

Motivations for Sex among College-Attending Emerging Adults: A Developmental Perspective

A Thesis Presented for the
Master of Science
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Kayley Nicole Davis
May 2018

Copyright © by Kayley N. Davis
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my major professor, Dr. Spencer Olmstead, for guiding me in this process and for encouraging me in my pursuit of a Master's degree.

I would like to thank Drs. Amy Rauer and John Orme, my committee members, for their valued and thoughtful feedback and support throughout this process.

I would also like to thank the Department of Child and Family Studies, for providing me with the opportunity to complete the Master's degree, as well as the members of the Well-Being in Adolescents and Emerging Adults (WAE) Research Lab for their support and feedback.

Lastly, I would like to thank my father, Dr. Trey Davis, who has always encouraged me to persist through adversity. His support of me throughout this process was a vital part of its completion. I would also like to thank my life partner, Tyler McMahan, for always supporting me, and especially so throughout this process. The love and support I receive from both of them propelled me through the completion of a Master's degree and a thesis.

ABSTRACT

Emerging adulthood (ages 18-29) is theorized to be a distinct developmental period in the life course that embodies many unique experiences, including within the realms of sex and sexuality. Sexual activity among emerging adults is well documented; however, limited attention has been given to the association between developmental perceptions and endorsed motivations for sex. This study examined how perceptions of emerging adulthood status are associated with college students' ($N = 1,109$) endorsed motivations for sex (i.e., enhancement, intimacy, and coping), after controlling for demographic and known correlates of motivations for sex. Identity exploration, experimentation/possibilities, and negativity/instability were positively associated with enhancement motivations for sex, whereas only identity exploration was positively associated with intimacy motivations for sex. Lastly, negativity/instability was positively associated with coping motivations for sex, and self-focus and feeling “in-between” were negatively associated with coping motivations for sex. Implications for research and sexuality education for emerging adult populations are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL INFORMATION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW	2
Theoretical Background.....	2
Motivations for Sex in Emerging Adulthood.....	3
Identity Exploration	4
Experimentation/Possibilities	4
Instability	5
Self-Focus	5
Feeling “In-Between”	5
CHAPTER THREE MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	7
Current Study	7
Participants.....	8
Procedures.....	9
Measures	10
Control Variables: Demographic Correlates of Motivations for Sex	10
Control Variables: Other Known Correlates of Motivations for Sex	10
Independent Variables: Features of Emerging Adulthood.....	12
Dependent Variables: Motivations for Sex.....	13
Analysis Plan	13
CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	15
Preliminary Analyses	15
Regression Analyses	16
Enhancement Motivations	16
Intimacy Motivations	17
Coping Motivations	17
Discussion	18
Enhancement Motivations	19
Intimacy Motivations	19
Coping Motivations	20
CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	23
Limitations	23
Implications.....	24
REFERENCES	26

APPENDIX.....	30
VITA.....	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive information and bivariate correlations with motivations for sex	31
Table 2: Hierarchical regression analyses for motivations for sex	33

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Emerging adulthood (ages 18-29) is a distinct developmental period, in which sexual exploration and experimentation typically occur (Arnett, 2015). Sexual engagement among emerging adults may have several motivations, including intimacy, physical pleasure, and coping (Cooper, Shapiro, & Powers, 1998; Patrick, Maggs, & Abar, 2007). Although various motivations for sex among emerging adults have been examined, there is not a distinct theoretical framework that enhances our understanding of motivations for sex among emerging adults (Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006). Thus, the purpose of this study was to use the emerging adulthood framework (Arnett, 2015), situated within the life course theory (Bengston & Allen, 1993), to examine how emerging adults' perceptions of the various features of their current developmental period were associated with their endorsed motivations for engaging in sexual activity. Knowing what motivates emerging adults to engage in sexual activity is necessary to identify and reduce sexual risk behaviors and promote sexual health and well-being during this time of increased exploration and potential vulnerability (e.g., exposure to sexually transmitted infections [STIs]; Cooper et al., 1998; Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006; Patrick et al., 2007).

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Background

Although emerging adulthood is not a universally accepted stage in the life course (Arnett, Kloep, Hendry, & Tanner, 2011), with some scholars arguing that it is a developmental process rather than a stage (Arnett et al., 2011), we focused on facets of this period as a life course stage as presented by Arnett (2015). The emerging adulthood framework is especially useful for studying college students. While emerging adulthood can span a large age range (ages 18-29), using a more conservative age range (i.e., ages 18-25) may be more applicable to the study of college students (Arnett, 2015). Many students perceive their time in college as an opportunity for experimentation, identity exploration, and self-focus (Arnett, 2015). Thus, the emerging adult stage, situated within individual life course theory (Bengston & Allen, 1993), is a useful theory for interpreting and explaining behavioral motivations for sexual activity using college student samples.

A central concept within life course development theory is *stages* (White, Klein, & Martin, 2015). Emerging adulthood is a specific stage within the individual life course and is considered distinct from other developmental stages (e.g., adolescence, adulthood; Arnett, 2015). In addition, the concept of *norms* is important to life course theory. Norms are socially constructed expectations for behavior and are often influenced by age and life course stage (White et al., 2015). According to Arnett (2015), the following five features of emerging adulthood are considered normative for individuals in this particular stage: (a) identity exploration, (b) experimentation/possibilities, (c) being self-focused, (d) instability, and (e) feeling “in-between.” These norms are influenced by society, and, as such, do not necessarily exist within all contexts (Arnett, 2015). Many individuals within developed cultures who are

afforded more opportunities are considered emerging adults, as they have the option to explore their identity and experiment with various behaviors and beliefs (Arnett, 2015). Traditional college students fit within this developmental framework and were the focus of this study.

Motivations for Sex in Emerging Adulthood

Motivations for sex among emerging adults generally, and college students specifically, have been found to vary widely. The well-validated Sexual Motives Scale (SMS; Cooper et al., 1998) and its later revision (SMS-R; Patrick, Maggs, Cooper, & Lee, 2011) identify three commonly endorsed motivations for sexual activity: enhancement, intimacy and coping. *Enhancement* motivations for sex are defined as “appetitive self-focused motivations, such as having sex to enhance physical or emotional pleasure” (Cooper et al., 1998, p. 1530). *Intimacy* motivations for sex are defined as “appetitive social motives, such as having sex to achieve intimacy with another” (Cooper et al., 1998, p. 1530). *Coping* motivations for sex are defined as “aversive self-focused motives, such as having sex to cope with threats to self-esteem or to avoid or minimize negative emotions” (Cooper et al., 1998, p. 1530).

These endorsed motivations for sex mirror the five features of emerging adulthood discussed by Arnett (2015). Specifically, college-attending emerging adults have endorsed both self-focused and partner-focused reasons for sex, likely indicative of sexual enhancement motivations (appetitive, self-focused) and intimacy motivations (appetitive, socially-focused), respectively (Patrick et al., 2007). Some emerging adults have endorsed coping motivations (aversive, self-focused) for sex (Cooper et al., 1998; Patrick et al., 2011), which may be indicative of instability and self-focus during this developmental period. We consider the potential intersection of these motivations and features here.

Identity Exploration

First, emerging adults often explore various identities, including sexuality (Arnett, 2015; Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006). This sexual exploration allows for the development and validation of their sexual identity (Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006). Sexual exploration is prominent during emerging adulthood, suggesting that emerging adulthood is a “formative” time for sexual identity development, where sexuality will likely have been incorporated and validated at the conclusion of this period (Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006, p. 250). For example, many emerging adults have been found to engage in casual sex as a means of developing their sexual identity while remaining free of relationship commitment (Claxton & van Dulmen, 2013; Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006).

Experimentation/Possibilities

Emerging adulthood is also a time of sexual experimentation and possibilities. The various sexual possibilities present allow emerging adults to experiment with various sexual roles and norms, and engage in a variety of sexual behaviors (Arnett, 2015). For example, some emerging adults, who have typically identified as heterosexual, experiment by engaging sexually with members of the same sex (Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006). Some may choose to forgo their heterosexual identity to pursue a same-sex orientation, while others may return to identifying as heterosexual (Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006). Further, emerging adults encounter a variety of opportunities to make decisions about their sexual behavior (Allen, Husser, Stone, & Jordal, 2008). Because of this access to various opportunities, emerging adults can decide who they want to have sex with, in what relationship context they will have sex, and if they will use protection. Additionally, college-attending emerging adults likely encounter new and different ideas about sexuality upon entering college, thus providing them with various ideas and philosophies with which to experiment (Lefkowitz, 2005).

Instability

Although having multiple options may be considered ideal for decision-making, they may also create instability (Arnett, 2015), including in the realm of sexuality. For example, whereas sexual activity has been found to be common among emerging adults, some research suggested that they engage in sex less frequently than older adults but are likely to have more sexual partners (e.g., Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006; Regnerus & Uecker, 2011). In addition to this discrepancy between sexual engagement and number of partners, emerging adults appear to engage in casual sex at greater rates than those in other age groups (Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006). Thus, it appears that emerging adults, in general, report having more sexual partners but engage in sex less frequently, yet engage in casual sex more frequently than others. This discrepancy between sexual behavior and frequency of sexual engagement is one example of sexual instability among emerging adults.

Self-Focus

Emerging adults have the opportunity to focus on themselves during this developmental period. As Arnett (2015) noted, this does not imply a time of selfishness, but rather a time to focus on one's self and determine what one wants for work, school, love, and sex. This self-focus allows for the development and modification of the sexual self (Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006). For example, some emerging adults may focus on and explore their various sexual interests (e.g., orientation, behaviors, attitudes, etc.) given their exposure to new ideas and freedom from parental monitoring.

Feeling "In-Between"

Emerging adults often report feeling that they are "in-between" adolescence and adulthood (Arnett, 2015). It is within this "in-between" period that emerging adults experience exploration and instability in various facets of life (Arnett, 2015). Emerging adults may

experience feelings of being “in-between” adolescence and adulthood regarding sexual behaviors, attitudes, and orientations (Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006). For example, for many emerging adults, sexuality exists between adolescence, where sex is often a novel phenomenon, and adulthood, where sex typically occurs with a life partner. According to Arnett (2015), most emerging adults do envision themselves getting married, but the marriage is an eventual outcome, not one actively being pursued. Rather, many emerging adults spend time exploring various romantic and sexual relationships. While romantic and sexual engagement may not be novel to them anymore, many emerging adults are not quite ready to commit to a monogamous sexual relationship (Arnett, 2015).

CHAPTER THREE MATERIALS AND METHODS

Current Study

The purpose of this study was to examine how motivations for sex (enhancement, intimacy and coping) were associated with the five developmental features of emerging adulthood. Because emerging adulthood can be a time of sexual exploration (Lefkowitz, 2005), it is important to assess how motivations for sex can be explained by developmental status, as this may improve sexual health education for emerging adults. We used non-directional tests, as a result in either direction would be important to detect (controlling for demographic and other known correlates of motivations for sex), but we anticipated the following directions in the tested associations:

H1: Greater agreement that this is a time of identity exploration will be positively associated with enhancement motivations for sex (H1a) and negatively associated with intimacy (H1b) and coping motivations for sex (H1c).

H2: Greater agreement that this is a time of experimentation/possibilities will be positively associated with enhancement (H2a) and intimacy motivations for sex (H2b) and negatively associated with coping motivations for sex (H2c).

H3: Greater agreement that this is a time of instability will be positively associated with enhancement (H3a) and coping motivations for sex (H3b) and negatively associated with intimacy motivations for sex (H3c).

H4: Greater agreement that this is a time of being self-focused will be positively associated with enhancement (H4a) and coping motivations for sex (H4b) and negatively associated with intimacy motivations for sex (H4c).

H5: Greater agreement that this is a time of feeling “in-between” will be positively associated with enhancement (H5a) and coping motivations for sex (H5b) and negatively associated with intimacy motivations for sex (H5c).

Participants

Participants were college-attending emerging adults recruited using communications studies research pools at a large public university in the Southeastern U.S. To increase sample size, two distinct samples from different semesters were combined. Cross-sectional data were collected in the fall 2014 ($N = 660$) and spring 2015 ($N = 985$) semesters. A total of 536 participants were removed for failure to meet the following eligibility requirements: they were 26 years or older ($n = 28$), they were engaged or married ($n = 5$), they had never engaged in any sexual behaviors (i.e., had not engaged in oral sex nor vaginal/anal intercourse; $n = 375$), they did not answer a demographic question that was included in analyses ($n = 40$), they indicated a “sex” other than male or female (i.e., transgender; $n = 1$), and they dropped out of the study prior to completing relevant study variables ($n = 87$). Although emerging adulthood has been theorized to range in age from 18-29, we limited our study to early emerging adulthood (ages 18-25), as the sample largely consisted of traditional college-attending emerging adults.

Of the participants removed (for dropping out, failure to answer a demographic question, or indicating a sex other than male or female), a greater proportion of participants removed (14.9%) identified as another race/ethnicity than did participants who identified as White/Caucasian (9.0%). This proportional difference was significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 1231) = 5.96, p = .02$. Additionally, a greater proportion of participants from the fall semester (15.2%) were removed than those from the spring semester (7.0%). This proportional difference was significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 1234) = 21.65, p \leq .001$. Lastly, participants removed reported greater

religiosity ($M = 11.96$, $SD = 6.30$, *potential range* = 0-20) than did participants who were retained ($M = 10.48$, $SD = 5.96$, *potential range* = 0-20); $t(1210) = -2.40$, $p = .02$.

The final study sample ($N = 1,109$) had a mean age of 19.1 years ($SD = 1.11$, *range* = 18-25). The sample was 58.1% women. Most participants (63.9%) were freshmen, followed by sophomores (24.2%), juniors (7.3%), seniors (4.5%), and “other” year in school (0.1%). Most (86.1%) identified their race/ethnicity as White/Caucasian, followed by Black/African American (6.6%), Asian American/Pacific Islander (2.8%), “other” race/ethnicity (2.6%), Latino/a or Hispanic (1.6%), and Native American/American Indian (0.3%). Most (94.9%) identified as heterosexual, followed by bisexual (2.6%), gay/lesbian (1.4%), unsure (0.7%), and “other” sexual orientation (0.4%). Most participants (45.1%) were in a committed relationship (i.e., dating exclusively) at the time of the study, followed by not being in a relationship (37.2%) and being in a casual relationship (i.e., a hookup relationship, a friends with benefits relationship, dating non-exclusively, hanging out, or talking; 17.7%).

Procedures

Data were collected as part of a larger research project about emerging adult characteristics and their associations with individual traits, behaviors, and relationships, which was approved by the university’s institutional review board. Participants were informed that the purpose of the study was to learn more about the period of emerging adulthood and how it relates to traits, behaviors, and relationships. They were instructed during the consent process that the survey would inquire about sexual attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. After providing informed consent, participants completed an online, restricted-access survey containing demographic items, scales and measures, and open-ended questions. Participants were compensated in the form of partial course credit.

Measures

Control Variables: Demographic Correlates of Motivations for Sex

We controlled for several demographic characteristics that have been shown to be related to emerging adults' motivations for sex, including age, biological sex, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation (see Armstrong & Reissing, 2015; Dawson, Shih, de Moor, & Shrier, 2008; Patrick et al., 2011). Additionally, we created a dichotomous variable for semester of data collection to control for semester (0 = *fall 2014*, 1 = *spring 2015*), as various events during the two semesters may influence sexual motivations (e.g., sporting events and spring break; e.g., Patrick, Morgan, Maggs, & Lefkowitz, 2011).

Control Variables: Other Known Correlates of Motivations for Sex

In addition to demographic characteristics, several variables have been shown to be related to emerging adults' motivations for sex and were controlled for in our analyses, including religiosity, relationship type, lifetime sexual experience, and casual sex attitudes (see Armstrong & Reissing, 2015; Patrick et al., 2011; Vasilenko, Duntzee, Zheng, & Lefkowitz, 2013).

Religiosity

Participants were asked, "Please indicate the level of intensity of your religious beliefs." Responses options ranged from (0) *Not at all intense* to (20) *Very intense*. Higher scores indicated greater religiosity. This single item measure has been used in previous studies on emerging adult sexual attitudes and behaviors (Blinded Citation).

Relationship type

Participants were first asked, "Are you currently in a romantic relationship?" Response options were (0) *No* and (1) *Yes*. For those who marked *Yes*, they were then asked, "If you are in a romantic relationship, which of the following best describes your relationship?" Response options included: *a hookup relationship*, *a friends with benefits relationship*, *dating-but not*

exclusively, hanging out, talking, and dating-exclusively. A categorical variable was created based on responses to these two questions. Participants who indicated that they were not in a relationship were coded as (0) *Not in a relationship*. Participants who indicated that they were in *a hookup relationship, a friends with benefits relationship, dating-but not exclusively, hanging out, or talking* were coded as (1) *In a casual relationship*. Participants who indicated they were *dating-exclusively* were coded as (2) *In a committed relationship*. In the analyses, *Not in a relationship* (0) was used as the reference group. This measure has been used in previous studies on emerging adult sexual attitudes and behaviors (Blinded Citation).

Sexual experience

The *sexual experience* variable was created using four items regarding consensual sexual behaviors. Participants were asked the following questions and asked to answer as *Yes* or *No*: “Have you ever given oral sex (oral-genital contact)?”; “Have you ever received oral sex (oral-genital contact)?”; “Have you ever had vaginal sex (penile-vaginal intercourse)?”; and “Have you ever had anal sex (penile-anal intercourse)?” A new variable was created to indicate whether participants had (0) *Only engaged in oral sex behaviors* and (1) *Engaged in intercourse behaviors* (i.e., vaginal and/or anal intercourse). It is important to distinguish oral sex from penile-vaginal/penile-anal intercourse, as studies have found that college students often do not define oral-genital contact as “having sex” (Hans & Kimberly, 2011; Sanders & Reinisch, 1999).

Casual sex attitudes

Casual sex attitudes was measured using Simpson and Gangestad’s (1991) attitudinal measure of sociosexuality. These three items were, “Sex without love is okay”; “I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying ‘casual sex’ with different partners”; and “I would have to be closely attached to someone (both emotionally and psychologically) before I can feel

comfortable and fully enjoy having sex with him or her” (reverse coded). Response options ranged from (1) *Strongly disagree* to (9) *Strongly agree*. Items were averaged with a possible range of 1 to 9. Higher scores indicate more permissive attitudes towards casual sex. Cronbach’s alpha for this measure was $\alpha = .82$.

Independent Variables: Features of Emerging Adulthood

The 31-item Inventory of the Dimensions of Emerging Adulthood (IDEA) scale was used to measure the perceived features of emerging adulthood (Reifman, Arnett, & Colwell, 2007). The IDEA has strong reliability and consistency with other demographic variables consistent with emerging adulthood (see Reifman et al., 2007). Participants read the following prompt:

First, think about this time in your life. By ‘time in your life,’ we are referring to the present time, plus the last few years that have gone by, and the next few years to come, as you see them. In short, you should think about a roughly five-year period, with the present time right in the middle. For each phrase shown below, please circle a number to indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree that the phrase describes this time in your life.

Each response began with the stem, “Is this period of your life a...,” and response options ranged from (1) *Strongly disagree* to (5) *Strongly agree*. Items within each subscale were averaged with a possible range of 1 to 5. Higher scores indicated greater identification with each feature of emerging adulthood.

We included the five subscales that measured the features of emerging adulthood. The identity exploration subscale included seven items (e.g., “Is this period of your life a time of finding out who you are?”; $\alpha = .90$). The experimentation/possibilities subscale included five items (e.g., “Is this period of your life a time of experimentation?”; $\alpha = .87$). The self-focus

subscale included six items (e.g., “Is this period of your life a time of focusing on yourself?”; $\alpha = .86$). The negativity/instability subscale included seven items (e.g., “Is this period of your life a time of confusion?”; $\alpha = .80$). The feeling “in-between” subscale included three items (e.g., “Is this period of your life a time of being not sure whether you have reached full adulthood?”; $\alpha = .81$).

Dependent Variables: Motivations for Sex

This study focused on three motivations for sex as dependent variables: enhancement, intimacy, and coping. We used the Sexual Motives Scale-Revised (SMS-R) to measure motivations for sex (Patrick et al., 2011). Participants read the following prompt: “Listed below are different reasons why people have sex. How important is each of these reasons in influencing your decisions about whether or not to have sex?” Response options ranged from (1) *Not at all important* to (5) *Very important*. Items for each subscale were averaged with a possible range of 1 to 5. Higher scores indicated greater endorsement for each motivation for sex. The enhancement subscale contained five items (e.g., “I have sex because I feel horny”; $\alpha = .92$). The intimacy subscale contained five items (e.g., “I have sex to have an emotional connection with my partner”; $\alpha = .96$). The coping subscale contained five items (e.g., “I have sex to cope with upset feelings”; $\alpha = .95$).

Analysis Plan

We conducted three hierarchical linear regressions to examine how perceived developmental status was related to enhancement, intimacy, and coping motivations for sex. In Block 1, we entered the five demographic correlates of motivations for sex: age, sex, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and semester (as control variables). In Block 2, we entered four additional known correlates of motivations for sex: religiosity, relationship type, sexual

experience, and casual sex attitudes (also control variables). In Block 3, we entered our independent variables: the five IDEA subscales. All analyses were conducted using SPSS 24.

CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Preliminary Analyses

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the variables in our study (All tables and figures are located in the appendix). The average level of religiosity was 10.48 ($SD = 5.96$, *potential range* = 0-20). The majority (45.1%) reported their relationship type as a committed relationship, followed by no relationship (37.2%) and a casual relationship (17.7%). Regarding lifetime sexual experience, most (82.7%) had engaged in intercourse (vaginal/anal), whereas 17.3% had engaged in oral sex only. Participants' mean score on the casual sex attitudes scale was 4.06 ($SD = 2.35$, *potential range* = 1-9). Regarding the IDEA subscales (*potential range* = 1-5), the average for experimentation/possibilities was 4.17 ($SD = .78$), followed by identity exploration ($M = 4.15$, $SD = .77$), self-focus ($M = 4.13$, $SD = .71$), feeling "in-between" ($M = 4.09$, $SD = .86$), and negativity/instability ($M = 3.67$, $SD = .72$). For our dependent variables (*potential range* = 1-5), the highest endorsed motivation for sex was intimacy ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.12$), followed by enhancement ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.06$) and coping ($M = 2.07$, $SD = 1.12$).

Table 1 also shows the bivariate correlations between the demographic controls, known correlate controls and independent variables (IDEA subscales) with the dependent variables (enhancement, intimacy, and coping motives). The demographic and known correlate control variables were generally associated with the dependent variables. Additionally, the IDEA subscales (i.e., independent variables) were correlated with the dependent variables, with the exception of coping, which was not correlated with the identity exploration or negativity/instability subscales.

Regression Analyses

Enhancement Motivations

Our first regression analysis examined enhancement motivations for sex. In Block 1, the demographic controls were entered (sex, age, race, sexual orientation, and semester). This model was significant, $F(5, 1108) = 6.99, p \leq .001$, and accounted for 2.6% of the variance in enhancement motivations for sex. In this model, sex ($\beta = .10, p \leq .001$), age ($\beta = .07, p = .02$), race ($\beta = -.08, p = .01$), and sexual orientation ($\beta = -.10, p = .002$) were significant. In Block 2, we entered the known correlates of motivations for sex (religiosity, relationship type, sexual experience, and casual sex attitudes) as control variables. This model was significant, $F(10, 1108) = 32.19, p \leq .001$, and explained an additional 19.4% of the variance. In this model, religiosity ($\beta = -.08, p = .008$), being in a committed relationship ($\beta = .08, p = .009$), sexual experience ($\beta = .20, p \leq .001$), and attitudes toward casual sex ($\beta = .34, p \leq .001$) were significant. In the final model (Block 3; see Table 2), the five IDEA subscales were added. Identity exploration ($\beta = .11, p = .02$), experimentation/possibilities ($\beta = .09, p = .05$), and negativity/instability ($\beta = .09, p = .011$) were significant. This final model was significant, adjusted $R^2 = .259, F(15, 1108) = 26.78, p \leq .001$, and explained an additional 5.9% of the variance in enhancement motivations for sex.

Three of our five hypotheses regarding enhancement motivations for sex were supported. Specifically, we hypothesized that identity exploration, experimentation/possibilities, and negativity/instability would be positively associated with enhancement motivations for sex (H1a, H2a, and H3a, respectively). Overall, we found that non-white participants, those in a committed relationship, with more sexual experience, and with more permissive casual sex attitudes reported greater enhancement motivations for sex. Individuals who were highly religious endorsed fewer enhancement motivations for sex. Lastly, individuals who indicated greater

agreement with the identity exploration, experimentation/possibilities, and negativity/instability subscales endorsed greater enhancement motives for sex.

Intimacy Motivations

Our second regression analysis examined intimacy motivations for sex. The demographic controls were entered in Block 1. This model was significant, $F(5, 1108) = 2.90, p = .013$, and accounted for 0.9% of the variance. In this model, sex ($\beta = -.10, p \leq .001$) was significant. The known correlate controls were entered in Block 2. This model was significant, $F(10, 1108) = 15.82, p \leq .001$, and explained an additional 10.9% of the variance. In this model, being in a committed relationship ($\beta = .27, p \leq .001$), sexual experience ($\beta = .13, p \leq .001$), and attitudes toward casual sex ($\beta = -.14, p \leq .001$) were significant. In the final model (Block 3; see Table 2), the five IDEA subscales were added, and only identity exploration ($\beta = .17, p \leq .001$) was significant. The final model was significant, adjusted $R^2 = .152, F(15, 1108) = 14.23, p \leq .001$, and explained an additional 3.4% of the variance in intimacy motivations for sex.

None of our hypotheses regarding intimacy motivations for sex were supported. However, the identity exploration subscale was positively related to intimacy motivations for sex, in the opposite direction of our hypothesis (H1b). Overall, individuals in committed relationships and with more sexual experience reported greater intimacy motivations for sex, whereas those more permissive casual sex attitudes endorsed fewer intimacy motivations for sex. Finally, individuals who indicated greater agreement with the identity exploration subscale endorsed greater intimacy motivations for sex.

Coping Motivations

Our third regression analysis examined coping motivations for sex. We entered the demographic controls in Block 1. This model was significant, $F(5, 1108) = 13.86, p \leq .001$, and

accounted for 5.5% of the variance. Sex ($\beta = .19, p \leq .001$), race ($\beta = -.09, p = .003$), and semester ($\beta = .11, p \leq .001$) were significant. Next, we entered the known correlate controls in Block 2. This model was significant, $F(10, 1108) = 16.37, p \leq .001$, and explained an additional 6.7% of the variance. In this model, being in a casual relationship ($\beta = .11, p \leq .001$), sexual experience ($\beta = .08, p = .007$), and attitudes towards casual sex ($\beta = .17, p \leq .001$) were significant. In the final model (Block 3; see Table 2), the five IDEA subscales were added, and negativity/instability ($\beta = .16, p \leq .001$), self-focus ($\beta = -.12, p = .02$), and feeling “in-between” ($\beta = -.10, p = .02$) were significant. The final model was significant, adjusted $R^2 = .143$ $F(15, 1108) = 13.30, p \leq .001$, and explained an additional 2.1% of the variance in coping motivations for sex.

Only one of five hypotheses regarding coping motivations for sex was supported. Specifically, negativity/instability was positively associated with coping motivations for sex (H3b). Contrary to our hypotheses, self-focus and feeling “in-between” were negatively associated with coping motivations for sex (H4b and H5b, respectively). Overall, men, non-white participants, those in casual relationships, with more sexual experience, and more permissive casual sex attitudes reported greater coping motivations for sex. Lastly, individuals who reported greater agreement with the negativity/instability subscale reported greater coping motivations for sex. In contrast, those who reported greater agreement with the self-focus and feeling “in-between” subscales reported fewer coping motivations for sex.

Discussion

The findings from our study have important implications for sexual health interventions and the emerging adulthood and motivations for sex literatures, as these findings indicate there are links between developmental perceptions and motivations for sexual activity when

controlling for relevant factors. Some of our findings are consistent with the theoretical features of emerging adulthood, whereas others highlight the need for further theoretical work. Findings also highlight the influence of developmental perceptions on sexual motivations and the importance of addressing each in sexual health education interventions.

Enhancement Motivations

Consistent with the theoretical assertion that emerging adulthood is a time of sexual identity exploration, experimentation, and instability for college students (Arnett, 2015; Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006), findings suggest that emerging adults who agree that this time in their lives is a time of identity exploration, experimentation, and instability also endorsed greater enhancement motivations for sex. Within this developmental context, it appears that there is an important relationship between identity exploration, experimentation, and instability, and with pleasure-related sexual motivations, as previous research has found that college students endorse pleasure as a primary motivator for sexual engagement (Hill & Preston, 1996). Emerging adults often explore their sexual identity and experiment with various sexual identities and behaviors, and although this lends to more opportunities, this may also create more instability within the realm of sexuality (Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006). Thus, these features of emerging adulthood seem to inform enhancement, or self-focused, pleasure-related sexual motivations. Although we did not find support for a relationship between the self-focus and feeling “in-between” subscales and the enhancement subscale, our findings highlight the exploratory nature of sexuality among our sample of college-attending emerging adults.

Intimacy Motivations

Because it has been found that emerging adults often explore their sexual identity by engaging in casual sex relationships while remaining free of romantic relationship commitment

(Claxton & van Dulmen, 2013; Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2006), we hypothesized that emerging adults who reported greater identity exploration would also endorse fewer intimacy motivations for sex. Counter to this hypothesis, however, emerging adults who scored higher on identity exploration in fact endorsed greater intimacy motivations for sex. Although emerging adulthood is a time for sexual identity exploration, it is also a time to explore various relationship partners (Arnett, 2015). Emerging adults often explore their options regarding love before deciding on a monogamous sexual partner. According to Arnett (2015), many emerging adults engage in the social norm of serial monogamy (Regnerus & Uecker, 2011), exploring various partners and their characteristics before making a long-term commitment. Thus, their identity explorations in the realm of sexuality may be motivated by the desire to find a suitable long-term romantic partner (Arnett, 2015), which has been theorized to be the primary goal of young adulthood (Erikson, 1963). This is a potential explanation for our finding, in that college-attending emerging adults may consider exploring their sexuality as being consistent with also exploring sexual intimacy.

Coping Motivations

Regarding coping motivations for sex, we found support for only one of our hypotheses. Specifically, those who reported to a greater extent that this time in their life is one of negativity and instability also endorsed greater coping motivations for sex. This finding highlights the instability that many emerging adults may encounter, and suggests that for some emerging adults, sexual engagement might be motivated by the desire to “minimize negative emotions” (Cooper et al., 1998, p. 1530). Cooper and colleagues (1998) found that coping motivations seemed to “promote instability” within both casual and committed relationships (p. 1552).

Contrary to our hypotheses, those who reported greater feelings that this time in the life course was one of self-focus and feeling “in-between” also endorsed fewer coping motivations for sex. We hypothesized that the self-focus subscale would be positively related to coping motivations for sex because coping motivations are defined as “aversive, self-focused motives” (Cooper et al., 1998, p. 1530). Additionally, because feelings of being “in-between” adolescence and adulthood are related to feelings of instability (Arnett, 2015), we hypothesized a positive relationship between the feeling “in-between” subscale and coping. However, both the self-focus and feeling “in-between” subscales were negatively related to coping motivations for sex. These results are surprising, given the nature of these concepts.

Theoretically, as emerging adulthood is a time of self-focus, we expected the self-focus subscale to be related positively to coping motivations for sex, as these are described as self-focused motivations. Yet, as Arnett (2015) suggested, being self-focused is not necessarily a negative phenomenon, but rather, a time to focus on oneself and one’s wants and needs as a means to identity development. Thus, being self-focused, for some, may be about focusing on one’s self in a positive, constructive way, which would help explain the negative relationship between being self-focused and coping motivations.

According to Arnett (2015), many emerging adults report feeling “in-between” adolescence and adulthood. These feelings are attributed to the instability of this stage in the life course. Thus, we hypothesized that the feeling “in-between” subscale would be positively related to coping motivations for sex, similar to the instability subscale. If the feeling of being “in-between” is exacerbated by feelings of instability, then both, theoretically, should be positively related to coping motivations for sex. However, our results indicated that reporting greater feelings of being “in-between” was negatively associated with coping motivations for sex.

Although feeling “in-between” includes aspects of negativity and instability, it also includes the aspects of identity exploration, which is not inherently a negative phenomenon. It is possible that, for many college-attending emerging adults, feeling “in-between” is not necessarily indicative of negativity or instability, but rather simply a feeling of not quite being an adult, yet. It is possible that this feeling of being in limbo does not create negative emotions and feelings that motivate emerging adults to have sex to cope. Rather, it is possible that emerging adults view these feelings of being in-between as growth opportunities and are more positive in general, and are therefore less likely to endorse coping motivations for sex. Alternatively, it is possible that feeling “in-between” could be creating negative emotions and feelings, but these feelings motivate some emerging adults to engage in coping mechanisms not related to sexuality (e.g., substance use).

CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Limitations

Our study findings should be considered in light of the following limitations. Our sample consisted of college students attending a single, public university in the Southeastern U.S. Thus, our findings cannot be generalized to all U.S. college students, nor to the population of emerging adults. To more accurately assess how perception of emerging adult developmental status is associated with endorsed motivations for sex, this study should be replicated in other regions in the U.S. with both college and non-college attending emerging adults. In addition, we did not include socioeconomic status (SES) in our control variables, but this may be an important variable to control for in the future. As Arnett (2015) indicated, not all young adults are afforded the opportunity to engage in such identity explorations and experimentations. Thus, assessing the extent to which motivations for sex vary as a result of SES is an important future step. Additionally, our sample consisted of predominately white, heterosexual participants. Future research should also examine motivations for sex and developmental perceptions with a more heterogeneous sample.

The measures used in this study are not without limitations. Specifically, the SMS-R (Patrick et al., 2011) treats motivations for sex as distinct from one another; however, individuals likely endorse multiple motivations for sex. Thus, by treating these motivations as distinct, we may not be capturing overlapping motivations. There are also limitations with how sex and sexual orientation were measured. Specifically, regarding sex, transgender individuals were not included in the study, nor was the question asked in such a way that allowed for these options (i.e., “What is your biological sex?”). Regarding sexual orientation, participants were asked to report their current sexual orientation, without considering that some individuals may identify

their orientation in one way but engage sexually with members outside of their identified orientation.

In addition to these limitations, our study was cross-sectional in nature. Thus, we could not determine how perceptions of developmental status nor motivations for sexual engagement change over time in college. Future studies should assess how these variables change throughout emerging adulthood. Another important future direction would be to assess motivations for sex as they pertain to those in other stages in the life course. Endorsed motivations for sex likely change as individuals develop over time. Thus, both cross-sectional studies comparing the endorsed motivations for sex of emerging adults to other adults (e.g., middle-aged adults, older adults), as well as longitudinal studies assessing how motivations for sex change over time would extend this area of study.

Implications

The implications of our findings are important for both future research and practice. As our study was novel in its analysis of the relationship between perception of developmental status and motivations for sexual engagement, future research should replicate and extend these findings using more advanced statistical methods. For example, future studies should assess potential mediating and moderating variables, including the known correlates of motivations for sex. This is especially important for the more surprising (and not hypothesized) relationships we found, such as the relationship between feeling “in-between” and coping motivations. Perhaps this relationship is mediated by feelings of psychological distress or loneliness, or perhaps moderated by biological sex. Understanding other factors that may facilitate or influence these relationships is important, as this will help to further inform sexual health interventions.

In addition to research implications, our findings have practical implications as well. Previous research has established an important connection between sexual motivations and engagement in both healthy and risky sexual behaviors (e.g., Cooper et al., 1998; Sanderson & Cantor, 1995). Among college student populations, scholars have found that individuals benefit from sexual health interventions tailored to their motivations for sexual engagement (Cooper et al., 1998; Sanderson & Cantor, 1995). Additionally, demographic characteristics, such as age, sex, and race/ethnicity, influence engagement in sexual behavior (Cooper et al., 1998). Calls to improve sexual health interventions by including important information on both motivations for sex and demographic characteristics have been made (e.g., Cooper et al., 1998; Ott, Millstein, Ofner, & Halpern-Felsher, 2006; Sanderson & Cantor, 1995), yet no studies, to our knowledge, have urged for the inclusion of developmental perceptions in sexual health interventions. Demographic characteristics alone do not explain the full scope of emerging adult motivations for sex, as was demonstrated by the limited amount of variance explained among our sample. Incorporating the developmental perceptions, and well as other attitudinal and behavioral variables, increased the variance explained significantly. Given the relationships between developmental perceptions and motivations for sex found in this study, it seems important to discuss this developmental stage with college students, assess their perceptions of their current life stage, and include this information as a context of or a component within sexual health education and interventions.

REFERENCES

- Allen, K. R., Husser, E. K., Stone, D. J., & Jordal, C. E. (2008). Agency and error in young adults' stories of sexual decision making. *Family Relations*, 57, 517-529.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2008.00519.x
- Armstrong, H. L., & Reissing, E. D. (2015). Women's motivations to have sex in casual and committed relationships with male and female partners. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 44, 921-934. doi: 10.1007/s10508-014-0462-4
- Arnett, J. J. (2015). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the early twenties* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Arnett, J. J., Kloep, M., Hendry, L. B., & Tanner, J. L. (2011). *Debating emerging adulthood: Stage or process?* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bengston, V. L., & Allen, K. R. (1993). The life course perspective applied to families over time. In P. Boss, W. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. Schumm, & S. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 469-499). New York, NY: Plenum.
- Claxton, S. E., & van Dulmen, M. H. M. (2013). Casual sexual relationships and experiences in emerging adulthood. *Emerging Adulthood*, 1(2), 138-150. doi: 10.1177/2167696813487181
- Cooper, M. L., Shapiro, C. M., & Powers, A. M. (1998). Motivations for sex and risky sexual behavior among adolescents and young adults: A functional perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(6), 1528-1558. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.6.1528
- Dawson, L. H., Shih, M., de Moor, C., & Shrier, L. (2008). Reasons why adolescents and young adults have sex: Associations with psychological characteristics and sexual behavior. *Journal of Sex Research*, 45(3), 225-232. doi: 10.1080/00224490801987457

- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and Society* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Hans, J. D., & Kimberly, C. (2011). Abstinence, sex, and virginity: Do they mean what we think they mean? *American Journal of Sexuality Education*, 6, 329-342.
doi:10.1080/15546128.2011.624475
- Hill, C. A., & Preston, L. K. (1996). Individual differences in the experience of sexual motivation: Theory and measurement of dispositional sex motives. *Journal of Sex Research*, 33(1), 27-45. doi:10.1080/00224499609551812
- Lefkowitz, E. S. (2005). "Things have gotten better": Developmental changes among emerging adults after the transition to university. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 20(1), 40-63.
doi:10.1177/0743558404271236
- Lefkowitz, E. S., & Gillen, M. M. (2006). "Sex is just a normal part of life": Sexuality in emerging adulthood. In J. J. Arnett & J. L. Tanner (Eds.), *Emerging adults in America: Coming of age in the 21st century* (pp. 235-255). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ott, M. A., Millstein, S. G., Ofner, S., & Halpern-Felsher, B. L. (2006). Greater expectations: Adolescents' positive motivations for sex. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 38(2), 84-89. doi:10.1363/3808406
- Patrick, M. E., Maggs, J. L., & Abar, C. C. (2007). Reasons to have sex, personal goals, and sexual behavior during the transition to college. *Journal of Sex Research*, 44(3), 240-249.
doi:10.1080/00224490701443759

- Patrick, M. E., Maggs, J. L., Cooper, M. L., & Lee, C. M. (2011). Measurement of motivations for and against sexual behavior. *Assessment*, 18(4), 502-516.
doi:10.1177/1073191110372298
- Patrick, M. E., Morgan, N., Maggs, J. L., & Lefkowitz, E. S. (2011). "I got your back": Friends' understandings regarding college student spring break behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40(1), 108-120. doi:10.1007/s10964-010-9515-8
- Regnerus, M., & Uecker, J. (2011). *Premarital sex in America: How young Americans meet, mate, and think about marrying*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Reifman, A., Arnett, J. J., & Colwell, M. J. (2007). Emerging adulthood: Theory, assessment, and application. *Journal of Youth Development*, 2(1), 37-48. doi: 10.5195/jyd.2007.359
- Sanders, S. A., & Reinisch, J. M. (1999). Would you say you "had sex" if...? *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 281, 275-277. doi:10.1001/jama.281.3.275
- Sanderson, C. A., & Cantor, N. (1995). Social dating goals in late adolescence: Implications for safer sexual activity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(6), 1121-1134.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.68.6.1121
- Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 870-883. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.60.6.870
- Vasilenko, S. A., Duntzee, C. I., Zheng, Y., & Lefkowitz, E. S. (2013). Testing two process models of religiosity and sexual behavior. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36, 667-673. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2013.04.002
- White, J. M., Klein, D. M., & Martin, T. F. (2015). *Family theories: An introduction* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

APPENDIX

Table 1*Descriptive information and bivariate correlations with motivations for sex (N = 1,109)*

	Mean(SD)/ %	Motivations for Sex		
Demographic Controls		<u>Enhancement</u>	<u>Intimacy</u>	<u>Coping</u>
Sex ^a		.10***	-.10***	.20***
Female	58.1%	[.04, .16]	[-.16, -.04]	[.13, .26]
Age	19.1(1.11)	.08**	.03	.01
		[.02, .13]	[-.04, .09]	[-.05, .07]
Race ^b		-.07*	.002	-.08*
White	86.1%	[-.13, -.02]	[-.05, .06]	[-.14, -.01]
Sexual Orientation ^c		-.09**	-.05	-.05
Heterosexual	94.9%	[-.14, -.04]	[-.11, .01]	[-.12, .02]
Semester ^d		.04	-.03	.13***
Fall 2014	36.2%	[-.02, .10]	[-.09, .03]	[.07, .20]
Known Correlates				
Religiosity ^e	10.48(5.96)	-.24***	-.03	-.12***
		[-.29, -.19]	[-.09, .03]	[-.18, -.06]
Relationship Type ^f				
No Relationship	37.2%	-.06*	-.23***	.01
		[-.12, -.003]	[-.29, -.18]	[-.05, .08]
Casual Relationship	17.7%	.07*	-.11***	.18***
		[.02, .12]	[-.16, -.05]	[.12, .24]
Committed Relationship	45.1%	.01	.31***	-.15***
		[-.05, .06]	[.25, .36]	[-.20, -.09]
Sexual Experience ^g		.31***	.13***	.13***
Oral Sex Only	17.3%	[.24, .36]	[.07, .20]	[.08, .18]
Vaginal/Anal Intercourse	82.7%			
Casual Sex Attitudes ^h	4.06(2.35)	.40***	-.15***	.27***
		[.35, .45]	[-.22, -.09]	[.22, .33]
IDEA Subscalesⁱ				
Identity Exploration	4.15(.77)	.16***	.21***	-.05
		[.10, .22]	[.15, .27]	[-.12, .01]
Experimentation/Possibilities	4.17(.78)	.19***	.14***	-.06*
		[.13, .25]	[.07, .21]	[-.13, .004]
Negativity/Instability	3.67(.72)	.16***	.12***	.04
		[.10, .22]	[.06, .18]	[-.03, .11]
Self-Focused	4.13(.71)	.13***	.19***	-.10***
		[.07, .20]	[.13, .25]	[-.17, -.03]

Table 1 Continued*Descriptive information and bivariate correlations with motivations for sex (N = 1,109)*

	Mean(SD)/ %	Motivations for Sex		
Feeling “In-Between”	4.09(.86)	.12*** [.06, .18]	.12*** [.06, .17]	-.08** [-.14, -.02]
Motivations for Sexⁱ				
Enhancement	3.45(1.06)		.31*** [.24, .38]	.36*** [.31, .41]
Intimacy	3.88(1.12)			-.001 [-.06, .06]
Coping	2.07(1.12)			

^aSex (*Male* = 1, *Female* = 0)^bRace (*White* = 1, *All others* = 0)^cSexual Orientation (*Heterosexual* = 1, *All others* = 0)^dSemester (*Spring* = 1, *Fall* = 0)^ePotential Range = 0-20^fRelationship Type (Dummy Coded: *No relationship* = reference group)^gSexual Experience (*Penile/anal intercourse* = 1, *Oral sex only* = 0)^hPotential Range = 1-9ⁱPotential Range = 1-5* $p < .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$

Note: [CI] = Bootstrap BCa Confidence intervals

Table 2*Hierarchical regression analyses for motivations for sex (N = 1109)*

Variables	Enhancement		Intimacy		Coping	
	Model 3		Model 3		Model 3	
	B (SE)	β	B (SE)	β	B (SE)	β
Demographic Controls						
Sex ^a	.04 (.06)	.02	.02 (.07)	.01	.24 (.07)	.12***
Age	.03 (.03)	.03	.01 (.03)	.01	-.02 (.03)	-.02
Race ^b	-.21 (.08)	-.07**	.02 (.01)	.01	-.26 (.09)	-.08**
Sexual Orientation ^c	-.15 (.13)	-.03	-.18 (.15)	-.04	-.12 (.15)	-.02
Semester ^d	.09 (.06)	.04	-.002 (.07)	-.001	.25 (.07)	.12***
Known Correlates						
Religiosity	-.01 (.01)	-.07*	-.01 (.01)	-.05	-.004 (.01)	-.02
Relationship Type ^e						
No Relationship						
Casual Relationship	.10 (.08)	.04	.10 (.09)	.03	.34 (.09)	.11***
Committed Relationship	.18 (.06)	.09**	.62 (.07)	.28***	-.11 (.07)	-.05
Sexual Experience ^f	.54 (.08)	.19***	.36 (.09)	.12***	.25 (.09)	.08**
Casual Sex Attitudes	.15 (.01)	.34***	-.06 (.02)	-.13***	.08 (.02)	.17***
IDEA Scale						
Identity Exploration	.15 (.07)	.11*	.24 (.07)	.17***	.14 (.07)	.09
Experimentation/Possibilities	.13 (.06)	.09*	-.05 (.07)	-.03	-.07 (.07)	-.05
Negativity/Instability	.13 (.05)	.09*	.04 (.06)	.03	.26 (.06)	.16***
Self-Focused	-.09 (.07)	-.06	.15 (.08)	.09	-.19 (.08)	-.12*
Feeling In-Between	.01 (.05)	.01	-.08 (.05)	-.06	-.13 (.05)	-.10*
Model F-Statistic		26.78***		14.23***		13.30***

Table 2 Continued*Hierarchical regression analyses for motivations for sex (N = 1109)*

	Enhancement	Intimacy	Coping
	Model 3	Model 3	Model 3
Adjusted R-Square	.26	.15	.14

^aSex (*Male* = 1, *Female* = 0)^bRace (*White* = 1, *All others* = 0)^cSexual Orientation (*Heterosexual* = 1, *All others* = 0)^dSemester (*Spring* = 1, *Fall* = 0)^eRelationship Type (Dummy Coded: *No relationship* = reference group)^fSexual Experience (*Penile/anal intercourse* = 1, *Oral sex only* = 0)* $p < .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$

VITA

Kayley Davis was born in Chinle, AZ, and grew up in Knoxville, TN. She graduated in 2012 from Anderson County High School in Clinton, TN. She received her Bachelor of Arts in 2015 from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville with a major in Psychology and minor in Child and Family Studies. Kayley entered the Child and Family Studies (CFS) Master's en-route-to Ph.D. program in Knoxville in 2016. Kayley was the CFS department's first Master's en-route-to Ph.D. student. Her research interests include human sexuality among young adults and the associated motivations, behaviors, and well-being. During her Master's career, Kayley worked as a graduate research assistant in the WAE lab and served as the Vice President of the CFS Graduate Student Organization, Housing Committee Chair for the 42nd annual Quint State Symposium, and the Graduate Student Representative for the Southeastern Council on Family Relations (SECFR). She graduated with a concurrent Master's degree in Child and Family Studies from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in May 2018 and continued in the Ph.D. program in Child and Family Studies.