	30
	Script E	3.87	0.68	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.27	0.98	30
	Script B	3.03	1.03	30
	Script C	2.97	0.89	30
	Script D	3.27	1.05	30
	Script E	3.37	1.00	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.47	0.94	30
	Script B	3.80	0.93	30
	Script C	3.80	0.81	30
	Script D	3.23	1.04	30
	Script E	3.87	0.90	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.60	0.72	30
	Script B	3.43	0.94	30
	Script C	3.27	0.87	30
	Script D	2.67	1.12	30
	Script E	3.57	0.97	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.20	1.08	15
	Script B	3.93	0.88	15
	Script C	3.27	0.96	15
	Script D	2.67	0.82	15
	Script E	3.73	0.59	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.27	1.10	15
	Script B	3.20	0.68	15
	Script C	3.13	0.92	15
	Script D	3.07	1.22	15
	Script E	3.07	0.96	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.53	1.06	15
	Script B	3.87	0.92	15
	Script C	3.73	0.88	15
	Script D	3.53	1.19	15
	Script E	3.87	0.74	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.67	0.82	15
	Script B	3.33	0.90	15
	Script C	3.27	0.59	15
	Script D	2.87	1.06	15
	Script E	3.47	1.06	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	4.07	0.80	15
	Script B	3.93	0.80	15
	Script C	3.47	0.92	15
	Script D	3.00	1.00	15
	Script E	4.00	0.76	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.27	0.88	15
	Script B	3.87	1.30	15
	Script C	2.80	0.86	15
	Script D	3.47	0.83	15
	Script E	3.67	0.98	15
	Male			
	Female			
Script A	3.40	0.83	15	
Script B	3.73	0.96	15	
Script C	3.87	0.74	15	
Script D	2.93	0.80	15	
Script E	3.87	1.06	15	
Male				
Script A	3.53	0.64	15	
Script B	3.53	0.99	15	
Script C	3.27	1.10	15	
Script D	2.47	1.19	15	
Script E	3.66	0.90	15	
For Entire Sample		3.41	0.98	600

Table GG-50

Mean Scores and Standard deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Passive CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	2.70	0.91	300
	Female	2.53	0.93	300
Parent	Female	2.63	0.89	300
	Male	2.61	0.95	300
Child	Female	2.62	0.93	300
	Male	2.61	0.91	300
Script	Script A	2.68	0.98	120
	Script B	2.75	0.94	120
	Script C	2.60	0.88	120
	Script D	2.40	0.81	120
	Script E	2.66	0.95	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	2.67	0.89	150
	Male	2.73	0.93	150
	Female			
	Female	2.58	0.89	150
	Male	2.49	0.96	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	2.72	0.91	150
	Male	2.68	0.91	150
	Female			
	Female	2.53	0.94	150
	Male	2.54	0.92	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	2.80	1.02	60
	Script B	2.78	0.83	60
	Script C	2.65	0.94	60
	Script D	2.47	0.79	60
	Script E	2.80	0.92	60
	Female			
	Script A	2.55	0.93	60
	Script B	2.72	1.04	60
	Script C	2.55	0.83	60
Script D	2.33	0.84	60	
Script E	2.52	0.97	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Parent by Child	Female				
	Female	2.52	0.88	150	
	Male	2.73	0.89	150	
	Male				
	Female	2.73	0.96	150	
	Male	2.49	0.93	150	
Parent by Script	Female				
	Script A	2.53	0.91	60	
	Script B	2.82	0.95	60	
	Script C	2.60	0.92	60	
	Script D	2.40	0.72	60	
	Script E	2.78	0.89	60	
	Male				
	Script A	2.82	1.03	60	
	Script B	2.68	0.93	60	
	Script C	2.60	0.85	60	
	Script D	2.40	0.91	60	
	Script E	2.53	1.00	60	
Child by Script	Female				
	Script A	2.50	0.95	60	
	Script B	2.83	0.98	60	
	Script C	2.57	0.91	60	
	Script D	2.50	0.81	60	
	Script E	2.72	0.96	60	
	Male				
	Script A	2.85	0.99	60	
	Script B	2.67	0.90	60	
	Script C	2.63	0.86	60	
	Script D	2.30	0.81	60	
	Script E	2.60	0.94	60	
	Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
		Female			
Female		2.59	0.89	75	
Male		2.76	0.88	75	
Male					
Female		2.85	0.91	75	
Male		2.60	0.93	75	
Female					
Female					
Female		2.45	0.87	75	
Male		2.71	0.90	75	
Male					
Female		2.60	1.00	75	
Male		2.37	0.91	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Sex by Parent by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	2.53	0.94	30
		Script B	2.80	0.89	30
		Script C	2.70	1.02	30
		Script D	2.40	0.66	30
		Script E	2.93	0.83	30
		Male			
		Script A	2.07	1.05	30
		Script B	2.77	0.77	30
		Script C	2.60	0.86	30
		Script D	2.53	0.90	30
		Script E	2.67	0.99	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	2.53	0.90	30
		Script B	2.83	1.02	30
		Script C	2.50	0.82	30
		Script D	2.40	0.77	30
		Script E	2.63	0.93	30
	Male				
	Script A	2.57	0.97	30	
	Script B	2.60	1.07	30	
	Script C	2.60	0.86	30	
	Script D	2.27	0.91	30	
	Script E	2.40	1.00	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	2.57	0.94	30
		Script B	2.87	0.90	30
		Script C	2.70	0.92	30
		Script D	2.63	0.93	30
		Script E	2.83	0.87	30
		Male			
		Script A	2.03	1.07	30
		Script B	2.70	0.75	30
		Script C	2.60	0.97	30
		Script D	2.30	0.60	30
		Script E	2.77	0.97	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	2.43	0.97	30
	Script B	2.80	1.06	30	
	Script C	2.43	0.90	30	
	Script D	2.37	0.70	30	
	Script E	2.60	1.04	30	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	2.67	0.88	30
	Script B	2.63	1.03	30
	Script C	2.67	0.76	30
	Script D	2.30	0.99	30
	Script E	2.43	0.90	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.27	0.69	30
	Script B	2.73	0.98	30
	Script C	2.43	0.97	30
	Script D	2.40	0.72	30
	Script E	2.77	0.94	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.80	1.03	30
	Script B	2.90	0.92	30
	Script C	2.77	0.86	30
	Script D	2.40	0.72	30
	Script E	2.80	0.85	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.73	1.11	30
	Script B	2.93	0.98	30
	Script C	2.70	0.84	30
	Script D	2.60	0.89	30
	Script E	2.67	0.99	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.90	0.96	30
	Script B	2.43	0.82	30
	Script C	2.50	0.86	30
	Script D	2.20	0.89	30
	Script E	2.40	1.00	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.20	0.56	15
	Script B	2.93	1.03	15
	Script C	2.47	1.06	15
	Script D	2.47	0.74	15
	Script E	2.87	0.84	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.87	1.13	15
	Script B	2.67	0.72	15
	Script C	2.93	0.96	15
	Script D	2.33	0.62	15
	Script E	3.00	0.85	15

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.93	1.10	15
	Script B	2.80	0.78	15
	Script C	2.93	0.70	15
	Script D	2.80	1.08	15
	Script E	2.80	0.94	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.20	1.01	15
	Script B	2.73	0.80	15
	Script C	2.27	0.88	15
	Script D	2.27	0.59	15
	Script E	2.53	1.06	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.33	0.82	15
	Script B	2.53	0.92	15
	Script C	2.40	0.91	15
	Script D	2.33	0.72	15
	Script E	2.67	1.05	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.73	0.96	15
	Script B	3.13	1.06	15
	Script C	2.60	0.74	15
	Script D	2.47	0.83	15
	Script E	2.60	0.83	15
	Male			
	Female			
Script A	2.53	1.13	15	
Script B	3.07	1.16	15	
Script C	2.47	0.92	15	
Script D	2.40	0.63	15	
Script E	2.53	1.06	15	
Male				
Script A	2.60	0.83	15	
Script B	2.13	0.74	15	
Script C	2.73	0.80	15	
Script D	2.13	1.13	15	
Script E	2.27	0.96	15	
For Entire Sample		2.62	0.92	600

Table GG-51

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Impulsive CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	3.01	0.95	300
	Female	2.95	0.97	300
Parent	Female	3.04	0.94	300
	Male	2.91	0.97	300
Child	Female	2.97	0.97	300
	Male	2.98	0.95	300
Script	Script A	2.98	0.95	120
	Script B	2.90	1.03	120
	Script C	3.05	0.92	120
	Script D	3.17	0.95	120
	Script E	2.79	0.91	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	3.05	0.94	150
	Male	2.96	0.96	150
	Female			
	Female	3.03	0.95	150
	Male	2.87	0.98	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	3.06	1.00	150
	Male	2.95	0.90	150
	Female			
	Female	2.89	0.93	150
	Male	3.01	1.00	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	3.02	1.05	60
	Script B	2.88	0.92	60
	Script C	3.07	0.91	60
	Script D	3.30	0.94	60
	Script E	2.82	0.87	60
	Female			
	Script A	2.93	0.84	60
	Script B	2.92	1.14	60
	Script C	3.08	0.94	60
Script D	3.03	0.94	60	
Script E	2.77	0.96	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	2.97	0.92	150
	Male	3.11	0.96	150
	Male			
	Female	2.97	1.01	150
	Male	2.85	0.92	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	3.17	0.94	60
	Script B	2.85	1.04	60
	Script C	3.22	0.80	60
	Script D	3.12	0.94	60
	Script E	2.85	0.94	60
	Male			
	Script A	2.78	0.92	60
	Script B	2.95	1.03	60
	Script C	2.88	1.01	60
	Script D	3.22	0.96	60
	Script E	2.73	0.88	60
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	3.08	1.01	60
	Script B	2.70	0.98	60
	Script C	3.05	0.95	60
	Script D	3.15	0.92	60
	Script E	2.88	0.94	60
	Male			
	Script A	2.87	0.87	60
	Script B	3.10	1.05	60
	Script C	3.05	0.91	60
	Script D	3.18	0.98	60
	Script E	2.70	0.87	60
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	3.01	0.97	75
	Male	3.09	0.92	75
	Male			
	Female	3.11	1.03	75
	Male	2.81	0.87	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	2.93	0.88	75
	Male	3.12	1.01	75
	Male			
Female	2.84	0.99	75	
Male	2.89	0.98	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Sex by Parent by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	3.13	1.17	30
		Script B	2.80	0.96	30
		Script C	3.27	0.79	30
		Script D	3.20	0.85	30
		Script E	2.87	0.86	30
		Male			
		Script A	2.90	0.92	30
		Script B	2.97	0.89	30
		Script C	2.77	0.97	30
		Script D	3.40	1.04	30
		Script E	2.77	0.90	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	3.20	0.66	30
		Script B	2.90	1.13	30
		Script C	3.17	0.83	30
		Script D	3.03	1.03	30
		Script E	2.83	1.02	30
	Male				
	Script A	2.66	0.92	30	
	Script B	2.93	1.17	30	
	Script C	3.00	1.05	30	
	Script D	3.03	0.85	30	
	Script E	2.70	0.88	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	3.27	1.08	30
		Script B	2.80	0.96	30
		Script C	3.07	0.98	30
		Script D	3.33	0.96	30
		Script E	2.83	0.95	30
		Male			
		Script A	2.77	0.97	30
		Script B	2.97	0.89	30
		Script C	2.97	0.85	30
		Script D	3.27	0.94	30
		Script E	2.80	0.81	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	2.90	0.92	30
	Script B	2.60	1.00	30	
	Script C	3.03	0.93	30	
	Script D	2.97	0.85	30	
	Script E	2.93	0.94	30	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	2.97	0.77	30
	Script B	3.23	1.19	30
	Script C	3.13	0.97	30
	Script D	3.10	1.03	30
	Script E	2.60	0.93	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.33	0.96	30
	Script B	2.47	0.82	30
	Script C	3.27	0.74	30
	Script D	2.90	0.92	30
	Script E	2.90	0.92	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.00	0.91	30
	Script B	3.23	1.10	30
	Script C	2.17	0.87	30
	Script D	3.33	0.92	30
	Script E	2.80	0.96	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.83	1.02	30
	Script B	2.93	1.08	30
	Script C	2.83	1.09	30
	Script D	3.40	0.86	30
	Script E	2.87	0.97	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.73	0.83	30
	Script B	2.97	1.00	30
	Script C	2.93	0.94	30
	Script D	3.03	1.03	30
	Script E	2.60	0.77	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.40	1.18	15
	Script B	2.53	0.83	15
	Script C	3.27	0.88	15
	Script D	3.00	0.85	15
	Script E	2.87	0.92	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.87	1.13	15
	Script B	3.07	1.03	15
	Script C	3.27	0.70	15
	Script D	3.40	0.83	15
	Script E	2.87	0.83	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.13	0.99	15
	Script B	3.07	1.03	15
	Script C	2.87	1.06	15
	Script D	3.67	0.98	15
	Script E	2.80	1.01	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.67	0.82	15
	Script B	2.87	0.74	15
	Script C	2.67	0.90	15
	Script D	3.13	1.06	15
	Script E	2.73	0.80	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.27	0.70	15
	Script B	2.40	0.83	15
	Script C	3.27	0.59	15
	Script D	2.80	1.01	15
	Script E	2.93	0.96	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.13	0.64	15
	Script B	3.40	1.18	15
	Script C	3.07	1.03	15
	Script D	3.27	1.03	15
	Script E	2.73	1.10	15
Male				
Female				
Script A	2.53	0.99	15	
Script B	2.80	1.46	15	
Script C	2.80	1.46	15	
Script D	3.13	0.64	15	
Script E	2.93	0.96	15	
Male				
Script A	2.80	0.86	15	
Script B	3.07	1.22	15	
Script C	3.20	0.94	15	
Script D	2.93	1.03	15	
Script E	2.47	0.74	15	
For Entire Sample		2.98	0.96	600

Table GG-52

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Conventional CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	3.04	0.94	300
	Female	3.02	0.92	300
Parent	Female	3.01	0.93	300
	Male	3.05	0.93	300
Child	Female	3.07	0.91	300
	Male	3.00	0.95	300
Script	Script A	3.18	0.94	120
	Script B	3.18	0.87	120
	Script C	2.96	0.93	120
	Script D	2.64	0.94	120
	Script E	3.21	0.88	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	3.01	0.97	150
	Male	3.08	0.92	150
	Female			
	Male	3.02	0.89	150
	Male	3.03	0.95	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	3.04	0.92	150
	Male	3.05	0.97	150
	Female			
	Male	3.10	0.91	150
	Male	2.95	0.92	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	3.18	1.08	60
	Script B	3.13	0.85	60
	Script C	3.07	0.84	60
	Script D	2.62	0.92	60
	Script E	3.22	0.90	60
	Female			
	Script A	3.18	0.77	60
	Script B	3.22	0.89	60
	Script C	2.85	1.01	60
Script D	2.67	0.93	60	
Script E	3.20	0.86	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Parent by Child	Female				
	Female	3.05	0.88	150	
	Male	2.97	0.98	150	
	Male				
	Female	3.09	0.95	150	
	Male	3.02	0.92	150	
Parent by Script	Female				
	Script A	3.07	0.99	60	
	Script B	3.08	0.87	60	
	Script C	3.02	0.87	60	
	Script D	2.63	0.88	60	
	Script E	3.27	0.94	60	
	Male				
	Script A	3.30	0.87	60	
	Script B	3.27	0.86	60	
	Script C	2.90	0.99	60	
	Script D	2.65	0.97	60	
	Script E	3.15	0.82	60	
	Child by Script	Female			
		Script A	3.17	1.06	60
Script B		3.23	0.83	60	
Script C		2.93	0.94	60	
Script D		2.80	0.84	60	
Script E		3.22	0.83	60	
Male					
Script A		3.20	0.80	60	
Script B		3.12	0.90	60	
Script C		2.98	0.93	60	
Script D		2.48	0.98	60	
Script E		3.20	0.94	60	
Sex by Parent by Child		Male			
		Female			
	Female	2.95	0.88	75	
	Male	3.07	1.06	75	
	Male				
	Female	3.13	0.95	75	
	Male	3.03	0.89	75	
	Female				
	Female				
	Female	3.16	0.87	75	
	Male	2.88	0.89	75	
	Male				
	Female	3.04	0.95	75	
	Male	3.01	0.95	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.03	1.10	30
	Script B	3.03	0.89	30
	Script C	3.13	0.86	30
	Script D	2.47	0.82	30
	Script E	3.37	1.00	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.33	1.06	30
	Script B	3.23	0.82	30
	Script C	3.00	0.83	30
	Script D	2.77	1.01	30
	Script E	3.07	0.79	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.10	0.89	30
	Script B	3.13	0.86	30
	Script C	2.90	0.89	30
	Script D	2.80	0.93	30
	Script E	3.17	0.87	30
Male				
Script A	3.27	0.64	30	
Script B	3.30	0.92	30	
Script C	2.80	1.13	30	
Script D	2.53	0.94	30	
Script E	3.23	0.86	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.03	1.22	30
	Script B	3.07	0.79	30
	Script C	3.00	0.87	30
	Script D	2.83	0.83	30
	Script E	3.27	0.83	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.33	0.92	30
	Script B	3.20	0.93	30
	Script C	3.13	0.82	30
	Script D	2.40	0.97	30
	Script E	3.17	0.99	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.30	0.88	30
	Script B	3.40	0.86	30
	Script C	2.87	1.01	30
	Script D	2.77	0.86	30
	Script E	3.17	0.83	30

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	3.07	0.64	30
	Script B	3.03	0.89	30
	Script C	2.83	1.02	30
	Script D	2.57	1.01	30
	Script E	3.23	0.90	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.03	1.10	30
	Script B	3.17	0.79	30
	Script C	2.97	0.85	30
	Script D	2.73	0.79	30
	Script E	3.37	0.77	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.10	0.89	30
	Script B	3.00	0.95	30
	Script C	3.07	0.91	30
	Script D	2.53	0.97	30
	Script E	3.17	1.09	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.30	1.02	30
	Script B	3.30	0.88	30
	Script C	2.90	1.03	30
	Script D	2.86	0.90	30
	Script E	3.07	0.87	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.30	0.70	30
	Script B	3.23	0.86	30
	Script C	2.90	0.96	30
	Script D	2.43	1.01	30
	Script E	3.23	0.77	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.73	1.10	15
	Script B	3.00	0.76	15
	Script C	3.00	0.93	15
	Script D	2.60	0.63	15
	Script E	3.40	0.83	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.33	1.05	15
	Script B	3.07	1.03	15
	Script C	3.27	0.80	15
	Script D	2.33	0.98	15
	Script E	3.33	1.18	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.33	1.29	15
	Script B	3.13	0.83	15
	Script C	3.00	0.85	15
	Script D	3.07	0.96	15
	Script E	3.13	0.83	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.33	0.82	15
	Script B	3.33	0.82	15
	Script C	3.00	0.85	15
	Script D	2.47	0.99	15
	Script E	3.00	0.76	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.33	1.05	15
	Script B	3.33	0.82	15
	Script C	2.93	0.80	15
	Script D	2.87	0.92	15
	Script E	3.33	0.72	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.87	0.64	15
	Script B	2.93	0.88	15
Script C	2.87	0.99	15	
Script D	2.73	0.96	15	
Script E	3.00	1.00	15	
Male				
Female				
Script A	3.27	0.70	15	
Script B	3.47	0.92	15	
Script C	2.80	1.21	15	
Script D	2.67	0.82	15	
Script E	3.00	0.93	15	
Male				
Script A	3.27	0.59	15	
Script B	3.13	0.92	15	
Script C	2.80	1.08	15	
Script D	2.40	1.06	15	
Script E	3.47	0.74	15	
For Entire Sample		3.03	0.93	600

Table GG-53

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Monogamous CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	3.03	1.11	300
	Female	2.96	1.06	300
Parent	Female	2.93	1.05	300
	Male	3.06	1.12	300
Child	Female	3.12	1.10	300
	Male	2.87	1.06	300
Script	Script A	3.19	1.06	120
	Script B	3.21	1.05	120
	Script C	2.81	1.07	120
	Script D	2.59	1.10	120
	Script E	3.18	1.02	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	2.97	1.07	150
	Male	3.09	1.15	150
	Female			
	Female	2.89	1.03	150
	Male	3.03	1.09	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	3.08	1.23	150
	Male	2.98	1.10	150
	Female			
	Female	3.15	1.07	150
	Male	2.77	1.02	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	3.12	1.21	60
	Script B	3.35	0.94	60
	Script C	2.75	1.08	60
	Script D	2.62	1.25	60
	Script E	3.32	0.85	60
	Female			
	Script A	3.27	0.88	60
	Script B	3.07	1.15	60
	Script C	2.87	1.07	60
Script D	2.57	0.95	60	
Script E	3.03	1.15	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	3.05	1.05	150
	Male	2.81	1.05	150
	Male			
	Female	3.19	1.15	150
	Male	2.93	1.07	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	3.17	0.98	60
	Script B	3.10	1.02	60
	Script C	2.58	1.00	60
	Script D	2.63	1.40	60
	Script E	3.17	1.03	60
	Male			
	Script A	3.22	1.14	60
	Script B	3.32	1.08	60
	Script C	3.03	1.10	60
	Script D	2.55	1.11	60
Script E	3.18	1.09	60	
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	3.37	1.06	60
	Script B	3.38	1.03	60
	Script C	2.98	1.17	60
	Script D	2.70	1.08	60
	Script E	3.15	1.04	60
	Male			
	Script A	3.02	1.03	60
	Script B	3.03	1.06	60
	Script C	2.63	0.93	60
	Script D	2.48	1.13	60
Script E	3.20	1.01	60	
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	3.03	1.05	75
	Male	2.92	1.10	75
	Male			
	Female	3.13	1.20	75
	Male	3.04	1.10	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	3.07	1.04	75
	Male	2.71	1.00	75
Male				
Female	3.24	1.10	75	
Male	2.83	1.05	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	<u>N</u>
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.30	1.06	30
	Script B	3.13	0.90	30
	Script C	2.50	1.04	30
	Script D	2.57	1.14	30
	Script E	3.37	0.96	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.93	1.34	30
	Script B	3.57	0.94	30
	Script C	3.00	1.08	30
	Script D	2.67	1.37	30
	Script E	3.27	0.74	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.03	0.89	30
	Script B	3.07	1.14	30
	Script C	2.67	0.96	30
	Script D	2.70	1.09	30
	Script E	2.97	1.07	30
Male				
Script A	3.50	0.82	30	
Script B	3.07	1.17	30	
Script C	3.07	1.14	30	
Script D	2.43	0.77	30	
Script E	3.10	1.24	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.13	1.20	30
	Script B	3.47	1.01	30
	Script C	2.80	1.16	30
	Script D	2.70	1.18	30
	Script E	3.30	0.95	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.10	1.24	30
	Script B	3.23	0.86	30
	Script C	2.70	1.02	30
	Script D	2.53	1.33	30
	Script E	3.33	0.76	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.60	0.86	30
Script B	3.30	1.06	30	
Script C	3.17	1.18	30	
Script D	2.70	0.98	30	
Script E	3.00	1.11	30	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	2.93	0.79	30
	Script B	2.83	1.21	30
	Script C	2.57	0.86	30
	Script D	2.43	0.89	30
	Script E	3.07	1.20	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.43	0.82	30
	Script B	2.67	1.05	30
	Script C	2.70	1.15	30
	Script D	2.70	1.06	30
	Script E	3.13	0.97	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.90	1.06	30
	Script B	2.93	0.98	30
	Script C	2.47	0.82	30
	Script D	2.57	1.17	30
	Script E	3.20	1.10	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.30	1.26	30
	Script B	3.50	1.01	30
	Script C	3.27	1.14	30
	Script D	2.70	1.12	30
	Script E	3.17	1.12	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.13	1.01	30
	Script B	3.13	1.14	30
	Script C	2.80	1.03	30
	Script D	2.40	1.10	30
	Script E	3.20	0.93	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.47	0.74	15
	Script B	3.20	1.08	15
	Script C	2.60	1.18	15
	Script D	2.60	0.99	15
	Script E	3.27	1.03	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.13	1.30	15
	Script B	3.07	0.70	15
	Script C	2.40	0.91	15
	Script D	2.53	1.30	15
	Script E	3.47	0.92	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.80	1.47	15
	Script B	3.73	0.88	15
	Script C	3.00	1.13	15
	Script D	2.80	1.37	15
	Script E	3.33	0.90	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.07	1.22	15
	Script B	3.40	0.98	15
	Script C	3.00	1.07	15
	Script D	2.53	1.41	15
	Script E	3.20	0.56	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.40	0.91	15
	Script B	3.33	1.05	15
	Script C	2.80	1.15	15
	Script D	2.80	1.15	15
	Script E	3.00	0.93	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.67	0.72	15
	Script B	2.80	1.21	15
	Script C	2.53	0.74	15
	Script D	2.60	1.06	15
	Script E	2.93	1.22	15
	Male			
	Female			
Script A	3.80	0.78	15	
Script B	3.27	1.10	15	
Script C	3.53	1.13	15	
Script D	2.60	0.83	15	
Script E	3.00	1.31	15	
Male				
Script A	3.20	0.78	15	
Script B	2.87	1.24	15	
Script C	2.60	0.99	15	
Script D	2.27	0.70	15	
Script E	3.20	1.21	15	
For Entire Sample		3.00	1.09	600

Table GG-54

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Reserved CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	2.89	0.87	300
	Female	2.92	0.90	300
Parent	Female	2.93	1.05	300
	Male	3.06	1.12	300
Child	Female	2.91	0.87	300
	Male	2.89	0.90	300
Script	Script A	2.94	0.93	120
	Script B	3.06	0.87	120
	Script C	2.73	0.88	120
	Script D	2.81	0.86	120
	Script E	2.96	0.86	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	2.89	0.90	150
	Male	2.88	0.84	150
	Female	2.88	0.86	150
	Male	2.96	0.93	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	2.88	0.87	150
	Male	2.89	0.88	150
	Female	2.95	0.88	150
	Male	2.89	0.92	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	3.00	0.99	60
	Script B	2.98	0.73	60
	Script C	2.72	0.87	60
	Script D	2.77	0.87	60
	Script E	2.97	0.86	60
	Female			
	Script A	2.88	0.87	60
	Script B	3.13	1.00	60
	Script C	2.75	0.90	60
Script D	2.85	0.86	60	
Script E	2.98	0.85	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	2.85	0.85	150
	Male	2.93	0.91	150
	Male			
	Female	2.98	0.89	150
	Male	2.86	0.88	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	2.85	0.97	60
	Script B	3.15	0.88	60
	Script C	2.67	0.84	60
	Script D	2.73	0.80	60
	Script E	3.03	0.84	60
	Male			
	Script A	3.03	0.88	60
	Script B	2.97	0.86	60
	Script C	2.80	0.92	60
Script D	2.88	0.92	60	
Script E	2.92	0.87	60	
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	2.85	0.94	60
	Script B	3.02	0.83	60
	Script C	2.72	0.97	60
	Script D	2.87	0.83	60
	Script E	3.12	0.87	60
	Male			
	Script A	3.03	0.92	60
	Script B	3.10	0.92	60
	Script C	2.75	0.90	60
Script D	2.75	0.90	60	
Script E	2.83	0.83	60	
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	2.89	0.86	75
	Male	2.89	0.93	75
	Male			
	Female	2.87	0.86	75
	Male	2.89	0.82	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	2.80	0.84	75
Male	2.96	0.89	75	
Male				
Female	3.09	0.90	75	
Male	2.83	0.95	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.87	1.01	30
	Script B	3.07	0.79	30
	Script C	2.67	0.92	30
	Script D	2.70	0.79	30
	Script E	3.17	0.91	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.13	0.97	30
	Script B	2.90	0.66	30
	Script C	2.77	0.82	30
	Script D	2.83	0.95	30
	Script E	2.77	0.77	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.83	0.95	30
	Script B	3.23	0.97	30
	Script C	2.67	0.76	30
	Script D	2.77	0.82	30
	Script E	2.90	0.76	30
Male				
Script A	2.93	0.79	30	
Script B	3.03	1.03	30	
Script C	2.83	1.02	30	
Script D	2.93	0.91	30	
Script E	3.07	0.94	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.87	1.04	30
	Script B	2.87	0.73	30
	Script C	2.80	0.89	30
	Script D	2.73	0.83	30
	Script E	3.13	0.82	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.13	0.94	30
	Script B	3.10	0.71	30
	Script C	2.63	0.85	30
	Script D	2.80	0.93	30
	Script E	2.80	0.89	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.83	0.83	30
	Script B	3.17	0.91	30
	Script C	2.63	0.85	30
	Script D	3.00	0.83	30
	Script E	3.10	0.92	30

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	2.93	0.91	30
	Script B	3.10	1.09	30
	Script C	2.87	0.94	30
	Script D	2.70	0.88	30
	Script E	2.87	0.78	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.70	0.84	30
	Script B	3.10	0.85	30
	Script C	2.60	0.81	30
	Script D	2.70	0.79	30
	Script E	3.13	0.86	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.00	1.08	30
	Script B	3.2.	0.93	30
	Script C	2.73	0.87	30
	Script D	2.77	0.82	30
	Script E	2.93	0.83	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.00	1.02	30
	Script B	2.93	0.83	30
	Script C	2.83	0.91	30
	Script D	3.03	0.85	30
	Script E	3.10	0.89	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.07	0.74	30
	Script B	3.00	0.91	30
	Script C	2.77	0.94	30
	Script D	2.73	0.98	30
	Script E	2.73	0.83	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.60	0.91	15
	Script B	3.07	0.70	15
	Script C	2.87	0.92	15
	Script D	2.53	0.74	15
	Script E	3.40	0.83	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.13	1.06	15
	Script B	3.07	0.88	15
	Script C	3.47	0.92	15
	Script D	2.87	0.83	15
	Script E	2.93	0.96	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.13	1.13	15
	Script B	2.67	0.72	15
	Script C	2.73	0.88	15
	Script D	2.93	0.88	15
	Script E	2.87	0.74	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.13	0.83	15
	Script B	3.13	0.52	15
	Script C	2.80	0.78	15
	Script D	2.73	1.03	15
	Script E	2.67	0.82	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.80	0.76	15
	Script B	3.13	0.99	15
	Script C	2.33	0.62	15
	Script D	2.87	0.83	15
	Script E	2.87	0.83	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.87	1.13	15
	Script B	3.33	0.98	15
	Script C	3.00	0.76	15
	Script D	2.67	0.82	15
Script E	2.93	0.70	15	
Male				
Female				
Script A	2.87	0.92	15	
Script B	3.20	0.86	15	
Script C	2.93	0.96	15	
Script D	3.13	0.83	15	
Script E	3.33	0.98	15	
Male				
Script A	3.00	0.66	15	
Script B	2.87	1.19	15	
Script C	2.73	1.10	15	
Script D	2.73	0.96	15	
Script E	2.80	0.86	15	
For Entire Sample		2.90	0.88	600

Table GG-55

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Homosexual CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	1.69	0.86	300
	Female	1.49	0.69	300
Parent	Female	1.60	0.78	300
	Male	1.57	0.79	300
Child	Female	1.52	0.77	300
	Male	1.65	0.80	300
Script	Script A	1.64	0.88	120
	Script B	1.85	0.74	120
	Script C	1.45	0.66	120
	Script D	1.68	0.89	120
	Script E	1.58	0.73	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	1.72	0.85	150
	Male	1.66	0.87	150
	Female			
	Female	1.49	0.68	150
	Male	1.49	0.70	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	1.62	0.80	150
	Male	1.76	0.91	150
	Female			
	Female	1.43	0.72	150
	Male	1.55	0.66	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	1.78	1.06	60
	Script B	1.75	0.82	60
	Script C	1.43	0.67	60
	Script D	1.75	0.88	60
	Script E	1.73	0.80	60
	Female			
	Script A	1.50	0.62	60
	Script B	1.42	0.62	60
	Script C	1.47	0.65	60
	Script D	1.62	0.90	60
Script E	1.43	0.62	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Parent by Child	Female				
	Female	1.56	0.75	150	
	Male	1.65	0.81	150	
	Male				
	Female	1.49	0.78	150	
	Male	1.66	0.79	150	
Parent by Script	Female				
	Script A	1.65	0.84	60	
	Script B	1.57	0.77	60	
	Script C	1.45	0.68	60	
	Script D	1.73	0.84	60	
	Script E	1.62	0.76	60	
	Male				
	Script A	1.63	0.92	60	
	Script B	1.60	0.72	60	
	Script C	1.45	0.65	60	
	Script D	1.63	0.94	60	
	Script E	1.55	0.70	60	
	Child by Script	Female			
		Script A	1.50	0.79	60
Script B		1.52	0.70	60	
Script C		1.38	0.64	60	
Script D		1.73	1.00	60	
Script E		1.48	0.62	60	
Male					
Script A		1.78	0.94	60	
Script B		1.65	0.78	60	
Script C		1.52	0.68	60	
Script D		1.63	0.78	60	
Script E		1.68	0.81	60	
Sex by Parent by Child		Male			
		Female			
	Female	1.69	0.81	75	
	Male	1.75	0.90	75	
	Male				
	Female	1.55	0.79	75	
	Male	1.77	0.92	75	
	Female				
	Female				
	Female	1.43	0.66	75	
	Male	1.55	0.70	75	
	Male				
	Female	1.43	0.77	75	
	Male	1.55	0.62	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	1.77	0.97	30
	Script B	1.80	0.85	30
	Script C	1.50	0.73	30
	Script D	1.77	0.90	30
	Script E	1.77	0.82	30
	Male			
	Script A	1.80	1.16	30
	Script B	1.70	0.79	30
	Script C	1.37	0.62	30
	Script D	1.73	0.87	30
	Script E	1.70	0.79	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	1.53	0.68	30
	Script B	1.33	0.61	30
	Script C	1.40	0.62	30
	Script D	1.70	0.79	30
	Script E	1.47	0.68	30
Male				
Script A	1.47	0.57	30	
Script B	1.50	0.63	30	
Script C	1.53	0.68	30	
Script D	1.53	1.01	30	
Script E	1.40	0.56	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	1.60	0.89	30
	Script B	1.67	0.80	30
	Script C	1.40	0.68	30
	Script D	1.90	0.92	30
	Script E	1.53	0.63	30
	Male			
	Script A	1.97	1.19	30
	Script B	1.83	0.83	30
	Script C	1.47	0.68	30
	Script D	1.60	0.81	30
	Script E	1.93	0.91	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	1.40	0.68	30
	Script B	1.37	0.56	30
	Script C	1.37	0.62	30
	Script D	1.57	1.04	30
	Script E	1.43	0.63	30

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	1.60	0.56	30
	Script B	1.47	0.68	30
	Script C	1.57	0.68	30
	Script D	1.67	0.76	30
	Script E	1.43	0.63	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	1.57	0.86	30
	Script B	1.47	0.68	30
	Script C	1.47	0.63	30
	Script D	1.83	0.91	30
	Script E	1.47	0.57	30
	Male			
	Script A	1.73	0.83	30
	Script B	1.67	0.84	30
	Script C	1.43	0.73	30
	Script D	1.63	0.77	30
	Script E	1.77	0.80	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	1.43	0.73	30
	Script B	1.57	0.73	30
	Script C	1.30	0.65	30
	Script D	1.63	1.07	30
	Script E	1.50	0.68	30
	Male			
	Script A	1.83	1.05	30
	Script B	1.63	0.72	30
	Script C	1.60	0.62	30
	Script D	1.63	0.81	30
	Script E	1.60	0.79	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	1.67	0.98	15
	Script B	1.73	0.80	15
	Script C	1.47	0.64	15
	Script D	2.07	0.96	15
	Script E	1.53	0.52	15
	Male			
	Script A	1.87	0.99	15
	Script B	1.87	0.92	15
	Script C	1.53	0.83	15
	Script D	1.47	0.74	15
	Script E	2.00	1.00	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	1.53	0.83	15
	Script B	1.60	0.83	15
	Script C	1.33	0.72	15
	Script D	1.73	0.88	15
	Script E	1.53	0.74	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.07	1.39	15
	Script B	1.80	0.78	15
	Script C	1.40	0.51	15
	Script D	1.73	0.88	15
	Script E	1.87	0.83	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	1.47	0.73	15
	Script B	1.20	0.41	15
	Script C	1.47	0.64	15
	Script D	1.60	0.83	15
	Script E	1.40	0.63	15
	Male			
	Script A	1.60	0.63	15
	Script B	1.47	0.74	15
	Script C	1.33	0.62	15
	Script D	1.80	0.78	15
	Script E	1.53	0.74	15
	Male			
	Female			
Script A	1.33	0.62	15	
Script B	1.53	0.64	15	
Script C	1.27	0.59	15	
Script D	1.53	1.25	15	
Script E	1.47	0.64	15	
Male				
Script A	1.60	0.51	15	
Script B	1.47	0.64	15	
Script C	1.80	0.68	15	
Script D	1.53	0.74	15	
Script E	1.33	0.48	15	
For Entire Sample		1.58	0.79	600

Table GG-56

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Cold CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	2.45	1.03	300
	Female	2.28	1.04	300
Parent	Female	2.46	1.06	300
	Male	2.27	1.00	300
Child	Female	2.25	1.03	300
	Male	2.48	1.05	300
Script	Script A	2.34	1.03	120
	Script B	2.34	1.08	120
	Script C	2.27	1.08	120
	Script D	2.55	1.01	120
	Script E	2.33	0.98	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	2.58	1.03	150
	Male	2.31	1.02	150
	Female			
	Female	2.35	1.09	150
	Male	2.20	0.99	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	2.31	1.00	150
	Male	2.58	1.04	150
	Female			
	Female	2.19	1.02	150
	Male	2.37	1.06	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	2.57	1.02	60
	Script B	2.47	1.07	60
	Script C	2.28	1.09	60
	Script D	2.65	1.01	60
	Script E	2.27	0.94	60
	Female			
	Script A	2.12	0.99	60
	Script B	2.22	1.09	60
	Script C	2.25	1.08	60
	Script D	2.45	1.02	60
Script E	2.38	1.03	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	2.25	1.02	150
	Male	2.67	1.07	150
	Male			
	Female	2.25	1.01	150
	Male	2.28	1.00	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	2.48	1.10	60
	Script B	2.50	1.14	60
	Script C	2.37	1.07	60
	Script D	2.58	1.06	60
	Script E	2.38	0.96	60
	Male			
	Script A	2.20	0.94	60
	Script B	2.18	1.00	60
	Script C	2.17	1.09	60
	Script D	2.52	0.97	60
Script E	2.27	1.04	60	
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	2.25	1.07	60
	Script B	2.13	1.05	60
	Script C	2.15	1.06	60
	Script D	2.48	0.93	60
	Script E	2.25	0.95	60
	Male			
	Script A	2.43	0.98	60
	Script B	2.55	1.08	60
	Script C	2.38	1.11	60
	Script D	2.62	1.09	60
Script E	2.40	1.01	60	
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	2.37	0.98	75
	Male	2.79	1.03	75
	Male			
	Female	2.25	1.03	75
	Male	2.37	1.01	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	2.13	1.04	75
	Male	2.56	1.11	75
Male				
Female	2.25	1.00	75	
Male	2.19	0.98	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Sex by Parent by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	2.77	1.01	30
		Script B	2.73	1.11	30
		Script C	2.23	1.10	30
		Script D	2.73	0.98	30
		Script E	2.43	0.86	30
		Male			
		Script A	2.37	1.00	30
		Script B	2.20	0.96	30
		Script C	2.33	1.09	30
		Script D	2.57	1.04	30
		Script E	2.10	1.00	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	2.20	1.13	30
		Script B	2.27	1.43	30
		Script C	2.50	1.04	30
		Script D	2.43	1.14	30
		Script E	2.33	1.06	30
	Male				
	Script A	2.03	0.85	30	
	Script B	2.17	1.05	30	
	Script C	2.00	1.08	30	
	Script D	2.47	0.90	30	
	Script E	2.37	1.01	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	2.37	1.00	30
		Script B	2.27	1.05	30
		Script C	2.13	1.07	30
		Script D	2.60	0.93	30
		Script E	2.20	0.96	30
		Male			
		Script A	2.77	1.01	30
		Script B	2.67	1.06	30
		Script C	2.43	1.10	30
		Script D	2.70	1.09	30
		Script E	2.33	0.92	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	2.13	1.13	30
		Script B	2.00	1.05	30
		Script C	2.17	1.05	30
		Script D	2.37	0.93	30
		Script E	2.30	0.95	30

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	2.10	0.85	30
	Script B	2.43	1.10	30
	Script C	2.33	1.12	30
	Script D	2.53	1.11	30
	Script E	2.47	1.11	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.20	1.13	30
	Script B	2.17	1.05	30
	Script C	2.37	1.03	30
	Script D	2.40	1.00	30
	Script E	2.13	0.90	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.77	1.01	30
	Script B	2.83	1.15	30
	Script C	2.37	1.13	30
	Script D	2.77	1.10	30
	Script E	2.63	0.96	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.30	1.02	30
	Script B	2.10	1.06	30
	Script C	1.93	1.05	30
	Script D	2.57	0.86	30
	Script E	2.37	1.00	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.10	0.85	30
	Script B	2.27	0.94	30
	Script C	2.40	1.10	30
	Script D	2.47	1.07	30
	Script E	2.17	1.02	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.33	0.90	15
	Script B	2.60	1.12	15
	Script C	2.13	1.06	15
	Script D	2.67	0.90	15
	Script E	2.13	0.92	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.20	0.94	15
	Script B	2.87	1.13	15
	Script C	2.33	1.18	15
	Script D	2.80	1.08	15
	Script E	2.73	0.70	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.40	1.12	15
	Script B	1.93	0.88	15
	Script C	2.13	1.13	15
	Script D	2.53	0.99	15
	Script E	2.27	1.03	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.33	0.90	15
	Script B	2.47	0.99	15
	Script C	2.53	1.06	15
	Script D	2.60	1.12	15
	Script E	1.93	0.96	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.07	1.35	15
	Script B	1.73	0.80	15
	Script C	2.60	0.99	15
	Script D	2.13	1.06	15
	Script E	2.13	0.92	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.33	0.90	15
	Script B	2.80	1.21	15
Script C	2.40	1.12	15	
Script D	2.73	1.16	15	
Script E	2.53	1.19	15	
Male				
Female				
Script A	2.20	0.94	15	
Script B	2.27	1.22	15	
Script C	1.73	0.96	15	
Script D	2.60	0.74	15	
Script E	2.47	0.99	15	
Male				
Script A	1.87	0.73	15	
Script B	2.07	0.88	15	
Script C	2.27	1.16	15	
Script D	2.33	1.05	15	
Script E	2.40	1.06	15	
For Entire Sample		2.37	1.04	600

Table GG-57

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Responsible CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	3.44	0.91	300
	Female	3.53	0.94	300
Parent	Female	3.42	0.94	300
	Male	3.54	0.92	300
Child	Female	3.62	0.93	300
	Male	3.34	0.91	300
Script	Script A	3.64	0.93	120
	Script B	3.63	0.91	120
	Script C	3.37	0.97	120
	Script D	3.14	0.90	120
	Script E	3.63	0.84	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	3.31	0.93	150
	Male	3.56	0.89	150
	Female			
	Female	3.53	0.95	150
	Male	3.52	0.94	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	3.50	0.95	150
	Male	3.37	0.88	150
	Female			
	Female	3.74	0.89	150
	Male	3.31	0.95	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	3.55	0.95	60
	Script B	3.62	0.76	60
	Script C	3.33	1.02	60
	Script D	3.07	0.92	60
	Script E	3.62	0.83	60
	Female			
	Script A	3.73	0.92	60
	Script B	3.65	1.04	60
	Script C	3.40	0.92	60
Script D	3.22	0.89	60	
Script E	3.63	0.86	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	3.53	0.93	150
	Male	3.32	0.94	150
	Male			
	Female	3.71	0.92	150
	Male	3.37	0.89	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	3.57	1.00	60
	Script B	3.57	0.95	60
	Script C	3.27	0.95	60
	Script D	3.22	0.92	60
	Script E	3.55	0.85	60
	Male			
	Script A	3.77	0.85	60
	Script B	3.70	0.87	60
	Script C	3.47	0.98	60
Script D	3.07	0.88	60	
Script E	3.70	0.83	60	
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	3.77	1.00	60
	Script B	3.83	0.74	60
	Script C	3.57	1.06	60
	Script D	3.22	0.85	60
	Script E	3.72	0.85	60
	Male			
	Script A	3.52	0.85	60
	Script B	3.43	1.02	60
	Script C	3.17	0.83	60
Script D	3.07	0.95	60	
Script E	3.53	0.83	60	
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	3.31	0.94	75
	Male	3.32	0.92	75
	Male			
	Female	3.69	0.92	75
	Male	3.43	0.84	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	3.75	0.87	75
	Male	3.32	0.98	75
	Male			
Female	3.73	0.91	75	
Male	3.31	0.93	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Sex by Parent by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	3.27	0.91	30
		Script B	3.50	0.86	30
		Script C	3.13	1.04	30
		Script D	3.13	0.90	30
		Script E	3.53	0.90	30
		Male			
		Script A	3.83	0.91	30
		Script B	3.73	0.64	30
		Script C	3.53	0.97	30
		Script D	3.00	1.95	30
		Script E	3.70	0.75	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	3.77	1.04	30
		Script B	3.63	1.03	30
		Script C	3.40	0.86	30
		Script D	3.30	0.95	30
		Script E	3.57	0.82	30
	Male				
	Script A	3.70	0.79	30	
	Script B	3.67	1.06	30	
	Script C	3.40	1.00	30	
	Script D	3.13	1.82	30	
	Script E	3.70	0.92	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	3.50	1.01	30
		Script B	3.77	0.73	30
		Script C	3.40	1.25	30
		Script D	3.13	1.90	30
		Script E	3.70	0.70	30
		Male			
		Script A	3.60	0.89	30
		Script B	3.47	0.78	30
		Script C	3.27	0.74	30
		Script D	3.00	0.95	30
		Script E	3.53	0.94	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	4.03	0.93	30
	Script B	3.90	0.76	30	
	Script C	3.73	0.83	30	
	Script D	2.30	0.79	30	
	Script E	3.73	0.98	30	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	3.43	0.82	30
	Script B	3.40	1.22	30
	Script C	3.07	0.91	30
	Script D	2.13	0.97	30
	Script E	3.53	0.73	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.70	0.99	30
	Script B	3.73	0.83	30
	Script C	3.20	1.03	30
	Script D	2.27	0.87	30
	Script E	3.73	0.83	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.33	0.99	30
	Script B	3.40	1.04	30
	Script C	3.33	0.88	30
	Script D	3.17	0.99	30
	Script E	3.37	0.85	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.83	1.02	30
	Script B	3.93	0.64	30
	Script C	3.93	0.98	30
	Script D	3.17	0.83	30
	Script E	3.70	0.88	30
	Male			
	Script A	3.70	0.65	30
	Script B	3.47	1.01	30
	Script C	3.00	0.74	30
	Script D	2.97	1.93	30
	Script E	3.70	0.79	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.27	0.80	15
	Script B	3.67	0.90	15
	Script C	2.93	1.22	15
	Script D	2.07	0.80	15
	Script E	3.60	0.83	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.27	1.03	15
	Script B	3.33	0.82	15
	Script C	3.33	0.82	15
	Script D	3.20	1.01	15
	Script E	3.47	0.99	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.73	1.16	15
	Script B	3.87	0.52	15
	Script C	3.87	1.13	15
	Script D	3.20	1.13	15
	Script E	3.80	0.56	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.93	0.59	15
	Script B	3.60	0.74	15
	Script C	3.20	0.68	15
	Script D	2.80	0.86	15
	Script E	3.60	0.91	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	4.13	0.99	15
	Script B	3.80	0.78	15
	Script C	3.47	0.74	15
	Script D	3.47	0.92	15
	Script E	3.87	0.83	15
	Male			
	Script A	3.40	0.99	15
	Script B	3.47	1.25	15
	Script C	3.33	0.98	15
	Script D	3.13	0.99	15
Script E	3.27	0.70	15	
Male				
Female				
Script A	3.93	0.88	15	
Script B	4.00	0.76	15	
Script C	4.00	0.85	15	
Script D	3.13	0.64	15	
Script E	3.60	1.12	15	
Male				
Script A	3.47	0.64	15	
Script B	3.33	1.24	15	
Script C	2.80	0.78	15	
Script D	3.13	0.99	15	
Script E	3.80	0.68	15	
For Entire Sample		3.48	0.93	600

Table GG-58

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Seductive CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	3.01	0.94	300
	Female	2.93	0.97	300
Parent	Female	2.98	0.95	300
	Male	2.94	0.96	300
Child	Female	2.99	0.98	300
	Male	2.93	0.94	300
Script	Script A	2.74	0.98	120
	Script B	2.86	0.91	120
	Script C	3.21	0.90	120
	Script D	3.31	1.01	120
	Script E	2.68	0.81	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	3.01	0.94	150
	Male	3.01	0.94	150
	Female	2.95	0.97	150
	Male	2.87	0.99	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	3.10	0.96	150
	Male	2.91	0.90	150
	Female	2.89	0.98	150
	Male	2.94	0.97	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	2.90	1.07	60
	Script B	2.88	0.80	60
	Script C	3.22	0.90	60
	Script D	3.38	0.87	60
	Script E	2.65	0.86	60
	Female			
	Script A	2.58	0.87	60
	Script B	2.83	1.01	60
	Script C	3.20	0.90	60
Script D	2.72	1.14	60	
Script E	2.96	0.76	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	3.01	0.97	150
	Male	2.95	0.93	150
	Male			
	Female	2.98	0.98	150
	Male	3.2.98	0.95	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	2.93	0.95	60
	Script B	2.83	0.94	60
	Script C	3.33	0.84	60
	Script D	3.18	1.02	60
	Script E	2.62	0.85	60
	Male			
	Script A	2.55	0.98	60
	Script B	2.88	0.89	60
	Script C	3.08	0.94	60
	Script D	3.43	1.00	60
Script E	2.75	0.77	60	
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	2.98	1.05	60
	Script B	2.82	0.87	60
	Script C	3.17	0.98	60
	Script D	3.35	0.99	60
	Script E	2.72	0.87	60
	Male			
	Script A	2.57	0.89	60
	Script B	2.97	0.95	60
	Script C	3.25	0.82	60
	Script D	3.27	1.04	60
Script E	2.65	0.76	60	
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	3.08	0.97	75
	Male	2.93	0.91	75
	Male			
	Female	3.12	0.96	75
	Male	2.89	0.91	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	2.93	0.98	75
	Male	2.97	0.96	75
Male				
Female	2.84	0.99	75	
Male	2.91	0.99	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.07	1.08	30
	Script B	3.87	0.90	30
	Script C	3.33	0.88	30
	Script D	3.17	0.79	30
	Script E	2.60	0.89	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.73	1.05	30
	Script B	2.90	0.71	30
	Script C	3.10	0.92	30
	Script D	3.60	0.89	30
	Script E	2.70	0.84	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.80	0.81	30
	Script B	2.80	1.00	30
	Script C	3.33	0.80	30
	Script D	3.20	1.22	30
	Script E	2.63	0.81	30
Male				
Script A	2.37	0.89	30	
Script B	2.87	1.04	30	
Script C	3.07	0.98	30	
Script D	3.27	1.08	30	
Script E	2.80	0.71	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.17	1.09	30
	Script B	2.93	0.79	30
	Script C	3.20	1.06	30
	Script D	3.47	0.73	30
	Script E	2.73	0.98	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.63	1.00	30
	Script B	2.83	0.83	30
	Script C	3.23	0.73	30
	Script D	3.30	0.99	30
	Script E	2.57	0.73	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.67	0.96	30
	Script B	2.70	0.95	30
	Script C	3.13	0.90	30
	Script D	3.23	1.19	30
	Script E	2.70	0.75	30

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	2.50	0.78	30
	Script B	2.97	1.07	30
	Script C	3.27	0.91	30
	Script D	3.23	1.10	30
	Script E	2.73	0.79	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.07	0.98	30
	Script B	2.77	0.94	30
	Script C	3.37	0.81	30
	Script D	3.20	1.10	30
	Script E	2.63	0.79	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.80	0.98	30
	Script B	2.90	0.94	30
	Script C	3.30	0.81	30
	Script D	3.17	1.06	30
	Script E	2.60	0.93	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.77	0.93	30
	Script B	2.87	0.96	30
	Script C	2.99	0.87	30
	Script D	3.50	0.97	30
	Script E	2.80	0.77	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.33	1.10	30
	Script B	2.90	0.82	30
	Script C	3.20	1.10	30
	Script D	3.37	0.90	30
	Script E	2.70	0.81	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.27	1.03	15
	Script B	2.80	0.94	15
	Script C	3.40	1.06	15
	Script D	3.20	0.56	15
	Script E	2.73	1.10	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.87	1.13	15
	Script B	2.93	0.88	15
	Script C	3.27	1.70	15
	Script D	3.13	0.99	15
	Script E	2.47	0.64	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.07	1.16	15
	Script B	3.07	0.59	15
	Script C	3.00	1.07	15
	Script D	3.73	0.80	15
	Script E	2.73	0.88	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.40	0.83	15
	Script B	2.73	0.80	15
	Script C	3.20	0.78	15
	Script D	3.47	0.99	15
	Script E	2.67	0.82	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.87	0.92	15
	Script B	2.73	0.96	15
	Script C	3.33	0.99	15
	Script D	3.20	1.42	15
	Script E	2.53	0.74	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.73	0.70	15
	Script B	2.87	1.06	15
	Script C	3.33	1.05	15
	Script D	3.20	1.01	15
	Script E	2.73	0.88	15
	Male			
	Female			
Script A	2.47	0.99	15	
Script B	2.67	0.98	15	
Script C	3.47	1.16	15	
Script D	3.27	0.96	15	
Script E	2.87	0.74	15	
Male				
Script A	2.27	0.80	15	
Script B	3.07	1.10	15	
Script C	3.20	0.78	15	
Script D	3.27	1.22	15	
Script E	2.73	0.70	15	
For Entire Sample		2.96	0.96	600

Table GG-59

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Unconventional CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	2.79	0.98	300
	Female	2.68	1.03	300
Parent	Female	2.80	0.99	300
	Male	2.67	1.02	300
Child	Female	2.75	1.03	300
	Male	2.72	0.99	300
Script	Script A	2.53	0.99	120
	Script B	2.58	0.99	120
	Script C	2.91	0.99	120
	Script D	3.11	1.00	120
	Script E	2.54	0.95	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	2.85	1.01	150
	Male	2.72	0.96	150
	Female			
	Female	2.75	0.98	150
	Male	2.61	1.09	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	2.82	1.04	150
	Male	2.75	0.93	150
	Female			
	Female	2.67	1.02	150
	Male	2.69	1.05	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	2.78	1.11	60
	Script B	2.55	0.93	60
	Script C	2.90	0.92	60
	Script D	3.08	1.03	60
	Script E	2.62	0.85	60
	Female			
	Script A	2.27	0.78	60
	Script B	2.62	1.06	60
	Script C	2.92	1.06	60
Script D	3.13	0.98	60	
Script E	2.47	1.05	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Parent by Child	Female				
	Female	2.78	1.00	150	
	Male	2.82	0.99	150	
	Male				
	Female	2.71	1.06	150	
	Male	2.62	0.98	150	
Parent by Script	Female				
	Script A	2.65	1.02	60	
	Script B	2.60	1.00	60	
	Script C	3.05	0.98	60	
	Script D	3.12	0.96	60	
	Script E	2.58	0.89	60	
	Male				
	Script A	2.40	0.94	60	
	Script B	2.57	1.00	60	
	Script C	2.77	0.98	60	
	Script D	3.10	1.05	60	
	Script E	2.50	1.02	60	
	Child by Script	Female			
		Script A	2.60	1.12	60
Script B		2.53	1.00	60	
Script C		2.93	1.02	60	
Script D		3.08	0.93	60	
Script E		2.58	0.98	60	
Male					
Script A		2.45	0.83	60	
Script B		2.63	0.99	60	
Script C		2.88	0.96	60	
Script D		3.13	1.08	60	
Script E		2.55	0.93	60	
Sex by Parent by Child		Male			
		Female			
	Female	2.85	1.01	75	
	Male	2.85	1.01	75	
	Male				
	Female	2.79	1.07	75	
	Male	2.65	0.83	75	
	Female				
	Female				
	Female	2.71	0.98	75	
	Male	2.79	0.98	75	
	Male				
	Female	2.64	1.06	75	
	Male	2.59	1.12	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	3.03	1.07	30
	Script B	2.60	1.00	30
	Script C	2.97	1.03	30
	Script D	3.10	0.96	30
	Script E	2.57	0.90	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.53	1.11	30
	Script B	2.50	0.86	30
	Script C	2.83	0.79	30
	Script D	3.07	1.12	30
	Script E	2.67	0.80	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.27	0.83	30
	Script B	2.60	1.00	30
	Script C	3.13	0.94	30
	Script D	3.13	0.97	30
	Script E	2.60	0.89	30
Male				
Script A	2.27	0.74	30	
Script B	2.63	1.13	30	
Script C	2.70	1.15	30	
Script D	3.13	1.01	30	
Script E	2.33	1.18	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.93	1.29	30
	Script B	2.47	0.94	30
	Script C	3.03	1.00	30
	Script D	3.07	1.02	30
	Script E	2.60	0.81	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.63	0.89	30
	Script B	2.63	0.93	30
	Script C	2.77	0.82	30
	Script D	3.10	1.06	30
	Script E	2.63	0.89	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.27	0.83	30
	Script B	2.60	1.07	30
	Script C	2.83	1.05	30
	Script D	3.10	0.85	30
	Script E	2.57	1.14	30

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	2.27	0.74	30
	Script B	2.63	1.07	30
	Script C	3.00	1.08	30
	Script D	3.17	1.12	30
	Script E	2.37	0.96	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.63	1.10	30
	Script B	2.47	1.04	30
	Script C	3.17	0.95	30
	Script D	3.13	0.86	30
	Script E	2.50	0.82	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.67	0.96	30
	Script B	2.73	1.94	30
	Script C	2.93	1.02	30
	Script D	3.10	1.06	30
	Script E	2.67	0.96	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.57	1.17	30
	Script B	2.60	0.97	30
	Script C	2.70	1.06	30
	Script D	3.03	1.00	30
	Script E	2.67	1.12	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.23	0.63	30
	Script B	2.53	1.04	30
	Script C	2.83	0.91	30
	Script D	3.17	1.12	30
	Script E	2.33	0.88	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	3.13	1.12	15
	Script B	2.47	0.99	15
	Script C	3.20	1.08	15
	Script D	3.00	0.85	15
	Script E	2.47	0.83	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.93	1.03	15
	Script B	2.73	1.03	15
	Script C	2.73	0.96	15
	Script D	3.20	1.08	15
	Script E	2.67	0.98	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.73	1.14	15
	Script B	2.47	0.92	15
	Script C	2.87	0.92	15
	Script D	3.13	1.19	15
	Script E	2.73	0.80	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.33	0.62	15
	Script B	2.53	0.83	15
	Script C	2.80	0.68	15
	Script D	3.00	1.07	15
	Script E	2.60	1.83	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.13	0.83	15
	Script B	2.47	1.13	15
	Script C	3.13	0.83	15
	Script D	3.27	0.88	15
	Script E	2.53	0.83	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.40	0.83	15
	Script B	2.73	0.88	15
	Script C	3.13	1.06	15
	Script D	3.00	1.07	15
	Script E	2.67	0.98	15
	Male			
	Female			
Script A	2.40	0.83	15	
Script B	2.73	1.03	15	
Script C	2.53	1.19	15	
Script D	2.93	0.80	15	
Script E	2.60	1.40	15	
Male				
Script A	2.13	0.64	15	
Script B	2.53	1.25	15	
Script C	2.87	1.13	15	
Script D	3.33	1.18	15	
Script E	2.07	0.88	15	
For Entire Sample		2.73	1.01	600

Table GG-60

Mean Scores and Standard deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Promiscuous CAD Item

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	2.81	1.44	300
	Female	2.64	1.20	300
Parent	Female	2.77	1.61	300
	Male	2.68	1.20	300
Child	Female	2.64	1.20	300
	Male	2.81	1.15	300
Script	Script A	2.38	1.10	120
	Script B	2.51	1.13	120
	Script C	2.94	1.32	120
	Script D	3.38	1.17	120
	Script E	2.43	1.04	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	2.90	1.13	150
	Male	2.73	1.15	150
	Female			
	Male	2.65	1.17	150
	Male	2.64	1.24	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	2.76	1.20	150
	Male	2.87	1.09	150
	Female			
	Female	2.53	1.19	150
	Male	2.76	1.21	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	2.67	1.17	60
	Script B	2.42	1.00	60
	Script C	3.03	1.13	60
	Script D	3.43	1.17	60
	Script E	2.52	0.95	60
	Female			
	Script A	2.08	0.94	60
	Script B	2.60	1.25	60
	Script C	2.85	1.13	60
Script D	3.33	1.17	60	
Script E	2.35	1.12	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Parent by Child	Female				
	Female	2.67	1.19	150	
	Male	2.88	1.11	150	
	Male				
	Female	2.62	1.20	150	
	Male	2.75	1.19	150	
Parent by Script	Female				
	Script A	2.43	1.18	60	
	Script B	2.62	1.12	60	
	Script C	3.03	1.06	60	
	Script D	3.25	1.16	60	
	Script E	2.48	1.03	60	
	Male				
	Script A	2.32	1.02	60	
	Script B	2.40	1.14	60	
	Script C	2.80	1.19	60	
	Script D	3.52	1.17	60	
	Script E	2.38	1.04	60	
	Child by Script	Female			
		Script A	2.33	1.16	60
Script B		2.38	1.11	60	
Script C		2.82	1.28	60	
Script D		3.25	1.14	60	
Script E		2.43	1.05	60	
Male					
Script A		2.42	1.05	60	
Script B		2.63	1.15	60	
Script C		3.07	0.95	60	
Script D		3.57	1.19	60	
Script E		2.43	1.03	60	
Sex by Parent by Child		Male			
		Female			
	Female	2.85	1.21	75	
	Male	2.95	1.06	75	
	Male				
	Female	2.67	1.19	75	
	Male	2.79	1.12	75	
	Female				
	Female				
	Female	2.48	1.16	75	
	Male	2.81	1.16	75	
	Male				
	Female	2.57	1.22	75	
	Male	2.71	1.26	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.83	1.29	30
	Script B	2.60	1.07	30
	Script C	3.13	1.11	30
	Script D	3.40	1.07	30
	Script E	2.53	0.94	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.50	1.04	30
	Script B	2.23	0.90	30
	Script C	2.93	1.17	30
	Script D	3.47	1.28	30
	Script E	2.50	0.97	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.03	0.93	30
	Script B	2.63	1.19	30
	Script C	3.03	1.03	30
	Script D	3.10	1.24	30
	Script E	2.43	1.14	30
Male				
Script A	2.13	0.97	30	
Script B	2.57	1.33	30	
Script C	2.67	1.21	30	
Script D	3.56	1.07	30	
Script E	3.27	1.11	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.77	1.19	30
	Script B	2.23	1.04	30
	Script C	2.97	1.27	30
	Script D	3.43	1.17	30
	Script E	2.40	0.97	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.57	1.17	30
	Script B	2.60	0.93	30
	Script C	3.10	1.00	30
	Script D	3.43	1.19	30
	Script E	2.63	0.93	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	1.90	0.96	30
Script B	2.53	1.17	30	
Script C	2.67	1.30	30	
Script D	3.07	1.11	30	
Script E	2.47	1.14	30	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	2.27	0.91	30
	Script B	2.67	1.35	30
	Script C	3.03	0.93	30
	Script D	3.60	1.19	30
	Script E	2.23	1.10	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.33	1.21	30
	Script B	2.43	1.14	30
	Script C	3.13	1.25	30
	Script D	3.07	1.14	30
	Script E	2.37	1.00	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.53	1.17	30
	Script B	2.80	1.10	30
	Script C	3.03	0.85	30
	Script D	3.40	1.17	30
	Script E	2.60	1.07	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.33	1.12	30
	Script B	2.33	1.09	30
	Script C	2.50	1.25	30
	Script D	3.43	1.14	30
	Script E	2.50	1.11	30
	Male			
	Script A	2.30	0.92	30
	Script B	2.47	1.20	30
	Script C	3.10	1.06	30
	Script D	3.60	1.22	30
	Script E	2.27	0.98	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	2.87	1.25	15
	Script B	2.40	1.18	15
	Script C	3.27	1.22	15
	Script D	3.27	1.16	15
	Script E	2.47	1.06	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.80	1.37	15
	Script B	2.80	0.94	15
	Script C	3.00	1.00	15
	Script D	3.53	0.99	15
	Script E	2.60	0.83	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	2.67	1.18	15
	Script B	2.07	0.88	15
	Script C	2.67	1.29	15
	Script D	3.60	1.18	15
	Script E	2.33	0.90	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.33	0.90	15
	Script B	2.40	0.91	15
	Script C	3.20	1.01	15
	Script D	3.33	1.40	15
	Script E	2.67	1.05	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	1.80	0.94	15
	Script B	2.47	1.13	15
	Script C	3.00	1.31	15
	Script D	2.87	1.13	15
	Script E	2.27	0.96	15
	Male			
	Script A	2.27	1.88	15
	Script B	2.80	1.27	15
Script C	3.07	0.70	15	
Script D	3.33	1.35	15	
Script E	2.60	1.30	15	
Male				
Female				
Script A	2.00	1.00	15	
Script B	2.60	1.24	15	
Script C	2.33	1.23	15	
Script D	3.27	1.10	15	
Script E	2.67	1.29	15	
Male				
Script A	2.27	0.96	15	
Script B	2.53	1.46	15	
Script C	3.50	1.13	15	
Script D	3.87	0.99	15	
Script E	1.87	0.74	15	
For Entire Sample		2.73	1.18	600

Table GG-61

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Parent Scale Factor 1

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	<u>N</u>
Sex	Male	56.70	12.70	300
	Female	57.63	11.92	300
Parent	Female	56.72	11.73	300
	Male	57.61	12.88	300
Child	Female	58.35	12.45	300
	Male	55.98	12.08	300
Script	Script A	59.07	11.63	120
	Script B	58.06	11.14	120
	Script C	55.19	12.55	120
	Script D	53.38	13.57	120
	Script E	60.13	11.43	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	55.99	12.07	150
	Male	57.42	13.30	150
	Female			
	Female	57.45	11.38	150
	Male	57.81	12.48	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	57.73	12.10	150
	Male	55.68	13.23	150
	Female			
	Female	58.97	12.81	150
	Male	56.28	10.84	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	58.33	12.34	60
	Script B	58.88	11.44	60
	Script C	55.25	12.51	60
	Script D	53.22	14.94	60
	Script E	57.83	11.45	60
	Female			
	Script A	59.80	10.94	60
	Script B	57.23	10.88	60
	Script C	55.13	12.69	60
Script D	53.55	12.17	60	
Script E	62.42	11.03	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	58.93	11.38	150
	Male	54.51	11.70	150
	Male			
	Female	57.77	13.46	150
	Male	57.45	12.31	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	57.72	12.27	60
	Script B	56.77	11.74	60
	Script C	53.23	11.11	60
	Script D	56.03	12.00	60
	Script E	59.83	10.87	60
	Male			
	Script A	60.42	10.90	60
	Script B	59.35	10.46	60
	Script C	57.15	13.65	60
Script D	50.73	14.60	60	
Script E	60.42	12.05	60	
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	60.90	11.69	60
	Script B	60.65	10.67	60
	Script C	56.73	11.58	60
	Script D	53.35	14.72	60
	Script E	60.12	11.89	60
	Male			
	Script A	57.23	11.38	60
	Script B	55.47	11.09	60
	Script C	53.65	13.37	60
Script D	53.42	12.44	60	
Script E	60.13	12.32	60	
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	58.57	11.56	75
	Male	53.40	12.08	75
	Male			
	Female	56.88	12.64	75
	Male	57.96	14.00	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	59.28	11.26	75
Male	55.61	11.27	75	
Male				
Female	58.67	14.26	75	
Male	56.95	10.43	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	56.57	13.24	30
	Script B	57.07	12.50	30
	Script C	52.10	11.87	30
	Script D	56.87	12.68	30
	Script E	57.33	9.76	30
	Male			
	Script A	60.10	11.32	30
	Script B	60.70	10.15	30
	Script C	58.40	12.53	30
	Script D	49.57	16.31	30
	Script E	58.33	13.07	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	58.87	11.32	30
	Script B	56.47	11.13	30
	Script C	54.37	10.37	30
Script D	55.20	11.43	30	
Script E	62.33	11.48	30	
Male				
Script A	60.73	10.65	30	
Script B	58.00	10.75	30	
Script C	55.90	14.80	30	
Script D	51.90	12.85	30	
Script E	62.50	10.76	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	59.33	12.11	30
	Script B	61.20	10.82	30
	Script C	56.80	11.63	30
	Script D	53.83	14.69	30
	Script E	57.47	10.28	30
	Male			
	Script A	57.33	12.69	30
	Script B	56.57	11.75	30
	Script C	53.70	13.35	30
	Script D	52.60	15.41	30
	Script E	58.20	12.66	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	62.47	11.25	30
	Script B	60.10	10.67	30
	Script C	56.67	11.73	30
	Script D	52.87	14.99	30
	Script E	62.77	12.94	30

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	57.13	10.11	30
	Script B	54.37	10.48	30
	Script C	53.60	13.62	30
	Script D	54.23	8.70	30
	Script E	62.07	8.94	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	60.43	11.67	30
	Script B	61.33	10.75	30
	Script C	54.33	9.56	30
	Script D	57.60	12.72	30
	Script E	60.93	11.15	30
	Male			
	Script A	55.00	12.44	30
	Script B	52.20	11.03	30
	Script C	53.13	12.53	30
	Script D	54.47	11.23	30
	Script E	58.73	10.65	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	61.37	11.90	30
	Script B	59.97	10.73	30
	Script C	59.13	13.02	30
	Script D	49.10	15.56	30
	Script E	59.30	12.72	30
	Male			
	Script A	59.47	9.91	30
	Script B	58.73	10.33	30
	Script C	55.17	14.20	30
	Script D	52.37	13.65	30
	Script E	61.53	11.45	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	60.60	12.57	15
	Script B	61.20	13.16	15
	Script C	52.40	10.74	15
	Script D	59.40	11.28	15
	Script E	59.27	8.88	15
	Male			
	Script A	52.53	13.03	15
	Script B	52.93	10.67	15
	Script C	51.80	13.27	15
	Script D	54.33	13.85	15
	Script E	55.40	10.51	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	58.07	11.93	15
	Script B	61.20	8.32	15
	Script C	61.20	11.11	15
	Script D	48.27	15.92	15
	Script C	61.20	11.11	15
	Script D	48.27	15.92	15
	Script E	55.67	11.54	15
	Male			
	Script A	62.13	10.69	15
	Script B	60.20	11.99	15
	Script C	55.60	13.61	15
	Script D	50.87	17.14	15
	Script E	61.00	14.33	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	60.27	11.13	15
	Script B	61.47	8.12	15
	Script C	56.27	8.12	15
	Script D	55.80	14.17	15
	Script E	62.60	13.14	15
	Male			
	Script A	57.47	11.72	15
	Script B	51.47	11.70	15
	Script C	52.47	12.21	15
	Script D	54.60	8.32	15
	Script E	62.07	10.02	15
Male				
Female				
Script A	64.67	11.30	15	
Script B	58.73	12.88	15	
Script C	57.07	14.78	15	
Script D	49.93	15.70	15	
Script E	62.93	13.19	15	
Male				
Script A	56.80	8.60	15	
Script B	57.27	8.51	15	
Script C	54.73	15.23	15	
Script D	53.87	9.33	15	
Script E	62.07	8.08	15	
For Entire Sample		57.17	12.32	600

Table GG-62

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Parent Scale Factor 2

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	34.38	6.94	300
	Female	34.89	6.47	300
Parent	Female	34.18	6.01	300
	Male	35.09	7.01	300
Child	Female	35.30	6.77	300
	Male	33.97	6.59	300
Script	Script A	35.44	6.42	120
	Script B	35.08	5.95	120
	Script C	33.70	6.89	120
	Script D	32.60	7.28	120
	Script E	36.35	6.37	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	33.99	6.39	150
	Male	34.77	7.46	150
	Female			
	Female	34.37	6.37	150
	Male	35.40	6.55	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	35.02	6.62	150
	Male	33.75	7.21	150
	Female			
	Female	35.57	6.92	150
	Male	34.20	5.92	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	35.35	6.70	60
	Script B	35.88	5.92	60
	Script C	33.63	6.88	60
	Script D	32.22	8.05	60
	Script E	34.83	6.59	60
	Female			
	Script A	35.53	6.17	60
	Script B	34.28	6.59	60
	Script C	33.77	6.95	60
Script D	32.98	6.47	60	
Script E	37.87	5.81	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Parent by Child	Female				
	Female	35.35	6.05	150	
	Male	33.01	6.49	150	
	Male				
	Female	35.24	7.44	150	
	Male	34.94	6.58	150	
Parent by Script	Female				
	Script A	34.23	6.90	60	
	Script B	34.13	6.45	60	
	Script C	32.57	5.96	60	
	Script D	33.75	6.42	60	
	Script E	36.23	5.70	60	
	Male				
	Script A	36.65	5.70	60	
	Script B	36.03	5.30	60	
	Script C	34.83	7.59	60	
	Script D	31.45	7.02	60	
	Script E	36.47	6.71	60	
	Child by Script	Female			
		Script A	36.55	6.17	60
Script B		36.68	5.96	60	
Script C		34.45	6.30	60	
Script D		32.57	7.83	60	
Script E		36.23	6.71	60	
Male					
Script A		34.33	6.52	60	
Script B		33.48	5.55	60	
Script C		32.95	7.41	60	
Script D		32.63	6.76	60	
Script E		36.47	6.07	60	
Sex by Parent by Child		Male			
		Female			
	Female	35.40	5.90	75	
	Male	32.59	6.58	75	
	Male				
	Female	34.64	7.30	75	
	Male	34.91	7.67	75	
	Female				
	Female				
	Female	35.31	6.23	75	
	Male	33.44	6.41	75	
	Male				
	Female	35.84	7.59	75	
	Male	34.96	5.32	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	34.03	7.34	30
	Script B	34.83	6.34	30
	Script A	34.03	7.34	30
	Script B	34.83	6.34	30
	Script C	32.23	6.17	30
	Script D	34.20	6.73	30
	Script E	34.67	5.25	30
	Male			
	Script A	36.67	5.83	30
	Script B	36.93	5.37	30
	Script C	35.03	7.37	30
	Script D	30.23	8.85	30
	Script E	35.00	7.79	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	34.43	6.56	30
	Script B	33.43	6.60	30
	Script C	32.90	5.82	30
Script D	33.30	6.17	30	
Script E	37.80	5.77	30	
Male				
Script A	36.63	5.66	30	
Script B	35.13	5.15	30	
Script C	34.63	7.93	30	
Script D	32.67	6.84	30	
Script E	37.93	5.94	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	36.37	6.15	30
	Script B	37.30	6.12	30
	Script C	34.50	6.06	30
	Script D	32.37	7.78	30
	Script E	34.57	6.17	30
	Male			
	Script A	34.33	7.17	30
	Script B	34.47	5.45	30
	Script C	32.77	7.63	30
	Script D	32.07	8.44	30
	Script E	35.10	7.08	30
	Female			
	Female			
Script A	36.73	6.30	30	
Script B	36.07	5.84	30	
Script C	34.40	6.63	30	
Script D	32.77	8.00	30	
Script E	37.90	6.91	30	

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	34.33	5.91	30
	Script B	32.50	5.56	30
	Script C	33.13	7.31	30
	Script D	33.20	4.57	30
	Script E	37.83	4.58	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	36.03	6.14	30
	Script B	36.50	6.22	30
	Script C	33.23	4.90	30
	Script D	34.63	6.72	30
	Script E	36.37	5.84	30
	Male			
	Script A	32.43	7.25	30
	Script B	31.77	5.86	30
	Script C	31.90	6.88	30
	Script D	32.87	6.08	30
	Script E	36.10	5.65	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	37.07	6.26	30
	Script B	36.87	5.79	30
	Script C	35.67	7.32	30
	Script D	30.50	8.40	30
	Script E	36.10	7.57	30
	Male			
	Script A	36.23	5.14	30
	Script B	35.20	4.70	30
	Script C	34.00	7.88	30
	Script D	32.40	7.46	30
	Script E	36.83	6.54	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	37.13	6.14	15
	Script B	36.60	6.96	15
	Script C	32.33	5.21	15
	Script D	35.67	5.79	15
	Script E	35.27	4.73	15
	Male			
	Script A	30.93	7.29	15
	Script B	33.07	5.30	15
	Script C	32.13	7.20	15
	Script D	32.73	7.47	15
	Script E	34.07	5.84	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	35.60	6.27	15
	Script B	38.00	5.29	15
	Script C	36.67	6.23	15
	Script D	29.07	8.28	15
	Script E	33.87	7.44	15
	Male			
	Script A	37.73	5.35	15
	Script B	35.87	5.41	15
	Script A	37.73	5.35	15
	Script B	35.87	5.41	15
	Script C	33.40	8.24	15
	Script D	31.40	9.53	15
	Script E	36.13	8.21	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	34.93	6.15	15
	Script B	36.40	5.63	15
	Script C	34.13	4.57	15
	Script D	33.60	7.61	15
	Script E	37.47	6.76	15
	Male			
	Script A	33.93	7.13	15
	Script B	30.47	6.29	15
	Script C	31.67	6.79	15
Script D	33.00	4.57	15	
Script E	38.13	4.81	15	
Male				
Female				
Script A	38.53	6.12	15	
Script B	35.73	6.22	15	
Script C	34.67	8.37	15	
Script D	31.93	8.57	15	
Script E	38.33	7.26	15	
Male				
Script A	34.73	4.61	15	
Script B	34.53	3.94	15	
Script C	34.60	7.75	15	
Script D	33.40	4.73	15	
Script E	37.53	4.49	15	
For Entire Sample		34.64	6.71	600

Table GG-63

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Child as Adult Scale Factor 1

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	14.03	3.52	300
	Female	13.34	3.74	300
Parent	Female	13.98	3.12	300
	Male	13.39	3.66	300
Child	Female	13.46	3.63	300
	Male	13.92	3.66	300
Script	Script A	13.02	3.43	120
	Script B	13.12	3.78	120
	Script C	14.13	3.52	120
	Script D	15.30	3.63	120
	Script E	12.87	3.33	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	14.37	3.63	150
	Male	13.69	3.93	150
	Female			
	Male	13.59	3.57	150
Sex by Child	Female	13.09	3.91	150
	Male			
	Female	13.93	3.50	150
	Male	14.13	3.55	150
	Female			
Sex by Script	Female	12.98	3.69	150
	Male	13.71	3.77	150
	Male			
	Script A	14.02	3.67	60
	Script B	13.08	3.22	60
	Script C	14.20	3.26	60
	Script D	15.75	3.64	60
	Script E	13.10	3.22	60
	Female			
	Script A	12.02	2.87	60
Script B	13.15	4.30	60	
Script C	14.07	3.78	60	
Script D	14.85	3.60	60	
Script E	12.63	3.44	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	13.50	3.58	150
	Male	14.46	3.60	150
	Male			
	Female	13.41	3.62	150
	Male	13.37	3.66	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	13.68	3.66	60
	Script B	13.30	3.78	60
	Script C	14.78	3.29	60
	Script D	15.03	3.80	60
	Script E	13.10	3.20	60
	Male			
	Script A	12.35	3.07	60
	Script B	12.93	3.81	60
	Script C	13.48	3.64	60
Script D	12.63	3.48	60	
Script E	12.63	3.45	60	
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	13.12	3.57	60
	Script B	12.45	3.32	60
	Script C	13.85	3.87	60
	Script D	14.93	3.54	60
	Script E	12.93	3.39	60
	Male			
	Script A	12.92	3.31	60
	Script B	13.78	4.12	60
	Script C	14.42	3.13	60
Script D	15.67	3.72	60	
Script E	12.80	3.28	60	
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	14.03	3.71	75
	Male	14.71	3.54	75
	Male			
	Female	13.84	3.31	75
	Male	13.55	3.49	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	12.97	3.39	75
Male	14.21	3.66	75	
Male				
Female	12.99	4.00	75	
Male	13.20	3.83	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	14.97	4.02	30
	Script B	13.37	3.61	30
	Script C	14.60	3.63	30
	Script D	15.53	3.50	30
	Script E	13.37	3.05	30
	Male			
	Script A	13.07	3.05	30
	Script B	12.80	2.82	30
	Script C	13.80	2.86	30
	Script D	15.97	3.82	30
	Script E	12.83	3.42	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	12.40	3.05	30
	Script B	13.23	4.01	30
	Script C	14.97	2.97	30
	Script D	14.53	4.06	30
	Script E	12.83	3.38	30
Male				
Script A	11.63	2.98	30	
Script B	13.07	4.65	30	
Script C	13.17	4.32	30	
Script D	15.17	3.11	30	
Script E	12.43	3.65	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	14.40	3.58	30
	Script B	12.60	2.57	30
	Script C	14.07	3.74	30
	Script D	15.53	3.67	30
	Script E	13.07	3.26	30
	Male			
	Script A	13.63	3.77	30
	Script B	13.57	3.75	30
	Script C	14.33	2.76	30
	Script D	15.98	3.65	30
	Script E	13.13	3.24	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	11.83	3.12	30
	Script B	12.30	3.97	30
	Script C	13.63	4.06	30
	Script D	14.33	3.35	30
	Script E	12.80	3.58	30

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	12.20	2.64	30
	Script B	14.00	4.52	30
	Script C	14.50	3.50	30
	Script D	15.37	3.82	30
	Script E	12.47	3.35	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	13.37	3.85	30
	Script B	12.07	2.96	30
	Script C	15.07	3.58	30
	Script D	14.43	3.74	30
	Script E	12.57	2.99	30
	Male			
	Script A	14.00	3.49	30
	Script B	14.53	4.14	30
	Script C	14.50	3.00	30
	Script D	15.63	3.81	30
	Script E	13.63	3.37	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	12.87	3.32	30
	Script B	12.83	3.65	30
	Script C	12.63	3.83	30
	Script D	15.43	3.31	30
	Script E	13.30	3.77	30
	Male			
	Script A	11.83	2.77	30
	Script B	13.03	4.03	30
	Script C	14.33	3.29	30
	Script D	15.70	3.69	30
	Script E	11.97	3.02	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	14.87	4.10	15
	Script B	12.60	2.90	15
	Script C	14.80	4.18	15
	Script D	15.00	3.53	15
	Script E	12.87	3.40	15
	Male			
	Script A	15.07	4.08	15
	Script B	14.13	4.16	15
	Script C	14.40	3.11	15
	Script D	16.07	3.52	15
	Script E	13.87	2.67	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	13.93	3.04	15
	Script B	12.60	2.29	15
	Script C	13.33	3.22	15
	Script D	16.07	3.86	15
	Script E	13.27	3.22	15
	Male			
	Script A	12.20	2.91	15
	Script B	13.00	3.34	15
	Script C	14.27	2.46	15
	Script D	15.87	3.91	15
	Script E	12.40	3.66	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	11.87	3.00	15
	Script B	11.53	3.02	15
	Script C	15.33	2.99	15
	Script D	13.87	3.98	15
	Script E	12.27	2.60	15
	Male			
	Script A	12.93	2.49	15
	Script B	14.93	4.23	15
Script C	14.60	3.00	15	
Script D	15.20	4.16	15	
Script E	13.40	4.03	15	
Male				
Female				
Script A	11.80	3.34	15	
Script B	13.07	4.72	15	
Script C	11.93	4.35	15	
Script D	14.80	2.62	15	
Script E	13.33	4.37	15	
Male				
Script A	11.47	2.67	15	
Script B	13.07	4.74	15	
Script C	14.40	4.05	15	
Script D	15.53	3.58	15	
Script E	11.53	2.26	15	
For Entire Sample		13.69	3.65	600

Table GG-64

Mean Scores and Standard deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Child as Adult Scale Factor 2

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	16.59	2.99	300
	Female	16.76	2.93	300
Parent	Female	16.47	2.82	300
	Male	16.89	3.09	300
Child	Female	17.14	3.09	300
	Male	16.22	2.76	300
Script	Script A	17.08	3.18	120
	Script B	17.25	2.99	120
	Script C	16.14	2.81	120
	Script D	15.54	2.72	120
	Script E	17.38	2.68	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	16.35	2.87	150
	Male	16.84	3.09	150
	Female			
	Female	16.59	2.77	150
	Male	16.93	3.09	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	16.87	3.11	150
	Male	16.32	2.86	150
	Female			
	Female	17.41	3.06	150
	Male	16.12	2.66	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	16.82	3.35	60
	Script B	17.38	2.55	60
	Script C	16.05	2.90	60
	Script D	15.32	3.02	60
	Script E	17.40	2.61	60
	Female			
	Script A	17.33	3.01	60
	Script B	17.12	3.39	60
	Script C	16.23	2.75	60
Script D	15.77	2.40	60	
	Script E	17.37	2.76	60

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	16.79	2.92	150
	Male	16.15	2.69	150
	Male			
	Female	17.49	3.23	150
	Male	16.29	2.82	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	16.65	3.08	60
	Script B	17.12	2.83	60
	Script C	15.62	2.32	60
	Script D	15.57	2.65	60
	Script E	17.40	2.74	60
	Male			
	Script A	17.50	3.24	60
	Script B	17.38	3.16	60
	Script C	16.67	3.17	60
Script D	15.52	2.81	60	
Script E	17.37	2.64	60	
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	17.53	3.38	60
	Script B	17.90	2.95	60
	Script C	17.67	3.20	60
	Script D	15.70	2.85	60
	Script E	17.88	2.49	60
	Male			
	Script A	16.62	2.92	60
	Script B	16.60	2.91	60
	Script C	15.62	2.27	60
Script D	15.38	2.60	60	
Script E	16.88	2.78	60	
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	16.53	2.88	75
	Male	16.16	2.88	75
	Male			
	Female	17.20	3.30	75
	Male	16.48	2.84	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	17.04	2.95	75
Male	16.15	2.52	75	
Male				
Female	17.77	3.14	75	
Male	16.09	5.32	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Sex by Parent by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	16.17	3.16	30
		Script B	17.13	2.43	30
		Script C	15.40	2.69	30
		Script D	15.37	2.61	30
		Script E	17.67	2.85	30
		Male			
		Script A	17.47	3.45	30
		Script B	17.63	2.68	30
		Script C	16.70	3.00	30
		Script D	15.27	3.42	30
		Script E	17.13	2.37	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	17.13	2.97	30
		Script B	17.10	3.22	30
		Script C	15.83	1.91	30
		Script D	15.77	2.73	30
		Script E	17.13	2.65	30
	Male				
	Script A	17.53	3.08	30	
	Script B	17.13	3.61	30	
	Script C	16.63	3.38	30	
	Script D	15.77	2.06	30	
	Script E	17.60	2.90	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	16.77	3.37	30
		Script B	17.87	2.69	30
		Script C	16.20	3.31	30
		Script D	15.40	3.08	30
		Script E	18.10	2.30	30
		Male			
		Script A	16.87	3.38	30
		Script B	16.90	2.35	30
		Script C	15.90	2.47	30
		Script D	15.23	3.00	30
		Script E	16.70	2.76	30
		Female			
		Female			
		Script A	18.30	3.27	30
		Script B	17.93	3.24	30
		Script C	17.13	3.08	30
		Script D	16.00	2.61	30
		Script E	17.67	2.70	30

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	16.37	2.40	30
	Script B	16.30	3.40	30
	Script C	15.33	2.06	30
	Script D	15.53	2.18	30
	Script E	17.07	2.84	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	17.07	3.17	30
	Script B	17.63	2.95	30
	Script C	15.73	2.56	30
	Script D	15.47	2.81	30
	Script E	18.03	2.25	30
	Male			
	Script A	16.23	2.98	30
	Script B	16.60	2.65	30
	Script C	15.50	2.10	30
	Script D	15.67	2.52	30
	Script E	16.77	3.06	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	18.00	3.57	30
	Script B	18.17	2.97	30
	Script C	17.60	3.54	30
	Script D	15.93	2.91	30
	Script E	17.73	2.74	30
	Male			
	Script A	17.00	2.85	30
	Script B	16.60	3.20	30
	Script C	15.73	2.46	30
	Script D	15.10	2.70	30
	Script E	17.00	2.52	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	16.20	2.81	15
	Script B	17.67	2.77	15
	Script C	15.53	2.85	15
	Script D	14.87	2.36	15
	Script E	18.40	2.29	15
	Male			
	Script A	16.13	3.58	15
	Script B	16.60	1.99	15
	Script C	15.27	2.60	15
	Script D	15.87	2.83	15
	Script E	16.93	3.22	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male				
	Male				
	Female				
		Script A	17.33	3.87	15
		Script B	18.07	2.69	15
		Script C	16.87	3.68	15
		Script D	15.93	3.67	15
		Script E	17.80	2.34	15
		Male			
		Script A	17.60	3.11	15
		Script B	17.20	2.70	15
		Script C	16.53	2.23	15
		Script D	14.60	3.14	15
		Script E	16.47	2.30	15
		Female			
		Male			
		Female			
		Script A	17.93	3.37	15
		Script B	17.60	3.23	15
		Script C	15.93	2.31	15
		Script D	16.07	3.17	15
		Script E	17.67	2.23	15
		Male			
		Script A	16.33	2.35	15
		Script B	16.60	3.25	15
		Script C	15.73	1.49	15
		Script D	15.47	2.26	15
		Script E	16.60	3.00	15
		Male			
		Female			
	Script A	18.67	3.24	15	
	Script B	18.27	3.33	15	
	Script C	18.33	3.35	15	
	Script D	15.93	2.02	15	
	Script E	17.67	3.18	15	
	Male				
	Script A	16.40	2.53	15	
	Script B	16.00	3.63	15	
	Script C	14.93	2.49	15	
	Script D	15.60	2.17	15	
	Script E	17.53	2.70	15	
For Entire Sample		16.68	2.96	600	

Table GG-65

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Child as Adult Scale Factor 3

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	6.29	1.48	300
	Female	6.23	1.41	300
Parent	Female	6.31	1.47	300
	Male	6.21	1.42	300
Child	Female	6.46	1.33	300
	Male	6.06	1.53	300
Script	Script A	5.91	1.47	120
	Script B	6.21	1.43	120
	Script C	6.53	1.30	120
	Script D	6.67	1.54	120
	Script E	5.98	1.35	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	6.28	1.49	150
	Male	6.29	1.35	150
	Female			
	Female	6.33	1.46	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	6.53	1.33	150
	Male	6.04	1.59	150
	Female			
	Female	6.38	1.34	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	5.98	1.67	60
	Script B	6.37	1.29	60
	Script C	6.58	1.34	60
	Script D	6.67	1.46	60
	Script E	5.83	1.49	60
	Female			
	Script A	5.83	1.25	60
	Script B	6.05	1.55	60
	Script C	6.48	1.26	60
Script D	6.67	1.63	60	
Script E	6.13	1.19	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	6.47	1.37	150
	Male	6.14	1.56	150
	Male			
	Female	6.44	1.30	150
	Male	5.99	1.49	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	6.05	1.48	60
	Script B	6.20	1.53	60
	Script C	6.62	1.30	60
	Script D	6.63	1.54	60
	Script E	6.03	1.44	60
	Male			
	Script A	5.77	1.47	60
	Script B	6.22	1.33	60
	Script C	6.45	1.29	60
Script D	6.70	1.56	60	
Script E	5.93	1.26	60	
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	6.28	1.40	60
	Script B	6.40	1.28	60
	Script C	6.63	1.28	60
	Script D	6.75	1.46	60
	Script E	6.22	1.21	60
	Male			
	Script A	5.53	1.46	60
	Script B	6.02	1.55	60
	Script C	6.43	1.32	60
Script D	6.58	1.63	60	
Script E	5.75	1.45	60	
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	6.45	1.29	75
	Male	6.11	1.67	75
	Male			
	Female	6.61	1.37	75
	Male	5.97	1.52	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	6.49	1.46	75
Male	6.17	1.46	75	
Male				
Female	6.27	1.21	75	
Male	6.00	1.48	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	5.93	1.70	30
	Script B	6.33	1.37	30
	Script C	6.67	1.42	30
	Script D	6.53	1.31	30
	Script E	5.93	1.57	30
	Male			
	Script A	6.03	1.67	30
	Script B	6.40	1.22	30
	Script C	6.50	1.28	30
	Script D	6.80	1.61	30
	Script E	5.73	1.41	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	6.17	1.23	30
	Script B	6.07	1.68	30
	Script C	6.57	1.19	30
	Script D	6.73	1.76	30
	Script E	6.13	1.31	30
Male				
Script A	5.50	1.20	30	
Script B	6.03	1.43	30	
Script C	6.40	1.33	30	
Script D	6.60	1.52	30	
Script E	6.13	1.07	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	6.43	1.50	30
	Script B	6.57	1.10	30
	Script C	6.73	1.51	30
	Script D	6.70	1.12	30
	Script E	6.23	1.38	30
	Male			
	Script A	5.53	1.74	30
	Script B	6.17	1.44	30
	Script C	6.43	1.17	30
	Script D	6.63	1.75	30
	Script E	5.43	1.50	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	6.13	1.31	30
Script B	6.23	1.43	30	
Script C	6.53	1.01	30	
Script D	6.80	1.75	30	
Script E	6.20	1.03	30	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	5.53	1.14	30
	Script B	5.87	1.66	30
	Script C	6.43	1.48	30
	Script D	6.53	1.53	30
	Script E	6.07	1.34	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	6.30	1.21	30
	Script B	6.33	1.52	30
	Script C	6.77	1.19	30
	Script D	6.60	1.65	30
	Script E	6.37	1.25	30
	Male			
	Script A	5.80	1.69	30
	Script B	6.07	1.55	30
	Script C	6.47	1.41	30
	Script D	6.67	1.45	30
	Script E	5.70	1.56	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	6.27	1.60	30
	Script B	6.47	1.01	30
	Script C	6.50	1.36	30
	Script D	6.90	1.24	30
	Script E	6.07	1.17	30
	Male			
	Script A	5.27	1.14	30
	Script B	5.97	1.54	30
	Script C	6.40	1.25	30
	Script D	6.50	1.82	30
	Script E	5.80	1.35	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	6.20	1.15	15
	Script B	6.33	1.29	15
	Script C	6.93	1.58	15
	Script D	6.33	0.98	15
	Script E	6.47	1.41	15
	Male			
	Script A	5.67	2.13	15
	Script B	6.33	1.50	15
	Script C	6.40	1.24	15
	Script D	7.73	1.58	15
	Script E	5.40	1.60	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	6.67	1.80	15
	Script B	6.80	0.86	15
	Script C	6.53	1.46	15
	Script D	7.07	1.16	15
	Script E	6.00	1.36	15
	Male			
	Script A	5.40	1.30	15
	Script B	6.00	1.41	15
	Script C	6.47	1.13	15
	Script D	6.53	1.96	15
	Script E	5.47	1.46	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	6.40	1.30	15
	Script B	6.33	1.60	15
	Script C	6.60	0.63	15
	Script D	6.87	2.13	15
	Script E	6.27	1.10	15
	Male			
	Script A	5.93	1.16	15
	Script B	5.80	1.61	15
Script C	6.53	1.60	15	
Script D	6.60	1.35	15	
Script E	6.00	1.51	15	
Male				
Female				
Script A	5.87	1.30	15	
Script B	6.13	1.06	15	
Script C	6.47	1.30	15	
Script D	6.73	1.34	15	
Script E	6.13	0.99	15	
Male				
Script A	5.13	0.99	15	
Script B	5.93	1.75	15	
Script C	6.33	1.40	15	
Script D	6.47	1.73	15	
Script E	6.13	1.19	15	
For Entire Sample		6.26	1.45	600

Table GG-66

Mean Scores and Standard deviations of Sex, Parent, Child,
and Script Variables on Child as Adult Scale Factor 5

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex	Male	5.74	1.44	300
	Female	5.56	1.38	300
Parent	Female	5.64	1.35	300
	Male	5.66	1.48	300
Child	Female	5.69	1.43	300
	Male	5.61	1.40	300
Script	Script A	5.86	1.49	120
	Script B	5.93	1.37	120
	Script C	5.56	1.45	120
	Script D	5.04	1.23	120
	Script E	5.87	1.35	120
Sex by Parent	Male			
	Female	5.68	1.41	150
	Male	5.81	1.48	150
	Female			
	Female	5.60	1.29	150
	Male	5.51	1.47	150
Sex by Child	Male			
	Female	5.76	1.45	150
	Male	5.73	1.44	150
	Female			
	Female	5.63	1.40	150
	Male	5.49	1.36	150
Sex by Script	Male			
	Script A	5.98	1.76	60
	Script B	5.92	1.29	60
	Script C	5.72	1.46	60
	Script D	5.08	1.17	60
	Script E	6.02	1.30	60
	Female			
	Script A	5.73	1.15	60
	Script B	5.93	1.45	60
	Script C	5.40	1.43	60
Script D	5.00	1.29	60	
Script E	5.72	1.40	60	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Parent by Child	Female			
	Female	5.57	1.34	150
	Male	5.71	1.36	150
	Male			
	Female	5.81	1.50	150
	Male	5.51	1.44	150
Parent by Script	Female			
	Script A	5.60	1.44	60
	Script B	5.90	1.36	60
	Script C	5.62	1.39	60
	Script D	5.03	0.99	60
	Script E	5.05	1.32	60
	Male			
	Script A	6.12	1.50	60
	Script B	5.95	1.38	60
	Script C	5.50	1.51	60
Script D	5.05	1.43	60	
Script E	5.68	1.37	60	
Child by Script	Female			
	Script A	5.67	1.64	60
	Script B	6.07	1.40	60
	Script C	5.50	1.55	60
	Script D	5.30	1.00	60
	Script E	5.93	1.36	60
	Male			
	Script A	6.05	1.29	60
	Script B	5.78	1.33	60
	Script C	5.62	1.35	60
Script D	4.78	1.38	60	
Script E	5.80	1.35	60	
Sex by Parent by Child	Male			
	Female			
	Female	5.53	1.39	75
	Male	5.83	1.43	75
	Male			
	Female	5.99	1.48	75
	Male	5.63	1.46	75
	Female			
	Female			
	Female	5.61	1.29	75
Male	5.59	1.29	75	
Male				
Female	5.64	1.51	75	
Male	5.39	1.42	75	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	5.57	1.70	30
	Script B	5.83	1.29	30
	Script C	5.83	1.44	30
	Script D	4.87	0.97	30
	Script E	6.30	1.24	30
	Male			
	Script A	6.40	1.75	30
	Script B	6.00	1.31	30
	Script C	5.60	1.50	30
	Script D	5.30	1.32	30
	Script E	5.73	1.31	30
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	5.63	1.60	30
	Script B	5.97	1.45	30
	Script C	5.40	1.33	30
	Script D	5.20	1.00	30
	Script E	5.80	1.38	30
Male				
Script A	5.83	1.15	30	
Script B	5.90	1.47	30	
Script C	5.40	1.55	30	
Script D	4.80	1.52	30	
Script E	5.63	1.45	30	
Sex by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	5.60	1.98	30
	Script B	5.93	1.36	30
	Script C	5.70	1.47	30
	Script D	5.47	1.04	30
	Script E	6.10	1.24	30
	Male			
	Script A	6.37	1.45	30
	Script B	5.90	1.24	30
	Script C	5.73	1.48	30
	Script D	4.70	1.18	30
	Script E	5.93	1.36	30
	Female			
	Female			
Script A	5.73	1.26	30	
Script B	6.20	1.45	30	
Script C	5.30	1.62	30	
Script D	5.13	0.94	30	
Script E	5.77	1.48	30	

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
	Male			
	Script A	5.73	1.05	30
	Script B	5.67	1.42	30
	Script C	5.50	1.23	30
	Script D	4.87	1.57	30
	Script E	5.67	1.35	30
Parent by Child by Script	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	5.30	1.37	30
	Script B	5.90	1.45	30
	Script C	5.40	1.45	30
	Script D	5.13	0.82	30
	Script E	6.13	1.31	30
	Male			
	Script A	5.90	1.47	30
	Script B	5.90	1.30	30
	Script C	5.83	1.32	30
	Script D	4.93	1.14	30
	Script E	5.97	1.35	30
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	6.03	1.83	30
	Script B	6.23	1.36	30
	Script C	5.60	1.65	30
	Script D	5.47	1.14	30
	Script E	5.73	1.41	30
	Male			
	Script A	6.20	1.10	30
	Script B	5.67	1.37	30
	Script C	5.40	1.38	30
	Script D	4.63	1.59	30
	Script E	5.63	1.35	30
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Female			
	Female			
	Script A	4.93	1.53	15
	Script B	5.93	1.44	15
	Script C	5.47	1.55	15
	Script D	5.07	0.88	15
	Script E	6.27	1.10	15
	Male			
	Script A	6.20	1.66	15
	Script B	5.73	1.16	15
	Script C	6.20	1.27	15
	Script D	4.67	1.05	15
	Script E	6.33	1.40	15

(table continues)

Variable	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Sex by Parent by Child by Script	Male			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	6.27	2.19	15
	Script B	5.93	1.34	15
	Script C	5.93	1.39	15
	Script D	5.87	1.06	15
	Script E	5.93	1.39	15
	Male			
	Script A	6.53	1.25	15
	Script B	6.07	1.34	15
	Script C	5.27	1.58	15
	Script D	4.73	1.34	15
	Script E	5.53	1.25	15
	Female			
	Male			
	Female			
	Script A	5.67	1.11	15
	Script B	5.87	1.51	15
	Script C	5.33	1.40	15
	Script D	5.20	0.78	15
	Script E	6.00	1.51	15
	Male			
	Script A	5.60	1.24	15
	Script B	6.07	1.44	15
	Script C	5.47	1.30	15
	Script D	5.20	1.21	15
Script E	5.60	1.24	15	
Male				
Female				
Script A	5.80	1.42	15	
Script B	6.53	1.36	15	
Script C	5.27	1.87	15	
Script D	5.07	1.10	15	
Script E	5.53	1.46	15	
Male				
Script A	5.87	0.83	15	
Script B	5.27	1.34	15	
Script C	5.53	1.19	15	
Script D	4.53	1.85	15	
Script E	5.73	1.49	15	
For Entire Sample		5.65	1.41	600

References

- Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42 (5), 830-838.
- Adams, M. (1976). Single Blessedness. New York: Penguin.
- Athanasiou, R., Shaver, P., & Travis, C. (1970, July). Sex. Psychology Today, pp. 39-52.
- Bane, M. & Weiss, R. (1980). Alone together: The world of single-parent families. American Demographics, 2 (5), 11-15.
- Bell, R. (1966). Premarital sex in a changing society. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bell, R. (1976). Social deviance: A substantive analysis. Homewood, Il: Dorsey Press.
- Bell, R. R. & Chaskes, J. B. (1970). Premarital sexual experiences among coeds, 1958 and 1968. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 81-84.
- Bernard, J. (1956). Remarriage. New York: Dryden Press.
- Billingsley, A., & Giovannoi, J. (1971). Family: One parent. In R. Morris (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Social Work, 1, New York: National Association of Social Workers.
- Burgess, E., & Wallin, P. (1953). Engagement and marriage. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

- Carns, D. E. (1973). Talking about sex: Notes on first coitus and the double standard. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35, 677-688.
- Castillo, M. G., & Johnson, R. J. (1988, April). Single parent sex: A double standard? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Psychological Association. Tulsa, OK.
- Cherlin, A. (1981). Marriage, divorce, remarriage. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Christensen, M. T., & Gregg, C. F. (1970). Changing sex norms in America and Scandinavia. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 616-627.
- Curran, J. (1975). Convergence toward a single sexual standard? Social Behavior and Personality, 3, 189-195.
- Darling, C. A., & Hicks, M. W. (1983). Recycling parental sexual messages. Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 9, 3, 233-243.
- Darling, C., Kallen, D., & Van Dusen, J. (1984). Sex in transition, 1900-1980. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13, 5, 385-399.
- Davis, K. E. (1971). Sex on campus: is there a revolution? Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1, 128-142.
- DeLamater, J., & MacCorquodale, P. (1979). Premarital sexuality: Attitudes, relationships, behavior. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Doughtery, S. (1978). Single adoptive mothers and their children. Social Work, 22 (Nov), 472-477.
- Ehrmann, W. (1959). Premarital dating behavior. New York: Hawthorn Books.
- Ferrell, M. Z., Tolone, W. L., & Walsh, R. H. (1977). Maturational and Societal Changes in the sexual double standard: A panel analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 255-271.
- Galper, R. E., & Luck, D. (1980). Gender, evaluation, and causal attribution: The double standard is alive and well. Sex Roles, 6, 273-283.
- Glasser, P., & Navarre, E. (1965). Structural problems of the one parent family. Journal of Social Issues, 21 (1), 98-109.
- Glick, P. C., & Spanier, G. B. (1980). Married and unmarried cohabitation in the U.S. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42 (Feb), 19-30.
- Gongla, P. A. (1982). Single parent families: A look at families of mothers and children. Marriage and Family Review, 5 (2), 5-27.
- Greenberg, J. B. (1979). Single parenting and intimacy: A comparison of mothers and fathers. Alternative Lifestyles, 2 (8), 308-330.
- Grow, L. (1979). Today's unmarried mothers: The choices have changed. Child Welfare, 50, 7, 363-371.

- Harper, R. A. (1961). Extramarital sex relations. In A. Ellis & A. Abarbanel (Eds.), The encyclopedia of sexual behavior (Vol 1). New York: Hawthorn Books.
- Hendrick, S., Hendrick, C., Slapion-Foote, M. J., & Foote, F. H. (1985). Gender differences in sexual attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1630-1642.
- Hetherington, E. M., Cox, M., & Cox, R. (1978). The aftermath of divorce. In J. H. Stevens Jr., & M. Morris (Eds.), Mother-child, father-child relations. (pp 149-176). Washington, DC: The National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Hofferth, S. L. (1985). Updating children's life course. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47 (1), 93-115.
- Hunt, M. M. (1966). The world of the formerly married. New York: McGraw Hill .
- Hunt, M. M. (1974). Sexual Behavior in the 1970's. New York: Macmillan.
- Hunt, M., & Hunt, B. (1977). The divorce experience. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Janda, L. H., O'Grady, K. E., & Barnhart, S. A. (1981). Effects of sexual attitudes and physical attractiveness on person percaption of men and women. Sex Roles, 7, 189-199.
- Johnson, M. M. (1977). Androgeny and the maternal principle, School Review, 86, 50-69.

- Johnson, R. W., Castillo M. G., Hanselka, L. (1987, March). Single parent sexual behavior: Others' perceptions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Southwestern Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Jurich, A. P., & Jurich, J. A. (1974). The effect of cognitive moral development upon the selection of premarital sexual standards. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 736-741.
- Kaats, G. R., & Davis, K. E. (1970). The dynamics of sexual behavior of college students. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 390-399.
- Kadushin, A. (1970). Single parent adoption: An overview and some relevant research. Social Service Review, 44, (3), 263-274.
- Katz, A. (1979). Lone fathers: perspectives and implications for family policy. Family Coordinator, 28, (3), 263-274.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). Sexual behavior in the human male. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1953). Sexual behavior in the human female. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Komarovsky, M. (1876). Dilemmas of masculinity: A study of college youth. New York: W. W. Norton.

- Lynn, B. D. (1969). Parental and sex role identification. Berkley, CA: McCutchen.
- Mark, M. M., & Miller, M. L. (1986). The effects of sexual permissiveness, target gender, subject gender, and attitude toward women on social perception: in search of the double standard. Sex Roles, 15 (5/6), 311-322.
- McCary, J. L. (1978). McCary's human sexuality. New York: D. Van Nostrand .
- Mendora, N. P., & Burton M. M. (1981). Extramarital sexual attitudes and norms of an undergraduate student population. Adolescence, 26 (62), 251-262.
- Nock, S. L. (1981). Family life cycle transitions: longitudinal effects on family members. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43 (8), 703-714.
- Norton, A., & Glick, P. (1979). Marital instability in America: past, present, future. In G. Levinger & O. Moles (Eds.), Divorce and separation. New York: Basic Books.
- Nye, F. I. (1976). Role structure and analysis of the family. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Reiss, I. L. (1967). The social context of premarital sexual permissiveness. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.

- Robinson, I. E., & Jedlicka, D. (1982). Change in sexual attitude and behavior of college students from 1965 to 1980: a research note. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 3, 237-340.
- Sack, A. R., Keller, J. F., & Hinckle, D. E. (1981). The sexual double standard: How prevalent today? College Student Journal, 15 (1), 47-52.
- Schorr, A., & Moen, P. (1979). The single parent and social policy. Social Policy, 9 (Mar/Apl), 15-21.
- Shireman, J., & Johnson, P. (1976). Single persons as adoptive parents. Social Service Review, 50 (Mar), 103-116.
- Simenauer, C., & Carroll, J. (1982). The New Americans. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Smith, M. (1981). The social consequences of single parenthood: A longitudinal perspective. Family Relations, 29 (1), 75-81.
- Spanier G. B., & Margolis, R. (1983). Marital separation and extramarital sexual behavior. The Journal of Sex Research, 19 (1), 23-48.
- Sprecher, S., McKinney, K., & Orbuch, T. (1986). Has the the double standard disappeared? An experimental test. Paper presented at the meeting of American Sociological Association. Sociological Abstracts, 34, s19101.

- Stein, P. (1983). Singlehood. In R. Macklin & R. Robin (Eds.), Contemporary families and alternative lifestyles. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications
- Stockard, J., & Johnson, M.M. (1980). Sex roles: Sex inequality and sex role development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Thompson, A. P. (1983). Extramarital sex: A review of the research literature. The Journal of Sex Research, 19 (1), 1-22.
- Thompson, E., & Gongla, P. (1983). Single parent families in the mainstream of American society. In R. Macklin & R. Robin (Eds.), Contemporary families and alternative lifestyles. Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1989). Studies in marriage and the family (Current Population Reports, Special Studies Series P-23, No. 162). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Wake, F. R. (1969). Attitudes towards the premarital sex behavior of their children and themselves. Journal of Sex Research, 5, 170-177.
- Weiss, R. (1979). Going it alone: The family life and social situations of the single parent. New York: Basic Books.