

HOW PARENTING STYLE AND RELIGIOSITY AFFECT THE TIMING OF JEWISH
ADOLESCENTS' SEXUAL DEBUT

By

ROBERT ETZKIN

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2004

Copyright 2004

by

Robert Etzkin

I would like to dedicate this paper to the many people who contributed to my upbringing as a Jewish adolescent. I feel very fortunate to have been constantly surrounded by an extraordinarily strong web of support and I am forever thankful for the many people who have provided me with infinite amounts of love, encouragement, and guidance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the many people who have contributed to my success and development as a student and as a person. First, I would like to thank Dr. Rose Barnett for being my thesis chair and providing me hours (and years) of guidance and direction with my study and for putting equal as much time and energy into support of my graduate school experience. I would also like to extend gratitude to my other committee members Dr. Suzanna Smith, and Dr. Stuart Schwartz for their continued support, insight, and constant belief in me and in my work. It was invaluable to me to have all three of my committee members' continued support. I would also like to thank Janice Col for helping to make my statistics make sense.

Most importantly I would like to thank my family. I owe my parents more than anything I could ever repay them for everything they have given me. I am forever grateful for all of the encouragement, guidance, love, and opportunities they have provided for me my whole life. More now, than ever before, do I appreciate all of the times I was pushed to succeed, and all of the times I was allowed to fail. I love you.

I would also like to thank my brother Josh. His trailblazing efforts and thick footprints through high school, college, and graduate school left me an easy path to follow and shoes impossible to fill. He set a high standard of excellence academically, and as a person morally and ethically, that undoubtedly has contributed to my development and success as a student and as a person.

In addition, I would like to express my gratitude to my extended family members: Uncle Al, Aunt Bunny, Cousin Brian, and Cousin David. I feel like one of the luckiest people in the world to have had the opportunity to grow up with all of them less than one mile away. This closeness provided me a great amount of support, a great amount of love, and a great amount of opportunities to have two additional “brothers” that were always there for me. Furthermore, I would like to thank my step-father Mark Rosenfield for accepting me into his family and for all of the support, wisdom and new experiences he has provided me. Also, I would like to thank my grandmothers Mitzi Goelman and Paula Etzkin for their love, support, and constant reinforcement of my Jewish background. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my best friend Benjamin Kaplan. Going to the same schools for sixteen years and having almost identical hobbies and interests provided us with countless memories and experiences that I look forward to reminiscing about upon his safe arrival back to the States from medical school in Israel.

If ever there was one motto that got me through tough times, helped me overcome challenges, and helped me maintain a positive outlook to the future it was this:

“Everything will work out for the best.” --- My Grandma Mitzi Goelman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | ix |
| ABSTRACT | xiv |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Introductory Background Statement..... | 1 |
| Parenting Style..... | 2 |
| Religiosity..... | 6 |
| Statement of the Problem..... | 7 |
| Research Questions..... | 8 |
| Primary Research Questions..... | 8 |
| Secondary Research Questions..... | 8 |
| Significance of the Study..... | 8 |
| Delimitations..... | 9 |
| Definition of Terms | 9 |
| 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 11 |
| Introduction..... | 11 |
| The Problem..... | 11 |
| Parental Communication and Parenting Style | 13 |
| Parental Communication | 13 |
| Parenting Style..... | 15 |
| Religiosity..... | 17 |
| Religious Affiliation..... | 17 |
| Religious Service Attendance..... | 19 |
| Community Religiosity | 20 |
| Other Factors | 21 |
| Family Structure | 21 |
| Academics | 26 |
| Gender | 27 |
| Peers | 28 |
| Summary..... | 28 |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| 3 | METHODOLOGY | 31 |
| | Population and Sample | 31 |
| | Settings | 32 |
| | Research Design and Subject Recruitment..... | 33 |
| | Instrumentation..... | 33 |
| | Personal Information | 34 |
| | Parenting Style..... | 36 |
| | Religiosity..... | 37 |
| | Statistical Analysis..... | 41 |
| | Primary Research Questions..... | 41 |
| | Secondary Research Questions..... | 42 |
| | Additional Results | 43 |
| 4 | RESULTS | 44 |
| | Descriptive Results | 44 |
| | Gender | 45 |
| | Religious Classification..... | 45 |
| | Sexual Intercourse | 46 |
| | Marriage | 46 |
| | Parenting Style..... | 46 |
| | Overall Religiosity Score | 55 |
| | Analysis of Research Questions | 56 |
| | Primary Research Questions..... | 56 |
| | Religiosity..... | 68 |
| | Virgins | 70 |
| | Summary..... | 73 |
| 5 | DISCUSSION..... | 74 |
| | Findings | 74 |
| | Descriptive Results | 74 |
| | Primary Research Questions..... | 75 |
| | Secondary Research Questions..... | 76 |
| | Parenting Style..... | 76 |
| | Religiosity..... | 80 |
| | Gender..... | 88 |
| | Summary..... | 88 |
| | Limitations..... | 88 |
| | Implications for Practice..... | 89 |
| | Recommendations for Future Research..... | 93 |
| APPENDIX | | |
| A | INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTERS..... | 96 |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|
| B | INFORMED CONSENT FORM..... | 98 |
| C | SURVEY INSTRUMENT..... | 100 |
| D | RELIGIOSITY INDEX GUIDE..... | 106 |
| E | ADDITIONAL TABLES OF RESULTS..... | 110 |
| | LIST OF REFERENCES..... | 131 |
| | BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH..... | 140 |

LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Table</u> | <u>page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 4-1 Participant gender..... | 45 |
| 4-2 Participant Classification of Judaism..... | 45 |
| 4-3 Participant experience of sex..... | 46 |
| 4-4 Respondents' selection of parents' parenting style..... | 51 |
| 4-5 Influence of parents' parenting style on decision to have, or not to have sex..... | 51 |
| 4-6 Non-virgin respondents' score on the Sum Religious Affiliation Index..... | 53 |
| 4-7 Non-virgin respondents' scores on the Sum Religious Attendance Index..... | 54 |
| 4-8 Non-virgin respondents' score on the Sum Community Religiosity Index..... | 55 |
| 4-9 Non-virgin respondents scores on the overall Sum Religiosity Index..... | 56 |
| 4-10 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among parenting styles..... | 57 |
| 4-11 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among parenting styles ANOVA..... | 57 |
| 4-12 Post-hoc evaluation of significant differences of mean age of sexual debut between parenting styles..... | 58 |
| 4-13 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of the Sum Religiosity Index..... | 60 |
| 4-14 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of the Sum Religious Index ANOVA..... | 61 |
| 4-15 Post-hoc evaluation of significant differences of mean age of sexual debut between levels of Sum Religiosity Index..... | 62 |
| 4-16 Comparison of age of sexual debut among levels of the Religious Affiliation Index..... | 63 |
| 4-17 Comparison of age of sexual debut among scores on Religious Affiliation Index ANOVA..... | 63 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4-18 | Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of Religious Attendance Index..... | 64 |
| 4-19 | Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of Religious Attendance Index ANOVA..... | 64 |
| 4-20 | Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of the Community Religiosity Index..... | 65 |
| 4-21 | Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of the Community Religiosity Index ANOVA..... | 66 |
| 4-22 | Comparison of mean age of sexual debut by gender..... | 66 |
| 4-23 | Comparison of mean age of sexual debut by gender ANOVA..... | 67 |
| E-1 | Age at first date..... | 111 |
| E-2 | Age at first serious relationship..... | 111 |
| E-3 | Parental discussion of sex..... | 111 |
| E-4 | Frequency of sexual discussion..... | 112 |
| E-5 | Depth of sexual discussion..... | 112 |
| E-6 | Number of topics covered in parental sexual discussion..... | 112 |
| E-7 | Sexual discussion included abstinence..... | 112 |
| E-8 | Sexual discussion included safe sex..... | 113 |
| E-9 | Sexual discussion included physical development..... | 113 |
| E-10 | Sexual discussion included emotion-based intimacy..... | 113 |
| E-11 | Sexual discussion included consequences..... | 113 |
| E-12 | Age at first sexual discussion..... | 114 |
| E-13 | Respondents' characterization of own family's level of observance at age of reference point..... | 114 |
| E-14 | Respondents' characterization of affiliation to Judaism at age of reference point..... | 115 |
| E-15 | Frequency of religious service attendance at age of reference point..... | 115 |
| E-16 | Attendance to Hebrew school/Sunday school at age of reference point..... | 115 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| E-17 School Type..... | 115 |
| E-18 Percentage of respondents that had a Bar/Bat Mitzvah..... | 116 |
| E-19 Level of respondent involvement in Jewish youth group at age of reference point..... | 116 |
| E-20 Proportion of respondents who grew up in communities that had Jewish Community Centers and if they were a member..... | 116 |
| E-21 Respondents' assessment of the level of their community's religiosity. | 116 |
| E-22 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among ages at first date ANOVA. | 117 |
| E-23 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among ages at first serious relationship ANOVA. | 117 |
| E-24 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among ages at first sexual discussion with parent ANOVA. | 117 |
| E-25 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among frequencies of sexual discussions ANOVA. | 117 |
| E-26 Post-hoc evaluations of significant differences between mean age of sexual debut between frequencies of sexual discussion. | 118 |
| E-27 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of depth of sexual discussions ANOVA. | 118 |
| E-28 Post-hoc evaluations of significant differences between mean age of sexual debut between levels of depth of sexual discussion. | 119 |
| E-29 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among classifications of Judaism ANOVA. | 119 |
| E-30 Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationship between mean age of sexual debut among classifications of Judaism. | 120 |
| E-31 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of religious affiliation ANOVA. | 120 |
| E-32 Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationship between mean age of sexual debut among levels of religious affiliation. | 121 |
| E-33 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of religious service attendance ANOVA. | 121 |
| E-34 Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of Hebrew school attendance ANOVA. | 122 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| E-35 | Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationships between mean age of sexual debut among levels of religious service. | 122 |
| E-36 | Post-hoc evaluations of significant relationships between mean age of sexual debut among levels of Hebrew school attendance. | 123 |
| E-37 | Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among primary school types ANOVA. . | 123 |
| E-38 | Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of involvement in Jewish youth groups ANOVA. | 123 |
| E-39 | Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationships between ages of sexual debut among levels of involvement in Jewish youth groups. | 124 |
| E-40 | Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among Jewish Community Center members and non-members ANOVA. | 124 |
| E-41 | Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationships between ages of sexual debut among Jewish Community Center members and non-members. | 125 |
| E-42 | Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of community religiosity ANOVA. | 125 |
| E-43 | Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationships between ages of sexual debut among levels of community religiosity. | 126 |
| E-44 | Frequency of restrictions on age at first date Chi-Square. | 126 |
| E-45 | Frequency of ages at first serious relationship Chi-Square. | 127 |
| E-46 | Frequency of if parents discussed sex Chi-Square. | 127 |
| E-47 | Frequency of frequency of sexual discussion Chi-Square. | 127 |
| E-48 | Frequency of levels of depth of sexual discussion Chi-Square. | 127 |
| E-49 | Frequency of ages at first sexual discussion Chi-Square. | 128 |
| E-50 | Mean of number topics covered in sexual discussion. | 128 |
| E-51 | Frequency of parents' parenting style Chi-Square. | 128 |
| E-52 | Frequency of levels influence believed that parents' parenting style had on decision not to have sex Chi-Square. | 128 |
| E-53 | Frequency of classifications of Judaism Chi-Square. | 129 |
| E-54 | Frequency of levels of affiliation to Judaism Chi-Square. | 129 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| E-55 | Frequency of frequency of religious service attendance Chi-Square..... | 129 |
| E-56 | Frequency of frequency of Hebrew school attendance Chi-Square..... | 129 |
| E-57 | Frequency of primary school type Chi-Square. | 129 |
| E-58 | Frequency of Bar/Bat Mitzvah Chi-Square..... | 130 |
| E-59 | Frequency of levels of involvement in a Jewish youth group Chi-Square..... | 130 |
| E-60 | Frequency of respondents' communities having Jewish Community Centers and if they were members Chi-Square. | 130 |
| E-61 | Frequency of levels of community religiosity Chi-Square. | 130 |

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science

HOW PARENTING STYLE AND RELIGIOSITY AFFECT THE TIMING OF JEWISH
ADOLESCENTS' SEXUAL DEBUT

By

Robert Etzkin

May 2004

Chair: Rosemary V. Barnett

Major Department: Family, Youth, and Community Sciences

The purpose of my study is to assess whether or not parenting style has an effect on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts. To examine parenting style, Baumrind's classification of parenting styles was used (1978). The study will also examine whether religiosity affects the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts.

One hundred sixty-eight research participants between the ages of 18 and 22 from a large university in the Southeast participated in my study. A survey instrument was created, revised, test-piloted, edited and then administered at three fraternities and two sororities to examine parenting style and religiosity. The demographic portion of the survey requested information related to gender, age, religious beliefs, intercourse, and marriage. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, frequency chi square tests, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA); while post hoc results were determined through Tukey's honestly significant difference.

Results showed that authoritative parenting provides a delay in the age of sexual debut for Jewish adolescents. All other parenting styles had mean ages less than the overall mean age of sexual debut, 17.10 years old, with indifferent parenting having the earliest. Results also showed that differing levels of religiosity have significant differences in their mean ages of sexual debut. Differences were found when comparing no substantial religiosity to minimal religiosity, and when comparing minimal religiosity to high religiosity. The findings suggest that both parenting style and religiosity independently affect the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. The study has implications for understanding two of the many factors that may affect the timing of a Jewish adolescent's sexual debut, and may help parents protect their adolescent from the negative effects associated with early sexual debut such as low academic achievement. Recommendations for future research include exploring the effects of family structure and peer networks to understand fully the many factors that affect the timing of adolescents' sexual debut.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter will introduce the main concepts of investigation in this study including, but not limited to the following: adolescence, parenting styles, religiosity, and other factors. It also will state the main research problem to be investigated, as well as the primary and secondary research questions to be answered through the study. The assumptions, delimitations, limitations, and main definitions also will be described.

Introductory Background Statement

Adolescence is a transition period: biologically, psychologically, socially, and economically. It is an exciting time in life that includes many positive situations laced in potential and also many negative situations where the consequences might not seem so evident. Adolescents become interested in sex and become biologically capable of reproduction. In addition, adolescents begin to develop complex cognitive abilities, their lives become more sophisticated and complicated, and they receive a taste of autonomy as they gain an ability to make their own decisions. In the United States, adolescents mature into adulthood and gain the right to work, to get married, and to vote (Arnett, 1994). And eventually, adolescents are expected to be able to support themselves financially. In most societies, adolescence is a time of growing up and of moving from the immaturity of childhood into the maturity of adulthood (Steinberg, 1999).

There are many activities across societies that have been socially constructed to be adult behaviors. For example, in the United States, one is not allowed to legally consume alcohol until the age of 21. This law might partially aim to ensure that drinking alcohol

remains exclusively an adult behavior. Other adult behaviors might include driving a motor vehicle, smoking, and engaging in sexual intercourse. Some might believe that these behaviors are more appropriate for adults because they all have potentially serious and dangerous consequences. Driving can result in serious injury or death to one's self and/or others (The Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, 2003). Smoking has been scientifically proven to be hazardous to one's health and others around the smoker (United States Surgeon General, 2003). Finally, engaging in sexual intercourse can spread diseases and can initiate reproduction (Fores, Tschann & Marin, 2002). Therefore, engaging in sexual intercourse as an adolescent can be considered a risk-related behavior. It is important to note that while sexual intercourse can occur between members of the same sex or opposite sex, this study will examine adolescents' sexual debut in the context of heterosexual relationships.

Parenting Style

A child's family, as the most influential socializing agent of a young child, provides a foundation for what is, and what is not, acceptable within the family and outside the home in society. Children watch, imitate and learn from their parents. Therefore, parenting style, or how a parent establishes and enforces rules and boundaries for their child(ren), becomes very important. Parents can be strict, loose or inconsistent with their rules, and they can set realistic, unrealistic or inconsistent goals for their children. It is possible that different parenting styles may affect child outcomes differently.

There are many ways to characterize parents' behavior toward their children. This study will utilize an approach that comes from the work of psychologist Diana Baumrind (1996, 1978). According to her theory, two aspects of a parent's behavior toward the

adolescent are critical: parental responsiveness and parental demandingness (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Parental responsiveness refers to the degree to which a parent responds to their child's needs in an accepting and supportive manner. Parental demandingness is the extent to which a parent expects and demands mature, responsible behavior from their child.

Parental responsiveness and parental demandingness are basically independent of each other. In other words, it is possible for a parent to be very demanding without being responsive and at the same time it is possible for a parent to be very responsive without being demanding. Therefore, various combinations of these dimensions can be examined. For example, a parent who is very responsive but not at all demanding is labeled permissive, whereas one who is equally responsive but also very demanding is labeled authoritative. Parents who are very demanding but not responsive are labeled authoritarian; parents who are neither demanding nor responsive are labeled indifferent. These are the four general parenting patterns as developed by Baumrind (1996, 1978). These four parenting styles will now be broken down further in order to gain a more complete understanding of the general characteristics of parents within each style, and their varied expectations of children and adolescents, affect child outcomes according to Baumrind.

Permissive parents behave in an accepting and passive way concerning issues of discipline. They tend to place relatively few demands on their child, giving the child a high degree of freedom to act as he or she wishes. Permissive parents are more likely to believe that control is an infringement on their child's freedom that may interfere with their child's healthy development. Instead of actively shaping their child's behavior,

permissive parents are more likely to view themselves as resources that their child may choose to use (Berk, 2000).

Authoritative parents are warm but firm. They set standards for their child's conduct that are consistent with their child's developing needs and capabilities. They place a high value on the development of autonomy and self-direction but assume the ultimate responsibility for their child's behavior. Authoritative parents deal with their child in a rational, issue-oriented manner, frequently engaging in discussion and explanation with their children over matters of discipline (Berk, 2000).

Authoritarian parents place a high value on obedience and conformity. They tend to favor more punitive, absolute, and forceful disciplinary measures. Verbal communication is not usually on an equal level in authoritarian households, because the underlying belief of authoritarian parents is that their child should accept without question all of the rules and standards established by the parents. They usually do not encourage independent behavior and, instead, place a good amount of importance on restricting their child's autonomy (Berk, 2000).

Indifferent parents try to do whatever is necessary to minimize the time and energy they must devote to interacting with their child. In extreme cases, indifferent parents may be considered neglectful in legal terms. They know little about their child's activities and whereabouts, show little interest in their child's experiences at school or with friends, rarely converse with their child, and rarely consider their child's opinion when making decisions. Rather than raising their child according to a set of beliefs about what is good for their child's development (as do the other three parenting types), indifferent parents

are “parent centered” and structure their home life primarily around their own needs and interests (Berk, 2000).

The organization process proposed by Baumrind provides a useful way of summarizing and examining some of the relations between parenting practices and adolescent development. In general, adolescents who have been raised in authoritative households are overall far better off than their peers who have been reared in authoritarian, permissive, or indifferent homes. Adolescents raised in authoritative homes are more responsible, more self-assured, more adaptive, more creative, more curious, more socially skilled, and more successful in school. Adolescents raised in authoritarian homes, in contrast, are more dependent, more passive, less socially adept, less self-assured, and less intellectually curious. Adolescents raised in permissive households are often less mature, more irresponsible, more conforming to their peers, and less able to assume positions of leadership. Adolescents raised in indifferent homes are often impulsive and more likely to be involved in delinquent behavior and in premature experiments with sex, drugs, and alcohol (Fuligni & Eccles, 1993; Kurdeck & Fine, 1994; Lamborn et al., 1991; Pulkkinen, 1982; Steinberg et al., 1994). Furthermore, although occasional exceptions to these general patterns have been found, the evidence linking authoritative parenting and healthy adolescent development is remarkably strong, and has been found in studies throughout a wide range of ethnic, regional, and socioeconomic groups (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Shucksmith, Hendry, & Glendinning, 1995; Steinberg et al., 1994; Weiss & Schwartz, 1996). This study will refer to Baumrind’s classifications of parenting styles throughout in order to have a clear understanding of the different ways that parents interact with their child(ren).

Religiosity

Religious beliefs, like moral and political beliefs, also become more abstract, more formatted, and more independent during adolescence. This may be seen as a result of the cognitive development of adolescents. As adolescents become increasingly capable of thinking in more complex ways, they begin to form their own system of beliefs, rather than relying solely on the teachings of their parents (Fowler, 1981). Three aspects of religiosity can affect an adolescent's timing of sexual debut: affiliation, attendance, and community religiosity. Some believe that the type of religious affiliation is less important than actually being affiliated. For example, there is not a strong difference found between adolescents who are affiliated as Christians and adolescents who are affiliated as Jewish. However, there is a major difference between those adolescents who are affiliated as either Christian or Jewish compared to those adolescents who are not affiliated at all (Rostosky, 2003). An exception could appear if religions that differ more than Christianity and Judaism were compared, but because Jewish adolescents are the group being examined and Christianity is the major religion of the United States, the conclusion drawn remains valid. Religious service attendance has been found to have a circular relationship with timing of sexual debut. The more frequently adolescents attend religious services the more likely they are to delay sexual debut. Similarly, the earlier an adolescent's sexual debut, the less likely he or she is to attend religious services (Thornton & Camburn, 1989).

The community the adolescent lives in may also affect the timing of sexual debut. For example, if an adolescent grows up in a highly religious community, the social norms of their community might include abstinence from premarital sex; teens may never consider having sex before marriage. In contrast, if an adolescent grows up in a

community where religion is never even talked about or is only minimally visible, it may seem more socially acceptable to have premarital sex. Some, but not all, research suggests that, overall, religious adolescents are significantly less likely than their peers to engage in premarital sexual intercourse, and somewhat less likely to engage in delinquent behavior, such as drug use; they are also less depressed (Benson, Donahue, & Erickson, 1989; Donahue, 1994; Litchfield, Thomas, & Li, 1997; Wright, Frost, & Wisecarver, 1993).

While religiosity, parenting style, and family structure may play a role in the timing of adolescent sexual debut, it is important to mention that an adolescent's peers may also affect the timing of sexual debut. As a parent's role in their adolescent's life diminishes, the adolescent's peers become increasingly influential. Whereas acquaintances or members of an adolescent's social circle of friends may have little influence, the peers that the adolescent believes to be their close friends, particularly their best friends, hold a high level of trust and power. The complexity of the many levels that peers can exist on makes the task of attempting to decipher the mutual influences of adolescent peers a very difficult task. Due to the power that peers may have in affecting adolescents' decision making, it is important to consider whether peers affect the timing of sexual debut.

Statement of the Problem

This study assesses whether or not parenting style has an effect on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts. It also examines the effect that the four parenting styles (permissive, authoritative, authoritarian, and indifferent) have on the age of sexual debut. The study also examines whether religiosity affects the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts.

Research Questions

The primary research questions focus on the main area of interest, parenting style among Jewish families and its impact on adolescent sexual debut. The secondary research questions focus on an additional area of interest, religiosity for Jewish adolescents and its impact on sexual debut. The final area of study examines differences in sexual debut between male and female Jewish adolescents.

Primary Research Questions

1. Is there a difference in the timing of sexual debut among Jewish adolescents raised with different parenting styles?
2. Do any of the four parenting styles positively affect (delay) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts?
3. Do any of the four parenting styles negatively affect (expediate) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts?

Secondary Research Questions

1. Is there a difference in the timing of sexual debut among Jewish adolescents with different levels of religiosity?
2. Do any of the three aspects of religiosity positively affect (delay) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut?
3. Is there a difference in timing of sexual debut between male and female Jewish adolescents?

Significance of the Study

Many studies have been done on the timing of adolescent sexual debuts (Noell & Biglan, 1995; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1999; Whitbeck, Yoder, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999). Studies have also examined the timing of sexual debut among racial and ethnic minorities (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993; Gillmore, Archibald, Morrison, Wilsdon, Wells, Hoppe, Nahom, & Murowchick, 2002; Upchurch, Aneshensel, Sucoff, Levy-Storms, 1999). However, there is only a small collection of studies on the timing of adolescents' sexual

debut among religious minorities (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993; Reed & Myers, 1991; Thornton & Camburn, 1989). Furthermore, there is an absence of literature specifically pertaining to Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. There is a need to bridge this gap in order to provide parents of Jewish adolescents research-based information on the impact of parenting styles on Jewish adolescent sexual debut.

Delimitations

- Data were collected during the fall semester of 2003.
- Participants who volunteered had to have approximately ten to fifteen minutes of free time to complete the survey.
- Participants belonged to a single type of historically Jewish student organizations at a large university in the Southeastern United States.

Limitations

- All subjects could choose not to participate in the study.
- Both genders may not be equally represented in the study.
- Students may not have answered all of the questions, causing incomplete data.
- The topic of adolescent sexual debut may be considered personal and may cause respondents to not always be truthful in all of their responses.
- A small convenience sample of Jewish fraternity and sorority members was used; therefore results cannot be generalized.

Assumptions

- Students participating in the study accurately remember their sexual debut.
- Students participating in the study are accurately reporting on their sexual debut.
- Convenience sampling will provide significant results.

Definition of Terms

- Adolescence refers to the transition between childhood and adulthood (Steinberg, 1999).

- Authoritarian parenting refers to a style of child rearing in which a parent is very demanding but not responsive (Baumrind, 1996, 1978).
- Authoritative parenting refers to a style of child rearing in which a parent is responsive but also very demanding (Baumrind, 1996, 1978).
- Bar/Bat Mitzvah is the religious ceremony in Judaism marking the young person's transition to adulthood (Steinberg, 1999).
- Community religiosity refers to the level of a community's overall religious involvement and proscription of religious norms (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993).
- Family structure is the form one's family takes on in respect to parents and siblings (Moore & Chase-Lansdale, 2001).
- Indifferent parenting refers to a style of child rearing in which a parent is neither demanding nor responsive (Baumrind, 1996, 1978).
- J.C.C. refers to the Jewish Community Center, an organization that began in 1854 to provide support for Jewish immigrants. These are now all across North America and provide many services such as day camps, fine and performing arts, nursery schools, athletics, services to the elderly, and informal education, all while still helping Jews settle into communities (www.jcca.org, 2004).
- Parental demandingness refers to the extent to which the parent expects and demands mature, responsible behavior from the child (Baumrind, 1996, 1978).
- Parental responsiveness refers to the degree to which a parent responds to their child's needs in an accepting, supportive manner (Baumrind, 1996, 1978).
- Parenting style refers to how a parent establishes and enforces rules and boundaries for their child(ren) (Steinberg, 1999).
- Permissive parenting refers to a style of child rearing in which a parent is very responsive but not at all demanding (Baumrind, 1996, 1978).
- Religiosity is the sum of one's religious involvement, religious attendance, and affection toward one's religion (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993).
- Sexual debut refers to the first experience of sexual intercourse (Calhoun & Friel, 2001).

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter will present a literature review on adolescence and sexual debut. The review will include the following topics: parental communication and parenting style, religiosity, and other potential risk factors associated with early sexual debut. The chapter will conclude with a summary linking these areas together to set a research rationale for the present study.

The Problem

Human sexual activity is inherently related to many of the social and public health concerns and challenges in the United States today (Calhoun & Friel, 2001; Di Mauro, 1995). Adolescent sexual behavior has long been treated within the framework of the sociology of deviant behavior (Reiss, 1967), and for some researchers early adolescent sexual activity is viewed as another case of problem behavior (Jessor & Jessor, 1983; Meschke & Silbereisen, 1997). These concerns stem from the potential risks surrounding adolescent sexual activity, which include early unintended pregnancies, sexually transmitted diseases (Calhoun & Friel, 2001), and a high cost to society (Haurin & Mott, 1990). Public costs associated with welfare and other target programs have been well documented (Haurin & Mott, 1990; Hofferth, 1987; Moore & Burt, 1982). Costs to the individual in the form of lower educational and economic prospects and poor health have also been established (Haurin & Mott, 1990; Hofferth & Moore, 1979; Strobino, Grason, & Minkovitz, 2002).

Of the 12 million cases of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) that are estimated to occur annually, adolescents account for one-quarter of those infected (Moore, 1992), and STD's have been increasing among adolescents since the 1970's (Center for Disease Control, 1992). According to the Center for Disease Control (1992), the cumulative number of acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) cases among adolescents between 13 and 19 years old increased from 127 in January 1987 to 789 in December 1991 (Luster & Small, 1994), but declined to 402 in 2002 (CDC, 2004). Recently, the estimated number of AIDS cases diagnosed for adolescents (13-19) declined substantially through 1999, but the rate of decline slowed between 1999 and 2000. The number of adolescent AIDS cases diagnosed in 2000 was still 1.4 % lower than that in 1999 (CDC, 2001).

While teenagers continue to contribute to the nation's sexually transmitted disease problem, the same cannot be said about teenage pregnancy. In the United States the birth rate for teenagers declined steadily throughout the 1990s, falling from 62.1 births per 1,000 teenagers 15-19 years old in 1991 to 48.5 in 2000, a reduction of 22 percent. The birth rates for adolescents ages 15-19 years old and 15-17 years old in 2000 were at all-time lows (Center for Disease Control, 2002), and continue to decline (CDC, 2004).

However, the problem remains that adolescents are beginning to have sex at younger ages and are therefore continuing to make themselves vulnerable to potential pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases. Well over half, 60.5%, of high school seniors report that they have had sex (Brener et al., 2001). The age of sexual debut has been steadily declining, the number of sexual partners before age 18 has been increasing, and only one in five adolescents remain virgins by the time they turn twenty years old

(Calhoun & Friel, 2001; Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994). The young adolescent is usually unprepared for difficult relationship decisions associated with close intimacy (Day, 1992), and because of their undeveloped decision-making process, they may not be able to realize the potential health and economic costs of their actions. Given these recent trends, adolescent sexuality continues to be an important area of research.

Parental Communication and Parenting Style

Parental Communication

Communication of parental values is one of the primary means by which parents socialize their children. Regarding sexual activity, parents can directly reduce the risks their children face by doing such things as encouraging their adolescents to avoid unprotected intercourse and by monitoring their children's comings and goings (Luster & Small, 1994).

In view of this, it would seem that sex education in the family might be an important intervention for delaying the transition to sexual activity (Moore, Peterson, Furstenberg, 1986). Despite the widespread belief that parents should be the primary source of information about sexuality, in practice they usually are not (Abrams et al., 1990; Ansuini et al., 1996; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1999; Rosenthal & Smith, 1995). Even when parents do communicate with their children about sexuality, they focus on issues relating to physical development and sexual safety rather than more psychological, relationship-based topics, or those which might be considered personal, such as practicing safe sex and emotion-based intimacy (Baldwin & Baranoski, 1990; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1999; Rosenthal et al., 1997). Most parents find the task of providing sex education for their children daunting and one for which they feel ill-equipped (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1999; Rosenthal et al. 1997). Numerous researchers have reported that few

parents provide a detailed sex education and many do not broach the topic at all (Furstenberg, 1976; Inazu & Fox, 1980; Kahn et al., 1985). There is a clear gap between what parents know they should do and what parents are actually doing.

Meschke and Silbereisen (1999) reported that Jessor, Costa, Jessor, & Donovan (1983) found that poor communication with parents and lack of parental support predicted early initiation of adolescent sexual activity. By contrast, delayed debut is associated with high levels of parental monitoring and open parent-child communication about sexual issues (Levin, Xu, & Bartkowski, 2002). Communication is perceived as the principal method through which sexual knowledge and attitudes are transmitted (Pick & Palos, 1995). Therefore, parental communication about sexual issues is a key measure of family involvement in adolescents' lives. The discussion of sex seems to have the effect of delaying sexual activity primarily among the daughters of traditional parents (Moore, Peterson, & Furstenberg, 1986), and other researchers have concluded parental communication decreases sexual activity (Inazu & Fox, 1980; Meschke & Silbereisen, 1997). However, findings on this topic have been mixed. Some researchers have found no consistent effects of parental communication (Miller & Moore, 1990). Regardless of the findings of a few studies, some researchers still believe that parents need to learn how to provide the right amount of the right information at the right time, whether it concerns academic achievement or sexual development (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1999).

One reason parents fail as sex educators may be their biased sexual communication patterns. Parents, especially mothers, tend to tailor their communications to be gender-appropriate (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1999), thus leaving feminine issues a blur in boys' minds and masculine issue a blur in girls' minds. Girls receive more information than

boys do about such topics as menstruation, abortion, pregnancy, and dealing with sexual pressure, and less information on such topics as masturbation and wet dreams (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1999). In addition, researchers have repeatedly reported that parents are less likely to discuss sex with sons than with daughters (Freeman, Rickels, Huggins, Mudd, Garcia, & Dickens, 1980; Kahn et al, 1985; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1999). However, different things may work for boys than for girls and vice versa. For example, among daughters of traditional parents, the incidence of sexual activity is lower when the parents discuss sex and/or television programming with sexual content with their daughters. Moreover, the more that parents discuss decisions with their daughters, the lower the incidence of sexual activity among daughters with traditional parents. In addition, among sons, a tendency on the part of traditional parents to listen to their sons and discuss decisions is related to a lower probability of sexual activity. However, the discussion of sex per se is associated with a greater likelihood that sons were sexually experienced (Moore, Peterson, & Furstenberg, 1986). This clearly illustrates a possible discrepancy between what the effective communication tools are for sons and what they are for daughters.

Parenting Style

Parents who use less power-oriented (“inductive” or “authoritative”) means of control tend to have children who exhibit more socially appropriate behavior on a number of indicators (Miller, McCoy, Olson, & Wallace, 1986). Parenting styles may also play a larger role in determining adolescents’ ages of sexual debut. Parental monitoring and harsh discipline consistently have been shown to affect other minor deviant behaviors that are highly correlated with early sexual intercourse (Simons, Johnson & Conger, 1996; Whitbeck et al., 1999). Styles vary by parent; however some parenting styles seem

to be more successful than others. For example, teens who view their parents as overcontrolling exhibit a greater number of sexual risk-taking behaviors (Barber, 1992; Rogers 1999). Sexual intercourse is most likely to occur among adolescents who have the most autonomy (the least parental control) to date whom they want, to date at an early age, and to control their own dating activities (where to go, when to come home, etc.) (Miller, McCoy, Olson & Wallace, 1986).

Parents can significantly reduce the likelihood that their daughters will become pregnant by carefully supervising who they date, where they go, and their arrival time back home (Hogan & Kitagawa, 1985; Miller, McCoy, Olson & Wallace, 1986). High levels of parental supervision (Hogan & Kitagawa, 1985) and a close relationship between adolescents and their parents significantly predicted the later timing of adolescent sexual activity (Meschke & Silbereisen, 1997). However, the amount of monitoring and controlling can play a role too. Excessive strictness and restricting rules might increase the risk of having sexually permissive children (Miller, McCoy, Olson & Wallace, 1986). Past studies suggest that parents who use a highly controlling, authoritarian approach are least effective in producing subsequent internalization of parental values (Baumrind, 1996, 1973, 1971; Hoffman, 1975, 1970; Miller, McCoy, Olson, & Wallace, 1986). In the case of adolescent sexual behavior, parenting styles that maximize child compliance in the present might not be as effective in the future when adolescents are older and away from their parents' immediate supervision (Miller, McCoy, Olson & Wallace, 1986). It should also be noted that the parenting style that adolescents perceive their parents to have might differ from the actual parenting style that a parent uses. Closer parent-child relationships are associated with delayed sexual debut

but not pregnancy experience (Moore & Chase-Lansdale; Resnick et al., 1997). It is more important if this close parent-child relationship is characterized as close by the child rather than by the parent. Adolescents who perceive their parents as being supportive and emotionally close report less sexual risk-taking behaviors (Luster & Small, 1994; Rogers, 1999). Furthermore, a close parent-child relationship is not only important because of all of the positive effects, but also because there are less negative effects. For example, poor parent-child relationships have greater effects on timing of first intercourse than do positive parent-child relationships (Whitbeck, Yoder, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999).

Positive parental communication and monitoring are protective factors for all adolescents academically, emotionally, and sexually. Adolescent sexual activity has many costs to the individuals involved, their families, and society. Parental discussion of sexual issues with their adolescent may provide a delay in the onset of their adolescent's sexual debut (Inazu & Fox, 1980; Meschke & Silbereisen, 1997).

Religiosity

Religious Affiliation

Religious institutions still play a substantial role in determining and reinforcing values in American society (Studer & Thornton, 1987). For many individuals, religious values are the source of moral proscriptions or general limitations and the teachings of the churches are therefore likely to play a role in the formation of individual attitudes, values, and decisions (Thornton & Camburn, 1989). In terms of adolescent sexual debut, religiosity may represent an important protective factor against risk among adolescents (Coie & Watt, 1993). Many adolescents may not engage in risk-related behavior due to their religious beliefs and the proscriptions of their faith (Cochran & Beeghley, 1991;

Jessor, 1993; Netting, 1992; Woodroof, 1985). Recent reviews suggest that religiosity is associated with the delay of adolescent sexual debut (Rostosky & Galliher, 2000).

The type of religion that one adheres to appears not to be very significant. Religious participation is more important in determining sexual attitudes and behavior than is religious affiliation (Thornton & Camburn, 1989). Furthermore, church attendance and adherence to religious teachings are probably more important in understanding sexual behavior than is the type of religion to which one belongs (Inazu & Fox, 1980; Zelnik et al., 1981). Thornton and Camburn (1989) found that the effects of attendance on sexuality do not appear to depend greatly on religious affiliation and the effects of premarital sexual attitudes on attendance at religious services are fairly similar across major religious traditions. The religion that one adheres to and the frequency of attendance to religious services serve two separate purposes. Whereas religious affiliation may set the context for developing sexual values, greater frequency of church attendance can reinforce the conservative influence of these values on adolescent sexual behavior (Mott, 1984; Studer & Thornton, 1987).

Religious motivation may play a factor in an adolescent's age of sexual debut. Zaleski and Schiaffnio (2000) assert that those who attend church and participate in religion based upon their master motive or religion that shapes their everyday actions have more frequent church attendance (Allport & Ross, 1967), as well as more conservative sexual attitudes (Reed & Meyers, 1991). In contrast, those who use their religion for outside ends, such as security, solace, status, and self-justification are likely to have more liberal sexual attitudes (Reed & Meyers, 1991).

Church attendance and religious importance are likely to produce less permissive attitudes and less engagement in premarital sex, while the acceptance of premarital sex is likely to reduce religious participation. Both of these mechanisms would lead to a negative correlation between religious involvement and premarital sex (Thornton & Camburn, 1989) but would not show which one is a cause or which one is an effect. Regardless of which is the cause, most literature agrees that it is those without a religious affiliation at all that would be the most likely to accept and engage in premarital intercourse (Thornton & Camburn, 1989). Nevertheless, it is difficult to tease out the relationship among such interrelated issues as religious beliefs, conservative values, adherence to a code of ethics, or fear of committing sin (Day, 1992).

Religious Service Attendance

Individuals who attend church frequently and who value religion in their lives are probably more likely than others to develop sexual attitudes and behavior that are consistent with religious teachings. Involvement in religious institutions would also enhance the chances of young people for making friends with peers who have restrictive attitudes toward premarital sex (Thornton & Camburn, 1989). Adolescents who strongly identify with religious teachings and traditions are less likely to engage in risk-related behaviors, such as sexual activity (Zaleski & Schiaffino, 2000). Thus religion may serve as an important social referent for adolescents' decisions to abstain from sexual relations (Cochran & Beeghley, 1991).

Thornton and Camburn (1989) found that differences in behavior across religions are generally modest in magnitude and usually statistically insignificant, with the only statistically significant coefficient being the negative impact of Jewish identification on ever having had sex. The same study found that the mothers of Jewish and unaligned

young people are more permissive in their parenting styles than the mothers of those who identify as fundamentalist or Baptist. Mothers seem to be a focal point of research about how religiosity affects an adolescent's sexual debut. Also, it has been reported that the effect of mother's religious practices increased from the later grade levels, perhaps as children became more personally aware of their parents' religious beliefs (Whitbeck, Yoder, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999).

Community Religiosity

The community's religiosity may also affect the age of an adolescent's sexual debut. The psychic, social, and economic costs that adolescent women attach to early nonmarital pregnancy appear to be evaluated on the parameters characterizing their immediate environment (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993). In a study of social context and adolescent behavior, a group of researchers examined the impact of a community on the transition to sexual activity. They reported that the level of religiosity characterizing a community, as indicated by both the prevalence of religious adherents and the orthodoxy of local religious organizations, also may influence adolescent sexual and contraceptive behaviors. Furthermore, because organized religions place great value on marriage and family formation (Thornton & Camburn, 1989), nonmarital sexual activity, both in general and among adolescents in particular, is more likely to be proscribed in religious than in less religious communities (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993). The same study found that the level of social disintegration characterizing the community, the community's socioeconomic status, and its population composition all play significant roles in determining the timing of the transition to sexual activity. Furthermore, they concluded that community religiosity exercises significant effects on both intercourse and contraceptive behavior (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993).

Other Factors

A central task for teenagers has always been to establish a sense of identity, in which the sexual self needs to be integrated as a core element (Erikson, 1968). Today, issues related to sexuality are still highly salient; in 10th grade (16 years old) a substantial number of young people are either sexually active or contemplating becoming so (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1999). Using the 8th grade as a comparison group, transition to 9th grade increased the likelihood of becoming sexually active by two times, and beginning 10th grade by three times (Whitbeck, Yoder, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999). For nearly 20 years, it has been noted that drug use, smoking, and alcohol consumption are often strongly associated with early sexual behavior (Jessor, Jessor, Costa, & Donovan, 1983). The most robust and researched predictor of early adolescent intercourse has been adolescent participation in other adult-like or deviant behavior (Whitbeck, Yoder, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999). Furthermore, this is consistent with studies concerned with numbers of sex partners (Noell & Biglan, 1995). An additional study found that sexual risk-taking behavior was correlated with other problem behaviors in adolescence such as cigarette smoking, use of alcohol and other drugs, antisocial behavior, and academic failure (Luster & Small, 1994). This web comprised of various factors that combine to affect adolescents and their decision making is not limited to only parenting style and religiosity. Factors such as family structure, academic achievement, gender, and peers may also play a role in affecting the timing of an adolescent's sexual debut.

Family Structure

Although not examined in this study, another major factor that may affect the timing of adolescent sexual debut is family structure. Adolescence is the crucial time in which individuals establish lifestyles and behavioral patterns that have profound effects

on adult health (Di Mauro, 1995). Home environment and family members help to form adolescents' sexual beliefs and expression through social learning, role modeling, social control, and supervision (Elkins & Peterson, 1993; Maccoby & Martin, 1983, Thornton & Camburn, 1987), with teens living with both biological parents identified as having the optimal opportunity for overall wellbeing (Elkins & Peterson, 1993; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Upchurch et al., 2001). Having two biological parents present in a household is assumed to provide more adult supervision of children (Haurin & Mott, 1990; Newcomer & Udry, 1987). With respect to sexual activity, teens living with both biological parents have lower risk than those living in other situations (Flewelling & Baumann, 1990; Upchurch et al., 2001, Upchurch et al., 1999).

One explanation is that adolescents in two-parent households have fewer opportunities to engage in sexual activity because of greater parental supervision and monitoring than adolescents in single-parent families (Hogan & Kitagawa, 1985; Millier, Forehand & Kotchick, 1999; Moore & Chase-Lansdale, 2001; Thompson, Hanson & McLanahan, 1994). Another explanation suggests that the instability brought on by marital disruption and subsequent transitions accounts for the earlier sexual activity in single-parent households (Moore & Chase-Lansdale, 2001; Wu & Martinson, 1993). Children in a married household receive more monitoring, time, and attention compared with children in single-parent and cohabiting households (Moore & Chase-Lansdale, 2001). In addition, greater conflict and less warm relationships between parents during and after divorce adversely affect parenting and youth psychological development, resulting in a variety of problematic behaviors including early sexual debut and pregnancy (Chase-Lansdale & Cherlin, 1995; Peterson & Zill, 1986). However, despite

the history of marital disruption, stepfamilies seem to be more of a protective factor than a risk factor. Girls in single-parent families had earlier ages of sexual debut, whereas girls in stepfamilies were not significantly different from those in intact biological families. This could mean that a stepfamily has the potential to serve as a protective factor, whereas many times people may view stepfamilies as a risk factor, because they are not comprised of the natural or birth parents (Calhoun & Friel, 2001).

Mothers. Mothers alone may play a large role in the timing of their adolescent daughter's age of sexual debut. Adolescents, particularly girls, who have close relationships with their mothers, are likely to be less sexually active than adolescent girls who do not have close relationships with their mothers (Calhoun & Friel, 2001; Hofferth, 1987). For boys, having a biological father in the home slows the transition into sexual intercourse at each age and having a biological father present is critical in reducing the chance of making the actual sexual transition (Day, 1992). In addition, numerous other studies have highlighted the connection between a father's absence and/or single parenting and early sexual behavior of children (Hogan & Kitagawa, 1985; Miller, McCoy & Olson, 1988).

Research has found that girls from single-parent families were found to be more likely to become sexually active at an earlier age than those who grew up in two-parent families (Kinnaird & Girrad, 1986; Meschke & Silbereisen, 1997; Miller & Bingham, 1989; Newcomer & Udry, 1985; Zelnick et al., 1981). Similarly, adolescents in single-parent families tend to become sexually active earlier than adolescents in two-parent families (Forste & Heaton, 1998; Miller & Moore, 1990; Whitbeck, Yoder, Hoyt & Conger, 1999). However, the effect of having a single-parent family may depend on

whether there was ever a marriage before. Teenagers living in households with mothers who were single as a result of a marital disruption were more likely to experience earlier sexual debut than girls living in married-parent households. In addition, teenagers with mothers who were single as a result of a marital disruption had a greater risk of pregnancy than teenagers in single-mother, never-married households (Moore & Chase-Lansdale, 2001). Nevertheless, many studies (Hogan & Kitagawa, 1985; Kantner & Zelnik, 1978; Moore & Furstenberg, 1986; Newcomer & Udry, 1987) have found the marital status of the parents to be related to coital initiation rates, with lower rates related to two-parent homes (Udry & Billy, 1987).

Although there is evidence that warm, supportive, and communicative parents delay sexual experience among their offspring (Inazu & Fox, 1980; Zelnik, Kantner & Ford, 1981) there is also evidence that levels of closeness and communication with parents have little or no effect on adolescent sexual activity (Newcomer & Udry, 1983, Whitbeck et al., 1999). It is possible that the effects of parenting on adolescent sexuality are largely indirect through their influence on children's emotional states (Whitbeck, Conger, & Kao, 1993) or the child's affiliation with deviant peers (Whitbeck et al., 1999; Whitbeck & Simons, 1994).

Siblings. As socialized agents, older siblings may set standards of conduct or serve as role models for younger siblings. And, in the role of confidante, older siblings are more likely than parents to offer support without judgment or to be critical but non-punitive in times of adolescent crisis (Haurin & Mott, 1990). Therefore, an adolescent's older sibling may have a greater effect on an adolescent's age of sexual debut than the adolescent's parents. So, it may seem reasonable to expect that having a large number of

sexually active siblings and friends would be associated with stronger and more pervasive pressures to conform (East, Felice & Morgan, 1993). Research has shown that adolescent sibling pairs have displayed correlated ages at sexual onset and extent of sexual permissiveness (Haurin & Mott; Rodgers & Rowe, 1993; Rowe, Rodgers, Meseck-Bushey & St. John, 1989). In addition, for both white boys and white girls, there are significant and substantively meaningful direct linkages between the ages of sexual initiation of older and younger siblings (Haurin & Mott, 1990). East, Felice, and Morgan (1993) found that siblings' attitudes regarding sexual permissiveness and levels of sexual activity are related.

Younger siblings may be protective factors. Sexual intercourse may be less common among adolescents who have many younger siblings. In addition, the adolescents who held the most conservative sexual attitudes had more siblings, especially more younger siblings (East, Felice, & Morgan, 1993; Miller, Igginson, McCoy & Olson, 1987). Furthermore, Rodgers and Rowe (1993) found, in studying random sibling pairs within families, that younger siblings had systematically higher levels of sexual activity at a given age than their older siblings, even when controlling for various genetic, developmental, and historical effects (East, Felice & Morgan, 1993).

One other major factor is whether or not the sibling relationship is same-sex or opposite-sex. The greater the familiarity with and perceived similarity to another person, the more likely their behavior and attitudes provide content and validation of the adolescent's emerging adult identity. Therefore, on the basis of the similarity principle, I anticipate a higher correlation in age at first sexual intercourse between same-sex than opposite-sex sibling pairs (Haurin & Mott, 1990). East, Felice & Morgan (1993) found

that having an adolescent childbearing sister has a stronger effect on permissive sexual attitudes and non-virgin status than does having many sexually active sisters. They also found that when compared to girls with only non-childbearing adolescent sisters, girls with an adolescent childbearing sister have more permissive sexual attitudes, have more positive intentions for future sexual activity, and are more likely to be non-virgins. It should be emphasized that sibling effects still seem to take a backstage position in relation to more fundamental family background factors such as the presence of both parents in the home and regular church attendance when it comes to predicting the timing of first intercourse (Haurin & Mott; 1990).

Academics

An adolescent's mother may play a role in their age of sexual debut outside of their parental monitoring, supervision and parenting style. The mother's educational attainment has also been found to contribute to delaying adolescent sexual debut. Higher parental education has been associated with later initiation of adolescent intercourse (Furstenberg et al., 1987; Heaton & Jacobson, 1994; Leigh et al., 1988). In addition, previous findings suggest a positive association between parental education and age of sexual debut (Miller, 1998) for boys in some studies (e.g., Ku, Sonenstein, & Pleck, 1993) but only for girls in other studies (e.g. Bearman & Bruckner, 2001). In addition, it has been found that highly educated mothers, mothers who are married to and living with the fathers, and mothers who were less sexually active as adolescents have daughters with reduced probability of coital transition (Udry & Billy, 1987). Brewster (1994) reported that adolescent females whose mothers attended college were more likely to delay sexual debut. However, it has also been found that parent education was not associated with the virginity status of boys or girls (Feldman et al., 1995). Educational aspirations and

school involvement are also important protective factors for adolescents. Adolescents who have aspirations for college are more apt to delay becoming sexually active (Donovan & Jessor, 1985; Hofferth & Hayes, 1987). Similarly, adolescents who are highly involved in extracurricular activities at school with conventional peers may be more likely to delay intercourse (Miller & Olson, 1988). However, there may be differences among males and females concerning the actual effects of academics on an adolescent's sexual debut.

Gender

Luster and Small (1994) found some factors that were associated with sexual risk taking were the same and some were different for females and for males. Factors associated with sexual risk taking among females include low GPA, frequent alcohol consumption, low levels of parental monitoring, and a lack of communication about birth control with mothers. For males, sexual risk taking was associated with low GPA, frequent alcohol consumption, suicidal ideations, low levels of parental support, and a history of sexual abuse. In addition, males are often said to experience strong peer pressure to engage in coitus (Udry & Billy, 1987). This may be true due to the popular societal framework of an adolescent male becoming a man when he experiences sexual debut. Another gender difference can be found related to after-school activities. It has been reported that time spent in school-related activities and homework delay the transition to sexual activity longer for girls than for boys (Whitbeck, Yoder, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999). This is strong evidence toward high schools providing just as many team sport opportunities for girls as for boys. However, while team sports can help build self-esteem, having high levels of self-esteem may actually be a risk factor. Both an external locus of control and higher levels of self-esteem predicted an early transition to

intercourse. Perhaps these young women are confident and more forward in their approach to boys (Day, 1992).

Peers

As one would expect, peers become increasingly more influential as adolescents get older (Treboux & Busch-Rossnagel, 1990). Adolescents in general begin to care more about how others view them, and strive to be accepted. Their peers' perception of them becomes more important. One example is the adolescent's peers' perception of whether or not he/she is sexually active. Peers' perceptions of adolescent's sexual activity may lead to comments like, "You haven't done it yet! What's the matter with you?" This is one clear way of communicating sexual expectations among the adolescent's peers. Peers influence each other's sexual behavior indirectly through everyday communication and directly through communication of sexual expectations among friends (Rodgers & Rowe, 1993). In order to gain acceptance among their peers, adolescents usually attempt to act appropriately in the eyes of their peers (Hartup, 1991; Hollingshead, 1975). With respect to sexual activity, adolescents might sometimes make decisions that meet their peers' expectations in order to gain acceptance or remain accepted, thereby empowering their peers in the timing of their sexual debut.

Summary

This chapter discussed the important findings surrounding adolescent sexual debut. It reported that the birth rate for teenagers as well as the number of AIDS cases reported among teenagers is declining. This chapter also reported on research of parenting style and parental communication, finding that the authoritative parenting style is most likely to produce positive child outcomes and that parental communication of sexual topics has been found to have both positive effects and no effect at all on the timing of adolescents'

sexual debut. However, parental communication about sexual issues is still a key measure of family involvement in adolescents' lives and therefore will be examined in this study. Furthermore, this chapter reported on the positive effects that an adolescent's religiosity (including religious affiliation, religious service attendance, and community religiosity) have been found to have on the timing of their sexual debut. The factors of parenting style and religiosity are the focus of this study, as it aims to examine whether either one affects the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut.

Although other factors may have minor influences (e.g., the suppressing effects of pro-social activities for girls), the important predictors seem to be opportunity, attitudes that fit societal views of sexuality (e.g., MTV, commercials, popular songs, and television programming), and participation in other adult-like behaviors (e.g., alcohol use and deviant peers) (Whitbeck, Yoder, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999). The first predictor, opportunity, comes from a lack of parental supervision and monitoring (parenting style). In addition, opportunity may arise from a family structure where there is only one parent present. The second predictor, attitudes that fit societal views of sexuality, can come from any one of the many media outlets that are geared toward adolescents. In addition, their community's or society's views of sexuality are shaped by their own religiosity, their parents' religiosity and their community's religiosity. An adolescent's view of society is partially shaped by their religious involvement and attendance. The third predictor, other adult-like behaviors, can come from a breakdown or lack of any one of the following: parental communication and parenting style, family structure, religiosity, academics, peers and other societal factors. There are many factors that can affect the timing of an adolescent's sexual debut. This study will focus on examining parenting

style and religiosity (independently) and whether they affect the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

The following study was designed to examine the effects of parenting styles and religiosity on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts. It will investigate whether a specific parenting style, as categorized by Baumrind (1996, 1978), has a larger impact on timing of sexual debut than others. The study will also explore whether a Jewish adolescent's religiosity affects the timing of their sexual debut. Finally, the study will examine whether there is a difference in timing of sexual debut among Jewish adolescents by gender. This chapter will cover the population and sample, setting, research design and subject recruitment, instrumentation, and statistical analysis for the present study. The information in these sections will describe all procedures, methods, and analyses for the study that will work toward the study's goal to determine whether or not parenting style and/or religiosity affect the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut.

Population and Sample

The population is Jewish students at a large university in the Southeast United States. Potential participants were located and identified through the University's predominantly and/or historically Jewish fraternities and sororities on campus. According to their presidents, these fraternities and sororities consist of a majority of Jewish students.

This university publishes demographic statistics every academic year. For the academic year of 2002-2003, the gender demographics were fifty-two percent female,

and forty-eight percent male. Approximately twenty-three percent of the members of this university's student body are minorities with seven percent of the student population consisting of African-American students, almost ten percent Hispanic students, and almost seven percent Asian American or Pacific Islander students. Seventy-two percent of enrolled students are undergraduates, twenty-one percent are graduate students and seven percent are in professional degree programs (including dentistry, law, medicine, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine). In addition, out of the total of approximately 46,000 total students at this university, about 6,000 are Jewish (13%), with about 5,000 Jewish undergraduates and 1,000 Jewish graduate students.

The sample for my study consisted of a group of Jewish undergraduate students who elected to participate in my study after I introduced and explained the study. The final sample was 168 individuals.

Settings

The study was conducted at a large university in the Southeast. The participants were informed of the study at their weekly chapter meetings in their respective fraternity or sorority house. The study was conducted in a reserved room during the hours of chapter meetings in September and October of 2003. The participants were briefed on the topic, benefits/risks, expected length of completion, and who to contact with questions or concerns. They were then given a consent form to sign. Once a participant signed and dated the "Informed Consent" form, they were given the survey. Confidentiality was ensured through the anonymous format of the survey. Participants were never asked for their name on the instrument. In addition, participants gave the completed surveys to the research assistants face down. Numbers were later assigned for data analysis after the surveys had been randomly mixed.

Research Design and Subject Recruitment

This study is a cross-sectional study and the unit of analysis is the individual. Recruitment of subjects occurred through the selected fraternities and sororities. The samples were limited to those fraternity and sorority members that were present at their weekly chapter meeting that week and who consented to participate. The primary researcher gave the participants an introduction to the topic, a list of all of the benefits and risks, the expected length of completion, and who to contact with questions or concerns. Furthermore, potential participants were informed that if they would like to be notified of the results of the study to write their e-mail addresses down after they completed the survey. No respondents did this. Although the surveys were administered on different days across two months, this study is still a cross-sectional study because the surveys were not given as a pre-test/post-test. Students who participated on different days were not the same as students who participated on the first day, thus allowing the study to still be labeled as cross-sectional.

Instrumentation

The survey instrumentation (Appendix C) consisted of twenty-five items which were broken up into a personal information section and two content sections. I revised the instrument three times over two months after careful examination and lengthy discussion with my committee. The first revision came after it was pilot-tested with three professors at the same large Southeastern university. The second revision followed a pilot-test of two graduate students at the same university, and the third and final revision occurred after a follow-up committee meeting. Changes were made accordingly.

The two subject sections are parenting style and religiosity. Due to the complex nature of these individual items in this instrument, they will be discussed for further understanding of this study.

Personal Information

The first background item asked for the participant's sex. The results from this item were used in the analysis of gender differences. This was followed by the question, "Do you consider yourself Jewish?" This item eliminated any discrepancy between who was Jewish and who was not Jewish. Using the phrase, "do you consider yourself," eliminated any written rules or religious laws as the sole classification for membership. Respondents who declared themselves "Not Jewish" were excluded from this study (N=2).

The third introductory question asked participants whether they had sexual intercourse, and the answers were, "Yes, and I was ___ years old the first time," and "No, I have not and I am currently ___ years old." The answer to this item provided the individual with their specific "reference point."

The directions after item three explained that if the participant's answer was "Yes" for item three, then the number (age) would be considered the "reference point" for the remainder of the survey. If the answer was "No" for item four, then the participant's current age would be considered their "reference point" for the remainder of the survey. The term "reference point" was used throughout the survey to clearly create a time frame regarding sexual debut for respondents to use while completing the survey.

The concept of "Reference point," was used for two main reasons. First, it was used as a phrase to unify those who had experienced their sexual debut and those who had not. For example, if every item asked the participant to describe any dating

restrictions that were present at the time of their sexual debut, the item would have clearly excluded those who had not experienced their sexual debut. By making their current age the reference point for respondents who had not experienced their sexual debut every item could be answered by both types of respondents. Second, the concept of reference point was used to help participants answer questions that could possibly require them to remember back many years and recall the feelings and situations of that time in their life. In addition, because the study examined factors (parenting style and religiosity) that affect an adolescent's sexual debut, it was important to be able to examine these factors with a perspective that is based on a very specific time. For example, presenting a question that asks to describe a relationship with a sibling now could have yielded a different answer when asked to describe a relationship with a sibling at one's reference point, a time potentially in one's past. Clearly, questions that examined factors at a respondent's "reference point" are much more relevant regarding adolescent sexual debut than questions that consider a respondent's current status.

Item four asked the participant to fill in the blank with their reference point. By writing it down, participants became more accustomed to associating that number with the term "reference point" throughout the duration of the survey administration. Furthermore, by having written this number (age) on the front page, respondents could easily refer back to this item on the first page.

The Personal Information section concluded with item five asking, "Are you or were you married at the age of your reference point?" This question helped in the analysis determining whether Jewish adolescents were consistent with Judaism's proscriptions against premarital sex.

Parenting Style

The first subject section, items six through fifteen, examined parenting style. Items six and seven inquired about dating. Item six asked how old the respondent was when he/she was first allowed to date, while item seven asked if there were rules or restrictions on the age at which they could first date. Dating restrictions are one way in which form that parenting style is displayed. Item eight asked their first serious relationship. All three of these items helped to examine the level of parental demandingness.

A major part of parenting style affecting an adolescent's sexual debut was sexual discussion with their parent(s). Not only was whether or not a discussion ever occurred important but so was the gender of the parent that held the discussion (Meschke, Bartholomae, & Zentall, 2000). Therefore, item nine asked, "Did your parents discuss sex with you before your reference point?" The respondent had the following choices: "Yes they both did," "Yes, my same-sex parent did," "Yes, my opposite sex parent did," and "No, not at all." In addition, many more factors may affect the timing of an adolescent's sexual debut such as: the frequency of parental sexual discussions, how in-depth the discussion is, the topics covered, and the age at first discussion. The next item aimed to determine the frequency of sexual discussions between the parent and the adolescent. Responses to frequency were, "A one-time thing," "More than once," "Part of an on-going dialogue of sexual topics," "Daily," and "Does not apply." Item eleven examined how in-depth their sex discussion was if one occurred. The respondent had five choices that ranged from "Very in-depth" to "Not at all." Another important aspect of parent/adolescent sexual discussions was the topics that were covered. Participants were asked to check all of the topics that were included during the sexual discussion(s)

with their parent(s). The choices were, “Physical development,” “Abstinence,” “Safe sex,” “Emotion-based intimacy,” and “Consequences.” The final item with regards to parent/adolescent sexual discussion asked, “If a sexual discussion occurred, how old were you at the first discussion?” All of these sexual discussion items were important because if a parent discusses sex with their adolescent, the information is probably accurate and could lead to the adolescent making more informed decisions.

This section concluded with the definition of the four major parenting styles according to psychologist Diana Baumrind (1996, 1978). The definitions of each parenting style were defined in terms of parental responsiveness and parental demandingness. These two terms are defined immediately preceding the four definitions of parenting styles. Item fourteen then asked, “Which parenting style is the closest to the way you were raised up to your reference point?” The respondent had choices of the four major parenting styles, Permissive, Authoritarian, Indifferent, and Authoritative. This item was specifically used to examine if a relationship existed between an adolescent’s perceived parenting style and their age of sexual debut. Item fifteen examined the respondent’s belief about the influence of parenting style on their decision to have sexual intercourse for the first time. The choices ranged from “Very strong influence” to “No influence at all.” This question was specifically examined to see whether a relationship existed between an adolescent’s perceived level of parental influence on sexual debut and age of sexual debut. Analyses of this entire section helped determine whether or not parenting style affects the timing of Jewish adolescents’ sexual debuts.

Religiosity

The second subject section, items sixteen through twenty-five, examined religiosity from a Jewish standpoint. The items in this section inquired about the participant’s

religious affiliation and attendance, and their community's religiosity. Each of these three sections was one-third of the Sum Religiosity Index (Appendix D) which was used to represent the respondent's overall level of religiosity. The Sum Religiosity Index consisted of three sections with varying amounts of items. In order to weight the three sections equally, each section (affiliation, attendance, and community religiosity) was scored individually and translated into a percentage. The three religiosity sections were then combined to create one overall religiosity score.

Item sixteen asked the respondent to classify the division of Judaism that they believe they belong to. The respondent had four choices: "Orthodox," "Conservative," "Reform" or "Other please explain." This was important because the division of Judaism an adolescent believes they belong to may affect the timing of their sexual debut. This item was examined independently of the religiosity index and was explored for statistical significance by frequencies and a chi-square test. This item was excluded from the religiosity index due to its subjective nature. A person belonging to any classification of Judaism can have a religiosity of any level. For example, a respondent who classified themselves as Orthodox can have a high, moderate, or low level of religiosity similar to someone who classified themselves as Conservative.

The index began with two items (seventeen and eighteen) that focused on affiliation to Judaism. The first item with respect to affiliation asked the respondent to characterize their family's practice of religion. Their responses ranged from "Very strongly observant," to "Not observant at all." The last item about religious affiliation asked the respondent how he/she would rate his/her affiliation to Judaism at the age of their reference point. Affiliation was described as meaning how much one feels a part of

or how much one identifies with any certain group. The choices included “Very strongly affiliated,” “Moderately affiliated,” “Somewhat affiliated,” “Minimally affiliated,” and “Not affiliated at all.”

The next four items, nineteen through twenty-two, focused on religious attendance. The first two items asked about frequency of attendance at religious services and Hebrew school. Hebrew school is often started in 3rd grade and its primary purpose (in most synagogues) is to familiarize children with the Hebrew language and to form the basis for Bar/Bat Mitzvah training. The item specifically pertaining to religious service attendance asked the respondent to choose which answer was closest to the frequency of their religious service attendance at the time of their reference point. Responses included, weekly or almost weekly, monthly or almost monthly, a few times per year, only on High Holidays, and not at all.

The next item, twenty-one, asked the participant to characterize the school he/she attended at the age of their reference point. Their choices were, “Private and Jewish,” “Private and religious but not Jewish,” “Private and non-religious,” and “Public.” The next item asked whether or not the respondent had a Bar/Bat Mitzvah.

A Bar Mitzvah is for a boy and a Bat Mitzvah is for a girl. The actual Hebrew translation of Bar is “son of,” while Bat means “daughter of.” When combined with the word mitzvah it simply translates to son/daughter of the commandments. This traditional ceremony is described by some as “a coming of age” ceremony, and the definition literally means that Judaism now looks upon that child as an adult. In the past, Jewish girls were not allowed to have a Bat Mitzvah. It is only in the past two generations that it has become more acceptable for women to go through the coming of age ceremony once

reserved for boys becoming men. Orthodox (Jewish) girls are currently still forbidden to have a Bat Mitzvah and are not even counted for a quorum in any religious service.

Whether or not an adolescent experienced this ceremony is sometimes decided by their attendance to religious services, with less religious service attendance not emphasizing the ceremony as much, and limiting the amount of exposure to the ceremony when compared to an adolescent with a greater religious service attendance.

The third section of religiosity, community religiosity, had a few different aspects. The first item, twenty-three, asked about the level of involvement of the adolescent in a Jewish youth group. It asked, "Were you a member of a Jewish youth group?" and gives some common examples. Any adolescent who is involved in a religion-based youth group might be seen as more affiliated toward that religion than those who are not members of youth groups. In addition, it is a variable in community religiosity too, because one might be less likely to be involved in a religious youth group in a less religious community where less opportunities are available compared to communities that are more religious, where many more opportunities to participate in a religious youth group may exist.

The next two items, twenty-four and twenty-five, also focused solely on the adolescent's community religiosity. Item twenty-four asked if there was a Jewish Community Center in their community and if there was the respondent a member. Jewish Community Center's (J.C.C.'s) are very popular across the United States and Canada. There are eleven in the state of Florida and over 230 J.C.C.s across the United States and Canada. These community centers provide a multitude of services to the community and usually provide year-round programming specifically aimed at

adolescents. Whether or not a J.C.C. is present in a community may help in determining a community's religiosity because a more religious community is more likely to have a demand for a J.C.C. than a community that is not religious at all. The final item, twenty-five, asked the participant to consider their Jewish community at their reference point. It asked, "How would you rate your Jewish community's religiosity up until your reference point?" Following, was the range of responses: "Very religious," "Moderately religious," "Somewhat religious," "Minimally religious," and "Not religious at all." The survey concluded with a note thanking each respondent for their time and explaining that their completion of the survey helped to contribute to the understanding of the experiences of Jewish youth.

Statistical Analysis

Data analysis included basic descriptive statistics of all the items. Frequencies were run on each item to provide the basic descriptive statistics. Next, the data set was split into two groups for analytical purposes. The first group consisted of those respondents who answered "Yes" to having had sex (n=121). The second group consisted of those respondents who answered "No" to having had sex (n=47). Dividing the two groups allowed for analyses of just those respondents who have experienced their sexual debut and the factors that affected the timing of their sexual debut. The division also allows for description of characteristics of the virgin group.

Primary Research Questions

In order to investigate the primary research question, which asks if parenting style affects the timing of a Jewish adolescent's sexual debut, ANOVAs were calculated for the "Yes" group to determine the mean age of sexual debut by parenting style. In addition, the answer to primary research question two, which asks if any parenting style

positively affected (delayed) the timing of a Jewish adolescent's sexual debut, should be found by exploring whether a relationship exists between each parenting style and the mean age of sexual debut ($p < .05$). This will help in determining whether, for those who have had sex, any of the four parenting styles positively affected (delayed) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts, and whether any of the four parenting styles negatively affected (expedited) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts.

Secondary Research Questions

In order to determine if there is a difference in timing of sexual debut among Jewish adolescents who had different levels of religiosity, the two separate data sets were again used to isolate those who had actually experienced their sexual debut. The "Yes" group data set was used to compare the respondent's Sum Religiosity Index score with their age of sexual debut and additionally used to determine whether any of the three aspects of religiosity positively affected (delayed) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. One-way ANOVAs were used again to determine if there were differences in the mean age of sexual debut between and within these groups ($p < .05$).

Finally, to explore the third secondary research question which simply asks if there is a difference in timing of sexual debut for Jewish adolescents between genders, a Crosstabs procedure was run. Statistical differences ($p < .05$) between males and females and among different ages of reference points, parenting styles, and religiosity were evaluated using Crosstabs to help determine if there is a difference in timing of sexual debut among male and female Jewish adolescents. In addition, a chi-square test was run to evaluate whether there were differences in age of sexual debut by gender.

Additional Results

Additional significant relationships ($p < .05$) were explored through oneway ANOVAs that were run for each item for the data set that only included those who had sexual intercourse (“Yes dataset, $n=121$). Furthermore, all respondents who said they had not had sexual intercourse (“No” dataset, $N= 47$) were considered to have had a delay in timing of sexual debut because all respondents were 18 years old or older, and the mean age of sexual debut for those who had sex was 17.10 years old. In order to formulate protective factors that might have contributed to these delays in timing of sexual debut frequency tests were run on each item for the “No” data set. It was assumed that if one type of response were selected by a clear majority of respondents, this choice may have represented a protective factor. All of these statistical analyses were completed utilizing SPSS (version 12.0).

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

The primary purpose of this study was to examine how parenting style and religiosity affect the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. It explored current college students' analysis of different aspects of their parents' rules and communicative actions. It also examined three aspects of religiosity: religious attendance, religious affiliation, and community religiosity, in terms of age of sexual debut. Finally, this study observed differences in age of sexual debut by gender. Results for all of these questions will be discussed in this chapter. The chapter concludes with additional significant results that were not directly related to primary or secondary research questions.

Descriptive Results

Before discussing the analyses of each research question which was outlined in Chapter 1, a brief description of the participant population will be discussed. The demographic characteristics of the research participants consisted of exactly 170 respondents. However, two respondents replied that they were not Jewish and were therefore excluded from the survey data, leaving a sample size of approximately 170 (n = 168). A complete breakdown of the demographic characteristics of the study can be examined in tables throughout this chapter. In addition, respondents who reported they had sexual intercourse will be referred to as non-virgins, while respondents who have not will be referred to as virgins.

Gender

Men made up more than half of the population (53.0%), or 89 of the 168 respondents, and females composed a little less than half (47.0%), or 79 of the 168 respondents. The gender breakdown of this study was consistent with the assumptions created during data collection. Due to data collection occurring at three fraternity houses, compared to only two sorority houses, a majority-male gender breakdown was expected. However, if the number of responses at each house were equal, then males would have made up 60% and females 40% of the participants. The higher than expected female percentage is accounted for by an overall higher female willingness to participate in the study, as an approximately equal opportunity for all house members was available at each house.

Table 4-1. Participant gender.

| Gender | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------------|
| Male | 89 | 53.0 |
| Female | 79 | 47.0 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Religious Classification

All of the study participants were Jewish, due to the nature of the study. Half were Conservative (50.0%), followed by Reform (45.2%), Orthodox (2.4%), and Other (2.4%) (Table 4-2).

Table 4-2. Participant Classification of Judaism.

| Classification | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------------|
| Orthodox | 4 | 2.4 |
| Conservative | 84 | 50.0 |
| Reform | 76 | 45.2 |
| Other | 4 | 2.4 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Sexual Intercourse

In this study, 121 of 168 (72.0%) respondents reported having previously had sex before the administration of the survey, while 47 (28.0%) of 168 respondents reported not having had sexual intercourse. All 168 (100.0%) of respondents answered this question. The mean age of sexual debut (for those who reported having previously had sex) was 17.10 years (SD= .148).

Table 4-3. Participant experience of sex.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Yes, has had sex | 121 | 72.0 |
| No, has NOT had sex | 47 | 28.0 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Marriage

All 168 (100.0%) of the respondents answered the question about their current marital status. All replied that they were currently not, and have not been, married.

Parenting Style

Age at first date and first serious relationship. This section of the survey asked questions that helped provide depth into the background of respondents' parent(s)' parenting style. These specific questions include items about the timing of other events, which might be related to the timing of sexual debut, such as first date and first serious relationship. The sample reported the following ages at the time of first date: 26 of 168 (15.5%) reported 12 years old or younger, 19 of 168 (11.3%) reported 13 years old, 30 of 168 (17.9%) reported 14 years old, 53 of 168 (31.5%) reported 15 years old, 25 of 168 (14.9%) reported 16 years old, 5 of 168 (3.0%) reported 17 years old, and equally 5 of 168 (3.0%) respondents reported 18 years old. Five respondents (3.0%) responded that they had not yet been on a first date (Table E-1).

Furthermore, when asked if there was a restriction on the age at which they could first date, a vast majority 95.8% (161 of 168) reported there were no restrictions on the age at which they could first date, while only 7 (4.2%) responded they did have restrictions on the age at which they could first date. When respondents were questioned on the age at the time of what they would consider their first serious relationship, only a small percentage (3.6%) said they were 13 years old, 14 or 15 years old comprised 19.6%, 16 years old made up 35.1%, 17 years old was the response for 11.3%, and having their first serious relationship at legal adult age of 18 was 13.1%. In addition, 29 (17.3%) of 168 respondents said they had not yet been in a serious relationship.

Parental sexual communication. Parenting style is not just made up of rules, restrictions, and demands, but there is also the very important aspect of parental communication and responsiveness. For this study, it was important to examine parental communication about sex. Respondents were asked if their parent(s) ever discussed sex with them, which parent did, how often a sexual discussion occurred, how in-depth the discussion(s) was, what topics were covered, and how old they were when the first sexual discussion occurred. When respondents were asked whether their parents discussed sex with them before their reference point, nearly half 83 of 168, or 49.4%, said both parents discussed with them, nearly one fourth (24.4%) said only their same sex parent discussed sex with them, and 4 (2.4%) said only their opposite sex parent discussed sex with them. Almost one-fourth (23.8%) of the respondents said that neither parent discussed sex with them before their reference point (E-3).

When asked about the frequency of a sexual discussion, 35 (20.8%) said their discussion was a one-time thing, the most frequent reply was that the discussions were

more than once (34.5%), the next most frequent response was the sexual discussions were part of an on-going dialogue (21.4%), and only 1 (.6%) respondent said their discussions occurred daily. This question did not apply to 38 (22.6%) of the 168 respondents according to their responses. If those respondents who replied that the question did not apply to them are disregarded and only those who actually had a sexual discussion are taken into account the percentage breakdowns are as follows: 27% discussion was a one-time thing, 45% discussions were more than once, 27% discussions were part of an on-going dialogue, and 1% said discussions occurred daily (Table E-4).

When asked about the depth of the sexual discussion (Table E-5) almost half (46.4 %) of all respondents said their sexual discussion was either very in-depth or in-depth, while almost a third, 58 of 168 respondents (30.3%), said their sexual discussion was not in-depth or not in-depth at all. This question did not apply to 39 of the 168 respondents (23.2%) according to their responses. If those respondents who replied that the question did not apply to them are disregarded and only those who had a sexual discussion are calculated, the percentage breakdowns are as follows: 60% very in-depth or in-depth and 40% not in-depth or not in-depth at all. So, for those parents who did discuss sex with their adolescent, more than half had discussions that were in-depth, or very in-depth.

If a sexual discussion occurred, respondents were also asked about the content (Table E-6). They were allowed to select as many of the following topics as were applicable: physical development, abstinence, safe sex, emotion-based intimacy, and consequences. The number of topics discussed created a nearly equal distribution with only one topic being covered for 12 of 168 respondents (7.1%), only two topics being covered for 28 respondents (16.7%), three topics were covered for 27 respondents

(16.1%), four topics were covered for 28 respondents (16.7%), and all five topics were covered for 33 respondents (19.6%). This question was not answered by 40 (23.8%) of 168 respondents because it did not apply to them or for other reasons. If those respondents who did not answer the question are disregarded and only those who had a sexual discussion are taken into account, the percentage breakdowns are as follows: only one topic, 9.4%; only two topics, 21.9%; three topics, 21.1%; four topics, 21.9%; and all five topics were covered for 25.8%.

The topic of physical development (Table E-7) was covered for 68 (40.5%) of 168 respondents. When we disregard the 40 respondents who did not answer this question, of the remaining respondents who said that they discussed at least one of the five topics, 53.8% had discussed physical development.

The topic of abstinence (Table E-8) was covered for 70 of the 168 respondents (41.7%). When we disregard the 40 respondents who did not answer this question, for the remaining respondents who reported that they had discussed at least one of the five topics, 54.7% said that abstinence was a topic. The topic of safe sex (Table E-9) was covered for 115 (68.5%), and when we disregard the 40 respondents who did not answer this question, of the remaining respondents, 89.8% had safe sex as a topic of discussion. The topic of emotion-based intimacy (Table E-10) was covered for 66 (39.3%), and when we disregard the 40 respondents who did not answer this question, for the remaining respondents who responded that they had at least one of the five topics, 51.6% had emotion-based intimacy as a topic within their sexual discussion. The topic of consequences (Table E-11) was covered for 107 (63.7%), and when we disregard the 40 respondents who did not answer this question, for the remaining respondents who

responded that they had at least one of the five topics, 83.6% had consequences as a topic within their sexual discussion.

Also of interest was the age at which this first sexual discussion occurred (Table E-12). According to respondents, 20 had their first sexual discussion before 10 years old (12.0%), 18 had their first sexual discussion at 10 or 11 years old (10.7%), 22 had their first sexual discussion at 12 years old (13.1%), 36 had their first sexual discussion at 13 years old (21.4%), 21 had their first sexual discussion at 14 or 15 years old (12.5%), while 10 had their first sexual discussion at 16 or 17 years old (6.0%). This question was not answered by 41 (24.4 %) of 168 respondents. If those respondents who did not answer the question are disregarded and only those who had a sexual discussion are taken into account, the percentage breakdowns are as follows: First sexual discussion before 10 years old, 15.7%; first sexual discussion at 10 or 11 years old, 14.2%; first sexual discussion at 12 years old, 17.3%; first sexual discussion at 13 years old, 28.3%; first sexual discussion at 14 or 15 years old, 16.5%; first sexual discussion at 16 or 17 years old, 7.9%.

Based on Baumrind's (1996, 1978) four classifications of parenting styles, respondents were next asked to classify the parenting style that best described their parent(s) at the time of their sexual debut (Table 4-4). According to respondents, 77 believed their parents' parenting style to be permissive (45.8%), 63 believed their parents' parenting style to be authoritative (37.5%), 16 believed their parents' parenting style to be authoritarian (9.5%), while 12 believed their parents' parenting style to be indifferent (7.1%). When respondents were asked how much the parenting style that they were raised with influenced their decision to have sexual intercourse for the first time

(Table 4-5), 14 (8.3%) responded that their parents' parenting style had a very strong influence on their decision, 33 (19.6%) responded that their parents' parenting style had a strong influence on their decision, 54 (32.1%) responded that their parents' parenting style had at least some influence on their decision, 43 (25.6%) said their parents' parenting style had very little influence at all on their decision, while 24 (14.3%) said their parent's parenting style had no effect at all on their decision.

Table 4-4. Respondents' selection of parents' parenting style.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------------|
| Permissive | 77 | 45.8 |
| Authoritarian | 16 | 9.5 |
| Indifferent | 12 | 7.1 |
| Authoritative | 63 | 37.5 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table 4-5. Influence of parents' parenting style on decision to have, or not to have sex.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Very strong influence | 14 | 8.3 |
| Strong influence | 33 | 19.6 |
| Some influence | 54 | 32.1 |
| Very little influence | 43 | 25.6 |
| No influence at all | 24 | 14.3 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Religiosity

Religiosity is the other major factor that this study aims to explore. The following sections will examine respondents' answers to questions regarding religious affiliation, religious attendance, and community religiosity. Each section will be examined by (a) frequencies and proportions for each question, and (b) frequencies and proportions on the religiosity index of those respondents who reportedly have had their sexual debut. Following an examination of each of the three individual religiosity components (affiliation, attendance, and community religiosity), the overall religiosity index

(Appendix D) will be examined for frequencies and proportions to explore levels of religiosity for those respondents who reported they have had a sexual debut (N=121).

Religious affiliation. Respondents were asked how they would characterize their family's practice of religion (Table E-13). To this question, only 2 of 168 said their family's practice of religion was very observant (1.2%), 24 said their family's practice of religion was moderately observant (14.3%), 90 said their family's practice of religion was somewhat observant (53.6%), 50 said their family's practice of religion was not very observant (29.8%), and 2 said their family's practice of religion was not observant at all (1.2%).

Respondents were then asked how they would rate their affiliation to Judaism up to their reference point (Table E-14). On this item, 40 said they were very strongly affiliated to Judaism (23.8%), 66 said they were strongly affiliated to Judaism (39.3%), 38 said they were somewhat affiliated to Judaism (22.6%), 24 said they were not very affiliated or not affiliated at all to Judaism (14.3%).

Overall, these two items were rated using a Religious Affiliation Index (Appendix D) created for this study in order to gain a sum religious affiliation score for respondents who reported having had a sexual debut. The Index found that 10 of 121 respondents scored a highest religious affiliation (8.3%), 12 scored a high religious affiliation (9.9%), 41 scored a moderate religious affiliation (33.9%), 25 scored a minimal religious affiliation (20.7%), and 33 scored a not very religious at all religious affiliation (27.3%).

Table 4-6. Non-virgin respondents' score on the Sum Religious Affiliation Index

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Not very religious | 33 | 27.3 |
| Minimal religious affiliation | 25 | 20.7 |
| Moderate religious affiliation | 41 | 33.9 |
| High religious affiliation | 12 | 9.9 |
| Highest religious affiliation | 10 | 8.3 |
| Total | 121 | 100.0 |

Religious attendance. Respondents were asked how often they attended religious services at their reference point (Table E-15). Nineteen of 168 respondents reported that they attended weekly or almost weekly (11.3%), 28 said they attend monthly or almost monthly (16.7%), 69 said they attended a few times per year (41.1%), 45 said they attended only on the High Holidays (26.8%), and 7 said they did not attend at all (4.2%).

Respondents were then asked if they regularly (at least once per week) attended a Hebrew School or Sunday School at the age of their reference point (Table E-16). According to respondents, 44 said yes (26.2%), 110 said they did not at the age of their reference point but did up to a different age (65.5%), and 14 said they did not attend a Hebrew School or Sunday School at all (8.3%).

The study also aimed not only to explore religious schooling, but primary school background as well. Respondents were asked to characterize the primary school that they attended at the age of their reference point (Table E-17). To this question, 12 of 168 respondents reported their primary school was private and Jewish (7.1%), 7 reported their primary school was private and religious but not Jewish (4.2%), 14 said their primary school was private and non-religious (8.3%), and 135 said their primary school was public (80.4%). The last item in the religious attendance component asks the respondent if they had a Bar/Bat Mitzvah (Table E-18). According to respondents, 150 of 168

respondents reported that they had a Bar/Bat Mitzvah (89.3%), while 18 reported that they had not (10.7%).

Overall, these four questions were rated using a Religious Attendance Index (Appendix D) created for this study to gain a sum religious attendance score for those respondents who had reported having had a sexual debut. The Index found that 4 of 121 respondents scored highest religious attendance (3.3%), 8 scored high religious attendance (6.6%), 27 scored moderate religious attendance (22.3%), 69 scored minimal religious attendance (57.0%), and 13 scored no substantial religious attendance (10.7%).

Table 4-7. Non-virgin respondents' scores on the Sum Religious Attendance Index.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| No substantial religious attendance | 13 | 10.7 |
| Minimal religious attendance | 69 | 57.0 |
| Moderate religious attendance | 27 | 22.3 |
| High religious attendance | 8 | 6.6 |
| Highest religious attendance | 4 | 3.3 |
| Total | 121 | 100.0 |

Community religiosity. Respondents were asked if they were involved in a Jewish youth group (Table E-19). To this question, 37 of 168 respondents stated that they were highly involved in a Jewish youth group (33.0%), 10 were moderately involved (6.0%), 28 were somewhat involved (16.7%), 36 were only slightly involved (21.4%), and 57 were not involved at all in a Jewish youth group (33.9%). Next, respondents were asked whether their community had a Jewish Community Center (Table E-20). Results showed that 149 of 168 respondents reported their community did have a J.C.C (88.7%) while 19 reported that their communities did not (11.3%). Of those 149 respondents that grew up in communities that did have a J.C.C., 84 were members (56.4%) and 65 were not members (43.6%). The final item on the instrument asked respondents to characterize their Jewish community at the time of their reference point (Table E-21). To

this question, 6 characterized their community as very religious (3.6%), 69 thought their community was moderately religious (41.1%), 53 said their community was somewhat religious (31.5%), 25 said their community was minimally religious (14.9%), while 14 said their community was not religious at all (8.3%). In addition, 1 (.6%) respondent did not answer this question.

Overall, these three questions were rated using a Community Religiosity Index (Appendix D) created for this study to gain a sum community religiosity score for those respondents who reported having had a sexual debut (Table 4-8). The Index found that 7 of 121 respondents scored a highest community religiosity (5.7%), 17 scored a high community religiosity (14.0%), 22 scored a moderate community religiosity (18.2%), 56 scored a minimal community religiosity (46.3%), and 19 scored a no substantial community religiosity (15.7%).

Table 4-8. Non-virgin respondents' score on the Sum Community Religiosity Index.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| No substantial community religiosity | 19 | 15.7 |
| Minimal community religiosity | 56 | 46.3 |
| Moderate community religiosity | 22 | 18.2 |
| High community religiosity | 17 | 14.0 |
| Highest community religiosity | 7 | 5.7 |
| Total | 121 | 100.0 |

Overall Religiosity Score

Overall, the three sections of religious affiliation, religious attendance, and community religiosity were rated using a specific index for each variable. Each index then was weighted equally (33%) and calculated to form an overall Sum Religiosity Index (S.R.I.) (Appendix D). This index was used to help calculate the effects that religiosity may have had on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. For this study, the S.R.I. found that of the 121 respondents who reportedly had their sexual debut,

14 scored a high religiosity (12.4%), 21 scored a moderate religiosity (17.4%), 51 scored a minimal religiosity (42.1%), and 34 scored a no substantial religiosity (28.1%). These results will be analyzed further in the next section, which specifically examines results for each primary and secondary research question stated in Chapter 1.

Table 4-9. Non-virgin respondents scores on the overall Sum Religiosity Index.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|----------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| No substantial religiosity | 34 | 28.1 |
| Minimal religiosity | 51 | 42.1 |
| Moderate religiosity | 21 | 17.4 |
| High religiosity | 15 | 12.4 |
| Total | 121 | 100.0 |

Analysis of Research Questions

Primary Research Questions

Primary research question 1. Is there a difference in timing of sexual debut among Jewish adolescents raised with different parenting styles?

The purpose of this question was to explore and compare the mean age of sexual debut for each of the four parenting styles (Table 4-10). For those respondents who responded that they have experienced their sexual debut (n=121), 51 classified their parents' parenting style as Permissive (41.1%), 48 classified their parents' parenting style as Authoritative (39.7%), 13 classified their parents' parenting style as Authoritarian (10.7%), and 9 classified their parents' parenting style as Indifferent (7.4%). The mean age of sexual debut for each parenting style is as follows: Authoritative--17.73 years old (SD=1.38), Permissive--16.88 years old (1.64), Authoritarian--16.69 years old (1.44), and Indifferent--15.56 years old (1.74). The overall mean age of sexual debut for all respondents who reported having already experienced their sexual debut was 17.10 years old (SD=1.63).

Conducting oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impact of parenting style on the mean age of sexual debut indicated the presence of a significant relationship ($f=6.42$, $p<.001$) among parenting styles with respect to mean age of sexual debut (Table 4-11). Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test was used to test all possible pairwise comparisons between parenting styles and the mean ages of each parenting style (Table 4-12). "HSD is the most conservative of the post-hoc tests in that it is the most likely to accept the null hypothesis of no group differences" (U.C.L.A., 2004).

Two significant relationships were found for difference of mean of sexual debut between parenting styles. The first was between permissive and authoritative parenting styles ($p<.05$) (Table 4-12). The second was between indifferent and authoritative parenting styles ($p<.05$) (Table 4-12).

Table 4-10. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among parenting styles.

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
|---------------|-----|-------|----------------|------------|
| Permissive | 51 | 16.88 | 1.64 | .23 |
| Authoritarian | 13 | 16.69 | 1.44 | .40 |
| Indifferent | 9 | 15.55 | 1.74 | .58 |
| Authoritative | 48 | 17.73 | 1.38 | .20 |
| Total | 121 | 17.10 | 1.63 | .15 |

Table 4-11. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among parenting styles ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| Between Groups | 45.05 | 3 | 15.02 | 6.42 | .00(*) |
| Within Groups | 273.77 | 117 | 2.34 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p<.05 = *$.

Table 4-12. Post-hoc evaluation of significant differences of mean age of sexual debut between parenting styles.

Dependent Variable: reference point

Tukey HSD

| Parenting Style (I) | Parenting Style (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Sig. |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|
| Permissive | Authoritarian | .19 | .48 | .98 |
| | Indifferent | 1.33 | .55 | .08 |
| | Authoritative | -.83 | .31 | .03(*) |
| Authoritarian | Permissive | -.19 | .48 | .98 |
| | Indifferent | 1.14 | .66 | .32 |
| | Authoritative | -1.04 | .48 | .14 |
| Indifferent | Permissive | -1.33 | .55 | .08 |
| | Authoritarian | -1.14 | .66 | .32 |
| | Authoritative | -2.17 | .56 | .00(*) |
| Authoritative | Permissive | .85 | .308 | .03(*) |
| | Authoritarian | 1.04 | .48 | .14 |
| | Indifferent | 2.17 | .56 | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$

Primary research question 2. Do any of the four parenting styles positively affect (delay) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts?

The purpose of this question was to explore and compare the mean age of sexual debut for each of the four parenting styles (Table 4-10) and to identify which, if any, parenting style has a positive effect on the mean age of sexual debut. To do this, a comparison of mean ages of sexual debut across parenting styles was generated through a oneway ANOVA test ($p < .05$) and each mean was compared to that of the overall mean of sexual debut for the study, 17.10 years old (Table 4-10). Authoritative is the only parenting style that has a mean, 17.73 years old, greater than the overall mean of sexual debut for the study, 17.10 years old. Furthermore, as mentioned above, significant statistical differences in the means of sexual debut were found for permissive ($p < .05$) and indifferent ($p < .05$) parenting styles when compared to the authoritative parenting style (Table 4-12). It should be noted that, according to the survey instrument, the permissive

and indifferent parenting styles both lack parental demandingness, which the instrument defines, as parent(s)/guardian(s) setting high standards and insisting that their children meet them. Therefore, it may be a single characteristic within a parenting style rather than an overall parenting style that affects the mean age of sexual debut.

Primary research question 3. Do any of the four parenting styles negatively affect (expedite) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts?

The purpose of this question was to explore and compare the mean age of sexual debut for each of the four parenting styles (Table 4-10) and to identify which, if any parenting style negatively affects (expedites) the mean age of sexual debut. To do this, a comparison of means of sexual debut among parenting styles was generated through a oneway ANOVA test ($p < .05$) and each mean was compared to that of the overall mean of sexual debut for the study, 17.10 years old (Table 4-11).

Three out of the four parenting styles had negative effects on sexual debut and generated means of sexual debut less than the overall mean of sexual debut for this study. They were permissive (16.88), authoritarian (16.69), and indifferent (15.56) parenting styles. The two parenting styles that have the greatest negative effect, when computing difference of means (overall mean – mean of parenting style), are authoritarian and indifferent (Table 4-12). It should be noted that, according to Baumrind (1996, 1978), the authoritarian and indifferent parenting styles both lack parental responsiveness, which the instrument defines as parent(s)/guardian(s) engaging in open discussions and having verbal give and take with their children.

Secondary Research Questions

Secondary research question 1. Is there a difference in timing of sexual debut among Jewish adolescents who had different levels of religiosity?

The purpose of this question was to determine if Jewish adolescents' level of religiosity affected their age of sexual debut. To do this, the three sections of religious affiliation, religious attendance, and community religiosity were rated using a specific index for each factor (Appendix D). Each index then was weighted equally (1/3, .33%) and calculated to form an overall Sum Religiosity Index (Appendix D). This sum index was then used to help calculate the effects that overall religiosity may have had on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. A oneway ANOVA ($p < .05$) was run to compare means of sexual debut among different levels of overall religiosity based on the created Sum Religiosity Index.

The five possible levels of overall religiosity were as follows: highest religiosity, high religiosity, moderate religiosity, minimal religiosity, and no substantial religiosity. No respondents fell into the highest religiosity category. When compared to the overall mean age of sexual debut, 17.10 years old, mathematical differences were found among the four remaining levels of overall religiosity. The mean ages of sexual debut were as follows: high overall religiosity, 16.53 years old; moderate overall religiosity, 17.00 years old; minimal overall religiosity, 18.00 years old; and no substantial overall religiosity, 16.06 years old.

Table 4-13. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of the Sum Religiosity Index.

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
|----------------------------|-----|-------|----------------|------------|
| No substantial religiosity | 34 | 16.06 | 1.30 | .22 |
| Minimal religiosity | 51 | 18.00 | 1.20 | .17 |
| Moderate religiosity | 21 | 17.00 | 1.79 | .39 |
| High religiosity | 15 | 16.53 | 1.77 | .46 |
| Total | 121 | 17.10 | 1.63 | .15 |

Conducting oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impact of overall religiosity on the mean age of sexual debut indicated the presence of a significant

relationship ($f=6.42$, $p<.001$) among different levels of religiosity with respect to mean age of sexual debut (Table 4-14). Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test was used to test all possible pairwise comparisons between overall levels of religiosity and the means of each parenting style (Table 4-15). Two significant relationships were found for mean differences in age of sexual debut among levels of overall religiosity. The first one was between no substantial overall religiosity and minimal overall religiosity ($p<.05$). The second was between minimal overall religiosity and high overall religiosity ($p<.05$) (Table 4-15).

Table 4-14. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of the Sum Religious Index ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-------|---------|
| Between Groups | 83.19 | 3 | 27.73 | 13.77 | .000(*) |
| Within Groups | 235.62 | 117 | 2.01 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p<.05 = *$.

Table 4-15. Post-hoc evaluation of significant differences of mean age of sexual debut between levels of Sum Religiosity Index.

Dependent Variable: reference point

Tukey HSD

| Sum Religiosity Score (I) | Sum Religiosity Score (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Sig. |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|
| No substantial religiosity | Minimal religiosity | -1.94 | .31 | .00(*) |
| | Moderate religiosity | -.94 | .39 | .11 |
| | High religiosity | -.47 | .44 | 1.00 |
| Minimal religiosity | No substantial religiosity | 1.94 | .31 | .00(*) |
| | Moderate religiosity | 1.00 | .37 | .05(*) |
| | High religiosity | 1.47 | .42 | .00(*) |
| Moderate religiosity | No substantial religiosity | .94 | .39 | .11 |
| | Minimal religiosity | -1.00 | .37 | .05(*) |
| | High religiosity | .47 | .48 | 1.00 |
| High religiosity | No substantial religiosity | .47 | .44 | 1.00 |
| | Minimal religiosity | -1.47 | .42 | .00(*) |
| | Moderate religiosity | -.47 | .48 | 1.00 |

Note. $p < .05 = *$

Secondary research question 2. Do any of the three aspects of religiosity positively affect (delay) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut?

The purpose of this question was to explore and compare the mean age of sexual debut for each of the four levels of overall religiosity (Table 4-13) and to identify which, if any of the three variables of overall religiosity has a positive effect on the mean age of sexual debut. The three variables examined were religious affiliation, religious attendance, and community religiosity. To do this, the three components of religious affiliation, religious attendance, and community religiosity were rated using a specific index for each factor.

Religious affiliation. When the first component, religious affiliation, was compared to the overall mean age of sexual debut of 17.10 years old, two levels of religious affiliation positively affected (delayed) the timing of sexual debut (Table 4-16). They were minimal religious affiliation with a mean age of 17.24 years old and moderate

religious affiliation with a mean age of 18.12 years old. The two extreme levels of religious affiliation provided mean ages of sexual debut farthest from the overall mean (overall mean age of sexual debut – mean age of sexual debut for each level of religious affiliation). The mean age for not very religious was 16.12 and on the other end, the mean age for highest religious affiliation was 16.10. However, the mean for high religious affiliation (16.83) was a lot closer to the overall mean age. Conducting oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impact of religious affiliation on the mean age of sexual debut indicated the presence of a significant relationship ($f=10.68$, $p<.001$) among different levels of religious affiliation with respect to mean age of sexual debut (Table 4-17).

Table 4-16. Comparison of age of sexual debut among levels of the Religious Affiliation Index.

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
|--------------------------------|-----|-------|----------------|------------|
| Not very religious | 33 | 16.12 | 1.45 | .25 |
| Minimal religious affiliation | 25 | 17.24 | 1.36 | .27 |
| Moderate religious affiliation | 41 | 18.12 | 1.31 | .20 |
| High religious affiliation | 12 | 16.83 | 1.19 | .34 |
| Highest religious affiliation | 10 | 16.10 | 2.02 | .64 |
| Total | 121 | 17.10 | 1.63 | .15 |

Table 4-17. Comparison of age of sexual debut among scores on Religious Affiliation Index ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-------|--------|
| Between Groups | 85.78 | 4 | 21.44 | 10.68 | .00(*) |
| Within Groups | 233.03 | 116 | 2.01 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p<.05 = *$.

Religious attendance. When religious attendance was compared to the overall mean age of sexual debut of 17.10 years old, three levels of religious attendance positively affected (delayed) the timing of sexual debut (Table 4-18). They were minimal

religious attendance with a mean age of 17.23, moderate religious attendance with a mean age of 17.33, and high religious attendance with a mean age of 17.25. Once again, as was the case with religious affiliation, the two extremes of religious attendance provided the largest negative effect in difference (overall mean age – mean age of each level of religious attendance) of mean age of sexual debut. No substantial religious attendance had a mean age of 16.69 years old and highest religious attendance had a mean age of 14.24 years old. Conducting oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impact of religious attendance on the mean age of sexual debut indicated the presence of a significant relationship ($f=3.87$, $p<.01$) among different levels of religious attendance with respect to mean age of sexual debut (Table 4-19). We can, therefore, conclude that there are differences in group means, indicating that the independent variable, religious attendance, has an effect on the dependent variable mean age of sexual debut.

Table 4-18. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of Religious Attendance Index.

| | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | Standard Error |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-------|--------------------|----------------|
| No substantial religious attendance | 13 | 16.69 | 1.89 | .52 |
| Minimal religious attendance | 69 | 17.23 | 1.5 | .18 |
| Moderate religious attendance | 27 | 17.33 | 1.39 | .27 |
| High religious attendance | 8 | 17.25 | 1.49 | .53 |
| Highest religious attendance | 4 | 14.25 | 2.50 | 1.25 |
| Total | 121 | 17.10 | 1.63 | .15 |

Table 4-19. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of Religious Attendance Index ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| Between Groups | 37.50 | 4 | 9.38 | 3.87 | .01(*) |
| Within Groups | 281.31 | 116 | 2.43 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p<.05 = *$.

Community religiosity. When community religiosity was compared to the overall mean age of sexual debut of 17.10 years old, two levels of community religiosity positively affected (delayed) the timing of sexual debut (Table 4-20). They were minimal community religiosity with a mean age of 17.16 years old and high community religiosity with a mean age of 17.65 years old. It should be noted that the moderate community religiosity, the level in between minimal and high community religiosity, had a mean age of 17.05. In addition, consistent with the results of religious affiliation and religious attendance, the two extremes of levels of community religiosity provided the largest negative difference (overall mean age – mean age of each level of community religiosity) from the overall mean age of sexual debut. No substantial community religiosity had a mean age of 16.84 years old and highest community religiosity had a mean age of 16.14 years old. Conducting oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impact of community religiosity on the mean age of sexual debut indicated the lack of a significant relationship ($f=1.236$), at the $p<.05$ level, among different levels of community religiosity with respect to mean age of sexual debut (Table 4-21). It cannot be concluded, therefore, that there are differences in group means, indicating that the independent variable, level of community religiosity, did not have a significant effect on the dependent variable mean age of sexual debut.

Table 4-20. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of the Community Religiosity Index.

| | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | Std. Error |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-------|--------------------|------------|
| No substantial community religiosity | 19 | 16.84 | 1.12 | .26 |
| Minimal community religiosity | 56 | 17.16 | 1.73 | .23 |
| Moderate community religiosity | 22 | 17.05 | 1.65 | .35 |
| High community religiosity | 17 | 17.65 | 1.27 | .31 |
| Highest community religiosity | 7 | 16.14 | 2.41 | .91 |
| Total | 121 | 17.10 | 1.63 | .15 |

Table 4-21. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of the Community Religiosity Index ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups | 13.04 | 4 | 3.26 | 1.24 | .30 |
| Within Groups | 305.77 | 116 | 2.6 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Secondary research question 3. Is there a difference in timing of sexual debut among Jewish adolescents of different gender?

The purpose of this question is to investigate whether male and female Jewish adolescents have differences in the timing of their sexual debut. When compared to the overall mean age of sexual debut, 17.10 years old, neither males nor females had mean ages of sexual debut far from the overall mean age. Males had a mean age of sexual debut of 17.16 years old and females had a mean age of sexual debut of 17.00 years old. Conducting oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impact of gender on the mean age of sexual debut indicated the lack of a significant relationship ($f = .283$), at the $p < .05$ level, between genders with respect to mean age of sexual debut. It cannot be concluded, therefore, that there are differences in group means, indicating that the independent variable, gender, may not have had an effect on the dependent variable mean age of sexual debut.

Table 4-22. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut by gender.

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
|--------|-----|-------|----------------|------------|
| Male | 74 | 17.16 | 1.80 | .21 |
| Female | 47 | 17.00 | 1.34 | .19 |
| Total | 121 | 17.10 | 1.63 | .15 |

Table 4-23. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut by gender ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-----|------|
| Between Groups | .76 | 1 | .76 | .28 | .60 |
| Within Groups | 318.05 | 119 | 2.67 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Additional Results

Additional significant relationships ($p < .05$) were explored through oneway ANOVAs that were run for each item for the data set that only included those who had sexual intercourse (“Yes dataset, $n=121$).

Parenting Style

A significant relationship ($f=4.95$, $p < .05$) was found between age at first date and mean ages of sexual debut (Table E-22). In addition, a significant relationship ($f=6.07$, $p < .05$) was found between age of first serious relationship and mean ages of sexual debut (Table E-23). Furthermore, a significant relationship ($f=2.44$, $p < .05$) was found for age of first sexual discussion when comparing mean ages of sexual debut (Table E-24). Therefore, all three, age of first date, age of first serious relationship, and age of first sexual discussion, had an effect on the timing of sexual debut. However, due to one or more ages having two or less responses, post-hoc tests were unable to be run on any of the three items.

Frequency of sexual discussion ($f=3.36$, $p < .05$) and how in-depth the sexual discussion was ($f=3.18$, $p < .05$) also provided a significant relationship when comparing mean ages of sexual debut. For frequency of sexual discussion, Tukey’s HSD test yielded a significant relationship between the mean age of sexual debut for those who had only one sexual discussion and those respondents who had more than one sexual discussion.

Tukey's HSD test yielded a significant difference in mean age of sexual debut between those respondents who had a very in-depth sexual discussion(s) and those respondents who had an in-depth sexual discussion(s).

Religiosity

A significant relationship ($f=10.20$, $p<.05$) was found among different classifications of Judaism when comparing mean ages of sexual debut (Table E-29). Tukey's HSD test yielded two significant relationships (Table E-30). They were found when comparing both Reform and Conservative independently to Orthodox ($p<.05$). In addition, another significant relationship ($f=18.04$, $p<.01$) was found among levels of observance when comparing mean ages of sexual debut (Table E-30). However, due to one or more of the levels of observance having two or less responses, I could not run post-hoc tests on this item to make pairwise comparisons. The level of religious affiliation also yielded a significant relationship ($f=11.31$, $p<.01$) when comparing mean ages of sexual debut (Table E-31). Specific significant pairwise relationships were discovered using Tukey's HSD test (Table E-32). Significant relationships were found among every level of affiliation when each was compared pairwise with not very affiliated ($p<.05$). An additional significant relationship ($p<.05$) was found between very strongly affiliated and moderately affiliated.

Religious service attendance ($f=7.37$, $p<.05$, Table E-33) and Hebrew School attendance ($f=7.25$, $p<.05$, Table E-34) also yielded significant relationships when comparing mean ages of sexual debut. For religious service attendance, Tukey's HSD test only yielded one significant pairwise relationship ($p<.05$) (Table E-35). It was between those respondents who attended religious services a few times per year compared to those respondents who only attended religious services during the High

Holidays. For Hebrew school attendance, significant pairwise relationships ($p < .05$) were found between those respondents who attended Hebrew school up to their reference point and those respondents who did not attend Hebrew school at the age of their reference point but did attend Hebrew school up to an age younger than their reference point (Table E-36). Primary school type also yielded a significant relationship ($f = 3.28$, $p < .05$) when comparing mean ages of sexual debut. However, post-hoc test results showed no significant pairwise relationships (Table E-37).

Community religiosity was also examined using oneway ANOVA to explore effects on the mean age of sexual debut (Table E-38). For involvement in a Jewish youth group, a significant relationship ($f = 4.91$, $p < .05$) was found when comparing mean ages of sexual debut (Table E-39). Post-hoc tests (Tukey's HSD) showed two significant pairwise relationships ($p < .05$, Table E-40). The first one was between those respondents who said they were not involved at all and those respondents who said they were only slightly involved. The second significant relationship was found between those respondents who were only slightly involved in a Jewish youth group and those respondents who were somewhat involved in a Jewish youth group. Exploring membership to a Jewish Community Center (J.C.C.), a significant relationship ($f = 7.39$, $p < .05$) was found when comparing mean ages of sexual debut (Table E-41). Tukey's HSD test yielded one significant pairwise relationship ($p < .05$) is between those respondents who had a J.C.C. in their community and were not members and those respondents who had a J.C.C. in their community and were members (Table E-42). Finally, when examining the levels of how respondents characterized the religiosity of their community, another significant relationship ($f = 6.33$, $p < .05$) was found when comparing the mean ages of sexual debut

(Table E-43). Two significant pairwise relationships ($p < .05$) were found when post-hoc (Tukey's HSD) tests were run (Table E-44). The first one was between those respondents who classified their community as minimally religious and those respondents who classified their community as moderately religious. The second significant relationship was between those respondents who classified their community as moderately religious and those respondents who classified their community as not religious at all.

Virgins

All respondents who said they had not had sexual intercourse ("No" dataset, $N = 47$) were considered to have had a delay in timing of sexual debut because all respondents were 18 years old or older, and the mean age of sexual debut for those who had sex was 17.10 years old. In order to formulate protective factors that might have contributed to these delays in timing of sexual debuts, frequency tests were run on each item for the "No" data set along with Chi-Square Tests. If a majority of virgins had selected one type of response, this might provide clues leading to the discovery of a protective factor for early sexual debut.

A statistically significant relationship ($p < .05$) was found using a Chi-Square Test between the number of respondents who had restrictions on the age they could first date ($n = 3$) and the number of respondents who had no restrictions on the age they could first date ($n = 44$) (Table E-44). Another significant relationship ($p < .05$) was found using the same method among the responses for age at first serious relationship, with 24 respondents claiming to never have been in what they would consider a serious relationship (Table E-45). In addition, significant relationships were found among responses regarding whether any parent discussed sex with them prior to their reference

point ($p < .05$, Table E-46), the frequency of sexual discussions prior to their reference point ($p < .05$, Table E-47), and for how in-depth the sexual discussions prior to the respondent's reference point ($p < .05$, Table E-48), which for virgins would be their current age. An additional significant relationship ($p < .05$) was found among age at first sexual discussion (Table E-49). For those virgins who had a sexual discussion ($n=35$), all but 6 had the discussion at age 13 or younger (29). When examining how many of the five sexual topics were discussed for the virgins ($n=47$), an average of almost three topics ($M=2.81$, $SD=1.95$) were discussed (Table E-50), indicating that discussing at least three topics may be a protective factor in the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut.

It is important to identify, if possible, a parenting style that a majority of virgins ($n=47$) had. A significant relationship ($p < .05$) was found among responses, with permissive being chosen by 26 (55.3%) and authoritative being chosen by 15 (31.9%). It should be noted that both of these parenting styles (according to the survey instrument (Baumrind, 1996, 1978) possess the quality of parental responsiveness, which is defined in the survey as a parent(s)/guardian(s) engaging in open discussions and having verbal give and take with their children (Table E-51). Finally, a significant relationship ($p < .05$) was found among responses to the question that asks how much influence do you believe your parents' parenting style had on your decisions to have (in this case to not have) sex (Table E-52).

When examining religiosity, many more statistically significant relationships appeared ($p < .05$). The first significant relationship was found among classifications of Judaism ($p < .01$, Table E-53). Conservative ($N=23$, 48.9%) and Reform ($N=20$, 42.3%) made up the majority of the virgin respondents. The next significant relationship ($p < .01$)

was found within respondents classifying the strength of their affiliation to Judaism (Table E-54). A clear majority (78.7%) of respondents were only somewhat affiliated or not very affiliated at all. These two groups comprised 37 out of the total 47 virgin respondents.

When asked about their religious service attendance, 33 (70.2%) of the 47 virgin respondents said they attended synagogue at least a few times per year. In addition, a Chi-Square Test displayed a significant statistical relationship ($p < .05$) for religious service attendance (Table E-55). Furthermore, with respect to Hebrew school attendance, 46 (97.9%) out of the 47 virgin respondents said they attended Hebrew school up to a certain age. The Chi-Square test also conveyed yet another statistically significant relationship ($p < .05$, Table E-56). The same test showed significant relationships for primary school type (Table E-57) and whether or not the respondent had a Bar/Bat Mitzvah (Table E-58). For primary school type, a vast majority (80.9%) or 38 out of the 37 virgin respondents said they went to public school. Similarly, a clear majority (89.4%) said they have had a Bar/Bat Mitzvah, making up 42 out of the 47 virgin respondents.

A statistically significant relationship ($p < .05$) was found using a Chi-Square Test for the final three items. They were: level of involvement in a Jewish youth group (Table E-59), whether or not the respondent's community had a Jewish Community Center and if they were a member (Table E-60), and how the respondent would rate their community's religiosity (Table E-61). The most common responses to level of involvement in a Jewish youth group were the two extremes. Highly involved comprised 38.3% and not involved at all comprised 29.8%. However, if we were to combine the top

three levels of involvement in a Jewish youth group, we would see that almost 60% (N=28, 59.6%) of the virgin respondents (N=47) were at least somewhat involved in a Jewish youth group. In addition, when looking at whether or not there was a Jewish Community Center in the respondent's city in which they grew up, 41 (87.2%) out of the 47 virgin respondents said there was a J.C.C. in their city. Out of those 41 virgin respondents who had a J.C.C. in their city, 20 (48.8%) were members and 21 (51.2%) were not. When asked to characterize their community's religiosity, a vast majority (87.0%) of the virgin respondents claimed their community's religiosity to be at least somewhat religious.

Summary

This chapter has provided descriptive results for all items of the instrument: gender, religious classification, sexual intercourse, marriage, parenting style, religiosity, religious affiliation, religious attendance, and community religiosity. In addition, this chapter focused on results related to the primary and secondary research questions stated in Chapter 1. This chapter concluded with additional information on results that were found to be statistically significant for items that were not directly related to the primary or secondary research questions. The following chapter will discuss in-depth the results related to the primary and secondary research questions.

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

Findings

This study was designed to examine the effects of parenting style on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. It explored four classifications of parenting styles (Baumrind, 1996, 1978) to determine whether a specific parenting style affected the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. Each parenting style was examined for positive (delay) and negative (early) relationships compared to the overall mean age of sexual debut, which for this study was 17.10 (SD=1.63) years old. Furthermore, this study examined the effects of religiosity on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. Religiosity was comprised of three components: religious affiliation, religious attendance, and community religiosity. Each component was measured as an independent index and then equally compiled into a Sum Religiosity Index (Appendix D), which was used to explore whether religiosity affects the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. The study also explored each independent index to determine whether any isolated aspect of religiosity affects the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. Finally, the timing of sexual debut for Jewish adolescents was examined by comparing mean ages of sexual debut between genders.

Descriptive Results

The participant population provides a background of factors that may affect the timing of a Jewish adolescent's sexual debut. More than half of the population was male

(53.0%), which possibly occurred because data collection took place at three fraternity houses compared to only two sorority houses.

Participants' classifications of Judaism yielded a population comprised of basically two groups. Conservative and Reform Judaism were the classifications for over 95% of respondents. In order to make broad generalizations about the timing of sexual debut for Jewish adolescents across all sects of Judaism, a near equal distribution would have been necessary. However, because the only two non-Jewish respondents were not counted in data collection, all respondents were Jewish (N=168) and research questions can therefore still be answered about the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut.

This study focuses on the timing of sexual debut and in order to examine factors that contributed to respondents either having sex or not having sex. It was important to separate those respondents who had experienced their sexual debut (non virgins, N=121) from those who had not (virgins, N=47) and examine each group separately. Finally, although every sect of Judaism, is opposed to premarital sex, regardless of the different ways they portray it, all respondents (N=168) reported that they were currently not, and have not been married. This means that 121 (72.0%) out of 168 respondents acted against Judaism's common fiber of opposition to premarital sex.

Primary Research Questions

1. Is there a difference in timing of sexual debut among Jewish adolescents raised with different parenting styles?
2. Do any of the four parenting styles positively affect (delay) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts?
3. Do any of the four parenting styles negatively affect (expediate) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debuts?

Secondary Research Questions

1. Is there a difference in timing of sexual debut among Jewish adolescents who had different levels of religiosity?
2. Do any of the three aspects of religiosity positively affect (delay) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut?
3. Is there a difference in timing of sexual debut among Jewish adolescents of different gender?

Oneway ANOVAs ($p < .05$) were used to analyze and answer each of these research questions. The group of interest used to analyze the research questions was only those respondents who reported having experienced their sexual debut ($N=121$). This group was isolated for exploration because each research question asks about the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut, thereby limiting research to those respondents who have actually experienced their sexual debut. The other group ($n=47$), respondents who have not experienced their sexual debut, was analyzed using Chi-square tests for frequencies. Because the mean age of sexual debut for those respondents who had experienced their sexual debut was 17.10 years old, and all respondents were 18 years old or older, then those respondents who had not experienced their sexual debut are considered to have a delay in the timing of their sexual debut when compared to the mean age of sexual debut. This population of virgins was, therefore, examined for factors that may have contributed positively to the delaying of sexual debut.

Parenting Style

In order to determine effects that parenting style may have had on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut, the survey (Appendix D) defined four parenting styles according to Baumrind (1996, 1978) and defined each one. Respondents were then asked to classify which of the four parenting styles was closest to the way they were reared, up

to the age of their reference point. As previously mentioned, to examine sexual debut the data set must be limited to only those respondents who reported having had experienced their sexual debut (N=121). The mean age of sexual debut for each parenting style is as follows: Indifferent 15.56 (SD=1.74), Authoritarian 16.69 (SD=1.44), Permissive 16.88 (SD=1.64), and Authoritative 17.73 (SD=1.38). Clearly, there is a difference in timing of sexual debut among parenting styles.

Conducting oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impact of parenting style on the mean age of sexual debut indicated the presence of a significant relationship ($f=6.42$, $p<.01$) among parenting styles with respect to mean age of sexual debut (Table 4-11). This study can conclude that parenting style does, in fact, have an effect on Jewish adolescents' timing of sexual debut. This finding is consistent with previous findings for adolescents that differences in levels of parental demandingness and parental responsiveness (the two factors that Baumrind (1996, 1978)) uses to classify parenting styles) may affect adolescent outcomes (Baldwin & Baranoski; Levin, Xu, Bartkowski, 2002; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1999; Rosenthal et al., 1990). Additionally, two significant relationships were found for difference of mean of sexual debut among parenting styles. The first relationship was between permissive and authoritative parenting styles ($p<.05$) (Table 4-12). The second relationship was between indifferent and authoritative parenting styles ($p<.05$) (Table 4-12). Authoritative parenting style, which produced the highest mean age of sexual debut (17.73), according to Baumrind (1996, 1978), is high on both parental responsiveness and parental demandingness. Both indifferent and permissive parenting styles are low on parental demandingness. It is, possible that Jewish adolescents whose parents set high standards for them and insist that

their children meet them, may have a later sexual debut than those Jewish adolescents whose parents do not.

Authoritative parenting has often been cited as the most effective means of parenting in respect to child outcomes (Luster & Small, 1994; Meschke & Silbereisen, 1997; Rodgers, 1999; Whitbeck, Yoder, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999). Adolescents reared in authoritative homes are more responsible, more self-assured, more adaptive, more creative, more curious, more socially skilled, and more successful in school than adolescents reared in non-authoritative homes (Fulgini & Eccles, 1993; Kurdeck & Fine, 1994; Lamborn et al., 1991; Pulkkinen, 1982; Steinberg et al., 1994). These parents are described as warm but firm and maintain standards for their child's conduct by forming expectations that are consistent with their child's developing needs and capabilities (Berk, 2000). In terms of timing of sexual debut, an authoritative parent would, not only have expectations of their adolescent about not having sex at a young age, but also would communicate openly with them about their sexual expectations (parental demandingness). Furthermore, an authoritative parent would openly discuss sex with their adolescent at a young age, and as they grew. In addition, the discussions would be in-depth and cover age-appropriate topics (parental responsiveness).

When looking for one or more parenting styles that may negatively affect (expedite) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut, the mean age of sexual debut for this study must be examined. For all respondents who reported having experienced their sexual debut, the mean age of sexual debut was 17.10 years old (SD= 1.63). While permissive ($M=16.88$) and authoritarian (16.69) both had mean ages of sexual debut less than the overall mean age of 17.10, the difference between each parenting style mean and

the overall mean is only .22 and .41 respectively. When those differences are translated into months, the difference between the mean ages of sexual debut for permissive and authoritarian parenting styles compared to the mean age of sexual debut is less than three months earlier for permissive and less than five months earlier for authoritarian.

The largest difference appears when the indifferent parenting style is examined. The mean age of sexual debut for respondents who reported their parents having an indifferent parenting style was 15.56 years old ($SD=1.74$). Indifferent parents minimize the time and energy they devote to interacting with their child. They know little about their child's activities and whereabouts, show little interest in their child's experiences at school or with friends, rarely converse with their child, and rarely consider their child's opinion when making decisions (Berk, 2000). While Baumrind classifies the indifferent parenting style as being low on parental demandingness and low on parental responsiveness (1996, 1978), it has also been well documented that adolescents with indifferent parents are not as likely to encounter positive child outcomes as adolescents of other parenting styles (Luster & Small, 1994; Meschke & Silbereisen, 1997; Rodgers, 1999; Whitbeck, Yoder, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999). This study's finding of adolescents with indifferent parents having an early sexual debut is consistent with other studies' findings, assuming that an early sexual debut is considered a negative outcome. With parents who are not demanding and not responsive, the adolescent has the power and many opportunities to make decisions on their own; and it has been found that sexual intercourse is most likely to occur among adolescents who have the most autonomy (the least parental control) to date whom they want, to date at an early age, and to control their own dating activities (where to go, when to come home, etc.) (Miller, McCoy, Olson &

Wallace, 1986). Furthermore, adolescents raised in indifferent homes are often impulsive and more likely to be involved in delinquent behavior and in premature experiments with sex, drugs, and alcohol (Fulgini & Eccles, 1993; Kurdeck & Fine, 1994; Lamborn et al., 1991; Pulkkinen, 1982; Steinberg et al., 1994). This study's findings are consistent with previous research, not only for the indifferent parenting style having the worst outcome, but as well for the authoritative parenting style having the best outcome.

Religiosity

In order to determine the effects that religiosity may have had on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut, the Sum Religiosity Index (SRI) (Appendix D) was used to compare the mean age of sexual debut for each level of overall religiosity. As described in previous chapters, the SRI is an overall score made up of three parts that all were rated equally: religious affiliation, religious attendance, and community religiosity. Also, as described in previous chapters, the SRI was intended to have five levels; however no respondents scored in the highest religiosity level. Therefore, the four remaining levels of overall religiosity are: no substantial religiosity, minimal religiosity, moderate religiosity, and high religiosity. "No substantial religiosity," produced a mean age of sexual debut of 16.06 years old (SD=1.0); "minimal religiosity" produced a mean age of sexual debut of 18.00 years old (SD=1.20); "moderate religiosity" produced a mean age of sexual debut of 17.00 (SD=1.79); and "high religiosity" produced a mean age of sexual debut of 16.53 (SD=1.77). Clearly, there is a difference in timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut among levels of religiosity. This finding is consistent with previous research that found religiosity affects the likelihood that an adolescent will engage in risk-related behaviors, such as sexual activity (Wilcox, Rostosky, Randall, & Wright, 2001; Zaleski & Schiaffino, 2000).

Conducting oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impact of overall religiosity on the mean age of sexual debut indicated the presence of a significant relationship ($f=13.77$, $p<.01$) among levels of overall religiosity with respect to mean age of sexual debut (Table 4-14). It therefore can be concluded that Jewish adolescents' religiosity can affect the timing of their sexual debut. Thus, religion may serve as an important social referent for adolescents' decisions to abstain from sexual relations (Campbell & Stewart, 1992; Cochran & Beeghley, 1991).

Additionally, two significant relationships were found for difference of mean of sexual debut among levels of overall religiosity. The first relationship was between no substantial religiosity and minimal religiosity ($p<.05$) (Table 4-15). It appears from these that even a little religiosity delays sexual debut, compared to no religiosity. The second relationship was between minimal overall religiosity and high overall religiosity ($p<.05$) (Table 4-15). If we look at these significant relationships together, we see that both, the low extreme (no substantial religiosity) and the high extreme (high religiosity), have the earliest mean ages of sexual debut and that these relationships are significant when compared to minimal religiosity, which had the highest mean age of sexual debut at 18.00 years of age. Extremes at either end seem to produce a negative outcome in terms of timing of sexual debut. While many studies find that strong religiosity is associated with a delay in the timing of sexual debut (Campbell & Stewart, 1992; Cochran & Beeghley, 1991; Jessor, 1992; Netting, 1992; Woodroof, 1985; Zaleski & Schiaffino, 2000), this study suggests that a high level of religiosity may not produce a positive outcome. In other words, excessive religiosity may not serve as a protective factor in terms of timing of sexual debut. It is therefore possible that Jewish adolescents who have even minimal

or moderate levels of overall religiosity may have the best chance at a positive outcome and a later sexual debut than those Jewish adolescents who have either extremely high or non-existent religiosity.

When looking for one aspect of overall religiosity that may have positively affected (delayed) the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut, we must look at the different levels for each aspect. This study examined whether: (a) different levels of religious affiliation produce a delay in the timing of sexual debut, (b) different levels of religious attendance produce a delay in the timing of sexual debut, and (c) different levels of community religiosity produce a delay in the timing of sexual debut. To explore each aspect, the created index for each was examined by analyzing and comparing the mean ages of sexual debut for each level.

Religious affiliation. The results from the Religious Affiliation Index (Appendix D) were explored to determine the effects of religious affiliation on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. The mean ages of sexual debut were examined for each of the five levels of religious affiliation. The five levels and their reported means are: "Not very religious," 16.12 years old (SD=1.45); "Minimal religious affiliation," 17.24 (SD=1.36); "Moderate religious affiliation," 18.12 (SD= 1.31); "High religious affiliation," 16.83 (SD=1.19); and "Highest religious affiliation," 16.10 (SD=2.02). Clearly, there is a difference in timing of sexual debut among different levels of religious affiliation, with minimal religious affiliation and moderate religious affiliation positively affecting (delaying) the timing of sexual debut. It has been reported that many adolescents may not engage in risk-related behavior due to their religious beliefs and the proscriptions of their faith (Campbell & Stewart, 1992; Cochran & Beeghley, 1991; Jessor, 1992; Netting,

1992; Woodroof, 1985), and this is consistent with the findings of this study. It is possible that the level of affiliation a Jewish adolescent feels toward Judaism will affect the timing of their sexual debut. This presents a challenge to parents, to keep Judaism a priority in post Bar/Bat Mitzvah years, which is usually dominated by the emergence of stronger peer relationships (Treboux & Busch-Rossnagel, 1990).

A oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) determined the impact of religious affiliation on the mean age of sexual debut, indicating the presence of a significant relationship ($f=10.68$, $p<.01$) among levels of religious affiliation with respect to mean age of sexual debut (Table 4-17). This study can conclude that religious affiliation does, in fact, have an effect on Jewish adolescents' timing of sexual debut. Four significant relationships were found for difference of mean of sexual debut among levels of religious affiliation. The first three relationships were all found among not very religious, high religious affiliation and highest religious affiliation when each was compared pair-wise to moderate religious affiliation ($p<.05$). The fourth relationship was between not very religious and minimal religious affiliation ($p<.05$). If these significant relationships are examined together, both findings indicate that the low extreme (not very religious) and the high extreme (highest religious affiliation), have the lowest mean ages of sexual debut and that these relationships are significant when compared to moderate religious affiliation which had the highest mean age of sexual debut at 18.12 years of age. Extreme religious affiliation, on either end, seems to produce the most negative outcome in terms of timing of sexual debut. This finding is similar to that of overall religiosity. As mentioned before many studies find that strong religiosity, of which religious affiliation is a component, is associated with a delay in the timing of sexual debut

(Campbell & Stewart, 1992; Cochran & Beeghley, 1991; Jessor, 1992; Netting, 1992; Woodroof, 1985; Zaleski & Schiaffino, 2000). This study found, however, that an extremely high level of religious affiliation may not produce the same positive outcome. In other words, the highest levels of religious affiliation may not serve as a protective factor in terms of timing of sexual debut. It is possible that Jewish adolescents who have moderate levels of religious affiliation may have a better chance of later sexual debut than those Jewish adolescents who have either extremely high or not very religious affiliations. Previous research agrees with the fact that adolescents with moderate religious affiliation are more likely to have positive outcomes than adolescents who are not very religious (Coie et al., 1993). However, this study's finding of an early sexual debut for those Jewish adolescents who had extremely high religious affiliation seems to be unique.

Religious attendance. To determine the effects of religious attendance on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut, I will explore the results from the Religious Attendance Index (Appendix D). I will closely examine the mean ages of sexual debut for each of the five levels of religious attendance. The five levels and their means are: "No substantial religious attendance," 16.19 (SD=1.88); "Minimal religious attendance," 17.23 (SD=1.51); "Moderate religious attendance," 17.33 (SD=1.39); "High religious attendance," 17.25 (SD=1.49); and "Highest religious attendance, 14.25 (SD=2.50). Clearly, there is a difference in timing of sexual debut among different levels of religious attendance, with three middle levels (minimal religious attendance, moderate religious attendance, and high religious attendance) positively affecting (delaying) the timing of sexual debut.

A oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impact of religious attendance on the mean age of sexual debut indicated the presence of a significant relationship ($f=3.87$, $p<.01$) among levels of religious attendance with respect to mean age of sexual debut (Table 4-19). It can be concluded that religious attendance does have an effect on Jewish adolescents' timing of sexual debut. Additionally, three significant relationships were found for difference of mean of sexual debut among levels of religious attendance. All three relationships were found in comparison to highest religious attendance ($p<.05$). Minimal, moderate, and high religious attendance all produced significant relationships when compared independently and pair-wise to highest religious attendance. If these significant relationships are examined together, both the low extreme (no substantial religious attendance) and the high extreme (highest religious attendance), have the earliest mean ages of sexual debut and the relationship between the high extreme, highest religious attendance, and the middle of the five levels, moderate religious attendance (which had the highest mean age of sexual debut (17.33)), have a significant relationship. It appears that extreme religious attendance, on either the low end or the high end, seems to produce the most negative outcome in terms of timing of sexual debut. This finding is similar to and supports the prior finding related to overall religiosity and religious affiliation. As mentioned earlier, many studies find that strong religiosity, of which religious attendance is a component of, provides a delay in the timing of sexual debut (Campbell & Stewart, 1992; Cochran & Beeghley, 1991; Jessor, 1992; Netting, 1992; Woodroof, 1985; Zaleskit & Schiaffino, 2000). This study found that to be true, but also suggests that the highest levels of religious attendance may not delay sexual debut. It is possible that Jewish adolescents who have moderate levels of

religious attendance may have a better chance of later sexual debut than those Jewish adolescents who have either very high or low levels of religious attendance. While previous research has showed that low religious service attendance is associated with early sexual debut (Zaleski and Schiaffnio, 2000), this study's finding of extremely high levels of religious attendance not producing the same positive effects as moderate levels of religious attendance seem to be unique.

Community religiosity. To determine the effects of community religiosity on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut, this study explored the results from the Community Religiosity Index (Appendix D). The mean ages of sexual debut were closely examined for each of the five levels of community religiosity. The five levels and their means are: "No substantial community religiosity," 16.84 (SD=1.12); "Minimal community religiosity," 17.16 (SD=1.73); "Moderate community religiosity," 17.05 (SD=1.65); "High community religiosity," 17.65 (SD=1.27); and "Highest community religiosity," 16.14 (SD=2.41). Clearly, there is a difference in timing of sexual debut among different levels of community religiosity, with high community religiosity positively affecting (delaying) the timing of sexual debut. This finding is consistent with previous research that found that adolescents who grow up in communities with higher levels of religiosity are more likely to delay having sex than those who grow up in less religious communities (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993). This could be due to the theory that non-marital sexual activity, both in general and among adolescents in particular, is more likely to be proscribed in religious than in less religious communities (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993).

Conducting oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impact of community religiosity on the mean age of sexual debut indicated the lack of a significant relationship ($f=1.24$) among levels of community religiosity with respect to mean age of sexual debut at the $p<.05$ level. It cannot be concluded, therefore, that community religiosity has an effect on Jewish adolescents' timing of sexual debut. However, a simple examination of the mean ages of sexual debut for each of the five levels of community religiosity found consistent results with each of the other sections of religiosity. If mean ages of sexual debut are examined, both the low extreme (no substantial community religiosity) and the high extreme (highest community religiosity) have the earliest mean ages of sexual debut (16.84 and 16.14, respectively). Extreme community religiosity, on either the low end or the high end, seems to produce the most negative outcome in terms of timing of sexual debut. This analysis is similar to that of overall religiosity, religious affiliation, and religious attendance. As mentioned earlier, many studies find that strong religiosity, of which community religiosity is a component, delays the timing of sexual debut (Campbell & Stewart, 1992; Cochran & Beeghley, 1991; Jessor, 1992; Netting, 1992; Woodroof, 1985; Zaleski & Schiaffino, 2000). This study found that to be true, but also suggests that the highest levels of community religiosity may not serve as a protective factor in terms of timing of sexual debut. It is possible that Jewish adolescents who have moderate levels of community religiosity have a better chance of a positive outcome and a later sexual debut than those Jewish adolescents who have either extremely high levels or no substantial community religiosity. While previous research found that low community religiosity is associated with early sexual debut (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993), this study's finding that the

highest levels of community religiosity does not produce the same positive effects as moderate levels of community religiosity, seem to be unique.

Gender

In order to determine the effects of gender on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut, the mean age of sexual debut was calculated for both genders. The mean age of male respondents (N=74) was 17.16 years old (SD=1.80) and the mean age of female respondents (N=47) was 17.00 (SD=1.34). However, in reality, this difference is a matter of about a month and was not statistically significant.

A oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impact of gender on the mean age of sexual debut indicated the lack of a significant relationship ($f=.283$) among levels of community religiosity with respect to mean age of sexual debut at the $p<.05$ level. It cannot be concluded that gender has an effect on Jewish adolescents' timing of sexual debut. This is consistent with the previous analysis of mean ages of sexual debut by gender.

Summary

Overall, the findings from this study provide valuable information regarding Jewish adolescents. It is important to emphasize the main findings of this study regarding parenting style and religiosity. This study found significant differences in the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut among different parenting styles and among different levels of religiosity. In addition, my study has provided insight into the lives of Jewish adolescents, the way they were reared, and the decisions that they made as adolescents.

Limitations

The limitations associated with this present study include

- All subjects could choose not to participate in the study.

- Both genders were not equally represented in the study.
- The topic of adolescent sexual debut may be considered personal and may inhibit response accuracy.
- Results are subject to errors in memory recall about sexual debut and ages of parental conversations about sex.
- Results may be skewed to do small sample size.

Each fraternity and sorority house at which data were collected allowed the study to be conducted at their house under the condition that it was voluntary. This may have contributed to the total number of respondents not being as high as possible.

There was potential for many more participants, as each fraternity and sorority house has over 100 active members. In addition, the study was conducted at three fraternity houses and two sorority houses contributing to a slightly uneven gender distribution.

Furthermore, the study focused on adolescent and sexual topics and personal information. This may have caused some respondents to not be as forthcoming and may have caused respondents to not always be truthful in all of their responses. Finally, respondents (N=121) were asked to remember their decisions and their surrounding environment at the age of their sexual debut, which could have been as much as 7 years before the survey; and to recall conversations with parents about sex, possibly as much as 10 years before the survey. This delay could introduce some inaccuracy in reporting.

Implications for Practice

The present study has essential implications for Jewish parents, adolescents, communities, and youth workers. Many findings of this study suggest ways that Jewish parents can protect their adolescents against an early sexual debut, such as controlling the age that their child can first date, the age at which they first discuss sex with their child, the topics that they cover, and, most importantly, their overall parenting style.

Many previous studies show that an authoritative parenting style provides the most likely chances of positive child outcomes in various areas such as academic achievement. This study has shown similar findings in terms of the timing of sexual debut, with authoritative parenting apparently delaying sexual debut. If Jewish parents want to help their adolescents postpone sexual debut then they must be warm but firm. They must set standards for their adolescent's conduct, but also form expectations that are consistent with their adolescent's developing needs and capabilities. Furthermore, Jewish parents must place a high value on the development of autonomy and self-direction of their adolescent, but also assume the ultimate responsibility for their adolescent's behavior. Finally, Jewish parents must deal with their child in a rational, issue-oriented manner, frequently engaging in age-appropriate discussions and explanations with their children about sexual topics. In summary, Jewish parents must be consistently and realistically demanding of their adolescents as well as responsive and openly communicative in order to be able to protect against early sexual debut.

Jewish adolescents are faced with unique challenges such as preparing for and achieving their Bar/Bat Mitzvah; however, they also face the same challenges as other adolescents, i.e. academics, peer pressure, and the transition to greater autonomy and decision making. While adolescents cannot control their parents' parenting style, adolescents can begin to form their own religious beliefs and behaviors. This study shows that, overall, religiosity does have an effect on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut, and, more specifically, religious affiliation and religious attendance affect the timing of their sexual debut. It has been reported that many adolescents may not engage in risk-related behavior due to their religious beliefs and the proscriptions of their

faith (Campbell & Stewart, 1992; Cochran & Beeghley, 1991; Jessor, 1992; Netting, 1992; Woodroof, 1985). With an early sexual debut considered a risk-related behavior, the finding of this study is consistent with other research. This means that, fostered in the proper manner by their parents and/or community, a Jewish adolescent's affiliation to Judaism can serve as a protective factor not only in terms of sexual debut but against other deviant behaviors.

Furthermore, individuals who attend their religious institution frequently and who value religion in their lives are more likely than others to develop sexual attitudes and behavior that are consistent with religious teachings (Thornton & Camburn, 1989). While each sect of Judaism teaches their opposition to premarital sex differently, it is, nonetheless, a consistent fiber across Judaism. This means that, if fostered in the proper manner by their parents and/or community, a Jewish adolescent's attendance to a synagogue can serve as a protective factor in terms of their age of sexual debut. Finally, while this study did not find significant results in terms of community religiosity and mean age of sexual debut, other studies have (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993; Thornton & Camburn, 1989). In addition, because organized religions such as Judaism place great value on marriage and family formation (Thornton & Camburn, 1989), nonmarital sexual activity, both in general and among adolescents in particular, is more likely to be proscribed in religious than in less religious communities (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993). Youth groups, Jewish or not, provide opportunities for adolescents to serve their community, leadership and social opportunities, and, most importantly, give them less time to be participating in deviant behavior. Community centers, Jewish or not, provide an opportunity for adolescents to socialize, participate in community-wide programs, and

most importantly, to be in a supervised environment where they are less likely to have the opportunity to participate in deviant behavior. Furthermore, this study examined the effect of community religiosity on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut through the use of a religiosity index, and did not examine the effect that any single aspect of community religiosity may have had. Therefore, while not evident in this study, it is still possible that if a community has a Jewish Youth group and a Jewish Community Center, a Jewish adolescent's involvement in either or both can serve as a protective factor in terms of the age of their sexual debut by proscribing values against premarital sex.

This study also has implications for Jewish communities. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the level of religiosity characterizing a community (as indicated by both the prevalence of religious adherents and the orthodoxy of local religious organization) also may influence adolescent sexual and contraceptive behaviors (Thornton & Camburn, 1989). In addition, it has been concluded that community religiosity exercises significant effects on both intercourse and contraceptive behavior (Brewster, Billy, & Grady, 1993). Because an adolescent's religious community can have an influence on their sexual behaviors, it is the responsibility of each Jewish community and the institutions and agencies that support them, to serve as a protective factor and a positive influence.

The face of many Jewish communities is their Jewish Community Center (J.C.C.) and there are many. Across the United States and Canada there are over 350 J.C.C.s that provide services to people of all ages and backgrounds that could be utilized to protect against early sexual debut. As J.C.C.s work to serve members of all backgrounds, most J.C.C.s have specialized departments that are divided by ages. It is possible that through the J.C.C.'s programs geared specifically to teens/adolescents, that they are fostering

rules, boundaries, and demands consistent with the Jewish adolescent's parents. Thus, the J.C.C. can serve as an additional monitor of adolescent behavior. A J.C.C. can support the optimal authoritative parenting style by remaining demanding and equally responsive to the needs of Jewish adolescents and thereby also becoming a protective factor against Jewish adolescents having early sexual debuts.

Recommendations for Future Research

To more fully explore the effects that parenting style and religiosity have on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut, future studies may be elaborated in several ways. First, future studies on the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut may focus on a representative and large data set. This would allow for the data to be analyzed in different ways, which are not possible with a small data set, and could possibly yield detailed and expansive results. Second, future studies may attempt to explore other factors than parenting style and religiosity that may affect the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. One such factor is family structure, including parents, divorce, siblings with age and gender differences, and additional family members in the house. Other factors that can be examined are peers, academic achievement, and educational attainment of the Jewish adolescent's parents. Sexual debut is a rainbow of interwoven factors, each of which can affect another and an adolescent's sexual debut. It is difficult to remove one factor affecting sexual debut and isolate it without wondering how every other factor may interact with it as well. Finally, a study that examines current adolescents (middle school and high school students) may provide an accurate picture of contemporary youth issues. This would eliminate the need to ask college students to remember back seven years and attempt to report accurately about decisions they made and their surrounding home environment almost a decade ago.

This study is one of the first to specifically examine Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. After determining that parenting style and religiosity both independently affect the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut, it is imperative to disseminate these results through different outlets to allow Jewish parents, Jewish religious leaders, and Jewish community leaders the best opportunity to protect Jewish adolescents from an early sexual debut. Some researchers recommend that parents need to learn how to provide the right amount of the right information at the right time, whether it concerns academic achievement or sexual development (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1999). This is where a Jewish Community Center comes in. To be most effective, Jewish parents, Jewish religious leaders, and Jewish community leaders need to know how to approach, discuss, and facilitate a sexual conversation, all of which can occur within the walls of a J.C.C. and can be administered by educated and trained Jewish professionals.

Finally, providing this information directly to Jewish adolescents would create an educational forum based on facts that will help shape their decision making and allow Jewish adolescents to communicate openly and knowingly about sexual topics with their parents and their peers. Still, parents need to take the initiative by clearly vocalizing their expectations of their adolescent's sexual behavior and by openly communicating age-appropriate sexual topics in an on-going dialogue that allows for verbal give and take. As adolescents become interested in sex and become biologically capable of reproduction, the need to educate them on sexual topics becomes more and more important.

Adolescence is an exciting time in life that includes many positive situations full of potential and also many negative situations where the consequences might not seem so evident to the young person. Sexual intercourse is one of those situations where the

consequences may not be apparent. This study has shown that both parenting style and religiosity affect the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut. And, as adolescents begin to develop, their lives become more sophisticated and complicated, and they receive a taste of autonomy as they gain an ability to make their own decisions, hopefully the decision on when to have sex is based on education provided by their parents and the consequences are clear.

APPENDIX A
INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTERS

1. TITLE OF PROTOCOL: “Factors Affecting the Timing of Jewish Adolescents’ Sexual Debut”

2. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(s): (Robby Etzkin, Bachelor’s Degree of Human Resource Development, Teaching Assistant, Family, Youth, and Community Sciences, 121 NW 25th Street, Gainesville, FL 32607, (352) 271-5636, RobbyEtzkin@hotmail.com)

3. SUPERVISOR (IF PI IS STUDENT): (Dr. Rose Barnett, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Family, Youth, and Community Sciences, 3041 McCarty Hall PO Box 110310, Gainesville, FL 32611-0310, (352) 392-2201 ext. 257, rvbarnett@ufl.edu, (352) 392-8196)

4. DATES OF PROPOSED PROTOCOL:
From: April 9, 2003 To: November 30, 2003

5. SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR THE PROTOCOL: None

6. SCIENTIFIC PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION: To determine if parenting style and/or certain Jewish practices such as religious service attendance or religious school attendance, affect the timing that Jewish adolescents first have intercourse.

7. DESCRIBE THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY IN NON-TECHNICAL LANGUAGE. The Principal Investigator will introduce himself and his topic and then will ask participants to consent and to complete a survey. See attached survey entitled, “Factors Affecting the Timing of Jewish Adolescents’ Sexual Debut.”

8. POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND ANTICIPATED RISK. No more than minimal risk

9. DESCRIBE HOW PARTICIPANT(S) WILL BE RECRUITED, THE NUMBER AND AGE OF THE PARTICIPANTS, AND PROPOSED COMPENSATION (if any): Participants will be recruited through four University of Florida organizations. They are Alpha Epsilon Phi and Delta Phi Epsilon sororities and Alpha Epsilon Pi and Tau Epsilon Phi fraternities. The Principal Investigator is seeking at least 50 participants from each organization for a sum of over 200. All participants will be eighteen years of age or older. Added max per pi 500 and signed

10. DESCRIBE THE INFORMED CONSENT PROCESS. INCLUDE A COPY OF THE INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT (if applicable). Each participant will be given a copy of the informed consent form prior to his or her involvement in the study. Participants will return a signed copy before receiving a survey. See attached “Informed Consent” form.

Principal Investigator's Signature

Supervisor’s Signature

I approve this protocol for submission to the UFIRB:

Dept. Chair/Center Director

Date

APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Informed Consent

Protocol Title: Factors Affecting the Timing of Jewish Adolescents' Sexual Debut

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the Research Study: The purpose of this study is to examine specific factors that may affect the age at which Jewish adolescents first have intercourse.

What you will be asked to do in this study: Following a brief introduction you will be asked to consent to and to complete a short survey. The nature of the questions will include topics such as sexual history and religiosity. An example of a sexual history questions is, "Have you had sexual intercourse?" and an example of religiosity question is, "Did you have a Bar or Bat Mitzvah?" You do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to.

Time Required: 15 minutes

Risks and Benefits: No more than minimal risks and there are no direct benefits to the individual. However, participating fraternities and sororities will be acknowledged in all publications including the thesis and all future journal publications

Compensation: none

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to Withdraw from the Study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:

Robby Etzkin, Graduate Student, Department of Family, Youth, and Community Sciences, 3041 McCarty Hall, PO Box 110310, Gainesville, FL 32611-0310, (352) 392-2201

Rose Barnett, Ph.D., Department of Family, Youth, and Community Sciences, 3041 McCarty Hall, PO Box 110310, Gainesville, FL 32611-0310, (352) 392-2201 ext. 257

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:

UFIRB Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250, (352) 392-0433

Agreement: I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description.

Participant Signature

Date

Principal Investigator

Date

APPENDIX C
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

“Factors Affecting the Timing of Jewish Adolescents’ Sexual Debut”

- Please circle the answer that most accurately describes you or fill in the blanks.

Personal Information

1. What is your sex?
 - A. Male
 - B. Female

2. Do you consider yourself Jewish?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No, please STOP and return this survey to the facilitator, thank you for your time.

3. Have you had sexual intercourse?
 - A. Yes, I was __ years old the first time.
 - B. No, I have not, and I am currently _____ years old.
 - If you answered “Yes” for question 3, then the number (age) you filled in will be considered your “**reference point**” for the remainder of the survey.
 - If you answered “No” for question 4, then your current age will be considered your “**reference point**” for the remainder of the survey.

4. Please fill in the blank. **My reference point is** ____.

5. Are you or were you married at the age of your **reference point**?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No

Parenting Style

6. How old were you when you went on your first date?
 - A. I was _____ years old.
 - B. I have not been on a date.

7. Were there rules or restrictions on the age at which you could first date?
 - A. Yes, I was not allowed to date until I was _____ years old.
 - B. No, I was not restricted.

8. How old were you when you began what you would consider your first serious relationship?
 - A. I was _____ years old
 - B. I have not been in what I consider a serious relationship

9. Did your parent(s)/guardian(s) discuss sex with you **before your reference point**?
 - A. Yes, they both did.
 - B. Yes, my same-sex parent did only
 - C. Yes, my opposite-sex parent did only.
 - D. No, not at all.

10. If a sexual discussion occurred was it:
 - A. A one-time thing
 - B. More than once
 - C. Part of an on-going dialogue of sexual topics
 - D. Daily
 - E. Does not apply

11. If a sexual discussion occurred, how in-depth was the dialogue?
 - A. Very in-depth
 - B. In-depth
 - C. Not in-depth
 - D. Not in-depth at all
 - E. Does not apply

12. If a sexual discussion occurred, please check all of the topics that were discussed during the sexual discussion(s) with your parent(s).
 - Physical development
 - Abstinence
 - Safe sex
 - Emotion-based Intimacy
 - Consequences

13. If a sexual discussion occurred, how old were you at the first discussion?

I was _____ years old.

For this study:

---“Responsive” will refer to parent(s)/guardian(s) engaging in open discussions and having verbal give and take with their children.

---“Demanding” will refer to parent(s)/guardian(s) setting high standards and insisting that their children meet them.

The following definitions of parenting styles will be used for this study.

- Permissive: responsive but not demanding
- Authoritarian: demanding but not responsive
- Indifferent: neither demanding nor responsive
- Authoritative: demanding and responsive

14. Which parenting style is the closest to the way you were raised up to your **reference point**?

- A. Permissive
- B. Authoritarian
- C. Indifferent
- D. Authoritative

15. How much did the parenting style that you were raised with influence your decision to have sexual intercourse for the first time?

- A. Very strong influence
- B. Strong influence
- C. Some influence
- D. Very little influence
- E. No influence at all

Religiosity

16. How would you characterize your Jewish upbringing?

- A. Orthodox
- B. Conservative
- C. Reform
- D. Other, please name _____

17. How would you characterize your family’s practice of religion?

- A. Very strongly observant
- B. Strongly observant
- C. Somewhat observant
- D. Minimally observant
- E. Not observant at all

18. How would you rate your affiliation to Judaism up to your reference point?
Affiliation can mean how much one feels a part of any group.
- A. Very strongly affiliated
 - B. Moderately affiliated
 - C. Somewhat affiliated
 - D. Not very affiliated
 - E. Not affiliated at all
19. How often do you or did you attend synagogue for religious services at your **reference point**?
- A. Weekly or almost weekly
 - B. Monthly or almost monthly
 - C. A few times per year
 - D. Only on High Holidays
 - E. Not at all
20. Did you regularly (at least once per week) attend a Hebrew School or Sunday School at the age of your **reference point**?
- A. Yes
 - B. No, but I did regularly attend until I was ____ years old.
 - C. No, I did not attend at all.
21. How would you characterize the school you attended at the age of your **reference point**?
- A. Private and Jewish
 - B. Private and religious but not Jewish
 - C. Private and non-religious
 - D. Public
22. Did you have a Bar or Bat Mitzvah?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
23. Were you involved in a Jewish youth group? For example, BBYO, USY, etc.
- A. Yes, I was highly involved.
 - B. Yes, I was moderately involved.
 - C. Yes, I was somewhat involved.
 - D. Yes, I was only slightly involved.
 - E. No, I was not involved at all.
24. Did your community have a Jewish Community Center (JCC)?
- A. Yes, but I was not a member.
 - B. Yes, and I was a member.
 - C. No, it did not.

25. How would you characterize your Jewish community at the time of your reference point?
- A. Very religious
 - B. Moderately religious
 - C. Somewhat religious
 - D. Minimally religious
 - E. Not religious at all

Thank you for your time. Your completion of this survey has helped contribute to our understanding of the experiences of Jewish youth. Thank you once again.

APPENDIX D
RELIGIOSITY INDEX GUIDE

Religiosity Index Guide

3 Aspects: Religious Affiliation, Religious Attendance, and Community Religiosity

All three aspects will equal each other in order to obtain an overall religiosity score. This cumulative score will serve to explore the research question: Does religiosity affect the timing of Jewish adolescents' sexual debut? This new variable will be called "relig sum" and will be made up of three additional variables: rel aff sum, rel att sum, and com rel sum.

Each of the three sub-variables will be scaled differently due to the different number of questions in each of their respective sections.

The breakdown will be as follows:

Religious Affiliation will cover survey questions 17 and 18. Both questions will be weighted equally.

For question 17: Respondents will receive 10 points for A. very strongly observant, 7 points for B. moderately observant, 4 points for C. somewhat observant, 1 point for D. not very observant, and 0 points for E. not observant at all. The maximum score received will be ten and the minimum will be zero.

For question 18: Respondents will receive 10 points for A. very strongly affiliated, 7 points for B. moderately affiliated, 4 points for C. somewhat affiliated, 1 point for D. not very affiliated, and 0 points for E. not affiliated at all. The maximum score received will be ten and the minimum will be zero.

The sum total of scores for the sub variable religious affiliation will total to 20 points. The scale for assessing the sum score will be as follows:

20-17 highest religious affiliation
16-14 high religious affiliation
13-11 moderate religious affiliation
10-8 minimal religious affiliation
7-0 not very religiously affiliated

This religious affiliation sum score will then be calculated into a proportion out of 20. For example, a high religious affiliation score of 15 will be transformed into an overall score of .75 (15/20) for calculating overall religiosity. This proportion will make up 1/3 of the overall religiosity score.

Religious Attendance will cover survey questions 19, 20, 21, & 22. All questions will be weighted equally.

For question 19: Respondents will receive 10 points for A. weekly or almost weekly, 7 points for B. monthly or almost monthly, 4 points for C. a few times per year, 1 point for D. only on high holidays, and 0 points for E. not at all. The maximum score received will be ten and the minimum will be zero.

For question 20: Respondents will receive 10 points for A. yes, 5 points for B. no, but I did regularly attend until a different age, and 0 points for C. no, I did not attend at all. The maximum score received will be ten and the minimum will be zero.

For question 21: Respondents will receive 10 points for A. private and Jewish, 5 points for B. Private and religious but not Jewish, 0 points for C. private and non-religious, and 0 points for D. Public. The maximum score received will be ten and the minimum will be zero.

For question 22: Respondents will receive 10 points for A. Yes and 0 points for B. no. The maximum score received will be ten and the minimum will be zero.

The sum total of scores for the sub variable religious affiliation will total to 40 points. The scale for assessing the sum score will be as follows:

40-34 highest religious attendance
 33-28 high religious attendance
 27-22 moderate religious attendance
 21-15 minimal religious attendance
 14-0 no substantial religious attendance

This religious attendance sum score will then be calculated into a proportion out of 40. For example, a high religious attendance score of 30 will be transformed into an overall score of .75 (30/40) for calculating overall religiosity. This proportion will make up 1/3 of the overall religiosity score.

Community Religiosity will cover survey questions 23, 24, & 25. All questions will be weighted equally.

For question 23: Respondents will receive 10 points for A. yes, I was highly involved, 7 points for B. yes, I was moderately involved, 4 points for C. yes, I was somewhat involved, 1 point for D. yes, I was only slightly involved, and 0 points for E. no, I was not involved. The maximum score received will be ten and the minimum will be zero.

For question 24: Respondents will receive 10 points for B. Yes, and I was a member, 5 points for A. yes, but I was not a member, and 0 points for C. no, it did not. The maximum score received will be ten and the minimum will be zero.

For question 25: Respondents will receive 10 points for A. very religious, 7 points for B. moderately religious, 4 points for C. somewhat religious, 1 point for D. minimally religious, and 0 points for E. not religious at all. The maximum score received will be ten and the minimum will be zero.

The sum total of scores for the sub variable religious affiliation will total to 30 points. The scale for assessing the sum score will be as follows:

30-26 highest community religiosity
 25-21 high community religiosity
 20-16 moderate community religiosity
 15-11 minimal community religiosity
 10-0 no substantial community religiosity

This community religiosity sum score will then be calculated into a proportion out of 30. For example, a high religious attendance score of 24 will be transformed into an overall score of .80 (24/30) for calculating overall religiosity. This proportion will make up 1/3 of the overall religiosity score.

OVERALL RELIGIOSITY will take the *proportion* from each of the three variables above and add them together, then divide that number by 3 (the number of variables involved). This new proportion will be the overall religiosity number. This new number will be assessed as follows:

1.0 - .85 highest religiosity
 .84 - .70 high religiosity
 .69 - .55 moderate religiosity
 .54 - .40 minimal religiosity
 .39 - .00 no substantial religiosity

APPENDIX E
ADDITIONAL TABLES OF RESULTS

Table E-1. Age at first date.

| Age (Years) | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Have not been on date | 5 | 3.0 |
| 10.00 | 3 | 1.8 |
| 11.00 | 6 | 3.6 |
| 12.00 | 17 | 10.1 |
| 13.00 | 19 | 11.3 |
| 14.00 | 30 | 17.9 |
| 15.00 | 53 | 31.5 |
| 16.00 | 25 | 14.9 |
| 17.00 | 5 | 3.0 |
| 18.00 | 5 | 3.0 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-2. Age at first serious relationship.

| Age (Years) | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Never been in one | 29 | 17.3 |
| 13.00 | 6 | 3.6 |
| 14.00 | 13 | 7.7 |
| 15.00 | 20 | 11.9 |
| 16.00 | 59 | 35.1 |
| 17.00 | 19 | 11.3 |
| 18.00 | 15 | 8.9 |
| 19.00 | 4 | 2.4 |
| 20.00 | 1 | .6 |
| 21.00 | 2 | 1.2 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-3. Parental discussion of sex.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|---|-----------|---------------|
| Yes both parents discussed sex | 83 | 49.4 |
| Yes, only same sex parent discussed sex | 41 | 24.4 |
| Yes, only opposite sex parent discussed sex | 4 | 2.4 |
| No, neither parent discussed sex | 40 | 23.8 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-4. Frequency of sexual discussion.

| How Often did Parents discuss Sex | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| A one-time thing | 35 | 20.8 |
| More than once | 58 | 34.5 |
| On-going dialogue | 36 | 21.4 |
| Daily | 1 | .6 |
| Does not apply | 38 | 22.6 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-5. Depth of sexual discussion.

| Level of Depth | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Very in-depth | 15 | 8.9 |
| In-depth | 63 | 37.5 |
| Not in-depth | 39 | 23.2 |
| Not in-depth at all | 12 | 7.1 |
| Does not apply | 39 | 23.2 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-6. Number of topics covered in parental sexual discussion.

| Number of Topics Covered | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| 0 topics covered | 40 | 23.8 |
| 1 topic covered | 12 | 7.1 |
| 2 topics covered | 28 | 16.7 |
| 3 topics covered | 27 | 16.1 |
| 4 topics covered | 28 | 16.7 |
| 5 topics covered | 33 | 19.6 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-7. Sexual discussion included abstinence.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| No, did NOT discuss abstinence | 98 | 58.3 |
| Yes, discussed abstinence | 70 | 41.7 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-8. Sexual discussion included safe sex.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| No, did NOT discuss safe sex | 53 | 31.5 |
| Yes, discussed safe sex | 115 | 68.5 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-9. Sexual discussion included physical development.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|--|-----------|---------------|
| No, did NOT discuss physical development | 100 | 59.5 |
| Yes, discussed physical development | 68 | 40.5 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-10. Sexual discussion included emotion-based intimacy.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|--|-----------|---------------|
| No, did NOT discuss emotion-based intimacy | 102 | 60.7 |
| Yes, discussed emotion-based intimacy | 66 | 39.3 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-11. Sexual discussion included consequences.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| No, did NOT discuss consequences | 61 | 36.3 |
| Yes, discussed consequences | 107 | 63.7 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-12. Age at first sexual discussion.

| Age (Years) | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| No discussion occurred | 41 | 24.0 |
| 4.00 | 2 | 1.2 |
| 5.00 | 5 | 3.0 |
| 6.00 | 4 | 2.4 |
| 7.00 | 2 | 1.2 |
| 8.00 | 3 | 1.8 |
| 9.00 | 4 | 2.4 |
| 10.00 | 11 | 6.6 |
| 11.00 | 7 | 4.2 |
| 12.00 | 22 | 13.2 |
| 13.00 | 36 | 21.6 |
| 14.00 | 9 | 5.4 |
| 15.00 | 12 | 7.2 |
| 16.00 | 5 | 3.0 |
| 17.00 | 5 | 3.0 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-13. Respondents' characterization of own family's level of observance at age of reference point.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Very strongly observant | 2 | 1.2 |
| Moderately observant | 24 | 14.3 |
| Somewhat observant | 90 | 53.6 |
| Not very observant | 50 | 29.8 |
| Not observant at all | 2 | 1.2 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-14. Respondents' characterization of affiliation to Judaism at age of reference point.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Very strongly affiliated | 40 | 23.8 |
| Strongly affiliated | 66 | 39.3 |
| Somewhat affiliated | 38 | 22.6 |
| Not very affiliated | 20 | 11.9 |
| Not affiliated at all | 4 | 2.4 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-15. Frequency of religious service attendance at age of reference point.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Weekly or almost weekly | 19 | 11.3 |
| Monthly or almost monthly | 28 | 16.7 |
| A few times per year | 69 | 41.1 |
| Only on High Holidays | 45 | 26.8 |
| Not at all | 7 | 4.2 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-16. Attendance to Hebrew school/Sunday school at age of reference point.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Yes | 44 | 26.2 |
| No, but attended until another age | 110 | 65.5 |
| No, did not attend at all | 14 | 8.3 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Note. The term "another age" refers to an age different to that of the respondent's reference point.

Table E-17. School Type.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Private and Jewish | 12 | 7.1 |
| Private and religious but not Jewish | 7 | 4.2 |
| Public | 14 | 8.3 |
| Total | 135 | 80.4 |
| | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-18. Percentage of respondents that had a Bar/Bat Mitzvah.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Yes, had bar/bat mitzvah | 150 | 89.3 |
| No, did NOT have bar/bat mitzvah | 18 | 10.7 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-19. Level of respondent involvement in Jewish youth group at age of reference point.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Highly involved | 37 | 22.0 |
| Moderately involved | 10 | 6.0 |
| Somewhat involved | 28 | 16.7 |
| Only slightly involved | 36 | 21.4 |
| Not involved at all | 57 | 33.9 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-20. Proportion of respondents who grew up in communities that had Jewish Community Centers and if they were a member.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Yes, but I was not a member | 65 | 38.7 |
| Yes, and I was a member | 84 | 50.0 |
| No, it did not | 19 | 11.3 |
| Total | 168 | 100.0 |

Table E-21. Respondents' assessment of the level of their community's religiosity.

| | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Very religious | 6 | 3.6 |
| Moderately religious | 69 | 41.3 |
| Somewhat religious | 53 | 31.7 |
| Minimally religious | 25 | 15.0 |
| Not religious at all | 14 | 8.4 |
| Total | 167 | 100.0 |

Table E-22. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among ages at first date ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-----|--------|
| Between Groups | 91.24 | 9 | 10.1 | 4.9 | .00(*) |
| Within Groups | 227.5 | 111 | 2.05 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-23. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among ages at first serious relationship ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| Between Groups | 105.18 | 9 | 11.69 | 6.07 | .00(*) |
| Within Groups | 213.63 | 111 | 1.93 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-24. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among ages at first sexual discussion with parent ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| Between Groups | 72.87 | 13 | 5.61 | 2.44 | .01(*) |
| Within Groups | 245.94 | 107 | 2.30 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-25. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among frequencies of sexual discussions ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| Between Groups | 25.27 | 3 | 8.42 | 3.36 | .02(*) |
| Within Groups | 293.54 | 117 | 2.51 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-26. Post-hoc evaluations of significant differences between mean age of sexual debut between frequencies of sexual discussion.

Dependent Variable: reference point

Tukey HSD

| Frequency of Sexual Discussion (I) | Frequency of Sexual Discussion (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Sig. |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|
| One-time | More than once | -1.19 | .39 | .02(*) |
| | On-going dialogue | -.63 | .44 | .50 |
| | Does not apply | -.99 | .43 | .10 |
| More than once | One-time | 1.19 | .39 | .02(*) |
| | On-going dialogue | .57 | .41 | .51 |
| | Does not apply | .20 | .39 | .95 |
| On-going dialogue | One-time | .63 | .44 | .50 |
| | More than once | -.57 | .41 | .51 |
| | Does not apply | -.36 | .44 | .84 |
| Does not apply | One-time | .99 | .43 | .10 |
| | More than once | -.20 | .39 | .95 |
| | On-going dialogue | .36 | .44 | .84 |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-27. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of depth of sexual discussions ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| Between Groups | 31.54 | 4 | 7.89 | 3.18 | .02(*) |
| Within Groups | 287.27 | 116 | 2.48 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-28. Post-hoc evaluations of significant differences between mean age of sexual debut between levels of depth of sexual discussion.

Dependent Variable: reference point

Tukey HSD

| Depth of sexual discussion (I) | Depth of sexual discussion (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Sig. |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|
| Very in-depth | In-depth | -1.48 | .53 | .05(*) |
| | Not in-depth | -1.04 | .56 | .35 |
| | Not in-depth at all | -.1000 | .69 | 1.00 |
| | Does not apply | -1.36 | .56 | .12 |
| In-depth | Very in-depth | 1.48 | .53 | .05(*) |
| | Not in-depth | .44 | .38 | .77 |
| | Not in-depth at all | 1.38 | .55 | .10 |
| Not in-depth | Does not apply | .12 | .38 | 1.0 |
| | Very in-depth | 1.04 | .56 | .35 |
| | In-depth | -.44 | .38 | .77 |
| | Not in-depth at all | .94 | .58 | .49 |
| Not in-depth at all | Does not apply | -.32 | .42 | .94 |
| | Very in-depth | .10 | .69 | 1.00 |
| | In-depth | -1.38 | .55 | .10 |
| | Not in-depth | -.94 | .58 | .49 |
| Does not apply | Does not apply | -1.26 | .58 | .20 |
| | Very in-depth | 1.36 | .56 | .12 |
| | In-depth | -.12 | .38 | 1.0 |
| | Not in-depth | .32 | .42 | .94 |
| | Not in-depth at all | 1.26 | .58 | .20 |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-29. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among classifications of Judaism ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-------|--------|
| Between Groups | 66.10 | 3 | 22.03 | 10.20 | .00(*) |
| Within Groups | 252.71 | 117 | 2.16 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-30. Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationship between mean age of sexual debut among classifications of Judaism.

Dependent Variable: reference point

Tukey HSD

| Type of Judaism (I) | Type of Judaism (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Sig. |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|
| Orthodox | Conservative | -3.29 | 1.06 | .01(*) |
| | Reform | -1.98 | 1.06 | .25 |
| | Other | -1.50 | 1.47 | .74 |
| Conservative | Orthodox | 3.29 | 1.06 | .01(*) |
| | Reform | 1.30 | .27 | .00(*) |
| | Other | 1.79 | 1.06 | .33 |
| Reform | Orthodox | 1.98 | 1.06 | .25 |
| | Conservative | -1.30 | .27 | .00(*) |
| | Other | .48 | 1.06 | .97 |
| Other | Orthodox | 1.50 | 1.47 | .74 |
| | Conservative | -1.79 | 1.06 | .33 |
| | Reform | -.48 | 1.06 | .97 |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-31. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of religious affiliation ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-------|--------|
| Between Groups | 89.44 | 4 | 22.36 | 11.31 | .00(*) |
| Within Groups | 229.37 | 116 | 1.98 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-32. Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationship between mean age of sexual debut among levels of religious affiliation.

Dependent Variable: reference point

Tukey HSD

| Affiliation to Judaism (I) | Affiliation to Judaism (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Sig. |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|
| Very strongly affiliated | Moderately affiliated | -1.22 | .36 | .01(*) |
| | Somewhat affiliated | -.73 | .39 | .34 |
| | Not very affiliated | 1.26 | .45 | .05(*) |
| | Not affiliated at all | -1.41 | .87 | .48 |
| Moderately affiliated | Very strongly affiliated | 1.22 | .36 | .01(*) |
| | Somewhat affiliated | .49 | .33 | .57 |
| | Not very affiliated | 2.48 | .39 | .00(*) |
| | Not affiliated at all | -.19 | .84 | 1.0 |
| Somewhat affiliated | Very strongly affiliated | .73 | .39 | .34 |
| | Moderately affiliated | -.49 | .33 | .57 |
| | Not very affiliated | 1.99 | .42 | .00(*) |
| | Not affiliated at all | -.67 | .85 | .93 |
| Not very affiliated | Very strongly affiliated | -1.26 | .45 | .05(*) |
| | Moderately affiliated | -2.48 | .39 | .00(*) |
| | Somewhat affiliated | -1.99 | .42 | .00(*) |
| | Not affiliated at all | -2.67 | .88 | .02(*) |
| Not affiliated at all | Very strongly affiliated | 1.4 | .87 | .48 |
| | Moderately affiliated | .19 | .84 | 1.0 |
| | Somewhat affiliated | .68 | .85 | .93 |
| | Not very affiliated | 2.67 | .88 | .02(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-33. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of religious service attendance ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| Between Groups | 64.59 | 4 | 16.15 | 7.37 | .00(*) |
| Within Groups | 254.22 | 116 | 2.19 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-34. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of Hebrew school attendance ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| Between Groups | 34.90 | 2 | 17.4549 | 7.25 | .00(*) |
| Within Groups | 283.91 | 118 | 2.41 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-35. Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationships between mean age of sexual debut among levels of religious service.

Dependent Variable: reference point

Tukey HSD

| Religious Service Attendance (I) | Religious Service Attendance (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Sig. |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|
| Weekly or almost weekly | Monthly or almost monthly | -.13 | .53 | 1.0 |
| | A few times per year | -.94 | .460 | .25 |
| | Only on high holidays | .71 | .48 | .57 |
| | Not at all | 1.17 | .85 | .64 |
| Monthly or almost monthly | Weekly or almost weekly | .13 | .53 | 1.0 |
| | A few times per year | -.81 | .40 | .26 |
| | Only on high holidays | .85 | .42 | .27 |
| | Not at all | 1.3 | .81 | .50 |
| A few times per year | Weekly or almost weekly | .94 | .460 | .25 |
| | Monthly or almost monthly | .81 | .40 | .26 |
| | Only on high holidays | 1.66 | .33 | .00(*) |
| | Not at all | 2.11 | .77 | .05 |
| Only on high holidays | Weekly or almost weekly | -.72 | .48 | .57 |
| | Monthly or almost monthly | -.85 | .42 | .27 |
| | A few times per year | -1.66 | .33 | .00(*) |
| | Not at all | .46 | .78 | .98 |
| Not at all | Weekly or almost weekly | -1.17 | .85 | .64 |
| | Monthly or almost monthly | -1.30 | .81 | .50 |
| | A few times per year | -2.11 | .77 | .05 |
| | Only on high holidays | -.46 | .78 | .98 |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-36 Post-hoc evaluations of significant relationships between mean age of sexual debut among levels of Hebrew school attendance.

Dependent Variable: reference point

Tukey HSD

| Hebrew School Attendance (I) | Hebrew School Attendance (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Sig. |
|---|---|-----------------------|----------------|--------|
| Attended at age of reference point | Did NOT attend at reference point but did up to a certain age | -1.12 | .32 | .00(*) |
| | Did NOT attend at all | -.05 | .51 | 1.0 |
| Did NOT attend at reference point but did up to a certain age | Attended at age of reference point | 1.12 | .32 | .00(*) |
| | Did NOT attend at all | 1.07 | .47 | .06 |
| Did NOT attend at all | Attended at age of reference point | .05 | .51 | 1. |
| | Did NOT attend at ref. point but did up to a certain age | -1.07 | .47 | .06 |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-37. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among primary school types ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| Between Groups | 24.70 | 3 | 8.23 | 3.28 | .02(*) |
| Within Groups | 294.11 | 117 | 2.51 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-38. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of involvement in Jewish youth groups ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| Between Groups | 46.20 | 4 | 11.55 | 4.91 | .00(*) |
| Within Groups | 272.62 | 116 | 2.35 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-39. Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationships between ages of sexual debut among levels of involvement in Jewish youth groups.

Dependent Variable: reference point

Tukey HSD

| Involvement in Jewish Youth Group (I) | Involvement in Jewish Youth Group (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Sig. |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|
| Highly involved | Moderately involved | -.66 | .678 | .87 |
| | Somewhat involved | .39 | .49 | .93 |
| | Slightly involved | -.98 | .45 | .19 |
| | Not involved at all | .49 | .42 | .77 |
| Moderately involved | Highly involved | .66 | .68 | .87 |
| | Somewhat involved | 1.05 | .67 | .52 |
| | Slightly involved | -.32 | .64 | .99 |
| | Not involved at all | 1.16 | .62 | .35 |
| Somewhat involved | Highly involved | -.39 | .49 | .93 |
| | Moderately involved | -1.05 | .67 | .52 |
| | Slightly involved | -1.37 | .43 | .02(*) |
| | Not involved at all | .11 | .41 | 1.0 |
| Slightly involved | Highly involved | .98 | .45 | .19 |
| | Moderately involved | .32 | .64 | .99 |
| | Somewhat involved | 1.37 | .43 | .02(*) |
| | Not involved at all | 1.47 | .36 | .00(*) |
| Not involved at all | Highly involved | -.49 | .42 | .77 |
| | Moderately involved | -1.16 | .62 | .35 |
| | Somewhat involved | -.19 | .41 | 1.0 |
| | Slightly involved | -1.47 | .36 | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-40. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among Jewish Community Center members and non-members ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|------|--------|
| Between Groups | 35.50 | 2 | 17.75 | 7.34 | .00(*) |
| Within Groups | 283.31 | 118 | 2.40 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-41. Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationships between ages of sexual debut among Jewish Community Center members and non-members.

Dependent Variable: reference point

Tukey HSD

| Community has J.C.C. (I) | Community has J.C.C. (J) | Mean Diff. (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Yes, but I was NOT a member | Yes, and I was a member | -1.11 | .30 | .00(*) |
| | No, it did not | -.12 | .49 | .97 |
| Yes, and I was a member | Yes, but I was NOT a member | 1.11 | .30 | .00(*) |
| | No, it did not | .99 | .47 | .09 |
| No, it did not | Yes, but I was NOT a member | .12 | .49 | .97 |
| | Yes, and I was a member | -.99 | .47 | .09 |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-42. Comparison of mean age of sexual debut among levels of community religiosity ANOVA.

| | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups | 57.13 | 4 | 14.28 | 6.33 | .00 |
| Within Groups | 261.68 | 116 | 2.26 | | |
| Total | 318.81 | 120 | | | |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-43. Post-hoc evaluation of significant relationships between ages of sexual debut among levels of community religiosity.

Dependent Variable: reference point

Tukey HSD

| Religiosity of Jewish Community (I) | Religiosity of Jewish Community (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Sig. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|
| Very religious | Moderately religious | -2.38 | .89 | .07 |
| | Somewhat religious | -1.88 | .91 | .24 |
| | Minimally religious | -.81 | .93 | .91 |
| | Not religious at all | -.92 | .97 | .88 |
| Moderately religious | Very religious | 2.38 | .89 | .07 |
| | Somewhat religious | .50 | .33 | .57 |
| | Minimally religious | 1.57 | .39 | .00(*) |
| | Not religious at all | 1.46 | .48 | .02(*) |
| Somewhat religious | Very religious | 1.88 | .91 | .24 |
| | Moderately religious | -.50 | .33 | .57 |
| | Minimally religious | 1.07 | .42 | .09 |
| | Not religious at all | .96 | .51 | .32 |
| Minimally religious | Very religious | .81 | .93 | .91 |
| | Moderately religious | -1.57 | .39 | .00(*) |
| | Somewhat religious | -1.07 | .42 | .09 |
| | Not religious at all | -.11 | .54 | 1.00 |
| Not religious at all | Very religious | .92 | .97 | .88 |
| | Moderately religious | -1.46 | .48 | .02(*) |
| | Somewhat religious | -.96 | .51 | .32 |
| | Minimally religious | .11 | .54 | 1.00 |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-44. Frequency of restrictions on age at first date Chi-Square.

| | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| | Rules at First Date |
| Chi-Square | 35.77 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 1 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-45. Frequency of ages at first serious relationship Chi-Square.

| | Age at First Serious Relationship |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Chi-Square | 71.64 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 7 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-46. Frequency of if parents discussed sex Chi-Square.

| | Parents Discuss Sex |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| Chi-Square | 13.51 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 3 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-47. Frequency of frequency of sexual discussion Chi-Square.

| | Frequency of Sexual Discussion |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| Chi-Square | 13.11 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 4 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .01(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-48. Frequency of levels of depth of sexual discussion Chi-Square.

| | Depth of Sexual Discussion |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Chi-Square | 19.28 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 4 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-49. Frequency of ages at first sexual discussion Chi-Square.

| | Age at First Discussion |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Chi-Square | 36.17 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 14 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-50. Mean of number topics covered in sexual discussion.

| | N | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|-----------------|----|--------|-----------|
| Topics Included | 47 | 2.8085 | 1.95201 |

Table E-51. Frequency of parents' parenting style Chi-Square.

| | Parenting Style |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Chi-Square | 31.21 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 3 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-52. Frequency of levels influence believed that parents' parenting style had on decision not to have sex Chi-Square.

| | Influence of Parenting Style |
|--------------------|------------------------------|
| Chi-Square(a) | 12.68 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 4 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .01(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-53. Frequency of classifications of Judaism Chi-Square.

| | Type of Judaism |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Chi-Square(a) | 32.75 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 3 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-54. Frequency of levels of affiliation to Judaism Chi-Square.

| | Affiliation to Judaism |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Chi-Square(a) | 31.62 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 4 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-55. Frequency of frequency of religious service attendance Chi-Square.

| | Religious Service Attendance |
|--------------------|------------------------------|
| Chi-Square(a) | 25.38 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 5 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-56. Frequency of frequency of Hebrew school attendance Chi-Square.

| | Hebrew School Attendance |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Chi-Square(a) | 42.17 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 2 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-57. Frequency of primary school type Chi-Square.

| | Primary School Type |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| Chi-Square(a) | 78.87 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 3 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-58. Frequency of Bar/Bat Mitzvah Chi-Square.

| | Bar/Bat mitzvah |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Chi-Square(a) | 29.13 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 1 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-59. Frequency of levels of involvement in a Jewish youth group Chi-Square.

| | Involvement in Jewish Youth Group |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Chi-Square(a) | 17.15 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 4 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-60. Frequency of respondents' communities having Jewish Community Centers and if they were members Chi-Square.

| | Community has J.C.C. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Chi-Square(a) | 8.98 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 2 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .01(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

Table E-61. Frequency of levels of community religiosity Chi-Square.

| | Religiosity of Jewish Community |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| Chi-Square(a) | 32.04 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 4 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .00(*) |

Note. $p < .05 = *$.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abrams, J. (1990). *The parent's guide to teenage sex and pregnancy* [Review of Book]. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 105 (18), p2222.
- Allport, G. W., & Rosa, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 423-443.
- Ansuini, C.G., & Fidler-Woite, J. (1996). The source, accuracy, and impact of initial sexuality information on lifetime wellness. *Adolescence*, 31 (122), p283.
- Arnett, J. (2002). Are college students adults? Their conceptions of the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Adult Development*, 1, 213-224.
- Baldwin, S. & Baranoski, M.V. (1990). Family interactions and sex education in the home. *Adolescence*, 25 (99), p573.
- Barber, B. (1992). Family, personality, and adolescent problem behavior. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 69-79.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs* 4 (Whole no. 1).
- Baumrind, D. (1973). The development of instrumental competence through socialization. In A. Pick (Ed.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology* (Vol. 7). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. *Youth and Society*, 9, 239-276.
- Barumind, D. (1996). The discipline controversy revisited. *Family Relations*, 45 4, 405.
- Bearman, P., & Bruckner, H. (2001). Promising the future: Virginity pledges and first intercourse. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106 (4), 859.
- Benson, P., Donahue, M., & Erickson, J. (1989). Adolescence and religion: Review of the literature from 1970-1986. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 1, 153-181.
- Berk, L. (2000). *Child development: (5th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Brewster, K., Billy, J., & Grady, W. (1993). Social context and adolescent behavior: The impact of community on the transition to sexual activity. *Social Forces*, 71, 713-740.
- Calhoun, E., & Friel, L. (2001). Adolescent sexuality: Disentangling the effects of family structure and family context. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 63 (3), 669.
- Cochran, J.K., & Beeghley, L. (1991). The influence of religion on attitudes toward Nonmarital sexuality: A preliminary assessment of reference group theory. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30 (1), 45.
- Center for Disease Control. (2002). Web site: www.cdc.gov. Retrieved: January, 2004.
- Chase-Lansdale, P.L., & Cherlin, A.J. (1995). The long-term effects of parental divorce on the mental health of young adults: A developmental perspective. *Child Development*, 66 (6), 1614.
- Coie, J., & Watt, N. F. (1993). The science of prevention: A conceptual framework and some directions for a national research. *American Psychologist*, 48 (10), 1013.
- Day, R.D. (1992). The transition to first intercourse among racially and culturally diverse youth. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 749-762.
- Di Mauro, D. (1995). Executive summary. Sexuality research in the United States: An assessment of the social and behavioral sciences. Web site: <http://www.indiana.edu/~kinsey/SSRC/sexrealn.html>. Retrieved: November, 2002.
- Donahue, M. (1994). *Positive youth development in religiously-based youth programs*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence, San Diego.
- Donovan, J., & Jessor, R. (1985). Structure of problem behavior in adolescence and young adulthood. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 890-904.
- Dornbusch, S., Ritter, P., Liederman, P., Roberts, D., & Fraleigh, M. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244-1257.
- East, P., Felice, M., & Morgan, M. (1993). Sisters' and girlfriends' sexual and childbearing behavior: Effects on early adolescent girls' sexual outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 953-963.
- East, P.L., & Rook, K.S. (1992). Compensatory patterns of support among children's peer relationships: A test using school friends, non-school friends, and siblings. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 168-172.
- Elkins, L.E., & Peterson, C. (1993). Gender differences in best friendships. *Sex Roles*, 29 (7/8), 497.

- Erikson, E.H. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Feldman, S., Rosenthal, D., Brown, N., & Canning, R. (1995). Predicting sexual experience in adolescent boys from peer rejection and acceptance during childhood. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 5*, 387-411.
- Flewelling, R., & Baumann, K. (1990). Family structure as a predictor of initial substance use and sexual intercourse in early adolescence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52*, 171-181.
- The Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles. (2003). Web site: www.fhp.state.fl.us. Retrieved: October, 2003.
- Fores, E., Tschann, J.M., & Marin, B.V. (2002). Latina adolescents: Predicting intentions to have sex. *Adolescence, 37* (148), 659.
- Forste, R.T., & Heaton, T.B. (1988). Initiation of sexual activity among female adolescents. *Youth & Society, 19* (3), 250.
- Fowler, J. (1981). *Stages of faith*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Freeman, E.W., Rickels, K., Huggins, G.R., Mudd, E.H., Garcia, C.R., & Dickens, H.O. (1980). Adolescent contraceptive use: Comparisons of male and female attitudes and information. *American Journal of Public Health, 70* (8), 790.
- Fulgini, A., & Eccles, J. (1993). Perceived parent-child relationships and early adolescents' orientation toward peers. *Developmental Psychology, 29*, 622-632.
- Furstenberg, F.F., Jr. (1976). *Unplanned parenthood: The social consequences of teenage childbearing*. New York: Free Press.
- Furstenberg, F.F., Jr., Morgan, F.P., Moore, K.A., & Peterson, J.L. (1987). Race differences in the timing of adolescent intercourse. *American Sociological Review, 52*, 511-518.
- Gillmore, M.R., Archibald, M.E., Morrison, D.M., Wilsdon, A., Wells, E.A., Hoppe, M.J., Nahom, D., & Murowchick, E. (2002). Teen sexual behavior: Applicability of the theory of reasoned action. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 64* (4), 885.
- Hartup, W.W., & Overhauser, S. (1991). Friendships. In R.M. Lerner, A.C. Petersen, & J. Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of adolescence*, (pp.378-384). New York: Garland.
- Haurin, R.J., & Mott, F.L. (1990). Adolescent activity in the family context: The impact of older siblings. *Demography, 27*, 537-557.
- Heaton, T.B., & Jacobson, C.K. (1994). Race differences in changing family demographics in the 1980s. *Journal of Family Issues, 15* (2), 290.

- Hofferth, S.L. (1987). Social and economic consequences of teenage childbearing. In S. Hofferth & C. Hayes (Eds.), *Risking the future: Adolescent sexuality, pregnancy, and childbearing*, (Vol. 2, pp.123-144). Washington DC: National Academy Press.
- Hofferth, S.L., Kahn, J.R., & Baldwin, W. (1987). Premarital sexual activity among U.S. teenage women over the past three decades. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 19, 46-53.
- Hofferth, S.L., & Moore, K.A. (1979). Early childbearing and later economic well-being. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 224-234.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1970). Moral Development. In P. Mussen (ed.), *Carmichael's handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 2, pp.313-319). New York: Wiley.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1975). Moral Internalization, Parental Power, and the Nature of the Parent-Child Interaction. *Developmental Psychology*, 11, 118-239.
- Hogan, D.P., & Kitagawa, E.M. (1985). The impact of social status, family structure, and neighborhood on the fertility of black adolescents. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90, 825-855.
- Hollingshead, A. (1975). *Elmtown's youth and Elmtown revisited*. New York: Wiley. (Original work published 1949)
- Inazu, J.K., & Fox, G.L. (1980). Maternal influence on the sexual behavior of teenage daughters. *Journal of Family Issues*, 1, 81-102.
- Jessor, R. (1992). Successful adolescent development among youth in high-risk settings. *American Psychologist*, 48 (2), 117.
- Jessor, R., Costa, F., Jessor, L., & Donovan, J. (1983). Time of first intercourse: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 608-626.
- The Jewish Community Center Association. (2003) Web site: www.jcca.org. Retrieved: April, 2003.
- Kahn, S., Zimmerman, G., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Getzels, J. (1985). Relations between identity in young adulthood and intimacy in midlife. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 1316-1322.
- Kantner, J.F., & Zelnik, M. (1978). Teen pregnancies rising. *Science News*, 113 (6), 87.
- Kinnaird, K.L., & Girrad, M. (1986). Premarital sexual behavior and attitudes toward marriage and divorce among young women as a function of their mothers' marital status. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 757-765.
- Ku, L., Sonenstein, F.L., & Pleck, J. (1993). Neighborhood, family, and work: Influences on the premarital behaviors of adolescent males. *Social Forces*, 72, 479-503.

- Kurdeck, L., & Fine, M. (1994). Family acceptance and family control as predictors of adjustment in young adolescents: Linear, curvilinear, or interactive effects. *Child Development, 65*, 1137-1146.
- Lamborn, S., Mounts, N., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development, 62*, 1049-1065.
- Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leigh, B.C. (1989). Reasons for having and avoiding sex: Gender, sexual orientation and relationship to sexual behavior. *Journal of Sex Research, 26*, 199-209.
- Levin M.L., Xu, X., & Bartkowski, J.P. (2002). Seasonality of sexual debut. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 64* (4), 871.
- Litchfield, A., Thomas D., & Li B. (1997). Dimensions of religiosity as mediators of the relations between parenting and adolescent deviant behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 12*, 199-226.
- Luster, T., & Small, S. (1994). Factors associated with sexual risk-taking behaviors among adolescents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56*, 622-632.
- Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E.M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Socialization, personality, and social development* (Vol.4, pp.12-25), New York, Wiley.
- Meschke, L.L., Bartholomae, S., & Zentall, S. R. (2000). Adolescent sexuality and parent-adolescent processes: Promoting healthy teen choices. *Family Relations, 49* (2), 143.
- Meschke, L.L., & Silbereisen, R.K. (1997). The influence of puberty, family processes, and leisure activities on the timing of first sexual experience in adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 20* (4), 403.
- Miller, B., & Bingham, R. (1989). Family configuration in relation to the sexual behavior of female adolescents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*, 499-506.
- Miller, B.C., Higginson, R., McCoy, K., & Olson, T.D. (1987). Family configuration and adolescent sexual attitudes and behavior. *Population and Environment, 9*, 111-123.
- Miller, B.C., McCoy, J.K., Olson, T.D., & Wallace, C.M. (1986). Parental discipline and control attempts in relation to adolescent sexual attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48*, 503-512.

- Miller, B., & Moore, K. (1990). Adolescent sexual behavior, pregnancy, and parenting: Research through the 1980s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 499-506.
- Miller, B.C., & Olson, T.D. (1988). Sexual attitudes and behavior of high school students in relation to background and contextual factors. *Journal of Sex Research*, 24, 194-200.
- Miller, K.S., Forehand, R., & Kotchick, B.A. (1999). Adolescent sexual behavior in two ethnic minority samples: The role of family variables. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 61 (1), 85.
- Miller, S.A. (1998). *Developmental Research Methods* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Moore, M. (1992). The family as portrayed on prime-time television, 1947-1990: Structure and characteristics. *Sex Roles*, 26, 41-62.
- Moore, K.A., & Burt, M. R. (1982). *Private crisis, public cost*. Washington DC: Urban Institute.
- Moore, M.R., & Chase-Lansdale, L. (2001). Sexual intercourse and pregnancy among African American girls in high-poverty neighborhoods: The role of family and perceived community environment. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 63 (4), 1146.
- Moore, K.A., Peterson, J.L., & Furstenberg, F.F. (1984). *Starting early: The antecedents of early premarital intercourse*. Paper presented at the 1984 annual meetings of the Population Association of America.
- Moore, K.A., Peterson, J.L., & Furstenberg, F.F. (1986). Parental attitudes and the occurrence of early sexual activity. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 777-782.
- Mott, F.L. (1984). *The patterning of female teenage sexual behaviors and attitudes*. Paper presented at the 1983 annual meeting of the American Public Health Association.
- Noell, J., & Biglan, A.W. (1995). Does sexual coercion play a role in the high-risk sexual behavior of adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 18 (6), 549.
- Netting, N.S. (1992). Sexuality in youth culture: Identity and change. *Adolescence*, 27 (108), 961.
- Newcomer, S. & Udry, J. (1985). Oral sex in an adolescent population. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 14, 41-56.
- Newcomer, S., & Udry, J. (1987). Parental marital status effects on adolescent sexual behavior. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 235-240.

- Peterson, J.L., & Zill, N. (1986). Marital disruption, parent-child relationships, and behavior problems in children. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 48 (2), 295.
- Pick, S., & Palos, P.A. (1995). Impact of the family on the sex lives of adolescents. *Adolescence*, 30 (119), 667.
- Pulkkinen, L. (1982). Self-control and continuity from childhood to adolescence. In P. Baltes & O. Brim (Eds.), *Life-span development and behavior* (Vol. 4, pp.7-16). New York: Academic Press.
- Reed, L.A., & Meyers, L.S. (1991). A structural analysis of religious orientation and its relation to sexual attitudes. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 51 (4), 943.
- Reiss, I.L. (1967). *The social context of premarital sexual permissiveness*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Resnick, M., Bearman, P., Blum, R., Bauman, K., Harris, K., Jones, J., Tabor, J., Beuhring, T., Sieving, R., Shew, M., Ireland, M., Bearinger, L., & Udry, J. (1997). Protecting adolescents from harm: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 278, 823-832.
- Rodgers, J., & Rowe, D. (1993). Social contagion and adolescent sexual behavior: A developmental EMOSA model. *Psychological Review*, 100, 479-510.
- Rogers, K.B. (1999). Parenting processes related to sexual risk-taking behaviors of adolescent males and females. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 99-109.
- Rosenthal, D.A., & Smith, A. (1995). Adolescents' perceptions of their risk environment. *Journal of Adolescence*, 18 (2), 229.
- Rosenthal, D.A., & Smith, A. (1997). Adolescent sexual timetables. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 26 (5), 619.
- Rosenthal, D.A., & Smith, A. (1998). Revisiting sexual styles: Patterns of adolescents' self-perceptions. *Psychological Reports*, 83 (1), 65.
- Rosenthal, D.A., & Feldman, S. (1999). Personal and social factors influencing age at First sexual intercourse. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 28 (4), 319.
- Rotosky, S.S. Regnerus, M.D., Comer, W., & Laurie, M. (2003). Coital debut: The role of religiosity and sex attitudes in the Add Health Survey. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40 (4), 358.
- Rostosky, S.S., & Galliher, R.V. (2001). Sexual behaviors and relationship qualities in late adolescent couples. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23 (5), 583.

- Rowe, D., Rodgers, J., Meseck-Bushey, S., & St. John, C. (1989). Sexual behavior and nonsexual deviance: A sibling study of their relationship. *Developmental Psychology, 25*, 61-69.
- Santelli, J., Robin, L., Brener, N., & Lowry, R. (2001). Timing of alcohol and other drug use and sexual risk behaviors among unmarried adolescents and young adults. *Family Planning Perspectives, 33* (5), 200.
- Shucksmith, J., Hendry, L., & Glendinning, A. (1995). Models of parenting: Implications for adolescent well-being within different types of family contexts. *Journal of Adolescence, 18*, 253-270.
- Simons, R.L., Johnson, C., & Conger, R.D. (1996). Mother's parenting. In R.L. Simons & Associates (Eds.), *Understanding differences between divorced and intact families* (pp.45-63). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Steinberg, L. (1999). *Adolescence* (5th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill College.
- Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S., Darling, N., Mounts, N., & Dornbusch, S. (1994). Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development, 65*, 754-770.
- Strobino, D.M., Grason, H., & Minkovitz, C. (1987). Charting a course for the future of women's health in the United States. *Social Science & Medicine, 54* (5), 839.
- Studer, M., & Thornton, A. (1987). Adolescent religiosity and contraceptive usage. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 49* (1), 117.
- Thomson, E., Hanson, T., & McLanahan, S. (1994). Family structure and child well-being: Economic resources vs. parental behaviors. *Social Forces, 73*, 221-242.
- Thornton, A.D., & Camburn, D. (1987). The influence of the family on premarital sexual attitudes and behavior. *Demography, 24*, 323-340.
- Thornton, A., & Camburn, D. (1989). Religious participation and adolescent sexual behavior and attitudes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*, 641-653.
- Treboux, D., & Busch-Rossnagel, N. (1990). Social network influences on adolescent sexual attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 5*, 175-189.
- Tucker, C., Barber, B., & Eccles, J. (1997). Advice about life plans and personal problems in late adolescent sibling relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 26*, 63-76.
- Udry, J., & Billy, J. (1987). Initiation of coitus in early adolescence. *American Sociological Review, 52*, 841-855.

- University of California at Los Angeles Academic Technology Services: SPSS FAQ. (2003). SPSS FAQ: What does Cronbach's alpha mean? Retrieved January, 2004, from <http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/spss/faq/alpha.html>.
- Upchurch, D.M., Aneshensel, C.S., Sucoff, C. A., & Levy-Storms, L. (1999). Neighborhood and family contexts of adolescent sexual activity. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 61 (4), 920.
- Upchurch, D.M., Aneshensel, C.S., Mudgal, J., & McNeely, C.S. et al. (2001). Sociocultural contexts of time to first sex among Hispanic adolescents. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 63 (4), 1158.
- Weiss, L., & Schwartz, J. (1996). The relationship between parenting types and older adolescents' personality, academic achievement, adjustment, and substance use. *Child Development*, 67, 2101-2114.
- Whitbeck, L., Conger, R., & Kao, M. (1993). Minor deviant behaviors and adolescent sexuality. *Youth and Society*, 25, 24-37.
- Whitbeck, L.B., Hoyt, D.R., & Conger, R.D. (1999). Perceived Parental Acceptance as a moderator of religious transmission among adolescent boys and girls. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 61 (2), 362.
- Whitbeck, L.B., & Simons, R.L. (1994). The effects of divorced mothers' dating behaviors and sexual attitudes on the sexual attitudes of their adolescents. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 56 (3), 615.
- Whitbeck, L.B., Yoder, K.A., Hoyt, D.R., & Conger, R.D. (1999) Early adolescent sexual activity: A developmental study. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 61 (4), 934.
- Woodroof, T.J. (1985). Premarital sexual behavior and religious adolescents. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 24 (4), 343.
- Wright, L., Frost, C., & Wisecarver, S. (1993). Church attendance, meaningfulness of religion, and depressive symptomatology among adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 22, 559-568.
- Wu, L., & Martinson, B.C. (1993). Family structure and the risk of a premarital birth. *American Sociological Review*, 58 (2), 210.
- Zaleski, E.H., & Schiaffino, K.M. (2000). Religiosity and sexual risk-taking behavior during the transition to college. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23 (2), 223.
- Zelnick, M., Kantner, J., & Ford, K. (1981). *Sex and pregnancy in adolescence*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Robert Benjamin Etzkin was born in Mansfield, Ohio (about 80 miles Southwest of Cleveland), and his family almost immediately moved south to Orlando, Florida. From the age of two months old all the way through his seven years of college, every year but one was spent in the state of Florida. Although the terrain through his schooling seemed similar, he attended a very diverse set of schools. He attended the Jewish Community Center (J.C.C.) of Greater Orlando's preschool which prepared him well for elementary school and provided him the beginnings of many lifelong friendships. Robby, as he was now called, breezed through elementary school at Spring Lake (Altamonte Springs, FL) and Wekiva (Longwood, FL) picking up first place in a county-wide math contest in 3rd grade. Throughout his elementary years, he also attended Sunday School and began attending Hebrew School in 3rd grade, both at his synagogue, Congregation Ohev Shalom. In addition, he still spent many days after school at the J.C.C. allowing him to continue those friendships from preschool, and keeping him out of harm's way

Middle school, the beginning of Robby's own adolescence, saw him continue to excel academically, while taking on many additional tasks. He again received county-wide honors, this time for his skills in percussion, and in addition, continued his attendance at Hebrew School, which resulted in a successful Bar Mitzvah in 1992. Robby's middle school experience ended at McLean Middle School in Fort Worth, Texas as his family had planned a permanent relocation. However, midway through his 8th grade year, his parents had made plans to divorce. Robby finished the school year in

Texas with great grades and then made plans to move back to Orlando to rejoin his lifelong friends.

High school provided many new experiences for Robby and many opportunities to expand his skills and talents. He continued to be honored for his skills in percussion, as he, and his best friend, Benjamin Kaplan, were named captains of the marching band's drum line at their high school during their junior and senior years. Robby's rise to the top was not immediate however. He entered Lake Brantley High School (Altamonte Springs, Florida) like every other freshman did, but for Robby he faced an additional challenge. He was the fourth Etzkin to attend Lake Brantley, and for the first time since elementary school, Robby was at the same school as his older brother and two older cousins. While the benefits of having older family members at school with him were great, the challenges formed by teachers' expectations were somewhat overwhelming. Robby, struggled academically (by his standards) his ninth grade year, but recovered throughout the rest of his high school years to graduate with a 3.5 grade point average. However, the most unique thing about his high school career did not occur at Lake Brantley High, but rather at the Alexander Muss High School in Israel. Robby was awarded a scholarship, based on an essay and academic achievement, and finished his junior year of high school in Hod Ha'Sharon, Israel. He participated in an American program that brings Jewish high school students from all over the United States together in Israel for a two-month study program. Abroad, he learned Israeli and Jewish history by actually traveling to the locations where history was made. This two month program challenged Robby by forcing him to become independent and to grow as a person far away from home. Robby

did all of this while still completing his course work which he brought with him from the United States including preparing for and taking three Advanced Placement Exams.

Robby's identity had been formed. He was now aware of his strengths and weaknesses and was ready to take on college. After graduating from Lake Brantley High School in 1997, he was awarded the Florida Academic Scholarship (currently named Bright Futures) and chose to follow in his brother's footsteps and attend the University of Florida. Robby's adjustment to U.F. was quick and painless, with his brother, older cousin and friends he had known since preschool all within a few miles of him. One week before his first day of college, he joined the University of Florida's marching band's drum line and was able to play alongside his brother, his best friend, Benjamin Kaplan, and his brother's best friend (and Ben's brother), Jo Kaplan. The two sets of brothers had grown up together since Robby was in 2nd grade. Through the drum line, Robby made many new friends, and was guided through many new college experiences. By his sophomore year, Robby was ready to lead. He returned to the drum line for a second year and was named president of the drum line in just his sophomore year. He also interviewed for and received a position as a resident advisor in a dormitory at U.F., a position he held for three years in two different dorms (Hume Hall & Broward Hall), along with completing four years in the marching band. As his four years flew by, Robby was able to touch many people's lives, but his proudest achievement was yet to come. In March of 2001, Robby not only found out that he was graduating from the University of Florida with honors, but that he had been accepted into U.F.'s graduate school. After graduating with a Bachelor of Science degree in human resource development, Robby began his graduate student career in the department of Family, Youth, and Community

Sciences and will graduate with his Master's degree in May of 2004. Robby's graduate school experience was not to be outdone by his undergraduate years, however. He moved off-campus for the first time and succeeded in trying out and becoming one of the University of Florida's mascots. His academics and his new time commitment to Gators athletics dominated his graduate school years and provided many invaluable memories and many more priceless pictures. After his graduation, Robby will be working as the Children's Director and Assistant Camp Director at the Jewish Community Center of Richmond, Virginia, bringing him back to the same institution where he started. At 25 years old, he is now ready to give back to a place that gave so much to him.