Published in final edited form as:

J Am Coll Health. 2018 ; 66(8): 739–746. doi:10.1080/07448481.2018.1440571.

Examining the influence of gender and sexual motivation in college hookups

Jessica A. Blayney, M.A.^a, Melissa A. Lewis, Ph.D.^b, Debra Kaysen, Ph.D.^b, and Jennifer P. Read, Ph.D.^a

^aDepartment of Psychology, SUNY – University at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York, USA

^bDepartment of Psychiatry, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA

Abstract

Objective—Hooking up is common in college, and has been linked to heavy drinking. Hookups have positive as well as negative consequences, and thus the motivations for hooking up are complex. Yet, little research has focused on these motivations. The present study examined the role that gender and drinking patterns play in the relationship between sexual motivation and penetrative hookups.

Participants—Heavy drinking college students ($N = 396$) completed online surveys between September/October 2009.

Method—Sexual motivation, alcohol, and hooking up were assessed.

Results—Enhancement motives and drinking frequency predicted more frequent oral and vaginal sex when hooking up, while peer and partner motives predicted anal sex. Men endorsed greater enhancement motives, peer motives, and hookup oral and vaginal sex. For men, coping motives predicted oral and vaginal sex and peer motives predicted anal sex.

Conclusions—Results provide greater insight into the reasons why college students engage in penetrative hookups.

Keywords

College students; gender differences; hooking up; sexual behaviors; sexual motivation

Hooking up in college

“Hooking up” is a sexual encounter between two people who are not in a committed relationship that can include anything from kissing to having sex.^{1–5} Hooking up is ubiquitous on U.S. college campuses, with prevalence estimates ranging from 53–76% of students who have hooked up.⁶ As such, these sexual encounters have drawn much research attention over the past several years. Gender differences have been noted in some studies, with women reporting fewer hookups, fewer hookup partners, and a preference for

traditional dating over hooking up.⁷⁻⁹ Hookups often occur under the influence of alcohol,^{4,10} and in fact, heavier drinkers are more likely to have penetrative sex when hooking up.^{10,11} This is important because approximately half of college students do not use condoms during penetrative hookups,^{2,4} and penetrative hookups can place young adults at risk for sexually transmitted infections and/or unwanted pregnancy. Yet despite the potential risks, many college students report positive consequences from hooking up,¹²⁻¹⁵ suggesting that there are rewards – not just risks – associated with these sexual encounters. These rewards likely motivate hook up behavior. Thus, investigations into the factors that motivate men and women to hook up are needed as such information could improve our understanding of this increasingly normative sexual behavior in college students.

Sexual motivation and other risky sexual behavior

Functionalist perspectives posit that individuals use sexual behavior to meet a variety of psychological needs.¹⁶ For some, these needs may encourage riskier sexual practices. Cooper et al. identified six motivations (“motives”) typically endorsed by young adults as reasons for having sex.¹⁶ These included enhancement (e.g., for the thrill of it), intimacy (e.g., to feel closer to a sexual partner), coping (e.g., to deal with negative emotions), self-affirmation (e.g., to bolster one’s sense of self), partner (e.g., to please one’s partner), and peer reasons (e.g., to gain peer approval). Despite the prevalence of risky sexual behavior among college students, there have been surprisingly few studies examining sexual motives in this population. From the limited studies conducted, findings suggest that college students commonly have sex for enhancement and intimacy reasons.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Relative to college women, college men tend to report higher overall motivations for sex, with the exception of intimacy.¹⁶ Other studies have found college men to be higher specifically in enhancement and coping motives compared to college women.^{18,19}

Data from college and non-college samples of young adults suggest that enhancement and coping motives may be especially important to understanding risky sexual behavior, as these motives have been linked to a greater number of sexual partners and sexual consequences.^{16,18,20} Other motives may serve a protective function. For instance, intimacy motives predict fewer sexual partners and more contraceptive use,^{16,18} while self-affirmation, partner, and peer motives have been linked to less overall sexual experience.¹⁶ Within the studies reviewed, the focus has been largely on vaginal sex. As noted, hooking up includes a range of penetrative sexual experiences, including oral and anal sex, which are also associated with sexual risk, but have been less well examined. Not everyone who typically hooks up will engage in vaginal sex and so investigating the psychological needs that motivate a range of sexual experiences (oral, vaginal, anal sex) can broaden our understanding of hooking up in college.

Sexual motivation and hooking up

Surprisingly few studies have examined the reasons why college students hook up. Studies in this area suggest that men report greater sexual motivation for hooking up,²¹ including higher enhancement and peer motives.¹⁴ Central to these studies, the focus has been on predictors of sexual motives among those who hook up (i.e., gender, attachment style)^{14,21}

rather than how sexual motives predict hooking up sexual behavior. The latter is an important area to study as men often endorse greater sexual motives including enhancement and coping,^{16,18,19} and these motives have been linked to riskier sexual behavior (i.e., greater sexual partners, sexual consequences).^{16,18} Examining gender differences in sexual motives may provide greater insight into why men in particular may be more drawn to casual sexual encounters like hooking up.

Hooking up among heavier drinkers

Approximately 60% of college students drink alcohol, and of those, roughly 40% engage in heavy episodic drinking (4+/5+ drinks in one occasion for women/men).²² Heavier drinkers are more likely to hookup, report a greater number of hookup partners, and are more likely to have penetrative sex when hooking up.^{10,11} Alcohol may help facilitate hooking up sexual behavior, but it can also increase risk for sexual and emotional consequences.^{4,12,23} To our knowledge, no studies have examined how typical drinking may influence the relationship between sexual motivation, gender, and hooking up sexual behavior. It seems plausible that heavier and more frequent drinkers, especially men higher in enhancement and coping motives, would be more likely to engage in a range of penetrative hooking up sexual behaviors. However, this has yet to be empirically tested.

The present study

Despite the prevalence of hooking up in college, little is known about why college students hook up. The purpose of the present study was to address this gap by examining (1) the associations between sexual motives and the frequency of penetrative hooking up sexual behaviors (oral, vaginal, and anal sex) and (2) whether these associations varied by gender (primary aim) and drinking patterns (exploratory aim). Based on the existing literature, we hypothesized that (1) men would report greater enhancement, coping, self-affirmation, partner, and peer motives, while women would report greater intimacy motives, (2) enhancement and coping motives would be positively associated with a greater frequency of penetrative hooking up sexual behaviors, while intimacy, self-affirmation, partner, and peer motives would be negatively associated, and (3) gender would moderate these associations such that enhancement and coping motives would be more strongly associated with a greater frequency of penetrative hooking up sexual behaviors for men in particular. Finally, as an exploratory aim, we were interested in how drinking patterns may impact these relationships. We hypothesized that drinking frequency would further moderate the associations, such that men who were more frequent drinkers would show the strongest associations between enhancement and coping motives and penetrative hooking up sexual behaviors. Given the association between penetrative sexual behaviors and higher risk of sex-related negative consequences, we chose to focus our analyses on these specific hooking up behaviors.

Method

Participants and procedures

The present study was drawn from a larger longitudinal intervention study on alcohol use and risky sexual behavior in college students.²⁴ A total of 3,224 randomly selected undergraduates ages 18–25 were invited to participate in the web-based study. The number invited was based on a calculated percentage aimed to fulfill the larger study's recruitment goals. Student names and contact information were first acquired from the University's Registrar Office. Students were mailed and then e-mailed an invitation to take part in a 20-minute screening survey. Upon logging in, participants were shown an information statement. A total of 1,468 (56% women) agreed to participate and 1,387 (56% women) completed the screening survey. Eligibility criteria for the larger study included: (1) having sex in the past year, (2) typically having sex with the opposite sex, and (3) consuming 4+/5+ drinks in one occasion for women/men at least once in the past month. Eligible participants ($n = 575$) were invited to the 45-minute baseline survey. Participants were compensated with \$10 for screening and \$15 for baseline. All procedures were approved by the University's Institutional Review Board.

Given our focus on hooking up, the present study was comprised of 396 college students (60% female) who reported hooking up at some point in their lifetime. We operationalized hooking up as "*an event where you were physically intimate (any of the following: kissing, sexual touching, oral sex, vaginal sex, anal sex) with someone whom you were not dating or in a romantic relationship with at the time and in which you understood there was no mutual expectation of a romantic commitment.*" Analyses were conducted using screening and baseline data (data completed prior to the intervention).²⁴ The ethnic composition included 71% ($n = 281$) White, 12% ($n = 46$) Asian, 10% ($n = 40$) multi-racial, and 7% ($n = 29$) as 'other.' In addition, 5% of the sample ($n = 20$) also identified as Hispanic. The mean age of participants was 20.12 years old ($SD = 1.48$). More than half of the sample (59%) were not in a monogamous relationship and 97% identified as heterosexual. Participants reported drinking an average of 2.36 days ($SD = 1.56$) and consuming an average of 14.17 drinks ($SD = 11.14$) in a typical week during the past three months.

Measures

Alcohol use and hooking up was assessed at screening, while sexual motives were assessed at baseline. Throughout the surveys, sex was defined for participants as oral, penile-vaginal, or penile-anal intercourse.

Drinking frequency—The Daily Drinking Questionnaire (DDQ)²⁵ was used to assess drinking frequency in the past three months. First, participants were asked to report the number of typical drinks they consumed each day in an average week (i.e., a typical Monday, Tuesday, etc). Next, days where any drinking occurred were dichotomized (0 = *no*, 1 = *yes*) and then summed to reflect typical drinking frequency (possible range = 0–7 days).

Hookup behaviors—After the hooking up definition was presented, participants were asked many partners they had hooked up with and how many times they had hooked up in

the past three months. Responses options were open-ended. Participants were then asked how often they typically engaged in a variety of sexual behaviors when hooking up. The specific sexual behaviors inquired about were kissing, sexual touching, oral sex, vaginal sex, and anal sex, with response options ranging from 1 = *never* to 5 = *always*. Given our interest in the sexual behaviors associated with greater risk (i.e., penetrative sex), we limited our investigation of hooking up to oral, vaginal, and anal sex.

Sexual motivation—The Sexual Motives Scale (SMS)¹⁶ is a 29-item questionnaire that was used to assess the reasons why participants generally have sex. As noted, sex was defined throughout the surveys as oral, penile-vaginal, and penile-anal intercourse. The SMS consists of six subscales: (1) enhancement ($\alpha = .82$; “*having sex for the thrill of it*”), (2) intimacy ($\alpha = .87$; “*having sex to feel emotionally closer*”), (3) self-affirmation ($\alpha = .90$; “*having sex to feel more self-confident*”), (4) coping ($\alpha = .88$; “*having sex to cheer yourself up*”), (5) partner approval ($\alpha = .87$; “*having sex out of worry your partner won’t want you if you don’t have sex*”), and (6) peer approval ($\alpha = .89$; “*having sex because your friends are having sex*”). Response options ranged from 1 = *never/almost never* to 5 = *almost always/always*. Subscale scores were calculated by taking the mean of the items included.

Results

Data analytic plan

In this sample of heavy drinking college students, we were interested in examining (1) the associations between sexual motives and the frequency of penetrative hooking up sexual behavior and (2) whether these associations were moderated by gender (primary aim) and drinking frequency (exploratory aim). First, a MANOVA was run to determine whether there were significant gender differences across study variables. Second, hierarchical multiple regressions were run to evaluate the frequency of oral, vaginal, and anal sex during a hookup as a function of sexual motives, gender, and drinking frequency. Preliminary models revealed no significant interactions with drinking frequency and so these interactions were dropped to reduce model complexity. Still, given the co-occurrence between alcohol use and risky sexual behavior, including hooking up,^{4,26} we retained drinking frequency as a predictor in the final models. Sidak’s alpha adjustment was used to reduce the risk of Type I error and significant results were based on the adjusted $\alpha = .017$.

Descriptive information

Table 1 provides the means, standard deviations, and ranges for study variables. On average, participants hooked up 5.48 times ($SD = 10.47$) with 1.72 partners ($SD = 2.27$) in the past three months. Across the sample, oral and vaginal sex occurred more frequently during a hookup than anal sex.

Gender differences

Our first hypothesis was that men would report greater enhancement, coping, self-affirmation, partner, and peer motives, while women would report greater intimacy motives. MANOVA results (see Table 1) revealed significant gender differences among study

variables. Post-hoc t-tests found that men reported higher enhancement and peer motives as well as more frequent oral and vaginal sex when hooking up.

Associations between gender, sexual motives, and hookup behaviors

The second hypothesis was that enhancement and coping motives would be positively associated with a greater frequency of penetrative hooking up sexual behaviors, while intimacy, self-affirmation, partner, and peer motives would be negatively associated with these behavioral outcomes. Table 2 provides zero-order correlations. For women, enhancement and self-affirmation were positively associated with the frequency of oral sex when hooking up. Only enhancement motives were associated with vaginal sex and no motives were associated with anal sex. For men, coping motives were positively associated with oral and anal sex and there was a trend for vaginal sex when hooking up. Partner and peer motives were also positively associated with hooking up anal sex. Drinking frequency was positively correlated with hookup oral and vaginal sex for women and with hookup vaginal and anal sex for men.

Gender as a moderator for motive-behavior associations

Next, we examined whether the associations between sexual motives and the frequency of penetrative hooking up sexual behaviors were moderated by gender. The third hypothesis was that enhancement and coping motives would be more strongly associated with a greater frequency of penetrative hooking up sexual behaviors for men. For regression analyses, main effects for sexual motives, gender, and drinking frequency were entered at Step 1 and then two-way interactions (Gender X Sexual Motives) were entered at Step 2. All predictors were mean centered and significant interactions were examined with tests of simple slopes.^{27,28} Significant interactions are presented as the predicted cell means, which were derived from the regression equation with higher and lower values represented as one standard deviation above and below the centered means.^{24,25}

Hookup oral sex (Table 3)—Sexual motives, gender, and drinking frequency accounted for a small proportion of variance ($R^2 = .16$) in the frequency of oral sex when hooking up. Enhancement motives, male gender, and drinking frequency were positively associated with oral sex at Step 1. The results at Step 2 revealed a significant interaction between coping motives and gender (see Figure 1, Panel A). Simple slopes tests indicated that coping motives were positively associated with the frequency of oral sex for men ($\beta = .29, p = .004$), but not women ($\beta = -.12, p = .19$).

Hookup vaginal sex (Table 4)—Similar to oral sex, sexual motives, gender, and drinking frequency accounted for a small proportion of variance ($R^2 = .10$) in the frequency of vaginal sex when hooking up. Enhancement motives, male gender, and drinking frequency were positively associated with vaginal sex at Step 1. Step 2 results revealed a significant interaction between coping motives and gender (Figure 1, Panel B) and a trend for enhancement motives and gender. Follow up analyses suggested that (a) coping motives were positively associated with the frequency of vaginal sex for men ($\beta = .28, p = .007$), but not women ($\beta = -.06, p = .54$) and (b) a trend for enhancement motives to be negatively

associated with the frequency of vaginal sex for women ($\beta = -.27, p < .001$), but not men ($\beta = .02, p = .80$).

Hookup anal sex (Table 5)—Sexual motives, gender, and drinking frequency accounted for a small proportion of variance ($R^2 = .14$) in the frequency of anal sex when hooking up. At Step 1, partner motives and peer motives were positively associated with anal sex. We also noted a trend for drinking frequency and anal sex. A significant interaction between partner motives and gender was noted at Step 2 (Figure 1, Panel C). Follow up indicated that partner motives were positively associated with the frequency of anal sex for men ($\beta = .22, p < .001$), but not women ($\beta = .06, p = .44$).

Comment

Functionalist perspectives posit that individuals use sexual behavior to meet a variety of psychological needs.¹⁶ Hooking up has become increasingly normative in college, yet few studies have looked at the factors that motivate college students to hook up. The present study examined how sexual motives were associated with the frequency of penetrative hooking up sexual behaviors (oral, vaginal, and anal sex) and whether gender moderated these associations. Findings revealed enhancement motives were associated with more frequent oral and vaginal sex when hooking up, while peer and partner motives were associated with anal sex. Gender differences were also noted in sexual motives and hooking up. Relative to women, men reported higher enhancement and peer motives as well as more frequent hookup oral and vaginal sex. For men in particular, coping motives were associated with more frequent oral and vaginal sex and peer motives were associated with more frequent anal sex when hooking up.

In our sample of heavy drinking college students, drinking frequency was a largely consistent predictor of penetrative hooking up sexual behaviors (oral and vaginal sex, with a trend for anal sex). Our findings, as well as the findings of others, suggests that alcohol plays an important role in hooking up,^{4,5,29} which may have implications for sexual assault risk. For heavier and more frequent drinkers, alcohol may facilitate sexual interactions with less familiar hookup partners (i.e., acquaintances, strangers). At the same time, more frequent drinkers, particularly those who drink prior to sex, may be inadvertently placing themselves at risk for unwanted sexual experiences, including sexual assault.³⁰ Given that we did not find any two- or three-way interactions with drinking frequency in preliminary models, our results suggest that the frequency in which college students drink uniquely influences the frequency of penetrative sex when hooking up.

In this study, we also found that greater enhancement motives predicted more frequent oral and vaginal sex when hooking up. From a functionalist perspective, this would suggest that in the context of hooking up, oral and vaginal sex can provide some with a means for achieving excitement, positive emotions, and positive consequences. Indeed, many college students report positive emotions following hooking up,^{4,12,14} which likely reinforces engaging in these sexual behaviors with hookup partners. Although anal sex was a lower base rate behavior, students appeared more driven by partner and peer motives when having anal sex during a hookup. These ‘aversive social motives’ focus on using sex to avoid

rejection from one's partner and/or peers.¹⁶ Thus, more frequent anal sex when hooking up may allow some a way of gaining approval from salient others. Other studies have linked partner and peer motives to less intercourse frequency,¹⁶ although these studies did not examine aversive social motives in relation to specific penetrative sexual behaviors (i.e., oral, vaginal, anal sex). Our findings add to this growing literature by highlighting the complexities of what motivates college drinkers to engage in a range of hooking up sexual behaviors.

Consistent with our hypotheses, coping motives were positively associated with penetrative hooking up sexual behavior (i.e., oral and vaginal sex), particularly for men. Coping motives typically reflect using sexual behavior to cope with threats to self-esteem or feelings of sadness, stress, or loneliness.¹⁵ These results are consistent with Patrick and Lee,¹⁸ who also found gender differences in coping motives, particularly in more sexually inexperienced men. Perhaps these college men are more likely to engage in frequent oral and vaginal sex while hooking up in order to deal with negative affect in response to life stressors (i.e., work, school) or societal pressures (i.e., gaining sexual experience, avoiding self-esteem threats). Bancroft et al.³¹ found that men who have sex when they are depressed are likely to do so for intimacy and self-validation reasons, while anxious men have sex in hopes of achieve a calming effect.³² Our findings suggest that coping motives are a particularly important reason for engaging in oral and vaginal sex during a hookup for heavy drinking college men.

Given the lack of expectations for commitment between hookup partners, we expected partner and peer motives to be negatively associated with hooking up. Surprisingly, we found the opposite; greater partner motives were associated with more frequent anal sex during a hook up for men, but not women. For those high in partner motives, the goal of sexual behavior is often to satisfy the needs of the sexual partner as a way of avoiding rejection. In other studies, partner motives have been linked to less sexual experience and riskier sexual decisions.^{16,33} Given the low base rate of anal sex in this sample, future research is needed to replicate this finding and the implications of other-focused motives for anal sex when hooking up.

Clinical implications

Hooking up is prevalent on college campuses and is associated with both risks and rewards for those who engage in it.^{2,4,12,14,23,34,35} Thus, understanding the reasons why college students are drawn to more casual sexual encounters like hooking up is important for risk prevention programs. Knowledge of how penetrative hooking up sexual behavior meets particular psychological needs may inform the types of strategies that could improve prevention efforts. This may include interventions aimed at increasing intimacy motives or decreasing other-focused motives (partner, peer), especially if these motives are associated with riskier sexual decision-making when hooking up (i.e., less condom use). For men high in coping motives, identifying alternative means for handling negative affect may be beneficial in decreasing the reliance on casual sexual encounters for mood or stress regulation.

Limitations and future directions

Our sample was comprised of heterosexual heavy drinkers. Future research is needed to explore sexual motivation for hooking up in sexual minority men and women as well as in non-drinkers. In this study, we used the Sexual Motives Scale (SMS), a reliable and valid measure of sexual motivation. More recently, a measure of hooking up motives was developed (Hookup Motives Questionnaire; HMQ),³⁶ which borrows largely from the Drinking Motives Questionnaire.³⁷ Conceptually, and in at least one empirical study, motivation profiles comparing drinking and sexual motivation have been found to differentially predict behavior (i.e., drinking motivations predicting alcohol outcomes, sexual motivations predicting sexual outcomes).³⁷ Future work should explore the relationship between the HMQ and SMS in terms of predictive validity for hooking up sexual behavior. Given the cross-sectional nature of the data, we cannot make inferences about temporal ordering. Although it is logical to examine how sex motives predict hookup behaviors, it may also be the case that one's hooking up experience (and sexual history more generally) impacts their sexual motives. Thus, future research using longitudinal designs is needed to determine the temporal direction and changes in sexual motives and hooking up over time. This study also did not look at sexual consequences associated with hooking up. Future studies using ecological momentary assessment can provide a more fine-grained examination of whether and how sexual motives predict hookups and sexual consequences.

Acknowledgments

Data collection and manuscript preparation were supported by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Grant K01AA016966 awarded to M. A. Lewis.

Funding

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (K01AA016966).

References

1. Bogle, K. Hooking up: Sex, Dating, and Relationships on Campus. New York, NY, US: New York University Press; 2008.
2. Fielder R, Carey M. Predictors and consequences of sexual 'hookups' among college students: a short-term prospective study. Arch Sex Behav. 2010; 39:1105–1119. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-008-9448-4 [PubMed: 19130207]
3. Lewis M, Atkins D, Blayney J, Dent D, Kaysen D. What is hooking up? Examining definitions of hooking up in relation to behavior and normative perceptions. J Sex Res. 2013; 50:757–766. DOI: 10.1080/00224499.2012.706333 [PubMed: 23057805]
4. Lewis M, Granato H, Blayney J, Lostutter T, Kilmer J. Predictors of hooking up sexual behaviors and emotional reactions among U.S. College students. Arch Sex Behav. 2012; 41:1219–1229. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-011-9817-2 [PubMed: 21796484]
5. Owen J, Rhoades G, Stanley S, Fincham F. 'Hooking up' among college students: demographic and psychosocial correlates. Arch Sex Behav. 2010; 39:653–663. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-008-9414-1 [PubMed: 18839300]
6. Stinson R. Hooking up in young adulthood: a review of factors influencing the sexual behavior of college students. J Coll Student Psychother. 2010; 24:98–115. DOI: 10.1080/87568220903558596
7. Bradshaw C, Kahn A, Saville B. To hook up or date: which gender benefits? Sex Roles. 2010; 62:661–669. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-010-9765-7

8. Garneau C, Olmstead S, Pasley K, Fincham F. The role of family structure and attachment in college student hookups. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2013; 42:1473–1486. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-013-0118-9 [PubMed: 23733154]
9. Katz J, Schneider M. Casual hook up sex during the first year of college: prospective associations with attitudes about sex and love relationships. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2013; 42:1451–1462. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-013-0078-0 [PubMed: 23519593]
10. Thomson Ross L, Zeigler S, Kolak A, Epstein D. Sexual hookups and alcohol consumption among African American and Caucasian college students: a pilot study. *J Psychol: Interdiscipl and Appl*. 2015; 149:582–600. DOI: 10.1080/00223980.2014.946461
11. Paul E, McManus B, Hayes A. 'Hookups': characteristics and correlates of college students' spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *J Sex Res*. 2000; 37:76–88. DOI: 10.1080/00224490009552023
12. Owen J, Fincham F. Young adults' emotional reactions after hooking up encounters. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2011; 40:321–330. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-010-9652-x [PubMed: 20809375]
13. Shepardson R, Walsh J, Carey K, Carey M. Benefits of hooking up: Self-reports from first-year college women. *Int J Sex Health*. 2016; 28:216–220. DOI: 10.1080/19317611.2016.1178677 [PubMed: 28243341]
14. Snapp S, Ryu E, Kerr J. The upside to hooking up: college students' positive hookup experiences. *Int J Sex Health*. 2015; 27:43–56. DOI: 10.1080/19317611.2014.939247
15. Strokoff J, Owen J, Fincham F. Diverse reactions to hooking up among U.S. university students. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2015; 44:935–943. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-014-0299-x [PubMed: 24872187]
16. Cooper M, Shapiro C, Powers A. Motivations for sex and risky sexual behavior among adolescents and young adults: a functional perspective. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1998; 75:1528–1558. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.75.6.1528 [PubMed: 9914665]
17. Grossbard J, Lee C, Neighbors C, Hendershot C, Larimer M. Alcohol and risky sex in athletes and nonathletes: what roles do sex motives play? *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 2007; 68:566–574. DOI: 10.15288/jsad.2007.68.566 [PubMed: 17568962]
18. Patrick M, Maggs J, Cooper M, Lee C. Measurement of motivations for and against sexual behavior. *Assessment*. 2011; 18:502–516. DOI: 10.1177/1073191110372298 [PubMed: 20581394]
19. Patrick M, Lee C. Sexual motivations and engagement in sexual behavior during the transition to college. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2010; 39:674–681. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-008-9435-9 [PubMed: 19067151]
20. Brown J, Talley A, Littlefield A, Gause N. Young women's alcohol expectancies for sexual risk-taking mediate the link between sexual enhancement motives and condomless sex when drinking. *J Behav Med*. 2016; 39:925–930. DOI: 10.1007/s10865-016-9760-8 [PubMed: 27342615]
21. Kenney S, Thadani V, Ghaidarov T, LaBrie J. First-year college women's motivations for hooking up: a mixed-methods examination of normative peer perceptions and personal hookup participation. *Int J Sex Health*. 2013; 25:212–224. DOI: 10.1080/19317611.2013.786010 [PubMed: 25705322]
22. Flack W, Daubman K, Stine E, et al. Risk factors and consequences of unwanted sex among university students: Hooking up, alcohol, and stress response. *J Interpers Violence*. 2007; 22:139–157. DOI: 10.1177/0886260506295354 [PubMed: 17202573]
23. Citation removed for peer review process
24. Collins R, Parks G, Marlatt G. Social determinants of alcohol consumption: the effects of social interaction and model status on the self-administration of alcohol. *J Consult Clin Psych*. 1985; 53:189–200. DOI: 10.1037/0022-006X.53.2.189
25. Howells N, Orcutt H. Diary study of sexual risk taking, alcohol use, and strategies for reducing negative affect in female college students. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 2014; 75:399–403. DOI: 10.15288/jsad.2014.75.399 [PubMed: 24766751]
26. Aiken, L, West, S. *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions* [e-book]. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc; 1991.
27. Cohen, J, Cohen, P, West, S, Aiken, L. *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis For The Behavioral Sciences*. 3. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers; 2003. e-book

28. Fielder R, Walsh J, Carey K, Carey M. Predictors of sexual hookups: a theory-based, prospective study of first-year college women. *Arch Sex Behav.* 2013; 42:1425–1441. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-013-0106-0 [PubMed: 23657811]
29. Bird E, Gilmore A, George W, Lewis M. The role of social drinking factors in the relationship between incapacitated sexual assault and drinking before sexual activity. *Addict Behav.* 2016; 52:28–33. DOI: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.08.001 [PubMed: 26348279]
30. Bancroft J, Janssen E, Strong D, Carnes L, Vukadinovic Z, Long J. The relation between mood and sexuality in heterosexual men. *Arch Sex Behav.* 2003; 32:217–230. DOI: 10.1023/A:1023409516739 [PubMed: 12807294]
31. Folkman S, Chesney M, Pollack L, Phillips C. Stress, coping, and high-risk sexual behavior. *Health Psychol.* 1992; 11:218–222. DOI: 10.1037/0278-6133.11.4.218 [PubMed: 1396489]
32. Harlow L, Quina K, Morokoff P, Rose J, Grimley D. HIV risk in women: a multifaceted model. *J Appl Biobehav Res.* 1993; 1:3–38. DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-9861.1993.tb00025.x
33. Eshbaugh E, Gute G. Hookups and sexual regret among college women. *J Soc Psychol.* 2008; 148:77–89. DOI: 10.3200/SOCP.148.1.77-90 [PubMed: 18476484]
34. Littleton H, Tabernik H, Canales E, Backstrom T. Risky situation or harmless fun? A qualitative examination of college women's bad hook-up and rape scripts. *Sex Roles.* 2009; 60:793–804. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-009-9586-8
35. Kenney S, Lac A, Hummer J, LaBrie J. Development and validation of the Hookup Motives Questionnaire (HMQ). *Psychol Assessment.* 2014; 26:1127–1137. DOI: 10.1037/a0037131
36. Cooper M. Motivations for alcohol use among adolescents: development and validation of a four-factor model. *Psychol Assessment.* 1994; 6:117–128. DOI: 10.1037/1040-3590.6.2.117
37. Patrick M, Maggs J. Profiles of motivations for alcohol use and sexual behavior among first-year university students. *J Adolescence.* 2010; 33:755–765.

Figure 1.
Interactions between gender and sexual motives.

Table 1

Means and standard deviations by gender.

Variable	Total				<i>F</i>
	<i>M (SD)</i>	Actual Range	Women <i>M (SD)</i>	Men <i>M (SD)</i>	
Drinking frequency	2.38 (1.56)	0–7	2.23 (1.54)	2.60 (1.56)	$F(1, 393) = 5.24^{\dagger}$
Number of hookups (past 3 months)	5.48 (10.47)	0–50	5.06 (9.93)	6.09 (11.23)	$F(1, 393) = 0.91$
Number of hookup partners (past 3 months)	1.72 (2.27)	0–10	1.56 (2.03)	1.94 (2.57)	$F(1, 393) = 2.65$
Enhancement motives	3.95 (0.86)	1–5	3.84 (0.87)	4.12 (0.84)	$F(1, 393) = 10.36^{***}$
Intimacy motives	3.47 (0.99)	1–5	3.55 (0.98)	3.34 (0.98)	$F(1, 393) = 4.24$
Self-affirmation motives	2.01 (1.01)	1–5	1.94 (0.96)	2.13 (1.07)	$F(1, 393) = 3.39$
Coping motives	1.57 (0.77)	1–5	1.53 (0.73)	1.62 (0.82)	$F(1, 393) = 1.16$
Partner motives	1.25 (0.56)	1–5	1.25 (0.52)	1.26 (0.61)	$F(1, 393) = 0.01$
Peer motives	1.17 (0.51)	1–5	1.06 (0.19)	1.33 (0.74)	$F(1, 393) = 28.33^{***}$
Frequency of hookup oral sex	1.75 (1.06)	0–4	1.48 (1.00)	2.16 (1.01)	$F(1, 393) = 43.02^{***}$
Frequency of hookup vaginal sex	1.81 (1.26)	0–4	1.59 (1.26)	2.13 (1.18)	$F(1, 393) = 18.12^{***}$
Frequency of hookup anal sex	0.18 (0.57)	0–4	0.15 (0.53)	0.23 (0.62)	$F(1, 393) = 2.19$

Note. *N*s for men ranged from 158 to 160 due to missing data. For all analyses, we used Sidak's alpha adjustment for significance testing. $^{\dagger} p = .02$ to $.03$ * $p < .017$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Table 2

Zero-order correlations by gender.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Drinking frequency	—	0.12	0.01	0.12	0.30 ^{***}	0.10	0.13	0.19 ^{***}	0.16 [*]	0.06
2. Enhancement motives	0.04	—	0.37 ^{***}	0.18 ^{**}	0.14 [†]	−0.15 [†]	0.10	0.21 ^{***}	0.23 ^{***}	0.03
3. Intimacy motives	−0.09	0.40 ^{***}	—	0.14 [†]	0.10	−0.01	0.05	−0.01	0.02	−0.05
4. Self-affirmation motives	0.10	0.40 ^{***}	0.18 [†]	—	0.69 ^{***}	0.41 ^{***}	0.39 ^{***}	0.16 [*]	0.05	0.03
5. Coping motives	0.06	0.24 ^{**}	0.21 ^{**}	0.69 ^{***}	—	0.39 ^{***}	0.36 ^{***}	0.10	0.05	0.06
6. Partner motives	0.18 [†]	0.09	0.14	0.47 ^{***}	0.44 ^{***}	—	0.34 ^{***}	0.08	0.05	0.07
7. Peer motives	0.11	0.18 [†]	0.10	0.62 ^{***}	0.61 ^{***}	0.69 ^{***}	—	0.13	0.03	0.07
8. Frequency of hookup oral sex	0.11	0.13	−0.02	0.15	0.22 ^{**}	0.03	0.03	—	.45 ^{***}	.31 ^{***}
9. Frequency of hookup vaginal sex	0.20 ^{**}	0.02	−0.05	0.06	0.18 [†]	0.03	0.03	0.58 ^{***}	—	.22 ^{***}
10. Frequency of hookup anal sex	0.26 ^{***}	0.01	−0.03	0.16	0.23 ^{**}	0.52 ^{***}	0.41 ^{***}	0.19 [*]	0.20 ^{**}	—

Note. *N*s ranged from 158 to 160 for men due to missing data. Correlations for women are displayed in bold on the upper half of the diagonal and correlations for men are shown on the lower half of the diagonal.

[†] $p = .02$ to $.03$

^{*} $p < .017$

^{**} $p < .01$

^{***} $p < .001$.

Table 3

Sexual motives and the frequency of hookup oral sex.

	Variable	B	SE B	β	p value	R ²
Step 1	Drinking frequency	0.08	0.03	0.12 [*]	.016	0.15
	Gender	0.59	0.11	0.28 ^{**}	<.000	
	Enhancement motives	0.21	0.07	0.17 ^{**}	.002	
	Intimacy motives	-0.10	0.06	-0.09	.068	
	Self-affirmation motives	0.08	0.07	0.08	.250	
	Coping motives	0.10	0.09	0.07	.295	
	Partner motives	0.04	0.11	0.02	.689	
Step 2	Peer motives	-0.14	0.13	-0.07	.272	
	Gender × Enhancement motives	-0.12	0.14	-0.05	.381	0.16
	Gender × Intimacy motives	0.01	0.11	0.01	.967	
	Gender × Self-affirmation motives	-0.15	0.15	-0.07	.308	
	Gender × Coping motives	0.56	0.19	0.20 ^{**}	.003	
	Gender × Partner motives	-0.11	0.23	-0.03	.630	
	Gender × Peer motives	-0.61	0.43	-0.16	.154	

Note: N = 394

^{*} $p < .017$ ^{**} $p < .01$.

Table 4

Sexual motives and the frequency of hookup vaginal sex.

	Variable	B	SE B	β	p value	R ²
Step 1	Drinking frequency	0.12	0.04	0.14 ^{***}	.004	0.08
	Gender	0.44	0.13	0.17 ^{***}	.001	
	Enhancement motives	0.25	0.08	0.17 ^{***}	.002	
	Intimacy motives	-0.09	0.07	-0.07	.182	
	Self-affirmation motives	-0.08	0.09	-0.06	.377	
	Coping motives	0.17	0.11	0.11	.132	
	Partner motives	0.10	0.14	0.04	.468	
	Peer motives	-0.14	0.16	-0.06	.386	
	Gender $\times$ Enhancement motives	-0.36	0.17	-0.12 [†]	.032	0.10
	Gender $\times$ Intimacy motives	-0.01	0.14	-0.00	.968	
Step 2	Gender $\times$ Self-affirmation motives	-0.10	0.18	-0.04	.590	
	Gender $\times$ Coping motives	0.56	0.23	0.17 [*]	.016	
	Gender $\times$ Partner motives	-0.26	0.28	-0.06	.358	
	Gender $\times$ Peer motives	-0.01	0.52	-0.00	.992	

Note: $N = 395$.[†] $p = .02$ to $.03$ ^{*} $p < .017$ ^{**} $p < .01$ ^{***} $p < .001$.

Table 5

Sexual motives and the frequency of hookup anal sex.

	Variable	B	SE B	β	p value	R ²
Step 1	Drinking frequency	0.04	0.02	0.10 [†]	.036	0.12
	Gender	-0.01	0.06	-0.01	.947	
	Enhancement motives	0.03	0.04	0.05	.401	
	Intimacy motives	-0.04	0.03	-0.07	.214	
	Self-affirmation motives	-0.08	0.04	-0.14	.041	
	Coping motives	0.02	0.05	0.03	.673	
	Partner motives	0.21	0.06	0.21 ^{***}	< .000	
	Peer motives	0.26	0.07	0.23 ^{***}	< .000	
Step 2	Gender × Enhancement motives	0.00	0.08	0.01	.987	0.14
	Gender × Intimacy motives	-0.03	0.06	-0.03	.634	
	Gender × Self-affirmation motives	-0.11	0.08	-0.10	.162	
	Gender × Coping motives	0.05	0.10	0.04	.596	
	Gender × Partner motives	0.40	0.12	0.20 ^{***}	.001	
	Gender × Peer motives	0.01	0.23	-0.01	.963	

Note: N = 393

[†] p = .02 to .03^{***} p < .001.