

PADGETT, JOSEPH E., M.A. *The Date and Hookup Social Scripts: Patterns of Sexual Partnering among College Students in the United States.* (2012)  
Directed by Dr. Arielle Kuperberg. 280 pp.

Using the Online College Social Life Survey (OCSLS, N=24,131 students 22 institutions), I conduct empirical analyses in an effort to differentiate and understand the date and hookup social scripts. These scripts address sexual partnering, and existing literature portrays the hookup script as surpassing the date script as preferred method of sexual partnering among college students. To what extent do these social scripts differ? I implement extensive difference testing, develop logistic as well as ordinal response regression models, and utilize multilevel modeling techniques to examine selection into, levels of risk during, and the outcomes of college students' sexual encounters. I address gender, social ties, personal traits, and structural features of college life in my analyses. Based on a theoretical framework situating trust as a cognitive tool, I question the effects of social contexts, personal goals, and divergent scripts on individuals' behavior. Do meeting contexts that represent a greater potential social connection readily facilitate trust states that lead students to engage in risk-taking behavior? What traits are correlated with a greater probability of hooking-up rather than dating, facing higher levels of STI risk, participation in encounters while intoxicated, and low or high levels of reported satisfaction following encounters? Findings reveal that hooking-up, compared to dating, is indicative of higher probability of elevated STI risk, results in lower likelihood of high overall satisfaction, and is highly correlated with intoxication during the encounter. I conclude the hookup script does not act as a replacement to the script of dating, rather that these scripts represent divergent goals and methods of obtaining those goals.

THE DATE AND HOOKUP SOCIAL SCRIPTS:  
PATTERNS OF SEXUAL PARTNERING  
AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS  
IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Joseph E. Padgett

A Thesis Submitted to  
the Faculty of The Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

Greensboro  
2012

Approved by

---

Committee Chair

To Dylan and Rachel, a world of potential unfolds before you. Many are too afraid, too angry, too lazy, or too vacant to think of what *could be*. Most trod the path chance sets for them, never deciding one for themselves. You are not locked into any one way, and if you see an overwhelming number of roads, don't be afraid of what you might miss by choosing one; you can turn back or make a detour later if necessary. Don't become exhausted with indecision or walk without volition; before settling for the notion that no path or destination suits you, remember you are free to create your own of either.

I want to thank my family for contributing to my success and personality. Dad's reminders about the reality of any situation, unwavering work ethic, and subtle but constant observation of the world influenced me to take up those assets; and my mother may not know how I endeavor to implement her love of family and happiness in the face of hardship. Ashley, you are a high light in my life, no one else is quite like you. When you told me that Jayce arrived safely, I saw a clear picture of a future that made me smile that I am not sure I ever had before. Mr. Smith, you're a great guy, and I am glad you're around. Denise, while I'm never brimming over with sunshine, please know I do have a great time when we get together.

I have come to see love as more than some random feeling that abruptly arrives. Love is the ultimate expression of one's values, a *reward earned* for qualities achieved in character and person. It is the emotional price paid by one person for the joy he receives from the virtues embodied by another. Teresa, I couldn't love you more.

APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis written by Joseph E. Padgett has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Members \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

June 18, 2012  
Date of Acceptance by Committee

July 2, 2012  
Date of Final Oral Examination

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to formally thank each of my committee members. Shelly Brown-Jeffy and Steve Kroll-Smith, you were essential sounding boards as I conducted research and authored this work. As I worked my way through this storm your advice and good humor have been indispensable. I could not have happened across two more approachable, pleasant, and insightful folks. You have both made my time at UNCG enjoyable in many ways. Thank you for being stand-out individuals.

To my chair, Arielle Kuperberg, my ability to integrate the personal whirlwind I call workflow in a practical way with others' practices rarely approaches what might be mistaken as orderly. I am not the first to pour unfiltered ideas on others' ears, preferring to contemplate quietly toward refinement. You helped me improve my ability to converse with an other and follow an emerging path, rather than adhering to the meticulous solo flight plan that is my usual practice. Also, your well-placed reminders that completion can, from time to time, trump perfection were helpful (regardless of what I am sure was a sour look on my face when you reminded me of as much). I am glad to have had you as an advisor. Recognizing your recent debut in the role of professor and that this has likely been a bit of a learning experience for you as well, I want you to know that I feel certain you will offer meaningful contributions and guidance to future students just as you have to me.

Again, many thanks to you all.

## PREFACE

Sociology is the science whose objective is to interpret the meaning of social actions. Through this interpretation, sociology seeks to give an explanation of the effects produced by, and the way in which a given social action proceeds. By action, I mean human behavior; behavior is action when and to the extent that actors see their own or the behavior of others as being subjectively meaningful and purposeful. This subjective meaning may be what is actually intended by a specific individual on a given historical occasion or an aggregate of a number of actors as an approximate average. That meaning might also be what is attributed to the actor or actors as types in pure abstraction. In neither case is this meaning somehow correct or true by some transcendent criterion (Weber 2009). Although, society tends to use the term ‘truth’ in many other ways.

In this work of sociology, I make every effort to move with truth<sup>1</sup> as I present the work of others, my own inquiries, my methods of discovery, my findings, and what I understand those findings to mean. I discuss the topic of inquiry, and interpret the details in which that topic is embedded in the hopes of finding the truth<sup>2</sup> of the matter. I am confident that what follows represents a cogent discussion of the truths<sup>3</sup> surrounding the topic under consideration; but I will leave any pretense of locating Truth<sup>4</sup> to those who

---

<sup>1</sup> truth: sincerity in action, character, and utterance

<sup>2</sup> truth: the state of being the case

<sup>3</sup> truth: a property found to be in accord with reality

<sup>4</sup> Truth: a transcendent fundamental reality; an absolute knowledge of a singular transcendental reality

possess that special sort of personality required to conduct such an arduous journey toward vanity<sup>5,6</sup>.

The specific topic of sexual partnering encounters amongst college students in the United States is the direct object of this investigation, and I will attempt to address it thoroughly. Also, I utilize this discussion as an opportunity to pose and implement a theoretical point of view, drawn from a number of areas in the social sciences, for which I have developed a great deal of respect and an aspiration to explore to the fullest extent. Secondary to my chosen topic and related goal of understanding it, I aim to illustrate what I understand sociology to be. The most I can desire from this process, and make no mistake – this is a process rather than a rigid, completed mechanism – is to learn about the social world that we, as an aggregate of individuals interacting with one another, create and inhabit. What can I learn about these particular social forms, dating and hooking-up, that I can share with others; and what general understanding of society can be drawn from what we might learn by way of this investigation? Beneath the stated goals of this research rests also my broad goal as a social scientist - understanding.

---

<sup>5</sup> vanity: futility; lacking in value

<sup>6</sup> vanity: character or quality of conceit

As a final delay, before I begin an inquiry it is a favorite habit of mine to locate and offer a few brief words from the giants upon whose shoulders I stand. I find that the following relate well to the topic of this work (and likely to many others) ...

*Everything in the world is about sex, except sex.*

– Oscar Wilde

*A desire presupposes the possibility of an action to achieve it; action presupposes a goal which someone believes is worth achieving.*

– Ayn Rand

*Different men seek after happiness in different ways and by different means, and so make for themselves different modes of life.*

– Aristotle

*It is only by risking our persons from one hour to another that we live at all.*

– William James

*The pretension of any systematic and definitive completeness would be, at least, a self-illusion. Perfection can here be obtained by the individual student only in the subjective sense that he communicates everything he has been able to see.*

– Georg Simmel

*It is unbecoming for young men to utter maxims.*

– Aristotle<sup>7</sup>

*Now, Voyager, sail thou forth, to seek and find...*

– Walt Whitman

---

<sup>7</sup> My apologies for not heeding your advice, Aristotle.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES .....	xv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
The Self, Risk, and Social Interaction .....	4
Purpose of the Study .....	6
Research Questions .....	8
Selection into Dating and Hooking Up as Modes of Sexual Partnering Experience .....	8
Behaviors during Sexual Partnering Encounters .....	9
Outcomes of Sexual Partnering Encounters .....	9
II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL SCRIPTS .....	11
The Date .....	13
Rise of the Hookup .....	19
III. THEORETICAL MOTIVATIONS .....	23
Risk and Trust .....	23
Trust as a Latent State .....	27
Meeting Contexts, Social Ties, and Trust .....	32
Sexual Markets as Structural Influences .....	35
IV. PRIOR LITERATURE REGARDING VARIABLES OF CONCERN IN RELATION TO SEXUAL PARTNERING .....	40
Gender .....	40
Age .....	44
Age at Sexual Debut .....	47
Race .....	48
Religious Attendance .....	51
Mother’s Education Attainment .....	52
Sexual Outcomes .....	53
Living Arrangements and Fraternity/Sorority Membership .....	56

Education Aspirations.....	57
Grade Point Average.....	58
V. HYPOTHESES.....	59
The Date, the Hookup, and Interest in Relationship-Building .....	59
Selection into Dating and Hooking up as Modes of Sexual Partnering Experience .....	61
Behaviors during Sexual Partnering Encounters .....	64
Outcomes of Sexual Partnering Encounters .....	67
VI. EXPLANATION OF METHODS.....	71
Predictive Models .....	71
Model Validation .....	81
VII. DATA ANALYZED.....	84
The Online College Social Life Survey .....	84
Institution of Attendance Supplemental Data.....	85
Preparation for Analyses.....	86
VII. VARIABLES CONSIDERED.....	89
Sexual Partnering Encounters and Previous Encounter Experience .....	89
Predictor Variables.....	91
Meeting Contexts.....	91
How Well Respondents Believe they Know Hookup Partners prior to the Encounter.....	97
Intoxication .....	97
Outcomes Variables.....	99
Interest in a Romantic Relationship After a Hookup Encounter .....	99
Level of Sexually Transmitted Infection Risk during Encounters .....	100
Overall Satisfaction after Partnering Encounter .....	103
Individual Level Control Variables .....	105
Gender.....	105
Race.....	106
Age.....	106
Religious Attendance .....	107

Mother's Education Attainment.....	108
Birth in the United States.....	108
Respondents' Living Arrangements .....	109
Fraternity/Sorority Membership .....	109
Education Aspirations.....	110
Grade Point Average.....	110
Number of Previous Intercourse Partners.....	111
Age at Sexual Debut .....	112
Wants More Dates/Hookups.....	113
Encounter Level Variables.....	114
Race of Encounter Partner .....	114
Sexual Behaviors during Partnering Encounters .....	115
Characteristics of Education Institution Attended .....	116
Tuition Costs.....	116
Attendance at a Private Institution.....	117
Make-up and Size of the Student Body at Institution.....	117

IX. REGARDING INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL EFFECTS AND HIERARCHICAL LINEAR MODELING.....	119
--	-----

X. MODEL OUTCOMES AND INTERPRETATION.....	122
---	-----

Interest in a Romantic Relationship after a Hookup Encounter.....	122
Selection into Dating and Hooking up as Modes of Sexual Partnering Experience .....	125
Comparing Sexual Partnering Encounters .....	125
Comparing Students by Encounter Experience .....	128
Predicting Previous Encounter Experience.....	145
Prevalence of Encounters.....	151
Behaviors during Sexual Partnering Encounters .....	154
Encounter Type and STI Risk Level.....	155
Intoxication and STI Risk Level.....	157
Predicting Intoxication during Encounter.....	163
Outcomes of Sexual Partnering Encounters .....	174
Intoxication and Satisfaction after Encounter.....	174
Encounter Type and Satisfaction after Encounter .....	177

XI. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	181
The Hookup Script and Interest in a Romantic Relationship following an Encounter .....	181
Selection into Dating and Hooking up as Modes of Sexual Partnering Experience .....	183
Intoxication .....	183
Predicting Encounter Type .....	185
Prevalence of Encounters.....	188
Behaviors during Sexual Partnering Encounters .....	189
Encounter Type and STI Risk Level.....	189
Correlation between Intoxication and STI Risk Level by Encounter Type.....	193
Predicting Intoxication during Encounter .....	194
Meeting Contexts and STI Risk Levels .....	195
How Well Respondents Believe they Know Hookup Partners prior to the Encounter.....	196
Outcomes of Sexual Partnering Encounters .....	197
Encounter Type and Level of Satisfaction.....	198
Intoxication and Level of Satisfaction following Encounter .....	200
XII. CONCLUDING REMARKS .....	203
Differentiating the Date and Hookup Social Scripts.....	205
Directions for Further Study .....	208
The Intersection of Date and Hookup Social Scripts and Structural Conflict .....	208
Sharpening Theoretical Perspectives .....	210
Potential Policy Implications and Factors Limiting this Study.....	212
REFERENCES .....	214
APPENDIX A. ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING LEVEL OF INTEREST IN A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP W/PARTNER AFTER A HOOKUP ENCOUNTER .....	228
APPENDIX B. LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING ENCOUNTER TYPE .....	231

APPENDIX C. RESULTS OF LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS PREDICTING ENCOUNTER EXPERIENCE .....	234
APPENDIX D. RESULTS OF ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING STI RISK LEVEL DURING ENCOUNTER .....	237
APPENDIX E. LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING INTOXICATION DURING ENCOUNTER.....	242
APPENDIX F. PREDICTING LEVEL OF SATISFACTION AFTER ENCOUNTER.....	245

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Contexts in which Individuals Meet Encounter Partners.....	92
Table 2. Manner in which Respondents were Questioned regarding Sexual Behaviors during Partnering Encounters .....	101
Table 3. STI Risk Level during Partnering Encounters .....	101
Table 4. Comparison of Males’ Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience .....	126
Table 5. Comparison of Females’ Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience .....	127
Table 6. Comparison of Males who Engage in Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience .....	129
Table 7. Comparison of Females who Engage in Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience .....	135
Table 8. Partnering Encounter Experience by Race and Gender .....	143
Table 9. Frequency of Religious Attendance by Partnering Encounter Experience .....	148
Table 10. Students’ Encounter Experience .....	151
Table 11. Levels of STI Risk during Partnering Encounters .....	155
Table 12. Levels of STI Risk during Encounters by Number of Previous Intercourse Partners.....	160
Table 13. Intoxication during Encounter, Overall and by Intoxicant Used .....	164
Table 14. Comparison of Male Students by How Well they Believe they Knew their Hookup Partner before the Encounter .....	168

Table 15. Comparison of Female Students by How Well they Believe they Knew their Hookup Partner before the Encounter .....	172
Table 16. Level of Satisfaction after Encounter by Presence of Intoxication .....	175

## LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. A Linear Random-Intercept Model .....	75
Figure 2. A Random-Intercept Logit Model .....	76
Figure 3. A Three-Level Logistic Random-Intercept Model.....	77
Figure 4. Threshold Function for Determining Observed Dichotomous Response from Logistic Regression Models .....	77
Figure 5. An Ordinal Response Logit Model for Single-Level Data .....	78
Figure 6. Category Specific Linear Predictor for Ordinal Response Logistic Regression .....	78
Figure 7. Latent Response Structural Formulation of Ordered Logit Model.....	79
Figure 8. Measurement Model Formulation Dividing Latent Response Variable into Categories for Determining Ordinal Outcomes.....	79
Figure 9. Threshold Model Generating Ordinal Response based on Latent Response Outcome Variable .....	79
Figure 10. Model for Determining Cumulative Probabilities based on Logit Link Function .....	80
Figure 11. Final Form of the Latent Response Ordinal Logistic Regression Model .....	80
Figure 12. Formulation of Wald Test Statistic.....	82
Figure 13. Formulation of Z Test Statistic.....	82

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Two forms of sexual partnering encounter are prevalent in the United States - dates, the commonly known form of social interaction between two individuals, potentially leading to romantic involvement; and hookups, a type of sexual encounter that is not expected to lead to romantic involvement and frequently involves a degree of anonymity between partners. In the work that follows, I seek to gain a better understanding of these two forms of sexual partnering. Dating has been widely recognized in the United States since the early twentieth century as a form of sexual partnering encounter (Bailey 1989). The hookup is a more recent phenomenon that slowly began to emerge in the 1960's and has since risen to rival dating as the dominant form of sexual partnering encounter on college campuses (Bogle 2008; England et al. 2007). Bolstered by media reports of what some see as flagrant sexual deviance on college campuses, such as a Rolling Stone exposé that followed accusations of rape leveled against the players of Duke University's lacrosse team in 2006 (Reitman 2006), increased attention has been given to sexual partnering practices, particularly on college campuses, in recent years (Regnerus & Uecker 2011). Some researchers have reported that the hookup script offers greater benefit to males than to females (Bradshaw et al. 2010; England et al. 2007; Epstein et al. 2009; Owen et al. 2010). Another common

thread in recent research is that hookups have taken the position formerly held by dates, that of most prevalent form of sexual partnering activity (Bogle 2008; England et al. 2007; Stepp 2007), and there is a widespread assumption that college students are enthusiastic about hooking-up (Regnerus & Uecker 2011).

To what extent and in what ways do these two forms of sexual partnering activity differ, and what benefits and detriments do they entail? As suggested by other researchers, has the hookup become more common than the date amongst college students? In this thesis I will explore behaviors during these sexual partnering encounters and their outcomes, as well as how they differ from one another. Using the Online College Social Life Survey (OCSLS), which surveys 24,131 college students at 22 colleges and universities in the United States during a period between 2005 and 2011, I conduct empirical analyses in an effort to differentiate and understand date and hookup encounters.

The OCSLS asks respondents questions that reveal many details about their most recent date encounter, most recent hookup encounter, and the nature of their romantic relationships. Information gathered by the survey includes details such as where the respondent initially met their date or hookup partner, what sexual activities occurred during the date or hookup encounter, drug and alcohol use during these encounters, and opinions regarding satisfaction with the sexual activity as well as the partnering encounter overall. The survey also gathers demographic data about, sexual history of, and various attitudes espoused by respondents. I specifically examine selection into dating and hooking-up, levels of risk represented by behaviors during sexual partnering

encounters, and outcomes of the activities, with gender, contexts, and personal characteristics being key areas of concern.

What are the prevailing forms of sexual partnering encounters? Sexual scripting theory provides a theoretical framework for describing how and why date and hookup encounters differ. The nature of a social script is such that when one individual begins to enact parts of a script others may be able to recognize their underlying motivations and desired outcomes, and choose to avoid the actor or proceed with further interaction (Maticka-Tyndale et al. 1998). The scripting perspective of sexual conduct, formulated by Simon & Gagnon (2003) expands upon the metaphor of dramaturgy to explain typical sequences of social interactions, specifically sexual interactions, and individuals' understandings of those patterns.

Two scripts for sexual partnering activity are currently recognizable and utilized by students and other members of society in the United States – the 'date' and the 'hookup.' The scripting perspective is a robust and stable explanatory metaphor for sexual conduct. By examining the behaviors during these sexual partnering encounters, a better understanding of what the date and hookup social scripts entail will be available. One might also draw from Wittgenstein's philosophy and apply the game metaphor to sexual partnering activity. Ironically, popular culture seconds this application as evidenced by the contemporary use of the slang phrase 'don't hate the player, hate the game' or the term 'scoring' used to describe successfully engaging in sexual intercourse.

Imagine that a ball is kicked; players move down the field, offenses push, defenses prevent, and the game moves on. At times though, one team is saying they would like to play ‘football’ while the other team understands them to mean ‘soccer.’ The players find themselves face to face on the field before the miscommunication becomes clear, and chaos ensues. Which game are college students in the United States playing? What are the rules? Everyone is reading from a script, but how many actors are on the same page?

### **The Self, Risk, and Social Interaction**

Sexuality and intimate relationships represent a specific realm where individuals face physical harm as well as risks pertaining to their concept of self (Giddens 1991). Recognition of the norms of sexual partnering encounters allows individuals to interact with others in an attempt to achieve various goals of sexual satisfaction, acceptance, and intimacy. However, as with many social norms, the norms of sexual partnering are not always precise and are forever in flux. Shared knowledge and symbols may hold slightly different meanings for separate individuals; expectations do not always conveniently align.

Historically, the concept of risk was non-existent. Individuals and groups were of course aware of the vast array of dangers that the contingent nature of life may bring one’s way, but the specific notion of ‘risk’ emerged only sometime after the Middle Ages as the world moved into the modern era (Giddens 1999). While the idea of risk continues to entail some awareness of natural dangers, the term is considered foremost as relative to

ontological security and an awareness of the socially generated hazards unique to life in the modern era. We insert ourselves into a structure of incompatibilities that are lived as being ‘obvious.’ Our daily experience is part ontological in character, part biographical, and part historically established (Schutz & Luckmann 1973). The contexts in which we exist, and here I imply the full spectrum of what many portray as a natural-social dichotomy, weigh heavily on how we do life, that is - how we ‘get by.’ Of chief concern to the individual in modern social environments are risks that threaten the self and the individual’s identity, as individuals add their personal goals, decisions, and actions, to the surrounding contexts both affecting and being affected by the world around them.

Removed from the stability provided by reliance upon tradition in pre-modern eras, and acutely affected by the distantiation of time and space occurring in modern societies, individuals reflexively monitor and continually construct their identities. This identity construction occurs against a structure generated and sustained by the institutions and social norms that constitute our world. The reflexive project of the self consists in sustaining a coherent, continuously revised, biographically organized narrative with notions of life style, dialectic interplay between global and local, and the routine monitoring and control of the body as integral to the very nature of agency and being accepted in a trusted way by others as a competent actor (Giddens 1991). All knowledge comes with the caveat “until further notice,” and we base our decisions on knowledge that is only sufficient up to any given point where novelty occurs. Our knowledge comes not only from experience, but is found in the experience of others (Schutz & Luckmann 1973), information that is available in the form of norms and social scripts.

On the other side of what often appear as typical daily actions lurk peculiar forms of confusion. A sense of reality shared between individuals in society and the normality that rests therein are fragile, and a disturbance within these frameworks represents a threat to the individual's identity and ability to act efficiently. We rely upon shared meaning and predictable patterns of action to determine available and appropriate responses to the social worlds through which we move (Miszta 2001). These norms exist through and influence the socialization of individuals, who come to recognize particular social scripts as appropriate to any given event that may arise.

### **Purpose of the Study**

This research stands to make contributions to the scholarly literature in the areas of social psychology, scripting theory, theory of sexual markets, the effects of social contexts on individual behavior, and the manner in which individuals mitigate the cognitive demands of modern social life. The purpose of the study is to clarify the nature of, and differences between, the two sexual partnering scripts that prevail on college campuses in the United States. I intend to develop a clear understanding of how date and hookup encounters typically occur and how these occurrences correspond to current notions about the scripts available to students. Are students forced to either participate in hookup culture or forgo sexual partnering all together? As will be discussed further, a common notion is that the nature of college students' sexual activity has come to be little more than a series of anonymous encounters. This may be true for many college students, but is it the case that this is the new norm? Further, I attempt to understand the

benefits and risk to each gender that are represented by the various forms of sexual partnering encounters, as well as considering demographic and other characteristics.

Over the past decade researchers have begun to analyze the issue of hooking-up as an increasingly common form of sexual partnering activity. Some have analyzed the gendered nature of the hookup with varying results (Bogle 2008; Bradshaw et al. 2010; Eisenberg et al. 2009; England et al. 2007; Fielder & Carey 2010b; Glenn & Marquardt 2001; Reid et al. 2011). Others consider the influence of a party atmosphere and the presence of alcohol as facilitating casual sex encounters (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger 2009; Fielder & Carey 2010b; Maticka-Tyndale et al. 1998; Paul et al. 2000). Academic researchers and journalists alike consider changes in sexual partnering activities over time (Bailey 1989; Bogle 2008; Stepp 2007), with some lamenting the arrival of the hookup as destructive (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger 2009; Stepp 2007). Others indicate that, with the hookup, traditional gender roles are changing (Bradshaw et al. 2010; Reid et al. 2011). Previous researchers have noted also that individuals' perception of norms regarding hookup behavior tends to greatly overestimate the activity in which their peers engage, perhaps leading them to change their own behavior (Lambert et al. 2003; Lewis et al. 2007).

In order to expand upon the existing literature, I will analyze the hookup directly alongside the date and make clear comparisons between the two on similar measures, a comparison that has not been previously established. I analyze both forms of sexual partnering encounters beginning with selection into these encounters. I continue by analyzing behaviors during these activities. Finally, I consider the outcomes of each

form and compare the two. My goal is to draw a better understanding of the date and hookup social scripts, the people who choose to engage in date and hookup encounters, and the outcomes of each. Do common assumptions within academic literature, popular culture productions, and media depictions hold true, or is there a reality that differs from what might be expected based only upon a surface understanding?

### **Research Questions**

I draw from the existing literature to initially inform analyses of the date and hookup sexual partnering scripts. Is the hookup script, unlike the date script, void of interest in romantic relationship formation? Differences in the individuals who set out to engage in sexual partnering activities are considered as they elect to engage in either or both dates and hookups. Behaviors during the partnering activities are considered, and the outcomes of each activity are also examined. The following research questions guide my analyses.

### **Selection into Dating and Hooking Up as Modes of Sexual Partnering Experience**

Initially, I consider selection into specific sexual partnering encounters. Demographics of individuals who elect to engage in date and hookup encounters are analyzed along with their attitudes and beliefs as well as information about their personal sexual history. Who engages in date encounters? Who engages in hookup encounters? I analyze the characteristics of individuals who respond to questions about their most

recent date encounter and most recent hookup encounter, comparing the two on key characteristics.

### **Behaviors during Sexual Partnering Encounters**

I analyze responses about sexual behaviors during each type of sexual partnering encounter and consider how they differ from one another. Do more risky sexual behaviors occur during date encounters as compared to hookup encounters or vice versa? How do behaviors during dates differ from behaviors during hookups? Are there differences in the levels of sexual activity that commonly take place during each? I compare responses from males and females separately in order to consider how hookup experiences differ by gender. I also ask how hookups compare to date experiences in this regard. I analyze the contexts in which individuals meet partners in order to determine whether levels of risky sexual behavior differ significantly based upon cues drawn from social contexts. I then examine the behaviors during instances of each type of sexual partnering encounter to discover if date encounters represent higher levels of risky sexual behavior than do hookup encounters. Levels of alcohol and drug use during dates and hookups are also analyzed.

### **Outcomes of Sexual Partnering Encounters**

Finally, the outcomes of each type of sexual partnering encounter are examined. Do these two social scripts lead to significantly different levels of satisfaction? I analyze differences in outcomes by gender in order to consider how both genders benefit from

and feel about a date or hookup after having engaged in the sexual partnering encounter. Are hookup encounters satisfying? To what extent, if any, do dates represent a difference in level of satisfaction from hookups? Are hookups gendered? Do hookups represent greater levels of satisfaction for males? Are dates gendered? Do dates represent greater levels of satisfaction for females? I then consider how intoxication affects satisfaction with sexual partnering encounters. Do the effects differ for dates and hookups?

## CHAPTER II

### HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL SCRIPTS

In her book, *Unhooked*, journalist Laura Sessions Stepp (2007) explores the nature of hookup culture among college students. The defining characteristic of a hookup, she points out, "is the ability to unhook from a partner at any time, just as [students] might delete an old song on their iPod or an out-of-date 'away' message on their computer." This ease of detachment is thought to give individuals maximum flexibility so that any inconvenience, be it an onset of term papers, locating a 'hotter' partner, or a mere change in the direction of whim's wind, is easily overcome without repercussions (Hughes et al. 2005; Stepp 2007). Stepp sees the ability to 'un-hook' as the key characteristic that delineates hookup culture.

*Unhooked* begins with Stepp discussing a story of reports from middle school officials in Washington, D.C. to parents that a group of approximately a dozen females had been performing oral sex on two or three boys for most of the school year. At that time her interests in the changing patterns of sexual behavior amongst adolescents and young adults in the United States moved her to research the matter further. Later she found herself covering stories regarding the behavior of college students and set out to research the nature of hookup culture. Her investigative reporting background is readily apparent in her work; the book is built upon accounts from personal interviews with students and offers extensive quotes from individuals who have engaged in hookup

encounters. Stepp situates her discussion by outlining the meaning of the 'hookup' through Jamie's story.

Jamie, a senior at Duke University at the time of Stepp's interviews, recounts her experience entering the college environment and the nature of her sex life over the course of her academic career. Stepp came into contact with Jamie after a guest lecture for a course on the family at Duke in 2004. Comments from students during Stepp's class discussion, in a few short phrases, seem to sum up the nature of the hookup script as it is frequently explained in the research literature. When asked about their definitions of hookups students responded with "don't have to work at it," "easy to talk about," and "no relationship." Stepp remarks that "the students didn't seem particularly thrilled by the concept of hooking-up, but it was clear that many had adopted it as a life form." After the discussion, Stepp was approached by Jamie who she subsequently interviewed over several sessions.

During interviews with Jamie, Stepp learned that, among the young woman's peers, two options seemed to dominate social life in relation to sexual partnering. On one hand, Jamie outlined a situation that she and her peers referred to as similar to being "married" or "joined at the hip." This monogamous type of relationship was looked down upon by some who did not favor the time investment and regimented nature of long-term romantic relationships that might be viewed as "steady dating." Academic researchers note similar explanations from students, including features such as long term commitment and time spent together participating in relationship building activities by the individuals who

are 'dating' as being intrinsic to the dating script (England & Thomas 2007; Reid et al. 2011).

A second pattern involved individuals partnering randomly and frequently in a very casual manner. Jamie described how she herself came to follow the second path. Her nights often began by arriving at local bars with friends, dancing with friends, dancing with random strangers, and having drinks, mirroring reports from researchers who describe hookups as occurring in similar contexts (Bogle 2008; England et al. 2007). Jamie explained that, as the night progressed and friends paired off with males they had met, it seemed easier to hookup with guys with whom she had danced than to find a reason not to. The young women commented at being upset at the end of any given night if no one had asked for her phone number or showed interest in engaging her further.

### **The Date**

Jamie's narrative represents a social script far different from that of the traditional notion of dating. An examination of the meaning of dating and how it developed into a recognizable form within society will be demonstrative of the development of a social script over time and how social factors intersect as such a change occurs. I refer now to another work that considers changes in sexual partnering activities over time. I harken back to an era well before my own by way of *From Front Porch to Back Seat*, a book by historian, Beth L. Bailey. The prerogative of this thesis does not include courtship to any great extent, but I briefly raise this social script as a point of reference. In Bailey's work one finds an extensive discussion of the emergence of dating and youth culture, the

development of mass media outlets that cater to that culture, and the effects of experts who, by their examination, helped to solidify 'youth' as a discrete category within modern society.

Courtship is a term which has become somewhat antiquated, though still used at times. At the turn of the twentieth century this term was used to describe a process whereby teenaged individuals developed relationships of an intimate nature with others (Bailey 1989). The social script of courtship represented a private act between individuals and their families, but, as youth culture came into existence, courtship was supplanted by the then new script of dating. Bailey recounts a 1920's era story of a young man who asks a girl if he might 'call' on her. When the man arrived at the girl's home she had on her hat, and little other detail is provided. However, from this brief blurb Bailey unpacks a wealth of meaning. The key words in this short telling are "she had her hat on." To early twentieth century Americans this signaled that the girl expected to leave the house. The interaction between the young man and woman represent an intersecting of two scripts - courtship and dating collide in this brief story. The young man who came to call on the woman expected to be received in the family parlor, meet the woman's mother, and perhaps enjoy some refreshments. The young woman expected a "date," to be "taken out" somewhere and entertained (Bailey 1989; Bogle 2008).

The transition from courting to dating shifted the location of partnering activities from the private homes of individuals into the public sphere. Here we see how the emergence of a social script can affect other facets of life aside from the specific type of social interaction that is its main concern. Nights out at public venues became common

as the dating script flourished. As this shift to public venues occurred, it is likely that the behavior of service providers, such as the owners of the business dating couples patronized, adjusted to these new behavior patterns by changing their own practices. Courtship represented a mostly private, highly regimented script with heavy parental involvement and well-established, carefully considered norms (Bailey 1989; Bogle 2008). These norms varied from one community to the next in small ways, but overall the courtship ritual followed a widely recognized sequence. This sequence became so well known that it was reflected in popular music, as seen in Horton's (1957) content analysis of popular culture songs that detailed the courtship process. Similarities between the development of the date script, at a time when the predominant script for sexual partnering was that of courtship, and the current development of the hookup script and its appearance in the popular press are apparent.

Following the courtship script, as a young woman reached the proper age she became available to receive male callers. At first, the mother or other guardian of the young woman would invite young men to call, but as young women grew older they would be afforded the opportunity to extend an invitation to any unmarried young man to whom they had been properly introduced via private gatherings, entertainment events, or dinners (Bailey 1989), affording men the opportunity to display their desirable traits. Physical appearance and the skills of a homemaker were thought to be important to males, while females were thought to seek out traits such as higher education levels, desirable economic position, and various positive personality traits (Feingold 1992).

Young men who received an invitation owed the hostess and her daughter a duty call of thanks, meaning that he would pay a visit to the young woman's home and enact the social ritual outlined by the courtship script. Undesired or undesirable callers were given excuses and turned away (Bailey 1989). Various norms governed all aspects of this process, including such details as appropriate length of time between invitation and call, whether or not refreshments were to be served, and appropriate topics of conversation; these norms and related rituals were deeply entrenched, and breaks from the proscribed patterns were viewed as being rude. Failure to meet expectations by acting according to institutionalized patterns were thought of as a social slight, a kind of insult which signaled that the young man in question lacked the social skills of a distinguished gentleman worthy of social esteem. Occurring in the young woman's home insured that courtship activities took place under at least a minimum level of supervision (Bailey 1989; Feingold 1992). As the dating script became increasingly more common, society parted ways with much of the courtship script. It is an interesting endeavor to consider whether a similar shift may be currently underway, as touted in academic and popular literature, from the date script to the hookup script.

The term 'dating' is rarely defined outright in previous literature, providing a glimpse at just how engrained in popular culture the notion of dating has become. In much of the existing literature, authors write with a sense that readers are already aware of what the term entails. Christopher and Sprecher (2000) refer to dating as a premarital long-term romantic relationship. Recent research has found that, on the modern college campus, students similarly use the term 'dating' to refer to the activities of couples

already in romantic relationships (England & Thomas 2007), an indication that dating does imply a long term commitment. As youth culture emerged and dating replaced courtship, the relocation of partnering activities to the public sphere (Bailey 1989) signaled the new script of dating as valuing consumption, privileging competition, and presenting a model of sexual partnering that would be referred to in the vocabulary of economic exchange. Activities involving economic consumption, such as nights out at movie theaters and soda parlors, became common place within the dating script (Bailey 1989; Bogle 2008; England & Thomas 2007).

The growing specialization called for in many careers throughout the beginning of the twentieth century, and the resulting lengthening of education, facilitated the emergence of both youth culture and the date script. Following World War II, the United States government implemented what has come to be known as the GI Bill of Rights (GI Bill). The GI Bill represented a large-scale underwriting of programs that were intended to assist veterans with reintegration following wars. In practice, programs related to the GI Bill acted as another factor which greatly increased college enrollment (Nam 1964). As youths attended college and moved out of their parents' homes before marriage with increasing frequency (Rosenfeld 2007), they were afforded many of the characteristics of adulthood, such as greater freedom from parental supervision, but not burdened to as great a degree as adults with jobs and the expectation to marry and 'settle down.' This trend helped to encourage a shift away from courtship's emphasis as a pathway to marriage, toward dating as a social and recreational activity, but without giving up the sexual explorations that had characterized the later stages of courtship (Bailey 1989).

As gender norms began to change across society in the United States over time, beginning with the sexual revolution of the 1960's following to the third wave feminist movement of the 1990's, women asking men out on dates became more common place and accepted. Regardless of these changes, dates remain gendered; when asked about what a date is, college students consistently report the normative script of traditional gender roles, following a sequence of events during which males are more commonly proactive than females. Dating partners meet and 'go out' to what is typically a public place, with restaurants and theaters being prime examples; and dates implying the desire and potential for romantic as well as sexual interests on the part of the parties involved (Bailey 1989; England & Thomas 2007; Bradshaw et al. 2010).

Over time, dating replaced the previously dominant sexual partnering script of courtship. By the 1920's the change had begun to spread widely, found especially in more urban areas. This was reflected in a flood of media activity. Magazines such as *Mademoiselle* and *Seventeen*, through their feature articles and many advice sections, reflected a shift in emphasis from courtship's concern with family ties and formality to the social and recreational process of dating (Bailey 1998). Dating has been recognized as common behavior from that time to the present, and individuals have made decisions on the structuring of their social interactions that are partly the result of the pervasive awareness of the nature of the dating script among members of society.

### **Rise of the Hookup**

The emergence of the hookup began slowly, born out of the 1960's group party culture. Prior to the 1960's, most dates occurred in public places, but took place between very small groups or only involved the two individuals who were dating, with couples or groups of two to three couples spending their time together in public settings (Bailey 1989). During the 1960's a shift in behavior occurred, and larger groups began to spend time together as a 'party' atmosphere replaced what were previously more intimate gatherings. The hookup is now a widely recognized, if somewhat flexible and vaguely defined, social script for sexual partnering (Bogle 2008; England et al. 2007; Reid et al. 2011). True to its origin in the large party atmosphere fostered in the 1960's, hooking-up frequently begins in party settings amidst large groups where individuals meet, often for the first time, and engage one another in a wide range of sexual behaviors with little to no expectation of developing a long-term romantic relationship (Bogle 2008; England et al. 2007; Maticka-Tyndale et al. 1998).

The term 'hook up' has come to be used by adolescents, young adults, and others to describe casual, noncommittal encounters of a sexual nature between two individuals (Bogle 2008; Flack et al. 2007; Downing-Matibag & Geisinger 2009; Paul & Hayes 2002). These encounters vary widely in the level of physical contact which takes place, with any given encounter consisting of as little contact as kissing or including more intimate sexual acts such as manual genital stimulation, oral sex, vaginal intercourse, anal intercourse, or any combination of such sexual acts (Bogle 2008; Downing-Matibag & Geisinger 2009). Hookup encounters have become a common activity among young

adults and adolescents as evidence from various studies confirms; approximately three fourths of all college students report having had at least one such encounter (Eisenberg 2001; Fielder & Carey 2010; Paul & Hayes 2002). Many college students engage in serial casual sex encounters occurring outside of committed relationships with multiple partners (Turchick & Garske 2009).

The characteristic feature of the hookup script, making these encounters distinct from those available through enacting the dating script, is that no commitment or long-term emotional involvement is expected to arise from a hookup encounter. Emotional attachment stemming from a hook up encounter is commonly discouraged (Paul & Hayes 2002), with some researchers (Grello et al. 2006) reporting that 70% of college students engage in sexual activity with individuals whom they do not consider as potential romantic partners. Partners who engage in a hookup may be well acquainted, meet through a mutual acquaintance, or be complete strangers; however, a degree of anonymity is said to be a very common occurrence. In some studies, over 55% of respondents report engaging in hookups with completely anonymous partners (Bogle 2008; Paul & Hayes 2002).

There is a notable consensus regarding the nature of hookups. Hookups are consistently defined as lacking emotional commitment (England et al. 2007; Fielder & Carey 2010b; Paul & Hayes 2002). That hookup encounters occur in a mostly spontaneous fashion is also widely agreed upon. Most often, but not always, hookup encounters do not lead to relationships (England et al. 2007; Reid et al. 2011; Stepp 2007). Finally, for better or worse, the hookup has become a socially acceptable, and at

times encouraged, form of sexual partnering amongst adolescents, emerging adults, and college students (Bogle 2008; England et al. 2007; Paul & Hayes 2002; Penhollow et al. 2007; Stepp 2007). Though much consensus regarding the details of the hookup script exist, some accounts do conflict on several issues; writers variously indicate that hookup encounters have become more prevalent than dates, while others continue to place the date as the dominant script for sexual partnering (Bogle 2008; England et al. 2007; Regnerus & Uecker 2011).

Another point that merits clarification is the gendered nature of hookups. Some studies indicate that hookups represent greater benefits for males (Fielder & Carey 2010a; Owen et al. 2010; Paul & Hayes 2002), while others indicate that women are not perceived in a negative manner for engaging in hookup encounters, as may be expected in light of traditional gender double standards, and that women experience a higher degree of agency than has traditionally been the case (Bradshaw et al. 2010; Reid et al. 2011). Furthermore, outside of considerations related to the college environment and the increase in the enacting of the hookup script, there is a gap in the literature regarding the contexts in which individuals meet hookup partners, contexts in which individuals meet date partners, what sorts of sexual behaviors occur during each of these encounters, and analyses that compare the two scripts overall.

Existing literature focuses sharply on hookup encounters without explicitly comparing the date and hookup scripts and the encounters to which they lead. I intend for the research at hand to expand upon the existing literature by extensively analyzing dates and hookups using a survey instrument that asks the same or similar questions

about each. The size of the data set (N=24,131) affords the opportunity to compare individuals who dated (N=14,398) to individuals who hooked up (N=14,630) on comparable measures. Selection into date and hookup encounters, characteristics of the encounters, characteristics of individuals who engage in date and/or hookup encounters, and details regarding the outcomes of encounters of each type are considered here.

CHAPTER III  
THEORETICAL MOTIVATIONS

**Risk and Trust**

The concept of risk involves notions of danger and hazard, but is largely differentiated from those concepts. Risk is described by Anthony Giddens (1999) as a concept that emerged after the Middle Ages. Initially related to the geographic exploration of uncharted territory, risk came to be aligned with an aspiration to control the future. In modern society individuals have become increasingly preoccupied with controlling the future and with notions of security and safety. Essentially, ‘risk’ always has a negative connotation and refers to the chance of avoiding undesirable outcomes (Giddens 1999). Calculative acceptance of, or one might say a welcomed embracing of, risk is common in the modern era as seen in stock markets, extreme sports, and recreational drug use. A key aspect of risk is the potential for gains – be they monetary or sensation seeking in nature. Historically, hazards and dangers were accepted by individuals as a given. No matter how potentially disastrous, pre-industrial hazards and dangers were taken simply to be a fact of life originating with some force beyond human influence – gods, nature, demons, or fate (Beck 1992; Giddens 1999). As industrialization and technology have advanced toward ever more efficient means by

which danger and hazard are mitigated, risks have taken on a unique role in our daily lives.

In modern society, to some extent the concept of risk continues to be married to a notion of danger, but managing nature's danger is increasingly possible via the progression of human development, in the fields of science and technology in particular. Yet risk, differentiated from hazards and danger, is largely socially established. Also, risk is often personally chosen in many respects, unlike the dangers of the past that simply 'happened to' an individual. Shifting forms of scientific information and social organization bring the contingencies of natural disaster under control, or at least within range of an efficient contingency plan, while emergent social risks come to the fore at a time when individuals are ever more concerned with manipulating the future and controlling the details of their life-narrative. Destiny and Fate offered man a neat package of sorts, releasing him from a certain responsibility that comes with choice; simultaneously, the choices confronting us seem to proliferate.

A common theme in the past, found in the diverse theories and writings of Weber, Orwell, Marx, Huxley, and so many others, has pointed toward a mechanically regimented, highly organized society brought about by ever-increasing bureaucratization and technological advance. As it turns out, social advances have given way to further mayhem. Rather than an incredibly calculated, predictable set of known quantities, modern society has offered a flurry of tweets and wall posts, countless blogs telling us something that we probably need to know, and an endless sea of seemingly contradictory 'self-help' claims each assuring us definitive improvement in our quality of life. So

many reports of indispensable self-help measures exist, with each and every one claiming an unshakable foundation built upon the strongest stuff of modern technology, that one might easily fall into an obsessive madness attempting to fill every waking, and in some cases unconscious, moment with one sort of self-improvement project or another. How is one to cope with this barrage of information, calculation, and constant decision making demanded of each and every individual in today's world?

Many researchers writing about trust focus their attention toward the way in which trust emerges in a context of rapid flows of information and constant changes that occur in modern society. These writers frequently embed notions of vulnerability, uncertainty, and risk, all easily recognizable in sexual interactions, into their definitions of trust (Luhmann 1988; Giddens 1990; Mishra 1996; Misztal 1996, 2001; Seligman 1997). Some define trust as "the mutual confidence that no party to an exchange will exploit another's vulnerability" (Sabel 1993). As defined by Luhmann (2000), trust relates to future actions, unknowns, and, as a basic starting point, trust can be considered a practice or state of being that becomes significant only in the context of uncertainty. Thus risk and trust are bound to one another and oriented toward considerations of future outcomes largely influenced by, and occurring within, social interactions. Trust provides a crutch with which we hobble down life's path, constantly attempting to sidestep the downsides of the risks we encounter and the overwhelming number of decisions to be made, all while continuing to reap potential benefits. Relating risk and trust to the research at hand, the question becomes one of how individuals select a sexual partner with whom they will enter a state of trust and engage in sexual activity; how do

individuals face the risks inherent to this activity in order to obtain the desired rewards without becoming paralyzed by indecision?

Trust presupposes awareness of risk, offering reliability in the face of contingent outcomes, and serves to minimize concerns about potential adversity; though entering a trust state need not be a completely conscious decision. What is taken to be acceptable risk varies with contexts and each individual's level of tolerance. Trust is a means by which individuals deal psychologically with risks that may otherwise be prohibitive of engaging in interactions, such as the risks inherent to sexual behaviors during partnering encounters. Without trust, individuals could not engage in the 'leap of faith' that is required within many social interactions, where the potential for negative outcomes is high (Giddens 1990; Lupton 1999). Trust can result from faith in a social organization and reliance upon the normalcy provided by certain social contexts, and helps individuals to weave a "veil of invulnerability," allowing them to get on with life by fending off the cognitive demands presented by risks. Consistent routines, recognizable social scripts, and stable social contexts are seen as vital to the establishment of this veil and allow individuals to continually deal with situations of uncertainty in an efficient manner (Giddens 1991).

As Schutz & Luckman (1973) point out, "every state of affairs is for us unproblematic until further notice." We carry on our lives with the view that what has been will continue to be. We repeat our past successful acts and attempt to avoid situations that exude the noxious odor of our previous mistakes. Trusting in social contexts relieves us of anxiety's burdens (Giddens 1990; Lupton 1999). A coherent

social script and expectations, born of familiar social contexts and symbols, that an other will not exploit one's vulnerability, or some means of diminishing or altogether ignoring the anxiety of risks such as denial or intoxication, are essential for entering into a sexual encounter. We 'put our self on the line' when we interact in such an intimate manner with others. Social scripts offer that backdrop against which we examine every situation in search of those deficiencies or novel experiences that do not fit well with what we have incorporated into our taken-for-granted schema (Schutz & Luckman 1973).

Many perspectives address risk and trust, with various disciplines taking slightly different approaches. Economists commonly view trust as either calculative (Williamson 1993) or institutional (North 1990). Psychologists frequently frame discussions of trust in terms of attributes of trustors and trustees, focusing on a number of internal cognitions that personal attributes yield (Rotter 1967; Tyler 1990). Sociologists discuss trust in terms of socially embedded properties of relationships among people and institutions (Granovetter 1985; Zucker 1986). Two major means of analyzing risk emerge from technico-scientific approaches and social constructionist approaches. These approaches can be conceptualized by imagining a spectrum moving from a realist position at one pole to a strong social constructionist, or relativist, position at the other (Lupton 1999).

### **Trust as a Latent State**

What I offer now is a comprehensive view of risk and trust drawn from the positions along this spectrum and various disciplines to discuss a process of calculative, rational assessment of risks carried out by actors, taking place within symbolic, culturally

based realms. Any given individual may be seen as a rational actor who bases decisions upon the social contexts in which they act. Individuals economize as they make decisions, but what they economize about is available to them via a socially constructed cognitive repertoire through which they construe how the world is, what causal or other chains of efficacy operate there, and how values are to be ranked (Hampsher-Monk & Hindmoor 2010; Schutz & Luckman 1973). Knowledge obtained from the contexts in which the individual meets a potential sexual partner, a desire to achieve goals such as sexual satisfaction or peer acceptance, and a shared awareness of a social script for doing so provide the bases for these calculations.

Sociologists, such as Giddens (1991) and Beck (1992), view risk as a combination of calculus based processes and an awareness of the contingent nature of knowledge and social activity. Within conditions of modern social life, successful navigation of risk depends upon the increasing role played by society's institutions, from the family to the university to government, and their mechanisms, all of which are based upon trust, vested not in individuals but in abstract social systems and common perceptions of risk and a contingent future (Beck 1992; Foucault 1975; Giddens 1990, 1991; Lupton 1999). Examples of circumstances where risks are institutionalized, within surrounding frameworks of trust, include financial investment, physically dangerous sports, and the use of modern medicine (Giddens, 1990). The modern concept of college, in a general sense, acting as an individual's first venture into the 'real world,' within a somewhat protected environment, represents an institutionalization of risk and trust as well. In such an environment an individual may perceive a degree of safety and mitigation of risks, and

be more likely to enter into a state of trust with fellow students and individuals encountered within the contexts of college life.

Discussions of trust, in the spirit of the proffered formulation found in the literature can be traced from Simmel (1950) to Luhmann (1988), Blau (1964), Giddens (1990; 1991), Beck, and Fox (1974). Trust is taken to be a tool for simplifying the complexity of modern social life in order to better tolerate contingency. Interest in trust as a social process can be traced to the work of Georg Simmel, who had a strong impact on subsequent researchers in the social sciences (Mollering 2001). For Simmel, trust is ‘an antecedent or subsequent form of knowledge’ (Simmel 1950). Simmel found trust to be an intermediate between knowledge and ignorance about others. This is a logical consequence of his position that complete knowledge or ignorance would eliminate the possibility of, and need for trust (Mollering 2001; Simmel 1950). His thoughts on trust presume a weak link between the identifiable bases of trust and the actual expectations that human beings have when they reach a state of trust. Simmel points out a mysterious element that is required to explain trust and to understand its unique nature, similar to the concept of a leap of faith (Mollering 2001), and describes trust as a “fundamental category of human conduct” and a “state of mind... which is both less and more than knowledge” (Brownlie & Hawson 2005; Simmel 1971).

Following from Simmel, Mollering (2001) conceptualizes trust as a mental process of three elements: expectation, the outcome of which can be favorable or unfavorable; interpretation, the experiencing of social reality that provides ‘good reasons’ which are the bases of trust; and suspension, best thought of as the leap of faith that

corresponds to Simmel's mysterious element. Simmel and Mollering focus on a reflexive element to trust that can be seen in Giddens's theory as well. In *The Consequences of Modernity* and *Modernity and Self-Identity*, Anthony Giddens writes at length on the concepts of risk and uncertainty, which are recognized as constant companions by individuals as they approach life in modern Western society. Uncertainty can be seen to arise in all aspects of human life. Social norms, societal structures, and institutions become central to the nature of modern social life and greatly influence the day to day activity and selfhood of the individual, shaping the individual's decisions to interact, and in what way, with others (Lupton 1999). According to Mizralski (2001), the development of trust is closely tied to perceptions of normalcy and can be best analyzed by considering the rules that are deployed to reduce contingency and the arbitrariness of interactional order.

I conceptualize trust here as a means rather than an end, and treat trust as a latent state or social mechanism which mitigates the cognitive load of decision making inherent to the proliferation of information which we are compelled to address during our goal seeking and risk calculation activities. Based upon social contexts, individuals choose what roles to take on and what actions are called for in those roles. Normal appearances, viewed as reliable, peaceful environments, help to reduce cognitive demand upon the individual by providing routinized conduct and averting threats. Norms and recognizable social contexts, along with expected patterns of action, come together to form the scripts individuals read from during social interaction, as in the case with dates and hookups. The social contexts in which individuals meet sexual partners are taken into consideration

here in order to examine the effects of contexts on behavior during the partnering encounters. I consider the social scripts of dating and hooking-up, how recognition of these might facilitate trust states, and analyze sexual partnering encounters to better understand how these actually take place.

Relational trust, or a person's level of confidence in the strength of the relationship between specific individuals and within specific interactions (Couch & Jones 1997; Rempel et al. 1985), becomes an issue as the individual struggles to make sense of improbabilities, where, in a specific situation of uncertainty, they decide to believe or not believe that someone or something represents a break from comfortable patterns of behavior or 'normalcy' (Brownlie & Howson 2005; Misztal 1996). In order to cope with such decisions in regards to normalcy and expected outcomes, it is rational for individuals to forego accumulating precise information and assessing risks in terms of the specific others involved, and to question instead the trustworthiness of the institutions and broader social contexts in which the exchange is situated (Brownlie & Howson 2005; Wynne 1996).

Most daily interactions entail a degree of contingency and risk which, when taken together, represent a high level of cognitive demand. By preserving the routine of daily life and placing trust in society's systems individuals reinforce in themselves and others' feelings of normalcy that dissolve the unpredictability of reality. This process increases perceptions of general security and trustworthiness, facilitating action (Giddens 1992; Misztal 2001; Simmel 1950; Schutz & Luckmann 1973). The individual may, in some sense, be seen as engaging in social interaction with the conglomeration of meaning and

expectation that develops around an other. In the absence of familiarity developed during previous interactions, the individual interacts with the context and social cues as much as with the specific other, utilizing commonly known scripts as guides for action.

### **Meeting Contexts, Social Ties, and Trust**

How might meeting contexts affect the probability of dating or hooking-up with someone? I draw upon the various theoretical literatures on the development of trust and social contexts in order to categorize meeting places for date and hookup partners. Students who hookup with or date another person must possess a certain level of trust before engaging in such intimate social contact, including trusting that they will be personally safe during possible sexual encounters. Misztal (2001) points out that the development of trust greatly depends on perceptions of normalcy; by providing routinized conduct and averting threats, 'normal' appearances and recognizable social scripts work to reduce the cognitive demand an individual experiences.

When an adequate degree of shared symbols exist between individuals there is a greater possibility that a state of trust will emerge allowing conscious awareness to be reduced, a sense of predictability to become a guide for action, and individuals to feel assured that their surroundings are conducive to specific patterns of behavior (Giddens 1992; Misztal 2001). As individuals form social bonds and establish shared meaning, goals, and a sense of community, generalized trust emerges. This generalized trust state creates a framework in which individuals can feel comfortable, having assessed risks and channels for mitigating those risks, and then proceed to enact social scripts such as the

date or hookup script. Preservation of typical routines and placement of trust in society's systems allows individuals to reinforce the necessary feelings of normalcy to mitigate the unpredictability of reality for themselves as well as for others with whom they interact (Giddens 1992; Msztal 2001; Simmel 1950).

The tendency of the individual, developed during early socialization, to trust or not trust in the generalized other combined with the cues of first impressions and subsequent interactions that the individual interprets based upon social contexts work together. These factors operate to determine the existence or lack of trust in any particular exchange (McKnight et al. 1998; Simmel 1971). In his discussion of 'the stranger' (1971), Simmel states that the stranger "is fixed within a certain spatial circle – or within a group whose boundaries are analogous to spatial boundaries." This use of spatial terminology to explain the relationship between individuals and the stranger can be applied to intimate others and acquaintances as well (Goto 1996).

The social space between an individual and an intimate other can be compared to physical distance and thought of as 'close,' while a stranger would be conceptualized as socially 'distant.' Alternatively, these social spaces between individuals may be referred to as small or large. Social distance is seen to be a determinant of trust (Goto 1996). In the case of encountering an other, the individual may associate a new individual as close or distant socially based on the context in which the encounter occurs. In this way, an individual who is introduced to a stranger by a family member may perceive a smaller social distance between themselves and the new other than between themselves and someone they were introduced to by a mere acquaintance or via a chance meeting in a public place.

Contexts where individuals find greater amounts of knowledge and higher expectations that norms will be maintained are more likely to facilitate trust states and lead to greater interaction than contexts that represent a greater absence of knowledge (Goto 1996; Simmel 1971).

Based on this theory of trust and social distances, I conclude that individuals who meet in what may be termed 'close social contexts' will be more likely to engage one another in social exchange, such as sexual partnering activities, than individuals who meet one another in what can be thought of as 'distant social contexts.' Meeting an other in contexts involving family members could reasonably be believed to facilitate trust states more readily than meeting a stranger on a street corner. Further, individuals derive a certain degree of comfort based upon social contexts, as demonstrated by the concept of transitivity.

Transitivity, as discussed by social network analysts, may be useful for understanding the ease with which a connection is expected to emerge when an individual meets an other through introduction by a family member. Transitivity is simply the expectation that if A establishes a tie to B, and B establishes a tie to C, then A is likely to also establish a tie to C. This tendency can be viewed as a network of interconnections beginning with B, in which case one might describe transitivity by stating that if two actors, A and C, each have ties to B, then there is an increased likelihood that they are or will become tied to one another (Granovetter 1973; Handcock et al. 2007). Put another way, if my brother has a positive connection to Mary and

introduces me to her in a way that makes that apparent, I will, at least initially, develop a positive connection with Mary as well.

The family, considered to be one of the two most important institutions to the process of socialization, is responsible for facilitating many of the subsequent associations the individual will form over the course of their life (Jalava 2003); it is appropriate to expect connections with others facilitated by family members to hold a higher degree of familiarity and facilitate trust states more readily than other means for social networking. Institutions in which individuals regularly participate such as churches and schools also represent major forces of socialization; such institutions provide stable contexts where trust states may develop readily. More distant social contexts, such as public parks or shopping malls, represent very low degrees of shared social connection, and, as such, are theoretically not as conducive of social interaction, such as sexual partnering, where trust states are necessary due to the intense level of risks involved in the exchange.

### **Sexual Markets as Structural Influences**

The market aspects of meeting sexual partners are not always, though sometimes, explicitly acknowledged by individuals and society as a whole. These social structures represent another facet of context and its effects on behavior. In sexual markets individuals seek out the characteristics they prefer and the activities they desire from sexual partners and sexual partnering encounters; individuals' networks are also shaped

by the social and geographic contexts in which they develop (Fischer et al. 1977; Kalmijn & Flap 2001).

Economic laws of supply and demand dictate that an individual's ability to realize their goals, in sexual markets as in any other market, depend in large part on demand for and availability of what they are seeking within a particular market environment (England & Farkas 1986). Sexual scripting theory is useful for analyzing the range of activities available to individuals as they seek to engage in sexual activity. Various scripts represent possible scenarios that individuals may seek out, patterns of behavior for initiating and carrying out those encounters, and guidelines for the outcomes of those activities. This provides little information, however, about individuals' decisions to engage in certain types of activities rather than others, a matter to which the supply side (availability in social contexts) and demand side (personal goals and desires) market theories speak directly (Mollenhorst et al. 2008).

Economic choice theories and rational actor models are concerned with how individuals utilize resources available to them through societal structures to pursue specific goals; these theoretical positions help to shed light on why people choose to pursue certain types of encounters to the exclusion of others and how pairs become matched (Mortensen 1998; Mueller 1986; South & Lloyd 1992). Using an economic approach toward understanding sexual behavior entails considerations of availability of resources, one's own and the resources one seeks from others, scenarios that might come to be individual goals, which of these goals the individual chooses to strive for, their capacity to achieve these goals, and how such factors affect behavior (Laumann et al.

1994). A community can be analyzed as a marketplace in which males seek to acquire sex from females and vice versa. Instead of being fully separate and private events, sexual activities of different couples are loosely interrelated by market principles and societal structures. Gender roles are differentiated in such a way that males are typically thought to be purchasers and females sellers of sex in many societies across the world; though it is clear that this is not always a hard and fast rule (Baumeister & Vohs 2004). This metaphor for sexual exchange also occurs in a literal sense, as seen in circumstances involving voluntary prostitution as well as very unfortunate cases of involuntary human trafficking.

Nobel laureate Gary Becker (1976) defined an economic theory of human behavior by outlining four main assumptions behind such an approach. This theory holds that individual behaviors are interconnected in markets systems, in the presence of stable preferences, where individual choices are shaped by costs and benefits. Scarce, but desirable, resources are allocated by shifts in price and other market influences. The sellers of goods enter into competition with one another as they seek out desired goods, and individual actors continually seek to maximize their outcomes. Interactions between two parties can be analyzed by examining the costs and benefits to each individual, and interactions are likely to occur only when both parties gain more than they expend.

Economic theories of exchange assume that each person gives something to and receives something from the other in every interaction. In sexual partnering activities the 'goods' exchanged are not limited strictly to sex. Other goods exchanged during sexual partnering activities include affection, consideration and respect, commitment to a

relationship, an increase in prestige (i.e. individuals lauded by peers for sexual exploits), and at times material goods such as money, drinks, movie tickets, etc. (Becker 1976; Baumeister & Vohs 2004). It is possible that each party to the exchange is able to achieve a net gain due to the resources they give up representing a greater value to the partner than to themselves. Of course, this is an ideal type, but these basic principles can be uncovered in all voluntary exchanges.

What is assumed in market models of sexual partnering activity is that individuals seek the best deal possible given their available resources and the available supply within the market where they operate. Some individuals may seek sexual partners who are attractive, sexually promiscuous, wealthy, prepared to commit to a long term relationship, or any of a number of other traits. Most likely, individuals are in search of a combination of many traits and place various weights on those traits as they seek out a partner (Becker 1973; England & Farkas 1986; Mortensen 1988); individuals are willing to accept less than a desirable amount of one trait in order to increase the quantity or quality of their take on other traits.

The various sexual scripts may represent greater or lesser likelihood of success depending on the 'goods' the individual is after in their search and what price they are willing to pay for those goods. Individuals who are seeking a long term relationship involving emotional commitment and greater investment of time and other resources may elect to seek out date encounters as these traits are more prevalent in the dating script. Those who seek 'no strings attached' encounters where emotional attachment and time investment are not priorities or the lack thereof is an acceptable 'cost' may be more likely

to follow the hookup script. The emergence of multiple scripts for sexual partnering may signal multiple paths to the same goals – in this case sex; or multiple scripts may represent separate searches for divergent goods.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRIOR LITERATURE REGARDING VARIABLES OF CONCERN IN RELATION TO SEXUAL PARTNERING

#### **Gender**

Gender is a powerful system of social practices which constitute individuals as different in socially significant ways according to biological sex differences, and organizes them based on these differences (Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin 1999). Gender affects the basic guidelines individuals adhere to as they frame interaction (West & Zimmerman 1987). In interaction with many other salient social variables such as race, age, ability, nationality, prestige, and socioeconomic status, gender is a key organizing factor of social life (Sprague 2005). Western societies have accepted a cultural perspective of gender which views men and women as natural and doubtless categories of being with distinct psychological and behavioral tendencies that can be predicted based on their reproductive functions (West & Zimmerman 1987).

Perceived differences between the two genders are frequently seen as enduring and fundamental. As such, individuals respond to one another and situations based in part on cues related to gender, their own and that of the individuals with whom they interact. Unlike other social divisions, such as race and class status, the two groups that typify gender divisions are essentially equal in number, increasing the levels of interaction between the two group designations in comparison to other types of stratification (Blau & Schwartz 1984). Another important feature differentiating gender

from other social divisions is that its constitutive cultural beliefs and confirmatory experiences are sustained within a context of continual interaction between the group designations (Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin 1999), rather than amongst individual groups in relative isolation from one another. I consider each gender separately in my analyses due to the highly differentiated roles found in sexual partnering scripts and societal expectations, as well as the multifaceted differences in life experiences of individuals related to their gender both socially and biologically.

Differences between the genders are readily apparent when considering sexual partnering attitudes and behaviors. When asked to agree or disagree with the statement “I would not have sex with someone unless I was in love with them,” Laumann et al. (2004) find the average response for women was closest to “agree.” The average response for men, however, was closest to “disagree.” This is somewhat instructive of prevailing gender differences regarding sexual behavior. Men tend to have more permissive attitudes toward sex in general and report more sexual partners than do women, as consistently indicated by previous research (Eisenberg et al. 2009; Fielder & Carey 2010a; Laumann et al. 2004; Maticka-Tyndale et al. 1998). This represents a basic mathematic predicament as men should have the same number of female partners as women have male partners overall. This inconsistency has been found in many studies across multiple countries (Fielder & Carey 2010a; Grello et al. 2006; Laumann et al. 1994; Laumann et al. 2004; Regnerus & Uecker 2011). Lauman et al. (1994) offer several logical explanations for this occurrence including the possibility that men may be having more sex with men than women do with women, men and women may differ in

what they view as 'sex,' and the possibility that men exaggerate their reports while women under report.

Men are significantly more likely than women to report having had several sex partners, and they are significantly less likely than women to report having no sex partners at all or only one (Laumann et al. 1994), with men consistently reporting higher numbers of sexual partners than women (Eisenberg et al. 2009; Laumann et al. 2004; Maticka-Tyndale et al. 1998). Men are more likely than women to count non-vaginal sex toward their total number of partners, and a gender double standard that frowns upon women for high numbers of sexual partners may pressure women into under reporting (Regnerus & Uecker 2011). Sex ratios also play a part in gender difference in sexual activity as indicated by sexual economics theory (South & Lloyd 1992). In situations where one gender significantly outnumbered the other, such as in religious settings and colleges where females are commonly the majority, the minority gender will have greater market value as they are in lower supply. This higher market value will give the minority gender greater leverage and ability to seek sex on their own terms (Baumeister & Vohs 2004; Regnerus & Uecker 2011; South & Lloyd 1992).

Differences in reactions to intimacy and emotional disclosure have been noted between males and females. Women are more likely to pursue sex within relationships and casual sex is less attractive to females than to males (Bogle 2008; Bradshaw et al. 2010; Paul & Hayes 2002; Regnerus & Uecker 2011). Duncombe & Marsden (1993) indicate that for many men emotional non-disclosure seems to be a central and unchanging part of their identity. Ingham (1984) likens men to 'psychic celibates' who

fail to commit to any deep emotional involvement in relationships such as marriage and fatherhood. The notion that males seem less involved in what Duncombe & Marsden (1993) call “emotion work,” or “*doing* intimacy,” seems to be common in the literature and in popular culture (Epstein et al 2009). Traces of the notion of a gendered division of emotion can be found from Talcott Parson’s discussion of the nuclear family, contrasting the role of the male as breadwinner to the female’s expressive responsibility for providing emotional warmth and support in the home (Parsons & Bales 1956), to current literature (Duncombe & Marsden 1993; McKinney & Sprecher 1991; Regnerus & Uecker 2011).

For women, the emotional quality of sexual interactions seems to be more influential upon their evaluations of sexual relationships (Basson 2000; Duncombe & Marsden 1993). Women who are dissatisfied with the amount of affection and caring in a relationship report sexual dissatisfaction as well, while males who report sexual dissatisfaction tend to lament the low quantity of sex and want more frequent, impulsive, and varied sexual behavior (Hite 1981; McKinney & Sprecher 1991). Studies comparing married women who report low sexual desire to married women who report normal levels of desire have indicated that those with inhibited sexual desire also report lower levels of affection in and satisfaction with their marital relationships than those with normal levels of desire (Stuart et al. 1987).

While males tend to seek physical satisfaction from sexual encounters, some researchers point out that women are more interested in receiving other ‘goods’ from sexual encounters, such as love, attention, affection, and emotional union (Basson 2000;

Bogle 2008; Leigh 1989; Meston & Buss 2007; Regnerus & Uecker 2011). Studies have found that males are more motivated by goals such as physical release, while women are more motivated by emotional reasons, such as to be psychologically closer to their partner. Other studies have indicated that men, more than women, have sex in order to relieve stress and enhance their feeling of personal power (Hill & Preston 1996; Leigh 1989; Meston & Buss 2007).

### Age

During the freshman year, men and women alike enter college on equal standing, test the limits of their new found freedoms, and most indicate that they do not wish to be ‘tied down,’ meaning that they do not want to be dedicated to a single sexual partner (Bogle 2008). This marks a time of sexual experimentation and heavy alcohol use for both males and females who report that they enjoy partying and hooking-up (Paul & Hayes 2002; Vander Ven & Beck 2009). This pattern begins to change after the freshman year and men’s and women’s goals begin to diverge. Many men continue to enjoy the status quo, content to continue hooking-up with various partners and having sexual interactions without the emotional commitment of dating and established relationships (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger 2009; England & Thomas 2007; Duncombe & Marsden 1993). The hookup script works well for these males and they express no wish to change. Women become increasingly more interested in relationships; they continue to hookup, but they want encounters to develop into something more (Bogle 2008; Fielder & Carey 2010b).

Though not frequently a conscious decision, an age difference between partners has been a longstanding phenomenon. Some studies find that fewer than 4% of women between the ages of eighteen and twenty three years report being in a relationship with a man that is at least two years younger than themselves. Approximately 40% of young women are or have been in a relationship with a man who is three or more years older than themselves. This phenomenon does not occur among males, who consistently partner with women their own age or younger (Regnerus & Uecker 2011). This age gap is related to various characteristics of both genders and varying emphases placed on traits as being desirable in partners. For men, age is often equated to resources like attractiveness, maturity, and stability (Schmitt 2006). For women, being younger is often equated with greater beauty. Age then becomes a marketing tool for males in sexual marketplaces while it is viewed as a deficit for females. However, the age gap in marriages in the United States has continually narrowed. Marrying men and women were separated by an average of over four years in 1890, by approximately 2.5 years in 1960, and presently that number has fallen below two years (Regnerus & Uecker 2011).

The average age of marriage has risen over the past 60 years, but many individuals are now sexually active during adolescence (Bogle 2008). Recessions aside, the economic state in the United States is generally a good one. The American education system is extensive and widely accessible, and labor force participation rates are generally high for women, especially by historical comparison. Relatively speaking, economic situations in the United States are good from both a historical and global perspective, and in circumstances of manageable economic standing, delaying marriage

becomes an economical decision. For many, marriage implies children, and children are an economic investment. With changes in sexual norms over the past century and the advent of highly effective forms of birth control, sex is widely available outside of marriage in dates and hookups. Delaying marriage is frequently couched in one of several cultural claims that are used to legitimize this delay, including the 'can't afford it' script, a 'be your own person' script, and a script that expresses deflated confidence in the institution of marriage all together (Regnerus & Uecker 2011).

Age also affects sexual partnering activities in terms of where people look for partners. Laumann et al. (2004) find that women must look farther afield for sexual partners as they age, a phenomenon that does not seem to occur with men. This is explained in terms of sexual market theory by a decrease in marketability that comes with age for women. As individuals age their friends marry and their social networks contain fewer and fewer singles. For this reason older individuals in general may be required to look further outside of their normal social networks than younger individuals. This results in a higher search cost when looking for a partner. Several factors combine to put older females at a disadvantage relative to older males in the sexual market place. As females age there are fewer males of their same age and older due to greater frequency of male mortality at younger ages than females. Age is seen as a deficit in sexual markets for females while it is a gain for males. Also, the presence of children represents a higher cost associated with an individual, usually female, that has either had children out of wedlock or with a previous partner (Regnerus & Uecker 2011).

Other ways in which age is related to sexual partnering involve the effects of early transition into sexual activity and frequency of unintended pregnancy (Brewster et al. 1993). In 2001 unintended pregnancy was reported at the highest rate among 18-19 year olds as compared to other age groups with one out of ten women reporting an unintended pregnancy. Also, an estimated nineteen million cases of sexually transmitted infections occur annually with almost half among individuals fifteen to twenty four years of age (Turchick & Garske 2009). By the age of 18, more than 70% of adolescents report having had a romantic relationship in the last eighteen months, and the number of previous sexual partners increases with age (Regnerus & Uecker 2011; Shulman et al. 2009). National studies of youth report initiation into sexual activity differs by race. Black individuals are found to enter into sexual activity earlier than other groups, followed by Hispanics, Whites, and Asians (Cavanagh 2007; O'Sullivan et al. 2007). Additionally, youths from more desirable economic circumstances are found to delay initiation into sexual activity longer than others (O'Sullivan et al. 2007).

### **Age at Sexual Debut**

The age of an individual at sexual debut is an important marker for tendency toward high-risk behavior and risks for contracting sexually transmitted disease (Orr et al. 2008). Early first sexual intercourse is associated with risky behaviors such as drug use, not using contraception, having higher numbers of sex partners, and having intercourse more frequently (Seidman 1994). Earlier first intercourse is also correlated with lower socioeconomic status (Orr et al. 2008; Seidman 1994), and later age of sexual

debut and is associated with higher levels of importance placed upon religion (Resnick et al. 1997). Research indicates that early initiation into sexual activity negatively impacts academic performance as well (Schvaneveldt et al. 2001).

### **Race**

Differences are found by race in regards to patterns of sexual sequences and levels of sexual activity. Greater portions of Black individuals report having more than one sex partner in the past year than that among other races, and substantially fewer Asians than individuals of other race groups report more than one partner. Both Black and White people report more partners over the adult lifetime than Hispanics, Asians, or Native Americans (Laumann et al. 2004). People of various races also differ in terms of the percent of non-marital sexual encounters that occur outside of romantic relationships.

A higher percentage of non-marital sexual encounters occurring outside of romantic relationships are reported amongst Blacks than other race groups. 28.8% of non-marital sexual encounters of White males occur outside of romantic relationships, 33.4 % for Blacks, 29.4% for Hispanics, and 18.7% for Asians. 17.9% of non-marital sexual encounters occur outside of romantic relationships for White females, 19% for Blacks, 17.3% for Hispanics, 17.6% for Asians. Overall, 29.1% of non-marital sexual encounters occur outside of romantic relationships for males and 18% for females. Asian Americans are less likely to engage in casual sex behaviors than other race groups (Feldman et al. 1999; Owen et al. 2010), and Blacks have been found to report more

permissive attitudes toward casual sex than Whites and other groups (Owen et al. 2010; Weinberg & Williams 1988).

Economic theories explain these occurrences among Black males as a simple matter of supply and demand (Harknett & McLanahan 2004; Kalmijn 1993; Kalmijn & Flapp 2001; Regnerus & Uecker 2011). One in nine Black males between the ages of twenty and thirty four are incarcerated (Regnerus & Uecker 2011). This results in an imbalance that affects the sexual marketplace and its dynamics. Available Black males are in low supply and therefore gain more bargaining power in the sexual marketplace which enhances their access to sexual variety (Beck 1973; Regnerus & Uecker 2011). Black women face a market situation that is unique in that there is a lack of status equal Black males from which partners could be drawn. This leaves Black women with few options as White and Hispanic men tend to favor Whiteness in their sex partners (Kalmijn 1993; Laumann et al. 2004). These factors provide logical explanations for some of the variance in the behaviors of Black males compared to other groups.

College students who are racial minorities may act differently than members of their racial group as a whole due to their low numbers in college compared to other races. The relative numbers of socially and culturally different people in a group are seen as critical in shaping interaction dynamics (Kanter 1977a). In his analysis of the significance of numbers in social life, Simmel (1950) argued that numerical modifications bring about qualitative changes in group interactions. When a minority group is present in a social setting it is found in some case that the minority group will receive heightened attention or visibility that exacerbates pressures for them to perform

well in regards to particular social standards. These individuals can feel isolated from informal social networks and their differences from the dominant group may be exaggerated. The minority group may also be encapsulated into stereotyped roles. Rossabeth Moss Kanter (1977b) defined this situation as “tokenism.” According to Kanter, the circumstances defined as tokenism are likely to occur in situations where a minority group composes less than 15% of the whole group. When this situation occurs it can be expected that individuals in the minority group may change their behavior due to increased scrutiny.

Empirical research from the 1980’s and forward has shown that various kinds of intermarriage have become more common over the course of the twentieth century including marriages between various Protestants and Catholics, Jews and Christians, and between various ancestral groups that formally did not intermarry, such as Irish and Italians (Kalmijn 1991, 1993; Kosmin et al. 1991; Lieberman & Waters 1988). Findings such as these are indicative of a weakening of group boundaries in the United States. However, one exception seems to be the boundary between Blacks and Whites. This boundary between Black and White interracial marriage and friendship is said to stem from strong patterns of residential segregation, and socioeconomic divide (Kalmijn 1993; McPherson et al. 2001). Another exception can be seen in the indication found in previous literature that as intimacy increases racial homophily increases (Blackwell & Lichter 2004). Some theories of friendship have identified several bases for interpersonal attraction. These include propinquity, status, homophily, and reciprocity (Hallinan & Williams 1989; McPherson et al. 2001; Quillian & Campbell 2003). Homophily is the

tendency for individuals to develop social connections, such as friendships, with similar others (Quillian & Campbell 2003).

The settings from which friends are typically chosen are usually relatively homogeneous in composition causing a combination of homophily and propinquity, the tendency to form friendships with others who share the same social situation, to produce high levels of racial homogeneity in social networks (Feld 1982; Quillian & Campbell 2003). Propinquity, however, can also work to promote increased cross-race friendships, provided the social setting is sufficiently heterogeneous (Quillian & Campbell 2003). Cross-race friendships tend to increase as the number of White and Black students move toward parity, but, even in numerically integrated situations, interracial friendships remain less likely than same-race friendships (Hallinan & Williams 1989; Quillian & Campbell 2003).

### **Religious Attendance**

Among individuals who display religiosity, faith clearly plays a role in their sexual decision making. More devoutly religious individuals tend to report fewer partners and less sex (Regnerus & Uecker 2011), while individuals with no religious affiliation have a higher incidence of having many sex partners (Laumann et al.1994). The type of religion does not seem to cause this effect; as indicated in previous research, commitment to religion causes the effect more than the type of religion. Increased religious attendance has been found to decrease the chance of casual physical encounters (Burdette et al. 2009). Sex among religious individuals is far more likely to occur within

relationships and to develop less rapidly and after greater displays of commitment than sex occurring between individuals who do not display traits of religiosity (Regnerus & Uecker 2011).

Religion seems to be more important to females and plays more of a role in their sexual decision making than men (Laumann et al. 2004; Regnerus & Uecker 2011). Religious participation has been found to increase with age, and women tend to have higher religious participation than do men. (Laumann et al. 2004). While religiosity is related to a lower number of overall partners, religious affiliation provides a more extensive network of acquaintances from which to draw partners. Both men and women frequently meet partners in institutionally embedded, socially pre-selective settings, and individuals who meet in religious contexts are likely to share similar worldviews leading to more compatible matches (Laumann et al. 2004). While religious beliefs and attendance may discourage permissive sexual behavior, religious attendance produces a network of connections from which to draw partners.

### **Mother's Education Attainment**

Sociologists, family studies researchers, and other social scientists have emphasized the role of the primary group tie of the family in the transmission of social capital, status, and other resources such as friendship and business networks across generations (Bianchi & Robinson 1997; Sewell & Hauser 1980; Yeung & Pfeffer 2009). A child from a highly educated parent will benefit from positive interactions with that parent, and perhaps genetic factors, that convey encouragement toward and set the stage

for increased cognitive development and ability. Social interactions with such a parent can create resources that will enhance the child's realization of their potential for academic achievement (Bianchi & Robinson 1997).

Further, parents with higher levels of education may have greater expectations for their children than other parents, thus instilling a motivation for academic success in their offspring, perhaps resulting in different behavior patterns later in the child's life (Yeung & Pfeffer 2009). The effects of parental education and the subsequent forms of social capital they are able to transmit to their offspring may heavily influence student behavior, including college students' selectivity in sexual partnering practices and other social activity, with those whose parents were not as highly educated being less prepared to participate in marriage and dating markets (Musick et al. 2012).

### **Sexual Outcomes**

Engaging in a sexual encounter represents a wide array of risk factors, both physical and emotional. Sexual orientation, type of sexual contact, number of sex partners, and frequency of sexual interaction are all characteristics that have been cited as risk factors for the passing of sexually transmitted infections (STI's) (Jog et al. 1993). The risk of infecting or being infected by a partner with acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) is higher among men who have sex with men due to the occurrence of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) being more prevalent among this group (Das et al. 2010; Jog et al. 1993; Turner et al. 1989). As regards types of sexual contact, female infection through vaginal intercourse with an infected male has been documented, and

female to male infection can also occur through vaginal intercourse (Padian 1987). HIV transmission through receiving anal intercourse is believed to be a more efficient route of transmission than vaginal intercourse (Jog et al. 1993; Padian 1987). There are also documented cases of transmission in both heterosexual and homosexual men engaging in oral sex, but this type of transmission is less common (Jog et al. 1993; Spitzer & Weiner 1989). Many students are unaware of STI risks and researchers indicate that as much as 50% of students showed little concern about contracting STI's (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger 2009).

Intercourse represents a greater level of risk than many non-coital sexual acts, due to factors such as pregnancy and STI's. Encompassing a broader range of non-coital sexual behaviors in operationalizing sexual encounters is suggested as a more accurate reflection of the variety of experiences and levels of risk present during sexual partnering encounters (Paul et al. 2000). For these reasons it is important to differentiate individuals who engage in sexual partnering behaviors where low levels of risk are present from individuals engaging in encounters that include sexual acts such as vaginal or anal penetration.

Emotional risks, such as depression and low self-esteem, are also related to types of sexual encounters and different behaviors within those encounters. Individuals who do not hookup have been found in some studies to have higher self-esteem than both individuals who have non-coital hookups and individuals who have coital hookups (Paul et al. 2000). Depression has been linked with casual sex behavior for females (Grello et al. 2006), but males who engage in casual sex have been found to exhibit the fewest

depressive symptoms of any group (Eisenberg 2009). Social risk factors can be related to emotional well-being also, and women have been shown to be at higher risk of obtaining a bad reputation than men by engaging in sex casually or with multiple partners (England et al. 2007). However, the psychological pressure to conform to stereotypes of males as sexually promiscuous and engaging in partnering encounters with as many partners as possible has been shown to be stressful for males (Paul & Hayes 2002), which may lead to alterations in behavior patterns as a stress avoidance measure.

Several factors are found to predict engagement in risk taking sexual behavior. Family background has been linked to general attitudes about sex and relationships. Parental divorce and parental relationship conflict are associated with less commitment to marriage and greater likelihood of short term partnering (Amato & Deboer 2001; Fielder & Carey 2010a). Among college women, those with divorced parents were more likely to report having hooked up (Owen et al 2010). Parental divorce has also been associated with higher levels of sexual behavior with non-romantic partners (Manning et al. 2005). Lower parental income has been associated with increased casual sex and greater levels of risky behavior as well (Miller et al. 2001; Owen et al. 2010).

Short term durations of romantic relationships are found to be related to higher levels of health risk (Manning et al. 2005). College women, in particular, have been found to be at greater risk for sexual assault than women in the general population (Nurius et al. 1996). Beliefs about the availability of condoms and the individual's ability to properly utilize or persuade a partner to properly utilize a condom can bring about lowered or non-use of condoms leading to greater instances of STI's and

pregnancy. Beliefs about one's own efficacy and self-esteem are also related to taking appropriate protective measures and resisting unwanted sex (Hutchinson & Wood 2007). Risk-taking behavior, in general, has been found to increase through childhood toward a peak during the adolescent and college years, after which levels are found to recede (Figner et al. 2009).

Males are found to consistently report higher numbers of previous sexual partners than females (Grello et al. 2006). This, again, may be related to males' tendency to seek physical interaction above relationship formation compared to females as discussed above. Individuals with greater levels of casual sex experience are found to report higher numbers of sexual partners than those who report greater romantic involvement and intentions (Grello et al. 2006). Number of previous sexual partners have been found to be correlated with depressive symptoms (Eisenberg et al. 2009), self-esteem (Fielder & Carey 2010a), higher risk for sexually transmitted infections (Parsons et al. 2000), and sexual outcomes of hookup encounters (Fielder & Carey 2010a).

### **Living Arrangements and Fraternity/Sorority Membership**

Students who forgo campus dormitory living arrangements in favor of private living arrangements report heavier drinking. Individuals who choose private living arrangements in college have also been found to have a higher level of increase in alcohol consumption as they transition from high school to college compared to students who live in campus dorms (Fromme et al. 2008). College students living with their family of origin are found to engage in fewer risky sexual behaviors (Hittner & Kryzanowski

2010). Hittner & Kryzanowski (2010) find that males who reside in campus living arrangements have been found to be more likely to engage in casual sex than those living off-campus, while no such correlation was found for females. Students living in fraternities and sororities have been found to report substantially higher numbers of casual sex partners than those living in student residence halls as well as reporting higher rates of alcohol and drug use (Dinger & Parsons 1999; Nurius et al. 1996).

### **Education Aspirations**

Research suggests that men are consistently able to translate higher education and good economic prospects into increased opportunities in the marriage market (Cooney & Hogan 1991; Goldscheider & Waite 1986; Musick et al. 2012). Also, increase in years of schooling is found to increase the chances of ever marrying for women (Musick et al. 2012; Thornton et al. 1995). Long-term trends in research show that those with higher education levels are unlikely to marry someone of lower education levels, and those with low levels of education are unlikely to marry up (Blackwell 1998; Kalmijn 1991a). High education aspirations may lead individuals to seek to further their education at elite universities, where, as some research suggests, the hookup may be the preferred form of partnering activity as it represents a time savings and may be more congruent with the highly competitive atmosphere on such campuses (Regnerus & Uecker 2011; Stepp 2007).

### **Grade Point Average**

Grade point average may be reflective of an individual's natural academic talent, but is likely to also reflect both a desire to achieve and execution of practices that lead to success. Like education aspirations more generally, academic achievement may indicate that an individual places high value on their academic career. Such a positive outlook toward education has been found to be a protective factor for young adults who are considered to be at risk for a number of negative outcomes including academic failure, low socioeconomic achievement, and health risks (Jessor 1991). Quatman et al. (2001) point out a negative correlation between frequency of dating and academic achievement in adolescents, and that frequency of dating and academic motivation are negatively correlated. Literature in the areas of health and education research indicates strong relationships between student sexual activity and lowered academic achievement. Increased sexual activity comes with higher risks of sexually transmitted infections, risk of pregnancy, potential depressive and lowered self-esteem symptoms, and less time spent attending to school related activities (Grello et al. 2006; Symons et al. 1997).

CHAPTER V  
HYPOTHESES

**The Date, the Hookup, and Interest in Relationship-Building**

According to views popular among researchers, journalists, and students alike, the hookup script has developed in such a way that a desire for long-term commitment is not thought to be a goal individuals have in mind when engaging in a hookup encounter; long-term involvement is not thought to develop from hookups. The hookup is taken to be a divergent path extending forward in a departure from the more traditional form of sexual partnering encounter – the date. It is unclear based on existing literature whether these two social scripts are completely separate from one another yet targeting the same goal, nor whether either is more prevalent than the other. Some researchers have suggested that hookups do lead to further involvement between encounter partners, perhaps developing into a romantic relationship, but the overarching theme remains one of emotional and romantic detachment in regards to hooking-up. In agreement with these notions, I formulate a hypothesis regarding the nature of hookups.

*H<sub>1</sub>: Hookups do not lead to individuals becoming interested in entering a romantic relationship with encounter partners.*

*H<sub>0</sub>: Hookups do lead to individuals becoming interested in entering a romantic relationship with encounter partners.*

I test this hypothesis by analyzing the percentage of individuals who report having a hookup encounter and whether or not those individuals indicate interest in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after the hookup. This information is not asked of respondents in regards to date encounters, making direct comparison of the two encounter types difficult. Based on popular media depictions, personal experience, and academic literature, it is apparent to me that the date script is very well established and holds essentially the same meaning for all groups across society in the United States. Considering the level of entrenchment of the date script, the absence of information from the OCSLS regarding an interest in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after a date does not represent a hurdle that must be overcome. However, such an analysis examining hookup encounters is necessary as the hookup script is not nearly as well defined nor understood. For dates, interest in romantic involvement with the encounter partner is implied by virtue of the inclusion of relationship building intentions in the dating script as a defining feature.

I address this hypothesis by analyzing the portion of respondents who report desiring a romantic relationship after a hookup encounter; also, I formulate ordered logistic regression models for males and females predicting level of interest in a romantic relationship with the partner after a hookup encounter. I analyze the effects of various traits on the probability of being interested in a romantic relationship with the partner after a hookup and consider what that information might indicate about the nature of the hookup script. The effects of intoxication, taken to be a key part of the hookup script, desire for more opportunity for hookups, and the effects of other characteristics on the

probability of interest in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after a hookup are considered, and their relation to and inclusion in the hookup script are examined.

Beyond the initial hypothesis stated above, I formulate hypotheses that address various aspects of both date and hookup encounters in an effort to account for points raised in the existing literature and in an effort to contribute to the body of knowledge surrounding college students' sexual behaviors. My hypotheses are intended to lead toward analyses that will expand existing knowledge about date and hookup encounters, and I examine aspects of these scripts that have not previously been addressed or which may be items of debate in the current literature. By following a trajectory from selection into, activity during, and outcomes of sexual partnering encounters, and by addressing students' experiences and how they may differ for each gender, I attempt to differentiate dates from hookups based on various traits of the encounters, the individuals who engage in them, and the outcomes of each.

### **Selection into Dating and Hooking up as Modes of Sexual Partnering Experience**

In addition to examining demographic characteristics of individuals who elect to engage in date and/or hookup encounters, I analyze individuals' family background, educational aspirations, and desires for sexual partnering opportunities, and sexual histories, as well as other traits. To what extent do individuals who engage in hookups differ from those who engage in dates? Are those who engage in hookups a distinct group apart from those who engage in dates, both, or neither on these characteristics? I consider similarities and differences between the encounters as well as between the

individuals who engage in these encounters. Noting differences in the scripts of dates and hookups outlined by previous writers, my second hypothesis is guided by the belief that dates and hookups differ greatly.

*H<sub>2</sub>. Date encounters differ significantly from hookup encounters.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. Date encounters do not differ significantly from hookup encounters.*

If the date and hookup scripts do greatly differ, these differences may be related to the actual encounter scripts or extend beyond the encounters and be attributable to the differences in the individuals who enact the scripts. Individuals possessing certain traits may be more likely to enact the hookup script than the date script. Life experiences, such as being raised in a home with well-educated parents, personal characteristics, such as race or age, and behaviors, such as religious attendance or early entrance into sexual activity, may lead an individual to prefer one type of encounter over the other. I hypothesize that those who select into these behaviors will report significant differences on a number of individual traits.

*H<sub>3</sub>. Individuals who engage in date encounters differ significantly from individuals who engage in hookup encounters.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. Individuals who engage in date encounters do not differ significantly from individuals who engage in hookup encounters.*

I also consider the theme that hookups have come to surpass dates as the most common form of sexual partnering activity on college campuses. I hypothesize that this form occurs more frequently than do dates:

*H<sub>4</sub>. Hookups occur at a significantly higher rate than do dates.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. Hookups occur at the same or a significantly lower rate than do dates.*

To address my first hypothesis regarding selection into encounter experiences, I carry out t-tests of difference between the dates of individuals who did date but did not hookup (N=2,301, 14.37% of respondents) and the hookups of individuals who did hookup but did not date (N=1,049, 6.55% of respondents). Next, I analyze the encounters of individuals who engaged in both date and hookup encounters (N=6,825, 42.63% of respondents) by conducting t-tests of difference between those individuals' date encounters (74.79% of all date encounters) and hookup encounters (86.68% of all hookup encounters). Comparisons are made based on the set of variables representing encounter characteristics. To analyze differences between individuals who elect to engage in dates, hookups, both, or neither, I first conduct t-tests of difference comparing individuals who have various combinations of encounter experience. I then calculate a series of logistic regression models predicting individuals' previous encounter experience. I compare the regression coefficients of each model to determine their effects on respondents likely encounter experience.

In order to speak to the rate at which dates and hookups occur, and whether one form or the other is more prevalent, I calculate the rate of date and hookup encounters

based on the occurrence of each as reported by the students responding to the OCSLS and compare the two. I also consider rates within various demographic groups, such as by gender, race, living arrangement, and achievement as measured by grade point average.

### **Behaviors during Sexual Partnering Encounters**

How do individuals experience what they view to be date and hookup encounters? What types of risks are individuals taking when they engage in date and hookup encounters? If the hookup script does involve anonymity to the extent reported in previous literature, does this mean that individuals who engage in hookups are more reserved and less willing to take risks than those who enact the dating script, which is said to be concerned with relationship building? Put another way, will the possibility for and/or intent to develop a long-term romantic relationship, which is taken to be inherent to the dating script, motivate individuals to engage in more intimate sexual behaviors thus exposing themselves to a greater risk of STI's? I examine the levels of STI risk that occur in dates and hookups in order to address these questions.

*H<sub>5</sub>. Date encounters are associated with a significantly higher probability of increased STI risk levels than are hookup encounters.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. Date encounters are associated with the same or significantly lower probability of increased STI risk levels than are hookup encounters.*

Previous researchers point out that intoxication plays a role in sexual partnering activities, particularly hookup encounters, and that risk taking behaviors such as binge drinking and drug use commonly occur alongside other risk taking behaviors. In order to

address these findings, I ask questions regarding intoxication and test the hypothesis that intoxication will lead to higher levels of risky sexual behavior. I also develop a hypothesis regarding the frequency of intoxication within encounters. Noting that intoxication has been cited by previous researchers as an anticipatory excuse for engaging in behaviors that may lead to social criticism or awkwardness, I make the assumption that intoxication will be more prevalent in hookup encounters as these encounters are taken to be more spontaneous than date encounters.

*H<sub>6</sub>. Individuals who are intoxicated during sexual partnering encounters report significantly higher levels of risky sexual behavior than those who are not intoxicated.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. Individuals who are intoxicated during sexual partnering encounters report the same or significantly lower levels of risky sexual behavior.*

*H<sub>7</sub>. Intoxication is present at a significantly higher rate during hookup encounters than during date encounters.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. Intoxication is present at the same or a significantly lower rate during hookup encounters than date encounters.*

What are the effects of the social contexts in which individuals meet partners on subsequent behavior and levels of risk taken during sexual partnering encounters? Does self-reported familiarity with a partner increase the risk taking behaviors that individuals engage in during hookup encounters? Finally, how does intoxication during a sexual partnering encounter relate to the level of STI risk taken during the encounter? Do individuals who are intoxicated engage in higher levels of risky sexual behavior? As

previous literature indicates, is intoxication more common during hookup encounters than date encounters?

Based on individuals' reliance on socially established knowledge and social ties to navigate exchanges, I hypothesize that those individuals who feel they know a hookup partner to some degree prior to the encounter will engage in increased levels of STI risk as compared to those who do not feel that they know the partner well. Based on perceptions of social distance stemming from contexts, individuals enter into a state of trust and may be more likely to engage in risk taking behaviors during a sexual partnering encounter. I form two hypotheses that address these notions.

*H<sub>8</sub>. The contexts in which individuals meet lead to significantly different levels of STI risk.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. The contexts in which people meet do not lead to significantly different levels of STI risk.*

*H<sub>9</sub>. Levels of STI risk during hookup encounters are significantly higher among individuals who believe they know their partner well than among individuals who do not.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. Levels of STI risk are not significantly different or are significantly lower among individuals who believe they know their partner well than among individuals who do not.*

I test my hypotheses regarding STI risk during sexual partnering encounters by creating ordered logistic regression models, separately for males and females, predicting level of risky behavior utilizing various key variables of concern. Along with

demographic, attitudinal, and education traits, I utilize meeting contexts, behaviors during encounters, and intoxication during encounter as predictor variables alongside a number of other traits included as control variables. For my hypothesis addressing the relationship between how well individuals believed they knew their hookup partner and levels of risky sexual behavior during the hookup encounter, I utilize t-tests of difference comparing students ,whom I categorize by how well they indicate having known their encounter partner prior to the hookup, along a number of personal characteristics and attitudes. This analysis is only calculated for hookups as an equivalent question regarding how well respondents felt they knew date partners is not present in the OCSLS data.

### **Outcomes of Sexual Partnering Encounters**

A primary concern motivating the current research is an interest in the outcomes that develop from the date and hookup scripts. How does gender factor into the experiences of college students as they engage in sexual partnering activities? I ask whether dates and hookups are gendered and, if so, which gender benefits from each type of encounter. How do levels of intoxication and sexual behaviors during encounters affect the outcomes of sexual partnering activities? Based on previous research, it is my estimate that the date represents a somewhat more stable script than the hookup. Noting that previous writers have indicated that hookups involve a degree of emotional detachment and in spite of the traditional gender norms attributed to the date script I hypothesize that, overall, dates will lead to higher levels of satisfaction than hookups.

*H<sub>10</sub>. Dates represent a significantly higher degree of overall satisfaction after encounter than do hookup encounters.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. Dates represent the same or significantly lower degree of overall satisfaction after encounter than do hookup encounters.*

While my hypothesis regarding the outcomes of sexual partnering activities operate under the assumption that dates represent greater levels of satisfaction overall than do hookups, I separately consider gender specific levels of satisfaction. For these hypotheses I draw from previous literature and work under the assumption that the hookup script represents a lack of emotional attachment and serves to facilitate sexual activity with no further commitment. This is a pattern that has been previously cited as favoring male satisfaction. In light of this I hypothesize that males report higher levels of satisfaction with hookups than do females.

*H<sub>11</sub>. Hookup encounters represent a significantly higher degree of overall satisfaction after encounter for males than females.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. Hookup encounters represent the same or significantly lower degree of satisfaction after encounter for males than females.*

Conversely, I hypothesize that females will report greater levels of satisfaction with dates than do males. If current notions about males favoring emotionally detached opportunities for sexual activity and females displaying a preference for emotional connection hold true, then the date script, where engagement has greater potential for resulting in relationship development, may reasonably be expected to lead to greater satisfaction for females than males.

*H<sub>12</sub>. Dates represent a higher degree of overall satisfaction after encounter for females than males.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. Dates represent the same or significantly lower degree of overall satisfaction after encounter for females than males.*

Finally, I address the role of intoxication in sexual partnering encounters and how intoxication may affect the outcomes of date and hookup encounters. I hypothesize that intoxication will lead to lower degrees of satisfaction with both dates and hookups. If intoxication results in greater levels of risk taking behavior, it stands to reason that individuals may experience regret or other negative outcomes such as social awkwardness, rejection, and increased levels of STI risk. Some previous research indicates that intoxication is utilized as a type of scapegoat for behaviors that are later regretted by individuals who engage in sexual partnering activities. Such findings inform the following hypotheses.

*H<sub>13</sub>. Intoxication is correlated with a significantly lower degree of satisfaction after encounter for both dates and hookups.*

*H<sub>0</sub>. Intoxication is not significantly related to lower degrees of satisfaction after encounter or is indicative of increased levels of satisfaction with sexual partnering encounters for both dates and hookups.*

My first hypotheses regarding the outcomes of sexual partnering activities address the degree of satisfaction with each type of sexual partnering encounter overall, gender differences in satisfaction with dates and hookups, and the effects of intoxication during encounters. I calculate ordered logistic regression models predicting overall satisfaction

with sexual partnering encounters, separately for males and females, including intoxication, other encounter level characteristics, personal traits, and institution level characteristics as predictor and control variables. Based on the resulting models, I seek to determine if a significant difference in likely levels of satisfaction occur based on the modeled predictor variables; to determine how various encounter, personal, and contextual traits affect the probability of increased overall satisfaction; and to analyze the effects of intoxication during encounter on the outcomes of the encounter.

CHAPTER VI  
EXPLANATION OF METHODS

**Predictive Models**

As I presented my several hypotheses in the preceding section I indicated methods I intend to make use of in order to investigate the various topics addressed. I will now provide a more detailed explanation of the regression methods I have selected, as well as other statistical techniques utilized. The group of statistical techniques collectively labeled “regression” has expanded in both predictive power and number over the past thirty years. Advances in statistical software and computing power over time have provided helpful methods for implementing regression techniques (Long 1997). For all analyses presented here I have made extensive use of the Stata data analysis and statistical software package produced by StataCorp to implement the various methods described. Stata is designed in such a way as to be readily extendible, a feature that welcomes community contributions that tackle specific methods and issues by implementing methods that are native to the software distribution package in a different manner and/or by providing functionality that expands the software’s original capabilities.

Along with various minor extensions, I make use of a Stata extension package referred to as GLLAMM as recommended by Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal (2008), who are also the producers of this extension. Along with Stata's native regression commands, I implement GLLAMM in order to calculate hierarchical regression models. In many instances, multiple commands are utilized and the results of each have been compared to insure consistency and accuracy of the models chosen for my analyses. For a more extensive discussion of statistical software packages and extensions I suggest referencing Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal (2008), Li et al. (2011), and StataCorp's website and user community forum (Stata Listserve). I will not go into great detail here regarding variations in results between available software packages and commands other than to point out that, while minor variations do occur, modern statistical software and computing techniques are well documented and results are largely consistent amongst the major software packages commonly utilized by sociologists, economists, medical researchers, and researchers from other fields. Best practices recommended within the literature and by producers of computing software have been implemented here to the greatest feasible degree.

In my effort to explore the two types of sexual partnering script addressed in this work, I develop regression models which predict outcomes on key variables of concern based on a set of control variables drawn from characteristics of the students surveyed, their sexual partnering encounters, and the social contexts of the institutions where they study. These traits are chosen based upon the previous research and theoretical

motivations that I have previously outlined. Each of these variables and procedures for their preparation are discussed in subsequent chapters.

To analyze the influence of various factors on the probability that an individual has engaged or not engaged in a date and/or hookup encounter, I treat each category of encounter experience separately. I formulate logistic random-intercept regression models for each of the four encounter experience categories, which are represented by a series of binary variables, to predict the probability of an individual reporting a positive response for having engaged in the specific combination of encounters represented by a particular category. I have chosen to refer now to the encounter experience category of 'Date Only,' representing individuals who engaged in a date but did not engage in a hookup, for explanatory purposes; the process I will now outline I also carry out in a similar manner for additional regression models which variously predict encounter experience categories and intoxication during encounters. Each of these models, as well as the ordered logistic regression models discussed below, is developed and calculated using a similar process, with only minor variations as called for by the specific level of measurement of the outcome variable under examination.

I begin by fitting a multiple logistic regression model predicting having engaged in only a date encounter (in which case the variable Date Only = 1) as compared to all other combinations of encounter experience (indicated by the variable Date Only = 0) by maximum likelihood estimation. Initial multiple regression models, the results of which are not reported, are utilized as a point of reference only. To address the structural characteristics of the social environments in which students engage, the institutions

present in the OCSLS data are treated as randomly sampled. To account for potential effects resulting from the nested structure of the data, where respondents are students who are nested within schools, I formulate a random-intercept regression model predicting having dated but not hooked up. An unconditional, or null, model is also developed during each formulation for comparison and testing purposes.

Random-intercept regression models have several advantages over the more simplistic multiple regression models, including the ability to estimate the effects of covariates at the cluster (school) level, consideration of clusters as being sampled from a population, and the ability to control for cluster-level effects in order to clarify the effects of outcome variables, such as the dependent variable representing a student having engaged in a date but not a hookup encounter, which are measured at lower levels of the hierarchical data structure, i.e. at the student level (Li et al. 2011; Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008). When examining a two-level data structure, use of random-intercepts regression models for continuous outcome variables accounts for variance across students and schools by separating a variance residual into two parts, each pertaining to a different level of the available data (Goldstein 1995). This division results in a between-cluster component, which represents variance between schools, and a within-cluster component, which represents variance within specific schools (Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008). Unobserved cluster-level characteristics, which may have an effect on the student level outcome variables, are represented by a residual term that is specific to clusters and constant across cases. This term is denoted here as  $\zeta_j$ . A second component, specific to

each cluster at each case, is indicated here by  $\epsilon_{ij}$ . The linear random-intercept model is formulated as seen in Figure 1.

Figure 1. A Linear Random-Intercept Model

$$y_{ij} = \beta_1 + \beta_a x_{pij} + \zeta_j + \epsilon_{ij}$$

Within this formulation,  $\beta_1$  through  $\beta_a$  are fixed parameters which represent the effects of predictor and control variables whose variances are estimated together with the variance of the term  $\epsilon_{ij}$ .

The conventional logit model, that is commonly utilized to address binomial outcome variables, determines the effect of covariates representing specific traits on the probability of an event occurring versus not occurring, and is conditioned by an assumption that responses are independent among the data analyzed. Data from the OCSLS fail to meet this condition due to the data's nested structure. The basic logit model is extended to formulate a random-intercept logit model by relaxing the conditional independence assumption among responses from a cluster by including a random intercept – denoted as  $\zeta_j$  - for each cluster. Figure 2 presents the random-intercept logit model.

Figure 2. A Random-Intercept Logit Model

$$\text{logit}\{\Pr(y_i = 1|x_i)\} = \beta_1 + \beta_2x_{2j} + \beta_3x_{3ij} + \beta_4x_{2j}x_{3ij} + \zeta_j$$

With the terms  $\zeta_j | x_{ij} \sim N(0, \psi)$  and  $\zeta_j$  being independent across clusters, represented by  $j$ , the fixed effects  $\beta_1$  through  $\beta_4$  and a random effect  $\zeta_j$ .

Because it captures both the mean and the dependence structures, facilitating a more useful analysis of the effects of covariates at each level of the data, this model is useful for examining hierarchical data structures. Utilizing this model, I obtain a more efficient consideration of any unobserved factors, such as campus cultural differences or other effects across the schools sampled in the OCSLS. Inference beyond schools in the sample becomes more feasible and greater accuracy in terms of the statistical significance of the regression coefficients is obtained utilizing this formulation than is possible with other regression techniques (Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008). Furthermore, this multilevel approach offers a convenient framework for analyzing the effects of macro contextual structures on respondent level covariates (Li et al. 2011; Guo 2000).

In order to investigate factors that lead to a given partnering encounter being considered a date versus a hookup, I consider encounters as a unit of measure resulting in a three level structuring of the OCSLS data. For this purpose, I view the OCSLS data as having a three level nested structure, and formulate a logistic random-intercept model predicting the outcome of encounter type. This model is fit utilizing a latent response formulation where encounters  $i$  are nested within respondents  $j$  who are nested in schools  $k$ . The model is illustrated in Figure 3.

Figure 3. A Three-Level Logistic Random-Intercept Model

$$y_{ijk}^* = \beta_1 + \beta_2 x_{2ijk} + \dots + \beta_{11} x_{11jk} + \zeta_{jk}^{(2)} + \zeta_{jk}^{(3)} + \epsilon_{ijk}$$

In this formulation  $\epsilon_{ijk} | x_{ijk}, \zeta_{jk}^{(2)}, \zeta_{jk}^{(3)}$  has a logistic distribution with the variance  $\pi^2/3$  (Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008), and the observed dichotomous response is generated from the following threshold function:

Figure 4. Threshold Function for Determining Observed Dichotomous Response from Logistic Regression Models

$$y_{ijk} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y_{ijk}^* > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The covariates from this model can then be interpreted as an increase or decrease in the probability that a given partnering encounter will be reported as a hookup (coded as 1) rather than a date (coded as 0).

For several of the outcome variables analyzed in this investigation, I implement ordered logistic regression methods. Interest in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after a hookup, level of STI risk during encounter, and satisfaction after encounter are each coded as categorical responses based on the OCSLS data. For each of the resulting variables, the categories are ordered by degree or intensity. Models predicting such outcome variables are based upon the models for binary outcome variables discussed above. The formulation of an ordinal response model for data with a single level structure considers an ordinal response outcome variable, denoted as  $y_i$ , with

a given number,  $S$ , of ordered categories, denoted as  $s$  ( $s = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ). To specify a regression model for such a response, the model structure presented in Figure 5 is utilized.

Figure 5. An Ordinal Response Logit Model for Single-Level Data

$$\Pr(y_i > s | x_i) = F(\beta_2 x_i - J_s) \quad s = 1, 2, 3, \quad S - 1$$

In Figure 5,  $F(\cdot)$  is a cumulative distribution function (CDF). This represents the cumulative probability that a response is in a higher category than  $s$  given a specific covariate structure, denoted here by  $x_i$  (Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008). This structure is a generalized linear model when  $F(\cdot)$  is considered to be the inverse link function and if the category-specific linear predictor  $v_{is}$  is formulated as presented in Figure 6.

Figure 6. Category Specific Linear Predictor for Ordinal Response Logistic Regression

$$v_{is} = \beta_2 x_2 - J_s$$

Category-specific parameters, here denoted by  $J_s$ , are often referred to as thresholds.

Within such a model, the link function represents a cumulative probability, rather than the expectation of the response (Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008).

An alternative formulation of the ordered logit model based on the concept of a latent variable facilitates a more intuitive means for interpreting the model results (Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008). Defining  $y^*$  as a latent variable with an infinite negative to positive range, the latent variable structural formulation is given in Figure 7.

Figure 7. Latent Response Structural Formulation of Ordered Logit Model

$$y_i^* = x_i\beta + \epsilon_i$$

In Figure 7,  $i$  is the observation and  $\epsilon$  is a random error. The measurement model formulation for binary outcomes divides  $y^*$  into  $J$  ordinal categories (Long & Freese 2006) as in Figure 8.

Figure 8. Measurement Model Formulation Dividing Latent Response Variable into Categories for Determining Ordinal Outcomes

$$y_i = m \text{ if } \tau_m - 1 \leq y_i^* < \tau_m \text{ for } m = 1 \text{ to } J$$

The observed ordinal responses  $y_i$  are generated from the latent continuous response  $y_i^*$  by way of a threshold model, denoted in Figure 9.

Figure 9. Threshold Model Generating Ordinal Response based on Latent Response Outcome Variable

$$y_i = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1 \text{ if } y_i^* \leq J_1 \\ 2 \text{ if } J_1 < y_i^* \leq J_2 \\ \dots \\ S \text{ if } J_{S-1} < y_i^* \end{array} \right\}$$

According to this threshold model, the observed response will be 1 if the latent response  $y_i^*$  is less than  $J_1$  and will be 2 if the latent response  $y_i^*$  exceeds  $J_1$  and does not equal or exceed  $J_2$ . Similarly the observed response will be  $S$ , representing the highest category, if  $y_i^*$  exceeds  $J_2$  (Long & Freese 2006; Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008).

Specifying a logit link in the latent response model, the cumulative probabilities are depicted in Figure 10.

Figure 10. Model for Determining Cumulative Probabilities based on Logit Link Function

$$\Pr(y_i > s | x_i) = \frac{\exp(\beta_2 x_i - J_s)}{1 + \exp(\beta_2 x_i - J_s)}$$

The process above can be extended further, to address data, such as that from the OCSLS used here, which have a nested structure through the inclusion of a cluster specific random-intercept  $\zeta_{ij}$  (Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008). After adding this term, the latent response formulation of the ordered logistic regression model, including three independent variables for the purposes of illustration, can be written as Figure 11.

Figure 11. Final Form of the Latent Response Ordinal Logistic Regression Model

$$y_{ij}^* = \beta_2 x_{2ij} + \beta_3 x_{3ij} + \beta_4 x_{2j} x_{3ij} + \zeta_{1j} + \epsilon_{ij}$$

In Figure 11,  $\epsilon_{ij} | x_{ij}, \zeta_{1j}$  have logistic distributions and are independent across clusters and cases, and the continuous latent responses  $y_{ij}^*$  correspond to the ordinal outcome categories of the hypothetical dependent variable  $y_{ij}$  through a threshold model just as outlined above in the ordinal response model addressing single level data.

### **Model Validation**

After utilizing statistical software to calculate the models discussed above, formulated separately for each outcome variable to be considered, I verify all models by addressing efficiency of individual predictors, comparison to base model predictions, and by obtaining goodness-of-fit measures. I first test for overall fit of each model utilizing inferential statistics to compare the full model with a null model. The likelihood-ratio tests statistic, based on differences in deviance comparing a complete model to a null model, is implemented for this purpose (Hosmer & Lemeshow 2000; Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008). I test the goodness of fit of each model by calculating a coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ). Of the available  $R^2$  measures applicable to logistic regression models, I make use of McFadden's  $R^2$ . I have chosen McFadden's  $R^2$  statistic, which is analogous to the  $R^2$  commonly utilized for interpreting multiple regression models with continuous outcomes, as this measure proves to be preferable to other pseudo-  $R^2$  calculations due to efficiency, consistency, and ease of calculation (Long & Freese 2006; Menard 2000).

Tests of individual predictors are based on the Wald and  $z$  test statistics, and  $p$  values derived from these statistics are reported. These test statistics are typically concerned with an individual regression parameter, such as  $\beta_2$  from the logistic random-intercept formulation outlined above. The Wald test statistic for testing the null hypothesis  $H_0: \beta_2 = 0$  is depicted in Figure 12.

Figure 12. Formulation of Wald Test Statistic

$$w = \left( \frac{\hat{\beta}_2}{SE(\hat{\beta}_2)} \right)^2$$

The Wald test has a  $\chi^2$  null distribution with 1 degree of freedom due to the null hypothesis dictating one restriction. In the statistics software package I utilize to calculate regression models (Stata), the  $z$  statistic, which is analogous to the Wald statistic, is implemented within regression commands and included in the results of each. The  $z$  statistic is formulated as presented in Figure 13.

Figure 13. Formulation of Z Test Statistic

$$z = \left( \frac{\hat{\beta}_2}{\widehat{SE}(\hat{\beta}_2)} \right)^2$$

The  $z$  statistic is a common test for individual regression coefficients and has a standard normal null distribution due to the fact that its square has a  $\chi^2$  distribution with 1 degree of freedom.

Based on the  $z$  statistic, a two-sided  $p$  value is calculated. The  $p$  value, supposing a hypothetical test statistic of  $S$ , is simply the probability of observing a test statistic as extreme as  $S$  assuming the null hypothesis is true. If the  $p$  value derived from the  $z$  score is less than a chosen level of significance based on a normal distribution, the null hypothesis is then rejected (Long & Freese 2005; Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008). As is common practice in the social sciences, the chosen level of significance for all analyses

presented in this work is  $p < .05$ . At times, I do examine marginally significant results, which are cases where  $p < .1$ . A  $p$  value of less than  $.05$  indicates less than a 5% chance of encountering the statistic in question under a normal distribution. Likewise,  $p < .00$ ,  $p < .000$ , and  $p < .0000$  each represent increasingly lower probabilities of the statistic in question occurring by chance under a normal distribution. This framework of reporting  $p$  values is also useful for determining the significance of the previously mentioned likelihood-ratio test statistic, which I utilize to examine the overall fit of models, and is reported in the same manner for that application (i.e.  $p < .05$  indicates less than a 5% chance of encountering the results examined under a normal distribution).

In regard to the ordered logistic regression models outlined above, my analyses will not include extensive discussions of the precise levels of the dependent variables that are predicted by each model considering the set of predictor and control variables discussed at any given time. With ordered logistic regression model results, including the threshold cumulative probabilities corresponding to each category of the ordered response dependent variables as will be reported in my findings, it is possible to predict the probability of a specific or hypothetical respondent obtaining a given response on the dependent variable. However, for the analyses in this work, the directional changes in probability of higher or lower outcomes brought about by the effects of the traits under consideration are sufficient for addressing the research questions proposed.

CHAPTER VII  
DATA ANALYZED

**The Online College Social Life Survey**

In order to test my hypotheses, I analyze the Online College Social Life Survey (OCSLS), which surveys 24,131 college students at 22 colleges and universities in the United States between 2005 and 2011. This survey is conducted by Dr. Paula England and draws from various colleges in the United States including private universities, state universities, and one community college at the time of this writing. Respondents are located by way of offering the survey to students in various courses at those institutions, mostly in the context of large introductory-level classes. The sample cannot be taken to be representative of all college students in the United States as respondents have been located based on convenience rather than completely random sampling methods. However, the sample none the less represents a broad cross section of students from varying types of schools across the nation and is taken to adequately generalizable for the purposes of this study. To my knowledge, the OCSLS represents the largest sample size for a survey of this type. Other large data sets drawn from college students exist, but none include the level of detail on dates and hookups provided by the OCSLS.

Previously, this survey has been utilized by to draw conclusions about college students' sexual partnering encounters, and findings based on the OCSLS data have been consistent with other information garnered by way of separate data and methods. While care must be given before formulating far reaching conclusions, the current research represents a sturdy basis for future study and a firm foundation of knowledge is developed that paints a clear image of the nature of the topic under consideration. I utilize the most recent version of the OCSLS, as of June 2011, to conduct my analyses. The overall sample consists of 24,131 respondents. The sample is largely female (68.83%) with approximately one third of the sample being male (31.17%). 14,454 of the respondents (59.89%) supplied details about their most recent date. 14,682 of the respondents (61.11%) supplied details about their most recent hookup.

### **Institution of Attendance Supplemental Data**

Before processing the data from the OCSLS, I collect additional data about the institutions included in the survey. During a period from approximately January 2011 to December 2011 information on the institutions where the OCSLS has been offered to students was collected and added to the OCSLS data base. This process largely involved data collection by way of publicly available information from the Internet. Various sites were utilized to acquire school data, but one main source of information is the site operated by U.S. News & World Report (US News, URL available in reference section). From the home page of US News I access the page for education and subsequently the college rankings. From there, the individual colleges were found using the site's search

function. On the page specific to each institution, information such as ranking, tuition costs, percent male/female of the student body population, and other details about each institution are available. Information available from this source is based on 2010 data, as indicated by US News. All institutions were listed with US News, with the exceptions of Foothill College and University of California, Merced. For these two institutions a combination of searching the institution maintained web sites and directly e-mailing institution staff were utilized.

Additionally, for all other information not available by way of US News, I attempted first to access information from institution maintained sites, by e-mailing institution staff directly, and by mining information from Peterson's College Search (URL available in references). The data collected may or may not correspond directly to the period of data collection at any given institution. As such, the information is approximate. Data collected regarding institution characteristics and the data from the survey instrument are separated by a maximum of approximately five years. The data are thought to be reasonably representative of the campus environments at the time of data collection at each institution and are treated as such here.

### **Preparation for Analyses**

I then begin converting the OCSLS data into formats that will facilitate efficient analyses. Initially, I trim the data of all cases where the respondent did not indicate their sex. Two questions from the OCSLS address sex. One question asks respondents "Which sex are you?" and offers options for male and female. 191 (<1%) respondents

did not provide a response to this question. The same question is asked a second time allowing for the additional responses of 'transgendered - male to female' and 'transgendered - female to male' beyond the 'male' and 'female' responses. 155 (<1%) respondents did not supply a response to this question. A cross tabulation of the variables for each instance of the question inquiring about the respondent's sex reveals that 36 (<1%) respondents who reported being transgendered (25 male to female, 11 female to male) did not respond to the instance of the question allowing only a response of either male or female.

For the purposes of this study I have elected to omit transgendered individuals from my analyses for several reasons. As a practical matter, these individuals represent less than 1% of the overall sample before harmonizing the sample for information missing on other variables of concern, which would have decreased the already small number of transgendered respondents further. From a theoretical as well as ethical point of view, due to the marginalization I am aware that transgendered individuals are subject to and the unique experiences they encounter, I am hesitant to speak to their traits without an extensive undertaking of data collection and literature review, the magnitude of which cannot be accomplished within the scope of the present study. I make only passing reference to this group in the interest of providing detailed information as regards the data and methods utilized for my analyses.

After dropping transgendered individuals and individuals who did not report their sex from the data, I move forward with coding the data using standard procedures for collapsing categorical variables into more manageable forms and coding binary variables

as necessary. After coding a set of control variables, predictor variables, and key variables of concern (discussed in detail in Chapter VIII), I purge the data set of extraneous variables to make the information more manageable and increase computational efficiency. The final step in my data preparation involves creating separate instances of the data. I prepare two forms of the data set corresponding to the hierarchical nature of the information.

Students are nested within schools, representing an initial shape of the data. Further, each student was questioned regarding their most recent date encounter and their most recent hookup encounter. This represents a nesting of encounters within students for the purpose of comparing encounters against other encounters. After reshaping the data to reflect the nesting of encounters within students I arrive at a second form of the data base. Each form of the OCSLS data that I utilize for these analyses contains identical information, but is shaped differently to facilitate appropriate and efficient analyses. Details regarding specific variables, the questions from which they are drawn, and how they are coded and interpreted can be found in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER VIII  
VARIABLES CONSIDERED

**Sexual Partnering Encounters and Previous Encounter Experience**

In order to analyze the two types of sexual partnering encounters that are most prevalent on college campuses in the United States, I code a series of variables related to both date and hookup encounters. The OCSLS asks respondents questions regarding “the last date that [they] went on with someone whom [they] were not already in an exclusive relationship” and the last time they “hooked up with someone” with whom they “were not already in an exclusive relationship” whether or not they knew the person beforehand. Utilizing the questions “What was the sex of your date?” and “What was the sex of your hookup partner?” in combination with the questions regarding the respondents’ own gender, I code variables indicating the types of encounters in which the respondent has engaged based on heterosexual partnering encounters.

As with the previously mentioned exclusion of transgendered individuals from my analyses, encounters involving same-sex partners are likewise excluded. Analyzing same-sex sexual partnering encounters represents an interesting and potentially fruitful area of study that, unfortunately, falls outside of the constraints of the present inquiry. Of all male respondents’ encounters, 7.8% (N=737 encounters or the date encounters of 332 respondents and hookup encounters of 405 respondents, not mutually exclusive) were same-sex encounters, and 3.37% (N=660 encounters or the date encounters of 326

respondents and hookup encounters of 334 respondents , not mutually exclusive) of female respondents' encounters were same-sex encounters. These encounters are not analyzed. However, it is worth noting that a consideration of respondents' proclaimed sexual orientation does not trigger exclusion. That is to say, whether or not a respondent proclaims to be heterosexual or homosexual is not the basis for the above mention exclusion. The encounters of respondents who proclaim a homosexual or bisexual orientation are still considered in my analyses if the encounter they report involved an opposite sex partner. When analyzing individuals who did not engage in a given encounter (date or hookup), no examination of their sexual orientation is carried out, particularly within the regression analyses.

After narrowing my consideration to opposite-sex encounters only, I find that 2,812 (58.93%) male respondents and 6,314 (56.18%) female respondents indicate having engaged in a date encounter. 2,407 (50.44%) males and 5,467 (48.64%) females indicate having engaged in a hookup encounter. Examining encounter experience in greater detail, I code variables indicating categories of previous sexual partnering encounter experience. These four categories include having engaged exclusively in dates (N=4,694, 14.52%), having engaged exclusively in hookups (N=2,155, 6.67%), having engaged in both a date and hookup encounter (N=13,808, 42.71%), and having engaged in neither type of encounter (N=11,672, 36.10%).

## **Predictor Variables**

### **Meeting Contexts**

To analyze the contexts in which individuals meet date and hookup partners, I code variables based on responses to the questions “Where did you and your date first meet?” and “Where did you and the person you hooked up with first meet?” For both questions, respondents select from supplied responses including ‘class,’ ‘student club/team,’ ‘dorm,’ ‘work,’ ‘personal ad/dating service,’ ‘at a party/bar/nightclub,’ and ‘other.’ A subsequent open-ended question asked “If other, please specify.” From the original sample, 4,100 (28.75%) of those who had dated and 3,115 (25.50%) of the individuals who had hooked up provided an open-ended response to these questions. These open ended responses were coded as an initial set of thirteen categories and an ‘other’ category for responses that were indiscernible, too vague, or otherwise not possible to categorize. The ‘other’ category included 1.5% of date encounter meeting places and 1.8% of hookup encounter meeting places; these are excluded from the analyses from this point forward.

I develop categories of meeting contexts based on likely social distance between the individual and the partner at their meeting, knowledge that the individual may draw about the partner from the context in which they meet, and the nature of the social setting represented by the respondents’ replies to the above listed meeting context questions. Based on independent t-test of difference across demographic and other variables, I reduce the initial thirteen categories to eight meeting contexts by consolidating groups

that show little to no statistical difference and are logically similar. These categories are discussed in detail below, and the results of this process can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Contexts in which Individuals Meet Encounter Partners

Category of Meeting Context	Males		Females	
	Dates	Hookups	Dates	Hookups
Person Recommendation	7.14	6.74	13.47	11.78
Internet Social Networks	0.67	0.37	1.71	1.15
Common Interest/History	5.86	4.80	6.01	7.34
Institutional Contexts	40.63	33.06	33.86	27.70
Dorm/Dorm Related	17.54	21.35	12.77	17.05
Public Spaces	2.49	1.82	2.99	2.90
Personals Advertisements	0.92	0.66	1.49	1.02
Bars/Parties	24.75	31.20	27.71	31.07
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

The first category, Personal Recommendation, combines two of the initial thirteen categories: respondents who meet the partner through family (included responses such as “through my brother” and “my sister’s friend”) and those who meet through friends (including responses such as “through mutual friends” and “a friend’s friend”). This category represents a close social distance, as individuals who meet through such contexts are likely to readily develop positive or negative notions about the new individual based on the relationship between that individual and an intimate other. A second category, Internet Social Networks, includes responses such as “on facebook” and “online/myspace.” This category may represent medium social distances, as online social networks develop by individuals ‘liking’ or ‘adding’ new others located through people who are currently part of their actual social networks. However, I recognize that a great

deal of randomly meeting others is possible within online social networks as individuals utilize search functions that filter members based on data such as geographic location, common high school attended, and similar information. Members of online social networks can utilize these search functions to locate others whom they may not know but with whom they share some common characteristics and ‘add’ or ‘like’ them in order to grow their Internet social network.

The third category, Common Interest/History, combines three of the initial thirteen categories: ‘Repeat Event/Common Interest’ (including responses such as “ballroom dance class/club” and “our mutual sports team”), ‘One Time Event/Common Interest’ (including responses such as “sporting event,” “tennis match,” and “photo shoot”), and ‘Shared History/Hometown’ ( including responses such as “from my hometown,” “knew from high school,” and “we grew up together”). In these settings, individuals are likely to perceive some shared interests with the individuals they encounter and as such are more likely to form ‘like-me’ associations that might provide a stable basis for the development of trust states.

The fourth category, Institutional/Formal Contexts, is established based on trust in society’s institutions and the typically repetitive encounters thought to occur related to these contexts. The ‘class,’ ‘student club/team,’ and ‘work’ categories originally provided to respondents were coded into this category. Additionally, open ended responses such as “orientation,” “college event,” “alcoholics anonymous,” “non-profit organization volunteers,” and “at church” are coded into this category as well. This

category, thought to represent a close to medium social distance, is utilized as the category to which others are compared in my regression analyses.

The original category provided to respondents of ‘dorm’ is coded along with open-ended responses related to institutional living contexts (such as “at a dorm-sponsored dance” and “we were roommates in an on-campus apartment”) into the fifth category, Dorm/Dorm Related. These responses are separated from other institutional contexts due to an assumption that living in relatively close quarters with others is likely to be more conducive of getting to know one another and hence more likely to facilitate trust states. Also, as students living in dorms have private rooms, providing a successful negotiation with one’s roommate can be carried out, there may be increased opportunity for sexual activity in readily available locations. Students have a reasonable expectation that they can locate the encounter partner again should the need arise, and dorms are monitored to some extent by campus staff and by virtue of being surrounded by other students. This is not to say that negative outcomes are prevented by engaging in a sexual partnering encounter after meeting in the context of a dorm or dorm-related event. However, there is a clear increase in the level of institutionalized norms and expectations available within these contexts than might be found when in a public place, a new other’s home, etc. These expectations may well act as the catalysts for trust states.

A sixth category, Public, is a combination of three of the initial thirteen groups: ‘Neighborhood’ (including responses such as “we are neighbors,” “same apartment building,” and “off campus house”), ‘Service Industry/Retail’ (including responses such as “grocery store,” “coffee house,” and “hotel”), and ‘Public Spaces’ (including

responses indicating highly public areas such as “the bus,” “the park,” and “at a beach”). These responses are thought to represent relatively broad social distance, with few obvious common characteristics between individuals upon chance meetings in such settings.

The final two categories of meeting contexts represent special cases; they are avenues that individuals are more likely to enter with the specific goal of sexual partnering in mind. In these contexts, personal motivations and the dictations of social scripts may overrule any lack of information. The result is a trust state that will facilitate action in spite of otherwise inhibitive factors. When I speak of a ‘trust state’ emerging under such circumstances, I wish to remind the reader of the broad sense in which I am applying the term. Rather than referring here to the common sense usage of the term, which is more akin to specific interpersonal trust, I am referring to trust in more general terms. Interpersonal trust is highly situational and rests upon a foundation of specific knowledge in regards to a specific other. This intense form of trust, as will surely come as a surprise to some, is not necessary for the interaction I discuss now. This is particularly the case in light of the likely goals the individuals who are party to such an exchange hope to achieve.

For instance, individuals who have each responded to a personals advertisement online, or perhaps from a magazine or billboard, are likely to possess neither the level of personal knowledge of one another nor the reliance on shared social ties necessary for the growth of strong interpersonal trust. Never the less, these same individuals will likely have a shared awareness of a social script for sexual partnering and some perception of

the norms of interactions facilitated by personals advertisements. With only this level of information and expectation, two such individuals might enter a trust state by agreeing to a Goffman-esque sort of social contract. These individuals effectively say to one another – “In this interaction I will accept the self you portray, as an other harboring only the appropriate intentions related to ‘personals advertisement partnering.’ I will take the self you present as reality, and act accordingly. I will do so, only if you also accept the self I am portraying, and likewise act accordingly.” If both parties agree to and maintain the terms of this contract, the interaction will proceed, and each party has an increased likelihood of achieving some goal, presumably sexual in nature.

I code the Personals Advertisements category with responses such as “adultfriendfinder.com” and “online/personal ad.” These are Internet sites that cater directly to individuals seeking others with whom they might arrange a date or hookup. Additionally, the originally supplied response of ‘at a party/bar/nightclub’ is combined with open ended responses such as “bar,” “at a club in London,” “pool hall,” and “keg stands at a townhouse” into the ‘Bars/Parties’ category. As discussed above, previous research indicates that a party atmosphere and the presence of alcohol are conducive to locating sexual partners and engaging in sexual activity.

### **How Well Respondents Believe they Know Hookup Partners prior to the Encounter**

For students who engaged in a hookup encounter, the OCSLS asks “How well did you know the person you hooked up with before you hooked up?” Based on responses to this question, I code a categorical variable with three categories. 22.36% (N=1,755) of students who engage in a hookup indicate knowing the partner little to none prior to the encounter, 51.54% (N=4,092) indicate knowing the partner moderately, and 26.11% (N=2,073) indicate knowing the partner well prior to the encounter. This variable is a subjective report from the respondent, and it makes no indication of the length of time the respondent had known the partner or what sort of social ties the respondent had with the partner prior to the encounter.

### **Intoxication**

In order to examine levels of intoxication during encounters, I first consider alcohol consumption during the partnering encounter. The OCSLS asks students to supply the number of beers, the number of glasses of wine, the number of mixed drinks or shots, and the number of malt beverages. Precise accounting for alcohol consumption based on these measures is not possible. However, common drink equivalences can be utilized to arrive at an adequate approximation of alcohol consumption. For the purposes of this analysis, number of beers is assumed to refer to standard North American beers, which are commonly served in cans, bottles, or glasses and measure twelve ounces. Number of glasses of wine is assumed to refer to the common five ounce wine glass.

Number of malt beverages is assumed to refer to the standard North American can, bottle, or glass measuring twelve ounces. Number of mixed drinks or shots is assumed to refer to the consumption of the standard 1.25 ounce shot of a high proof liquor commonly utilized in cocktail mixing. Assuming these measures, each shot, beer, malt beverage, or glass of wine would equal approximately the same amount of alcohol consumed (National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism 2010; Wechsler et al. 2002).

The variable 'Units of Alcohol Consumed' is calculated from the sum of all alcoholic beverages consumed as indicated by the respondent. This process is carried out identically for both dates and hookups. After calculating units of alcohol consumed, I formulate a categorical variable representing abstinence (N=9,402, 54.50%), moderate alcohol consumption (N=2,481, 14.46%), and binge drinking (N=5,275, 30.74%) during encounters. Moderate drinking is taken to be one to three drinks for females and one to four drinks for males (Wechsler et al. 2002). Binge drinking is defined as greater than three drinks for females and greater than four drinks for males (National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism 2010; Wechsler et al. 2002).

I then generate a binary variable representing any type of intoxication during partnering encounters. Besides alcohol consumption, this variable is also based on consumption of other intoxicating substances. Substances other than alcohol that students reported consuming during sexual partnering encounters include marijuana (N=1,443, 8.41%), psychedelic drugs (N=66, <1%), inhalants (N=4, <1%), stimulants (N=141, <1%), and sedative intoxicants (N=31, <1%). However, the majority of students who have a positive response on the intoxication variable do so as the result of alcohol

consumption. Also, use of various drugs during encounters is not mutually exclusive, so there is potential that students were under the influence of multiple intoxicants. The variable utilized in this investigation for intoxication is not intended to imply the degree of intoxication, merely the presence or absence of intoxication; this variable does not address the many types of intoxication and the differing effects on the mind and body possible.

### **Outcome Variables**

The several variables listed below are utilized as dependent variables in the regression models I formulate in order to address my hypotheses. Intoxication, discussed above, is also utilized as a dependent variable in one of the logistic regression models. Aside from their use in regression, the following variables, along with the intoxication variable, are analyzed in a number of ways, primarily as I calculate descriptive statistics and conduct t-tests of difference. Each of these variables is derived from discussions in previous literature and coded based on a combination of theoretical organization, statistical methods to be utilized, and the nature of the available data.

### **Interest in a Romantic Relationship After a Hookup Encounter**

Is the hookup script, as pointed out in the existing literature, void of the possibility for romantic relationship development? Does the theme found in Stepp's (2007) work, *Un-hooked*, that students participate in hookup culture because of the lack of attachment ring true? The OCSLS asks students who engage in hookups how

interested they were in any romantic involvement with the partner following the encounter. Assuming that the hookup script truly does not lead to long-term romantic involvement between partners, one might expect that, by and large, students will indicate that they have no interest in a relationship with the hookup partner. Based on students' responses to the question "Were you interested in having a romantic relationship with the person you hooked up with after you hooked up?" I code a categorical variable with three possible values representing no interest, possible interest, and definite interest.

### **Levels of Sexually Transmitted Infection Risk during Encounters**

Considering the various types of sexual behavior that respondents engage in during date and hookup encounters and the physical risks involved, I analyze responses to the question "Which sexual behaviors did you engage in (check all that occurred)?" This question is asked about both date and hookup encounters. Respondents are provided with fourteen behaviors and asked to check off any combination of acts that occurred during the encounter similar to the presentation found in Table 2. Respondents were also asked about condom use through the inclusion of the question "Did you use a condom?" Based on literature regarding the transmission of STI's and condom use, responses to the sexual activity questions are coded into four categories that represent varying levels of STI risk during partnering encounters. The outcome of this coding is presented in Table 3.

Table 2. Manner in which Respondents were Questioned regarding Sexual Behaviors during Partnering Encounters

Which sexual behaviors did you engage in? (check all that apply)
<p style="text-align: center;">Kissing or making out</p> <p style="text-align: center;">You touched your partner’s breast or buttocks area</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Had your breast or buttocks area touched by your partner</p> <p style="text-align: center;">You stimulated your partner’s genitals with your hand</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Had your genitals stimulated by your partner’s hand</p> <p style="text-align: center;">You performed oral sex on your partner</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Your partner performed oral sex on you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Had vaginal sexual intercourse</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Anal intercourse: you penetrated your partner</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Anal intercourse: your partner penetrated you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">You stimulated your own genitals</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Your partner stimulated his/her genitals</p> <p style="text-align: center;">You had an orgasm</p> <p style="text-align: center;">You think your partner had an orgasm</p>

note: question presented separately for each encounter type

Table 3. STI Risk Level during Partnering Encounters

Risk Level	Male		Female	
	Dates	Hookups	Dates	Hookups
Low	35.35	22.70	50.85	28.03
Moderate	14.88	11.78	12.79	13.82
High	37.40	50.60	25.87	41.60
very High	12.37	14.92	10.49	16.55
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

The first level of STI risk, Low Risk, represents cases in which the respondent indicates that no genital stimulation, no oral sex, and no penetrative sex occurred during the partnering encounter. This category may or may not have included mutual masturbation (manual stimulation of the respondent’s own genitals or the respondent’s partner manually stimulating their own genitals). The sexual behaviors included in this

category represent a low possibility of disease transmission. Diseases such as common colds, mononucleosis, strep throat, and similar infections can be transmitted via exchange of saliva during kissing, but transmission of most STI's, particularly HIV, is unlikely through the types of contact included in this category. STI's that can be transmitted via kissing, such as gonorrhea, are typically curable by way of antibiotic treatment.

A second level of STI risk, Moderate Risk, includes cases where manual genital stimulation between partners occurred or oral sex with the use of a condom took place. Out of 1,262 encounters where a respondent either gave or received oral sex, but no penetrative sex occurred, only 124 involved the use of a condom. Any cases where a respondent reported that oral sex, but not vaginal or anal sex, occurred during the partnering activity without the use of a condom being reported is included in the High Risk category because of potential transmission of infections such as hepatitis and the herpes virus. The High Risk category also includes encounters where vaginal or anal sex occurred with the use of a condom.

Cases where respondents indicated that penetrative sex occurred were labeled as Very High Risk if no condom was utilized. Even with condom use, penetrative sex represents a high level of risk due to potential misuse or malfunction of the condom and transmission of STI's that cannot be prevented by condom use, such as some types of genital warts and the herpes virus. Penetrative sex without the use of a condom represents the highest possibility of transmitting STI's, particularly HIV, hepatitis, and human papillomavirus. This categorizing of STI risk is carried out for both dates and hookups in the same manner.

### **Overall Satisfaction after Partnering Encounter**

The OCSLS asks respondents who engaged in a date and/or hookup to indicate their level of satisfaction after the encounter. I chose to consider the responses to the question asking respondents whether respondents enjoyed an encounter as a gauge of students' opinions and feelings about their sexual partnering encounter experiences. This decision was made in part because the question imposes very little in the way of requirements that might skew the students' perception. Students likely pursue date and hookup encounters for a plethora of reasons, and to pick a measure of a specific behavior or feeling regarding a single aspect of these encounters may result in overlooking the students' intentions and determinations arbitrarily.

Rather than attempting to measure the benefits to students from partnering encounters by way of other items in the OCSLS, such as achievement of orgasm or whether the respondent felt awkward speaking with the partner following the encounter, I make use of the questions that address the issue of satisfaction after encounters by asking simply "How much did you enjoy your date overall?" or "How much did you enjoy the hookup overall?" Responses are coded as 'None,' 'Very Little,' 'Somewhat,' and 'Very Much.' A question pertaining to achievement of orgasm as well as a question asking whether the respondent enjoyed the physical sexual behaviors during the encounter is available in the OCSLS. I did not use these items as an overall measure here as it is my belief that doing so would narrow the range of possible goals that may bring about a student's satisfaction with an encounter. That is to say that perhaps orgasm or physical

pleasures were not any particular student's only or even their main intention as they enacted the date or hookup script.

If long-term romantic relationship building is the goal of the date script, it is reasonable to assume that a student may not be particularly satisfied by whatever happened physically during an encounter, yet still have derived a great deal of enjoyment from the encounter. This may not follow to quite the same degree with hookups, but I will now propose an instance where a similar lack of concern with physical pleasure from the encounter may occur even as regards a hookup. As mentioned by previous researchers, a competitive situation may exist on some campuses, and in such an environment hooking-up becomes a goal in and of itself. Given the vague nature of the hookup script, there is little in the way of the inclusion of particular sexual behaviors as requirements in order to be seen as having participated in a hooked up. Students simply seeking social interaction and peer approval may have no need to 'go all the way' to achieve their goal, and thereby these students derive a high level of satisfaction from an encounter without orgasm or particularly satisfying physical activity. For these reasons I prefer, and choose to analyze responses from, the question in the OCSLS that asks students whether they enjoyed an encounter. This allows the respondent to set their own terms for what it means to have enjoyed the encounter.

For dates, 1.07% of respondents indicated that they did not enjoy the date encounter overall. 3.54% of respondents indicated that they enjoyed the date encounter overall 'Very Little.' 29.61% enjoyed the date encounter 'Somewhat,' and 65.77%

indicated that they enjoyed the date encounter ‘Very Much.’ Of the 14,398 respondents who did date, 8,946 supplied a response to this question.

For hookups, 5.19% of respondents indicated that they did not enjoy the hookup encounter overall. 10.15% replied that they enjoyed the hookup encounter ‘Very Little.’ 36.90% enjoyed the hookup encounter ‘Somewhat,’ and 47.75% indicated that they enjoyed the hookup encounter ‘Very Much.’ Of the 14,630 respondents who did hookup, 14,598 supplied a response to this question.

### **Individual Level Control Variables**

#### **Gender**

Gender, as is covered in the discussion of the OCSLS data used for this study found in Chapter VII, is determined from responses to the question “Which sex are you?” 23,940 respondents (99.20% of the entire original sample) supplied an answer to this question. A second question regarding gender offering responses indicative of transsexuality is also present in the OCSLS, but is largely not considered in this study due to the small numbers of transsexual students responding to the survey. Thirty six additional cases were recorded by the more detailed sex variable beyond the 23,940 recorded by the sex variable based only on the male and female biological sex assignments. Again, for the purposes of this study only males and females will be considered in the analyses due to the low number of transsexual individuals in the sample and an inability to reach meaningful results regarding this group. Males (N=7,461) make up 31.17% of the sample after excluding transgendered individuals and those who did not

indicate their sex, and, after these exclusions, 68.83% (N=23,940) of the sample is composed of females. Rather than implementing gender directly in models as a control variable, I separate all analyses by gender.

## **Race**

The race and ethnic makeup of the OCSLS sample is largely non-Hispanic White, reflecting the racial makeup of the United States general population. Respondents were provided with thirteen race categories and asked to check all that applied to themselves. A fourteenth category of 'other' was also included and students were allowed to supply an answer if they chose the other category. A second option for race is also included in the OCSLS which asks respondents 'If you had to pick one race or ethnic group to describe yourself, which would it be?' From the responses to these questions I code a variable, 'Race,' that consists of five categories as follows: White (58.18%), Asian (15.71%), Hispanic (12.16%), Black (6.36%), and Other Race (7.59%). Race is utilized as a control variable in all regression models, and the various instances where I conduct difference testing each include a consideration of race.

## **Age**

To consider respondents' age, responses to the question "How old are you?" ranging from "18" to "25 or older" are analyzed. These original eight age categories are collapsed into four categories as follows: '18-19' (46.96%), '20-21' (34.25%), '22-23' (11.28%), and '24+' (7.51%). The overall range of ages in the OCSLS is of course rather

restricted as the survey addresses only college students. Some of the OCSLS respondents are older than the average age of most college students based on any measures of central tendency. This is likely due to late entry into college, as with non-traditional students, graduate level students who may have responded to the survey, or reduced rate of progress through college. No attempt is made here to determine the actual reasons behind any given respondent's age differing from what might be expected among college students. Also, age is highly collinear with respondents' class standing; hence class standing is not included in my analyses.

### **Religious Attendance**

Addressing religious attendance, respondents to the OCSLS are asked "How often did you typically attend religious services in the past year?" Supplied responses from the OCSLS are re-coded with "never" as 'Never,' "a few times a year" and "one to three times per month" as 'Some,' and "once a week" and "more than once a week" as 'Frequently.' Of the final harmonized sample, 33.88% (N=5,425) indicate no religious attendance, 53.37% (N=8,545) indicate some religious attendance, and 12.75% (N=2,041) indicate frequent religious attendance. Sex among religious individuals is far more likely to occur within relationships, to develop less rapidly, and to occur after greater displays of commitment (Regnerus & Uecker 2011). Religion seems to be more important to females and play more of a role in their sexual decision making than for men (Lauman et al. 2004; Regnerus & Uecker 2011). Religious participation is found to increase with age, and women tend to have higher religious participation than do men.

(Laumann et al. 2004). In consideration of this information, religious attendance is included as a control variable in all of the models I develop and utilized for all instances of difference testing as well as other calculations.

### **Mother's Education Attainment**

In consideration of the level of educational attainment achieved by respondents' mothers, the OCSLS includes the question "What level of education has your mother completed?" Responses to this question are coded as "Less than High School," "High School," "Some College," "BA," and "Graduate School." Within the final harmonized sample, 19.16% (N=3,068) of respondents' mothers had graduate level educations. 28.92% (N=4,360) of respondents indicated that their mothers had baccalaureate level educations. 25.41% (N=4,068) of respondents' mothers had at least some college education, and 18.64% (N=2,985) had a high school education, and only 7.87% (N=1,260) of respondents' mothers did not complete high school.

### **Birth in the United States**

I entertain the possibility that individuals who are exchange students or who may have otherwise migrated from other countries to the United States may exhibit diverse attitudes and behavior patterns in comparison with those who are born in the United States. A question from the OCSLS which asks students about their country of birth is utilized to code a binary variable indicated if a respondent was born in the United States. This of course does not account for length of time spent immersed in the culture of the

United States or any other country regardless of birth place. However, it is reasonable to assume that differences may exist based on place of birth and as such this variable is considered during each of my analyses.

### **Respondents' Living Arrangements**

Based on the question “Where do you live?” I generate a categorical variable with five possible responses. 44.17% (N=7,072) of respondents in the finalized sample indicate living in a dormitory. 3.10% (N=497) live in a fraternity or sorority house, 3.48% (N=557) indicate residing in on-campus housing other than a dormitory or fraternity/sorority house, 15.05% (N=2,409) indicate residing with their parents, and 34.20% (N=5,476) report living independently off-campus. Living arrangement is included as a control in all models and considered for each instance of difference testing that I conduct.

### **Fraternity/Sorority Membership**

Addressing notions about the effects of fraternity or sorority membership on students' experiences during college, I include a binary variable indicating Greek organization membership in all models and consider Greek organization membership during all instances of difference testing. This variable is coded based on responses to the question “Are you in a fraternity or sorority?” Of the final sample, 11.53% (N=1,846) of respondents indicate fraternity or sorority membership. 12.49% (N=596) of males and 11.12% (N=1,250) of females report Greek organization membership.

### **Education Aspirations**

Respondents to the OCSLS are asked “What is the highest level of schooling you intend to complete?” Responses to this question are coded as “Less than a BA,” “BA,” “Master’s Degree,” and “Doctoral.” 29.81% (N=4,773) of respondents in the harmonized sample indicate an intention to obtain a doctoral level education. 39.28% (N=6,289) report an intention to acquire a master’s degree. 27.77% (N=4,447) intend to obtain a bachelor’s degree, and 3.14% report an intention to complete less than a bachelor’s level of education. Education aspirations may affect students’ behavior in terms of time spent studying and planned life trajectory. For instance, students who intend to enter graduate school may be less willing to engage in long-term romantic relationships due to the possibility of a decreased ability to relocate with a partner because of additional education obligations. Education aspirations are used as a control variable in all regression models.

### **Grade Point Average**

Respondents were also asked to indicate their current cumulative grade point average. Responses are coded into four categories. 7.49% (N=1,200) of respondents in the final sample report less than a 2.1 GPA., while 33.52% report a GPA from 2.1 to 3.0. A plurality of students, 47.30% (N=7,574) indicate a current GPA between 3.1 and 3.75, and 11.68% (N=1,870) of respondents reported a GPA of 3.76 or higher. Similar to education aspirations, which are a measure of a student’s attitudes about and plans for furthering their education, GPA is included in my analyses as a control with the

assumption that it measures students' actual behaviors and ability as regards study habits and academic performance.

Rather than merely reflecting a student's attitudes, as with the variable for education aspirations, GPA is reflective of some combination of a student's academic ability, dedication to their course of study, ability to navigate the institutional structures of higher education, and choosing to take the necessary measures to achieve higher degrees of success in their studies. My purpose for including GPA and education aspiration in my models is the belief that this will allow for the controlling of social pressures, such as imperatives, or lack thereof, issued by parental figures who desire success from their children; personal motivations to succeed; academic talent; as well as any other latent variables related to attitudes and behaviors in regards to academic trajectory. In short, my goal with these two variables is to address both the students' attitudes and behaviors surrounding their education. Additionally, desirable outcomes on these measures are likely to influence others' opinions of a student, which will in turn affect their position in the sexual marketplace on campus, and future social market places including job markets or entrance into graduate education markets.

### **Number of Previous Intercourse Partners**

Respondents' previous sexual experiences are likely to influence their sexual conduct and may affect which sexual scripts they choose to enact and what behaviors they engage in during sexual partnering encounters. I utilize the number of a respondent's previous sexual intercourse partners as a control variable in all regression

models and in all instances of difference testing. The variable representing number of previous intercourse partners is derived from respondents' responses to the question "How many people have you had intercourse with?" I generate a categorical variable from these responses, placing students in one of six categories. These categories include an indication of virginity (28.06%, N=4,492), one previous partner (21.59%, N=3,456), two to three previous partners (19.59%, N=3,137), four to five previous partners (11.20%, N=1,794), six to ten previous partners (11.89%, N=1,904), and eleven or more previous sexual intercourse partners (7.67%, N=1,228).

### **Age at Sexual Debut**

Like previous number of sex partners, age at sexual debut may have an effect on subsequent behavioral patterns of an individual. For this reason I include age at sexual debut in all models and consider it during instances of difference testing and other calculations. Age at sexual debut is coded as a categorical variable. Categories of age at sexual debut include an indication of virginity (28.29%, N=4,530) along with categories representing loss of virginity at the age of fourteen years or younger (5.25%, N=840), fifteen years of age (8.99%, N=1,440), sixteen years of age (14.71%, N=2,356), seventeen years of age (15.40%, N=2,466), eighteen years of age (15.65%, N=2,506), and loss of virginity at the age of nineteen years or older (11.70%, N=1,873).

There is a noteworthy but minor discrepancy (N=38) between the category representing virginity for the age at sexual debut variable and the virginity category for the number of previous intercourse partners variable. My efforts to account for this

discrepancy within the coding and manipulation of the survey data are inconclusive. It is unclear as to if and/or why individuals would supply discrepant responses for these questions. I will not speculate on this subject, other than to venture the guess that an error might have occurred as respondents manually entered their response to one or the other question. It is also possible that some respondents may have misunderstood one or the other of the two questions from which these variables are derived.

### **Wants More Dates/Hookups**

Turning again to students' attitudes and desires, I code variables based on students' responses when asked to disagree or agree with the statements "I wish there were more opportunities for going on dates before a relationship is established at my college" and "I wish there more opportunities for hooking up at my college." Students were provided the option to indicate strong agreement, agreement, disagreement, or strong disagreement with these statements. These variables are included as controls in all of my analyses in an effort to capture the effects of various attitudes toward the two sexual partnering encounter scripts. Students' reasons behind their particular opinions are not investigated by subsequent questioning, and as such any consideration of what may result in students agreeing or disagreeing with these statements would be speculative. However, inclusion of these variables in the analyses does afford some ability to make conclusions based on the effects of these attitude positions on the various outcomes considered in regression models and other analyses. For example, do students

who have neither dated nor hooked up strongly agree that they desire more opportunities to do so? If such a correlation exists is it statistically significant?

### **Encounter Level Variables**

In addition to the level of STI risk during partnering encounters and the contexts in which respondents meet date and hookup encounter partners outlined above, I also consider several other characteristics of individual partnering encounters in my investigation.

#### **Race of Encounter Partner**

The race of an individual's encounter partner is coded in an identical manner to the variable indicating respondents' race. I consider this variable in models addressing interest in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after a hookup because of evidence from existing literature regarding interracial marriage and partner formation. Inclusion of this variable when predicting interest in a romantic relationship is thought to account for the possibility that a respondent may be willing to engage in a sexual partnering encounter with a partner of another race regardless of reluctance to carry on a long-term interracial relationship if that respondent's concept of the hookup includes the avoidance of commitment. An individual may feel no apprehension engaging someone of different race sexually, while simultaneously desiring to avoid any stigma that may be related to long-term interracial relationships.

## **Sexual Behaviors during Partnering Encounters**

Questions included in the OCSLS regarding sexual behaviors during partnering encounters are discussed above in the explanation of the variable I utilize as I consider levels of STI risk during encounters. The variables used to calculate the STI risk level variable are not included in models predicting STI risk levels. These variables are however included in a model predicting satisfaction after encounters and are utilized during difference testing and other calculations. Variables indicative of the following sexual behaviors during encounters are considered.

First, whether kissing, touching of the breasts and buttocks area, and/or manual stimulation of one's own genitals, but not the stimulating of the partners genitals, oral sex, vaginal sex, or anal sex are coded into a series of binary variable. Whether the partner stimulated the respondent's genitals manually or the respondent stimulated their partner's genitals manually is coded as a second binary variable. For this binary variable, behaviors included in the first binary variable may or may not have occurred. Similarly, for a third binary variable concerning sexual behaviors during encounters, any of the behaviors that result in a positive response on the preceding two variables may have occurred, but are not indicative of a positive response unless oral sex was present during the encounter.

In this way, behaviors during sexual encounters are coded according to the occurrence of the specific behavior during a particular encounter that is taken to represent the highest degree of intimacy and/or level of STI risk in comparison to other behaviors. A fourth variable represents the occurrence or not of vaginal sex, but not anal sex, and a

final variable which indicates the occurrence of anal sex during an encounter is also generated. Taken together, these variables form a single categorical variable for which the categories may or may not be cumulative but exclude the activities necessary to meet the requirements for placement in all categories which exceed them. In this coding scheme, specific behaviors trigger a change to the next category of behavior while no other behaviors related to lower categories are necessary for inclusion in the upper level categories.

### **Characteristics of Education Institution Attended**

#### **Tuition Costs**

In all models formulated, I include a variable which indicates the costs of tuition at the institution the respondent attends. This variable is coded with three categories based on an overview of the institutions present in the OCSLS and the range of tuition costs they represent. The three categories of tuition costs include a category representing institutions with tuition costs below \$7,500 attended by 27.12% (N=4,342) of students included in the finalized sample, institutions with between \$7,500 and \$20,000 attended by 56.69% (N=9,060) of respondents, and institutions with tuition costs greater than \$20,000 attended by 16.30% of respondents. While extensive financial assistance programs related to higher education exist in the United States, differences in tuition costs may result in a selection process whereby those students with greater financial resources have a greater possibility of attending institutions with higher tuition costs if they choose to do so. This could result in some level of homogenization of the student

body of any given institution in terms of students' socioeconomic background. For this reason tuition cost at the institution attended by respondent is included in all regression models and attended to during various other calculations.

### **Attendance at a Private Institution**

The OCSLS includes data collected from several institutions that might be considered by many to be 'elite' universities. Several, but not all, of these institutions are private universities. Private universities might be considered unique compared to public institutions due to varying patterns of attendance, higher rates of legacy students (students whose family members attended the same university where they now study), elevated average socioeconomic standing of the families of students in attendance, and other such factors. A binary variable indicating whether a student attends a private institution or public institution is included in all of my analyses.

### **Make-up and Size of the Student Body at Institution**

I also include variables that describe the demographic make-up of the student body at a respondent's institution of attendance in all analyses. This series of variables includes an indication of the percent of the student body consisting of females as well the percentage of the student body consisting of each of five race categories (White, Black, Asian, Hispanic, and Other Race). Inclusion of these variables is intended to address the structural features of the social contexts in which students attend college, controlling for variations from campus to campus. Ratios of gender to gender and race to race may

affect a student's attitudes and behaviors, as discussed above with the occurrence of tokenism or as addressed by supply side economic theories. Number of undergraduates, categorized as less than 10,000 (21.94%, N=3,513), 10,000 to 20,000 (40.33%, N=6,458), and greater than 20,000 students (37.72%, N=6,040) is also included in all models for these reasons.

CHAPTER IX  
REGARDING INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL EFFECTS  
AND HIERARCHICAL LINEAR MODELING

The nature of the OCSLS is such that a nested structure is present in the data. For the majority of the analyses in the research at hand, the individual, or individual occurrence of a partnering activity, is considered as the unit of analysis. That is, traits of individuals who select into sexual partnering activities are analyzed, behaviors during individual date or hookup encounters are analyzed, and the outcomes of individual encounters are analyzed. However, these individuals and the sexual partnering encounters they report are grouped by virtue of the survey being administered at various institutions. These institutions are heterogeneous on traits such as private versus public operation, whether the institution is a research intensive university or a community college, the ratio of male to female students at the institution, and so on. A group of individuals from any single institution will be homogeneous on those same traits. With this in mind, it is important to consider the institution level effects and how these influence individual level characteristics.

The nature of nested data represents several problems for statistical analyses. Individuals who exist within hierarchies tend to exhibit a greater degree of similarity than

individuals randomly sampled from an entire population. For example, individuals at a historically race segregated institution may share more characteristics with one another than do individuals located through a random sampling of all college students within the United States. Another issue with nested data involves the problem of independence of observations as mentioned in the discussion of regression methods in Chapter VI. Most such analytic techniques require independence of observations as a primary assumption for analysis. This assumption is violated to some degree when individuals within a sample are drawn from multiple instances of an institution type such as a healthcare unit, school district, or business, and as such ordinary least squares regression produces standard errors that are too small (Long 1997; Osborne 2000; Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal 2008). This leads to higher probability of rejection of a null hypothesis than if the data analyzed include strictly independent observations (Osborne 2000).

Hierarchical linear models (HLM) have been utilized in previous research throughout the social sciences in order to test hypotheses about cross-level effects. HLM has also been utilized to test various hypotheses by predicting partitioning of variance and covariance components among levels of data, such as decomposing the covariance among sets of student-level variables into within- and between-school components (Raudenbush & Bryk 2002). HLM is similar to ordinary least squares regression in that an outcome variable is predicted as a function of a combination of one or more independent variables plus an intercept. This process is carried out in HLM for the base level variables, typically the individual level. On subsequent levels, the base level slope and intercept become dependent variables that are predicted from that level's independent

variables. This process can predict slopes as well as intercepts (means) and can be utilized to model cross-level interactions (Osborne 2000; Raudenbush & Byrk 2002).

As indicated in Chapter VI, HLM techniques are utilized in addition to simple inclusion of the above discussed characteristics of students' institution of attendance throughout this investigation. These methods are used primarily to mitigate the effects of various institutional level characteristics, improving the problem of erroneous standard errors due to the clustering of individuals within each institution. Some discussion comparing institutional level characteristics will be included in the analyses where relevant and interesting findings are encountered. Ratios of males to females, institution type, race and gender make-up of the student body at the institution, tuition costs, and number of undergraduate students attending an institution are included as institution-level controls as outlined in the previous section.

## CHAPTER X

### MODEL OUTCOMES AND INTERPRETATION

#### **Interest in a Romantic Relationship after a Hookup Encounter**

I now offer an explanation and interpretation of the outcomes of the regression models discussed in Chapter VI and the various statistical techniques utilized to address my several hypotheses. I begin by reviewing the nature of the hookup script as regards the building of long-term romantic relationships, and predict students' interest in developing a romantic relationship with the partner after participating in a hookup encounter utilizing ordered logistic regression. I arrive at a model that predicts males' interests in having a romantic relationship with a hookup partner after an encounter with an  $R^2$  of .07. A likelihood-ratio test of the model against a null model is significant (chi square=183.25,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=65$ ). For females, the model reveals an  $R^2$  of .04 and is significant as revealed by a likelihood-ratio test comparing the model to a null model (chi square=326.82,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=65$ ). The results of these models are listed in detail in Appendix A.

Within the male model, intoxication during encounter (OR=.18,  $p<.000$ ) significantly predicts a decrease in the probability of interest in forming a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after the hookup has occurred. Meeting through personals advertisements (OR=.08,  $p<.05$ ) substantially decreases the probability of

interest in a romantic relationship with the hookup partner. Interestingly, the occurrence of manual genital stimulation (OR=.58,  $p<.1$ ) or oral sex (OR=.54,  $p<.05$ ) each decrease the probability of being interested in a long-term romantic relationship with the partner while the occurrence of anal sex (OR=3.12,  $p<.05$ ) significantly predicts a substantial increase in the probability of being interested in a romantic relationship. Higher numbers of previous intercourse partners significantly predict a decrease in the probability of being interested in a romantic relationship with the partner after the hookup encounter (OR=.43,  $p<.00$  for those with four or five previous intercourse compared to those who report two or three previous partners, OR=.41,  $p<.00$  for those with eleven or more previous intercourse partners), and lower GPA indicates an increase in the probability of level of interest in a romantic relationship after the hookup encounter (OR=1.97,  $p<.000$  for those with a GPA of 2.1-3.0 compared to 3.1-3.75, OR=1.67,  $p<.1$  for those with a GPA of less than 2.1).

For females, intoxication has a similar effect to that for males and significantly predicts a decreased probability of higher levels of interest in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after the hookup (OR=.49,  $p<.000$ ). The Internet Social Network meeting context category (OR=1.89,  $p<.05$ ), as compared to meeting through institutional contexts, significantly predicts an increase in the probability of interest in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner while meeting in a public context (OR=.73,  $p<.05$ ) significantly predicts a decrease in the probability in interest in a relationship with the partner. Unlike males, meeting through personals advertisements is not significantly indicative of a change in probability of interest in a romantic relationship with the partner

after the encounter when compared to meeting in an institutional context. Like males, females who report anal sex during a hookup encounter (OR=1.75,  $p<.05$ ) are significantly more likely to be interested in a romantic relationship with the partner after the encounter. While vaginal sex during encounter was not significant amongst males, females who report vaginal sex during the encounter (OR=1.35,  $p<.000$ ) are significantly more likely to be interested in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after a hookup. Differences in GPA are not significant in the female model.

Of males who engaged in a hookup encounter, 36.57% report having no interest in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after the hookup. 39.48% of males indicate possible interest in a romantic relationship with the partner after the hookup encounter, while only 23.95% report definite interest. Of females, 27.57% report no interest in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after the hookup, 39.35% report possible interest, and 33.08% report definite interest. These findings contradict the notion that the hookup script is devoid of interest in romantic relationship formation. While not a drastic difference, an independent t-test reveals that differences in males and females interest in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after a hookup are significant ( $p<.000$ ). I find that females are somewhat more likely than males to become interested in forming a long-term romantic relationship with the partner after a hookup encounter (mean=.87 for males, mean=1.06 for females with 0 indicating no interest in romantic relationship and 2 indicating definite interest). 63.43% of males report at least some interest in a romantic relationship with the encounter partner after a hookup while a greater percentage of females, 72.43%, report at least some interest. After considering

these findings, it seems that differences in interest in a romantic relationship after a hookup encounter may be more reflective of gender differences than of characteristics of the hookup script itself.

### **Selection into Dating and Hooking up as Modes of Sexual Partnering Experience**

#### **Comparing Sexual Partnering Encounters**

In order to test whether date encounters differ significantly from hookup encounters, I utilize t-tests of difference to compare encounters reported by students with various types of previous encounter experience against one another on a number of traits. The results are presented separately for males and females below in Table 4 and Table 5.

Table 4. Comparison of Males' Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience

Control Variables		Males							
		Dates of Those Who Only Dated (1)	Hookups of Those Who Only Hooked up (2)	Dates of Those Who Dated and Hooked up (3)	Hookups of Those Who Dated and Hooked up (4)	1x3	2x4	3x4	1x2
Categories of Meeting Context	Personal Rec.	8.47	6.27	6.7	6.84				
	Social Net.	0.85	0.99	0.61	0.28		**		t
	Common Interest/ Shared History	6.64	10.89	5.53	3.96		***	*	*
	Institution	53.11	23.01	36.71	33.16	***		*	***
	Dorm	15.96	24.09	18.05	20.8			*	**
	Public Places	1.98	0.33	2.67	2.03		t		t
	Personals Ads.	0.71	0.33	1.03	0.75				
	Bars/Parties	12.29	25.08	28.69	32.17	***	**	*	***
Partner Same Race		44.77	58.42	61.51	60.9	***	*		**
Above the Clothing during Encounter		50.34	0.99	32.24	25.05	***	***	***	***
Genital Stimulation during Encounter		4.8	0	9.7	11.98	***		*	
Oral Sex during Encounter		2.12	21.45	7.27	12.45	***	***	***	***
Vaginal Sex during Encounter		12.29	71.62	28.13	45.61	***	***	***	***
Anal Sex during Encounter		1.13	5.94	2.3	2.88	t		*	***
Intoxication During Encounter		10.17	68.98	42.62	67.55	***	***	***	***

Table 5. Comparison of Females' Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience

Control Variables		Females							
		Dates of Those Who Only Dated	Hookups of Those Who Only Hooked up	Dates of Those Who Dated and Hooked up	Hookups of Those Who Dated and Hooked up	1x3	2x4	3x4	1x2
Categories of Meeting Context	Personal Rec.	14.50	11.39	13.1	11.81			t	t
	Social Net.	2.2	1.07	1.55	1.17			t	t
	Common Interest/ Shared History	6.91	12.06	5.69	6.62	t	***	t	***
	Institution	42.25	27.21	13.05	27.79	***		**	***
	Dorm	13.37	23.32	12.62	16.04		***	***	***
	Public Places	3.33	4.02	2.89	2.74		*		
	Personals Ads.	1.38	0.54	1.53	1.09			*	*
	Bars/Parties	16.07	20.38	31.59	32.73	***	***		*
Partner Same Race		42.37	60.59	59.33	59.18	***			***
Above the Clothing during Encounter		60.93	0.54	48.56	31.1	***	***	***	***
Genital Stimulation during Encounter		3.26	0	8.45	14.2	***		***	
Oral Sex during Encounter		2.64	23.73	4	7.5	**	***	***	***
Vaginal Sex during Encounter		8.73	73.06	20.46	42.07	***	***	***	***
Anal Sex during Encounter		0.63	2.68	0.79	1.15	**		t	***
Intoxication During Encounter		12.18	63.94	35.42	66.22	***	***	***	***

The date experiences reported by males who only dated differ significantly from the dates of those who both dated and hooked up when comparing the two groups by meeting contexts ( $p < .000$  for those who meet partners in institutional contexts,  $p < .000$  for those who meet partners in the contexts of a bar or party), based on race of encounter partner ( $p < .000$  for those who reported having a same race partner), and on types of sexual activity during the encounter ( $p < .000$  for kissing/touching of breast or buttocks,  $p < .000$  manual genital stimulation,  $p < .000$  oral sex,  $p < .000$  vaginal sex). For females, these encounters differ based on meeting in the contexts of an institution ( $p < .000$ ), meeting in the contexts of a bar or party ( $p < .000$ ), and by race of partner ( $p < .000$ ). They also differ by the occurrence of various sexual behaviors during the encounter including kissing/touching of breasts or buttocks ( $p < .000$ ), manual genital stimulation ( $p < .000$ ), oral sex ( $p < .00$ ), vaginal sex ( $p < .000$ ), and anal sex ( $p < .00$ ).

### **Comparing Students by Encounter Experience**

I then test for differences between students by encounter experience category in order to consider the possibility of various traits of individuals leading to selection into different types of sexual partnering encounter experiences. These results are presented separately below, first for males in Table 6 and for females in Table 7.

Table 6. Comparison of Males who Engage in Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience

Controls		Males by Previous Encounter Experience Category									
		Males Who Only Dated (1)	Males Who Only Hooked up (2)	Males Who Dated & Hooked up (3)	Males Who Neither Dated nor Hooked up (4)	1x3	2x3	3x4	1x4	2x4	1x2
Respondent Level Variables - Demographic											
Race	White	50.56	65.35	66.43	66.43	***		***		***	***
	Black	4.38	7.26	6.24	6.24	t					
	Asian	28.25	8.58	10.41	10.41	***		***		***	***
	Hispanic	11.44	9.57	10.31	10.31						
	Other Race	5.37	9.24	6.61	6.61		t		*		*
Age	18-19	35.73	55.45	34.22	34.22		***	***	***		***
	20-21	42.94	30.69	40.98	40.98		**	***	***		***
	22-23	13.28	7.92	16.83	16.83	*	***	***	***		*
	24+	8.05	5.94	7.97	7.97						
Religious Attendance	Never	33.33	44.88	35.21	35.21		**	t	*	*	***
	Some	47.18	47.52	57.99	57.99	***	**	***			
	Frequently	19.49	7.59	6.8	6.8	***		***	t	***	***
Mother's Education	<HS	9.04	6.93	4.55	4.55	***	t	***			
	HS	17.37	22.44	16.03	16.03		**	***	*		t
	SC	25.28	22.44	25.04	25.04						
	BA	30.65	30.36	30.15	30.15			*	t		
	GR	17.66	17.82	24.24	24.24	***	*	**			
Born in the USA		79.94	92.08	89.55	89.55	***		***	*	***	***
Living Arrangement	Dorm	39.27	56.77	36.47	36.47		***	***	***	t	***
	Fraternity/Sorority	2.26	1.65	7.64	7.64	***	***	***	*		
	Other On-Campus	4.24	5.28	3.98	3.98					*	
	Off-Campus	35.73	25.08	41.96	41.96	**	***	***	***		***
	w/Parents	18.5	11.22	9.94	9.94	***		***		***	**

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

Table 6. (continued) Comparison of Males who Engage in Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience

Controls		Males by Previous Encounter Experience Category									
		Males Who Only Dated (1)	Males Who Only Hooked up (2)	Males Who Dated & Hooked up (3)	Males Who Neither Dated nor Hooked up (4)	1x3	2x3	3x4	1x4	2x4	1x2
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Education and Attitudes											
Fraternity/Sorority Member		9.18	8.91	20.07	20.07	***	***	***	***	**	
Education Aspirations	<BA	4.8	0.99	2.72	2.72	**	t	**		*	**
	BA	25.42	39.6	31.04	31.04	**	**		*	**	***
	MA	39.55	34.98	38.54	38.54			*	*		
	DR	30.23	24.42	27.71	27.71			t		*	t
GPA	<2.1	5.51	8.91	8.49	8.49	**					*
	2.1-3.0	37.29	43.23	39.9	39.9			***	*	***	t
	3.1-3.75	45.48	39.93	43.37	43.37					*	
	3.76+	11.7	7.92	8.25	8.25	**		***		**	t
Wants More Opportunities to Date	Strongly Agree	20.48	14.52	19.6	19.6		*	**	**		*
	Agree	48.87	39.93	46.98	46.98		*		t	t	**
	Disagree	27.68	40.26	30.66	30.66		**		*		***
	Strongly Disagree	2.97	5.28	2.77	2.77		*	***	**		t
Wants More Opportunities to Hook-up	Strongly Agree	11.44	12.54	16.5	16.5	**	t	***			
	Agree	25.28	38.28	36.05	36.05	***		***		***	***
	Disagree	49.44	39.6	41.82	41.82	***		***		**	**
	Strongly Disagree	13.84	9.57	5.63	5.63	***	**	***		t	t

t=p&lt;.1, \*=p&lt;.05, \*\*=p&lt;.01, \*\*\*=p&lt;.000

Table 6. (continued) Comparison of Males who Engage in Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience

Controls		Males by Previous Encounter Experience Category									
		Males Who Only Dated (1)	Males Who Only Hooked up (2)	Males Who Dated & Hooked up (3)	Males Who Neither Dated nor Hooked up (4)	1x3	2x3	3x4	1x4	2x4	1x2
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Sexual History											
Age at Loss of Virginity	Virgin	45.76	9.24	12.99	12.99	***	t	***	t	***	***
	14 or younger	3.11	8.91	7.17	7.17	***		***		***	***
	15	4.38	8.58	9.85	9.85	***		***		**	**
	16	6.36	21.45	16.92	16.92	***	t	***	*	***	***
	17	10.45	19.14	21.38	21.38	***		***		***	***
	18	13.28	23.1	18.99	18.99	**	t	***		***	***
	19+	16.67	9.57	12.71	12.71	**		***	***		**
Number of Previous Partners	None	43.79	10.89	12.52	12.52	***		***	t	***	***
	1	26.84	15.51	10.88	10.88	***	*	***		***	***
	2-3	17.09	23.76	23.25	23.25	**		***	**	***	*
	4-5	5.79	21.12	15.94	15.94	***	*	***	**	***	***
	6-10	4.24	16.17	19.5	19.5	***		***		***	***
	11+	2.26	12.54	17.91	17.91	***	*	***	t	***	***

t=p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.000

Comparing males who have dated but not hooked up to males who have hooked up but not dated, I find that these two groups differ significantly by race ( $p < .000$  Whites,  $p < .000$  Asians,  $p < .05$  Other Race individuals), age ( $p < .000$  18-19 year olds,  $p < .000$  20-21 year olds,  $p < .05$  22-23 year olds), religious attendance ( $p < .000$  no religious attendance,  $p < .000$  frequent religious attendance), and number of previous intercourse partners ( $p < .000$  none,  $p < .000$  one previous partner,  $p < .05$  two to three previous partners,  $p < .000$  four to five previous partners,  $p < .000$  six to ten previous partners,  $p < .000$  eleven or more previous partners). Significant differences are also found by living arrangement ( $p < .000$  dorm residence,  $p < .000$  living off-campus,  $p < .00$  living with parents), education aspirations ( $p < .00$  less than bachelor's education,  $p < .000$  bachelor's level education), GPA ( $p < .05$  less than 2.1 GPA), and age at loss of virginity ( $p < .000$  virgin,  $p < .000$  fourteen years or younger,  $p < .00$  fifteen years,  $p < .000$  sixteen years,  $p < .000$  seventeen years,  $p < .000$  eighteen years,  $p < .00$  nineteen years or older). These groups also differ in terms of wishing for more opportunities to date ( $p < .05$  strong agreement,  $p < .00$  agreement,  $p < .000$  disagreement), and agreement with the statement "I wish there were more opportunities for hookups at my school" ( $p < .000$  agreement,  $p < .00$  disagreement).

Notable differences when comparing males who have only dated to those who both date and hookup include differences by race ( $p < .000$  Whites,  $p < .000$  Asians), mother's educational attainment ( $p < .000$  less than high school,  $p < .000$  graduate level education), and number of previous intercourse partners ( $p < .000$  none,  $p < .000$  one,  $p < .00$  two to three,  $p < .000$  four to five,  $p < .000$  six to ten,  $p < .000$  eleven or more). These groups differ further by living arrangement ( $p < .000$  fraternity/sorority residence,  $p < .00$

living off-campus,  $p < .000$  living with parents), GPA ( $p < .00$  less than 2.1 GPA,  $p < .00$  3.76 and higher GPA), and education aspirations ( $p < .00$  less than bachelor's level,  $p < .00$  bachelor's level). Age at loss of virginity is another area of significant difference between males who only dated and males who dated and hooked up ( $p < .000$  virgins,  $p < .000$  loss of virginity at age fourteen or younger,  $p < .000$  age fifteen,  $p < .000$  sixteen years,  $p < .000$  seventeen years,  $p < .00$  eighteen years,  $p < .00$  nineteen years or older). These two groups do not differ in terms of desire for more opportunities for dates, but do differ by agreement as to whether they wish for more opportunities for hookups ( $p < .00$  strong agreement,  $p < .000$  agreement,  $p < .000$  disagreement,  $p < .000$  strong disagreement).

Between males who hooked up only and males who both dated and hooked up, I find significant differences in terms of religious attendance ( $p < .00$  no attendance,  $p < .00$  some attendance), mother's educational attainment ( $p < .00$  high school level education,  $p < .05$  graduate level education), living arrangement ( $p < .000$  dorm residence,  $p < .000$  fraternity residence,  $p < .000$  living off-campus), and fraternity membership ( $p < .000$ ) in addition to differing by several other traits. A focus on males who have both dated and hooked up compared to males who have done neither reveals differences by race ( $p < .000$  White,  $p < .000$  Asian), religious attendance ( $p < .00$  none,  $p < .00$  some), mother's education ( $p < .00$  high school,  $p < .05$  bachelor's level,  $p < .00$  graduate level), and number of previous intercourse partners ( $p < .000$  for all categories of previous number of sex partners). These groups also differ by living arrangement ( $p < .000$  dorm residence,  $p < .000$  fraternity residence,  $p < .000$  living off-campus,  $p < .000$  living with parents), age at loss of virginity ( $p < .000$  for each category of age at loss of virginity), and both wishing

for more opportunity for dates ( $p < .00$  strong agreement,  $p < .000$  strong disagreement) and hookups ( $p < .000$  for all categories).

Table 7. Comparison of Females who Engage in Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience

Controls		Females by Previous Encounter Experience Category									
		Females Who Only Dated (1)	Females Who Only Hooked up (2)	Females Who Dated & Hooked up (3)	Females Who Neither Dated nor Hooked up (4)	1x3	2x3	3x4	1x4	2x4	1x2
Respondent Level Variables - Demographic											
Race	White	46.58	67.83	66.59	66.59	***		***	**	***	***
	Black	9.48	7.64	5.08	5.08	***	**	***	**		
	Asian	22.79	8.85	9.69	9.69	***		***	***	***	***
	Hispanic	14.38	8.98	11.28	11.28	**	t	***		***	***
	Other Race	6.78	6.7	7.36	7.36			*	**	*	
Age	18-19	42.88	54.83	38.72	38.72	**	***	***	***	**	***
	20-21	37.16	32.84	41.11	41.11	**	***	***	***	***	*
	22-23	11.99	7.51	14.23	14.23	*	***	***	***		**
	24+	7.97	4.83	5.94	5.94	**		***		***	**
Religious Attendance	Never	25.49	37.27	34.56	34.56	***		*	***	*	***
	Some	54.17	57.1	57.91	57.91	*		***	**	***	
	Frequently	20.34	5.63	7.53	7.53	***	t	***	*	***	***
Mother's Education	<HS	11.74	4.96	5.31	5.31	***		***		***	***
	HS	18.9	18.63	16.88	16.88	t		***			
	SC	27.31	24.26	25.63	25.63						***
	BA	25.74	32.44	30.73	30.73	***		***		**	*
	GR	16.32	19.71	21.44	21.44	***		***		**	*
Born in the USA		81.42	92.23	91.26	91.26	***		***	**	***	***
Living Arrangement	Dorm	39.99	53.62	38.28	38.28		***	***	***		***
	Fraternity/Sorority	1.63	1.34	4.81	4.81	***	***	***	*		
	Other On-Campus	2.45	3.08	4.21	4.21			***	*		
	Off-Campus	34.71	31.37	41.51	41.51	***	***	***	***	**	
	w/Parents	20.21	10.59	11.19	11.19	***		***	t	***	***

t=p&lt;.1, \*p&lt;.05, \*\*p&lt;.01, \*\*\*p&lt;.000

Table 7. (continued) Comparison of Females who Engage in Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience

Controls		Females by Previous Encounter Experience Category									
		Females Who Only Dated (1)	Females Who Only Hooked up (2)	Females Who Dated & Hooked up (3)	Females Who Neither Dated nor Hooked up (4)	1x3	2x3	3x4	1x4	2x4	1x2
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Education and Attitudes											
Fraternity/Sorority Member		9.35	7.77	17.43	17.43	***	***	***	***	**	
Education Aspirations	<BA	3.95	2.68	2.28	2.28	***		**			
	BA	23.73	28.69	27.01	27.01	*			*		*
	MA	39.67	41.69	41.88	41.88			***		*	
	DR	32.64	26.94	28.83	28.83	**		**		*	**
GPA	<2.1	7.85	7.91	6.92	6.92			t			
	2.1-3.0	32.08	36.86	34.52	34.52	t		***	**	***	*
	3.1-3.75	47.58	48.93	48.58	48.58						
	3.76+	12.49	6.3	9.98	9.98	**	**	***	**	***	***
Wants More Opportunities to Date	Strongly Agree	18.46	19.84	25.38	25.38	***	**	***	***	***	
	Agree	46.58	47.05	45.69	45.69			*	*	*	
	Disagree	32.27	29.49	26.4	26.4	***	t	***	***	***	
	Strongly Disagree	2.7	3.62	2.53	2.53		t	***	***	**	
Wants More Opportunities to Hook-up	Strongly Agree	3.01	4.96	2.91	2.91		**	t	t	***	*
	Agree	12.05	17.43	15.23	15.23	**		***	t	***	***
	Disagree	60.2	61.13	64.87	64.87	**	*	***			
	Strongly Disagree	24.73	16.49	16.99	16.99	***		***	**	***	***

t= $p < .1$ , \*= $p < .05$ , \*\*= $p < .01$ , \*\*\*= $p < .000$

Table 7. (continued) Comparison of Females who Engage in Sexual Partnering Encounters by Previous Encounter Experience

Controls		Females by Previous Encounter Experience Category									
		Females Who Only Dated (1)	Females Who Only Hooked up (2)	Females Who Dated & Hooked up (3)	Females Who Neither Dated nor Hooked up (4)	1x3	2x3	3x4	1x4	2x4	1x2
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Sexual History											
Age at Loss of Virginity	Virgin	42.56	7.91	15.69	15.69	***	***	***	**	***	***
	14 or younger	3.39	10.05	5.71	5.71	***	***	*	*	***	***
	15	5.71	14.34	11.95	11.95	***	t	***	**	***	***
	16	10.67	20.78	18.05	18.05	***	t	***	**	***	***
	17	9.48	19.44	17.09	17.09	***		***	***	***	***
	18	12.55	17.69	17.55	17.55	***		***		**	***
	19+	15.63	9.79	13.95	13.95		**	***	***		***
Number of Previous Partners	None	42.5	8.04	15.98	15.98	***	***	***	**	***	***
	1	23.23	15.28	13.03	13.03	***		***	***	***	***
	2-3	19.52	27.88	21.92	21.92	*	***	***	*	***	***
	4-5	7.47	16.76	17.11	17.11	***		***	*	***	***
	6-10	5.15	22.12	20.67	20.67	***		***	**	***	***
	11+	2.13	9.92	11.28	11.28	***		***		***	***

t=p&lt;.1, \*p&lt;.05, \*\*p&lt;.01, \*\*\*p&lt;.000

Turning to females (Table 7 above), I find similar patterns of significant difference between individuals with differing partnering encounter experiences. Comparing females who have only dated to females who have only hooked up, I find differences by race ( $p < .000$  Whites,  $p < .000$  Asians,  $p < .000$  Hispanics), religious attendance ( $p < .000$  no attendance,  $p < .000$  frequent attendance), and mother's education level ( $p < .000$  less than high school,  $p < .000$  some college,  $p < .05$  bachelor's level,  $p < .05$  graduate level). I also find differences by number of previous intercourse partners ( $p < .000$  for each category), living arrangement ( $p < .000$  dorm residence,  $p < .000$  residing with parents), education aspirations ( $p < .05$  bachelor's level,  $p < .00$  doctoral level), GPA ( $p < .00$  GPA of 2.1-3.0,  $p < .000$  GPA of 3.76 or higher), and age at loss of virginity ( $p < .000$  for all categories). While females who have dated but not hooked up do not differ significantly from females who have hooked up only in terms of desire for more opportunities to date, they do significantly differ by agreement with the statement "I wish there were more opportunities for hookups at my school" ( $p < .05$  strong agreement,  $p < .000$  agreement,  $p < .000$  strong disagreement).

Females who have only dated differ significantly from females who have engaged in both date and hookup encounters by race ( $p < .000$  White,  $p < .000$  Black,  $p < .000$  Asian,  $p < .000$  Hispanic), religious attendance ( $p < .000$  no attendance,  $p < .05$  some attendance,  $p < .000$  frequent attendance), mother's education attainment level ( $p < .000$  less than high school,  $p < .000$  bachelor's level,  $p < .000$  graduate level), and number of previous intercourse partners ( $p < .000$  none,  $p < .000$  one,  $p < .05$  two to three,  $p < .000$  four to five,  $p < .000$  six to ten,  $p < .000$  eleven or more previous partners). Significant differences also

exist between these two groups by education aspirations ( $p < .000$  less than a bachelor's level education,  $p < .05$  bachelor's level,  $p < .00$  doctoral level), GPA ( $p < .00$  3.76 or higher GPA), desiring more opportunities for dates ( $p < .000$  strongly agree,  $p < .000$  disagree) and hookups ( $p < .00$  agreement,  $p < .00$  disagreement,  $p < .000$  strong disagreement). Age at loss of virginity is another area where females who have engaged in only date encounters differ from females who have engaged in both date and hookup encounters as well ( $p < .000$  virgin,  $p < .000$  loss of virginity at fourteen years or younger,  $p < .000$  at age fifteen,  $p < .000$  age sixteen,  $p < .000$  age seventeen,  $p < .000$  age eighteen).

Females who have both dated and hooked up also differ from females who have engaged in neither type of partnering encounter. Between these two groups I find significant differences by race ( $p < .000$  White,  $p < .000$  Black,  $p < .000$  Asian,  $p < .000$  Hispanic,  $p < .05$  Other Race individuals), age ( $p < .000$  for all categories), religious attendance ( $p < .05$  no attendance,  $p < .000$  some attendance,  $p < .000$  frequent attendance). Additionally, these two groups differ by previous number of intercourse partners ( $p < .000$  for all categories), living arrangement ( $p < .000$  for all categories), sorority membership ( $p < .000$ ), education aspirations ( $p < .00$  less than bachelor's level,  $p < .000$  master's level,  $p < .00$  doctoral level), and GPA ( $p < .000$  2.1-3.0 GPA,  $p < .000$  3.76 and higher GPA). Differences by age at loss of virginity were also significant ( $p < .000$  virgins,  $p < .05$  loss of virginity at age fourteen or younger,  $p < .000$  fifteen years,  $p < .000$  sixteen years,  $p < .000$  seventeen years,  $p < .000$  eighteen years,  $p < .000$  nineteen years or older), in desiring more opportunity for dates ( $p < .000$  strong agreement,  $p < .05$  agreement,  $p < .000$  disagreement,  $p < .000$  strong disagreement) and differences in desiring more opportunities for hookups

( $p < .000$  agreement,  $p < .000$  disagreement,  $p < .000$  strong disagreement) were significant as well.

From these t-tests of difference I conclude that individuals who have dated but not hooked up, hooked up only, both dated and hooked up, and those who have engaged in neither date nor hookup encounters differ substantially. This evidence lends support to the notion that dates and hookups differ and that individuals with differing characteristics either engage or refrain from engaging in these encounters in to differing degrees. To investigate further, I interpret the results of random-intercept logistic regression models that predict whether a partnering encounter is a date or hookup based on the encounters engaged in by students who responded to the OCSLS (see Appendix B).

The variable 'encounter type' is coded as 0 for dates and 1 for hookups. The OCSLS asks respondents to think back to their most recent date encounter and most recent hookup encounters. Here, respondents are reporting their view of whether an encounter was a date or hookup after the occurrence of the encounter, rather than what type of encounter they took it to be as they entered into it. With this in mind, one might expect that the activity during and outcome of the encounter has influenced the student's perception of whether the encounter was in fact one or the other encounter type. The model formulated here indicates the likelihood of the encounter being a date or a hookup after it has occurred based on the effects of the characteristics of the encounter, characteristics of the respondent, and characteristics of the institution where the respondent attends college. By including institution level characteristics in the model, I intend to control for the occurrence of slightly different concepts of what it means for an

encounter to be a date or hookup from campus to campus. Inclusion of covariates for school level characteristics also mitigates the effects of varying sexual markets from campus to campus, and issues relating to regression analysis using nested data as discussed in Chapter VI.

Overall, covariates representing characteristics of the encounter prove to be of greater significance for predicting encounter type than did respondent or institution level variables. The Common Interest/History (OR=1.27,  $p<.00$ ), Dorm (OR=1.59,  $p<.000$ ), and Bars/Parties (OR=1.26,  $p<.000$ ) meeting contexts are each significant in the female model. Females who meet their encounter partners in these contexts are more likely to report the encounter as a hookup than a date as compared to those who meet encounter partners by way of institutional contexts. All of the sex behaviors during the encounter that are considered in the model increase the likelihood of the encounter being considered to be a hookup rather than a date by females. The occurrence of oral sex (OR = 6.14,  $p<.000$ ) or vaginal sex (OR = 6.79,  $p<.000$ ) during the encounter greatly increase this probability, as do the occurrence of anal sex (OR=5.01,  $p<.000$ ) and manual genital stimulation (OR=3.89,  $p<.000$ ).

The above findings are similar to those from the model predicting the type of males' partnering encounters. While the Common Interest/History meeting context was not significant for males, the Dorm (OR=1.42,  $p<.000$ ) and Bars/Parties (OR=1.34,  $p<.000$ ) meeting contexts similarly increased the probability of the encounter being a hookup rather than date encounter as is the case within the female model. Sex behaviors that occur during the encounter also show a similar pattern amongst males to that

amongst females. As with females, each of the sex behaviors considered increased the probability of males reporting the encounter as being a hookup rather than date encounter, with oral sex (OR=5.69,  $p<.000$ ), anal sex (OR=4.62,  $p<.000$ ), and vaginal sex (OR=5.36,  $p<.000$ ) greatly increasing the probability of the encounter being reported as a hookup rather than a date. The occurrence of manual genital stimulation (OR=2.98,  $p<.000$ ) also significantly predicts an increased probability of the encounter being a hookup rather than a date.

By race, female respondents who indicated their race to be Asian (OR=.82,  $p<.1$ ) have a marginally significant decrease in the probability of a partnering encounter being a hookup rather than a date. Within the sample, 49.94% of Asian females who engage in a date encounter while only 31.91% engaged in a hookup encounter. 22.03% of Asian females who engage in only a date encounter, 4.00% in only a hookup encounter, 27.91% in both types of encounter, and 46.06% engaged in neither a date nor hookup encounter. Asian females who engaged in only a date encounter represent a larger portion of their race group, followed closely by black females (20.27%), than other race groups. The percent of Asian females engaging in neither type of encounter is also higher than for other race groups (White-32.69%, Black-40.00%, Hispanic-42.79%, Other Race-39.77%), with a smaller percentage of White females reporting engaging in neither encounter than any other race group. These results can be found in Table 8.

Table 8. Partnering Encounter Experience by Race and Gender

Date Only					
	White	Asian	Hispanic	Black	Other Race
Male	12.83	23.04	16.04	11.31	11.38
Female	11.37	22.03	15.88	20.27	12.27
Hookup Only					
Male	7.09	3.00	5.74	8.03	8.38
Female	7.76	4.00	4.65	7.65	5.68
Neither					
Male	30.06	48.62	35.25	32.85	38.32
Female	32.69	46.06	42.79	40.00	42.27
Both					
Male	50.02	25.35	42.97	47.81	41.92
Female	48.18	27.91	36.69	32.08	39.77

\*percentages

This pattern is also present amongst Asian males, who have a marginally significant decreased probability of hooking up as compared to dating. 48.39% of Asian males report engaging in a date encounter while only 28.35% report engaging in a hookup encounter. The percent of Asian males reporting engaging in only a date encounter (23.04%) is a higher portion of Asians overall than for those of any other race reporting engaging in only a date encounter. Asian males report engaging in neither a date or hookup encounter (48.62%) to a larger portion than do other race groups.

I find an interesting relationship between the number of previous intercourse partners reported by respondents and the probability of hooking up. While previous research indicates that hookups are conducive to casual, serial partnering, I find that among females who report six to ten previous intercourse partners (OR=.85,  $p < .05$ ) there is a significant decrease in the probability of hooking up rather than dating as compared

to those who report two to three intercourse partners. Likewise, for males who report six to ten previous partners, the probability of an encounter being a hookup is decreased (OR=.84,  $p<.1$ ). Reporting eleven or greater previous intercourse partners (OR=.74,  $p<.00$ ) also significantly decreased the probability of an encounter being a hooking up rather than a date for females, but was not significant for males. Sorority membership increased the probability of the encounter being a hookup rather than a date for females (OR=1.14), but fraternity membership for males caused no significant change in probability.

Desiring or not desiring an opportunity for more dates was not significant for males or females. However, for females who strongly disagree with the statement "I wish there were more opportunities for hooking up at my school," there is a significant decrease in the probability of hooking up (OR=.89,  $p<.05$ ) rather than dating. This was not significant for males, but males who agreed with the same statement (OR=1.12,  $p<.1$ ) were marginally more likely to report an encounter as being a hookup rather than a date as compared to males who disagree. No institution level variables are significant for males. For females, the percent of the student body at the institution where they attend college that consists of Blacks (OR=.98,  $p<.1$ ) and Asians (OR=.99,  $p<.1$ ) are each of marginal significance and slightly decrease the probability of an encounter being a hookup rather than a date. The percent of the student body consisting of Other Race individuals (OR=1.01,  $p<.05$ ) was also marginally significant for females and slightly increased the probability of hooking up.

## **Predicting Previous Encounter Experience**

I continue to investigate differences in the date and hookup scripts by analyzing respondents' previous encounter experience. I develop logistic regression models predicting a respondents' inclusion in each of the four previously mentioned categories of respondents' sexual partnering encounter experience. I develop eight models, one for each category of encounter experience for males and for females. These results are presented in Appendix B. The models predicting having engaged in a date encounter but not a hookup encounter for males (chi square=344.47,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=52$ ,  $R^2=.10$ ) and females (chi square=601.70,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=52$ ,  $R^2=.06$ ) are each significant. Males who are Black (OR=.68,  $p<.1$ ), as compared to White males, have a decreased probability of having only dated whereas females who are Black (OR=1.58,  $p<.000$ ) are significantly more likely to have only dated. Asian females also have an increased probability of indicating having only dated rather than indicating any other category of previous encounter experience.

Frequent religious attendance in comparison with some religious attendance significantly predicts having dated but not hooked up for males (OR=1.36,  $p<.05$ ) but not females; whereas no religious attendance in comparison to some religious attendance significantly predicts a lowered probability of having engaged in only a date encounter for females (OR=.84,  $p<.00$ ) but not males. This is indicative of an overall trend found by previous researchers suggesting that frequent religious attendance is associated with lower likelihood of engaging in casual sexual partnering, as found in the hookup script. Mother's educational attainment is not statistically significant for males or females.

Increased number of previous intercourse partners significantly predicts a lowered probability of having only dated among males (OR=.53,  $p<.00$  for males with four to five previous partners compared to males with two to three previous partners, OR=.32,  $p<.000$  for males with six to ten previous partners, OR=.13,  $p<.000$  for males with eleven or more previous partners) and females (OR=.63,  $p<.000$  for females with four to five previous partners, OR=.39,  $p<.000$  for females with six to ten previous partners, OR=.27,  $p<.000$  for females with eleven or more previous partners). Living arrangements and GPA are not found to significant in the male or female models, although education aspirations do significantly predict an increase in probability of having dated but not hooked up amongst males (OR=1.34,  $p<.00$  for males who aspire to master's level education in comparison to bachelor's level education, OR=1.28,  $p<.05$  for males who aspire to doctoral level education) but not females.

Strong agreement (OR=1.42,  $p<.00$ ) and agreement (OR=1.28,  $p<.05$ ), as compared to disagreement, with the statement "I wish there were more opportunities for dates at my school" significantly predicts an increase in the probability of having dated but not hooked up for males, and strong disagreement with the statement (OR=.52,  $p<.000$ ) predicts lowered probability of having only dated for females. Corresponding to this attitude statement, strongly disagreeing with the statement "I wish there were more opportunities for hookups at my school" significantly predicts a greater probability of having dated but not hooked up for both males (OR=1.36,  $p<.05$ ) and females (OR=1.20,  $p<.00$ ). Attending a private institution rather than a public institution is a significant predictor of having dated but not hooked up for males (OR=3.00,  $p<.05$ ) but not females,

and percent of student population consisting of Black individuals significantly increases the probability of having only dated for both males (OR=1.04,  $p<.05$ ) and females (OR=1.04,  $p<.00$ ). Percent of student population consisting of Asian individuals is a significant predictor of increased probability of having only dated for females (OR=1.03,  $p<.000$ ) but not males.

Turning to the models predicting having hooked up but not dated (chi square=22.72,  $p<0000$ ,  $df=52$ ,  $R^2=.11$ , for males, chi square=443.47,  $p<0000$ ,  $df=52$ ,  $R^2=.08$  for females), I find that race is not significant for males or females. As regards religious attendance, the pattern stands in opposition to that found for religious attendance in the model predicting having only dated. No religious attendance compared to some religious attendance is a significant predictor of greater probability of having hooked up but not dated for males (OR=1.56,  $p<.00$ ), and frequent religious attendance significantly predicts a lower probability of having hooked up but not dated for females (OR=.67,  $p<.05$ ). These effects of religious attendance are reflected in an interesting way in the model predicting having experienced both a date and hookup encounter (chi square=1158.10,  $p<0000$ ,  $df=52$ ,  $R^2=.27$  for males, chi square=2273.93,  $p<0000$ ,  $df=52$ ,  $R^2=.67$  for females) and in the model predicting having experienced neither (chi square=935.62,  $p<0000$ ,  $df=52$ ,  $R^2=.28$  for males, chi square=2112.63,  $p<0000$ ,  $df=52$ ,  $R^2=.24$  for females).

In comparison to some religious attendance, both frequent religious attendance and no religious attendance significantly predict a decrease in the probability of having both dated and hooked up for males (OR=.65,  $p<.000$  no attendance, OR.61,  $p<.000$

frequent attendance) and females (OR=.88,  $p<.00$  no attendance, OR=.74,  $p<.000$  frequent attendance). However, no religious attendance (OR=1.37,  $p<.000$  for males, OR=1.27,  $p<.000$  for females) as compared to some religious attendance is significantly predictive of an increase in the probability of having neither dated or hooked up, and frequent religious attendance is significantly predictive of an increased probability for females (OR=1.16,  $p<.05$ ) as well. The percentage of all respondents' partnering encounter experience by frequency of religious attendance is depicted in Table 9.

Table 9. Frequency of Religious Attendance by Partnering Encounter Experience

	No Religious Attendance	Some Religious Attendance	Frequent Religious Attendance
Date Only			
Male	33.33	47.18	19.49
Female	25.49	54.17	20.34
Hookup Only			
Male	44.88	47.52	7.59
Female	37.27	57.10	5.63
Neither			
Male	37.96	45.81	16.23
Female	32.57	49.58	17.85
Both			
Male	35.27	57.94	6.80
Female	34.67	57.78	7.54

\*percentages

Increased level of mother's educational attainment is significantly predictive of an increased probability of having engaged in both a date and hookup encounter (OR=1.29,  $p<.05$  for males whose mothers have some college education compared to a high school education, OR=1.28,  $p<.05$  for males whose mothers have a bachelor's level education, OR=1.33,  $p<.05$  for males whose mothers have a graduate education, OR=1.26,  $p<.00$  for

females whose mothers have a bachelor's level education,  $OR=1.30$ ,  $p<.00$  for females whose mothers have a graduate level education), but signals a decrease in the probability of having engaged in neither for both males ( $OR=.78$ ,  $p<.05$  for those whose mothers have some college education,  $OR=.78$ ,  $p<.05$  for those whose mothers have a bachelor's level education) and females ( $OR=.87$ ,  $p<.05$  for those whose mothers have some college education,  $OR=.79$ ,  $p<.00$  for those whose mothers have a bachelor's level education,  $OR=.74$ ,  $p<.000$  for those whose mothers have a graduate level education). Increased level of education aspirations is marginally significant for males ( $OR=.85$ ,  $p<.1$  for those who aspire to a master's level education rather than a bachelor's level education) and significant for females ( $OR=.86$ ,  $p<.05$  for those who aspire to obtain master's level education) predicting a decrease in the probability of having neither dated nor hooked up.

However, for females ( $OR=.79$ ,  $p<.000$  for those with a GPA of 2.1-3.0 compared to those with a GPA of 3.1-3.75,  $OR=1.35$ ,  $p<.000$  for those with a 3.76 or higher GPA) but not males, increased GPA significantly predicts a greater likelihood of having neither dated nor hooked up. GPA is not significant for males in the model predicting having hooked up but not dated, but having a GPA of 3.76 or higher significantly predicts a lower probability of having hooked up but not dated for females ( $OR=.58$ ,  $p<.00$ ). Lower education aspirations significantly predict a decrease in the probability of having hooked up but not dated for males ( $OR=.28$ ,  $p<.05$  for those who aspire to lower than a bachelor's level education) but not significant amongst females. Virginity, as compared to having lost one's virginity at age sixteen, is significantly related to a lower probability of having hooked up but not dated amongst males ( $OR=.13$ ,  $p<.000$ ) but not females,

while increases in age at loss of virginity predicts an increase in probability of having dated and hooked up for both males (OR=1.74,  $p<.000$  for males who lost their virginity at age seventeen as compared to age sixteen, OR=1.75,  $p<.000$  at age eighteen, OR=2.25,  $p<.000$  age 19 or older) and females (OR=1.30,  $p<.000$  age seventeen, OR=1.98,  $p<.000$  age eighteen, OR=2.89,  $p<.000$  age nineteen or older).

Wanting more opportunities for dates as evidenced by agreement with the statement “I wish there were more opportunities for dates at my school,” decreases the probability of having hooked up but not dated for males (OR=.64, .05 for those who strongly agree rather than disagree, OR=.66,  $p<.00$  for those who agree) but is not significant amongst females. Agreement with the same statement significantly predicts an increase in probability of having both dated and hooked up for males (OR=1.35,  $p<.00$  strong agreement, OR=1.29,  $p<.00$ ) and females (OR=2.19,  $p<.000$  strong agreement, OR=1.35 agreement), and decreases the probability of having done neither for both males (OR=.76,  $p<.00$  strong agreement, OR=.79,  $p<.00$  agreement) and females (OR=.45,  $p<.000$  strong agreement, OR=.72,  $p<.000$  agreement). Attending an institution with tuition costs over \$20,000 is not a significant predictor for any category of encounter experience amongst males, but for females is predictive of a decrease in probability of having hooked up only (OR=.27,  $p<.00$ ) and an increased probability of having both dated and hooked up (OR=1.76,  $p<.05$ ). In addition to increasing the probability of having only dated amongst males (OR=3.00,  $p<.05$ ), private rather than public institution attendance significantly predicts an increased probability of having only hooked up

amongst females (OR=2.59,  $p<.05$ ) and a decreased probability of having neither dated nor hooked up amongst males (OR=.46,  $p<.05$ ).

### **Prevalence of Encounters**

Moving next toward a consideration of the notion, promoted by some previous researchers, that the hookup script has replaced the date script on college campuses, I analyze the occurrence of each encounter among students responding to the OCSLS. In terms of response rates to the questions asking students about their most recent date encounter and their most recent hookup encounter (see Table 10 below), I find that 42.63% of all students report engaging in both a date and a hookup encounter. This means that a plurality of students have engaged in dates and hookups, rather than neither or only one or the other exclusively. 36.45% report having engaged in neither a date nor hookup encounter. Analyzing those who report engaging in either encounter exclusively, I find that a higher percentage of students report only having dated (14.37%) than having only hooked up (6.55%). This contradicts previous remarks by some researchers and journalists who believe that the hookup script is replacing the date script.

Table 10. Students' Encounter Experience

	Frequency	Percent
Date Only	2,301	14.37
Hookup Only	1,049	6.55
Neither	5,836	36.45
Both	6,825	42.63

Analyzing the percentage of students' sexual partnering encounter experiences by gender fails to reveal any substantially greater stratification. Of students who indicate having dated but not hooked up, 14.94% of males fall into this category as compared to 14.34% of females. 6.69% of males report having hooked up but not dated. Similarly, 6.66% of females report having hooked up but not dated. 34.32% of males report engaging in neither type of encounter, and 36.86% of females report having engaged in neither encounter. Reflective of the common notion that has been previously supported in the literature that males are more sexually active than females on average, 44.05% of males report engaging in both types of encounter while 42.14% of females report having engaged in both type of encounter.

In order to make a more clear comparison between the occurrence of dates compared to hookups, I calculate an approximation of the rates of occurrence of these encounter types. Based on students who indicate their class standing as 'sophomore' (N=3973), I calculate the occurrence of having engaged in at least one date encounter and the occurrence of having engaged in at least one hookup encounter by sophomore year of college. I complete this calculation utilizing students' responses to the questions asking about most recent date and most recent hookup encounter respectively. Dividing the number of sophomores who give details about their most recent date encounter (N=2332) by the number of sophomores, I find that approximately 59 of every 100 students report having engaged in a date encounter by the time they are a sophomore. It is unclear as to precisely when this date encounter occurred during their lifespan as the questions used to make the calculation do not reach this level of specificity. Similarly, I make this

calculation for hookup encounters and find that 49 of every 100 students report at least one hookup encounter by their sophomore year of college. Using these calculations, it appears that experience with date encounters is slightly more common than experience with hookup encounters by the time students are in their sophomore year.

Analyzing this issue in another way yields different results. Based on questions asking about previous number of dates and previous number of hookups, I calculate a rate of occurrence for dates and hookups by the number of times each encounter has occurred amongst all sophomores in the sample. Dividing the sum of date encounters reported by all sophomores in the sample (N=11,908) by the number of sophomores (N=3,973), I find an average of 2.99 dates per student during their sophomore year. Dividing the sum of hookup encounters reported by all sophomores in the sample (N=12687) by the number of sophomores, I find an average of 3.19 hookups per student during their sophomore year. This information, in conjunction with the rates of sophomores having engaged in at least one date and rates of sophomores having engaged in at least one hookup, indicates that while more students have engaged in date encounters by their sophomore year, higher numbers of hookups have occurred amongst students by their sophomore year.

Taking into account the nature of the date script as including behaviors geared toward establishing long-term romantic commitment and such behaviors being absent from the hookup script, these rates seem to coincide quite well with the nature of the two scripts if one were to assume that each script is representative of a pathway to the separate goals. Since dating potentially results in commitment, presumably of a monogamous nature, and relationship building behaviors require greater time

commitment than is called for by the anonymous, detached hookup script, students should have a decreased frequency of dates due to resource burdens. Hookups, while perhaps not being enacted by as many students by number, require less commitment of resources and are never intended to endure. This seems to lead to a situation where hookup encounters occur more by volume amongst students as a group than do dates.

### **Behaviors during Sexual Partnering Encounters**

I now move to an explanation of the ordered response logistic regression models which I formulate to address my hypotheses regarding behaviors during sexual partnering encounters and the contexts in which people meet in relation to levels of STI risk during an encounter. If individuals meet in close social contexts, such as the Institutional category of meeting contexts, which I use here as a comparison category, or through personal recommendation, do they then feel more comfortable entering into a trust state with their partner leading them to engage in increased levels of STI risk? The initial female model addressing this issue is significant when tested against a null model (chi square=1189.75,  $p < .0000$ ,  $df=60$ ), and results in an  $R^2$  of .10. The initial male model results in a significant likelihood-ratio test (chi square=1241.70,  $p < .0000$ ,  $df=60$ ) when compared to a null model and has an  $R^2$  of .24. Refer to Appendix D for the detailed results of these models.

### Encounter Type and STI Risk Level

Encounter type is marginally significant in the male model (OR=4.17,  $p<.1$ ) as an encounter considered to be a hookup rather than a date significantly increasing the probability of increased STI risk levels. For females, this effect is significant (OR=3.41,  $p<.000$ ) and also indicative of an increase in the probability of increased STI risk during encounter. Meeting a partner through personal recommendation is not significant in either model. Meeting by way of common interest or shared background (OR=1.63,  $p<.000$ ) significantly predicts an increased probability of greater STI risk as compared to meeting through an institutional context amongst females, but is not significant amongst males. For males, meeting in a public contexts (OR=1.32,  $p<.05$ ) or through personals advertisements (OR=1.55,  $p<.1$ ) increases the probability of greater STI risk during an encounter, but is not a significant predictor amongst females. Meeting in the context of a bar or party has no significance amongst males, but this meeting context (OR=.80,  $p<.00$ ) significantly predicts a decrease in STI risk level during encounter for females. For the portions of each encounter type that represent the presence of each level of STI risk, refer to Table 11 below.

Table 11. Levels of STI Risk during Partnering Encounters

	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	Total
Date Encounters	45.82	13.44	29.63	11.11	100
Hookup Encounters	26.37	13.28	44.27	16.08	100
All Encounters	34.45	13.33	38.2	14.02	100

\*percentages

Among the respondent level predictor variables included in the model found in Appendix D, frequent religious attendance significantly predicts a lowered probability of increase in STI risk for both males (OR=.62,  $p<.05$ ) and females (OR=.62,  $p<.00$ ). Higher GPA also significantly predicts lowered probability of higher levels of STI risk during encounter for both genders (OR=.50,  $p<.1$  for males with 3.76+ GPA, OR=.78,  $p<.05$  for females with 3.76+ GPA). Aspiring to doctoral level study significantly predicts lower STI risk levels during encounter for males (OR=.79,  $p<.1$ ) but not females. Interestingly, increased age at sexual debut significantly decreases probability of STI risk for males (OR=.65,  $p<.05$  for males who lost their virginity at nineteen years or older as compared to loss of virginity at sixteen years of age), but significantly predicts an increased level of STI risk during encounter for females (OR=1.25,  $p<.1$  for females who lost their virginity at age nineteen or older compared to at sixteen years of age). Both males (OR=1.21,  $p<.05$ ) and females (OR=1.20,  $p<.05$ ) who agree to the statement "I wish there were more opportunities for hookups at my school," as compared to those who disagree, have an increased probability for higher STI risk during encounter.

For males, attending an institution with greater numbers of undergraduate students (OR=1.23,  $p<.00$  for males at institutions with 20,000 or more undergraduates compared to those at institutions with between 10,000 and 20,000 students) significantly predicts increased STI risk during encounter but has no significant effect amongst females. Attending an institution with higher tuition costs also significantly predicts increased STI risk during encounter for males (OR=1.50,  $p<.000$ ) but not females.

## **Intoxication and STI Risk Level**

In order to address the effects of intoxication during encounters and the effects of meeting contexts, I utilize the results of the secondary models found in Appendix D, which predict STI risk levels during encounters. Building on the initial models predicting STI risk levels during encounters, I add an additional predictor variable indicating intoxication during encounter to the model. For males, this formulation results in a significant likelihood-ratio test when compared to a null model (chi square=510.40,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=61$ ) and an  $R^2$  measure of .11. The female model also results in a significant likelihood-ratio test (chi square=1189.82,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=61$ ) and has an  $R^2$  measure of .11.

For males, an encounter being a hookup rather than a date is only marginally significant prior to the addition of the intoxication covariate. After the addition of this variable, the impact of an encounter being a hookup rather than a date is not as great, although it remains quite substantial; and after addition of the covariate for intoxication, the significance of encounter type (OR=2.13,  $p<.001$ ) as a predictor of greater probability of higher STI risk during encounter for males increases. Engaging in a hookup encounter rather than a date encounter (OR=3.34,  $p<.000$ ) continues to increase the probability of higher STI risk level during encounter. Hookup encounters differ greatly from date encounters in regards to STI risk levels indicated by the effect of hookup encounters being indicative of an increase in the probability of higher STI risk levels for males by 100% and over 200% for females. Intoxication is also a significant predictor for both males (OR=1.25,  $p<.05$ ) and females (OR=1.18,  $p<.00$ ), causing an increase in the probability of higher STI risk levels.

After controlling for intoxication during encounter, public meeting contexts and meeting the partner by way of personals advertisements are no longer significant predictors of STI risk levels amongst males as compared to meeting in an institutional context. However, meeting the partner in the contexts of a bar or party (OR=.81,  $p<.1$ ) becomes marginally significant. I find no substantial change in the effects of meeting contexts in the female model. Religious attendance is also no longer significant amongst males after controlling for intoxication during encounter, but continues to significantly predict a decrease in the probability of higher STI risk levels amongst females (OR=1.28,  $p<.000$  for females reporting no religious and attendance and OR=.77,  $p<.05$  for females reporting frequent religious attendance, with some religious attendance utilized as a reference group). GPA (OR=.78,  $p<.05$  for females with GPA of 3.76 or higher compared to those with GPA of 3.1-3.75) continues to be a significant predictor of lowered probability of greater STI risk levels amongst females. The significance of GPA (OR=1.53,  $p<.05$  for males reporting GPA less than 2.1, and OR=.69,  $p<.1$  for males reporting GPA of 3.76 or higher) for predicting STI risk level amongst males increases with the addition of the control for intoxication during encounter to the model. Education aspirations lose significance amongst males and remain insignificant amongst females after controlling for intoxication.

In the initial model predicting STI risk level, number of previous intercourse partners is significant for females but not significant for males. This changes after including a control for intoxication, and number of previous intercourse partners becomes a significant predictor of STI risk level during encounter for both males and females.

Males who reported no previous partners (OR=.39,  $p<.00$ ) or one previous sex partner (OR=.51,  $p<.000$ ) were significantly less likely than those reporting two to three previous sex partners to have higher STI risk levels during the encounter. Males reporting four to five previous partners (OR=2.23,  $p<.000$ ), six to ten previous partners (OR=2.68,  $p<.000$ ), or eleven or more previous partners (OR=5.52,  $p<.000$ ) have an increased probability of high STI risk level during encounter.

Similarly, females who report only one previous sex partner (OR=.48,  $p<.000$ ) are significantly less likely to have increased STI risk level during the encounter compared to females who report two to three previous partners. Females reporting four to five previous partners (OR=1.74,  $p<.000$ ), six to ten previous partners (OR=2.80,  $p<.000$ ), or eleven or more previous partners (OR=4.92,  $p<.000$ ) have a substantially higher probability of increased STI risk levels during the encounter. The table below (Table 12) illustrates individuals by number of intercourse partners and levels of STI risk during encounter.

Table 12. Levels of STI Risk during Encounters by Number of Previous Intercourse Partners

Males		Number of Previous Intercourse Partners					
		None	1	2-3	4-5	6-10	11+
STI Risk Level	Low	57.46	40.45	31.06	22.39	17.92	11.88
	Moderate	22.66	18.89	13.87	11.65	10.15	6.35
	High	18.49	33.06	44.72	50.83	55.26	54.84
	Very High	1.39	7.60	10.35	15.13	16.67	26.93
Total		100	100	100	100	100	100
Females		Number of Previous Intercourse Partners					
		None	1	2-3	4-5	6-10	11+
STI Risk Level	Low	62.98	47.94	38.63	31.87	24.63	20.35
	Moderate	22.36	18.20	13.58	10.52	9.25	7.71
	High	13.71	26.36	35.63	41.42	45.70	43.38
	Very High	0.95	7.50	12.16	16.19	20.42	28.56
Total		100	100	100	100	100	100

\*percentages

After including a control for intoxication during encounter, age at loss of virginity decreases in significance for males, but virginity (OR=.23,  $p < .000$ ) as compared to loss of virginity at age sixteen significantly predicts a decreased probability of elevated STI risk levels as does loss of virginity at age seventeen (OR=.61,  $p < .00$ ). For females, there is no change in significance of age at sexual debut. Institution level characteristics lose all significance amongst males while remaining the same amongst females as before controlling for intoxication.

I expand this model further by separating the analysis of dates and hookups in order to clarify the effects of the predictor variables within each encounter type. This results in four additional models, one of each type for both genders ([chi square=327.16,  $p < .0000$ ,  $df=60$ ,  $R^2=.08$  for the male date model, chi square=491.67,  $p < .0000$ ,  $df=60$ ,

$R^2=.10$  for the male hookup model] [chi square=91.75,  $p<.00$ ,  $df=60$ ,  $R^2=.40$  for the female date model, chi square=1100.62,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=60$ ,  $R^2=.09$  for the female hookup model]), the results of which can also be found in Appendix D.

As I review the male models date and hookup specific models, I find several notable differences in the effects of encounter, respondent, and institution level characteristics. Within males' date encounters, intoxication (OR=1.53,  $p<.000$ ) significantly predicts an increase in the probability of higher STI risk levels, but during hookup encounters intoxication (OR=.84,  $p<.1$ ) is marginally indicative of a decreased probability of high STI risk levels. No meeting contexts are significant in the date model, but within hookup encounters, the Common Interest/History meeting context (OR=1.95,  $p<.00$ ) significantly predicts an increase in the probability of higher levels of STI risk as compared to meeting the partner in institutional contexts. Asians (OR=1.74,  $p<.00$ ), as compared to Whites, have a significantly increased probability of higher STI risk levels during date encounters but not during hookup encounters.

Living arrangement becomes significant when considering only date encounters (OR=1.42,  $p<.05$  for those living off-campus compared to those living in a dormitory, OR=1.49,  $p<.05$  for those living with their parents). Increased age at sexual debut (OR=.66,  $p<.00$  for individuals who were seventeen at sexual debut) and virginity (OR=.41,  $p<.41$ ) each significantly predict a lower probability of high STI risk levels during encounter in comparison to loss of virginity at age sixteen. Finally, attending an institution with fewer than 10,000 undergraduate students (OR=1.75,  $p<.05$ ) significantly

predicts a decrease in the probability of high STI risk levels during encounter within males' hookup encounters but is not significant within their date encounters.

For the female date and hookup models, there are also a number of differences in the effects of various traits on the probability of increased STI risk levels during encounter. Within females' date encounters, intoxication (OR=1.99,  $p<.000$ ) indicates a significant increase in likelihood of high STI risk levels. However, in females' hookup encounters intoxication (OR=.83,  $p<.00$ ) significantly predicts lower levels of STI risk. Differences in the effects of meeting contexts within females' encounters include meeting through personals advertisements (OR=1.83,  $p<.1$ ) predicting greater levels of STI risk during dates while not having any significant effect within hookup encounters and meeting in the contexts of a bar or party (OR=.81,  $p<.00$ ) significantly predicting a decrease in probability of high STI risk during hookup encounters while showing no significant effect within date encounters. I find no other substantial contrasts between the effects of the modeled traits between females' date and hookup encounters.

Differences in the effects of intoxication during dates as compared to hookup encounters may be the result of individuals whose inhibitions are lowered as they become intoxicated, which, on the surface, appears to be counterintuitive given the results just presented. However, these individuals may be disinhibited to a point where they decide to engage in a hookup encounter when originally not intending to do so, while at the same time not becoming so disinhibited as to take great STI risks. That is to say, individuals who engage in date encounters are intentionally setting out to engage a partner with whom they have at least some degree of interest in sparking a long-term

romantic relationship, thus a trust state develops readily with desire making up for any deficit of information. Such date encounters may well be premeditated, unlike the chance hookup encounters of students having no interest in relationship formation who coincidentally happen across an opportunity, while at a local bar with friends for example, to obtain sexual satisfaction. This explanation accords well with the randomness thought to be part of the hookup script as well as the non-concern with relationship formation.

### **Predicting Intoxication during Encounter**

As I mentioned above, past research findings indicate that a party atmosphere involving intoxication is a common component of the hookup script. To test my hypothesis regarding intoxication being more likely to occur during hookup encounters than date encounters, I again analyze results from a logistic regression model, now predicting intoxication during encounter. These results are available in Appendix E. For the male model predicting intoxication during encounter, an  $R^2$  of .52 indicates that approximately 52% of the variance in the occurrence of intoxication during an encounter is explained by the model predictor variables. A likelihood-ratio test of the full model compared to a null model is significant (chi square=529.23,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=65$ ). Also, for the female model an  $R^2$  of .49 and a significant likelihood-ratio test (chi square=1241.36,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=65$ ) indicate an adequate goodness-of-fit of the model and moderate to strong predictive capability. In accordance with existing literature, for both males (OR=4.79,  $p<.000$ ) and females (OR=5.81,  $p<.000$ ), hooking up as compared to dating

significantly increases the probability of intoxication during encounter. The occurrence of intoxication during encounters reported by respondents is described below in Table 13.

Table 13. Intoxication during Encounter, Overall and by Intoxicant Used

Intoxicant Use		Males			Females		
		All Encounters	Dates	Hookups	All Encounters	Dates	Hookups
Any Intoxication during Encounter		49.81	34.53	67.73	46.46	29.61	65.91
Alcohol Consumption	Moderate	12.77	11.93	13.74	15.21	13.09	17.66
	Binge	33.74	19.50	50.43	29.42	14.77	46.33
Marijuana Use		12.20	8.69	16.30	6.74	4.57	9.24
Use of Other Intoxicants		3.66	3.39	3.93	1.93	1.79	2.06

\*percentages

Encounter level characteristics from the logistic regression model predicting intoxication during sexual partnering encounters (Appendix E) reveal similar patterns between males and females. For females, meeting the encounter partner through personal recommendation (OR=1.24,  $p<.05$ ), at a dorm or dorm related activity (OR=1.22,  $p<.05$ ), or in the context of a bar or party (OR=2.75,  $p<.000$ ) increases the probability of intoxication during the encounter as compared to meeting via an institutional context. Meeting through personals advertisements (OR=.42,  $p<.00$ ) or Internet social networks (OR=.30,  $p<.000$ ) significantly decreases the probability of being intoxicated during the sexual partnering encounter amongst females. The meeting contexts of Internet social networks is not significant amongst males (OR=.70, not significant). Meeting the encounter partner through personals advertisements (OR=.34,  $p<.1$ ) decreases the probability of being intoxicated during the encounter as compared to those who meet a partner through an institutional context, but this decrease is only marginally significant.

Sexual behaviors are correlated with intoxication for both males and females as indicated by significant increases in the probability of intoxication during encounter for all sexual behavior predictor variables. Anal sex during encounter significantly predicts a substantial increase in the probability of intoxication during encounter for males, who are approximately six times more likely to report intoxication during an encounter including anal sex (OR=7.01,  $p<.000$ ). Anal sex causes the greatest increase in probability of intoxication during encounter for females, as well, with females who report anal sex occurring during the encounter being over four times as likely to be intoxicated (OR=4.19,  $p<.000$ ) with other variables held constant compared to those who do not report this behavior.

Black males (OR=.39,  $p<.00$ ) and females (OR.25,  $p<000$ ), as compared to Whites, show a significant decrease in the probability of reporting intoxication during an encounter. Male Asians are marginally less likely to be intoxicated during an encounter (OR=.61,  $p<.1$ ) as compared to Whites. No other significant effects are found by race. Frequent religious attendance compared to only some religious attendance (OR=.53,  $p<.00$  for males, OR=.50,  $p<.000$  for females), virginity as compared to having lost one's virginity at age sixteen (OR=.33,  $p<.00$  for males, OR=.53,  $p<.05$  for females) significantly decreases the probability of intoxication during encounter. Fraternity (OR=1.40,  $p<.1$ ) and sorority (OR=1.30,  $p<.05$ ) membership each increase the probability of intoxication during encounter, and increased mother's educational attainment (OR=1.51,  $p<.05$  for males whose mothers obtained a bachelor's degree,

OR=1.24,  $p<.05$  for females whose mothers obtained a bachelor's degree) also significantly predicts intoxication during encounter.

For females (OR=.76,  $p<.00$  MA, OR=.73,  $p<.00$  doctoral) but not males, increased education aspirations are significantly predictive of a decrease in probability of intoxication during encounter. Another notable difference between males and females is related to desire for greater opportunity for dates and hookups. Amongst males who strongly agree that they wish for more opportunities to date (OR=.62,  $p<.00$ ) there is a significant decrease in the probability of intoxication during encounter; while amongst females, strong agreement (OR=1.29,  $p<.00$ ) significantly predicts an increase in intoxication during encounter as compared to disagreement.

Institution level characteristics show some correlation with intoxication for both males and females. Males (OR=.56,  $p<.00$ ) and females (OR=.71,  $p<.05$ ) who attend schools with tuition costs of \$7,500 or lower each have a decreased probability of intoxication during an encounter as compared to individuals who attend institutions with tuition costs between \$7,500 and \$20,000. The percentage of the student body at the institution where the respondent attends college which consists of Black individuals (OR=.92,  $p<.00$  for males, OR=.93,  $p<.000$  for females) and Asian individuals (OR=.98,  $p<.05$  for males, OR=.97,  $p<.00$  for females) significantly predicts a slight decrease in the probability of intoxication during encounter as compared to the portion of the student body consisting of Whites. Private, in contrast to public, institution attendance nor number of undergraduate students at institution show any significant change in probability of intoxication during encounter for either gender.

I address my hypothesis that hookup encounters where individuals who report having known their encounter partner well before the hookup will involve greater levels of STI risk by conducting t-tests of difference comparing individuals who indicated knowing their partner little, those who knew the partner moderately, and those who indicated knowing the partner well. These results for males can be found in Table 14 below.

Table 14. Comparison of Male Students by How Well they Believe they Knew their Hookup Partner before the Encounter

Control Variables		Males					
		Knew Little	Knew Moderately	Knew Well	1x2	1x3	2x3
Encounter Level Variables							
STI Risk during Encounter	Low	21.49	25.7	16.28	*	*	***
	Moderately	13.41	12.04	9.39	t		
	High	51.83	50.55	49.62		t	**
	Very High	13.26	11.7	24.71		***	***
Respondent Level Variables - Demographic							
Race	White	64.04	64.56	72.26		**	**
	Black	5.5	7.14	5.47			
	Asian	12.63	10.17	7.74		**	
	Hispanic	10.1	10.83	9.06			
	Other Race	7.73	7.3	5.47			
Age	18-19	38.04	36.75	35.85			
	20-21	38.04	39.29	43.02		t	
	22-23	14.41	16.57	15.09			
	24+	9.51	7.38	6.04		*	
Religious Attendance	Never	37.44	35.36	37.92			
	Some	55.72	57.67	54.91			
	Frequently	6.84	6.97	7.17			
Mother's Education	<HS	5.35	5.5	2.83		*	*
	HS	16.34	16.74	17.55			
	SC	23.33	25.1	25.47			
	BA	31.8	30.11	28.3			
	GR	23.18	22.56	25.85			
Born in the USA		87.52	89.5	93.21			
Living Arrangement	Dorm	39.38	38.8	39.43			
	Fraternity/Sorority	7.13	6.32	8.11			
	Other On-Campus	3.71	3.69	5.47			t
	Off-Campus	41.31	39.79	37.74			
	w/Parents	8.47	11.4	9.25	*		

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

Table 14. (continued) Comparison of Male Students by How Well they Believe they Knew their Hookup Partner before the Encounter

Control Variables		Males					
		Knew Little	Knew Moderately	Knew Well	1x2	1x3	2x3
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Education and Attitudes							
Fraternity/Sorority Member		20.95	17.39	18.68	t		
Education Aspirations	<BA	2.67	2.3	2.64			
	BA	32.69	31.09	34.53			
	MA	38.04	39.87	33.77			t
	DR	26.6	26.74	29.06			
GPA	<2.1	7.13	9.6	8.3	t		
	2.1-3.0	38.34	40.03	42.83			
	3.1-3.75	45.62	42.08	41.89			
	3.76+	8.92	8.29	6.98			
Wants More Opportunities to Date	Strongly Agree	19.32	18.87	18.68			
	Agree	46.81	48.32	40.94		*	**
	Disagree	31.5	30.35	35.47			*
	Strongly Disagree	2.38	2.46	4.91		*	**
Wants More Opportunities to Hookup	Strongly Agree	19.17	14.77	14.72	*	*	
	Agree	36.4	38.06	32.64			*
	Disagree	39.52	41.59	43.96			
	Strongly Disagree	4.9	4.58	8.68		**	*
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Sexual History							
Age at Loss of Virginity	Virgin	13.52	12.72	10.75			
	14 or younger	7.13	7.55	7.74			
	15	10.55	9.6	8.68			
	16	18.28	17.8	15.85			
	17	19.61	21.08	23.21			
	18	20.21	18.95	19.62			
	19+	10.7	12.31	14.15		t	
Number of Previous Partners	None	12.48	13.86	8.49	*	*	**
	1	9.36	11.24	14.72	**	**	*
	2-3	21.69	21.9	28.68	**	**	**
	4-5	14.56	18.95	14.15			*
	6-10	22.14	18.29	15.85	**	**	
	11+	19.76	15.75	18.11			

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

For males who indicate knowing the encounter partner little prior to the hookup, 13.26% indicate that very high STI risk levels occurred during the encounter. This is significantly different ( $p < .000$ ) from the 24.71% of males who indicate having known their partner well prior to the hookup who indicate the occurrence of very high levels of STI risk, but not significantly different from the 11.70% of those who indicate knowing the partner moderately who indicate that the encounter involved very high levels of STI risk. Of males who report knowing their partner little, 21.49% report low levels of STI risk during the hookup encounter, and this is significantly different ( $p < .000$ ) from the 16.28% reporting low STI risk levels during the encounter among males who indicate having known the partner well prior to the hookup.

Amongst females (see results in Table 15 below), of those who indicate having known the encounter partner little prior to the hookup 35.38% report low STI risk levels during the encounter. This is significantly different from both the 30.62% reporting low STI risk among females who indicated knowing the partner moderately ( $p < .00$ ) and the 17.85% reporting low STI risk levels among females who indicated knowing the partner well ( $p < .000$ ). Of women who indicate having known the encounter partner little prior to the hookup, 12.02% report very high levels of STI risk, and this is significantly different from the 25.40% of females who indicated knowing the partner well who report very high levels of STI risk during the encounter. While the pattern is more clear amongst females than males, for both genders, those who felt that they knew their hookup partner well prior to the encounter engaged in significantly higher levels of STI risk than did students who report having known the partner little. This evidence supports the theory

that individuals who are more familiar with one another are more likely to engage in risky sexual behaviors with their partners. This may be due to the ease with which trust states develop between the individual and their hookup partner.

Table 15. Comparison of Female Students by How Well they Believe they Knew their Hookup Partner before the Encounter

Control Variables		Females					
		Knew Little	Knew Moderately	Knew Well	1x2	1x3	2x3
Encounter Level Variables							
STI Risk during Encounter	Low	35.38	30.62	17.85	**	***	***
	Moderately	15.61	14.32	11.83		**	**
	High	36.99	41.47	44.92	**	***	***
	Very High	12.02	13.59	25.4		***	***
Respondent Level Variables - Demographic							
Race	White	64.79	65.85	69.73		**	**
	Black	3.63	5.99	5.64	*	**	
	Asian	10.62	10.55	7		**	***
	Hispanic	12.89	10.41	10.82	*		
	Other Race	8.08	7.21	6.8			
Age	18-19	43.47	41.8	37.46		**	**
	20-21	38.29	38.91	43.1		*	**
	22-23	11.89	13.47	14.32		t	
	24+	6.35	5.81	5.12			
Religious Attendance	Never	37.02	34.7	34.15			
	Some	55.72	57.95	58.85			
	Frequently	7.26	7.34	7			
Mother's Education	<HS	6.17	5.67	3.95		**	*
	HS	45.97	17.23	17.76			
	SC	22.23	25.97	26.64	*	**	
	BA	30.67	31.53	30.72			
	GR	24.95	19.6	20.93	***	*	
Born in the USA		89.75	91.26	92.81		**	t
Living Arrangement	Dorm	40.56	41.21	38.43			t
	Fraternity/Sorority	4.36	4.28	4.34			
	Other On-Campus	5.26	3.93	3.5	t	*	
	Off-Campus	40.02	39.58	41.61			
	w/Parents	9.8	11	12.12		t	

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

Table 15. (continued) Comparison of Female Students by How Well they Believe they Knew their Hookup Partner before the Encounter

Control Variables		Females					
		Knew Little	Knew Moderately	Knew Well	1x2	1x3	2x3
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Education and Attitudes							
Fraternity/Sorority Member		15.88	16.53	15.88			
Education Aspirations	<BA	2.27	2.54	1.88			
	BA	27.77	27.46	26.38			
	MA	41.92	41.07	43.75			t
	DR	28.04	28.92	28			
GPA	<2.1	8.8	6.96	5.9	*	**	
	2.1-3.0	30.94	36.23	35.45	**	*	
	3.1-3.75	49.09	48.24	48.67			
	3.76+	11.16	8.56	9.98	*		
Wants More Opportunities to Date	Strongly Agree	26.04	24.05	24.89			*
	Agree	46.46	46.54	44.01			***
	Disagree	24.41	26.8	28.58		*	
	Strongly Disagree	3.09	2.61	2.53			
Wants More Opportunities to Hookup	Strongly Agree	4.26	2.71	3.18			
	Agree	19.33	14.27	14.97			
	Disagree	61.43	65.92	63.9	**		
	Strongly Disagree	14.97	17.09	17.95			
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Sexual History							
Age at Loss of Virginity	Virgin	17.88	15.21	11.41	*	***	***
	14 or younger	5.35	6.3	7		t	
	15	10.98	12.25	13.03			
	16	16.24	18.55	19.51	t	*	
	17	17.15	17.4	17.56			
	18	18.33	17.4	17.43			
	19+	14.07	12.88	14.06			
Number of Previous Partners	None	17.33	15.56	11.99		***	**
	1	14.25	12.5	14.52			t
	2-3	23.32	21.68	24.3			*
	4-5	16.7	17.23	16.98			
	6-10	19.51	21.68	20.54			
	11+	8.89	11.35	11.67		*	

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

### **Outcomes of Sexual Partnering Encounters**

To predict the effects of various encounter, respondent, and institution characteristics on satisfaction with partnering encounters I formulate ordered logistic regression models predicting level of satisfaction after an encounter and address differences by gender and encounter type. These models are presented in Appendix F. A model for females predicting overall satisfaction with encounter results in an  $R^2$  of .05 and a significant likelihood-ratio score when compared to a null model (chi square=538.49,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=66$ ). The male model results in an  $R^2$  of .02 and a significant likelihood-ratio test (chi square=263.55,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=66$ ). In both models, hookups (OR=.47,  $p<.000$  for males, OR=.39,  $p<.000$  for females) in comparison to dates and intoxication during encounter (OR=.46,  $p<.000$  for males, OR=.60,  $p<.000$  for females) significantly predict a decreased probability of enjoying the encounter overall.

#### **Intoxication and Satisfaction after Encounter**

Of the date encounters engaged in by male respondents, 66% of those reporting little to no satisfaction with the encounter overall were intoxicated. Of males reporting very much satisfaction with the date encounter, 50.30% were intoxicated. For females who report little to no satisfaction with the date encounter overall, 52.54% were intoxicated; 47.37% who reported very much overall satisfaction were intoxicated. Of hookups reported by male respondents, 73.90% who report little to no overall satisfaction were intoxicated while 63.91% who report very much satisfaction were intoxicated. Of females reporting little to no satisfaction with the hookup encounter 69.31% were

intoxicated, and 61.97% of females reporting very much satisfaction with the hookup encounter were intoxicated. The portion of students reporting various levels of satisfaction after encounters who were intoxicated is reported in Table 16 below.

Table 16. Level of Satisfaction after Encounter by Presence of Intoxication

Males' Satisfaction Level after Encounter						
Intoxication during Encounter	Date			Hookup		
	Little-None	Somewhat	Very Much	Little-None	Somewhat	Very Much
Not Intoxicated	34.00	39.57	49.70	26.10	27.83	36.09
Intoxicated	66.00	60.43	50.30	73.90	72.17	63.91
Females' Satisfaction Level after Encounter						
Intoxication during Encounter	Date			Hookup		
	Little-None	Somewhat	Very Much	Little-None	Somewhat	Very Much
Not Intoxicated	47.46	45.65	52.63	30.69	29.53	38.03
Intoxicated	52.54	54.35	47.37	69.31	70.47	61.97

\*percentages

Meeting the encounter partner through personal recommendation, as compared to meeting through institutional contexts, is significantly predictive of an increased probability of satisfaction with the encounter overall for females (OR=1.25,  $p<.05$ ) but not for males. The common interest/history meeting contexts is significantly predictive of an increased probability of satisfaction for males (OR=1.64,  $p<.05$ ) and marginally significant for females (1.23,  $p<.01$ ). No other meeting contexts are significant. For males, oral sex (OR=1.41,  $p<.05$ ), vaginal sex (OR=1.89,  $p<.000$ ), and anal sex (OR=3.63,  $p<.000$ ), but not genital stimulation, are predictive of an increased probability of greater satisfaction with the encounter overall. Similarly, females who report oral sex (OR=1.40,  $p<.00$ ), vaginal sex (OR=1.89,  $p<.000$ ), or anal sex (OR=2.58,  $p<.000$ ) are

more likely to report greater satisfaction with the encounter overall. Manual genital stimulation (OR=1.35,  $p<.00$ ) also significantly predicted an increased probability of reporting higher overall satisfaction with the encounter for females.

Living off-campus, as compared to living in a dormitory, is a marginally significant predictor of a lower probability of satisfaction with encounter for males (OR=.76,  $p<.1$ ) but not females. No living arrangements were significantly predictive for females. Fraternity or sorority membership is not a significant predictor of satisfaction with either encounter, nor is age at loss of virginity for either males or females. Education aspirations and GPA showed no significance in the female model. In contrast, for the male model, lower GPA (OR=1.29,  $p<.05$  for males with GPA of 2.1-3.0 as compared to those with GPA of 3.1-3.75) is predictive of greater satisfaction with encounter, and higher education aspirations (OR=.76,  $p<.05$  for males who aspire to obtain a master's level education as compared to those who only wish to obtain a bachelor's level education) is predictive of a decrease in probability of being satisfied with the encounter overall.

Agreement and strong agreement with the statement "I wish there were more opportunities for dates at my school" is predictive of a lower probability of being satisfied with the encounter overall for both males (OR=.74,  $p<.05$  for males who strongly agree, OR=.74,  $p<.00$  for males who agree) and females (OR=.85,  $p<.1$  for females who strongly agree, OR=.86,  $p<.05$  for females who agree) as compared to those who disagree. Institution level characteristics were not significant for females. However, males who attended institutions with over 20,000 undergraduate students (OR=1.70,

p<.05) were significantly more likely to experience higher degrees of satisfaction with the encounter overall than those who attended institutions with between 10,000 and 20,000 students. Private as compared to public institution attendance had no significance and race and gender make-up of the student population at the institution attended had no substantial effect on the probability of overall satisfaction with encounter.

### **Encounter Type and Satisfaction after Encounter**

Of the hookup encounters engaged in by males in the sample, 10.35% report little to no satisfaction with the encounter overall, 36.04% report some satisfaction, and 53.61% report that they were very much satisfied. 13.79% of females engaging in a hookup report little to no satisfaction with the encounter, 34.95% report some satisfaction, and 51.26% report being very much satisfied. I expand the initial models predicting level of satisfaction after an encounter by restricting the analyses further to only hookup encounters. This results in two additional models (chi square=204.27, p<.0000, df=65 for males, chi square=274.86, p<.0000, df=65 for females, also found in Appendix F).

Analyzing these hookup only models, I find that intoxication significantly predicts a lowered probability of satisfaction with encounter for both males (OR=.60, p<.000) and females (OR=.66, p<.000). Frequent religious attendance (not significant for males, OR=.80, p<.05 for females), lower mother's educational attainment (not significant for males, OR=.74, p<.05 for females whose mothers have less than a high school education compared to those whose mothers have a high school education), and

strong disagreement with the statement “I wish there were more opportunity for hookups at my school” compared with disagreement (not significant for males, OR=.84,  $p<.05$  for females) each cause a significant decrease in the probability of overall satisfaction with the hookup encounter amongst females but not males. Higher mother’s educational attainment (OR=1.43,  $p<.05$  for males whose mothers have graduate degrees compared to those whose mothers completed high school, not significant for females), lower GPA (OR=1.20,  $p<.1$  for males who have 2.1-3.0 GPA compared to those with 3.1-3.75, not significant for females), and agreement (OR=1.25,  $p<.05$  for males, not significant for females) with the statement “I wish there were more opportunity for hookups at my school” compared to disagreement are each predictive of an increased probability of satisfaction with encounter for males but not females.

Of the date encounters engaged in by students in the sample, 2.79% of males report little to no satisfaction with the encounter overall, 31.05% report some satisfaction, and 66.16% report that they were very much satisfied with the encounter. For date encounters engaged in by females in the sample, 4.74% report little to no satisfaction with the encounter overall, 28.76% report some satisfaction, and 66.50% report being very much satisfied. Restricting the models predicting level of satisfaction after an encounter again, now to only dates (also found in Appendix F), results in a significant model for both males (chi square=204.28,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=65$ ,  $R^2=.05$ ) and females (chi square=205.33,  $p<.0000$ ,  $df=65$ ,  $R^2=.48$ ).

Once again I find that intoxication is significantly predictive of a decreased probability of satisfaction with encounter (OR=.60,  $p<.000$  for males, OR=.69,  $p<.000$ ).

Religious attendance is not significant amongst males nor females, neither does any race group, as compared to Whites, indicate any significant effect on probability of satisfaction with encounter. Amongst males, oral sex (OR=1.52,  $p<.00$ ), vaginal sex (OR=5.55,  $p<.000$ ), and anal sex (OR=1.97,  $p<.000$ ) are significant predictors of increased satisfaction with encounter. This is not the case amongst females, where I find that only vaginal sex (OR=1.71,  $p<.000$ ) is significantly predictive of satisfaction. Previous number of intercourse partners is significant for females (OR=1.30,  $p<.05$ ), for whom having only one previous partner, in comparison to having two to three partners, increases the probability of satisfaction with encounter, but only marginally significant for males (OR=.80,  $p<.1$  for those with four to five partners).

Increased education aspirations have an opposite effect on the probability of satisfaction with date encounters for males compared to females. For males, increased education aspirations (OR=.75,  $p<.00$  for those who aspire to a master's level education rather than a bachelor's level education) significantly predicts lower likelihood of satisfaction with date encounter. For females, increased education aspirations (OR=1.23,  $p<.05$  for those who aspire to a doctoral level education) indicate an increase in the probability of greater satisfaction with encounter.

Lack of desire for more opportunity to date at one's institution of attendance, illustrated by students' agreement or disagreement with the statement "I wish there were more opportunity for dates at my school," signals an increase in probability of satisfaction with date encounter for both males (OR=1.69,  $p<.1$ ) and females (OR=1.92,  $p<.05$ ). However, agreement with the statement "I wish there were more opportunities

for hookups at my school,” has differing effects for males (OR=1.25,  $p<.05$ ) than for females (OR=.80,  $p<.05$ ) indicating a significant increase in probability of satisfaction with encounter males and a significant decrease for females. Other differences between males’ and females’ probability of satisfaction with date encounters are the significant prediction of a lowered probability for females who attend an institution with lower tuition costs (OR=.75,  $p<.05$  for females who attend an institution with tuition costs below \$7,500 as compared to attending an institution with tuition costs between \$7,500 and \$20,000) but not for males, and the significant prediction of an increased probability for males who attend an institution with greater than 20,000 undergraduate students (OR=1.52,  $p<.05$ ) as compared to attending institutions with between 10,000 and 20,000 undergraduate students.

## CHAPTER XI

### DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In the discussion that follows, I begin by reconsidering common notions about hookup encounters, addressing first an issue taken to be a decisive factor in distinguishing the hookup script from the date script – interest in the development of long-term romantic relationships. I then proceed by following the sequence, as previously outlined, of selection into date and hookup encounters, behaviors during sexual partnering encounters. Finally, I address the outcomes of date and hookup sexual partnering encounters. Additional comments, included throughout, take up currents of thought in previously existing literature.

#### **The Hookup Script and Interest in a Romantic Relationship**

##### **following an Encounter**

As indicated by Paul & Hayes (2002), and a number of others (Bogle 2008; England et al. 2007; Fielder & Carey 2010b; Reid et al. 2011; Paul & Hayes 2002; Stepp 2007), the hookup script is thought to lack any concern for relationship building or romantic involvement. Based on accounts within the existing academic literature, media reports, and imagery found in popular culture outlets, it is easy to see that a widespread notion of hooking up as a boisterous, perhaps even reckless, type of sexual behavior prevails. The characteristic anonymity tied to the hookup script is also an alarming

aspect of this emerging social form for parents and public health official alike. While the sexual revolutions of decades past may have led to a relaxing of negative attention and stigmatization brought on by engaging in serial sexual partnering encounters, the AIDS scare of the 1980's certainly thrust the risks associated with STI's to the fore in the minds of many. The notion that college students are hungrily chasing their next sexual partnering encounter with any willing stranger who might be randomly available seems to me a bit overstated, however.

Addressing my first hypothesis, and the nature of hookup scripts more generally, I find that a majority of both male and female college students who engage in hookup encounters entertain at least some possibility of developing a long-term romantic relationship with their partner following the encounter. This stands in opposition to accounts finding a near absolute lack of interest in relationship building to be part and parcel to the hookup script. Based on the results of difference testing, I find that females are somewhat more likely than males to be interested in a romantic relationship with their partner after a hookup encounter. This finding corresponds to indications made by previous researchers that females are more interested in relationship formation than males on average.

The bulk of students indicate possible interest in a long-term romantic relationship with the partner after a hookup encounter. In other words, on average students are somewhat indifferent. Students may not care to rule out the possibility of a relationship with the partner after a hookup encounter, but they are not quite interested in any active pursuit of one either. I imagine this attitude could be accurately captured in a

statement such as “well, if it happens I’m OK with it.” There is some irony to be found here, particularly in the light of the push in modern society for micromanagement of one’s life-narrative, by thinking of students as taking a non-committed position toward commitment, being neither for nor against it.

### **Selection into Dating and Hooking up as Modes of Sexual Partnering Experience**

#### **Intoxication**

As I address my second hypothesis and compare hookup encounters to date encounters, I find the effects of intoxication during the encounter to be among the most striking results. Intoxication, particularly as a result of binge drinking, is cited as a distinguishing feature of the hookup script. By my analysis, 47.58% of students who engage in hookup encounters do so while also engaging in binge drinking, compared to 35.95% who abstain from alcohol consumption all together during these encounters. 50.43% of males and 46.33% of females who engage in hookups report binge drinking during the encounter. It may be the case that alcohol consumption and spur of the moment behavior are what introduce the reported absence of concern for relationship building into the hookup script.

I do not intend to indicate that alcohol consumption causes a decrease in concern with relationship formation in general, rather that alcohol consumption, as a sensation seeking activity, may be common among individuals who seek sexual activity in order to satisfy what amounts to a generic urge for excitement. Such persons are thrill seeking, not planning for a future relationship that they hope to kick off by engaging in hookup

encounter. I find that, for students who engage in a hookup encounter, the percentage of those who report binge drinking during the encounter who have no interests in a romantic relationship with the partner afterward (37.17%) is higher than for students overall (35.95%) and substantially higher than the percentage among students who abstained from alcohol consumption during the encounter (22.73%). Among those who are hooking-up, individuals who enjoy binge drinking makeup a large portion of all individuals who hookup who are not interested in developing a long-term relationship after the encounter.

Intoxication of any kind is present during 67.55% of the hookups engaged in by male students with both hookup and date encounter experience and 66.22% for females; only 42.62% of the date encounters engaged in by males from this same group and 35.42% of females occurred while the respondent was in some way intoxicated (these comparison are each significant based on an independent t-test,  $p < .000$ ). Comparing dates engaged in by students with only date experience to the hookups of students with only hookup encounter experience, this contrast becomes more extreme. This comparison reveals that 10.17% of males' encounters and 12.18% of females' encounters, amongst those with only date experience, and 68.98% of males' encounters and 63.98% of females' encounters, amongst those with only hookup experience, involved respondents who were intoxicated (each of these comparisons is significant based on an independent t-test,  $p < .000$ ). From these results I conclude that reports of intoxication being common to the hookup script are largely accurate. Furthermore, these results suggest that intoxication is not as thoroughly integrated into the date script as is

the case with the hookup script. This statement begs the additional questions of “why?” and “how?” this is and came to be the case, questions I will delay addressing for a moment.

### **Predicting Encounter Type**

Date encounters differ significantly from hookup encounters on a number of other variables as well, including meeting contexts and sexual behaviors during encounter. These differences largely follow similar patterns when analyzing encounters separately by gender. Males and females who meet their encounter partner through the social contexts of dorm life have a 50% greater chance of reporting the encounter with that partner to have been a hookup rather than a date, seconding previous research findings which point toward the college campus itself as being an environment that is conducive to hookup culture. Additionally, individuals who meet their encounter partner in the context of a bar or party are more likely to report the encounter with that partner as a hookup rather than a date. This increased probability also corresponds well to notions about differences between dates and hookups that include a belief that the hookup script involves a party atmosphere and widespread intoxication.

While not statistically significant, meeting a partner in what I have conceived of as contexts representing larger social distances did indicate a decrease in the likelihood of an encounter with that partner being considered to be a hookup rather than a date encounter within the logistic regression model predicting encounter type (Appendix B). From independent t-tests of difference comparing the encounters engaged in by students

of differing previous encounter experience categories (see Table 4 in Chapter X), I find significant differences based on the meeting context categories representing public spaces, dorm contexts, and bars/parties. A lower portion of the date encounters of individuals with only date encounter experience than the portion of hookups engaged in by individuals with only hookup encounter experience involve meeting in the context of a bar or party. The same is true of the date encounters engaged in by respondents who are experienced with both types of sexual partnering encounters as compared to the hookup encounters of this same group. Again, my findings lend support to notions about the existence of a distinct correlation between hookups and a party atmosphere. Based on these results, I conclude that date encounters and hookup encounters, speaking to encounter level characteristics directly, do greatly differ.

Comparing individuals grouped by their partnering encounter experiences with one another (see Table 6 and Table 7 in Chapter X), I find that many significant differences exist across respondent level traits. These include significant differences between individuals of all categories of encounter experience in age, religious attendance, number of previous intercourse partners, education aspirations, GPA, age at loss of virginity, and having or not having a desire for more opportunities to hookup. All comparisons of differences in terms of desiring or not desiring more opportunities to date were found to be significant except for the comparison of males who only dated to individuals with both date and hookup encounter experience.

The occurrence of each of the levels of sexual activity during the encounter substantially increase the chances, by more than 500% for females and more than 400%

for males, of the encounter being considered to be a hookup as opposed to a date encounter. This is indicative of greater levels of sexual permissiveness during hookups rather than date encounters, and leads to a reasonable assumption that the date script is more concerned with relationship formation than is the hookup script. Such findings lend credibility to the idea that these two scripts are in actuality concerned with different goals; with the goal of the date script being relationship formation and the goal of the hookup script being oriented toward sexual excitement. With this in mind, it makes sense that so many students engage in both types of encounters.

As previous researchers have pointed out, college students may be interested in relationship formation and never the less delay establishing long-term romantic relationships because of their intense schedules or uncertainty regarding their plans after leaving college. Those indications and support from my findings here bring me to several conclusions about the date and hookup scripts and the way they intersect on college campuses. I find it to be the case that while students on average remain open to the possibility of entering a relationship, they are selective about whom they date and they do not actively pursue dating. At the same time, students also enjoy sexual activity and recognize the hookup script as a path to achieving that goal without confusing the two objectives of sex and relationship formation, which would precipitate all sorts of emotional conflict both internal and between students and their partners. Common recognition of the hookup script essentially increases the market supply & visibility of potential hookup partners, thus facilitating easy initiation of hookups. This leads directly to a consideration of my fourth hypothesis.

## **Prevalence of Encounters**

Do hookups occur at a significantly higher rate than do dates? In one sense the answer is simply “yes.” After calculating rates of dates and hookups during students’ first year of college, I find the rate of students who report having had at least one date encounter (59/100) to be higher than the rate of students who report having at least one hookup encounter (49/100) by the same point in their education career. However, comparing these rates of students who have experienced at least one date or hookup to the rates of date and hookup encounters by volume tells a different story. Calculating a rate of encounter occurrences for both dates and hookups among students by their sophomore year reveals that approximately 2.99 dates occur per student while 3.19 hookup encounters occur per student. As previously mentioned, students who have engaged in both date and hookup partnering encounters represent a plurality compared to other categories of encounter experience. How are both of these encounters, if we assume that both are stand-ins for a trajectory related to long-term pair formation, simultaneously so common? My response to this inquiry is to question the premise directly. I have come to the conclusion that such an assumption is fundamentally flawed and fails to adequately understand the purpose of these two scripts.

I propose that the combination of these findings, regarding rates of encounters and rates of individuals who have engaged in encounters, offers support for my conclusion that the date and hookup social scripts represent separate pathways to the divergent goals of relationship formation on the one hand and sexual excitement on the other. A slightly

different explanation, continuing to follow the concept of separate goals for each social script, is that rather than the hookup script having the end game of sexual satisfaction per se, the goal of the hookup script may be sensation seeking in general as purely a form of recreation. This helps to explain both the occurrence of seeking sexual experiences in the absence of a desire for relationship formation as well as the high portions of students who become intoxicated and/or participate in the chaotic social melee of a party environment as part of engaging in hookups.

### **Behaviors during Sexual Partnering Encounters**

#### **Encounter Type and STI Risk Level**

What sorts of behaviors occur during sexual partnering encounters? Are date encounters, as I hypothesize based on the notion that individuals who are seeking romantic relationships will be more likely to enter into a trust state with their partner, associated with a significantly higher probability of increased STI risk levels? The variable representing STI risk level is coded with ordinal categories ascending from one to four. Mean level of STI risk during hookup encounters is found to be 2.5 compared to a mean level of 2.06 during date encounters. Utilizing t-tests of difference, I find this comparison of mean STI risk levels during encounters by type to be significant ( $p < .000$ ). In the initial ordered logistic regression model predicting STI risk levels, the covariate representing the effect of an encounter being considered to be a hookup rather than a date encounter indicates an increased probability for higher STI risk levels among both males and females alike. These results indicate that, as regards risky sexual behaviors, the

hookup script does represent a greater degree of risk than the date script. This leads to an inability to reject the null hypothesis corresponding to my fifth hypothesis. The effect of encounter type has a greater impact on males, who have nearly a 320% higher chance of increased STI risk levels during hookups as compared to dates, while engaging in a hookup as compared to a date encounter results in approximately a 240% greater chance for increased STI risk levels amongst females.

It is worth pointing out once more that hookups are considered to be one-off events, whereas dates are geared toward repeat encounters. While, as stated above, I reject the null statement of my fifth hypothesis, I would like to draw the reader's attention to a bit of nuance pertaining to the questions offered in the OCSLS regarding date encounters in combination with a careful consideration of the sequence of events included in the date script. The OCSLS gives some instruction to respondents regarding subsequent date related questions as follows:

*All of the following date questions refer to 'the last date that you went on with someone you were not already in an exclusive relationship.'*

Imagine now those proactive individuals who initiate a date encounter or pairs of students who mutually decide to engage in a date encounter. The date script tells any who are aware of its nature that one individual will request the company of another, most likely by asking the target date partner to accompany them to a movie, concert, etc., or perhaps after simultaneous realization on the part of two individuals that they share an interest in engaging one another in a

date encounter they will decide on the sequence of events mutually as well. This is the point in the date script sequence that the questions from the OCSLS address. The instructions given refer to the date only as the actual moment of spending time together rather than also including a consideration of the parts of the date script that lead to the request and acceptance that bring about the actual moment of the encounter proper.

Since the date script seems to involve a greater span of time and thought than the hookup script, some detail may have been lost by the questions regarding the moments making-up the encounter by not tempering those questions with details about the thought processes and exchanges leading up to the encounter. Unlike hookups, dates are not spontaneous; the encounter is planned, which necessarily calls for at least a brief interaction between the partners leading up to the encounter excluding arranged or 'blind' dates. Hookup partners are likely to have begun to enact the hookup script only moments before what might be thought of as the actual encounter occurring. One script provides much more time for contemplation and the development of motives and plans of action than the other, so asking about the encounter specifically without considering other facets of the scripts may not be the most illuminating approach.

I propose that, even at this early point during enactment of the date script, both individuals have considered the possibility of romantic relationship formation, and that they are aware of the likelihood of the target date partner also making a similar consideration. One might ask "what about a random person who

is approached and asked for a date by someone they barely know or don't know at all?" The scenario represented by this interjection changes little in actuality, provided the person accepts the invitation. If they do not accept, the person attempting to enact the date script is rejected and moves on, perhaps searching for someone else with whom they are willing to consider developing a long-term relationship. If the target date partner accepts, they most likely realize the interests of the person offering the invitation and are either somewhat willing to make the same consideration or perhaps they are merely attempting to be courteous. I will leave those scenarios aside and focus on partners who are willingly engaging in the date encounter and accepting of the likely motives and trajectory related to doing so.

A consideration of initiating a long-term romantic relationship need not be a hard and fast decision, but at this point in the date script that possibility is at least minimally acknowledged. Again, this is the only requirement called for by the questioning in the OCSLS dealing with dates. From this I make an important determination. Even with only a minimal amount of welcoming the possibility of repeat encounters that could result in a long-term relationship, as signaled by choosing to engage in a date encounter, an individual has also signaled to themselves and to the date partner that this interaction does not necessarily end here and now. With the hookup script, the interaction is believed to end with the specific interaction at hand.

Hookup partners may happen to hookup again at a later date, but that would represent a repeat of the hookup script rather than a continuance. In light of this, I deduce that individuals may see no pay off to delaying sexual gratification during a hookup encounter, particularly not in comparison to a date encounter. If two individuals engage in a date, where there is an implicit notion that future encounters may occur, it is feasible that they will determine that the cost of waiting (for sexual gratification) to obtain other rewards is worthwhile and will pay off in the form of a delayed return on investment. These rewards may include emotional gratification, an even greater sexual payoff at a later time, and an enhanced assurance that the interaction will extend beyond the moment at hand. For individuals who are enacting the hookup script, these types of payoff are not part of the cost benefit analyses as any long-term reward is precluded by the very nature of the script.

### **Correlation between Intoxication and STI Risk Level by Encounter Type**

My sixth hypothesis states that individuals who are intoxicated during sexual partnering encounters will report significantly higher levels of STI risk than individuals who are not. At this point in my analysis I add the control variable representing intoxication during encounter to the initial models predicting STI risk level. In this second set of models, the effect of encounter type is not as substantial as that found in the initial model, revealing that perhaps

some of the increased probability of higher STI risk level is actually attributable to intoxication rather than to what sort of encounter in which the student participates. However, an encounter being a hookup rather than a date does continue to significantly predict an increase in the probability of higher STI risk levels occurring during encounters for both male and female respondents.

I also find that intoxication significantly predicts an increased probability of higher STI risk for both males and females. However, analyzing dates and hookups separately reveals that intoxication has an opposite effect on the probability of higher STI risk levels occurring during a hookup encounter than for date encounters and encounters overall. Intoxication during a hookup encounter actually predicts a decrease in the probability of higher levels of STI risk, while intoxication is associated with an increase in this probability during date encounters. I conclude that a reasonable level of support is present for hypothesis six as regards sexual partnering encounters overall and date encounters specifically, but for hookup encounters the available evidence leads to a rejection of the corresponding null hypothesis.

### **Predicting Intoxication during Encounter**

In order to address the likelihood of an individual being intoxicated during a partnering encounter, I turn to the results of the logistic regression model predicting intoxication (see Appendix E). My seventh hypothesis predicts that hookup encounters are more likely to involve intoxication than are date

encounters. This is a frequent issue raised in the existing literature surrounding the hookup script, with many authors indicating that intoxication is a major component of the hookup script. From the results of my analyses, I conclude that this assumption about hookups is valid. The covariate from this model indicating encounter type predicts substantial increases in the likelihood of intoxication during encounter comparing individuals who hookup to individuals who date. An encounter that is a hookup rather than a date is approximately 380% more likely to include intoxication amongst males and approximately 480% as likely amongst females. While this verifies that hookups are more likely to involve intoxicated participants than dates, it does not lead to any conclusion as to why this might be the case.

### **Meeting Contexts and STI Risk Levels**

Returning to the results of the second set of ordered logistic regression models that predict STI risk levels during sexual partnering encounters (Appendix D), I conclude that the null statement of my eighth hypothesis can be rejected with comfortable certainty. Covariates representing the effects of meeting in the contexts category representing bars and parties or meeting in contexts related to shared interests or a common background significantly predict changes in the probability of higher STI risk levels occurring during a partnering encounter for both males and females.

### **How Well Respondents Believe they Know Hookup Partners prior to the Encounter**

Do students who feel that they know their encounter partner participate in behaviors that lead to higher levels of STI risks during hookups more so than individuals who feel that they do not know their encounter partner? From the results of a series of t-test of difference, I find that significant differences in STI risk levels during the encounter exist between respondents, grouped here by an indication of how well they believed that they knew their hookup partner before the encounter taking place (see Table 14 and Table 15 in Chapter X). Male and female students engaging in very high levels of STI risk during a hookup encounter makeup nearly twice the proportion of all respondents who indicate knowing their encounter partner well prior to the encounter as amongst respondents who report knowing their partner little to none prior to the encounter. From this I garner support for my hypothesis that those individuals who feel they know their partner well will be willing to take greater levels of risk during hookup encounters.

This willingness to take greater levels of risk during a partnering encounter may be the result of the emergence of a trust state between an individual and a partner they know well, resulting in greater comfort with the partner and a willingness to face risks. Another possibility is that, due to their perception of knowing the partner well, the respondent may feel more powerfully tied socially to this individual and hence be more willing to offer the partner

increased sexual satisfaction via more intimate sex acts in search of peer approval, acts which also happen to carry greater levels of STI risk.

Of all hookup encounters engaged in by students, combining the portion who report knowing their partner moderately with those who report knowing the partner well results in 77.64% of students knowing the partner moderately or better as compared to the remaining 22.36% who know the partner little or not at all. Also, examining only the highest and lowest categories of how well a respondent knew their hookup partner, I see that a greater portion of these students report knowing the partner well (26.11%) than report knowing the partner little to not at all (22.36%). It appears that accounts of anonymity between hookup encounter partners may be somewhat inflated as well, and that completely anonymous rests closer to being the exception than the rule. A student having at least a modicum of familiarity with a hookup partner prior to a hookup is the most likely scenario.

### **Outcomes of Sexual Partnering Encounters**

At this point I review the findings of my analyses addressing outcomes of date and hookup partnering encounters. After these sexual partnering encounters take place, how do students view the encounters? Are they satisfied with the outcomes? In light of research finding correlations between sexual partnering encounter experiences and depressive symptoms; indications that sexual partnering encounters represent stratified levels of benefit between genders; and other seemingly negative aspects of college students' participation, or lack

thereof, in date and hookup encounters, I test the hypothesis that dates represent greater degrees of overall satisfaction after a sexual partnering encounter as compared to hookups. Each of my hypotheses about the outcomes of sexual partnering encounters is addressed, in part, by analyzing the results of ordered logistic regression models predicting satisfaction after an encounter (found in Appendix F). These models are expanded to additional configurations by analyzing date encounters and hookup encounters separately.

### **Encounter Type and Level of Satisfaction**

Reviewing the results from the combined date and hookup models for each gender, I determine that the covariate representing the effects of an encounter being a hookup rather than a date from each model indicates a significant decrease in the probability of higher levels of satisfaction after an encounter for each gender. The variable representing satisfaction after an encounter is ordinal and coded with categories ascending from level one to level three, with level three representing respondents who report being very much satisfied after an encounter. Overall, taking males and females together and conducting a t-test of difference, I find the mean levels of satisfaction of 2.62 and 2.39 for dates and hookups respectively to be significantly different ( $p < .0000$ ). This suggests that the null statement of my tenth hypothesis can be safely rejected.

Considering all encounters, date encounters do represent significantly higher degrees of overall satisfaction with the partnering encounter when compared to hookup encounters. This is also apparent when comparing mean levels of satisfaction for each encounter type by gender. I find that amongst males the mean level of satisfaction after date encounters is 2.63, which is significantly different ( $p < .0000$ ) than the mean level of 2.43 for male respondents following a hookup encounter. For females, I find that the mean level of satisfaction reported after date encounters of 2.62 and the mean level of satisfaction of 2.37 reported after females' hookup encounters are also significantly different ( $p < .0000$ ). This lends additional support to my tenth hypothesis.

Based on significant ( $p < .000$ ) t-tests of difference comparing the mean level of satisfaction following hookup encounters for males (2.43) to that of females (2.37), the null statement of my eleventh hypothesis cannot be rejected, as males prove to be satisfied at a significantly higher level on average following hookup encounters than do females. Such a benefit from the hookup script for males that does not reach females is potentially due to some characteristic, other than gender, of the individuals who elect to enact the hookup script. This characteristic could be the difference in males' and females' degree of concern for involvement in a long-term romantic relationship that has been reported in previous research findings. Alternately, addressing my twelfth hypothesis I do reject the null statement. A t-test of difference comparing the mean level of

satisfaction amongst females following a date encounter to males' mean level of satisfaction following a date encounter results in no significant difference. It may be the case that dates represent the same level of satisfaction following a sexual partnering encounter for both genders or that dates represent lower degrees of satisfaction for females than males. Results in this regard are inconclusive, but males do report slightly higher levels of satisfaction following dates than do females (+.01 level of satisfaction).

### **Intoxication and Level of Satisfaction following Encounter**

The last facet attached to the outcomes of the date and hookup scripts that I consider is a question of whether intoxication during an encounter results in a lower degree of satisfaction following the encounter. Regret is reported in existing literature as often following hookup encounters. The investigations of previous researchers have at times suggested that the involvement of intoxication during hookup encounters, and perhaps this is also applicable to date encounters, is utilized by students in anticipation of socially awkward moments during which they are called upon by peers to discuss their sexual exploits. This may well be the case, and an "it was the alcohol talking" excuse is not likely to strike anyone familiar with the party culture portrayed so often in popular media, such as what can be seen in the 2009 comedy film *The Hangover*, as being overly farfetched.

As I imagine a scenario in which a student who has engaged in a hookup encounter with a total stranger is confronted by disapproving peers, I come to

what I see as a reasonable assumption. If an individual feels the need to give an excuse for their behavior, it is not outside the realm of possibilities that they are not satisfied with whatever behavior or occurrence that has caused the need for this excuse. This is not to say that no college student is capable of facing social pressure without an excuse in their tool belt with which they might hammer down any stray nails threatening to injure them as they tread past their peers. However, what might be an otherwise positive opinion of an experience could quickly sour as the hot rays of daylight beat down and reveal the lurid details of sexual activity with a less than socially acceptable partner to the entire world, or at least to the entire campus.

As the covariate from the ordered logistic regression models for dates and hookups predicting overall satisfaction after encounters indicates (see Appendix F), intoxication during encounter does predict a decrease in the probability of higher levels of overall satisfaction occurring after an encounter. This effect is significant for both males and females, and is true of both hookups and dates. As such, I reject the null hypothesis that intoxication is not significantly related to lower degrees of satisfaction after encounter for both dates and hookups. There is a significant correlation between being intoxicated during a sexual partnering encounter, of either type, and subsequently reporting lower levels of satisfaction with the encounter overall. Again, this cannot be read as a determination of causality, but is strong evidence of a correlation. It is likely the case that the anticipatory excuse scenario mentioned above plays a part in this correlation.

Regretting one's behavior and instances of intoxication may also be factors that are correlated to various personality traits that are not measured here.

## CHAPTER XII

### CONCLUDING REMARKS

Over the course of this thesis, I have addressed topics found in previous literature regarding college students' sexual partnering encounters. I have covered an array of theoretical perspectives that variously speak to sexual encounters, the nature of risk and trust, and the manner in which individuals navigate the modern world and its abundance of shifting information as they strive toward diverse goals. I have provided a historical analysis of the emergence of new social scripts, and traced the development of two specific social scripts - the date and the hookup – which represent what are now widely recognized forms of social exchange in the United States that pertain to sexual partnering interactions. By offering empirical data and analyses I have made an effort to clarify specific aspects of the date and hookup social scripts and assumptions about them found in the literature. The date and hookup social scripts are commonly enacted by college students in the United States, and the empirical evidence presented here is based upon a sizable sample of college students who report details about themselves and their sexual partnering encounters. This sample of college students was collected from various institutions in the United States of different types located in separate regions of the nation. While the sampling method utilized during collection of the data was not fully randomized, the data set is taken to be highly representative of college students in the United States as it draws from a broad-cross section of students across the nation.

My goal for this thesis has been foremost to investigate sexual partnering scripts and the sexual experiences of college students, but I have also attempted to tie together threads drawn from various corners of the social science landscape in such a way that the material here might help to reveal mechanisms operating beneath the surface of any given type of social interaction. To that end, and throughout this discussion of sexual partnering scripts, I have put forth an effort to merge views seen from somewhat of a phenomenological and social constructionist vantage point with both an image of structural determinants and a snapshot of the individual level social-psychological trappings of the rational actor. Drawing from theoretical perspectives offered by a diverse array of authors, I conceive of the trust state as a tool or mechanism that assists the individual in meeting the cognitive demands we are confronted with as we move through the social world. The concepts of social distance, social ties, normalcy, and social structures have been subthemes guiding my approach.

Based on the symbolic interaction inherent to the human condition and life in modern society, as well as the manner in which knowledge develops and is deployed in our daily lives through social interaction and reflexive monitoring, I have spoken to reliance upon shared symbols encountered in the forms of societal norms and expectations. These features of social life are comparable to and influence the development of social scripts. Together, social scripts, societal norms, and certain contextual features of the social circles in which actors operate have been demonstrated as holding the potential to facilitate trust states, providing a means by which individuals ‘get on’ with their daily lives. Society’s structures have been discussed here, in part, by

way of market mechanisms as applied to social interactions as well as societal expectations and individuals responses to them. These social forces surround college students as they engage one another in interactions and seek goals of sexual satisfaction or long-term romantic relationship formation. My discussion in this thesis has included a consideration of the balance that exists between the individual and social structures – structures that we generate and sustain as a societal unit.

While working toward a clarification of the date and hookup social scripts, I have implicitly offered an image of the development of norms within society. I believe that my analyses, results, and theoretical considerations, while focused primarily upon sexual partnering encounters, might easily be applied to a wide range social interactions and diverse social forms. As regards my primary purpose, I have attempted to differentiate the date and hookup scripts, to gain a better understanding of what each entails, to uncover similarities and differences between the encounters to which these scripts lead as well as the individuals who participate in them, and I have arrived at a number of conclusions.

### **Differentiating the Date and Hookup Social Scripts**

In light of this investigation, it is my belief that, rather than operating as two methods toward achieving a single goal, the date and hookup social scripts represent separate methods for achieving divergent goals. These goals overlap in many ways, and the game pieces and player positions for the date and hookup scripts are quite similar. As a result, it is clear that misunderstandings between

individuals, who are searching for goals which are incompatible, can and do develop. While notions of the hookup script as void of romantic relationship development are inflated, long-term relationship building is not a primary goal for individuals enacting the hookup script. Instead, students who enact this script are more likely to be searching for easily accessible sexual encounters. However, most students who have experienced a hookup encounter have also experienced date encounters, and on average students do not exhibit a stark preference for either type of encounter. Students who enact the hookup script are likely not to be actively seeking a relationship partner, but are nevertheless likely to be open to the possibility of relationship development should factors align in a manner where this becomes convenient.

Reports of the hookup script greatly favoring male over female satisfaction, I find, are somewhat inaccurate. Significant differences in the level of satisfaction after encounter are found between genders for hookup, but not date, encounters; and the differences that exist between genders for hookup encounters are not drastic contrasts. I am in agreement with other researchers who support the notion that females experience greater degrees of autonomy within the current configuration of the hookup script and are able to act as they prefer while experiencing stigma to a lesser extent than has been historically related to the courtship script or the dating script. Hookup and date encounters, as well as the individuals who engage in each, do differ on a number of relevant traits. I take these differences to be another indication that these scripts represent

two separate social forms geared toward largely different goals, believing that if these scripts addressed the same goals a greater degree of similarity would exist between them. Comparing rates of dates and hookups per student to rates of individuals who have experienced at least one date or one hookup lends further support still to the concept of these two scripts as coexisting rather than one rising to replace the other.

While I have come to the conclusion that the hookup script is not currently acting as a replacement to the date script in any strict sense, changes in other areas of social life stand to alter this trajectory, as can be seen via the proffered historical analysis detailing the shift from courtship as a predominant partnering script to what amounted to its being replaced by the date script. For instance, the hookup script does seem to be pervasive on college campuses, with a large portion of students participating in hookup encounters. If the numbers of individuals attending institutions of higher education in the United States rise as has been an ongoing trend, it stands to reason that additional members of society will come into direct contact with the hookup script. A key difference, however, in the date script as related to courtship script and the hookup script as related to the date script pertains to the explanation I am offering here – namely, that dates and hookups target diverse goals.

The courtship script and the date script varied in many ways, but retained key similarities. While the date script extracted romantic relationship formation from the watchful eyes in the homes of young women, it continued to follow a

trajectory of relationship building activities that were similar to those of the courtship script, albeit with a change of venues. Ultimately, the date stood to result in marriage just as the courtship script had before it. In the current intersection of scripts this is not the case. Dating continues to have substantial features that build toward the intensification of long-term romantic involvement, which is understood to hold at least the potential for marriage. The hookup script, while not void of the potential for relationship formation as thought by some, is in no way concerned with marriage. Based on this investigation, I offer a theory that in the case of a mutual desire to form a lasting relationship developing, hookup partners will begin enacting the date script by spending time together participating in relationship building activities, rather than continuing to utilize the hookup script after their goals have shifted toward romantic involvement and away from sensation seeking. This proposition on my part leads me to a few suggestions for future research.

### **Directions for Further Study**

#### **The Intersection of Date and Hookup Social Scripts and Structural Conflict**

If, as I am proposing, the date and hookup scripts represent divergent goals that overlap, what precisely is the nature of that intersection? This is a clear path for future research. Such an investigation could easily begin with the premise that hookups are a means to achieving what amounts to sensation seeking. The obvious desirable experience that can be located by enacting the

hookup script is sexual satisfaction, but this script also includes a likelihood of, and perhaps even encourages intoxication and large social gatherings where individuals revel the night away, as it were. Operating in close proximity to, and often swapping out participants with the hookup script, the date script is available to individuals who are interested in the separate goal of establishing a stable relationship. This research path would need to follow a travel itinerary that includes an analysis of personality traits and goal orientation, and would also need to thoroughly investigate students' plans for their futures beyond college. As some authors have suggested, are students setting aside hopes for long term romance and marriage until a presumably more stable post-college lifestyle can be established and targeting sensation seeking activities in the mean time?

Harkening back to economic terminology, the date and hookup social scripts may result in separate markets. For those who find commitment, emotional attachment, and a pathway to marriage attractive, the date script might be utilized as a sort of stock exchange. Similarly, those who are simply out for a thrill will need to work to acquire a desirable market share. In either case, individuals will have to navigate the ins and outs of reaching their target market, promoting their wares, and making wise investments in order to achieve gains.

However, as the hookup script continues to defy precise definition, and a number of individuals may just as well ignore the desires of others, or simply be unaware of others' desires, students may have a type of buyer's remorse as they realize they have enacted the wrong script. When these two markets intersect, as

with the above mentioned instance of two hookup encounter partners developing a desire to establish a long-term relationship, what is the exchange rate? Is there a buyout or some form of transition costs involved with moving from market to market? Does a shortage in one market precipitate a change in the supply of the other? Can a good salesman or saleswoman, or perhaps an entire firm in the case of campus cliques, expand the scope of their preferred market via peer pressure and other means of market manipulation?

### **Sharpening Theoretical Perspectives**

In my effort to address trust states, I had hoped to uncover interesting findings regarding meeting contexts and social distance. While significant findings were present involving meeting contexts and correlations between how well individuals felt they knew their hookup partners, I did not find the opportunity to probe my theoretical positions to as great of an extent as I had hoped. Utilizing the survey instrument from the OCSLS with the addition of questions designed to sharpen the images of social distance, trust states, and the presence or absence of familiarity with encounter partners before, during, and after encounters, may provide the possibility of designing empirical tests better suited to an investigation of some of the theoretical considerations I offer in this work.

Specifically, either or both of two modifications could open productive lines of research. Revising the current survey instrument and adding to it in such

a way as to obtain a finer gradient of information, either in the direction of macro or micro considerations, could facilitate better approaches to theory. Focusing more on institution level characteristics might open up an avenue for addressing the effects of macro structures on behavior, analyzed within the test bed of the college campus, and potentially leading to more wide spread applications across society. Other applications that spring to mind include romance late in life within retirement communities as well as considerations of sexual partnering scripts in the high school environment.

Conversely, refining attitude questions and including any of a number of available personality measures, such as those measuring depression as depressive symptoms have previously been linked to hookup encounters and the associated behaviors during these encounters, would offer additional insight into some of the considerations in this work dealing with individuals' processes of decision making as regards sexual partnering. A line of investigation following this trajectory might also uncover correlates of personality traits, risk-taking behavior, and what social structures allow for lower negative outcomes in interaction with risk-related individual traits. Are there social scripts that leave room for risk-takers to indulge their impulses while adequately avoiding lasting negative effects? Might the hookup represent such a script? How detrimental are the effects of individuals reading from separate scripts?

### **Potential Policy Implications and Factors Limiting this Study**

Before closing, a brief word regarding policy implication stemming from this study is in order. From the current results, previous assumptions regarding sexual partnering encounters that were based on smaller or otherwise more limited samples have been addressed and could be clarified further without additional data collection. The available descriptive statistics that have been derived from the OCSLS data provide a few indications that are relevant to several types of programs commonly found on college campuses and within other communities. These include indications of the specific contexts in which individuals meet sexual encounter partners and which of those contexts represent varying degrees of STI risk during subsequent encounters. Such information may be useful to programs with the goals of preventing the spread of infectious disease, intimate partner violence, and other social problems related to sexual partnering.

Further, various sorts of awareness programs may find information from this study valuable in educating students as to what the reality of campus sex life is actually like. Pluralistic ignorance, another topic I suggest for future study, is an occurrence within groups whereby members of a given group inaccurately view notions surrounding a given issue as being widely acknowledged norms. When pluralistic ignorance occurs, these perceptions, as suggested by the label, are less than accurate, and members of the group base decisions on these falsely conceived norms. The result is a type of self-fulfilling prophecy. This can be

particularly problematic when negative outcomes are continually sustained due to each individual in the group espousing the belief that they are acting in accordance with the overall expectations of the group. The sad irony in instances of pluralistic ignorance is that no one is actually being satisfied and everyone is acting against their better judgment spurred along by a type of imagined peer pressure. Portions of this work and further analysis of the OCSLS data could be implemented and expanded upon in an effort to gain a better understanding of pluralistic ignorance or related social mechanisms.

Further data mining of the OCSLS in its current configuration is possible; the variables addressed in this study do not exhaust the potential variables that could be generated from the survey questions asked of respondents. In particular, the questions discussed here that were used for developing variables describing date encounters and hookup encounters were also asked of respondents, in slightly altered form, as a line of questioning specifically addressing respondents' recent romantic relationships. Unfortunately, under the constraints of this project those questions were not addressed. That information alone represents a considerable expansion of the procedures used in this thesis.

With this remark, I will end my discussion and spare the reader an unnecessary analysis of that ever dwindling social construct that limits all such investigations – time.

## REFERENCES

- Amato, P.R. & D.D. DeBoer. 2001. "The Transmission of Marital Instability across Generations: Relationship Skills or Commitment to Marriage?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63:1038-1051.
- Bailey, Beth L. 1989. *From Front Porch to Back Seat: Courtship in Twentieth Century America*. Baltimore, MA: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Basson, R. 2000. "The Female Sexual Response: A Differential Model." *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 26:51-65.
- Baumesiter, Roy & Kathleen Vohs. 2004. "Sexual Economics: Sex as a Female Resource for Social Exchange in Heterosexual Interactions." *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8:339-363.
- Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Becker, Gary S. 1976. *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Bianchi, Suzanne M. & John Robinson. 1997. "What did You Do Today? Children's Use of Time, Family Composition, and the Acquisition of Social Capital." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59:332-344.
- Blackwell, Debra L. 1998. "Marital Homogamy in the United States: The Influence of Individual Paternal Education." *Social Science Research*, 27:159-188.
- Blackwell, Debra L. & Daniel T. Lichter. 2004. "Homogamy among Dating, Cohabiting, and Married Couples." *The Sociological Quarterly*, 45(4):719-737.
- Blau, P.M. 1964. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley.
- Blau, P.M. & J.E. Schwartz. 1984. *Crosscutting Social Circles*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Bogle, Kathleen. 2008. *Hooking-Up: Sex, Dating, and Relationships on Campus*. New York: New York University Press.

- Bradshaw, Carolyn, Arnold S. Kahn, & Bryan K. Saville. 2010. "To Hookup or Date: Which Gender Benefits?" *Sex Roles*, 62:661-669.
- Brewster, Karin L., John O.G. Billy, & William R. Grady. 1993. "Social Context and Adolescent Behavior: The Impact of Community on the Transition to Sexual Activity." *Social Forces*, 71(3):713-740.
- Brownlie, Julie & Alexandra Howson. 2005. "'Leaps of Faith' and MMR: An Empirical Study of Trust." *Sociology*, 39(2):221-239.
- Burdette, Amy M., Christopher G. Ellison, Terrence D. Hill, & Norval Glenn. 2009. "'Hooking Up' at College; Does Religion Make a Difference?" *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 48(3):535-551.
- Cavanagh, Shannon E. 2007. "The Social Construction of Romantic Relationships in Adolescence: Examining the Role of Peer Networks, Gender, and Race." *Sociological Inquiry*, 77(4):572-600.
- Christopher, F.S. & S. Sprecher. 2000. "Sexuality in Marriage, Dating, and Other Relationships: A Decade in Review." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4):999-1017.
- Cooney, Teresa M. & Dennis P. Hogan. 1991. "Marriage in an Institutionalized Life Course: First Marriage among American Men in the Twentieth Century." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53:178-190.
- Couch, Laurie L. & Warren H. Jones. 1997. "Measuring Levels of Trust." *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31:319-336.
- Das, Moupali, Priscilla Lee Chu, Glenn-Millo Santos, Susan Scheer, Eric Vittinghoff, Willi McFarland, & Grant N. Colfax. 2010. "Decreases in Community Viral Load are Accompanied by Reductions in New HIV Infections in San Francisco." *PLOS One*, 5(6):1-9.
- Dinger, M.K. & N. Parsons. 1999. "Sexual Activity among College Students Living in Residence Halls and Fraternity or Sorority Housing." *Journal of Health Education*, 30(4):242-246.
- Downing-Matibag, Teresa M. & Brandi Geisinger. 2009. "Hooking Up and Sexual Risk Taking among College Students: A Health Belief Model Perspective." *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(9):1196-1209.

- Duncombe, Jean & Dennis Marsden. 1993. "Love and Intimacy: The Gender Division of Emotion and 'Emotion Work' a Neglected Aspect of Sociological Discussion of Heterosexual Relationships." *Sociology*, 27(2):221-241.
- Eisenberg, M.E. 2001. "Differences in Sexual Risk Behavior between College Students with Same-Sex and Opposite-Sex Experience: Results from a National Survey." *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 30(6):575-589.
- Eisenberg, M.E., D.M. Ackard, M.D. Resnik, & D. Neumark-Sztainer. 2009. "Casual Sex and Psychological Health among Young Adults: Is Having 'Friends with Benefits' Emotionally Damaging?" *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 41(4):231-237.
- England, Paula & George Farkas. 1986. *Households, Employment, and Gender: A Social, Economic, and Demographic View*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- England, Paula, Emily Fitzgibbons Shafer, & Alison C.K. Fogerty. 2007. "Hooking Up and Forming Romantic Relationships on Today's College Campuses," in *The Gendered Society Reader*, Michael Kimmel & Amy Aronson (eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- England, Paula & Reuben Thomas. 2007. "The Decline of the Date and the Rise of the Hookup," in *Family in Transition*, A. Skolnick & J. Skolnick (eds.). New York: Pearson.
- Epstein, M., J.P. Calzo, A.P. Smiler, L.M. Ward. 2009. "Anything from Making out to Having Sex: Men's Negotiations of Hooking Up and Friends with Benefits Scripts." *Journal of Sex Research*, 46(5):414-424.
- Feingold, Alan. 1992. "Gender Differences in Mate Selection Preferences: A test of the Parental Investment Model." *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1):125-139.
- Feld, Scott L. 1982. "Social Structural Determinants of Similarity among Associates." *American Sociological Review*, 47:797-801.
- Feldman, S.S., R.A. Turner, & K. Araujo. 1999. "Interpersonal Context as an Influence on Sexual Timetables of Youths: Gender and Ethnic Effects." *Journal on Research of Adolescence*, 9:25-52.
- Fielder, Robyn L. & Michael Carey. 2010a. "Predictors of Sexual 'Hookups' among College Students: A Short Term Prospective Study." *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39:1105-1119.

- 2010b. "Prevalence and Characteristics of Sexual Hookups among First-Semester Female College Students." *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 36:346-359.
- Figner, B. R.J. Mackinlay, F. Wilkening, & E.U. Weber. 2009. "Affective and Deliberative Processes in Risky Choice: Age Differences in Risk Taking in the Columbia Card Task." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 35(3):709-730.
- Fischer, Claude S., Robert Max Johnson, C. Ann Stueve, Kathleen Gerson, Lynne McCallister Jones, & Mark Baldassare. 1977. *Networks and Places: Social Relations in the Urban Setting*. New York: Free Press.
- Flack, William, K.A. Daubman, M.L. Caron, J.A. Asadorian, N.R. D'Aureli, S.N. Gigliotti, A.T. Hall, S. Kiser, & E.R. Stine. 2007. "Risk Factors and Consequences of Unwanted Sex among University Students hooking-up, Alcohol, and Stress Response." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(2):139-15.
- Fromme, Kim, William R. Corbin, & Mark I. Kruse. 2008. "Behavioral Risks during the Transition from High School to College." *Developmental Psychology*, 44(5):1497-1504.
- Foucault, Michael. 1995. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison* New York: Vintage Books.
- Fox, Alan. 1974. *Beyond Contract: Work, Power, and Trust Relations*. London: Faber.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- 1992. *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love, and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- 1999. *Runaway World*. New York: Routledge.
- Glenn, N. & E. Marquardt. 2001. "Hooking up, Hanging out, and Hoping for Mr. Right: College Women on Dating and Mating Today." New York: Institute for American Values. ERIC, EBSCOhost (accessed December 31, 2011).

- Goldscheider, Frances Kobrin & Linda J. Waite. 1986. "Sex Differences in the Entry into Marriage." *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(1):91-109.
- Goto, Sharon G. 1996. "To Trust or Not to Trust: Situational and Dispositional Determinants." *Social Behavior and Personality*, 24(2):119-132.
- Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6):1360-1380.
- 1985. *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. New York: Basil Black.
- Grello, C.M., D.P. Welsh, & M.S. Harper. 2006. "The Nature of Sex in College Students." *The Journal of Sex Research*, 43(3):255-267.
- Guo, Guang & Hongxin Zhao. 2000. "Multilevel Modeling for Binary Data." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26:441-462.
- Hallinan, Maureen T. & Richard A. Williams. 1989. "Interracial Friendship Choices in Secondary Schools." *American Sociological Review*, 54:67-78.
- Hampsher-Monk, Iain & Andrew Hindmoor. 2010. "Rational Choice and Interpretive Evidence: Caught Between a Rock and a Hard Place?" *Political Studies*, 58:47-65.
- Handcock, Mark S., Adrian Raftery, & Jeremy M. Tantrum. 2007. "Model-based Clustering for Social Networks." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 170(2):301-354.
- Harknett, Kristen & Sara S. McLanahan. 2004. "Racial and Ethnic Differences in Marriage after the Birth of a Child." *American Sociological Review*, 69:790-811.
- Hill, Craig A. & Leslie K. Preston. 1996. "Individual Differences in the Experiences of Sexual Motivation: Theory and Measurement of Dispositional Sexual Motives." *The Journal of Sex Research*, 33(1):27-45.
- Hite, S. 1981. *The Hite Report on Male Sexuality*. New York: Knopf.
- Hittner, James B. & Jennifer J. Kryzanowski. 2010. "Residential Status Moderates the Association between Gender and Risky Sexual Behavior." *Journal of Health Psychology*, 15:634-640.

- Horton, Donald. 1957. "The Dialogue of Courtship in Popular Songs." *American Journal of Sociology*, 62(6):569-578.
- Hosmer, D.W., Jr. & S. Lemeshow. 2000. *Applied Logistic Regression*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hughes, Mikayla, Kelly Morrison, & Kelli Jean K. Asada. 2005. "What's Love got to do with It? Exploring the Impact of Maintenance Rules, Love Attitudes, and Network Support on Friends with Benefits Relationships." *Western journal of Communication*, 69(1):49-66.
- Hutchinson, M. Katherine & Elyssa B. Wood. 2007. "Reconceptualizing Adolescent Sexual Risk in a Parent-Based Expansion of the Theory of Planned Behavior." *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 39(2):141-146.
- Ingham, M. 1984. *Men*. London: Century.
- Jalava, Janne. 2003. "From Norms to Trust: The Luhmannian Connections between Trust and System." *European Journal of Social Theory*, 6(2):173-190.
- Jessor, Richard. 1991. "Risk Behavior in Adolescence: A Psychosocial Framework for Understanding Action." *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 12:597-605.
- Jog, Billy, K. Tanfer, W.R. Grady, & D.H. Klepinger. 1993. "The Sexual Behavior of Men in the United States."
- Josang, Audun, Roslan Ismail, & Colin Boyd. 2007. "A Survey of Trust and Reputation Systems for Online Service Provision." *Decision Support Systems*, 43:618-644.
- Kalmijn, Matthijs. 1991. "Shifting Boundaries: Trends in Religious and Educational Homogamy." *American Sociological Review*, 56: 786-800.
- . 1993. "Trends in Black/White Intermarriage." *Social Forces*, 72(1):119-146.
- Kalmijn, Matthijs & Henk Flap. 2001. "Assortative Meeting and Mating: Unintended Consequences of Organized Settings for Partner Choices." *Social Forces*, 79(4):1289-1312.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977a. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1977b. "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." *American Journal of Sociology*, 82:965-990.

- Kosmin, Barry A., Sidney Goldstein, Joseph Waksberg, Nava Lerer, Ariella Keysar, & Jeffrey Scheckner. 1991. *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*. Council of Jewish Federations.
- Lambert, T.A., A.S. Kahn, & K.J. Apple. 2003. "Pluralistic Ignorance and Hooking Up." *Journal of Sex Research*, 40(2):129-133.
- Laumann, Edward O., John H. Gagnon, Robert T. Michael, & Stuart Michaels. 1994. *The Social Organization of Sexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Laumann, Edward O., Stephen Ellingson, Jenna Mahay, Anthony Paik, & Yoosij Youm. 2004. *The Sexual Organization of the City*. 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.
- Lewis, Melissa A., Christine M. Lee, & Megan E. Patrick. 2007. "Gender-Specific Normative Misperceptions of Risky Sexual Behavior and Alcohol-Related Risky Sexual Behavior." *Sex Roles*, 57:81-90.
- Li, Baoyue, Hester Liingsma, Ewout Steyberg, & Emmanuel Lesaffre. 2011. "Logistic Random Effects Regression Models: A Comparison of Statistical Packages for Binary and Ordinal Outcomes." *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 11(77):1-11.
- Lieberson, Stanley & Mary C. Waters. 1988. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Luhmann, N. 1988. "Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives." Pp. 94-107 in *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*, edited by D. Gambetta. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Long, J. Scott. 1997. *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Long, J. Scott & Jeremy Freese. 2006. *Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata*. College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Lupton, Deborah. 1999. *Risk*. New York: Routledge.

- Manning, Wendy D., Monica A. Longmore, & Peggy C. Giordano. 2005. "Adolescents' Involvement in Non-Romantic Sexual Activity." *Social Science Research*, 34:384-407.
- Maticka-Tyndale, E., E.S. Herold, & D. Mewhinney. 1998. "Casual Sex on Spring Break: Intentions and Behaviors of Canadian Students." *The Journal of Sex Research*, 35:254-264.
- McKinney, Kathleen & Susan Sprecher (eds.). 1991. *Sexuality in Close Relationships*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- McKnight, D. Harrison, Larry Cummings, & Norman Chervany. 1998. "Initial Trust Formation in New Organizational Relationships." *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3):473-490.
- McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, & James M. cook. 2001. "Birds of a Feather: Homophily and Social Networks." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27:415-444.
- Menard, Scott. 2000. "Coefficients of Determination for Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis." *The American Statistician*, 54(1):17-24.
- Meston, Cindy M. & David M. Buss. 2007. "Why Humans Have Sex." *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 36:477-507.
- Mishra, A. K. 1996. "Organizational Responses to Crisis: The Centrality of Trust." Pp. 261-287 in *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*. R. Kramer & T. Tyler (eds.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Misztal, Barbara. 1996. *Trust in Modern Societies: The Search for the Bases of Moral Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 2001. "Normality and Trust in Goffman's Theory of Interaction Order." *Sociological Theory*, 19(3):312-324.
- Mollenhorst, Gerald, Beate Volker, & Henk Flap. 2008. "Social Contexts and Personal Relationships: The Effect of Meeting Opportunities on Similarity for Relationships of Different Strength." *Social Networks*, 30:60-68.
- Mollering, Guido. 2001. "The Nature of Trust: From Georg Simmel to a Theory of Expectation, Interpretation and Suspension." *Sociology*, 35(2):403-420.

- Mott, F.L., M.M. Fondell, P.N. Hu, L. Kowaleski-Jones, & E.G. Menaghan. 1996. "The Determinants of First Sex by Age Fourteen in a High-Risk Adolescent Population." *Family Planning Perspectives*, 28(1):13-25.
- Mueller, Dennis C. 1986. "Rational Egoism versus Adaptive Egoism as Fundamental Postulate for a Descriptive Theory of Human Behavior." *Public Choice*, 51:3-23.
- Musick, Kelly, Jennie E. Brand, & Dwight Davis. 2012. "Variation in the Relationship between Education and Marriage: Marriage Market Mismatch?" *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74:53-69.
- Nam, Charles B. 1964. "Impact of the 'GI Bills' on the Educational Level of the Male Population." *Social Forces*, 43(1):26-32.
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. 2010. *Rethinking Drinking: Alcohol and Your Health*. NIH Publication No. 10-3770.
- North, D.C. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nurius, Paul S., Jeanette Norris, Linda Dimeff, & Thomas L. Graham. 1996. "Expectations Regarding Acquaintance Sexual Aggression among Sorority and Fraternity Members." *Sex Roles*, 35(7):427-444.
- Orr, Mark Jennifer S Hirsch, & John Santelli. 2008. Long-Term Health Correlates of Timing of Sexual Debut: Results from a National US Study." *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(1):155-161.
- Osborne, Jason W. 2000. "The Advantages of Hierarchical Linear Modeling." *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(1).
- O'Sullivan, Lucia F., Mariah Mantsun Cheng, Kathleen Mullan Harris, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2007. "I Wanna Hold Your Hand: The Progression of Social, Romantic, and Sexual Events in Adolescent Relationships." *Perspectives on Sexual & Reproductive Health*, 39(2):100-107.
- Owen, J.J., G.K. Rhoades, S.M. Stanley, & F.D. Finchman. 2010. "'Hooking Up' among College Students: Demographic and Psychosocial Correlates." *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39:653-663.
- Padian, N.S. 1987. "Heterosexual Transmission of AIDS: International Perspectives and National Projections." *Reviews of Infectious Diseases*, 9:947-960.

- Parsons, Talcott & R.F. Bales. 1956. *Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process*. New York: Routledge.
- Parsons, J.T., P.N. Halkitis, D. Bimbi, & t. Borkowski. 2000. "Perceptions of the Benefits and Costs Associated with Condom Use and Unprotected Sex among Late Adolescent College Students." *Journal of Adolescence*, 23:377-391.
- Paul, Elizabeth L., Brian McManus, & Alison Hayes. 2000. "'Hookups:,' Characteristics and Correlates of College Students' Spontaneous and Anonymous Sexual Experiences." *The Journal of Sex Research*, 37(1):76-88.
- Paul, Elizabeth L. & Alison Hayes. 2002. "The Casualties of Casual Sex: A Qualitative Exploration of the Phenomenology of College Students' Hookups." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 19:639-661.
- Penhollow, Tina, Michael Young, & William Bailey. 2007. "Relationship between Religiosity and 'Hooking Up' Behavior." *American Journal of Health Education*, 38(6):338-345.
- Peterson's College Search. 2011. College Search Home Page. Accessed at <http://www.petersons.com/college-search.aspx>.
- Quatman, T., Sampson, K., Robinson, C., Watson, C.M. (2001). "Academic, motivational, and emotional correlates of adolescent dating." *Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs*, 127, 211-235.
- Quillian, Lincoln & Mary E. Campbell. 2003. "Beyond Black and White: The Present and Future of Multiracial Friendship Segregation." *American Sociological Review*, 68:540-566.
- Rabe-Hesketh, Sophia & Anders Skrondal. 2008. *Multilevel and Longitudinal Modeling Using Stata*. College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Raudenbush, Stephen W. & Anthony S. Byrk. *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Reid, Julie A., Sinnika Elliot, & Gretchen R. Webber. 2011. "Casual Hookups to Formal Dates: Refining the Boundaries of the Sexual Double Standard." *Gender and Society*, 25:545-568.
- Reitman, Janet. 2006. "Sex Scandal at Duke." *Rolling Stone*, online. Accessed at [http://www.rollingstone.com/news/story/10464110/sex\\_scandal\\_at\\_duke](http://www.rollingstone.com/news/story/10464110/sex_scandal_at_duke).

- Regnerus, Mark & Jeremy Uecker. 2011. *Premarital Sex in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rempel, J.K., J.G. Holmes, & M.P. Zanna. 1985. "Trust in Close Relationships." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49:95-112.
- Resnick, Michael D., Peter Bearman, Robert Blum, Karl Bauman, Kathleen Harris, Jo Jones, Joyce Tabor, Trish Beuhring, Renee E. Sieving, Marcia Shew, Marjorie Ireland, Linda H. Bearinger, & Richard Udry. 1997. "Protecting Adolescents from Harm: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 278(10):823-832.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia & Lynn Smith-Lovin. 1999. "The Gender System and Interaction." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25:191-216.
- Rosenfeld, Michael J. 2007. *The Age of Independence: Interracial Unions, Same Sex Unions, and the Changing American Family*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rotter, J.B. 1967. "A New Scale for the Measurement of Interpersonal Trust." *Journal of Personality*, 35:615-665.
- Sabel, C. F. 1993. "Studied Trust: Building New Forms of Cooperation in a Volatile Economy." *Human Relations* 46:1133-70.
- Schmitt, David P. 2006. "Short- and Long-term Mating Strategies: Additional Evolutionary Systems Relevant to Adolescent Sexuality." In *Romance and Sex in Adolescence and Emerging Adulthood: Risks and Opportunities*. A. Crouter & A. Booth (eds.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schutz, Alfred & Thomas Luckmann. 1973. *The Structures of the Life-World*. (Volumes One & Two). Translated by R. Zaner & H.T. Englehardt, Jr. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Schvaneveldt, Paul L., Brent Miller, Helen Berry, & Thomas R. Lee. 2001. "Academic Goals, Achievement, and Age at First Sexual Intercourse: Longitudinal, Bidirectional Influences." *Adolescence*, 36(144):767-787.
- Seidman, Stuart N. & Ronald O. Reider. 1994. "A Review of Sexual Behavior in the United States." *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 151(3):330-341.
- Seligman, Adam. 1997. *The Problem of Trust*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Sewell, W.H. & R.M. Hauser. 1980. "The Wisconsin Longitudinal Study of Social and Psychological Factors in Aspirations and Achievements." *Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization*, 1:59-99.
- Shulman, S., S. D. Walsh, O. Weisman, & M. Schlyer. 2009. "Romantic Context, Sexual Behavior, and Depressive Symptoms among Adolescent Males and Females." *Sex Roles*, 61:850 -863.
- Simmel, Georg. 1950. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. New York: Free Press.
- 1971. *On Individuality and Social Forms: Selected Writings*. Donald N. Levine (ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Simon, William & John H. Gagnon. 2003. "Sexual Scripts: Origins, Influences, and changes." *Qualitative Sociology*, 26(4):491-497.
- South, Scott J. & Kim M. Lloyd. 1992. "Marriage Opportunities and Family Formation: Further Implications of Imbalanced Sex Ratios." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54:440-451.
- Spitzer, P.C., & N.J. Weiner. 1989. "Transmission of HIV from a Woman to a Man by Oral Sex." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 320:251-253.
- Sprague, Joey. 2005. *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers: Bridging Differences*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Stata Corp. 2011. *Stata: Release 12. Statistical Software*. College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Stata Listserve. An Internet community resource for Stata users. Accesible via <http://www.stata.com/statalist/>.
- Stepp, Laura Sessions. 2007. *Unhooked*. New York: Penguin.
- Stuart, F.M., D.C. Hammond, & M.A. Pett. 1987. "Inhibited Sexual Desire in Women." *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 16:91-106.
- Symons, Cynthia Wolford, Bethann Cinelly, Tammy C. James, & Patti Groff. 1997. "Bridging Student Health Risks and Academic Achievement through Comprehensive School Health Programs." *Journal of School Health*, 67(6):220-227.

- Thornton, A., W.G. Axinn, & J.D. Treachman. 1995. "The Influence of School Enrollment and Accumulation on Cohabitation and Marriage in Early Adulthood." *American Sociological Review*, 60(5):762-774.
- Turchick, J.A. & J.P. Garske. 2009. "Measurement of Sexual Risk Taking among College Students." *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38:936-948.
- Turner, C.F., H.G. Miller, & L.E. Moses. *AIDS, Sexual Behavior and Intravenous Drug Use*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Tyler, T.R. 1990. *Why People Obey the Law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- US News & World Report. Home page accessed at <http://www.usnews.com/rankings>.  
Education page accessed at <http://www.usnews.com/education>.
- Vander Ven, Thomas & Jeffrey Beck. 2009. "Getting Drunk and Hooking Up: An Exploratory Study of the Relationship between Alcohol Intoxication and Casual Coupling in a University Sample." *Sociological Spectrum*, Vol. 29: 626-648.
- Weber, Max. 2009. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Translated by H.H. Gerth & C. Wright Mills. New York: Routledge.
- Wechsler, Henry, Jae Eun Lee, Meichun Kuo, Mark Seibring, Toben Nelson, & Hang Lee. 2002. "Trends in College Binge Drinking during a Period of Increased Prevention Efforts: Findings from Four Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study Surveys: 1993-2001." *Journal of American College Health*, 50(5):203-217.
- Weinberg, M.S. & C.J. Williams. 1988. "Black Sexuality: A Test of Two Theories." *Journal of Sex Research*, 25:197-218.
- West, Candace & Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society*, 1(2):125-151.
- Williamson, O.E. 1993. "Calculativeness, Trust, and Economic Organization." *Journal of Law and Economics*, 36:453-486.
- Wynne, B. 1996. "May the Sheep Safely Graze? A Reflexive View of the Expert-lay Knowledge Divide," in S. Lash, B. Szerszynski and B. Wynne (eds). Pp. 27-83 in *Risk, Environment and Modernity. Towards a New Ecology*. London:Sage.
- Yeung, Wei-Jun Jean & Kathryn M. Pfeiffer. 2009. "The Black-White Test Score Gap and Early Home Environment." *Social Science Research*, 38:412-437.

Zucker, L.G. 1986. "Production of Trust: Institutional Sources of Economic Structure 1840-1920." In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.) *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8:53-111. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

APPENDIX A

ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING LEVEL OF INTEREST IN A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP W/PARTNER AFTER A HOOKUP ENCOUNTER

Gender		Male	Female
Encounter Level Variables			
Intoxicated during Encounter		.18***	.49***
Meeting Contexts	Personal Rec	1.21	1.13
	Social Net	1.24	1.89*
	Common Int/Hist	1.57	.90
	Dorm	.82	1.08
	Public	1.15	.73*
	Personals	.08*	.97
	Bars/Parties	.83	1.00
Physical Activity during Encounter	Genital Stim	.58t	1.09
	Oral Sex	.54*	1.10
	Vaginal Sex	.86	1.35***
	Anal Sex	3.12*	1.75*
Partner Same Race		1.65	1.55***
Respondent Level Variables - Demographic			
Race	Black	.65	1.01
	Asian	.85	1.03
	Hispanic	1.72	1.06
	Other Race	.73	.98
Age	20-21	1.53t	1.15*
	22-23	1.84*	1.21*
	24+	2.36*	1.14
Religious Attendance	None	1.39	.91t
	Frequent	1.00	.92
Mother's Education	<HS	.70	.92
	SC	.98	1.01
	BA	.98	.97
	Grad.	1.68*	.98
Born in the USA		.60t	.99
Living Arrangement	Fraternity/ Sorority	.74	1.07
	Other On-Campus	2.13t	.77t
	Off-Campus	1.48t	1.02
	w/Parents	.74	.98

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

APPENDIX A (continued)

Gender		Male	Female
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Education and Attitudes			
Fraternity/Sorority Member		1.20	.87t
Education Aspirations	<BA	.58	1.37t
	MA	.81	.98
	DR	1.23	.90
GPA	<2.1	1.67t	.85
	2.1-3.0	1.97***	.96
	3.76+	1.04	1.04
Wants More Opportunities for Dates	Strongly Agree	.73	1.02
	Agree	.79	1.02
	Strongly Disagree	1.60	.84
Wants More Opportunities for Hookups	Strongly Agree	.56*	.90
	Agree	.83	.83**
	Strongly Disagree	1.20	1.06
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Sexual History			
Age at Loss of Virginit	Virgin	1.42	1.17
	14 or younger	1.25	1.20
	15	.67	1.16
	17	.76	.97
	18	.91	1.07
	19+	.95	1.12
Number of Previous Intercourse Partners	None	.27**	.80
	1	1.46	1.03
	4-5	.43**	.88
	6-10	.82	.89
	11+	.41**	.97

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

APPENDIX A (continued)

Gender		Male	Female
Institution Level Variables - Characteristics of Institution of Respondent's Attendance			
Tuition Cost	<7.5K	.60t	1.06
	>20K	1.32	1.34
Student Body	% Female	1.08*	1.01
	% Black	1.04	.99
	% Asian	1.02	1.02**
	% Hispanic	1.00	1.00
	% Other Race	1.04	.99
Private Institution		.37	.65t
Number of Undergrads	<10K	1.55	1.08
	>20K	1.59	1.09
Details of Regression Model			
Constant			
Cut Points	1	-2.72	-.55
	2	11.22	1.21
$\psi$ (respondents)		57.62	.00
$\psi$ (schools)		.00	.00
Log Likelihood		-2466.89	-5817.37
Likelihood-ratio Test	Chi <sup>2</sup>	183.25****	326.82****
	Degrees of Freedom	65	65
R <sup>2</sup>		.07	.04

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000, \*\*\*\*=p<.0000

APPENDIX B

LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING ENCOUNTER TYPE

Gender		Male	Female
Encounter Level Variables			
Intoxicated during Encounter		.21	.48
Meeting Contexts	Personal Rec	1.12	1.04
	Social Net	.80	.76
	Common Int/Hist	.88	1.27**
	Dorm	1.42***	1.59***
	Public	.82	1.05
	Personals	.83	.77
	Bars/Parties	1.34***	1.26***
Physical Activity during Encounter	Genital Stim	2.98***	3.89***
	Oral Sex	5.69***	6.14***
	Vaginal Sex	5.36***	6.79***
	Anal Sex	4.62***	5.01***
Partner Same Race		.91	1.03
Respondent Level Variables - Demographic			
Race	Black	1.10	.86
	Asian	.76 <sup>t</sup>	.82 <sup>t</sup>
	Hispanic	.96	.97
	Other Race	1.01	.97
Age	20-21	1.01	1.01
	22-23	1.00	1.02
	24+	.93	1.03
Religious Attendance	None	1.03	.95
	Frequent	.91	.93
Mother's Education	<HS	.88	.84 <sup>t</sup>
	SC	.94	1.02
	BA	.96	1.07
	Grad.	.99	1.00
Born in the USA		1.10	1.07
Living Arrangement	Fraternity/ Sorority	.96	1.04
	Other On-Campus	1.04	1.09
	Off-Campus	.95	1.05
	w/Parents	.92	.99

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

Appendix B (continued)

Gender		Male	Female
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Education and Attitudes			
Fraternity/Sorority Member		1.05	1.14*
Education Aspirations	<BA	.77	.93
	MA	.93	1.05
	DR	.97	1.01
GPA	<2.1	1.01	.91
	2.1-3.0	.98	.99
	3.76+	1.15	.97
Wants More Opportunities for Dates	Strongly Agree	1.02	1.06
	Agree	1.00	1.02
	Strongly Disagree	.85	1.05
Wants More Opportunities for Hookups	Strongly Agree	.98	1.02
	Agree	1.12 <sup>t</sup>	1.02
	Strongly Disagree	.88	.89*
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Sexual History			
Age at Loss of Virginity	Virgin	.89	1.16
	14 or younger	.88	1.09
	15	.93	1.03
	17	1.06	1.00
	18	1.06	.99
	19+	1.04	.96
Number of Previous Intercourse Partners	None	1.16	.87
	1	.90	1.01
	4-5	1.00	.90
	6-10	.84 <sup>t</sup>	.85*
	11+	.86	.74**

<sup>t</sup>=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

Appendix B (continued)

Gender		Male	Female
Institution Level Variables - Characteristics of Institution of Respondent's Attendance			
Tuition Cost	<7.5K	.87	.94
	>20K	1.14	1.02
Student Body	% Female	1.01	.99
	% Black	.99	.98 <sup>t</sup>
	% Asian	1.00	.99 <sup>t</sup>
	% Hispanic	1.00	1.01
	% Other Race	1.01	1.01*
Private Institution		.79	.96
Number of Undergrads	<10K	1.05	1.07
	>20K	.99	.92
Details of Regression Model			
Constant		.21	.48
Cut Points	1		
	2		
$\psi$ (respondents)		.00	.00
$\psi$ (schools)		.00	.00
Log Likelihood		-3228.96	-7102.44
Likelihood-ratio Test	Chi <sup>2</sup>	709.01****	1942.39****
	Degrees of Freedom	64	64
R <sup>2</sup>		.52	.55

<sup>t</sup>=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000, \*\*\*\*=p<.0000

APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS PREDICTING ENCOUNTER EXPERIENCE

Encounter Experience		Dated Only		Hooked up Only		Dated & Hooked up		Neither Dated nor Hooked up	
Gender		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Respondent Level Variables - Demographic									
Race	Black	.68t	1.58***	1.31	1.17	.71*	.44***	1.62**	1.59***
	Asian	1.14	1.36**	.79	.97	.51***	.57***	1.58***	1.35***
	Hispanic	1.00	1.11	1.05	.84	.76*	.81*	1.36*	1.31**
	Other Race	.64*	.91	1.50t	.83	.76t	.78**	1.48**	1.51***
Age	20-21	1.53***	1.39***	.60**	.75**	1.34**	1.37***	.65***	.64***
	22-23	1.62**	1.52***	.35***	.47***	1.12	1.38***	.88	.67***
	24+	2.10***	1.54**	.33**	.46***	.40***	.37***	3.55***	3.64***
Religious Attendance	None	.98	.84**	1.56**	1.04	.65***	.88**	1.37***	1.27***
	Frequent	1.36*	1.12	1.07	.67*	.61***	.74***	1.11	1.16*
Mother's Education	<HS	1.43t	1.16	1.27	.81	.79	.72**	.87	1.21t
	SC	1.17	1.03	.69*	.98	1.29*	1.11	.78*	.87*
	BA	1.15	.90	.86	1.16	1.28*	1.26**	.78*	.79**
	Grad.	.93	.94	.63*	1.12	1.33*	1.30**	.93	.74***
Born in the USA		.77*	.82*	1.47	1.20	1.02	1.36***	1.11	.87t
Living Arrangement	Fraternity/ Sorority	.64	.66t	.40t	.68	2.01**	1.70**	.55t	.61*
	Other On-Campus	.91	.94	1.79t	1.10	1.18	1.25t	.76	.79
	Off-Campus	1.06	1.01	.67*	.95	1.60***	1.28***	.64***	.76***
	w/Parents	.91	1.10	.75	.96	1.04	.90	1.05	1.00

APPENDIX C (continued)

Encounter Experience		Dated Only		Hooked up Only		Dated & Hooked up		Neither Dated nor Hooked up	
Gender		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Education and Attitudes									
Fraternity/Sorority Member		.87	.95	.78	.65**	2.48***	2.24***	.40***	.44***
Education Aspirations	<BA	1.37	1.13	.28*	1.13	.82	.81	1.29	1.15
	MA	1.34**	1.07	.76t	1.06	1.11	1.10t	.85t	.86*
	DR	1.28*	1.06	.76	1.01	1.02	1.04	.97	.94
GPA	<2.1	.73t	1.11	1.04	1.03	1.14	.94	1.04	1.05
	2.1-3.0	1.14	.98	1.20	1.11	.96	1.21***	.90	.79***
	3.76+	.84	.98	1.09	.58**	.95	.85*	1.12	1.35***
Wants More Opportunities for Dates	Strongly Agree	1.42**	.89	.64*	1.08	1.35**	2.19***	.71**	.45***
	Agree	1.28*	.99	.66**	1.12	1.29**	1.35***	.79**	.72***
	Strongly Disagree	.60t	.52***	.91	1.11	.74	.94	1.65**	1.40**
Wants More Opportunities for Hook-ups	Strongly Agree	.76t	1.06	1.08	1.92**	1.49**	.75*	.76*	.99
	Agree	.66***	.84t	1.53**	1.38**	1.39***	1.26**	.81*	.78***
	Strongly Disagree	1.36*	1.20**	1.24	.77*	.51***	.60***	1.33*	1.54***
Age at Loss of Virginity	Virgin	2.01*	1.76*	.13***	.52	.52**	.55**	1.63*	1.33
	14 or younger	2.12*	1.13	.82	1.36*	.85	.62***	1.05	1.67***
	15	1.59t	.94	.61t	1.03	1.10	.89	1.01	1.21t
	17	1.02	.84	.77	1.07	1.74***	1.30**	.59**	.74**
	18	.99	.97	1.20	1.24	1.75***	1.98***	.52***	.41***
	19+	1.36	1.33*	1.15	1.23	2.25***	2.89***	.30***	.22***
Number of Previous Intercourse Partners	None	.99	1.03	1.53	.40*	.55**	.85	1.87**	1.50*
	1	1.64***	1.04	.47***	.46***	.22***	.28***	4.61***	4.68***
	4-5	.53**	.63***	1.93**	1.05	1.93***	2.30***	.35***	.42***
	6-10	.32***	.39***	1.37	1.38**	3.50***	3.97***	.23***	.17***
	11+	.13***	.27***	1.36	1.31t	5.21***	5.26***	.22***	.16***

t=p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.000

APPENDIX C (continued)

Encounter Experience		Dated Only		Hooked-up Only		Dated & Hooked-up		Neither Dated nor Hooked-up	
Gender		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Institution Level Variables - Characteristics of Institution of Respondent's Attendance									
Tuition Cost	<7.5K	2.07***	1.40**	1.06	.87	.75*	.99	.81t	.85t
	>20K	.76	.92	1.25	.27**	.87	1.76*	1.04	.98
Student Body	% Female	.99	1.00	.98	.96*	.99	.98	1.03	1.04**
	% Black	1.04*	1.04**	1.00	.95**	.98	.98t	.99	1.02t
	% Asian	1.01	1.03***	.98	.96***	.99	1.00	1.01t	1.00
	% Hispanic	1.00	.99	.96*	.99	1.02*	1.01	.99t	.99*
	% Other Race	.99	.98**	1.00	1.02t	1.01	1.01	1.00	1.00
Private Institution		3.00*	1.32	.92	2.59*	1.27	.84	.46*	.70
Number of Undergrads	<10K	.66	1.07	.65	1.09	1.26	.96	1.15	.88
	>20K	1.28	1.52**	.59	.60*	.96	1.01	.95	.86
Details of Regression Model									
Constant		.11	.08**	1.22	2.16	.94	.77	.20	.19*
Log Likelihood		-1783.81	-4241.54	-991.30	-2472.78	-2373.14	-5943.77	-2348.48	-5758.38
Likelihood-ratio Test	Chi <sup>2</sup>	344.47****	601.70****	222.72****	443.47****	1158.10****	2273.93****	935.62****	2112.63****
	Degrees of Freedom	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	52
R <sup>2</sup>		.10	.06	.11	.08	.27	.67	.28	.24

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

APPENDIX D

RESULTS OF ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING STI RISK LEVEL DURING ENCOUNTER

Gender		Male		Female		Male		Female	
Encounter Level Variables									
Encounter Type		4.17 <sup>t</sup>	2.13 <sup>***</sup>	3.41 <sup>***</sup>	3.34 <sup>***</sup>	Dates	Hookups	Dates	Hook ups
Intoxicated during Encounter			1.25 <sup>*</sup>		1.18 <sup>**</sup>	1.53 <sup>***</sup>	.84 <sup>t</sup>	1.99 <sup>***</sup>	.83 <sup>**</sup>
Meeting Contexts	Personal Rec	.94	1.02	.98	.98	1.15	1.25	1.04	.90
	Social Net	.65	.91	1.12	1.15	.38	2.21	1.52	.86
	Common Int/Hist	2.28	1.58 <sup>*</sup>	1.63 <sup>***</sup>	1.63 <sup>***</sup>	.92	1.95 <sup>**</sup>	1.67 <sup>**</sup>	1.37 <sup>**</sup>
	Dorm	.76	.86	.90	.89	1.12	.86	.94	.87 <sup>t</sup>
	Public	1.32 <sup>*</sup>	1.14	1.29	1.29	.96	.96	1.17	1.20
	Personals	1.55 <sup>t</sup>	1.48	.92	.74	1.71	1.08	1.83 <sup>t</sup>	.68
	Bars/Parties	.67	.81 <sup>t</sup>	.80 <sup>**</sup>	.78 <sup>**</sup>	.89	.99	.88	.81 <sup>**</sup>

<sup>t</sup>=p<.1, <sup>\*</sup>=p<.05, <sup>\*\*</sup>=p<.01, <sup>\*\*\*</sup>=p<.000

APPENDIX D (continued)

Gender		Male		Female		Male		Female	
Respondent Level Variables - Demographic									
Race	Black	.38	.58*	1.17	1.21	.69t	.60**	1.03	1.17
	Asian	1.54	1.28	1.34*	1.35*	1.74**	.91	1.40*	1.21t
	Hispanic	.62	.78	1.05	1.06	.89	.82	1.22	.94
	Other Race	.89	.99	1.06	1.07	1.04	.90	1.39t	.93
Age	20-21	.57*	.70**	.80**	.80**	.72**	.84	.80*	.91
	22-23	.41t	.60**	.71**	.70**	.58**	.78t	.55***	.92
	24+	.62*	.76	.62**	.61**	.65*	.94	.60*	.75*
Religious Attendance	None	1.26	1.15	1.28***	1.28***	1.15	1.11	1.34**	1.17**
	Frequent	.92**	.91	.75*	.77*	.87	1.00	.86	.77*
Mother's Education	<HS	1.36t	1.21	1.27	1.27	1.03	1.27	1.49t	1.09
	SC	.78	.87	1.01	1.01	.89	.99	.96	1.04
	BA	.83	.93	1.06	1.05	.89	1.01	.97	1.07
	Grad.	.60	.75t	1.11	1.10	.97	.74*	1.05	1.10
Born in the USA		1.20	1.12	1.09	1.09	1.00	1.21	1.00	1.13
Living Arrangement	Fraternity/Sorority	1.34t	1.15	1.15	1.14	1.43	.92	1.08	1.04
	Other On-Campus	1.75	1.35	1.33	1.33	1.50	1.19	1.14	1.26
	Off-Campus	1.60	1.26	1.04	1.03	1.42*	1.01	.99	1.02
	w/Parents	1.98	1.46t	1.04	1.03	1.49*	1.22	.73t	1.20t

t=p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.000

APPENDIX D (continued)

Gender		Male		Female		Male		Female	
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Education and Attitudes									
Fraternity/Sorority Member		.96	.95	.68***	.67***	.94	.98	.79t	.76**
Education Aspirations	<BA	.89	.94	1.31	1.32	1.08	.84	1.15	1.40t
	MA	.99*	.98	.88	.89	1.10	.95	.79*	.99
	DR	.79t	.86	.98	.99	.98	.89	1.01	.98
GPA	<2.1	2.00	1.53*	1.17	1.19	1.31	1.28	1.43*	1.01
	2.1-3.0	1.10	1.10	1.11	1.11	1.01	1.11	1.12	1.07
	3.76+	.50t	.69t	.78*	.78*	.75	.85	.86	.84t
Wants More Opportunities for Dates	Strongly Agree	.64	.72*	1.10	1.09	.88	.79*	1.01	1.08
	Agree	.68	.79*	.99	.99	.97	.81*	1.09	.93
	Strongly Disagree	3.24	2.17*	1.11	1.11	2.77***	1.31	1.17	1.09
Wants More Opportunities for Hook-ups	Strongly Agree	2.37t	1.63**	1.00	1.00	1.51**	1.34*	.78	1.10
	Agree	1.21*	1.09	1.20*	1.19t	.97	1.05	1.19	1.15t
	Strongly Disagree	1.97	1.51t	.96	.96	1.00	1.61**	.90	1.02

t=p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.000

APPENDIX D (continued)

Gender		Male		Female		Male		Female	
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Sexual History									
Age at Loss of Virginity	Virgin	.09**	.23***	.22***	.22***	.41**	.38***	.41*	.27***
	14 or younger	1.68*	1.32	1.41*	1.41*	1.26	1.18	1.09	1.36*
	15	.81	.86	1.11	1.11	1.01	.85	1.18	1.04
	17	.46*	.61**	1.05	1.05	.66**	.81	1.12	1.01
	18	.95*	.96	1.17	1.17	.83	1.17	1.17	1.16
	19+	.65*	.75	1.25t	1.26t	.66*	1.03	1.27	1.23*
Number of Previous Intercourse Partners	None	.25**	.39**	.71	.70	.67	.49**	.75	.86
	1	.33	.51***	.48***	.48***	.81	.51***	.61**	.53***
	4-5	4.04	2.23***	1.75***	1.74***	1.93***	1.52**	1.48**	1.57***
	6-10	5.94	2.68***	2.81***	2.80***	1.78***	2.43***	2.15***	2.33***
	11+	18.57	5.52***	5.01***	4.92***	3.02***	3.70***	2.98***	4.00***

t=p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.000

APPENDIX D (continued)

Gender		Male		Female		Male		Female	
Institution Level Variables - Characteristics of Institution of Respondent's Attendance									
Tuition Cost	<7.5K	.90*	1.01	1.05	1.06	1.15	.99	1.12	.98
	>20K	1.50***	1.29	.71	.71	2.10	.73	1.47	.66
Student Body	% Female	1.00***	1.00	1.01	1.02	1.00	.99	1.04*	1.01
	% Black	1.05t	1.04	1.02	1.02	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.02t
	% Asian	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.99	1.00	.99	1.00
	% Hispanic	1.00t	.99	.98**	.98**	1.00	1.00	.99t	.99*
	% Other Race	.99**	.99	.98*	.98*	.99	.99	1.00	.97**
Private Institution		.62***	.80	1.35	1.35	.77	1.09	.95	1.29
Number of Undergrads	<10K	1.51	1.27	.85	.85	.68	1.75*	.55*	1.04
	>20K	1.23**	1.11	.93	.93	.99	1.10	.87	.99
Details of Regression Model									
Cut Points	1	-2.12	-1.21	.46	.60	-.60	-1.84	2.33	-.81
	2	-.07	-.17	1.41	1.55	.13	-1.12	3.11	-.06
	3	5.96	3.57	4.30	4.44	2.37	1.69	5.33	2.23
$\psi$ (respondents)		106.46	3.24	2.68	2.68	.00	.00	1.86	.00
$\psi$ (schools)		1.36	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Log Likelihood		-3928.25	-4602.91	-10374.43	-10341.76	-2079.21	-2592.21	-4227.56	-6214.73
Likelihood-ratio Test	Chi <sup>2</sup>	1241.70****	510.40 ****	1189.75 ****	1189.82 ****	327.16 ****	491.67 ****	91.75 **	1100.62 ****
	Degrees of Freedom	60	61	60	61	60	60	60	60
R <sup>2</sup>		.24	.60	.10	.11	.08	.10	.40	.09

t=p<.1, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.000, \*\*\*\*p<.0000

APPENDIX E

LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING INTOXICATION DURING ENCOUNTER

Gender		Male	Female
Encounter Level Variables			
Encounter Type		4.79***	5.81***
Meeting Contexts	Personal Rec	1.52*	1.24*
	Social Net	.70	.30***
	Common Int/Hist	1.43	1.08
	Dorm	1.79***	1.22*
	Public	.79	.89
	Personals	.34t	.42**
	Bars/Parties	3.52***	2.75***
Physical Activity during Encounter	Genital Stim	6.88***	3.78***
	Oral Sex	4.53***	4.17***
	Vaginal Sex	4.54***	2.74***
	Anal Sex	7.01***	4.19***
Partner Same Race		1.43	1.30*
Respondent Level Variables - Demographic			
Race	Black	.39**	.25***
	Asian	.61t	.91
	Hispanic	1.14	.96
	Other Race	.97	1.00
Age	20-21	1.03	1.05
	22-23	1.07	1.35*
	24+	1.69*	2.06***
Religious Attendance	None	.87	.90
	Frequent	.53**	.50***
Mother's Education	<HS	.80	.88
	SC	1.27	1.06
	BA	1.51*	1.24*
	Grad.	1.14	1.28*
Born in the USA		1.15	1.01
Living Arrangement	Fraternity/ Sorority	1.66t	1.19
	Other On-Campus	1.42	.94
	Off-Campus	1.24	1.22*
	w/Parents	.93	1.01

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

APPENDIX E (continued)

Gender		Male	Female
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Education and Attitudes			
Fraternity/Sorority Member		1.40 <sup>t</sup>	1.30 <sup>*</sup>
Education Aspirations	<BA	1.01	.86
	MA	.99	.76 <sup>**</sup>
	DR	.88	.73 <sup>**</sup>
GPA	<2.1	1.40	.82
	2.1-3.0	1.11	1.11
	3.76+	.87	1.14
Wants More Opportunities for Dates	Strongly Agree	.62 <sup>**</sup>	1.29 <sup>**</sup>
	Agree	1.06	1.30 <sup>**</sup>
	Strongly Disagree	.53 <sup>t</sup>	1.18
Wants More Opportunities for Hookups	Strongly Agree	1.52 <sup>*</sup>	.98
	Agree	1.41 <sup>**</sup>	1.25 <sup>*</sup>
	Strongly Disagree	.44 <sup>**</sup>	.81 <sup>*</sup>
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Sexual History			
Age at Loss of Virginity	Virgin	.33 <sup>**</sup>	.53 <sup>*</sup>
	14 or younger	.75	.99
	15	1.12	1.07
	17	.90	.93
	18	1.01	.98
	19+	.92	.90
Number of Previous Intercourse Partners	None	1.86 <sup>t</sup>	1.00
	1	.76	.60 <sup>***</sup>
	4-5	1.72 <sup>**</sup>	1.19
	6-10	3.03 <sup>***</sup>	1.29 <sup>*</sup>
	11+	2.49 <sup>***</sup>	2.26 <sup>***</sup>

<sup>t</sup>=p<.1, <sup>\*</sup>=p<.05, <sup>\*\*</sup>=p<.01, <sup>\*\*\*</sup>=p<.000

APPENDIX E (continued)

Gender		Male	Female
Institution Level Variables - Characteristics of Institution of Respondent's Attendance			
Tuition Cost	<7.5K	.56**	.71*
	>20K	.61	1.07
Student Body	% Female	.96	.95*
	% Black	.92**	.93***
	% Asian	.98*	.97**
	% Hispanic	1.01	1.02*
	% Other Race	1.01	1.00
Private Institution		1.31	1.03
Number of Undergrads	<10K	.79	.96
	>20K	.81	.93
Details of Regression Model			
Constant		.78	2.66
$\psi$ (respondents)		3.31	2.41
$\psi$ (schools)		.00	.08
Log Likelihood		-2736.47	-6464.43
Likelihood-ratio Test	Chi <sup>2</sup>	529.23****	1241.36****
	Degrees of Freedom	65	65
R <sup>2</sup>		.52	.49

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000, \*\*\*\*=p<.0000

APPENDIX F

PREDICTING LEVEL OF SATISFACTION AFTER ENCOUNTER

Gender		Male	Female	Male		Female	
Encounter Level Variables							
Encounter Type		.47***	.39***	Dates	Hookups	Dates	Hookups
Intoxicated during Encounter		.46***	.60***	.60***	.60***	.69***	.66***
Meeting Contexts	Personal Rec	1.27	1.25*	1.11	1.11	1.13	1.34**
	Social Net	.72	1.15	.80	.80	1.12	1.09
	Common Int/Hist	1.64*	1.23t	1.49t	1.49t	1.52*	1.08
	Dorm	.97	.97	.99	.99	1.27t	.95
	Public	1.26	.78	1.23	1.23	.86	.78
	Personals	.73	.74	1.11	1.11	.57t	.83
	Bars/Parties	1.01	.89	1.10	1.10	.89	1.01
Physical Activity during Encounter	Genital Stim	.93	1.35**	1.26	1.26	1.08	1.47***
	Oral Sex	1.41*	1.40**	1.52**	1.52**	.99	1.53***
	Vaginal Sex	1.89***	1.89***	5.55***	1.97***	1.71***	1.73***
	Anal Sex	3.63***	2.58***	1.97***	5.55***	1.49	2.32**
Partner Same Race		1.39t	1.38**	1.59*	1.59*	1.17	1.42**
Respondent Level Variables - Demographic							
Race	Black	.80	1.27	.88	.88	1.28	1.30t
	Asian	.99	.82	1.17	1.17	.85	.90
	Hispanic	1.14	1.21	1.43	1.43	1.09	1.29*
	Other Race	.87	1.03	1.07	1.07	1.13	1.03
Age	20-21	1.04	1.06	1.00	1.00	1.21*	.99
	22-23	1.44*	1.02	1.30t	1.30t	1.11	.98
	24+	1.69*	1.31t	1.22	1.22	1.88**	.98
Religious Attendance	None	.85	.95	.99	.99	.90	.98
	Frequent	1.12	.78*	1.13	1.13	.87	.80*
Mother's Education	<HS	.88	.72*	1.02	1.02	.82	.74*
	SC	.89	1.00	.98	.98	1.07	.98
	BA	1.05	.99	1.07	1.07	1.03	1.00
	Grad.	1.23	.97	1.34*	1.34*	.93	1.01
Born in the USA		.91	1.06	.87	.87	1.11	.99
Living Arrangement	Fraternity/Sorority	.96	1.18	1.03	1.03	.79	1.33t
	Other On-Campus	.67	.89	.67t	.67t	.87	.91
	Off-Campus	.76t	1.02	.75*	.75*	1.18	.95
	w/Parents	.74	1.07	.64*	.64*	1.23	.98

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

APPENDIX F (continued)

Gender		Male	Female	Male		Female	
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Education and Attitudes							
Fraternity/Sorority Member		.87	1.11	.83	.83	1.28 *	1.03
Education Aspirations	<BA	.80	1.30	1.00	1.00	1.08	1.32
	MA	.76 *	1.03	.75 **	.75 **	1.01	1.04
	DR	.92	1.05	.85	.85	1.23 *	.97
GPA	<2.1	1.05	1.00	.96	.96	1.10	.95
	2.1-3.0	1.29 *	.94	1.20 t	1.20 t	.90	.96
	3.76+	.78	.93	.81	.81	.80 t	.96
Wants More Opportunities for Dates	Strongly Agree	.74 *	.85 t	.86	.86	.79 *	.92
	Agree	.74 **	.86 *	.84 t	.84 t	.81 *	.94
	Strongly Disagree	1.09	1.20	1.69 t	1.69 t	1.92 *	.93
Wants More Opportunities for Hookups	Strongly Agree	1.00	.93	1.04	1.04	.81	1.04
	Agree	1.25 *	.96	1.25 *	1.25 *	.80 *	1.05
	Strongly Disagree	.83	.85 *	.75	.75	.98	.84 *
Respondent Level Variables (continued) - Sexual History							
Age at Loss of Virginity	Virgin	1.40	.70	1.35	1.35	.83	.73
	14 or younger	1.18	.94	1.29	1.29	.97	1.01
	15	.99	1.03	1.05	1.05	.90	1.08
	17	1.24	.91	1.11	1.11	.91	.96
	18	1.22	1.02	1.04	1.04	1.03	1.02
	19+	1.22	.91	1.21	1.21	.71 *	1.04
Number of Previous Intercourse Partners	None	.61 t	1.05	.67	.67	.87	1.16
	1	.89	1.13	.83	.83	1.30 *	1.04
	4-5	.81	1.01	.80 t	.80 t	1.05	1.00
	6-10	1.21	1.16	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.20 *
	11+	1.26	1.26 t	1.23	1.23	1.05	1.33 *

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000

APPENDIX F (continued)

Gender		Male	Female	Male		Female	
Institution Level Variables - Characteristics of Institution of Respondent's Attendance							
Tuition Cost	<7.5K	.92	.91	1.01	1.01	.75*	1.04
	>20K	1.92	1.49	2.14	2.14	1.63	1.17
Student Body	% Female	1.04 <sup>t</sup>	1.01	1.03	1.03	1.03 <sup>t</sup>	.99
	% Black	.98	.99	1.01	1.01	1.02	.97*
	% Asian	1.02*	1.00	1.02*	1.02*	1.00	1.00
	% Hispanic	1.00	1.01 <sup>t</sup>	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.01
	% Other Race	1.01	1.00	1.01	1.01	1.01	.99
Private Institution		.58	.75	.58	.58	.73	.93
Number of Undergrads	<10K	1.27	1.21	.95	.95	1.28	1.11
	>20K	1.70*	1.07	1.52*	1.52*	1.16	1.00
Details of Regression Model							
Cut Points	1	-2.97	-2.69	.15	.15	-1.03	-2.01
	2	-1.38	-.23	2.29	2.29	1.38	-.15
	3	1.64					
$\psi$ (respondents)		2.12	1.56	.00	.00	.00	.00
$\psi$ (schools)		.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Log Likelihood		-3578.92	-8032.28	-2142.30	-2142.30	-2791.53	-5248.73
Likelihood-ratio Test	Chi <sup>2</sup>	263.55****	263.55****	204.28****	204.27****	205.33****	274.86****
	Degrees of Freedom	66	66	65	65	65	65
R <sup>2</sup>		.02	.05	.05	.06	.48	.03

t=p<.1, \*=p<.05, \*\*=p<.01, \*\*\*=p<.000