

Sara Alfieri, Elena Marta, Clelia Anna Mannino, Daniela Barni

*Somiglianze e differenze nel pregiudizio di genere di genitori e figli:  
l'effetto dell'intreccio tra famiglia e cultura*

Abstract

Pochi studi hanno indagato similarità e differenze rispetto al pregiudizio di genere tra genitori e figli. Il presente lavoro si suddivide in due fasi: lo scopo della prima è di indagare se esistano similarità nei profili di risposta dei genitori e dei loro figli giovani adulti. La Fase II vuole indagare il livello di similarità “unica” tra genitori e figli rispetto al pregiudizio di genere (effetto dello stereotipo culturale).

I partecipanti sono 293 famiglie italiane (giovane adulto, madre e padre, per un totale di 879 soggetti).

Ciascun partecipante ha compilato la Scala di Sessismo Ambivalente (Glick & Fiske, 1996) e la Scala di Ambivalenza verso gli Uomini. Poiché la nostra ricerca include dati familiari, sono state utilizzate specifiche analisi, quali gli indici diadici (Kenny, Kashy & Cook, 2006).

I risultati rivelano che (1) i profili di risposta di genitori e figli sono dissimili, e (2) che la poca varianza condivisa tra di essi sia dovuta all'effetto dello stereotipo culturale.

**Parole chiave:** pregiudizio di genere, ruoli di genere e generazione, indici diadici, effetto dello stereotipo culturale, similarità tra genitori e figli.

*Introduction*

Literature has demonstrated that the development of gender prejudice in children and adolescents is determined by a complex interaction between family variables and socio-cultural context influences (Booth & Amato, 1994; Castelli, Tomelleri & Zogmaister, 2009;

*Somiglianze e differenze nel pregiudizio di genere di genitori e figli: l'effetto dell'intreccio tra famiglia e cultura*

MATERIALI

Crouter, Manke & McHale, 1995; Eccles, Jacobs & Harold, 1990; Ex & Janssens, 1998; Glick & Hilt 2000; Kulik, 2002; McHale, Crouter & Tucker, 1999; Moen, Erickson & Dempster-McClain, 1997; Tenenbaum & Leaper, 2002; Sinclair, Dunn & Lowery, 2005). However, little attention is given to the role of intertwinement between family and socio-cultural context.

MATERIALI

At the conclusion of a brief review of psychosocial studies on intergenerational values and bonds, Boehnke (2001) proposes a classification of this research into two groups: research on social change and research on transmission in the family. This distinction, although admittedly simplifying the picture, highlights one of the current limitations of investigations in this area: a consideration of either the socio-cultural context or the family sphere, but not both. Missing, to cite Knafo (2003), are studies that focus on transmission in context and that are able to combine family processes and conditions with social processes and conditions, even if only in the interpretation of results.

The notion that family plays a crucial role in primary socialization and the stabilization of adult personalities dates back to the 1950's and 1960's. During a person's entire life cycle, the family is an important environment for acquiring beliefs, attitudes, models, values, and norms that reflect the broader normative and socio-cultural context (Cigoli, Marta & Tamanza, 2000; Molinari, Speltini & Dalolio, 2001). Among the elements learned are ethical values, religious traditions, attitudes toward life and sexuality, as well as attitudes toward the opposite sex (Scabini, 1995).

On a theoretical level, we expect a relationship between the attitudes of parents and their children. Indeed, people commonly believe that children's prejudice is none other than a simple reflection of their parents' attitudes (O'Bryan, Fishbein & Ritchey, 2004). However, empirical evidence to support this notion has not provided a clear picture.

Most studies that examine the socialization of prejudice concentrate on childhood and, occasionally, on early adolescence (4-12 years). This research places particular emphasis on Aboud's (1988) social-cognitive developmental aspects, in particular ethnic prejudice (White *et al.*, 2009). The few studies that do include adolescent samples seem to agree that there is significant similarity in the ethnic prejudice and racism of parents and their adolescent offspring (Moscher & Scodel, 1960), and that this similarity only appears during adolescence (Castelli *et al.*, 2007). These conclusions fall in line with previous research

highlighting adolescence as a critical period when individuals become interested in intergroup relations and acquire a more complex political and social vision anchored in reality (Altemeyer, 1998; Erikson, 1968).

The aforementioned studies have often considered family to be the only socializing agency that transmits prejudice, frequently excluding other sources of influence, such as peers, teachers, and the media. Other lines of research, in contrast, have underestimated the role of family, exclusively focusing on the “social” context. We believe that family and socio-cultural contexts are not mutually exclusive, but rather, inextricably linked. The family is not situated in a “social vacuum”. Parents not only have a defined family role (i.e., being a mother or father, with all that this entails), but they also simultaneously possess and enact certain socio-cultural characteristics related to being adults and belonging to a specific gender (i.e., being a woman or man). Similarly, offspring possess characteristics typical of “young” family members but, at the same time, have certain socio-cultural qualifications (i.e., being a boy, a girl, a boy scout, a cheerleader, etc.) (Barni, 2009). The complexity of these “double” roles lies in the idea that they are not mutually exclusive.

As the primary social form of the relationship between genders and generations, the family carries out a fundamental cultural and social function. “*Culture [...] is what’s shared by a large group and transmitted across generations- ideas, attitudes, behaviors and traditions*” (Myers, 2008, p. 177). Generations and gender are the crucial nexus between family role status (i.e., being a mother, father, or child) and social role status (i.e., being an adult, adolescent or emerging adults; being a man or a woman). Gender is principally a cultural phenomenon (for a recent review of the topic see Muehlenhard & Peterson, 2011); generations and gender roles vary significantly from culture to culture and at different times.

The cultural value climate (i.e., *cultural stereotype effect* or *zeitgeist*), if shared, may inflate parent-child similarity. This makes difficult to establish to what extent similarity actually depends on processes embedded in the family (i.e., unique similarity) (Kenny, Kashy & Cook, 2006). As early as 1955 Cronbach noticed that members of a dyad can appear similar, not because they really are but because they answer in a “stereotypical” manner. “Stereotypical” refers to a typical or normative tendency in people’s responses to a set of variables (Kenny, Kashy & Cook, 2006) because of shared socio-cultural context.

*Somiglianze e differenze nel pregiudizio di genere di genitori e figli: l'effetto dell'intreccio tra famiglia e cultura*

MATERIALI

What is meant by *socio-cultural context*? Parents and offspring are traditionally thought of as belonging to different subcultures, one example of a socio-cultural context (Coleman, 1961; Emler, 1993). Results from research on values provide empirical support for the presence of generational subcultures. In a study conducted in Israel with families of Israeli and Russian origin, Knafo and Schwartz (2001) showed that parents and adolescent are very similar to their respective peers in value preferences, controlling for place of birth and indigenous/immigrant status. In fact, adolescent children were more similar to their peers than to their parents. Generational membership, then, seems to significantly influence individual choices. Gender is also considered to have different subcultures: that of males is characterized by values connected to instrumentality while that of females is dominated by values centered on affectivity (Di Dio *et al.*, 1996). The complexity of these “double” roles lies in the idea that they are not mutually exclusive.

*Families with a young adult child*

To date, researchers investigating gender prejudice have failed to consider emerging adulthood, the age range immediately following adolescence (Arnett, 2000). Little research specifically addresses the presence of gender prejudice in 20-28 year-olds and whether those attitudes are socialized/transmitted via family or other sources. In 1986 Glass, Bengtson, and Dunham observed that, “*Very little is known about intergenerational attitude similarity across the lifespan or the forces generating similarity across the lifespan [...]. Theories of developmental aging [...] suggest that parents and children have different investments in family relationships and different sources of power in family interaction as they move through the life course. [...] This position implies that social status similarity should account for relatively less of the relationship between parents’ and children’s attitudes at this point in the life cycle, since young adults have not attained many of the social statuses that inform their parents’ beliefs*” (pp. 686-687). This often occurs in the Italian context where it is common for young adults to continue living with their family even after the age of 30 (Eurostat, 2012). In these cases, the interconnection between the family and socio-cultural context is particularly interesting; young adults are “adults” in terms of age, sharing that status with their parents, but have not yet completely separated from their family. As such, these families provide a unique context to study the similarities

and differences in gender prejudice, and the role that gender could play. Literature, however, has yet to address this topic.

### *Background on interdependent data*

The theoretical background briefly outlined reveals the complexity of investigating similarities and differences in gender prejudice between parents and children. Distinguishing whether those similarities/differences can be attributed to the family or, instead, to the gender and generation role is both a methodological and statistical challenge. It is crucial to use techniques that are appropriate and specific to family data (Lanz & Rosnati, 2002; Luo & Klohnen, 2005; McKeown & Thomas, 1988; Zentner & Renaud, 2007).

The most common strategies for analyzing similarities and differences between parents and their offspring can be traced back to two typologies: (1) a *variable-centered* typology that compares different family members as groups, and (2) a *couple-centered* strategy that deals with dyads and conceptualizes the couple as specific to a certain construct. The first typology has been widely used to study how parents influence the prejudice of their offspring. The second typology, however, remains unexplored in the study of prejudice, although it is utilized in other research contexts such as values (to which reference will frequently be made in this paper).

Many phenomena studied in the social sciences are interpersonal by definition and, thus, cannot be related exclusively to a single individual, but rather, to two or more people who share the same socio-cultural context. Take romantic relationships, for example, if we ask individuals to indicate the quality of communication with their partners, those responses will inevitably be linked to how they believe their partners view the communication.

Dyadic measures are able to capture this interpersonal aspect by reflecting the contribution of two people who share a common experience (Bond & Kenny, 2002). “*The dyad is arguably the fundamental unit of interpersonal interaction and interpersonal relations*” (Kenny, Kashy & Cook, 2006, p. 1). As such, data collected from two members of the same dyad are *non-independent* (or interdependent): “*If the two scores from the two members of the dyad are non-independent, then those two scores are more similar to (or different from) one another than are two scores from two people who are not members of*

*Somiglianze e differenze nel pregiudizio di genere di genitori e figli: l'effetto dell'intreccio tra famiglia e cultura*

MATERIALI

*the same dyad*” (Kenny, Kashy & Cook, 2006, p. 4). Dealing with non-independent data, then, requires techniques that go beyond the statistical analyses that are traditionally employed.

Thus, the objectives of the present work are:

I) In Phase I, to describe the gender prejudice of mothers, fathers, and their young adult children, and to measure the similarity between parents and children using specific dyadic indexes (dyadic correlations -  $r_{\text{dyadic}}$ );

II) In Phase II, to understand whether the similarity found between parents and children in Phase I can be attributed to family or to cultural stereotype effect. To achieve this objective, we calculated the cultural stereotype effect and subtracted it from calculations of dyadic correlations.

As will be presented in greater detail in the Method section (Phase II), cultural stereotype effect means a typical or normative tendency in people’s responses with respect to a set of variables (Kenny, Kashy & Cook, 2006).

### *Method*

#### *Participants*

Participants were 293 Italian families (for a total of 879 people) comprised of a young adult child, mother, and father, all residing in the same household.

Children (34.2% male, 65.8% female) were between 20 and 28 years of age ( $M = 23.4$  years;  $SD = 2.32$ ). Mothers ranged in age from 40 to 66 ( $M = 51.24$  years;  $SD = 4.97$ ), and fathers from 41 to 73 ( $M = 54.8$  years;  $SD = 5.36$ ).

48.3% of young adults were students, 21.6% were employed, and 28.4% were both students and employed. 90.5% of mothers and 81.3% of fathers had steady employment.

Families who did not return the questionnaires of all three family members were eliminated from analysis to obtain the most congruent data. Eight families returned questionnaires

from only mother and child, two returned questionnaires from only father and child, and six returned questionnaires from only the children in the family. Thus, thirty-two questionnaires were eliminated in total. Participants were the same in both studies.

### *Recruitment*

Data were collected in northern Italy. Young adults were recruited during class time from courses in eight different university departments (Psychology, Education Sciences, Literature, Sociology, Economics, Statistics, Architecture, and Political Science) and in four different universities. Parents were recruited in shops, factories, cooperatives, and associations.

Each person recruited to the study was asked to bring home an envelope containing three questionnaires, one for him/herself and two for additional family members, so that we could obtain a complete triad (composed of mother, father, and young adult child). Everyone that received questionnaires was asked to provide his/her informed consent before participating. In addition, people were notified that participation was free and voluntary, and that data would only be used for research purposes and in an aggregate manner.

### *Instruments*

To analyze attitudes toward men and women and to reveal their intrinsic ambivalence, Glick and Fiske (1996, 1997, 1999, 2001ab; Glick *et al.*, 2000, 2004) developed two scales: the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and the Ambivalence toward Men Inventory. These two scales were used in both studies.

*The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory* (ASI) assesses attitudes toward women across two dimensions: *hostile* (e.g., “Many women, under the guise of equality, are really seeking favoritism, such as hiring policies that favor women over men”), and *benevolent* (e.g., “No matter how fulfilled he is, a man is never truly complete as a person if he does not have the love of a woman”). The Scale is composed of 22 items, 11 of which saturate the Hostile dimension, and just as many the Benevolent dimension.

*Somiglianze e differenze nel pregiudizio di genere di genitori e figli: l'effetto dell'intreccio tra famiglia e cultura*

MATERIALI

The *Ambivalence toward Men Inventory* (AMI) includes the same two dimensions, but examines attitudes toward men: (1) *hostile attitudes* (e.g., “It is typical of a man who is sexually attracted to a woman to have no qualms about doing anything necessary to bring her to bed”), and (2) *benevolent attitudes* (e.g., “Even if both members of a couple work, the woman should be attentive to caring for her man and house”). The Scale is composed of 20 items, equally distributed between the Benevolent and Hostile dimensions.

Participants used a six-point Likert-type scale to indicate their level of agreement with each statement (0 = “*totally disagree*”; 5 = “*totally agree*”). A total score for each subscale was calculated by summing all items and calculating a mean. Both scales were translated, adapted, and validated for use in the Italian context by Manganelli, Rattazzi, Volpato, and Canova (2008). Cronbach alphas were calculated for both dimensions of each scale and for each family member. All alphas were reliable (see Table 1).

<i>Cronbach <math>\alpha</math></i>	Mother	Father	Young Adult
Hostile Sexism	.88	.86	.85
Benevolent Sexism	.84	.78	.78
Hostile Ambivalence	.84	.79	.77
Benevolent Ambivalence	.88	.86	.85

**Table 1** Cronbach alpha for each subscale of the Hostile Sexism and Ambivalence toward Men scales for each family member.

Before beginning data analysis, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis to examine the factorial structures of each subscale for each family member. Results indicated that each subscale had the same factorial structure for all actors involved (i.e., the factor structure of the hostile and benevolent attitude subscales was the same for mothers, fathers, and young



adults).

## PHASE I

### *Descriptive analyses*

Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated for the Sexism and Ambivalence to describe the prejudice of young adults and their parents.

### *Dyadic correlations*

Dyadic correlations ( $r_{\text{dyadic}}$ ) were utilized in the present work. The former detected the degree of *similarity* in the prejudice of family members (young adult child/mother, young adult child/father). The application of these techniques reflects our adherence to a *family research* framework in which the family is both an object of research and a unit of analysis, and where the level of analysis is likely relational (Lanz & Rosnati, 2002; Luo & Klohnen, 2005; McKeown & Thomas, 1988; Zentner & Renaud, 2007).

The calculation of a dyadic index is based on Pearson's well-known formula for the  $r$  coefficient; however, the degree of association does not concern two variables taken from a set of subjects, but rather on a set of scores from subjects within the same dyad. Thus, in the present research all parents were not compared with all offspring (as would have happened with Pearson's "classic"  $r$  correlation). Instead, *each parent* was compared with *his/her own child*.

$$rdyadic = \frac{\sum (X_{pi} - M_{pi}) \cdot (X_{ci} - M_{ci})}{\sqrt{\sum (X_{ci} - M_{ci})^2 \cdot \sum (X_{ci} - M_{ci})^2}}$$

$X_{pi}$  = score for item  $i$  of parent;

$M_{pi}$  = mean of parent's scores for item  $i$ ;

$X_{ci}$  = score for item  $i$  of child;

$M_{ci}$  = mean of child's scores for item  $i$ .

Like Pearson's correlation, the dyadic correlation index is sensitive only to the shape of variables: "*generally, correspondence in shape is thought to be the most important component of the dyadic index: The more similar the shape, the greater the similarity. The critical issue in dyadic indexes is how differences in level and spread are handled*" (Kenny, Kashy & Cook, 2006, p. 325). However, the index does not provide information about mean differences (*level*) nor does it take into account the variability in distributions (*spread*) (Bernieri *et al.*, 1994; Kenny, Kashy & Cook, 2006).

A dyadic correlation reaches its highest score when there is overlap between two profiles of scores and when those two profiles present a parallel, but not superimposed, trend. Like Pearson's correlation, a dyadic correlation has values between  $-1$  and  $+1$ . High, positive scores indicate that two partners have a similar trend moving in the same direction: when the value of one partner increases, so does the other's value. High, negative scores indicate that two partners have similar trends, but in the opposite direction: when the value of one increases, the value of the other decreases. A correlation tending to 0 indicates that the two response profiles being compared are neither similar nor dissimilar. In general, correlation coefficients whose absolute value is between .30 and .49 are considered of medium size. Coefficients less than or greater than these cut-offs are considered, respectively, to be small and large (Cohen, 1988).

Although similarity cannot be considered synonymous with influence, it is still true that a certain degree of similarity is necessary to be able to give a positive assessment to the efficacy of an exchange. Finding something of oneself in a child is an expectation that is more than legitimate in a parent and, at the same time, receiving something of value from a parent is an equally warranted expectation in a child (Bengtson, 1975; Bengtson & Roberts, 1991).

## *Results*

### *Descriptive Analyses*

Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated for Sexism and Ambivalence to

describe the prejudice of young adults and their parents (see Table 2).

	Minimum (1)	Maximum (6)	Mean	SD
Hostile Sexism male child	2.10	6.00	3.80	0.79
Hostile Sexism female child	1.10	5.50	3.25	0.91
Hostile Sexism mother	1.00	5.50	2.98	0.96
Hostile Sexism father	1.10	6.00	3.52	0.98
Benevolent Sexism male child	1.80	5.30	3.68	0.76
Benevolent Sexism female child	1.10	5.40	3.83	0.84
Benevolent Sexism mother	1.00	6.00	3.48	0.96
Benevolent Sexism father	1.10	5.90	3.85	0.83
Hostile Ambivalence male child	1.88	5.13	3.42	0.72
Hostile Ambivalence female child	1.38	5.75	3.83	0.85
Hostile Ambivalence mother	1.25	6.00	3.95	0.95
Hostile Ambivalence father	1.00	6.00	3.46	0.86
Benevolent Ambivalence male child	1.10	5.50	3.56	0.77
Benevolent Ambivalence female child	1.00	5.50	3.35	0.98
Benevolent Ambivalence mother	1.00	6.00	3.10	1.04
Benevolent Ambivalence father	1.00	5.80	3.51	0.98

**Table 2** Range, mean scores, and standard deviations for responses on the Ambivalent Sexism and Ambivalence toward Men scales.

As illustrated in Table 2, participants' mean scores are medium to high on all scales. Scores of young adult males on the Benevolent Sexism scale do not differ significantly from their fathers' scores. Statistically significant differences with respect to young adult males do, however, emerge for other dimensions. For mother/son dyads, statistically significant differences were found in: Hostile Sexism  $t(197)=6.45$ ,  $p<.001$ ; Benevolent Sexism  $t(197)=3.05$ ,  $p<.001$ ; Hostile Ambivalence  $t(186)=-3.87$ ,  $p<.001$ ; Benevolent Ambivalence  $t(84)=3.47$ ,  $p<.001$ . Father/son dyads had statistically significant differences

*Somiglianze e differenze nel pregiudizio di genere di genitori e figli: l'effetto dell'intreccio tra famiglia e cultura*

MATERIALI

MATERIALI

in: Benevolent Ambivalence  $t(185)=1.96, p<.05$ . Benevolent Sexism  $t(197)=-.17, p=.86$ ; Hostile Ambivalence  $t(182)=1.05, p=.29$ ; Hostile Sexism  $t(196)=3.95, p<.001$ .

With regard to young adult females, the picture is more complex. Scores of young adult females on the Benevolent Sexism subscale do not differ significantly from their fathers' scores. In addition, young adult females and their mothers do not significantly differ in their scores on the Hostile Ambivalence subscale. However, significant differences with respect to young adult females do emerge for other dimensions. For mother/daughter dyads, statistically significant differences were found in: Hostile Sexism  $t(187)=2.48, p<.05$ ; Benevolent Sexism  $t(187)=2.64, p<.01$ ; Hostile Ambivalence  $t(169)=-1.62, p=.10$ ; Benevolent Ambivalence  $t(156)=2.20, p<.05$ . Father/daughter dyads had statistically significant differences in: Benevolent Ambivalence  $t(161)=-2.51, p<.05$ ; Hostile Ambivalence  $t(169)=2.99, p<.01$ ; Hostile Sexism  $t(184)=-3.58, p<.01$ ; Benevolent Sexism  $t(185)=-1.25, p=.21$ . As results illustrate, young adult females score lower than their fathers on the Hostile Sexism subscale and the Benevolent Ambivalence subscale, and higher on the Hostile Ambivalence subscale. When compared to their mothers, young adult females score higher on all scales except the Hostile Ambivalence subscale in which they do not differ.

*Dyadic correlations*

Dyadic correlations ( $r_{\text{dyadic}}$ ) were used to determine the degree of similarity between the gender prejudice of parents and their respective offspring. An index between parent data and offspring data on both dimensions (i.e., Hostile and Benevolent) of the Ambivalence and Sexism scales was calculated for each dyad. The analytical unit of these indices is, therefore, the dyad. Results, are shown in Table 3.

The similarity between parents and their offspring tends toward zero for all constructs investigated, except Hostile Sexism between mother and daughter in which small dyadic correlations emerge ( $r_{\text{dyadic}}=.25$ ). Pearson correlations are also very small and not statistically significant.

	$r_{\text{dyadic}}$			
	Son- Mother	Son- Father	Daughter- Mother	Daughter- Father
Hostile Sexism	.13	.13	.25	.13
Benevolent Sexism	.11	.07	.18	.01
Hostile Ambivalence	.05	.05	.11	.06
Benevolent Ambivalence	.04	.06	.03	.02

**Table 3** Comparison between Pearson correlations  $r$  and dyadic correlations.

*Somiglianze e differenze nel pregiudizio di genere di genitori e figli: l'effetto dell'intreccio tra famiglia e cultura*

MATERIALI

Statistically significant differences between parents and children do not emerge for any of the dimensions investigated. Thus, gender does not appear to be a discriminant variable. Although mean scores calculated using “traditional” analytic techniques (i.e., paired-samples *t*-tests) for each father/mother and his/her own child are similar, response profiles of the dyads do not have the same trend in the involved actors.

*PHASE II*

*Analysis*

*Cultural stereotype effect*

The present research will consider gender and generation to be two aspects of cultural stereotype effect. The calculation of the cultural stereotype effect does not allow one to completely sever the generational aspect from that of gender. On the one hand, it would be important to divide the two aspects (gender/generation) in order to understand which has a greater impact on the similarity of the response profiles. On the other hand, however, this calculation makes it possible to fully grasp the complexity of this dual nature, which cannot be severed (a "son" belongs both to the gender category "male" as well as to the generational category "young").

To measure the cultural stereotype effect, we used a procedure proposed by Kenny and Acitelli (1994). A cultural stereotype response profile was operationalized as the mean of family members' responses on each dimension of the Ambivalence and Sexism scales. Each participant's responses were composed of two parts: (1) a component related to the cultural stereotype effect (i.e., the socially shared tendency for individuals to respond in a certain way), and (2) a component representing the response's uniqueness. By removing the shared cultural stereotype component from dyadic correlation and calculating dyadic correlations with the “purified” scores (i.e., scores in which the cultural stereotype component has been removed), we obtained an index of the unique similarity between two family members. Recall that the cultural stereotype effect refers to people's tendency to respond in a typical, socially shared way. If the goal of research is to explore the unique similarity that is shared by members of a dyad, the cultural stereotype effect must be calculated and removed.

The cultural stereotype effect was operationalized separately for males and females offspring (i.e. sons and daughters) and parents (i.e., fathers and mothers) in terms of mean scores obtained by the participants on the two scales. For each subscale, scores were mean-centered as previous results suggest they play an important role in influencing the similarity of parents and children in their gender prejudice. We then recalculated the dyadic correlations, controlling for the cultural stereotype effect, to capture the degree of unique similarity that links each parent to his/her own child.

### Results

As illustrated in Table 4, if we remove the cultural stereotype effect when calculating dyadic correlations they become significantly smaller in the majority of cases. Dyadic correlations only increase for Benevolent Sexism in father-daughter pairs, although only by a small amount. This suggests that the gender and generation role (cultural stereotype effect), rather than relationship-specific uniqueness, plays a larger role in influencing participants' responses.

**Table 4** Comparison between overall and “purified” dyadic correlations.

	Son-Mother			Son-Father			Daughter-Mother			Daughter-Father		
	$r_{dyadic}$	$r_{dyadic}$ “pure”	$p$	$r_{dyadic}$	$r_{dyadic}$ “pure”	$p$	$r_{dyadic}$	$r_{dyadic}$ “pure”	$p$	$r_{dyadic}$	$r_{dyadic}$ “pure”	$p$
Hostile Sexism	.13	-.02	$t(94)=-3.69,$ $p=.00$	.13	.01	$t(92)=-3.08,$ $p=.00$	.25	.03	$t(179)=-3.86,$ $p=.00$	.13	.02	$t(179)=-8.69,$ $p=.00$
Benevolent Sexism	.11	.08	$n.s.$	.07	.09	$n.s.$	.18	.17	$n.s.$	.01	.09	$t(164)=2.63,$ $p=.00$
Hostile Ambivalence	.05	.03	$n.s.$	.05	.03	$n.s.$	.11	.08	$t(162)=-2.17,$ $p=.05$	.06	.04	$t(162)=-2.69,$ $p=.05$
Benevolent Ambivalence	.04	.02	$n.s.$	.06	.02	$n.s.$	.03	.01	$n.s.$	.02	.00	$n.s.$

*Discussion*

The aim of the present research was two-fold: (1) to investigate whether the prejudice response profiles of parents and their young adult children are similar, and (2) to determine whether this similarity results from a specificity of the family role or the gender and generation role (i.e., cultural stereotype effect).

Given that our participants were family members and data were thus interdependent, we used a couple-centered approach. This approach made it possible to compare parents and offspring as a specific dyad (i.e., each parent paired with his/her own child), and not as social groups (as would occur with traditional Pearson's  $r$  correlations). As part of our approach, we utilized dyadic correlations ( $r_{\text{dyadic}}$ ). The former assess whether members of the dyad (i.e., mother and young adult child, or father and young adult child) have similar response trends. We also attempted to determine whether the variance explained by dyadic correlations is due to membership in the same dyad or to cultural stereotype effect, understood in the present work as gender role (i.e., being male or female in social terms) and generation role (i.e., being "young" or "old").

Dyadic correlations ( $r_{\text{dyadic}}$ ) in the present study are small, indicating that the response profiles of parents and offspring do not have similar trends. It is interesting to note that this dissimilarity occurs both for male and female offspring, in contrast to literature claiming that there is greater similarity between parents and offspring of the same gender (see, for example, O'Bryan, Fishbein & Ritchey, 2004). As already pointed out when the dyadic conditions were described, although similarity cannot simply be considered synonymous with influence, some influence makes it possible to give a positive assessment to the outcome of an exchange (Bengtson, 1975; Bengtson & Roberts, 1991).

In Phase II we also calculated the cultural stereotype effect to assess how much of the small similarity between parents and offspring was due to specificity of the family role or to the gender and generation role (cultural stereotype effect). When subtracting the cultural stereotype effect from dyadic correlations, there was a statistically significant decrease in almost all dyadic correlations. Thus, the small similarity in gender prejudice between parents and offspring is mostly due to parents' gender and generation role and not simply to family relationship.

The studies presented here address a complex topic that has not yet been addressed using



a family research approach. In doing this research, we are attempting to begin to fill several gaps.

*The interconnection between family and socio-cultural context in the study of gender prejudice.* Past research on the socialization/transmission of attitudes has traditionally focused either on strictly family-related influences or social influences, omitting the interconnection between them. The present work highlights the importance of examining the *relationship* between family and social aspects as a topic of inquiry.

*Age range - families with a young adult child.* Numerous studies have concentrated on the relationship between the gender prejudice of parents and children when children are school-age. More recently, research has also examined adolescents. The phase of young adulthood, however, has thus far been neglected. It is important to consider this developmental phase, having regard to the progressive increase in young people with the typical characteristics of this age group (for a review, see Arnett, 2000). In addition, studying young adults would help to develop continuity in the literature, offering the opportunity to compare age groups and explore, for example, whether the influence of family context peaks during adolescence and then decreases as children become older.

*Methodology - couple centered approach.* This strategy offers great potential, but it has not previously been used in studies that examine attitudes within the family. Other research areas, such as interpersonal relationships and values, do utilize this strategy and offer important insights that “traditional” methods of research cannot.

*Interdisciplinarity* - This research affects many areas of psychology (social psychology, educational psychology, research methodology, etc.) And neighboring sciences (such as sociology and pedagogy.) and can be useful in different ways. It can lead to many different applications because it helps to better understand the transmission of gender prejudice from parents to children.

Unfortunately, given the lack of comparable research, we were unable to compare our data with that of analogous studies.

As in all research, it is important to consider several limitations. First, there may be numerous moderating and mediating variables that influence the similarities and differences in gender prejudice between parents and their offspring. These similarities and differences cannot simply be attributed to one’s being a member of the same family because, as revealed by the present findings, some dyadic profiles of parents and offspring

*Somiglianze e differenze nel pregiudizio di genere di genitori e figli: l'effetto dell'intreccio tra famiglia e cultura*

MATERIALI

were very elevated while other profiles were not. In research that also uses dyadic correlations, Rohan and Zanna (1996) found an  $r_{\text{dyadic}}$  equal to .54 between the value profiles of parents and their offspring and detected high variability between dyads, some of which exhibited strongly discordant profiles and others, an almost perfect overlap. Rohan and Zanna attribute this variability to the influence of family factors on the possible intervening variables, in particular parent's childrearing style. For example, an authoritarian or permissive style would lead to greater similarity between the values of a child and his/her parents. In addition to childrearing styles, numerous other variables may also influence the variability between dyads, such as children's identification with their parents (Castelli, Zogmaister & Tomelleri, 2009), family climate, communication level, admiration, support, perceived conflict, and socio-demographic variables (i.e., birth order and socio-economic status).

A second limitation is that the results presented here provide a glimpse of the relationship between gender prejudice and gender and generation roles, and the interconnections between the family and socio-cultural contexts. However, our work does not provide information about the trend of these aspects over time. It would be greatly beneficial to undertake longitudinal research capable of monitoring possible changes during different phases of the life cycle. For example, it would be interesting to test the hypothesis that family is the predominant (but not exclusive) influence on socialization during infancy, that family and socio-cultural contexts are equally influential during adolescence as adolescents decide which influence will prevail, and that young adults are influenced more by the socio-cultural context, perhaps due to their prior acceptance or rejection of family influence.

Future studies using the same family research approach can provide a more comprehensive picture of the complex phenomenon under study.

*Bibliography*

- About, F. (1988). *Children and Prejudice*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other authoritarian personality. In M.P. Zanna, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. London: Academic Press.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). High hopes in a grim world. Emerging Adults' Views of Their Futures and "Generation X". *Youth & Society*, 31, 267-286.
- Barni, D. (2009). *Trasmettere valori. Tre generazioni familiari a confronto. [Transmitting values. Three family generations compared]*. Milano: Unicopli.
- Bengtson, V. L., & Roberts, R. (1991). Intergenerational solidarity in aging families: An example of formal construction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 856-870.
- Bengtson, V. L. (1975). Generation and family effects in value socialization. *American Sociological Review*, 40, 358-371.
- Bernieri, F. J., Zuckerman, M., Koestner, R., & Rosenthal, R. (1994). Measuring person perception accuracy: Another look at self-other agreement. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 367-378.
- Boehnke, K. (2001). Parent-offspring value transmission in a societal context. Suggestions for a utopian research design with empirical underpinnings. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 241-255.
- Bond, C. F., Jr., & Kenny, D. A. (2002). The triangle of interpersonal models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 355-366.
- Booth, A., & Amato, P. (1994). Parental gender role nontraditionalism and offspring outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 865-877.
- Castelli, L., Carraro, L., Tomelleri, S., & Amari, A. (2007). White children's alignment to the perceived racial attitudes of the parents: Closer to the mother than the father. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 25, 353-357.
- Castelli, L., Tomelleri, S., & Zogmaister, C. (2009). The transmission of racial attitudes within the family. *Developmental Psychology*, 45, 586-591.
- Cigoli, V., Marta, E., & Tamanza, G. (2000). La valorizzazione della famiglia nello scambio tra le generazioni. [Making the most of the family in the exchange between the generations]. In V. Cigoli, *Il vello d'oro. Ricerche sul valore famiglia. [The golden fleece. Research on the family value]*. Cinisello Balsamo: CISF – San Paolo.

*Somiglianze e differenze nel pregiudizio di genere di genitori e figli: l'effetto dell'intreccio tra famiglia e cultura*

MATERIALI

- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Coleman, J. S. (1961). *The Adolescent Society*. New York: Free Press.
- Crouter, A., Manke, B., & McHale, S. (1995). The family context of gender intensification in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 66, 317-329.
- Di Dio, L., Saragovi, C., Koestner, C., & Aubé, J. (1996). Linking personal values to gender. *Sex Roles*, 34, 621-636.
- Eccles, J. S., Jacobs, J. E., & Harold, R. O. (1990). Gender role stereotypes, expectancy effects, and parents' socialization of gender differences. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46, 183-201.
- Emler, N. (1993). Il ruolo delle relazioni sociali nella formazione e nell'espressione dei valori adolescenziali. [The role of social relations in the formation and expression of adolescent values]. In S. Ansaloni & M. Borsari (Eds.), *Adolescenti in gruppo. Costruzione dell'identità e trasmissione dei valori*. [Adolescents in groups. Identity construction and value transmission] (pp. 113-124). Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Ex, C., & Janssens, J. (1998). Maternal influences on daughters' gender role attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 38, 171-186.
- Glass, J., Bengtson, V. L., & Dunham, C. (1986). Attitude similarity in three-generation families, Socialization, status inheritance or reciprocal influence? *American Sociological Review*, 51, 685-698.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 119-135.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The ambivalence toward men inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 519-536.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001a). Ambivalent sexism. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 33, pp. 115-188). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001b). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56, 109-118.

- Glick, P., & Hilt, L. (2000). Combative children to ambivalent adults: The development of gender prejudice. In T. Eckes & M. Trautner (Eds.), *Developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 243-272). Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Glick, P., *et al.* (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 763-775.
- Glick, P., *et al.* (2004). Bad but bold: Ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender inequality in 16 nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*, 713-728.
- Kenny, D. A., & Acitelli, L. K. (1994). Measuring similarity in couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *8*, 417-431.
- Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Knafo, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2001). Value socialization in families of Israeli-born and Soviet-born adolescents in Israel. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *32*, 213-228.
- Knafo, A. (2003). Contexts, relationship quality, and family value socialization: The case of parent-school ideological fit in Israel. *Personal Relationships*, *10*, 371-388.
- Kulik, L. (2002). The impact of social background on gender-role ideology: Parents' versus children's attitudes. *Journal of Family Issues*, *23*, 53-73.
- Lanz, M., & Rosnati, R. (2002). *Metodologia della ricerca sulla famiglia. [Methodology of research on the family]*. Milano: LED.
- Luo, S., & Klohnen, E. C. (2005). Assortative mating and marital quality in newlyweds: A couple-centred approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 304-326.
- Manganelli Rattazzi, A. M., Vopato, C., & Canova, L. (2008). L'atteggiamento Ambivalente verso Uomini e Donne. Un contributo alla Validazione delle Scale ASI E AMI. [The Ambivalent attitudes toward men and women. A contribution to the validation of the ASI and AMI Scales]. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia [Italian Journal of Psychology]*, *35*, 261-287.
- McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., & Tucker, C. J. (1999). Family context and gender role socialization in middle childhood: Comparing girls to boys and sisters to brothers. *Child Development*, *70*, 990-1004.
- McKeown, B., & Thomas, D. (1988). *Q methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

*Somiglianze e differenze nel pregiudizio di genere di genitori e figli: l'effetto dell'intreccio tra famiglia e cultura*

MATERIALI

- Moen, P., Erickson, M. A., & Dempster-McClain, D. (1997). Their mothers' daughters? The intergenerational transmission of gender attitudes in a world of changing roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 281-293.
- Molinari, L., Speltini, G., & Dalolio, S. (2001). Valori, regole e relazioni nello sviluppo della competenza sociale. [Values, rules and relations in the development of social competence]. *Età Evolutiva*, [Evolutionary Age], 70, 16-29.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Peterson, Z.D. (2011). Distinguishing Between Sex and Gender: History, Current Conceptualizations, and Implication. *Sex Roles*, 64, 791-803.
- Myers, D. G. (2008). *Social Psychology. Ninth Edition*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- O'Bryan, M., Fishbein, H., & Ritchey, N. (2004). Intergenerational transmission of prejudice, sex role stereotyping and intolerance. *Adolescence*, 39, 407-426.
- Rohan, M. J., & Zanna, M. P. (1996). Value transmission in families. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson & M. P. Zanna (Eds), *The psychology of values: The Ontario symposium* (vol. 8, pp. 253-276). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Scabini, E. (1995). *Psicologia sociale della famiglia. Sviluppo dei legami e trasformazioni sociali*. [Social psychology of the family. Development of bonds and social transformations]. Torino: Bollati Boringhieri.
- Tenenbaum, H. R., & Leaper, C. (2002). Are parents' gender schemas related to their children's gender related cognitions? *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 615-630.
- White, F. A., Wooten, B., Man, J., Diaz, H., Rasiyah, J., Swift, E., & Wilkinson, A. (2009). Adolescent racial prejudice development: The role of friendship quality and inter-racial contact. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33, 524-534.
- Zentner, M., & Renaud, M. (2007). Origins of adolescents' ideal self: An intergenerational perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 557-574.

*Sara Alfieri è psicologa, assegnista presso il Dipartimento di Psicologia dell'Università Cattolica di Milano, collaboratrice del Centro di Ateneo Studi e Ricerche sulla Famiglia. Si occupa di pregiudizio etnico e di genere e della trasmissione del pregiudizio all'interno della famiglia, relazioni familiari, transizione all'età adulta.*

*Elena Marta è psicologa e Professore ordinario di Psicologia Sociale e Psicologia di Comunità presso la Facoltà di Psicologia dell'Università Cattolica di Milano. Collabora da anni presso il Centro di Ateneo Studi e Ricerche sulla Famiglia della medesima università. Tra i temi di suo interesse: volontariato e impegno nel sociale, transizione*

Sara Alfieri, Elena Marta, Clelia Anna Mannino, Daniela Barni

*all'età adulta, relazioni familiari.*

*Clelia Anna Mannino è psicologa e collabora con il Dipartimento di Psicologia dell'Università del Minnesota. Tra i suoi interessi di ricerca: sviluppo del senso di comunità tra i giovani, impegno nel sociale, transizione all'età adulta.*

*Daniela Barni è psicologa e ricercatrice presso la Facoltà di Psicologia dell'Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore di Milano. Collabora da anni presso il Centro di Ateneo Studi e Ricerche sulla Famiglia della stessa università. I suoi interessi di ricerca si rivolgono allo studio delle relazioni familiari, con particolare attenzione al tema dei valori e alla metodologia della ricerca in psicologia.*

MATERIALI