

Gender and Ethnicity in Dating, Hanging Out, and Hooking Up: Sexual Scripts Among Hispanic and White Young Adults

Asia A. Eaton

Department of Psychology, Florida International University

Suzanna M. Rose

Department of Psychology, Florida International University

Camille Interligi

Department of Psychology, Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Katherine Fernandez

Department of Psychology, Nova Southeastern University

Maureen McHugh

Department of Psychology, Florida International University

We examined the scripts associated with heterosexual Hispanic and White young adults' most recent initial sexual or romantic encounter using two samples of heterosexual undergraduates: 224 Hispanic students (49% female) and 316 White students (51% female). Scripts were identified for three types of encounters: dating, hanging out, and hooking up. The three scripts had more than half of their actions in common. Items such as get to know one another, feel aroused, and engage in physical contact were present across all scripts for all participant groups. As expected, traditional gender roles were present within all scripts, but more so for dates than for hangouts and hookups. Men reported a higher presence of traditional gender roles than women across scripts and put a higher priority on the goal of physical intimacy across all scripts. Dating was the most prevalent script for all young adults, contradicting contemporary claims that "dating is dead." In terms of ethnicity, a higher proportion of Hispanic than White young adults went on dates, and a higher proportion of White students went on hookups, implying that social and contextual variables are important in understanding young adults' intimate relationships.

For nearly a century, dating was the most common way young heterosexual adults in the United States pursued romance and relationships (Cate & Lloyd, 1992). Dates evolved from 19th-century courtship practices (Bailey, 1988) and are more recently understood as highly scripted social engagements that involve unchaperoned interactions between a woman and man to explore romantic potential (Cate & Lloyd, 1992; Mongeau, Serewicz, & Therrien, 2004). Hookups, or casual sexual interactions, have been described as the new norm for sexual behavior among college students, presumably replacing dating (Bogle, 2008; Garcia, Reiber, Massey, & Merriwether, 2012). Hookups involve sexual behavior among uncommitted

partners, though the extent of sexual behavior on hookups varies widely from kissing to sexual intercourse (Bogle, 2008; Fielder & Carey 2010; Reiber & Garcia, 2010). Hanging out is another way young adults get together romantically in place of dating, defined as when "women and men spend loosely organized, undefined time together, without making their interest in one another explicit" (Glenn & Marquardt, 2001, p. 5).

Sexual scripts such as dates, hookups, and hangouts are cognitive schema that describe and prescribe interpersonal behavior in sexual situations (Masters, Casey, Wells, & Morison, 2013; Simon & Gagnon, 1986). These scripts outline the ordered actions and events that typically and should occur during an encounter, much like a written script for a dramatic play (Schank & Abelson, 1977; Tomkins, 1987). Extensive research has shown that the dating script, especially for first dates, is well established, highly structured, and gender typed (for a review, see Eaton &

Correspondence should be addressed to Asia A. Eaton, Department of Psychology, Florida International University, 11200 SW 8th St., DM 208, Miami, FL 33199. E-mail: aeaton@fiu.edu

Rose, 2011). Both men and women agree that the man is expected to be active and assertive and the woman is expected to be deferential and sexually enticing.

On a date, the man is supposed to pick up the woman, pay for date expenses, initiate physical contact, and otherwise determine the pace and components of the date (e.g., Morr Serewicz & Gale, 2008; Rose & Frieze, 1989, 1993). The woman is not expected to initiate any actions and instead decides only whether the man's actions are acceptable by rejecting or approving his advances. These expectations appear to influence men's and women's actual dating behavior, which illustrate men as the more active partner (Eaton & Rose, 2012).

A few studies have also examined the hanging out script using both qualitative work and script methodology (Eaton & Rose, 2012; Glenn & Marquardt, 2001); the hookup script has also been examined using qualitative methods (e.g., Epstein, Calzo, Smiler, & Ward, 2009). However, no research has assessed the hookup script using cognitive script methodology. The scripts for hanging out and hooking up are presumably less structured than dates in terms of the number of prescribed actions and have fewer gender-typed expectations (Eaton & Rose, 2012). Two studies comparing dating and hangout scripts found that hangouts involved less planning than dates and were less constrained by gender roles, though they were just as structured as the date script in terms of the number of script actions (Eaton & Rose, 2012). In addition, even though gender-typed actions were less frequent for hangouts, men more often than women regarded themselves as the initiator of actions.

The first intent in the present study was to determine empirically how a hookup script compared with the date and hangout scripts. Although script methodology has not yet been used to study hookups, Bogle (2008) has offered a summary of a hookup encounter based on qualitative work. She described a typical hookup as occurring at the end of a night of hanging out with a large group of friends when either the man or the woman initiates a nonverbal cue to express interest in pairing off. If interest in hooking up is mutual, the two decide where to go. Alcohol is said to play a central role in the hookup, and each partner usually pays for his or her own drinks or activity costs. Some sexual behavior, ranging from kissing to sexual intercourse, occurs. There is no expectation of the relationship continuing. The relationship returns to whatever it was prior to the hookup (Bogle, 2008, pp. 29–44). Similarly, other researchers have defined hookups as sexual encounters “usually lasting one night, between two people who are strangers or brief acquaintances” that “may or may not include sexual intercourse” (Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000, p. 79). Hookups are assumed to involve a sexual experience of some sort, but there is no consensus about the specific behaviors involved (Oster, 2015). In sum, it appears that hookups are similar to hangouts in that they are less gender typed and more spontaneous and casual than dates but involve more sexual intimacy than hangouts or dates.

Script methodology, in which participants are asked to recall and report the events of their most recent initial romantic encounter, was used to determine the number and type of actions in a hookup compared to a date or hangout for heterosexual college men and women (Abelson, 1981; Simon & Gagnon, 1986). Assessments using self-report on Likert-type scales were also used to compare these encounters along dimensions often used in research on dates, including measures of satisfaction and goals (e.g., Mongeau, Jacobsen, & Donnerstein, 2007; Mongeau et al., 2004).

In addition to examining the content, structure, and gender typing of the hookup script compared to date and hangout scripts, we wanted to clarify the prevalence of these three sexual scripts among young adults. As mentioned earlier, many studies portray hookups as being highly normalized on college campuses (Bogle, 2008; England, Shafer, & Fogarty, 2007; Reid, Elliott, & Webber, 2011), even claiming that hookups “have largely replaced heterosexual dating on campus” (Stinson, Levy, & Alt, 2014, p. 59). In support of this assertion, one study of undergraduate students found that both men and women had nearly twice as many hookups as first dates (Bradshaw, Kahn, & Saville, 2010).

Other research, however, has found that the sexual behavior of college students over the past 25 years has not changed substantially (Monto & Carey, 2014). Specifically, Monto and Carey (2014) found that college students in 1988–1996 did not report having more sexual partners or more frequent sex than students from 2004–2012. Additional work has found that dates remain the most common form of romantic interaction on college campuses (Eaton & Rose, 2012). Finally, although most college students have hooked up and report high levels of acceptance of uncommitted sex (Garcia et al., 2012; Paul et al., 2000), young adults also overestimate others' comfort with hookups (Lambert, Kahn, & Apple, 2003; Reiber & Garcia, 2010) and the frequency with which others are hooking up (Holman & Sillars, 2012).

A final consideration that has often been overlooked in previous research is how ethnicity affects young adults' sexual scripts. Indeed, one reason for the seeming contradiction in the prevalence of college students' sexual scripts may be that the rate of each encounter type differs across ethnic groups (Eaton & Rose, 2012; Owen, Fincham, & Moore, 2011; Paul et al., 2000). In White college populations, hooking up does appear to be popular. Studies find that most White students have hooked up at least once in the past year (e.g., Owen, Rhoades, Stanley, & Fincham, 2010), with the median number of annual hookups being two or three (Owen et al., 2011) and the mean being about 10 (Paul et al., 2000). The differences in mean and median numbers of hookups reported in the literature may result from a number of factors, including differences in the researchers' definitions of a hookup, sample differences, methodological decisions (e.g., the inclusion or exclusion of outliers), and skewedness of the data. For example, Owen and colleagues (2010) found that 48% of their total sample reported that they had never hooked up and that the skewedness of the

response distributions varied according to participant ethnicity.

The most common sexual script for Hispanic college students, however, appears to be the traditional date (Eaton & Rose, 2012). In one investigation, 63% of Hispanic college students across two separate studies reported that their most recent initial romantic encounter was a date, and only 8% reported that it was a hookup (Eaton & Rose, 2012). A significant difference in the popularity of a hookup versus a date across racial and ethnic groups has been documented previously. Owen and colleagues (2010) found that Hispanic, African American, and Asian American students from two large public universities were less likely to hook up than were White students.

Research on dating, sex, and romance in Hispanic American populations has often pointed to the influence of traditional gender roles in shaping relationship norms and behaviors. Specifically, Hispanic Americans have been described as holding strong beliefs about heteronormativity, male dominance, and female submissiveness in intimate partner relationships (e.g., Stephens & Eaton, 2014). Compared to other racial/ethnic groups, Hispanic Americans have more conservative gender-role ideologies (Ahrold & Meston, 2010; Keil & Christie-Mizell, 2008; Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004; Roehling, Hernandez Jarvis, & Swope, 2005), more conservative attitudes toward sexual activity, especially for women (e.g., Ahrold & Meston, 2010; Eisenman & Dantzker, 2006; Villarruel, 1998), and show less support for women's rights issues such as legalized abortion (Taylor, Lopez, Martinez, & Velasco, 2012).

Hispanics' more conservative beliefs about gender and sexuality are related to the influence of Catholicism in Hispanic culture. Indeed, the cultural ideal for Hispanic women, *marianismo*, comes from the belief in the Virgin Mary (Wamsley, 2014). Marianismo prescribes that women should embrace moral and sexual purity, warmth, and vulnerability. Men, on the other hand, are expected to embody *machismo*, which includes prescriptions to be sexually potent and dominant (Falicov, 2010; Mayo & Resnick, 1996; Torres, Solberg, & Carlstrom, 2002). However, Hispanic gender-role norms are often highly congruent with gender-role beliefs held by other racial/ethnic groups (Eisenman & Dantzker, 2006; Stephens & Eaton, 2014). Machismo and marianismo may therefore sometimes reflect differences in strength of gender-role norms within Hispanic communities rather than dramatic differences in kind or quality.

Most research on youth's initial romantic encounters has been conducted with White, heterosexual college students in a predominantly White environment (e.g., Bogle, 2008; Laner & Ventrone, 1998, 2000; Paul & Hayes, 2002). However, it is critically important to investigate and understand the sexual and gender norms, experiences, and attitudes of other ethnic minority youth as they occur within their communities (e.g., Stephens & Eaton, 2014). Research on ethnic minorities may resolve apparent contradictions in the literature on youth and emerging adult relationships. Just as

importantly, in just a few decades Whites will no longer be an ethnic majority. By 2050, nearly one-third of the U.S. population under age 20 will be Hispanic (Passel & Cohn, 2008) and 27% of the entire U.S. population will be Hispanic (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). Given that Hispanics are the fastest-growing ethnic minority population, research on the relationship norms, values, and experiences of Hispanics in particular is needed to promote healthy relationship development for future generations of children and adults. In addition, as the proportion of Hispanic youth increases, the beliefs and experiences this population brings to the table may become the new youth baseline.

The current research used identical methodologies to study Hispanic and White undergraduates, allowing for direct between-group comparisons. Studies directly comparing the sexual and romantic behavior of Hispanic and White college students are needed to accurately evaluate both within- and between-group differences. Comparisons of independent studies using Hispanics versus Whites can be problematic because different studies use different methodologies at different points in time. As such, differences across populations may merely reflect variations in methodology across studies, such as changes in question format and wording.

In summary, the aim in the present research was to investigate and compare the nature and prevalence of sexual scripts used by Hispanic and White young adults during their most recent romantic or sexual encounter. The first goal was to establish the script for each type of encounter using a script methodology following Eaton and Rose (2012) and to compare content, structure, and gender roles across script types. Our second goal was to determine the prevalence of dates, hookups, and hangouts in college populations. Our third goal was to examine how ethnicity affects young adults' sexual scripts, including script prevalence, satisfaction, and goals.

Predictions

The predictions were based on social scripting theory, gender roles, and research on Hispanic culture. For hypothesis 1 (H1), we predicted that the man would initiate more actions than the woman in each script type, congruent with gender roles requiring men to be active in romantic and sexual encounters. Along these lines, we anticipated that the more modern hangout and hookup scripts would reflect fewer gendered behaviors than dates but would still contain more male-initiated actions than female-initiated actions, especially for male participants.

Hypothesis 2 (H2) stated that dating would be more prevalent among Hispanic young adults, whereas hookups would be more common among White young adults, both in terms of their most recent initial encounter as well as for measures of lifetime hookup experience. Going on traditional dates is consistent with the tendency of Hispanic groups and families to hold more conservative

attitudes toward gender and sexuality than Whites, as well as with previous work on Hispanic college students (Eaton & Rose, 2012). For instance, Eaton and Rose (2012) found dates were the interaction of choice for most Hispanic undergraduates' most recent initial romantic encounter (72% of women and 57% of men) but that fewer had gone on hangouts (18% of women and 26% of men) or hookups (4% of women and 12% of men). The prediction that White young adults would have more experience with hookups is also consistent with research showing that hookups are an increasingly popular form of romantic and sexual interaction among White college students (e.g., Bradshaw et al., 2010).

Hypotheses 3a and 3b proposed that White compared to Hispanic young adults would be more satisfied with hookups and perceive them to be more ideal (H3a) and that men compared to women would be more satisfied with hookups and perceive them to be more ideal (H3b). In terms of the prediction about ethnicity (H3a), Eaton and Rose (2012) reported that Hispanic men and women who went on hookups were less satisfied than those who went on dates. However, hookups appear relatively normative for White young adults (e.g., Bradshaw et al., 2010). In terms of gender (H3b), men report a greater preference for casual sex than women and experience more benefits from hooking up than women do (Bradshaw et al., 2010; Herold & Mewhinney, 1993). There is also evidence that hookups are less emotionally positive for women than for men (Owen et al., 2010) and that women experience more regret than men on hookups (Eshbaugh & Gute, 2008; Fielder & Carey, 2010), especially when alcohol is involved (LaBrie, Hummer, Ghaidarov, Lac, & Kenney, 2014).

Hypotheses 4a and 4b concerned script goals. For hypothesis 4a, we predicted that the goal "find out more about the person" would be ranked more highly for a date than a hookup. Hypothesis 4b stated that the goal "to heighten a physical relationship" would be ranked more highly for a hookup than a date. These predictions were based on Mongeau and colleagues' (2004) report that, among White undergraduates, the most popular goal for a date was to "have fun," followed by (in rank order) learning about the partner to reduce uncertainty, investigating romantic potential, developing a friendship, and heightening a physical relationship. However, congruent with the idea that hookups involved uncommitted sexual contact, "to heighten a physical relationship" was expected to be ranked more highly for a hookup than a date.

For all inferential statistics in this article, we set the alpha level for significance testing at .05.

Method

Participants

Participants were 540 undergraduates: 224 heterosexual Hispanic undergraduate students (109 women, 115 men)

and 316 heterosexual White (non-Hispanic) undergraduate students (160 women, 156 men). To be eligible for the study, participants needed to answer *Yes* to the following question: "Have you ever had any romantic, sexual, or dating experience that was mutual/voluntary?" Participants in both samples were between the ages of 18 and 24.

Hispanic participants were drawn from a large, public, urban, Hispanic-serving institution (HSI; 61% Hispanic student population) in the Southeastern United States; all participants self-identified as Hispanic or Latino, and most (79%; 176/224) reported that they spoke Spanish fluently. White participants were drawn from a primarily White institution (PWI; 84% White student population) in the Northeastern United States; all participants self-identified as White. Racial/ethnic identity was assessed by asking participants to select their main race/ethnicity from one of the following categories: Native American, Asian, Black, Hispanic/Latino, White/Caucasian, multiracial, or other. Participants' mean age was 19.32 ($SD = 1.49$), with Hispanic participants being about one year older than White participants ($M = 19.86$, $SD = 1.90$, versus $M = 18.95$, $SD = .94$), $t(534) = 7.29$, $p < .001$.

Data on participants' year in school, romantic relationship status, living situation, and parents' highest education by participant race/ethnicity is found in Table 1. Notably, far more Hispanic than White students lived at home, while more White students lived in a dorm on campus or in an apartment or condo. These differences are likely due to the nature of the two institutions from which each sample was drawn. The HSI is a predominantly commuter institution and the PWI is a predominantly residential campus.

Procedure

The study took place online using Qualtrics survey software. Students were recruited via each respective university's psychology subject pool and given course credit for participation.

Measures

Sexual Scripts. The script survey was adapted from Eaton and Rose (2012). Participants were first asked to describe their most recent initial romantic (sexual) encounter. The "sexual encounter" cue option provided to half the participants was added to address the possibility that previous research using only the "romantic encounter" cue may have biased participants to only report encounters that were subjectively deemed as "romantic," possibly resulting in the underreporting of unromantic or purely sexual encounters. The complete prompt was as follows: "We are interested in all kinds of initial romantic (sexual) relationship encounters (e.g., hookups, dates, hanging out, one-night stands, etc.). More specifically, we are interested in the events which occur when going out with someone for the first time."

Table 1. Additional Demographics of Student Samples by Ethnicity

Demographic	Hispanic Participants (n = 224)	White Participants (n = 316)	Test Statistics
Year in college***			$\chi^2 = 67.3, p < .001$
1st year	41%	61%	
2nd year	20%	28%	
3rd year	22%	9%	
4th year or more	17%	2%	
Percent currently in a "committed romantic relationship"*	54%	44%	$\chi^2 = 4.80, p = .028$
Time of most recent romantic/sexual encounter			$\chi^2 = 1.91, p = .39$
Within the past 6 months	65%	66%	
6 months to 1 year ago	12%	15%	
More than 1 year ago	23%	19%	
Living arrangement***			$\chi^2 = 361.54, p < .001$
At home	84%	6%	
In a dorm on campus	4%	63%	
In an apartment or condo	8%	29%	
Mother's highest level of education ^a	$M = 4.67, SD = 2.05$	$M = 4.92, SD = 1.77$	$t(530) = 1.50, p = .14$
Father's highest level of education**	$M = 4.49, SD = 2.09$	$M = 4.91, SD = 1.81$	$t(518) = 2.43, p = .015$

^a From 1 (No high school education) to 9 (Doctoral).

*Significant at $p < .05$. ***Significant at $p < .001$.

Participants were then directed to a checklist of 68 actions and to indicate for each action if it had occurred (Yes/No/Don't know). If yes, they then were asked to indicate who performed the action (Self/Partner/Both). Five actions were combined with other actions to eliminate redundancies, resulting in 63 actions that were used in the final analyses. Participants also were asked to label the encounter using one of five terms: *Date*, *Hookup*, *One-night stand*, *Hanging out*, and *Other*, the latter of which was accompanied by a text box participants could use to give a name to their encounter that had not been included in our list. This question constituted our measure of the script type used. These specific labels were used because qualitative pretesting in this population (Eaton & Rose, 2012) indicated that these were the uniquely identifiable and familiar scripts in the Hispanic sample.

Prevalence. Experience with the various sexual scripts was assessed three different ways. First, script prevalence was assessed based on the percentage of participants labeling their most recent romantic/sexual encounter with each of five script types, *Date*, *Hookup*, *One-night stand*, *Hanging out*, and *Other*. The question prompt for this item was as follows: "Please select the term that best describes the nature of the last time you went out with someone for the first time." Second, participants were asked to rate their lifetime experience with each script type by responding to the following questions on Likert-type fully labeled scales from 1 (*None*) to 5 (*A great deal*): "How much experience have you had with (dating/hooking up/hanging out)?" Third, participants were asked to report the number of lifetime partners they had for each script type by responding to the following open-ended questions: "How many people have you (dated/hooked up with/hung out with for romantic or sexual reasons) over the course of your life?"

Satisfaction. Four items measured satisfaction. Participants were asked to specify using a 5-point scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 5 (*Extremely*): "How satisfied were you with the way the interaction was set up, including the type of events that occurred and the order in which they occurred?" and "How ideal for you was the way the interaction was set up, including the type of events that occurred and the order in which they occurred?"

Goals. Participants were asked to rank five goals for the encounter they just described from 1 (*Least important to me*) to 5 (*Most important to me*). The goals were identified by Mongeau and colleagues (2004) and included: "Have a good time," "Find out more about the person" (i.e., reduce uncertainty about the person), "See if we could go out more often" (i.e., investigate romantic potential), "Develop a friendship," and "Heighten our physical relationship."

Script Coding

The actions associated for each of the three scripts was determined separately for the four participant groups (Hispanic women, White women, Hispanic men, White men). An action had to be cited by 50% or more of participants describing that script to be included, consistent with previous work (Eaton & Rose, 2012). For example, for the action "eat" to be included in the date script for Hispanic women, 50% or more of all Hispanic women who described a date would have to select that action for it to be considered a scripted action. To determine if an action was gender typed, 50% or more of the participants in a subgroup would have to attribute that action to a particular actor(s) (i.e., the male partner or the female partner).

While the original criterion for inclusion of items in sexual scripts was prevalence of 25% in the sample (e.g.,

Laner & Ventrone, 1998; Rose & Frieze, 1993) based on cognitive script methodology (Bower, Black, & Turner, 1979), previous work used a 50% standard for the inclusion of actions and events when sexual scripts were elicited using checklists (Eaton & Rose, 2012). Klinkenberg and Rose (1994) foresaw that using a checklist format in lieu of an open-ended measure to elicit script criteria would result in a greater frequency of various actions, potentially requiring a more stringent criteria for script inclusion. The 50% (or higher) criterion is also consistent with work examining adolescents' sexual scripts, in which items were considered characteristic for a script if they were thought to occur in "most cases" (Krahé, Bieneck, & Scheinberger-Olwig, 2007), as well as with work on life scripts, which consider "high-frequency" life script events to be those that 50% or more of participants see as prototypical (Berntsen & Rubin, 2004; Koppel & Berntsen, 2014).

Results

Preliminary Analyses

The proportion of participants reporting each script type was determined first. Dates were the most common type of encounter overall (56%), followed by hangouts (25%), hookups (13%), one-night stands (4%), and other (2%). Responses of hookups and one-night stands were combined in subsequent analyses for two reasons: (a) the response rate for one-night stands was very low for all groups and (b) research has suggested that one-night stands are a specific subcategory of hookups (Jonason, 2013; Wentland & Reissing, 2011, 2014).

Responses to the "other" category were not used to develop a formal sexual script, though they were included in quantitative analyses of script frequencies. It was not possible to develop a proper script for this option due to the low rate of these encounters and the wide variability of encounters specified within this category. Of the 12 participants across samples who chose the "other" option, nine entered a name for their encounter in the free response area. Examples of free responses for this category included "limbo," "friends with benefits," "date and hookup," "relationship," and "hanging out turned into a committed relationship." However, there were never more than two "other" scripts with similar titles, so it was not feasible to create an additional coherent category of script.

Next, the effect of prompt type was examined using chi-square analyses. Prompt type (sexual versus romantic) was found to have no effect on the proportion of the script types reported for each participant group. Thus, the prompt types were combined in subsequent analyses.

Primary Analyses

Our first goal was to compare the scripts for the three main types of most recent initial encounters, including date,

hangout, and hookup. The actions included in each of the three script types, based on the 50% criterion, are shown by gender and ethnicity in Table 2. All scripts were highly structured, ranging from 35 to 49 actions that met the criterion for participants within each group. The exact percentage of participants mentioning each of the possible 63 actions and events is shown in Appendix A, including the items that did and did not meet script criterion.

A large number of actions (55%, $n = 27$) was shared across type of encounter, suggesting that dates, hangouts, and hookups had a common core script. Common actions included *ask for the outing; groom and dress; feel nervous; compliment each other; evaluate each other; engage in physical contact; feel aroused, tell other [you] had a good time; and ask for second outing*. The common actions found here also were identified in earlier research as being part of the date script (e.g., Rose & Frieze, 1989; Laner & Ventrone, 2000). This suggests that the date script provides the basic structure for both hangouts and hookups.

Hypothesis 1 was that the man would initiate more actions than the woman for each script type. This hypothesis was supported. As shown in Table 2, all participant groups saw men as initiating more activities than women on dates (5–10 versus 0–2) using the 50% cutoff criteria. When comparing the total number of date script actions assigned to men versus women for any of the 49 actions that qualified for any of the scripts, men were assigned an average of 8.31 items on dates ($SD = 5.89$) compared to an average of 3.64 for women ($SD = 3.29$), $t(302) = 11.74$, $p < .001$.

Also as expected, the man initiated more actions on hookups (from 1–7) than the woman (from 0–2) using the 50% cut off criteria. When comparing the total number of hookup script actions assigned to men versus women for any of the 49 actions that qualified for any of the scripts, men were assigned an average of 8.12 items on hookups ($SD = 5.77$) compared to an average of 2.92 for women ($SD = 3.19$), $t(92) = 7.25$, $p < .001$.

On hangouts, however, only male participants saw the man as initiating more actions than the woman. Hispanic men reported initiating 11 actions on hangouts (versus zero for their female partners) and White men reported initiating four actions on hangouts (versus zero for their female partners). Women who reported hangouts, however, did not show this pattern. Instead, they indicated comparable activity levels from each partner: Hispanic women reported initiating two hangout actions (versus two for their male partners) and White women saw themselves and their male partners as initiating one action each. When comparing the total number of hangout script actions assigned to men versus women for any of the 49 actions that qualified for any of the scripts, men were assigned an average of 6.89 items on hangouts ($SD = 5.00$) compared to an average of 4.16 for women ($SD = 3.66$), $t(131) = 4.61$, $p < .001$.

Thus, as expected, all scripts involved gender typing to some extent, with the man being responsible for initiating more actions than the woman. The actions most often attributed to men across script types and participant groups

GENDER AND ETHNICITY IN DATING

Table 2. Actions Meeting Script Criteria for Actual Dates, Hangouts, and Hookups by Gender and Ethnicity

Actions	Date				Hangout				Hookup			
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men	
	Hispanic (n = 72)	White (n = 80)	Hispanic (n = 83)	White (n = 68)	Hispanic (n = 24)	White (n = 49)	Hispanic (n = 16)	White (n = 43)	Hispanic (n = 9)	White (n = 28)	Hispanic (n = 15)	White (n = 41)
1. ASK FOR THE OUTING	♦	♦M	♦M	♦M	♦	♦M	♦M	♦M	♦M	♦M	♦	♦M
2. ACCEPT INVITATION	♦W	♦W	♦	♦	♦	♦W	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
3. DECIDE WHAT TO DO	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
4. TELL FRIENDS AND FAMILY	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
5. Discuss plans with parents	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
6. GROOM AND DRESS	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
7. FEEL NERVOUS	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦W	♦	♦M	♦	♦W	♦	♦	♦
8. CHECK/WORRY ABOUT APPEARANCE	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦W	♦	♦	♦
9. Prepare car or apartment	♦	♦	♦M	♦M	♦	♦	♦M	♦M	♦	♦	♦	♦M
10. Check Money	♦	♦	♦M	♦M	♦	♦	♦M	♦M	♦	♦	♦	♦M
11. PICK OTHER UP	♦M	♦	♦M	♦M	♦	♦	♦M	♦M	♦M	♦	♦M	♦M
12. Be early	♦	♦	♦M	♦M	♦	♦	♦M	♦M	♦M	♦	♦	♦
13. Wait for other	♦W	♦	♦M	♦	♦W	♦	♦M	♦	♦W	♦	♦	♦
14. Welcome other to home	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
15. Introduce/talk to parents/friends	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
16. Pick up friends/go to friends	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
17. Plans fall through	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
18. Redecide where to go	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
19. GET TO KNOW EACH OTHER	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
20. Figure out where stand	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
21. COMPLIMENT EACH OTHER	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
22. JOKE, TALK, LAUGH	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
23. EVALUATE EACH OTHER	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
24. Talk to friends	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦M	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
25. TRY TO IMPRESS OTHER	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
26. ATTEND EVENT	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
27. EAT	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
28. Drink alcohol	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
29. Pay	♦M	♦M	♦M	♦M	♦	♦	♦M	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦M
30. Offer to pay	♦	♦	♦M	♦	♦	♦	♦M	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦M
31. Decline other's offer to pay	♦M	♦	♦M	♦	♦	♦	♦M	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦M
32. FLIRT/SMILE/WINK	♦	♦	♦M	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
33. COURTEOUS BEHAVIOR	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
34. ENGAGE IN PHYSICAL CONTACT	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
35. FEEL AROUSED	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
36. KISS GOODNIGHT	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
37. Initiate Making out	♦M	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦
38. ACCEPT MAKING OUT	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦

(Continued)

Table 2. (Continued)

Actions	Date				Hangout				Hookup			
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men	
	Hispanic (n = 72)	White (n = 80)	Hispanic (n = 83)	White (n = 68)	Hispanic (n = 24)	White (n = 49)	Hispanic (n = 16)	White (n = 43)	Hispanic (n = 9)	White (n = 28)	Hispanic (n = 15)	White (n = 41)
39. Initiate sex												
40. Accept/have sex	♠M	♠	♠M	♠	♠	♠	♠M	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠
41. TAKE OTHER HOME/TO CAR	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠M
42. Go home/plan to leave												
43. Stay after/sleep over												
44. TELL OTHER HAD GOOD TIME	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠
45. ASK FOR ANOTHER OUTING	♠M	♠	♠M	♠	♠M	♠	♠	♠	♠M	♠	♠	♠
46. ACCEPT 2ND OUTING	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠W	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠
47. TELL OTHER WILL BE IN TOUCH	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠
48. CALL/TEXT POST-OUTING	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠
49. Report positive feelings	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠	♠
Total actions	45	42	42	43	35	43	49	41	44	41	46	49
Initiated by Man	7	2	10	5	2	1	11	4	3	1	1	7
Initiated by Woman	2	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0

Note. Actions cited by 50% or more of participants are considered script elements and are indicated within the data columns by ♠. Actions that were cited by 50% or more of participants across all scripts and groups are indicated in caps in column 1. M = 50% or more of participants indicated that the action was initiated by the man; W = 50% or more of participants indicated that the action was initiated by the woman.

included *ask for the outing; prepare car/apartment; check money; pickup/go to other; pay; decline other's offer to pay; take other home; and ask for second outing*. Only three actions were attributed to women more than once across all participants groups and script types: *accept invitation for the outing; feel nervous; and wait for other*.

Several script actions were unique to a particular script and are worth noting. First, more than 50% of Hispanic and White women reported *discussing date with parents*, making it a dating script element for women. This action was not cited by women for hangouts or hookups or by men for any script type. *Figure out where you stand* was a script element for most scripts; however, it was almost unanimous among Hispanic men who went on hangouts (93% included this item), while other groups did not show that level of agreement in their scripts (42%–77%).

The hookup script included the action *drink alcohol* for all participant groups. It also was part of the script for White men's hangouts. The action *have sex* was unique to hookups and met script criterion for White women and all men, but not for Hispanic women. In addition, Hispanic women did not cite *have good feelings* as being part of their hookups. Only 11% of Hispanic women who went on hookups reported good feelings about it, whereas *have good feelings* was part of the hookup script for the other groups.

Next, hypothesis 2 proposed that dating would be more prevalent among Hispanics than Whites, while hookups would be more common among Whites than Hispanics. The prevalence of the most recent sexual script reported by participant ethnicity and gender is shown in Table 3. Hispanic young adults most often described their most recent initial romantic encounter as a date (69%), followed by a hangout (18%), a hookup (11%), and other (2%). The prevalence of script types for White participants followed the same pattern: dates were most common (47%), followed by hangouts (29%), hookups (22%), and other (2%).

A chi-square analysis was then used to examine the proportion of script types reported by ethnicity. Ethnicity was found to significantly affect prevalence of script type based on an omnibus test, $\chi^2(3, N = 540) = 27.90, p < .001$. This was followed with a binomial test comparing the

proportion of dates versus all other scripts (dummy coded) reported by Whites versus Hispanics. This test revealed that dates were more common recent initial encounters for Hispanic than for White young adults (69% versus 47%), $\chi^2(1, N = 540) = 26.62, p < .001$. Also supporting hypothesis 2, a binomial test examining the proportion of hookup scripts reported (versus all other scripts) revealed that hookups were more often reported by White than Hispanic participants as their most recent encounter (22% versus 11%), $\chi^2(1, N = 540) = 11.37, p = .001$.

Hypothesis 2 also stated that Whites would report more hookup experience and a higher number of lifetime hookup partners than Hispanics. We examined lifetime experience with dates, hangouts, and hookups among ethnic groups using Likert-type measures assessing experience with each script and open-ended measures assessing the number of lifetime partners participants experienced each script with. A 2 (gender) \times 2 (ethnicity) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) examining all six outcome variables (lifetime experience with dates, hangouts, and hookups and partners on dates, hangouts, and hookups) revealed a number of main effects but no interactions.

As expected, White participants rated themselves as having significantly more experience with hookups than Hispanic participants using the Likert-type measure (Table 4). Men also rated themselves as having more experience with hooking up than women ($M = 3.39, SD = 1.16$ versus $M = 2.84, SD = 1.18$), $F(1, 531) = 26.64, p < .001$. Thus, our prediction about racial/ethnic differences in the number of hookup partners was not supported.

Regarding experience with hangouts, White participants reported a higher number of hangout partners than Hispanic participants (Table 4). Also, a significant effect of gender was found. Men had more partners than women for all script types, including more date partners ($M = 6.05, SD = 6.24$, versus $M = 4.90, SD = 3.56$, $F(1, 534) = 7.10, p = .008$), nearly twice as many hangout partners ($M = 10.09, SD = 11.64$ versus $M = 5.38, SD = 5.54$, $F(1, 534) = 34.12, p < .001$), and almost twice as many hookup partners ($M = 10.27, SD = 11.33$ versus $M = 5.16, SD = 5.80$), $F(1, 534) = 39.57, p < .001$.

Hypothesis 3a stated that Whites would be more satisfied with hookups and perceive them to be more ideal than Hispanics, and hypothesis 3b stated that men would be more satisfied with hookups and perceive them to be more ideal than women. Contrary to hypothesis 3a, a 2 (gender) \times 2 (ethnicity) MANOVA revealed no differences in hookup satisfaction or idealness for Hispanics compared to Whites. Hypothesis 3b was supported, however: Men were found to be more satisfied with hookups than women ($M = 3.75, SD = .98$ versus $M = 3.24, SD = 1.09$), $F(1, 89) = 5.02, p = .027$. Men also rated hookups as more ideal than women ($M = 3.32, SD = 1.08$ versus $M = 2.78, SD = .92$), $F(1, 89) = 5.70, p = .019$.

We then turned to examining script goals. For hypothesis 4a we predicted that the goal *find out more about the person*

Table 3. Proportion of Participants Reporting Type of Most Recent Romantic/Sexual Encounter by Ethnicity and Gender

Ethnicity	Gender	Date	Hangout	Hookup ^a	Other	Total n
		n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	
Hispanic	Women	72 (66)	24 (22)	9 (8)	4 (4)	109
	Men	83 (72)	16 (14)	15 (13)	1 (1)	115
	Total	155 (69)	40 (18)	24 (11)	5 (2)	224
White	Women	80 (50)	49 (30)	28 (18)	3 (2)	160
	Men	68 (44)	43 (28)	41 (26)	4 (2)	156
	Total	148 (47)	92 (29)	69 (22)	7 (2)	316
Total		303 (56)	132 (25)	93 (17)	12 (2)	540

^a The hookup category includes individuals who reported hookups as well as one-night stands.

Table 4. *Lifetime Experience With Dates, Hookups, and Hangouts by Ethnicity*

Experience	Hispanic Participants (n = 224)			White Participants (n = 316)			Test Statistics F, p
	M (SD)	Mdn	Mo	M (SD)	Mdn	Mo	
Likert-type measure of lifetime script experience ^a							
Dates	3.38 (.92)	3.00	4.00	3.40 (1.01)	3.00	3.00	.03, .85
Hookups*	2.96 (1.17)	3.00	3.00	3.22 (1.22)	3.00	4.00	6.56, .01
Hangouts	4.22 (.92)	4.00	5.00	4.31 (.75)	4.00	5.00	1.52, .22
Number of lifetime partners							
Dating partners	5.64 (4.70)	4.00	3.00	5.37 (5.39)	4.00	3.00	.31, .58
Hookup partners	7.08 (8.38)	5.00	0.00	8.17 (9.99)	5.00	3.00	2.19, .14
Hangout partners*	6.87 (8.85)	4.00	2.00	8.38 (9.79)	5.00	4.00	4.00, .046

^a Measured from 1 (*None*) to 5 (*A great deal*).

*Significant at $p < .05$.

Table 5. *Mean Rankings of Goals for the Date and Hookup Scripts by Gender*

Goals and Scripts	Women M (SD)	Men M (SD)		p	95% CI
Date script goal rankings	(n = 140)	(n = 137)	<i>F</i> (1, 275)		
Find out more about the person**	4.04 (.89)	3.64 (1.16)	10.16	.002	[-.12, -.80]
Have a good time	3.98 (1.05)	3.97 (1.16)	.001	.98	[-.38, .35]
Develop a friendship*	3.00 (1.23)	2.58 (1.38)	6.57	.011	[-1.09, -.23]
See if we could go out more often	2.54 (1.01)	2.50 (1.11)	.08	.78	[-.29, .41]
Heighten a physical relationship***	1.44 (.96)	2.30 (1.42)	32.72	< .001	[.68, 1.47]
Hookup script goal rankings	(n = 36)	(n = 50)	<i>F</i> (1, 85)		
Find out more about the person	3.42 (1.00)	3.12 (1.12)	1.61	.21	[-.76, .17]
Have a good time	4.33 (.93)	4.46 (.93)	.39	.53	[-.28, .53]
Develop a friendship***	3.31 (1.31)	2.20 (1.36)	14.36	< .001	[-1.69, -.53]
See if we could go out more often	2.39 (.90)	2.06 (.95)	.12	.73	[-.33, .48]
Heighten a physical relationship***	1.56 (1.32)	2.76 (1.46)	17.00	< .001	[.62, 1.79]
Hangout script goal rankings	(n = 70)	(n = 53)	<i>F</i> (1, 119)		
Find out more about the person*	3.87 (1.03)	3.34 (1.11)	3.97	.048	[-.15, -.92]
Have a good time	4.01 (1.08)	4.32 (.83)	.54	.46	[-.05, .66]
Develop a friendship	3.30 (1.22)	3.04 (1.43)	.88	.35	[-.74, .21]
See if we could go out more often	2.39 (.95)	2.17 (1.07)	.34	.56	[-.58, .15]
Heighten a physical relationship**	1.43 (.84)	2.13 (1.32)	8.82	.004	[.32, 1.09]

Note. Higher means indicate higher prioritization, from 5 (*Most important to me*) to 1 (*Least important to me*).

*Significant at $p < .05$. **Significant at $p < .01$. ***Significant at $p < .001$.

would be ranked more highly for a date than a hookup; hypothesis 4b stated that the goal to *heighten a physical relationship* would be ranked more highly for a hookup than a date. We expected these findings to hold for men and women and across ethnic groups.¹

To test hypothesis 4a, we performed 2 (script: date versus hookup) \times 2 (gender) analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the goal of *find out more about the person*. We found a main effect of script on the ranking given to this goal, $F(1, 359) = 19.65, p < .001$, as well as a main effect of gender, $F(1, 359) = 7.24, p = .007$, but no interaction between the two, $F(1, 359) = .16, p = .69$. As expected, both men

and women rated this goal as more important on dates than on hookups, and women saw this goal as more important overall than men (see Table 5).

To test hypothesis 4b we performed a 2 (script: date versus hookup) \times 2 (gender) ANOVA on the goal to *heighten a physical relationship*. We found a marginally significant main effect of script on the ranking given to this goal, $F(1, 359) = 3.44, p = .064$, as well as a significant main effect of gender, $F(1, 359) = 44.45, p < .001$, but no interaction between the two, $F(1, 359) = 1.27, p = .26$. Men and women rated this goal as marginally more important on hookups than dates, and men saw this goal as more important overall than women (see Table 5).

Although we had no specific predictions for hangout goals, we found that hangout goals followed the same order as hookup goals. Both of these rated *have a good time* as the most important goal, followed by *find out more*

¹ 2 (ethnicity) \times 2 (gender) MANOVAs performed on each of the five goals for those who reported a date script and for those who reported a hookup script found no main effects of ethnicity or interactions of ethnicity and gender, allowing us to collapse across ethnicity.

about the person, develop a friendship, see if we could go out more often, and heighten a physical relationship. Importantly, date goals followed a very similar pattern to hangouts and hookups, with the only difference being that those who went on dates swapped the order of the first two goals, with *find out more about the person* first and *have a good time* second.

Discussion

In contrast to recent claims that dating is dead on college campuses and that “most college students have had more hookups than first dates” (Kerner, 2013), dating was the most common type of initial romantic/sexual encounter for both Hispanic and White young adults. This is consistent with analyses of national survey data from Monto and Carey (2014), who found that college students from the past decade are not reporting higher levels of sexual activity than students from three decades ago.

The results presented here also indicated that dates, hangouts, and hookups share a common structure: 55% of actions were shared across the three scripts and were cited as script actions by Hispanic and White women and men alike. The structure very closely follows the pattern established in earlier studies of a first date (e.g., Rose & Frieze, 1993), suggesting that the date script is the prototype for both the hangout and hookup script. This also supports recent suggestions that college students’ actual sexual behavior has changed less over the past few decades than the lore and jargon associated with it (Monto & Carey, 2014).

While our findings largely contrast with claims that hookups follow a markedly different script than dates or hangouts (e.g., Bogle, 2008; Garcia et al., 2012), the hookup did include two actions unique to that script: *drink alcohol* and *have sex*. This result appears to support previous research that the use of alcohol or other substances is associated with relaxed attitudes toward having casual sex (e.g., Lyons, Manning, Longmore, & Giordano, 2014). Although the action *have sex* met script criteria for hookups, not all hookups included having sex. As indicated by previous research (e.g., Oster, 2015), our findings show that hookups involved a range of sexual activities ranging from kissing to physical contact to sexual intercourse but do not necessarily involve intercourse.

Our results further indicate that gender roles persist across all scripts, although to differing degrees. The date script included the most gender typing of actions, followed by hookups, then hangouts, consistent with previous research comparing a date with a hangout (Eaton & Rose, 2012). Specifically, the man was viewed as the initiator of more actions across all scripts. This suggests that the man is expected to provide the momentum for the encounter, regardless of type of encounter. However, women did not view the man’s role to be as dominant as men themselves did. Regardless of type of encounter, male participants viewed themselves as the initiator of actions. This finding

suggests women may not be aware that men feel or believe themselves to have more responsibility than women to structure heterosexual encounters.

The fact that women see themselves as more agentic than men see them in actual sexual encounters may reflect the fact that women’s self-concepts have become increasingly agentic over time, whereas men’s self-concepts have not become increasingly communal (Spence & Buckner, 2000). Being guided by their self-concepts, both during the actual script and its recall, women see themselves as controlling a fair portion (i.e., about half) of the script, while men see themselves as the actor with the most agency. The incongruity between men’s and women’s perceptions of control in actual sexual encounters is an interesting area for future research, as it may be a source of tension and conflict in intimate relationships and may help explain some instances of male sexual entitlement and coercion (e.g., Hill & Fischer, 2001).

Gender roles also were reflected in participants’ number of partners and script goals, suggesting that a double standard of behavior is in effect to some extent. Although men and women reported the same number of date partners, men reported about twice as many hangout and hookup partners as women. This is congruent with research showing that, due in part to gender-role norms, men tend to overreport their number of sexual partners while women tend to underreport their number of sexual partners (e.g., Alexander & Fisher, 2003).

Overall, women rated finding out more about their partners a more important goal than men did. In contrast, men rated heightening a physical relationship as being a more important goal than women. These results suggest that, across all types of encounters, women compared to men are more consciously evaluating the romantic and friendship potential of their partners. However, although men were more interested in the physical aspects of the relationship than women, they too rated finding out about their partners more highly than heightening a physical relationship. These findings are consistent with Furman and Hand (2006), who suggested that one purpose of casual sexual relationships may be to move toward a more traditional relationship.

Another important finding related to script goals was that *have a good time* was the highest-rated goal for men and women for all encounters except one (*finding out more about the person* just outranked *having a good time* on dates for women). The fact that having fun was not only a critical goal for men and women but that it was a major priority for all scripts reflects the fact that dating is no longer seen merely as a path to marriage (Bailey, 1988). Instead, dates are viewed as opportunities for mutual enjoyment, exploration, and gratification (e.g., McAnulty & Cann, 2012). Given that hookups and hangouts are considered to be even more spontaneous and lighthearted than traditional dates, it is not surprising the priority for these encounters was also to have fun.

As expected based on Hispanic cultural norms, dating was both more prevalent and preferred by Hispanic than

White college students. Also, compared to Hispanic students, White students hooked up more often and rated themselves as having more experience with hookups. Taken together, these data paint a compelling picture that ethnicity has an impact on young adults' sexual scripts. Traditional dating was the clear norm for Hispanic young adults. Furthermore, although hooking up was more often identified as the type of most recent initial encounter for White than Hispanic young adults, it had not replaced dating.

Inconsistent with our expectations, White young adults did not have more hookup partners than Hispanics, even though as noted previously they rated themselves as having more experience with hookups on a Likert-type scale. There are a few possible explanations for these contradictory findings. White students may have hooked up with the same partner repeatedly, which could provide experience that would not be reflected in a count of partners. Alternatively, Whites and Hispanics may have different perceptions of their level of hookup experience or may construe the question about hookup experience differently.

Strengths of our approach included using the same methodology across samples and asking participants to report specifically on their most recent initial romantic encounter. Extending the script methodology to an analysis of hookups enabled a direct comparison of script content across script types and provided a more complete set of data that could be compared with previous research. Asking about the most recent initial encounter was a good method for eliciting unbiased assessments of encounter frequency, because participants are reporting a specific encounter in detail rather than perceptions or recollections of multiple events spread over long periods of time. Asking about participants' most recent initial encounter provided a snapshot of the actual encounter types that occur; this snapshot should be representative of all initial encounter types over time.

One limitation of the current study is that we asked about participants' most recent *initial* romantic or sexual encounter rather than their most recent encounter. For this reason, second, third, and fourth dates, hookups, and hangouts were not included in the assessment. Thus, the prevalence of dating in general may be underestimated in this study because individuals may be more likely to have multiple additional dates with the same person than they are to have multiple additional hookups, especially given that what was initially considered a hookup or one-night stand may be categorized eventually as a date if subsequent interactions occur.

However, the fact that we asked only about the first time participants experienced a sexual script with a partner may have led to a more accurate estimation of hookups (including one-night stands) than in previous research. Because of the stigma associated with casual sex (Allison & Risman, 2013; Marks & Fraley, 2005) the label used to describe a first encounter with a particular partner may be less prone to retrospective bias than a later encounter. These later encounters, taking place in the context of what is becoming more of

an ongoing relationship, may be more likely to be construed as relationally oriented than sexually oriented.

A second limitation of the study is that both White and Hispanic students in our study were predominantly college freshmen and sophomores (among Hispanics, 61% were in their first or second year; among Whites, 89% were in their first or second year). Thus, the sexual and romantic experiences of more advanced college students were not as well represented in our findings. However, as scholars have argued that hooking up largely takes place early in college (Fielder & Carey, 2010; Olmstead, Roberson, Pasley, & Fincham, 2015), the strong representation of first- and second-year students in both of our ethnic/racial samples gives us confidence that contemporary college students do not mainly engage in a hookup culture. Students from both of these samples mainly went on dates as their most recent sexual script. On the other hand, the fact that a significantly larger proportion of White students were in their first and second year than Hispanic students (Table 1) may be part of the reason Whites reported significantly more hookups than Hispanic students as the most recent initial encounter.

A third limitation to this study involved the variety of encounters that may have been included in the hookup script. While the four unique script types we provided participants were congruent with the modal scripts uncovered in the Hispanic sample via qualitative pretesting (Eaton & Rose, 2012), these script names might not be the modal scripts used by the White sample. Indeed, scripts such as "booty calls" and "friends with benefits," while typically understood as types of hookups (Wentland & Reissing, 2014), may have been uniquely identifiable scripts in the White population. However, in the open-ended response for the "other" script option, there were never more than two people who gave the same alternative script name. It may be that participants who went on what they considered a "booty call" simply labeled it as a hookup or one-night stand for the purpose of this study. These two categories were ultimately collapsed and used to determine the hookup script. Because all of these types of casual sex and romance scripts were collapsed together into one hookup script, we are not able to examine the unique features of each or the extent to which they vary across racial/ethnic groups.

A final and important limitation of this study is that racial/ethnic background of participants was confounded with other factors, such as institution type, region of the United States, and student residency. Thus, any differences we found between Hispanic and White students, such as the higher level of hookup scripts reported by Whites, could be related to factors other than race/ethnicity. For example, the HSI is a commuter school whose students typically live at home, where engaging in hookups might be difficult, while students at the residential PWI generally live on campus or in off-campus housing away from their families and likely experience more privacy and freedom to engage in hookups. Differences in institution type (HSI versus PWI), region (Southeast versus Northeast), student residency (commuter versus residential), and locality (urban versus suburban/

rural) between the Hispanic and White samples may all influence the development of a campus climate related to dating, hookups, and hangouts, which influences student attitudes about these encounters, their likelihood of engaging in them, and actions and goals that compose them.

However, while drawing Hispanic and White students from different universities introduced confounds into our design, it was vitally important to gather samples of students from universities with differing cultural norms. By using a Hispanic sample from a Hispanic majority institution we could ensure that the dominant culture reflected at the university was Hispanic and could be contrasted with the PWI at which Anglo culture was dominant. Because most Hispanic majority universities are commuter universities (U.S. Department of Education, 2007), and because Hispanic and White youth tend to live in different parts of the country (Fry & Taylor, 2013), it was not possible to eliminate the confounds between student race/ethnicity, campus residency, and region of the United States. Further, the fact that Hispanic students commute to the university while living at home reflects Hispanic culture, which expects young adults—especially young women—to live with their parents until they marry (Santiago, Andrade, & Brown, 2004; Unmuth, 2012).

In addition, we did not ask participants about their own or their parents' country of origin or citizenship, which likely varied both between and within our racial/ethnic samples. By grouping together all participants who self-identified as "White" and all participants who self-identified as "Hispanic" we may have obscured important within-group cultural differences. Future research should attend to the heterogeneity in Hispanic and White college students based on their multifaceted cultural identifications.

Future Directions

One future direction to explore further is how gender roles are enacted within hangouts and hookups. The scripts identified here for hangouts and hookups suggest these interactions are not free from gender stereotypes or double standards as was once hoped (e.g., Reid et al., 2011), especially from the man's point of view. It may be important to further explore gender roles within hookups specifically. White men more so than Hispanic men defined the man as having the prerogative to initiate interactions and physical contact within the hookup script. It may be that male dominance within this script, combined with the use of alcohol, could result in more sexual coercion.

Another potential direction for future research is to explore the social and cultural predictors of various sexual scripts. We found that Hispanic participants were more likely to go on dates than White students, and that Whites students were more likely to hook up than Hispanics. Research has found that a number of social and contextual factors influence dating, hooking up, and other initial romantic encounter frequencies among young adults (Stinson, 2010), including the presence of alcohol (Owen

et al., 2010; Paul et al., 2000), being on vacation (Maticka-Tyndale, Herold, & Mewhinney, 1998; Sönmez et al., 2006), peer approval (Holman & Sillars, 2012), and participants' socioeconomic background (Owen et al., 2010). However, social and cultural factors such as values, norms, and social and contextual affordances are also likely to affect engagement in various sexual scripts. Additional research in these areas would increase our understanding of the role ethnicity plays in the sexual scripts of young adults.

Conclusion

Findings from this study of White and Hispanic heterosexual college students support the idea that young adults' dating and mating behavior in the United States is changing but not in the ways that many have speculated. As suggested in recent reviews of college students' sexual scripts (McAnulty & Cann, 2012) and survey data on college students' sexual activity (Monto & Carey, 2014), the hookup phenomenon appears to have been overstated.

While young adults are hanging out and hooking up in addition to going on traditional dates, these encounters are the exception to the rule for White and Hispanic men and women, who are mainly going on dates when they first go out with someone. Moreover, these "new" encounters look remarkably like traditional dates. Men's and women's top priority for all of these encounters was to "have fun"; all of the scripts involved the gender typing of actions (though men's scripts were more gendered than women's); and half of all script actions and events were shared across all three scripts for all samples of participants (men and women, Hispanic and White).

Part of the reason for the high similarity across all three script types may be that, influenced by changing social roles and new sexual scripts, dates have become more casual and less gendered in the past several decades. Indeed, the fact that "have fun" was a paramount goal for men's and women's dates suggests that young adults conceive of these scripts as means to highly personal rather than social-structural ends, such as marriage and family. However, the fact that hanging out and hooking up closely resemble dates also suggest that elements of the date script strongly influenced contemporary means for interacting romantically. Gender roles persist within young adults' sexual scripts, as do gender differences in perceptions of each partner's agency.

Finally, it is important to note that any consideration of young adults' sexual and romantic behaviors should take cultural and contextual variables into consideration. As uncovered in our work, there are sometimes very meaningful differences in the experiences of students based on race/ethnicity or geographic location. Hispanic participants in our sample were substantially more likely to go on dates (versus other encounters) than White participants, and White participants were more likely to hook up. This difference matters because, although the scripts share many

actual elements, participants' psychological construal of these elements does appear to differ by gender and race/ethnicity. For example, only 11% of the Hispanic women in our sample reported that they felt good on their hookup, whereas all other groups reported this on hookups more than half the time. To better understand the interpretations and meanings assigned to the actions and events in the date, hookup, and hangout sexual scripts, we suggest the use of qualitative research that understands participants from the perspective of their unique social locations.

References

- Abelson, R. P. (1981). Psychological status of the script concept. *American Psychologist*, *36*, 715–729.
- Ahrold, T. K., & Meston, C. M. (2010). Ethnic differences in sexual attitudes of U.S. college students: Gender, acculturation, and religiosity factors. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *39*, 190–202. doi:10.1007/s10508-008-9406-1
- Alexander, M. G., & Fisher, T. D. (2003). Truth and consequences: Using the bogus pipeline to examine sex differences in self-reported sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research*, *40*(1), 27–35. doi:10.1080/00224490309552164
- Allison, R., & Risman, B. J. (2013). A double standard for "hooking up": How far have we come toward gender equality? *Social Science Research*, *42*(5), 1191–1206. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2013.04.006
- Bailey, B. L. (1988). *From front porch to back seat: Courtship in twentieth-century America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Berntsen, D., & Rubin, D. C. (2004). Cultural life scripts structure recall from autobiographical memory. *Memory and Cognition*, *32*(3), 427–442. doi:10.3758/BF03195836
- Bogle, K. A. (2008). *Hooking up: Sex, dating, and relationships on campus*. New York: New York University Press.
- Bower, G. H., Black, J. B., & Turner, T. J. (1979). Scripts in memory for text. *Cognitive Psychology*, *11*, 177–220. doi:10.1016/0010-0285(79)90009-4
- Bradshaw, C., Kahn, A. S., & Saville, B. K. (2010). To hook up or date: Which gender benefits? *Sex Roles*, *62*, 661–669. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9765-7
- Cate, R. M., & Lloyd, S. A. (1992). *Courtship*. Sage series on close relationships. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Eaton, A. A., & Rose, S. (2011). Has dating become more egalitarian? A 35 year review using *Sex Roles*. *Sex Roles*, *64*, 843–862. doi:10.1007/s11199-011-9957-9
- Eaton, A. A., & Rose, S. M. (2012). Scripts for actual first date and hanging-out encounters among young heterosexual Hispanic adults. *Sex Roles*, *67*(5–6), 285–299. doi:10.1007/s11199-012-0190-y
- Eisenman, R., & Dantzer, M. L. (2006). Gender and ethnic differences in sexual attitudes at a Hispanic-serving university. *Journal of General Psychology*, *133*(2), 153–162. doi:10.3200/GENP.133.2.153-162
- England, P., Shafer, E. F., & Fogarty, A. C. K. (2007). Hooking up and forming romantic relationships on today's college campuses. In M. S. Kimmel & A. Aronson (Eds.), *The gendered society reader* (3rd ed., pp. 531–547). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Epstein, M., Calzo, J. P., Smiler, A. P., & Ward, L. M. (2009). Anything from making out to having sex: Men's negotiations of hooking up and friends with benefits scripts. *Journal of Sex Research*, *46*(5), 414–424. doi:10.1080/00224490902775801
- Eshbaugh, E. M., & Gute, G. (2008). Hookups and sexual regret among college women. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *148*(1), 77–89. doi:10.3200/SOCP.148.1.77-90
- Falicov, C. J. (2010). Changing constructions of machismo for Latino men in therapy: The devil never sleeps. *Family Process*, *49*(3), 309–329. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2010.01325.x
- Fielder, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2010). Predictors and consequences of sexual "hookups" among college students: A short-term prospective study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *39*, 1105–1119. doi:10.1007/s10508-008-9448-4
- Fry, R., & Taylor, P. (2013, May 9). II. Immediate entry into college. *Pew Research Center: Hispanic Trends*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/05/09/ii-immmediate-entry-into-college/>
- Furman, W., & Hand, L. S. (2006). The slippery nature of romantic relationships: Issues in definition and differentiation. In A. C. Crouter & A. Booth (Eds.), *Romance and sex in adolescence and emerging adulthood: Risks and opportunities* (pp. 171–178). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Garcia, J. R., Reiber, C., Massey, S. G., & Merriwether, A. M. (2012). Sexual hookup culture: A review. *Review of General Psychology*, *16*, 161–176. doi:10.1037/a0027911
- Glenn, N., & Marquardt, E. (2001). *Hooking up, hanging out, and hoping for Mr. Right: College women on dating and mating today*. New York, NY: Institute for American Values.
- Herold, E. S., & Mewhinney, D. K. (1993). Gender differences in casual sex and AIDS prevention: A survey of dating bars. *Journal of Sex Research*, *30*(1), 36–42. doi:10.1080/00224499309551676
- Hill, M. S., & Fischer, A. R. (2001). Does entitlement mediate the link between masculinity and rape-related variables? *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *48*(1), 39–50. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.48.1.39
- Holman, A., & Sillars, A. (2012). Talk about "hooking up": The influence of college student social networks on nonrelationship sex. *Health Communication*, *27*(2), 205–216. doi:10.1080/10410236.2011.575540
- Jonason, P. K. (2013). Four functions for four relationships: Consensus definitions of university students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *42*(8), 1407–1414. doi:10.1007/s10508-013-0189-7
- Keil, J. M., & Christie-Mizell, C. (2008). Beliefs, fertility, and earnings of African American, Hispanic, and non-Hispanic White mothers. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *30*(3), 299–323. doi:10.1177/0739986308320541
- Kerner, I. (2013, May 16). Young adults and a hookup culture. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2013/05/16/health/kerner-hookup-culture/>
- Klinkenberg, D., & Rose, S. (1994). Dating scripts of lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *26*(4), 23–35. doi:10.1300/j082v26n04_02
- Koppel, J., & Berntsen, D. (2014). The cultural life script as cognitive schema: How the life script shapes memory for fictional life stories. *Memory*, *22*(8), 949–971. doi:10.1080/09658211.2013.859269
- Krahé, B., Bieneck, S., & Scheinberger-Olwig, R. (2007). Adolescents' sexual scripts: Schematic representations of consensual and nonconsensual heterosexual interactions. *Journal of Sex Research*, *44*(4), 316–327. doi:10.1080/00224490701580923
- LaBrie, J. W., Hummer, J. F., Ghaidarov, T. M., Lac, A., & Kenney, S. R. (2014). Hooking up in the college context: The event-level effects of alcohol use and partner familiarity on hookup behaviors and contentment. *Journal of Sex Research*, *51*(1), 62–73. doi:10.1080/00224499.2012.714010
- Lambert, T. A., Kahn, A. S., & Apple, K. J. (2003). Pluralistic ignorance and hooking up. *Journal of Sex Research*, *40*, 129–133. doi:10.1080/00224490309552174
- Laner, M. R., & Ventrone, N. A. (1998). Egalitarian daters/traditionalist dates. *Journal of Family Issues*, *19*, 468–477. doi:10.1177/019251398019004005
- Laner, M. R., & Ventrone, N. A. (2000). Dating scripts revisited. *Journal of Family Issues*, *21*, 488–500. doi:10.1177/019251300021004004
- Lyons, H. A., Manning, W. D., Longmore, M. A., & Giordano, P. C. (2014). Young adult casual sexual behavior: Life-course-specific motivations and consequences. *Sociological Perspectives*, *57*(1), 79–101. doi:10.1177/0731121413517557
- Marks, M. J., & Fraley, R. C. (2005). The sexual double standard: Fact or fiction? *Sex Roles*, *52*(3–4), 175–186. doi:10.1007/s11199-005-1293-5
- Masters, N. T., Casey, E., Wells, E. A., & Morrison, D. M. (2013). Sexual scripts among young heterosexually active men and women: Continuity and change. *Journal of Sex Research*, *50*(5), 409–420. doi:10.1080/00224499.2012.661102

- Maticka-Tyndale, E., Herold, E. S., & Mewhinney, D. (1998). Casual sex on spring break: Intentions and behaviors of Canadian students. *Journal of Sex Research, 35*(3), 254–264. doi:10.1080/00224499809551941
- Mayo, Y. Q., & Resnick, R. P. (1996). The impact of machismo on Hispanic women. *Affilia, 11*(3), 257–277. doi:10.1177/088610999601100301
- McAnulty, R. D., & Cann, A. (2012). College student dating in perspective: “Hanging out,” “hooking up,” and friendly benefits. In R. D. McAnulty (Ed.), *Sex in college: The things they don't write home about* (pp. 1–18). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Mongeau, P. A., Jacobsen, J., & Donnerstein, C. (2007). Defining dates and first date goals: Generalizing from undergraduates to single adults. *Communication Research, 34*(5), 526–547. doi:10.1177/00936502070305235
- Mongeau, P. A., Serewicz, M. C. M., & Therrien, L. F. (2004). Goals for cross-sex first dates: Identification, measurement, and the influence of contextual factors. *Communication Monographs, 71*(2), 121–147. doi:10.1080/0363775042331302514
- Monto, M. A., & Carey, A. G. (2014). A new standard of sexual behavior? Are claims associated with the “hookup culture” supported by general social survey data? *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(6), 605–615. doi:10.1080/00224499.2014.906031
- Morr Serewicz, M. C., & Gale, E. (2008). First-date scripts: Gender roles, context, and relationship. *Sex Roles, 58*, 149–164. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9283-4
- Olmstead, S. B., Roberson, P. N. E., Pasley, K., & Fincham, F. D. (2015). Hooking up and risk behaviors among first semester college men: What is the role of precollege experience? *Journal of Sex Research, 52*(2), 186–198. doi:10.1080/00224499.2013.843147
- Oster, M. (2015, March 26). Five myths about teen sex. *Child trends*. Retrieved from <http://www.childtrends.org/five-myths-about-teen-sex/>
- Owen, J., Fincham, F. D., & Moore, J. (2011). Short-term prospective study of hooking up among college students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 40*(2), 331–341. doi:10.1007/s10508-010-9697-x
- Owen, J. J., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Fincham, F. D. (2010). “Hooking up” among college students: Demographic and psychosocial correlates. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 39*(3), 653–663. doi:10.1007/s10508-008-9414-1
- Passel, J. S., & Cohn, D. (2008, February 11). U.S. population projections: 2005–2050. *Pew Research Center: Hispanic Trends*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2008/02/11/us-population-projections-2005-2050/>.
- Paul, E. L., & Hayes, K. A. (2002). The casualties of “casual” sex: A qualitative exploration of the phenomenology of college students’ hookups. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 19*, 639–661. doi:10.1177/0265407502195006
- Paul, E. L., McManus, B., & Hayes, A. (2000). “Hookups”: Characteristics and correlates of college students’ spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *Journal of Sex Research, 37*, 76–88. doi:10.1080/00224490009552023
- Raffaelli, M., & Ontai, L. L. (2004). Gender socialization in Latino/a families: Results from two retrospective studies. *Sex Roles, 50*(5–6), 287–299. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000018886.58945.06
- Reiber, C., & Garcia, J. R. (2010). Hooking up: Gender differences, evolution, and pluralistic ignorance. *Evolutionary Psychology, 8*(3), 390–404. doi:10.1177/147470491000800307
- Reid, J. A., Elliott, S., & Webber, G. R. (2011). Casual hookups to formal dates: Refining the boundaries of the sexual double standard. *Gender and Society, 25*(5), 545–568. doi:10.1177/0891243211418642
- Roehling, P. V., Hernandez Jarvis, L. H., & Swope, H. E. (2005). Variations in negative work-family spillover among White, Black, and Hispanic men and women: Does ethnicity matter? *Journal of Family Issues, 26*(6), 840–865. doi:10.1177/0192513X05277552
- Rose, S., & Frieze, I. H. (1989). Young singles’ scripts for a first date. *Gender and Society, 3*, 258–268. doi:10.1177/089124389003002006
- Rose, S., & Frieze, I. H. (1993). Young singles’ contemporary dating scripts. *Sex Roles, 28*, 499–509. doi:10.1007/bf00289677
- Santiago, D., Andrade, S., & Brown, S. (2004). *Latino student success at Hispanic-serving institutions: Findings from a demonstration project*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED506048.pdf>
- Schank, R., & Abelson, R. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15*(2), 97–120. doi:10.1007/bf01542219
- Sönmez, S., Apostolopoulos, Y., Yu, C. H., Yang, S., Mattila, A., & Yu, L. C. (2006). Binge drinking and casual sex on spring break. *Annals of Tourism Research, 33*, 895–917. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2006.06.005
- Spence, J. T., & Buckner, C. (2000). Instrumental and expressive traits, trait stereotypes, and sexist attitudes: What do they signify? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*, 44–62. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2000.tb01021.x
- Stephens, D. P., & Eaton, A. A. (2014). The influence of masculinity scripts on heterosexual Hispanic college men’s perceptions of female-initiated sexual coercion. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 15*(4), 387–396. doi:10.1037/a0034639
- Stinson, R. D. (2010). Hooking up in young adulthood: A review of factors influencing the sexual behavior of college students. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 24*(2), 98–115. doi:10.1080/87568220903558596
- Stinson, R. D., Levy, L. B., & Alt, M. (2014). “They’re just a good time and move on”: Fraternity men reflect on their hookup experiences. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 28*(1), 59–73. doi:10.1080/87568225.2014.854683
- Taylor, P., Lopez, M. H., Martinez, J., & Velasco, G. (2012, April 4). *V Politics, values, and religion*. *Pew Research Center: Hispanic Trends*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/04/04/v-politics-values-and-religion/>
- Tomkins, S. (1987). Script theory. In J. Aronoff, A. I. Rabin, & R. A. Zucker (Eds.), *The emergence of personality* (pp. 147–216). New York, NY: Springer.
- Torres, J. B., Solberg, V. S., & Carlstrom, A. H. (2002). The myth of sameness among Latino men and their machismo. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 72*(2), 163–181. doi:10.1037/0002-9432.72.2.163
- Unmuth, K. L. (2012, June 1). Hispanic girls face special barriers on road to college. *Education week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/cw/articles/2012/06/07/34latinas.h31.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2015). 2014 national population projections: Summary tables: Percent distribution of the projected population by Hispanic origin and race for the United States: 2015–2060 [Table 11]. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/projections/data/national/2014/summarytables.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2007). United States department of education accredited postsecondary minority institutions. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/edlite-minorityinstit-list-hisp-tab.html>
- Villarruel, A. M. (1998). Cultural influences on the sexual attitudes, beliefs, and norms of young Latina adolescents. *Journal of the Society of Pediatric Nurses, 3*(2), 69–79. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6155.1998.tb00030.x
- Wamsley, E. S. (2014). Marianismo. In D. J. Leonard & C. Lugo-Lugo (Eds.), *Latino history and culture: An encyclopedia* (1st ed., pp. 314–316). New York, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Wentland, J. J., & Reissing, E. (2011). Taking casual sex not too casually: Exploring definitions of casual sex relationships. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 20*, 75–91.
- Wentland, J. J., & Reissing, E. (2014). Casual sexual relationships: Identifying definitions for one-night stands, booty calls, fuck buddies, and friends with benefits. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 23*(3), 167–177. doi:10.3138/cjhs.2744

Appendix A. Percentage of Participants Reporting Each Possible Script Action for Actual Dates, Hangouts, and Hookups by Gender and Ethnicity

Script Action	Date						Hangout						Hookup										
	Women			Men			Women			Men			Women			Men							
	Hispanic (n = 72)	White (n = 80)	Hispanic (n = 83)	White (n = 68)	Hispanic (n = 24)	White (n = 49)	Hispanic (n = 16)	White (n = 43)	Hispanic (n = 9)	White (n = 28)	Hispanic (n = 15)	White (n = 41)	Hispanic (n = 72)	White (n = 80)	Hispanic (n = 83)	White (n = 68)	Hispanic (n = 24)	White (n = 49)	Hispanic (n = 16)	White (n = 43)	Hispanic (n = 9)	White (n = 28)	Hispanic (n = 15)
1. Ask for the outing	89	86	99	88	88	84	87	81	78	75	80	93											
2. Accept invitation	100	95	96	78	92	92	93	81	89	82	79	90											
3. Decide what to do	92	86	98	84	78	82	84	84	87	72	87	95											
4. Tell friends and family	88	85	60	72	61	82	69	65	78	63	54	59											
5. Discuss plans with parents	65	51	23	32	27	45	27	23	22	15	14	26											
6. Groom and dress	97	94	100	78	82	86	100	84	100	89	67	92											
7. Feel nervous	87	89	68	71	70	82	60	61	100	74	79	71											
8. Check/worry about appearance	99	91	96	90	96	94	93	81	100	79	80	90											
9. Prepare car or apartment	48	51	70	69	46	39	67	61	44	32	64	66											
10. Bring flowers or gift	44	28	38	25	17	14	27	7	13	7	29	29											
11. Check money	79	64	93	77	54	67	75	79	63	30	58	83											
12. Pick other up/go to other	67	65	77	81	33	33	82	44	67	56	73	83											
13. Be early	56	49	64	47	33	35	0	9	44	41	50	53											
14. Be late	30	23	29	19	27	35	69	49	44	46	47	49											
15. Wait for other	65	45	61	53	65	59	63	47	56	46	67	68											
16. Welcome other to home	59	65	43	54	54	67	63	54	67	59	40	68											
17. Introduce to parents/friends	64	68	55	60	46	69	75	54	88	59	40	68											
18. Drive around/get lost	36	45	19	32	38	39	25	9	44	29	21	26											
19. Pick up/go to friends	28	29	23	27	21	43	31	35	67	43	33	39											
20. Disagree	40	25	37	35	26	41	50	37	43	35	31	43											
21. Plans fall through	49	30	36	34	44	53	64	47	33	36	47	42											
22. Redecide where to go	37	36	32	38	25	41	69	40	44	32	43	51											
23. Get to know each other	94	96	99	91	96	88	100	95	100	96	80	85											
24. Figure out where stand	63	63	77	68	42	65	93	65	75	50	54	74											
25. Compliment other	96	86	99	90	82	84	100	91	100	89	87	90											
26. Joke, talk, laugh	100	99	100	96	96	98	100	95	100	100	87	95											
27. Evaluate other	87	75	95	72	87	84	92	70	89	67	93	76											
28. Talk to friends	68	69	58	54	71	84	64	67	78	78	47	77											
29. Try to impress other	84	83	83	77	82	80	62	74	89	81	79	75											
30. Attend event	88	68	86	66	58	67	75	70	89	68	64	83											
31. Eat	92	81	89	82	61	69	81	72	89	59	87	78											
32. Drink alcohol	42	33	37	25	38	47	50	42	78	57	67	72											
33. Pay	70	66	99	88	48	37	87	70	89	39	87	95											
34. Offer to pay	84	75	89	82	35	55	73	70	78	50	64	90											
35. Decline offer to pay	57	39	73	60	23	37	56	54	56	29	50	76											
36. Flirt/smile/wink	100	95	100	90	92	94	100	88	100	100	86	100											
37. Courteous behavior	97	99	98	93	87	96	100	93	100	93	86	97											
38. Be rude/no talking	7	14	7	12	13	16	19	19	11	23	13	20											
39. Accept/engage in physical contact	80	75	87	74	65	80	100	65	89	93	77	90											
40. Reject physical contact	13	19	8	10	38	25	19	7	13	25	17	90											
41. Felt Aroused	67	51	90	75	73	76	87	74	78	82	71	95											
42. Kiss goodnight	79	76	83	84	57	86	88	65	89	78	73	85											

GENDER AND ETHNICITY IN DATING

43. Initiated making out	56	40	73	66	52	55	79	56	89	59	86	93
44. Accepted making out	62	56	72	72	54	74	73	61	89	82	86	93
45. Rejected making out	17	14	5	9	21	12	13	5	29	11	7	15
46. Initiated sex	23	26	31	32	21	31	40	28	22	56	57	68
47. Accepted sex	29	26	29	37	17	31	44	28	22	61	53	68
48. Rejected sex	22	15	9	7	35	27	13	9	22	22	7	8
49. Take other home/to car	76	68	83	77	63	59	75	72	56	54	71	71
50. Go home/plan to leave	65	66	66	62	63	61	79	61	67	36	33	62
51. Stay after/sleep over	28	40	32	43	26	51	50	37	33	78	64	73
52. Told other had a good time	97	93	98	85	79	92	94	81	100	69	73	95
53. Handshake/say goodbye	46	45	40	38	48	51	47	44	44	35	39	30
54. Ask for another outing	86	80	89	84	68	76	81	65	89	62	64	80
55. Accept second outing	93	85	83	81	76	82	81	67	67	69	77	80
56. Decline second outing	6	13	6	3	13	18	0	7	13	4	8	11
57. Tell other will be in touch	76	83	85	75	75	81	81	81	75	76	93	72
58. Absence of physical affection	10	13	10	7	39	25	13	21	43	15	20	16
59. Failed to initiate physical affection	23	13	12	13	36	25	20	28	38	15	20	11
60. Have something go wrong	11	16	18	29	22	31	19	26	33	32	33	22
61. Call/text after outing	97	89	89	85	83	86	93	81	67	96	79	80
62. Report positive feelings	99	95	98	90	91	92	100	93	11	96	87	95
63. Report negative feelings	12	19	12	15	29	27	15	19	22	39	42	18

