Adolescent Relationship Inauthenticity and Romantic Relationship Quality in Young Adulthood

Rachel Arocho

Carolyn Tucker Halpern

Guang Guo

DRAFT CURRENT MARCH 22, 2019

PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR DISTRIBUTE WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHORS

PLEASE CONTACT rachel.arocho@gmail.com WITH COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS

We are grateful to the Carolina Population Center for training support (T32 HD091058) and for general support (P2C HD050924). This research uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and funded by grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgment is due Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis.

Abstract

Adolescent romantic relationship experiences are associated with relationship experiences later in life. This study focuses on the implications of adolescent relationship "inauthenticity"– mismatch between the content of ideal and real relationships – for relationship quality and intimate partner violence in young adulthood using Waves I, II, and IV from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health). We compare adolescents' ideal relationship sequences, reported in Wave I, and the sequences of real relationships, from Wave II, using optimal matching sequence analyses to measure inauthenticity. We then use inauthenticity to predict relationship quality and intimate partner violence in young adulthood (ages 24-32) with attention to differences by gender and race/ethnicity. Overall, adolescent relationship inauthenticity did not consistently predict young adult relationship quality by any measure in overall or stratified models. It seems that adolescent relationship inauthenticity does not carry forward through respondents' later relationships.

Relationship experiences in adolescence have broad implications across multiple domains of adulthood, including mental health (Sandberg-Thoma & Kamp Dush, 2014) and later romantic relationships (Madsen & Collins, 2011; Raley, Crissey, & Muller, 2007). One way of understanding an adolescent's romantic experience is to understand both what the individual desired in a relationship and what they actually experienced. The degree of match or mismatch between expectations and reality, deemed inauthenticity (Soller, 2015), may shape the individual's continued experiences with romance and intimacy. In the present study, we estimate the association between the degree of an individual's adolescent relationship inauthenticity and multiple measures of quality of romantic relationships in young adulthood.

Young Love and Lifecourse Implications

In the transition between child and adult, adolescents face unique new opportunities and challenges, and what they experience at this time can set them on trajectories for long-term developmental outcomes. Romantic and intimate relationships provide a new and meaningful way to connect with others and carry hope of experiences to come (Collins, 2003). Adolescent romantic experiences are not without risk, however. Young involvement in these relationships, especially in sexual relationships, is associated with poorer mental health for most youth, especially females (Joyner & Udry, 2000; Soller, Haynie, & Kuhlemeier, 2017). Even when relationships have positive aspects, negative interactions such as conflict or criticism can still be associated with poorer mental health (Beckmeyer, Coleman, & Proulx, 2018).

Various aspects of adolescent relationships are associated with relationships throughout adulthood. Characteristics of adolescent relationships, such as quality, bear resemblance to characteristics of the relationships individuals go on to experience in young adulthood (Madsen & Collins, 2011). Additionally, the timing of relationship formation, especially marriage but

perhaps even cohabitation, can predict divorce risk (Copen, Daniels, & Mosher, 2013; Kuperberg, 2014). Relationship experiences in adolescence can also predict attitudes towards relationships that may then predict later behaviors. For example, teens who report more involved dating, especially with sexual behaviors, report greater expectations to marry in early adulthood (Crissey, 2005), which can in turn predict actually marrying young (Arocho & Kamp Dush, 2017; Willoughby, 2014).

Expectations Realized (or Not)

Adolescents do not go into relationships as a blank slate. Rather, individuals, having been exposed to discourse about relationships and having observed examples of romantic relationships, especially marriage (Cherlin, 2010), almost certainly form attitudes about relationships (e.g. marriage; Willoughby, Hall, & Luczak, 2015), including what might constitute an "ideal" relationship. When asked, most adolescents are able to clearly delineate desired and undesired relationship activities (such as kissing, gift-giving, or saying "I love you") and even determine an ideal order of activities within a hypothetical relationship (Choukas-Bradley, Goldberg, Widman, Reese, & Halpern, 2015). Expectations for relationships may have their own significance in the equation of adolescents' romantic relationships and long-term outcomes. For example, individuals who violate their adolescent expectations for the timing of marriage have been found to be less mentally healthy in adulthood and more likely to have divorced (Carlson, 2012).

This particular notion of ideal behaviors in relationships, perhaps thought of as a script (Harding, 2007), may have its own special significance. Recognition of the importance of adolescent relationship content (i.e., activities) is not new. In fact, content is one of the seven main features of adolescent romantic experiences highlighted by Collins (2003). One way to

understand how content may be associated with outcomes is by comparing an adolescent's expected romantic relationship content to what they experience. This degree of match or mismatch ("inauthenticity") has been implicated in adolescent girls' mental health outcomes both directly (Soller, 2014) and as a moderator of the association between early sexual experience and poorer mental health (Soller et al., 2017). However, the long-term outcomes of relationship inauthenticity have not yet been assessed. Development is a life-long process (Elder, Johnson, & Crosnoe, 2003), and given the developmental significance of adolescent relationships (Collins, Welsh, & Furman, 2009), exploring the potential long-term outcomes of inauthenticity may provide insight into young adult relationship development and quality.

Moderators of Risk

Not all individuals are as likely to be vulnerable to poor outcomes from inauthenticity as others, so we use two frameworks to understand continuity of risk that may be conferred from adolescent experiences to young adult relationship outcomes: the heterogeneous population model and the state dependence model. The heterogeneous population model suggests that some individuals are more vulnerable to poor outcomes throughout the life course due to stable personal or relationship characteristics (Halpern, Spriggs, Martin, & Kupper, 2009). The state dependence model complements the heterogeneous population model in stating that victimization experiences change the individual or their social context and thereby increase the probability on ongoing negative experiences (Nagin & Paternoster, 2000). In this study, we consider both state sources of risk for poorer relationships in young adulthood (experiencing adolescent relationship inauthenticity) as well as heterogeneous sources of risk (gender and racial/ethnic identity) that may moderate associations between relationship inauthenticity and outcomes.

State sources of risk. Experiencing inauthenticity in adolescent relationships could leave one vulnerable to poor relationship experiences through young adulthood. If one has specific ideals for what a relationship should look like but is unable to enact or realize those ideals, the relationship may not be a satisfying or high quality as one would have liked (such as the findings of Carlson, 2012 that marrying off-time of expectations was associated with an increased risk of divorce). Additionally, inauthenticity may cause one to trespass their own role-identity, which can then lead to poorer mental health; this is one way that inauthenticity was theorized to predict poor adolescent mental health outcomes, at least for young women, as observed by Soller (2014).

Heterogeneous sources of risk. Fundamental identities may be sources of increased risk for individuals throughout their lives and over differing contexts. In studies limited to adolescence, relationship inauthenticity seems to matter more for girls' mental health than boys' (Soller, 2014; Soller et al., 2017). This could be in part due to females' greater role-identity emphasis on romantic relationships leading to a greater susceptibility to poor outcomes from relationship inauthenticity (Soller, 2014). To explore the possibility of increased risk to respondents of different genders, we examine gender-stratified models. Gender may not be the only risk-raising status, however. Relationship ideals also vary by race and ethnicity (Choukas-Bradley et al., 2015), as do early relationship experiences (Meier & Allen, 2009). Relationship quality can suffer in the face of stress conferred by minority statuses, likely due to discrimination or social stigma (Trail, Goff, Bradbury, & Karney, 2012), so individuals of minority racial or ethnic identities may also vary in their experiences of adolescent relationship inauthenticity and associated outcomes.

Research Questions

Drawing on the life course perspective (Elder Jr, Johnson, & Crosnoe, 2003) and the state

dependence model (Halpern et al., 2009; Nagin & Paternoster, 2000), we hypothesize that adolescents who begin their forays into romance by trespassing their ideals will be vulnerable to poorer relationship experiences later, namely lower quality relationships, in young adulthood. Considering population heterogeneity, we also explored variation in these associations by gender and race/ethnicity, as some groups may be more susceptible to poor outcomes than others. We were guided by the following research questions:

1. Is adolescent relationship inauthenticity associated with relationship quality and characteristics in young adulthood?
2. Are some demographic groups (i.e., females, racial/ethnic minorities) more vulnerable to poor outcomes from inauthentic adolescent relationships? That is, does gender or racial/ethnic identity moderate these associations?

Method

Data

To address these issues, we use data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), a population-based sample first interviewed in 1994-95 and followed for more than 20 years. We tracked respondents from when they stated their relationship ideals and experiences in adolescence (Waves I and II) on through their young adult experiences (Wave IV, ages 24-32). Nearly 15,000 respondents were interviewed in both Wave I and IV, though our analytic sample was limited in various ways (more below). Add Health is the only national dataset to allow for a thorough examination of relationship content ideals versus reality as it includes a detailed measure of desired relationship content and a matching assessment of content in actual relationships the respondents experienced.

Measures

To assess relationship inauthenticity, we utilized a series of questions asked of respondents in Wave I (ages 12-19) to code adolescents' desired relationship content. The adolescents were asked to indicate if they desired to participate in any of 17 activities in a relationship they might have in the coming year, and then indicate the order in which they would like the activities to occur. These behaviors included experiences like exchanging gifts, saying "I love you," holding hands, and having sex. One year later in Wave II, respondents were asked to indicate which behaviors had actually occurred in relationships they had since the last interview, and in which order. Based on previous work (Soller, 2014), we measured *relationship inauthenticity* as the "cost" (in substitutions, ordering changes, deletion and addition of activities) of transforming an ideal script to a real one using optimal matching in sequence analysis (Abbott & Tsay, 2000). In this way, inauthenticity was a measure of the difference between the relationship the respondent experienced and the one they hoped for, both in content and the ordering of activities.

Optimal Matching. Because of changes to the activities available in the idealized scripts versus the real reports in Wave II, the scripts were harmonized. In the ideal scripts, giving gifts and saying "I love you" were each separated into two activities: the respondent doing the activity to the partner (giving a gift), and the respondent receiving the activity from the partner (the partner saying, "I love you," to the respondent). In the reported relationships in Wave II, these were collapsed into one item each (exchanging gifts, exchanging statements of love). These were harmonized by marking the first instance of the behavior in the ideal script and removing the second instance from the sequence. Respondents could also include getting married as an activity in their ideal script, but not in the real script (marriages were recorded elsewhere in the survey, but not in sequence with the other behaviors listed), so "marriage" was removed from ideal

scripts. Finally, in the reports of real relationship behaviors in Wave II but not in the ideal scripts, respondents could report that the partners touched each other's genitals. As this was not reported in the ideal script, this activity was removed from the harmonized sequences.

To create the measure of inauthenticity, each respondents' ideal script and the list of activities in their most recent relationship reported at Wave II were compared using the Needleman-Wunsch Algorithm using the -oma- command from the SADI suite in Stata15 (Halpin, 2017; StataCorp, 2017). To calculate the cost of the differences between the sequences, the analyst must specify the values of each substitution, insertion, or deletion. As some activities are more likely to follow each other than others, the costs of substituting each activity for another should vary according to rarity. In addition, the cost of inserting or deleting a whole activity, rather than shifting its relative position, might be considered the costliest change. As such, we used a published, asymmetrical matrix of substitution costs to generate the values for changing the ordering of items (Soller, 2014) and set the "indel" (insertion and deletion) cost to the highest value of the substitution costs, 5.23. The total value of the difference between sequences was divided by the length of the longer sequence to standardize costs among respondents (Soller, 2014). For relationships that were ongoing at Wave II, and thus may not have had time to complete all the activities listed in one's ideal sequence, the reported sequence was truncated to the length of the ideal sequence, following the practices of others using these data (Soller, 2014).

Outcome Variables

Relationship Characteristics and Quality in young adulthood were measured for respondents' current or most recent relationships at Wave IV; we included all relationship types respondents could report at this time, including cohabitations, marriages, dating relationships, and "pregnancy" relationships (which we combined with dating for comparing relationship

types). We measured six aspects of quality. For both current and most recent relationships, this included satisfaction and experiences of intimate partner violence. For current relationships only, we also measured the respondent's rating of love for their partner, commitment to the relationship, happiness with the relationship, and closeness to the partner.

Satisfaction was measured as the mean of responses to seven statements ($\alpha = .89$) regarding either a current or most recent relationship. Respondents were asked to rate their agreement with each statement on a five-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, with the variable coded so that higher ratings represented higher satisfaction. Example statements included, "We (enjoy/enjoyed) doing even ordinary, day-to-day things together," and, "My partner (expresses/expressed) love and affection for me."

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) was measured through a series of questions asking if the respondent had ever done certain behaviors to their partner and vice-versa. These behaviors included threats, pushing, shoving, throwing things that could hurt, slapping, hitting, or kicking; respondents also reported if they or their partners had an injury because of a fight, or if one of the partners had forced sexual relations. Respondents were coded as having experienced any IPV if they reported that any of the behaviors had occurred by either partner; this was further measured as respondent as victim only, respondent as perpetrator only, and respondent as both (versus neither).

A series of questions was asked only of respondents in current relationships regarding various characteristics of their relationships. *Love* was the response to, "How much do you love (partner)?" with responses coded as 4 *a lot*, 3 *somewhat*, 2 *a little,* and 1 *not at all*. *Happiness* was measured as, "In general, how happy are you in your relationship with (partner)?" with responses coded as 3 *very happy*, 2 *fairly happy*, and 1 *not too happy*. Commitment was

measured as, “How committed are you to your relationship with (partner)?” with responses coded as 4 *completely*, 3 *very*, 2 *somewhat*, and 1 *not at all*. Finally, closeness was assessed by showing respondents a series of images of two circles, ranging from barely touching (coded 1) to almost completely overlapped (7) and asking, “Select the picture…which best illustrates how close you feel to (partner).”

Moderating and Control Variables.

In addressing the questions stemming from the state dependence and population heterogeneity models, we used respondent gender (male = 1) and respondent racial and ethnic identity (Hispanic, NonHispanic White, NonHispanic black, and NonHispanic Other) as *stratifying variables.* Gender was measured from interviewer report at Wave I. Racial and ethnic identity was measured from self-report at Wave I.

A number of *control variables* were included in each model. From Wave 1, we examined the household rosters and coded respondents as living in two parent families or not. From Waves I and II, when the ideal and real romantic scripts were assessed, we controlled for the age of the respondent at Wave I and the difference in ages between the partner and respondent in Wave II (positive values indicate the partner was older than the respondent), the gender of the partner in Wave II, whether the Wave II relationship was a “special” or “liked” romantic relationship (as “liked” relationships were assessed differently, but had the potential to become “special” relationships with time, see Soller, 2014), whether the Wave II relationship was ongoing at the Wave II interview, whether the respondent reported having had sex with the Wave II partner, and experiences of either psychological or physical violence in the Wave II relationship.

From Wave IV, we controlled for the present or most recent partners’ gender, age relative to respondent (within 2 years of respondent or older or younger by 2+ years), the relationship

type (cohabitation, marriage with cohabitation, direct marriage, or dating/pregnancy), the relationship duration (from start of relationship as reported by respondent), relationship ongoing status (for variables that could be assessed for both current and recent relationships), respondent prior marriage, and the respondent's educational attainment.

Analytic Sample

There were 14,800 respondents with valid weights in Wave IV. However, the analytic sample was restricted in important ways: 1) respondents had to have valid ideal relationship data from Wave I and valid real relationship data from Wave II to calculate the inauthenticity measure, and 2) respondents had to report a current or most recent relationship in Wave IV. Additionally, for current analyses we limited the analytic sample to those with non-missing data; future analyses will incorporate multiple imputation to recover respondents with missing control or exploratory data who otherwise qualify. From Wave I and II, 7,197 respondents with Wave IV weights had the necessary data to calculate the inauthenticity measure; however, 2,894 (40.2%) of the relationships from Wave II had begun before the measure of ideal relationships in Wave I (comparing relationship start dates to Wave I interview dates) and were excluded from current analyses, leaving 4,303 valid inauthenticity measures. Within Wave IV, 14,290 respondents had weights and qualified in that they reported a current or most recent relationship. Only 4,227 respondents qualified with both metrics, however. From those, 524 (12.4%) were missing control variable data and were excluded from present analyses, leaving 3,703 respondents who qualified for the current analyses (weighted subpopulation = 5,684,214.5). The weighted descriptive statistics of this analytic sample are presented in Table 1. Each model subpopulation *n* varied slightly because of missing data on outcome variables or because some outcome variables were only assessed for ongoing relationships (n = 3,119); each model subpopulation unweighted *n* is

noted along with results in Table 2. All models were estimated within the SVY suite in Stata15 to account for the complex survey sampling design and attrition between waves (Chen & Chantala, 2014).

Analyses Plan

All outcome variables were tested in regression models appropriate to the outcome variable's distribution. For satisfaction, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was used. For IPV, logistic (for any IPV) and multinomial logistic (for the different experiences of IPV) regression were used. For love, happiness, commitment, and closeness, ordinal logistic regression was used. Additionally, for closeness, an OLS model was also tested.

Results

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of the analytic sample, n = 3,703, as well as means for each variable by gender. Mean inauthenticity for the sample was 2.71, ranging from 0 (if their ideal and real relationship sequences matched perfectly) to 5.23 (if the ideal and real relationship sequences had no behaviors in common). The outcomes, shown in the bottom panel, indicated most respondents reported satisfying, low-violence and high-quality relationships. The mean rating of satisfaction was 4.08 out of 5. Twenty-eight percent of respondents indicated some form of violence occurring in their relationships, with 12% reporting only being the victim, 5% reporting being the perpetrator, and 12% reporting being both. About 8 of 10 respondents reported they loved their partners "a lot," 69% were "very happy," 69% were "completely committed" to the relationship, and respondents reported an average closeness of 5.39 on the 7-point scale.

The analytic sample was only slightly more female than male (46% male). The majority of the sample was Non-Hispanic White (73%), with 11% Hispanic, 12% Non-Hispanic Black,

and 4% Non-Hispanic Other Race. Regarding their characteristics when inauthenticity was assessed, Waves I and II, respondents were, on average, nearly age 16 at Wave I. In Wave II, respondents were an average of 0.25 years younger than their partners and 53% reported male partners. The majority, 91%, of relationships used to calculate the inauthenticity measure of Wave II were "special" rather than "liked" relationships and 55% were ongoing at Wave II. Thirty-five percent of respondents reported sex in the relationship, 18% reported psychological violence, and 6% reported physical violence.

In Wave IV, 54% reported male partners, with 36% of respondents within two years of their partner's age. Nearly half of the relationships in this sample were marriages started in cohabitation (33%), with 30% cohabitations, 11% direct marriage without cohabitation, and 26% a dating relationship or relationship based around a shared pregnancy. The relationships had been going for an average of nearly 60 months and 85% were ongoing at the time of interview. At this time, 11% of respondents had been married before, not counting their current partner if married. Sixty percent of respondents had a high school education or some college, with 7% reporting less education, 25% reporting a college degree or some graduate education, and 8% reporting a graduate degree or more (including a professional degree).

Regression Results

Table 2 shows a summary of results for inauthenticity predicting outcomes across variables and stratified models; all controls included in each model. Overall, inauthenticity was generally associated negatively with quality and positively with experiencing IPV, especially as a victim. However, few of these associations were statistically significant. Significant associations were only observed in three instances: for Black respondents only, one-unit greater inauthenticity was associated with a reduction of 0.09 units of satisfaction. For Hispanics only,

greater inauthenticity was associated with 26% lower odds of experiencing IPV in their relationship. For Non-Hispanic respondents of "other" racial identity, greater inauthenticity was associated with 72% greater odds of reporting higher commitment. For all these associations, the significance was relatively weak ($p < 0.05$); and considering the large number of tests being made these significant findings may be spurious. Taken together, the results of these models suggest that adolescent relationship inauthenticity is likely not associated with specific relationship outcomes in young adulthood. Tables 3-10 show the full results tables for each outcome of interest.

Discussion

Results of the present study suggest that, despite predicting potentially serious outcomes in adolescence, especially for females (Soller, 2014; Soller et al., 2017), adolescent relationship inauthenticity does not appear to confer risk of poor-quality relationships in young adulthood. Indeed, we found almost no association between inauthenticity and relationship quality, even when models were stratified by gender and race/ethnicity.

Although some qualities of adolescent relationships do seem to have long-term ramification (Madsen & Collins, 2011), it could be that adolescent relationship inauthenticity is simply not strong enough measure of adolescent relationship experience on its own to predict relationship quality in young adulthood.

It could also be that inauthenticity in itself is not a negative experience in the long-term. For some individuals, not experiencing their "ideal" relationship could be a positive experience, if their ideal was a relationship that would have been negative, such as if their ideal relationship included behaviors that were too "heavy" for their current developmental level (Collins et al., 2009). In this study, inauthenticity was simply an overall measure of mismatch; future research

should consider if there are "types" of inauthenticity, or at least if the various factors causing a relationship to be considered inauthentic, such as specific ideal behaviors that were not realized, should be considered negative or positive experiences.

The finding that adolescent inauthenticity did not predict negative outcomes in young adulthood could be taken as a positive thing, if it really is that inauthenticity is not a state source of risk (Nagin & Paternoster, 2000). Inauthenticity in adolescence may be frustrating or negative at the time (Soller, 2014; Soller et al., 2017) but does not appear to have bearing for one's future relationship quality. Rather, more contemporary influences on relationship quality and experiences may be more important, meaning that individuals with mis-matched adolescent ideals and experiences are not doomed to negative continuing relationships.

The strengths of this study include a large, nationally-representative, and diverse sample as well as a long timeframe in which to study the experience and outcomes of adolescent relationship inauthenticity. Additionally, Add Health is quite unique in the ideal and real relationship behaviors measures, which provided an objective measure of dissimilarity between prospective reports of ideal relationships and retrospective reports of real relationship experiences.

There were limitations to the study as well, however. The sample was limited by the necessity of measuring real relationship experiences at Wave II. Some groups, particularly respondents who were seniors in Wave I, were not included in the Wave II survey by design, though they were invited to participate in the later waves of the study. Because inauthenticity was measured in Wave II, the loss of those respondents was carried through to the outcome measures of the current study. In addition, the measures of relationship quality were self-reported and skewed towards responses indicating high quality relationships. Previous work, especially

with marital quality, suggests this is not unusual, but the limited variation in the responses could have contributed to the lack of significant associations observed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, although adolescent relationship inauthenticity is common and seems to matter for adolescent outcomes, including mental health, it does not seem to hold bearing for relationship qualities in young adulthood. Rather, once individuals are in their mid-twenties and later, other factors may be more influential for relationship quality and experiences. What happens in adolescent relationships, at least in terms of inauthenticity, may stay in adolescence.

References

Abbott, A., & Tsay, A. (2000). Sequence Analysis and Optimal Matching Methods in Sociology:Review and Prospect. *Sociological Methods & Research, 29*(1), 3-33. doi:10.1177/0049124100029001001

Arocho, R., & Kamp Dush, C. M. (2017). Like mother, like child: Offspring marital timing desires and maternal marriage timing and stability. *Journal of Family Psychology, 31*(3), 261-272. doi:10.1037/fam0000218

Beckmeyer, J. J., Coleman, M., & Proulx, C. M. (2018). Perceived romantic relationship quality: Associations with adolescents' depressive symptoms and externalizing behavior. *Family Relations, 67*(4), 539-551. doi:doi:10.1111/fare.12341

Carlson, D. L. (2012). Deviations from desired age at marriage: Mental health differences across marital status. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 74*(4), 743-758. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00995.x

Chen, P., & Chantala, K. (2014). *Guildelines for Analyzing Add Health Data*. Retrieved from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: https://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/documentation/guides/wt_guidelines_20161213.pdf

Cherlin, A. J. (2010). *The marriage-go-round: The state of marriage and the family in America today*. New York: Vintage.

Choukas-Bradley, S., Goldberg, S. K., Widman, L., Reese, B. M., & Halpern, C. T. (2015). Demographic and developmental differences in the content and sequence of adolescents' ideal romantic relationship behaviors. *Journal of Adolescence, 45*, 112-126. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.08.019

Collins, W. A. (2003). More than myth: The developmental significance of romantic relationships during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 13*(1), 1-24.

Collins, W. A., Welsh, D. P., & Furman, W. (2009). Adolescent romantic relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 631-652.

Copen, C. E., Daniels, K., & Mosher, W. D. (2013). *First premarital cohabitation in the United States: 2006-2010 National Survey of Family Growth.* Retrieved from Hyattsvill, MD: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr064.pdf

Crissey, S. R. (2005). Race/ethnic differences in the marital expectations of adolescents: The role of romantic relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*(3), 697-709. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00163.x

Elder, G. H., Johnson, M. K., & Crosnoe, R. (2003). The emergence and development of life course theory. In J. T. Mortimer & M. J. Shanahan (Eds.), *Handbook of the Life Course* (pp. 3-19). Boston, MA: Springer US.

Elder Jr, G. H., Johnson, M. K., & Crosnoe, R. (2003). *The emergence and development of life course theory*: Springer.

Halpern, C. T., Spriggs, A. L., Martin, S. L., & Kupper, L. L. (2009). Patterns of intimate partner violence victimization from adolescence to young adulthood in a nationally representative sample. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 45*(5), 508-516.

Halpin, B. (2017). SADI: Sequence analyses tools for Stata. *The Stata Journal, 17*(3), 546-572. doi:https://www.stata-journal.com/article.html?article=st0486

Harding, D. J. (2007). Cultural context, sexual behavior, and romantic relationships in disadvantaged neighborhoods. *American Sociological Review, 72*(3), 341-364. doi:10.1177/000312240707200302

Joyner, K., & Udry, J. R. (2000). You don't bring me anything but down: Adolescent romance and depression. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 369-391.

Kuperberg, A. (2014). Age at coresidence, premarital cohabitation, and marriage dissolution: 1985–2009. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *76*(2), 352-369. doi:10.1111/jomf.12092

Madsen, S. D., & Collins, A. W. (2011). The salience of adolescent romantic experiences for romantic relationship qualities in young adulthood. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*(4), 789-801.

Meier, A., & Allen, G. (2009). Romantic relationships from adolescence to young adulthood: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Sociological Quarterly, 50*(2), 308-335. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2009.01142.x

Nagin, D., & Paternoster, R. (2000). Population heterogeneity and state dependence: State of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 16*(2), 117-144.

Raley, R. K., Crissey, S., & Muller, C. (2007). Of sex and romance: Late adolescent relationships and young adult union formation. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69*(5), 1210-1226.

Sandberg-Thoma, S. E., & Kamp Dush, C. M. (2014). Casual sexual relationships and mental health in adolescence and emerging adulthood. *The Journal of Sex Research, 51*(2), 121-130. doi:10.1080/00224499.2013.821440

Soller, B. (2014). Caught in a bad romance. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 55*(1), 56-72. doi:10.1177/0022146513520432

Soller, B. (2015). “I did not do it my way”: The peer context of inauthentic romantic relationships. *Sociological Perspectives, 58*(3), 337-357. doi:10.1177/0731121415576578

Soller, B., Haynie, D. L., & Kuhlemeier, A. (2017). Sexual intercourse, romantic relationship inauthenticity, and adolescent mental health. *Social Science Research, 64*, 237-248. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2016.10.002

StataCorp. (2017). Stata statistical software: Release 15. College Station, TX: Statacorp LLC.

Trail, T. E., Goff, P. A., Bradbury, T. N., & Karney, B. R. (2012). The costs of racism for marriage: How racial discrimination hurts, and ethnic identity protects, newlywed marriages among Latinos. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(4), 454-465. doi:10.1177/0146167211429450

Willoughby, B. J. (2014). Using marital attitudes in late adolescence to predict later union transitions. *Youth & Society, 46*(3), 425-440. doi:10.1177/0044118x12436700

Willoughby, B. J., Hall, S. S., & Luczak, H. P. (2015). Marital paradigms: A conceptual framework for marital attitudes, values, and beliefs. *Journal of Family Issues, 36*(2), 188-211. doi:10.1177/0192513x13487677

Table 1: *Weighted Descriptive Statistics for 3,703 Respondents in Analytic Sample (3,119 for outcomes only assessed in current relationships)*

	Mean	SE	Min	Max	Unweighted *n*	Mean Male	Mean Female
Inauthenticity	2.71	0.02	0	5.23	3703	2.80	2.64
Wave I							
Male	0.46	0.01			3703		
Race/Ethnicity					3703		
Hispanic	0.11	0.02				0.11	0.10
NH White	0.73	0.03				0.72	0.73
NH Black	0.12	0.02				0.12	0.13
NH Other	0.04	0.01				0.05	0.04
Age	15.67	0.11	11.58	19.58	3703	15.85	15.52
Two parent family	0.66	0.02				0.67	0.65
Wave II							
Partner Age Difference	0.25	0.05	-11.58	18.25	3703	-0.71	1.08
Male Partner	0.53	0.01			3703	0.01	0.99
"Special" Relationship	0.91	0.01			3703	0.89	0.94
Relationship Ongoing	0.55	0.01			3703	0.51	0.58
Sex in Relationship	0.35	0.02			3703	0.34	0.36
Psychological Violence in Relationship	0.18	0.01			3703	0.18	0.18
Physical Violence in Relationship	0.06	0.00			3703	0.07	0.05
Wave IV							
Male Partner	0.54	0.01			3703	0.02	0.98
Age Relative to Partner					3703		
Partner Younger 2+ Years	0.27	0.01				0.44	0.13
Within 2 Years	0.36	0.01				0.38	0.35
Partner Older 2+ Years	0.36	0.01				0.18	0.52
Relationship Type					3703		
Cohabitation	0.30	0.01				0.31	0.29
Marriage after Cohabitation	0.33	0.01				0.30	0.36
Direct Marriage	0.11	0.01				0.10	0.12
Dating/Pregnancy	0.26	0.01				0.29	0.23
Relationship Duration (Months)	57.76	1.14	0	233	3703	53.32	61.59
Current Relationship	0.85	0.01			3703	0.83	0.87
Prior Marriage	0.11	0.01			3703	0.10	0.13
Education					3703		
Less than High School	0.07	0.01				0.29	0.23
High School to Some College	0.60	0.02				0.60	0.59
College to Some Graduate	0.25	0.02				0.23	0.27
Masters or More	0.08	0.01				0.07	0.09
Outcomes (Wave IV)							
Satisfaction (Scale)	4.08	0.02	1	5	3702	4.07	4.09
Intimate Partner Violence (ever)	0.28	0.01			3693	0.32	0.25
Intimate Partner Violence (Types)					3693		
None in Relationship	0.72	0.01				0.68	0.75
Victim	0.12	0.01				0.17	0.07
Perpetrator	0.05	0.00				0.02	0.07
Both Victim and Perpetrator	0.12	0.01				0.13	0.11

Love					3117		
A Lot	0.82	0.01				0.79	0.85
Somewhat	0.10	0.01				0.11	0.09
A Little	0.04	0.00				0.06	0.03
Not at All	0.04	0.00				0.04	0.03
Happy					3115		
Very	0.69	0.01				0.67	0.71
Fairly	0.24	0.01				0.26	0.22
Not too	0.06	0.01				0.06	0.07
Commitment					3116		
Completely	0.69	0.01				0.63	0.74
Very	0.17	0.01				0.21	0.14
Somewhat	0.08	0.01				0.10	0.07
Not at All	0.06	0.01				0.06	0.05
Closeness	5.39	0.04	1	7	3114	5.26	5.50

Table 2: *Summary Results of Inauthenticity from All Models, All Controls Included*

Variable	Full Model	Male Only	Female Only	Hispanic Only	NH White Only	NH Black Only	NH Other Only
Satisfaction[1]	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	-0.10*	0.01
IPV, ever[2]	1.01	1.05	0.98	0.73*	1.02	1.11	1.18
IPV, type (vs. Neither)[2,3]							
Victim	1.12						
Perpetrator	0.87						
Both	0.96						
Love[2]	1.04	1.00	1.05	1.16	1.03	0.98	0.89
Commitment[2]	0.92	0.87	0.97	1.06	0.88	1.01	1.57
Happiness[2]	0.97	0.89	1.04	1.07	0.98	0.84	1.84
Closeness, ordinal[2]	0.99	0.90	1.09	0.96	0.98	0.95	1.65*
Closeness, continuous[1]	-0.02	-0.10	0.06	0.02	-0.03	-0.06	0.15

Note: *[1]OLS Coefficient, [2]Odds Ratio or Relative Risk Ratio, [3]Results could not be calculated in stratified models due to small cell sizes. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.*

Table 3: *Results of Satisfaction Model, OLS Regression,* n = *3702*

	Full Model	Male Only	Female Only	Hispanic Only	NH White Only	NH Black Only	NH Other Only
Inauthenticity	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	-0.10*	0.01
Wave I							
Male	-0.11			0.21	-0.29	-0.29	0.77
Race/Ethnicity							
Hispanic	-0.06	-0.01	-0.09				
NH White (Ref)							
NH Black	-0.13**	-0.05	-0.18**				
NH Other	-0.05	-0.07	-0.06				
Age	-0.03*	-0.03	-0.03	0.00	-0.03*	-0.05*	-0.01
Two Parent Family	0.08*	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.08*	0.14	0.28
Wave II							
Age Difference with Partner	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00
Male Partner	0.00	0.18	-0.10	-0.11	-0.16	0.02	0.88*
"Special" Relationship	-0.02	-0.09	0.08	0.54*	-0.12	-0.01	0.25
Relationship Ongoing	0.04	0.01	0.06	0.16	0.01	0.07	0.12
Sex in Relationship	-0.04	-0.07	-0.02	-0.34*	0.00	-0.08	-0.13
Psychological Violence in Relationship	0.00	0.08	-0.07	0.05	-0.02	0.07	0.23
Physical Violence in Relationship	-0.23**	-0.30*	-0.13	0.27	-0.29*	-0.18	-0.64*
Wave IV							
Male Partner	-0.11	-0.15	-0.13	0.32	-0.13	-0.40	-0.09
Age Relative							
Partner Younger 2+ Years	-0.02	-0.04	0.02	-0.10	0.00	0.00	-0.40*
Within 2 Years (Ref)							
Partner Older 2+ Years	-0.03	-0.04	-0.03	-0.30*	0.02	-0.01	-0.35
Relationship Type							
Cohabitation	0.02	-0.05	0.09	0.01	0.01	-0.04	0.10
Marriage after Cohabitation (Ref)							
Direct Marriage	0.04	0.13	-0.03	-0.33	0.12	-0.41*	0.65*
Dating/Pregnancy	-0.13*	-0.24**	-0.03	-0.14	-0.15*	-0.24	0.33

Relationship Duration (Months)	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00
Current Relationship	0.54***	0.46***	0.62***	0.37*	0.59***	0.42***	0.45*
Prior Marriage	-0.01	-0.05	0.01	0.20	-0.06	0.12	0.03
Education							
Less than High School	-0.10	-0.18	0.01	-0.11	-0.07	0.06	0.09
High School/Some College (Ref)							
College to Some Graduate	0.14***	0.15***	0.15**	0.29**	0.15***	0.04	-0.01
Masters or More	0.22***	0.14	0.29***	0.29	0.21***	0.22*	-0.08
Constant	4.19***	4.42***	3.97***	3.30***	4.35***	5.06***	2.56**

Note: **p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.*

Table 4: *Results of IPV Model, Ever versus Never, Logistic Regression,* n = *3693*

	Full Model	Male Only	Female Only	Hispanic Only	NH White Only	NH Black Only	NH Other Only
Inauthenticity	1.01	1.05	0.98	0.73*	1.02	1.11	1.18
Wave I							
Male	1.57			0.78	2.15	2.55	0.31
Race/Ethnicity							
Hispanic	1.40*	1.18	1.71**				
NH White (Ref)							
NH Black	1.84***	1.98***	1.74**				
NH Other	1.21	1.36	1.04				
Age	0.96	0.96	0.96	1.04	0.94	0.95	0.82
Two Parent Family	0.78*	0.71*	0.85	0.89	0.73*	0.84	0.44
Wave II							
Age Difference with Partner	1.01	1.02	1.01	0.97	0.98	1.19**	1.05
Male Partner	1.18	0.18*	2.46	1.11	1.27	1.33	1.07
"Special" Relationship	0.71	0.65	0.83	0.36	0.65	1.34	0.13**
Relationship Ongoing	0.93	1.01	0.92	0.97	0.93	0.77	1.03
Sex in Relationship	1.09	1.18	0.99	0.99	1.10	1.26	0.71
Psychological Violence in Relationship	1.28	1.17	1.32	0.75	1.30	1.42	1.88
Physical Violence in Relationship	1.16	0.84	1.63	2.33	0.93	1.04	10.09**
Wave IV							
Male Partner	0.93	0.97	1.25	0.71	1.22	0.76	0.17
Age Relative							
Partner Younger 2+ Years	1.17	1.00	1.66*	2.13	1.10	1.42	0.75
Within 2 Years (Ref)							
Partner Older 2+ Years	1.03	0.85	1.21	1.25	1.04	1.27	0.37*
Relationship Type							
Cohabitation	1.27	1.48	1.12	0.91	1.32	1.43	5.61**
Marriage after Cohabitation (Ref)							
Direct Marriage	0.74	0.90	0.63	0.93	0.58**	1.06	3.17
Dating/Pregnancy	0.53**	0.69	0.41**	0.40	0.57	0.49	1.12

Relationship Duration (Months)	1.00*	1.01*	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.01
Current Relationship	0.82	0.94	0.69	0.97	0.75	1.03	1.34
Prior Marriage	1.06	1.08	0.98	1.21	1.19	0.28*	0.97
Education							
Less than High School	1.07	1.38	0.80	1.03	0.92	2.11	0.88
High School/Some College (Ref)							
College to Some Graduate	0.59***	0.67*	0.51***	1.26	0.51***	0.59	1.35
Masters or More	0.70	0.71	0.65	0.23	0.74	1.08	0.39
Constant	0.92	1.06	0.40	1.32	1.19	0.51	59.85

Note: **p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.*

Table 5: *Results of IPV Model, Role in Violence versus Neither, Multinomial Logistic Regression,* n = *3693*

	Victim	Perpetrator	Both
Inauthenticity	1.12	0.87	0.96
Wave I			
Male	2.58*	0.73	1.18
Race/Ethnicity			
Hispanic	0.96	1.25	1.99***
NH White (Ref)			
NH Black	1.76***	0.82	2.42***
NH Other	0.93	1.03	1.57
Age	0.97	0.97	0.94
Two Parent Family	0.71*	0.84	0.83
Wave II			
Age Difference with Partner	1.06	0.97	1.00
Male Partner	1.11	0.83	1.40
"Special" Relationship	0.68	2.02	0.61*
Relationship Ongoing	1.15	0.69	0.87
Sex in Relationship	1.09	0.90	1.21
Psychological Violence in Relationship	1.40	1.30	1.13
Physical Violence in Relationship	0.97	1.08	1.40
Wave IV			
Male Partner	0.76	2.84	0.70
Age Relative			
Partner Younger 2+ Years	1.22	1.75	1.02
Within 2 Years (Ref)			
Partner Older 2+ Years	1.22	1.43	0.76
Relationship Type			
Cohabitation	1.07	2.04*	1.20
Marriage after Cohabitation (Ref)			
Direct Marriage	0.75	0.70	0.77
Dating/Pregnancy	0.58*	0.68	0.41*
Relationship Duration (Months)	1.00	1.00	1.00*
Current Relationship	0.61*	2.06	0.85
Prior Marriage	1.12	0.88	1.05
Education			
Less than High School	0.91	1.21	1.20
High School/Some College (Ref)			
College to Some Graduate	0.53***	0.69	0.60**
Masters or More	0.88	0.69	0.54
Constant	0.26	0.02*	0.78

Note: **p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.*

Table 6: *Results of Love Model, Ordinal Logistic Regression,* n = *3117*

	Full Model	Male Only	Female Only	Hispanic Only	NH White Only	NH Black Only	NH Other Only
Inauthenticity	1.04	1.00	1.05	1.16	1.03	0.98	0.89
Wave I							
Male	1.33			9.93*	0.41	0.43	47.29
Race/Ethnicity							
Hispanic	0.78	0.79	0.82				
NH White (Ref)							
NH Black	0.73	0.85	0.58*				
NH Other	0.69	0.76	0.54				
Age	0.94	1.01	0.85*	0.96	0.96	0.85	1.04
Two Parent Family	1.12	1.09	1.21	0.51	1.28	1.26	0.44
Wave II							
Age Difference with Partner	0.96	0.95	0.97	0.99	0.95	1.01	1.17
Male Partner	2.61	7.33	1.46	0.91	1.72	0.65	325.23**
"Special" Relationship	0.77	0.72	0.83	1.10	0.72	1.13	0.02*
Relationship Ongoing	0.97	0.71*	1.26	0.97	0.93	0.82	10.57
Sex in Relationship	0.63**	0.65	0.64*	0.26*	0.67*	0.86	0.05*
Psychological Violence in Relationship	1.10	1.21	1.03	0.47	1.08	1.86	2.31
Physical Violence in Relationship	1.14	1.06	1.36	232.01***	0.93	0.84	3.24
Wave IV							
Male Partner	0.79	0.80	0.84	26.24***	0.36	0.75	0.10
Age Relative							
Partner Younger 2+ Years	0.95	0.96	1.13	0.43	0.92	1.69	0.09*
Within 2 Years (Ref)							
Partner Older 2+ Years	0.90	1.01	0.94	0.29*	1.12	0.87	0.59
Relationship Type							
Cohabitation	1.21	0.61	2.44*	1.38	0.98	1.29	181.16**
Marriage after Cohabitation (Ref)							
Direct Marriage	0.94	0.65	1.10	0.29	1.17	0.27*	3240.70***
Dating/Pregnancy	0.20***	0.10***	0.36***	0.14**	0.15***	0.18***	43.48*

Relationship Duration (Months)	1.01***	1.01*	1.01**	1.01	1.01	1.01*	1.10**
Prior Marriage	1.02	1.04	0.92	1.23	0.94	1.25	0.17
Education							
Less than High School	0.59*	0.38**	1.25	0.56	0.73	1.10	0.91
High School/Some College (Ref)							
College to Some Graduate	1.39*	1.36	1.59	2.59	1.36	1.07	13.40*
Masters or More	1.29	1.36	1.40	1.33	1.43	2.53**	0.99
Cut Points							
1	0.01***	0.01***	0.00***	0.03	0.00***	0.00	8.13
2	0.04***	0.04**	0.01**	0.11	0.01**	0.00	23.45
3	0.11*	0.11*	0.03*	0.50	0.03*	0.01	84.14

Note: *$p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$.

Table 7: *Results of Commitment Model, Ordinal Logistic Regression,* n = *3116*

	Full Model	Male Only	Female Only	Hispanic Only	NH White Only	NH Black Only	NH Other Only
Inauthenticity	0.92	0.87	0.97	1.06	0.88	1.01	1.57
Wave I							
Male	0.70			2.21	0.16**	0.46	93.19**
Race/Ethnicity							
Hispanic	0.62**	0.54**	0.75				
NH White (Ref)							
NH Black	0.48***	0.42***	0.56**				
NH Other	0.68	0.94	0.51				
Age	0.97	0.97	0.94	1.05	0.97	0.93	0.67
Two Parent Family	1.11	1.06	1.19	0.89	1.19	1.12	0.55
Wave II							
Age Difference with Partner	0.97	0.93	1.00	0.95	0.97	0.97	0.96
Male Partner	1.33	1.32	1.51	1.84	0.34	1.92	33.77**
"Special" Relationship	1.03	0.83	1.55	3.11*	0.83	1.09	1.04
Relationship Ongoing	1.05	0.97	1.17	0.91	1.09	1.02	1.52
Sex in Relationship	0.76*	0.63*	0.98	0.58	0.75	0.90	0.75
Psychological Violence in Relationship	0.87	0.93	0.83	0.89	0.73	0.99	5.34
Physical Violence in Relationship	0.82	0.71	1.06	1.06	0.90	0.66	0.06
Wave IV							
Male Partner	0.87	1.19	0.69	3.81*	0.69	0.57	2.66
Age Relative							
Partner Younger 2+ Years	0.96	0.99	0.94	0.67	0.86	1.67	0.62
Within 2 Years (Ref)							
Partner Older 2+ Years	0.93	0.98	0.92	0.71	0.93	1.17	0.51
Relationship Type							
Cohabitation	0.77	0.48***	1.41	0.95	0.72	0.55	3.32
Marriage after Cohabitation (Ref)							
Direct Marriage	0.96	0.92	0.98	0.29	1.21	0.34	570.86***
Dating/Pregnancy	0.19***	0.11***	0.29***	0.11***	0.18***	0.12***	0.82

Relationship Duration (Months)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.01	1.02
Prior Marriage	1.15	1.19	1.15	1.29	1.01	3.30**	0.33
Education							
Less than High School	0.77	0.75	0.82	0.61	1.05	0.75	1.19
High School/Some College (Ref)							
College to Some Graduate	1.35*	1.27	1.55*	2.56*	1.26	1.25	1.36
Masters or More	1.24	1.20	1.41	0.94	1.15	2.74***	0.68
Cut Points							
1	0.01***	0.01***	0.03***	0.26	0.00***	0.01*	0.04
2	0.03***	0.02***	0.08*	0.96	0.01***	0.05	0.13
3	0.11**	0.07*	0.23	5.34	0.02***	0.19	0.94

Note: *$p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$.

Table 8: *Results of Happiness Model, Ordinal Logistic Regression,* n = *3115*

	Full Model	Male Only	Female Only	Hispanic Only	NH White Only	NH Black Only	NH Other Only
Inauthenticity	0.97	0.89	1.04	1.07	0.98	0.84	1.84
Wave I							
Male	0.58			1.84	0.25*	0.11***	824.72***
Race/Ethnicity							
Hispanic	0.73*	0.77	0.71				
NH White (Ref)							
NH Black	0.57***	0.71	0.47***				
NH Other	0.72	0.64	0.77				
Age	0.96	0.97	0.94	1.06	0.98	0.83*	0.61
Two Parent Family	1.25*	1.11	1.39*	0.89	1.33**	1.29	1.06
Wave II							
Age Difference with Partner	0.99	0.95	0.99	1.04	0.97	1.02	0.98
Male Partner	0.72	1.35	0.32	1.25	0.34	0.18**	154.13***
"Special" Relationship	0.96	0.77	1.28	1.70	0.84	0.94	3.43
Relationship Ongoing	1.05	0.95	1.13	1.33	1.00	1.06	1.93
Sex in Relationship	0.86	0.64*	1.11	0.38**	0.94	1.00	1.20
Psychological Violence in Relationship	1.02	1.15	0.93	1.26	1.00	0.90	1.01
Physical Violence in Relationship	0.70	0.67	0.75	1.35	0.59	0.93	0.10
Wave IV							
Male Partner	0.88	1.10	0.57	1.64	0.85	0.46	6.01
Age Relative							
Partner Younger 2+ Years	0.83	0.88	0.85	0.72	0.85	0.85	0.09**
Within 2 Years (Ref)							
Partner Older 2+ Years	0.82	0.89	0.82	0.55	0.94	0.70	0.26
Relationship Type							
Cohabitation	0.89	0.64*	1.18	0.77	0.80	0.91	2.90
Marriage after Cohabitation (Ref)							
Direct Marriage	1.42	1.06	1.70*	0.98	1.47	0.80	1903.85***
Dating/Pregnancy	0.45***	0.27***	0.68	0.31*	0.45***	0.31**	1.24

Relationship Duration (Months)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Prior Marriage	0.88	0.96	0.86	0.86	0.81	1.77	0.35
Education							
Less than High School	0.79	0.65	1.13	0.78	0.99	0.53	2.68
High School/Some College (Ref)							
College to Some Graduate	1.34*	1.49	1.33	2.50*	1.32	1.16	0.54
Masters or More	1.46	1.57	1.53*	1.71	1.55	1.47	1.21
Cut Points							
1	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***	0.24	0.01***	0.00***	0.18
2	0.10**	0.08*	0.05*	1.97	0.05**	0.00***	2.09

Note: **p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.*

Table 9: *Results of Closeness Model, Ordinal Logistic Regression,* n = *3114*

	Full Model	Male Only	Female Only	Hispanic Only	NH White Only	NH Black Only	NH Other Only
Inauthenticity	0.99	0.90	1.09	0.96	0.98	0.95	1.65*
Wave I							
Male	0.73			1.95	0.48	0.99	9.93
Race/Ethnicity							
Hispanic	0.83	0.84	0.87				
NH White (Ref)							
NH Black	0.86	1.06	0.74*				
NH Other	1.17	1.07	1.22				
Age	0.97	0.97	0.96	1.05	0.99	0.86*	0.86
Two Parent Family	1.19*	1.11	1.27*	0.94	1.26*	1.07	2.84*
Wave II							
Age Difference with Partner	0.99	0.95	1.00	0.97	0.99	1.03	1.02
Male Partner	1.34	1.18	1.45	1.22	1.01	1.41	18.20**
"Special" Relationship	1.17	1.01	1.34	2.29	1.01	1.35	1.72
Relationship Ongoing	1.02	0.91	1.12	1.10	1.02	0.85	1.86
Sex in Relationship	0.85	0.68*	1.03	0.40**	0.94	0.78	0.61
Psychological Violence in Relationship	1.10	1.10	1.12	0.92	1.07	1.21	2.07
Physical Violence in Relationship	0.60*	0.63	0.57*	3.12	0.52	0.56*	0.42
Wave IV							
Male Partner	0.63	0.93	0.44	2.57	0.53	0.65	0.74
Age Relative							
Partner Younger 2+ Years	0.92	0.99	0.97	0.45	0.90	1.59	0.33
Within 2 Years (Ref)							
Partner Older 2+ Years	1.13	1.43	1.07	0.51*	1.28	1.22	0.53
Relationship Type							
Cohabitation	0.93	0.66*	1.28	0.72	0.87	1.07	2.04
Marriage after Cohabitation (Ref)							
Direct Marriage	1.15	1.22	1.08	0.31*	1.47*	0.41*	6.81*
Dating/Pregnancy	0.34***	0.22***	0.50***	0.24**	0.34***	0.20***	1.69

Relationship Duration (Months)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.02
Prior Marriage	1.02	1.18	0.96	1.45	0.96	0.87	0.91
Education							
Less than High School	0.90	0.70	1.24	0.96	1.03	0.95	2.51
High School/Some College (Ref)							
College to Some Graduate	0.88	0.92	0.90	1.62	0.80	1.03	0.73
Masters or More	0.69*	0.93	0.61**	0.68	0.65*	1.38	0.39
Cut Points							
1	0.02***	0.01***	0.03**	0.10	0.01***	0.00**	1.06
2	0.04***	0.03***	0.06*	0.20	0.03***	0.01**	2.42
3	0.08***	0.05***	0.11	0.42	0.05***	0.02*	4.18
4	0.16**	0.11**	0.22	0.80	0.11**	0.03*	8.16
5	0.32	0.22	0.42	1.67	0.22	0.06	25.16
6	0.84	0.60	1.13	4.36	0.61	0.19	66.01

Note: **p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.*

Table 10: *Results of Closeness Model, OLS Regression,* n = *3114*

	Full Model	Male Only	Female Only	Hispanic Only	NH White Only	NH Black Only	NH Other Only
Inauthenticity	-0.02	-0.10	0.06	0.02	-0.03	-0.06	0.15
Wave I							
Male	0.00			0.83	-0.56	0.13	2.40**
Race/Ethnicity							
Hispanic	-0.21	-0.19	-0.21				
NH White (Ref)							
NH Black	-0.19	-0.01	-0.36**				
NH Other	0.06	0.07	0.02				
Age	-0.03	-0.03	-0.05	0.01	-0.02	-0.14*	-0.13
Two Parent Family	0.14	0.07	0.22*	-0.11	0.18	0.04	0.84*
Wave II							
Age Difference with Partner	-0.01	-0.05	0.00	-0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.00
Male Partner	0.40	0.10	0.62	0.32	-0.05	0.31	2.39***
"Special" Relationship	0.13	-0.01	0.25	0.91	-0.03	0.39	0.33
Relationship Ongoing	0.03	-0.10	0.13	0.12	0.01	-0.09	0.45
Sex in Relationship	-0.15	-0.29*	-0.03	-0.79**	-0.05	-0.23	-0.45
Psychological Violence in Relationship	0.10	0.17	0.05	0.00	0.03	0.36	0.45
Physical Violence in Relationship	-0.47*	-0.54	-0.36	0.88	-0.55	-0.55	-0.51
Wave IV							
Male Partner	-0.27	0.05	-0.40	0.86	-0.40	-0.27	0.20
Age Relative							
Partner Younger 2+ Years	-0.14	-0.12	-0.01	-0.66	-0.14	0.38	-1.01*
Within 2 Years (Ref)							
Partner Older 2+ Years	0.04	0.26	-0.01	-0.47	0.15	0.09	-0.60
Relationship Type							
Cohabitation	0.08	-0.31	0.41**	-0.18	0.03	0.08	0.68
Marriage after Cohabitation (Ref)							
Direct Marriage	0.08	0.08	0.05	-0.91*	0.28	-0.87*	1.41**
Dating/Pregnancy	-0.92***	-1.40***	-0.48**	-1.12**	-0.92***	-1.49***	0.62

Relationship Duration (Months)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01*
Prior Marriage	-0.04	0.01	-0.06	0.51	-0.13	-0.16	0.00
Education							
Less than High School	-0.15	-0.43	0.24	0.00	-0.06	-0.04	1.06
High School/Some College (Ref)							
College to Some Graduate	0.00	0.04	0.05	0.48	-0.06	0.13	-0.25
Masters or More	-0.20	-0.05	-0.24	-0.12	-0.25	0.41	-0.75
Constant	5.89***	6.50***	5.31***	4.22**	6.40***	7.30***	2.86

Note: **p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.*