Working Paper Series
WP-09-10

September 2009

DEVELOPMENTAL SHIFTS IN THE CHARACTER OF ROMANTIC AND SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS FROM ADOLESCENCE TO YOUNG ADULTHOOD

Peggy C. Giordano
Wendy D. Manning
Monica A. Longmore
Christine M. Flanigan
Department of Sociology
Bowling Green State University

This research was supported by the National Center for Family & Marriage Research, which is funded by a cooperative agreement, grant number 5 UOI AEOOOOOI-03, between the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and Bowling Green State University.
Any opinions and conclusions expressed herein are solely those of the author(s) and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of any agency of the Federal government.

Developmental Shifts in the Character of Romantic and Sexual Relationships from Adolescence to Young Adulthood

Peggy C. Giordano, Wendy D. Manning, Monica A. Longmore, and Christine M. Flanigan

ABSTRACT

Recent research on adolescent romantic relationships has added to the voluminous literature on marriage, but less is known about the character of relationship experiences during the young adult years. Studies are especially limited that include non-college youth and that explicitly compare adolescent and young adult romantic and sexual relationships. It is also important to explore ways in which gender influences the character and meaning of these romantic experiences. This chapter presents results of analyses of survey data from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS) that identify developmental shifts in the nature of romantic relationships, as respondents have moved from adolescence to young adulthood. TARS is a longitudinal examination of the romantic and sexual experiences of 1,321 respondents who were interviewed four times, first in adolescence and subsequently as they have navigated the transition to adulthood.

The core question addressed in this chapter is how characteristics of respondents' current or most recent romantic relationships change from adolescence into adulthood. The chapter also includes a review of other recent TARS findings that provide a more comprehensive portrait of the fluidity and range of romantic and sexual relationship experiences that characterize this phase of the life course. For example, recognizing that young adulthood is a period of change and flux, research relying on the TARS data has also focused on the phenomena of breaking up and getting back together and having sex with ex-boyfriends/girlfriends--dynamics that are quite common, but that highlight some of the difficulties of establishing the boundaries of what constitutes a dating relationship (Halpern-Meekin, Manning, Giordano, & Longmore, 2010). In addition, while young adulthood is generally understood as a time when romantic attachments take on greater weight/significance, this period is associated with increased likelihood of casual sex experiences (Lyons, 2009). Thus, we also include a review of findings about the trajectories of casual sex and factors associated with variability in casual sexual experiences.

A COMPARISON OF ADOLESCENT AND YOUNG ADULT ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Compared to research on romantic relationships, studies of family processes and peer influence have a much longer history within the field of adolescent development. This historical neglect is likely connected to the belief that adolescents' dating relationships tend to be transitory and somewhat shallow, thus lessening their potential impact (e.g., Merten, 1996). Nevertheless, recent theorizing has suggested a key role for romantic relationships in adolescent development (Collins, Welsh, & Furman, 2009), and research findings indicate that adolescents, themselves, often consider these relationships to be an important part of their lives (Giordano, Longmore, & Manning, 2006). Consistent with these ideas and findings, more focused investigations have suggested that romantic partners are a potential influence on such consequential outcomes as drug/alcohol use, academic achievement, delinquency involvement, and sexual decision-making (e.g., Cleveland, 2003; Giordano, Phelps, Manning, & Longmore, 2008; Haynie, Giordano, Manning, & Longmore, 2005). More recently, researchers have begun to explore ways in which these formative experiences influence the nature and timing of later adult relationships (Raley & Sullivan, 2010; Sassler, 2010).

In the contemporary context, adolescent dating relationships do not segue neatly and inevitably into adult marital or cohabiting unions. Increases in the average age at first marriage and the more variable order of key life events creates for many an extended period of non-marital romantic involvement that takes place during the phase of life increasingly referred to as “emerging adulthood” (Arnett, 2000, 2004; Osgood, Foster, Flanagan, & Ruth, 2005; Settersten, Furstenberg, & Rumbaut, 2005; Setterstein, & Mayer, 1997). Cohabitation has received attention, as it is increasingly common (in 2002, 58% of 25-29 year old women ever cohabited), in part, due to delayed first marriage (Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008). Yet, cohabitation is not ubiquitous during emerging adulthood, suggesting the importance of exploring the relationship experiences of young adults who are dating and cohabiting. How, then, do the relationships formed in young adulthood differ from the adolescent romantic relationships that have been the subject of recent research attention? A primary goal of this chapter is to explicitly compare reports of qualities and dynamics within adolescent and young adult romantic relationships, including age-related influences of

gender on relationship experiences, and to explore the effects of cohabitation relative to dating on young adult relationship dynamics. An advantage of a longitudinal approach is that we can observe changes in the character of romantic relationships as individuals have matured, rather than relying on a cross-sectional comparison of samples characterized by different age ranges. Another advantage of these data is the measurement emphasis in the TARS study on relationship qualities and dynamics, which allows us to build a developmental perspective on specific characteristics of romantic relationships. An important goal is to determine whether gendered responses observed in prior analyses of adolescents (notably boys' lower scores on perceived power in their relationships (Giordano et al., 2006)) shift as respondents move into young adulthood. We focus on domains included in prior research on adolescent relationships (communication, emotion, and power/influence dynamics), but also include attention to utilitarian concerns, recognizing that these may become more salient as priorities in this next stage of life.

Prior Research on Developmental Shifts

In an early discussion of developmental progressions in romantic relationships, Dunphy (1963) focused on changes in the nature of the connections between peers and romantic partners. The initial preference for same-gender friendships gives way to the mixed-gender peer group, a forum that provides an entrée to the world of heterosexual interactions and activities. With time and increased experience, couple relationships become common, with more popular youths leading the way in this regard. Connolly and Goldberg (1999) also highlighted that changes within the romantic realm are inextricably connected to peer group relationships and concerns. Initially, young adolescents may develop "crushes" that are discussed in detail with close friends, while the romantic interactions themselves may be fleeting or sporadic (see also Merten, 1996). Their conceptualization also suggests that mixed-sex peer groups provide opportunities for developing feelings of comfort with the opposite sex and fulfill needs for affiliation and companionship. This companionate or affiliative phase is followed by more serious levels of involvement in romantic relationships, eventually leading to phases that include feelings of permanence and commitment. Connolly et al. (2004) found support for the notion that while such a progression is not inevitable, the move from same-gender relationships to group-based mixed-gender

interactions and finally to more serious dyadic relationships was a common pattern within their sample of Canadian youth.

Brown (1999) developed a generally compatible portrait of the development of romantic involvement during adolescence, identifying initiation, status, affection, and bonding phases. His conceptualization stressed teens' lack of experience and feelings of awkwardness in the early phases of romance, and the strong role played by the peer group as a source of advice and socialization. The inclusion of a status phase also underscores that dating and partner choices can be a source of social capital with respect to fitting in and one's position in adolescent social hierarchies. Brown argued that the later phases of romantic involvement, in contrast, are marked by deeper levels of caring, sexual intimacy, and eventually a concern with the relationship's permanence. In support of this idea, Brown noted findings obtained by Roscoe, Diana, and Brooks (1987) who observed that younger adolescents more often listed status and recreation as reasons for dating, while late adolescents more often listed sexual activity, companionship and having "goals for the future" (p. 66) as important considerations. Similarly, Seiffge-Krenke (2003) in a prospective study of 103 German adolescents found that romantic partner's perceived social support was significantly higher at age 21 compared with responses provided during earlier assessments (at ages 13, 15, and 17).

As many of the studies in this area relied on relatively small, homogeneous samples, Meier and Allen's (2009) analyses of the three waves of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) represents an important addition to literature on developmental progressions. Based on the two adolescent waves of data, Meier and Allen identified six overall patterns that took into account number of relationships and durations respondents reported (ranging from not being involved in any form of dating relationship to casual or multiple relationships to a pattern of steady dating). The authors found considerable stability in a one year interval (i.e., 70% of those who reported no relationships at time 1 also reported no relationship at time 2), but where changes occurred, progression was more common than regression to an early form. The authors also found that those respondents who were further along in this dating sequence were more likely to cohabit or marry by the time of the third wave of interviews. Meier

and Allen note that a limitation of the Add Health data set is that it contains few measures of relationship qualities, suggesting the utility of our focus here on subjectively experienced dynamics within these early relationships.

The research reviewed above provides a basis for expecting age-related changes in the character of romantic relationships. The current study contributes beyond this prior work, which has focused largely on overall perceptions of partner support or importance of the relationship, by exploring within-individual changes in a range of qualities and dynamics of romantic relationships. Nevertheless, theoretical discussions within this developmental literature have been useful in identifying specific domains that warrant further investigation. For example, Brown (1999) and Connolly et al. (2004) describe the awkwardness and lack of confidence characteristic of early adolescent romantic ties but have not directly studied age-related trends in these feelings and perceptions. A secondary objective of this comparative analysis is to examine similarities and differences in male and female respondents' romantic relationship experiences, and how these patterns may shift with maturation. The literature provides a basis for developing hypotheses with respect to gender, but recent findings produce somewhat contradictory portraits. For example, scholars have suggested that both male and female adolescents experience feelings of awkwardness in communication and lack of self-assurance when they begin to develop romantic relationships. However, Maccoby (1990) argued that while "both sexes face a relatively unfamiliar situation to which they must adapt" (p. 517), the transition is accomplished more easily for male youths--who often simply transport their dominant interaction style into this new form of social relationship. A contrasting perspective is that because girls are more experienced than boys with intimate dyadic communications by virtue of their own earlier friendship experiences, boys must make a bigger developmental leap as they begin to learn this more intimate way of relating to another. In support of the latter view, Giordano et al. (2006) found that adolescent boys scored significantly higher than their female counterparts on a scale indexing perceived *awkwardness in communication* with a focal romantic partner.

Movement into romantic relationships involves more than developing a level of comfort while communicating with the opposite gender. It also requires a full complement of relationship skills, most

communication based as well. Young people must become familiar with the process of making initial overtures, learn how to communicate their needs to partners, manage conflict, and successfully terminate unwanted relationships. Here, too, young women might feel more competent and confident as they have experienced similar social dynamics in prior relationships (e.g., friendship troubles and their repair). While prior research has shown that boys frequently score higher on scales measuring general self-esteem and self-efficacy (Gecas & Longmore, 2003), in an analysis of these relationship skills among early adolescents, teenage male respondents compared with their female counterparts reported lower *confidence navigating adolescent romantic relationships* (Giordano et al., 2006).

Much theorizing about these communication processes centers on the 'newness' of dating, particularly for adolescent boys. However, as young people mature and gain experience within this social arena, perhaps young men in particular are more likely to become the confident actors that Maccoby described. Accordingly, we explore whether age is associated with reduced feelings of communication awkwardness and greater feelings of confidence navigating romantic relationships, considering also whether the gender gap in these communication dynamics and feelings of confidence dissipates as respondents mature into adulthood.

Communication processes comprise a core aspect of close relationships; however, researchers have suggested that heightened emotionality, especially the experience of passionate love, encompass relationship dynamics and emotional rewards that are arguably unique to the romantic context (Giordano, Longmore, & Manning, 2001). Focusing on these domains, studies of adolescent romantic involvement have also theorized about strong gender differences. Some scholars have emphasized that while girls are likely to become highly invested in their romantic entanglements (Eder, Evans, & Parker, 1995), boys are socialized within their peer worlds to avoid or deny softer emotions and are teased and ridiculed by peers if they reveal signs of emotionality (Fine, 1987). In turn, this literature suggests that boys learn to devalue relationships that engender positive emotions and to objectify and denigrate the young women who are their partners in romantic interactions. Overall, much previous research supports the idea of an emotional closing off process, as boys are observed making crude comments in the school lunchroom

(Eder et al., 1995), describing their romantic relationships as tedious (Wight, 1994), or constructing relationships as a game perpetrated on young women for the purpose of sexual conquest (Anderson, 1989).

In contrast to these emphases, recent quantitative and qualitative findings support the idea that boys often develop positive emotional feelings toward partners and accord significance and positive meanings to their romantic relationships (Korobov & Thorne, 2006; Tolman, Spencer, Harmon, Rosen-Reynoso, & Striepe, 2004; Way & Chu, 2004). The notion that new attitudes and feelings can emerge from these early romantic experiences is consistent with Thorne's (1993:133) key observation that "incidents of crossing (gender boundaries) may chip away at traditional ideologies and hold out new possibilities." To the degree that boys in romantic relationships engage in a distinctive form of intimate self-disclosure lacking within their peer discourse, and receive both positive identity and social support from a caring female partner, it could be argued that boys may be more dependent on these relationships than girls who have a range of other opportunities for intimate talk and social support. Generally consistent with this hypothesis, prior analyses of wave 1 TARS data indicated no gender differences in feelings of passionate love within romantic relationships (Giordano et al., 2006).

We expect that as respondents mature, relationships will become even more intimate and provide greater emotional rewards than those that characterize the adolescent period. Yet it is possible that as young men gain confidence and additional relationship experience, including sexual experience, they may be more likely to engage in dating experiences that are not characterized by strong emotions (i.e., the idea of 'scoring' as a competitive game, the notion of 'getting over'). We explore the relationship between age and feelings of passionate love directly and whether the data reveal gender and age interactions in reports of these feelings. Some research on college samples suggests that highly gendered patterns may not be observed in young adulthood. For example, Hatfield and Sprecher (1986), relying on a 30-item passionate love scale, did not find strong gender differences in reports of love as reported within a sample of male and female college students. Similarly, using Add Health, Brown and Bulanda (2008) found similar levels of relationship satisfaction and love among dating young men and women.

A third key dimension of relationships is the nature of influence and power. The social influence literature emphasizes that the more highly valued the relationship, the more individuals are willing to accede to influence attempts to maintain or enhance their standing with valued others (Blau, 1964). Given that traditional gender socialization emphasizes the centrality of relationships in girls' lives, it is conventional to argue that structurally based gender inequalities tend to be reproduced at the couple level, and that on average, the male partner acquires more power and control in the relationship (Komter, 1989). While these ideas originally were applied to adult marital relations, the notion of gendered inequalities of power is also a recurrent theme within the adolescence literature (Eder et al., 1995; Thorne, 1993). Further, if young women's identities depend on relationships with romantic partners, it follows that these others would be a significant source of reference and influence. In contrast, to the degree that male adolescents' concerns lie outside the romantic context itself (i.e., where heterosexual success is merely a form of competition and basis for camaraderie with male peers), we may expect the romantic partner's influence to be (and to be viewed as) rather minimal (see Collins, 2004:238). A contrasting hypothesis is that adolescent girls, due to their greater familiarity with issues of intimacy and skill in communication, would be expected to make influence attempts, while boys (highly interested/engaged in this new relationship form) would often be receptive to such attempts. Theories of symbolic interaction also suggest a more situated, constantly negotiated view of power dynamics, in contrast to a straightforward male privilege argument (see e.g., Sprey, 1999). Consistent with the latter perspective, we found that boys score higher on perceptions of influence attempts and actual influence on the part of their romantic partners (Giordano et al., 2006).

During adolescence, social forces that are generally understood as fostering adult gender inequalities are at a distance; thus, the reproduction of traditionally gendered power dynamics may be markedly less than complete. This suggests the importance of assessing the nature and extent of developmental changes as respondents have matured into adulthood in the romantic partner's *influence attempts*, *actual influence (as perceived by the respondent)*, and perceptions of the *power balance* within the relationship (defined as getting one's way, given some level of disagreement). We expect that as individuals spend increased time

with their romantic partners, and peer relationships begin to recede somewhat in importance, in general, the romantic partner will increase as a source of reference, support, and influence. A key question, however, is whether the non-traditional gender pattern observed in connection with adolescent romantic relationships continues to be characteristic of the young adult romantic context. For example, Furman and Burhmester (1992) found a grade by gender interaction: older boys scored higher on power, whereas older girls scored lower relative to their younger female counterparts.

McCall and Simmons (1966) noted that while it is typical to evaluate the intrinsic benefits of close relationships and dynamics that center on issues of intimacy, social relationships often provide more extrinsic or utilitarian benefits. Thus, in addition to being an important partner in communication, object of affection, or source of reference and influence, the dating partner may provide tangible benefits. Marriage has often been described in light of these extrinsic elements, particularly as their provision connects to gender inequalities (where men gain power from their historically greater ability to bring such extrinsic benefits to the relationship). In the current analysis, we focus on non-marital dating partners, and ascertain whether there is a developmental shift in the provision of extrinsic rewards and how gender influences observed developmental progressions.

Dating and Cohabiting in Young Adulthood

As part of the delay of first marriage, cohabitation has become increasingly common. Indeed, in 2002, nearly 60 percent of women aged 25-29 had ever cohabited, and cohabitation is now the typical pathway into marriage (62% of first marriages are preceded by cohabitation) (Goodwin, Mosher, & Chandra, 2010; Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008). Empirical studies of the nature of cohabiting unions have most often compared cohabiters to married individuals, and have found that individuals who cohabit on average report lower relationship quality, less homophily, lower fertility, and less gender equity than married individuals (e.g., Blackwell & Lichter, 2000; Brines & Joyner, 1999; Brown, 2004; Hohmann-Marriott, 2006; Loomis & Landale, 1994; Qian, 1998). Thus, differences between cohabitating and being married are well-documented.

Yet surprisingly, few studies have compared the qualities and dynamics of cohabiting and dating

young adults. One recent study using Add Health reported that cohabiting and dating men and women share similar levels of relationship satisfaction (Brown & Bulanda, 2008). While there are gender distinctions in levels of love, cohabiting and dating young adult men report similar levels of love, and cohabiting women report significantly higher levels of love than dating women (Brown & Bulanda, 2008). However, as noted by Meier and Allen (2009), the range of relationship qualities is limited in this particular data set. As such, similarities and differences between young adult daters and cohabiters with respect to dynamics of communication, feelings of closeness, power, and instrumental concerns are largely unexplored. An examination of how the relationship qualities of dating and cohabiting relationships are similar and different will speak to the issue of where cohabitation fits in the American courtship system. We recognize that while cohabiting and dating relationships are both non-marital unions, the qualities and dynamics within cohabiting unions may be different from the relationships of young adult daters who do not co-reside. Thus, in the analyses we describe below, we include attention to this distinction as we explore basic developmental and gender trends observed in relationship characteristics (relating to issues of communication, emotion, influence, and partner utility) in the transition from adolescence to young adulthood.

DATA AND METHODS

Data

The TARS sample (n = 1,321) was drawn from the year 2000 enrollment records of all youths registered for the seventh, ninth, and eleventh grades in Lucas County, Ohio. The following waves of TARS data were collected in 2002, 2004, and 2006. A parent questionnaire was completed at wave 1. The initial sample universe encompassed records elicited from 62 schools across seven school districts. The stratified, random sample, devised by the National Opinion Research Center, includes oversamples of Black and Hispanic adolescents. Unlike school-based studies, school attendance was not a requirement for sample inclusion, and interviews were conducted in the respondent's home using preloaded laptops to administer the interview while maintaining privacy.

We draw on the wave 1 and wave 4 interviews for the descriptive statistics and all four waves for the

growth curve analyses. The analytic sample at each wave used in the growth curve analyses is limited to respondents who were dating or cohabiting at the time of that wave's interview (n ranges from 752 to 952 across the four waves, with a total of 3,550 person-period observations). The current analyses focus on respondents who report about heterosexual experiences. Although information was collected about homosexual identities, the number of respondents at each wave who report homosexual experience and/or identities is too small to explore age-related changes in the character of these experiences.

Respondents may be dating or cohabiting with the same or different persons across interview waves. For the descriptive statistics, the sample is further limited so that "adolescent daters" were all aged 12-17 in the wave 1 interview (n = 855), while the "early adult daters" (n = 672) and "early adult cohabitors" (n = 203) were all aged 18-23 in the wave 4 interview. Respondents were asked if they were dating, using the question: "Is there someone you are currently dating--that is, a girl/guy you like and who likes you back?" If respondents answered 'yes' then they are coded as dating. The early adult cohabitors reported a cohabiting relationship, either responding affirmatively to the question "Are you currently living with someone?" or reporting that they cohabited with their most recent (but not current) romantic partner. In addition to the relationship qualities described below, we include three measures of the relationship context beyond whether the relationship is co-residential versus a dating relationship. We include a dichotomous measure of whether the couple has had sexual intercourse. We include a dichotomous measure of whether the relationship is ongoing at the time of interview versus being the respondent's most recent (but ended) relationship. Finally, we include an estimate of relationship duration measured in months. These basic features of the relationship are included as controls in order to gauge whether the character of these relationships vary systematically by age and are not a simple function of, for example, longer average durations among older respondents.

Our measures of relationship quality focus on the domains of communication, emotion, influence and utility. *Communication Awkwardness* is a scale of four items such as "Sometimes I don't know quite what to say to [PARTNER]" and has alphas across the waves ranging from .71 - .76 (Powers & Hutchinson, 1979). *Dating Confidence* is a scale created for TARS that includes three items such as

"How confident are you that you could break-up with someone you no longer like?" Across the four waves, this scale has alphas that range from .70 to .74. *Passionate Love* is an abbreviated, 4-item version of Hatfield and Sprecher's (1986) Passionate Love Scale, including items such as "[PARTNER] always seems to be on my mind" (α = .84 - .85). *Emotional Rewards* is measured by two items, "[PARTNER] makes me feel attractive" and "[PARTNER] makes me feel good about myself" (α = .75 - .85). *Partner Influence Attempts* is based on two items, "[PARTNER] always tries to change me" and "[PARTNER] tries to control what I do" (Shulman, Laursen, Kalman, & Karpovsky, 1997). Alphas for that scale range from .74 to .84 across the waves. *Partner's Actual Influence* is measured by three items such as "I sometimes do things because I don't want to lose [PARTNER]'s respect" (α = .70 - .72). *General Decision-making Power* is measured by a single item from Blood and Wolfe's (1960) index: "If the two of you disagree about something, who usually gets their way?" This is coded so that higher scores indicate greater decision-making power for the respondent. We measure *Partner's* and *Respondent's Instrumental Support* separately, each with three items such as "How often have you done the following for [PARTNER]: paid to see a movie or do some other fun activity?" Alphas range from .80 - .84 for partner's instrumental support and .80 - .83 for respondent's support.

We also include sociodemographic indicators potentially related to relationship quality (see e.g., Cavanagh, Crissey, & Raley, 2008). *Family structure* is measured by asking at wave 1: "During the past 12 months, who were you living with most of the time?" Adolescents who lived with only one biological parent were coded 1. Those who lived with both biological parents were coded as 2 if his/her parents were married. Adolescents who lived with one biological parent and parent's spouse were coded as 3 to reflect a stepfamily. Respondents whose biological parents are cohabiting and those who live with one biological parent and his/her cohabiting partner are coded as 4. Respondents who did not fall into one of these categories were coded as 5 "other" (e.g., living with grandparents or other relatives, foster care, etc.). For multivariate analyses, dummy variables were created with "two biological parents" as the contrast category. *Gender* is self-reported. *Age* is calculated from the adolescent's date of birth and the date of the interview. *Race/ethnicity* is classified as White, Black, Hispanic, and 'Other' race/ethnicity.

White is the contrast category in the multivariate analyses. *Parent's education* is measured from the parent's questionnaire completed primarily by mothers. We ask the question "How far did you go in school?" and give seven response options. These options are collapsed into a four-category variable: responses were coded 1 if the parent had less than a high school education; 2 if the parent had a high school education; 3 if the parent had some education beyond high school, but no four-year college degree; and 4 if the parent had a bachelor's degree or higher. Dummy variables were created for the multivariate analyses with high school as the contrast category.

Analytic Strategy

We first present descriptive statistics for the sample, with a focus on the subsets of adolescent daters (wave 1) and young adult daters and cohabitors (wave 4). To assess change over time, we use a multilevel, linear mixed effects model. Each relationship quality is modeled separately, and Tables 2 - 5 show two models for each quality. At each wave, we use single year of age as our measure of time, with each respondent contributing up to four relationships (one at each wave) for analysis. Age is modeled linearly for ease of interpretation. The first model is a basic model that includes age (time), gender, and an age by gender interaction if such an interaction is significant. The second model shown is a full model, including all covariates and any statistically significant interactions between the covariates and age.

RESULTS

Descriptive Analyses

Table 1 indicates that the qualities of communication, emotional aspects of the relationship, influence, and instrumental support all appear to change as respondents age and as the nature of the union becomes more embedded as reflected in cohabiting versus dating. For example, communication awkwardness is highest among teens (mean = 9.9), relative to young adult daters (mean = 9.2), with the lowest scores of communication awkwardness being reported by young adults who are cohabiting (mean = 8.6). Similarly, dating confidence is lowest among teen daters (mean = 10.4) and highest among cohabitors relative to adult daters (mean = 12.5 and 11.8, respectively). Emotional qualities of romantic

relationships also appear to increase as a consequence of age and intensity of the romantic relationship, with passionate love scores being lowest for teen daters (mean = 14) and highest for young adult cohabitors (mean = 16.3). Similarly, the romantic partner's attempts to influence the partner (mean = 3.8, 4.2, and 4.3 for teen daters, young adult daters, and young adult cohabitors, respectively) and actually influencing the partner increase (mean = 6.4, 7.4, and 7.7 for teen daters, young adult daters, and young adult cohabitors, respectively). The most striking increases, however, are associated with receiving and providing instrumental support (partner's provision of instrumental support = 7.0, 8.6, and 10.2, for teen daters, young adult daters, and cohabitors, respectively). Respondents who are cohabiting provide greater levels of instrumental support to their partners (mean = 10.6), relative to young adult daters (mean = 8.2) and teen daters (mean = 6.8).

Aspects of the relationship context also indicate that relationships become more serious as adolescents transition to young adulthood. For example, the average duration of young adult dating relationships (10.5 months) is more than twice as long as the average duration of teen dating relationships (4.8 months), with early adult cohabitors having the longest relationships among the three groups (15.8 months). Likewise, 58 percent of teen dating relationships are current at the time of wave 1 interview compared to 62.5 percent of dating relationships reported by young adults at wave 4 and 88.7 percent of early adult cohabiting relationships. Sexual activity within the relationship is more uncommon among teen daters (23.0%), while most of the early adult daters (72.9%) and virtually all of the early adult cohabitors (94.1%) have had sex in their most recent relationship.

The teen daters at wave 1 are, on average, 15.2 years old. Looking at early adults at wave 4, the daters (20.1) appear to be just slightly younger than the cohabitors (20.8). The racial/ethnic composition of teen and young adult daters appears roughly the same with about two-thirds of those groups being non-Hispanic White; however, it appears that Hispanics are overrepresented among the early adult cohabitors (16.8%, versus 8.2% of young adult daters). There do not seem to be many differences in family structure between teen and early adult daters; however, early adult cohabitors appear to be more likely to have been raised by single parents or in stepfamilies. Parental education also seems similar among the two groups

of the daters, with early adult cohabitors being less likely to have a custodial parent with a college degree or higher education.

Multivariate Analyses

Tables 2 - 5 show the results of growth curve analyses regarding communication, emotionality, power/influence, and instrumental support. Graphs depicting these findings are subsequently presented as figures. In all tables the first model consists of coefficients for age and gender, and age and gender interactions if statistically significant. Model 2 includes relational and sociodemographic characteristics and significant age interactions.

Table 2 shows growth curve results for two communication-related relationship qualities--communication awkwardness and dating confidence. Results indicate significant decreases in perceptions of communication awkwardness associated with age. Both Models 1 and 2 indicate there is a significant interaction between age and gender. However, contrary to expectations, communication awkwardness decreases more so with age among female relative to male respondents. This association remains in the full model and is illustrated in Figure 1. Although our primary focus is age and gender effects, results in the models show associations between other basic relationship features and sociodemographic controls. Relationship duration, reporting about a current relationship, having had sex, and Hispanic ethnicity are associated with reduced feelings of communication awkwardness. The next model shows that, consistent with results for communication awkwardness, perceived confidence navigating various aspects of dating relationships increases with age. Female respondents report greater feelings of confidence, and the lack of a significant interaction of gender and age indicates that this gender gap persists in early adulthood. Figure 2 displays the relationship between age and gender based on Model 2. Model 2 results also indicate that cohabitors and those who have had sex in their most recent relationship report greater dating confidence.

Table 3 shows the results of growth curve analyses for passionate love and emotional rewards, our two measures of emotionality in romantic relationships. Model 1 for passionate love indicates that in general perceptions of passionate love increase as respondents get older. The age results in Model 2 are

consistent with Model 1 and indicate that age is related to increases in passionate love. Figure 3 illustrates the pattern of findings based on Model 2. In addition, the gender gap is no longer evident in the full model; males and females share similar scores on the love scale. Further analyses indicate that the gender gap in scores on the love scale only exists in cohabiting relationships and not adolescent or adult dating relationships (results not shown). Being in a current relationship and having had sex in the relationship are both associated with higher scores on the love scale. Non-Hispanic Black respondents score lower on the passionate love scale than do non-Hispanic White respondents, while those from single parent and other living situations score lower than those from two-parent married families.

As with passionate love, respondents' ratings of the emotional rewards they receive in their relationships increase with age, but females report that they receive more emotional rewards consistently throughout the ages observed in our study (Model 1). Results from the full model (Model 2) indicate a similar relationship between emotional rewards and age and gender. Figure 4 displays the relationships between age, gender, and emotional rewards. The gender gap persists as respondents move from adolescence into early adulthood. Regarding covariates, we find that relationship duration is associated with emotional rewards among younger respondents in the sample, and those who are currently dating and who have had sex in their relationships report greater emotional rewards. There are significant differences in perceptions of emotional rewards by race/ethnicity, with non-Hispanic Blacks reporting that they receive less emotional rewards than do non-Hispanic Whites. There are also significant differences according to family structure during childhood, with those from single parent or cohabiting parent families scoring lower on the emotional rewards scale than do those from two-parent married families.

The growth curve analyses related to power and influence are shown in Table 4. In Model 1, partner influence attempts increase with age. Consistent with prior research on younger adolescents (Giordano et al., 2006), male respondents score higher on their partner attempting to influence them, and the lack of a significant age and gender interaction term indicates that the effect of gender is consistent across age. In the full model (Model 2), the gender gap persists with female respondents experiencing fewer influence

attempts than male respondents. Yet in the full model, there is no longer an age gradient due in large part to the inclusion of sexual intercourse into the model. Figure 5 illustrates the age and gender relationship. Of the other covariates, duration is positively associated with partner influence attempts, as is having sex within the relationship. On the other hand, being in a current relationship is associated with fewer partner influence attempts as respondents age. Non-Hispanic Black and "Other" respondents, and to a lesser extent Hispanics, experience lower levels of influence attempts in early adolescence, but such influence attempts increase in frequency more than they do for non-Hispanic Whites. Respondents who grew up in stepfamilies also experience larger increases in partner influence attempts with age than do those from two-parent married families.

The next two models show that as with influence attempts, partner's actual influence increases with age. Consistent with the results for influence attempts, male respondents perceive significantly more actual influence from their partners. The lack of a significant gender and age interaction term indicates that this gender gap does not shift during the age period studied. In the full model predicting partner's actual influence, there remains an age gradient and gender gap (Figure 6). Relationship duration is positively associated with partner's influence among older respondents, and partner's actual influence is also higher within cohabiting relationships and those relationships where sex has occurred. Those in current relationships, on the other hand, report less actual partner influence. Hispanics report less partner influence than non-Hispanic Whites, and those whose custodial parent has less than a high school education report more actual influence from their partners than those whose parents have a high school degree.

The last set of models in Table 4 examines general decision-making power. Model 1 indicates that decision-making power does not systematically change with age. Female respondents score significantly higher, indicating that they perceive a more favorable level of power in their relationships. The interaction of gender and age is not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of gender is similar from adolescence to early adulthood. In the full model, the gender gap persists and no age gradient exists (Figure 7). Relationship duration is negatively associated with decision-making power. Hispanics and

non-Hispanic Blacks report greater relationship power than non-Hispanic Whites in early adolescence, but this difference decreases over time. In addition, those from single parent homes report greater relationship decision-making throughout adolescence and early adulthood than those from two-parent married families.

Table 5 shows the growth curve analyses of variables related to instrumental support within teen and early adult romantic relationships. Model 1 shows that receipt of instrumental support from partner increases with age, but the interaction term indicates that the increase is much larger for males. The gender gap observed in early adolescence, where females receive much more instrumental support from their partners than do males, closes by early adulthood. In the full model, a similar set of age and gender effects are observed (Figure 8). Of the other covariates, longer relationship duration, being in a current relationship, and cohabiting are all associated with increased instrumental support from one's partner. Partner support is higher among sexually active couples in early adolescence, but this gap also closes by early adulthood. Partner instrumental support is higher among Hispanics than non-Hispanic Whites in early adolescence. Again, this gap closes by early adulthood. Those from single parent and "other" living situations during childhood report lower levels of partner instrumental support than do those from two-parent married families. Respondents whose parent has less than a high school education report receiving more instrumental support from partners than do those with high school-educated parents, throughout adolescence and early adulthood. Respondents whose parents have some college education also report more partner instrumental support in early adolescence, but this gap closes by early adulthood.

The last two sets of models in Table 5 show that respondents' reports about their own provision of instrumental support also increase with age. In early adolescence, female respondents report that they provide significantly less support to their partners, but with instrumental support increasing more for females, by early adulthood, young women report providing more instrumental support to their partners than do their male counterparts. Model 2 shows that the gender pattern continues to operate with female respondents indicating that they provide less support than males in early adolescence, but more support than males by early adulthood (Figure 9). Being in a current relationship, having had sex in the

relationship, and cohabiting rather than dating are all associated with higher provision of instrumental support. Longer relationship duration is also associated with higher provision of instrumental support, particularly in early adolescence. Non-Hispanic Blacks report less instrumental support in early adolescence, but this gap closes by early adulthood.

Summary: Changes over time in Relationship Qualities and Dynamics

The above analyses reveal significant developmental shifts in the nature of dating relationships from adolescence to young adulthood. As respondents age they reported decreased feelings of awkwardness and concomitant increases in perceived confidence navigating their dating lives. Findings suggest an overall increase in feelings associated with romantic love and other emotional rewards of these relationships. At the same time, as respondents mature relationships also include greater instrumental rewards and support. Taken together, these findings provide a strong contrast to recent studies decrying the end of romance, and rise of a 'hookup' culture characterized by a succession of sexual liaisons lacking intimacy and investment in these relationships (Bogle, 2008)

Our analyses also demonstrated that the generally more intimate portrait of relationships among older respondents is not entirely due to the subset of respondents who have begun cohabiting with their romantic partners. The growth curve models control for cohabitation status, and additional analyses indicate that while the cohabiting couples are closer in some respects (cohabiters score higher on dating confidence, partner influence attempts, and instrumental support), cohabiting and dating relationships share similar levels of love and emotional rewards, perceived power, and actual influence. The findings that indicate few emotional differences between cohabiting and dating relationships mirror those reported by Brown and Bulanda (2008) using Add Health data.

It is also of particular interest that many of the gender distinctions in the pattern of responses documented in prior analyses of responses of adolescents continue to be observed when we focus on respondents who are entering the phase of emerging adulthood. Thus, for example, while there is a general upward trend in the direction of greater perceived influence of the romantic partner, male respondents, like their younger counterparts, report higher levels of attempted and actual influence on the

part of their romantic partners. Moreover, contrary to traditional theorizing, older males, on average continue to report a less favorable power balance within their relationships, relative to the reports female respondents provided. Further, while we hypothesized that the gender gap in perceived communication awkwardness might disappear as male respondents gained additional relationship experience, the gender interaction indicates a sharper age-related decline in perceived awkwardness among female compared with male respondents.

Gender differences that warrant further exploration include the utilitarian and emotional rewards findings. Responses of relatively young adolescents indicate that male partners on average provided more utilitarian benefits within these relationships (thus reflecting a traditional gender portrait), but results indicate a sharper increase in older female respondents' reports about the utilitarian support they provide their partners. Male reports about their female partners' provisions of support generally parallel these findings. Although it is not possible to document cohort shifts with these data, such findings appear consistent Risman and Schwartz' (2002) recent focus on young women's greater levels of participation in higher education and the labor force. The authors argue that this may be associated with enhanced feelings of power and independence, and in turn with changes in the way young women conduct their romantic and sexual lives. The findings reported here suggest that young men may also benefit from the practical or tangible benefits young women can bring to the relationship. It would be useful to develop more refined measures of utilitarian or practical benefits, and to explore how their provision connects to relationship dynamics and decision-making within young adult relationships.

Findings with respect to emotional rewards also need additional research scrutiny. While we do not observe strong gender differences in report of feelings of passionate love, female respondents consistently score higher on the index of emotional rewards of the relationship. This may relate to the specific items that comprise this scale (my partner makes me feel attractive, my partner makes me feel good about myself), as it may be more customary for male than female partners to make positive comments about a partner's attractiveness. The finding may also be viewed as evidence of the survival of traditional gender scripts (wherein young women are more heavily invested in the romantic arena, and more focused on the

emotional rewards intimate relationships provide). Yet the direction of findings does provide a caveat to prior research that has emphasized the decline in well-being of young women and the erosion of self-esteem that often accompanies entry into the romantic realm (Joyner & Udry, 2000; Pipher, 1994). As the other findings we reported indicate that male respondents consistently score higher on partner influence attempts and actual influence (indicating that the female partner may be less than satisfied with some aspects of their behavior), perhaps this is related to males' generally lower scores on items such as "my partner makes me feel good about myself."

Due to the central role of power in prior studies of gender relations, additional research is needed that relies on more nuanced measures of power, ideally including attention to specific arenas or domains of decision-making, and exploring mechanisms through which partners influence one another. It is also important to conduct longitudinal studies that follow young adult respondents into their mid-to-late twenties to determine whether the movement to marriage and childbearing influences relationship quality, especially the perceived power balance within the relationship, and perhaps a shift to more traditionally gendered patterns.

Parenthood and Romantic Relationships in Young Adulthood

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to explore fully the role of parenthood as an outcome of relationship dynamics as well as being an influence upon them. However, we recognize that this is a limitation, given that the early adult years are a prime time for transitions to parenthood—38 percent of women have a birth by age 24 (Schoen, Landale, & Daniels, 2007). Much attention has been paid to childbearing during the teenage years (prior to age 18); however, there has been a leveling off of teenage fertility. The average age at entry into motherhood in the United States is 25 and there have been small increases in the birth rates among women 18-24 (Hamilton, Martin, & Ventura, 2007). Indeed, much unintended fertility (often mistimed births) occurs during the early 20's (the average age at unintended first birth is 23 among recent birth cohort (Wildsmith, Guzzo, & Hayford, 2010)).

Parenthood cannot be equated with other signals of adulthood in part because of the lasting impression a child leaves on the life course, as well as the reality that the bar to achieve this milestone is

simply unprotected sexual intercourse. A recent analysis of relationship factors predicting sexual intercourse within a given adolescent romantic relationship documented that many of the relationship qualities described above are significant predictors of whether intercourse occurred (Giordano, Manning, & Longmore, 2010). Although sex becomes more ubiquitous within the context of young adult relationships, it is reasonable to hypothesize that some of these same dynamics are associated with experiencing a pregnancy, whether intended, mistimed, or unintended. Relationship seriousness and duration have been linked to inconsistent or non-use of a condom (Manning, Flanigan, Giordano, & Longmore, 2009), and young adults may evaluate both partners and the costs of pregnancy experience differently during this phase of the life course. It would be useful to explore more systematically whether relationship qualities and dynamics are more powerful predictors of young adult as contrasted with adolescent pregnancies.

The transition to parenthood has also been found to *change* the nature of relationships; however the findings depend on the timing and relationship context of parenthood (Umberson, Pudrovska, & Reczek, 2010). These studies rely on change indicators of relationship satisfaction and well-being and examine whether those who had children between interview waves shifted in their reports of well-being. For example, unmarried and married mothers do not experience many negative implications of parenthood, while cohabiting mothers experience more costs to parenthood (Nomaguchi & Milke, 2003; Woo & Raley, 2005). Given that the majority of young adult mothers entered parenthood outside of marriage it is important to consider the relationship context of parenthood (Schoen et al., 2007). Although the length of time between interview periods precludes a fine-grained analysis of relationship qualities pre-and post birth, the TARS protocol includes a direct question asking parents to indicate how having a child has changed their relationship. In response, 54 percent agree or strongly agree that their child brought the parents closer together. This suggests considerable variability in the effect of childbearing on relationship qualities during this period, and highlights the need to further explore the role of such dynamics as both an influence on and consequence of these childbearing experiences.

Beyond Romantic Relationships: Recent Research on Relationship 'Churning,' Sex-with-One's-Ex, and

Casual Sex

The statistical analyses described above are longitudinal, and thus relative to cross-sectional examinations, provide a useful window on respondents' romantic experiences across time and development. Nevertheless, the focus on one's current or most recent romantic relationship does not provide a completely comprehensive portrait of the full range of young adults' romantic and sexual experiences. While the findings indicate a general trend toward deepening levels of intimacy and interdependence, dating and even cohabiting relationships are not marital unions, and thus instability and breaking up are also part of the dynamics that characterize many relationships. In addition, sexual behavior does occur outside the traditional dating context, and thus information about these more casual liaisons will not be captured by analyses focused solely on dating relationships. Below we briefly review recent TARS findings focused on these experiences that serve to round out and complicate the portrait of romantic and sexual relationships that are forged during the young adult years.

Evidence of Relationship 'Churning'

Americans are waiting longer to get married. The average age at marriage is at a historical highpoint of 26 for women and 28 for men (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009). These delays in marriage have afforded young adults more 'life course space' for an increasing number of premarital sexual partners, dating opportunities, and cohabiting partners (Cohen & Manning, 2010). Thus young adults are potentially involved in the starting and ending of many relationships. Prior research has shown that marriages may involve separations and reconciliations (Binstock & Thornton, 2003), and the endings of young adult relationships may also be complex. Breaking up for young adults relative to adolescent daters may be especially 'hard to do,' given the findings described above, indicating longer average durations and higher levels of intimacy associated with the relationships of the older respondents. Consistent with this observation we find a greater proportion of young adult than adolescent relationships involve reconciliations. In young adulthood approaching half (44%) of young adult respondents reported at least one instance of a breakup followed by a reconciliation, and just under a quarter have experienced more than one such disruption (Halpern-Meekin et al., 2010). We find these 'failed break-ups' are more

common in cohabiting unions (50%) than dating relationships (43%). Among the TARS respondents, having experienced at least one disruption is the majority experience for Black daters and cohabitors as well as for Hispanic and other/mixed race cohabitors. Thus, the endings of young adult relationships are not straight forward and suggest the importance of further exploring these more fluid processes of ending and starting relationships. Certainly, basing our understanding of young adult relationships on a model of marriage may not be appropriate.

A consequence of relationship churning or breaking up and getting back together is that sex may occur with an ex-boyfriend or girlfriend. We find that among adolescents a large share of casual sexual experiences are in fact instances in which respondents report having sex with exes (Manning et al., 2006). Halpern-Meekin et al. (2010) examine a related phenomenon in early adulthood. The TARS data indicate that about half of young adults who have broken up with a partner report having had sex with their ex. Similar proportions of male and female respondents report such an experience, while cohabitors are significantly more likely to have had sex with an ex; nearly three-quarters (72%) of cohabiting young adults who break up experience sex with an ex—41 percent of daters reported that they had been sexually intimate with a former boyfriend or girlfriend. Older respondents relative to their younger counterparts are significantly more likely to report having had sex with an ex.

Typically, analyses of relationship instability focus on the duration of relationships, and contrast couples in stable relationships with those who have "broken up." However, these examples of "failed" breakups and having sex with an ex underscore the difficulties in drawing clear, distinct boundaries when considering the careers of young adult dating relationships. Not surprisingly, those who have experienced a relationship disruption report greater relationship conflict; however it is also important to note that such respondents also report higher levels of intimate self-disclosure within their relationships – a dynamic that is often associated with the progression of feelings of intimacy and interdependence, and that may be linked to the couple's inability to completely sever ties. Thus, both negative and positive features of these relationships are associated with increased odds of experiencing this type of relationship dynamic. It is important to explore these blurred boundaries in more detail, not only because this more fully

characterizes the way in which individuals 'do' romance during the period, but also because of possible health risks associated with these patterns. The breakup period may expose either or both partners to new sexual partners, but the level of intimacy and trust that exists may limit the perceived need to be consistent in using condoms when there is a reconciliation period, or when the opportunity arises to become sexually intimate with a former partner.

Casual Sex

Even though a large percentage of young adults are dating or cohabiting, many young adults have also had sexual experiences outside one of these more traditional contexts. The majority (73%) of sexually active young adults in the TARS have reported ever having had sex with at least one 'casual' partner (that is with someone the respondent did not consider a 'dating' partner), and 49 percent of sexually active young adults did so in the two years prior to interview. On average young adults who had a casual sex partner in the last two years report having had three casual sex partners. Men are more likely to have experienced casual sex (men report an average of 3.5 partners in the last two years versus women who report an average 2 casual sex partners). Multivariate analyses indicate that the gender gap in casual sex experience is explained by men's more liberal sexual attitudes (Lyons, Manning, Giordano, & Longmore, 2010).

Young adults are more likely to experience casual sex than are adolescents. The TARS indicate that 23 percent of sexually active 16 year olds reported casual sex in contrast to 79 percent of 23 year olds. Growth curve analyses indicate gender differences in the trends in involvement in casual sex across the four waves of interviews-reflecting the transition from adolescence to young adulthood. The gender gap is minimal at ages 15 and 16. During this period, males do not have more casual sex partners; however, males increase the number of casual sex partners over time at a significantly faster rate than females. We could not explain the greater increase in casual sex partners among males with the inclusion of mediators such as substance use, peer behavior and attitudes, social psychological well-being, traditional beliefs, and family measures. Casual sex appears to be normative part of the young adult life course stage, and casual sex often has complex meanings and motivations associated with the behavior.

Much of the prior research on casual sex in young adulthood has been limited to studies of college students. Some researchers have argued that the college environment is particularly conducive to involvement in these more casual experiences (Bogle, 2008). However, recent analyses of the TARS data indicate that non-college youth are significantly more likely to report such experiences relative to those who attend colleges or universities (Lyons et al., 2010). We do find, however, that the gender gap in casual sexual experience is greater among young adults at the lower educational levels. In fact, men and women enrolled in college (four-year institutions) experience similar numbers of casual sex partners.

The respondents' reports of casual experience are consistent with the emerging adulthood literature in that young adulthood is often seen as a time for sexual exploration (Arnett, 2004). Overall, nearly half (47%) of all young adults agree or strongly agree that sex should occur with someone they love, suggesting that casual sex is acceptable to about half of young adults (results not shown). As the multivariate results described above suggest, there appears to be a gender element to the acceptance of casual sex, with 38 percent of male young adults and 55 percent of female young adults indicating that sex should only occur with someone they love. And, even though a majority of sexually active young adults thus have some experience with casual sex, similar to reports of sexually active adolescents (Manning et al., 2006), young adults are not typically having casual sex with individuals they have just met (i.e., the idea of a one-night stand). The vast majority of young adults who reported recent casual experiences had sex with friends or ex-partners.

A subset of TARS respondents participated in in-depth qualitative interviews that provide insight into the ways in which these young adults understand such experiences. Respondents report traditional motivations for casual sex such as physical pleasure, enjoyment, and the influence of situations involving alcohol, but also focus on unique concerns of the young adult phase of the life course. Kelly, a college sophomore, indicated that her involvement with one casual sex partner was "just for fun kind of…both people understand that there's not going to be an emotional attachment." Consistent with this notion, only 17 percent of respondents state they have casual sex because they think it will bring them closer to their casual sex partner.

However, other motivations for engaging in casual sex behavior these young adults described actively reflect on the transitional nature of the young adult phase of the life course, as some respondents emphasized busy schedules, residential moves, and feeling too young to be tied down to a committed relationship. For instance, Sara, a 20-year-old female with two casual sex partners and who dropped out of community college describes her recent experience, "No. I knew it wasn't- It was just gonna be a casual-that I knew was going to be a casual thing… Because he lives in (another state) and I lived up here. I knew that I was never gonna' live there, and he was never gonna' live here. And the long-distance thing would have never worked." Kaleb, a 21-year-old male, who reported involvement with two casual sex partners, explains his sexual relationship remains casual because his partner is moving away to college: "Uh…she was going to…it was her last year of high school, and she was about to go to college. So, I mean we could have worked out… But, it wouldn't have worked out cause, she was going to college."

CONCLUSIONS

Although a majority of young adults in the TARS study report some experience with casual sex, dating and cohabiting relationships are nevertheless more common relationship forms. Our data indicate that about 50 percent of the sample reported having sex only with a romantic partner, an additional 40 percent reported romantic as well as casual sex experience, and less than 10 percent of this sample of sexually active young adults indicated that sexual behavior only occurred within the context of casual rather than dating relationships. Results reviewed above also suggest that, when compared with earlier dating relationships, those formed in young adulthood tend to be characterized by increasing levels of intimacy and interdependence. A challenge for future research is to provide a more fully developed portrait of the sequencing and connections between these varied experiences. For example, while some casual sexual liaisons (about 20% at wave 4) overlap with more serious relationships (i.e., reflecting a pattern of cheating or concurrency), in many instances these experiences follow a break-up (sex with ex), or may be a substitute when the individual simply has not found a suitable longer-term intimate partner.

Others may consciously declare a moratorium on serious relationships, but most often this is viewed

within the context of the young adult phase of the life course, rather than being seen as an alternative lifestyle decision. That a majority within the sample expect to eventually marry (Manning, Longmore, & Giordano, 2007) and/or to cohabit suggests the continuing cultural impact of norms favoring the development of a close, stable relationship, rather than involvement in a succession of casual liaisons. It is interesting to note that even those within the sample who suggested that others would see them as 'players' often developed rationalizations about their behavior, including the idea of simply being too young to be "tied down" yet, or suggesting that they are still looking for 'the right girl' (Giordano, Longmore, Manning, & Northcutt, 2009). Other motivations for lack of serious involvement with a romantic partner challenge further the notion that higher levels of attachment and intimacy always represent 'progress' from a developmental standpoint. Thus, some within the sample had bracketed off concerns with dating and romance because of real or potential negative influences on their education and work goals (Manning, Giordano, Longmore, & Hocevar, 2009). Although the most common reason provided for not dating in the survey data was the desire to avoid drama (56%), this was followed closely by the idea that they were too involved in work/school (48%). These findings are supported by the qualitative data. An 18-year-old female respondent recently quit dating her boyfriend to catch up with school work in hopes of attending a local community college. "Ahh, it [the relationship] stopped because I don't want a boyfriend now that I'm studying. I want a clear mind [laughs]." When asked why he is not currently dating, 18-year-old Jamal replies "I'm worried about school," while Brandy emphasized that she wanted "to be into school more than [into] boys."

Further follow-ups of the sample will allow us to explore the longer-term implications for well-being, relationship formation, and achievement, of having chosen these varied relationship paths in adolescence and early adulthood. The influence of childbearing on the qualities and dynamics of young adults' dating lives and the influence of dating on variations in parenting experiences also warrant greater research attention. Finally, although our sample size did not permit a separate examination, more research is needed on the dating and cohabiting experiences of sexual minority youths as they navigate the transition to adulthood.

REFERENCES

Anderson, E. (1989). Sex codes and family life among poor inner-city youths. *Annals of the American Academy of Political Social Science, 501,* 59-79.

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55,* 69-480.

Arnett, J. J. (2004). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties*. England: Oxford University Press.

Binstock, G., & Thornton, A. (2003). Separations, reconciliations, and living apart in cohabiting and marital unions. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65,* 432-443.

Blackwell, D. L., & Lichter, D. T. (2000). Mate selection among married and cohabiting couples. *Journal of Family Issues, 21*, 275-302.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: J. Wiley.

Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). *Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Bogle, K. (2008). *Hooking up: College students and no-rules relationships.* New York: New York University Press.

Brines, J., & Joyner, K. (1999). The ties that bind: Principles of cohesion in cohabitation and marriage. *American Sociological Review, 64,* 333-356.

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, S. L. (2004). Moving from cohabitation to marriage: Effects on relationship quality. *Social Science Research, 33*, 1-19.

Brown, S. L., & Bulanda, J. R. (2008). Relationship violence in young adulthood: A comparison of daters, cohabitors, and marrieds. *Social Science Research, 37*, 73-87.

Cavanagh, S. E., Crissey, S. R., & Raley, R. K. (2008). Family structure and Adolescent Romance.

Journal of Marriage and Family, 70, 698-714.

Cleveland, H. H. (2003). The influence of female and male risk on the occurrence of sexual intercourse within adolescent relationships. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 13,* 81-112.

Cohen, J. A., & Manning, W. D. (2010). The relationship context of premarital serial cohabitation. *Social Science Research, 39,* 766-776.

Collins, R. (2004). *Interaction ritual chains*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Collins, W. A., Welsh, D. P., & Furman, W. (2009). Adolescent romantic relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60,* 631-652.

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

Connolly, J., Craig, W., Goldberg, A., & Pepler, D. (2004). Mixed-gender groups, dating, and romantic relationships in early adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *14,* 185-207.

Dunphy, D. C. (1963). The social structure of urban adolescent peer groups. *Sociometry, 26,* 230-246.

Eder, D., Evans, C., & Parker, S. (1995). *School talk: Gender and adolescent culture.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Fine, G. A. (1987). *With the boys: Little league baseball and preadolescent culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1992). Age and sex differences in perceptions of networks of personal relationships. *Child Development, 63,* 103-115.

Gecas, V., & Longmore, M. A. (2003). Self-esteem. In J. J. Ponzetti Jr. (Ed.), *international encyclopedia of marriage and family relationships, second edition* (pp. 1419-1424). New York: Macmillan Reference, USA.

Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A., & Manning, W. D. (2001). A conceptual portrait of adolescent romantic relationships. In D. Kinney (Ed.), *Sociological studies of children and youth* (pp. 111-

142). London: Elsevier Science.

Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A., & Manning, W. D. (2006). Gender and the meanings of adolescent romantic relationships: A focus on boys. *American Sociological Review, 71,* 260-287.

Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A., Manning, W. D., & Northcutt, M. J. (2009). Adolescent identities and sexual behavior: An examination of Anderson's player hypothesis. *Social Forces, 87*(4), 1813-1844.

Giordano, P. C., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2010). Affairs of the heart: Qualities of adolescent romantic relationships and sexual behavior. *Journal of Research on Adolescence,* forthcoming.

Giordano, P. C., Phelps, K. D., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2008). Adolescent academic achievement and romantic relationships. *Social Science Research, 37,* 37-54.

Goodwin, P. Y., Mosher, W. D., & Chandra, A. (2010). Marriage and cohabitation in the United States: A statistical portrait based on cycle 6 (2002) of the National Survey of Family Growth. National Center for Health Statistics. Vital Health Stat 23(28).

Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1986). Measuring passionate love in intimate relationships. *Journal of Adolescence, 9,* 383-410.

Halpern-Meekin, S. C., Manning, W. D., Giordano, P. C., & Longmore, M. A. (2010). Breaking up is hard to do? Explaining failed breakups. *Working Paper Series* 2010-09, Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.

Hamilton, B. E., Martin, J. A., & Ventura, S. J. (2007). *Births: Preliminary data for 2006. National vital statistics reports; Vol. 56, no 7*. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

Haynie, D. L., Giordano, P. C., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2005). Adolescent romantic relationships and delinquency involvement. *Criminology, 43,* 177-210.

Hohmann-Marriott, B. (2006). Shared beliefs and the union stability of married and cohabiting couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68,* 1015-1028.

Joyner, K., & Udry, J. R. (2000). You don't bring me anything but down: Adolescent romance and

depression. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 41,* 369-391.

Kennedy, S., & Bumpass, L. L. (2008). Cohabitation and children's living arrangements: New estimates from the United States. *Demographic Research, 19,* 1663-1692.

Komter, A. (1989). Hidden power in marriage. *Gender and Society, 3,* 187-216.

Korobov, N., & Thorne, A. (2006). Intimacy and distancing: young men's conversations about romantic relationships. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 21,* 27-55.

Loomis, L. L., & Landale, N. S. (1994). Nonmarital cohabitation and childbearing among Black and White American women. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 56,* 949-962.

Lyons, H. A. (2009). *Casual sex in adolescence and young adulthood: A mixed methods approach* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://www.ohiolink.edu/etd/

Lyons, H. A., Manning, W. D., Giordano, P. C., & Longmore, M. A. (2010). Casual sex among young adults: Education differentials. *Working Paper Series* 2010-07, Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.

Maccoby, E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. *American Psychologist, 45,* 513-20.

Manning, W. D., Flanigan, C. M., Giordano, P. C., & Longmore, M. A. (2009). Relationship dynamics and consistency of condom use among adolescents. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 41*(3), 181-190.

Manning, W. D., Giordano, P. C. & Longmore, M. A. (2006). Hooking Up: The Relationship Contexts of Nonromantic Sex. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 21*(5), 459-483.

Manning, W. D., Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A., & Hocevar, A. (2009). Romantic relationships and academic/career trajectories in early adulthood. In F. Fincham & M. Cui (Eds.), *Romantic relationships in emerging adulthood.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Manning, W. D., Longmore, M. A., & Giordano, P. C. (2007). The changing institution of marriage: Adolescents' expectations to cohabit and to marry. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69*(3), 559-575.

McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. (1966). *Identities and interaction*. New York: Free Press.

Meier, A., & Allen, G. (2009). Romantic relationships from adolescence to young adulthood: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Sociological Quarterly, 50,* 308-335.

Merten, D. E. (1996). Going-with: The role of a social form in early romance. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 24,* 462-484.

Nomaguchi, K. M., & Milkie, M. (2003). Costs and rewards of children: The effects of becoming a parent on adults' lives. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 413–430.

Osgood, D. W., Foster, E. M., Flanagan, C., & Ruth, G. R. (Eds.). (2005). *On your own without a net: The transition to adulthood for vulnerable populations.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pipher, M. (1994). *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the selves of adolescent girls*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Powers, W. G., & Hutchinson, K. (1979). The measurement of communication apprehension in the marriage relationship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41,* 89-95.

Qian, Z. (1998). Changes in assortative mating: The impact of age and education, 1970-1990. *Demography, 35,* 279-292.

Raley, R. K., & Sullivan, M. K. (2010). Social-contextual influences on adolescent romantic involvement: The constraints of being a numerical minority. *Sociological Spectrum, 30,* 65-89.

Risman, B., & Schwartz, P. (2002). After the sexual revolution: Gender politics in teen dating. *Contexts, 1,* 16-24.

Roscoe, B., Diana, M. S., Brooks, R. H. (1987). Early, middle, and late adolescents' views on dating and factors influencing partner selection. *Adolescence, 22,* 59-68.

Sassler, S. (2010). Partnering across the life course: Sex, relationships, and mate selection. *Journal of Marriage and Family,* forthcoming.

Schoen, R., Landale, N. S., & Daniels, K. (2007). Family transitions in young adulthood. *Demography, 44,* 807-820.

Seiffge-Krenke, I. (2003). Testing theories of romantic development from adolescence to young adulthood: Evidence of a developmental sequence. *International Journal of Behavioral*

Development, *27*, 519-531.

Settersten, R. F. Jr., Furstenberg, F. F. Jr., & Rumbaut, R. G. (Eds.). (2005). *On the frontier of adulthood: Theory, research, and public policy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Settersten, R. A. Jr., & Mayer, K. U. (1997). The measurement of age, age structuring, and the life course. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23,* 233–261.

Shulman, S., Laursen, B., Kalman, Z., & Karpovsky, S. (1997). Adolescent intimacy revisited. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 26*(5), 597-617.

Sprey, J. (1999). Family dynamics: An essay on conflict and power. In M. R. Sussman, S. K. Steinmetz, & G. W. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of marriage and the family, second edition* (pp. 667-685). New York: Plenum.

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Tolman, D. L., Spencer, R., Harmon, T., Rosen-Reynoso, M., & Striepe, M. (2004). Getting close, staying cool: Early adolescent boys' experiences with romantic relationships. In N. Way & J. Y. Chu (Eds.), *Adolescent boys: Exploring diverse cultures of boyhood* (pp. 235-255). New York: New York University Press.

Umberson, D., Pudrovska, T., & Reczek, C. (2010). Parenthood, childlessness, and well-being: A life course perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72*(3), 612-629.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009). Table MS-2: Estimated median age at first marriage, by sex: 1980 to the present. Retrieved September 1, 2009 from http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/hh-fam/ms2.csv

Way, N., & Chu, J. Y. (2004). *Adolescent boys: Exploring diverse cultures of boyhood.* New York: New York University Press.

Wight, D. (1994). Boys' thoughts and talk about sex in a working class locality of Glasgow. *The Sociological Review, 42,* 703-738.

Wildsmith, E., Guzzo, K. B., & Hayford, S. R. (2010). Repeat unintended, unwanted and seriously mistimed childbearing in the United States. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 42*,

14-22.

Woo, H., & Raley, R. K. (2005). A small extension to “Costs and rewards of children: The effects of becoming a parent on adults' lives.” *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *67*, 216–221.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics, Teen and Young Adult Romantic Relationships

	Means/Percents		
	Teen Dating	**Early Adult Dating**	**Early Adult Cohabiting**
RELATIONSHIP QUALITIES			
Communication:			
Communication Awkwardness	10.0	9.2	8.6
Dating Confidence	10.4	11.8	12.4
Emotion:			
Passionate Love	14.0	15.4	16.3
Emotional Rewards	7.6	8.0	8.0
Influence:			
Partner Influence Attempts	3.8	4.1	4.3
Partner's Actual Influence	6.4	7.4	7.7
General Decision-Making Power	2.1	2.0	2.2
Instrumental Support:			
P's Instrumental Support	7.0	8.6	10.2
R's Instrumental Support	6.9	8.2	10.6
Relationship Context:			
Is a Current Relationship	58.0%	62.5%	88.7%
Relationship Duration (est. in months)	4.8	10.5	15.8
Had Sex in Relationship	23.0%	72.9%	94.1%
Sociodemographic Characteristics:			
Age	15.2	20.1	20.8
Gender (Female)	50.3%	48.4%	64.0%
Race Ethnicity:			
Hispanic	7.3%	8.2%	16.8%
Non-Hispanic White	67.2%	64.7%	56.2%
Non-Hispanic Black	22.7%	23.5%	24.1%
Non-Hispanic Other	2.9%	3.6%	3.0%
Family Structure at W1:			
Single Parent	23.4%	22.5%	30.1%
Two Biological, Married Parents	47.6%	54.2%	32.5%
Cohabiting Parents (Bio or Step)	6.5%	5.7%	7.9%
Stepfamily	14.2%	11.3%	22.2%
Other Living Situation	8.3%	6.4%	7.4%
Parent's Education at W1:			
Less than High School	11.2%	9.7%	14.8%
High School	32.7%	31.4%	34.5%
>High School, No 4-Year Degree	32.7%	31.6%	40.4%
4-Year College Degree+	23.5%	27.4%	10.3%
N	855	672	203

Sources: The Teen Dating column includes data from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS), wave 1, age<18; the Young Adult data comes from TARS wave 4, age>17.

Table 2: Growth Curve Models, Change in Communication-Based Relationship Qualities from Adolescence to Early Adulthood

	Communication Awkwardness		Dating Confidence	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	B	B	B	B
Intercept	10.59 ***	11.74 ***	9.08 ***	8.97 ***
Age	-0.11 ***	-0.10 *	0.27 ***	0.20 ***
Gender (Female)	-0.16	0.19	1.13 ***	1.08 ***
Gender (Female) x Age	-0.14 **	-0.14 **		- - -
Relationship Duration (est. in months)		-0.12 ***		0.01
Is a Current Relationship		-1.38 ***		-0.01
Had Sex in Relationship		-0.38 **		0.38 ***
Cohabiting (vs. Dating)		0.06		0.45 **
Race Ethnicity:				
Hispanic		-1.22 **		-0.15
Non-Hispanic White (ref.)		- - -		- - -
Non-Hispanic Black		-0.44		0.27
Non-Hispanic Other		-1.01		0.61
Family Structure at W1:				
Single Parent		0.09		0.06
Two Biological, Married Parents (ref.)		- - -		- - -
Cohabiting Parents (Bio or Step)		0.29		-0.19
Stepfamily		0.21		0.31
Other Living Situation		0.47		0.17
Parent's Education at W1:				
Less than High School		0.09		0.01
High School (ref.)		- - -		- - -
>High School, No 4-Year Degree		-0.20		0.17
4-Year College Degree+		-0.05		0.25
Significant Interactions With Age:				
Duration x Age		0.01 **		- - -
Race Ethnicity:				
Hispanic x Age		0.25 ***		- - -
Non-Hispanic Black x Age		0.12 *		- - -
Non-Hispanic Other x Age		0.21		- - -

Source: Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study, Waves 1-4.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3: Growth Curve Models, Change in Reports of Love and Emotional Rewards from Adolescence to Early Adulthood

	Passionate Love		Emotional Rewards	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	B	B	B	B
Intercept	12.99 ***	12.29 ***	7.17 ***	6.83 ***
Age	0.30 ***	0.15 ***	0.06 ***	0.06 ***
Gender (Female)	0.46 ***	0.08	0.61 ***	0.52 ***
Relationship Duration (est. in months)		0.16 ***		0.05 ***
Is a Current Relationship		1.44 ***		0.44 ***
Had Sex in Relationship		0.75 ***		0.19 **
Cohabiting (vs. Dating)		0.15		-0.11
Race Ethnicity:				
Hispanic		-0.15		-0.10
Non-Hispanic White (ref.)		- - -		- - -
Non-Hispanic Black		-0.47 **		-0.28 ***
Non-Hispanic Other		-0.26		-0.09
Family Structure at W1:				
Single Parent		-0.39 *		-0.19 *
Two Biological, Married Parents (ref.)		- - -		- - -
Cohabiting Parents (Bio or Step)		-0.45		-0.32 *
Stepfamily		-0.33		-0.12
Other Living Situation		-0.55 *		-0.19
Parent's Education at W1:				
Less than High School		-0.08		0.15
High School (ref.)		- - -		- - -
>High School, No 4-Year Degree		0.09		0.12
4-Year College Degree+		0.12		0.17
Significant Interactions With Age:				
Duration x Age		-0.01 ***		-0.01 ***

Source: Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study, Waves 1-4.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4: Growth Curve Models, Change in Influence and Power from Adolescence to Early Adulthood

	Partner Influence Attempts		Partner's Actual Influence		General Decision-Making Power	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	B	B	B	B	B	B
Intercept	3.84 ***	4.01 ***	6.37 ***	6.80 ***	1.92 ***	1.82 ***
Age	0.07 ***	0.00	0.19 ***	0.06 *	-0.01	0.00
Gender (Female)	-0.54 ***	-0.55 ***	-1.13 ***	-1.17 ***	0.38 ***	0.38 ***
Relationship Duration (est. in months)		0.03 ***		0.01		0.00 *
Is a Current Relationship		-0.09		-0.27 **		0.03
Had Sex in Relationship		0.37 ***		0.20 *		0.04
Cohabiting (vs. Dating)		0.19		0.48 **		0.05
Race Ethnicity:						
Hispanic		-0.33		-0.40 *		0.27 **
Non-Hispanic White (ref.)		---		---		---
Non-Hispanic Black		-0.39 *		-0.11		0.17 *
Non-Hispanic Other		-0.86 *		-0.33		0.10
Family Structure at W1:						
Single Parent		0.23		-0.23		0.08 *
Two Biological, Married Parents (ref.)		---		---		---
Cohabiting Parents (Bio or Step)		-0.06		0.16		0.05
Stepfamily		-0.35		-0.04		0.00
Other Living Situation		0.43		-0.07		0.03
Parent's Education at W1:						
Less than High School		0.16		0.40 *		0.04
High School (ref.)		---		---		---
>High School, No 4-Year Degree		-0.03		0.16		0.03
4-Year College Degree+		-0.09		0.17		0.01
Significant Interactions With Age:						
Duration x Age		---		0.01 *		---
Current Relationship X Age		-0.07 **		---		---
Race Ethnicity:						
Hispanic x Age		0.09 *		---		-0.04 **
Non-Hispanic Black x Age		0.12 ***		---		-0.02
Non-Hispanic Other x Age		0.14 *		---		0.01
Family Structure at W1:						
Single Parent x Age		-0.01		---		---
Cohabiting Parents (Bio or Step) x Age		0.01		---		---
Stepfamily x Age		0.03 *		---		---
Other Living Situation x Age		-0.05		---		---

Source: Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study, Waves 1-4.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 5: Growth Curve Models, Change in Instrumental Support from Adolescence to Early Adulthood

	Partner's Instrumental Support		Respondent's Instrumental Support	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	B	B	B	B
Intercept	3.79 ***	2.66 ***	7.54 ***	7.28 ***
Age	0.59 ***	0.48 ***	0.10 **	-0.14 ***
Gender	4.08 ***	3.78 ***	-3.63 ***	-3.67 ***
Gender (Female) x Age	-0.42 ***	-0.43 ***	0.57 ***	0.51 ***
Relationship Duration (est. in months)		0.13 ***		0.18 ***
Is a Current Relationship		0.67 ***		0.69 ***
Had Sex in Relationship		1.89 ***		0.82 ***
Cohabiting (vs. Dating)		0.49 **		0.63 ***
Race Ethnicity:				
Hispanic		1.01 *		-0.36
Non-Hispanic White (ref.)		- - -		- - -
Non-Hispanic Black		0.38		-0.94 **
Non-Hispanic Other		-0.43		-0.24
Family Structure at W1:				
Single Parent		-0.52 ***		-0.19
Two Biological, Married Parents (ref.)		- - -		- - -
Cohabiting Parents (Bio or Step)		-0.01		0.14
Stepfamily		-0.18		-0.14
Other Living Situation		-0.53 *		-0.05
Parent's Education at W1:				
Less than High School		0.97 *		-0.01
High School (ref.)		- - -		- - -
>High School, No 4-Year Degree		1.04 ***		-0.10
4-Year College Degree+		0.42		-0.11
Significant Interactions With Age:				
Duration x Age		- - -		-0.01 **
Had Sex in This Relationship x Age		-0.17 ***		- - -
Race Ethnicity:				
Hispanic x Age		-0.14 *		0.09
Non-Hispanic Black x Age		-0.01		0.14 **
Non-Hispanic Other x Age		0.11		0.00

Source: Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study, Waves 1-4.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$