The Role of Family Structure, Family Processes, and Family Content in Predicting
Adolescent Sexual Activity

Abbey L. Fruth

Monica A. Longmore

Peggy C. Giordano

Wendy D. Manning

Bowling Green State University

Dept. of Sociology

and Center for Family and Demographic Research

The Role of Family Structure, Family Processes, and Family Content in Predicting
Adolescent Sexual Activity

Past research on adolescent sexual activity has focused mostly on how family

structure affects adolescents' sexual activity. However, besides family structure, there

are also family processes that may influence adolescents' sexual behavior. For example,

some research has looked at family processes in relation to adolescent sexual activitywith

respect to monitoring, control, support and supervision (e.g., Longmore, Manning, &

Giordano, 2001), however, dating specific family processes have not been examined.

Additionally, family content (e.g., the parent's past and present behaviors and the

parent's beliefs about sexual activity) has not been examined previously. It is important

to address this gap because these factors may play a role in adolescents' sexual behaviors.

The current study uses the Toledo Adolescent Relationship Study to understand

how family processes and family content affect adolescent sexual activity. Specifically

we examine two issues. First, are dating specific measures of family processes better

predictors than general family processes in determining adolescents' sexual activity?

Second, do parents' past and present behaviors and values affect the likelihood that

adolescents are sexually active? While primarily research has examined general family

processes in relation to adolescents' sexual activity, this research extends prior research

by including dating specific family processes and measures of parental behavior and

beliefs.

Prior Research

Studies show that, in general, when adolescents do not have good relationships

with their parents they tend to be more rebellious and to experience more conflict with

parents, as well as to engage in more delinquent activities (Noller, 1994). Relatedly, parental support and closeness, communication, and monitoring all have important positive outcomes for adolescents (Noller, 1994; Youniss & Smollar, 1985). Familial processes, however, are influenced by family structure.

Family Structure

Family structure has been examined repeatedly with respect to adolescent sexual activity. For example, adolescent girls are more likely to have sexual intercourse when they come from single families as compared to intact families (Davis & Friel, 2001; Miller & Bingham, 1989). Also adolescents from two parent families are less likely to have had sex than adolescents from other family forms (Santelli, Lowry, Brener, & Robin, 2000). The effect may vary by race. Residing in a single parent family, increases black girls risks for experiencing first sexual intercourse, but not white girls risks (Wu & Thomson, 2001).

Family disruptions may also affect adolescent sexual activity. Adolescents who live in disrupted families are more likely to have sexual intercourse than those adolescents who are not in disrupted families (Flewelling & Bauman, 1990). This affect may also vary by race. For white girls, but not black girls, the more family situation changes they go through, the more likely they are to have sex (Wu & Thomson, 2001). It appears it is the number of parents in the household that matter for Black girls, while it is the number of disruptions that matter for White girls.

Family Processes

Family processes may also play a role in sexual activity. For example, girls, but not boys, delay sexual initiation when they have high quality relationships with their

mothers (Davis & Friel, 2001). Adolescents, also have less sexual activity when there is higher parental monitoring (Miller, Forehand, & Kotchick, 1999), and higher parental monitoring is also a predictor of less sexual risk taking (Huebner & Howell, 2003). What is less well known, however, are the implications of specific monitoring strategies associated with adolescents' dating relationships.

We argue that dating specific family processes may be better predictors of adolescent sexual activity than general family process predictors. Borawski, Ievers-Landis, Lovegreen, and Trapl (2003) found that negotiated unsupervised time is a better predictor of sexual activity in adolescents than parental monitoring. Those adolescents with more negotiated unsupervised time are more likely to have had sex, and to have the intention to have sex. This suggests that it is not general monitoring, but the monitoring of dating specific activities that deter adolescents from engaging in sexual activity.

Parent-adolescent communication has also been examined in relation to adolescent's sexual activity. When looking at the effect of general communication on adolescent's sexual activity the results are mixed. Less frequent sexual intercourse is associated with positive general communication with mothers (Miller et al., 1999), while perceived frequency of communication is not related significantly to adolescent's sexual risk taking (Huebner & Howell, 2003).

The effect of communication with parents about sex on adolescent sexual activity has similar mixed results. Davis and Friel (2001) found that communication about sex with mothers is associated with a greater likelihood of earlier sexual debut for both girls and boys. On the other hand, others have found that mother and daughter communication about sexual risk was found to decrease the daughter's sexual activity in general, and

decrease the number of days their daughters engage in unprotected sexual intercourse (Hutchison, Jemmott, Jemmott, Beaverman, & Fong, 2003).

Family Content

During adolescence, children begin to see their parents as persons rather than just as their parents (Youniss & Smollar, 1985). Youniss and Smollar (1985) emphasize how adolescents change their perspective on their parents. Even though the relationship between adolescents and parents remains hierarchical, adolescents begin to see their parents as individuals with wants and needs. This is important because adolescents may become more aware of their parents' own activities. While Youniss and Smollar emphasize this change in perspective, they do not look at how this new awareness of parents and their activities may affect adolescents' behaviors.

In a similar vein, adolescents also may begin to understand their parents' beliefs and values. When adolescents are close to their parents they often adopt their parents' beliefs about certain subjects without really thinking about alternatives (Noller, 1994). As a result, the parents' ideas about sex and the parents' actions regarding sex may play a major role in determining whether an adolescent is sexually active.

Limited research has examined family content variables in relation to adolescents' sexual behavior, however, the few studies that have examined such variables have found associations between parent's beliefs and adolescents' sexual activity. A non-representative sample of White and Latino adolescents reported less sexual experience when mothers were believed to hold more conservative attitudes toward sex and when mothers advocated that adolescents wait until marriage to have sex (Hovell et al., 1994). In this same sample, a greater degree of sexual experience was reported when adolescents

believed their mothers had premarital sex (Hovell et al., 1994). Similarly, adolescents engage in sexual activities earlier when there is more approval of sex from parents (Davis & Friel, 2001). Regarding Black and Hispanic adolescents, higher rates of sexual intercourse were reported when mothers were believed to have permissive attitudes about sexual behaviors (Miller et al., 1999). Additionally, in a sample of Hispanic and Black males, Black males were likely to have had sex when their father was a teen dad, while Hispanic males were likely to have had sex when they have a sibling who was a teen parent (Rucibwa, Modeste, Montgomery, & Fox, 2003). In conclusion, family content variables, such as the parent's past and present behaviors, as well as the parent's values, may play an important role in likelihood of having had sexual intercourse.

Previous studies that have included family content variables, however, have not included a wide array of variables. For example, Davis and Friel (2001) and Miller et al. (1999) only examine maternal attitudes toward sex in their studies. Similarly, Rucibwa (2003) only examined whether the adolescent's father or a sibling has had a teenage pregnancy and whether the parents disapprove of the teen having sex. Finally, Hovell et al. (1994) examined whether the teen believes their mother had premarital sex, if the mother wants the teen to wait till marriage to have sex, and the mother's attitudes about the teen having sex. None of the previous studies included the parent's present behavior, and the parent's feelings about their own past sexual behavior. Also none of the studies included the parent's age when they first had intercourse.

Most of the previous studies also only used a limited sample. Hovell et al. (1994) only included Latino and White adolescents. Miller et al. (1999) only included Black and Hispanic adolescents, and finally, Rucibwa et al. (2003) included only Black and

Hispanic male adolescents. This study also moves beyond this prior research by including White, Black, and Hispanic girls and boys.

Sociodemographic Factors

There are other factors that have been found to be important in predicting adolescent sexual activity. First of all, gender is a factor. Boys are more likely to have ever had sex than girls (Flewelling & Bauman, 1990). Recent research shows that male sexual debut occurs on average, at age 17, and girls' sexual debut occurs on average at age 17.6 (Alan Guttmacher Institute, 2004). Age is also a factor, as older adolescents are more likely to no longer be a virgin (Miller & Bingham, 1989; Santelli et al., 2000). Another factor is race. Black girls are more likely to have had sex than non-black girls (Miller & Bingham, 1989), and Black girls and boys are more likely to have had sex than Whites (Santelli et al., 2000). White boys and girls have more sexual experience than Latino boys and girls (Hovell et al., 1994). Religiosity is also a factor. Adolescents that rate high on religiosity are less likely to have sexual intercourse (Davis & Friel, 2001; Miller & Bingham, 1989). As result, it is important to control for gender, age, race, and religiosity.

Current Investigation

The current study focuses on how family structure, family processes, and family content affect the likelihood that adolescents' have had sex. What is most important in predicting adolescents' sexual behavior? While most previous studies have examined family processes in the general sense, we will be examine dating family processes including monitoring of dating, conflict over dating, and parental support of dating. Parents may not monitor many things in their adolescent's everyday life, but when it

comes to dating they may monitor more, therefore it is important to distinguish between the various dimensions. We also examine, both, the parent's past and their present behavior. Some studies have examined how a few family content factors affect adolescent's sexual activity. We will examine the parent's age at first intercourse, his/her dating history, as well as the parent's present behaviors, i.e., present cohabitation, and dating behaviors. We will also examine the parent's beliefs about their child being sexually active.

This study moves past prior research in the following ways. First, dating specific measures of family processes are used. Dating specific monitoring, communication about sex, and conflict about dating are used instead of generic family processes measures. Secondly, family contents are examined in ways that have not been done in prior research. The parent's past and present are used as predictors, as well as their values and beliefs.

Hypotheses

Family Structure Hypotheses
1.   Adolescents from single parent families or from "other" families will be more likely to have had sex than adolescents from two biological parent families.

2.   Adolescents who have had more family disruptions will be more likely to have had sex.

Family Processes Hypotheses

1.   Adolescents with more parental caring, more dating monitoring, more communication about sex, and fewer disagreements about dating will be less likely to have had sex.

2.   Dating specific family processes variables will be better predictors of having had sex than general family processes variables.

Family Content Hypotheses

1.   Parental Attitudes: Adolescents whose parent is more cautious about their child dating, and who has a higher preferred age for their child to first have sex will be less likely to have had sex.

2.   Parent's past: Adolescents whose parents have more regrets about their sexual activity as teenagers, who were younger when they first had sex, and who were younger when they first became pregnant will be more likely to have had sex.

3.   Parent's present: Adolescents whose parent has been married more times, who has a dating partner spend the night, or who is cohabitating will be more likely to have had sex.

Methods

Data

We use wave 1 of the Toledo Adolescent Relationship Study. In 2001, personal interviews were conducted with 1316 teenagers. The sample was drawn from the enrollment records for 2000 of all youths in the 7th, 9th, and 11th grades in Lucas County, Ohio. This encompassed 62 schools across 7 school districts, although school attendance was not a criterion for inclusion in the sample, as in-home interviews were completed. The sample includes over-samples of African-American and Latino adolescents. The sampling strategy was devised by the National Opinion Research Center, and further details are available upon request. Interviewers initially asked a series of questions, and

then respondents completed more sensitive sections of the protocol using a laptop preloaded using ci3 software. The sample was limited to only those respondents with a valid response on the dependent variable (n=1307).

Measures

Dependent Variable. The dependent variable in *having had sexual intercourse*. This measured by asking respondents have you ever had sexual intercourse (sometimes this is called "making love," "having sex," or "going all the way"). Yes is coded as 1, while no is coded as 0.

Independent Variables. The independent variables include control variables (gender, race, age, & religiosity), family structure variables including family disruptions, family processes (parental caring, dating monitoring, communication about sex, disagreements about dating), and family content variables (parent's cautiousness about dating, preferred age at first sex, parent's age at first sex, parent's age at first pregnancy, parent's sexual regrets, number of times married, having a dating partner spend the night, and cohabitating).

Respondent's *race* is coded 1 if the respondent is White, 2 if the respondent is African-American, 3 if the respondent is Hispanic, and 4 if the respondent is another race. Dummy variables were created for the purposes of multivariate analyses with White as the contrast category.

Age is a computer calculated variable based on the respondent's date of birth and the date of the interview.

Religiosity was measured by asking the respondent how important is religion in your life. Responses range from not all important to very important with high scores indicating very important.

Family structure is measured by asking the respondent during the past 12 months, who were you living with <u>most</u> of the time. Respondents who indicated they lived with only one biological parent were coded 1 "one biological parent." Respondents who indicated they lived with both biological parents or their parents have joint custody were coded as 2 "two biological parents." Respondents who indicated they lived with one biological parent and their parent's spouse or partner were coded as 3 "one biological plus step/cohab." Finally, Respondents who did not fall into one of the previous categories were coded as 4 "Other." For the purposes of multivariate analyses, dummy variables were created with "two biological parents" as the contrast category. Missing values were included in the modal category (two biological parents).

Family disruptions is measured by asking the parent/guardian how many times has your child experienced a change in whom s/he lives with. Responses range from 0 times to 15 times. Missing values (n=59) were imputed with the mean.

Parental caring is measured by asking respondents the following: my parents often ask about what I am doing in school; my parents give me the right amount of affection; my parents trust me; I'm closer to my parents than a lot of kids my age; and I feel close to my parents. Responses for each question range from strongly disagree to strongly agree, with high scores indicating strongly agree. The scale score is calculated as the mean of the items, multiplied by five. Cronbach's alpha for this scale is .77. Missing values were substituted with the mean.

Dating monitoring is measured by asking the respondents how often your parents let you make your own decisions about (1) your social life; (2) who you can date; and (3) how often you can date. Responses range from never to very often with high responses indicating never. The scale score is calculated as the mean of the items, multiplied by three. Cronbach's alpha for this scale is .86. Missing values were substituted with the mean.

General Parental monitoring is measured by asking the respondents how often your parents let you make your own decisions about (1) the time you must be home on the weekends; (2) the people you hang around with; and (3) what you wear. Responses range from never to very often with high responses indicating never. The scale score is calculated as the mean of the items, multiplied by three. Cronbach's alpha for this scale is .56. Missing values were substituted with the mean.

Communication about sex is measured by asking respondents my parents sometimes talk to me about (1) sex; (2) birth control; and (3) waiting to have sex until I am married. Responses range from strongly disagree to strongly agree with high responses indicating strongly agree. The scale score is calculated as the mean of the items, multiplied by three. Cronbach's alpha for this scale is .73. Missing values were substituted with the mean.

Disagreements about dating is measured by asking respondents how often do you and your parents have disagreements or arguments about your dating. Responses range from never to two or more times a week, with high scores indicating two or more times a week. Missing values were substituted with the mean.

Disagreements is measured by asking respondents how often do you have disagreements or arguments with your parents. Responses range from never to two or more times a week, with high scores indicating two or more times a week. Missing values were substituted with the mean.

Parent's cautiousness about dating is measured by asking the parent the following: it's good for teenagers to have a healthy cynicism about the opposite sex; I think some children have too much freedom to be around the opposite sex; I think some parents allow their children too much freedom to date; it's better not to get too serious about one boy/girl in high school. Responses for the items range from strongly disagree to strongly agree with high scores indicating strongly agree. Cronbach's alpha for this scale is .58. Missing values were substituted with the mean.

Parent's preferred age at first sex is measured by asking the parent what is the appropriate age for your child to start having sex. Responses range from 15 to 35 years old. Missing values were substituted with the mean. Because many of the respondents have missing values for preferred age (n= 126) *Missing Age* is a dummy variable created for the multivariate analyses to determine if there is a difference between those respondents who answered the question and those respondents who did not.

Parent's age at first sex is measured by asking the parent at what age did you first have sexual intercourse. Responses range from 6 to 32. Missing values were substituted with the mean.

Parent's age at first pregnancy is measured by asking the parent at what age did you first become pregnant (or get someone pregnant). Responses range from 10 to 36. Missing values were substituted with the mean.

Parent's sexual regrets is measured by asking parents about their regrets about their sexual behavior as a teen. Responses range from I have no regrets to I have lots of regrets, with a high score indicating lots of regrets. Missing values were substituted with the mean.

Number of times married is measured by asking parents how many times have you been married. Responses range from 0 times to 8 times. Missing values were substituted with the mean.

Having a dating partner spend the night is coded as 1 if the parent is single and they have their boyfriend/girlfriend stay overnight in their home. Otherwise it is coded as 0.

Cohabitating is coded as 1 if the parent indicates that they are cohabitating. Otherwise it is coded as 0.

Analytic Strategy

Logistic regression is used to predict the likelihood of having had sex by Wave 1. Two separate analyses will be run. The first set of models contains general family processes variables, while the second set of analyses contains the dating specific processes and the family content variables. In the first set of analyses, the first model contains the control variables. Family structure is added in the second model, and the general family processes are added in the third model. In the second set of analyses, the control variables are in the first model. Family structure variables are added in the second model. In the third model, the dating specific family processes are added, and in the final model, the family content variables are added.

Results

Bivariate

Table 1 shows the distributions of the variables. At the bivariate level, those who have had sex are more likely to be male, older, and have low religiosity. A large proportion are also African-American or Hispanic. A large proportion also come from single parent families. Those adolescents who have had sex are more likely to have had more family disruptions, less parental caring, less dating monitoring, and more disagreements with their parents about dating. Adolescents who have had sex are more likely to have a parent who is cautious about them dating and have a parent who has a younger age from them to start having sex. Finally, adolescents who have had sex are more likely to have a parent who first had sex at younger ages and who first got pregnant at younger ages.

Multivariate

Table 2 contains the coefficient estimates for the logistic regression of having had sexual intercourse on the predictor variables. In model 1, having had sex is regressed on the control variables. This model is significant (χ^2 = 383, p< .001). In this model, older adolescents and adolescents that are less religious have higher odds of having sex. African Americans and Hispanics also have higher odds of having had sex as compared to White adolescents.

In model 2 the family structure variables are added. This model is a significant improvement over the previous model ($\Delta\chi^2$ = 28.4, p< .001). In this model female becomes significant. Females have lower odds of having had sex as compared to males. Age, African American, Hispanic, and religiosity are all still significant. Of the family structure variables one bio, step/cohab, and other are significant. Adolescents from all

other family structures than two biological parents have higher odds of having had sex as compared to adolescents from two biological parent families.

In model 3, the dating specific family processes variables are added. This model is a significant improvement to the previous model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 49.26$, p< .001). In this model, all variables that were significant in the previous model are still significant. Of the family process variables dating monitoring, sex communication, and disagreements about dating are significant. An increase in one unit of dating monitoring decreases the odds of having had sex by 11%. An increase in one unit of sex communication increases the odds of having had sex by 7%. There is a 27% increase in the odds of having had sex for every unit increase in disagreements about dating.

In model 4, the family content variables are added. This model is a significant improvement over the previous model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 33.11$, p< .001). In this model step/cohab is no longer significant. Of the family content variables only age for sex, parent's age at first sex, and parent's age at first pregnancy are significant. There is a 6 % decrease in the odds of having had sex for every one year increase in the parent's preferred age for first sex for the adolescent. For every one year increase in the parent's age at first sex, there is a 9% decrease in the odds of having had sex. A one year increase in the parent's age at first pregnancy decreases the odds of having had sex by 4%.

Table 3 contains the coefficient estimates for the logistic regression of having had sexual intercourse on the predictor variables with the general family processes variables. In model 1, having had sexual intercourse is regressed on the control variables, and in model 2 the family structure variables were added to the model. In model 3, the general family processes are added to the model. This model is a significant improvement to

model 2 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 9.00$, p< .05). The only significant family processes variable is parental general monitoring. A unit increase in monitoring decreases the odds of having had sex by 5%. The dating specific family processes variables did a much better job of predicting having had sexual intercourse than the general family processes variables.

Discussion

The current study's findings on the effects of family structure, processes and content move beyond prior research. First of all, dating specific measures of family processes were found to better predict the likelihood of having had sex than general measures of family processes after controlling for demographics and family structure. Of the dating specific measures low parental dating monitoring, high levels of communication about sex, and high levels of disagreements about dating predict a greater likelihood of having had sex, while of the general family processes variables, only low levels of parental monitoring predict a greater likelihood of having had sex. Just disagreements with parents did not predict having had sex. Also, parental caring was not significant in either analysis, suggesting that it is not just caring about your children that keeps them from having sex. Although, it should be noted that the causal order between family processes and adolescent's sexual behavior is uncertain. For example, it may be that there is more communication about sex because the adolescent is sexually active, not that the sexual communication is leading to the sexual activity. Also there may be more disagreements about dating because the adolescent is having sex.

It is not a surprise that dating specific measures are better predictors of sexual activity than general predictors. For example, if one were studying the relationship between family processes and academic achievement, achievement specific processes

would most likely be better predictors than general processes. The time parents' spend helping their children with homework, and communication about school and homework would most likely be better predictors than general time spent together and general communication. Similarly, it is important to use dating specific family processes not general processes when examining dating or sexual activity.

The present findings also show the importance of examining family content variables in relation to adolescent sexuality. The parent's preferred age for their child to first have sex, as well as the age the parent first had sex and the age the parent's first pregnancy predicts whether the adolescent has had sex. This shows that not only is the parent's present attitudes about their child having sex important, but also the parent's past behavior. Interestingly, the parent's present behavior was not significantly related to the adolescent having had sex. At the bivariate level, the parent's cautiousness about dating was significant, however this was no longer significant at the multivariate level. Perhaps those parents who are cautious about teens dating have higher dating monitoring as well.

There are some limitations to the present study. First the causal order between the processes variables and sexual activity may be in question. Secondly, this is not a nationally representative sample and can only be generalized to Toledo Ohio area youth. We are, however, currently using longitudinal data to reexamine the data. (The longitudinal analyses will be presented at the PAA conference.)

The present study makes several contributions to the current literature on adolescent sexuality. First of all, this study shows that it is important to examine dating specific family processes in relation to adolescent sexuality. Dating specific processes are better predictors of adolescent sexual activity than general family processes. Also,

this study shows that family content variables are important predictors of adolescents having had sex. More research needs to be done in this area to determine how the family content variables are affecting adolescents' lives in other domains.

References

Alan Guttmacher Institute. 2004. U.S. teenage pregnancy statistics. New York: Alan Guttmacher Institute.

Borawski, E. A., Ievers-Landis, C. E., Lovegreen, L. D., & Trapl, E. S. Parental monitoring, negotiated unsupervised time, and parental trust: The role of perceived parenting practices in adolescent health risk behaviors. Journal of Adolescent Health, 33, 60-70.

Davis, E. C. & Friel, L. V. (2001). Adolescent sexuality: Disentangling the effects of family structure and family context. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 63, 669-681.

Flewelling, R. L. & Bauman, K. E. (1990). Family structure as a predictor of initial substance use and sexual intercourse in early adolescence. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 171-181.

Hovell, M., Sipan, C., Blumberg, E., Atkins, C., Hofstetter, C. R., & Kreitner, S. (1994). Family influences on Latino and Anglo adolescents' sexual behavior. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56, 973-986.

Huebner, A. J. & Howell, L. W. (2003). Examining the relationship between adolescent sexual risk-taking and perceptions of monitoring, communication, and parenting styles. Journal of Adolescent Health, 33, 71-78.

Hutchinson, M. k., Jemmott, J. B., Jemmott, L. S., Braverman, P., & Fong, G. T. (2003). The role of mother-daughter sexual risk communication in reducing sexual risk behaviors among urban adolescent females: A prospective study. Journal of Adolescent Health, 33, 98-107.

Longmore, M. A., Manning, W. D., & Giordano, P. C. (2001). Preadolescent parenting strategies and teens' dating and sexual initiation: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family,63, 322-335.

Miller, B. C. & Bingham, C. R. (1989). Family configuration in relation to the sexual behavior of female adolescents. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51, 499-506.

Miller, K. S., Forehand, R., & Kotchick, B. A. (1999). Adolescent sexual behavior in two ethnic minority samples: The role of family variables. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61, 85-98.

Noller, P. (1994). Relationships with parents in adolescence: Process and outcome. In R. Montemayor, G.R. Adams, & T.P. Gullotta (Eds.), Personal relationships during adolescence (pp. 37-77). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Rucibwa, N. K. Modeste, N., Montgomery, S., & Fox, C. A. (2003). Exploring family factors and sexual behaviors in a group of black and Hispanic adolescent males. American Journal of Health Behaviors, 27, 63-74.

Santelli, J. S., Lowry, R., Brener, N. D., & Robin, L. (2000). The association of sexual behaviors with socioeconomic status, family structure, and race/ethnicity among US adolescents. American Journal of Public Health, 90, 1582-1588.

Wu, L. L. & Thomson, E. (2001). Race differences in family experience and early sexual initiation: Dynamic models of family structure and family change. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 63, 682-696.

Youniss, J. & Smollar, J. (1985). Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Table 1. Distribution of Variables

	Mean/Frequency	Had Sex	
		yes	no
Gender			
Female	48.5%	47.5%*	53.4%
Male	51.5%	52.5%	46.6%
Age	15.3	16.4***	14.7
Race			
African American	24.7%	32.9%***	20.9%
Hispanic	11.3%	15.0%	9.5%
Other Race	2.0%	1.2%	2.4%
White	62.1%	50.9%	67.2%
Religiosity	3.3	3.0***	3.4
Family Structure			
One bio	25.8%	33.7%***	22.2%
Step/Cohab	17.8%	18.9%	17.2%
Other Family	5.8%	9.2%	4.3%
Two Bio	50.7%	38.4%	56.4%
Disruptions	0.7	1.0***	0.6
Parental Caring	19.8	19.3***	20.0
Dating Monitoring	11.5	5.4***	6.9
Sex Communication	9.2	9.4	9.1
Disagreements about Dating	1.8	2.0***	1.7
Cautious about Dating	15.2	14.9***	15.4
Age for Sex	21.1	20.6***	21.4
Sexual Regrets	2.3	2.4	2.3
Parent's Age first sex	17.2	16.6***	17.5
Parent's age at first pregnancy	21.4	20.3***	21.7
Number of times married	1.2	1.2	1.2

Spend the night			
yes	7.9%	9.9%	7.0%
no	92.1%	90.1%	93.0%
Cohabiting			
yes	6.8%	7.4%	6.6%
no	93.2%	92.6%	93.4%

Table 2. Coefficient Estimates and Odds Ratios for the Logistic Regression of Having
  Had Sexual Intercourse

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	b	e^b	b	e^b	b	e^b	b	e^b
Intercept	-11.61***		-12.30***		-11.16***		-7.81***	
Female	-0.24	0.79	-0.33*	0.72	-0.54***	0.58	-0.55***	0.58
Age	0.73***	2.09	0.75***	2.12	0.72***	2.05	0.76***	2.13
African American	1.09***	2.97	0.74***	2.10	0.81***	2.25	0.74***	2.09
Hispanic	1.04***	2.82	0.89***	2.44	0.98***	2.66	0.87***	2.39
Other Race	0.03	1.03	-0.14	0.87	-0.06	0.94	-0.15	0.86
(White)								
Religiosity	-0.29***	0.75	-0.24***	0.79	-0.24***	0.79	-0.21***	0.81
One Bio			0.80***	2.22	0.81***	2.24	0.79***	2.20
Step/Cohab			0.48*	1.61	0.44*	1.56	0.34	1.41
Other Family			0.94**	2.56	1.05**	2.87	0.92**	2.50
(Two Bio)								
Disruptions			0.07	1.07	0.07	1.07	0.05	1.06
Parental Caring					-0.04	0.96	-0.05	0.96
Dating Monitoring					-0.12***	0.89	-0.12***	0.89
Sex Communication					0.07*	1.07	0.06*	1.06
Disagreements about Dating					0.24***	1.27	0.26***	1.30
Cautious about Dating							0.01	1.01
Age for Sex							-0.06*	0.94
Missing Age							-0.46	0.63
Sexual Regrets							-0.11	0.90
Parent's Age first sex							-0.09*	0.92
Parent's age at first pregnancy							-0.05*	0.96
Number of times married							0.04	1.04
Spend the night							-0.20	0.82

Cohabiting								-0.26	0.77
N	1307		1307		1307		1307		
Likelihood Ratio	383.00***		411.40***		460.66***		493.77***		
$\Delta \chi^2$			28.40***		49.26***		33.11***		

Table 3. Coefficient Estimates and Odds Ratios for the Logistic Regression of Having
      Had Sexual Intercourse

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b	e^b	b	e^b	b	e^b
Intercept	-11.61***		-12.30***		-11.38***	
Female	-0.24	0.79	-0.33*	0.72	-0.35*	0.70
Age	0.73***	2.09	0.75***	2.12	0.73***	2.07
African American	1.09***	2.97	0.74***	2.10	0.81***	2.26
Hispanic	1.04***	2.82	0.89***	2.44	0.96***	2.60
Other Race	0.03	1.03	-0.14	0.87	-0.12	0.89
(White)						
Religiosity	-0.29***	0.75	-0.24***	0.79	-0.22***	0.80
One Bio			0.80***	2.22	0.78***	2.18
Step/Cohab			0.48*	1.61	0.45*	1.58
Other Family			0.94**	2.56	0.91**	2.49
(Two Bio)						
Disruptions			0.07	1.07	0.07	1.08
Parental Caring					-0.03	0.98
Monitoring					-0.06*	0.95
Disagreements					0.08	1.08
N	1307		1307		1307	
Likelihood Ratio	383.00***		411.40***		420.40***	
$\Delta \chi^2$			28.40***		9.00*	