UCLA
On-Line Working Paper Series

Title

A Characterization of Young Adults' Nonmarital Sexual Relationships: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/66k5t4cp

Authors

Kusunoki, Yasamin
Upchurch, Dawn M.

Publication Date

2006-09-01

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

California Center for Population Research
University of California - Los Angeles

A Characterization of Young Adults' Nonmarital Sexual Relationships: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health

Yasamin Kusunoki
Dawn M. Upchurch

CCPR-013-06

September 2006

California Center for Population Research
On-Line Working Paper Series

A Characterization of Young Adults' Nonmarital Sexual Relationships: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health*

Yasamin Kusunoki

and

Dawn M. Upchurch

University of California, Los Angeles

PLEASE DO NOT CITE WITHOUT AUTHORS' PERMISSION

Paper presented at Session #72, "Relationships and Sexual Behavior in Youth," at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, March 30-April 1, 2006, Los Angeles, CA.

*Yasamin Kusunoki, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Public Health, 650 Charles E. Young Drive South, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1772, ykusunok@ucla.edu. Dawn M. Upchurch, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Public Health, 650 Charles E. Young Drive South, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1772, upchurch@ucla.edu. Both Dr. Upchurch and Ms. Kusunoki are affiliates of the California Center for Population Research. This research is supported by grant R01 HD41886 from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to Dr. Upchurch. The authors thank Elizabeth Frankenberg and the participants of the Sociology of Family Working Group for their comments and suggestions.

Abstract

The relational patterns and behaviors that are experienced during adolescence and young adulthood are influential for reproductive health outcomes and set the stage for future family formation choices and behaviors. In order to better understand the extent to which the relational context influences behavior within relationships, it is imperative that researchers first explore these relationships in a more comprehensive manner than has been done previously. Using the retrospective sexual relationship histories of young adults from the most recent wave (2001-2002) of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), this paper provides a detailed description of young adults' nonmarital sexual relationships and explores young adults' relationship histories. Findings suggest that the characteristics of the nonmarital sexual unions that are formed during the early life course are quite diverse. The type of relationship (defined as cohabiting, exclusively dating, frequently but not exclusively dating, dating once in a while, and having sex only) and other features of these sexual relationships (e.g., duration, age difference between partners) differ depending on the gender, race/ethnicity, and age of the young adult. Additionally, some patterns of associations across racial/ethnic groups and age categories differ for women and men. Moreover, the features of these sexual relationships vary across the different relationship types. Finally, a number of individual-level sociodemographic characteristics are associated with having experienced certain types of relationship histories. In particular, there are enduring effects of family background and religious denomination during adolescence that differ for women and men.

Introduction

Personal involvement in romantic and sexual relationships increases substantially during adolescence and young adulthood as does the significance of these relationships (Furman et al., 1999; Christopher, 2001; Collins, 2003). These relationships provide a salient context for psychological, social, and sexual development among youth (Coates, 1999; Connolly & Goldberg, 1999; Erikson, 1968; Feiring, 1999; Fischer et al., 1996; Leaper & Anderson, 1997; Sullivan, 1953). Becoming sexually experienced and forming these early relationships are socially and culturally defined transitions with personal and social meaning and consequences (Christopher, 2001; Coates, 1999; Collins, 2003; DeLamater, 1981; Furman & Wehner, 1994; Gagnon & Simon, 1973; Miller & Benson, 1999). Relational patterns and behaviors experienced during this period are influential for reproductive health outcomes (Darroch et al., 2001; Finer et al., 1999; Ford & Lepkowski, 2004; Laumann & Youm, 1999; Miller et al., 1999; Santelli et al., 1998; Ventura et al., 2000) and set the stage for future family formation choices and behaviors (Erikson, 1968; Sullivan, 1953; Thornton, 1990).

Research interest in romantic and sexual relationships during the early life course is fairly recent (Brown et al., 1999). Theoretical development and empirical work on close relationships have largely evolved within disciplines operating in isolation from one another (Blumstein & Kollock, 1988; Kelley et al., 1983) and have not been extensively applied to the unique types of *nonmarital* relationships that occur during adolescence and early adulthood. Moreover, the problem-focused emphasis of most research on sexual and contraceptive behavior among youth has overshadowed the notion that sexual exploration and the formation of romantic and sexual relationships are crucial for development and are often normative (Collins, 2003; Graber et al., 1998; Herold & Marshall, 1996). As a result, less is known about the nature and characteristics of the nonmarital sexual relationships that are formed during this time period.

The objective of the current study is to explore the types and features of nonmarital sexual relationships that individuals form during the early life course. This research is made possible by the availability of detailed relationship information in the most recent wave (2001-2002) of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health). We first provide a detailed description of young adults' nonmarital sexual relationships and examine the variability in the characteristics of these relationships by young adults' gender, race/ethnicity, and age. We then examine how the features of these relationships vary across the different relationship types. Finally, we investigate the extent to which individual-level sociodemographic characteristics are associated with having experienced particular relationship histories. The current study is a work in progress; we anticipate that this initial exploration will assist us in the development of a more complete characterization of youth's nonmarital sexual relationships. Information obtained from the current endeavor will enable us to better understand the extent to which the characteristics of these nonmarital sexual relationships are associated with behaviors that occur in these relationships as well as with subsequent union and family formation behaviors.

Background and Conceptual Approach

An emerging body of literature suggests that individuals' contraceptive behavior varies by the characteristics of their relationships. Relationships in which the couple had known one another a greater amount of time before first sex are more likely to use contraception (Manlove et al., 2003; Sheeran et al., 1999). Contraceptive use, particularly condom use, becomes less consistent with increased duration of a relationship (Fortenberry et al., 2002; Howard et al., 1999; Ku et al., 1994; Macaluso et al., 2000; Manlove et al., 2003). Individuals in relationships involving more frequent sexual activity are less likely to use condoms (Katz et al., 2000; Sheeran et al., 1999). There is also an association between the type of relationship and contraceptive practices, although the direction of this effect has been mixed. Many studies have found that

new or casual relationships are more likely to use contraception and to do so consistently, while established or committed relationships are less likely to do so (Fortenberry et al., 2002; Katz et al., 2000; Ku et al., 1994; Macaluso et al., 2000; Upchurch et al., 1992; Wingood & DiClemente, 1998). Other studies find that contraceptive use is more common in committed relationships (Ford & Norris, 2000; Ford et al., 2001; Manlove et al., 2003; Manning et al., 2000). Age difference between partners also has implications for contraceptive behavior. Young women who are involved with an older partner are less likely to report using contraception (Abma et al., 1998; Darroch et al., 1999; Glei, 1999; Manning et al., 2000; Miller et al., 1997). A negative effect of age difference on contraceptive use has also been found among a sample of both young women and men (Ford et al., 2001; Manlove et al., 2003). While few studies have examined racial/ethnic differences between partners in relation to contraceptive use, research indicates that there are substantial racial/ethnic differences in sexual mixing patterns and the degree of openness in sexual networks, and that these differences may be associated with differential risk of STDs (Ford & Lepkowski, 2004; Ford et al., 2002; Laumann & Youm, 1999).

Although the literature has demonstrated the importance of relationship factors for contraceptive behavior, research is still hindered by the lack of a comprehensive measurement of nonmarital sexual relationships and individuals' relationship histories. Specifically, research has been limited by the number of dimensions and relationship-specific measures available in most data sets. Studies often categorize relationship type as a simple dichotomy, such as casual versus regular or nonromantic versus romantic, and use number of relationships as an indicator of relationship history. While useful, these types of measures only capture a portion of the overall meaning and variability of youth's nonmarital relationship experiences. Youth form a variety of relationships, many of which may be precursors to long-term commitments such as marriage and cohabitation. In addition, it may not only be the number of relationships that individuals have

had that is important to understanding their history but also the types of relationships. Because of the inherent diversity of individuals' relationships, we argue that a more comprehensive conceptualization of relationships themselves as well as individuals' relationship histories is warranted. Much of the previous research has been concerned with understanding relationship effects in high risk populations, especially those at increased risk for STDs. These early characterizations may not provide an adequate depiction of the relationship experiences of a more representative sample of adolescents and young adults.

We extend the literature by exploring a more detailed measure of the type of nonmarital sexual relationships that youth form as well as other features of these relationships. We also investigate individuals' relationship histories, operationalized as the most common types of relationships in which youth have been involved. The most recent wave of Add Health includes multiple measures for each relationship, which allows investigators to more fully model the contours of youth's relationships. Because of the level of detail available in the Add Health data, we are able to explore multiple relationship-specific measures that we conceptualize to be indicators of *relationship commitment* and *couple homogamy*. Measures of commitment include relationship type, amount of time the couple knew one another before first sexual intercourse, duration of the sexual relationship, and frequency of sexual activity. Relationship type is defined as cohabiting, exclusively dating, frequently but not exclusively dating, dating once in a while, and having sex only. Allowing for these various types of relationships provides greater detail than has been possible in past research. We view this measure of type as reflecting a continuum that ranges from the most committed type (i.e., cohabiting) to the least committed type (i.e., sexual only). Homogamy is operationalized as the degree of similarity between partners in terms of their age and race/ethnicity. These characteristics represent key relational conditions that arise from relationship interactions (e.g., frequency of sexual activity) and the combination of each

partner's attributes (e.g., age difference between partners). They are hypothesized to reflect the nature and function of the relationship and thus to contribute to how the relationship begins and changes and what behaviors occur in the relationship.

The current research draws on aspects of the ecological model and the life course perspective to provide a framework for conceptualizing the links between individuals and their relationships. The ecological model posits that dyads, or two-person systems, are critical contexts for psychological, social, and sexual development, especially for adolescents and young adults (Bronfenbrenner, 1995; Erikson, 1968; Fischer et al., 1996; Furman et al., 1999; Sullivan, 1953). The life course perspective also emphasizes the dyad as a significant context, and proposes that individuals make choices that shape their life conditional on their experiences and characteristics, and within the constraints and opportunities available to them (Elder, 1995). Our framework views sexual relationships as critical contexts and posits that these relationships are complex and diverse. Moreover, we recognize that individuals' characteristics may influence their relationship experiences, including the types of partners and relationships that are formed.

As relationships evolve, individuals' attitudes and behaviors may change depending on the conditions of and experiences within relationships (Kelley et al., 1983). The tenets of social exchange theory shed light on the mechanisms by which relationships evolve and why it is expected that individuals behave differently depending on the specific relationships in which they are involved. Although we are unable to directly measure social exchange within relationships, we contend that this perspective is useful in understanding the nature of close relationships such as sexual unions. The basic principle of social exchange theory states that much of social interaction involves reciprocal exchanges of resources that proffer rewards and costs to those involved (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Sprecher, 1998; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Interdependence is created by the exchange of resources between partners in a relationship and

assures its continuity and the relative lack of interdependence may contribute to dissolution (Kelley et al., 1983). Commitment is a major feature of this interdependence and is intertwined with the strength, frequency, and duration of interactions between partners (Kelley et al., 1983). As partners become more interdependent, social exchange processes are altered and may reflect changes in the nature and function of relationships (Laursen & Jensen-Campbell, 1999). Relationships in which there is greater interdependence tend to have greater frequency and diversity of interconnections and shared activities (Berscheid et al., 1989; Kelley et al., 1983), which may have important implications, such as improved communication, greater investment in the relationship, and satisfaction. We hypothesize that youth's relationships are diverse in terms of commitment. We posit that the other features of relationships that reflect commitment, such as frequency of sexual activity and duration, will differ depending on the type of relationship, with more committed relationship types being longer and experiencing frequent sexual activity.

Theoretical advancements in the area of homogamy have focused on marriages, friendships, and peer networks, often at the exclusion of other relationships, such as dating relationships during youth. This makes it difficult to assess whether similarities or differences between youth on ascribed characteristics, such as age and race/ethnicity, may also be critical features of relationships formed during adolescence and young adulthood. However, two key ideas help substantiate why these similarities or differences are important. First, ties between individuals with similar characteristics are more likely to be closer and last for a longer duration than are ties between individuals who are dissimilar. Second, similarities reflect shared knowledge and experiences, which may make communication easier (McPherson et al., 2001). Age and racial/ethnic differences between partners may reflect differences in maturity, sexual experience, social and sexual networks, resources, and status. These differences may also reveal discrepancies in the couple's expectations for marriage and children and/or contribute to an

imbalance in power. Interracial relationships are less likely to be public and involve support from others and are more likely than intraracial relationships to end (Wang, Kao, & Joyner, in press). We hypothesize that most relationships are formed between individuals with similar characteristics but that relationships in which partners differ by age and race/ethnicity are not unusual. We also posit that the more committed types of relationships are less likely to be heterogamous.

Individuals bring with them a set of beliefs and experiences that are learned through social processes. Sociodemographic characteristics, such as gender, race/ethnicity, and age, are markers of an individual's location in society and are often indicative of differences in the beliefs that youth have about romance and sexual expression and how they conceptualize and define their relationships. These characteristics shape life experiences and may partially determine whether and with whom youth form relationships, the characteristics of their relationships, and the behaviors that occur within these relationships (Connolly & Goldberg, 1999; DeLamater, 1987; Feiring, 1999; Gagnon, 1990; Leaper & Anderson, 1997; Maccoby, 1998; Miller & Benson, 1999).

Romantic and sexual relationships develop within the context of existing gender-relations (Maccoby, 1998). This contributes to the formation of gender-differentiated attitudes and behaviors that then affect how individuals relate to and negotiate behaviors with the other sex in heterosexual relationships (Feiring, 1999; Leaper & Anderson, 1997; Maccoby, 1998). These gendered norms and roles become internalized by youth thereby influencing their attitudes and behaviors as well as the content and quality of their social interactions. Women often express a more relational orientation and express more romantic views, whereas men tend to express a more recreational orientation (DeLamater, 1987; Gagnon & Simon, 1973; Hynie et al., 1998; Maccoby, 1998; Oliver & Hyde, 1993). Men report more permissive attitudes toward casual sex,

while women tend to report the importance of intimacy and commitment (Oliver & Hyde, 1993). We hypothesize that women and men form different types of relationships, with men being more likely than women to form relationships that are described as being sexual only. We also hypothesize that features of their relationships differ, with women reporting a longer amount of time before first sexual intercourse and men reporting greater frequency of sexual activity.

Racial/ethnic differences in relationship characteristics may be indicative of subgroup normative differences regarding the expectations of relationship formation, the meanings ascribed to them, and the types of relationships desired. As mentioned earlier, there are differences in patterns of sexual mixing and degree of openness of sexual networks by race/ethnicity, with blacks being more likely to choose partners who are the same race (Ford & Lepkowski, 2004; Ford et al., 2002; Laumann & Youm, 1999). There are also racial/ethnic differences in youth's expectations of marriage, with both black girls and boys being more likely than other racial/ethnic groups to report low expectations (Crissey, 2005). Additionally, there are differences in the availability of partners that vary by race/ethnicity (Lichter et al., 1992), which would not only potentially influence the types of relationships individuals themselves will form but also the types of family formation processes that individuals are exposed to during adolescence. We hypothesize that there are racial/ethnic differences in the type and features of relationships, with whites being more likely to form exclusively dating relationships and blacks being less likely to form relationships with partners of a different race/ethnicity.

Given the substantial developmental variation that occurs across adolescence and into young adulthood, social exchange processes may vary depending on the individual youth (Laursen & Jensen-Campbell, 1999). In particular, resources may be more or less valued by the youth and society depending on the age of the youth, resulting in the formation of different types of relationships (Brown, 1999; Connolly & Goldberg, 1999). In the early phases of the life

course, the socially-defined rewards motivating relationship formation center on the self and approval from peers and not on the relationship itself. During the middle phases, youth begin to have affiliative needs and become concerned with companionship. During the later phases of the life course, youth have formed a more secure sense of identity and the desire for intimacy in the context of a relationship is of greater concern. Relationships during these later phases tend to be longer, include more diverse and frequent interactions and have more salience in youths' lives (Brown, 1999; Connolly & Goldberg, 1999). Sexual activity can also be viewed as a resource to be exchanged (Sprecher, 1998). As sexual activity becomes more appropriate in later phases, it is likely that this type of resource is exchanged with greater frequency. We hypothesize that relationship characteristics vary across age, such that relationships that began at younger ages are less likely to be committed relationships than those formed later and that relationships that began at older ages are more likely to include frequent sexual activity and to involve cohabitation.

Family background and religious denomination also influence youth's relationship experiences. The family is central to youth's formation of sexual attitudes and behaviors as it provides a social and economic environment, cultural values, and standards of sexual conduct (Becker, 1981; DeLamater, 1981; Fox, 1981; Maccoby, 1992). The family also shapes the attitudes and beliefs regarding relationship formation and monitors the types of partners and relationships that are formed through role modeling, social learning, control, and supervision (DeLamater, 1981; Hirschi, 1969; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Parsons & Bales, 1955). Religion also serves as a socialization agent by influencing the norms and attitudes that youth develop about sexuality and by regulating relationship experiences through social control. Those who identify with a particular religious denomination often share the sexual standards and norms put forth by that denomination and behave accordingly (Studer & Thornon, 1987; Zaleski & Schiaffino, 2000). We expect to find differences in young adults' relationship histories by their

family background and religious denomination during adolescence. We hypothesize that young adults who did not live with both biological parents during adolescence are more likely to have had cohabiting relationship experiences and also more likely to have had relationships described as sexual only. We posit that individuals who were raised in families with higher socioeconomic status are less likely to have had these types of relationship histories. We hypothesize a similar type of relationship experience among those with no religious affiliation.

In this study, we are particularly interested in the type and features of young adults' sexual relationships and who tends to have what types of relationships and what types of relationship histories. Therefore, we first describe young adults' sexual relationships and investigate differences between young women's and men's sexual relationships. We then investigate differences between racial/ethnic subgroups' sexual relationships and examine whether the characteristics of sexual relationships differ depending on the age at which the individual began the relationship. Next, we investigate how the features of relationships vary across the different relationship types. Finally, we examine the extent to which individual-level sociodemographic characteristics are associated with having experienced particular relationship histories. Because the content, quality, and effects of young women's and men's social interactions often differ, analyses are stratified by gender.

Data and Methods

Study Design and Sample

The data to be used for this analysis are from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), which is a survey designed to assess the health status of adolescents and young adults in the United States and to explore the causes of their health-related behaviors, with a focus on the multiple social and physical contexts in which they reside (Harris et al., 2003). These data are well suited for this investigation because they contain

information about multiple relationships for each individual, allowing researchers to create a relationship history for each individual.

The original sampling frame consisted of 80 high schools, with "feeder schools" (e.g., junior high school) for each identified high school also being sampled. The student roster constituted the student-level sampling frame. From that listing, a baseline sample was drawn consisting of a core sample and several oversamples. The core sample is a probability sample of size 12,105 that is nationally representative of students enrolled in grades 7-12 during the 1994-95 academic year. With the oversamples, the Wave I sample size is 20,745; respondents were 11-21 years old. The Wave II sample (survey conducted in 1996) consists of all adolescents interviewed at Wave I, except for the deletion of 12th graders and one of the oversamples. The Wave II sample size is 14,738; respondents were 12-22 years old. In 2001 and 2002, Wave I respondents, now young adults aged 18-27, were reinterviewed. The Wave III sample size is 15,197. Response rates at each wave are 78.9%, 88.2%, and 77.4%, respectively.

The relationship-level data from the Wave III in-home interview is the primary source of data for this study.[1] At Wave III, respondents were asked to identify romantic and/or sexual relationships that they were involved in since the summer of 1995. Respondents then answered a short list of questions pertaining to each identified relationship. Based on the answers to these questions, relationships were categorized and more detailed questions were asked in a subsequent section based on the type(s) of relationship (relationship could have been more than one type).[2] The first type was comprised of all relationships in which sexual relations had occurred (sexual relations was defined as vaginal, oral, or anal sex). The second type was comprised of two of the respondent's "most important" relationships. The third type was

[1] The relationship data collected in Waves I and II differ substantially from that of Wave III.
[2] This "type" is different from the measure used to define relationship type in the analyses. This is a study design measure that determined which set of questions an individual would be asked for a given relationship.

comprised of a subsample of heterosexual, current relationships with a partner who was 18 years old or older that had lasted three months or more. Different versions of the questionnaire were administered according to these defined types. Due to this study design, the level of detailed information varies and is available for only a subset of individuals and then for a subset of relationships. Accordingly, we focus on the first type of relationship (i.e., sexual) because this type is the most inclusive of the universe of identified relationships (N=36,128 relationships for 11,735 individuals). Because our ultimate goal is to understand the ways in which nonmarital sexual relationships influence contraceptive behaviors that occur within relationships as well as subsequent family formation behaviors, we limit the analysis to heterosexual nonmarital relationships in which vaginal sex occurred. We also exclude individuals who are missing a Wave III weight and information on family background and exclude relationships for which information is missing. The final analytic sample is 8,701 individuals and 24,470 relationships.

Variable Description and Measurement

Relationship Commitment. Indicators of commitment include relationship type, amount of time the couple knew one another before first sexual intercourse, duration of the sexual relationship, and frequency of sexual activity. Relationship type is created using several questions. For relationships that did not involve a marriage or cohabitation, respondents were asked to describe their relationships from a list of responses. Because the current analysis excludes marriages, the final relationship type variable, which is a combination of the responses to this question and questions on marriage and cohabitation, includes the following mutually exclusive categories: (1) cohabiting, (2) dating exclusively, (3) dating frequently but not exclusively, (4) dating once in a while[3], and (5) only having sex. The amount of time the couple knew one another before first having sex includes the following categories: (1) one day or less,

[3] This type of relationship will also be referred to as "occasionally dating".

(2) more than a day but less than a week, (3) one to two weeks, (4) two to four weeks, (5) one to five months, (6) six months to a year, and (7) a year or more. Duration is measured as the length of the sexual relationship in months and categorized into quintiles representing: (1) one month or less, (2) two to four months, (3) five to 12 months, (4) 13 to 27 months, and (5) 28 months or more. Frequency of sexual activity is categorized as: (1) had sex on only one occasion, (2) one time per week or less, (3) two times per week, (4) three times per week, (5) four to seven times per week, and (6) eight or more times per week.

Couple Homogamy. Relationship-specific variables used to evaluate homogamy are constructed. Specifically, we create variables indicating differences by age and race/ethnicity. Age difference between partners is collapsed into the following categories: (1) partner is three or more years older, (2) partner is two years older, (3) partner is one year older, (4) partner is same age, (5) partner is one year younger, (6) partner is two years younger, and (7) partner is three or more years younger. Racial/ethnic difference between partners is constructed by comparing the respondent's and partner's race/ethnicity. This variable is coded 1 if the partner is a different race/ethnicity and 0 otherwise.

Other Relationship Characteristics. Additional relationship-level variables include whether the relationship is current and whether a pregnancy occurred in the relationship. Current status is coded 1 if current and 0 otherwise. Pregnancy status is coded 1 if a pregnancy had ever occurred in the relationship and 0 otherwise.

Relationship History. Because we are interested in individuals' relationship histories, we create a summary measure that reflects their relationship histories in terms of the types of relationships that individuals tended to experience. This variable is created across individuals' set of sexual relationships. First, a detailed variable was created that distinguished all possible unique combinations of the different types of relationships individuals' experienced. This

variable was then collapsed into the following categories based on commonly observed groupings: (1) all or most of individuals' relationships were cohabiting relationships, (2) all or most of individuals' relationships were exclusively dating relationships, (3) some of individuals' relationships were cohabiting or exclusively dating (i.e., serious) and some of individuals' relationships were frequently but not exclusively dating relationships, occasionally dating relationships, or sexual only relationships (i.e., casual), (4) all or most of individuals' relationships were frequently but not exclusively dating relationships and occasionally dating relationships, and (5) all or most of individuals' relationships were sexual only. The reference category in the multinomial regression analysis is the "all or most relationships were exclusively dating" category as this is the most common relationship history and is most normative in terms of type and features for this age group.

Individual sociodemographic characteristics. We also examine several individual-level sociodemographic measures, including gender, race/ethnicity, age, family background, and religious denomination. Gender is coded as 1 for men and 0 for women. For race/ethnicity, priority is given to any mention of being Hispanic, with groups defined as non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, or non-Hispanic other.[4] Non-Hispanic white is the reference category in the multinomial regression analysis. In the bivariate cross-tabulations, age is represented as the age of the individual at the beginning of the relationship. This variable is measured in years and categorized into quintiles: (1) 15 years or younger, (2) 16-17 years, (3) 18-19 years, (4) 20-21 years, and (5) 22 years or older. This measure of age is unique to each relationship and thus varies across relationships. In the multinomial regression analysis, we include age at Wave III, which is measured in years and ranges from 18-27.

[4] The other category combines Asians and Native Americans due to small sample sizes. We recognize that combining these two groups is problematic, however due to small sample sizes we combine rather than drop them. Given that this is now a heterogeneous group, we will not make much of the results for this contrast.

Family background during adolescence is also included as an individual-level measure in the multinomial regression analysis. Information from the Add Health household roster at Wave I was used to construct a detailed family structure variable categorized as: (1) two biological parents, (2) biological mother with stepfather, (3) biological father with stepmother, (4) biological mother only, (5) biological father only, and (6) "other" situations (e.g., living with relatives other than parents). The two biological parents category is the reference. Mother's and father's education are separately coded as years of schooling completed.[5] For a resident parent whose education was not reported, the missing value was imputed using conditional mean imputation. Household income for 1994 was available only from information obtained from the Wave I Parent questionnaire. Approximately 17,000 of the Wave I respondents had a parent who was also interviewed at Wave I. For missing cases, log-income is imputed from family characteristics as reported by the adolescent, using OLS regression.[6] Religious denomination during adolescence is also included in the multinomial regression analysis. Respondents were asked to identify their religious affiliation from a list of 28 responses that also included no affiliation. Religious affiliation is collapsed into the following categories[7]: (1) no religious affiliation, (2) Catholic, (3) Protestant, (4) Non-Christian, (5) "other" religions, (5) missing information. Protestants are the reference group in the multinomial regression analysis.

Analytic Strategy

We first develop relationship-specific measures for each relationship and then construct the summary measure representing relationship histories for each individual. Descriptive statistics and percentage distributions of individual and relationship characteristics are presented

[5] Nonresident parents were coded zero on education. Any constant would be valid; zero is convenient. Interpretation of contrasts between family types without a defined parent and family types with both parents requires post-estimation calculation.

[6] The characteristics used in the imputation include mother's education, father's education, family structure, number of hours worked per week by the father and mother, and whether the mother and father received public assistance.

[7] These categories are based on similar categories used in past research (Brewster et al., 1998; Ellison, 1991).

for all young adults and separately for women and men. Bivariate cross-tabulations are performed to examine whether the characteristics of young adults' relationships vary by their race/ethnicity and age. We also perform bivariate cross-tabulations to investigate whether features of these relationships differ across relationship types. Design-based F tests are conducted to determine significant differences by gender, race/ethnicity, age, and relationship type. Finally, we utilize multinomial regression analysis to examine associations between individual-level sociodemographic characteristics and the different types of relationship histories experienced by young adults. Bivariate cross-tabulations and multinomial regression analysis are stratified by gender. All analyses are weighted, account for the complex study design, and were performed using Stata 8.2 (Stata Corp, 2003).

Results

Individual and relationship characteristics, total and by gender

The first panel of Table 1 presents the individual-level characteristics of the young adults (N=8,701 individuals). The mean age of respondents at Wave III is 22 years. There are similar percentages of women and men. Over two-thirds of the young adults are white (70.1%), followed by blacks (15.0%), Hispanics (10.8%), and the remainder are Asian or Native American. Over half of young adults lived with both biological parents as of the Wave I interview date, and almost one-quarter lived with their biological mother only; the remainder lived in stepfamilies, with their biological father only, or in other situations. Among young adults who had a mother, maternal education as of Wave I was 13.2 years and among those who had a father, paternal education as of Wave I was 13.5 years (both equivalent to some college). The mean 1994 household income was $44,722. Over half of young adults identified as Protestant at the Wave I interview, one-quarter identified as Catholic, and over 10% stated that they did not have a religious affiliation. The remaining youth identified as Non-Christian, some

other religion, or did not provide information on religious affiliation. With the exception of family background, there are no significant differences in these characteristics by gender.

The second panel of Table 1 presents the characteristics of young adults' relationships (N=24,470 relationships). The majority of relationships are described as exclusively dating (37.9%), followed by relationships described as sexual only (23.2%), cohabiting (19.2%), frequently but not exclusively dating (11.9%), and relationships in which the couple dated once in a while (7.8%). About 10% of couples had known one other for a day or less before first sex, over one-quarter of couples had known one other for more than a month but less than six months, and over 20% had known one other for a year or more. Almost one-quarter of relationships lasted a month or less, almost half lasted more than a month but less than or equal to a year, and over one-quarter lasted for more than a year. Sex occurred on only one occasion for almost 20% of relationships. Among relationships in which sex occurred on more than one occasion, the majority involve sex about 1 time per week, followed by relationships in which sex occurs 4-7 times per week, 2 times per week, 3 times per week, and 8 or more times per week. Almost one-quarter of relationships involve a partner who is more than two years older, one-fifth of partners are the same age, and less than 7% of relationships involve a partner who is more than two years younger. About 20% of relationships are interracial. Over one-fifth of relationships are current as of the Wave III interview date. A pregnancy occurred in 11% of relationships. The majority of relationships began when the respondent was 18 to 19 years old; less than 10% began at age 15 or younger and over 12% began at age 22 or older. There are significant differences in the characteristics of young women's and men's relationships. Women's relationships are more likely to be described as exclusively dating than are men's relationships, and men's relationships are more likely to be described as sex only than are women's relationships. Women knew their partners for a longer amount of time before first having sex. Women's relationships are longer

than men's relationships. Men report having had more frequent sexual activity. Women are more likely to be involved with an older partner whereas men are more likely to date partners who are the same age or younger. There are no gender differences in whether the partner is a different race/ethnicity. Women are more likely to report a current relationship. Women's relationships are more likely to have involved a pregnancy. Women are also more likely to have started their relationships at younger ages than men.

The last panel of Table 1 presents the summary relationship measures for young adults (N=8,701 individuals). About 19% of young adults were involved in mostly cohabiting relationships and over one-third were involved in mostly exclusively dating relationships. About 11% had mostly frequently but not exclusively dated or occasionally dated and over 12% were involved in mostly sex only relationships. Over 20% of young adults had experienced some serious relationships (i.e., cohabiting or exclusively dating) and some casual relationships (i.e., frequently but not exclusively dating, occasionally dating, or having sex only). Women are more likely than men to have had mostly exclusively dating relationship experiences and men are more likely than women to have experienced mostly sex only relationships. Over one-quarter of young adults had experienced a pregnancy in any relationship, with women being more likely than men to have had a pregnancy. The average number of relationships per individuals is 2.8, with women reporting slightly more relationships than men (2.9 and 2.7, respectively).

Relationship characteristics by race/ethnicity

Tables 2a and 2b present the bivariate distributions of relationship characteristics by young women's and men's race/ethnicity, respectively. There are no racial/ethnic differences in relationship type among women. However, among men, blacks are more likely to have had cohabiting relationships and sex only relationships (21.8% and 30.5%, respectively) and whites and other race/ethnicities are more likely to have had exclusively dating relationships (37.0% and

44.4%, respectively). Black women are more likely to have known their partner for a longer amount of time (29.9%) and other racial/ethnic women are least likely to have known their partner for a day or less (3.6%); there is no difference among men. Both white women and men are more likely than their racial/ethnic counterparts to have had relationships that lasted a month or less (22.8% and 27.6%, respectively) and black women and men are more likely to have had relationships that lasted over two years (24.8% and 20.1%, respectively). There are no significant differences across racial/ethnic groups in terms of age differences between partners. There are, however, racial/ethnic differences in whether the partner is a different race/ethnicity, with different patterns for women and men. Among women, other race/ethnicities have the highest percentage (66.6%), followed by Hispanics (51.4%) and whites (17.3%), with black women having the lowest percentage (9.6%). Among men, however, Hispanics have the highest percentage (47.4%), followed by other race/ethnicities (44.1%) and blacks (29.7%), and finally whites (19.4%). Black and Hispanic women are more likely to report a current relationship (28.0% and 26.3%, respectively) and black and other racial/ethnic men are more likely to report a current relationship (27.7% and 28.3%, respectively). Among both women and men, blacks and Hispanics have the highest percentage of relationships with a pregnancy.

Relationship characteristics by age

Tables 3a and 3b present the bivariate distributions of relationship characteristics by young women's and men's age at the beginning of the relationship, respectively. There are significant age differences in the characteristics of relationships for both women and men. The patterns are similar for women and men, unless otherwise noted. The percentage of relationships that are exclusively dating decreases as the age at which the relationship was formed increases (e.g., among women, it is 51.3% at age 15 or younger and 32.9% at age 20 or 21). Sex only relationships are less common among relationships that began prior to age 18 and more common

among relationships that began at age 20 or 21 (e.g., among men, it is 22.5% at age 16 or 17 and 35.3% at age 20 or 21). Among women, most cohabiting relationships began at age 18 or 19 whereas among men, most began at age 22 or older. As the age at the start of the relationship increases, the percentage of relationships in which the couple knew one another for a week or less increases. Relationships that were formed during adolescence tend to be longer than those formed in adulthood. For instance, among relationships that began at 15 years or younger, one-third of women's and one-quarter of men's relationships lasted over two years compared to less than 5% among relationships that began at age 22 or older. There are also differences in whether the partner is older or younger. Among men, as age at the beginning of the relationship increases, the percentage of relationships with a partner who is the same age decreases (e.g., 33.6% at age 15 or younger and 17.1% at age 22 or older) and the percentage of relationships with a partner who is three or more years younger increases (e.g., 3.9% at age 15 or younger and 24.9% at age 22 or older). Among women, relationships formed at later ages are more likely to involve younger partners than those formed earlier. Relationships formed later are more likely to be current. Pregnancies are more likely to have occurred in relationships that began earlier (e.g., among women, it is 22.1% at age 15 or younger and 9.2% at age 22 or older).

Relationship characteristic by relationship type

Tables 4a and 4b present the bivariate distributions of relationship characteristics by relationship type for young women and men, respectively. Relationship type is significantly associated with all other relationship characteristics among men, and all expect for whether the partner is a different race/ethnicity among women. The patterns are similar for women and men, unless otherwise noted. Exclusively dating relationships are least likely to involve couples who had known one another for less than a week before first having sex and sex only relationships are most likely. The majority of cohabiting relationships lasted over two years (42.4% among

women and 35.3% among men), the majority of exclusively dating relationships lasted between five months and a year (35.7% among women and 36.3% among men), the majority of frequently dating relationships lasted more than a month but less than five (39.1% among women and 43.8% among men), the majority of occasionally dating relationships (37.8% among women and 36.7% among men) and the majority of sex only relationships lasted a month or less (65.1% among women and 63.8% among men). This suggests that, in general, relationships that are more committed in terms of type tend to be longer than those that are less committed. The association between frequency of sexual activity and relationship type is more variable, although it appears that the least committed relationships (i.e., occasionally dating and sex only) are more likely to have had sex on only one occasion. Sexual activity occurs more than three times per week for the majority of cohabiting relationships.

Cohabiting unions are most likely to involve a partner who is three or more years older (43.8% among women and 14.6% among men). Exclusively dating relationships are least likely to have this type of age difference (32.0% among women and 5.2% among men). The most common type of age difference among women's sex only relationships is one in which the partner is three or more years older (38.4%). Exclusively dating relationships are least likely to be interracial (18.2% among women and 17.4% among men) and sex only relationships are the most likely (24.8% among women and 21.4% among men), but this difference across types is only significant for women. Almost half of cohabiting relationships and almost one-quarter of exclusively dating relationships are current. About 40% of women's cohabiting relationships and over one-quarter of men's cohabiting relationships involved a pregnancy. The majority of all types of relationships began when the individual was 18 or 19 years old. Exclusively dating relationships are more likely to have been formed when the individual was 15 years old or younger relative to the other types of relationships.

Relationship histories

The next set of tables present the results of the multinomial regression analysis of relationship histories in terms of the most common types of relationships experienced. Recall that the comparison group includes individuals who mostly had exclusively dating relationships and that the "some serious and some casual" type of history is comprised of individuals who had some cohabiting or exclusively dating relationships and some frequently but not exclusively dating, occasionally dating, or sex only relationships.

Table 5a presents the results for women. The older the young woman is at Wave III, the more likely she is to have had mostly cohabiting relationship experiences or to have had some serious and some casual relationships relative to mostly exclusively dating relationships. Black women are less likely than white women to have formed mostly cohabiting relationships but are more likely to have been involved in mostly frequently but not exclusive or occasionally dating relationships. Compared to women who were raised with both biological parents, women who lived with their biological mother and stepfather are more likely to have had some serious and some casual relationship experiences. (Post-estimation computation is required to evaluate the family structure contrasts without two parents. The model coefficients cannot be interpreted without taking parental education into consideration. When evaluated at the mean of mother's education, the contrast for biological mom only for mostly sexual only relationship experiences is positive, indicating that women who lived in this type of family situation during adolescence are more likely to have had this type of relationship experience.) As mother's education increases, the likelihood of having had some serious and some casual relationship experiences decreases, as does the likelihood of having had mostly frequently or occasionally dating relationships relative to mostly exclusively dating relationships. As father's education increases, the likelihood of having had mostly cohabiting relationship experiences, mostly frequently or

occasional dating relationship experiences, and mostly sex only relationship experiences decreases. Compared to women raised as Protestant, women with no religious affiliation are more likely to have had mostly cohabiting relationships. Women who identified as some other religion during adolescence are less likely to have had some serious and some casual relationships, as are those who did not provide information on their religious denomination. Catholic and non-Christian women are less likely to have had mostly frequently or occasionally dating relationship experiences. Having had a pregnancy in any relationship is positively associated with having mostly cohabiting relationships and with having some serious and some casual relationships. As the number of relationships increases, the likelihood of having had mostly cohabiting relationships decreases, whereas the likelihood of having had any of the other relationship experiences increases relative to having mostly exclusively dating experiences.

Table 5b presents the results for men. Age is also positively associated with relationship experiences for men but is only significant for having had mostly cohabiting relationships relative to mostly exclusively dating relationships. There are also racial/ethnic differences for men but different patterns exist. Unlike women, black men are not significantly different from white men in terms of having mostly cohabiting relationships. Black men are more likely than white men to have had mostly frequently or occasionally dating relationship experiences and also to have mostly sex only relationships. Whereas there are no differences between Hispanics and whites among women, there are for men. Compared to white men, Hispanic men are more likely to have had mostly cohabiting relationship experiences and to have had mostly frequently or occasionally dating relationship experiences. Family background during adolescence is also important for men, but different factors are significant. Men who lived with a biological father and stepmother are more likely to have mostly cohabiting relationships and to have mostly frequently or occasional dating relationships relative to mostly exclusively dating relationships.

(Post-estimation calculations are required to evaluate the coefficient for biological mom only for mostly cohabiting relationships. Upon evaluation at the mean of mother's education, this contrast is positive, indicating that men who lived with a biological mother only are more likely to have had this type of relationship experience compared to men raised with both biological parents.) Unlike women, mothers' education is not associated with having had particular relationship experiences and father's education is only negatively associated with having had mostly cohabiting relative to mostly exclusively dating relationship experiences. And, while there was no income effect among women, household income during adolescence is significant and negatively associated with having any of the other types of relationship experiences relative to having mostly exclusively dating relationships among men. The effect of religious denomination during adolescence is not as pronounced for men, with only men who identified as Catholic being less likely to have had mostly frequently or occasionally dating experiences. Similar to the findings for women, the likelihood of having had any pregnancy is higher for men with mostly cohabiting experiences as well as for men with some serious and some casual relationship experiences. Also similar to women, as the number of relationships increases, the likelihood of having mostly cohabiting relationships decreases, whereas the likelihood of having any of the other relationship experiences increases.

Discussion

The results of this study highlight the variability in young adults' nonmarital sexual relationships and in their relationship histories. The type and features of these relationships differ depending on the gender, race/ethnicity, and age of the individual and several patterns of associations across racial/ethnic groups and age categories differ for women and men. In addition, the features of these nonmarital sexual relationships vary by whether they are cohabiting, exclusively dating, frequently but not exclusively dating, occasionally dating, or

sexual only relationships. Finally, a number of individual-level sociodemographic characteristics are associated with the type of relationship histories that young adults experience, the effects of which differ for women and men. The findings point to the need for continuing research to further elaborate and better understand the determinants and consequences of these differences.

There are several gender differences in the distributions of the commitment indicators. Women are more likely than men to report exclusively dating relationships whereas men are more likely than women to report sex only relationships. Women's relationships tend to be longer than men's relationships. Men report having known their partners for a shorter amount of time before first sex and report more frequent sexual activity in their relationships than do women. These gender differences support the notion that women and men often have different motivations for and attitudes regarding relationships, with women more often reporting the importance of commitment and men more often supporting casual sex (Oliver & Hyde, 1993). Although these differences may not be expected given that these are heterosexual relationships, it is likely a result of the truncated age range of this sample and differential relationship trajectories and processes that vary by gender. The oldest individuals are 27 years old. If we were able to follow these adults, we may find that as men age and thus enter more serious relationships, the characteristics of women's and men's relationships may become more similar. In addition, women often date older men who are likely outside the age range of this sample. Another reason for these differences may be reporting differences. Men may be less likely to remember the details of their relationships and thus less likely to report their relationships, and women may recall more serious relationships and thus report these at the exclusion of casual relationships. Gender differences may also be the result of perceptual differences in the how relationships are defined and characterized. Two individuals in the same relationship may evaluate the relationship differently. A woman may define the relationship as exclusively dating while her

partner may describe the same relationship as frequently but not exclusively dating. Similarly, if the end date of a relationship, for example, is ambiguous because the couple repeatedly breaks up and then gets back together, the perceived end date may not be the same for both partners.

We also find significant differences in the commitment indicators according to the age at which the relationship was formed. Fewer exclusively dating relationships are started at later ages. This does not support our hypothesis that relationships formed earlier are less committed in terms of type than those formed later. It is likely however, that youth are forming other types of committed relationships in early adulthood, such as cohabitations, and are also experimenting with other types of relationships, such as sex only relationships. In fact, the percentage of relationships described as sexual only is lower among relationships that began during adolescence and higher among those that began during early adulthood. And among men, the percentage of cohabiting relationships increases with increasing age at formation. Couples tend to know one another for a shorter amount of time before first having sex at older ages of relationship formation. Age has substantial cultural and social meaning and indicates to the youth and to society what type of relationships and behaviors may or may not be appropriate (DeLamater, 1987; Gagnon, 1990). With increasing age, sexual activity becomes more appropriate and thus individuals may not deem it necessary to wait as long to engage in sexual activity and may be less hesitant about engaging in sex only relationships. In addition, the social controls placed on youth are often lower in young adulthood than in adolescence, and the social contexts within which individuals meet and interact with partners change with age. Relationships formed at older ages are also less likely than those formed earlier to be of longer duration. This again may be the result of experimenting with other types of relationships. In early adulthood, as youth transition from their parents' home to their own, enter college, and begin employment, exposure to different geographic locations, social contexts, and partner pools

may expand and therefore result in the formation of new relationships. If we were to follow these individuals and their relationships, we may observe the hypothesized association.

There are also differences in terms of homogamy. As other studies have found (Ford et al., 2001; Ford & Norris, 2000), women are more likely than men to be involved in relationships with an older partner. In addition, we find that as the age at relationship formation increases, the percentage of relationships with a partner who is older also increases; this pattern is observed for both women and men. Consistent with other researchers (Ford et al., 2001; Joyner & Kao, 2005), we observe that the formation of interracial relationships during youth is not unusual. About one-fifth of relationships involve partners who are heterogamous in terms of race/ethnicity. This percentage is similar for women and men, a pattern that is also exhibited among a sample of adolescent relationships (Ford et al., 2003), and is also similar across the different categories of age at relationship formation. There are however, substantial racial/ethnic differences in involvement in interracial relationships, as has been indicated by other research (Ford & Lepkowski, 2004; Ford et al., 2002; Joyner & Kao, 2005; Laumann & Youm, 1999). Furthermore, our results suggest that there are different patterns of involvement in these types of relationships for women and men. Other racial/ethnic women have the highest percentage of interracial relationships and are followed closely by Hispanic women. White women are much less likely to have partners of a different race/ethnicity and black women are the least likely. Hispanic men, on the other hand, are the most likely to be involved in a relationship with a partner who is a different race/ethnicity, followed by other racial/ethnic men, black men, and white men. We confirm the finding that blacks are less likely than other racial/ethnic groups to form interracial relationships. We find however, that black women exhibit the lowest percentage of these types of relationships, much lower than black men. This may be a function of the differential supply of eligible partners available to black women. Black women's social

networks may also hold varying levels of acceptance of interracial relationships for women compared to men.

Youth are involved in various types of sexual relationships that have unique features. Exclusively dating relationships are least likely and sex only relationships are most likely to involve couples who knew one another for a day or less before first sex. The more committed types of relationships (i.e., cohabiting and exclusively dating) last longer and engage in more frequent sexual activity. The least committed types (i.e., occasionally dating or sex only) are most likely to involve sex on only one occasion. Although we hypothesized that there would be less heterogamy in more committed types of relationships such as cohabiting relationships, we find that cohabiting relationships are actually more likely to involve partners who are a different age than are exclusively dating relationships. Cohabiting relationships tend to be less similar on ascribed characteristics such as age relative to marital relationships (Schoen & Weinick, 1993) and couples who lived together before marriage are less homogamous in terms of age than those who did not (Forste & Tanfer, 1996). It may be that these exclusive relationships are the types of relationships that are more likely to proceed to marriage than to cohabitation, thereby partially explaining this result. We do, however, observe differences in terms of whether the partner is a different race/ethnicity among women, which does support our hypothesis. Relationships described as only sexual are most likely to involve a partner who is a different race/ethnicity and relationships described as exclusively dating are least likely. We are able to examine a more detailed measure of relationship type and observe that there are important differences in the features of these relationship types that may not have been detected by the commonly utilized dichotomous measures of past research. In other words, there appear to be gradations of relationship type; more committed relationships can be broken down into additional categories of cohabiting and exclusively dating, and we find that the characteristics of these two types differ.

Similarly, less committed relationships can be further broken down into categories of frequently but not exclusively dating, dating once in a while, and only having sex, and again there is variation across these categories.

Our multinomial regression analysis of young adults' relationship histories reveal new findings yet to be corroborated in the literature. While the majority of young adults experience mostly cohabiting or mostly exclusively dating relationships, a substantial percentage experience both serious and casual relationships, and a fair amount experience mostly sex only relationships. Several sociodemographic factors are associated with having experienced certain relationship histories, even after controlling for number of relationships and pregnancy. For women and men, older individuals at Wave III are more likely to have experienced mostly cohabiting relative to mostly exclusively dating relationships. Race/ethnicity, family background, and religious denomination are also associated with relationship experience for women and men, but in different ways. While black women are less likely to have experienced mostly cohabiting relationships relative to white women, there are no differences in this type of experience between white and black men. There are few other racial/ethnic differences among women, but several differences among men. For instance, black men are more likely than white men to have experienced relationships that were mostly sexual only and Hispanic men are more likely than white men to have experienced mostly frequently but not exclusively or occasionally dating relationships. Higher levels of maternal and paternal education are associated with lower likelihoods of having the other types of experiences relative to having had mostly exclusively dating relationships, but this is significant only among women. Among men, it is a higher household income level that is associated with a lower likelihood of having had the other types of experiences. Religious denomination is more pronounced among women. For instance, women who were raised with no religious affiliation are more likely to have had mostly

cohabiting experiences and women who were raised as Catholic or a non-Christian religion are less likely to have had mostly casual experiences (i.e., frequently but not exclusively or occasionally dating relationships). These results confirm the hypothesized associations between these key sociodemographic characteristics and the relationship histories youth experience, and illustrate that these factors differ for women and men. Further research in this area is warranted.

This study provides new descriptive information regarding youth's nonmarital sexual relationships. However, it is not without limitations. There may be recall or reporting bias that creates a select sample of identified relationships. Individuals may remember and thus report more salient long-term relationships but overlook more casual short-term relationships. In addition, there may be selection into certain types of relationships. For instance, individuals who are motivated by intimacy needs may have fewer partners, have partners who are more familiar, and have closer relationships than those who are motivated by pleasure-seeking goals (Cooper, Shapiro, & Powers, 1998). Because of the truncated age range of these young adults, there may also be selection of individuals who transitioned to sexual relationships at earlier ages. There are other dimensions of relationships that are also important but are unavailable for this sample of sexual relationships, such as emotional closeness, gender equity, and violence. In addition, we have not yet accounted for overlap across relationships. Although an individual may have described a relationship as exclusively dating, we have not yet confirmed that this is the case. We also do not have information from the individual's partners and are therefore only capturing one member of the couple's perspective on how a relationship is defined and characterized. Still, these results provide some of the first detailed descriptive results for a more normative sample of nonmarital sexual relationships.

Again, the results that we present are descriptive and preliminary. This research is still in progress. Ultimately, our goal is to determine the best characterization of these nonmarital

sexual relationships. One possible approach will be to create relationship typologies. For example, a relationship may be categorized by a combination of characteristics, such as shorter duration, sex only, and overlaps with other sexual relationships. As there are no standardized scales or data reduction techniques to accurately conceptualize these relationships, we will also explore whether some relationship-specific measures, such as factors that reflect commitment, may be better represented as scales. Multilevel modeling strategies will be employed, which will allow us to model within individual variation, while also modeling variability between individuals and testing for cross-level interactions. Once we have a clearer understanding of these relationships, we will proceed to an investigation of relationship-specific contraceptive practices and the role of the relational context within a multilevel framework.

In order to better understand the extent to which the relational context may influence behavior within and across relationships, it is imperative that researchers explore relationships in a more comprehensive manner than has been done in the past. Moreover, it is critical that we begin to recognize that simple dichotomies, such as regular versus casual or romantic versus nonromantic, may not adequately characterize the potentially numerous types of relationships that are formed during the early life course. Youth form a variety of relationships and these different relationship types have unique features. This has implications for behavior and may explain, for instance, the mixed results of previous research regarding the association between relationship type and contraceptive practices. Our study extends research in the area of romantic and sexual relationships by providing some of the first descriptive findings on nonmarital sexual relationships among a nationally representative sample of young adults.

References

Abma, J., Driscoll, A., Moore, K. (1998). Young women's degree of control over first intercourse. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 30, 12-18.

Becker, G.S. (1981). *A treatise on the family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Berscheid, E., Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. (1989). The relationship closeness inventory: Assessing the closeness of interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(5), 792-807.Blumstein, P., & Kollock, P. (1988). Personal relationships. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14, 467-490.

Blumstein, P., & Kollock, P. (1988). Personal relationships. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14, 467-490.

Brewster, K.L., Cooksey, E.C., Guilkey, D.K., & Rindfuss, R.R. (1998). The changing impact of religion on the sexual and contraceptive behavior of adolescent women in the United States. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60: 493-504.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1995). Developmental ecology through space and time: A future perspective. In P. Moen, G.H. Elder Jr., & K. Luscher (Eds.), *Examining lives in context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development* (pp. 599-619). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Brown, B.B. (1999). "You're going out with who?" Peer group influences on adolescent romantic relationships. In W. Furman, B.B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 291-329). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, B.B., Feiring, C., & Furman, W. (1999). Missing the love boat: Why researchers have shied away from adolescent romance. In W. Furman, B.B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 1-16). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Christopher, F.S. (2001). *To dance the dance: A symbolic interactional exploration of premarital sexuality*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Coates, D.L. (1999). The cultured and culturing aspects of romantic experiences in adolescence. In W. Furman, B.B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 330-363). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, W.A. (2003). More than myth: The developmental significance of romantic relationships during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13(1), 1-24.

Connolly, J.A., & Goldberg, A. (1999). Romantic relationships in adolescence: The role of friends and peers in their emergence. In W. Furman, B.B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 266-290). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, M.L., Shapiro, C.M., & Powers, A.M. (1998). Motivations for sex and risky sexual behavior among adolescents and young adults: A functional perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(6), 1528-1558.

Crissey, S.R. (2005). Race/ethnic differences in the marital expectations of adolescents: The role of romantic relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 697-709.

Darroch, J.E., Landry, D.J., & Oslak, S. (1999). Age differences between sexual partners in the United States. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 31(4), 160-167.

Darroch, J.E., Singh, S., Frost, J.J. and the Study Team. (2001). Differences in teenage pregnancy rates among five developed countries: The roles of sexual activity and contraceptive use. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 33(6), 244-250, 281.

DeLamater, J. (1981). The social control of sexuality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 7, 263-290.

DeLamater, J. (1987). Gender differences in sexual scenarios. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Females, males, and sexuality: Theories and research* (pp. 127-139). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Elder, G.H., Jr. (1995). The life course paradigm: Social change and individual development. In P. Moen, G.H. Elder Jr., & K. Luscher (Eds.), *Examining lives in context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development* (pp. 101-139). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ellison, C.G. (1991). Religious involvement and subjective well- being. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 32(1), 80-99.

Erikson, E.H. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis*. New York: Norton.

Feiring, C. (1999). Gender identity and the development of romantic relationships in adolescence. In W. Furman, B.B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 211-232). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Finer, L.B., Darroch, J.E., & Singh, S. (1999). Sexual partnership patterns as a behavioral risk factor for sexually transmitted diseases. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 31(5), 228-236.

Fischer, J.L., Munsch, J., & Greene, S.M. (1996). Adolescence and intimacy. In G.R. Adams, R.M. Montemayor, & T.P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Psychosocial development during adolescence* (pp. 95-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ford, K., & Norris, A. (2000). Patterns of union formation among urban minority youth in the United States. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 29(2), 177-188.

Ford, K., & Lepkowski, J. (2004). Characteristics of sexual partners and STD infection among American adolescents. *International Journal of STD and AIDS*, 15, 260-265.

Ford, K., Sohn, W., & Lepkowski, J. (2001). Characteristics of adolescents' sexual partners and their association with use of condoms and other contraceptive methods. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 33, 100-105, 132.

Ford, K., Sohn, W., & Lepkowski, J. (2002). American adolescents: sexual mixing patterns, bridge partners, and concurrency. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*, 29(1), 13-19.

Ford, K., Sohn, W., & Lepkowski, J. (2003). Ethnicity or race, area characteristics, and sexual partner choice among American adolescents. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40(2), 211-218.

Forste, R. & Tanfer, K. (1996). Sexual exclusivity among dating, cohabiting, and married women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 33-47.

Fortenberry, J.D., Tu, W., Harezlak, J., Katz, B.P., & Orr, D.P. (2002). Condom use as a function of time in new and established adolescent sexual relationships. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92(2), 211-213.

Fox, G.L. (1981). The family's role in adolescent sexual behavior. In T. Ooms (Ed.), *Teenage pregnancy in a family context,* (pp. 73-130). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Furman, W., Brown, B.B., & Feiring, C. (Eds.) (1999). *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Furman, W., & Wehner, E.A. (1994). Romantic views: Toward a theory of adolescent romantic relationships. In R. Montemayor, G.R. Adams, & T.P. Gullota (Eds.), *Personal relationships during adolescence* (pp. 168-195). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gagnon, J.H. (1990). The explicit and implicit use of the scripting perspective in sex research. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 1, 1-43.

Gagnon, J.H., & Simon, W. (1973). *Sexual conduct: The social sources of human sexuality*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Glei, D.A. (1999). Measuring contraceptive use patterns among teenage and adult women. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 31(2), 73-80.

Graber, J.A., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Galen, B.R. (1998). Betwixt and between: Sexuality in the context of adolescent transitions. In R. Jessor (Ed.), *New perspectives on adolescent risk behavior* (pp. 270-316). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Harris, K.M., Florey, F., Tabor, J., Bearman, P.S., Jones, J., & Udry, J.R. (2003). The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health: Research Design [WWW document]. URL: http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/design.

Herold, E.S., & Marshall, S.K. (1996). Adolescent sexual development. In G.R. Adams, R.M. Montemayor, & T.P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Psychosocial development during adolescence* (pp. 62-94). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Howard, M.M., Fortenberry, D., Blythe, M.J., Zimet, G.D., & Orr, D.P. (1999). Patterns of sexual partnerships among adolescent females. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 24(5), 300-303.

Hynie, M., Lydon, J. E., Cote, S., & Wiener, S. (1998). Relational sexual scripts and women's condom use: The importance of internalized norms. *Journal of Sex Research*, 35(4), 370-380.

Joyner, K. , & Kao, G. (2005). Interracial relationships and the transition to adulthood. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 563-581.

Katz, B.P., Fortenberry, D., Zimet, G.D., Blythe, M.J., & Orr, D.P. (2000). Partner-specific relationship characteristics and condom use among young people with sexually transmitted diseases. *Journal of Sex Research*, 37(1), 69-75.

Kelley, H.H., Berscheid, E., Christensen, A., Harvey, J.H., Huston, T.L., et al. (1983). *Close relationships*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Kelley, H.H., & Thibaut, J.W. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. New York: Freeman.

Ku, L., Sonenstein, F.L., & Pleck, J.H. (1994). The dynamics of young men's condom use during and across relationships. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 26(6), 246-251.

Laursen, B., & Jensen-Campbell, L.A. (1999). The nature and functions of social exchange in adolescent romantic relationships. In W. Furman, B.B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 50-74). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Laumann, E. O., & Youm, Y. (1999). Racial/ethnic group differences in the prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases in the United States: A network explanation. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*, 26(5), 250-261.

Leaper, C., & Anderson, K.J. (1997). Gender development and heterosexual romantic relationships during adolescence. In S. Shulman & W.A. Collins (Eds.), *Romantic relationships in adolescence: Developmental perspectives* (pp. 85-103). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lichter, D.T., McLaughlin, D.K., Kephart, G., & Landry, D.J. (1992). Race and the retreat from marriage: A shortage of marriageable men? *American Sociological Review*, 576, 781-799.

Macaluso, M., Demand, M.J., Artz, L.M., & Hook, E.W., III. (2000). Partner type and condom use. *AIDS*, 14(5), 537-546.

Maccoby, E.E. (1992). The role of parents in the socialization of children: An historical overview. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(6), 1006-1017.

Maccoby, E.E. (1998). *The two sexes: Growing up apart, coming together*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Maccoby, E.E., & Martin, J.A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.) & E.M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *The handbook of child psychology: Volume 4, Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.

Manlove, J., Ryan, S., & Franzetta, K. (2003). Patterns of contraceptive use within teenagers' first sexual relationships. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 35(6), 246-255.

Manning, W.D., Longmore, M.A., & Giordano, P.C. (2000). The relationship context of contraceptive use at first intercourse. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 32(3), 104-110.

McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J.M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415-444.

Miller, B.C., & Benson, B. (1999). Romantic and sexual relationship development during adolescence. In W. Furman, B.B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 99-121). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, H.G., Cain, V.S., Rogers, S.M., Gribble, J.N., & Turner, C.F. (1999). Correlates of sexually transmitted bacterial infections among U.S. women in 1995. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 31(1), 4-6, 23.

Miller, K.S., Clark, L.F., & Moore, J.S. (1997). Sexual initiation with older male partners and subsequent HIV risk behavior among female adolescents. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 29, 212-214.

Oliver, M.B., & Hyde, J.S. (1993). Gender differences in sexuality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 29-51.

Parsons, T., & Bales, R.F. (1955). *Family, socialization, and interaction process*. New York: Free Press.

Santelli, J.S., Brener, N.D., Lowry, R., Bhatt, A., & Zabin, L.S. (1998). Multiple sexual partners among U.S. adolescents and young adults. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 30(6), 271-275.

Schoen, R., & Weinick, R.M. (1993). Partner choice in marriage and cohabitations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 408-414.

Sheeran, P., Abraham, C., & Orbell, S. (1999). Psychosocial correlates of heterosexual condom use: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(1), 90-132.

Sprecher, S. (1998). Social exchange theories and sexuality. (The use of theory in research and scholarship on sexuality). *Journal of Sex Research*, 35(1), 32-41.

StataCorp. (2003). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 8.2*. College Station, TX: Stata Corporation.

Studer, M. & Thornton, A. (1987). Adolescent religiosity and contraceptive usage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49(1), 117-128.

Sullivan, H.S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York: Norton.

Thibaut, J.W., & Kelley, H.H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.

Thornton, A. (1990). The courtship process and adolescent sexuality. *Journal of Family Issues*, 11(3), 239-273.

Upchurch, D.M., Weisman, C.S., Shepherd, M., Brookmeyer, R., Fox, R., et al. (1991). Interpartner reliability of reporting of recent sexual behaviors. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 134(10), 1159-1166.

Ventura, S.T., Mosher, W.D., Curtin, S.C., Abma, J.C., & Henshaw, S.K. (2000). Trends in pregnancies and pregnancy rates by outcome: Estimates for the United States, 1976-96. *Vital Health Statistics*, 21(56). National Center for Health Statistics.

Wang, H., Kao, G., & Joyner, K. Stability of interracial and intraracial romantic relationships among adolescents. In press, *Social Science Research*.

Wingood, G.M., & DiClemente, R.J. (1998). Partner influences and gender-related factors associated with noncondom use among young adult African American women. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26(1), 29-51.

Zaleski, E.H., & Schiaffino, K.M. (2000). Religiosity and sexual risk taking behavior during the transition to college. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 223-227.

Acknowledgement

This research uses data from Add Health, a program project designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris, and funded by a grant P01-HD31921 from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 17 other agencies. Special acknowledgment is due Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Persons interested in obtaining data files from Add Health should contact Add Health, Carolina Population Center, 123 W. Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, NC 27516-2524 (www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth/contract.html).

Table 1. Select characteristics of young adults and their nonmarital sexual relationships, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002)

	Percentage or Mean		
Characteristics	Total	Women	Men
Individual characteristics			
Age at Wave III (yrs)	21.79	21.68	21.90
Gender			
Women	50.4	-	-
Men	49.6	-	-
Race/ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic White	70.1	70.3	69.9
Non-Hispanic Black	15.0	15.7	14.3
Hispanic	10.8	10.1	11.5
Non-Hispanic Other	4.1	3.9	4.3
Family background at WI**			
Both biological parents	56.1	54.6	57.5
Biological mom/stepdad	8.2	8.5	8.0
Biological dad/stepmom	2.0	1.5	2.5
Biological mom only	24.8	26.9	22.6
Biological dad only	3.8	3.3	4.4
Other situations	5.1	5.2	5.0
Parental education at WI			
Maternal education	13.22	13.17	13.27
Paternal education	13.51	13.51	13.50
Household income at WI (1994)	$44,722	$44,847	$44,595
Religious denomination at WI			
No religion	13.5	13.2	13.8
Catholic	25.9	24.7	27.2
Protestant	54.2	55.6	52.7
Non-Christian	1.9	1.8	1.9
Other	3.0	3.1	3.0
Missing information on religion	1.5	1.6	1.4

Table continued on next page

Table 1. Select characteristics of young adults and their nonmarital sexual relationships, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002) (continued)

	Percentage or Mean		
Characteristics	Total	Women	Men
Relationship-specific characteristics			
Relationship type***			
Cohabiting	19.2	20.0	18.4
Exclusively dating	37.9	40.3	35.3
Frequently but not exclusively dating	11.9	13.2	10.5
Dating once in a while	7.8	8.6	6.9
Only having sex	23.2	17.9	28.9
Time knew each other before first sex***			
≤ 1 day	9.5	6.5	12.7
2-7 days	9.4	7.2	11.8
1-2 weeks	9.9	8.0	12.0
2-4 weeks	12.4	11.9	12.9
1-5 months	25.6	29.1	21.7
6 months-1 year	11.7	12.9	10.5
≥ 1 year	21.5	24.4	18.4
Duration of sexual relationship***			
≤ 1 month	23.5	21.1	26.1
2-4 months	22.2	21.7	22.8
5-12 months	25.0	26.2	23.7
13-27 months	13.8	14.0	13.7
≥ 28 months	15.5	17.0	13.7
Frequency of sexual activity***			
Had sex once	19.5	18.3	20.8
≤ 1 time per week	24.3	28.8	19.3
2 times per week	12.1	12.7	11.4
3 times per week	11.7	12.9	10.4
4-7 times per week	21.8	20.3	23.5
≥ 8 times per week	10.6	7.0	14.6
Age difference***			
Partner ≥ 3 years older	24.1	37.0	10.1
Partner 2 years older	11.0	15.8	5.7
Partner 1 year older	13.3	16.0	10.5
Partner same age	21.5	18.7	24.5
Partner 1 year younger	14.0	8.1	20.5
Partner 2 years younger	9.2	3.1	15.8
Partner ≥ 3 years younger	6.9	1.3	12.9
Race/ethnic difference			
Partner same race/ethnicity	79.7	79.0	80.4
Partner different race/ethnicity	20.3	21.0	19.6

Table continued on next page

Table 1. Select characteristics of young adults and their nonmarital sexual relationships, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002) (continued)

	Percentage or Mean		
	Total	Women	Men
Relationship-specific characteristics (continued)			
Current status*			
Past	77.9	77.0	78.9
Current	22.1	23.0	21.1
Pregnancy occurred in relationship***			
No	88.6	85.9	91.5
Yes	11.4	14.1	8.5
Respondent's age at beginning of relationship (yrs)***			
<=15	9.0	10.6	7.4
16-17	23.2	24.8	21.4
18-19	31.6	31.5	31.6
20-21	23.8	22.0	25.7
>=22	12.4	11.1	13.9
Summary relationship measures			
Relationship experiences***			
All or most cohabiting	19.1	19.2	19.0
All or most exclusively dating	36.0	38.4	33.6
Some serious/some casual†	21.7	22.2	21.1
All or most frequently or dating once in a while	10.9	11.7	10.1
All or most sexual only	12.3	8.5	16.2
Pregnancy in any relationship***	26.8	33.5	20.1
Number of relationships**	2.80	2.90	2.70

Note: Weighted percentages and means. *N*=4,682 women (*N*=13,581 relationships) and *N*=4,019 men (*N*=10,889 relationships).

Design-based F-test significance levels for gender comparisons: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$.

† Serious defined as cohabiting or exclusively dating and casual defined as frequently or occasionally dating or sexual only relationships.

Table 2a. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young women's nonmarital sexual relationships by young women's race/ethnicity, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002)

Relationship characteristics	White	Black	Hispanic	Other
Relationship type				
Cohabiting	20.0	18.9	23.3	17.8
Exclusively dating	41.2	36.8	37.7	41.4
Frequently but not exclusively dating	12.5	15.4	15.0	13.2
Dating once in a while	8.4	10.1	8.3	6.9
Only having sex	17.9	18.8	15.7	20.7
Time knew each other before first sex*				
≤ 1 day	7.1	5.3	5.6	3.6
2-7 days	7.6	6.2	6.8	5.8
1-2 weeks	8.3	7.1	7.9	5.7
2-4 weeks	12.0	11.2	11.9	11.9
1-5 months	28.7	27.8	31.3	36.5
6 months-1 year	12.7	12.5	13.9	14.5
≥ 1 year	23.6	29.9	22.6	22.0
Duration of sexual relationship***				
≤ 1 month	22.8	15.6	16.1	21.0
2-4 months	22.3	17.4	21.6	26.9
5-12 months	26.0	26.5	28.5	22.5
13-27 months	13.7	15.7	13.0	15.4
≥ 28 months	15.2	24.8	20.8	14.2

Table continued on next page

Table 2a. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young women's nonmarital sexual relationships by young women's race/ethnicity, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002) (continued)

	White	Black	Hispanic	Other
Relationship characteristics (continued)				
Frequency of sexual activity**				
Had sex once	18.9	16.9	16.2	17.4
≤ 1 time per week	27.9	32.3	28.5	33.4
2 times per week	12.6	12.1	13.4	17.1
3 times per week	12.8	13.1	14.1	10.6
4-7 times per week	21.3	16.5	19.5	16.0
≥ 8 times per week	6.5	9.1	8.3	5.5
Age difference				
Partner ≥ 3 years older	36.4	39.6	38.5	35.4
Partner 2 years older	15.9	14.9	16.8	16.8
Partner 1 year older	16.0	16.2	14.0	18.7
Partner same age	18.8	18.5	18.7	16.1
Partner 1 year younger	8.6	6.1	7.5	7.3
Partner 2 years younger	2.9	3.5	3.5	3.9
Partner ≥ 3 years younger	1.4	1.2	1.0	1.8
Partner different race/ethnicity***	17.3	9.6	51.4	66.6
Relationship current***	21.7	28.0	26.3	21.2
Pregnancy occurred in relationship***	10.4	28.8	21.5	11.8

Note: Weighted percentages. *N*=13,581 relationships.
Design-based F-test significance levels for racial/ethnic group comparisons: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 2b. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young men's nonmarital sexual relationships by young men's race/ethnicity, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002)

Relationship characteristics	White	Black	Hispanic	Other
Relationship type***				
Cohabiting	17.5	21.8	17.8	19.6
Exclusively dating	37.0	26.9	31.0	44.4
Frequently but not exclusively dating	9.9	12.5	12.9	7.3
Dating once in a while	6.6	8.3	8.0	5.8
Only having sex	28.6	30.5	30.3	22.9
Time knew each other before first sex				
≤ 1 day	13.2	11.6	12.3	8.7
2-7 days	11.4	14.4	11.6	12.4
1-2 weeks	11.8	12.0	13.6	9.3
2-4 weeks	12.5	14.4	13.8	11.9
1-5 months	22.1	18.9	21.3	26.1
6 months-1 year	10.2	9.7	12.8	13.2
≥ 1 year	18.8	19.0	14.6	18.4
Duration of sexual relationship***				
≤ 1 month	27.6	20.7	24.8	20.3
2-4 months	23.5	20.3	21.6	20.3
5-12 months	23.6	23.1	24.7	24.9
13-27 months	13.2	15.8	13.8	15.3
≥ 28 months	12.1	20.1	15.1	19.2

Table continued on next page

Table 2b. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young men's nonmarital sexual relationships by young men's race/ethnicity, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002) (continued)

	White	Black	Hispanic	Other
Relationship characteristics (continued)				
Frequency of sexual activity***				
Had sex once	21.3	19.7	22.0	11.8
≤ 1 time per week	19.2	20.6	18.2	19.1
2 times per week	11.1	14.4	9.2	11.2
3 times per week	10.2	11.1	10.4	11.6
4-7 times per week	25.1	16.8	20.7	25.0
≥ 8 times per week	13.0	17.4	19.5	21.3
Age difference				
Partner ≥ 3 years older	9.7	13.5	9.7	8.2
Partner 2 years older	5.8	4.9	6.0	4.8
Partner 1 year older	10.7	9.4	9.1	13.8
Partner same age	24.4	24.3	26.1	24.3
Partner 1 year younger	21.1	18.9	18.1	19.7
Partner 2 years younger	16.0	15.4	15.8	13.8
Partner ≥ 3 years younger	12.3	13.6	15.2	15.4
Partner different race/ethnicity***	12.5	29.7	47.4	44.1
Relationship current***	19.4	27.7	21.8	28.3
Pregnancy occurred in relationship***	5.8	18.4	13.8	9.9

Note: Weighted percentages. *N*=10,889 relationships.
Design-based F-test significance levels for racial/ethnic group comparisons: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 3a. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young women's nonmarital sexual relationships by young women's age at the beginning of the relationship, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002)

	<=15	16-17	18-19	20-21	>=22
Relationship characteristics					
Relationship type***					
Cohabiting	18.9	18.9	21.8	19.8	18.8
Exclusively dating	51.3	47.2	38.3	32.9	34.5
Frequently but not exclusively dating	8.7	12.0	13.6	14.1	16.9
Dating once in a while	7.0	8.2	7.9	9.7	10.8
Only having sex	14.1	13.7	18.4	23.5	19.0
Time knew each other before first sex***					
≤ 1 day	3.8	4.7	5.5	10.0	8.8
2-7 days	6.4	5.8	7.1	7.9	10.6
1-2 weeks	5.5	6.4	9.2	8.9	8.6
2-4 weeks	8.4	10.1	12.8	12.7	15.1
1-5 months	30.4	27.4	30.2	28.6	29.5
6 months-1 year	18.8	16.2	12.2	9.0	9.5
≥ 1 year	26.7	29.4	23.0	22.9	17.9
Duration of sexual relationship***					
≤ 1 month	14.8	16.9	20.9	26.8	25.8
2-4 months	12.4	17.5	21.9	27.2	28.6
5-12 months	26.6	26.1	25.9	24.4	30.6
13-27 months	11.9	14.0	15.9	13.3	11.8
≥ 28 months	34.3	25.5	15.4	8.3	3.2

Table continued on next page

Table 3a. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young women's nonmarital sexual relationships by young women's age at the beginning of the relationship, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002) (continued)

	<=15	16-17	18-19	20-21	>=22
Relationship characteristics (continued)					
Frequency of sexual activity					
Had sex once	16.0	17.5	18.3	20.6	17.2
≤ 1 time per week	26.7	29.7	28.1	28.8	30.8
2 times per week	12.4	12.7	13.1	12.0	13.8
3 times per week	16.9	13.3	12.1	11.8	12.4
4-7 times per week	21.3	20.3	21.3	19.6	17.7
≥ 8 times per week	6.7	6.5	7.1	7.2	8.1
Age difference***					
Partner ≥ 3 years older	38.5	31.9	37.0	38.4	43.9
Partner 2 years older	21.8	17.3	16.5	13.4	9.9
Partner 1 year older	20.3	19.1	16.1	12.6	11.2
Partner same age	15.4	20.1	19.2	20.1	14.7
Partner 1 year younger	2.7	8.8	8.1	9.5	8.8
Partner 2 years younger	1.2	2.2	2.4	4.1	7.0
Partner ≥ 3 years younger	0.1	0.6	0.7	2.0	4.5
Partner different race/ethnicity	17.6	20.1	21.2	22.1	23.6
Relationship current***	12.9	13.9	23.8	28.6	39.8
Pregnancy occurred in relationship***	22.1	17.3	13.2	10.4	9.2

Note: Weighted percentages. *N*=13,581 relationships.
Design-based F-test significance levels for age comparisons: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 3b. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young men's nonmarital sexual relationships by young men's age at the beginning of the relationship, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002)

	<=15	16-17	18-19	20-21	>=22
Relationship characteristics					
Relationship type***					
Cohabiting	12.2	16.2	19.7	18.3	22.7
Exclusively dating	45.2	45.0	35.4	29.2	25.8
Frequently but not exclusively dating	11.5	11.4	10.0	10.0	10.4
Dating once in a while	6.7	4.9	7.4	7.2	8.8
Only having sex	24.4	22.5	27.5	35.3	32.3
Time knew each other before first sex***					
≤ 1 day	9.7	7.3	12.1	16.5	17.5
2-7 days	8.9	9.8	11.7	12.9	15.0
1-2 weeks	9.9	10.0	12.1	12.8	14.1
2-4 weeks	14.7	12.1	12.3	13.2	13.6
1-5 months	21.4	25.7	22.5	19.9	17.1
6 months-1 year	12.3	14.3	10.2	8.9	7.3
≥ 1 year	23.1	20.8	19.1	15.8	15.4
Duration of sexual relationship***					
≤ 1 month	20.4	17.9	26.2	32.1	30.8
2-4 months	18.3	19.1	21.8	24.9	29.0
5-12 months	24.0	25.5	23.8	21.9	23.6
13-27 months	12.4	15.3	13.8	12.8	13.2
≥ 28 months	24.9	22.2	14.4	8.3	3.4

Table continued on next page

Table 3b. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young men's nonmarital sexual relationships by young men's age at the beginning of the relationship, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002) (continued)

	<=15	16-17	18-19	20-21	>=22
Relationship characteristics (continued)					
Frequency of sexual activity					
Had sex once	19.4	16.6	22.3	22.8	21.2
≤ 1 time per week	19.5	21.0	19.1	18.6	18.3
2 times per week	12.3	11.2	11.4	10.4	12.7
3 times per week	7.7	11.5	11.2	9.3	10.2
4-7 times per week	26.3	24.7	21.4	24.2	23.8
≥ 8 times per week	14.8	15.0	14.6	14.7	13.8
Age difference***					
Partner ≥ 3 years older	9.8	5.0	8.9	11.7	18.3
Partner 2 years older	11.2	5.7	5.3	4.6	5.7
Partner 1 year older	13.0	14.7	9.7	9.7	5.6
Partner same age	33.6	26.3	28.7	19.4	17.1
Partner 1 year younger	19.9	24.5	22.0	18.4	14.8
Partner 2 years younger	8.6	16.6	15.1	19.3	13.6
Partner ≥ 3 years younger	3.9	7.2	10.3	16.9	24.9
Partner different race/ethnicity	19.6	19.0	18.3	21.5	19.7
Relationship current***	7.7	11.5	20.5	26.4	34.3
Pregnancy occurred in relationship***	11.5	11.1	8.2	6.9	6.4

Note: Weighted percentages. *N*=10,889 relationships.
Design-based F-test significance levels for age comparisons: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 4a. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young women's nonmarital sexual relationships by relationship type, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002)

Relationship characteristics	Cohabiting	Exclusively dating	Frequently but not exclusively dating	Dating once in a while	Only having sex
Time knew each other before first sex***					
≤ 1 day	5.1	2.6	4.6	9.1	17.1
2-7 days	8.7	5.0	7.4	7.7	10.2
1-2 weeks	8.3	6.6	11.3	8.7	8.0
2-4 weeks	13.6	11.4	14.2	11.4	9.5
1-5 months	30.7	33.7	28.8	27.2	18.1
6 months-1 year	11.9	15.3	10.8	10.8	11.0
≥ 1 year	21.7	25.4	22.9	25.1	26.1
Duration of sexual relationship***					
≤ 1 month	2.2	8.3	18.1	37.8	65.1
2-4 months	8.9	21.6	39.1	32.7	18.2
5-12 months	23.3	35.7	29.7	16.5	10.1
13-27 months	23.2	17.5	7.3	6.9	4.1
≥ 28 months	42.4	16.9	5.8	6.1	2.5
Frequency of sexual activity***					
Had sex once	3.6	7.1	17.7	35.1	52.0
≤ 1 time per week	15.5	29.4	40.0	46.0	25.9
2 times per week	11.6	16.2	14.9	8.2	7.0
3 times per week	15.9	16.4	12.3	3.9	6.3
4-7 times per week	36.3	24.5	12.1	4.7	6.4
≥ 8 times per week	17.1	6.4	3.0	2.1	2.4

Table continued on next page

Table 4a. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young women's nonmarital sexual relationships by relationship type, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002) (continued)

Relationship characteristics (continued)	Cohabiting	Exclusively dating	Frequently but not exclusively dating	Dating once in a while	Only having sex
Age difference***					
Partner ≥ 3 years older	43.8	32.0	38.1	39.8	38.4
Partner 2 years older	15.0	16.5	15.9	16.8	14.9
Partner 1 year older	14.1	18.6	15.3	15.5	12.8
Partner same age	13.5	20.7	19.1	17.3	20.2
Partner 1 year younger	7.6	8.4	7.8	7.3	8.3
Partner 2 years younger	3.9	2.7	2.6	2.8	3.7
Partner ≥ 3 years younger	2.1	1.1	1.2	0.5	1.7
Partner different race/ethnicity***	21.4	18.2	23.1	22.1	24.8
Relationship current***	49.9	23.2	12.4	10.8	6.1
Pregnancy occurred in relationship***	40.2	10.3	6.3	4.8	3.9
Respondents' age at beginning of relationship***					
≤ 15 years	10.1	13.5	7.1	8.6	8.3
16-17 years	23.4	29.1	22.6	23.7	18.9
18-19 years	34.3	29.9	32.5	28.9	32.2
20-21 years	21.8	18.0	23.6	24.9	28.9
≥ 22 years	10.4	9.5	14.2	13.9	11.7

Note: Weighted percentages. *N*=13,581 relationships.
Design-based F-test significance levels for relationship type comparisons: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 4b. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young men's nonmarital sexual relationships by relationship type, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002)

Relationship characteristics	Cohabiting	Exclusively dating	Frequently but not exclusively dating	Dating once in a while	Only having sex
Time knew each other before first sex***					
≤ 1 day	8.7	3.0	8.5	11.0	29.3
2-7 days	13.0	7.3	10.9	15.6	16.2
1-2 weeks	13.8	10.4	17.5	17.4	9.3
2-4 weeks	14.0	14.6	17.0	13.9	8.2
1-5 months	24.6	31.2	18.4	19.3	10.0
6 months-1 year	10.2	13.8	10.0	9.1	7.2
≥ 1 year	15.7	19.7	17.7	13.7	19.8
Duration of sexual relationship***					
≤ 1 month	3.9	7.5	17.4	36.7	63.8
2-4 months	11.0	21.5	43.8	36.0	20.9
5-12 months	24.7	36.3	24.8	16.8	8.8
13-27 months	25.1	19.7	8.1	4.9	3.3
≥ 28 months	35.3	15.0	5.9	5.6	3.2
Frequency of sexual activity***					
Had sex once	4.2	6.8	20.5	31.1	46.2
≤ 1 time per week	9.9	22.0	24.6	27.1	18.3
2 times per week	9.5	13.5	13.8	16.4	7.7
3 times per week	12.1	12.9	12.6	10.0	5.5
4-7 times per week	36.1	30.4	19.4	9.8	11.9
≥ 8 times per week	28.2	14.4	9.1	5.6	10.4

Table continued on next page

Table 4b. Percentage distributions of the characteristics of young men's nonmarital sexual relationships by relationship type, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002) (continued)

Relationship characteristics (continued)	Cohabiting	Exclusively dating	Frequently but not exclusively dating	Dating once in a while	Only having sex
Age difference***					
Partner ≥ 3 years older	14.6	5.2	10.2	11.7	13.0
Partner 2 years older	4.9	5.1	5.6	5.1	7.1
Partner 1 year older	11.1	12.4	8.7	8.3	8.9
Partner same age	17.3	25.6	25.6	27.0	26.8
Partner 1 year younger	19.7	24.0	18.2	19.4	17.7
Partner 2 years younger	16.2	16.1	16.3	15.8	15.1
Partner ≥ 3 years younger	16.2	11.6	15.4	12.8	11.4
Partner different race/ethnicity	20.9	17.4	19.6	19.2	21.4
Relationship current***	47.5	23.6	15.4	13.1	5.0
Pregnancy occurred in relationship***	28.3	5.4	4.6	3.1	2.2
Respondents' age at beginning of relationship***					
≤ 15 years	4.9	9.4	8.1	7.0	6.2
16-17 years	18.8	27.4	23.3	15.2	16.7
18-19 years	33.8	31.7	30.2	33.8	30.2
20-21 years	25.5	21.3	24.6	26.5	31.4
≥ 22 years	17.0	10.2	13.8	17.5	15.5

Note: Weighted percentages. *N*=10,889 relationships.
Design-based F-test significance levels for relationship type comparisons: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 5a. Multinomial logistic regression results (coefficients) of relationship histories on young women's characteristics, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002)

Individual characteristics	All or most cohabiting	Some serious and some casual†	All or most frequently or occasionally dating	All or most sexual only
Age at Wave III	0.1742***	0.0682*	0.0406	0.0458
Race/ethnicity (ref: White)				
Black	-0.9493***	-0.1348	0.4303*	0.1778
Hispanic	-0.3070	0.0748	0.4653	0.3117
Other	0.1967	-0.3649	-0.0551	-0.0976
Family structure at WI (ref: Two bio parents)				
Biological mom, stepdad	0.3781	0.4642*	0.1354	-0.0757
Biological dad, stepmom	0.3277	0.3253	-0.4423	0.2127
Biological mom only	-0.7227	-0.3612	-1.3015**	-1.8640**
Biological dad only	-0.7103	-0.2255	-1.5919**	0.2077
Other situations	-0.8769	-0.6533	-2.1575**	-2.0986**
Parental education at WI				
Maternal education	-0.0645+	-0.0534*	-0.0832*	-0.0023
Paternal education	-0.0779*	-0.0320	-0.0851*	-0.1492**
(ln) Household income at WI	-0.1307+	-0.0121	-0.0814	-0.0770
Religious denomination at WI (ref: Protestant)				
No religion	0.4589*	-0.0299	-0.0875	0.2406
Catholic	-0.2113	-0.2453+	-0.3695*	-0.1812
Non-Christian	-1.1755+	-0.5790+	-1.3991*	-0.6596
Other	0.2311	-0.7860*	-0.6221	-0.5378
Missing information on religion	-0.1204	-1.3713**	-0.4163	0.6399
Any pregnancies in relationships	1.7837***	0.6876***	-0.0310	-0.2379
Number of relationships	-0.6274***	0.0672***	0.2358***	0.3740***
Intercept	-1.5294	-1.1804	-0.1868	-1.5255
F (76, 53) = 14.25***				

Note: Weighted results. *N*=4,682 women. Comparison category is all or most relationships exclusively dating.
† Serious defined as cohabiting or exclusively dating and casual defined as frequently or occasionally dating or sexual only relationships.
+$p \leq 0.1$; * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 5b. Multinomial logistic regression results (coefficients) of relationship histories on young men's characteristics, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III (2001-2002)

Individual characteristics	All or most cohabiting	Some serious and some casual†	All or most frequently or occasionally dating	All or most sexual only
Age at Wave III	0.2006***	0.0567	0.0522	0.0378
Race/ethnicity (ref: White)				
Black	-0.0521	0.1323	0.8143***	0.4196*
Hispanic	0.4370*	-0.1482	0.5973*	0.0353
Other	-0.5515+	-0.3676	-0.1539	-0.5007+
Family structure at WI (ref: Two bio parents)				
Biological mom, stepdad	0.1059	-0.0379	0.5870*	-0.0949
Biological dad, stepmom	1.3985***	0.0826	1.1262*	-0.0055
Biological mom only	-1.1139*	-0.0021	-0.2694	-0.8080
Biological dad only	0.1590	-0.2729	-0.8821	-0.0001
Other situations	-0.8350	-0.3512	-1.5420+	-0.3295
Parental education at WI				
Maternal education	-0.0404	-0.0285	-0.0566	0.0011
Paternal education	-0.0788*	-0.0033	-0.0103	-0.0463
(ln) Household income at WI	-0.4842***	-0.2185*	-0.3252**	-0.4267***
Religious denomination at WI (ref: Protestant)				
No religion	0.2045	0.0636	-0.2185	-0.2529
Catholic	-0.2302	-0.1221	-0.4626*	0.0828
Non-Christian	0.6399	0.3651	0.2299	-0.5529
Other	0.1300	0.2313	-0.2640	0.3631
Missing information on religion	0.0740	-0.5818	-0.0125	0.3217
Any pregnancies in relationships	1.5781***	0.6616***	-0.3733	-0.2150
Number of relationships	-0.4816***	0.1786***	0.1782***	0.4519***
Intercept	-1.1924	-1.0269	-0.7558	-0.7901
F (76, 53) = 13.39***				

Note: Weighted results. *N*=4,109 men. Comparison category is all or most relationships exclusively dating.
† Serious defined as cohabiting or exclusively dating and casual defined as frequently or occasionally dating or sexual only relationships.
* $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$.