

Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 00:1–17, 2013
Copyright © Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
ISSN: 0092-623X print / 1521-0715 online
DOI: 10.1080/0092623X.2012.751074



1 **Toward a More Complete Understanding**
2 **of Reactions to Hooking Up Among**
3 **College Women**

4 JESSE OWEN and KELLEY QUIRK
5 *University of Louisville, Counseling Psychology, College of Education, Louisville,*
6 *Kentucky, USA*

7 FRANK FINCHAM
8 *Florida State University Family Institute, Tallahassee, Florida, USA*

9 *Hooking up, a relatively common behavior among young adults,*
10 *refers to a casual sexual encounter, ranging from kissing to sexual*
11 *intercourse, without an expectation of ongoing physical encounters*
12 *or relational commitment. Reactions to hooking up have examined*
13 *psychosocial outcomes as a proxy for specific reactions. The present*
14 *study examined the reactions of 190 college women, with a specific*
15 *focus on the effect of hooking up on their social/peer network, their*
16 *sexual/romantic sense of self, and their academic performance.*
17 *Results demonstrated large positive effects for sexual/romantic re-*
18 *actions and social/academic engagement reactions in comparison*
19 *with negative personal reactions. In addition, higher ratings of*
20 *anxious attachment, loneliness, and relational/intimacy sex mo-*
21 *tives were related to less positive reactions, highlighting the impor-*
22 *tance of attachment and motivations behind hookup experiences.*
23 *Implications for educational practice and future research are of-*
24 *fered.*

Q1

25 *Hooking up* refers to a range of physical intimacies, from kissing to in-
26 *tercourse that occur infrequently or once and where the partners do not*
27 *necessarily expect future physical encounters or a committed relationship*
28 *(Glenn & Marquardt, 2001; Owen, Rhoades, Stanley, & Fincham, 2010; Paul,*
29 *McManus, & Hayes, 2000). Hooking up is common among young adults*
30 *(e.g., 50% to 85%; Owen et al., 2010; Paul et al., 2000), and a variety of*
31 *predictors have been identified that differentiate between those who report*

Address correspondence to

Q2

32 hooking up and those who do not, such as alcohol use, casual sex attitudes,
33 extroversion, loneliness, religiosity, and insecure attachment (e.g., Burdette,
34 Ellison, Hill, & Glenn, 2009; Fielder & Carey, 2010a; Gentzler & Kurns, 2004;
35 Gute & Eshbaugh, 2008; Owen, Fincham, & Moore, 2011). However, less is
36 known about young adults' reactions to hooking up, and consequently they
37 are the focus of the present study.

38 Two approaches examine reactions to hooking up. In the first, re-
39 searchers have examined differences in psychological functioning (e.g., de-
40 pressive symptoms, self-esteem) between young adults who have hooked
41 up and those who have not. For example, Fielder and Carey (2010a) found
42 that women who engaged in penetrative hookups reported more depressive
43 symptoms as compared with women who did not. Although this approach
44 has advantages, it does not account for selection effects (or other third vari-
45 able effects); specifically young adults who decide to hook up may have
46 other characteristics that predispose them to have better or worse mental
47 health. Thus, hooking up may be a part of a larger constellation of risk fac-
48 tors for negative mental health outcomes (Grello, Welsh, & Harper, 2003).

49 The second approach assesses directly young adults' reactions to hook-
50 ing up (Glenn & Marquardt, 2001; Lewis, Granato, Blayney, Lostutter, &
51 Kilmer, 2011; Townsend & Wasserman, 2011). For example, Owen and col-
52 leagues (2010) categorized men and women on the basis of their emotional
53 reactions to hooking up and found that 48.7% of women endorsed only neg-
54 ative emotional reactions as compared with 26.0% of men. Other researchers
55 using continuous rating scales (e.g., Fielder & Carey, 2010b; Lewis et al.,
56 2011; Owen & Fincham, 2011) have found that men and women reported
57 more positive than negative emotions to hooking up; however, men typically
58 reported hooking up to be more positive and less negative as compared with
59 women (Lewis et al., 2011; Owen & Fincham, 2011).

60 To date, most research on young adults' reactions to hooking up has
61 centered on emotional reactions. Although young adults' emotional reactions
62 to hooking up are important, there are also other developmentally salient out-
63 comes that may relate to the hookup experience. Accordingly, we examine
64 how young adults perceive that hooking up affects normative developmental
65 tasks for young adults: (a) social/peer network, (b) sexual/romantic sense
66 of self, and (c) academic performance (Beyers & Goossens, 2002; Manning,
67 Longmore, & Giordano, 2005).

68 HOOKING UP REACTIONS: SOCIAL/PEER NETWORKS

69 Lewis and colleagues (2011) found that approximately 78% of young adults
70 hook up with a friend or an acquaintance; thus, there may be a shift in the
71 ways the members of the social network relate to one another. In a similar
72 vein, hooking up can influence feelings of social connection with others,

73 such feelings of loneliness (Owen, Fincham, & Moore, 2011). Given that
74 social/peer networks have been linked to engagement in college/university
75 activities, retention, and less psychological distress (Bai & Pan, 2009; Fried-
76 man & Mandel, 2009; Heckert et al., 2000), it is important to better understand
77 how young adults' perceive that hooking up is associated with their feelings
78 of connectedness with their peers.

Q3

79 Hooking Up Reactions: Romantic and Sexual Sense of Self

80 Hooking up is one way that young adults can explore elements of romantic
81 relationships and their sexual sense of self. For example, some young adults
82 (65% of women and 45% of men) hook up with the hope of transitioning
83 into a committed relationship (Owen & Fincham, 2011; also see Eisenberg,
84 Ackard, Resnick, & Neumark-Sztainer, 2009). Romantic and sexual explo-
85 ration is commonly reported as motivations for engaging in hookups (Glenn
86 & Marquardt, 2001; Hughes et al., 2005). Thus, the extent to which hooking
87 up is perceived to positively or negatively affect one's romantic and sexual
88 sense of self is likely to be influenced by young adults' relational schemas
89 and sexual motivations.

90 Attachment theory suggests that internal working models of rela-
91 tionships shape motivations for future romantic and casual relationships
92 (Gentzler & Kerns, 2004; Hazen & Shaver, 1998; Paul et al., 2000). Se-
93 cure attachment reflects comfort in close relationships whereas insecure at-
94 tachment reflects two facets, either anxiety about becoming close to others
95 or the avoidance of close relationships altogether. In theory, young adults
96 with more anxious attachment may be more likely to have negative sex-
97 ual/romantic reactions to hooking up because they typically have relational
98 schemas that predispose them toward investment in a relationship while
99 heightening their fear of abandonment by their romantic partners (Hazen &
100 Shaver, 1998).

Q4

101 In the sex-motives literature, Cooper and colleagues (Cooper, Barber,
102 Zhaoyang, & Talley, 2011; Cooper, Shapiro, & Powers, 1998) has pro-
103 posed a two-dimensional model: approach vs. avoidance and self vs. social.
104 These two dimensions produce four prototypical sexual motives: (a) self-
105 affirmation (avoidance/self), which reflects engaging in a hookup to escape
106 negative emotions and avoid threats to self-esteem; (b) self-enhancement
107 (approach/self) or the desire to hook up for sexual gratification; (c) partner-
108 approval (avoidance/social), which reflects the desire to seek approval or
109 minimize negative reactions of the hookup partner; and (d) relational in-
110 timacy (approach/social) or the hope to develop a stronger intimate con-
111 nection with the hookup partner (Cooper et al., 1998). These motives have
112 been associated with decisions to engage in casual sex encounters (see
113 Cooper et al., 2011) and might influence the ways in which hooking up

114 affects young adults' sexual sense of self. We expected young adults who en-
 115 dorse more self-affirmation, partner approval, and relational intimacy sexual
 116 motives might exhibit less positive sexual/relational hooking up reactions,
 117 given that hooking up typically does not involve clear communication be-
 118 tween partners about the relational connection or longer term commit-
 119 ted relationships (Bisson & Levine, 2009; Eisenberg et al., 2009; Owen &
 Q5 120 Fincham, in press).

121 Hooking-Up Reactions: Academic Performance

122 There are two primary reasons to examine the relation between hooking up
 123 and academic functioning. Approximately 40% of college students report be-
 124 ing so distressed that it interferes with their academic functioning (American
 125 College Health Association, 2007) and hooking up has been associated with
 126 psychological distress, especially for women (Fielder & Carey, 2010a; Grello
 127 et al., 2003; Owen et al., 2010). Thus, it is possible that negative reactions
 128 to hooking up may affect psychological well-being and academic performance.
 129 Alternatively, some young adults may have entered the hookup with the
 130 hope of developing a deeper relational connection (i.e., relational intimacy
 131 sex motives; Owen & Fincham, 2011). Thus, young adults who report more
 132 relational sexual motives might be more likely to report more interference in
 133 academic performance when reporting their reactions to hooking up. Regard-
 134 less of the frame of mind—distress or hope for deeper connection—there
 135 may be a level of distraction or disruption to academic behavior.

136 Across studies, alcohol use and hookups are ubiquitously entangled.
 137 Owen and Fincham (2011) found that more alcohol use was associated with
 138 fewer positive and more negative emotional reactions to hooking up; sug-
 139 gesting that alcohol use during the hookup does not provide an excuse
 140 function but may fuel more regret after the hookup. For reactions to hook-
 141 ing up related to social/peer networks, romantic/sexual sense of self, and
 142 academic performance, it is likely that alcohol use plays a role in concert
 143 with young adults' attachment styles or sex motives (Cooper et al., 2011). For
 144 example, alcohol use during a hookup may relate to a desire for pleasing
 145 a partner or increase the likelihood of gratifying their sexual needs. Conse-
 146 quently, it is important to understand the unique effects of sex motives and
 147 attachment on reactions to hooking up beyond what is typically associated
 Q6 148 with alcohol induced states.

149 This study examines women's reactions to hooking up; women are more
 150 likely to have negative emotional reactions compared with men (e.g., Lewis
 151 et al., 2011; Owen et al., 2010; Owen & Fincham, 2011), and women are
 152 at greater risk for contracting STIs (in heterosexual casual sex encounters)
 Q7 153 as compared with men (Mayaud & Mabey, 2004; Padian, 1997). Many of
 154 the risk factors for engaging in hooking up are more robust for women.
 155 For example, alcohol use is more likely to influence women's negotiation
 156 and decision-making processes as compared with men (Owen & Fincham,

157 2011b). For example, alcohol use reduces the likelihood of condom use
158 when women hook up (Scott-Sheldon, Huedo-Medina, Warren, Johnson,
159 Carey, 2011). These data highlight potential gender inequities in the larger
160 society and can also influence hookups.

161 The Present Study

162 We expected young adults' perceptions that hooking up positively affected
163 their social/peer networks to report less loneliness and fewer depressive
164 symptoms. We anticipated young adults who endorsed more self-affirmation,
165 partner approval, and relational intimacy sexual motives and more anxious
166 attachment to exhibit less positive sexual/relational reactions to hooking up.
167 We also posited that young adults who report that hooking up negatively
168 affected their academic performance to endorse more depressive symptoms
169 and more relational intimacy sexual motives. Last, we expected that alcohol
170 use would be negatively associated with young adults' perception that hook-
171 ing up affected their social/peer networks, romantic/sexual sense of self, and
172 academic performance.

173

METHOD

174 Participants

175 We recruited 400 female participants, of which 190 (47.5%) reported hooking
176 up in the past year. Our sample comprised these 190 college women, of
177 which 74 were freshmen, 69 were sophomores, 34 were juniors, and 13
178 were seniors. Their average age was 19.54 years ($SD = 2.21$). Regarding
179 race/ethnicity, 129 identified as White, 5 identified as Asian American, 18
180 identified as Black, 22 Hispanic, and 13 identified as multiethnic/racial, and
181 3 did not respond. To ensure participants' responses were valid we included
182 screener items throughout the study (e.g., "Relationships are based on trust,
183 to ensure that we can trust your responses please check the Agree box").
184 Participants who did not complete these items accurately were screened from
185 the final sample.

186 Measures

187 SOCIAL, ACADEMIC, ROMANTIC, AND SEXUAL HOOKING UP REACTIONS SCALE (SARS)

188 Developed for the present study, this measure initially comprised 24 items
189 reflecting hooking up outcomes that may positively or negatively influence
190 social ($n = 8$), academic ($n = 8$), and sexual/romantic relationships ($n = 8$).
191 We purposely developed items that were worded positively and negatively
192 to help address the range of potential reactions. After consulting with two
193 content experts (i.e., those who have published studies examining hooking

TABLE 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis of Social, Academic, Romantic, and Sexual Hooking Up Reactions Scale (SARS)

Items	F1	F2	F3
2. I have gained more confidence about sex (and related behaviors) based on this hookup.	.60		
10. This hookup has taught me a lot about my sexual comfort with partners.	.71		
14. This hookup has strengthened my commitment to be in an exclusive romantic relationship (e.g., boyfriend/girlfriend).	.56		
15. This hookup helped me be more comfortable talking about sex.	.78		
16. This hookup taught me important things about myself that will benefit me in future romantic relationships (e.g., boyfriend/girlfriend).	.77		
1. This hookup has negatively impacted relationship with my friends.		-.54	
3. My school work has been negatively impacted as a result of this hookup.		-.51	
6. This hookup made me feel worse about my ability to be in romantic relationships (e.g., boyfriend/girlfriend).		-.77	
7. I feel distracted in class as a result of this hookup.		-.71	
8. Relationship with my friends have become strained due to this hookup.		-.72	
11. I question my ability to find a suitable partner for a romantic relationship (e.g., boyfriend/girlfriend) after this hookup.		-.64	
13. I feel less sure about myself sexually speaking after this hookup.		-.73	
4. My friends approve of me for hooking up.			.41
5. I feel more connected with my friends as a result of this hookup.			.52
9. I have performed better in my classes after this hookup.			.50
12. I feel more engaged in my school work after this hookup.			.62
Cronbach's alphas	.79	.84	.70
<i>M</i>	3.15	1.93	3.50
<i>SD</i>	0.98	0.80	0.73

Note. F1 = SARS–Sexual/Romantic Reactions; F2 = SARS–Negative Reactions; F3 = SARS–Social/Academic Engagement.

194 up), we excluded or reworded 12 items, resulting in 16 items. The items were
 195 rated on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The
 196 items are listed in Table 1 and the psychometrics of the scale is presented in
 197 the results section.

198 SEX MOTIVES SCALE (COOPER ET AL., 1998)

199 We used four subscales of the Sex Motives Scale, which was constructed to
 200 reflect the two motivational dimensions described above. All of the items
 201 had the same stem: “Now thinking about your sexual experience with your

202 most recent hookup partner, to what extent did you engage in this ex-
 203 perience to . . . ” and were rated on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5
 204 (*a great deal*). The first subscale reflected sexual motives regarding relational
 205 intimacy ($\alpha = .94$), and an example is “. . . become more intimate with this
 206 person?” The second subscale reflects self-enhancement motives ($\alpha = .87$).
 207 An example item is “. . . just for the thrill of it?” The third subscale reflects
 208 self-affirmation ($\alpha = .80$) and an example item is “to make you feel more
 209 self-confident?” The fourth subscale reflects Partner Approval ($\alpha = .87$) and
 210 an example item is “. . . so this person would not be mad at you?” Support
 211 for the psychometric properties of the Sex Motives Scale has been demon-
 212 strated in previous studies, such as differentiating between exclusive and
 213 casual sexual relationships for motives in college and community samples
 214 (e.g., Cooper et al., 1998; Sheldon et al., 2006).

Q8

215 EXPERIENCES IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIP SCALE-SHORT FORM (WEI, RUSSELL,
 216 MALLINCKRODT, & VOGEL, 2007)

217 This scale used to assess participants’ attachment. Specifically, the scale has
 218 two subscales: anxiety and avoidance, with six items per subscale. The items
 219 are rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*definitely not like me*) to 7 (*defi-*
 220 *nitely like me*). Wei, Russell, Mallinckrodt, and Vogel (2007) reported support
 221 for the validity for this shorten measure through correlations with psycholog-
 222 ical well-being, loneliness, fear of intimacy, and comfort with self-disclosure
 223 measures. Cronbach’s alphas for the avoidance and anxiety subscales in the
 224 current sample were .86 and .75, respectively.

225 TYPE OF PHYSICAL INTIMACY

226 Participants endorsed the types of physical intimacy involved in their
 227 hookups. The response options were “kissing,” “petting,” “oral sex,” and
 228 “intercourse (vaginal, anal).” Participants were able to endorse more than
 229 one type of physical intimacy. On the basis of their responses, we coded
 230 penetrative hookups (hookup-penetrative) if the participants indicated “oral
 231 sex” or “intercourse” ($n = 99$; 52.1%) and nonpenetrative hookups (hookup-
 232 nonpenetrative) if the participants indicated “kissing” and/or “petting” only
 233 ($n = 91$; 47.9%). We used this variable as a control variable in the analyses.

234 LONELINESS

235 The University of California–Los Angeles Loneliness Scale is a commonly
 236 used measure to assess individuals’ perceptions of how lonely they feel
 237 (Russell, 1996). The eight-item version used required participants to make
 238 ratings on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 4 (*often*). The Univer-
 239 sity of California–Los Angeles Loneliness Scale has demonstrated adequate
 240 reliability across samples and is commonly related to numerous indicators

241 of psychological distress (e.g., depression, low self-esteem; see Vassar &
 Q9 242 Crosby, 2008). Cronbach's alpha in this study was .83.

243 DEPRESSIVE SYMPTOMS

244 The 10-item version of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression Scale
 245 (Radloff, 1977) assessed depressive symptoms. The items are rated on a 4-
 Q10 246 point scale, with higher scores indicating more distress. The Center for
 247 Epidemiologic Studies-Depression Scale has demonstrated adequate reliabil-
 248 ity and validity estimates in numerous studies (see Cole, Rabin, Smith, &
 Q11 249 Kaufman, 2004). Cronbach's alpha in this study was .78.

250 ALCOHOL USE

251 We used two items to assess the degree to which the young adult and their
 252 hookup partner were intoxicated during the hookup:

253 During your most recent hooking up experience, were you and/or your
 254 partner under the influence of a substance (e.g., alcohol)?
 255 I was____ and My partner was____.

256 These items were rated on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (*not intoxi-*
 257 *cated*) to 4 (*very intoxicated*). The correlation between these two items was
 258 high, $r = .87$, and we averaged the two items to create a composite score.
 259 Previous studies have identified that alcohol use before hooking up is more
 260 predictive of emotional reactions (Owen & Fincham, 2011). Accordingly, we
 261 opted to use this method to assess alcohol use as opposed to a measure of
 262 general alcohol use.

263 Procedures

264 Participants were recruited through an introductory course on families across
 265 the lifespan that fulfills a social studies requirement and therefore attracts
 266 students from across the university. Data were collected during the spring
 267 semester of 2012 at Florida State University. Students were offered multiple
 268 options to obtain extra credit for the class, one of which comprised the
 269 survey used in this study. Of the class, 98% decided to participate in the
 270 study. They completed informed consent and were told how to access the
 271 online survey. They were given a 5-day window in which to complete the
 272 survey. All procedures were approved by the university's institutional review
 273 board.

274

RESULTS

275 To determine whether distinct reactions to hooking up emerge in so-
 276 cial, romantic/sexual, and academic domains we conducted an exploratory

277 factor analysis, using principle axis extraction with oblique rotation for SARS
278 items. We retained items that loaded $>.40$ on a factor with cross loadings
279 no greater than $.30$ on other factors. A three-factor model emerged (see
280 Table 1) albeit one that differed slightly from what was predicted. Factor
281 1 accounted for 32.13% of the variance with items reflecting reactions to
282 sexual behaviors and romantic relationships (labeled *sexual/romantic re-*
283 *actions*). Factor 2 accounted for 10.60% of the variance, and the items
284 loading on this factor reflected a negative reaction about the hookup in
285 regard to academic, peer relationships, and efficacy in future romantic rela-
286 tionships (labeled *negative personal reactions*). The third factor accounted
287 for 4.81% of the variance and the items reflect increased engagement
288 within their social network and academics (labeled *social/academic en-*
289 *gagement*). Internal consistency estimates for the three factors ranged from
290 $.70$ to $.84$.

291 The means and standard deviations for the SARS variables in the study
292 are shown in Table 1. Participants reported a mean score on the SARS-
293 negative personal reactions of 1.93, suggesting that negative reactions to
294 hooking up were not common. For the other two SARS subscales, the mean
295 scores were closer to the midpoint of the scale (3.15 and 3.50). The dif-
296 ference between negative personal reactions and sexual/romantic reactions
297 ($d = 0.82$) was statistically significant ($p < .001$). Similarly, the difference
298 between negative personal reactions and social/academic engagement ($d =$
299 1.24) were statistically significant ($p < .001$). In addition, there was a statis-
300 tically significant difference between social/academic engagement and sex-
301 ual/romantic reactions ($p < .01$, $d = -0.40$).

302 Next, we examined the bivariate correlations between the SARS sub-
303 scales and the other variables in the study. Because the subscales yielded by
304 the SARS did not conform exactly to what was expected, our predictions can-
305 not always be linked directly to the associations with other variables. Table 2
306 shows that negative personal reactions were positively associated with more
307 anxious attachment, alcohol use, depressive symptoms, and feelings of lone-
308 liness as well as the sex motives of relational intimacy, self-affirmation, and
309 partner approval. Given that negative personal reactions include reactions
310 regarding young adults' social relationships, academic performance, and ro-
311 mantic relationships these associations are consistent with what is to be
312 expected. Social/academic engagement reactions were negatively associated
313 with anxious attachment and sex motives of relational intimacy and self-
314 affirmation. These results are consistent with our expectations; however,
315 we also anticipated that social/peer aspect of this subscale would result
316 in significant associations with loneliness and the academic aspects of this
317 scale would be associated with fewer depressive symptoms—but neither
318 expectation was supported by the data. Sexual/romantic reactions demon-
319 strated a negative association with anxious attachment, alcohol use, as well
320 as the sex motives of relational intimacy and self-affirmation. These results
321 are consistent with our original predictions.

TABLE 2. Bivariate Correlations With the Social, Academic, Romantic, Sexual Reactions Scale

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. SARS-neg	—											
2. SARS-SR	-.41**	—										
3. SARS-SA	-.36**	.51**	—									
4. HU-sex	.14	-.16*	-.08	—								
5. Avoidant	.09	-.04	-.02	.03	—							
6. Anxious	.33**	-.29**	-.29**	-.01	.12	—						
7. Depressive	.31**	-.02	-.01	.05	.16*	.35	—					
8. Lonely	.36**	.02	.02	.03	.26**	.27**	.52**	—				
9. Alcohol	.17*	-.27**	-.13	.14	-.03	.06	-.01	-.08	—			
10. Intimacy	.25**	-.36**	-.26**	.15	-.13	.16	.04	-.08	.01	—		
11. Enhance	-.11	-.10	-.07	-.18*	.13	-.08	-.02	-.04	.16	-.12	—	
12. Self aff	.21**	-.23**	-.22**	.13	.15	.15	.18*	.18*	-.05	.07	-.22**	—
13. Part apprvl	.31**	-.11	-.12	.03	.05	.18*	.21**	.12	-.08	.18*	-.06	.45**

Note. SARS = Social, Academic, Relational Reactions to Hooking Up Scale. SARS-neg = SARS-negative reactions; SARS-SR = SARS-sexual/romantic reactions; SARS-SA = SARS-social/academic engagement; HU-sex = hooking up sexual intimacy (coded 1 = oral/intercourse, 0 = kissing/petting); avoidant = avoidant attachment; anxious = Experiences in Close Relationship Scale-Short Form, anxious attachment; depressive = Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression Scale, depressive symptoms; lonely = University of California-Los Angeles, Loneliness Scale; alcohol = alcohol use; intimacy = sex motives-intimacy; enhancement = sex motives-enhancement; self-aff = sex motives-self-affirmation; part apprvl = sex motives-partner approval.

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

TABLE 3. Linear Regression Models Predicting SARS Reactions to Hooking Up

	Negative reactions		Sexual/romantic reactions		Social/academic engagement	
	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	β	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	β	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	β
Anxious	.13 (.06)	.17*	-.24 (.08)	-.26**	-.16 (.06)	-.23**
Depressive	.09 (.15)	.06	.17 (.18)	.09	—	—
Lonely	.40 (.13)	.28**	.09 (.16)	.05	—	—
Alcohol	.10 (.07)	.11	-.16 (.08)	-.15	—	—
Intimacy	.09 (.07)	.15	-.19 (.06)	-.24**	-.12 (.05)	-.21**
Self-aff	.02 (.07)	.03	-.19 (.08)	-.19*	-.13 (.06)	-.17*
Part apprvl	.23 (.10)	.19*	—	—	—	—
HU-sex	—	—	-.18 (.15)	-.09	—	—

Note. SARS = Social, Academic, Relational Reactions to Hooking Up Scale. Anxious = Experiences in Close Relationship Scale-Short Form, anxious attachment; depressive = Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression Scale, depressive symptoms; lonely = University of California-Los Angeles, Loneliness Scale; alcohol = alcohol use; intimacy = sex motives-intimacy; self-aff = sex motives-self affirmation; part apprvl = sex motives-partner approval; HU-sex = hooking up sexual intimacy (coded 1 = oral/intercourse, 0 = kissing/petting).

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

322 Although univariate associations with reactions to hooking up are inter-
 323 esting, it is important to examine them in a multivariate context. Significant
 324 bivariate correlations with the SARS factors were therefore used in three dif-
 325 ferent regression equations where each SARS factor served as the outcome
 326 variable (see Table 3).

327 The model predicting negative personal reactions was statistically
 328 significant, $F(7, 182) = 9.93$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .25$. Of the pre-
 329 dictor variables, anxious attachment, feelings of loneliness, and sex
 330 motives-seeking partner approval were positively associated with negative
 331 reactions. The second equation predicting sexual/romantic reactions was
 332 also statistically significant, $F(7, 182) = 8.30$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .21$.
 333 Anxious attachment, sex motives-intimacy, and sex motives-self-affirmation
 334 were negatively associated with young adults' sexual/romantic reactions. The
 335 third regression predicting social/academic engagement reactions was sta-
 336 tistically significant, $F(3, 184) = 9.85$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .12$. Consistent
 337 with the previous model, anxious attachment, sex motives-intimacy, and sex
 338 motives-self-affirmation were negatively associated with social/academic
 339 engagement reactions.

340

DISCUSSION

341 Hooking up can influence several aspects of young adults' lives, including
 342 their sense of self as sexual and romantic partners, social networks and
 343 academic performance. Although conceptually distinct these facets of young
 344 adults' lives were interrelated at the empirical level. Young adults' reactions

345 to hooking up reflected the degree to which they perceived: (a) increases in
 346 their awareness and comfort about sexual behaviors and interest in romantic
 347 relationships (sexual/romantic reactions), (b) enhancements with their social
 348 networks and academic performance (social/academic engagement), and (c)
 349 negative effects on their peer relationships, academic performance, and con-
 350 fidence about future romantic relationships (negative personal reactions).
 351 Comparison of the three domains showed that young adults reported greater
 352 (large effect sizes) sexual/romantic reactions and social/academic engage-
 353 ment reactions as compared with negative personal reactions, which sup-
 354 ports previous studies that have found that young adults report that hooking
 355 up results in more positive than negative emotional reactions (e.g., Lewis
 356 et al., 2011; Owen & Fincham, 2011). These three areas for hooking up re-
 357 actions extend ways to understand how young adults' perceive the benefits
 358 and costs to hooking up beyond emotional reactions to hooking up.

359 Hooking up can result in increased awareness of the sexual self, in-
 360 cluding confidence in talking about sex with sexual partners and comfort
 361 in sexual behavior as well as increased dedication toward and knowledge
 362 of future exclusive romantic relationships. These aspects may be important
 363 in navigating sexual encounters, such as discussing condom use (Serovich
 364 & Greene, 1997), as well as strengthening confidence in romantic relation-
 365 ships, which has been associated with higher relationship quality (Owen
Q13 366 et al., 2012). Depending on how a hookup experience unfolds and the
 367 meaning and reactions individuals generate, they may become more or less
 368 at ease with sexual behaviors and their sense of a sexual self. For exam-
 369 ple, following a hookup experience, one might feel more confident in their
 370 sexual skills and may feel more comfortable with their sexuality (AUTHORS
Q14 371 blinded). In contrast, individuals who engage in a hookup may decide that
 372 they value more commitment and security in romantic relationships. Whether
 373 positive or negative, it seems that these experiences may shape views of self
 374 and expectations or desires in future relationships.

375 The degree to which these sexual/romantic reactions are positive or neg-
 376 ative appears to be related to attachment styles and sexual motives. Specifi-
 377 cally, young adults who reported more anxious attachment styles as well as
 378 sex motives of relational intimacy and self-affirmation were less likely to have
 379 positive sexual/romantic reactions to hooking up. In many ways, anxious at-
 380 tachment and these two sex motives share a theoretical commonality. That
 381 is, anxious attachment styles reflect a longing to be emotionally close with
 382 others while fearing abandonment and searching for ways to reduce this anx-
Q15 383 iety (Hazen & Shaver, 1998). Thus, relational intimacy sexual motives might
 384 reflect one approach to developing emotional connectedness with others. Si-
 385 multaneously, self-affirmation sex motives reflect a sexual approach to help
 386 avoid negative consequences or likely fear of abandonment. Future research
 387 is needed to understand how these sexual motives and anxious attachment
 388 relate in the prediction of sexual/romantic reactions, because there was little

389 statistical overlap between these concepts. Thus, the ways in which anx-
390 ious attachment and sexual motives relate to hooking up is likely to explain
391 different aspects of the experience.

392 Another interesting and underexplored aspect of casual sexual behav-
393 iors is the potential positive perceived influence on academic performance
394 and peer relationships. Common within this developmental phase is a fo-
395 cus on acceptance within peer groups and success in academics (Beyers &
396 Goossens, 2002). Although we expected that academics and social networks
397 would not converge, we found that one aspect of young adults' reactions to
398 hooking up includes their perception that their social network and academic
399 performance were enhanced after the hookup. Thus, hooking up can result
400 in positive effects, as perceived by young adults, in their social networks and
401 academic performance. Similar to sexual/romantic reactions, young adults
402 who reported more anxious attachment and sexual motives of relational inti-
403 macy and self-affirmation were less likely to report positive social/academic
404 engagement reactions. Thus, the approach (relational intimacy) and avoid-
405 ance (self-affirmation) sexual motivations coupled with anxious attachment
406 might be a barrier for young adults to benefit from the hookup—regardless
407 of the foci (i.e., with peers, academics, or sexual/romantic).

408 Last, hooking up can result in negative reactions and our study found
409 one general factor that encompasses these negative reactions. The lack of
410 specificity across the social, sexual/romantic, and academic in young adults'
411 negative reactions lends itself to a couple of explanations. It is possible that
412 the negative effects of hooking up affects young adults' universally—from
413 academics to peers to sexual/romantic sense of self. Alternatively, negative
414 reactions to hooking up may reflect a general discomfort about the experi-
415 ence and this subscale may reflect such a sentiment. Given that social,
416 academic, and sexual/romantic sense of self are interrelated, it is difficult to
417 disentangle what is driving this factor and more research is needed to better
418 understand young adults' negative reactions. For example, there are potential
419 health concerns related to hooking up that can cause anxiety and distrac-
420 tion, such as the possibility of contracting an STI or becoming pregnant.
421 Consequently, these reactions may influence ones' ability to concentrate or
422 focus on academic tasks, may relate to how one feels around peers, and may
423 influence one's sexual/romantic sense of self.

424 Young adults' negative personal reactions were positively associated
425 with anxious attachment, feelings of loneliness, and the sexual motive of
426 partner approval. Young adults' anxious attachment style coupled with part-
427 ner approval sexual motives appeared to lead to more negative reactions. It
428 could be that the desire to be with others and wanting to reduce negative
429 reactions from the hookup partner resulted in an interaction that was not
430 advantageous, which may be due to the transient nature of hookups (e.g.,
431 Eisenberg et al., 2009). It is possible that these factors, coupled with feelings
432 of loneliness, may have resulted in ruminations after the experience leading

433 to increased academic distraction, negative interactions (or isolation from)
434 with peers, and questioning of the sexual/romantic sense of self. These re-
435 sults parallel previous research on partner approval sexual motives (Cooper
436 et al., 2008) and loneliness-emotional reactions research (Owen & Fincham,
437 2011), and yet extend those findings regarding attachment theory and reac-
438 tions to hooking up.

439 Limitations and Implications

440 The present study has several limitations. First, the correlational design does
441 not yield information on direction of effects. Consequently, we used theory
442 to guide our models and their interpretation. Second, we collected data
443 with women only; thus, it is important to replicate our findings (including
444 factor structure) with men. We decided to focus on women's hooking-up
445 experience because of growing evidence that women tend to have fewer
446 positive outcomes than do men (e.g., Fielder & Carey, 2010a; Lewis et al.,
447 2011; Owen et al., 2010; Owen & Fincham, 2011). Third, we purposely
448 focused on reactions that would be most consistent with young adults in
449 college; as such, we do not expect or intend our findings to extend to
450 young adult women who are not in college. Fourth, our originally predicted
451 factor solution was not fully realized, which may suggest that further scale
452 development is needed. Thus, the SARS is probably best considered to have
453 initial support but further validation is needed to increase the viability of this
Q16 454 measure. Fifth, although alcohol use during the current hooking up and
455 emotional reactions to hooking up have been noted in previous research
456 (e.g., Owen & Fincham, 2011), such an association was not found here. It is
457 possible that alcohol use during the hooking up could differently relate to
458 emotional reactions versus social, relational, and academic reactions. Thus,
459 given the ubiquitous nature of alcohol use within hookups, future research
460 may want to explore the role of alcohol use in the variety of reactions to
461 hooking up.

462 Notwithstanding these limitations, there are implications for educational
463 practice and future research. Our findings may help inform relationship ed-
464 ucation programs (Fincham, Stanley, & Rhoades, 2011). That is, central to
465 positive or negative reactions to hooking up for a range of outcomes seem to
466 rest with attachment theory and sexual motives. Specifically, relationship ed-
467 ucation programs may want to address unique variants for young adults who
468 endorse more anxious attachment as they tend to have fewer positive and
469 more negative reactions to hooking up. On the basis of our study, it could
470 be that young adults who report more anxious attachment may not get their
471 relational needs met via hooking up. It is possible that more problematic they
472 may not gain knowledge or confidence about their sexual or relational sense
473 of self, which is consistent with previous research regarding the relationship
474 between anxious attachment and misidentification of respectful relationships

475 (Owen, Quirk, & Manthos, 2012). Consistently, sexual motives that focus on
 476 approach motives for relational intimacy as well as avoidance motives for
 477 avoiding personal or partner discomfort tend to result in less positive and
 478 more negative reactions to hooking up. Thus, it would be important for
 479 young adults to consider their motivations in the context of what may result
 480 from hooking up.

Q17

481

REFERENCES

- 482 American College Health Association. (2007). *American College Health Association-*
 483 *National College Health Assessment: Reference Group Executive Summary Fall*
 484 *2006*. Baltimore, MD: Author.
- 485 Bisson, M. A., & Levine, T. R. (2009). Negotiating a friends with benefits relationship.
 486 *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 25*, 125–140.
- 487 Bai, H., & Pan, W. (2009). A multilevel approach to assessing the interaction effects
 488 on college student retention. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research,*
 489 *Theory & Practice, 11*, 287–301.
- 490 Beyers, W., & Goossens, L. (2002). Concurrent and predictive validity of the Stu-
 491 dent Adaptation to College Questionnaire in a sample of European freshman
 492 students. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 62*, 527–538.
- 493 Burdette, A. M., Ellison, C. G., Hill, T. D., & Glenn, N. D. (2009). Hooking up at
 494 college: Does religion really make a difference? *Journal for the Scientific Study*
 495 *of Religion, 48*, 535–551.
- 496 Cooper, M. L., Barber, L. L., Zhaoyang, R., & Talley, A. E. (2011). Motivational
 497 pursuits in the context of human sexual relationships. *Journal of Personality,*
 498 *79*, 1333–1368.
- 499 Cooper, M. L., Shapiro, C. M., & Powers, A. M. (1998). Motivations for sex and risky
 500 sexual behavior among adolescents and young adults: A functional perspective.
 501 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1528–1558.
- 502 Eisenberg, M. E., Ackard, D. A., Resnick, M. D., & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2009).
 503 Casual sex and psychological health among young adults: Is having “friends
 504 with benefits” emotionally damaging? *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive*
 505 *Health, 41*, 231–237.
- 506 Fielder, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2010a). Predictors and consequences of sexual “hook-
 507 ups” among college students: A short-term prospective study. *Archives of Sexual*
 508 *Behavior, 39*, 1105–1119.
- 509 Fielder, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2010b). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual
 510 hookups among first-semester female college students. *Journal of Sex and Mar-*
 511 *ital Therapy, 36*, 346–359.
- 512 Fincham, F. D., Stanley, S. M., & Rhoades, G. K. (2011). Relationship education in
 513 emerging adulthood: Problems and prospects. In F. D. Fincham & M. Cui (Eds.),
 514 *Romantic relationships in emerging adulthood* (pp. 293–316). New York, NY:
 515 Cambridge University Press.
- 516 Friedman, B. A., & Mandel, R. G. (2009). The prediction of college student academic
 517 performance and retention: Application of expectancy and goal setting theories.
 518 *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 11*, 227–246.

- 519 Gentzler, A. L., & Kerns, K. A. (2004). Associations between insecure attachment and
520 sexual experiences. *Personal Relationships, 11*, 249–265.
- 521 Glenn, N. D., & Marquardt, E. (2001). *Hooking up, banging out, and hoping for Mr.*
522 *Right: College women on dating and mating today*. New York, NY: Institute for
523 American Values.
- 524 Grello, C. M., Welsh, D. P., & Harper, M. S. (2006). No strings attached: The nature
525 of casual sex in college students. *Journal of Sex Research, 43*, 255–267.
- 526 Gute, G., & Eshbaugh, E. M. (2008). Personality as a predictor of hooking up among
527 college students. *Journal of Community Health Nursing, 25*, 26–43.
- 528 Hazen, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment
529 process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511–524.
- 530 Lewis, M. A., Granato, H., Blayney, J. A., Lostutter, T. W., & Kilmer, J. R. (2011).
531 Predictors of hooking up sexual behaviors and emotional reactions among U.S.
Q18 532 college students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*.
- 533 Mayaud, P., & Mabey, D. (2004). Approaches to the control of sexually transmit-
534 ted infections in developing countries: Old problems and modern challenges.
535 *Sexually Transmitted Infections, 80*, 174–182.
- 536 Manning, W. D., Longmore, M. A., & Giordano, P. C. (2005). Adolescents' involve-
537 ment in non-romantic sexual activity. *Social Science Research, 34*, 384–407.
- 538 Owen, J., Chapman, K., Quirk, K., Inch, L., Bergen, C., McMillen, A., & France, T.
539 (2012). Processes of change in relationship education for lower income African
540 American couples. *Journal of Couple and Relationship Therapy, 11*, 51–68.
- 541 Owen, J., & Fincham, F. D. (2010). Effects of gender and psychosocial factors on
542 “friends with benefits” relationships among young adults. *Archives of Sexual*
543 *Behavior, 40*, 311–320.
- 544 Owen, J., & Fincham, F. D. (2011). Young adults' emotional reactions after hooking
545 up encounters. *Archive of Sexual Behaviour, 40*, 321–330.
- 546 Owen, J., Fincham, F. D., & Moore, J. (2011). Short-term perspective study of hooking
547 up among college students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 40*, 331–341.
- 548 Owen, J., Rhoades, G., Stanley, S., & Fincham, F. (2010). Hooking up among college
549 student: demographic and psychosocial correlates. *Archives of Sexual Behavior,*
550 *39*, 653–663.
- 551 Owen, J., Quirk, K., & Manthos, M. (2012). I get no respect: The relationship between
552 trauma and romantic relationship functioning. *Journal of Trauma & Dissocia-*
553 *tion, 13*, 175–189.
- 554 Paul, E. L., McManus, B., & Hayes, A. (2000). “Hookups” characteristics and correlates
555 of college students' spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *Journal*
556 *of Sex Research, 37*, 76–88.
- 557 Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in
558 the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*, 385–401.
- 559 Russell, D. W. (1996). UCLA loneliness scale (Version 3): Reliability, validity, and
560 factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 66*, 20–40.
- 561 Scott-Sheldon, L. A. J., Huedo-Medina, T. B., Warren, M. R., Johnson, B. T., Carey,
562 M. P. (2011). Efficacy of behavioral interventions to increase condom use and
563 reduce sexually transmitted infections: A meta-analysis, 1991 to 2010. *Journal*
564 *of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes, 58*, 489–498.

- 565 Serovich, J., & Greene, K. (1997) Predictors of adolescent sexual risk taking be-
566 haviours which put them at risk for contracting HIV. *Journal of Youth and*
567 *Adolescence*, 26, 429–444.
- 568 Townsend, J. M., & Wasserman, T. H. (2011). Sexual hookups among college stu-
569 dents: Sex differences in emotional reactions. *Archives of Sexual Behaviors*, 40,
570 1173–1181.
- 571 Wei, M., Russell, D. W., Mallinckrodt, B., & Vogel, D. L. (2007). The Experiences
572 in Close Relationship Scale (ECR)-Short Form: Reliability, validity, and factor
573 structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 88, 187–204.