

Scripts for Actual First Date and Hanging-Out Encounters Among Young Heterosexual Hispanic Adults

Asia A. Eaton · Suzanna M. Rose

Published online: 14 July 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2012

Abstract This research presents two studies examining scripts for the actual initial romantic encounters of young heterosexual Hispanic adults in the Southeastern U.S. In Study 1, 242 Hispanic undergraduates were asked to describe their most recent first romantic encounter using a cognitive script methodology, and then to classify the encounter as being a date, hangout, hookup, one-night stand, or other type of encounter. Encounters were most frequently classified as a date, followed by hangouts; very few individuals indicated that their most recent encounter was a hookup or one-night stand. Dates were described as highly gender stereotypic, with men performing significantly more actions overall than women. The date script also included more gender-typed actions, was more structured, and was considered more ideal than a hangout. In Study 2, a checklist of 60 actions derived from Study 1 was used to assess the most recent initial romantic encounters of 217 Hispanic undergraduates. Dates were reported most frequently, followed by hangouts. Dates continued to be highly gender stereotyped with men being responsible for more actions than women, and the date script continued to include more gender-typed actions than the hangout. A date was also more structured and rated as more ideal and satisfying than a hangout. The predominance of and preference for dates, the most gender-typed way for young adults to get together romantically, was consistent with Hispanic cultural norms that support traditional gender roles.

Keywords Dating · Social dating · Hangout · Hookup · Scripts · Sexual scripts · Gender · Hispanic · Heterosexual · Young adults

Introduction

The conventional ideal for heterosexual romantic relationships in the U.S. characterizes the man's role as dominant in terms of initiating the interaction or courtship, initiating sexual activity, and fulfilling a provider role (Bailey 1988). Traditionally the woman's role is reactive in terms of responding to the man's overture, limiting sexual interaction, and exhibiting communal traits such as being emotionally expressive. These roles have been determined to be present in all phases of heterosexual relationships, including attraction, dating, love, romance, and sexuality (e.g., Belsey 1994; Impett and Peplau 2003; Knudson-Martin and Mahoney 2009; Sprecher and McKinney 1993) and to be particularly strong in the early phase of relationships such as during dating. For instance, research on hypothetical and actual first date scripts has confirmed that the man's role is active in terms of initiating, planning, and paying for the date, and the woman's role is reactive (e.g., Morr Serewicz and Gale 2008; Rose and Frieze 1989, 1993).

However, other types of early relationship encounter scripts, "hanging out" and "hooking up" appear to be popular among young adults. "Hanging out" occurs when women and men "spend loosely organized, undefined time together, without making their interest in one another explicit" (Glenn and Marquardt 2001, p. 5). The term "hookup" refers to a casual sexual interaction between friends, brief acquaintances, or strangers who do not expect a commitment (e.g., Fielder and Carey 2010; Wright et al. 2010; Reid et al. 2011). Because hookups are usually limited to a single occasion (e.g., Grello et al. 2006; Paul et al. 2000), "hookup" and "one-night stand" often are used interchangeably.

The extent to which hangouts or hookups rely on gender roles is unclear. Generally, gender roles are presumed to be less prevalent for hangouts and hookups than for dates. For example, the majority of college students studied by Paul & Hayes (2002) described actual hookups as being equally

A. A. Eaton (✉) · S. M. Rose
Department of Psychology, Florida International University,
Florida 33199, USA
e-mail: aeaton@fiu.edu

open to initiation by women or men, suggesting that hookups may be a more egalitarian way for men and women to get together than dates. A qualitative analysis of reactions to a heterosexual hookup scenario followed by a date also found that women were accorded sexual agency in the context of a hookup, but were more restricted by their gender role in the date that followed (Reid et al. 2011).

A related issue concerns how popular hangouts and hookups are compared to dates. If handouts and hookups are more prevalent than dates as well as less reliant on gender roles, this might suggest that initial romantic encounters are becoming more egalitarian. Some researchers have argued that hooking up has become one of the primary ways that young heterosexuals get together on college campuses in the U.S. (e.g., Bogle 2008; Bradshaw et al. 2010; Glenn and Marquardt 2001). Other studies have found that students greatly overestimate both how often hookups actually occur within the general student culture (Holman and Sillars 2011), and how comfortable one's peer are with hooking up (Lambert et al. 2003). In addition, Bradshaw et al. (2010) reported that women preferred dates to hookups, possibly because of the sexual double standard. Women also had more negative evaluations and feelings than men did when asked to describe their most recent one-night stand (Campbell 2008).

A further consideration that has received little attention concerns the role of culture on gender roles in initial romantic encounters. Almost all research on young people's first dates, hangouts, and hookups has been conducted with White heterosexual college students (e.g., Bogle 2008; Laner and Ventrone 1998, 2000; Paul and Hayes 2002). The findings generated from White samples may not reflect reality for Hispanic or Black students, for example. Many core cultural values, like the value of emotional control in Asian/Asian-American culture (e.g., Mauss et al. 2010) are relevant to sexuality and gender, so it is likely that these values influence college men and women's roles in dating and getting together romantically.

The overall purpose of this paper is to elucidate and compare the various interpersonal scripts used by heterosexual Hispanic college students in the U.S. in their first romantic encounters. Extending research on initial romantic encounters to this large and rapidly growing group is the primary focus and contribution of this paper. Hispanics are members of the largest racial/ethnic minority group in the country, and are among the fastest growing populations on college campuses today (Fry 2011). It is important to better understand the interpersonal behaviors and attitudes of young Hispanics in the U.S. because they represent a substantial proportion of all young people in the U.S. Any claims about the behavior and attitudes of young persons in the U.S. would thus be remiss to exclude Hispanics. Moreover, the growing number of Hispanic Americans

represents a powerful force for setting standards and mainstream cultural practices. Finally, it is important to study young and college-age Hispanic men and women because U.S. Hispanics are disproportionately young compared to the general population, with a median age of 27 for Hispanics and 39 for non-Hispanics (Pew Hispanic Center 2009). Young Hispanics thus represent a large and influential proportion of their own ethnic/racial group. Studying the psychology of young Hispanics will ultimately allow us to better predict and understand the social future of the U.S.

Hispanic cultural norms give authority and superiority to men, popularized as "machismo," while women are expected to be submissive, chaste, and dependent, popularized as "marianismo" (e.g., Gowan, and Treviño 1998; Mayo and Resnick 1996; Raffaelli and Ontai 2004). According to the ideals of machismo and marianismo, men are expected to be authoritative, aggressive, and dominant, whereas women are expected to be loving (but not sexual), passive, modest, and subservient (Espin 1986). These ideals are derived, in part, from the influence of Catholicism on Hispanic culture ("marianismo" stems from the Virgin Mary or "Maria"), that teaches that men and women are meant by divine design to be different and complementary (e.g., Kreeft 2001). This influence is both historic and ongoing, as Hispanics today are far more likely to be Catholic than the U.S. general public (62 % compared to 23 %) and are more religious than most Americans (they are more likely to say they belong to a religion and to attend religious services regularly) (Pew Hispanic Center 2011).

Given these highly conventional gender roles, it follows that there is a "double standard" for the sexual behavior of men and women in most Hispanic cultures (for a review, see Raffaelli and Suarez-al-Adam 1998). This "double standard" in judgments of men and women's sexual behavior dictates that males are rewarded for heterosexual sexual behavior while females are derogated for similar behaviors (for a review see Crawford and Popp 2003). Evidence of this standard can be seen in Mexico where, for example, 62 % of men report having had premarital intercourse by age 19 compared with only 14 % of women (Liskin 1985). Research has also found that Hispanic women in the U.S. engage in lower levels of sexual activity than either non-Hispanic white or black women (e.g., Grimstead et al. 1993), while U.S. Hispanic men engage in more sexual activity than men of other ethnicities (e.g., Billy et al. 2008).

There is evidence that young Hispanic adults endorse these ideals as well, at least to some extent. For instance, Hispanic individuals tend to have their first kiss at a later age than Whites (Regan et al. 2004). The sexual double standard also manifests itself in older average ages of first sex for Hispanic girls than for Hispanic boys in the U.S. (e.g., Upchurch et al. 1998; Upchurch et al. 1999). Also, Ahrold and Meston (2010) found that Hispanic college

students were significantly more traditional in terms of gender roles than White college students; that is, were more likely than White students to agree with statements such as “it is unnatural for women to be the initiator of sexual relations.” Similarly, Zavella and Xóchitl (2005) found that Mexican American high school girls strongly abide by heteronormative discourses for negotiating relationships and sexual behavior, including the belief that men are dominant (“los hombres son machistas”).

Research on other Hispanic ethnicities suggests that conventional gender roles and a strong double standard of behavior for men and women are prevalent among young Cuban-American men (Wright 2011) as well as more generally among “Latinos,” including Cuban, Puerto Rican, Central and South American, and Mexican college students (Raffaelli 2005). Thus, when beginning an initial romantic encounter, young Hispanics may use a script that is more structured and more differentiated according to gender roles.

The general aim of the current research was to examine what actions defined the scripts for the various types of actual initial romantic encounters described by young Hispanic adults and how those scripts compared, especially in terms of gender stereotypicality. A cognitive-script methodology was used to address this aim (Abelson 1981; Bower et al. 1979). This methodology has been used to determine the script for a first date (e.g., Rose and Frieze 1989) and is easily applicable to the study of hangouts or hookups. In this method, participants are asked to describe in detail what typically happens or has happened during a familiar activity, such as eating in a restaurant. Script norms are determined by high agreement on the actions that are used. Within cognitive script research, actions that are endorsed by 25 % or more of participants generally are regarded as meeting script criteria and are classified as basic script actions; actions endorsed by a majority of participants would be considered strong script elements (e.g., Bower et al. 1979). Scripts with a greater number of basic script actions are viewed as being more structured.

Five hypotheses were proposed in our examination of the initial romantic encounters of young Hispanic adults. First (H1), dating was expected to be the most frequent type of recent initial romantic encounter for young Hispanic adults, based on the fact that dates are highly gender-typed and Hispanic cultural norms support traditional gender roles. Specifically, it was expected that dates would occur at a significantly higher rate than hangouts, hookups, or one-night stands. Second (H2), we expected that participants would attribute, on average, significantly more actions to the man than to the woman on dates. The norms expressed in contemporary dating and relationship advice self-help books (Eaton and Rose 2011) and current research on dating scripts in the U.S. (e.g., Laner and Ventrone 2000; Morr Serewicz and Gale 2008) indicate that the man’s role on a

date includes planning, initiating actions, and taking charge/control, while reactive behaviors and concern for one’s appearance are considered typical of and appropriate for women. Men were thus expected to perform significantly more actions than women on dates.

Third, gender roles were predicted to be more active in the date script than in hangouts, hookups, or one-night stands (H3). Specifically, we expected more gender-typed items to meet the script criteria in dates than would meet the script criteria in hangouts, hookups, or one-night stands. Fourth (H4), the date script was expected to be more structured than hangout, hookup, and one-night stand scripts in terms of having a longer list of actions and events that met the script criteria. This was expected because the date script has been in existence longer than the other script types, so it may be more elaborate and have higher levels of consensus in cultural memory and practice than the newer scripts. In support of this, researchers have suggested that the script for hookups “appears to be less detailed” than the script for dates (Bradshaw et al. 2010), and definitions of “hookups” have been inconsistent across participants and researchers (Garcia et al. 2012). Finally (H5), a date was expected to be rated as more satisfying and ideal than hangouts, hookups, or one-night stands by young Hispanic adults, whose cultural norms for men and women are more congruent with traditional dates than any of the other encounter types.

Two studies were undertaken to explore these questions and hypotheses. In Study 1, the goals were to identify what type of initial romantic encounter was most prevalent among young Hispanic adults, to evaluate gender roles within each script, and to assess the script associated with each script label using a free recall format typical of the cognitive-script methodology. In Study 2, the intent was to verify the scripts using a checklist format based on the coding system used in Study 1.

Study 1: Scripts Using Cognitive Script Methodology

In Study 1 the initial romantic encounter scripts of young Hispanic adults were studied using a cognitive script methodology (Bower et al. 1979) as applied by Rose and Frieze (1989) and Morr Serewicz and Gale (2008) to the study of dating scripts. Again, based on Hispanic cultural norms, dating was expected to be the most frequent type of recent initial romantic encounter reported (H1), participants were expected to attribute significantly more actions to the man than to the woman on actual dates (H2), more gender-typed actions were expected to occur in the date script than in the other three scripts (H3), the date script was expected to be more structured, i.e., to include more actions than the other three scripts (H4), and dates were expected to be rated the most satisfying and ideal of all three scripts (H5).

Method

Participants

Participants were 242 heterosexual undergraduate students (148 women, 94 men) recruited through the psychology subject pool at a large, urban, predominantly Hispanic university in Miami, Florida. As of 2000, 66.75 % of residents in Miami spoke Spanish as their first language (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). In terms of national origin and/or ethnic origin, 65 % of the Miami populace in 2012 were persons of Hispanic or Latino origin, (U.S. Census Bureau 2012), and 34 % of the populace was Cuban specifically.

At the university where this study was conducted, over 60 % of the student body university self-identifies as Hispanic (including but not limited to Cuban, Puerto Rican, Central and South American, and Mexican). Participants were recruited through solicitation in the psychology department study recruitment system. Only Spanish-English bilingual Hispanic participants were selected for this study to assure that participants were immersed in Hispanic culture. Participants' mean age was 20.88, ranging from 18–29 ($SD=2.53$); women's and men's mean age did not differ. Participants were relatively evenly distributed across undergraduate class years, with 18 % of students being in their first year, 19 % in their second year, 25 % in their third year, 22 % in their fourth year, and 15 % in their fifth year.

About half of women and of men reported being currently involved in a "committed romantic relationship" (55 % and 53 %, respectively). The average time since participants' most recent initial romantic encounter was 1.12 years (ranging from less than one day before study participation to 10 years prior, $SD=1.69$). Women were significantly younger than their men partners ($M_s=20.75$ and 22.52), $t(141)=7.72$, $p<.001$, and men were marginally older than their women partners ($M_s=21.09$ and 20.65), $t(90)=1.90$, $p=.06$.

Procedure

Participants completed the study online through the university's psychology subject pool in exchange for course credit.

Measures

All measures were in English. Participants were first asked to describe their most recent initial romantic encounter using the following prompt:

We are interested in all kind of initial romantic relationship encounters (e.g., hookups, dates, hanging out, one-night stands, etc.). Specifically, we are interested in the events which occur when going out with

someone for the first time. Please describe the most recent time you went out with someone for the first time, using up to 20 actions or events to explain what occurred, from beginning to end.

This prompt was constructed based on pretesting showing that these four script types- "hookups," "dates," "hang-outs," and "one-night stands"- existed in the present population and were uniquely identifiable types of initial romantic encounters. In contrast to much previous research on dating scripts, this prompt did not explicitly ask participants to report an event that occurred when going out with "someone new" (e.g., Rose and Frieze 1989, 1993; Laner and Ventrone 2000). Instead, this prompt left the previous relationship between partners purposefully ambiguous to elicit scripts that could include the first romantic or sexual encounter between friends or long-time acquaintances as well as strangers or brief acquaintances.

On the same page as the prompt, participants were given 20 long textboxes, without word limits, to use to respond to the prompt. After describing their encounter using these textboxes, participants were asked to choose one of four labels derived from pretesting to describe the encounter: date, hookup, one-night stand, and hanging out. Participants could also select an "other" option if they felt none of the labels provided fit their encounter, and were then asked to freely enter how they would label the encounter. Next, participants specified how long ago the encounter occurred. Outcome measures assessed the quality of the encounter and the kind of contact participants had after the encounter. The measures of quality included: satisfaction (1=not at all satisfied to 5=extremely satisfied), how ideal the encounter was (1=not at all ideal to 5=extremely ideal), how attracted they were to the partner at the time (1=not at all attracted to 5=extremely attracted), how much they liked the personality of the person they went out with (from 1=did not like at all to 5=liked very much). The measures of continued contact included: if they continued to see partner (yes/no), if the partner was a friend at the time of the encounter (yes/somewhat/no), and if they considered the partner a friend today (yes/somewhat/no).

Script Coding/Criteria

Each action cited by participants was coded using 51 script actions. Forty six were actions used previously by Rose and Frieze (1993), and five new actions were added to encompass responses occurring within this group, including: "disagree," "flirt/smile/wink," "reject physical contact," "absence of physical contact," and "immediate post-outing contact" (i.e., phone call, email, or text message). An action item was defined as a *verb* (Verb 2012), i.e., a word or words that in syntax conveys an action (e.g., eat, drive,

pay), an occurrence (e.g., happened, became), or a state of being (e.g., be, feel). Each action also was coded to indicate if it was initiated/performed by the woman, man, or both/ unspecified (this category was used in the case that participants described an action as being performed by us/we or if no actors were specified, such as in the examples “went to a movie” or “kissed”).

One rater coded each action in each script using the 51 script codes, also coding for who initiated or performed the action; a second rater coded a random selection of 10 % of all scripts. Inter-rater reliability for application of the 51 codes was 83 % (fixed-marginal kappa: .82, free-marginal kappa: .83). Next, the number of participants citing each action and the frequency with which each action was cited within scripts were determined. Following Bower et al. (1979), a script was defined as consisting of those actions mentioned at least once by 25 % or more of participants.

Results

As predicted (H1), the majority of young Hispanic undergraduates said their most recent initial romantic encounter was a date, followed by hanging out, hookups, “other,” and one-night stands (see Table 1). A binomial test comparing the proportion of dates to the proportion of hangouts (the next largest script category) confirmed that dates were reported at a significantly higher rate than hangouts (147 of 204 were dates, $p < .001$), and were thus also more frequent than each of the other categories. The specific descriptions of the “other” category did not constitute a new type; examples include: an “affair,” a “one-night stand that turned into friends with benefits,” and a “party.” There were no significant differences in the frequency with which women and men participants reported the four main script types of date, hangout, hookup, or one-night stand, $\chi^2(3, N=232) = 6.19, n.s.$

The date and hangout scripts are reported in Table 2; however, a script analysis could not be performed on

hookups or one-night stands due to the low frequency of these types of encounters. Women’s and men’s scripts for each event are reported separately. An action was considered to be a script element if more than 25 % of participants cited that specific behavior as occurring during that type of event (Bower et al. 1979).

Gender roles for young Hispanic adults were typical in both the first date and hangout script, with the man’s role being more clearly specified than the woman’s role. For a date, according to women participants, no action by the woman met script criteria, but five actions for the man did (i.e., ask for the outing, pick up other, pay expenses, be courteous, and take other home). Likewise for men participants, no actions initiated by the woman met the criteria, but three for the man did (i.e., ask for the outing, pick up other, and take other home).

To test H2, that participants would assign, on average, more actions to the man than to the woman on dates, we compared the average number of male-initiated actions to the average number of female-initiated actions in dates using a paired-samples t -test. As expected, participants reported that men performed significantly more actions than women on dates when looking across all possible 51 script codes ($M_s = 3.54$ vs. 1.88), $t(146) = 4.94, p < .001$. This was true for both men and women participants ($M_s = 3.11$ vs. .66), $t(55) = 5.87, p < .001$, and ($M_s = 3.80$ vs. 2.64), $t(90) = 2.48, p < .05$.

Also as hypothesized (H3), the hangout script had fewer gender-typed actions that met script criteria than the date script. Women and men alike had two actions that meet criteria that were initiated by the man (pick up other and take other home or to car). No woman-initiated action met script criteria for either men or women participants. Thus, while a date was more gender-typed than a hangout according to the 25 % script criteria, the man was more responsible than the woman for specific actions and events in both types of encounters.

Chi-squared analyses were used to examine if women and men participants differed in their perceptions of who was responsible for the five gender-typed script actions for a date (man: ask for the outing, pick up other, pay, be courteous, and take other home) and the two gender-typed script actions for a hangout (man: pick up other and take other home) by comparing the extent to which women and men participants saw the action was initiated by the woman, man, or both/unspecified. Previous research has shown that while there is a high level of agreement between men and women as to the content of hypothetical and actual dating scripts, men have been found to focus more on their own actions in reporting scripts than women (Rose and Frieze 1993). In this study, however, among participants who included the gender-typed items in their encounter, no participant gender differences were found in perceptions of who was responsible for the actions on either a date or hangout (all χ^2 s (2) ≤ 2.48 , all p s $> .28$);

Table 1 Proportion of participants reporting each of the script types in Study 1 and 2

	Date	Hangout	Hookup	One-night stand	“Other”
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Study 1 Participants					
Women	91 (61 %)	37 (25 %)	10 (7 %)	1 (<1 %)	9 (6 %)
Men	56 (60 %)	20 (21 %)	14 (15 %)	3 (3 %)	1 (1 %)
Study 2 Participants					
Women	101 (72 %)	26 (18 %)	5 (4 %)	3 (2 %)	6 (4 %)
Men	43 (57 %)	20 (26 %)	9 (12 %)	2 (3 %)	2 (3 %)

Table 2 Study 1: Actual date and hangout scripts for Hispanic women and men based on actions mentioned by at least 25 % of participants per script using free recall

Actual Date Script		Actual Hangout Script	
Women participants (N=91)	Men participants (N=56)	Women participants (N=37)	Men participants (N=20)
Man: Ask for the outing	Man: Ask for the outing	Decide what to do	Decide what to do
Man: <i>Pick up/go to other</i>	Man: <i>Pick up/go to other</i>	Man: <i>Pick up/go to other</i>	Man: <i>Pick up/go to other</i>
<i>Joke/talk/laugh</i>	<i>Joke/talk/laugh</i>	Meet at friends or elsewhere	Meet at friends or elsewhere
<i>Attend event</i>	<i>Attend event</i>	<i>Joke/talk/laugh</i>	<i>Joke/talk/laugh</i>
<i>Eat</i>	<i>Eat</i>	<i>Attend event</i>	Evaluate other/figure out where stand
Man: Pay	Pay	<i>Eat</i>	<i>Attend event</i>
Man: Be polite/attend to other	<i>Engage in physical contact</i>	Pay	<i>Eat</i>
<i>Engage in physical contact</i>	Man: <i>Take other home/to car</i>	<i>Engage in physical contact</i>	Drink alcohol
Man: <i>Take other home/to car</i>	Kiss goodnight	Man: <i>Take other home/to car</i>	Flirt/smile/wink
Go home/plan to leave			<i>Engage in physical contact</i>
Post-outing contact			Man: <i>Take other home/to car</i>
Report positive feelings			Report positive feelings
Total actions=12	Total actions=9	Total actions=9	Total actions=12
5 initiated by man;	3 initiated by man;	2 initiated by man;	2 initiated by man;
0 initiated by woman	0 initiated by woman	0 initiated by woman	0 initiated by woman

Italics indicate that the action occurred in all four versions of the scripts. An action includes the designation “Man” or “Woman” if at least 25 % of all participants said the action was performed by the man or the woman

women and men participants were equally likely to attribute these actions to men in both scripts.

The expectation (H4) that the first date script would be more structured than the hanging out script was not supported in terms of the number of actions that met the script criteria. As shown in Table 2, women’s date script had 12 actions and men’s had nine, while women’s hangout script had nine actions and men’s had 12. Six actions (shown in italics in Table 2) were shared across type of encounter and gender indicating that the core structure of both a date and hangout were similar. The average number of words participants used to describe a date and a hangout was also not significantly different (140 and 159 words), $F(1, 203)=.42, n.s.$

However, dates were more structured than hangouts in terms of action items involving planning. For example, “paying” qualified as a script action for dates, but not for hangouts. The expectation that one is responsible for paying for date expenses requires pre-planning. In addition, hangouts included more actions that were mutually performed or initiated and less planned. For example, men and women’s hangout scripts both included the item “meet at friends or elsewhere.” By virtue of meeting at an independent location, both the man and women are presumably responsible for getting to the event independently. The hangout script also included the item “decide what to do” suggesting that a hangout requires mutual decision-making during the encounter itself, whereas this is pre-decided for dates.

Finally, the hypothesis (H5) that a date would be evaluated more positively than a hangout was supported for one of the four measures of quality: idealness of the encounter. A 2 x 2 MANOVA (type of encounter x gender) revealed that participants who described a date reported their encounter to be significantly more ideal than participants who reported hangouts ($M_s=3.73$ and 3.45), $F(1, 201)=3.92, p < .05$. No other main effects or gender or interaction effects were found for the other three quality measures including satisfaction with the encounter, attraction to the partner, or liking for the personality of the partner. Chi-squared analyses also revealed no difference for type of encounter for the other outcome measures. A majority of participants in both dates and hangouts were at least “somewhat” friends at the time of the encounter (74 %), continued to see their partners after the encounter (85 %), and currently considered them to be at least “somewhat” a friend (76 %).

Discussion

The scripts derived using cognitive script methodology to determine Hispanic young adults’ scripts for their most recent initial romantic encounter generally were consistent with the predictions. Dating was indeed the most frequent type of most recent initial romantic encounter for young Hispanic adults; dating involved more structure than hangouts in terms of planning and gender roles, and dates were rated as being more ideal

than hangouts. These findings are consistent previous research indicating that gender roles in dating are robust among young adults (Eaton and Rose 2011), as well as with the expectation that a date would be more commonly practiced than a hangout among Hispanic students (e.g., Raffaelli and Ontai 2004).

However, this study contained several drawbacks. First, it was not possible to determine the scripts for hookups or one-night stands because so few participants reported engaging in these types of encounters. Second, the cognitive script methodology used in Study 1 may not have provided a full picture of the scripts due to participant errors or forgetting. For this reason, in Study 2, we used a “checklist format” to confirm the content of the scripts.

Study 2: First Date and Hangout Scripts Using a Checklist Format

In Study 2, a second group of young Hispanic adults drawn from the same population was asked to describe their most recent initial romantic encounter using a checklist format to further elaborate and confirm the date and hangout scripts. Participants were asked to indicate which of 60 actions occurred during their most recent encounter and then to choose a label for the encounter. The four hypotheses proposed earlier were used for this study as well, though they were modified slightly. First (H1), dates were expected to be reported more frequently than hangouts, hookups, or one-night stands, again motivated by knowledge of the traditional values for heterosexual relationships prevalent in Hispanic culture. Second, we again expected participants to attribute significantly more actions to the man than to the woman on dates (H2). Third, gender roles were expected to be more pronounced on a date than on a hangout (H3). Fourth, (H4), dates were predicted to involve more structure in terms of planning items and script length than hangouts. Fifth (H5), dates were expected to have more positive evaluations than hangouts.

Method

Participants

Participants were 217 heterosexual Hispanic undergraduates (141 women, 76 men), fluent in both Spanish and English, and recruited through the psychology subject pool at the same predominantly Hispanic university in Miami, Florida.

Participant's mean age was 21.18, ranging from 18–29 ($SD=2.36$). Participants were mostly third-year students, with 21 % of students being in their first year, 12 % in their second year, 40 % in their third year, 19 % in their fourth year, and 3 % in their fifth year. Most women (67 %) and 41 % of men reported currently being involved in a “committed romantic relationship.” The average time since

participants' last initial romantic encounter was 1.12 years (ranging from 2 days before study participation to 10 years prior, $SD=2.17$). As in Study 1, women participants were significantly younger than their men partners ($M_s=21.28$ vs. 23.05), $t(123)=4.76$, $p<.001$, though men in this sample did not differ significantly in age from their women partners ($M_s=20.92$ vs. 20.54), $t(64)=1.21$, $n.s.$

Procedure

Participants completed the study online through the university's psychology subject pool in exchange for course credit.

Measures

All measures were in English. The Initial Romantic Encounter checklist used in Study 2 consisted of 60 actions. The 51 script codes used in Study 1 were included; however, four of the 51 actions were divided into two distinct categories to yield 55 actions (“be early/late” was split into “be early” and “be late,” “evaluate other/figure out where stand” was split into “evaluate other” and “figure out where stand,” “prepare car/apartment/flowers” was split into “prepare car or apartment” and “bring flowers or gift,” and “joke/talk/laugh” was split into “joke/talk/laugh” and “get to know other”). Five novel actions also were added (i.e., “offer to pay,” “decline offer to pay,” “fail to initiate physical contact,” “stay after/sleep over,” and “decline invitation for second outing”).

Participants were asked to indicate which of the 60 actions occurred on their most recent initial romantic encounter (yes/no/don't know) and, if so, to indicate who performed the action (self/partner/both). The complete prompt was as follows:

Please indicate *whether or not* each of the following events/actions took place the last time you went out with someone for the first time. If the event or action listed DID occur, please also indicate who did/initiated it. If you initiated/did the action, check Self; if other, check Other; if both, check Both; if no one, leave it blank.

After completing the checklist, participants were asked to indicate how long ago the encounter occurred and to select one of five terms that best described the encounter they wrote about: a date, a hookup, a one-night stand, hanging out, and the option “other.” Participants also were asked the same follow-up questions concerning quality of the interaction and post-encounter contact as in Study 1.

Script Coding/Criteria

The original 25 % criterion for inclusion as a script action was based on cognitive script methodology (Bower et al.

1979). For Study 2, a more stringent criterion of 50 % mention for inclusion as a script action was used because of the high level of detail and ease of reporting made possible by the checklist format.

Results

As expected (H1), the majority of young Hispanic adults described their most recent initial romantic encounter as a date. The next most common type of encounter was hanging out, followed by a hookup, “other,” and a one-night stand (see Table 1). A binomial test comparing the proportion of dates to the proportion of hangouts (the next largest script category) confirmed that dates were reported at a significantly higher rate than hanging out (144 of 190 were dates, $p < .001$), and were thus also more frequently reported than any of the other script types. There were no significant differences in the proportion of women and men participants reporting each of the four encounter types, $\chi^2(3, N=209)=7.12, n.s.$

H2, that men would be seen as responsible for more actions than women on a date, was again supported. Participants reported that men performed significantly more actions than women on dates when looking across all 60 possible script actions and events ($M_s=19.93$ vs. 6.84), $t(143)=13.94, p < .001$. This was true for both men and women participants ($M_s=18.58$ vs. 2.32), $t(42)=12.47, p < .001$, and ($M_s=20.51$ vs. 8.76), $t(100)=9.81, p < .001$.

Scripts for a date and hangout are shown in Table 3; however it was not possible to determine scripts for the hookups or one-night stands due to the low number of participants reporting these types of encounters. Women’s and men’s scripts are reported separately. In order to be considered a script action, the action had to be cited by 50 % or more of all participants describing that type of encounter (see Table 4 for exact percentages for each action category provided in the checklist).

The date script included twelve gender-typed actions (ten initiated by the man and two by the woman) and the hangout script included six gender-typed actions (five initiated by the man and one by the woman). Based on the 50 % script inclusion criteria, women and men differed in terms of their perception of the man’s role on the date. Women participants named five actions as being initiated by the man that met script criteria (i.e., ask for the outing, pick up/go to other, pay, take other home, and ask for a second outing), whereas men cited ten date actions as being initiated by the man (i.e., ask for outing, prepare car or apartment, check money, pick up/go to other, be early, wait for other, decline other’s offer to pay, pay, take other home, ask for second outing). Both women and men attributed few actions to the woman in the date script. Women cited two actions as being initiated by the woman on the date (accepting the initial invitation, accepting second invitation) and men cited only one action as being initiated by the woman on the date (accept invitation).

H3 also was supported. The hangout script was again less gendered than the date script in terms of the script criteria, particularly for women participants. Women participants had no male-initiated actions that met script criterion in the hangout script and only one female-initiated action (accept invitation). For men participants, five hangout actions met script criteria for being male-initiated (man: decide what to do, prepare car or apartment, pick up/go to other, pay, and take other home/to car); no female-initiated action met script criteria.

To further examine whether date scripts were more gendered than hangout scripts, we used two-way chi-squared analyses to examine the frequency with which thirteen gendered actions included in either the date or hangout script occurred. As shown in Table 5, seven gender-typed actions occurred significantly more often on dates than hangouts, including one female-initiated action (i.e., accept a second date) and six male-initiated actions (i.e., asking for the date, accepting the date, deciding what to do, picking up the date, arriving early, and asking for a second date).

Next, chi-squared analyses were performed to determine if women and men participants differed significantly in terms of the extent to which they saw the gendered items as attributable to the man, the woman, or both. On dates, among participants who listed the gender-typed items as having occurred on their date, men and women participants differed significantly in terms of 7 of the 12 gender-typed actions. Men significantly more often than women saw themselves as responsible for the six items initiated by the man, including: prepare car or apartment (88 % vs. 40 %), check money (85 % vs. 33 %), pick up/go to other (88 % vs. 72 %), be early (78 % vs. 46 %), wait (88 % vs. 21 %), and ask for second outing (82 % vs. 60 %) (all $\chi^2_s(2) > 6.54, p_s < .05$). In comparison, women cited women (i.e., themselves) significantly more often as performing the female-typed action “accept second outing” than did men (85 % vs. 24 %), $\chi^2(2, N=121)=41.56, p < .001$. Thus, while both women and men in this study perceived the core structure of a date to be initiated and controlled by the man, men more frequently than women report this pattern.

For hangouts, chi-squared analyses of the six gender-typed items revealed that, for participants who listed the gender-typed item as having occurred on their hangout, men significantly more often than women cited four actions as being male-initiated: decide what to do (65 % vs. 24 %), prepare car or apartment (100 % vs. 42 %), pick up/go to other (93 % vs. 65 %), and take other home/to car (100 % vs. 86 %) ($\chi^2_s(2) > 5.60, p_s < .05$). Thus, as with dates, men saw themselves as more responsible for hangout actions than women reported men to be.

Also as predicted (H4), the date script was more structured than the hangout script for both men and women. Women’s first date script had 35 actions compared to 27 for a hangout, while men indicated that a date had 36 actions

Table 3 Study 2: Actual date and hangout scripts for Hispanic women and men based on actions used by at least 50 % of participants per script using a checklist format

Actual Date Script		Actual Hangout Script	
Women participants (N=101)	Men participants (N=43)	Women participants (N=26)	Men participants (N=20)
Man: <i>Ask for the outing</i>	Man: <i>Ask for the outing</i>	<i>Ask for the outing</i>	<i>Ask for the outing</i>
Woman: <i>Accept invite for outing</i>	Woman: <i>Accept invite for outing</i>	Woman: <i>Accept invite for outing</i>	<i>Accept invite for outing</i>
<i>Decide what to do</i>	<i>Decide what to do</i>	<i>Decide what to do</i>	Man: <i>Decide what to do</i>
<i>Tell friends and family</i>	<i>Tell friends and family</i>	<i>Tell friends and family</i>	<i>Tell friends and family</i>
<i>Groom and dress</i>	<i>Groom and dress</i>	<i>Groom and dress</i>	<i>Groom and dress</i>
Worry about appearance	Worry about appearance	<i>Feel nervous</i>	<i>Feel nervous</i>
<i>Feel nervous</i>	<i>Feel nervous</i>	<i>Get to know each other</i>	Man: Prepared car or apartment
Check money	Man: Prepare car or apartment	<i>Figure out where stand</i>	Check money
Man: Pick up/go to other	Man: Check money	<i>Compliment other</i>	Man: Pick up/go to other
Be early	Man: Pick up/go to other	<i>Joke/talk/laugh</i>	Be early
Wait for other	Man: Be early	<i>Evaluate other</i>	<i>Get to know each other</i>
<i>Get to know each other</i>	Man: Wait for other	Talk to friends	<i>Figure out where stand</i>
<i>Figure out where stand</i>	<i>Get to know each other</i>	<i>Try to impress other</i>	<i>Compliment other</i>
<i>Compliment other</i>	<i>Figure out where stand</i>	<i>Attend event</i>	<i>Joke/talk/laugh</i>
<i>Joke/talk/laugh</i>	<i>Compliment other</i>	<i>Eat</i>	<i>Evaluate other</i>
<i>Evaluate other</i>	<i>Joke/talk/laugh</i>	<i>Pay</i>	<i>Try to impress other</i>
Talk to friends	<i>Evaluate other</i>	<i>Flirt/smile/wink</i>	<i>Attend event</i>
<i>Try to impress other</i>	Talk to friends	<i>Courteous behavior</i>	<i>Eat</i>
<i>Attend event</i>	<i>Try to impress other</i>	<i>Accept physical contact</i>	Offer to pay
<i>Eat</i>	<i>Attend event</i>	<i>Take other home/to car</i>	Decline offer to pay
Offer to pay	<i>Eat</i>	<i>Kiss goodnight</i>	Man: <i>Pay</i>
Man: <i>Pay</i>	Offer to pay	<i>Told other had a good time</i>	<i>Flirt/smile/wink</i>
<i>Flirt/smile/wink</i>	Man: Decline offer to pay	<i>Ask for another outing</i>	<i>Courteous behavior</i>
<i>Courteous behavior</i>	Man: <i>Pay</i>	<i>Accept second outing</i>	Engage in physical contact
Engage in physical contact	<i>Flirt/smile/wink</i>	<i>Told other will be in touch</i>	<i>Accept physical contact</i>
<i>Accept physical contact</i>	<i>Courteous behavior</i>	<i>Have post-outing contact</i>	Man: <i>Take other home/to car</i>
Go home/plan to leave	Engage in physical contact	<i>Report positive feelings</i>	<i>Kiss goodnight</i>
Man: <i>Take other home/to car</i>	<i>Accept physical contact</i>		<i>Told other had a good time</i>
<i>Kiss goodnight</i>	Man: <i>Take other home/to car</i>		<i>Ask for another outing</i>
<i>Tell other had a good time</i>	<i>Kiss goodnight</i>		<i>Accept second outing</i>
Man: <i>Ask for another outing</i>	<i>Tell other had a good time</i>		<i>Told other will be in touch</i>
Woman: <i>Accept second outing</i>	Man: <i>Ask for another outing</i>		<i>Have post-outing contact</i>
<i>Tell other will be in touch</i>	<i>Accept second outing</i>		<i>Report positive feelings</i>
<i>Have post-outing contact</i>	<i>Tell other will be in touch</i>		
<i>Report positive feelings</i>	<i>Have post-outing contact</i>		
	<i>Report positive feelings</i>		
Total actions=35	Total actions=36	Total actions=27	Total actions=33
5 initiated by man;	10 initiated by man;	0 initiated by man;	5 initiated by man;
2 initiated by woman	1 initiated by woman	1 initiated by woman	0 initiated by woman

Italics indicate that the action occurred in all four versions of the scripts. An action includes the designation “Man” or “Woman” if at least 50 % of all participants said the action was performed by the man or the woman

and a hangout had 33. In general, both scripts were highly structured; as shown in italics in Table 3, 26 actions were shared across scripts.

Finally, as predicted (H5), the date script was evaluated more positively than the hangout script in terms of three of the four measures of quality. A 2 x 2 MANOVA (type of

Table 4 Study 2: Proportion of Hispanic women and men who confirmed the occurrence of these actions in dates and hangouts using checklist format (“don’t know” category omitted)

	Date		Hangout	
	% Women participants	% Men participants	% Woman participants	% Men participants
1. Ask for the outing	87	90	63	63
2. Accept invitation for outing	97	88	72	68
3. Decide what to do/discuss plans	92	98	81	85
4. Tell friends and family	81	71	58	55
5. Discuss plans with parents	43	45	19	25
6. Groom and dress	98	95	92	90
7. Worry about or change appearance	50	54	39	25
8. Feel nervous	90	79	62	55
9. Prepare car or apartment*	49	85	46	60
10. Bring flowers or gift*	31	19	12	25
11. Check money	64	79	48	65
12. Pick other up/go to other	71	79	46	70
13. Meet at friends/work/another location	39	26	38	30
14. Be early *	66	63	48	55
15. Be late *	29	23	38	30
16. Wait for other	52	61	45	45
17. Welcome other to home	42	36	35	35
18. Introduce to parents/roommate/friends	43	30	39	25
19. Meet or talk to parents/roommate	43	40	31	45
20. Drive around/get lost/leave	24	28	27	25
21. Pick-up friends/go to friends	17	16	19	10
22. Disagree	25	20	24	35
23. Plans fall through/re-decide where to go	31	36	28	39
24. Get to know each other*	90	91	88	80
25. Figure out where stand*	69	78	50	78
26. Compliment other	89	93	85	85
27. Joke, talk, laugh*	97	100	100	95
28. Evaluate other*	88	86	88	78
29. Talk to friends	60	52	56	45
30. Try to impress other	76	79	56	53
31. Attend event (e.g., movies, show, party)	86	74	81	70
32. Eat	73	77	81	65
33. Drink alcohol	33	33	46	16
34. Offer to pay †	72	84	46	70
35. Decline offer to pay †	49	61	46	55
36. Pay	75	98	73	75
37. Flirt/smile/wink	94	98	92	80
38. Courteous behavior	99	98	96	80
39. Be rude/no talking	1	5	0	0
40. Engage in physical contact	67	78	46	60
41. Accept physical contact	71	83	52	74
42. Reject physical contact	15	5	19	0
43. Fail to initiate physical contact†	14	16	30	15
44. Have sex	6	19	12	21
45. Stay after/sleep over†	1	0	23	20
46. Go home/plan to leave	55	44	46	42

Table 4 (continued)

	Date		Hangout	
	% Women participants	% Men participants	% Woman participants	% Men participants
47. Take other home/to car	76	91	69	85
48. Take friends home	10	12	15	15
49. Kiss goodnight	66	78	56	55
50. Handshake/say goodbye	40	26	46	30
51. Told other had a good time	99	95	80	90
52. Ask for another outing	82	77	54	50
53. Accept invitation for second outing	91	77	62	60
54. Decline invitation for second outing†	7	5	12	0
55. Tell other will be in touch	81	75	75	75
56. Absence of physical contact	21	14	31	10
57. Have something go wrong	10	7	12	11
58. Have post-outing contact (call, email, text)	86	85	73	75
59. Report positive feelings	97	98	92	95
60. Report negative feelings	7	15	13	16

*This item was part of a joint item in Study 1

†New item added in Study 2

encounter x gender) performed on the quality measures revealed that dates were regarded as significantly more ideal than hangouts ($M_s=3.83$ vs. 3.26), $F(1, 184)=16.02$, $p<.001$, as well as more satisfying ($M_s=4.00$ vs. 3.59), $F(1, 184)=7.34$, $p<.01$. Those who were on a date compared to hangouts also were more attracted to their partner ($M_s=4.19$ vs. 3.52), $F(1, 184)=17.02$, $p<.001$. No significant gender or interaction effects were observed.

In addition, one other outcome measure differed for type of encounter as hypothesized. Participants who went on a date (89 %) were more likely to continue to see their partner than those who had a hangout (74 %), $\chi^2(1, N=189)=6.12$, $p<.05$. No differences occurred for the other measures. Most considered their partner to be at least “somewhat” of a friend before the encounter (79 %) and at the present time (75 %).

Table 5 Study 2: Frequency of gender-typed items in dates vs. hangouts using checklist format

Gender-typed actions from date or hangout	Date ($N=144$) % (n/N*)	Hangout ($N=46$) % (n/N*)	χ^2 , Df
Items attributed to the woman			
Accept invite for outing	94 % (135/143)a	70 % (31/44)b	19.36, 1
Accept invite for second outing	86 % (121/140)a	61 % (28/46)b	14.19, 1
Items attributed to the man			
Ask for the outing	88 % (127/144)a	63 % (27/43)b	14.70, 1
Prepare car or apartment	60 % (81/134)a	52 % (24/46)a	.96, 1
Check money	69 % (94/137)a	59 % (26/44)a	1.35, 1
Decide what to do/plan activities	94 % (129/138)a	83 % (38/46)b	4.86, 1
Pick up other/go to other	73 % (105/143)a	57 % (26/46)b	4.68, 1
Be early	65 % (90/138)a	44 % (20/45)b	5.23, 1
Wait for other	54 % (77/142)a	50 % (23/46)a	.25, 1
Pay	82 % (118/144)a	74 % (34/46)a	1.41, 1
Decline offer to pay	53 % (75/142)a	50 % (23/46)a	.11, 1
Take other home/to car	70 % (113/141)a	76 % (35/46)a	.35, 1
Ask for another outing	80 % (115/143)a	52 % (24/46)b	14.27, 1

Items with differing subscripts within rows are significantly different at the $p<.05$ level

* N in each cell includes participants who reported that that event or action did or did not occur during their encounter; participants who selected “don’t know” regarding the presence of an event are not included

General Discussion

In this research, we used two approaches to examine the frequency, scripts, gender roles and quality of the most recent initial romantic encounters of young heterosexual Hispanic adults. Our findings indicate that the most common type of initial romantic encounter for young Hispanic adults, and the most ideal, was a date. Hanging out emerged as the second most frequently used script; hookups and one-night stands were seldom represented in participants' most recent initial encounters.

It is important to note that in this research, participants were not asked to label their encounters before reporting them. Because scripts guide and influence attention, evaluation, behavior and memory (Fiske and Taylor 1991), choosing a script name or label from the outset might have influenced what participants retrieved from memory or felt was relevant or important to include in their description. Indeed, research has shown that exposure to sexual scripts specifically can evoke false memories and influence perceptions and judgments (Lenton and Bryan 2005). Instead, participants in this study reported their actual interpersonal scripts without being first biased by what they knew to be the stereotypical content of each label's cultural script. Still, while respondents were not asked to label their encounters a priori, their reconstruction of encounters may have been informed by cultural scripts to the extent that they personally encoded or recalled the event using a cultural script.

The finding that dates were far more commonplace than hangouts or hookups is in contrast to other findings indicating that hooking up has become one of the primary means for getting together on college campuses (e.g., Bogle 2008; Bradshaw et al. 2010; Glenn and Marquardt 2001). There are two possible explanations. One explanation is that, as hypothesized, young Hispanic adults are more traditional in terms of initiating romantic relationships than young White adults studied in previous research. A second explanation is that hookups may not be as prevalent as presumed. Recent research indicates that students overestimate how often hookups occur within the general student culture. For example, Holman and Sillars (2011) found that even in a predominantly White student sample in the northwestern U.S., only about one third of participants reported ever having experienced two or more sexual hookups, though 90 % estimated that the typical student had two or more hookups.

The results indicating that men control more actions than women on dates and that dates are more structured and gender-typed than hangouts confirms previous findings that gender roles in dating are robust (Eaton and Rose 2011). The results confirm that, at least among young Hispanic adults, actual first dates remain very gender-typed, with men initiating and controlling far more date events than

women. Indeed, in Study 1 women were not found to control any date events or actions based on the 25 % inclusion criteria for scripts. Study 2 using the checklist format provided further evidence that the man's actions form the backbone of both the date and hangout script. These male-initiated actions reflect that men have greater power and influence over the encounters. However, with control comes responsibility, and men saw themselves as being "in charge" of actions on both dates and hangouts to a greater extent than did women.

Finally, both men and women who described a date reported it as being more ideal and satisfying than those who described a hangout but only among those participants who used the checklist format. There are four possible explanations. First, the date script is more aligned with typical male and female roles that continue to be valued in Hispanic culture (e.g., Gowan, and Treviño 1998; Mayo and Resnick 1996; Raffaelli and Ontai 2004). Second, a structured script may help to reduce participants' uncertainty and improve their confidence by providing a clear and shared set of individual and interpersonal rules for engagement. Stereotypes, schemas, and heuristics, for example, are known to help people organize and simplify complex or uncertain situations and give individuals more confidence to respond in effective and efficient ways (e.g., Dovidio and Gaertner 1998; Hogg 2001; Macrae et al. 1994; Tversky and Kahneman 1974). Third, a date requires more intentionality than a hangout and it may be that romantic interest is stronger under circumstances that require a clear invitation and acceptance in order to proceed. If so, greater pre-encounter interest might be responsible for more positive outcomes for a date than a hangout. Finally, it is possible that the participants whose most recent initial encounters were dates are somehow different from the participants whose most recent initial encounters were hangouts. For example, participants who only go on dates and never hangout may do so because they are generally satisfied with the long-standing, gender-based format of dates. Participants that have attempted hanging out, on the other hand, may be harder to please when it comes to romantic or sexual encounters. Thus, they may be more often engaging in less orthodox ways of getting together with partners as well as reporting less general satisfaction. Because we did not manipulate the type of recent encounter people engaged in or reported on, we cannot rule out this alternative explanation.

Limitations and Future Directions

One limitation of the studies presented in this paper is that participants reported only on one initial romantic encounter, their most recent one, rather than giving estimates of their total number of experiences with dates, hangouts, hookups,

and one-night stands. Thus, we do not know if the participants who reported recently going on a date have different recent or lifetime dating patterns than those who reported other kinds of encounters. Also because of this method, our estimation of the prevalence of initial romantic encounters across the whole student population may be biased towards capturing the prevalence of encounters within a particular semester, school year, or class year, rather than capturing the relative frequency of encounter types for participants across their whole careers as undergraduate students. However, in both Study 1 and 2, there was a wide range and standard deviation for how long ago participants' most recent initial romantic encounters were, and in Study 1 participants were relatively evenly distributed across undergraduate class years. Future research estimating the prevalence of initial romantic encounters in a population based on recent encounters, however, should also assess within-subject estimates of individuals' experiences with these encounters to provide additional clarity.

A second limitation of these studies is the potentially biased wording of the study prompts, which asked participants to provide descriptions of "initial romantic relationship encounters (e.g., hookups, dates, hanging out, one-night stands, etc.)." Our intention in using this wording was to create a prompt that would invite descriptions of all kinds of encounters with romantic or sexual intentions or overtones, while excluding purely friendship-based encounters. However, by specifying that the encounters must be "romantic," participants may have been biased towards encounters that they subjectively deemed were "romantic," excluding unromantic or purely sexual encounters. Indeed, the fact that so few hookups and one-night stands were reported found is consistent with this interpretation because these activities are defined as involving spontaneous sex and little direct communication between partners (e.g., Holman and Sillars 2011).

In addition, the prompt specified that participants should describe events which occur when "going out with someone." By using the term "going out," participants may have unintentionally biased against reporting hookups and one-night stands that may more often occur in a person's dorm or home. However, the prompt explicitly mentioned that all four encounter types were suitable for reporting, with the intent of soliciting all four encounter types with the same vigor. Future research might compare responses to script prompts including the word "romantic" or the phrase "going out" against those excluding the word "romantic" or "going out," or using the word "romantic" in one prompt and the word "sexual" in another prompt to see if different types of scripts are elicited.

Third, our hypotheses about the frequency, content, structure, and satisfaction associated with the various scripts we assessed were grounded in knowledge of Hispanic cultural norms for appropriate behavior for men and women.

However, our studies did not test whether, in fact, Hispanic cultural norms were the reason dates predominated in our sample, or the reason that participants were more satisfied with dates than with hangouts. To address these issues, future research might create written accounts of dates and hangouts in which gender role traditionality is manipulated and assess Hispanic college students' perceptions of how satisfied the partners should be. It would also be fruitful to assess the extent to which individual students endorse gender role norms and determine the extent to which that predicts their engagement in and satisfaction with various encounter types.

Lastly, future research should examine the initial romantic scripts of young adults from additional ethnic and cultural backgrounds, such as Black or Asian students, or Hispanic students located in a different part of the U.S. Each of these populations may have its own norms and rules for getting together romantically, and each is likely to express these norms and rules in unique as well as common ways. Moreover, the perceptions, norms, traditions, and behavioral expressions of Hispanic people differ based on their country of origin, immigrant status, level of acculturation (e.g., Cabassa 2003). Some research has shown, for example, that U.S. born Cuban-American women college students are more likely to be sexually active and to engage in risky sexual behavior than Cuban-American women students not born in the U.S. (Raffaelli et al. 2005). Understanding shifts in interpersonal relationships among young men and women over time must include attention to the changes in the cultural and social diversity in the U.S. and the interpersonal legacies that diverse groups bring to the table.

References

- Abelson, R. P. (1981). Psychological status of the script concept. *American Psychologist*, *36*, 715–729. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.36.7.715.
- Ahrold, T. K., & Meston, C. M. (2010). Ethnic differences in sexual attitudes of U.S. college students: Gender, acculturation, and religiosity factors. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *39*, 190–202. doi:10.1007/s10508-008-9406-1.
- Bailey, B. L. (1988). *From front porch to back seat: Courtship in twentieth-century America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Belsey, C. (1994). *Desire: Love stories in western culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Billy, J. O. G., Transfer, K., Grady, W. R., & Keplinger, D. H. (2008). The sexual behavior of men in the United States. *Family Planning Perspectives*, *25*, 52–60. doi:10.2307/2136206.
- Bogle, K. A. (2008). *Hooking up: Sex, dating, and relationships on campus*. New York: New York University Press.
- Bower, G. H., Black, J. B., & Turner, T. J. (1979). Scripts in memory for text. *Cognitive Psychology*, *11*, 177–220. doi:10.1016/0010-0285(79)90009-4.
- Bradshaw, C., Kahn, A. S., & Saville, B. K. (2010). To hook up or date: Which gender benefits? *Sex Roles*, *62*, 661–669. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9765-7.

- Cabassa, L. (2003). Measuring acculturation: Where we are and where we need to go. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 127–146. doi:10.1177/0739986303025002001.
- Campbell, A. (2008). The morning after the night before: Affective reactions to one-night stands among mated and unmated women and men. *Human Nature*, 19, 157–173. doi:10.1007/s12110-008-9036-2.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2000). Data Center Results – Miami, Florida. Modern Language Association. Retrieved from http://www.mla.org/map_data_results&state_id=12&county_id=&mode=&zip=&place_id=45000&city_id=&ll=&a=&ea=&order=r.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2012). State & County QuickFacts: Miami, Florida. Retrieved from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/12/12086.html>.
- Crawford, M., & Popp, D. (2003). Sexual double standards: A review and methodological critique of two decades of research. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 40, 13–26. doi:10.1080/00224490309552163.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1998). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The causes, consequences, and challenges of aversive racism. In J. Eberhardt & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 3–32). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Eaton, A. A., & Rose, S. (2011). Has dating become more egalitarian? A 35 year review using *Sex Roles*. *Sex Roles*, 64, 843–862. doi:10.1007/s11199-011-9957-9.
- Espin, O. M. (1986). Cultural and historical influences on sexuality in Hispanic/Latin women. In J. B. Cole (Ed.), *All American women: Lines that divide, ties that bind* (pp. 272–284). New York: The Free Press.
- Fielder, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2010). Predictors and consequences of sexual “hookups” among college students: A short-term prospective study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39, 1105–1119. doi:10.1007/s10508-008-9448-4.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fry, R. (2011). *Hispanic college enrollment spikes, narrowing gaps with other groups*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Garcia, J. R., Reiber, C., Massey, S. G., & Merriwether, A. M. (2012). Sexual hookup culture: A review. *Review of General Psychology*, 16, 161–176. doi:10.1037/a0027911.
- Glenn, N., & Marquardt, E. (2001). *Hooking up, hanging out, and hoping for Mr. Right: College women on dating and mating today*. New York: Institute for American Values.
- Gowan, M., & Treviño, M. (1998). An examination of gender differences in Mexican-American attitudes toward family and career roles. *Sex Roles*, 38, 1079–1093.
- Grello, C. M., Welsh, D. P., & Harper, M. S. (2006). No strings attached: The nature of casual sex in college students. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 43, 255–267. doi:10.1080/00224490609552324.
- Grimstead, O. A., Faigles, B., Binson, D., & Eversley, R. (1993). Sexual risk for human immunodeficiency virus infection among women in high-risk cities. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 25, 252–277. doi:10.2307/2136141.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). Social categorization, depersonalization, and group behavior. In M. A. Hogg & R. S. Tindale (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Group processes* (pp. 56–85). Oxford: Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9780470998458.ch3.
- Holman, A., & Sillars, A. (2011). Talk about “Hooking Up”: The influence of college student social networks on nonrelationship sex. *Health Communication*, 27, 205–216. doi:10.1080/10410236.2011.575540.
- Impett, E. A., & Peplau, L. A. (2003). Sexual compliance: Gender, motivational, and relationship perspectives. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40, 87–100. doi:10.1080/00224490309552169.
- Knudson-Martin, C., & Mahoney, A. R. (2009). *Couples, gender, and power: Creating change in intimate relationships*. New York: Springer.
- Kreeft, P. (2001). *Catholic Christianity: A complete catechism of Catholic Church beliefs based on the Catechism of the Catholic Church*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press.
- Lambert, T. A., Kahn, A. S., & Apple, K. J. (2003). Pluralistic ignorance and hooking up. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40, 129–133. doi:10.1080/00224490309552174.
- Laner, M. R., & Ventrone, N. A. (1998). Egalitarian daters/traditionalist dates. *Journal of Family Issues*, 19, 468–477. doi:10.1177/019251398019004005.
- Laner, M. R., & Ventrone, N. A. (2000). Dating scripts revisited. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21, 488–500. doi:10.1177/019251300021004004.
- Lenton, A. P., & Bryan, A. (2005). An affair to remember: The role of sexual scripts in perceptions of sexual intent. *Personal Relationships*, 12, 483–498. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2005.00127.x.
- Liskin, L. (1985, November–December). Youth in the 1980s: Social and health concerns. *Population Reports*, XIII(5), M350–M388.
- Macrae, C. N., Milne, A. B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (1994). Stereotypes as energy-saving devices: A peek inside the cognitive toolbox. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 37–47. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.66.1.37.
- Mauss, I. B., Butler, E. A., Roberts, N. A., & Chu, A. (2010). Emotion control values and responding to an anger provocation in Asian-American and European-American individuals. *Cognition and Emotion*, 24, 1026–1043. doi:10.1080/02699930903122273.
- Mayo, Y. Q., & Resnick, R. P. (1996). The impact of machismo on Hispanic women. *Journal of Women & Social Work*, 11, 257–277.
- Morr Serewicz, M. C., & Gale, E. (2008). First-date scripts: Gender roles, context, and relationship. *Sex Roles*, 58, 149–164. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9283-4.
- Paul, E. L., & Hayes, K. A. (2002). The causalities of “casual” sex: A qualitative exploration of the phenomenology of college students’ hookups. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 19, 639–661.
- Paul, E. L., McManus, B., & Hayes, A. (2000). “Hookups”: Characteristics and correlates of college students’ spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *Journal of Sex Research*, 37, 76–88. doi:10.1080/00224490009552023.
- Pew Hispanic Center (2011). *2011 National survey of Latinos*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/04/04/v-politics-values-and-religion>.
- Pew Hispanic Center. (2009). *Between two worlds: How young Latinos come of age in America*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/117.pdf>.
- Raffaelli, M. (2005). Adolescent dating experiences described by Latino college students. *Journal of Adolescence*, 28, 559–572. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2005.04.001.
- Raffaelli, M., & Ontai, L. L. (2004). Gender socialization in Latino/a families: Results from two retrospective studies. *Sex Roles*, 50, 287–299. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000018886.58945.06.
- Raffaelli, M., & Suarez-al-Adam, M. (1998). Reconsidering the HIV prevention needs of Latino women in the United States. In N. L. Roth & L. K. Fullers (Eds.), *Women and AIDS: Negotiating safer practices, care, and representation* (pp. 7–41). New York: Haworth.
- Raffaelli, M., Zamboanga, B. L., & Carlo, G. (2005). Acculturation status and sexuality among female Cuban American college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 54, 7–13. doi:10.3200/JACH.54.1.7-13.
- Regan, P. C., Durvasula, R., Howell, L., Ureno, O., & Rea, M. (2004). Gender, ethnicity, and the developmental timing of first sexual and romantic experiences. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 32, 667–676. doi:10.2224/sbp.2004.32.7.667.

- Reid, J. A., Elliott, S., & Webber, G. R. (2011). Casual hookups to formal dates: Refining the boundaries of the sexual double standard. *Gender & Society, 25*, 545–568. doi:10.1177/0891243211418642.
- Rose, S., & Frieze, I. H. (1989). Young singles' scripts for a first date. *Gender & Society, 3*, 258–268. doi:10.1177/089124389003002006.
- Rose, S., & Frieze, I. H. (1993). Young singles' contemporary dating scripts. *Sex Roles, 28*, 499–509. doi:10.1007/BF00289677.
- Sprecher, S., & McKinney, K. (1993). *Sexuality*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science, 185*, 1124–1131. doi:10.1126/science.185.4157.1124.
- Upchurch, D. M., Levy-Storms, L., Sucoff, C. A., & Aneshensel, C. S. (1998). Gender and ethnic differences in the timing of first sexual intercourse. *Family Planning Perspectives, 30*, 121–127. doi:10.2307/2991625.
- Upchurch, D. M., Aneshensel, C. S., Sucoff, C. A., & Levy-Storms, L. (1999). Neighborhood and family contexts of adolescent sexual activity. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61*, 920–933. doi:10.2307/354013.
- Verb. (2012). In *Merriam Webster*. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/verb>.
- Wright, C. L. (2011). Intimate relationship behaviors of Cuban male college students. *Journal of Men, Masculinities and Spirituality, 5*, 97–113.
- Wright, M. O., Norton, D. L., & Matusek, J. A. (2010). Predicting verbal coercion following sexual refusal during a hookup: Diverging gender patterns. *Sex Roles, 62*, 647–660. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9763-9.
- Zavella, P., & Xóchitl, C. (2005). Sexuality and risks: Gendered discourses about virginity and disease among young women of Mexican origin. *Latino Studies, 3*, 226–245. doi:10.1057/palgrave.lst.8600139.