5-2016

Hooking Up, Romantic Relationship Self-Efficacy, and Attitudes Toward Marriage

Jacqueline Bible
Montclair State University

Abstract

This quantitative study sought to describe general and penetrative hookup behavior among college attending emerging adults aged 18-22, and to understand the relationships between hookup behavior, romantic relationship self-efficacy, and intent to marry. Cognitive behavioral theory viewed through a feminist lens grounded the study. The convenience sample consisted of 38 respondents (32 females, 6 males) from a mid-sized northeastern university. Respondents were asked to answer an online survey that asked about hookup behaviors, partner types, emotional experiences, feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy, and intent to marry. Frequencies revealed that respondents prefer to engage in hookups with partners they know and that the majority of respondents felt emotional satisfaction and emotional closeness half the time or less after engaging in hookups. T-tests and correlations were used to analyze the data. Men (M=19.17, SD=20.98) reported engaging in general hookup behavior more frequently than women (M=6.16, SD=3.97), $t(38)$=-3.38, p<.01. Further, hookup behavior (both general and penetrative) was not related to feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy or intent to marry suggesting that hookup behavior has become normative on college campuses. Implications and future research are discussed.

MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY

HOOKING UP, ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP SELF-EFFICACY, AND ATTITUDES TOWARD MARRIAGE

by

JACQUELINE BIBLE

A Master's Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Montclair State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Arts

May 2016

College of Education and Human Services

Department of Family and Child Studies

Thesis Committee:

[redacted]

Dr. Brad van Eeden-Moorefield
Thesis Sponsor

[redacted]

Dr. Soyoung Lee
Committee Member

[redacted]

Dr. Lisa Lieberman
Committee Member

HOOKING UP, ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP SELF-EFFICACY, AND ATTITUDES TOWARD MARRIAGE

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

by

JACQUELINE BIBLE

Montclair State University

Montclair, New Jersey

2016

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis sponsor Dr. Brad van Eeden-Moorefield. He spent endless hours discussing the literature, editing my numerous drafts, listening to my concerns, and encouraging me to perform to the best of my abilities. I truly do not believe I could have completed this thesis without his guidance, expertise, and support. Thank you for all you have done for me, this experience was invaluable and I plan to take the lessons I have learned with me into my future scholarship.

I would also like to thank my thesis committee members Dr. Soyoung Lee and Dr. Lisa Lieberman who acted as a sounding board when my sponsor and I were brainstorming ideas about the research. I appreciate the time and effort they put into reading my final drafts and the thoughtfulness they put into their questions. These ideas and their expertise helped to enhance my definitions and research methodology, and for that I am grateful.

This thesis has been one of the most challenging experiences of my life, and also the most rewarding. A special thank you to my family and friends for supporting me through the ups and downs of this journey, for believing in me, and for supporting my dream of working in academia one day. Without them, none of this would be possible.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Trends in young adult sexuality, dating, and serious romantic relationships are shifting (Wang & Parker, 2015). Marriage rates have declined over the past 50 years, individuals are waiting longer to marry, and both the acceptance and likelihood of cohabiting have increased significantly (Cherlin, 2010; Martin, Martin, & Martin, 2001). For example, in the 1960's, 91% of adults in the United States older than 25 were married compared to only 80% in 2012 (Wang & Parker, 2015). In a survey conducted by the US Department of Health and Human Services, 48% of women reported cohabitating between 2006 and 2010 as compared to only 34% of women in 1995 (Copen, Daniels, & Mosher, 2013). Further, the National Survey of Family Growth found that 45% of women with 4-year college degree reported cohabitating (Cherlin, 2010). In a qualitative study, Cherlin (2010) found that couples that choose to cohabit might not have any intention of ever marrying. In this regard, cohabitation has become a popular alternative to early marriage or marrying at all. Previous research partially attributes these relational shifts to economic changes, competitiveness in the workforce, and access to education (Wang & Parker, 2015), all of which also are related to changing views of marriage. An emerging literature suggests the burgeoning hookup culture and acceptance of visible sexuality also plays a role in shifting marital and relational attitudes among recent cohorts (Bogle, 2008). However, the majority of this literature is focused on hooking up and increased risks of contracting a sexually transmitted infection (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger, 2009; Salts, Seismore, Lindholm & Smith, 1994), and rarely focuses on how hooking up

is related to changes in marital attitudes (Sassler, 2010), or the processes by which the two are linked (Garcia, Reiber, Massey, & Merriwhether, 2012).

Historically, men and women engaged in some form of committed emotional relationship or waited until marriage before engaging in a sexual relationship (Garcia, et al., 2012). The nature of relationships, romantic or otherwise, is more diverse today than in previous decades though (Stinson, 2010), which is especially true of those that involve sexual interactions (Garcia, et al., 2012). Among college students, fewer are becoming romantically involved prior to engaging in sexual behaviors compared to earlier decades, preferring instead to "hang out" and/or "hookup." Hookups refer to the engagement, of two or more people, in sexual behaviors ranging from kissing to sexual intercourse with no expectation of commitment after (Lewis, Granato, Blayney, Lostutter, & Kilmer, 2012), and have become a popular relationship alternative on college campuses (Helm, Gondra, & McBride, 2015). The best estimates available suggest approximately 75% of students report hooking up at least once during their four years in college (Victor, 2012). Bradshaw, Kahn, and Saville (2010) found that their convenience sample of male and female college students had approximately two times the amount of hookups to first dates within the two years preceding the survey. Specifically, women reported engaging in an average of approximately four hookups and two first dates, whereas men reported an average of approximately six hookups and three first dates, in the previous two years.

Importantly, hookups encompass an array of different behaviors with different types of partners. Using a nationally representative sample, Herbernick, et al. (2010) found 12.8% of women, aged 18 to 24, reported engaging in oral sex and 28.6% of women reported engaging in sexual intercourse in the past 90 days. All of these behaviors

occurred in the context of a hookup. In the same study, 19.8% of men, aged 18-24, reported receiving oral sex and 24.0% reported engaging in sexual intercourse over the past 90 days, both in the context of a hookup (Herbernick, et al., 2010). Paul, McManus, and Hayes (2000) reported that college students, on average, have around 11 hookup partners throughout their college career with a range of 0 to 65 per year. In another study using a large convenience sample, England, Shafer, and Fogarty (2007) reported that 40% of their participants had hooked up zero to three times over their college careers, 40% had hooked up between four and nine times over their college careers, and 20% of participants had hooked up more than 10 times over their college careers.

Notably, hookups can occur with different types of partners. For example, Armstrong, et al. (2012) found that 8.3% of their male and female random sample had hooked up with a stranger, 24.0% had hooked up with a casual acquaintance, 53.8% had hooked up with a friend, and 13.8% had hooked up with an ex-partner. Further, heterosexual hookups are highly gendered experiences where most men are privileged and women often are at a disadvantage (Bersamin et al., 2014). Women are more inclined to seek serious romantic relationships during their college years and report preferring dating to hooking up (Bradshaw, Kahn, & Saville, 2010). However, men report a preference for hooking up to dating during their college years (Bradshaw, et al., 2010). This gender discrepancy in dating preferences may lead to emotional dissatisfaction among college-aged women more so than college-aged men (Victor, 2012). On college campuses where hooking up is an accepted norm, young women may feel confused, discouraged, and emotionally unfulfilled after engaging in a hookup due to their preference for romantic relationships. Further, women are at higher risk to experience

feelings of guilt, shame, regret, and distress after engaging in a hookup (Victor, 2012), which may lead to negative mental health outcomes and depressive symptoms (Sandberg-Thoma & Dush, 2014). Alternatively, men who engage in hookups have increased confidence and feelings of security, which may ultimately increase male self-esteem (Victor, 2012).

These studies suggest that men and women experience hooking up differently, in that men appear to be more likely to benefit whereas women are more likely to experience emotional hurt. Given these disparities, it is imperative for research to identify the processes by which they emerge, and whether such hookups may be associated with attitudes toward marriage. Hookups at this stage in women's lives may influence how they are interpreting their ability to find a secure and healthy romantic relationship now and in the future.

The idea that one believes he or she has the ability to form and maintain a successful and satisfying romantic relationship is known as romantic relationship self-efficacy, and is one such mechanism by which attitudes toward marriage may be influenced (Shurts & Myers, 2012). Little research has investigated the relationship between hooking up and relationship self-efficacy among emerging adults. How one perceives their romantic relationship self-efficacy can predict future relationship anxiety, expectations of relationship success, relationship satisfaction, and relationship commitment (Riggio, et al., 2013). Although hookups are understood to be uncommitted, women often seek emotional intimacy within them (Bogle, 2008; Lovejoy, 2015). Specifically, when hookups are consistent with the same partner, a "romance gap" often forms (Lovejoy, 2015, p. 477). This romance gap occurs when one partner, usually the

female, forms romantic feelings for the other partner in the context of a hookup (Lovejoy, 2015). Emotional intimacy is rarely discussed in the context of a hookup, creating a challenging situation for the partner with emotional feelings. The partner with emotional feelings may experience an internal conflict between expression of their feelings and continuing their hookup.

Lovejoy (2015) found that when hookups end due to the expression of unrequited emotional feelings, women are often left disappointed and may even feel romantically hurt and rejected. Interestingly, around 50% of hookups result in discrepancies of romantic feelings (Lovejoy, 2015). Since around 75% of emerging adults are engaging in hookups rather than serious romantic relationships (Owen & Fincham, 2011), it is likely that around half of these hookups are leaving one partner emotionally unsatisfied. If a partner exits the hookup with extreme emotional hurt (Lovejoy, 2015), he/she may have negative perceptions of his/her ability to have successful relationships (i.e. poor romantic relationship self-efficacy). If one perceives that they have poor romantic relationship self-efficacy, they may also have a negative outlook on their abilities to be in future serious romantic relationships, such as marriage (Shurts & Myers, 2012).

Research supports that feelings of self-efficacy will influence how much effort an individual will put forth toward a specific behavior (Bandura, 1977). If an individual has low romantic relationship self-efficacy he/she may feel that it is not worth the effort to seek out future romantic relationships, simply due to their failed experiences in previous romantic relationship settings. Therefore, these feelings of low romantic relationship self-efficacy may be related to negative attitudes toward future romantic relationships such as marriage. However, emerging adults may not perceive marriage to be the only option for

serious romantic relationships in the future. For example, using a convenience sample, Willoughby and Carroll (2010) found that sexual activity during emerging adulthood was significantly related to positive attitudes toward cohabitation. Salts et al. (1994) found that their convenience sample of participants who were virgins held more favorable attitudes toward marriage than non-virgins. More specifically, the more sexual partners a participant had the less favorable attitudes they had toward future marriage (Salts, et al., 1994). Due to the often brief and non-committal nature of a hookup, emerging adults may engage in sexual relationships with numerous partners over the course of their college career (Bogle, 2008). These findings imply that higher frequencies of hooking up may be related to more negative attitudes toward marriage.

Conceptual discrepancies, such as inconsistent definitions and primarily convenience sampling, among hookup culture literature has contributed to mixed results about the relationship between hooking up and attitudes toward marriage. Some scholars contend that delays in marriage and dating, increased preference for cohabiting, and increased visibility of sexuality have lead to the emergence of a hookup culture among young adults (Hamilton & Armstrong, 2009; Sassler, 2010.) Yet, there is also the assertion that hookup behavior could be further perpetuating delays in serious romantic relationships such as exclusive dating and marriage (Willoughby & Carroll, 2010). Stated another way, research and theory suggests a bidirectional relationship between the two, although the focus of the current study only examines hookups as an antecedent.

The purpose of this study was to describe hookup behavior and to investigate how hooking up among college students aged 18 to 22 is related to feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy and intentions to marry. Further, gender differences were

examined. General hookup behavior was defined as a range of behaviors from kissing to penetrative intercourse (e.g., mutual masturbation, fingering, rubbing, use of sex toys) between two or more partners (of the opposite or same sex) who express no commitment toward each other before or following their sexual encounter. Participants were also asked specifically about their penetrative hookup behaviors. A penetrative hookup was conceptualized as sexual behaviors ranging from oral sex to penetrative intercourse between two or more partners (of the opposite or same sex) who express no commitment toward each other before or following their sexual encounter. Importantly, hookups may occur one time (i.e. partners who have just met and engage in sexual contact one time; Wentland & Reissing, 2011) or may be recurrent between "fuck buddies" (i.e. partners who engage in multiple hookups over a period of time, yet still have no commitment to each other; Wentland & Reissing, 2011, p. 169), and this study was inclusive of both types. The study was limited to undergraduate college students aged 18 to 22 because this age range is characteristic of sexual exploration and engaging in hookup behavior (Bogle, 2008). College campuses provide minimal supervision over students' personal lives, which may foster sexual freedom among students. Cognitive behavioral theory (Hupp et al., 2008) viewed through a feminist lens (Osmond & Thorne, 2004), described in the next chapter, grounded the study, and led to the following research question and specific hypotheses:

RQ1: How can we describe college attending emerging adults' hookup behavior?

H1: There are gender differences among frequencies of hookups in that men will engage in more general hookups than women

H2: Frequency of general hookups is negatively related to romantic relationship self-efficacy

H3: Frequency of general hookups is negatively related to participants' intent to marry

H4: There are gender differences among frequencies of hookups in that men will engage in more penetrative hookups than women

H5: Frequency of penetrative hookups is negatively related to romantic relationship self-efficacy

H6: Frequency of penetrative hookups is negatively related to participants' intent to marry

H7: Women will have higher feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy than men

H8: Romantic relationship self-efficacy is positively related to intent to marry

CHAPTER 2

Conceptual Framework

This study used cognitive behavioral theory (Hupp, Reitman, & Jewell, 2008) viewed through a feminist lens (Osmond & Thorne, 2004) to examine how hookup behavior is related to feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy and intent to marry. Feminist theory asserts humans are relational beings, and interactions used to establish and/or maintain various types of relationships are influenced by socially constructed norms such as those guiding gender roles related to sexuality (Osmond & Thorne, 2004). One such norm would be that women should not engage in casual sexual behaviors outside of a committed relationship, whereas it is more acceptable for men to do so (Allison & Risman, 2013). Importantly, norms are cultural guidelines situated in a particular historical context that often privilege men and relegate women, and more specifically their behavior, such that hierarchies of privilege are maintained (Osmond & Thorne, 2004).

Humans are active agents and increased perceptions and actions of empowerment can help agents create change in their own lives and at the cultural level (Hupp et al., 2008). In this way, feminist theories view cognitions and behaviors as key mechanisms by which culture is created, reinforced, and/or reimagined. Cognitive behavioral theory helps specify the mechanisms and processes involved, whereas feminist theories also ensure gender remains central to any theorizing and analysis. As such, both grounded the current study. Importantly, engaging in hookups (a form of relational behavior) theoretically is related to cognitions about other relationships (i.e. marriage) and perceptions about one's ability to have good relationships. Further, the experience of

hooking up is gendered thus gender should be a contextual consideration within this analysis. Accordingly, this chapter presents the historical and contemporary conceptualization of hookups followed by a discussion of cognitive behavior theory and the importance of the addition of a feminist lens when examining hookup behavior.

Conceptualization of Hookups

Hooking up encompasses a range of sexual behaviors; yet, no universally accepted definition exists among scholars. For example, Fielder, Walsh, Carey, and Carey (2014) defined a hookup as a sexual encounter between partners who do not anticipate any future commitment to one another, with a specific focus on oral and penetrative sex. Manthos, Owen, and Fincham (2014) defined a hookup as exclusively penetrative sexual intercourse. Owen, Rhoades, Stanley, and Fincham (2010) used a broader and more descriptive definition of hooking up that included intimate behaviors ranging from passionate kissing and touching to oral sex or intercourse. This demonstrates how one study may define hooking up as strictly sexual intercourse behaviors (Bersamin, et al., 2014), whereas another study may define hooking up as a range of sexual behaviors (Owen, et al., 2010). Across studies there is one conceptual consistency: hookups involve no commitment to be sexually involved with the other partner beyond the one hookup event. Varying definitions of hookup behavior is problematic in research because it potentially compromises the validity of findings across studies (e.g., lack of ability to compare findings).

Discrepancies among definitions may explain some of the inconsistencies within the hookup literature on the impact of hookups on individual well-being (e.g., mental and physical health). For example, Bersamin and colleagues (2014) defined hookups as

strictly intercourse behaviors. They surveyed 3,907 undergraduate students and suggested that mental health outcomes were the same after engaging in casual sex for both men and women. Specifically, men and women reported sexual regret and feelings of regret, which are linked to poorer overall mental health. Alternatively, Owen and colleagues (2010) used a broader and more descriptive definition of hooking up that included intimate behaviors ranging from passionate kissing and touching to oral sex or intercourse. They surveyed 832 undergraduate students and found that women were more likely to feel negatively after hooking up when compared to men. Fifty percent of men reported positive reactions to hooking up, whereas only 25% of women reported positive reactions to hooking up (Owen et al., 2010). There are clear differences in these studies' findings, and these could be due to the differences in their definitions of hooking up. As such there also were measurement differences, meaning results lack a level of comparability across studies. Perhaps men and women feel similar amounts of regret when they have sexual intercourse with someone they have known for less than a week, however the discrepancy occurs with different hookup behavior in different contexts as well. As such, future literature must be consistent in its definitions of hookup behavior in order to fully understand its impact on emerging adults. The current study defined a general hookup as any sexual behavior ranging from kissing to penetrative intercourse, with a specific focus on penetrative behaviors (i.e. oral sex, vaginal sex and anal sex), between two partners who express no commitment toward each other before or following their sexual encounter.

Cognitive Behavioral Theory and Hookups

Cognitive behavioral theory stems from the tradition of behaviorism, which states that individuals learn through conditioning (Hupp et al., 2008). Behaviorism further purports that all behavior is learned from outside sources based on how others reinforce one's behavior. Post World War II, scholars were underwhelmed with behaviorisms' explanation of physical behavior and sought a more complex theory-- one that considered individual internal processes rather than just external reinforcement. As a result, the role of cognitions in influencing behavior was theorized more explicitly, and this lead to the articulation of cognitive behavioral theory (Crosbie-Burnett & Lewis, 2004).

Cognitive behavioral theory focuses on the intrapersonal processes that occur exclusively within each individual and the behaviors that influence and stem from those processes (Hupp, et al., 2008). For example, how one perceives his/her ability to be successful at a task may influence their behavior during the task (Bandura, 1977). The relationship between cognitions and behaviors is bidirectional, meaning they influence each other. The behavior one engages in influences their cognitions regarding that behavior (Hupp et al., 2008). Then these cognitions, such as feelings of self-efficacy, are related to an individual's decision to engage in a specific behavior (Bandura, 1977). For instance, if an individual fails at a specific task, it is likely that their feelings of self-efficacy will decrease (Bandura, 1977). These reduced feelings of self-efficacy will often lead to beliefs that the individual is not capable of successfully completing a similar task (Bandura, 1977). Since this person believes that they are unable to successfully complete this task (i.e. engage in the behavior), they are less likely to attempt it in the future (Bandura, 1977).

When attempting to understand how hookup behavior is related to attitudes toward marriage, it is essential to first understand the importance of individual cognitions, such as feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy. Individual perceptions of self-efficacy can significantly influence one's attitudes toward engaging in behaviors as well as his/her likelihood to actually engage in such behaviors (Bandura, 1977). With regard to romantic relationships, perceptions of self-efficacy may influence an individual's beliefs about his/her ability to be successful in a relationship and the behaviors he/she engages in to create a successful relationship (Shurts & Myers, 2012). Further, emotional outcomes of romantic relationships influence individual feelings of self-efficacy (Kavanaugh & Bower, 1985). As such, romantic relationship experiences in college, including hookups, may be related to romantic relationship self-efficacy in a positive or negative way depending on the hookup behavior and romantic involvement.

The prevalence of college romantic relationships appears to be declining and the popularity of hookups is increasing (Bogle, 2008). Hookups are not defined as romantic relationships, however, romantic feelings often occur within them (Lovejoy, 2015). Due to the inconsistency of romantic involvement between partners, emotional uncertainty and frequent formation of unreciprocated intimate feelings that may occur within a hookup it is possible that an individual may feel unsuccessful at relationships, ultimately impacting their feelings of self-efficacy in romantic relationships (Lovejoy, 2015). Specifically, the negative outcomes from these failed hookups may be related to individual feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy, because failures in romantic relationships threaten self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Kavanaugh & Bower, 1985). While there are likely to be complex interrelationships among these variables, the current study

focuses on individual links among hookups, relationship self-efficacy, and intentions to marry.

Feminist Perspectives and Hookups

By itself, cognitive behavioral theory helps specify the mechanisms and processes involved in the associations between hooking up, feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy, and attitudes toward marriage. However, it does not account for the influence of gender on these concepts. Feminist theory has five major theoretical assumptions: it focuses on the female experience; it views gender as an organizing construct; it states that gender must be analyzed in sociocultural and historical contexts; it calls into question how the family is constructed; and it pushes for change in worldwide gender biases (Osmond & Thorne, 2004). The experience of hooking up is gendered thus gender should be considered in analysis. Specifically, men and women perceive and experience hookup behavior differently (Allison & Risman, 2013). Adding a feminist lens to cognitive behavioral theory can explain why the gender gap exists in the hookup culture. It accounts for cultural norms surrounding men and women in the hookup culture as well as constructs, such as patriarchal control of the hookup culture (Bogle, 2008), that confine dating behavior for men and women.

Importantly, the social constructions of gender have created a sexual double standard within the hookup culture (Bersamin et al., 2014); men gain more social acceptance from engaging in hookup behavior, whereas women often are socially shamed for engaging in hookup behavior (Currier, 2013). Due to these differences, research and theory suggest engaging in hookups is perceived differently based on the gender of the individual (Allison & Risman, 2013). For example, men receive positive reinforcement

after engaging in a hookup and women receive negative reinforcement after engaging in a hookup. This maintains power differentials within the hookup culture (Lovejoy, 2015). Due to the praise that men receive after engaging in hookup behavior, they are conditioned to hookup because it perpetuates the cultural idea of masculinity (Epstein, Calzo, Smiler, & Ward, 2009). Men's positive outcomes from a hookup may lead them to believe they are acting in an "acceptable" way when it comes to romantic relationships. This positive reinforcement may lead to increased hookup behavior and may be related to increased feelings of self-efficacy. Yet, women prefer dating to hookup behavior (Bogle, 2008; Bradshaw, et al., 2010), but have limited options for physical and/or emotional relationships outside of hookups due to patriarchal control within dating norms and the hookup culture (Bogle, 2008; Lovejoy, 2015). Due to their limited options and usual criticism after engaging in a hookup due to the sexual double standard, women may have negative hookup outcomes, which may be related to lower feelings of self-efficacy.

Further, in a hookup, women's needs often are seen as secondary to men's. When females express sexual desire it is perceived as a masculine quality, and rejects the feminine script that society has created (Currier, 2013). Men are aware of women's desire for romantic relationships, and will initiate strategies, such as ignoring calls, avoiding the woman who they last hooked up with, or verbally stating that they do not want a romantic relationship, to make sure the relationship stays free of commitment (Bogle, 2008). In order for a woman to fulfill the hookup script, she often will perform oral sex on men without any sexual repayment, she will disregard her own sexual needs within a hookup, and she will avoid discussing her hookups in detail (Currier, 2013). Women are seen as subordinate in a hookup and their sexual needs often are put aside to accommodate male

sexual desires. Taken together, research clearly suggests gender differences exist in many hookup experiences.

CHAPTER 3

Contextualization of Relationships & Hookups

Hooking up has become a popular alternative to dating and committed romantic relationships among college attending emerging adults (Helm, et al., 2015). The cultural acceptance of sexual expression and freedom in the United States could be a contributing factor to this trend (Fernandez-Villaverde, Greenwood, & Guner, 2014). This acceptance may influence college students' participation in the hookup culture, ultimately influencing their feelings about intimacy in future romantic relationships. Throughout this section, general relationship trends, the culture of sexuality within the United States and hookup behavior among college students is examined.

Relationship Trends in the United States

General relationship trends. Relationships are more varied than in any previous decade. Currently, couples have the option to engage in casual short-term relationships, cohabitation prior to marriage or as an alternative to marriage, life-long partnership, marriage, divorce, and/or singlehood, among others (Sassler, 2010). Although marriage and the desire for intimacy are still the most desired relationship outcomes (Lichter, Batson, & Brown, 2004), the median age of first marriage for males is around 28.7 and for females is around 26.5 (Census Bureau, 2010; Cohn, Passel, Wang, & Livingston, 2010). This is higher than in previous decades (Bogle, 2008; Cherlin, 2010), and suggests individuals are postponing marriage.

Research also suggests that young adults may choose to cohabit with a partner either prior to, or instead of, marriage (Sassler, 2010). Reasons for cohabitation vary among couples (i.e. they have no intention of getting married but living together is

financially helpful, they have intentions of getting married, and/or couples may use this situation to evaluate if they are ready for marriage (Cherlin, 2010; Sassler, 2010). Using a convenience sample of 1,036 college students, Willoughby and Carroll (2012) investigated how demographics, relational behavior, and dating behavior influenced individual attitudes toward cohabitation among college students. They found that participants with liberal sexual attitudes were more likely to have positive attitudes toward cohabitation. However, they did not find a relationship between actual sexual behavior and attitudes toward cohabitation. Further, they found that young adults utilize cohabitation differently; some view it as a prerequisite to marriage whereas others view it as a commitment outside of marriage (Cherlin, 2010; Sassler, 2010). General relationship trends may be changing due to the high prevalence of hookup behavior on college campuses and liberal attitudes toward sexuality (England, 2013). It is important for scholars to investigate how the prevalence of hookup behavior and the acceptance of visible sexuality on college campuses may be contributing to the changes in romantic relationship trends.

Culture of sexuality and hooking up in the US. Previous generations have engaged in sexual experiences through committed romantic relationships (Stinson, 2010). Formerly, men would pursue women whom they were attracted to and court/date them until they were involved in a serious romantic relationship (Stinson, 2010). Premarital sex and sex outside of committed relationships was perceived negatively among society (Stinson, 2010). For example, in 1900 less than 10% of all women engaged in sex outside of marriage, via measures of self-report. Today, 75% of women report engaging in premarital sex (Fernandez-Villaverde, et al., 2014). This suggests that expression of

sexuality and sex outside of committed romantic relationships is much more acceptable in the United States today (Fernandez-Villaverde, et al., 2014).

Research suggests this acceptance of sexuality and casual sex can be attributed to different factors. The availability and acceptance of birth control methods, such as birth control pills and condoms, has increased sexual freedoms for women (Fernandez-Villaverde, et al., 2014; Stinson, 2010). Birth control has allowed individuals to engage in premarital sex with lowered risk of pregnancy or transmission of STI's. Further, the introduction of dating applications has created an easy way to access multiple hookup partners with little effort and little commitment (Bersamin, et al., 2014). Increased sexualization of the media and portrayal of increased positive attitudes toward casual sex may also be a contributing factor to America's culture of sexuality and acceptance of casual sex (Bersamin, et al., 2014). The media often leaves out the emotional consequences that can occur from casual sexual encounters leading people to mimic the behavior they see, with little knowledge of possible cognitive impacts (Bersamin et al., 2014). Accordingly, all of these factors could be contributing to increased hookup behavior on college campuses because emerging adults may view hookup behavior as a normal part of the college experience.

Hookup behavior among college students. Individuals who attend college are more likely to get married than individuals who do not attend college (Cherlin, 2010). However, college attending individuals often postpone marriage due to the extra time needed to focus on exceling in college and establishing their careers (Cherlin, 2010). Yet, little research has focused on hookup trends and their contribution to these delays, which has lead to a gap in the literature. It is important that scholars consider behaviors, such as

hooking up, as contributing factors to shifts in serious romantic relationship trends among college attending emerging adult cohorts (Sassler, 2010) due to its acceptance and popularity.

Fielder and colleagues (2013) conducted a longitudinal study to assess if hookups were replacing romantic relationships among a convenience sample of 483 first year female undergraduate students. They found that 40% of participants had engaged in a hookup over their first year of college, which suggests that college campus environments provide an atmosphere for sexual exploration. Further, hooking up was most popular among white students (Fielder, et al., 2013). Although hookups are popular avenues for college students to explore their sexuality with little commitment, some individuals still prefer to engage in committed romantic relationships (Fielder et al., 2013). As such, hooking up appeared to delay rather than replace participation in romantic relationships. This is important because research suggests college students who chose to engage in committed romantic relationships experienced fewer mental health issues than those who chose not to engage in committed romantic relationships (Braithwaite, Delevi, & Fincham, 2010). Further, preference for hookups over committed romantic relationships may occur due to different intentions post-graduation.

Sassler (2010) found that college students who are interested in getting married shortly after college graduation will engage in different relationship behaviors than those who do not intend to marry shortly after college graduation. Specifically, college students who intend to postpone marriage may engage in more brief casual sexual relationships, or hookups, with multiple partners than those who intend to marry young (Sassler, 2010). The hookup experiences these individuals engage in may impact more

than college students' sexual desires; hookups may influence their attitudes about intimacy in romantic relationships. Hookups consist of physical intimacy with a lack of emotional intimacy. Theoretically, the behavior that college students are engaging in will influence their cognitions about that behavior which will in turn impact future cognitions and behavior. If college students are learning to engage in these types of behaviors, they may learn that they are not adequate partners in committed romantic relationships, therefore they develop low relationship self-efficacy. These low levels of relationship self-efficacy may ultimately lead to avoidance and/or postponement of intimate future relationships such as marriage.

A Closer Look at the Nature and Variation of a Hookup

Among college students. College students' hookup behavior varies depending on numerous factors. England (2013) investigated hookup behavior trends through qualitative interviews, focus groups, and quantitative data from online surveys of undergraduate students. She found that 30-40% of hookups lead to sexual intercourse, whereas 25-33% of hookups involved making out and touching, with no genital contact. Alternatively, in a study of 118 first semester college women conducted by Fielder and Carey (2010), 98% of hookups involved making out, 67% involved touching of the breasts, 56% involved genital touching outside of the clothes, and 46% involved genital touching underneath clothing. This study reported that 27% of hookups lead to oral sex or vaginal intercourse (Fielder & Carey, 2010). Hookup partners may include friends (47%), acquaintances (23%), strangers (14%), and ex-partners (12%; Fielder & Carey, 2010). Further, sexual desire, partner's appearance, desire to feel attractive, and alcohol/drug use were all motivating factors to engage in hookup behavior. Data on the prevalence of

hooking up both informs scholars and professionals of behavior that occurs within hookups and also provides a mechanism to understand how different sexual behaviors can influence various well-being outcomes.

Demographic variations. Owen and colleagues (2010) conducted a study to investigate which college students were most likely to engage in hookups. They examined different demographic variables such as sex, ethnicity, parental incomes, parental divorce, and religiosity, as well as six psychosocial factors such as attachment styles, alcohol use, psychological well being, attitudes about hooking up, and perceptions of family environment. These variables were found to influence the likelihood that an individual engaged in a hookup within the year. For example, Caucasian and multi-ethnic students were significantly more likely to hookup than students who identified as a different ethnicity. Students who had high parental income, consumed large amounts of alcohol, and/or had favorable attitudes toward hooking up, were all more likely to engage in hookups (Owen, et. al. 2010).

In addition, an individual's gender, race, religiosity, alcohol consumption, previous relationship experiences, and/or the specific hookup behavior he or she engaged in may influence how their hookups impact them cognitively. After surveying 339 undergraduate students, Manthos and colleagues (2014) found that, undergraduates who hookup reported higher levels of alcohol use and higher levels of depressive symptoms with lower levels of religiosity. Further, women reported negative attitudes toward hooking up. The students who had negative attitudes toward hooking up were more likely to report lower psychological well-being (Owen et al., 2010). Individual demographics as well as the specific hookup behavior that occurs may contribute to the cognitive outcome

of a hookup. Further, negative mental outcomes that occur from a hookup may leave a lasting impression on individual feelings of self-efficacy.

Public Health Considerations

Research is clear that as the number of partners increases so does the risk of contracting a sexually transmitted infection (CDC, 2014). As such, hooking up is an important public health concern on college campuses (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger, 2009). Although college students account for 50% of newly diagnosed STIs each year (CDC, 2015), many college students are not concerned with the health risks that may come with engaging in casual sexual relationships with numerous partners (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger, 2009). Fielder and Carey (2010) found that female college freshman used condoms 0% of the time when performing oral sex and only 69% of the time when they engaged in vaginal sex. Among male freshmen, 69.7% reported engaging in at least one penetrative hookup during their first year of college (Olmstead, Roberson, Pasley, & Fincham, 2015). Potentially compounding the risk for contracting an STI, alcohol use is a strong predictor of engaging in a hookup as well as a reduced likelihood of using some form of protection (Fielder & Carey, 2010; Garcia et al., 2012). Although these statistics come from mostly convenience samples, and thus, are not generalizable to the larger populations, there are strong consistencies in findings that suggest undergraduate students are engaging in risky sexual behavior when engaging in hookups (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger, 2009), which is likely accurate.

The Current Study

Hooking up is a popular relationship alternative among undergraduate college students (Helm et al., 2015) and its association to future romantic relationships, such as

marriage, must be examined more closely. Individuals experience hookup behavior differently based on their gender, which ultimately may result in different social and cognitive outcomes. Further, individual cognitions about one's ability to be a successful romantic relationship partner may also be related to hookup behavior.

The sexual double standard. Patriarchal control of the hookup culture has created a sexual double standard (Bogle, 2008). The sexual double standard discourages women from engaging in casual sex with multiple partners; those that do may experience negative social consequences (Kreager & Staff, 2009). Using the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Kreager and Staff (2009) found that higher numbers of sexual partners were positively correlated with male peer acceptance, whereas higher numbers of sexual partners were negatively correlated with peer acceptance for women. Men experienced positive outcomes from engaging in sexual behaviors with multiple partners, however women did not (Kreager & Staff, 2009). The negative outcomes that stem from a hookup may lead women to seek more intimacy in their future romantic relationships (i.e. have more positive attitudes toward marriage). Yet, men benefit from hookup behavior; they are able to access sexual gratification with minimal risk of emotional vulnerability (Bogle, 2008). Further, the praise that men gain from engaging in hookups with multiple partners (Kreager & Staff, 2009) may lead them to prefer casual sexual relationships in the future, with little emotional intimacy (i.e. they have more negative attitudes toward marriage).

These differences may be related to distinctive psychological outcomes for men and women, such as self-efficacy, after engaging in hookup behavior. Bachtel (2013) conducted a survey that asked 300 randomly sampled undergraduate participants to

describe differences between male and female hookup experiences. She established four common themes in her research: 1) men have an increased focus on physical pleasure/sex within a hookup, 2) men are less emotional and women are more emotional, 3) women are more focused on a potential relationships, and 4) men gain positive social status from hooking up, whereas women gain negative social consequences when hooking up. The sexual double standard creates a script that promotes men to engage in numerous hookups, however shames women for engaging in them, possibly leading to changes in romantic relationships self-efficacy based on an individual's gender (Bachtel, 2013).

Further, society's favorable view toward men engaging in hookups is related to high levels of self-esteem and confidence when they engage in hookup behavior. High levels of self-esteem and confidence are protective factors against negative mental health outcomes, such as lowered self-efficacy (Victor, 2012). Using a convenience sample of undergraduate students, Victor (2012) found that males who engage in hookup behavior have increased confidence, which ultimately increases male self-esteem. Men with high self-esteem reported lower levels of rejection and ultimately less negative mental health outcomes after engaging in a hookup. Similarly, Owen et al. (2010) found a significant association between higher psychological well-being and hooking up for men, and no significant association for women. Specifically, men reported significantly higher positive reactions to hooking up than women did. Since men did not experience rejection and had overall positive experiences within their hookup experiences, theoretically, their feelings of self-efficacy were high (Bandura, 1977). However, females were more likely to have increased feelings of guilt, shame, regret, and distress with decreased positive mental health outcomes (Victor, 2012).

According to cognitive behavioral theory, these feelings of guilt, shame, regret, and distress, after engaging in hookup behavior, may indirectly lead to cognitive repercussions, such as lowered self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977) and depressive symptoms (Sandberg-Thoma & Dush, 2014). Bandura (1977) states that individuals will avoid threatening situations (for example, those that lead to negative outcomes) and this avoidance can be attributed to low levels of self-efficacy. The addition of a feminist lens ensures that gender differences within the hookup culture are taken into account, specifically in that men and women experience hooking up differently with different mental outcomes.

Gender and romantic relationship self-efficacy. Little research has investigated the relationship between hookup behavior in emerging adulthood and attitudes toward marriage. Some research suggests that after college graduation, students return to an environment where committed dating relationships are preferred (Bogle, 2008). However, other research suggests that the relationships an individual engages in during their time in college may influence their feelings toward future romantic relationships post graduation (Riggio, et al., 2013). An important factor to note when discussing hookup experiences is that an individual's gender may greatly influence his/her experiences within a hookup and the desired relationship type. Women seek committed relationships whereas men prefer to hookup with minimal commitment (Bogle, 2008; Bradshaw, Kahn, & Saville, 2010). Due to the lack of commitment in hookup relationships, women often leave these relationships emotionally unsatisfied (Lovejoy, 2015).

Using an interpretive phenomenological analysis, Stinson, Levy, and Alt (2014) discovered that some men view hookups as emotionally insignificant and use them for

sexual gratification. However, many women will engage in hookups with hopes that they will turn into serious romantic relationships (Lovejoy, 2015; Victor, 2012). Men have the power to choose if they will continue the hookup, end the hookup, or turn the hookup into a serious romantic relationship (Bogle, 2008), whereas women often have to settle for hookups instead of committed relationships (Gilmartin, 2006). This is consistent with feminist theoretical claims. With these power discrepancies and differences in emotional desires, women often leave a hookup emotionally unsatisfied (Bogle, 2008; Lovejoy, 2015; Stinson et. al, 2014). With regard to cognitive behavioral theory, emotional dissatisfaction that occurred due to the hookup may be related to decreased drive to engage in future romantic relationships such as marriage. Further, men who have good social skills and are involved in extra curricular activities, such as Greek life, have numerous opportunities to engage in hookups (Bogle, 2008; Stinson, et. al, 2014).

Using in depth interviews of 30 undergraduate women, Lovejoy (2015) examined how hooking up impacted young women in both positive and negative ways. She found that although women have the sexual freedom to engage in casual sexual relationships, they are often left with relationship ambiguity and unrequited romantic feelings as well as relationship exploitation and mistreatment. She found that hookups were usually controlled through the male partner and that once a "hookup relationship" was established; it was challenging to renegotiate terms of the relationship (such as emotional intimacy). Women were often at a loss of control in these situations, and settled for hookup relationships that were not emotionally satisfying. Clearly, this research suggests the experience and attitudes related to hooking up and relationships varies for men and women.

Hooking up and romantic relationship self-efficacy. Research suggests that low levels of self-efficacy may lead to decreased behavior and negative perceptions toward that behavior (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy in romantic relationships is referred to as romantic relationship self-efficacy. Romantic relationship self-efficacy is one's belief in their ability to be a romantic relationship partner (Shurts & Myers, 2012). With regard to romantic relationships, if a person has low self-efficacy, he/she may not seek future relationships due to his/her lack of confidence in his/her abilities to be in a successful relationship (Weiser & Weigel, 2016). If a person has high romantic relationship self-efficacy (i.e. they believe they are able to have positive romantic relationship) they may have more favorable views toward marriage (Weiser & Weigel, 2016).

In the current study, romantic relationship self-efficacy may relate to individual beliefs about abilities to be successful in future relationships, such as marriage. The belief about one's inability to be successful in intimate romantic relationships (such as marriage), due to poor outcomes of hookup behavior, may prompt negative attitudes toward marriage in the future. If someone repeatedly engages in hookup behavior, there is a possibility that romantic relationship self-efficacy may decrease. This could be related to low expectations for future romantic relationships due to the perceptions of failure in previous relationships, i.e. hookups.

Using a convenience sample, Kavanagh and Bower (1985) investigated how romantic success or failure influenced individual self-efficacy. They found that when participants believed they had "failed" in a romantic relationship (i.e., had "sad" feelings toward their relationship) they had lower overall self-efficacy, whereas participants who had a successful relationship (i.e., had "happy" feelings toward their romantic

relationship) had higher overall self-efficacy. These findings support the claim that previous relationships will influence individual feelings of self-efficacy. In situations such as hookups, the difference in experiences among men and women may lead to differences in self-efficacy. The praise that males receive from engaging in hookups may lead to positive feelings about their self-efficacy, and the negative stigmas that women receive from engaging in hookups may lead to decreased self-efficacy.

Similarly, using a convenience sample through an online survey, Weiser and Weigel (2016) found that individuals who had higher relationship self-efficacy were more likely to put forth greater effort in five relationship promoting behaviors: positivity, openness, assurances, networks, and tasks. Higher romantic relationship self-efficacy may lead individuals to seek future romantic relationships, such as marriage, and prompt them to engage in behaviors that will ensure relationship success. If an individual has low romantic relationship self-efficacy, they may view intimacy in romantic relationships as less desirable, and put forth less effort in attempting to find a future romantic relationship partner and maintain a relationship.

Riggio and colleagues (2011) created the self-efficacy in romantic relationships scale to broadly measure individual feelings of their abilities to be in romantic relationships. After this measure was created, Riggio and colleagues (2013) used it, to survey undergraduate students. Results showed that self-efficacy was related to relationship anxiety, expectations of relationship success, relationship satisfaction, commitment, and ability to cope with intimacy.

CHAPTER 4

Methods

Design

The current study used a cross-sectional Internet survey design. Online surveys are cost effective, time efficient, allow access to larger and more diverse populations, and are relatively convenient for respondents to access (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & O, 2004; van Eeden-Moorefield, Proux, & Pasley, 2006). This especially is true of college students who have access to computers on campus (Sax, Gilmartin, & Bryant, 2003). Further, online surveys allow for more anonymity (van Eeden-Moorefield, et al., 2006), which is an important methodological consideration for studies asking about sexual activity (Gosling, et al., 2004). Drawbacks of online surveys include the inability to answer participant questions in *real time*, inability to control the environment in which the survey is taken, potential for a single respondent to complete the survey multiple times thereby potentially jeopardizing data independence, representativeness of the sample to the general population, and lack of confirmation that the participant actually meets the inclusion criteria (Couper, 2000; Gosling, et al., 2004; Mustanski, 2001). Similarly, cross-sectional designs allow for relatively fast, inexpensive access to large samples and can be used to determine prevalence and associations among variables (Mann, 2003). However, cross-sectional studies are limited in their ability to determine cause and effect relationships and sequencing of events (Mann, 2003; Levin, 2006).

Internet surveys have the ability to reach diverse, large samples (Gosling, et al., 2004). To increase survey effectiveness, it is important to consider certain constructions and appearances to make surveys user-friendly (Singh, Taneja, & Mangalaraj, 2009).

This survey used progress bars to show the participant their progress in the survey (Singh, et al., 2009) Further, content was grouped and displayed over multiple pages to ensure that the respondent took the survey in the correct order. The font of the survey was legible and the color scheme was non-distracting to the respondent (Singh, et al., 2009)

Sample

This study used a convenience sample to examine hookups among college students from a medium sized northeastern university. Online surveys have a response rate of approximately 20%-30% (Watt, Simpson, McKillop & Nunn, 2002; Nulty, 2008); therefore, it is important to oversample respondents to gain a large enough sample size and achieve appropriate levels of power for the analyses (van Eeden-Moorefield, Proulx & Pasley, 2006). An adequate response rate was expected due to the subject matter the survey discussed. Mustanski (2001) found that the discussion of sex and sexuality on the Internet is extremely popular, so it was likely that respondents would be willing to respond to the survey compared to surveys on other topics. Unfortunately, the overall response rate was low (discussed below).

Respondents were recruited from all student organizations, sororities, and fraternities (Stinson, 2014) with email addresses listed on the university website, as well as two departments selected based on convenience. Convenience sampling allows for access to a large sample size while still being cost effective (Emerson, 2015). The major limitation of convenience sampling is the inability to generalize the results beyond the sample (Emerson, 2015). It is acknowledged that not all college students participated in organizations or were a part of the departments selected and this will be a limitation.

Overall, the sample included 6 males and 32 females, resulting in a total sample of 38 respondents (see Table 1). Respondents were 18-22 years of age (M= 20, SD=1.40) and had engaged in at least one hookup in the past 12 months. Eighteen to 22 year olds are considered to be in the beginning stage of emerging adulthood, which generally lasts until age 25 (Arnett, 2000); ages in which casual sexual relationships and hookup behavior is more common (Claxton & van Dulman, 2013). Seniors (28.9%), juniors (21.1%), sophomores (26.3%), and freshman (23.7%) responded to the survey. The overwhelming majority of this sample identified as heterosexual (78.9%). Five participants identified as asexual, two participants as bisexual, and one as gay/lesbian. Most respondents were white non-Hispanic (71%), followed by Latino (23.7%). Over half of the participants reported they were Catholic (65.8%). Over half were currently single or casually dating (57.9%).

Procedures

The current survey was constructed using Limesurvey.com (LimeSurvey, 2015), which is an online survey instrument used in previous literature (Hudson, Zordan, & Trauer, 2011). In order to gain access to the members of these groups, the primary investigator sent emails (see Appendix A) with a copy of the recruitment announcement (see Appendix B) to the current leaders of organizations and department chairs to ask for their support in recruitment. Recruitment of participants through authority figures promotes participation, particularly when dealing with diverse groups (Alvarez, Vasquez, Mayorga, Feaster & Mitrani, 2008). The investigator asked the leader of the organization or department chair if he/she would share the recruitment announcement with students via email, and offered to meet with the groups to explain the study and answer any

questions. In the recruitment email, potential respondents were asked to respond to the survey one time and were provided with contact information for the investigator should they have questions about the study (Birnbaum, 2004). Additionally, the announcement made clear that participation is anonymous and confidential. In order to help ensure data independence, the survey was set to only allow the participants to respond to the survey once: IP addresses that attempted to respond multiple times were not allowed to access the survey again (Birnbaum, 2004).

Prior to answering survey questions, students were asked to provide their approved IRB informed consent (see Appendix C). Participants provided their informed consent by checking the "Yes" box on the online consent form. Participants did not directly benefit from this research; however, it was thought that the results of this study could contribute to the limited research on hookup behavior and its relationship to attitudes toward marriage. Risks of participating in this research were minimal and unlikely, but included feelings of discomfort when being asked about personal sexual and relational behavior (Greenberg, Bruess, & Oswalt, 2014) and possibly recalling negative past hookup experiences (Eschbaugh & Gute, 2008); however, within the consent form participants were provided a direction to access campus mental health facilities. After checking this box, participants were redirected to the survey, which took around 20 minutes to complete. In the thank you message (Appendix D) at the end of the survey, respondents were asked if they would like to have their name entered in a drawing to win one of twenty possible ten-dollar gift cards to Dunkin Donuts. If respondents chose to enter this drawing, they were asked to send their email address to an email address created by the primary investigator (which was created for the sole purpose of collecting

incentive responses). This process ensured that identifying information was not connected to individual surveys. Respondent contact information was put into a separate file for incentive purposes only, which kept respondent anonymity. Respondents had one month to complete the survey. A reminder to complete the survey was sent to organization leaders and department chairs (see Appendix E) seven days after the initial recruitment letter was sent to ensure the maximum amount of participation possible. Leaders and department chairs were asked to forward the letter onto their students, and survey links were attached to all reminder emails. Crawford, Cooper, and Lamias (2001) found that after survey reminders were sent, there was a rapid increase in participation and a quick decline shortly after, therefore it was important to send at least one reminder to ensure maximum response rates.

When it came time to pick the winners for the ten-dollar Dunkin Donuts gift cards, participant's emails were put in chronological order based on when they entered the drawing, and the random.org's (Random.org, 2015) random number generator chose the twenty winners. A notification was sent to the winners through the email they provided. The ten-dollar gift cards were electronically sent to the respondents' emails using Dunkin Donuts' eGift program (Dunkin Donuts, 2015). Respondents were able to print off their gift card or redeem their ten-dollars from their smart phone. The drawing for the winners of the incentives was conducted after the survey closed to ensure participants had enough time to enter their names in the drawing.

Measures

This survey asked questions about respondents' hookup behavior within the past 12 months, romantic relationship self-efficacy, intent to marry, and demographic

questions (see Appendix F). Most scales used in this survey were decided upon based on previous literature's findings that these scales were reliable and valid. Demographic questions included gender, age, sexual orientation, religion, major, family background, and ethnicity.

Hookup Behavior. The measure for hookup behavior was developed by the researcher based upon a combination of hookup questionnaires used in previous literature. All hookup behavior variables represent answers to single item indicators of various aspects of hookup behavior. Participants were asked the number of times they have hooked up over the past year (Owen et al., 2010). Participants were then asked to identify the specific behaviors (e.g., oral sex, vaginal sex, anal sex) in which they engaged in during their hookups (Lewis, Granato, Blayney, Lostutter, & Kilmer, 2012). Participants were asked information about their hookup partners, such as where they were most likely to find their hookup partners, or if they knew their partners beforehand (Lewis, et al., 2012) as well as their emotional experiences after their hookups. Additional descriptive information about hookup behavior is presented in the results section.

Romantic relationship self-efficacy. Romantic relationship self-efficacy was measured using the Self-Efficacy in Romantic Relationships Scale (Riggio, et al., 2011). This scale aims to measure one's beliefs about his/her capability to be persistent in relationships and be a good partner (Riggio, et al., 2013). This 12-item scale is measured on a 9-point Likert Scale and some items are reverse coded; 1= *strongly disagree*, 5= *neither agree/disagree*, 9= *strongly agree*. Example items include: "Failure in my romantic relationships only makes me want to try harder," When I make plans in my

romantic relationship the first time, I am certain I can make them work." Scores are summed and can range from 12-108; higher scores indicate higher feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy. This scale had high reliability (α=.93) with a mean score of 75.83 (*SD*=22.72), among college attending emerging adults, suggesting an average level of self-efficacy among respondents.

Intent to marry. Intent to marry was measured by asking participants to answer the question "I intend to get married someday" on a 7-point Likert scale (0= *strongly disagree*, 1= *moderately disagree*, 2= *slightly disagree*, 3= *neither disagree or agree*, 4= *slightly agree*, 5= *moderately agree*, and 6= *strongly agree*). This question had a mean score of 5.6 suggesting that participants had strong intentions to marry.

Data Analysis

This study originally sought to investigate a moderating mediation model on how hooking up influences intent to marry as mediated by romantic relationship self-efficacy and moderated by gender. To do this, around 300 respondents would have been necessary to obtain adequate power (.90) according to G*Power. The actual number of respondents was 116, much lower than needed to test the model. Further, 78 respondents (4 males, 74 females) were excluded from the sample due to incomplete responses. The pattern of missing responses was not random. Specifically, respondents answered demographic questions and then skipped to the end of the survey, presumably to only apply for the incentive. The majority of incomplete responders were white non-Hispanic women who identified as heterosexual (see Table 1), similar to actual responders.

This resulted in 38 surveys with complete data that could be analyzed. Due to the low response rate and low power, the study was modified to analyze the individual links

among variables. Stated another way, each of the links in the original model was tested independently for the current study. Frequencies were used to answer research question one. T-tests were used to analyze hypotheses one, four, and seven. Correlations were used to analyze hypotheses two, three, five, six, and eight. For each hypothesis, a p-value of .05 or less was used to indicate statistical significance. Meaningful differences were assessed as well given the possibility of Type II errors related to sample size and power. These differences were assessed through comparison to existing literature as well as discussions between the researcher, thesis chair, and committee members.

CHAPTER 5

Results

General Hookup Behavior

Description of sample general hookup behavior. The research question sought to describe general hookup behavior trends among college attending emerging adults in the 12 months preceding completion of the survey. General hookup behavior was defined as a range of behaviors from kissing to penetrative intercourse (e.g., mutual masturbation, fingering, rubbing, use of sex toys) between two or more partners (of the opposite or same sex) who express no commitment toward each other before or following their sexual encounter. In this sample, 100% of respondents reported engaging in general hookup behavior at least once in the 12 months prior to the survey. Respondents reported engaging in general hookup behavior an average of approximately 8 times (*SD*=9.79), with a median of 6.00 and a range of 1-60 hookups.

Respondents were asked to describe the partners with whom they engaged in general hookups (see Table 2 and Table 3). When respondents were asked to report the number of times they had engaged in general hookup behavior with a partner of the same sex: 50.0% of male respondents and 9.4% of female respondents said they had, compared to 50.0% of male respondents and 90.63% of female respondents who had with a partner of the opposite sex. Approximately, 92% of respondents reported knowing their partner prior to engaging in general hookup behavior (83.3 % of males and 93.75% of females). Six respondents (15.8%) reported engaging exclusively in one-night stands, with someone they did not know previously. Both male and female respondents reported finding partners primarily through mutual friends (63.2%), followed by house parties

(42.1%), residence halls (26.3%), class (28.9%), social media (23.7%), and hookup/dating applications (21.1%). Only one respondent reported hooking up with someone they met through a club/organization.

When asked about the emotional experience of general hookup behavior, 66.7% of males and 87.5% of females reported feeling emotionally satisfied half of the time or less. In addition 83.3% of males and 90.6 % of females reported they felt emotional closeness half of the time or less (see Table 4 and Table 5). Specifically, 66.6% of males and 56.3% of females reported that they occasionally felt emotional closeness to their partner. Thirty-three percent of male respondents and 25.0% of female respondents reported never regretting a hookup, 50.0% of male respondents and 37.5% of female respondents reported occasionally regretting a hookup, and 0.0% of male respondents and 15.6% of female respondents reported regretting a hookup about 50% of the time. Twenty-one percent of respondents reported often or always regretting a general hookup.

Gender differences in general hookup behavior. T-Tests were used to examine mean differences in general hookup behavior between men and women. Consistent with hypothesis one, t-test results indicated a significant mean difference in frequency of general hookup behavior between males and females, $t(38)=-3.38$, $p<.01$. Specifically, men ($M=19.17$, $SD=20.98$) engaged in more hookups than women ($M=6.16$, $SD=3.97$), on average, which is consistent with previous literature (Paul et al., 2000). Importantly, the mean difference was approximately three times higher for men compared to women. Power was low for the sample (.43). Accordingly, these results should be considered with caution due to the possibility of a Type II error. At the same time, the magnitude of

difference in means between men and women suggest a low likelihood of error in spite of the power level.

General hookups, romantic relationship self-efficacy, and intent to marry. Correlations were run to examine the relationship between frequency of general hookup behavior and both romantic relationship self-efficacy and intent to marry. Contrary to hypotheses two and three, frequency of general hookup behavior was not significantly related to feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy or intent to marry (see Table 6) which is contrary to the literature on self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977) or marriage (Sassler, 2010).

Taken together, results on general hookup behavior suggest that this sample of emerging adults prefer to hookup with partners that they already know and that random hookups are less popular. Mutual friends and house parties seem to be the most popular ways to find hookup partners for both men and women. The majority of respondents felt emotional satisfaction and closeness half of the time or less after engaging in general hookup behavior, yet the majority also reported feeling regret half the time or less. This suggests that respondents may avoid emotional intimacy in hookups, consistent with the hookup script literature (Lovejoy, 2015). Overall, men reported significantly more hookups than women, although general hookup behavior was not related to romantic relationship self-efficacy or intent to marry. This suggests that within this sample, general hookup behavior may not be related to these cognitions.

Penetrative Hookup Behavior

Description of sample penetrative hookup behavior. The research question sought to describe penetrative hookup behavior trends among college attending emerging

adults over the span of 12 months prior to the survey. Again, the rationale to examine penetrative only hookup behavior more specifically, as opposed to only in combination with other forms of hookup behavior (as done above), was due to its higher likelihood of being a negative emotional experience as well as a more physically risky one (Owen & Fincham, 2011). Penetrative hookups were defined as sexual behaviors ranging from oral sex to penetrative intercourse between two partners who express no commitment toward each other before or following their sexual encounter. All respondents reported engaging in at least one penetrative hookup behavior over the last 12 months, with an average of 9 (SD=17.43) penetrative hookups, a median of 3 penetrative hookups, and a range of 1-100. On average, respondents engaged in oral sex approximately 5 times (*SD*= 7.76), vaginal sex approximately 5 times (*SD*=8.86), and anal sex approximately 1 time (*SD*=2.81). When asked specifically about penetrative hookups (see Table 2 and Table 3), 83.3% of male respondents and 93.8% of female respondents reported hooking up with individuals of the opposite sex, whereas 50% of male respondents and 6.3% of female respondents reported engaging in at least one penetrative hookup with a partner of the same sex. The majority of male (83.3%) and female (84.38%) respondents reported knowing their partner prior to engaging in a penetrative hookup. Similar to general hookup behavior, six respondents (15.8%) reported only engaging in one-night stands.

Overall, respondents reported finding penetrative hookup partners primarily through mutual friends (73.7%), followed by house parties (39.5%), residence halls (28.9%), class (26.3%), social media (18.4%), and hookup/dating applications (18.4%). Only one respondent reported finding their penetrative hookup partners through clubs/organizations.

When asked about penetrative hookups, 50% of males and 78.1% of females reported feeling emotionally satisfied about 50% of the time or less (see Table 4 and Table 5). Further, the majority of respondents (83.3% of males and 62.5% of females) felt emotional closeness 50% the time or less after engaging in a penetrative hookup. Finally, 100% of male respondents reported regretting a hookup half of the time or less and 81.25% of female respondents reported regretting a hookup half of the time or less. Together, this suggests that the majority of respondents experienced emotional satisfaction or emotional closeness less than half of the time during penetrative; however, only 15.8% of respondents reported often or always regretting penetrative hookups. This further suggests that respondents may understand the hookup script implying that emotions should be absent from penetrative behaviors (Lovejoy, 2015).

Gender differences in penetrative hookup behavior. A t-test was used to measure gender differences in penetrative hookup behavior. Men (M=15.00, SD=17.89) reported engaging in two times the amount of penetrative hookup behavior as women (M=7.47, SD=17.37), $t(38)$=-.97, p >.05, which supported hypothesis four. Although these findings were not significantly different, there appears to be a meaningful difference between male and female penetrative hookup behavior and support from previous literature (Paul et al., 2000). It may be evidence of a Type II error related to low sample size.

Romantic relationship self-efficacy in penetrative hookups. Correlations were used to assess the relationship among frequency of penetrative hookups and both romantic relationship self-efficacy and intent to marry. Frequency of penetrative hookups

was not related to romantic relationship self-efficacy or intent to marry, which did not support hypothesis five or hypothesis six (see Table 6).

Results showed that respondents reported engaging in higher average frequencies of penetrative hookups than general hookups, which suggests that penetrative hookup behavior may be more popular than general hookup behavior (Owen & Fincham, 2011). However, medians for general and penetrative hookup behavior show that general hookups may occur more frequently than penetrative hookups and this discrepancy in findings could be due to response bias. Oral and vaginal sex were the most popular types of penetrative hookup behavior. Similar to general hookups, the majority of respondents engaged in hookups with people they already knew, and the most popular places to find hookup partners was through mutual friends and house parties. Most respondents reported little emotional satisfaction or emotional closeness after engaging in a hookup, yet many also reported little regret after a hookup. Men reported engaging in penetrative hookups two times more often than women, however penetrative hookup behavior was not related to feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy or intent to marry. Taken together, hookup behavior reported in this sample may not influence feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy and intent to marry, however it is clearly still a gendered experience.

Hookups, Romantic Relationship Self-efficacy, and Intent to Marry

Somewhat consistent with hypothesis seven, women (M=76.66, SD=23.36) reported higher feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy than men (M=67.00, SD=19.46), although it was not a statistically significant finding, $t(38)=.95$, $p>.05$. Again, this may be evidence of a Type II error. Further, romantic relationship self-efficacy was

positively related to intent to marry (r=.49, p<.01), which supports hypothesis eight and is consistent with previous literature (Riggio, et al., 2011; 2013). This indicates that as feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy increased so did intentions to marry in future relationships. Power for these findings were low (.60), therefore gender differences within the correlations were not investigated (Riggio et al., 2013).

CHAPTER 6

Discussion

The current study sought to describe hookup behavior and to investigate how hooking up among college students aged 18 to 22 is related to feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy and intentions to marry. Gender differences were also examined. Each research question and hypothesis tested was grounded in the extant literature, cognitive behavioral (Hupp, et al., 2008), and feminist theories (Osmond & Thorne, 2004) highlighting the connections between behaviors and thoughts, and how each are gendered experiences (Bandura, 1977; Hupp et al., 2008; Osmond & Thorne, 2004). The initial research question investigated general frequency information related to different hookup behaviors as well as locations where hookup partners were found. The study hoped to resolve some of the discrepancies among scholars on how hookups should be defined in research (e.g., Bogle, 2008; Owen et al., 2010; Manthos et al., 2014).

Overall, respondents reported engaging in both penetrative and general hookup behavior, although there appear to be discrepancies in the results as to which behavior was engaged in more frequently. Consistent with previous literature (Fielder and Carey, 2010), respondents reported higher median frequencies of general hookups than median frequencies of penetrative hookups. However, when looking at the average frequencies, respondents appear to report a higher average frequency of penetrative hookup behavior to general hookup behavior. This suggests the possibility of response bias (Furnham, 1986). Alternatively, feminist theory suggests that high frequencies of penetrative hookup behavior could be due to the patriarchal control of the hookup culture, since penetrative hookup behavior seems to benefit males more than females (Currier, 2013).

Further, respondents reported preferring to engage in hookups with partners they knew, rather than with strangers. Past research (Paul et al., 2000) assumed that hookups occur solely with strangers or brief acquaintances, which did not seem to be the case in this study. Future definitions must account for the different types of partners individuals may hookup with to fully understand how different types of hookups may have different relationship development implications. Finally, most respondents reported following the hookup script in which emotional intimacy, such as satisfaction and closeness, was not felt after engaging in hookup behaviors. Those who did feel emotional satisfaction and emotional closeness after a hookup may be at risk for emotional let down due to the lack of emotional commitment that accompanies hookups. The individuals who reported feeling regret after engaging in a hookup may also be at risk for mental health implications (Sandberg-Thoma & Dush, 2014).

The results supported the first hypothesis in that men engaged in statistically more general hookup behavior than women (Paul et al., 2000). Yet, hypothesis two and three were not supported because general hookup behavior was not related to feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy or intent to marry. This suggests that general hookup behavior may not influence feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy and intent to marry in this sample, even though they are popular relationship alternatives in college (Helm et al., 2015), although the limited power of this study may have masked a possible relationship. One way to explain this finding may be that hookup behavior is so normalized among college attending emerging adults that it has little impact on perceptions of future relationship abilities as well as intentions regarding marriage. It is possible that the relationships individuals engage in after they graduate college are more

influential on feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy and intention to marry (Bogle, 2008). In that sense, hookup behavior may be viewed as a normal aspect of sexuality development and not as actual relationships (Bogle, 2008).

Hypothesis four was partially supported in that men reported engaging in two times the amount of penetrative hookup behavior as women, although this was not statistically significant (likely due to low power and low sample size). Meaningful verses statistically significant differences are discussed later in this section. We did not find support for hypothesis five and six because, similar to general hookup behavior, penetrative hookup behavior was not related to feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy or intent to marry. Again, young adults may believe that hookups are a normal part of college and do not view them as relationships that will influence their future. Women reported higher feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy than males, although these findings were not significant. This suggests that with more responses, hypothesis seven may have been supported. Finally, romantic relationship self-efficacy was positively related to intent to marry, which supports hypothesis eight. This finding provides practitioners with possible insight into the cognitive processes that occur throughout relationship formation. These findings are discussed in more detail below. Implications and future research are discussed later in this section as well.

Taken together, results suggest that both general and penetrative hookup behavior may not be as influential on future romantic relationships as predicted. Perhaps hookup behavior has become so normalized on college campuses that its influence on individual feelings of self-efficacy and intent to marry may be minimal, which is consistent with cognitive behavioral theory (Hupp et al., 2008). According to cognitive behavioral

theory, behaviors influence cognitions (Hupp et al., 2008); if hookup behavior is seen as normal, risk-free, sexual encounter (rather than a romantic relationship) it may have little impact on cognitions of romantic relationship self-efficacy or intent to marry. Respondents' felt little emotional satisfaction or closeness, yet also felt little regret after engaging in hookups, which suggests that men and women have learned to follow the hookup script. This suggests that respondents understand hookups for what they are, non-committed sexual relationships (Owen et al., 2011). Perhaps they are not putting as much emotional energy into hookups, which according to cognitive behavior theory would have little impact on romantic relationship self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). Consistent with previous literature, results showed that hookups are still gendered experiences (Paul et al., 2000) but perhaps these gender discrepancies have also become socially normalized. Feminist theory suggests that gender bias occurs on a sociocultural level and that individuals are socialized to understand these biases (Osmond & Thorne, 2004). Importantly, these results must be considered with caution due to the low sample size and low power of this study. Ultimately, some conclusions drawn based on the results are speculative and must be investigated further in future research.

Frequency of Hookup Behavior

There are inconsistencies in these results regarding frequency of general and penetrative hookup behavior. When measuring the averages, it appears that respondents engaged in slightly higher frequencies of penetrative hookup behavior (approximately 9 instances over 12 months) than general hookup behavior (approximately 8 instances over 12 months), which is different from Paul and colleagues' (2000) findings that on average respondents reported around 11 hookups over their entire college careers. Although the

numbers found in the current study are similar to the numbers reported in Paul et al.'s (2000) study, our findings were measured over 12 months rather than four years. Perhaps hookups are viewed as less risky and more normalized among recent undergraduate cohorts, ultimately leading to increased hookup behavior in recent years (Bogle, 2008). Alternatively, when using the medians to measure frequencies, respondents reported engaging in 6 general hookups over 12 months and 3 penetrative hookups over 12 months. It makes more sense that individuals would engage in general hookups more than penetrative hookups due to how they were defined.

In the current study, oral sex, vaginal sex, and anal sex were all reported within the context of a hookup, which is consistent with England's (2013) research on hookup behavior trends. She found that 30-40% of hookups lead to penetrative hookup behavior, whereas only 25-33% of hookups involved general hookup behavior such as making out and touching, with no genital contact. However these findings are inconsistent with Fielder and Carey's (2010) research, which found that the majority of respondent hookups involved general hookup behaviors (such as making out, touching of breasts, genital touching outside of clothes, and genital touching inside of clothes) and only 27% of hookups included oral sex or penetrative intercourse. Discrepancies in these research findings illustrates how inconsistent hookup behavior literature is, and emphasizes the importance of using explicit and consistent definitions of a hookup. Inconsistent findings not only make it challenging to compare findings across studies, but also dilute the literature's ability to explain the exact mechanisms to which hookups influence overall cognitions and mental health.

We speculate that the prevalence of penetrative hookup behavior may suggest that young adults believe they are "expected" to engage in penetrative sexual behaviors when hooking up. This may be due to the assumption that certain behaviors occur within hookups and possibly due to the patriarchal control of the hookup culture (Bogle, 2008; England, 2013). Men often benefit both cognitively and physically from penetrative hookup behavior and see penetrative sex as a goal when engaging in hookups (Currier, 2013; Owen & Fincham, 2011) whereas women may not (Currier, 2013; Owen & Fincham, 2011).

Due to the male-control within the hookup culture, this may influence women to conform to these behaviors (Kenney, Thadani, Ghaidarov, & LaBrie, 2013), which is in agreement with theoretical claims posed by feminist theory (Osmond & Thorne, 2004). For example, previous research found that in heterosexual hookups, women are often expected to perform oral sex on their male partner with no expectation of receiving oral sex (Currier, 2013). Further, there is a general understanding that penetrative hookups are often "complete" when the male climaxes even if the female does not (Currier, 2013). Power dynamics such as this further perpetuate patriarchal control within hookups (Currier, 2013). Ultimately, even if women are not aware of it, hookups are tailored to male needs, which may be the reason that penetrative hookups occurred more frequently than general hookups. Again, much of this is speculative. However, there is literature and theory to suggest the speculation may be viable to the extent that it represents importation directions for future studies to examine.

Hookup Partners

Both men and women found their partners through mutual friends, and house parties, which is similar to findings in previous research (Armstrong et al., 2012; Fielder & Carey, 2010). Additionally, the majority of respondents reported hooking up with partners they already knew, which suggests that emerging adults may prefer to hookup with partners with whom they already have some type of relationship (Armstrong et al., 2012; England, 2013; Fielder & Carey, 2010) rather than random individuals. Previous literature (Paul, et al., 2000) put an emphasis on how hookups are non-committal, which implied that hookups might be more likely among strangers or very casual acquaintances (Fielder & Carey, 2010). Yet, both men and women reported engaging in hookups with mutual friends and individuals they meet at parties (whom they are likely to have some form of background information), which suggests that emerging adults may find certain levels of comfort when they engage in hookups with individuals they already know (Fielder & Carey, 2010). Definitions used in scholarly hookup literature must encompass hookups between friends and acquaintances because they seem to be some of the most popular types of hookups (Fielder & Carey, 2010; Furman & Shaffer, 2011). Exclusion of partner types in definitions, such as friends who hookup with friends, would be a detriment to future literature and theoretical development due to its disregard for a large portion of hookups.

Furman and Shaffer (2011) studied the relationship between sexual behavior and different types of partners. They found that the frequency and type of sexual behavior differed depending on the individual's partners (e.g. women were more likely to engage in light genital touching with a friend than with a "friend with benefits" and men were

more likely to do so with a causal acquaintance compared to a friend or "friend with benefits."). Further, Brown and Vanable (2007) found that partner type also influenced if the individual engaged in risky-sexual behavior. When respondents reported consuming alcohol prior to a hookup (with an uncommitted partner) they were less likely to partake in safe-sex practices. Perhaps the reason emerging adults prefer to engage in hookups with individuals they know is due to their misconceptions that engaging in sexual behavior is safer if it is with someone they know. It is important to note that preference for hooking up with an individual that one already knows could create a sexual assault risk; communication of consent may be blurred due to the assumed behavior that is "supposed" to occur within a hookup and an assumed comfort (Fielder and Carey, 2010; Reiber & Garcia, 2010). This blurred consent line, due to misunderstandings about the types of hookup behavior each partner is comfortable with, may ultimately lead to unwanted sexual behavior (i.e. sexual assault; Reiber & Garcia, 2010). Further, individuals who know their partner may assume that protection from sexually transmitted infections and unintended pregnancy is not needed. This is particularly true of oral sex during a hookup. These assumptions ultimately lead to unsafe sex practices (Cooper, 2002; Fielder & Carey, 2010). Cognitive behavioral theory explains that if an individual experiences sexual assault, contracts an STI, or unintentionally gets pregnant, that could have serious implications on their cognitive health.

Further, it is interesting to note that despite the prevalence of social media and dating applications, made specifically to find hookup partners (Bersamin, et al., 2014), college attending emerging adults prefer to find their hookup partners through friends. Hookup applications, online hookup websites, and hookups with strangers may leave the

individual vulnerable to the unknown dangers of the Internet (i.e. false identities and inaccurate information) and dangers of engaging in sexual behavior with a stranger. These fears could also be an influence on why emerging adults choose to engage in hookups with people they already know and that they meet in person. Although much of this is speculative, theory and previous literature provide support for these ideas and prompt questions to be explored in future research.

Emotional Experiences

Half of the time or less, the majority of respondents reported feeling emotionally satisfied and emotional closeness after engaging in general hookup behavior, including penetrative hookup behavior. The majority of both men and women reported that they occasionally felt emotional closeness and emotional satisfaction after they engaged in a hookup, yet did not regret engaging in hookups. Feeling emotional closeness and emotional satisfaction is outside of the hookup script: hookups are supposed to be non-committal physical relationships with no expectation of a future relationship (Fielder et al., 2014; Owen et al., 2010). The lack of emotional satisfaction and emotional closeness that respondents reported the majority of the time suggests that they are following this hookup script. Interestingly, 0% of men reported occasionally or always regretting a penetrative hookup whereas 19% of women reported occasionally or always regretting a penetrative hookup. We speculate that gender may be a factor in emotional experiences and should be examined in future research. Yet, the minimal amounts of regret reported overall, suggest that the majority of men and women were content with their hookup experiences and that their hookup experiences were intentional and informed. This is contrary to the literature on alcohol and hookups, which poses that alcohol may be a

factor in why individuals engage in hookups which may lead to feelings of regret due to clouded judgment (Garcia, et al., 2012; Manthos et al., 2014).

Yet, there were still a small percentage of respondents, both male and female, that reported experiencing emotional satisfaction and emotional closeness often or always. Perhaps the hormones produced during sexual behavior create a feeling of emotional closeness even in the context of a hookup (Basson, 2005). Or, perhaps these emotional feelings are due to the limited opportunities for serious romantic relationships in college settings (Bogle, 2008; Lovejoy, 2015). Due to the male-dominance of college relationship landscapes (Bogle, 2008) and male preference for hookups, women's only options are to engage in hookups if they are looking for physical or emotional intimacy (Bogle, 2008). Most women seek romantic relationships (Bradshaw, et al., 2010), and may mistake hookup behavior as more committed than it is intended to be. The emotional energy that students put into hookups, may lead to unrequited feelings and emotional let down because hookups are understood to be non-committal (Lovejoy, 2015). When students start acting outside of the hookup script, miscommunication often occurs with what exactly the hookup relationship is.

It is important for research to take stock of the different types of hookup behavior emerging adults are engaging in to understand how they may be related to emerging adult cognitions and mental health. Previous research has found that different types of sexual behavior may influence certain emotions and cognitions that young adults experience (Sandberg-Thoma & Dush, 2014) and we must continue to investigate these relationships. Further, understanding different aspects of sexuality, such as how

individuals identify themselves and the type of behavior they engage in may provide a more holistic understanding of sexuality formation.

Gender Differences in Hookup Behavior

As predicted, men engaged in more general hookup behavior than women; which may be indicative of trends created by the sexual double standard (Kreager & Staff, 2009). Within our society, women are discouraged to engage in casual hookup relationships with multiple partners, yet men are praised for it (Currier, 2013; Kreager & Staff, 2009). Further, on average, men reported engaging in penetrative hookups two times more often than women, which also reflect the ideals of the sexual double standard. Findings such as these show that social ideas regarding sexuality may actually influence individual behavior. If a woman chooses to engage in hookup behavior with multiple partners, because it is a popular alternative to a relationship (Bogle, 2008; Lovejoy, 2015), the social stigma that follows the behavior may lead to negative mental health consequences. Mental health professionals must be aware of the impact that social norms have on individual sexuality and mental health outcomes.

Hookup Behavior and Self-Efficacy

Importantly, results indicated that general and penetrative hookup behavior might not be related to attitudes toward self-efficacy or intent to marry. This did not support our hypotheses on the relationship between frequency of hookup behavior and romantic relationship self-efficacy or intent to marry (i.e. no significant relationship was found among general hookup behavior or penetrative hookup behavior and feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy, intent to marry.) These findings are similar to Manning, Longmore, and Giordano (2007) who found no relationship between sexual behavior and

marital expectations (e.g. marriage is still the most popular relationship expectation; Lichter et al., 2004). Cognitive behavioral theory (Hupp et al., 2008) and research also suggests that previous relationship behavior influence feelings of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977), which is ultimately why it was hypothesized that hookup behavior would influence feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy. Since hookup behavior is a popular alternative to college romantic relationships (Helm, et al., 2015), it was thought that it could influence feelings about romantic relationships self-efficacy. Perhaps due to the culture and high visibility of sexuality in the United States, the current generation of emerging adults now view hookup behavior in college as so typical and routine that it ultimately does not impact beliefs about their future relationships. College students understand the behavior to be non-committal and typical, therefore they may no longer view it as risky. Consistent with cognitive behavioral theory, if the behavior is seen as typical, it may not influence cognitions (Hupp et al., 2008). Further, Bogle (2008) suggests that after emerging adults graduate from college they shift back into formal dating rituals. Engaging in formal dating behaviors so shortly after college hookups may in turn negate any threats to self-efficacy that occurred while in college. Further, since it is understood that emerging adults will engage in formal dating relationships after college, they may not perceive their hookup experiences as bad relationships. Therefore, they still intend to marry in the future despite engaging in hookup behavior in college. It is important to note that the small sample size and low power makes it challenging to draw definitive conclusions here. These findings cannot be generalized outside of this sample.

Gender Differences in Self-Efficacy

Finally, women had higher feelings of romantic relationships self-efficacy compared to men, although mean differences were not statistically significant (implications of this are discussed later). Since hookup behavior was not related to romantic relationship self-efficacy, it is possible that women naturally have higher feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy. During this age (i.e., in college), women seek emotional closeness and committed romantic relationships more so than men (Bogle, 2008; Bradshaw, Kahn, Saville, 2010). This desire to be in committed relationships during their time in college, may ultimately lead to higher levels of romantic relationship self-efficacy. Cognitive behavioral theory emphasizes the importance of individual cognitions on behavior, attitudes, and emotions (Hupp et al., 2008). If women have positive ideas about serious romantic relationships, they may be more likely to believe that they would be good at them. Further, the sexual double standard reinforces men to engage in hookups and stay out of serious committed relationships due to the praise they receive from hookup behavior. This social expectation of men may ultimately lower their feelings about their abilities to be in romantic relationships (i.e. lowered romantic relationship self-efficacy). It is important to note that these results were not statistically significant, likely due to the small sample size, although they appear to be meaningfully different. The differences between men and women's romantic relationship self-efficacy mean scores were large enough to suggest statistical differences would have been found had there been a larger sample size and larger power.

Romantic Relationship Self-Efficacy and Intent to Marry

Romantic relationship self-efficacy was positively related to intent to marry. This finding reveals how high romantic relationship self-efficacy may be an indicator for attitudes toward future romantic relationships and feelings toward intimacy in future relationships, specifically toward individual intent to marry (Riggio et al., 2011; 2013). Riggio and colleagues (2013) found that romantic relationship self-efficacy can predict relationship anxiety, expectations of relationship success, relationship satisfaction, relationship commitment, and ability to cope with intimacy. Higher romantic relationship self-efficacy scores revealed more intent for serious romantic relationships, which in this case could be seen as intent to marry. If individuals have stronger feelings about their abilities to be a romantic relationship partner, then perhaps they are more willing to enter into long term committed relationships such as marriage. These finding could be beneficial for marriage counselors, family counselors, and education programs in that they provide a pathway to understand and improve upon individual cognitions within the context of relationships. Looking into cognitions such as feelings of self-efficacy could create alternative models to understand relationship processes.

Limitations

Results of this study must be considered with caution because of low sample size that led to low power, as well as the highly unequal amount of female and male respondents. Due to the low power of this study, results are likely to contain Type II errors meaning that it is possible that there are more relationships among these variables that we were unable to statistically detect (Field, 2013). For example, men engaged in two times the average number of penetrative hookups, however it was not statistically

significant. This large mean discrepancy between men and women would likely be statistically different if the sample was larger, as found in prior research (Paul et al., 2000). Further there is the likelihood of response bias due to the discrepancies among the mean and median scores of general and penetrative hookups. Inflated mean scores could be due to social pressures to report high numbers of hookups (Furnham, 1986).

The response rates to this survey were surprisingly low, even though the survey topic addressed sexuality (Mustanski, 2001), used an online format (van Eeden-Moorefield, et al., 2006), offered incentives (Yancey, et al., 2006), and sent reminder messages (Crawford et al., 2001), all of which have been shown to elicit a high response rate. According to research conducted by Berry and Bass (2012), undergraduate emerging adults may be in a developmental stage that hinders their desire to engage in research on personal matters, such as sexuality. Therefore, it is possible that participants were uncomfortable reflecting upon their sexual behavior and sexuality, ultimately leading to a low overall response rate. Further, due to this developmental stage, respondents primary motive for taking the survey may have been to gain the incentive (rather than to further the literature), which may explain why they chose to skip such a large portion of the survey (Arnett, 2007).

Most participants who took the current survey either partially completed the survey or answered demographic questions and then skipped to the end of the survey where they were able to submit their incomplete responses and enter the raffle to win incentives. Situations such as this bring up the ethical consideration of forced survey responses. Forced response designs mandate that participants answer a question before moving on to the next one (Stieger, Reips, & Voracek, 2007). Using forced responses in

online surveys often leads to more complete data sets (Stieger, et al., 2007), yet may also lead to higher dropout rates (Stieger et al., 2007). In situations similar to the current study, incomplete data sets may actually be a hindrance to the quality of the research. Yet, forced response may influence a participant to answer a question in an inaccurate way (Stieger et al., 2007), particularly when dealing with a study population of college attending emerging adults. Emerging adults are at a stage in their life where they are self-focused and look to engage in behaviors that benefit their personal development (Arnett, 2007). In this case, the survey incentive would benefit their economic development. However, they may not feel the urgency to put forth the effort to answer the survey questions if it is not required. If surveys were to employ forced response questions, emerging adults may weigh out if the incentive is worth answering the questions. If they find that the incentive is worth the questions they may answer the forced response questions, however there is no guarantee they are answering them truthfully. This concern needs to be examined more closely. In addition, an important consideration when studying hookup behavior is the ethics of forcing a participant to answer questions about their sexual behavior. Future research should examine the research and ethical implications on forced response question use in online surveys in a way that allows a larger debate to occur in the academy. As the use of online surveys continues to rise, better ethics and data quality information is needed.

Implications

Insight into hookup behavior among men and women and how it influences individual feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy and intent to marry provides interesting potential implications to programming on college campuses and some

practical application within the mental health field. Programming and practice need to focus on how hookup behavior may impact college students both physically and cognitively (i.e. STI transmission, unintended pregnancy, risk for sexual assault, and negative mental health outcomes). Programming on college campuses provides *real time* information to college students about the risks of casual hookup relationships and helps them to understand how hooking up may impact them. This type of practical application could be seen as a prevention strategy for negative implications that may stem from hookups. Mental health counseling (i.e. practice) could be used more as an intervention strategy and would be utilized after an individual was experiencing mental health issues.

Hookup programming on college campuses. Hookup programming on college campuses has the unique ability to reach out easily to the population that actually engages in the type of behavior. It is vital that college programs provide accurate information on the types of behaviors that occur in the context of a hookup, frequencies of these behaviors, and possible emotional outcomes that may result from a hookup (i.e. unreciprocated emotional feelings and regret; Lovejoy, 2015), including discussions of issues of consent and sexual assault. If college students are informed of the risks (both physically and mentally) that result from hookup behavior and common social trends (such as the sexual double standard) that occur within a hookup, they have the ability to make an informed decision about whether they want to engage in hookup behavior or not. Currently, the definition of a hookup is ambiguous to scholars and individuals engaging in them alike. The absence of a concrete definition of a hookup may be purposeful among college students. If two college students "hooked up" there is a range of sexual behaviors they could have engaged in; it provides a sense of privacy regarding the exact sexual acts

that occurred, while still allowing individuals to share that they engaged in a sexual encounter with a partner (Kalish & Kimmel, 2011). Further, the vagueness of a hookup may protect the woman's reputation while still allowing men to benefit from the positive social status they gain from hooking up (Kalish & Kimmel, 2011). However, this vagueness may lead to misleading information on what exactly a hookup is and who is engaging in them. Programming must clarify these myths.

The burgeoning use of technology in daily lives could be used as an information pathway to college students and as a resource for hookup program efforts. Many universities have a daily campus email regarding current events happening on their respective campuses. Perhaps email systems such as these could be used to spread awareness about hookup behavior on college campuses as well as provide useful tool for college students to access mental health resources. Further, since results show that college students prefer to hookup with individuals they already know, perhaps university wide dating applications would safely provide college students with this outlet and reduce the risks of Internet dating. Within these dating apps, users could notify friends as to who they are going home with (provides a sense of the "buddy system") with an emergency feature if either of the partners needed help.

Practical Application in Counseling Settings. Not only do mental health professionals need to consider the implications that are related to hookup behavior (such as regret), but also family and marriage counselors must be aware of the importance of romantic relationship self-efficacy to an individual's intent to marry. Cognitive behavioral therapy is popular among mental health practitioners and is used to modify behavior through changing "faulty" cognitions (Drossel, Rummel, & Fisher, 2006).

Romantic relationship self-efficacy is an individual cognition; if an individual has low romantic relationship self-efficacy, they may avoid serious romantic relationships due to their belief that they are not good romantic relationship partners. Marriage and family clinicians should be aware of self-efficacy's relationship to intent to marry. If an individual has low romantic-relationship self-efficacy, a practitioner can work on changing this belief, ultimately changing the patient's behaviors and intentions toward marriage. This provides a pathway to understand the cognitions of individuals who want to get married. Marriage and family counselors can utilize strategies to enhance feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy for those who feel that they want to get married, but may not be worthy.

Future Research

Future research should investigate how all of these variables work together as a process unfolding overtime (i.e. how hookup behavior is related to attitudes toward future romantic relationships as mediated by romantic relationship self-efficacy and moderated by gender). This research could emphasize the importance of self-efficacy when attempting to engage in romantic relationships and would inform scholars and marriage practitioners. Due to the hookup culture's popularity among college attending emerging adults, future research needs to accentuate the impact these casual relationships have on long-term relationship trends in our society.

Further, future research should investigate same-sex hookups among college attending emerging adults and its impact on identity formation as well as implications to romantic relationship self-efficacy. Currently, research on this type of hookup is almost non-existent. In addition, future research must include more diverse samples to

understand how results differ for areas of diversity other than gender. Past research on the hookup culture literature uses predominantly white samples, which excludes a large population of college attending emerging adults. Larger samples over multiple campuses would be beneficial to future research to get a broader understanding of hooking up across college campuses. Further, it would be interesting for future studies to investigate differences among college young adults who choose to engage in relationships versus college youth who engage in hookups. Similarly, it would be interesting to investigate individuals who choose to hookup outside of college contexts.

Conclusion

Hookup behavior is currently a popular relationship alternative among college attending emerging adults (Helm et al., 2015). Therefore it is important that research take stock of influences that hookup behavior has on individual cognitions about abilities to be romantic relationship partners and how those may influence future relationships. This study found no relationship among hookup behavior and individual perceptions of romantic relationship self-efficacy or intent to marry.) The low power and sample size of this study elicits the possibility of a Type II error. Yet, research also suggests that emerging adults view hookups as a "normal" aspect of college, and intend to pursue serious romantic relationships after they have graduated (Bogle, 2008). It is possible that hookup behavior has become so normalized on campuses that it does not elicit impacts on feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy or intent to marry. Further, for those who postpone marriage, perhaps relationships after college negate the threats to self-efficacy and intent to marry that occur from hookup behavior.

Importantly, romantic relationship self-efficacy provides insight into the cognitive aspects of romantic relationships. It is important to understand how hookup behavior influences romantic relationship self-efficacy because it is evident that self-efficacy is related to intent to marry and possibly other future romantic relationship types. Perhaps the shift in relationship trends in the United States is due to delayed feelings of romantic relationship self-efficacy. Clearly, shifts in US relationship trends (Wang & Parker, 2015) are influenced by numerous factors; hookups and self-efficacy are two factors that should be explored more in-depth (Bogle, 2008; Riggio, et al., 2013; Weiser & Weigel, 2016).

References

Allison, R., & Risman, B. J. (2013). A double standard for "hooking up": How far have we come toward gender equality? *Social Science Research, 42,* 1191-1206. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2013.04.006

Alvarez, R. A., Vasquez, E., Mayorga, C. C., Feaster, D. J., & Mitrani, V. B. (2006). Increasing minority research participation through community organization research. Western Journal of Nursing Research, 28, 561-563. doi: 10.1177/0193945906287215

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55*, 469-480. doi: 10.1037//0003-066X.55.5.469

Arnett, J. J. (2007). Suffering, selfish, slackers? Myths and reality about emerging adults. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 36*, 23-39. doi: 10.1007/s10964-006-9157-z

Bachtel, M. K. (2013). Do hookups hurt? Exploring college students' experiences and perceptions. *Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health, 58,* 41-48. doi: 10.1111/j.1542-2011.2012.00266.x.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215.

Basson, R. (2005). Women's sexual dysfunction: Revised and expanded definitions. *Canadian Medical Association Journal, 172*, 1327-1333. doi:10.1503/cmaj.1020174

Berry, D. M., & Bass, C. P. (2012). Successfully recruiting, surveying, and retaining college students: A description of methods for the risk, religiosity, and emerging adulthood study. *Research in Nursing & Health, 35,* 659-670. doi: 10.1002/nur.21498

Bersamin, M. M., Zamboanga, B. L., Schwartz, S. J., Donnellan, M. B., Hudson, M., Weisskirch, R. S., … & Caraway, S. J. (2014). Risky business: Is there an association between casual sex and mental health among emerging adults? *Journal of Sex Research, 51*, 43-51. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2013.772088.

Birnbaum, M. H. (2004). Human research and data collection via the internet. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55,* 803-832. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141601

Bogle, K. (2008). *Hooking up: Sex, dating, and relationships on campus.* New York, NY: NYU Press.

Bradshaw, C., Kahn, A. S., & Saville, B. K. (2010). To hook up or date: Which gender benefits? *Sex Roles, 62,* 661-669. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9765-7

Braithwaite, S. R., Delevi, R., & Fincham, F. D. (2010). Romantic relationships and the physical and mental health of college students. *Personal Relationships, 17,* 1-12. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.2010.01248.x

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2015). *College health and safety*. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/family/college/.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2015). *Sexually transmitted diseases (STDs).* Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/std/.

Cherlin, A. (2010). Demographic trends in the United States: A review of research in the 2000s. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72*, 403-419. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00710.x

Claxton, S. E., & van Dulmen, M. H. M. (2013). Casual sexual relationships and experiences in emerging adulthood. *Emerging Adulthood, 1*, 138-150. doi: 10.1177/2167696813487181

Cohn, D., Passel, J. S., Wang, W., & Livingston, G. (2010). Barely half of U.S. adults are married- A record low. *Pew Research Center: Social and Demographic Trends.* Retrieved from http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2011/12/14/barely-half-of-u-s-adults-are-married-a-record-low/?src=prc-headline.

Cooper, M. L. (2002). Alcohol use and risky sexual behavior among college students and youth: Evaluating the evidence. *Journal of Studies of Alcohol, 14*, 101-117.

Copen, C. E., Daniels, K., & Mosher, W. D. (2013). First premarital cohabitation in the United States: 2006-2010 national survey of family growth. *National Health Statistics Report, 64,* 1-15.

Couper, M. P. (2000). Web surveys: A review of issues and approaches. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 64*, 464-494. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3078739

Crawford, S. D., Couper, M. P., & Lamias, M. J. (2001). Web Surveys: Perception of burden. *Social Science Computer Review, 19,* 146-162. doi: 10.1177/089443930101900202

Crosbie-Burnett, M., & Lewis, E. A. (2004). Theoretical contributions from social and cognitive behavioral psychology. In P. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A*

contextual approach (pp. 531-559). New York, NY: Springer Science + Business Media.

Currier, D. M. (2013). Strategic ambiguity: Protecting emphasized femininity and hegemonic masculinity in the hookup culture. *Gender & Society, 27*, 704-727. doi: 10.1177/0891243213493960

Descunter, C. J., & Thelen, M. (1991). Development and validation of a fear-of-intimacy scale. *Psychological Assessment, 3,* 218-225.

Downing-Matibag, T. M., & Geisinger, B. (2009). Hooking up and sexual risk taking among college students: A health belief model perspective. *Qualitative Health Research, 19*, 1196-1209. doi: 10.1177/1049732309344206

Dunkin Donuts [incentive tool]. Retrieved from https://www.dunkindonuts.com/dunkindonuts/en/ddcard/buyacard.html .

Emerson, R.W. (2015). Convenience sampling, random sampling, and snowball sampling: How does sampling affect the validity of research. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 109*(2), 164.

England, P. (2013). Understanding Hookup Culture: What's really happening on college campuses [video lecture]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L3Q2L7YQ2Hk.

England, P., Shafer, E. F., & Fogarty, A. C. K. (2007). Hooking up and forming romantic relationships on today's college campuses. In M. S. Kimmel, & A. Aronson (Eds.), *The gendered society reader (*pp. 531–47). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Epstein, M., Calzo, J. P., Smiler, A. P., & Ward, L. M. (2009). "Anything from making out to having sex": Men's negotiations of hooking up and friends with benefits scripts. *Journal of Sex Research, 46*, 414-424. doi: 10.1080/00224490902775801

Eschbaugh E. M., & Gute, G. (2008). Hookups and sexual regret among college women. *Journal of Social Psychological, 148*, 77-90. doi: 10.3200/SOCP.148.1.77-90.

Fernandez-Villarde, J., Greenwood, J., & Guner, N. (2010). From shame to game in one hundred years: An economic model of the rise in premarital sex and its de-stigmatization. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 12*(1), 25-61.

Field, A. (2012). Everything you never wanted to know about statistics. In M. Carmichael (Eds.), *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (pp. 40-88). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Fielder, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2010). Predictors and consequences of sexual "hookups" among college students: A short-term prospective study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 39*, 1105-1119. doi: 10.1007/s10508-008-9448-4

Fielder, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2010). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual hookups among first-semester female college students. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 36*, 346-359. doi: 10.1080/0092623X.2010.488118

Fielder, R. L., Carey, K. B., & Carey, M. P. (2013). Are hookups replacing romantic relationships? A longitudinal study of first-year female college students. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 52*, 657-659. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.09.001.

Fielder, R. L., Walsh, J. L., Carey, K. B., & Carey, M. P. (2014). Sexual hookups and adverse health outcomes: A longitudinal study of first-year college women. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*, 131-144. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2013.848255

French, M. T., Popovici, I., Robins, P. K., & Homer, J. F. (2014). Personal traits, cohabitation, and marriage. *Social Science Research, 45*, 184-189. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.01.002

Furman, W., & Shaffer, L. (2011). Romantic partners, friends, friends with benefits, and casual acquaintances as sexual partners. *Journal of Sex Research, 48*, 554-564. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2010.535623

Furnham, A. (1986). Response bias, social desirability and dissimulation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 7*, 385-400. doi: 10.1016/0191-8869(86)90014-0

Garcia, J. R., Reiber, C., Massey, S. G., & Merriwether, A. M. (2012). Sexual hookup culture: A review. *Review of General Psychology, 16*(2), 161- 176. doi: 10.1037/a0027911

Gilmartin, S. K. (2006). Changes in college women's attitudes toward sexual intimacy. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 16*, 429-454. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2006.00501.x

Gosling, S. D., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., John, O. P. (2004). Should we trust web-based studies? A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about internet questionnaires. *American Psychologist, 59*(2), 93-104. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.93

Greenberg, J. S., Bruess, C. E., & Oswalt, S. B. (2014). Sexuality research. In Jones & Bartlett (Eds.), *Exploring the dimensions of human sexuality* (pp. 30-67). Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett.

Hamilton, L., & Armstrong, E. A. (2009). Gendered sexuality in adulthood: Double binds and flawed options. *Gender & Society, 23*, 589-616. doi: 10.1177/0891243209345829

Helm, H. W., Gondra, S. D., & McBride, D. C. (2015). Hook-up culture among college students: A comparison of attitudes toward hooking-up based on ethnicity and gender. *North American Journal of Psychology, 17*, 221-232.

Herbernick, D., Reece, M., Schick, V., Sanders, S. A., Dodge, B., & Fortenberry, J. D. (2010). Sexual behavior in the United States: Results from a national probability sample of men and women ages 14-94. *Journal of Sexual Medicine, 5,* 255-265. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-6109.2010.02012.x.

Hudson, P. L., Zordan, R., Trauer, T. (2011). Research priorities associated with family caregivers in palliative care: International perspectives. *Journal of Palliative Medicine, 14*(4), 397-401. doi:10.1089/jpm.2010.0345

Hupp, S. D. A., Reitman, D., & Jewell, J. D. (2008). Cognitive behavioral theory. In M. Hersen & A.M. Gross (Eds.), *Handbook of clinical psychology* volume *2* (pp. 263-287). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kalish, R., & Kimmel, M. (2011). Hooking up: Hot hetero sex or the new numb normative? *Australian Feminist Studies, 26*(67), 138-151. doi: 10.1080/08164649.2011.546333

Kavanaugh, D. J., & Bower, G. H. (1985). Mood and self-efficacy: Impact of joy and sadness on perceived capabilities. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 9*, 507-525.

Kenney, S. R., Thadani, V., Ghaidarov, T., & LaBrie, J. W. (2013). First-year college women's motivations for hooking up: A mixed methods examination of

normative peer perceptions and personal hookup participation. *International Journal of Sexual Health, 25*, 212-224. doi: 10.1080/19317611.2013.786010

Kreager, D. A., & Staff, J. (2009). The sexual double standard and adolescent peer acceptance. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 72*(2), 143-164. doi: 10.1177/019027250907200205

Levin, K. A. (2006). Study design III: Cross-sectional studies. *Evidence-Based Dentistry, 7*, 24-25. doi:10.1038/sj.ebd.6400375

Lewis, M. A., Granato, H., Blayney, J. A., Lostutter, T. W., & Kilmer, J. R. (2012). Predictors of hooking up sexual behaviors and emotional reactions among U.S. college students. *Archive of Sexual Behavior, 41*, 1219-1229. doi: 10.1007/s10508-011-9817-2

Lichter, D. T., Batson, C. D. & Brown, J. B. (2004). Welfare reform and marriage promotion: The marital expectations and desires of single and cohabiting mothers. *Social Service Review, 78,* 2-25.

Limesurvey [survey tool]. Retrieved from https://www.limesurvey.org/en/.

Lovejoy, M. C. (2015). Hooking up as an individualistic practice: A double-edged sword for college women. *Sexuality & Culture, 19*, 464-492. doi: 10.1007/s12119-015-9270-9

Mann, C. J. (2003). Observational research methods. Research design II: Cohort, cross sectional, and case-control studies. *Emergency Medicine Journal, 20,* 54-60. doi:10.1136/emj.20.1.54

Manning, W. D., Longmore, M. A., & Giordano, P. C. (2007). The changing institution of marriage: Adolescents' expectations to cohabit and marry. *Center for Family and Demographic Research.* doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00392.x

Manthos, M., Owen, J. J., & Fincham, J. D. (2014). A new perspective on hooking up among college students: Sexual behavior as a function of distinct groups. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 31*, 815-829.

Martin, P. D., Martin, D., & Martin, M. (2001). Adolescent premarital sexual activity, cohabitation, and attitudes toward marriage. *Adolescence, 36*, 602-609.

Mustanksi, B. S. (2001). Getting wired: exploiting the internet for the collection of valid sexuality data. *The Journal of Sex Research, 38*, 292-301. doi: 10.1080/00224490109552100

Nulty, D. D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*, 301-314. doi: 10.1080/02602930701293231

Olmstead, S. B., Roberson, P. N. E., Pasley, K., & Fincham, F. D. (2015). Hooking up and risk behaviors among first semester college men: What is the role of precollege experience? *Journal of Sex Research, 52*(20), 186-198. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2013.843147

Osmond, M. W., & Thorne, B. (2004). Feminist theories: The social construction of gender in families and society. In P. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 591-625). New York, NY: Springer Science + Business Media.

Owen, J. J., & Fincham, F. D. (2011). Young adults' emotional reactions after hooking up encounters. *Archive of Sexual Behaviors, 40*, 321-330. doi: 10.1007/s10508-010-9652-x

Owen, J. J., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Fincham, F. D. (2010). "Hooking up" among college students: Demographic and psychosocial correlates. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 39*, 653-663. doi: 10.1007/s10508-008-9414-1

Park, S. S., & Rosen, L. A. (2013). The marital scales: Measurement of intent, attitudes, and aspects regarding marital relationships. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 54,* 295-312. doi: 10.1080/10502556.2013.780491

Paul, E. L., McManus, B., & Hayes, A. (2000). "Hookups": Characteristics and correlates of college students' spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *The Journal of Sex Research, 37*, 76-88. doi: 10.1080/00224490009552023

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*, 385-401.

Reiber, C., & Garcia, J.R. (2010). Hooking up: Gender differences, evolution, and pluralistic ignorance. *Evolutionary Psychology, 8*, 390-404. doi: 10.1177/147470491000800307

Riggio, H. R., Weiser, D., Valenzuela, A., Lui, P., Montes, R., & Heuer, J. (2011). Initial validation of a measure of self-efficacy in romantic relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51,* 601-606. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.05.026

Riggio, H. R., Weiser, D. A., Valenzuela, A. M., Lui, P. P., Montes, R., & Heuer, J. (2013). Self-efficacy in romantic relationships: Prediction of relationship attitudes

and outcomes. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 153*, 629-650. doi: 10.1080/00224545.2013.801826

Salts, C. J., Seismore, M. D., Lindholm, B. W., & Smith, T. A. (1994). Attitudes toward marriage and premarital sexual activity in college freshman. *Adolescence, 29*, 775-779.

Sandberg-Thoma, S. E., & Dush, C. M. K. (2014). Casual sexual relationships and mental health in adolescence and emerging adulthood. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(2), 121-130. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2013.821440

Sassler, S. (2010). Partnering across the life course: Sex, relationships, and mate selection. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72*(3), 557-575. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00718.x

Sax, L. J., Gilmartin, S. K., & Bryant, A. N. (2003). Assessing response rates and nonresponse bias in web and paper surveys. *Research in Higher Education, 44*, 409-432.

Shurts, W. M., & Myers, J. E. (2012). Relationships among young adults' marital messages received, marital attitudes, and relationship self-efficacy. *Adultspan Journal, 11*(2), 97-111. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0029.2012.00009.x

Singh, A., Taneja, A., & Mangalaraj, G. (2009). Creating online surveys: Some wisdom from the trenches tutorial. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 52*(2), 197-212. doi: 10.1109/TPC.2009.2017986

Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Archive of Internal Medicine, 166*(10), 1092-1097.

Stieger, S., Reips, U., & Voracek, M. (2007). Forced-response in online surveys: Bias from reactance and an increase in sex-specific dropout. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 58*(11), 1653-1660. doi: 10.1002/asi.20651

Stinson, R. D. (2010). Hooking up in young adulthood: A review of factors influencing the sexual behavior of college students. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 24,* 98-115. doi: 10.1080/87568220903558596

Stinson, R. D., Levy, L. B., & Alt, M. (2014). "They're just a good time and move on": Fraternity men reflect on their hookup experiences. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 28*, 59-73. doi: 10.1080/87568225.2014.854683

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). U.S. Decennial Census (1890-2000): American community survey (2010) [data file]. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/acs.

van Eeden- Moorefield, B., Proulx, C.M., & Pasley, K. (2006). A comparison of internet face-to-face (FTF) qualitative methods in studying the relationships of gay men. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 4*, 181-204. doi: 10.1080/15504280802096856

Victor, E. (2012). Mental health and hooking up: A self-discrepancy perspective. *The New School Psychology Bulletin, 9*(2), 24-34.

Wang, W., & Parker, K. (2014). Record share of Americans have never married. *Pew Research Center: Social & Demographic Trends.* Retrieved from http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2014/09/24/record-share-of-americans-have-never-married/.

Watt, S., Simpson, C., Mckillop, C. & Nunn, V. (2002). Electronic course surveys: Does automating feedback and reporting give better results. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 27*, 325-337. doi: 10.1080/0260293022000001346

Weiser, D. A., Weigel, D. J. (2016). Self-efficacy in romantic relationships: direct and indirect effects on relationship maintenance and satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 89*, 152-156. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2015.10.013

Wentland, J. J., & Reissing, E. D. (2011). Taking casual sex not too casually: Exploring definitions of casual sexual relationships. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 20*(3), 75-91.

Willoughby, B. J., & Carroll, J. S. (2010). Sexual experience and couple formation attitudes among emerging adults. *Journal of Adult Development, 17*, 1-11. doi: 10.1007/s10804-009-9073-z

Willoughby, B.J., & Carroll, J.S. (2012). Correlates of attitudes toward cohabitation: Looking at the associations with demographics, relational attitudes, and dating behavior. *Journal of Family Issues, 33*(11), 1450-1476. doi: 10.1177/0192513X11429666

Yancey, A. K., Ortega, A. N., & Kumanyika, S. K. (2006). Effective recruitment and retention of minority research participants. *Annual Review of Public Health, 27*, 1-28. doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.27.021405.102113

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

	Complete Responders		Incomplete Responders	
	f	%	*f*	%
Gender				
Female	32	84.21	74	94.90
Male	6	15.79	4	5.13
Graduation Year				
Freshman	9	23.68	11	14.11
Sophomore	10	26.32	14	17.95
Junior	8	21.05	25	32.05
Senior	11	28.94	25	32.05
Religion				
Atheist	5	13.16	2	2.56
Catholic	25	65.78	50	64.10
Hinduism	2	5.26	2	2.56
Jewish	2	5.26	1	1.28
Protestant/Christian	3	7.89	7	8.97
Other or N/A	2	5.26	16	20.51
Ethnicity				
East Asian/Asian American	1	2.63	1	1.28
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1	2.63	0	0.00
Latino/Hispanic American	9	23.68	23	29.48
Non-Hispanic White	25	65.79	39	50.00
South Asian/Indian	2	5.26	0	0.00
Other	1	2.63	4	5.13
Sexual Orientation				
Asexual	5	13.16	8	10.26
Bisexual	2	5.26	1	1.28
Gay/Lesbian	1	2.63	3	3.84
Heterosexual	30	78.95	54	69.23

Table 2. Description of Hookup Partner for all Respondents

	General Hookup Behavior		Penetrative Hookup Behavior	
	f	%	*f*	%
Know partner before hookup	35	92.11	33	86.84
Same-sex hookup	6	15.79	5	13.16
Opposite-sex hookup	34	89.47	35	92.10
Locations for hookup partners				
Bars	8	21.05	5	13.16
House Parties	16	42.11	15	39.47
Class	11	28.95	10	26.32
Dorm/ Apartment	10	26.32	11	28.95
Club or Org	1	2.63	1	2.63
Mutual Friends	24	63.16	28	73.68
Social media	9	23.68	7	18.42
Hookup Application	8	21.05	7	18.42

Table 3. Description of Hookup Partner by Gender

	General Hookup Behavior				Penetrative Hookup Behavior			
	Male	*%*	*Female*	*%*	*Male*	*%*	*Female*	*%*
Know partner before hookup	5	83.33	30	93.75	5	83.33	27	84.38
Same-sex hookup	3	50.00	3	9.38	3	50.00	2	6.25
Opposite-sex hookup	5	83.33	29	90.63	5	83.33	30	93.75
Locations for hookup partners								
Bars	1	16.66	7	21.88	1	16.66	4	12.50
House Parties	2	33.33	14	43.75	2	33.33	13	40.63
Class	2	33.33	9	28.13	2	33.33	8	25.00
Dorm/ Apartment	2	33.33	8	25.00	2	33.33	9	28.13
Club or Org	0	0.00	1	3.13	0	0.00	1	3.13
Mutual Friends	3	50.00	21	65.62	5	83.33	23	71.88
Social media	1	16.66	8	25.00	1	16.66	6	18.75
Hookup Application	2	33.33	6	18.75	1	16.66	6	18.75

Table 4. Emotional Experiences for all Respondents

	General Hookup Behavior		Penetrative Hookup Behavior	
	f	%	*f*	%
Emotional Satisfaction				
Never	6	15.79	8	21.05
Occasionally	16	42.10	9	23.68
About ½ the time	10	26.32	11	28.95
Often	4	10.52	7	18.42
Always	2	5.26	3	7.89
Emotional Closeness				
Never	8	21.05	10	26.32
Occasionally	22	57.89	15	39.47
About ½ the time	4	10.52	7	18.42
Often	3	7.89	4	10.52
Always	1	2.56	2	5.26
Regret				
Never	10	26.32	12	31.58
Occasionally	15	39.47	12	31.58
About ½ the time	5	13.16	8	21.05
Often	4	10.52	3	7.89
Always	4	10.52	3	7.89

Table 5. Emotional Experiences by Gender

	General Hookup Behavior				Penetrative Hookup Behavior			
	Male	*%*	*Female*	*%*	*Male*	*%*	*Female*	*%*
Emotional Satisfaction								
Never	0	0.00	6	18.75	0	0.00	8	25.00
Occasionally	1	16.66	15	46.88	1	16.66	8	25.00
About ½ the time	3	50.00	7	21.88	2	33.33	9	28.13
Often	1	16.66	3	9.38	2	33.33	5	15.63
Always	1	16.66	1	3.13	1	16.66	2	6.25
Emotional Closeness								
Never	1	16.66	7	21.88	1	16.66	9	28.13
Occasionally	4	66.66	18	56.25	4	66.66	11	34.38
About ½ the time	0	0.00	4	12.50	0	0.00	7	21.88
Often	1	16.66	2	6.25	1	16.66	3	9.38
Always	0	0.00	1	3.13	0	0.00	2	6.25
Regret								
Never	2	33.33	8	25.00	2	33.33	10	31.25
Occasionally	3	50.00	12	37.50	2	33.33	10	31.25
About ½ the time	0	0.00	5	15.62	2	33.33	6	18.75
Often	1	16.66	3	9.38	0	0.00	3	9.38
Always	0	0.00	4	12.50	0	0.00	3	9.38

Table 6. Correlations for Measured Variables

Variable	GHB	PHB	RRSE	ITM
GHB	--			
PHB	.34*	--		
RRSE	-.30	-.31	--	
ITM	-.30	-.12	.49*	--

**Note: p*=<05. GHB=General hookup behavior; PHB= Penetrative hookup behavior;

RRSE= Romantic relationship self-efficacy scale; ITM= Intent to marry

Appendix A

** Appendices were slightly altered to ensure confidentiality of respondents*

Letter to Leader of Organizations

Dear Student Organization Leader/ Department Chair,

My name is Jacqueline Bible, and I am a Master's student the Department of Family and Child Studies. My thesis examines how hooking up in college might influence our thoughts about future romantic relationships.

I am reaching out to you today in hopes that you will pass along the attached study announcement to your organizational members/students. This study consists of taking a brief, anonymous online survey (about 20 minutes) and was approved by the IRB (IRB approval #XXXX). At the end of the survey, respondents will be asked if they would like to be entered into a drawing to win one of twenty $10 gift cards to Dunkin Donuts. This information will be kept confidential and not connected to the survey answers.

I am more than happy to talk to you or come to one of your meetings to explain more about the study and answer any questions. If you have questions, you can contact me or my faculty supervisor, Dr. Brad van Eeden-Moorefield, at biblej1@montclair.edu or vaneedenmobr@montclair.edu .

Please forward the following recruitment flier to your members/students, and thank you for helping me out.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Bible, Masters Student
Family and Child Studies, Montclair State University

Appendix B

Recruitment email

Dear Student,

My name is Jacqueline Bible and I am a graduate student in *Family & Child Studies*. I would like to invite you to participate in my thesis research about how hooking up in college might influence future romantic relationships. This study will involve participating in an online survey, which should take about 20 minutes to complete. Participation is anonymous and confidential. Those who participate will be entered, if you want, into a drawing for one of twenty $10 gift cards to Dunkin Donuts.

To participate, you:

Must be 18-22 years
Had at least one hookup in the last year

If you have any questions, please contact Jacqueline Bible at biblej1@montclair.edu or Dr. Brad van Eeden-Moorefield at vaneedenmobr@montclair.edu.

Thank you for considering participating in this study. This study has been approved by the University Institutional Review Board (IRB #XXX).

The survey can be found here: <insert survey link>

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Bible, Masters Student
Family and Child Studies, Montclair State University

Appendix C

Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent: Please provide consent by selecting "yes" at the bottom of the page to begin the survey

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in a study about hooking up and romantic relationships. I hope to learn how engaging in hookup behavior influences how an individual feels about his/her ability to be in a romantic relationship and how that influences attitudes toward intimacy in future romantic relationships among college students. You were selected to participate in this study because you are an undergraduate student. To complete the survey you should be between the ages of 18 and 22 and have hooked up at least once in the past year.

If you decide to participate, please complete the following set of questions. Specifically, the survey asks questions about your hookup behavior (such as frequency, types of sexual behavior, and length of relationship with your partner), your perception of how you are as a romantic partner, your attitudes toward different types of romantic relationships, fear of intimacy, and mood. The purpose of this survey is to gain insight into how hooking up might be related to your perceptions and feelings about future romantic relationships. It will take about 20 minutes to complete the survey. You may not directly benefit from this research. However, we hope that the results of this study will contribute to the limited research on hookup behavior and attitudes toward intimacy in future romantic relationships. At the end of the survey, you will have a chance to enter a raffle to win 1 of 20 possible $10 Dunkin Donuts gift cards. You will still be eligible to enter the raffle if you do not complete the survey.

Although we do not believe there are any risks to completing this survey, it is possible that you may feel uncomfortable answering questions about your hookup behavior. Any discomfort or inconvenience to you may include feeling uncomfortable being asked to answer questions about your specific sexual practices or recalling negative past experiences (for example: a hookup you regret). Although unlikely, if you experience any discomfort from the survey questions please contact the university's Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS). CAPS offers short-term individual and group counseling to students. CAPS is located in Russ Hall. All counseling services are free, voluntary, and confidential. You may call (***) ***-*** or stop by for an appointment.

Participation is anonymous-- there will be no information linking the survey to you and you will never be asked for your name or other personal information as part of the main survey. There are no guarantees on the security of data sent on the Internet. Confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. We strongly advise that you use a personal device, laptop, or smartphone, when completing the survey, and to clear your browser history after you complete the survey.

Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your relationships with your university, or the school organization to which you belong.

If you decide to participate, you are free to stop at any time. You may skip questions you do not want to answer.

Please feel free to ask questions regarding this study. You may contact me or my faculty supervisor, Dr. Brad van Eeden-Moorefield, if you have additional questions at biblej1@montclair.edu or vaneedenmobr@montclair.edu .

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,

Jacqueline Bible
College of Education and Human Services
Family and Child Studies Department

By clicking the box below, I confirm that I have read this form and will participate in the project described. Its general purposes, the particulars of involvement, and possible risks and inconveniences have been explained to my satisfaction. I understand that I can discontinue participation at any time. My consent also indicates that I am 18 years of age.

[Please feel free to print a copy of this consent.]

☐ Yes ☐ No

The study has been approved by the University Institutional Review Board as study #00____ on _____.

Appendix D

Thank You Letter

Thank you for completing this survey!

As a thank you for participating, everyone who completed the survey and would like to be entered in a drawing to win 1 of 20 $10 gift cards to Dunkin Donuts should send an email to hookupsurveyincentives@gmail.com. You do not need to provide your name or information other than an email address. All information will be confidential and never connected with your survey responses.

The drawing will occur May 5, 2016 and winners will be notified that evening. An e-gift card will accompany notification.

If you have any questions please contact me or my faculty advisor.

Jackie Bible: biblej1@montclair.edu

Dr. Brad van Eeden-Moorefield: vaneedenmobr@montclair.edu

Thank you!

Jacqueline Bible

Appendix E

Reminder Letter to Respondents

[Leaders and Department Chairs were asked to forward this letter to their members]

Dear Respondents,

Please remember to complete the "Hooking Up, Romantic Relationship Self-Efficacy, and Feelings Toward Intimacy in Future Romantic Relationships" survey. Upon completion of the survey, you will have the opportunity to enter a drawing to win one of twenty $10 gift cards to Dunkin Donuts.

You may contact me or my faculty supervisor, Dr. Brad van Eeden-Moorefield, if you have additional questions at biblej1@montclair.edu or vaneedenmobr@montclair.edu. Thank you for participating in my study!

The survey can be found here: <insert survey link>

Best,

Jacqueline Bible, Masters Student
Family and Child Studies, Montclair State University

Appendix F

Survey Questions

Actual Survey Link: https://msusurveys.montclair.edu/index.php/227172/lang-en

Question Group 1: Consent Form

Y- Continue to survey

N- Continue to Thank you message

Question Group 2: Demographic Questions

Please respond to the following demographic questions:

1. With which gender do you identify most: M F

2. Do you identify as transgender? Yes No

2. Age: _____

3. What year are you in school?

Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

Which college is your major in? If you have more than one major you may select more than one college.

- Cali School of Music
- College of Education and Human Services
- College of Humanities and Social Sciences

- School of Communication and Media
- The Feliciano School of Business
- Undeclared/Other

With which religious affiliation do you most identify?

- Atheist
- Buddhist
- Catholic
- Hinduism
- Jewish
- Mormon
- Muslim
- Orthodox Church (Greek, Russian, Jewish, etc.)
- Protestant
- Other (Please specify) _____

What is your Race/Ethnicity? (Select all that apply):

- Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American
- East Asian or Asian American
- Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Latino or Hispanic American
- Middle Eastern or Arab American
- Native American or Alaskan Native
- Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American
- South Asian or Indian American
- Other (Please specify) _____

With which sexual orientation do you identify most?

- Asexual
- Bisexual
- Gay/Lesbian
- Heterosexual
- Pansexual
- Queer
- Other (Please specify)_____

People are different in their sexual attraction to other people. Which best describes your feelings of sexual attraction?

- Only attracted to females
- Mostly attracted to females
- Equally attracted to females and males
- Mostly attracted to males
- Only attracted to males
- Not sure

What is your parent's marital status?

- Cohabiting
- Divorced
- Married (First marriage)
- Remarried (Second or later marriage)
- Separated
- Single-Parent/ Never married
- Widowed
- Other (Please specify)_____

Thinking about the household you grew up in, how conservative or liberal do you believe it was?

- Very conservative
- Conservative
- Moderate
- Liberal
- Very Liberal

What is your current relationship status?

- Single
- Dating casually
- In a relationship
- Married
- Other (Please specify) _____

Thinking about the most serious romantic relationship you have had, how long did it last?

- 0-6 months
- 7-12 months (1 year)
- 13-18 months (1.5 years)
- 19-24 months (2 years)
- 25-30 months (2.5 years)
- 31-36 months (3 years)
- 37- 42 months (3.5 years)
- 43-48 months (4 years)
- 49 months + (over 4 years)

How old were you when this relationship began? _____

Question Group 3: Penetrative Hookup Behavior Questions

For the next questions, please think about the hookups you had over the past 12 months. By definition, a hookup encompasses sexual behaviors ranging from oral sex to penetrative intercourse between two or more partners (of the opposite sex or the same sex) who express no commitment toward each other before or following their sexual encounter.

1. About how many times did you engage in a hookup? _____

2. How many times did you engage in oral sex during a hookup? _____

3. How many times did you engage in penetrative vaginal sex during a hookup? _____

4. How many times did you engage in anal intercourse during a hookup? _____

5. How many times did you know your partner before you engaged in a hookup? _____

6. How many times did you hookup with the same person consistently over a period of time? _____

7. How many times did you hookup with a partner of the same sex? _____

8. How many times did you hookup with a partner of the opposite sex? _____

9. Thinking about all of the hookups you had in the last year, think about where you found hookup partners? (Please choose all that apply)

- Bars
- House parties
- Class
- Where you live (such as a dormitory or apartment)
- Organization or club meetings
- Through mutual friends
- Facebook, Instagram, or other social networking cites
- Hookup or dating applications
- Other (Please specify) _____

10. Where is the one most common place you have found a hookup partner in the last year?

- Bars
- House parties
- Class
- Where you live (such as a dormitory or apartment)
- Organization or club meetings
- Through mutual friends
- Facebook, Instagram, or other social networking cites
- Hookup or dating applications
- Other (Please specify) _____

	Never	Occasionally	About ½ the time	Often	Always
11. How often did you feel emotionally satisfied after engaging in a hookup?					
12. How often did you feel emotional closeness to your partner after engaging in a hookup?					
13. How often did you regret a hookup?					

Question Group 4: General hookup behavior

Now think about all the hookup behavior you have engaged in over the past 12 months. For this question, hookup behavior is defined as a range of behaviors from kissing to penetrative intercourse (for example: mutual masturbation, fingering, rubbing, use of sex toys etc.) between two or more partners (of the opposite sex or the same sex) who express no commitment toward each other before or following their sexual encounter.

1. About how many times did you engage in a hookup? _____

2. How many times did you know your partner before you engaged in a hookup? _____

3. How many times did you hookup with the same person consistently over a period of time? _____

4. How many times did you hookup with a partner of the same sex? _____

5. How many times did you hookup with a partner of the opposite sex? _____

6. Thinking about all of the hookups you had in the last year, think about where you found hookup partners? (Please choose all that apply)
   - Bars
   - House parties
   - Class
   - Where you live (such as a dormitory or apartment)
   - Organization or club meetings
   - Through mutual friends
   - Facebook, Instagram, or other social networking cites
   - Hookup or dating applications
   - Other (Please specify) _____

7. Where is the one most common place you have found a hookup partner in the last year?

- Bars
- House parties
- Class
- Where you live (such as a dormitory or apartment)
- Organization or club meetings
- Through mutual friends
- Facebook, Instagram, or other social networking cites
- Hookup or dating applications
- Other (Please specify) _____

	Never	Occasionally	About ½ the time	Often	Always
8. How often did you feel emotionally satisfied after engaging in a hookup?					
9. How often did you feel emotional closeness to your partner after engaging in a hookup?					
10. How often did you regret a hookup?					

Question Group 5: Romantic Relationship Self-Efficacy

The next set of questions ask about the type of romantic partner you think you would be if you were in a committed romantic relationship. A committed romantic relationship is defined as a committed serious relationship between you and a partner of the same or opposite sex.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements about how you would be as a romantic partner if you were in a committed romantic relationship?:

	SD	D	SWD	SLD	N	SLA	SWA	A	SA
1. I am just one of those people who is not good at being a romantic relationship partner									
2. Failure in my romantic relationships only makes me want to try harder									
3. When I make plans in my romantic relationships, I am certain I can make them work									
4. I have difficulty focusing on important issues in my romantic relationships									
5. If I can't do something successful in my romantic relationship the first time, I keep trying until I can									
6. I do not seem capable of dealing with most problems that may come up in romantic relationships									
7. Sometimes I avoid getting involved romantically because it seems like too much work									
8. Romantic relationships are very difficult for me to deal with									
9. I find it difficult to put effort into maintaining a successful romantic relationship									
10. I feel insecure about my ability to be a good romantic partner									

11. One of my problems is that I cannot come up with the energy to make my romantic relationships more successful									
12. Having a successful romantic relationship is difficult for me									

*_Note_: _SD_= Strongly Disagree; _D_= Disagree; _SWD_= Somewhat Disagree; _SLD_= Slightly Disagree; _N_= Neither; _SLA_= Slightly Agree; _SWA_= Somewhat Agree; _A_= Agree; _SA_= Strongly Agree

Question Group 6: Intent Scale

Please select the answer that most closely represents how you feel about different types of **future** relationships.

	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I intend to marry someday							
2. I want to marry							
3. I do not hope to marry							
4. I intend to cohabit (live with a romantic partner) someday							
5. I want to cohabit (live with a romantic partner)							
6. I do not hope to cohabit (live with a romantic partner)							
7. I intend to have a life-long partner (a partner with whom you have a life-long commitment however, do not plan on marrying) someday							
8. I want to have a life-long partner (a partner with whom you have a life-long commitment however, do not plan on marrying)							

9. I do not hope to have a life-long partner (a partner with whom you have a life-long commitment however, do not plan on marrying)							

Group 7: Fear of Intimacy

Imagine you begin a romantic relationship in the future. Please select the answer that most closely resembles the type of future relationship you would like to have. Note: In each statement, O refers to the person who would be in the close relationship with you.

	Not at all characteristic of me	Slightly characteristic of me	Moderately characteristic of me	Very characteristic of me	Extremely characteristic of me
1. I would feel uncomfortable telling O about things in the past that I felt ashamed of					
2. I would feel uneasy talking with O about something that has hurt me deeply					
3. I would feel comfortable expressing my true feelings with O					
4. If O were upset, I would sometimes be afraid of showing that I care					
5. I may be afraid to confide my innermost feelings to O					
6. I would feel at ease telling O that I cared about him/her					
7. I would have a feeling of complete togetherness with O					
8. I would be comfortable discussing significant problems with O					

9. A part of me would be afraid to make long-term commitment to O					
10. I would feel comfortable telling experiences, even sad ones to O					
11. I would probably feel nervous showing O strong feelings of affection					
12. I would find it difficult being open with O about my personal thoughts					
13. I would feel uneasy with O depending on me for emotional support					
14. I would not be afraid to share with O what I disliked about myself					
15. I will be afraid to take the risk of being hurt in order to establish a closer relationship with O					
16. I would feel comfortable keeping very personal information to myself					
17. I would not be nervous about being spontaneous with O					
18. I would feel comfortable telling O things that I do not tell other people					
19. I would feel comfortable trusting O with my deepest thoughts and feelings					
20. I would sometimes feel uneasy if O told me about very personal matters					
21. I would be comfortable revealing to O what I felt were my shortcomings and handicaps					
22. I would be comfortable with having a close emotional tie between us					
23. I would be afraid to share my private					

thoughts with O					
24. I would be afraid that I may not always feel close to O					
25. I would be comfortable telling O what my needs are					
26. I would be afraid that O would be more invested in the relationship that I would be					
27. I would feel comfortable about having open and honest communication with O					
28. I would sometimes feel uncomfortable listening to O's personal problems					
29. I would feel at ease to completely be myself around O					
30. I would feel relaxed being together and talking about our personal goals					

Group 8: Anxiety

Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you been bothered by the following problems?

	Not at all sure	Several Days	Over half the days	Nearly every day
1. Feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge				
2. Not being able to stop or control worrying				
3. Worrying too much about different things				
4. Trouble relaxing				
5. Being so restless that it's hard to sit still				

6. Becoming easily annoyed or irritated				
7. Feeling afraid as if something awful might happen				

How difficult have the problems, stated in the previous question, made it for you to do your work, take care of things at home, or get along with other people?

- Not difficult at all
- Somewhat difficult
- Very difficult
- Extremely difficult

Group 9: Depression

Next is a list of the ways you may have felt or behaved. Please indicate how often you've felt this way during the past week. Respond to all items.

During the past week...

	Rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day)	Some or a little of the time (1-2 days)	Occasionally or a moderate amount of time (3-4 days)	Most or all of the time (5-7 days)
1. I was bothered by things that usually do not bother me				
2. I did not feel like eating: my appetite was poor				
3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues				

even with the help from my family or friends				
4. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing				
5. I felt depressed				
6. I felt that everything I did was an effort				
7. I felt fearful				
8. My sleep was restless				
9. I talked less than usual				
10. I felt lonely				
11. I felt sad				
12. I could not get "going"				