

**Bowling Green State University
The Center for Family and Demographic Research**

<http://www.bgsu.edu/organizations/cfdr>

Phone: (419) 372-7279 cfdr@bgsu.edu

2013 Working Paper Series

**RELATIONSHIP INVOLVEMENT AMONG YOUNG ADULTS:
ARE ASIAN AMERICAN MEN AN EXCEPTIONAL CASE?**

Kara Joyner

Department of Sociology and
Center for Family and Demographic Research

Kelly Stamper Balistreri

Department of Sociology and
Center for Family and Demographic Research

Grace Kao

Department of Sociology
University of Pennsylvania

This research uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and funded by grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgment is due Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth>). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis.

ABSTRACT

Racial gaps in relationship involvement among young adults in the U.S. are likely amplified in population-based studies by an exclusive emphasis on coresidential relationships, especially marriage. We use data from the first and fourth waves of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) to examine differences by gender and race/ethnicity in romantic and sexual involvement among adults ages 25 through 32 ($N = 8,718$). We compare men and women of different racial groups with respect to their rates of current marriage and cohabitation and reveal how racial gaps in relationship involvement diminish when the definition of relationship is broadened to encompass sex and romance outside of a coresidential relationship. Asian men are the least likely of any gender/race group to be currently involved with a partner, regardless of whether involvement is defined. We use decomposition methods to identify factors that account for racial gaps in relationship involvement.

Key Words:

Social science research has long focused on marital status and timing because of their association with health and well-being, in addition to their connection to fertility. In recent decades, population-based studies of relationships have increasingly differentiated cohabiting individuals from those who are “single” (i.e., not residing with a romantic partner). These studies continue to document racial and ethnic gaps in marriage, with blacks having considerably lower rates of marriage than whites or Hispanics. Marriage rates among Hispanics vary considerably according by nativity and national origin but generally fall between those of whites and blacks (Landale & Oropesa 2007). It appears that the size of racial disparities in relationship involvement is largely dependent on how they are defined. For instance, Raley (1996) finds that the racial gap between whites and blacks in the timing of first unions is smaller for coresidential relationship involvement (i.e. marriage or cohabitation) than for marriage. Missing from previous studies is a broader definition of relationship that includes involvement with romantic and sexual partners outside of a coresidential union altogether. Delays in marriage and the ephemeral status of cohabiting relationships (as partners separate or marry relatively quickly) necessitate a broader conceptualization of relationship involvement, especially when focusing on young adults.

Previous research largely fails to address the relationship involvement of Asian Americans, but a recent study suggests they have lower rates of cohabitation and marriage than whites (Brown, Van Hook, & Glick 2008). Studies have paid closer attention to the racial mix of partners in relationships. Restricting their samples to current coresidential couples, often married couples, these studies document large sex differences in interracial involvement among blacks and Asians. Specifically, they find that black women and Asian men are much less likely than their same-race counterparts (i.e., black men and Asian women) to be coupled with a different-race partner (Qian 1997). Recent research suggests that black women’s likelihood of being

married decreases as black men's rates of interracial marriage in their metropolitan area increase (Crowder & Tolnay 2000). The gender gap in interracial involvement among Asians could similarly signal Asian men's marginalization from mate markets. A recent study of internet daters on Yahoo Personals finds that among those who expressed a racial preference, less than 10% of Asian men would not consider dating an Asian woman, yet approximately 40% of Asian women would rule out an Asian man. It also reveals that women of all different racial groups are more likely to exclude Asian men than men of any other racial group (Feliciano, Robnett & Komaie 2011).

Data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) offer us the opportunity to reassess racial hierarchies in mate selection using a broader definition of relationship and a more exhaustive set of racial groups (i.e., whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians). We first review and synthesize competing perspectives concerning factors that promote and impede relationship involvement. We then fill an important gap in several areas of demography by considering the implications of these perspectives for Asian Americans, a group that is generally disregarded by studies focusing on union formation and dynamics. Many of these perspectives address the formation of coresidential relationships and highlight economic factors, but a more comprehensive understanding of relationship involvement requires a consideration of a wider array of factors (e.g., physical attractiveness). Using data from Add Health, we compare men and women from different racial groups in terms of their current union status (i.e., single, dating, cohabiting, and married) based on reports from the wave four interview, conducted when most respondents were between the ages of 25 and 32. In doing so, we pay close attention to whether racial hierarchies differ depending on how relationships are defined. We also consider whether sexual minority respondents (i.e., those who report having a

same-sex partner or fail to identify as 100% heterosexual) are included in the sample versus excluded. Finally, we use logistic regression models to identify factors associated with current involvement and decomposition analyses to determine the extent to which they account for racial disparities in partnering.

BACKGROUND

Studies have drawn from a variety of different perspectives to explain the timing and likelihood of cohabitation and marriage. We use a life course framework to synthesize these arguments (Elder 2006). Generally speaking, a life course approach suggests that norms prescribe the appropriate timing and sequencing of cohabitation and marriage in relation to other events and roles (e.g., completing of schooling). It also underlines the importance of earlier experiences (i.e., “going steady” in adolescence) and physical characteristics for union formation in young adulthood. Importantly, this framework recognizes the fact that union formation does not occur within a vacuum but is contingent on one’s broader historical and social context. The duration of adulthood that individuals spend never married has continued to expand while marriage has become decreasingly coupled with childbearing, making the transition to adulthood more protracted and less orderly (Rindfuss 1991). Less often noted is the substantial increase since 1960 in the fraction of young adults aged 18-34 living at home; this increase was especially pronounced in the past decade (Payne 2012). These changes make it more important than ever before to consider the formation and dynamics of sexual and romantic relationships, not just coresidential unions.

Social Roles

Studies continue to show that union formation, particularly marriage, is facilitated by the occupancy of roles that forecast the ability to shoulder the responsibility of having a family.

Employment and earnings increase the likelihood of marriage, especially among men, largely because they are signals of financial independence and stability (Xie et al. 2007). As marriage is often viewed as incompatible with being a student, school enrollment reduces the likelihood of union formation (Thornton, Axinn, & Teachman 1995). Independent living is typically thought to be a marker of adulthood and its connection to union formation is more ambiguous. Relatively few studies have examined the influence of parental coresidence on union formation using U.S. samples (e.g., Goldscheider, Thornton, & Young-DeMarco 1993). Recent research suggests that living at home reduces coresidential union formation, but more so for men than for women (Guzzo 2006).

Lower SES youth, in particular, are increasingly barred from marriage due to the decline in their economic prospects and rising standards for marriage. In fact, most youth today express strict financial prerequisites for marriage, including a nice wedding, some savings, and stable employment (Edin, Kefalas, & Reed 2004; Smock, Manning, & Porter 2005). Studies also suggest that while financial independence and stability are more critical for men than for women in shaping union formation, gender differences in the effect of economic factors have declined in recent decades as economic prospects have become more important for women's marriage prospects but have remained critical for men (Sweeney 2002). Studies also document a reversal in the association between educational attainment and marriage, with college-educated women now exhibiting a greater likelihood of ever marrying than their less educated counterparts (Goldstein & Kenney 2001). Once again, this implies a convergence of the determinants of marriage between men and women.

Scholars continue to attribute the black-white gap in union formation and stability to increases in male joblessness and growth in the prison population, changes that have

disproportionately altered the life course of black men (Pettit & Western 2004). These changes have reduced marriage rates for blacks by shrinking the pool of marriageable males, particularly among less educated populations (Wilson & Neckerman 1986). Supporting the ideas of Wilson and other scholars, studies continue to suggest that marriage decreases as the ratio of marriageable men to women in local areas decreases. Still, variation in local mate markets explains only part of the race gap in the timing of first marriage and coresidence (Lichter et al. 1992; Raley 1996). Measures of wealth and labor force participation are also not able to fully explain the white-black gap in marriage (Schneider 2011). This longstanding gap between blacks and whites in coresidential union involvement begs the question of whether economic factors reduce their chances of having *any* type of relationship.

Assuming that higher socioeconomic attainment of men increases their desirability as potential mates, we would expect Asian American men to have better prospects of involvement than their white, black, or Hispanic male counterparts. After all, they have much higher levels of educational attainment and income. Kao, Vaquera, and Goyette (Forthcoming, 2013) find that among adults 25 and older, almost 50% of Asian Americans have a bachelor's degree or higher, compared to about 30% of whites, 18% of blacks, and 13% of Hispanics. Still, there is considerable heterogeneity in the educational attainment of Asians, with South Asians, Chinese, and Koreans faring better than whites and those from Cambodia and Laos doing worse (Kao & Thompson 2003). Asian women too should fare better than their counterparts, but as suggested earlier, women's prospects for marriage are less strongly linked with economic prospects. It remains an empirical question whether Asian men and women witness similar "relationship-returns" for education as their white counterparts.

While most individuals have completed college by the time they reached age 25, many

beyond this age are still enrolled in school or living at home. Among both Hispanics and Asians, the fraction of youth ages 18-24 who are enrolled in school full time or living at home differs considerably by generation. By design, Add Health over-represents respondents who are second or third generation. Second generation Asians and Hispanics, regardless of their ethnicity, are more likely to be living at home than whites and blacks. With a few exceptions (e.g., Mexicans), these groups are also more likely than their white and black counterparts to be enrolled in school full time (Rumbaut & Komaie 2010). Delays in home-leaving and school completion could ultimately reduce involvement among the children of immigrants in the period of young adulthood. An important question is whether they forego relationship involvement altogether in this period or simply avoid coresidential unions.

Adolescent Romance and Friendship

Studies have paid little attention to how earlier romantic experiences influence the timing of first coresidential unions, with some notable exceptions (e.g., Raley, Crissey, & Muller 2007; Thornton, Axinn, & Xie 2007). Studies that exploit measures collected prospectively suggest that romantic involvement in adolescence accelerates union formation in young adulthood. A variety of mechanisms have been posited for this influence. Most importantly, early involvement helps individuals develop interpersonal skills that are useful for forming and maintaining relationships in young adulthood (Raley, Crissey, & Muller 2007). These associations could also be due to selection; those who form romantic relationships earlier may have stronger interpersonal skills or qualities that attract the opposite-sex (Thornton 1990). Peer networks also play a role, as youth are more likely to be romantically involved the larger their networks of different-sex friends (Dunphy 1963 Connolly, Furman, and Konarsky 2000).

Research based on Add Health has documented intriguing racial and ethnic gaps in

friendship networks and romantic involvement during adolescence. Carver, Joyner, & Udry (2003) document how black, white, Hispanic, and Asian youth (most of whom are between the ages of 12 and 18) differ with respect to romantic involvement in the eighteen months prior to the interview. They find that Asians are less likely to report romantic involvement than whites, blacks, and Hispanics, who have roughly similar levels of involvement in adolescence. They also suggest that gender differences within racial groups are minimal. Kreager and Staff (2009) find that Asian boys and girls alike receive fewer nominations by different-sex peers at school than their same-sex counterparts who identify as white, black, or Hispanic. In fact, Asians are the only minority group to differ significantly from whites in this respect. These patterns for Asian girls appear to reflect their lack of immersion in friendship networks more generally. Asian girls also receive fewer same-sex nominations than white girls; however, Asian boys are not significantly different from white boys in terms of same-sex popularity. In sum, Asian Americans appear to forego friendship and romantic involvement with the opposite-sex in adolescence. This contrasts sharply with the findings of studies based on young adults that highlight sizeable gaps between Asian men and women (Feliciano, Robnett & Komaie 2011; Qian 1997).

Physical Characteristics

Studies have a long history of examining the role of physical characteristics in mate selection, but they have most heavily focused on associations between partner characteristics in marriage (e.g., Udry 1997). A recent spate of studies, however, has examined how physical characteristics are linked to current romantic involvement using population-based samples (e.g., Cawley, Joyner, & Sobal 2006; Manfredini et al 2012). Generally speaking, these studies suggest that physical attractiveness is more strongly linked to involvement for women than for men, and that overweight and obese women are penalized in mate markets. They also suggest that weight

is less strongly associated with involvement for black women than for white women. Studies also reveal a preference on the part of youth for the male partner to be taller than the female partner in a relationship and emphasize that average height varies with ethnicity but is correlated across genders within the racial groups. The fact that Asians are, on average, shorter than whites and blacks, has different implications for Asian men and women (Belot & Fidrmuc 2010). The preference for sexual dimorphism implies that, other things being equal, Asian women have the best prospects of finding a size-appropriate mate while Asian men have the worst prospects.

Media observers continue to note that Hollywood movies and advertisements promote Asian American men as geeky and awkward romantic partners. In fact, Asian American males usually serve as exemplar in their awkwardness around women. The character Long Duk Dong from *Sixteen Candles* (1984), a film by John Hughes, has been widely as the quintessential Asian American geek and is well known to Asian Americans males who were adolescents in the 1980s. As one literary source stated, “Every single Asian dude who went to high school or junior high during the era of John Hughes movies was called ‘Donger’” (Wong and Nakamura quoted in MacAdam, 2008). Film scholars and Asian American commentators have also lamented the fact that Asian American men rarely play romantic leads in films. Even when Asian American men are present as the lead male (usually in martial arts or action films), they rarely have the opportunity to demonstrate any physical displays of affection. For example in *Romeo Must Die*, a film based on *Romeo and Juliet* starring Chinese actor Jet Li and Aaliyah (an African American actress), the two leading characters never kiss despite the romantic link between them. A kiss was tested with a focus group, but they were uncomfortable with it, so in the cinematic release of this film, the two characters (again, based on *Romeo and Juliet*) hug instead.

Expectations

Population-based studies typically include romantically/sexually partnered or “dating” individuals in the single group and have contrasted them with those who are married and cohabiting. For capturing the experiences of young adults during the transition to adulthood, cohabiting and marital status is not the best measure of romantic and sexual involvement. This study distinguishes individuals who are romantically and/or partnered from those who are truly single. Studies rarely consider the influence of adolescent experiences with different-sex friendship and romance on union formation, and when they do, the emphasis is on coresidential relationships. Studies concerning how involvement is linked to earlier experiences and physical characteristic are also limited in number. The influence of social roles on union formation has been more thoroughly explored conceptually and empirically, but it is not obvious what they portend for romantic/sexual involvement. However, the evidence above does suggest that Asian men and Asian women leave adolescence with less experience interacting with the opposite-sex and their transition to adulthood is especially protracted given their delays in school completion and leaving home. Asian men, in particular, face a barrage of negative media portrayals and are the racial group most likely to be ruled out as a partner, even by Asian women.

METHOD

Data and Sample

This project uses information from the first and fourth waves of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) to examine differences by gender and race/ethnicity in relationship involvement among young adults. Add Health is a longitudinal school-based study. Using rosters from each school, Add Health selected a nationally representative (core) sample of 12,105 adolescents in grades seven to twelve to participate in the first in-home interview. Add Health additionally selected oversamples of four racial groups:

1,038 black adolescents from well-educated families, 334 Chinese adolescents, 450 Cuban adolescents, and 437 Puerto Rican adolescents. The first in-home interview was conducted between April and December of 1995. The response rate for the in-home sample was 79%. In 2007 and 2008, the project conducted a fourth wave of in-home interviews for 15,701 of the original 20,745 respondents (a retention rate of over 75%). By the time of the fourth in-home interview, respondents were between the ages of 24 and 32. Importantly, Add Health used state-of-the-art survey methods to identify the romantic and sexual involvement of respondents, as well as their sexual orientation (i.e., computer-assisted self-interviews and partner rosters).

The sample for most of our analyses is restricted to 4,328 males and 4,390 females (total $N = 8,718$). We began with 14,800 respondents who completed the wave one and four in-home interviews and had sample weights. Excluding respondents whose biological sex classification (marked by the interviewer) differed across waves one and four reduced the sample to 14,786. Of these respondents, 14,532 were classified as white, black, Hispanic, or Asian. Restricting the sample to respondents ages 25-32 reduced the sample to 14,461. Limiting the sample to respondents with information on key variables (e.g., sex partners last year and interview-rated attractiveness) reduced the sample further to 14,068 respondents. Next, we dropped respondents who failed to complete an in-school questionnaire, leading to a final sample size of 10,183. This last restriction was essential, as it enables us to include information on same-sex and opposite-sex popularity in adolescence. We also ran an additional set of analyses including respondents without in-school questionnaires to address sample bias (not shown). The general patterns for this expanded sample, including the race gaps in current involvement, were similar to those discussed presented below. Finally, we restrict our analyses to the respondents who report being 100% straight and fail to report any same-sex partnering, resulting in sample size of ($N=8,718$).

We explicitly address below how racial differences in partnering differ when sexual minorities are excluded versus included in the sample.

Variables

Our analyses utilize several different indicators of different-sex partnering based on the wave four interview. *Wave four union status* indicates whether the respondent is single (i.e., not in a current romantic or sexual relationship, “dating,” cohabiting, or married). This variable enables us to corroborate the results of conventional analyses that focus on different-sex marriage and to consider how patterns by gender and race/ethnicity change when the definition of relationship involvement is broadened to take into account any romantic/sexual involvement. *Wave four partner race* alternatively classifies currently partnered respondents by whether they have a same-race versus different-sex partner. This variable hints at how gender differences within racial groups are a by-product of interracial involvement. A third variable, *sex partners past year*, indicated whether respondents had no sex partners, a single sex partner, or multiple partners (i.e., two or more); sex was defined as oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse. In supplementary analyses presented in the Appendix, we expand the union and partner status variables to distinguish same-sex and different-sex partners.

We divide respondents into mutually exclusive categories on the basis of their answers to questions on race and Hispanic descent at the Wave I interview: Hispanic (of any race), and non-Hispanic black, non-Hispanic Asian, and non-Hispanic white (the reference category). Non-Hispanic respondents who report more than one race were asked what category that best described their race and classified accordingly. Using data from the first interview, we also construct measures of family structure (living with both biological or adopted parents) and parental socioeconomic status (SES); the parental SES variable, which ranges from one to ten, is

based on the occupation and education of parents and has missing values multiply-imputed (see Bearman & Moody 2004). We also include in our analyses measures typically included in studies of cohabiting and marital status or timing: age, own income, missing income, school enrollment, full-time employment, and educational attainment at the time of wave four. Educational attainment is measured as a series of dummy variables based on respondent's highest degree (less than a high school degree, high school degree, a bachelor's degree or higher), with those with some college acting as the reference group. We also use a dichotomous indicator of whether the parental home is the place where the respondent stays most often.

In addition to these demographic variables, we also include variables less routinely used in studies that capture opportunities and experiences forming romantic and sexual relationships. Based on the wave one interview, we include a dichotomous variable of whether the respondent was involved in a romantic relationship (i.e., a relationship that the respondent defined as romantic or one that involved romantic activities) at any point in the eighteen months that preceded the interview. We also count the number of times respondent was nominated as a friend by a same-sex and different-sex peer during the administration of the in-school questionnaire. Respondents with values of 5 or greater on the same-sex and different-sex popularity items were top-coded at 5 to reduce the influence of extreme observations. We also create a scale of attractiveness (ranging from 3 to 15) based on the interviewer's rating of respondent's physical attractiveness, personality attractiveness, and grooming ($\alpha = 0.767$). We are also able to create an attractiveness scale based on identical items at wave four ($\alpha = 0.702$). The interviewer additionally recorded the weight and height of respondents at wave four, enabling us to create measures of whether the respondent was overweight or obese, in addition to their height in inches. We do not include measures of height and weight from wave one for several reasons:

height and weight were self-reported; height changes considerably from wave one to wave four; and weight was highly correlated across waves one and four.

Analysis Plan

We begin this study by contrasting men and women who are white, black, Hispanic, and Asian according to their current relationship status and sexual partnering in the past year. We pay close attention to how patterns of partnering differ by race and sex, before and after the sample is restricted to respondents considered to be seeking a different-sex partner. We also compare men and women of different racial groups with respect to their values on the independent variables to better understand how they differ with respect to a constellation of factors likely correlated with romantic involvement. Next, we present logistic regression models (estimated for men and women separately) that address how current romantic involvement is associated with race and all other independent variables in both zero-order and full models. Taken together, analyses based on the descriptive statistics and models offer clues as to which factors potentially explain some of the racial disparities in partnering. To quantify the contribution of each factor to racial disparities, we present results from decomposition analyses. Our final analyses address how the correlates of involvement differ for “dating” (i.e., sexual or romantic relationships outside of cohabitation and marriage) in comparison to cohabitation or marriage.

RESULTS

Table 1 displays descriptive statistics (survey-adjusted means and proportions) for our sample of young adults (N=8,718) at the time of the wave-four interview; these statistics are stratified by both gender and race to capture the intersection of these statuses within mate markets. These analyses are restricted to respondents who identify as “100% heterosexual (straight)” and fail to report any sex or romance with someone of the same-sex. The rationale

here is to focus on respondents in heterosexual mate markets. While respondents identifying as mostly heterosexual or bisexual may also be part of these markets, they are documented to be inconsistent in their reports of their orientation across different waves of Add Health (Savin-Williams, Joyner, & Rieger 2012). Roughly one-half of respondents in the sample are female but the numbers of minorities are greater than in the general population, reflecting the oversamples of race/ethnic groups. Turning to our key focal outcomes, this table reveals large disparities in partnering across the groups. As previous studies show, racial and ethnic gaps in marriage are clearly evident, with blacks having lower rates of marriage than whites. The black-white gap is slightly smaller when defining relationships in terms of coresidence. Also in concert with previous studies, Hispanics appear closer to whites than blacks with respect to both marriage and cohabitation.

[TABLE ONE ABOUT HERE]

Asian men exceed black men in their marriage rates but they trail behind both white and Hispanic men. Asian women, on the other hand, fall between white and Hispanic women in their likelihood of being currently married. Among men and women alike, Asians are the least likely racial group to cohabit; however, the Asian-white gap in cohabitation is especially pronounced among the men. This reflects the fact that Asian men have by far the lowest likelihood of being in a cohabiting relationship. Keep in mind, though, that estimates of cohabitation and marriage rates in the general population include sexual minorities in the at-risk population. Asian men do populate the “dating” market; they have similar rates of dating as blacks and Hispanics but slightly lower rates than whites. Asian women similarly have rates of dating that more closely resemble other minorities than whites.

Broadening the definition of relationship dramatically reduces the gaps between blacks

and other groups, but further illustrates the precarious status of Asian men in mate markets. The proportion currently single ranges from 0.152 (white women) to 0.337 (Asian men). Asian men are considerably less likely to be partnered than their white, black, and Hispanic counterparts, and black women are less likely to be partnered than their white, Hispanic, and Asian counterparts. Comparing men and women within racial groups suggests a sizeable disparity between Asian men and Asian women; Asian men are almost twice as likely to be unpartnered as Asian women (i.e., 0.337 versus 0.170). The proportions unpartnered are almost equal for black men and women (i.e., 0.245 versus 0.232).

Information on the race of partner helps explain the disparities between Asian men and Asian women. Specifically, Asian men and women are closer with respect to the proportions with a same-race partner (0.443 versus 0.466) than in their involvement with a different-race partner (0.220 versus 0.364). Results from this same panel also reveal disparities between black men and women. Black men are more likely than black women to report having a different-race partner (0.168 versus 0.062), whereas black women are more likely than black men to report having a same-race partner (0.705 versus 0.587). These differences offset each other; black men and women are roughly comparable in their proportions single (0.245 and 0.232).

Information on sex partners during the last year offers yet another indicator of Asian men's exclusion from mate markets. Almost a third of Asian men (0.296) failed to report any different-sex partners in the past year. The fraction of respondents from other groups without recent sexual activity ranges from one-tenth (white men) to one-sixth (white and Hispanic women). Regardless of race, men are considerably more likely than women to report have multiple partners, and conversely, women are more likely to report having a single partner. These differences presumably reflect men's delay relative to women in forming committed

relationships.

The magnitude of these gaps could reflect the fact that sexual minorities are excluded from the sample. The top panel of Appendix A shows statistics for partnering prior to the exclusion of this group and distinguishes same-sex partnering. Once again, Asian men appear unusual in comparison to men from other racial groups and to Asian women. Over a third of Asian men are unpartnered (0.360), in comparison to less than one-sixth of Asian women (0.157). The persistence of patterns across the different samples largely reflects the extremely small fraction of respondents with same-sex partnering. The second panel further restricts the sample to respondents who are unequivocally heterosexual or straight. It is reassuring to note that this restriction effectively excludes the vast majority respondents with same-sex partners. The subsequent analyses (in addition to those in Table 1) include respondents who are 100% straight and fail to report any same-sex partnering.

Returning to Table 1, we highlight variables for which there are sizeable gaps between men of different racial groups. As documented in other studies, white men have higher means and percentages than black and Hispanic men on several different indicators of SES: parental SES, intact family, personal income, and educational attainment. For all of these different indicators, Asian men have higher values than white men. For instance, Asian men are much more likely than white men to obtain a college degree (0.549 versus 0.313). Patterns by race for role occupancy are less consistent. Asian men are slightly more likely than men of other racial groups to be still enrolled in school, but the gaps are quite small. Hispanic men are most likely to be employed full time (0.816), while black men are the least likely (0.639). Interestingly, Asian men are the most likely to be living at home (0.310) while white men are the least likely (0.129). At both waves, the interviewers tend not to discriminate in rating the grooming and attractive-

ness of men from different racial groups, as indicated by roughly comparable means in rating across the different groups. Consistent with the findings of previous studies, Asian men are the group least likely to be romantically involved in adolescence, and they also received the fewest friendship nominations from women. While Asian men are more likely than men of other groups to be a healthy weight, they are considerably shorter than their counterparts. White men and black men are tallest (on average, 5'10"), followed by Hispanic men (5'9"), and Asian men (5'7").

Similar racial differences in level of independent variables are observed among women, with a few key exceptions. Asian women have, on average, a much higher income than white women (\$38,541 a year versus \$26,587); Asian and white men are relatively close in terms of income. As indicated by full-time employment, Asian women have the strongest attachment to the labor force (0.617), while white women have the weakest (0.569). Hispanic women are most likely to be living at home (0.240), followed by Asian women (0.217), black women (0.171), and white women (0.097). At both waves one and four, interviewers rated black women the least favorably on attractiveness and grooming. Black women are the least likely to be classified as having a healthy weight (0.207), while Asians are the most likely (0.577). Asian women, like Asian men, are the group with the lowest rates of romantic involvement and the fewest votes from the opposite sex during adolescence. In sum, patterns for Asian men and women are similar in several respects.

Appendix B shows the proportions single, enrolled in school, employed full time, and living at home by age category (25-27; 28-29; 30-32) for these eight groups. Among white and black men the proportions single, enrolled in school, and living at home decreases monotonically with age, while the proportion employed increases with age. Other groups show these same

tendencies but we note some exceptions to this general pattern. Results pertaining to relationship involvement suggest that the gap between Asian men and other groups in the proportion single declines with age but does not completely close. Among Asian men, enrollment and employment fail to exhibit an obvious pattern across the age groups, but the proportion of Asian men living at home declines considerably with age, paralleling the decline in involvement. Results from the appendix also reveal that involvement among Asian men fails to differ by whether or not they were born in the U.S.; however, Asian men's involvement does differ by nationality.

Interestingly, Filipino men are much less likely than Chinese men and men of other nationalities to be single; however, they are the most likely of these three groups to be living at home. The small cell sizes preclude us from distinguishing nationalities that comprise the other category.

To better highlight racial differences in romantic involvement, and to identify factors that promote and impede involvement, we turn to multivariate analyses. Table 2 presents the odds ratios from logistic regression models predicting the likelihood of current relationship involvement in this sample of youth on the different-sex mate market. Following the practice of previous studies, we estimate separate models for men and women. The first column shows for men the effects of different factors (e.g., educational attainment) when added separately and the second column shows effects when all variables are combined. The third and fourth columns show these same estimates for women.

[TABLE TWO ABOUT HERE]

Results from the zero-order model for men (column one) show the unadjusted racial gaps in current relationship involvement. Asian men, but not black or Hispanic men, exhibit significantly lower odds of involvement than white men. Specifically, they have roughly half the odds of current involvement as white men. Several other variables display significant

associations with current involvement. Involvement increases with age and personal income, but not educational attainment or parental SES. Enrollment in school and living at home reduces involvement, while full-time employment increases involvement. All of the variables targeting opportunities for involvement for men (i.e., attractiveness at both waves; same-sex and opposite-sex popularity; adolescent romantic involvement, and height) have effects in the expected direction. In contrast to men who fall into the lower quartile with respect to height, men who are in higher quartiles are all significantly more likely to be currently involved. However, men who are overweight or obese have *greater* odds of current involvement than their counterparts who are healthy or underweight. (We failed to detect significant differences between respondents who were healthy weight and underweight; therefore, we collapsed these two categories.) Previous studies have documented changes in weight with shifts in relationship status, highlighting the nebulous causal linkages between the weight and involvement (Averett, Sikora & Argys 2008).

In contrast to the zero-order results, results based on the full model for men (column two) reveal weaker associations between the independent variables and involvement, with a few exceptions (e.g., parental SES and having a college degree). Still, most variables retain statistical significance at a $p < .05$ level. Importantly, the inclusion of these variables in the full model diminishes the race gaps and renders the Asian indicator variable non-significant. As will be revealed in the decomposition, some variables magnify differences between white and Asian males while others reduce the gaps. The overriding influence of these variables, however, is to reduce the gap.

Results from the zero-order model for women (column three) reveal that black women have significantly lower odds of current involvement than white women. Many of the factors that differentiate the involvement of men also differentiate the involvement of women, with some

notable exceptions. Perhaps reflecting women's earlier involvement in relationships, age does not have a significant nor positive effect. Income and full-time employment have weaker effects on involvement for women than for men, consistent with studies focusing on marital timing (Sweeney 2002). Height fails to significantly affect the involvement of women, though involvement appears to decrease slightly with increasing height. As in the case of men, enrollment in school and living with parents reduces involvement. Similarly, romantic involvement, opposite-sex popularity, and interviewer-rated attractiveness in adolescence all increase current involvement in young adulthood. The combination of these variables into a full model (column four) tends to attenuate effects. Most notably, the gap between black and white women in involvement decreases and falls out of significance ($p < 0.05$). As in the analyses of men, this reflects the fact that the variables play a greater role reducing rather than magnifying the gap.

Appendix C shows full models predicting current coresidence and marriage for men and women. Comparing these results with those from Table 2 reveals the extent to which effects of independent variables differ by how relationship involvement is defined. One notable difference is that black men and women display significantly lower odds of current coresidence and marriage than their white counterparts; the black-white gaps are greater for marriage than for coresidence. These findings are consistent with those of previous studies. Prior to the inclusion of other independent variables (results now shown) Asian men (but not women) were significantly less likely than their white counterparts to be coresiding ($p < 0.01$) or married ($p < 0.10$). Many of the factors associated with romantic/sexual involvement are also associated with coresidence and marriage, though the magnitude of effects varies slightly across the different models. For instance, living with parents reduces involvement using all specifications but

appears to reduce coresidence and marriage more than any involvement.

To address the role of different factors in reducing (and magnifying) race disparities in current involvement, we use a re-weighting technique analogous to several model-based approaches (see Geruso 2012). We focus this technique on Asian men and black women because these groups deviate the most from their same-sex white counterparts. This technique capitalizes on the fact that the proportion currently involved is a function of values on key variables and rates of involvement for different values on the variables. For the sake of simplicity, consider how the current involvement of individuals in a given group in this sample (e.g., Asian men), R , is a weighted average of their age composition and age-specific involvement rates:

$$R^{\text{Asian men}} = \sum_{x=25}^{32} C_x R_x,$$

where C_x is the proportion of individuals at age x , and R_x is the proportion of individuals currently involved at age x . This equation allows us to compute counterfactual rates of current involvement (R^{CF}) for different groups, assuming they retain their age-specific involvement rates but shift their age distributions to match other groups. For instance, how would Asian men's likelihood of involvement in this sample be if they had the same age distribution as white men? What fraction of the gap between white and Asian men would be eliminated? We use the following equation to identify how much of the observed gap between groups (e.g., Asian and white men) in rates of involvement is due to differences in age composition versus differences in age-specific involvement rates:

$$\% \text{ Explained} = 100 * \frac{R^{\text{Asian,CF}} - R^{\text{Asian}}}{R^{\text{White}} - R^{\text{Asian}}}$$

Positive values for the % explained indicate that changing the age distribution of a racial group such as Asian males reduces or explains the gap, whereas negative values demonstrate that

changing the age distribution magnifies the gap. To identify the influence of other discrete or categorical variables, we simply substitute them for the variable age and apply this strategy to each of our factors in turn.

We also perform this same exercise for black women, but changing their distributions of independent variables to match those of white women. Of course, a limitation of this method for decomposing differences between groups is that the percent explained differs depending on which group is chosen for the counterfactual distribution (and conversely, which group is chosen for the conditional rates). Consequently, we compute a second set of counterfactual rates of involvement that assume white men have the same distributions on variables as Asian men and that white women have the same distributions as black women. These alternative estimates are more precise as they rely on conditional rates of whites.

Table 3 shows the decomposition analyses of gaps in involvement rates between white men and Asian men, in addition to white women and black women. The first panel displays the observed rates for these groups as well as the racial gaps in current involvement. The second panel shows the counterfactual rates altering one variable at a time. The calculation of counterfactual rates using the above formula requires linear variables to be transformed into categorical variables. For instance, we create six income categories based on quintiles for men's income and the missing category. Importantly, the use of categories frees us from having to specify a functional form on the relationship between these variables and involvement rates. All of the calculations used to produce the counterfactual rates (not shown) begin with the weighted distributions of variables.

[TABLE THREE ABOUT HERE]

The first set of columns shows the counterfactual involvement rates for white men when

they are reweighted on each variable to match Asians. Living with parents explains the largest percent of the gap between white and Asian men (45%). Recall that the current involvement rates for white men and Asian men are 0.808 and 0.666, a gap of 0.146. Once white men are reweighted to resemble Asian men, their involvement rates increase to 0.743, reducing the gap between Asian and white men by 0.065. Thus, living with parents explains almost half of the observed gap (i.e., $0.065/0.146$). Height explains 22% of the gap; romantic relationship involvement explains 11%; and opposite-sex popularity explains 6%. The counterfactual rates for Asian men point to similar factors (e.g., living with parents explains 22%), but the results suggest these variables are less powerful in terms of gap reduction.

From the standpoint of white women re-weighted to match black women in composition, living with parents (24%), weight (21%), different-sex popularity (17%), and W1 interviewer-rated attractiveness (14%) are the largest drivers of the gap in involvement rates of black and white women. From the standpoint of black women, different-sex popularity (14%) and living with parents (11%) are the biggest factors that explain the gap. As in the case of Asian men, this exercise yields weaker explanatory power when viewed from the standpoint of minorities. This reflects the finding that these factors play a weaker role in distinguishing minorities than whites. For instance, living at home has a bigger influence for white men than for Asian men and obesity is not an obstacle for black women as it is for white women (results not shown). Still, the results of all four sets of decompositions suggest that is highly predicated on living arrangements and adolescent involvement with the opposite sex.

As results from Table 2 suggest, focusing on a single factor at a time inflates the influence of most variables, reflecting associations between the various factors with each other and with romantic involvement. This re-weighting method could be extended to take into

account the joint distribution of variables (e.g., living with parents and adolescent romantic involvement). Alternatively, a model-based method could be used to isolate the independent contributions of these variables. Both types of strategies have important advantages and disadvantages. The point of this exercise, however, is to highlight factors that have the greatest potential for explaining race and gender gaps in current involvement. It is also worth noting that this exercise does not address the causal relationships between various factors and involvement. This exercise simply captures the association between involvement and other factors. For instance, these results could alternatively suggest that being un-partnered in part accounts for why Asian men are more likely than white men to be living at home.

DISCUSSION

This study reassesses racial hierarchies in mate selection using a broader definition of relationship and a more exhaustive set of racial groups (i.e., whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians). It also enriches our understanding of mate selection by considering the influence of adolescent social ties and physical characteristics on involvement. We expected to find racial gaps in marriage among young adult men and women based on the findings of previous studies, with lower rates of marriage for black men and women in comparison to their same-sex white counterparts. We also predicted that the rates of marriage for Hispanics would fall between the rates for whites and blacks but be closer to those of whites. It was less obvious what a more inclusive definition of relationship would reveal in terms of race hierarchies and how Asians would fare relative to whites, blacks and Hispanics. Due to the emphasis of population-based studies on cohabitation and marriage, we were not able to foreshadow how established predictors of involvement (e.g., enrollment in school) would be correlated with our broader measure of romantic involvement. The scarcity of studies concerning adolescent social ties and physical

attractiveness also offered few clues as to the salience of these factors for any relationship involvement.

Data from Add Health enabled us to extensively examine the current involvement of whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians who were between the ages of 25 and 32 at the time of wave four. To refine our sample, we limited most of our analyses to respondents who identified as 100% heterosexual and failed to identify any recent involvement with a same-sex partner. Our results pertaining to rates of marriage corroborated the findings of previous studies. For men and women alike, whites were most likely to be married and blacks were the least likely. Hispanics fell between whites and blacks but were closer to whites in terms of marriage. Consistent with previous studies, defining relationships in terms of coresidence generally reduced gaps between whites, blacks, and Hispanics. Defining involvement in terms of any current romantic and/or sexual activity reduced these gaps even further, reflecting the fact that white men and women were less likely than their counterparts of other racial groups to be “dating” (i.e., currently involved in a relationship outside of a coresidential union). Still, a sizable gap between blacks and other groups remained using this broader definition of relationship.

Among Asians, patterns of involvement differed markedly for men and women. Asian men were much less likely than their same-sex counterparts from other racial groups to be single. Roughly one out of every five Hispanic and white men failed to report a current sexual and/or romantic partner; about a quarter of black men and a third of Asian men were classified as single. White, black, and Hispanic women generally resembled their male counterparts in their rates of involvement, but Asian women were half as likely as Asian men to be single (i.e., 17% versus 34%). This difference between Asian men and women was a reflection of their gap in coresidential involvement. The gap was also related to disparities in their interracial

involvement; Asian men were much less likely than Asian women to be in a relationship with a different-race partner (i.e., 22% versus 36%) but not much different in their likelihood of having a relationship with a same-race partner (i.e., 44% versus 47%). Asian men were not only unusual with respect to current involvement but also their sexual activity in the past year. For instance, Asian men were three times as likely as white men to report having zero sexual partners in the year prior to the interview (i.e., 30% versus 10%). The gap in partnering between Asian men and men of other racial groups persisted in analyses that were expanded to include sexual minority respondents, but the number added to this sample was relatively small.

In zero-order models run separately for men and women, black women and Asian men were the only groups to exhibit a significantly lower likelihood of current involvement than their white counterparts. In models with controls for demographic characteristics, however, these groups failed to significantly differ at a conventional level of significance (i.e., $p < 05$). Many of the factors previously associated with marriage and cohabitation were also found to be associated with our broader measure of any current involvement. For instance, school enrollment decreased men's current involvement, while income and employment increased their involvement. Also in line with previous studies, employment and earnings had weaker effects for women. Our expanded set of predictors also revealed some additional correlates of involvement. Most notably, men and women who were living with parents had roughly one-third the odds of involvement as their counterparts living in some other arrangement (e.g., living alone or with roommates). Wave one interviewer-rated attractiveness, romantic relationship involvement, and opposite-sex popularity additionally reduced involvement for men and women, underscoring the importance of experience and opportunity.

We used a re-weighting technique to identify factors most instrumental in explaining why

Asian men and black women were less likely than their white counterparts to be currently involved. Our decomposition analyses suggested that the observed gaps in partnering were not a reflection of economic factors. Rather, the gaps were explained by factors less routinely examined by previous studies of union formation: living with parents, adolescent romantic involvement, and adolescent popularity with the opposite sex. Physical attributes at wave four also accounted for some of the gaps in partnering but other key determinants varied in their effects on relationship involvement for men and women. Specifically, the involvement gap between Asian men and white men was partly explained by the fact the fact Asian men are shorter in height, while the gap between black women and white women was partly related to the fact that black women were heavier in weight. Of all the variables considered, however, living with parents explained the largest fraction of the gaps observed in partnering, but it is difficult to unravel the causal order between residing with parents and romantic relationship involvement.

The analyses presented in this study are limited in a few respects. Our measurement of relationship involvement and other key variables at the time of the wave four interview meant that temporality could not be addressed. We could not address the sequencing of relationship involvement relative to other roles due to the fact Add Health did not collect the dates of some key events (e.g., the date respondents began living with parents). We were also limited by our reliance on a school-based sample that excluded respondents who dropped out of school prior to the wave one interview. This exclusion likely narrowed the socioeconomic heterogeneity of our sample, and presumably, in a way that reduced gaps between whites and more disadvantaged minority groups. Another limitation is that we combined a variety of different ethnic groups under the categories white, black, Hispanic, and Asian. Still, the differences we identified between white and Asian men were consistent with findings regarding dating preferences, as

well as observations by Asian American film scholars and media observers. Our use of pan-ethnic categories, however, was also consistent with practices of studies concerning racial gaps in cohabitation and marriage. Add Health currently lacks information on characteristics of the communities in which respondents resided at the time of the wave four. Consequently, we were not able to address whether rates of interracial involvement among Asian women in a community reduced Asian men's chances of being partnered.

Future research could profit by extending these analyses in several directions. One important question that needs to be addressed is, what are the mechanisms by which living at home reduces current romantic involvement? Several arguments have been posited for how living at home is linked to union formation. One argument is that those living at home are more family oriented, suggesting they have a greater propensity to form a union. A competing argument is that living at home reduces opportunities for meeting potential partners and thus lowers the likelihood of union formation. Another argument is that living at home could be an indicator of emotional or financial immaturity, thereby reducing attractiveness as a potential partner (Mulder, Clark, & Wagner 2006). In spite of this speculation, few studies have examined the day-to-day lives of youth who reside with parents (Furstenberg 2010).

Given the strong mandate in American culture to leave home by their early twenties, living at home the late twenties and early thirties could be selective of individuals with traits that impede involvement (e.g., lack of ambition), particularly among whites. Kasinitz et al.'s (2008) *Inheriting the City* study compared the transition to adulthood among youth of five ethnic groups with foreign-born parents (i.e., Chinese, Dominicans, South Americans, West Indians, and Russians) with white, black, and Puerto Rican youth whose parents were born in the United States. It highlighted the fact that second-generation youth had dramatically different views of

living at home than their counterparts whose parents were born in this country. Whites, black, and Puerto Rican youth expressed the view that living with parents in the early twenties was not consistent with being an adult. In contrast, the second-generation youth viewed living at home as a way to continue schooling and save money for the future (Kasinitz et al. 2008). Differences in the meaning of living at home between the two broad sets of youth are consistent with the decomposition analyses that found living at home to reduce the involvement of white men more than Asian men.

Studies that examine racial differences in the presence and nature of other social ties could round out our understanding of why living with parents impedes involvement. A consideration of resources transferred between parents and children could also shed light on this issue. Analyses of this study revealed that, relative to their white counterparts, Asian men forego coresidential relationships, especially cohabitation but not “dating.” Youth who interact more routinely with parents, by virtue of living at home, may feel more reluctant than their counterparts living independently to start a relationship, as it would likely become known to parents (Rosenfeld & Kim 2005). Immigrant youth living at home may also have fewer opportunities to meet different-race partners and feel less inclined to begin relationships with individuals from other racial groups. This could explain the gap in interracial involvement between Asian men and Asian women. Future studies could also address whether Asian men are more inclined to live at home because their prospects of finding a partner are slim or whether their living arrangements dictate their prospects.

REFERENCES

- Averett, Susan L., Asia Sikora and Laura M. Argys. 2008. "For Better or Worse: Relationship Status and Body Mass Index." *Economics and Human Biology* 6:330-349.
- Bearman, Peter S. & Moody, James. 2004. "Suicide and Friendships among American Adolescents." *American Journal of Public Health* 94: 89-95.
- Belot, Michele and Jan Fidrmuc 2010. "The Anthropometry of Love, Height and Gender Asymmetries in Intermarriage." *Economics and Human Biology* 8:361-372.
- Brown, Susan L., Jennifer Van Hook, and Jennifer E. Glick. 2008 "Generational Differences in Cohabitation and Marriage in the U.S." *Population Research and Policy Review* 427:531-550.
- Carver, Karen, Kara Joyner, and J. Richard Udry. 2003. "National Estimates of Adolescent Romantic Relationships." Pp. 23-56 in P. Florsheim (Ed.), *Adolescent Romantic Relations and Sexual Behavior: Theory, Research, and Practical Implications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.
- Cawley, John, Kara Joyner, and Jeffery Sobal. 2006. "The Relationship Between Adolescent Obesity and Dating, Sex, Condom Use, and Pregnancy." *Rationality and Society* 18:67-94.
- Connolly, J., Furman, W., & Konarski, R. 2000. "The Role of Peers in the Emergence of Heterosexual Romantic Relationships in Adolescence." *Child Development* 71:1395-1408.
- Crowder, Kyle D. and Stewart E. Tolnay. 2000. "A New Marriage Squeeze for Black Women: The Role of Racial Intermarriage by Black Men." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:792-807.
- Dunphy, Dexter. 1963. "The Social Structure of Urban Adolescent Peer Groups." *Sociometry* 26:230-246.
- Edin, Kathryn, Maria J. Kefalas, and Joanna M. Reed. 2004. "A Peek Inside the Black Box: What Marriage Means for Poor Unmarried Parents." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66:1007-1014.
- Elder, Glen H., Jr. 2006. "Life Course Perspective." In *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, edited by George Ritzer. Fourth Edition. Pp. 2634-2639. Blackwell Publisher.
- Feliciano, Cynthia, Belinda Robnett, and Golnaz Komaie. 2009. "Gendered Racial Exclusion among White Internet Daters." *Social Science Research* 38:39-54.
- Feng, Peter X. (Editor). 2002. *Screening Asian Americans*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Furstenberg, Frank. 2010. "On a New Schedule: Transitions to Adulthood and Family Change." 2010. *Future of the Children* 20: 67-87.

- Geruso, Michael 2012. "Black-White Disparities in Life Expectancy: How Much Can the Standard SES Variables Explain?" *Demography* 49:553-574.
- Goldstein, Joshua R. and Catherine T. Kenney. 2001. "Marriage Delayed or Marriage Forgone? New Cohort Forecasts of First Marriage for U.S. Women." *American Sociological Review* 66:506-519.
- Guzzo, Karen Benjamin. 2006. "The Role of Life Course Events in Union Formation." *Social Science Research* 35:384-408.
- Kao, Grace, Elizabeth Vaquera, and Kimberly Goyette. 2013. *Education and Immigration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kao, Grace and Jennifer Thompson. 2003. "Racial and Ethnic Stratification in Educational Achievement and Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 417-442.
- Kasinitz, Philip, John H. Mollenkopf, Mary C. Waters and Jennifer Holdaway. 2008. *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age*. Cambridge and New York: Harvard University Press and the Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kreager, Derek A. and Jeremy Staff. 2009. "Sexual Double Standards and Adolescent Peer Acceptance." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 72:143-164.
- Laird, Sam. "Fox Sports Columnist Apologizes for 'Racist' Jeremy Lin Tweet." Mashable Social Media. <http://mashable.com/2012/02/13/whitlock-apologizes-for-lin-tweet/> Accessed on September 21, 2012
- Landale, Nancy S. and R.S. Oropesa. 2007. "Hispanic Families: Stability and Change." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 33: 381-405.
- Lichter, Daniel T., Diane K. McLaughlin, George Kephart, and David J. Landry. 1992. "Race and the Retreat from Marriage: A Shortage of Marriageable Men?" *American Sociological Review* 57:781-99.
- MacAdam, Alison. 2008. "Long Duk Dong: Last of the Hollywood Stereotypes?" Transcript of broadcast on National Public Radio, March 24, 2008. <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=88591800>. Accessed on September 21, 2012.
- Manfredini, Matteo, Marco Breschi, Alessio Fornasin, Chiara Seghieri. Forthcoming 2013. "Height, Socioeconomic Status and Marriage in Italy around 1900." *Economics and Human Biology*.
- Mulder, Clara, William A.V. Clark and Michael Wagner. 2006. "Resources, Living Arrangements and First Union Formation in the United States, the Netherlands and West Germany." *European Journal of Population* 22:3-35

- Oppenheimer, Valerie K. 1988. "A Theory of Marriage Timing." *American Journal of Sociology* 94:563-591.
- Payne, K. K. 2012. "Young Adults in the Parental Home, 1940-2010 (FP-12-22)." National Center for Family & Marriage Research. Retrieved from http://ncfmr.bgsu.edu/pdf/family_profiles/file122548.pdf
- Pettit, Becky and Bruce Western. 2004. "Mass Imprisonment and the Life Course: Race and Class Inequality in U.S. Incarceration." *American Sociological Review* 69:151-169.
- Qian, Zhenchao. 1997. "Breaking the Racial Barriers: Variations in Interracial Marriage between 1980 and 1990." *Demography*. 34:263-276.
- Raley, R. Kelly. 1996. "A Shortage of Marriageable Men? A Note on the Role of Cohabitation in Race Differences in Marriage." *American Sociological Review* 61:973-983.
- Raley, R. Kelly, Sarah Crissey, & Chandra Muller. 2007. "Of Sex and Romance: Adolescent Relationships in the Transition to Adulthood." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69:1210-1226.
- Raley, R. Kelly and Megan M. Sweeney. 2009. "Explaining Race and Ethnic Variation in Marriage: Directions for Future Research." *Race and Social Problems* 1:132-142.
- Rindfuss, Ronald. 1991. "The Young Adult Years: Diversity, Structural Change, and Fertility." *Demography* 28:493-512.
- Robnett, Belinda and Cynthia Feliciano. 2011. "Patterns of Racial-Ethnic Exclusion by Internet Daters." *Social Forces* 89:807-828.
- Rosenfeld, Michael J. and Byung-Soo Kim. 2005 "The Independence of Young Adults and the Rise of Interracial and Same Sex Unions." *American Sociological Review* 70:541-562
- Rumbaut, Rubén G. and Golnaz Komaie. 2010. "Immigration and Adult Transitions," *Future of Children* 20: 43-66.
- Savin-Williams Ritch C., Kara Joyner, and Gerulf Rieger. 2012. "Prevalence, Stability, and Change of Sexual Orientation Identity During Young Adulthood." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 41: 103-10.
- Schneider, Daniel. 2011. "[Wealth and the Marital Divide](#)." *American Journal of Sociology* 117:627-667.
- Smock, Pamela J., Wendy D. Manning, and Meredith Porter. 2005. "'Everything's There Except Money': How Money Shapes Decisions to Marry Among Cohabitators." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67: 680-696.

- Sweeney, Megan M. 2002. "Two Decades of Family Change: The Shifting Economic Foundations of Marriage." *American Sociological Review* 67:132-147.
- Thornton, Arland. 1990. "The Courtship Process and Adolescent Sexuality." *Journal of Family Issues* 11: 239-273.
- Thornton, Arland, Axinn, William G., and Teachman, Jay. 1995 "The Influence of School Enrollment and Accumulation on Cohabitation and Marriage in Early Adulthood." *American Sociological Review* 60:762-774.
- Thornton, Arland, Axinn, William G., and Xie, Yu. 2007. *Marriage and Cohabitation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thornton, Arland, Young-DeMarco, L., and Goldscheider, Frances. 1993. "Leaving the Parental Nest: The Experience of a Young White Cohort in the 1980s." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55:216-229.
- Udry, J. Richard. 1977. "The Importance of Being Beautiful." *American Journal of Sociology* 83:154-160.
- Wilson, William J. and Kathryn Neckerman, 1986. "Poverty and Family Structure: The Widening Gap Between Evidence and Public Policy Issues." In *Fighting Poverty: What Works and What Doesn't* (Sheldon Danziger and Daniel Wienberg, eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Xie, Yu, James M. Raymo, Kimberly Goyette, and Arland Thornton. 2007. "Work, Earnings Potential, and Career Aspirations." Pp. 286-302 in *Marriage and Cohabitation*, edited by Arland Thornton, William Axinn, and Yu Xie. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Table 1
Means and Proportions on Variables: Those Identifying as 100% Straight and No Involvement with a Same-Sex Partner (N = 8,718)

Variable	Men				Women			
	White	Black	Hisp	Asian	White	Black	Hisp	Asian
Wave 4 Union Status								
Single	0.19	0.24	0.20	0.34	0.15	0.23	0.18	0.17
Different-Sex Dating	0.17	0.23	0.20	0.21	0.11	0.27	0.17	0.19
Different-Sex Cohabiting	0.20	0.26	0.18	0.11	0.17	0.23	0.20	0.16
Different-Sex Married	0.44	0.27	0.42	0.34	0.57	0.26	0.45	0.49
Wave 4 Partner Race								
Single	0.19	0.24	0.20	0.34	0.15	0.23	0.18	0.17
Same-Race Partner	0.72	0.59	0.46	0.44	0.75	0.71	0.48	0.47
Different-Race Partner	0.09	0.17	0.35	0.22	0.10	0.06	0.34	0.36
Sex Partners Past Year (W4)								
No partners	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.30	0.17	0.11	0.17	0.13
1 Different-Sex Partner	0.66	0.40	0.55	0.49	0.69	0.65	0.70	0.74
Multiple Different-Sex	0.24	0.48	0.34	0.22	0.14	0.24	0.13	0.14
Independent Variables								
Age at Wave 4	28.28	28.52	28.25	28.56	28.10	28.37	28.28	28.45
Parental SES (Wave 1)	5.95	5.44	4.58	5.92	5.75	4.79	4.35	5.50
Intact family (Wave 1)	0.71	0.37	0.68	0.80	0.67	0.36	0.61	0.74
Personal income	41,256	26,115	37,988	43,832	26,587	23,191	27,104	38,541
Income missing	0.03	0.10	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.09	0.06	0.04
Less than high school	0.07	0.15	0.11	0.01	0.05	0.08	0.08	0.02
High school	0.28	0.36	0.30	0.17	0.21	0.27	0.27	0.22
Some college	0.34	0.30	0.36	0.27	0.34	0.35	0.35	0.29
College degree	0.31	0.19	0.22	0.55	0.40	0.31	0.30	0.47
Enrolled in school	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.16	0.17	0.23	0.18	0.19
Full-time employment	0.76	0.64	0.82	0.72	0.57	0.61	0.58	0.62
Living with parent(s)	0.13	0.23	0.22	0.31	0.10	0.17	0.24	0.21
IR attractiveness (Wave 1)	10.49	10.41	10.60	10.60	11.20	10.53	11.01	11.00
Romantic relationship (W1)	0.64	0.69	0.64	0.48	0.67	0.63	0.56	0.41
Different-sex popularity (W1)	1.69	1.75	1.63	1.24	1.88	1.31	1.42	1.18
Same-sex popularity (W1)	2.58	2.03	2.21	2.40	3.08	2.61	2.50	2.35
IR attractiveness scale	10.44	10.43	10.48	10.47	10.76	10.67	10.92	10.94
Underweight or healthy	0.29	0.34	0.21	0.39	0.40	0.21	0.30	0.58
Overweight	0.35	0.30	0.44	0.31	0.25	0.23	0.28	0.26
Obese	0.35	0.36	0.34	0.30	0.34	0.55	0.41	0.16
Height in inches	70.44	69.93	68.71	67.25	64.79	64.64	63.11	62.23
N of cases	2,493	881	637	317	2,332	1,133	662	263

Notes: Weighted estimates and unweighted sample sizes shown.

Table 2

Zero-Order and Full Model Odds Ratios of Current Involvement with a Different-Sex Partner: 100% Straight and No Involvement with a Same-Sex Partner at Wave 4 (N = 8,718)

Variable	Men		Women	
	Zero-Order	Full Model	Zero-Order	Full Model
Race /Ethnicity				
White	---	---	---	---
Black	0.73	0.95	0.59***	0.80†
Hispanic	0.98	1.08	0.79	1.05
Asian	0.47**	0.74	0.87	1.23
Independent Variables				
Age at Wave 4	1.13***	1.07†	1.04	0.97
Parental SES (Wave 1)	0.97	0.94*	1.01	0.95*
Intact family (Wave 1)	1.09	1.06	1.10	1.13
Logged personal income	1.15***	1.09**	1.04*	0.97
Income missing	1.43	1.10	0.49*	0.62
Less than high school	0.79	1.00	1.24	0.64
High school	0.79†	0.80	1.07	1.07
Some college	---	---	---	---
College degree	0.88	0.72*	1.07	0.99
Enrolled in school	0.65***	0.73*	0.61***	0.59**
Full-time employment	1.94***	1.28*	1.21†	0.81†
Living with parent(s)	0.23***	0.27***	0.28***	0.31***
IR attractiveness (Wave 1)	1.13***	1.10***	1.12***	1.07*
Romantic relationship (W1)	1.83***	1.42**	2.11***	1.88***
Different-sex popularity (W1)	1.15***	1.08†	1.21***	1.09*
Same-sex popularity (W1)	1.07*	1.00	1.11**	1.04
IR attractiveness scale	1.09**	1.04	1.08**	1.04
Underweight or healthy	---	---	---	---
Overweight	1.52**	1.32*	1.16	0.90
Obese	1.42*	1.35*	1.57**	0.79
Lower quartile in height	---	---	---	---
Lower middle quartile height	1.51*	1.31	0.99	0.93
Upper middle quartile height	1.46*	1.36†	0.96	0.94
Upper quartile in height	1.59**	1.37†	0.82	0.83
Intercept (Full Model)	---	0.06*	---	6.35†
F (Full Model)	---	9.80	---	8.67
N of cases	4,328	4,328	4,390	4,390

Notes: Unweighted sample sizes shown. Models adjust for design effects.

†p < .1. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 3. Decomposition of Current Involvement Rate for White Men, Asian Men, White Women, and Black Women:

Variable	White Male Rates with Asian Male Characteristics			Asian Male Rates with White Male Characteristics			White Female Rates with Black Female Characteristics			Black Female Rates with White Female Characteristics		
	$R^W - \% \Delta$			$R^A - \% \Delta$			$R^W - \% \Delta$			$R^B - \% \Delta$		
	R	$R^{W,CF}$	Gap	R	$R^{A,CF}$	Gap	R	$R^{W,CF}$	Gap	R	$R^{B,CF}$	Gap
Observed Rates, or R												
White Men	.808	---	---	.808	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Asian Men	.663	---	---	.663	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Gap (White - Asian Men)	.146	---	---	.146	---	---						
White Women	---	---	---	---	---	---	.848	---	---	.848	---	---
Black Women	---	---	---	---	---	---	.768	---	---	.768	---	---
Gap (White - Black Woman)	---	---	---	---	---	---	.080	---	---	.080	---	---
Counterfactual Rates, or R^{CF}												
Age (3 age groups)	.813	-.004	-3%	.640	-.023	-16%	.852	-.004	-5%	.769	.001	1%
Parental SES (Wave 1)	.810	-.002	-1%	.658	-.005	-3%	.855	-.007	-9%	.757	-.010	-13%
Intact family (Wave 1)	.807	.001	1%	.650	-.013	-9%	.856	-.008	-10%	.784	.016	21%
Income (Quintiles for Sex)	.815	-.006	-4%	.653	-.010	-7%	.842	.006	7%	.771	.003	4%
Educational attainment	.810	-.002	-1%	.648	-.015	-10%	.846	.002	2%	.766	-.002	-2%
School enrollment	.807	.002	1%	.666	.003	2%	.843	.004	5%	.769	.002	2%
Full-time employment	.805	.003	2%	.667	.004	3%	.846	.002	2%	.767	.000	0%
Living with parent(s)	.743	.065	45%	.695	.032	22%	.829	.019	24%	.776	.009	11%
IR attractiveness (Wave 1)	.810	-.001	-1%	.665	.002	2%	.837	.011	14%	.767	-.001	-1%
Romantic relationship (W1)	.792	.016	11%	.669	.006	4%	.844	.004	5%	.771	.003	4%
Different-sex popularity (W1)	.800	.009	6%	.684	.021	14%	.834	.014	17%	.779	.011	14%
IR attractiveness scale	.811	-.002	-2%	.672	.010	7%	.847	.001	2%	.770	.003	3%
Weight	.804	.004	3%	.666	.004	2%	.831	.017	21%	.769	.001	2%
Height (Quartiles for Sex)	.776	.032	22%	.669	.006	4%	.849	-.001	-1%	.768	.001	1%

Notes: Factors that suppress gaps between minorities and whites have a negative value for % explained.

Appendix A

Partnering of Add Health Respondents with Data from Waves 1 and 4: Entire Sample and Subset Identifying as 100% Straight at Wave 4 (N = 8,718)

Partnering at Wave 4	Men				Women			
	White	Black	Hisp	Asian	White	Black	Hisp	Asian
Entire Sample								
Wave 4 Union Status								
Single	0.20	0.26	0.20	0.36	0.16	0.24	0.19	0.16
Different-Sex Dating	0.16	0.23	0.20	0.20	0.11	0.26	0.17	0.21
Different-Sex Cohabiting	0.19	0.25	0.18	0.11	0.19	0.23	0.20	0.19
Different-Sex Married	0.43	0.25	0.40	0.32	0.53	0.25	0.43	0.43
Same-Sex Dating	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
Same-Sex Cohabiting	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00
Same-Sex Married	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sex Partners Past Year (W4)								
No partners	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.28	0.15	0.12	0.15	0.11
1 Different-Sex Partner	0.64	0.37	0.51	0.47	0.66	0.61	0.66	0.71
Multiple Different-Sex	0.23	0.47	0.32	0.21	0.16	0.23	0.14	0.17
1 Same-Sex Partner	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01
Multiple Same-Sex	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Partners of Both Sexes	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.00
N of cases	2,697	942	705	340	2,995	1,360	822	322
Those 100% Straight								
Wave 4 Union Status								
Single	0.19	0.25	0.20	0.34	0.15	0.23	0.18	0.17
Different-Sex Dating	0.17	0.23	0.20	0.21	0.11	0.27	0.17	0.19
Different-Sex Married	0.20	0.26	0.18	0.11	0.17	0.23	0.20	0.16
Different-Sex Cohabiting	0.44	0.27	0.43	0.34	0.57	0.26	0.45	0.49
Same-Sex Dating	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Same-Sex Married	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Same-Sex Cohabiting	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sex Partners Past Year (W4)								
No partners	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.30	0.17	0.11	0.17	0.13
1 Different-Sex Partner	0.66	0.39	0.55	0.49	0.69	0.65	0.69	0.74
Multiple Different-Sex	0.24	0.48	0.33	0.22	0.14	0.24	0.13	0.14
1 Same-Sex Partner	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00
Multiple Same-Sex	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Partners of Both Sexes	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
N of cases	2,500	883	641	320	2,347	1,145	673	263

Notes: Weighted percentages and unweighted sample sizes shown. Respondents were excluded if they failed to complete the W1 in-school questionnaire or in-home interview.

Appendix B

Social Roles by Select Characteristics: Sexual Majority Respondents (N = 8,718)

Background	Men					Women				
	N	Single	School	Work	Home	N	Single	School	Work	Home
Whites, by Age	2,493	0.19	0.14	0.76	0.13	2,332	0.15	0.17	0.57	0.10
25-27	748	0.21	0.17	0.72	0.15	839	0.18	0.19	0.57	0.14
28-29	938	0.20	0.12	0.76	0.14	821	0.14	0.15	0.58	0.08
30-32	807	0.16	0.12	0.80	0.09	672	0.13	0.14	0.55	0.05
Blacks, by Age	881	0.24	0.15	0.64	0.23	1,133	0.23	0.23	0.61	0.17
25-27	265	0.32	0.24	0.60	0.20	344	0.23	0.24	0.56	0.21
28-29	336	0.25	0.12	0.62	0.24	456	0.24	0.21	0.62	0.16
30-32	280	0.16	0.09	0.70	0.25	333	0.23	0.22	0.65	0.15
Hispanics	637	0.20	0.14	0.82	0.22	662	0.18	0.18	0.58	0.24
Nativity										
Foreign born	155	0.21	0.23	0.79	0.31	162	0.25	0.23	0.57	0.18
U.S. Born	482	0.19	0.11	0.82	0.19	500	0.17	0.17	0.59	0.26
Ethnicity										
Mexican	271	0.16	0.14	0.84	0.20	289	0.17	0.16	0.52	0.25
Cuban	133	0.26	0.11	0.76	0.22	132	0.20	0.24	0.72	0.21
Puerto Rican	129	0.17	0.16	0.78	0.18	122	0.09	0.14	0.67	0.22
Central / South	75	0.19	0.18	0.86	0.20	71	0.24	0.31	0.56	0.23
Other	29	0.41	0.03	0.66	0.42	48	0.28	0.14	0.69	0.23
Age										
25-27	120	0.22	0.17	0.85	0.22	134	0.16	0.15	0.58	0.21
28-29	262	0.21	0.15	0.78	0.25	269	0.15	0.18	0.65	0.28
30-32	255	0.15	0.06	0.82	0.17	259	0.24	0.23	0.53	0.24
Asians	317	0.34	0.16	0.72	0.31	263	0.17	0.19	0.62	0.21
Nativity										
Foreign born	130	0.33	0.21	0.73	0.27	129	0.18	0.17	0.64	0.25
U.S. Born	187	0.35	0.12	0.72	0.34	134	0.16	0.22	0.59	0.17
Ethnicity										
Chinese	97	0.48	0.15	0.83	0.31	62	0.28	0.21	0.83	0.15
Filipino	129	0.24	0.20	0.58	0.46	131	0.10	0.24	0.56	0.14
Other	91	0.36	0.13	0.80	0.18	70	0.21	0.15	0.61	0.28
Age										
25-27	68	0.49	0.18	0.60	0.42	56	0.27	0.26	0.65	0.35
28-29	124	0.34	0.15	0.80	0.28	80	0.11	0.23	0.59	0.17
30-32	125	0.22	0.16	0.73	0.26	127	0.10	0.11	0.60	0.10

Notes: Weighted percentages and unweighted sample sizes shown.

Appendix C

Full Model Odds Ratios of Coresidence and Marriage with a Different-Sex Partner: 100% Straight and No Involvement with a Same-Sex Partner at Wave 4 (N = 8,718)

Variable	Men		Women	
	Coresidence	Marriage	Coresidence	Marriage
Race /Ethnicity				
White	---	---	---	---
Black	0.73**	0.54***	0.38***	0.31***
Hispanic	0.90	0.98	0.79	0.72†
Asian	0.74	0.83	0.88	0.83
Independent Variables				
Age at Wave 4	1.15***	1.29***	1.00	1.18***
Parental SES (Wave 1)	0.94**	0.98	0.96*	0.97
Intact family (Wave 1)	1.12	1.26*	1.20	1.35**
Logged personal income	1.11***	1.08*	0.93**	0.89***
Income missing	1.61	0.94	0.45*	0.29***
Less than high school	1.24	1.04	0.59†	0.46**
High school	1.04	0.99	1.09	0.89
Some college	---	---	---	---
College degree	0.58***	0.70*	0.77*	1.07
Enrolled in school	0.80	0.95	0.59***	0.68**
Full-time employment	0.99	1.17	0.65**	0.72*
Living with parent(s)	0.13***	0.15***	0.12***	0.19***
IR attractiveness (Wave 1)	1.03	1.02	1.05†	1.08**
Romantic relationship (W1)	1.31*	0.93	1.77***	1.40**
Different-sex popularity (W1)	1.04	1.01	1.04	1.03
Same-sex popularity (W1)	1.02	1.01	1.01	1.04
IR attractiveness scale	1.01	1.04†	1.05†	1.06*
Underweight or healthy	---	---	---	---
Overweight	1.48**	1.49**	1.22†	1.12
Obese	1.54**	1.56**	1.11	1.29*
Lower quartile in height	---	---	---	---
Lower middle quartile height	1.19	0.95	0.82	0.91
Upper middle quartile height	1.16	0.99	0.75*	0.90
Upper quartile in height	1.15	0.95	0.74*	0.80†
Intercept (Full Model)	0.01***	0.00***	3.29	0.01***
F (Full Model)	11.46	9.44	17.40	14.22
N of cases	4,328	4,328	4,390	4,390

Notes: Unweighted sample sizes shown. Models adjust for design effects.

†p < .1. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.