Published in final edited form as:

J Sex Res. 2018 ; 55(9): 1180–1191. doi:10.1080/00224499.2017.1298714.

Evaluations and future plans after casual sexual experiences: Differences across partner type

Rose Wesche, M.S.^a, Shannon E. Claxton, Ph.D.^b, Eva S. Lefkowitz, Ph.D.^c, and Manfred H. M. van Dulmen, Ph.D.^d

^aDepartment of Human Development and Family Studies, Pennsylvania State University

^bDepartment of Psychology, Morningside College

^cDepartment of Human Development and Family Studies, University of Connecticut

^dDepartment of Psychology, Kent State University

Abstract

Casual sexual relationships and experiences (CSREs) are common among emerging adults, and their diversity may contribute to variability in their associations with mental health and future romantic relationship development. The present research used multiple regression analyses to examine how CSRE type (casual dating, friends with benefits [FWB], or booty call/one-night stand) is associated with short-term outcomes of these experiences, including positive and negative evaluations, plans to start a romantic relationship with a CSRE partner, and general plans for future CSREs. College students and non-college-attending emerging adults ($N = 192$, 80% female, mean age = 22.09 years) reported on recent sexual encounters through daily diaries collected around an alcohol consumption holiday. Individuals with casual dating partners evaluated their experiences more positively and/or less negatively than individuals with booty calls/one-night stands; these associations were moderated by gender and sexual behavior type. Individuals with casual dating partners were more oriented toward pursuing a romantic relationship with their partners than individuals with FWB or booty calls/one-night stands. However, no association was found between CSRE type and plans for future CSREs in general. Results highlight the diversity of CSREs and suggest that casual dating may be more rewarding than FWB and booty calls/one-night stands, particularly for women.

Keywords

college students; gender differences; normative sexual behavior; psychology and sexuality

The high prevalence of emerging adults' sexual behavior with casual partners has sparked debate in the research community about how diverse sexual relationships and experiences shape emotions and future sexual decisions (Fielder, Walsh, Carey, & Carey, 2014; Garcia & Reiber, 2008; Glenn & Marquardt, 2001; Manning, Longmore, & Giordano, 2005; Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000). Casual sexual relationships and experiences (CSREs) are sexual encounters between partners outside of committed romantic relationships (Lewis, Granato, Blayney, Lostutter, & Kilmer, 2012). Although some researchers have expressed concern that emerging adults prioritize CSREs over traditional romantic relationships despite

evaluating their CSREs negatively (Bersamin et al., 2014; Bogle, 2008; Heldman & Wade, 2010; Stinson, 2010), others describe CSRE involvement as a normative part of emerging adulthood, generally evaluated positively by emerging adults themselves (Owen, Quirk, & Fincham, 2014; Snapp, Ryu, & Kerr, 2015; Vrangalova & Ong, 2014). There is evidence for both perspectives, with research findings demonstrating inter-individual variability in the outcomes associated with CSRE involvement (e.g., Owen et al., 2014; Vasilenko, Lefkowitz, & Maggs, 2012). The diversity of CSRE types may help explain the variability in outcomes associated with these experiences. The goal of this paper is to examine the associations of CSRE partner type (casual dating, friends with benefits, booty calls, and one-night stands), with short-term outcomes of CSREs, including positive and negative evaluations, plans for future encounters with the same partner, and plans for future CSREs in general.

CSRE Type

The term “casual sexual relationships and experiences” has been used in the past to describe sexual encounters outside of committed romantic relationships (Claxton & van Dulmen, 2013). These experiences are diverse, varying in emotional closeness and frequency of sexual contact between partners (Claxton & van Dulmen, 2013; Jonason, 2013; Wentland & Reissing, 2011; Wentland & Reissing, 2014). These dimensions have informed the identification of multiple types of CSREs, including casual dating, friends with benefits (FWB), booty calls, and one-night stands (Claxton & van Dulmen, 2013; Mongeau, Jacobsen, & Donnerstein, 2007). FWB refers to friends who engage in sexual activity repeatedly, but do not define their relationship as romantic (Hughes, Morrison, & Asada, 2005). FWB involve relatively frequent sexual contact and include some degree of emotional closeness between partners due to their simultaneous friendship and sexual relationships. On the opposite end of the spectrum, one-night stands do not constitute relationships because they occur one time only and often take place with strangers or acquaintances (Cubbins & Tanfer, 2000; Wentland & Reissing, 2011). Booty calls, communications that are initiated with the intent of having sexual activity (Jonason, Li, & Cason, 2009), fall between FWB and one-night stands in that they may be reoccurring and often include some level of emotional intimacy, but not to the extent of FWB (Wentland & Reissing, 2011; Jonason, Li, & Richardson, 2011).

In addition to these categories, casual dating also constitutes a type of CSRE because the individuals engaging in these relationships do not consider themselves to be in a committed relationship (Schindler, Fagundes, & Murdock, 2010). These relationships share a number of characteristics with other CSREs: they are often not considered to be sexually exclusive (Paik, 2010) and are marked by uncertainty about one's partner and the future of the relationship (Mongeau et al., 2007; Schindler et al., 2010). Furthermore, many casual dating relationships share goals with other CSREs, including partner assessment, fun, and sex (Mongeau, Serewicz, & Therrien, 2004). Casual dating, however, is unique among CSREs in that it has a distinctive romantic connotation—individuals in casual dating relationships agree on the possibility of a committed relationship developing.

Despite the variety in emerging adults' sexual relationships and experiences, scholarly understanding of how these diverse partner types contribute to mental health and sexual

development is limited. Research on CSREs often does not distinguish between partner types, grouping all of these experiences together under the umbrella of casual sex or hooking up (e.g., Lyons, Manning, Longmore, & Giordano, 2014; Owen & Fincham, 2011). Other studies focus on a specific type of CSRE (e.g., Bisson & Levine, 2009; Jonason et al., 2009). This research has produced inconsistent findings on the outcomes associated with CSRE involvement. For example, some research findings show that CSREs are associated with higher depression/anxiety (Bersamin et al., 2014; Sandberg-Thoma & Kamp Dush, 2014), whereas other research findings do not show an association (Eisenberg, Ackard, & Neumark-Sztainer, 2009; Monahan & Lee, 2008). In addition, there is inter-individual variability in short-term evaluations of recent CSREs (Lewis et al., 2012; Owen & Fincham, 2011; Owen, Rhoades, Stanley, & Fincham, 2010). These conflicting findings may reflect the diversity of CSREs; if different types of CSREs are associated with different outcomes, grouping all CSREs together may produce null effects (Claxton & van Dulmen, 2013). Assessing whether different CSRE types are associated with distinct outcomes may help clarify inconsistent findings on the outcomes of CSRE involvement.

In addition to clarifying inconsistent findings, understanding the outcomes of different types of CSREs can inform sexual and relationship education efforts. Emerging adults' sexual partner choices have implications for the outcomes of their sexual interactions; however, limited resources exist for emerging adults navigating hookup culture (Garcia, Reiber, Massey, & Merriwether, 2012; Heldman & Wade, 2010). Existing relationship education programs targeted to emerging adults often focus on building skills within romantic relationships (e.g., Braithwaite & Fincham, 2009), with limited information about decision-making in CSREs. Understanding the outcomes of different CSRE types informs the expansion of these programs to address diverse relationship types. Explicating the outcomes of different types of CSREs is a step toward fine-tuning intervention content to address the needs of individuals with diverse sexual partnerships. For example, intervention program developers may consider including content addressing the fact that CSREs are diverse, that it is common for CSREs to lead to short-term emotional outcomes, and that not all CSREs are associated with equivalent emotional outcomes.

Positive and Negative Evaluations of CSREs

Short-term evaluations offer evidence of the subjective experience of engaging in CSREs. In contrast to distal outcomes such as depressive symptoms, short-term evaluations of CSREs assess feelings that are specific to the sexual encounter. These short-term evaluations allow individuals to describe how they believe engaging in a CSRE affected them immediately after that experience, providing information about how young adults perceive different sexual experiences. In addition, short-term evaluations reduce retrospective recall biases that may be influenced by subsequent events such as changes in relationship status (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003). Many individuals report ambivalence about CSRE involvement, with common evaluations including negative emotions such as regret, worry, and negative affect (Eshbaugh & Gute, 2008; Lewis et al., 2012; Townsend & Wasserman, 2011; Vasilenko et al., 2012), as well as positive evaluations, such as being happy or feeling closer to their partners (Owen & Fincham, 2011; Vasilenko et al., 2012). The differences in the nature of casual dating, FWB, booty calls, and one-night stands likely contribute to

differential evaluations. For example, knowing a partner well is associated with more positive evaluations of CSREs (Lewis et al., 2012). Additionally, emotional connection with a partner contributes to positive outcomes of CSREs (Paul & Hayes, 2002; Snapp et al., 2015; Strokoff, Owen, & Fincham, 2015).

Future Plans after CSREs

In addition to understanding the short-term emotional outcomes of CSREs, we are interested in understanding how CSRE involvement shapes future sexual choices. Two questions have arisen in past research on CSREs and relationship formation. First, are CSREs positively reinforcing, leading emerging adults to engage in additional CSREs, possibly at the expense of romantic relationships (Bogle, 2008; Freitas, 2013)? Some research has focused on the prevalence of CSREs versus romantic relationships, finding that the majority of sexual experiences occur in the context of romantic relationships, not CSREs (Fielder, Carey, & Carey, 2013; Siebenbruner, 2013). These findings suggest that CSRE involvement is not replacing romantic relationships. However, measuring the prevalence of CSRE involvement provides limited information about how CSREs are associated with future sexual decisions. A direct assessment of intentions to engage in future CSREs provides a more precise measurement of whether engaging in CSREs is positively reinforcing and whether individuals who engage in CSREs may choose to engage in additional CSREs in the future. In addition, understanding how CSRE type is associated with general future plans informs developmental perspectives on trajectories of sexuality and relationship development. Some CSREs may be more rewarding than others and thus may be more strongly associated with plans for future CSREs in general.

A second question related to future sexual choices after CSRE involvement is whether emerging adults use CSREs to begin romantic relationships (Garcia & Reiber, 2008; Mongeau, Knight, Williams, Eden, & Shaw, 2011; Owen & Fincham, 2012). Although definitions of one-night stands, booty calls, and FWB emphasize that these relationships are nonromantic, the results of past research suggest that this agreement does not always prevent people from wanting future romantic relationships to develop. Some individuals report entering a CSRE with the goal of beginning a romantic relationship or assessing a romantic partner; others report hoping for a romantic relationship to develop from their CSREs (Campbell, 2008; Garcia & Reiber, 2008; Lehmiller, VanderDrift, & Kelly, 2011; Manning, Giordano, & Longmore, 2006; Mongeau et al., 2011; Owen & Fincham, 2012), although most CSREs do not transition into romantic relationships (Bisson & Levine, 2009; Eisenberg, Ackard, Resnick, & Neumark-Sztainer, 2009; Paul et al., 2000).

Understanding how CSRE type is associated with romantic relationship plans may illuminate how CSREs fit into sexual and relationship development more generally. Romantic relationship formation is a salient task of emerging adulthood (Lanz & Tagliabue, 2007; Shulman & Connolly, 2013). The diversity of sexual experiences, though, complicates emerging adults' choices regarding whether and how to initiate romantic relationships. By comparing romantic relationship plans across CSRE types, we can determine whether certain types of CSREs may be more popular routes to forming romantic relationships,

thereby advancing understanding of diversity in romantic relationship formation in emerging adulthood.

Additional Influences on CSREs

In addition to CSRE type, past research examining outcomes of CSREs has highlighted the potential roles of gender, alcohol use, sexual behaviors, and college student status. Regarding gender, women may evaluate CSREs more negatively than men do (Bradshaw, Kahn, & Saville, 2010; Campbell, 2008; Owen & Fincham, 2011). Additionally, women may be more likely to hope for a CSRE to result in a committed relationship (Lehmiller et al., 2011), although other research shows no gender differences (Campbell, 2008; Garcia & Reiber, 2008). Regarding alcohol use, number of drinks directly prior to engaging in CSREs is associated with more negative evaluations (Lewis et al., 2012). Additionally, the prevalence of alcohol use before sexual encounters differs by CSRE type. Alcohol use plays a frequent role in booty calls and one-night stands (Fielder & Carey, 2010; Manthos, Owen, & Fincham, 2014; Owen et al., 2010; Paul et al., 2000; Ven & Beck, 2009). In contrast, alcohol use may only predict the first instance of sexual activity with a FWB partner (Wentland & Reissing, 2011). Regarding sexual behaviors, some evidence links oral and penetrative sex with CSRE partners to more negative consequences compared to kissing and/or touching (Owen & Fincham, 2011; Wesche, Lefkowitz, & Vasilenko, 2016).

Regarding college student status, research on emerging adults relies heavily on college student samples. This strategy limits the generalizability of findings on casual sex, which may differ in non-college contexts. The college experience may normalize CSREs by creating abundant opportunities for students to engage in unsupervised socializing, often in drinking contexts, with peers similar to them in age, education, and living conditions (Bogle, 2008; Carter, Brandon, & Goldman, 2010). This hookup culture may not be as prominent for non-college-attending emerging adults, which may lead to differences in the outcomes of CSREs, and the predictors of these outcomes, for college versus non-college samples. In order to better understand outcomes of CSREs for diverse groups of individuals, researchers have called for studies of emerging adult sexuality to include more non-college samples (Claxton & van Dulmen, 2013; Heldman & Wade, 2010; Wentland & Reissing, 2014).

The Present Research

In this paper, we examine associations between CSRE type and short-term outcomes of CSREs, including evaluations of recent experiences and intentions to have additional experiences. Assessing differences between CSRE types on positive evaluations, negative evaluations, romantic relationship plans, and general plans for future CSREs will clarify whether certain types of CSREs are perceived as more rewarding or reinforcing than others. Because of its relatively high emotional closeness and romantic connotations, we hypothesize that casual dating will be associated with more positive and less negative evaluations and a stronger desire to form a romantic relationship with one's current partner, compared to other CSRE types. To our knowledge, no study has assessed general future plans; consequently, we do not make a directional hypothesis for this research question.

Given their association with CSREs and/or outcomes of CSREs, we include gender, alcohol use, and type of sexual behavior (whether or not participants engaged in oral and/or penetrative sex on at least one day of data collection), and college student status as controls in our analyses. Additionally, we explore gender, alcohol use, type of sexual behavior, and college student status as potential moderators of the associations between CSRE type and evaluations and future plans. Investigating these interactions will inform future sexual and relationship education efforts by clarifying the circumstances and personal characteristics that make different types of CSREs more or less rewarding experiences.

Method

Participants and Procedure

The current study utilizes one wave of data from a larger study on casual sexual relationships and experiences (e.g., DeLuca, Claxton, Baker, & van Dulmen, 2015). Data were collected from two samples: college-based and community-based. College participants from a large Midwestern University were recruited via the Department of Psychological Sciences subject pool and compensated with course credit. The online community sample was recruited from across the United States online via Amazon's Mechanical Turk (Mturk) and compensated \$9.50 for completing all study assessments. Participants were eligible to complete the study if they planned to go out during the weekend, were between the ages of 18-29, and were not currently in a committed dating relationship.

The present research uses a daily diary data collection strategy, which enables us to collect evaluations and future plans the day after a sexual encounter occurred. These methods may produce more accurate results than other retrospective study designs because events are reported more proximally to the event (McAuliffe, DiFranceisco, & Reed, 2007). This strategy limits recall bias; relationship changes that occur between a sexual event and data collection, such as a break-up, can influence memories of the event. Time passed since an event can also impede memory; daily data may be especially useful for behaviors with casual sexual partners, whom an individual may see infrequently or only once.

Participants completed online daily diary assessments surrounding one of four high alcohol consumption holidays: Halloween 2013, Halloween 2014, Saint Patrick's Day 2014, or Saint Patrick's Day 2015. These high alcohol consumption events were utilized in order to capitalize on the possibility of alcohol consumption and CSRE engagement. On each of five days surrounding the holiday, participants reported on the previous day's sexual activity. These five days included weekends in order to capture the days when individuals were likely to "party." For example, data collection during Halloween 2013 (a Thursday) occurred Wednesday through Sunday. Approximately 1,200 individuals participated in the study. The analytic sample included participants who reported at least one sexual experience during the study (we include kissing as a sexual experience because past research findings demonstrate that kissing within CSREs is nearly ubiquitous and many CSREs involve only kissing; see Furman & Shaffer, 2011; Wesche et al., 2016) and provided complete data on all measures used in the regression analyses. An additional 19 participants were excluded because they reported more than one type of CSRE over the period of data collection, for an analytic sample of $N = 192$ (16% of total sample). Sixty-two percent of the analytic sample was

recruited through the university. The sample was 80% female and had a mean age of 22.09 years ($SD = 3.45$). Regarding race/ethnicity, 86% of participants identified as Caucasian/White, 6% as African American, 5% as Hispanic/Latino(a), 3% as biracial, 1% as Asian American/Pacific Islander, <1% as Native American/Alaskan Native, and 2% did not respond to this question. 89% of participants identified as heterosexual, 2% identified as homosexual, 9% identified as bisexual, and <1% identified as another sexual orientation. 65% of the sample reported that they were part- or full-time students, 31% were not in school and 4% did not respond to this question.

We compared the analytic sample to the overall sample on gender, race/ethnicity, age, and sexual orientation using a series of chi-square tests, and one t -test. The samples did not differ in their age or likelihood of being heterosexual. The analytic sample was more likely than the overall sample to be female (66% of overall sample; $\chi^2(1) = 12.20, p < .001$). Due to small cell sizes for racial/ethnic minority groups, comparisons on race/ethnicity focused on the likelihood of being Caucasian/White versus reporting another race/ethnicity. Individuals in the analytic sample were more likely to be Caucasian/White than individuals in the overall sample (72% of overall sample; $\chi^2(1) = 16.22, p < .001$).

We also compared the college and online subsamples on the same variables. Within the analytic sample, the college subsample was more likely to be heterosexual compared to the online subsample ($\chi^2(1) = 5.21, p < .05$; 93% of college analytic sample, 82% of online analytic sample). The college analytic sample was younger than the online analytic sample ($t(183) = 13.45, p < .001$; college $M = 20.40$ ($SD = 2.44$), online $M = 25.59$ ($SD = 2.49$)).

Measures

CSRE type—Sexual behavior was assessed by asking participants, “Did you engage in any sexual behaviors (for example, kissing, touching, oral sex, sexual intercourse, anal sex, other) with anyone” on the previous day. Participants who answered “yes” classified the encounter using the following definitions based on previous research (see Claxton & van Dulmen, 2013):

Casual Dating Relationship: you are going out on dates, but you have not made it official

Friend with benefits (FWB): friends who engage in sexual activity but do not consider themselves to be in a romantic relationship

Booty Call: a communication initiated toward an individual with the urgent intent either stated or implied, of having sexual activity and/or intercourse (meeting for impromptu sex)

One-night stand: a sexual encounter with another individual that only occurred one time

Participants were given these definitions and then selected their relationship to their partner: casual dating ($n = 63$), FWB ($n = 95$), or booty call or one-night stand ($n = 34$). We combined booty calls and one-night stands into a single category due to the conceptual similarities between these types of CSREs (both are characterized by relatively low

frequency of sexual contact and low emotional closeness between partners) and the low frequency of participants who reported either a booty call ($n = 22$) or one-night stand ($n = 12$).

Evaluations and future plans—Each day that participants reported engaging in any sexual behaviors, they answered 28 questions regarding their feelings about the experience. These items included questions from Campbell's (2008) measure of evaluations of sexual experiences, as well as additional items designed to measure expectations for future sexual encounters. The additional items were based on previous work on intentions including Fielder & Carey (2010) and research on the Theory of Interpersonal Behavior. There were six additional items: 3 items related to romantic relationship plans (e.g., "I would potentially like to have a romantic relationship with this person") and 3 items related to general future plans (e.g., "I hope to have another casual sexual encounter in the near future"). All items were rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). To determine the factor structure of this measure, we performed exploratory factor analyses on the items, which were average responses across all days of reported sexual activity. Exploratory factor analysis using the oblique rotation method with Geomin yielded a four-factor solution, based on interpretation of the Scree plot and Eigenvalues. Geomin rotation was used because it has been shown to perform well for moderately complex loading matrix structures and when the true loading structure is unknown (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2009; Browne, 2001). 11 items that loaded less than 0.50 on all factors were removed. We interpreted the four factors as representing positive evaluations ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.87$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .91$), negative evaluations ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.68$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .89$), plans for transitioning to a romantic relationship with the same partner (romantic relationship plans; $M = 3.62$, $SD = 1.30$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .93$), and plans for future CSREs in general (general future plans; $M = 2.36$, $SD = 0.90$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .63$).

Average number of drinks—On each day that participants reported engaging in sexual behaviors, they answered a question about whether they consumed alcohol before engaging in these sexual behaviors. If they reported that they had, they were asked to report the number of alcoholic drinks they had consumed and told that 1 Standard Drink = 12 ounces of beer, 1 shot of liquor (straight or in a mixed drink), or 5 ounces of wine. For regression analyses, we calculated participants' average number of drinks across days with sexual activity ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 4.48$, range = 0 – 20).

Type of sexual behavior—On each day that participants reported engaging in any sexual behaviors, they were provided with a list of sexual behaviors and asked to select all of the behaviors in which they engaged the previous day. If participants selected "You performed oral sex on your partner," "Your partner performed oral sex on you," Engaged in sexual intercourse," or "Engaged in anal sex" on at least one day of data collection, they were coded as having had oral/penetrative sex (1). If they did not report any of these behaviors, they were coded as not having had oral/penetrative sex (0). Sixty-one percent of the sample engaged in oral/penetrative sex on at least one day of data collection.

Results

First, we explored the bivariate associations of CSRE type and our control variables with positive evaluations, negative evaluations, romantic relationship plans, and general future plans. Mean levels of each outcome by partner type, and the results of ANOVAs comparing these means, are shown in Table 1. The ANOVAs revealed that there were statistically significant mean differences across partner type for all four outcomes.

Of the control variables, being male was associated with being more oriented toward general future plans, $t(183) = -5.13, p < .001$; male $M = 2.99$ ($SD = 0.84$), female $M = 2.19$ ($SD = 0.86$). Drinking more on days with sexual activity was associated with less positive evaluations ($r = -.15, p < .05$), more negative evaluations ($r = .34, p < .001$), being less oriented toward romantic relationship plans ($r = -.28, p < .001$), and being more oriented toward general future plans ($r = .19, p < .01$). Having oral/penetrative sex was associated with higher positive evaluations [$t(123.41) = -3.69, p < .001$; oral/penetrative $M = 3.51$ ($SD = 0.98$), no oral/penetrative $M = 4.00$ ($SD = 0.73$)], lower negative evaluations [$t(115.15) = 2.38, p < .05$; oral/penetrative $M = 1.66$ ($SD = 0.82$), no oral/penetrative $M = 1.40$ ($SD = 0.56$)], and less interest in future CSREs in general [$t(190) = -2.35, p < .05$; oral/penetrative $M = 2.55$ ($SD = 0.85$), no oral/penetrative $M = 2.24$ ($SD = 0.91$)]. Being in the college sample was associated with lower positive evaluations [$t(183) = 3.94, p < .001$; college $M = 3.68$ ($SD = 0.90$), non-college $M = 4.19$ ($SD = 0.62$)], and higher negative evaluations [$t(202) = -2.74, p < .01$; college $M = 1.58$ ($SD = 0.75$), non-college $M = 1.29$ ($SD = 0.47$)].

Next, we assessed the associations of CSRE type with evaluations and future plans using four linear regression analyses (Table 2, Model 1). CSRE type was dummy coded with casual dating as the reference group, such that the two other types of CSRE (FWB and booty calls/one-night stands) would be compared to casual dating. We chose casual dating as the reference group because past research on CSREs has implicitly or explicitly compared CSREs to traditional romantic relationships (e.g., Furman & Shaffer, 2011; Manning et al., 2006), and casual dating represents a traditionally accepted beginning to a romantic relationship. Control variables were gender, average number of drinks on days with sexual activity, type of sexual behavior, and whether the participant was in the college (1) or online (0) sample. FWB experiences were associated with higher negative evaluations and being less oriented toward romantic relationship plans, compared to casual dating. FWB experiences did not significantly differ from casual dating on positive evaluations or general future plans. Booty calls/one-night stands were associated with less positive evaluations, more negative evaluations, and being less oriented toward romantic relationship plans, compared to casual dating. Booty calls/one-night stands did not differ from casual dating on general future plans.

We also conducted exploratory moderation analyses in four regression models by adding interactions of gender by CSRE type, type of sexual behavior by CSRE type, (centered) number of drinks by CSRE type, and sample by CSRE type. The addition of gender*CSRE type interactions (Table 2, Model 2) significantly improved the amount of variance explained for positive evaluations and included statistically significant coefficients predicting positive and negative evaluations. For women, booty calls/one-night stands were associated with less

positive evaluations than was casual dating, and this difference was smaller for men. Similarly, booty calls/one-night stands were associated with more negative evaluations compared to casual dating, and this difference was smaller for men (see Figure 1).

The addition of type of sexual behavior*CSRE type interactions (Table 2, Model 3) significantly increased the amount of variance explained for positive and negative evaluations. Type of sexual behavior moderated the associations of booty calls/one-night stands with positive evaluations, negative evaluations, and romantic relationship plans. The associations of booty calls/one-night stands with more negative evaluations, less positive evaluations, and being less oriented toward a romantic relationship were stronger for individuals who had oral/penetrative sex with their CSRE partners (see Figure 1). Adding the number of drinks*CSRE type and sample*CSRE type interactions to the model did not improve the amount of variance explained for any outcome and did not produce any statistically significant interactions. Thus, these analyses are not presented in Table 2.

Post Hoc Power Analyses

We conducted post hoc power analyses to test the observed power to detect an effect of CSRE type on each outcome. That is, the analyses test the power of the F -test of the Null hypothesis that the change in $R^2 = 0$ when CSRE type is added to a regression model including all of the control variables assessed (gender, average number of drinks on days with sexual activity, type of sexual behavior, and college student status). We conducted these analyses using the G*Power program (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009; Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). For each analysis, the effect size f^2 was the effect size attributed to the addition of the dummy coded variables for FWB and booty calls/one-night stands. Power was .56 for positive evaluations, .79 for negative evaluations, .99 for romantic relationship plans, and .21 for general plans for future CSREs.

Discussion

The present research clarifies understandings of the associations of CSRE involvement with short-term evaluations and future plans by demonstrating that these outcomes differ by CSRE type. The results provide mixed support for the idea that different CSRE types are associated with different outcomes. In support of this idea, individuals with FWB and booty calls/one-night stands evaluated their experiences less positively and/or more negatively and were less interested in pursuing a romantic relationship with their partners, compared to individuals with casual dating partners. However, FWB and booty calls/one-night stands did not differ from casual dating in plans for future CSREs in general. Although these experiences were diverse and people reacted more positively to some types of CSREs than others, it does not seem that one type of sexual encounter encourages or discourages people from planning to have additional CSREs in the future.

Positive and Negative Evaluations

Consistent with hypotheses, findings regarding positive and negative evaluations suggest that casual dating is more rewarding than other types of CSREs. This finding helps clarify the mixed results of past research indicating inter-individual variability in evaluations of recent

CSREs (Lewis et al., 2012; Owen & Fincham, 2011; Owen et al., 2010), demonstrating that some of this variability is likely due to differences in CSRE type. Given that developing emotionally intimate relationships is a key task of emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000; Shulman & Connolly, 2013) and that many college students hope for a committed relationship despite engaging in CSREs (Bogle, 2008; Bradshaw et al., 2010; Mongeau et al., 2011), casual dating may be more rewarding than other CSRE types. Future research should continue to explore what characteristics of casual dating make it a less negative experience than other CSREs.

Associations between booty calls/one-night stands and positive and negative evaluations were moderated by sexual behaviors and gender. Regarding sexual behaviors, engaging in oral and/or penetrative sex strengthened differences in the evaluations of individuals with booty calls/one-night stands versus individuals with casual dating partners. These findings build on past research suggesting that CSREs involving oral and/or penetrative sex are associated with more negative consequences than those involving only kissing or touching (Owen & Fincham, 2011; Wesche et al., 2016). The present findings suggest that individuals who engage in oral and/or penetrative sex with CSRE partners evaluate casual dating more positively and less negatively than booty calls/one-night stands, specifically.

Regarding gender, worse CSRE evaluations for individuals with booty calls/one-night stands than individuals with casual dating were stronger for women than for men. This finding adds to past findings that women evaluate their recent CSREs more negatively than men do (Bradshaw et al., 2010; Campbell, 2008; Owen & Fincham, 2011), suggesting that women evaluate casual dating more positively and less negatively than booty calls/one-night stands, specifically. This explanation is consistent with evidence that women are more motivated by emotional intimacy in sexual relationships, whereas men tend to be more motivated by physical pleasure (Cooper, Shapiro, & Powers, 1998; Meston & Buss, 2007). Given the relatively low emotional closeness of booty calls/one-night stands, these types of CSREs may be particularly unfulfilling for women. In contrast, FWB and casual dating may fulfill both men's and women's sexual motives because they are characterized by more emotional closeness than booty calls and one-night stands.

However, women's motivations for sex may differ across partner types, with fewer intimacy motives and greater pleasure motives for sex with casual partners, compared to committed partners (Armstrong & Reissing, 2015). If women and men are both highly pleasure-motivated in casual sexual encounters, then it is unlikely that gender differences in sexual motives explain larger gender differences in evaluations of booty calls and one-night stands than casual dating. An alternative explanation involves the social desirability of these different types of relationships across gender. Women report greater social pressure than men to limit their sexual interactions to committed romantic relationships (Allison & Risman, 2013; Weaver, Claybourn, & MacKeigan, 2013). Thus, casual dating may be more satisfying for women than men because it holds a greater perceived possibility of a romantic commitment and, therefore, fewer potential social sanctions. Similarly, women may label a positive CSRE as casual dating after the fact if they associate positive experiences with romantic relationships.

FWB experiences were associated with more negative, but not less positive, evaluations than casual dating. One possible explanation is that this finding reflects the tension between friendship and sexual components of FWB experiences. Although the familiarity and trust between partners that tend to characterize FWB (Bisson & Levine, 2009; Erlandsson, Nordvall, Öhman, & Häggström-Nordin, 2012) may make some aspects of FWB -on average- as positive as casual dating relationships, relationship uncertainty or difficulty navigating both friendship and sexual components of the relationship may introduce challenges (Bisson & Levine, 2009). However, the limited power afforded by our small sample, and the fact that sexual behavior interactions reduced the statistical significance of this finding, highlight the need for additional research to further investigate evaluations of FWB experiences.

Findings regarding positive and negative evaluations of different CSREs may have implications for health and relationship education efforts related to CSREs. Because booty calls/one-night stands were evaluated more negatively than casual dating, particularly for women, sex and relationship educators interested in preventing negative outcomes of sexual experiences may consider targeting individuals who engage in booty calls and one-night stands. In addition, these programs may consider the role of gender in outcomes of CSREs. Our finding that the difference between evaluations of casual dating and booty calls/one-night stands was greater for women than men suggests that women may have different expectations of CSREs, and therefore may have different prevention needs.

Educators developing sexual and relationship education programs should also consider the role of alcohol in explaining positive and negative evaluations of CSREs. Consistent with past research (Lewis et al., 2012), we found that alcohol use was associated with more negative evaluations. However, in contrast to previous findings (Lewis et al., 2012), alcohol had no association with positive evaluations. Furthermore, alcohol use did not explain the associations between CSRE type and evaluations. Thus, the attributes of FWB and booty calls/one-night stands appear to contribute uniquely to negative evaluations of these CSRE types, and alcohol reduction strategies may not be sufficient to reduce negative evaluations of FWB and booty calls/one-night stands. Given that alcohol-focused prevention programs show mixed effectiveness in reducing negative short-term emotional outcomes of sexual experiences (Croom et al., 2009; Lewis et al., 2014; Patrick, Lee, & Neighbors, 2014), prevention programs that include information about the potential outcomes of specific types of CSREs and teach skills to improve sexual outcomes may be more effective at reducing negative sexual outcomes of CSREs than alcohol-based prevention programs are.

Future Plans

Our finding regarding romantic relationship plans challenges claims that many emerging adults use CSREs as a means to form romantic relationships (Garcia & Reiber, 2008; Mongeau et al., 2011; Owen & Fincham, 2012) by demonstrating that this desire varies substantially across CSRE types. Individuals who experienced booty calls/one-night stands reported little interest in transitioning to romantic relationships with their partners. Although this desire was moderate among individuals with FWB, it was strongest for individuals with casual dating partners. These findings may partially reflect differences in the definitions of

various CSRE types, with booty calls and one-night stands often defined as excluding plans for a future relationship (Cubbins & Tanfer, 2000; Jonason et al., 2009; Jonason, 2013; Wentland & Reissing, 2011; Wentland & Reissing, 2014), and casual dating inherently including the possibility of a romantic relationship. However, past research findings have shown that “no-strings-attached” sexual encounters do not prevent individuals from hoping for romantic relationships to develop from their CSREs (Garcia & Reiber, 2008; Grello et al., 2006), suggesting that our findings cannot be completely explained by differences in the definitions of these relationships. It appears that, if romantic relationships emerge from CSREs, it is most likely that they will stem from casual dating relationships, not FWB or booty calls/one-night stands. In the future, researchers may consider categorizing participants’ sexual experiences based on the characteristics of the experiences (e.g., emotional connection), rather than self-labeled CSRE type, in order to help explain why different types of CSREs are evaluated in distinct ways.

In contrast to CSRE type differences in romantic relationship plans, individuals with FWB and booty calls/one-night stands did not differ from individuals with casual dating partners in their plans for future CSREs in general. Notably, general future plans were low across all CSRE types. Thus, regardless of partner type, individuals were not highly interested in engaging in many future casual sexual relationships. This finding is consistent with past research finding that emerging adults engage in CSREs relatively infrequently—for example, one study found that, among college students who had engaged in CSREs in the past year, the median number of CSRE partners was three for men and one for women (Owen & Fincham, 2011).

Findings about associations between CSREs and short-term evaluations have implications for understanding CSREs’ role in sexual and relationship development. Despite positive evaluations of FWB and casual dating, these CSREs do not seem to be positively reinforcing. Even individuals with casual dating partners, who tended to evaluate their experiences positively, showed little interest in having additional similar experiences. This finding supports the idea that although experiencing a CSRE at some point may be a normative emerging adult experience, individuals do not aspire to have frequent casual sex, suggesting that emerging adults do not prioritize CSREs as valuable or important sexual experiences. Perhaps, consistent with past research (Fielder et al., 2013; Siebenbruner, 2013), individuals prefer to engage in sexual behavior in the context of committed romantic relationships. Future research should examine how short-term outcomes such as hopes for a romantic relationship or future plans for sexual encounters translate into actual relationship choices.

Limitations and Future Directions

The small sample size, recruitment around drinking holidays, and short-term nature of this study limit the conclusions that can be drawn and provide directions for future research. The small sample size of this study limited our ability to detect differences between CSRE types. Furthermore, because of the small sample (and consequently limited power for some of our analyses), we must be cautious in interpreting gender and sexual behavior interactions. Future research should further examine gender and sexual behavior differences in outcomes

of diverse CSREs and the possible mechanisms explaining these differences. In addition, partially due to sample size limitations, we combined booty calls and one-night stands in our analyses. Future research should explore differences between booty calls and one-night stands in larger samples because booty calls may be recurring whereas one-night stands typically occur only once.

We chose to recruit participants before holidays that are associated with heavy drinking and partying (Halloween and St. Patrick's Day) to capitalize on the possibility that participants drank and/or engaged in a CSRE. However, the unique characteristics of these holidays mean that they are not representative sampling occasions for either college students or non-college-attending emerging adults. Therefore, it is important that future studies replicate our findings during other weeks of the year.

This paper used a between-person comparison of CSRE types. It is impossible to rule out the possibility that differences in the evaluations and future plans of people with distinct CSRE types are due to unmeasured differences between individuals. For example, individuals with casual dating partners may be more intimacy-driven in general, which would explain both why they chose to have a casual dating partner and why they reported more interest in pursuing a romantic relationship than participants with less intimate CSREs. In order to rule out such confounding factors, longitudinal research should address how within-person differences in partner type are associated with short-term outcomes.

The data presented here represent a snapshot of emerging adults' CSRE experiences, which introduces the possibility of alternative explanations for our findings. CSRE labels and CSRE evaluations may influence one another. For example, individuals may be more likely to label their CSRE as a casual dating relationship if they perceive the possibility of a romantic relationship after the fact. In addition, labeling a CSRE as a casual dating relationship may influence how individuals view the future of their relationship because the definition of casual dating includes the possibility of a romantic relationship. Furthermore, the nature of CSRE relationships is likely to change over time (VanderDrift, Lehmler, & Kelly, 2012), leading to changes in evaluations, future plans, and relationship definitions. To better understand the role of CSREs in sexual and relationship trajectories, future research should examine how continued CSRE interactions shape these outcomes.

Finally, it is impossible to tell whether the short-term evaluations we assessed will correspond to depression, self-esteem, or future relationship choices. For example, feelings about a sexual encounter may fade, maintain, or become stronger over time. Additionally, it is unknown whether short-term evaluations will translate into changes in mental health, or whether short-term future plans will translate into relationship transitions or continued involvement in CSREs. Two key next steps are to (a) measure how CSRE type is associated with long-term outcomes and (b) link short-term outcomes of sexual encounters to long-term outcomes.

Although the present research was limited by the short-term nature of the study, the findings of this research are strengthened by the daily diary data collection strategy. Whereas many studies of CSREs rely on retrospective reports weeks or months after a sexual encounter, our

data collection strategy limited recall bias and therefore may have produced more accurate evaluations and future intentions (McAuliffe, DiFranceisco, & Reed, 2007).

A second innovative feature of this paper is its sample, which includes both college students and non-college-attending emerging adults. Researchers have called for studies of sexuality in emerging adults to include more non-college samples in order to improve the generalizability of results (Claxton & van Dulmen, 2013). We found that the college sample reported less positive evaluations, more negative evaluations, and less desire for future CSREs in general, compared to non-college-attending emerging adults. However, we did not find that college attendance moderated the associations of CSRE type with evaluations and future plans. Our results suggest that CSREs are experienced differently by college students than other emerging adults. Future research should continue to measure differences between college students and non-college-attending emerging adults.

Conclusion

The present research advances understandings of the differences between CSRE types and how they may correspond to evaluations and future plans after sexual encounters. Casual dating emerged as more rewarding than booty calls/one-night stands. Educators developing sex and relationship education programs should account for these differences when deciding whom to target in interventions and how to design intervention content. Additionally, individuals with casual dating partners expressed the most interest in forming a romantic relationship with their current partner; however, across all types of CSREs, individuals showed little interest in having casual sex in the future. These findings support calls for additional research to examine the processes by which different types of CSREs are associated with different evaluations, and how future plans after CSREs correspond to future behavior.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Institute on Drug Abuse grants T32 DA017629, P50 DA10075, and P50 DA039838 awarded to the Pennsylvania State University, the Judie Lasser Graduate Psychology Research Award and the Kent State University Applied Psychology Center Research Award.

References

- Allison R, Risman BJ. A double standard for “hooking up”: How far have we come toward gender equality? *Social Science Research*. 2013; 42:1191–1206. [PubMed: 23859725]
- Armstrong HL, Reissing ED. Women’s motivations to have sex in casual and committed relationships with male and female partners. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2015; 44:921–934. [PubMed: 25567073]
- Arnett JJ. Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*. 2000; 55:469–480. [PubMed: 10842426]
- Asparouhov T, Muthén B. Exploratory structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*. 2009; 16:397–438.
- Bersamin MM, Zamboanga BL, Schwartz SJ, Donnellan MB, Hudson M, Weisskirch RS, Caraway SJ. Risky business: Is there an association between casual sex and mental health among emerging adults? *Journal of Sex Research*. 2014; 51:43–51. [PubMed: 23742031]
- Bisson MA, Levine TR. Negotiating a friends with benefits relationship. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2009; 38:66–73. [PubMed: 17851750]

- Bogle K. Hooking up: Sex, dating, and relationships on campus. New York: New York University Press; 2008.
- Bolger N, Davis A, Rafaeli E. Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2003; 54:579–616.
- Bradshaw C, Kahn AS, Saville BK. To hook up or date: Which gender benefits? *Sex Roles*. 2010; 62:661–669.
- Braithwaite SR, Fincham FD. A randomized clinical trial of a computer based preventive intervention: replication and extension of ePREP. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2009; 23:32–37. [PubMed: 19203157]
- Browne MW. An overview of analytic rotation in exploratory factor analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*. 2001; 36:111–150.
- Campbell A. The morning after the night before: Affective reactions to one-night stands among mated and unmated women and men. *Human Nature*. 2008; 19:157–173. [PubMed: 26181462]
- Carter AC, Brandon KO, Goldman MS. The college and noncollege experience: a review of the factors that influence drinking behavior in young adulthood. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 2010; 71:742–750. [PubMed: 20731981]
- Claxton SE, van Dulmen MH. Casual sexual relationships and experiences in emerging adulthood. *Emerging Adulthood*. 2013; 1:138–150.
- Cooper ML, Shapiro CM, Powers AM. Motivations for sex and risky sexual behavior among adolescents and young adults: A functional perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1998; 75:1528–1558. [PubMed: 9914665]
- Croom K, Lewis D, Marchell T, Lesser ML, Reyna VF, Kubicki-Bedford L, Staiano-Coico L. Impact of an online alcohol education course on behavior and harm for incoming first-year college students: Short-term evaluation of a randomized trial. *Journal of American College Health*. 2009; 57:445–454. [PubMed: 19114384]
- Cubbins LA, Tanfer K. The influence of gender on sex: A study of men's and women's self-reported high-risk sex behavior. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2000; 29:229–257. [PubMed: 10992980]
- DeLuca HK, Claxton SE, Baker EA, van Dulmen MH. I get by with a little help from my friends: Examining the peer context of satisfaction with casual sexual relationships and experiences. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*. 2015; 12:565–578.
- Eisenberg ME, Ackard DM, Resnick MD, Neumark-Sztainer D. Casual sex and psychological health among young adults: Is having “friends with benefits” emotionally damaging? Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health. 2009; 41:231–237. [PubMed: 20444178]
- Erlandsson K, Nordvall CJ, Öhman A, Häggström-Nordin E. Qualitative interviews with adolescents about “friends-with-benefits” relationships. *Public Health Nursing*. 2013; 30:47–57. [PubMed: 23294387]
- Eshbaugh EM, Gute G. Hookups and sexual regret among college women. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 2008; 148:77–89. [PubMed: 18476484]
- Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang AG, Buchner A. G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*. 2007; 39:175–191. [PubMed: 17695343]
- Faul F, Erdfelder E, Buchner A, Lang AG. Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*. 2009; 41:1149–1160. [PubMed: 19897823]
- Fielder RL, Carey MP. Predictors and consequences of sexual “hookups” among college students: A short-term prospective study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2010; 39:1105–1119. [PubMed: 19130207]
- Fielder RL, Carey KB, Carey MP. Are hookups replacing romantic relationships? A longitudinal study of first-year female college students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2013; 52:657–659. [PubMed: 23298995]
- Fielder RL, Walsh JL, Carey KB, Carey MP. Sexual hookups and adverse health outcomes: A longitudinal study of first-year college women. *The Journal of Sex Research*. 2014; 51:131–144. [PubMed: 24350600]

- Freitas D. The end of sex: How hookup culture is leaving a generation unhappy, sexually unfulfilled, and confused about intimacy. New York: Basic Books; 2013.
- Furman W, Shaffer L. Romantic partners, friends, friends with benefits, and casual acquaintances as sexual partners. *Journal of Sex Research*. 2011; 48:554–564. [PubMed: 21128155]
- Garcia JR, Reiber C. Hook-up behavior: A biopsychosocial perspective. *Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology*. 2008; 2:192–208.
- Garcia JR, Reiber C, Massey SG, Merriwether AM. Sexual hookup culture: A review. *Review of General Psychology*. 2012; 16:161–176. [PubMed: 23559846]
- Glenn N, Marquardt E. Hooking up, hanging out, and hoping for Mr. Right: College women on dating and mating today. New York: Institute for American Values; 2001.
- Grello CM, Welsh DP, Harper MS. No strings attached: The nature of casual sex in college students. *Journal of Sex Research*. 2006; 43:255–267. [PubMed: 17599248]
- Heldman C, Wade L. Hook-up culture: Setting a new research agenda. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. 2010; 7:323–333.
- Hughes M, Morrison K, Asada KJK. What's love got to do with it? Exploring the impact of maintenance rules, love attitudes, and network support on friends with benefits relationships. *Western Journal of Communication*. 2005; 69:49–66.
- Jonason PK. Four functions for four relationships: Consensus definitions of university students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2013; 42:1407–1414. [PubMed: 24217952]
- Jonason PK, Li NP, Cason MJ. The “booty call”: A compromise between men's and women's ideal mating strategies. *Journal of Sex Research*. 2009; 46:460–470. [PubMed: 19253133]
- Jonason PK, Li NP, Richardson J. Positioning the booty-call relationship on the spectrum of relationships: Sexual but more emotional than one-night stands. *Journal of Sex Research*. 2011; 48:486–495. [PubMed: 20672215]
- Lanz M, Tagliabue S. Do I really need someone in order to become an adult? Romantic relationships during emerging adulthood in Italy. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 2007; 22:531–549.
- Lehmiller JJ, VanderDrift LE, Kelly JR. Sex differences in approaching friends with benefits relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*. 2011; 48:275–284. [PubMed: 20336576]
- Lewis MA, Granato H, Blayney JA, Lostutter TW, Kilmer JR. Predictors of hooking up sexual behaviors and emotional reactions among US college students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2012; 41:1219–1229. [PubMed: 21796484]
- Lewis MA, Patrick ME, Litt DM, Atkins DC, Kim T, Blayney JA, Larimer ME. Randomized controlled trial of a web-delivered personalized normative feedback intervention to reduce alcohol-related risky sexual behavior among college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2014; 82:429–440. [PubMed: 24491076]
- Lyons HA, Manning WD, Longmore MA, Giordano PC. Young adult casual sexual behavior: Life-course-specific motivations and consequences. *Sociological Perspectives*. 2014; 57:79–101. [PubMed: 25013267]
- Manning WD, Giordano PC, Longmore MA. Hooking up: The relationship contexts of “nonrelationship” sex. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 2006; 21:459–483.
- Manning WD, Longmore MA, Giordano PC. Adolescents' involvement in non-romantic sexual activity. *Social Science Research*. 2005; 34:384–407.
- Manthos M, Owen J, Fincham FD. A new perspective on hooking up among college students: Sexual behavior as a function of distinct groups. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 2014; 31:815–829.
- McAuliffe TL, DiFranceisco W, Reed BR. Effects of question format and collection mode on the accuracy of retrospective surveys of health risk behavior: A comparison with daily sexual activity diaries. *Health Psychology*. 2007; 26:60–67. [PubMed: 17209698]
- Meston CM, Buss DM. Why humans have sex. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2007; 36:477–507. [PubMed: 17610060]
- Monahan KC, Lee JM. Adolescent sexual activity: Links between relational context and depressive symptoms. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 2008; 37:917–927.

- Mongeau PA, Jacobsen J, Donnerstein C. Defining dates and first date goals: Generalizing from undergraduates to single adults. *Communication Research*. 2007; 34:526–547.
- Mongeau PA, Knight K, Williams J, Eden J, Shaw C. Identifying and explicating variation among friends with benefits relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*. 2011; 50:37–47. [PubMed: 22046972]
- Mongeau PA, Serewicz MCM, Therrien LF. Goals for cross-sex first dates: Identification, measurement, and the influence of contextual factors. *Communication Monographs*. 2004; 71:121–147.
- Owen J, Fincham FD. Young adults' emotional reactions after hooking up encounters. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2011; 40:321–330. [PubMed: 20809375]
- Owen J, Fincham F. Friends with benefits relationships as a start to exclusive romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 2012; 29:982–996.
- Owen J, Quirk K, Fincham F. Toward a more complete understanding of reactions to hooking up among college women. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*. 2014; 40:396–409. [PubMed: 23905685]
- Owen JJ, Rhoades GK, Stanley SM, Fincham FD. "Hooking up" among college students: Demographic and psychosocial correlates. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2010; 39:653–663. [PubMed: 18839300]
- Paik A. The contexts of sexual involvement and concurrent sexual partnerships. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*. 2010; 42:33–42. [PubMed: 20415883]
- Patrick ME, Lee CM, Neighbors C. Web-based intervention to change perceived norms of college student alcohol use and sexual behavior on Spring Break. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2014; 39:600–606. [PubMed: 24333038]
- Paul EL, Hayes KA. The casualties of 'casual' sex: A qualitative exploration of the phenomenology of college students' hookups. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 2002; 19:639–661.
- Paul EL, McManus B, Hayes A. "Hookups": Characteristics and correlates of college students' spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *Journal of Sex Research*. 2000; 37:76–88.
- Sandberg-Thoma SE, Kamp Dush CM. Casual sexual relationships and mental health in adolescence and emerging adulthood. *Journal of Sex Research*. 2014; 51:121–130. [PubMed: 24168063]
- Schindler I, Fagundes CP, Murdock KW. Predictors of romantic relationship formation: Attachment style, prior relationships, and dating goals. *Personal Relationships*. 2010; 17:97–105.
- Shulman S, Connolly J. The challenge of romantic relationships in emerging adulthood: Reconceptualization of the field. *Emerging Adulthood*. 2013; 1:27–39.
- Siebenbruner J. Are college students replacing dating and romantic relationships with hooking up? *Journal of College Student Development*. 2013; 54:433–438.
- Snapp S, Ryu E, Kerr J. The upside to hooking up: College students' positive hookup experiences. *International Journal of Sexual Health*. 2015; 27:43–56.
- Stinson RD. Hooking up in young adulthood: A review of factors influencing the sexual behavior of college students. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy*. 2010; 24:98–115.
- Strokoff J, Owen J, Fincham FD. Diverse reactions to hooking up among US university students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2015; 44:935–943. [PubMed: 24872187]
- Townsend JM, Wasserman TH. Sexual hookups among college students: Sex differences in emotional reactions. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2011; 40:1173–1181. [PubMed: 21975920]
- Vanderdrift LE, Lehmiller JJ, Kelly JR. Commitment in friends with benefits relationships: Implications for relational and safe-sex outcomes. *Personal Relationships*. 2012; 19:1–13.
- Vasilenko SA, Lefkowitz ES, Maggs JL. Short-term positive and negative consequences of sex based on daily reports among college students. *Journal of Sex Research*. 2012; 49:558–569. [PubMed: 21707408]
- Ven TV, Beck J. Getting drunk and hooking up: An exploratory study of the relationship between alcohol intoxication and casual coupling in a university sample. *Sociological Spectrum*. 2009; 29:626–648.
- Vrangalova Z, Ong AD. Who benefits from casual sex? The moderating role of sociosexuality. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. 2014; 5:883–891.

- Weaver AD, Claybourn M, MacKeigan KL. Evaluations of friends-with-benefits relationship scenarios: Is there evidence of a sexual double standard? *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*. 2013; 22:152–159.
- Wentland JJ, Reissing ED. Taking casual sex not too casually: Exploring definitions of casual sexual relationships. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*. 2011; 20:75–91.
- Wentland JJ, Reissing E. Casual sexual relationships: Identifying definitions for one night stands, booty calls, fuck buddies, and friends with benefits. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*. 2014; 23:167–177.
- Wesche R, Lefkowitz ES, Vasilenko SA. Latent classes of sexual behaviors: Prevalence, predictors and consequences. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. 2017; 14:100–111. DOI: 10.1007/s13178-016-0228-y [PubMed: 28163800]

Figure 1.
CSRE Type Interactions with Gender and Sexual Behavior Type

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics by CSRE Type

	Casual dating Mean (SD)	FWB Mean (SD)	Booty call/one-night stand Mean (SD)	F statistic
Positive evaluations	3.81 (0.87)	3.94 (0.77)	3.46 (1.04)	4.02**
Negative evaluations	1.29 (0.50)	1.49 (0.65)	1.89 (0.89)	9.17***
Romantic relationship plans	4.24 (1.03)	3.56 (1.16)	2.64 (1.49)	20.41***
General future plans	2.20 (0.84)	2.31 (0.85)	2.80 (1.03)	5.51**

Table 2

Regression Results Predicting Evaluations and Future Plans from CSRE Type (N = 192)

	Positive evaluations			Negative evaluations			Romantic relationship plans			General future plans		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
R-squared	.20	.23	.26	.21	.23	.25	.21	.23	.26	.20	.20	.20
Change in R-squared	.03 ^{***}	.03 [*]	.03 [*]	.02 ⁺	.02 ⁺	.02 ⁺	.02	.02	.03 [*]	<.01	<.01	<.01
<i>F</i>	7.65 ^{***}	6.70 ^{***}	6.26 ^{***}	8.12 ^{***}	6.83 ^{***}	6.16 ^{***}	8.33 ^{***}	6.82 ^{***}	6.51 ^{***}	7.68 ^{***}	5.76 ^{***}	4.57 ^{***}
Standardized beta												
Had FWB	.02	-.01	.03	.16 [*]	.17 [*]	.20	-.27 ^{***}	-.32 ^{**}	-.19	.02	.04	.03
Had booty call/one-night stand	-.16 [*]	-.27 ^{**}	-.10	.23 ^{**}	.34 ^{***}	.21 ⁺	-.42 ^{***}	-.47 ^{***}	-.27 [*]	.12	.12	.10
Male (1) or female (0)	.04	-.21	-.23 ⁺	.11	.29 [*]	.32 [*]	<-.01	-.27 ⁺	-.34 [*]	.29 ^{***}	.36 [*]	.37 [*]
Average number of drinks on days with sexual activity	-.01	<-.01	<-.01	.19 ^{**}	.19 [*]	.18 [*]	-.14 ⁺	-.14 ⁺	-.14 [*]	.14 ⁺	.14 ⁺	.14 ⁺
Sexual behavior type	.26 ^{***}	.25 ^{***}	.40 ^{**}	-.18 ^{**}	-.17 [*]	-.23 [*]	.10	.11 ⁺	.33 ^{**}	-.16 [*]	-.16 [*]	-.19
College (1) or online (0) sample	-.30 ^{***}	-.29 ^{***}	-.33 ^{***}	.17 [*]	.16 [*]	.18 [*]	-.07	-.07	-.11	-.14 [*]	-.13 ⁺	-.13 ⁺
Gender [*] FWB	.18	.22	.22	-.10	-.10	-.13	.25 ⁺	.25 ⁺	.30 [*]	-.08	-.09	-.09
Gender [*] Booty call/one-night stand	.31 [*]	.39 ^{**}	.39 ^{**}	-.26 [*]	-.26 [*]	-.32 [*]	.21 ⁺	.21 ⁺	.30 [*]	-.03 ⁺	-.04	-.04
Sexual Behavior Type [*] FWB		-.10	-.10			-.02			-.24		.03	.03
Sexual Behavior Type [*] Booty call/one-night stand			-.30 ^{**}			.24 [*]			-.33 ^{**}		.03	.03

⁺ $p < .10$.^{*} $p < .05$.^{**} $p < .01$.^{***} $p < .001$.