

**The Social Context of Adolescent Romantic Relationships:
School and Neighborhood Influences on Adolescent Relationship Formation**
Extended Abstract for Population Association of America 2009 Annual Meeting

Lloyd D. Grieger, *University of Michigan – Ann Arbor*

Yasamin Kusunoki, *University of Michigan – Ann Arbor*

David J. Harding, *University of Michigan – Ann Arbor*

Abstract:

In this paper, we use data from the first two waves of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health to analyze the impact of an adolescent's greater social context on the formation of romantic and non-romantic sexual relationships. We hypothesize that the degree of social disorganization, as indicated by compositional characteristics of the two settings where most youth spend the bulk of their time (school and neighborhood), influence where adolescents meet relationship partners and how embedded those partners are within their social networks. We test our hypotheses using descriptive statistics and multilevel regression analysis. We find that less socially controlled settings are sites where adolescents form intimate relationships and that high levels of disadvantage characterize relationships with partners who are less socially embedded in adolescents' social networks; however, high levels of neighborhood disadvantage appear to influence adolescents to form relationships with more socially embedded partners.

a. Description of Topic:

Researchers have recently begun to recognize the importance of adolescents' romantic and sexual relationships. Traditional topics of social concern such as sexual intercourse, contraceptive use, unintended pregnancy, and sexually transmitted infections have been increasingly analyzed as outcomes of dyadic partnerships between a young person and his or her partner. The burgeoning literature in this area indicates that characteristics of a relationship are associated with behaviors that occur within the relationship. However, relatively little work has investigated adolescent relationship formation.

Additionally, researchers have begun to interrogate influences on adolescent outcomes beyond individual- and family-level factors. Contextual factors (such as neighborhood or school composition) are increasingly understood to exert an independent influence on youth sexual behavior, reproductive health, and fertility. For example, this research finds support for the notion that the subjective experience of the neighborhood circumscribes an adolescents' choice set when making decisions about whether to have sex, use contraception, etc.

We specifically recognize that the romantic and/or sexual relationship is the site in which sexual intercourse, fertility, and other sexual outcomes occur. We also recognize the importance of social contexts such as school and neighborhood for the decision-making

of adolescents. In this study, we seek to connect these two concepts to more fully understand how adolescents' form romantic or non-romantic sexual relationships. We hypothesize that the compositional characteristics of the two settings in which most youth spend the bulk of their time (school and neighborhood) influence where they meet relationship partners and how embedded those partners are within their social networks. These relationship characteristics are important for behaviors because the degree to which a relationship is embedded in other social networks or in shared social contexts may have implications for behavior within the relationship, as more socially embedded partnerships may be subject to greater social control by peers or neighborhood adults. Thus, we are interested in the following research questions:

How is an adolescent's partner choice affected by school and neighborhood context, net of family and individual characteristics? Specifically, how do neighborhood and school composition influence:

- 1) the social context in which an adolescent's relationship commences?
- 2) the chosen partner's degree of embeddedness in the adolescent's social network?

b. Theoretical Focus:

We know that the formation of romantic relationships increases with age, and that young people derive a great deal of personal and social meaning from their relationships (Christopher 2001; Coates 1999; Collins 2003; Furman & Wehner 1994; Giordano, Longmore, & Manning 2001). In addition, a growing body of research has begun to explore characteristics of young people's partners and relationships as independent determinants of sexual activity (Kaestle & Halpern 2005; Kusunoki 2003), contraceptive behaviors (Ford, Sohn, & Lepkowski 2001; Howard et al. 1999; Katz et al. 2000; Ku, Sonenstein, & Pleck 1994; Kusunoki & Upchurch 2008; Manlove, Ryan, & Franzetta 2007; Manning, Longmore, & Giordano 2000), and sexually transmitted infections (Ford & Lepkowski 2004). Moreover, the relational patterns and behaviors that are learned during adolescence may set the stage for future relationships formed in later adulthood (Raley, Crissey, & Muller 2007). However, less is known about the factors that shape relationship formation among adolescents, particularly in which *shared social contexts* young people meet their partners and the *embeddedness* of their partners within young peoples' social networks, the two outcomes on which we focus in this paper. Given the growing evidence that relationships "matter," a better understanding of relationship formation during the early life course is of utmost importance.

Current research also suggests the importance of social contexts such as school and neighborhood in influencing young adult behaviors. Empirical evidence indicates that sexual risk-taking behaviors, particularly early sexual activity and unprotected intercourse, are more common among youth in neighborhoods characterized by socioeconomic disadvantage (e.g., Billy, Brewster, & Grady 1994; Brewster 1994a; Brewster 1994b; Brewster, Billy, & Grady. 1993). One common explanation for these findings, social disorganization theory, focuses on the neighborhood's capacity to

regulate and monitor the behavior of young people. It argues that neighborhood compositional disadvantages, such as low socioeconomic status, ethnic heterogeneity, and residential instability, lead to fewer social ties and thus diminished capacity for informal social control (Park & Burgess 1925; Shaw 1929; Shaw & McKay 1942). More socially organized communities, therefore, are better able to exert informal social control over youth and thereby to reduce opportunities for involvement in problem behaviors and to collectively monitor their behavior.

Different perspectives suggest different hypotheses about the association between neighborhood disadvantage and whether adolescents choose romantic or sexual partners from shared social contexts (school, neighborhood) or from overlapping social networks (embeddedness). Applied to youths' romantic and sexual relationship formation, social organization theory suggests that neighborhood disadvantage may decrease adults' control over partner selection. The result may be that adolescents are freer to select partners from other social contexts or to select partners who are less embedded in friendship networks.

Another perspective is suggested by ethnographic research on social interactions in disadvantaged neighborhoods, which has found that the use of public space is a function of compositional community factors. For example, communities characterized by low income and low levels of home ownership often use public space for social gathering and community socializing more so than affluent communities (Patillo 2007). Crowded dwellings lead the poor to spend more time outdoors, and this, coupled with limited geographic mobility, focuses social interaction on the neighborhood (Horowitz 1983). Harding (2008) finds that adolescents in more violent, disadvantaged neighborhoods are less likely to nominate classmates as friends and more likely to be friends with individuals who do not attend school. Collectively, this body of work predicts that adolescents in more disadvantaged neighborhoods may be more likely to select relationship partners from their own neighborhoods and from the highly overlapping social networks within them, suggesting that neighborhood disadvantage will be positively associated with shared neighborhood context and greater social embeddedness.

Overall, the existing literature has already identified an important association between social context (neighborhood effects) and sexual behavior and more recently has identified an association between relationship characteristics and these behaviors. The current study aims to more fully describe the process of relationship formation as a function of contextual compositional factors. Because we know that relationship characteristics are important determinants of relationship behavior, understanding how neighborhood compositional factors influence relationship formation has potentially important implications for behavior within relationships.

c. Data and Research Methods:

We use data from the first and second waves of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), a nationally representative study of students enrolled in grades 7-12 during the 1994-1995 academic year. The survey collects a wide array of

data from students, including relationship-level information about characteristics of romantic and non-romantic sexual relationships. Information is also collected from students and parents about family life. School administrators provide information about school-level characteristics. Neighborhood-level data from the census are readily available for merging onto the main dataset. The longitudinal structure of the data grants us the ability to analyze a large sample of adolescents of varying ages over a 1 to 2 year time period. These features make Add Health the most appropriate dataset for answering our research questions.

Respondents are asked to identify relationship partners or otherwise “important” or “significant” people in their lives. A series of questions is used to determine whether the relationship is romantic in nature, whether it is a non-romantic sexual relationship, or neither. Romantic relationships are “boyfriend/girlfriend”-like partnerships but are not necessarily sexual in nature. Non-romantic sexual relationships are sexual in nature, but lack the same type of commitment and formal recognition of relationship status that characterize romantic relationships. A one-time encounter would most-likely fall into this latter category of relationship. A series of questions is asked for up to three focal relationships of either kind, allowing a respondent to report up to six relationships in each wave. These questions seek information about the shared social contexts (neighborhood, school, both, neither) from which a respondent knew a partner prior to the start of the relationship and whether the partner was a part of the respondent’s social network.

Our outcomes of interest for this analysis are the “shared social context” of a relationship – i.e. from what social setting does the respondent know the partner – and the “social embeddedness” of the partner within the respondent’s social network. Shared social context is measured as whether the respondent knew the partner from school, the neighborhood, both, or neither. Social embeddedness is measured by whether the respondent’s partner was a friend, a friend of a friend, both, or neither.

Although we are primarily interested in how school and neighborhood compositional factors affect our outcomes, we also include in our analysis individual and family level characteristics as controls. School-level measures are obtained from the administrative surveys filled out by school officials and by the aggregated responses of students within the same school. Neighborhood-level measures are obtained from the contextual data included with the Add Health restricted data, from which we use census tract characteristics from the 1990 census.

First, we will present basic descriptive statistics about individual, family, school, and neighborhood level characteristics on our “social context” and “social embeddedness” outcomes. We do this for all relationships and separately by the two distinct relationship types (romantic and non-romantic). Second, we will use multivariate, multi-level (hierarchical) regression models to assess the partial effects of our school and neighborhood level measures holding individual and family characteristics constant. Because our outcomes are multicategorical, we will employ a multi-level multinomial logistic regression analysis with four levels: relationship, individual, school, and

neighborhood. We will run these multinomial logistic regressions using all relationships and separately for romantic and non-romantic sexual relationships.

d. Preliminary Findings:

We include preliminary findings from our analysis so far, which at this point includes relationship information derived only from Wave I of the Add Health data. Table 1 shows the sample size, number of relationships, and a variety of demographic characteristics for all respondents by relationship type. The “neighborhood disadvantage” index is the mean of six measures from the census: percent poor, male unemployment rate, percent single mother households, percent of those over 25 who are college graduates, percent of workers in managerial or professional occupations, and percent affluent families (income above \$75,000 per year), with the latter three reversed in polarity. This measure is standardized with a mean of 0 across all neighborhoods containing Add Health in-home respondents in Wave I with higher values indicating higher levels of neighborhood disadvantage. The information in the table indicates that 1) relationships in general are a relatively common experience for adolescents and 2) non-romantic sexual relationships are more likely to be experienced by adolescents with a greater degree of disadvantage. For example, the proportion of adolescents in two-parent families is higher and median family income is higher among those with romantic relationship experience only than among those with any non-romantic sexual relationship experience. The neighborhood disadvantage index is higher on average for those with any non-romantic relationship experience (regardless of whether or not the respondents also experienced a romantic relationship).

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics on our first outcome, the shared social contexts where a relationship begins. On average, relationships formed with a partner a respondent knows from school are experienced by adolescents with the highest proportion of two-parent families, highest median family income, and lowest level of neighborhood disadvantage compared to relationships formed in other contexts. Relationships formed with someone from the neighborhood are experienced by adolescents with the lowest proportion of two-parent family structure, lowest median income, and highest level of neighborhood disadvantage. Relationships formed with someone from both contexts are experienced by adolescents who have nearly the same proportion two-parent families and median income and slightly higher levels of neighborhood advantage compared to those who form relationships with someone from school. These preliminary results indicate that the neighborhood is the site where relationships are formed by those who are most disadvantaged (on average). Table 3 breaks down the descriptive statistics by relationship type, showing that non-romantic sexual relationships are generally experienced by adolescents facing more family and neighborhood disadvantage than are romantic relationships.

Table 4 shows descriptive statistics on our second outcome, social embeddedness. The most socially embedded relationships, those in which a partner is both friend and friend of friend, are experienced by adolescents with, on average, the highest proportion of two-parent family structure, median family income, and lowest level of neighborhood

disadvantage compared to the adolescents experiencing relationships with less social embeddedness (but this group is very similar to those whose relationships were with a friend). The least socially embedded relationships, those in which a partner was not classified as being a part of any network (called “none” in our table), are experienced by adolescents with the lowest proportion two-parent families, second lowest median family income, and highest level of neighborhood disadvantage. This is consistent with the hypothesis that more disadvantaged adolescents, measured both in terms of family and neighborhood characteristics, are more likely to have relationships that are less embedded in the adolescent’s social network. Table 5 breaks down these descriptive statistics by relationship type to show that non-romantic sexual relationships (typically considered more “deviant” than regular relationships) are generally experienced by more disadvantaged adolescents.

We present multinomial logistic regression results in Tables 6 and 7 for our outcomes regressed on a set of covariates that includes a neighborhood-level and school-level disadvantage index and individual-level controls. Unlike the models we proposed in section c, these regressions are not multi-level and represent a first-order analysis (e.g., they correct standard errors for respondent clustering by census tract, but not by school, and so standard errors for school characteristics may be underestimated). Table 6 indicates that, controlling for other factors, girls are more likely to choose partners they know from the neighborhood only and less likely to select as partners those they know from school only than to form relationships with partners they know from both contexts. Lower levels of mother and father education are associated with forming a relationship with someone from the neighborhood only and negatively related to forming a relationship with someone from school only. A high level of neighborhood disadvantage is associated with forming a relationship with someone from the neighborhood only. In general, these results indicate that adolescents who experience greater family and neighborhood disadvantage are more likely to form relationships with someone from the neighborhood, while more advantaged adolescents are more likely to form relationships with someone from school. This potentially signals that when social organization is high in the neighborhood, adolescents shift where they meet their partners to other settings like the school. Conversely, when social organization is low, the neighborhood is a viable place for adolescents to meet people with whom they will eventually form intimate relationships.

Table 7 indicates that, controlling for other factors, girls are less likely than boys to form relationships with less socially embedded partners. Black respondents are more likely than white respondents to form relationships with less socially embedded partners. Lower education of the mother and father are both associated with a higher likelihood that respondents’ will chose to form a relationship with a less socially embedded “friend of friend” than with someone who is both a “friend” and a “friend of friend.” Interestingly, higher levels of neighborhood disadvantage are positively associated with partner social embeddedness. This is consistent with the hypothesis that adolescents in poorer neighborhoods are embedded in more overlapping social networks.

Although our results are preliminary, we believe that they are a promising precursor to a coherent story about how school and neighborhood composition shape where and with whom adolescents' form different kinds of relationships. At this relatively early stage, it appears that less socially controlled settings are sites where adolescents form relationships. High levels of individual/family disadvantage characterize relationships with partners who are less socially embedded in adolescents' social networks; however, high levels of neighborhood disadvantage appear to influence adolescents to form relationships with more socially embedded partners. This supports our overarching proposition that the neighborhood context may exert an influence on adolescent relationship formation.

e. Next Steps:

For the final analysis, we will complete the following next steps:

1. We will refine and add well-defined measures of school and community composition. For the preliminary results we used only one broad index representing a combination of a number of compositional characteristics at the school and neighborhood levels. We will add richness to our model by including several separate compositional measures at each level of analysis in order to better understand the ways in which composition may affect our outcomes, net of other factors.
2. We will add data from the second wave of Add Health. The preliminary findings are based only on relationships reported in the first wave. The second wave collects similar information from respondents and presents an opportunity for us to increase our relationship sample size (by including additional relationships above and beyond the initial ones reported in Wave I) and to conduct validity assessments of our Wave I findings by conducting similar analyses using the data from Wave II.
3. We will use the multi-level modeling framework discussed in section c. The preliminary tables present multinomial logits that ignore the nested structure of the data (i.e., relationships within individuals within schools and neighborhoods). For the final analysis, we will take this nesting structure into account by using hierarchical modeling techniques.
4. We will estimate models separately for romantic and non-romantic relationships. This will allow us to investigate whether predictors operate differently by type of relationship.

References:

- Billy, J.O.G., Brewster, K.L., & Grady, W.R. (1994). Contextual effects on the sexual behavior of adolescent women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56(2), 387-404.
- Brewster, K.L. (1994a). Race differences in sexual activity among adolescent women: The roles of neighborhood characteristics. *American Sociological Review*, 59(3), 408-424.
- Brewster, K.L. (1994b). Neighborhood context and the transition to sexual activity among young black women. *Demography*, 31, 603-614.
- Brewster, K.L., Billy, J.O.G., & Grady, W. (1993). Social context and adolescent behavior: The impact of community on the transition to sexual activity. *Social Forces*, 71, 713-740.
- Christopher, F.S. (2001). *To dance the dance: A symbolic interactional exploration of premarital sexuality*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Coates, D.L. (1999). The cultured and culturing aspects of romantic experiences in adolescence. In W. Furman, B.B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 330-363). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Collins, W.A. (2003). More than myth: The developmental significance of romantic relationships during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13(1), 1-24.
- Ford, K., & Lepkowski, J. (2004). Characteristics of sexual partners and STD infection among American adolescents. *International Journal of STD and AIDS* 15, 260-265.
- Ford, K., Sohn, W., & Lepkowski, J. (2001). Characteristics of adolescents' sexual partners and their association with use of condoms and other contraceptive methods. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 33, 100-105, 132.
- Freshnock, L., & Cutright, P. (1979). Models of Illegitimacy. *Demography*, 16, 37-47.
- Furman, W., & Wehner, E.A. (1994). Romantic views: Toward a theory of adolescent romantic relationships. In R. Montemayor, G.R. Adams, & T.P. Gullota (Eds.), *Personal relationships during adolescence* (pp. 168-195). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Giordano, P.C., Longmore, M.A., & Manning, W.D. (2001). On the nature and developmental significance of adolescent romantic relationships. *Sociological Studies of Children and Youth*, 8, 111-139.
- Harding, D.J. (2008). Neighborhood violence and adolescent friendships. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 2(1), 28-55.
- Howard, M.M., Fortenberry, D., Blythe, M.J., Zimet, G.D., & Orr, D.P. (1999). Patterns of sexual partnerships among adolescent females. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 24(5), 300-303.
- Horowitz, Ruth. 1983. *Honor and the American Dream*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Kaestle, C.E., & Halpern, C.T. (2005). Sexual activity among adolescents in romantic relationships with friends, acquaintances, or strangers. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine*, 159, 849-853.
- Katz, B.P., Fortenberry, D., Zimet, G.D., Blythe, M.J., & Orr, D.P. (2000). Partner-specific relationship characteristics and condom use among young people with sexually transmitted diseases. *Journal of Sex Research*, 37(1), 69-75.
- Ku, L., Sonenstein, F.L., & Pleck, J.H. (1994). The dynamics of young men's condom use during and across relationships. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 26(6), 246-251.
- Kusunoki, Y. (2003). Dating violence within adolescent romantic relationships: Associations with sexual activity and contraceptive Use. Poster presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Minneapolis, MN, May 1-3, 2003.
- Kusunoki, Y., and Upchurch, D.M. (2008). Contraceptive method choice among youth in the United States: The importance of relationship context. Under review, *Demography*.
- Manlove, J., Ryan, S., & Franzetta, K. (2007). Risk and protective factors associated with the transition to a first sexual relationship with an older partner. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40, 135-143.
- Manning, W.D., Longmore, M.A., & Giordano, P.C. (2000). The relationship context of contraceptive use at first intercourse. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 32(3), 104-110.
- Mayer S. E. and Jencks, C. (1989). Growing up in poor neighborhoods: How much does it matter? *Science*, 243, 1441-1445.

- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Park, R.E., & Burgess, E.W. (1925). *The city*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Patillo, Mary. (2007). *Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City*. University of Chicago Press.
- 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, 1210-1226.
- Shaw, C.R. (1929). *Delinquency areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shaw, C.R., & McKay, H.D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, W.J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, W. J. (1991). Studying inner-city social dislocations: The challenge of public agenda research. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 1-14.

Table 1
Sample Members, Relationships, and Characteristics by Relationship Experience

	Adolescents with:					
	All	No Relationship Experience	Any Relationship Experience	Romantic Relationship Experience Only	Non-Romantic (Sexual) Relationship Experience Only	Both
Number of Adolescents	20,745	6,959	13,786	11,504	300	1,982
Number of Relationships	24,347	--	24,347	16,978	554	6,627
Romantic Relationships	20,900	--	20,900	--	--	
Non-Romantic Sexual Relationships	3,447	--	3,447	--	--	
Average Number of Relationships	1.17	--	1.77	1.46	1.85	3.6
Romantic Relationships Only	1.01	--	1.52	--	--	2.1
Non-Romantic Sexual Relationships Only	0.17	--	0.25	--	--	1.6
% Male	49.5	50.0	49.2	46.8	72.7	59.7
Average Age in Years	15.7	15.0	16.0	15.9	16.1	16.5
% White	52.2	49.6	53.4	54.5	34.7	51.1
% Black	22.2	21.8	22.3	20.8	39	28.2
% Hispanic	17.0	16.5	17.3	17.6	17.3	15.5
% Asian	6.8	10.2	5.1	5.3	7.0	3.2
% In two parent family	65.6	70.1	63.2	64.8	56.7	55.5
Median Family Income	35,632	35,444	35,723	36,000	32,575	35,000
% Private School	7.0	8.0	6.5	6.7	6.4	5.6
Median Neighborhood Disadvantage Index	-0.096	-0.119	-0.093	-0.096	-0.045	-0.045

Table 2
 Social Context of Relationship Formation by Race and Gender and Other Characteristics
 Level of Analysis: Relationship

	School Only	Neigh. Only	Both	Neither	Total
All	32.7	3.3	14.2	49.9	23,891
All Males	35.9	3.1	13.9	47.1	12,213
White	37.7	2.5	14.8	45.0	6,169
Black	35.3	4.5	12.7	47.5	2,993
Hispanic	32.2	3.4	13.7	50.7	2,225
Asian	35.0	1.4	12.0	51.6	560
All Females	29.4	3.4	14.4	52.8	11,663
White	31.4	2.5	16.2	49.9	6,598
Black	27.0	4.6	10.7	57.7	2,563
Hispanic	25.6	5.3	12.7	56.4	1,763
Asian	29.4	2.3	13.7	54.6	517
% Two Parent Fam	49.5	34.1	45.8	41.7	44.6
% Public School	92.8	93.9	95.1	93.1	93.3
Median Family Income	40,000	25,000	37,638	35,000	36,000
Median Neighborhood Disadvantage	-0.115	0.034	-0.119	-0.083	-0.094

Table 3
Social Context of Relationship Formation by Race and Gender and Other Characteristics
Level of Analysis: Relationship

	School Only		Neighborhood Only		Both		Neither		Total	
	Rom.	Non-Rom.	Rom.	Non-Rom.	Rom.	Non-Rom.	Rom.	Non-Rom.	Rom.	Non-Rom.
All	32.7	33.1	3.0	4.9	15.9	3.8	48.5	58.3	20,557	3,334
All Males	35.7	36.6	2.7	5.2	16.0	3.7	45.6	54.5	10,147	2,066
White	37.6	38.2	2.3	4.1	16.6	4.1	43.6	53.7	5,305	864
Black	35.3	35.1	3.6	7.6	15.6	2.9	45.5	54.3	2,310	683
Hispanic	31.9	33.7	3.2	4.2	15.7	4.2	49.2	57.9	1,824	401
Asian	33.5	46.2	1.4	1.5	13.5	0.0	51.5	52.3	495	65
All Females	29.6	27.2	3.3	4.3	15.7	4.0	51.4	64.5	10,397	1,266
White	31.7	29.5	2.4	3.1	17.8	3.7	48.2	63.7	5,865	733
Black	27.5	23.7	4.3	6.8	11.6	4.6	56.6	64.9	2,238	325
Hispanic	25.9	21.9	5.3	5.1	13.5	3.7	55.4	69.3	1,626	137
Asian	30.2	21.7	2.3	2.2	14.4	6.5	53.1	69.6	471	46
% Two Parent Fam	50.7	42.2	35.5	28.8	46.3	34.1	42.8	35.9	45.7	37.6
% Public School	92.4	95.2	93.2	96.3	95.0	96.8	93.0	93.6	93.1	94.4
Median Family Income	40,000	36,000	25,000	28,000	37,000	43,918	35,000	32,000	36,413	35,000
Median Neigh. Disadv.	-0.129	-0.049	0.037	0.029	-0.120	-0.049	-0.092	-0.045	-0.096	-0.045

Note: Race/gender rows contain row percents, other characteristics are outcome category means/median

Table 4
Degree of Relationship Partner Social Embeddedness by Race and Gender and Other Characteristics
Level of Analysis: Relationship

	Friends Only	Friend of Friend Only	Both	Other	None	Total
All	22.2	17.3	16.8	23.8	20.0	
All Males	22.8	16.0	13.1	22.2	25.8	12,213
White	25.0	14.4	14.7	23.4	22.6	6,169
Black	19.2	16.0	10.8	20.9	33.1	2,993
Hispanic	21.5	19.6	10.7	21.8	26.5	2,225
Asian	22.3	20.2	17.3	18.6	21.6	560
All Females	21.4	18.6	20.7	25.4	13.8	11,663
White	23.5	17.0	22.5	25.2	11.8	6,598
Black	18.5	20.0	16.5	27.0	18.1	2,563
Hispanic	19.0	21.2	20.5	23.8	15.4	1,763
Asian	18.2	25.0	20.3	24.0	12.6	517
% Two Parent Fam	47.2	41.7	46.9	45.5	41.2	44.6
% Public School	92.4	94.6	93.5	92.1	94.5	93.3
Median Family Income	39,000	33,000	40,000	38,000	33,283	36,000
Median Neigh. Disadvantage	-0.110	-0.074	-0.115	-0.115	-0.045	-0.939

Note: Race/gender rows contain row percents, other characteristics are outcome category means/medians

Table 5
Degree of Relationship Partner Social Embeddedness by Race and Gender and Other Characteristics
Level of Analysis: Relationship

	Friends Only		Friend of Friend Only		Both		Other		None		Total	
	Rom.	Non-Rom.	Rom.	Non-Rom.	Rom.	Non-Rom.	Rom.	Non-Rom.	Rom.	Non-Rom.	Rom.	Non-Rom.
All	21.6	25.8	17.7	14.9	17.6	12.3	23.7	24.5	19.6	22.4	20,557	3,334
All Males	22.5	24.3	16.7	12.9	13.9	9.5	21.7	24.9	25.3	28.4	10,147	2,066
White	24.8	26.3	14.7	12.3	15.5	10.3	22.7	27.6	22.4	23.6	5,305	864
Black	17.8	24.0	17.3	11.7	11.5	8.5	20.5	22.0	32.9	33.8	2,310	683
Hispanic	21.8	20.0	20.4	16.0	11.0	9.2	20.8	25.9	25.9	28.9	1,824	401
Asian	21.6	27.7	20.6	16.9	18.4	9.2	19.2	13.9	20.2	32.3	495	65
All Females	20.6	28.3	18.7	18.1	21.1	17.0	25.6	23.9	14.0	12.7	10,397	1,266
White	22.8	29.6	17.0	17.5	23.0	18.4	25.4	23.5	11.9	11.1	5,865	733
Black	17.0	28.6	20.3	17.9	17.0	12.9	27.7	22.5	18.1	18.2	2,238	325
Hispanic	18.8	21.2	21.3	20.4	20.4	21.9	23.6	27.0	15.9	9.5	1,626	137
Asian	17.6	23.9	24.8	26.1	21.0	13.0	23.6	28.3	13.0	8.7	471	46
% Two Parent Fam	48.5	40.5	43.0	32.1	47.6	40.8	46.9	37.2	42.1	36.5	45.7	37.6
% Public School	92.2	93.4	94.5	95.7	93.2	95.8	91.9	93.0	94.3	95.4	93.1	94.4
Median Family Income	40,000	35,000	33,370	31,508	40,000	36,000	38,939	35,000	34,000	31,000	36,413	35,000
Median Neigh. Disadv.	-0.119	-0.043	-0.075	-0.049	-0.119	-0.033	-0.124	-0.071	-0.048	-0.033	-0.096	-0.045

Note: Race/gender rows contain row percents, other characteristics are outcome category means/median

Table 6
Multinomial Logits of Social Context on Covariates

	Base Category: Both School and Neighborhood		
	School Only	Neigh. Only	Neither
Race (White Omitted)			
Hispanic	0.038	0.205	0.054
African American	0.158	0.425	0.205
Native American	-0.496	-0.181	-0.226
Asian	0.159	-0.215	0.232
Other	0.121	0.205	-0.019
Female	-0.161	0.197	0.171
Age	-0.039	1.040	0.600
Age Squared	0.000	-0.031	-0.015
Father Education (College Degree Omitted)			
Less than High School	-0.221	0.228	-0.002
High School Degree	-0.076	0.168	0.137
Some College	0.096	0.239	0.120
Mother Education (College Degree Omitted)			
Less than High School	-0.201	0.376	0.035
High School Degree	-0.251	0.013	-0.138
Some College	-0.126	0.172	0.049
Family Structure (Mother and Father Omitted)			
Mother Only	0.004	-0.030	0.103
Father Only	-0.015	0.273	0.338
Log Household Income (thousands)	-0.031	-0.271	-0.093
HS Disadvantage Measure	-0.005	0.000	-0.002
School Type (Junior High Only Omitted)			
High School Only	0.025	-0.058	-0.116
Grades 7-12	-0.329	-0.056	-0.192
Urbanicity (Rural Omitted)			
Urban	0.392	0.693	0.551
Suburban	0.175	0.682	0.420
Neighborhood Disadvantage Measure	0.115	0.290	0.062
Non-Romantic Sexual Relationship	-1.450	-1.877	-1.557
Constant	3.465	-8.447	-2.929

Bold coefficients are statistically significant at the 95% level of confidence.

Table 7
Multinomial Logits of Social Embeddedness on Covariates

	Base Category: Friend and Friend of Friend			
	Friends Only	Friend of Friend Only	Other	None
Race (White Omitted)				
Hispanic	-0.082	0.136	-0.026	0.188
African American	0.059	0.346	0.284	0.665
Native American	0.223	0.211	0.339	-0.030
Asian	-0.176	0.271	-0.240	0.017
Other	-0.241	0.011	-0.012	0.292
Female	-0.496	-0.290	-0.286	-1.052
Age	-0.341	0.367	0.120	-0.588
Age Squared	0.012	-0.007	0.003	0.021
Father Education (College Degree Omitted)				
Less than High School	0.079	0.389	0.185	0.270
High School Degree	-0.004	0.201	0.010	0.078
Some College	-0.046	0.063	0.040	-0.056
Mother Education (College Degree Omitted)				
Less than High School	0.072	0.276	-0.113	0.144
High School Degree	0.112	0.174	-0.033	0.195
Some College	0.011	0.127	0.000	-0.054
Family Structure (Mother and Father Omitted)				
Mother Only	-0.076	-0.019	-0.008	-0.069
Father Only	-0.038	0.114	0.120	-0.040
Log Household Income (thousands)	0.012	-0.018	-0.025	-0.036
HS Disadvantage Measure	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.002
School Type (Junior High Only Omitted)				
High School Only	-0.099	-0.093	0.025	-0.051
Grades 7-12	-0.007	-0.013	0.119	-0.149
Urbanicity (Rural Omitted)				
Urban	0.119	0.200	0.275	0.045
Suburban	-0.045	0.131	0.105	-0.108
Neighborhood Disadvantage Measure	-0.061	-0.145	-0.110	-0.092
Non-Romantic Sexual Relationship	-0.472	-0.057	-0.256	-0.296
Constant	3.262	-4.429	-2.129	4.486

Bold coefficients are statistically significant at the 95% level of confidence.