Title: Romantic-Relationship Experiences in the Emerging Adulthood and Later Marriage Behavior

Population Association of American 2019 Annual Meeting Submission

(Extended Abstract)

Janet Chen-Lan Kuo
Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, National Taiwan University
jclkuo@ntu.edu.tw

I-Chien Chen
Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Sociology/ College of Education, Michigan State University
ichiench@msu.edu

Abstract

Using data from the three waves (1,3,4) of the Add Health, the current study examines 1) what may feature the relationship experience in the emerging adulthood years; 2) whether and how individuals' late-teen and early-adulthood relationship experiences vary by one's socioeconomic background; 3) whether the relationship experience in the emerging adulthood years is related to the risk of marriage by early 30s. Employing the latent class analysis, the preliminary results show that young people who were more likely than the others to experience or attribute the cause of a dissolved relationship to "divergent expectations" seem to be more socioeconomically advantaged. And the multivariate logistic model shows that these people are more likely than their peers to marry by early 30s, net of socioeconomic background and other related factors. We argue that the findings may help reveal the underlying processes behind the well-documented socioeconomic divergences in family formation.

I. Introduction

Following the cultural shifts in the gender-role ideology and gender division, and along with premarital sex and cohabitation becoming more socially accepted, as well as the institutional transformation in higher education and economic reconstructing, for young people today the age period of the late teens and early twenties differs completely from what it had been a century ago. Instead of being a time of entering and settling into stable adult roles, for some young people today, the age period between the late teens and mid-twenties is characterized by longer and more widespread participation in postsecondary education and training, and for most, it is an age period featured by enormous flux, instability, uncertainty, and change. Given its salience and uniqueness, Psychologist Arnett (2000, 2007) used the term—emerging adulthood—to reflect this new phase of life.

Although the theory of emerging adulthood provides a useful perspective in understanding the social and cultural reality that contemporary young people are faced with, many scholars also noticed the diversity in the emerging adult years and found that young people from different socioeconomic backgrounds follow diverging paths to adult roles (Fingerman et al., 2015; Furstenberg, 2010; Furstenberg, Kennedy, McLoyd, Rumbaut, & Settersten, 2004; Meier, 2006). Because how individuals experience and what they do in their emerging adulthood years have profound implications for their future life opportunities and long-term well-beings, the emerging adulthood years have increasingly become an important stage of life for scholarly inquiry (e.g., Coyne, Padilla-Walker, & Howard, 2013; Schwartz, Zamboanga, Luyckx, Meca, & Ritchie, 2013).

Also, emerging adulthood is an important developmental period during which people gain intimate relationship experience before settling on someone to partner with. Compared to older generations, young people of more recent cohorts have more freedom in choosing their spouses. Additionally, with the increasing emphasis and prevalence of companionate marriage, the expectations of emotional intimacy and life compatibility in couples have become important and increasingly considered as a markable way of fostering the marital bond (Cherlin, 2009). Moreover, as the age has been increasingly postponed, the emerging adulthood years are a critical life stage for people of more recent cohorts to explore romantic relationships and experiment with their philosophies on intimate partnership (Shulman & Connolly, 2013), likely more intensively as compared to late adolescence years. Therefore, understanding how individuals' romantic experiences unfold in the "adult but not quite adult" life stage and how the experiences vary by their socioeconomic backgrounds, as well as how the relationship experiences in this period of life shape their marriage behavior may

provide rich insight into the underlying processes behind the well-documented socioeconomic divergences in marriage formation.

Despite the importance of emerging adult years for intimacy relationship development, prior studies on romantic relationships have often focused on the life stage of adolescence and their implications for psychosocial wellbeing (e.g., Davies & Windle, 2000; Giordano, Longmore, & Manning, 2006; Joyner & Udry, 2000). Little research, however, has directly examined how relationship experience in the emerging adulthood years shape people's family formation behavior later. This paper fills the gap in the preexisting literature and uses data from the first four waves of National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health, W1-W4) to answer three questions: First, what may feature the relationship experience in the late teens to the mid-20s, that is, the emerging adulthood years?

To answer this question, we focus on two dimensions of a relationship that capture the level of a person's exclusiveness and commitment in a relationship and the cause for a relationship to dissolve, respectively. Since it is common for contemporary young people to have a variety of romantic partners and engaged in multiple romantic/sexual relations before marriage, we employed the latent class analysis technique and created measures that could best capture a person's breaking-up experience and how involved they generally were in the romantic relationships formed in the emerging adulthood years. Every breakup could induce certain social and emotional costs, even though the degree may vary by relationship and depend on how involved a person is in the relationship. Also, a dissolved relationship and how it ended may have long-term implications for later romantic relationship development and adjustment (Fincham & Cui, 2010; Shulman & Connolly, 2013) and therefore, may further influence their marriage formation later. Second, we wonder whether and how individuals' late-teen and early-adulthood relationship experiences vary by one's socioeconomic background. Third, we wonder whether the relationship experience in the emerging adulthood years has anything to do with the risk of marriage before the end of their 20s and early 30s.

II. **Data and Methods**

The data used for the current analysis is from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), a nationally representative school-based survey of adolescents in grades 7 through 12 during the 1994–1995. First follow-up data collection was conducted in 1996, and the second follow-up data in 2001–2002 when the participants were 18 to 26 years old (Wave 3); and the fourth follow-up in 2008 when the participants were 24 to 32 years old (Wave 4; Harris et al., 2009). We used data from Waves 1, 3, and 4. The initial Wave 1 sample was 20, 745 adolescents

who completed in-home interviews. The analytic sample was restricted to those who reported romantic relationship history in Wave 3 and relationship occurred after age 16 (n=10,960), completed the fourth follow-up survey (n=8,787), those who are not missing in the longitudinal weight variable (n= 6,416) and those who are not missing in the covariates (n=5,782).

Measures

The dependent variable in this current study is whether married before Wave 4 when the participants were 24 to 32 years old. The dependent variable was coded as 0 "single (never married) or cohabitation in Wave 4", 1 "married or ever married before Wave 4."

Relationship exclusiveness and commitment. Information on the emerging adults' romantic relationship histories collected at Wave 3 when the participants were 18 to 26 years old and were used to identify the classification of intimacy relationship development. Respondents reported all romantic and sexual relationships since the summer of 1995. There were 38,375 relationship records and we excluded relations occurred before age 16 (relations= 31,856). To capture the impacts of prior romantic relationship histories on emerging adults' marriage decision, we distinguish the relationship characteristics into two dimensions: (1) *Relationship exclusiveness and commitment (2) Causes of relationship dissolution.* We constructed three variables to capture prior histories of exclusives relationship development within six years using individual self-reported the exclusiveness and commitment in each relationship. *Relationship exclusiveness and commitment* is asked the respondents to answer "Which of the following best describes your relationship with the partner at the present time?" Answers included dating exclusively; dating frequently, but not exclusively; dating once in a while and only having sex. We constructed three variables to represent to the experience of exclusiveness for individuals in their late teens and early 20s (1) percentage of exclusive relationship within six years, (2) percentage of non-exclusive relationship within six years, (3) percentage of sex-only relationship within six years. The denominator of the percentage is the total number of romantic relationship within six years. Dating relationships once in a while are excluded from this analysis because there was no exclusiveness information can be identified.

Causes of relationship dissolution are based on respondents' responses to the question of "What was the main reason the relationship ended?" The respondents were asked to choose one from fifteen possible reasons. We grouped into five major rationales of how young adults experienced intimate relationship dissolutions in the transition to adulthood. "*Relationship went sour" kind of reasons* include "started a relationship with someone else," "tired of other/out of love/grew apart," "relationship

had too much conflict, not getting along," "found something unacceptable about other," "One partner lied/was unfaithful." *"Breaking-up due to e divergent relationship expectation or life transitions"* kind of reasons include "one partner wanted relation more serious/committed than other" and "one partner wanted relation to be less committed and "you or partner moved away for school/job/service." "*Uncontrollable*" reasons include "partner was sent to jail/prison," "partner died," "unplanned pregnancy," and "you or partner was abusive." **"***Unknown" reasons* include "don't know," "other" and "refused to answer." We constructed five variables to represent the relationship dissolution experiences: (1) counts of relationship go sour within 6 years, (2) counts of relationship expectations go divergent/ life transition points within 6 years, (3) counts of uncontrolled relationships within 6 years, (4) counts of relationship ended with unknown reasons within 6 years and (5) counts of total relationship within 6 years. The range of total relationship is from 1 to 41 within 6 years.

Additionally, in predicting the risk of marriage in the late 20s or early 30s with the romantic relationship experience in the emerging adulthood years, the models also control for *family Structure*, the variable is constructed based on parent's report of marital status and their relations to the respondents. Information about residential parents' marital status was categorized into four types of families: two biological and married parents; divorced families; never married families and widowed families. *Parents' religiousness*, constructed based on three questions from the Wave 1 parent questionnaire, asking: "How often attend religious service" (4= Once a week or more, 1=never), "The importance of religion" (4= very important, 1= not important at all) and "How often pray" (6= At least once a day, 1=never). The reliability of this scale was 0.87 (Cronbach's Alpha) therefore we construct a factor score to represent the level of parents' religiousness. *Parental education* captures the highest level of parental maternal educational attainment (mostly based on mothers) with information from the Wave 1 parent questionnaire. These categories included: (1) less than a high school education (reference category), (2) a high school education, (3) some college education, or (4) a college degree or higher. *Family income* from the wave 1 parent questionnaire and imputed for those with missing parent interview. We also examined models using the natural log of family income and missing flag in the model. Different missing control strategies did not alter our main results. *Young adult educational attainment* was from the wave 4 questionnaire when they were at age 24 to 32. These categories included: (1) less than a high school education (reference category), (2) a high school education, (3) some college education, (4) four-year college degree and (5) Beyond college degree. *Respondents' religious faith* was from the questionnaire of the first wave and was categorized into six groups: (1) Mainline

Protestant ; (2) Evangelical Protestant; (3) Black Protestant; (4) Catholic; (5) Other; (7) No religion. We also control for individual respondents' socio-demographic covariates in the first wave, including respondents' age, race/ethnicity (non-Latino/a White [reference], Black, Latino/a, Asian or Pacific Islander, and others).

Analytic Strategy

Our analysis is composed of three stages. The first stage was to identify two latent classification of intimate relationship development in the dimensions of exclusiveness and causes of relationship dissolution, and to label the patterns based on the results. Latent profile models (LPA) with two, three, four and five latent classes were fitted on the two sets of continuous variables. Specifically, this analytic strategy was used to identify two distinct profile structures based on the relationship features of exclusiveness and commitment and causes of dissolution experienced by the emerging adults in the sample, as a means of understanding what expectations of intimacy and companionship were associated with the transition into marriage. The best-fitting solution in LPA is described by the different mean scores on each indicator variable which was depending on class membership (Masyn, 2013). To reduce the risk of a local maximum solution, all models were estimated twenty times with different random starting values (Kreuter & Muthén, 2008). BIC, SSABIC, BLRT, and LMR-LRT were used to determine the best numbers of the latent profile. The second stage was to compare family socio-economic status, religion, educational attainment and whether emerging adults ever married versus current in cohabitation or single (never married) status at age 24 to 32. The third stage was to use logistic regressions to understand the relationships between the intimate relationship development identified by LCA and the likelihood of transition into marriage at age 24 to 32. The opportunities and perceptions of intimate relationship experiences are different for women than for men. We estimate logistic regression models for males and females separately in predicting whether or not young adults were getting married at age 24 to 32.

III. Preliminary Findings

On the level of exclusiveness and commitment for relationships formed in the late teens and early 20s, results from the latent class analysis suggest that individuals could be classified into five types: "Type I: Relationship dabblers", "Type II: Exclusive relationship builders", "Type III: Non-exclusive daters", "Type IV; Diverse relationship mixers", and "Type V: Sex-only actors". In the analytic sample, 17% of the youth are classified as Type I; 40% as Type II; 15% as Type III; 21% as Type IV; 6% as Type V (see Table 1). Based on their premarital relationships in the

emerging adulthood years, men are more likely than women to be characterized as being sex-only actors or diver relationship mixers.

[Table 1 about here]

On the causes of breaking-up for relationships formed in the late teens and early 20s, results from the latent class analysis suggest that individuals could be classified into four categories, and each category is labeled as "Type I: Go-Sour", "Type II: Expectation going divergent", "Type III: Go Source mixed with uncontrolled reasons", and "Type IV: All possible reasons". In the analytic sample, 86% of the youth are classified as Type I; almost 8% as Type II; almost 5 % as Type III; less than 2 % as Type IV (see Table 1). For both men and women, "relationship going sour" is the most frequent cause for a relationship to dissolve. However, women are more likely than men to experience a relationship dissolution for adverse and uncontrollable reasons—incarceration of the partner or abusive relationships.

The classifications we attained from the latent class analysis on the two dimensions that feature each relationship's level of exclusiveness and commitment and causes of dissolution suggest that the relationship experience in the emerging adulthood years is indeed diverse and differs for individuals.

In the section that follows, we have a more detailed description of young people's break-up and involvement experiences and what may distinguish young people of different classification based on their socioeconomic backgrounds.

The Features of the Youth Demonstrating Different Types of Relationship Experience

On relationship exclusiveness and commitment

Table 2 shows that for people classified as the "Type I Relationship dabblers", in their formed relationships, a considerable proportion of them (32%) is exclusive but more often than not they couldn't identify the relationship status based on the level of their involvement, or commitment. For people classified as the "Type II Exclusive-relationship builders", almost 90% of their romantic relationships formed in the late teens to mid-20s are exclusive ones, with very limited experience in sex-only, causal dating, or non-exclusive kinds of relationship. As to the "Type III Non-Exclusive" individuals, almost 45% of their relationships are exclusive ones, and they are more likely to date causally than involve in exclusive relationships. For individuals in the "Type IV Diverse Relationship Mixers," the relationships they ever formed are largely sex-only ones, whereas there is still a considerable proportion of them are exclusive. For the fifth type "Sex-only Actors," almost 83% of relationships

they formed in the late teens and early 20s are sex-only relationships, with sporadically exclusive, non-exclusive, or casual dating kinds of relationships.

For sex-only daters, they are more likely than others to be males and have the largest number of premarital relationships ever formed within six years of observation and on the other hand, for the exclusive relationship builders are more likely to be females than others and have the smallest number of relationships formed. Additionally, compared with individuals of the rest four types, the *exclusive relationship builders* tend to come from families with higher household incomes, have more educated parents, are largely composed of college-goers, and are more educated later on, and are less likely to be African Americans. Together with parents of Type I Relationship dabblers, the exclusive relationship builders' parents also have a higher expectation of college attainment for the children. Notably, for the sex-only actors, they are least likely to be Asians.

[Table 2 about here]

On causes of relationship dissolution

Based on the causes of dissolution for each premarital relationship formed in the late teens and early 20s, the youth are classified into four categories. Panel 2 in Table 2 shows that for people in the "going-sour or growing apart" grop, the causes of their relationship dissolution are primarily due to some unknown causes or due to reasons such as starting a relationship with someone else, getting tired of partner/out of love/growing apart, not getting along, finding something unacceptable about the partner, or one partner being dishonest or unfaithful. As Table 1 shows, a vast majority of young people (87%) in the analytic sample broke up due to such reasons.

For young people in the "divergent expectations" group, although "relationship going sour or growing apart" are still a common cause of a breakup, compared to other types of people, they were more likely to break up for reasons such as school/service transitions or divergent expectation (e.g., one partner wanted relation more serious/committed than the other or wanted the relationship to be less committed than the other). People who are more likely to break up due to reasons related to "divergent expectations" are least likely to be female, and they formed more premarital relationships in the emerging adulthood years, and have a higher level of household income and parental education. Also, this group of people has a higher proportion ever attending a college and the educational attainment received was also higher than people in other categories. Besides, although not the highest, their parents also have a high level of expectation of their college attainment. However, this group

of people, compared to other groups, sex-only relationships take up quite a large proportion of all the ever formed premarital relationships.

The third group of people, also of a small size, belong to the "Going sour/growing apart and uncontrolled reasons" type. Compared with other groups of people, the "Going sour/growing apart and uncontrolled reasons" type of people are more likely to end a relationship due to uncontrollable reasons such as one or the partner being abusive, death, or incarceration of the partner. Last, the "all possible reasons" type of people who are almost as likely to break up for all kinds of reasons except for reasons associated with "divergent expectation."

Overall, we found that different types of relationship experience, either classified based on relationship exclusiveness or commitment or based on causes of relationship dissolution, demonstrate somewhat of variation in socioeconomic backgrounds. People whose relationship experience is characterized by "*exclusive relationship builders*" and "expectation going divergent" are more likely to come from wealthier households, where parents are also more educated and have a higher expectation for them to go to college, and indeed they are also more educated in the end.

Relationship Experience and Marriage entry by early 30s

Table 3 shows the coefficients from the multivariate logistic regression models estimating the marital status of the respondents by early 30s, separately for men and women. Table 3 shows that for individuals whose late-teen and early-20s relationship experience is marked by *exclusive relationship builders* or by *relationship dabblers* are more likely to marry by early 30s, compared with those by *non-exclusive daters.* Additionally, concerning the causes of relationship dissolution, those whose breakup experience is marked by "expectation going divergent" is more likely than the general folks, marked by *going sour or growing apart,* are more likely to marry by early 30s. The findings suggest that relationship experiences in the emerging adulthood years matter for people's marital behavior.

[Table 3 about here]

In sum, our preliminary results show that romantic relationship experience in the emerging adulthood years demonstrates a considerable diversity concerning their relationship exclusiveness and commitment. Although a vast majority of young people they generally broke up a relationship because they couldn't enjoy each other's company—relationship became sour, and they grew apart. Nonetheless, we found that there is a group of young people who are more likely than the others to

experience or attribute the cause of a dissolved relationship to "divergent expectations" as they and their partners had different expectations for the relationships or different life prospects. We found that the group of young people is more socioeconomically advantaged in terms of their family incomes, parental education, and their educational attainment. Also, in the multivariate logistic regression model, controlling for a wide array of covariates, including young people's socioeconomic statuses and educational attainment and general relationship involvement experience, we found "divergent expectations" individuals are more likely than their peers to marry by early 30s.

Table1: Relationship experience classifications

	Final analytic sample		Female		Male	
	All (N=5782)		(N=3212)		(N=2570)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Relationship Exclusiveness and Commitment						
Type I: Relationship dabblers	989	17.10	563	17.53	426	16.58
Type II: Non-exclusive daters	908	15.70	530	16.5	378	14.71
Type III: Exclusive relationship builders	2317	40.07	1391	43.31	926	36.03
Type IV; Diverse relationship mixers	1245	21.53	625	19.46	620	24.12
Type V: Sex-only actors	323	5.59	103	3.21	220	8.56
Causes of Relationship Dissolution						
Type I: Go-Sour	4943	85.49	2672	83.19	2271	88.37
Type II: Expectations going divergent	459	7.94	231	7.19	228	8.87
Type III: Go Sour mixed with uncontrolled reasons	291	5.03	252	7.85	39	1.52
Type IV: All possible reasons	89	1.54	57	1.77	32	1.25

Table 2 Socioeconomic Background Compositions of Relationship Experience Types (*Continued)*

	Panel 1: Based on Relationship Exclusiveness and Commitment				
	TYPE 1 Relationship dabblers	TYPE 2 Exclusive-relationship builders	TYPE 3 Non-exclusive daters	TYPE 4 Diverse relationships Mixers	TYPE 5 Sex-only actors
% exclusive relationships within 6 years	**31.68%**	**89.07%**	20.28%	**30.18%**	10.66%
% non-exclusive relationships within 6 years	13.50%	2.92%	**44.34%**	10.33%	3.28%
% sex-only relationships within 6 years	3.76%	1.10%	1.63%	**44.66%**	**82.25%**
% casual-dating relationships within 6 years	9.39%	1.33%	29.39%	9.11%	2.10%
% unclassified relationships within 6 years	**38.25%**	5.39%	4.14%	4.70%	1.53%
%Female	48.92%	56.43%	46.30%	50.67%	28.95%
# of premarital relationships within six years	3.27 (.20)	**2.25 (.06)**	2.73 (.13)	4.56 (.15)	**5.56 (.49)**
Family Income Ranking Score (1-100) at wave 1	51.07(2.30)	**57.09(1.62)**	51.33(2.44)	51.04(1.75)	50.82(3.39)
Parental Education (levels 1-5) at wave 1	3.14(.08)	**3.16(.05)**	3.06(.09)	**3.22(.07)**	3.04(.13)
College Enrollment (%)	58.95%	**69.50%**	67.42%	60.74%	54.45%
Educational Attainment of the respondent at wave 4	3.32(.07)	**3.54 (.04)**	3.32(.07)	3.28(.05)	3.12(.11)
% Non-Hispanic White	77.78%	76.81%	74.24%	78.36%	74.84%
% African American	8.34%	**6.12%**	13.10%	8.41%	10.36%
% Hispanic	7.17%	7.73%	6.42%	5.94%	7.82%
% Asian	2.83%	5.17%	3.92%	3.98%	**0.98%**
% Others	3.32%	3.46%	1.35%	2.87%	3.96%
Parental College expectation (1-3)	**2.31(.05)**	**2.30(.03)**	2.28(.05)	2.26(.04)	2.21(.08)

	Panel II: Based on Causes of Relationship Dissolution			
	TYPE 1 Going Sour	TYPE 2 Expectation going divergent	TYPE 3 Going Sour and uncontrolled reasons	TYPE 4 All Possible Reasons
% relationships ended due to "going sour"	**33.61%**	**36.90%**	**30.42%**	14.05%
% relationships ended due to “divergent expectations"	12.75%	**21.64%**	12.10%	1.59%
% relationships ended for uncontrolled reasons	0.00%	0.00%	**25.00%**	17.29%
% relationships ended for other reasons	9.10%	30.33%	13.78%	12.90%
% relationships ended for unknown reasons	34.48%	10.66%	18.65%	**54.18%**
%Female	49.99%	42.00%	88.91%	47.18%
# of premarital relationships within six years of observation	1.21(.03)	2.74(.20)	2.35(.16)	1.11 (.18)
Family Income Ranking Score (1-100) at wave 1	53.48(1.04)	60.09(3.18)	44.47 (2.62)	36.39(1.17)
Parental Education (levels 1-5) at wave 1	3.15(.04)	3.25(.12)	2.97(.15)	2.92(.09)
College Enrollment (%)	65.09%	67.05%	53.45%	32.78%
Educational Attainment of the respondent at wave 4	3.40(.03)	3.40(.08)	3.17(.14)	2.58(.06)
% Non-Hispanic White	76.61%	81.39%	75.32%	64.89%
% African American	8.36%	8.34%	7.85%	11.64%
% Hispanic	7.13%	4.61%	8.63%	15.84%
% Asian	4.42%	2.61%	0.00%	3.04%
% Others	2.86%	3.00%	7.24%	0.00%
Parental College Expectation (1-3)	2.29(.02)	2.27(.07)	2.25(.09)	2.06(.06)
% exclusive relationships within 6 years of observation	53.48%	32.61%	49.34%	13.34%

% non-exclusive relationships within 6 years of observation	13.18%	11.17%	11.80%	3.22%
% sex-only relationships within 6 years of observation	13.34%	38.68%	15.45%	24.74%
% casual-dating relationships within 6 years of observation	8.60%	10.13%	12.13%	4.81%
% unclassified relationships within 6 years of observation	10.78%	3.39%	9.89%	51.88%

Standard deviations in parentheses

Table 3. Coefficients from the Logistic regression models predicting the risk of marriage as of age 30 (weighted results)

	Female	Male
Age in Wave 1	0.240***	0.262***
	(0.038)	(0.044)
Educational Attainment at Wave 4 (Ref. < HS)		
High school	0.541	-0.030
	(0.331)	(0.336)
Some College	0.507+	0.258
	(0.301)	(0.302)
College	0.624*	0.208
	(0.317)	(0.322)
More than college	0.773*	0.367
	(0.328)	(0.348)
Household income	0.000	-0.003
	(0.001)	(0.002)
Race-Ethnicity (Ref. Non-Hispanic White)		
Black	-1.419***	-0.867***
	(0.189)	(0.224)
Hispanic	-0.638**	-0.057
	(0.236)	(0.235)
Asian	-0.353	-0.821**
	(0.280)	(0.315)
Others	-0.085	-0.094
	(0.305)	(0.343)
Causes of Relationship Dissolution (Ref. Going sour or growing apart)		
Divergent expectations	0.493*	0.217
	(0.242)	(0.234)
Going sour and uncontrollable	-0.074	-1.031+
	(0.220)	(0.556)
All reasons are possible, expect expectation going divergent	-0.052	0.262
	(0.485)	(0.601)
Relationship Exclusiveness and Commitment (Ref. Non-Exclusive dates)		
Relationship Dabblers	0.549**	0.930***
	(0.191)	(0.238)
Exclusive relationship builders	0.364*	0.489*
	(0.165)	(0.205)
Diverse relationship mixers	0.114	0.653**
	(0.198)	(0.223)
Sex-only actors	0.263	0.265
	(0.343)	(0.282)
Constant	-4.497***	-4.815***
	(0.677)	(0.754)
Number of respondents	3212	2570

** p<.05 ** p<.01 ** p<.001*Note—All the models also control for educational attainment of resident parents (w1), family structure (w1), respondents' religious beliefs (wave 1), and parents' religiosity (wave 1), and Household income rank scores (W1). Standard errors are in parentheses.

Reference in method section:

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, *55*(5), 469–480.

Arnett, J. J. (2007). Emerging Adulthood: What Is It, and What Is It Good For? *Child Development Perspectives*, *1*(2), 68–73.

Cherlin, A. J. (2009). The Origins of the Ambivalent Acceptance of Divorce. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *71*(2), 226–229.

Coyne, S. M., Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Howard, E. (2013). Emerging in a Digital World: A Decade Review of Media Use, Effects, and Gratifications in Emerging Adulthood. *Emerging Adulthood*, *1*(2), 125–137.

Davies, P., & Windle, M. (2000). Middle Adolescents' Dating Pathways and Psychosocial Adjustment. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *46*(1). Retrieved from

Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2010). Marriage in the New Millennium: A Decade in Review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*(3), 630–649.

Fincham, F. D., & Cui, M. (2010). *Romantic Relationships in Emerging Adulthood*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from

Fingerman, K. L., Kim, K., Davis, E. M., Furstenberg, F. F., Birditt, K. S., & Zarit, S. H. (2015). "I'll Give You the World": Socioeconomic Differences in Parental Support of Adult Children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *77*(4), 844–865.

Furstenberg, F. F. (2010). On a New Schedule: Transitions to Adulthood and Family Change. *The Future of Children*, *20*(1), 67–87.

Furstenberg, F. F., Kennedy, S., McLoyd, V. C., Rumbaut, R. G., & Settersten, R. A. (2004). Growing Up is Harder to do. *Contexts*, *3*(3), 33–41.

Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A., & Manning, W. D. (2006). Gender and the Meanings of Adolescent Romantic Relationships: A Focus on Boys. *American Sociological Review*, *71*(2), 260–287.

Joyner, K., & Udry, J. R. (2000). You don't bring me anything but down: adolescent romance and depression. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *41*(4), 369–391.

Kreuter, F., & Muthén, B. (2008). Analyzing Criminal Trajectory Profiles: Bridging Multilevel and Group-based Approaches Using Growth Mixture Modeling. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 24(1), 1-31.

Masyn, K.E. (2013). Latent class analysis and finite mixture modeling. In T.D. Little (Ed.) The Oxford Handbook of Quantitative Methods: Vol. 2. Statistical Analysis (pp. 551-611). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Meier, A. (2006). On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research, and Public Policy. Richard A. Settersten, Jr., Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr., & Ruben G. Rumbaut. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *68*(1), 256–258.

Schwartz, S. J., Zamboanga, B. L., Luyckx, K., Meca, A., & Ritchie, R. A. (2013). Identity in Emerging Adulthood: Reviewing the Field and Looking Forward. *Emerging Adulthood*, *1*(2), 96–113.

Shulman, S., & Connolly, J. (2013). The Challenge of Romantic Relationships in Emerging Adulthood: Reconceptualization of the Field. *Emerging Adulthood*, *1*(1), 27–39.