

Bucknell University

## Bucknell Digital Commons

---

Faculty Journal Articles

Faculty Scholarship

---

2012

### Sex Differences in Hookup Behavior: A Replication and Examination of Parent-Child Relationship Quality

T. Joel Wade

Bucknell University, [jwade@bucknell.edu](mailto:jwade@bucknell.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/fac\\_journ](https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/fac_journ)



Part of the [Other Psychology Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Wade, T. Joel. "Sex Differences in Hookup Behavior: A Replication and Examination of Parent-Child Relationship Quality." *Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology* (2012) : 494-505.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at Bucknell Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Journal Articles by an authorized administrator of Bucknell Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [dcadmin@bucknell.edu](mailto:dcadmin@bucknell.edu).

Original Article

**SEX DIFFERENCES IN HOOKUP BEHAVIOR: A  
REPLICATION AND EXAMINATION OF PARENT-CHILD  
RELATIONSHIP QUALITY**

Jennifer A. Shukusky

*Department of Psychology, Rutgers University*

T. Joel Wade

*Department of Psychology, Bucknell University*

**Abstract**

In the current research, we assessed the impact of parent-child relationships on attitudes toward, and engagement in, hookup behaviors using a sample of 407 college students. Based on prior research, it was hypothesized that heterosexual participants, especially women, who do not perceive themselves as having a strong, close, positive relationship with their opposite-sex parent would be more likely to engage in or attempt to engage in casual sexual behavior (hookups). Also, men were expected to be more satisfied with, and more in agreement with, hookup behavior than women. The results were partially consistent with the hypotheses. Men were more satisfied with and more in agreement with hookup behavior than women. But, opposite sex parent-child relationship quality only affected men's agreement with the hookup behavior of their peers. Men with lower relationship quality with their mothers agreed more with the hookup behavior of their peers. These results are discussed in relation to prior research on hooking up and prior research on parent-child relationships.

**Keywords:** Hookups, parent-child relationships, sexual behavior

**Introduction**

Hooking up is a common and public practice amongst emerging adults, especially on college campuses across the country (Bogle, 2008; Garcia & Reiber, 2008; Garcia, Reiber, Massey & Merriwether, 2012). In a review of hookup research, recent data show that 60-80% of college students in North America have hooked up (Bogle, 2008; England & Thomas, 2009; Garcia & Reiber, 2008; Garcia et al., 2012). This can include anything from kissing to sexual intercourse, defined differently by those who use it. Generally, *hooking up* refers to any spontaneous sexual activity between uncommitted individuals (not involved in a traditional romantic relationship- dating, boyfriend/

---

AUTHOR NOTE: Please direct correspondence to Jennifer A. Shukusky, Department of Psychology, Rutgers University, A301 Armitage Hall, 311 N 5<sup>th</sup> St., Camden, NJ 08102. Email: [jas819@scarletmail.rutgers.edu](mailto:jas819@scarletmail.rutgers.edu)

girlfriend) including kissing, intimate touching, oral sex, anal sex, and/or sexual intercourse. This definition does not include any previous agreements or plans to engage in any of the above behavior, as in *booty calls* (Jonason, Li, & Cason, 2009) or between *friends-with-benefits* (Bisson & Levine, 2009; Grello, Welsh, & Harper, 2006; Lehmiller, VanderDrift, & Kelly, 2010).

Due to the high likelihood that students have experienced some form of uncommitted sexual behavior, the current study sought to explore one factor that may influence students' attitudes toward and engagement in hookup culture. In addition to an examination of the prevalence of and students' feelings concerning hooking up, we also included a measure of parent-child relationship quality to evaluate the potential role of developmental relationships on these behaviors.

### *The Biopsychosocial Perspective*

The theoretical framework around hooking up is best supported by the biopsychosocial model (Garcia & Reiber, 2008; Garcia et al., 2012), encompassing evolutionary (biological), cultural, and social components. Evolutionary theory explains *why* people engage in hookup behaviors and social/sexual scripts explain *how* they go about doing so (Garcia et al., 2012).

According to evolutionary theory, men and women seek different qualities in their sexual partners (in general, not just in hookups) because of biological differences and inherently different roles in reproduction. Women tend to value cues of resource acquisition in potential mates while men value cues of reproductive capacity to a greater extent (Buss, 1989), reflecting sex-specific roles in reproduction and different motivations in the mate-selection process. Men seek to maximize their reproductive potential, so for them, uncommitted sexual behavior has been classified as evolutionary fitness-enhancing behavior (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Garcia & Reiber, 2008 on Buss, 2003). Men are therefore more likely to show interest in uncommitted sex (Bailey, Gaulin, Agyei, & Gladue, 1994). Capable of reproducing quickly with little sacrifice, men select to maximize their mating opportunities.

Women, on the other hand, do not benefit by increasing the number of their sexual partners and instead risk producing offspring of low quality if they mate without discriminating between their partners. While many men have favored the idea that college men are looking for sex, women believed that other college women were looking for relationships (Bogle, 2008). However, Garcia and Reiber (2008) point out that while both sexes engage in hookup behavior, each is hoping for a long term relationship to develop.

Sexual script theory provides that sexual encounters are shaped by a set of *scripts* that people learn and apply to sexual situations. Cultural scripts are largely focused on heterosexual gender-roles and guide who does what and when they do it. Men serve as active sexual agents (asking a girl out, paying for the movie, etc.) and women play a more passive role as a sexual object, but serve as *sexual gate-keepers* (Garcia et al., 2012). Especially as uncommitted sexual encounters prevail in media (i.e., music, movies, reality television show), consumers are influenced by these assumed *norms*. College students believe that their peers are more sexually permissive than they actually are (Chia & Gunther, 2006; Reiber & Garcia, 2010). These influences, and the high frequency with which emerging adults are engaging in these behaviors, demonstrate a distinct change in cultural cognitions about uncommitted sex; both men and women

openly discuss their acceptance of experience with hooking up (Bradshaw, Kahn, & Saville, 2010).

#### *Sex Differences in Hooking Up*

Though equal numbers of men and women (64%) reported having engaged in a hookup, 80% of men and 64% of women have tried to initiate one (Garcia & Reiber, 2008). Garcia and Reiber (2008) also report that men and women vary in terms of with whom they have engaged in sexual behavior: 50% of men and 72% of women with romantic partners, 34% of men and 26% of women with friends, 38% of men and 23% of women with acquaintances, 20% of men and 8% of women with strangers, and 19% of men and 14% of women with no one. But, do men and women's motivations for hooking up differ also?

Garcia and Reiber (2008) report that men and women did not differ in motivations for hooking up, whether for physical/sexual gratification, emotional gratification, because others are doing it, due to peer pressure, to initiate a romantic relationship, or because it was unintentional. Nor do they differ in their expectations of how hookups would end. Both men and women expected that most likely, further hookups would follow. However, ideally, women were significantly more likely than men to hope that hookups would evolve into romantic relationships while men were hoping for future hookups with that person.

#### *Parent-child Relationship Quality, Attachment, and Romantic Relationships*

Parent-child relationships can play a strong role in an individual's development and functioning in relationships with others (Bowlby, 1969, 1982; Collins & Read, 1990; Draper & Harpending, 1982; Furman, Simon, Shaffer, & Bouchev, 2002). Decades of attachment research indicate that strong emotional feelings are shared between children and their parents which ultimately influence a child's development. Children mentally develop representations of their relationships with their parents (known as *working models*) that influence children's cognitions, affect, and behavior with parents and influence representations of other close relationships, such as friendships or romantic relationships (Bowlby, 1973, 1979; Furman et al., 2002). Relationships established in childhood shape relationships formed later on in life, even influencing mate selection (Collins & Read, 1990; Gyuris et al., 2010); observing working models of loving relationships and being an object of love influence how people react to the actions of others and formulate expectations of what a romantic partner will be like.

Research has shown strong relationships between parent-child attachment history and the attachment styles growing individuals establish with their close peers and romantic partners (Collins & Read, 1990; Simpson & Belsky, 2008). Securely attached people can establish relationships with ease, depend on their partner, and have little or no concern about being left by their partner (Simpson, 1990). They also experience more positive than negative emotion, have an increased likelihood of establishing stable and long-lasting pair bonds, and exhibit higher levels of interdependence, trust, commitment, and satisfaction, and (Simpson, 1990, 2008). Avoidant attachment is associated with discomfort being close to, depending on, and trusting a romantic partner and anxious attachment is characterized by an avoidance of getting involved with romantic partners

and constantly doubt the foundations of the relationship, like trust and love. Does father absence affect attachment and romantic behavior?

Gibson (2008) reports that father absence increases parental hardship in child-rearing, places a strain upon a family, affects attachment and behavior issues in childhood/early pubertal development, and increases precocious sexual activity in adolescence (Belsky, Steinberg, & Draper, 1991). Heterosexual teenage girls without fathers demonstrate an early interest in the opposite sex, tend to have an unfavorable view of men and masculinity, and take little interest in establishing lasting emotional ties to a single partner (Draper & Harpending, 1982). Childhood relationship quality impacts romantic relationship later in life and may also influence emerging adults' sexual behaviors on college campuses. Women with absent fathers are more likely to engage in sexual activity earlier with less discrimination, display "precocious" sexual interest in boys, and often fail to maintain sexual and emotional ties to one partner (Draper & Harpending, 1982). Clearly, parent-child relationships affect children's sexual activity. But, it is not clear how hookup behavior is affected since research has not focused on parent-child relationships and hookup behavior. Therefore, in regard to hookup culture, it is necessary to examine the possible interaction between parent-child relationship quality and one's attitudes toward and engagement in uncommitted sex. The present research does that. Specifically, this research aims to replicate and expand the previous research on hookup culture by Garcia and Reiber (2008), including an investigation of the association between parent-child relationship quality and students' attitudes toward and engagement in casual sexual behaviors.

### *Hypotheses*

Based on evolutionary theory of biological sex differences, it was hypothesized that (1.) women would prefer for hookups to result in a long-term relationship rather than no relationship after a sexual encounter. (2.) Men would prefer to maintain some kind of sexual relationship with their hookup partners, but this preference would not be as strong as women's preferences. (3.) Women were also expected to practice a greater degree of partner selection/discrimination than men would. According to evolutionary theory in relation to reproductive fitness, (4.) men were expected to be more accepting of and (5.) more satisfied with hookup behaviors than women were.

(6.) It is hypothesized that heterosexual students who do not perceive themselves as having a strong, close, positive relationship with their opposite-sex parent will be more likely to engage in or attempt to engage in casual sexual behavior. (7.) This trend is expected to a greater extent for women, as opposed to men, consistent with previous research on women with absent fathers (Draper & Harpending, 1982; Gibson, 2008). Students who are low in parent-child relationship quality were also expected to be (8.) more accepting of hookup culture and (9.) more satisfied with hookup behavior.

## **Method**

### *Participants*

Participants were 121 men and 286 women ranging in age from 18-26 ( $M = 19.56$ ,  $SD = 1.27$ ) from a private university in the Northeast, recruited through advertisements in campus emails and the university's electronic message center. The population is predominantly straight (95.8%), white (90.2%) and upper-middle class

(52.1%, with an additional 13.0% upper class and 26.3% middle class). Nearly all of the participants were undergraduate students (28% first-years, 28% sophomores, 21% juniors, 22% seniors, and ~1% graduate students). Majority of the students, 91.4%, reported that they grew up in a household with 2 parents or parental figures and for 78.6% of the participants, they were their married, biological parents.

### *Procedure*

Participants responded to online survey comprised of 62 items in 4 definitive sections: (1.) Demographic information, (2.) items measuring attachment/ closeness with parents or other parental figures (adapted from Main, 1998), (3.) items assessing attitudes towards and engagement in hookups and sexual behavior (many items replicated from Garcia & Reiber, 2008), and (4.) a short form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972).

### *Measures*

**Relationship quality.** The attachment/closeness assessment consisted of 13 items adapted from Main (1998). The measure had high inter-item reliability ( $\alpha = .82$ ).

**Hookup awareness.** Hookup awareness consisted of the following 3 items: (1) How often do you attend social events at which you have the opportunity to have a hookup? (2) Who do you know that has engaged in a hookup? (3) For which of the following reason do you think other people engage in hookups?

**Hookup behavior.** Hookup behavior was assessed using data collected from the following 4 items, (1) Have you ever tried to engage in a hookup? (2) Have you ever engaged in a hookup? (3) How many times have you engaged in a hookup? (4) For which of the following reason have/would you engage in hookups? Hookup behavior scores were calculated by combining the first three items.

**Overall hookup satisfaction.** Hookup satisfaction scores were created by combining two items: (1) How satisfied are you after you have hooked up? And the reverse score of (2) How upset are you after you have hooked up?

**Social Desirability.** Social desirability scores were determined by a 10 item version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972).

## **Results**

### *Descriptive Statistics*

For the relationship quality measures, 95.6% of participants reported having a same-sex parental figure about whom they could answer questions and 93.1% reported have an opposite-sex figure about whom they could answer questions. In nearly all cases, it was the biological parent.

An overall examination of the data reveal that only 16.2% of the sample had never been in a romantic relationship and 5.6% had been in 5 or more romantic relationships. Of those who had not been in a romantic relationship, 8.1% reported that they had never tried to engage in a romantic relationship. Of the sample, 73.3% said they would ideally like to be in a romantic relationship or their current romantic relationship. Another 12.5% prefer a hookup or casual relationship like friends with benefits, another 4.2% wanted no strings attached hookups, and 7.1% do not want any relationship at all.

Tests of Hypotheses

**Categorical Data Analyses.** While there were no significant differences between the way in which participants expected their hookups to end in general, a Chi-square across sex and ideal hookup results was significant,  $\chi^2(371) = 19.25, p < .0001$ . Each sex showed significantly different preferences on how they would ideally like their hookups to end, see Table 1. Women were much more likely to want a romantic relationship to emerge from their sexual encounter.

**Table 1.** Ideal Hookup Results for Men and Women

	Men	Women	Total
In Friendship	20(18.0%)	46(17.7%)	66
In a Romantic Relationship	37(33.3%)	134(51.5%)	171
Future Hookups	39(35.1%)	41(15.8%)	80
Nothing More	15(13.5%)	39(15.0%)	54
Total	111	260	371

Numbers indicate the number of responses by the sample.

While the sexes showed no significant differences between their engagement in sexual behaviors with romantic partners or “true” friends, a Chi-square across sex and engagement in sexual behaviors with acquaintances was significant,  $\chi^2(407) = 5.41, p = .020$ , and across sex and engagement in sexual behaviors with strangers was significant,  $\chi^2(407) = 3.87, p = .049$ . Women were much more likely to report that they do not engage in hookups with acquaintances or strangers.

A Chi-square across sex and agreement with the statement “I would not engage in hookup behavior” was significant,  $\chi^2(407) = 5.39, p = .020$ . Women were also more likely than men to claim that they do not engage in hookup behavior. Because the opportunity may not be available for all participants to engage in hookup behavior or participants have no interest in engaging in hookup behavior, their attitudes towards the social culture were also evaluated.

Lastly, a Chi-square was computed in order to ascertain whether university status had any effect on hookup behavior. The Chi-square was significant,  $\chi^2(407) = 32.6, p < .0001$ . Upperclassmen reported significantly more participation in the hookup behavior.

**Analyses of Variance.** To determine if the sexes differed in their acceptance of hooking up behavior and overall satisfaction with hooking up, ANOVAs were computed across sex for to examine students’ agreement with hooking up behavior of peers and their overall satisfaction with hooking up. The ANOVA for agreement with hooking up behavior was significant,  $F(1, 407) = 15.34, p < .0001$ , see Table 2. The ANOVA for overall satisfaction with hooking up was also significant,  $F(1, 345) = 36.29, p < .0001$ , see Table 2. Men were more in agreement with the hooking up behavior of their peers than women were and were more satisfied overall with hooking up than women were. The social desirability covariate was also significant,  $F(1, 345) = 13.58, p = .048$ . The effects of social desirability were partialled out.

**Table 2.** Effect of Sex of Participant on: Agreement with Hookup Behavior of Peers, and Overall Satisfaction with Hooking up

Sex	Agreement	Satisfaction
Male	3.44(1.58)	8.66(2.11)
Female	2.77(1.59)	7.30(1.75)

Higher numbers mean more agreement and more satisfaction, standard deviations are in parentheses.

**Regression Models.** In order to determine if parental relationship quality affected agreement with the hookup behavior of peers separate regression models with collinearity diagnostics were computed for each sex. In each regression the dependent variable was agreement with hookup behavior and the independent variables were same sex parent relationship quality, opposite sex parent relationship quality, and the social desirability sum score.

The regression model for men was significant,  $F(3, 117) = 7.17, p = .03, R^2 = .07$ . Agreement with the behavior of peers who have hookups was predicted by, opposite sex parental relationship quality,  $B = -.28, p = .005$ , and same sex parental relationship quality,  $B = .19, p = .05$ , see Table 3. Men with low relationship quality with their mothers were significantly more likely to agree with the hookup behaviors of their peers than were their high relationship quality male peers. The regression model for women was not significant. Collinearity diagnostics revealed freedom from multicollinearity for all models tested.

**Table 3.** Regression Model for Effects of Parent-child Relationship Quality on Agreement with the Hookup Behaviors of Others for Men

Measure	B	SE
Opposite Sex Relationship Quality	-.28**	.02
Same Sex Relationship Quality	.19*	.01
Social Desirability Score	-.04	.07
R <sup>2</sup>	.07	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.05	

\*\*=  $p < .005$ , \*=  $p < .05$

Separate regression models were also computed to determine if parental relationship quality affects students' overall satisfaction with hooking up. The dependent variable in the models was overall satisfaction with hooking up and the independent variables in the model were once again opposite parental relationship quality, same sex parental relationship quality, and the social desirability score.

The regression model for women was significant,  $F(3, 238) = 3.53, p = .02, R^2 = .04$ . Same sex parental relationship quality was a marginally significant predictor of overall satisfaction with hooking up,  $B = .14, p = .055$ , see Table 4. Women with high relationship quality with their mothers were more satisfied with hooking up.



**Table 4.** Regression Model for Effects of Parent-child Relationship Quality on Overall Satisfaction with the Hookup Behavior for Women

Measure	<i>B</i>	SE
Opposite Sex Relationship Quality	.04	.008
Same Sex Relationship Quality	.14*	.01
Social Desirability Score	.11	.06
R <sup>2</sup>	.04	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.03	

\*=  $p = .055$

The regression model for overall satisfaction with hooking up for men was not significant. Collinearity diagnostics revealed freedom from multicollinearity for all models tested.

## Discussion

### *On Sex Differences*

The results were generally consistent with previous research in that the hookup culture is highly pervasive on the college campus and that defining the term hookup is difficult. Not everyone chooses the same partners or engages in the same specific behaviors under the umbrella of “hookups.” Careful consideration of the data show that university status and sex differences revealed the most significant differences.

Though some previous research on hooking up has found no sex differences (Garcia & Reiber, 2008), the sex differences discovered in the present study are consistent with other research (Bogle, 2008). Women were found to be significantly more likely than men to report that they do not engage in hookups with acquaintances or strangers, being choosier when selecting sexual partners (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Garcia & Reiber, 2008). Women were also more likely to check off that they did not engage in hookup behavior at all. With a greater biological investment in mating, evolutionary theory supports that women are the more selective sex. Men, on the other hand, with more expendable gametes and a greater period of fertility, reported engaging in hookups with many different partners, with whom they share a wide array of relationships, even without commitment (Bailey et al., 1994).

Consistent with Garcia and Reiber (2008), participants reported a very low expectation of romantic relationships resulting from hookup encounters. However, in the current study, ideal results of sexual interaction varied across sex. Women were significantly more likely than men to want a romantic relationship to emerge from their sexual encounter. This further shows that women seek more than a physical encounter, but an emotional and more long-term investment as well (Buss & Schmitt, 1993).

Overall, men were significantly more likely to agree with the hookup behaviors of their peers than women did, consistent with the evolutionary theory that uncommitted sexual behavior is more desirable for men (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Buss, 2003; Garcia & Reiber, 2008). Likewise, men were significantly more satisfied with hooking up than women were. This is consistent with the research of Owen and Fincham (2010) in which men reported more positive and fewer negative emotional reactions to hooking up than women did, though both men and women report that their experiences were more positive than negative. Considering the typical outcomes of hookup encounters and differing

evolutionary investment in sexual activities for men and women, from an evolutionary theory perspective one would expect men and women to differ in this way.

*On Parent-child Relationships*

Further investigation of the sex difference in agreement with casual sexual behavior revealed that the quality of the opposite-sex parent-child relationship was the strongest predictor of men's agreement with their peers' hookup behavior. While this is somewhat consistent with previous research on family turmoil (Belsky & Draper, 1991), it suggests that turmoil with one parent, similar to family turmoil, impacts children's sexual attitudes. Men with low relationship quality with their mothers were significantly more likely than men with high relationship quality with their mother to agree with their peer's hookup behavior. A son's turmoil with his mother may lead to insecure or avoidant attachment with women and consequently the son then views promiscuous sexual behavior such as hooking up as more acceptable. Observational learning may take place such that these low relationship quality with mother men never learn how to form a relationship with the opposite sex. Thus, they view uncommitted casual sex such as hooking up as very appropriate.

Working models of parental relationships imply that sexual imprinting shapes relationship styles in offspring (Collins & Read, 1990); therefore, stronger, more positive relationships with their mothers may encourage the men with higher relationship quality to seek more valuable and long lasting relationships, thus making them less approving of hookup culture. Additionally, the presence of alcohol and lowered inhibitions which facilitate hookups (Testa & Parks, 1996) also frequently contribute to increased sexual assault on campus. Therefore, it is possible that men close to their mothers may view the campus sexual arena as a potential harmful place to women. Consequently, they are less approving of the hookup culture.

In addition to the sex difference found regarding satisfaction with hookups, for women, satisfaction was predicted by same sex parental relationship quality. Women with high relationship quality with their mothers were more satisfied with hooking up. In terms of family turmoil, women who experience less turmoil with their mothers were more content with hookup behavior. Women practicing more selectivity with their hookup partners may feel their discriminating choice allows them to conform to social norms of sexual selectivity (Buss & Schmitt, 1993).

*On University Status*

The factor of university status also plays a role in hookup behavior. Having spent more than just a few months on campus, upperclassmen were significantly more likely to be more active (high) in hookup behavior than underclassmen. The findings indicate that hookup culture is so pervasive that the amount of exposure students have to the hypersexual campus climate is more likely to determine their participation in hookup behaviors, regardless of the relationships students built with their parents before coming to the university.

Also consistent with previous research, there is a common misperception that everyone is hooking up on college campuses (Bogle, 2008). While the proportions are generally high, 76.2% of the sample had engaged in a hookup. So, although the hookup culture is widely spread, not everyone is hooking up.

*Significance*

Although much research has been done to assess the prominence of hookup culture on campuses around the country, there is a dearth of research that offers explanations as to why these behaviors are so common. Though some research has investigated some of the negative impacts on daughters with absent fathers, whether or not the quality of parent-child relationships has an impact on young adult's hookup desires and participation had not yet been determined.

The present research addressed this dearth and shows that the quality of the relationship shared by a mother and son impacts the son's desires for romantic partners. This present research also adds to the small body of evolutionary theory based research that focuses on hookup behavior, especially as situated within the biopsychosocial model (Garcia et al, 2012).

*Limitations*

Items assessing hookup behavior were prefaced with a general definition of hooking up which incorporates all sexual behavior from kissing to intercourse. This is a broad range of sexual activity associated with different health risks and social stigmas. Engaging in spontaneous sexual behavior may expose an individual to sexually transmitted disease. The double standards of sexuality ingrained in popular culture also subjects individuals, especially women, to tarnishing their reputations. More specific questions regarding behavior may have revealed more differentiation between the subjects by the extent to which they become intimate with hookup partners. Kissing and sexual intercourse were not differentiated in this study even though the behaviors are associated with different levels of risk.

The greatest limitation of the study was having a homogenous sample of middle to upper class, white students. Nearly every member of the sample had two present biological parents, three-quarters of which were still married to each other. This is not necessarily representative of the general population. Other universities or regions of the country may reflect a more diverse population more strongly impacted by parent-absence. Lastly, more women participated in the present study than men did and few racial minorities and minorities of sexual identity were represented in the present study as well.

*Suggestions for Further Research*

While the study above aimed to assess the impact of relationships with parents on sexual behavior, other interpersonal relationships with siblings, same and opposite sex friends, and other people may also affect hookup behavior. Therefore, future research should examine the effect of other interpersonal relationships on hookup behavior. Additionally, future research examining the effect of other variables such as the attractiveness of a potential sexual partner, and women's menstrual cycles is warranted since these factors can also affect sexual behavior.

**Received July 15, 2012; Revision received November 9, 2012; Accepted November 16, 2012**

## References

- Ainsworth, M., Belhar, M., Waters, E. & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anderson, K. G., Kaplan, H., Lam, D., & Lancaster, J. (1999). Paternal care by genetic fathers and stepfathers II: Reports by Xhosa high school students. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 20*, 433-451.
- Bailey, J. M., Gaulin, S., Agyei, Y., & Gladue, B. A. (1994). Effects of gender and sexual orientation on evolutionarily relevant aspects of human mating psychology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*(6), 1081-1093.
- Belsky, J., Steinberg, L., & Draper, P. (1991). Childhood experience, interpersonal development, and reproductive strategy: An evolutionary theory of socialization. *Childhood Development, 62*, 647-670.
- Bisson, M. A., & Levine, T. R. (2009). Negotiating a friends with benefits relationship. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 38*, 66-73.
- Bogle, K. (2008). *Hooking up*. New York: New York University Press.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment* [Vol. 1 of Attachment and Loss]. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Separation: Anxiety and anger* [Vol. 2 of Attachment and Loss]. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Bowlby, J. (1979). *The Making and breaking of affectional bonds*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Bradshaw, C., Kahn, A. S., & Saville, B. K. (2010). To hook up or date: Which gender benefits? *Sex Roles, 62*, 661-669.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12*, 1-49.
- Buss, D. M. & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review, 100*(2), 204-232.
- Chia, S. C. & Gunther, A. C. (2006). How media contribute to misperceptions of social norms about sex. *Mass Communication & Society, 9*, 301-320.
- Collins, N. L. & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(4), 644-663.
- Draper, P. & Harpending, H. (1982). Father absence and reproductive strategy: an evolutionary perspective. *Journal of Anthropological Research, 38*, 255-273.
- England, P. & Thomas, R. (2009). The decline of the date and the rise of the college hookup. In A. Skolnick & J. Skolnick. (Eds.), *Family in Transition, 15*, 141-152. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Feeney, J. A. (2008). Adult romantic attachment: Developments in the study of couple relationships. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver. (Eds.), *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications, 2*, 131-157. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Furman, W., Simon, V. A., Shaffer, L., & Bouchey, H. A. (2002). Adolescents' working models and styles for relationships with parents, friends, and romantic partners. *Child Development, 73*, 241-255.
- Garcia, J. R. & Reiber, C. (2008). Hook up behavior: A biopsychosocial perspective. *Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology, 192-208*.

- Garcia, J. R., Reiber, C., Massey, S. G., & Merriwether, A. M. (2012). Sexual hookup culture: A review. *Review of General Psychology, 16*(2), 161-176.
- Gibson, M. A. (2008). Does investment in the sexes differ when fathers are absent? Sex-biased infant survival and child growth in rural Ethiopia. *Human Nature, 19*(3), 263-276. DOI: 10.1007/s12110-008-9044-2
- Grello, C. M., Welsh, D. P. & Harper, M. S. (2006). No strings attached: The nature of casual sex in college students. *Journal of Sex Research, 43*, 255–267.
- Gyuris, P., Jarai, R. & Bereczkei, T. (2010). The effect of childhood experiences on mate choice in personality traits: Homogamy and sexual imprinting. *Personality and Individual Differences, 49*, 467-472.
- Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., & Cason, M. J. (2009). The “booty call”: A compromise between men’s and women’s ideal mating strategies. *The Journal of Sex Research, 46*, 1-11.
- Lehmiller, J. J., VanderDrift, L. E., & Kelly, J. R. (2010). Sex differences in approaching friends with benefits relationships. *Journal of Sex Research, 48*, 275-284.
- Main, M., & Goldwyn, R. (1998). *Adult attachment classification system*. Unpublished manuscript. University of California: Berkeley, CA.
- Owen, J. & Fincham, F. D. (2010). Young adults’ emotional reactions after hooking up encounters. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 40*(2), 321-330.
- Reiber, C. & Garcia, J. (2010). Hooking up: Gender differences, evolution, and pluralistic ignorance. *Evolutionary Psychology, 8*(3), 390-404.
- Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(5), 971-980.
- Simpson, J. A. & Belsky, J. (2008). Attachment theory within a modern evolutionary framework. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver. (Eds.), *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications* (Vol. 2), 131-157. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Strahan, R. & Gerbasi, K. C. (1972). Short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 28*, 191-193.
- Testa, M. & Parks, K. A. (1996). The role of women’s alcohol consumption in sexual victimization. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 1*(3), 217-234.