

NEGOTIATING DESIRE: GENDER, INTERCOURSE, AND DEPRESSION IN ADOLESCENT ROMANTIC COUPLES

Lori A. Burrington, Pennsylvania State University*

Derek A. Kreager, Pennsylvania State University*

Dana L. Haynie, Ohio State University

***The authors contributed equally to this paper.**

Introduction

Along with links to teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections, the association between early sexual initiation and depression helps to define adolescent intercourse as age-inappropriate behavior and support abstinence-only educational policies (Spriggs and Halpern 2008). Moreover, research findings that the sex-depression correlation applies primarily to girls (Meier 2007), and that girls are generally more likely than boys to demonstrate internalizing problems in adolescence (Nolen-Hoeksema 1987, Hankin et al. 1998) provide further empirical support for longstanding policies targeting girls as the primary population for sexual education and public health interventions (Fine 1988, Fine and McClelland 2006). Yet the mechanisms underlying this association remain unclear, and failing to understand why female adolescent sexual intercourse is associated with increased depression frustrates meaningful policy production, and at worst, may foster interventions that increase negative mental health outcomes.

Research focused on the cultural contexts of gender and sexual development provide a useful avenue for understanding the links between gender, sex, and depression. A recent five-nation study by Madkour and colleagues (Madkour, Farhat, Halpern, Godeau, and Gabhain 2010) found that the negative physical and psychological symptoms associated with adolescent girls' sexual initiation applied only in the United States and Poland, but not in Scotland, Finland, or France. This and similar research suggests that the cultural contexts of sexual development matter for the sex-depression association. In the current paper, we explore the gendered nature of adolescent sexual intercourse and depression by focusing on

socialized differences in boys' and girls' desires for sex and their subsequent risks for intercourse and depressive symptoms. Building on feminist and romantic relationship scholarship, we argue that the general suppression or negation of girls' sexual desires in the United States, coupled with expected or encouraged boys' heterosexual desires, create relational asymmetries (Giordano Manning, and Longmore 2006a, 2006b; Giordano 2003) that strain adolescent romantic relationships and promote situations of sexual objectivity, compliance, or coercion. In heterosexual couples where partners have asymmetrical sexual desires, intercourse is more likely to be psychologically deleterious for the girl than the boy, as sex would be inconsistent with most girls' own sexual desires and societal expectations (Abma, Driscoll, and Moore 1998). We thus argue that the discrepancy between girls' previously-formed sexual desires and their realized sexual intercourse provides a mechanism to explain how sexual activity increases levels of female adolescent depression.

Numerous studies find that females report lower levels of sexual desire than males (Diamond and Savin-Williams 2009; Baumeister, Catanese, and Vohs 2001). These differences are thought to have both biological and social roots (Tolman and Diamond 2001; Udry, Talbert, and Morris 1986). Among social explanations, Tolman's (2002) qualitative research provides a compelling explanation for the dilemma that girls face with regard to their sexual desire: social strictures placed on female sexuality may lead girls to suppress (or fail to recognize) their feelings of desire, while at the same time encourage entrance into heterosexual romantic relationships with boys who likely lack similar sexual inhibitions. Tolman (2002) further argues that communication and recognition of girls' sexual desires increases their agency and reduces instances of sexual coercion, guilt, or subsequent sexual maladjustment. Fine and colleagues (Fine 1988; Fine and McClelland 2006) make a similar argument in their call for the revision of sexual education curricula to eliminate material that suggests that girls' desire is less acceptable than boys', and that girls should serve as gatekeepers to prevent sexual activity in heterosexual relationships.

While girls' desires are an important part of the equation, the relational approach advanced by Giordano and colleagues (2006a, 2006b) allows for the examination of both partners' desires and the association between those desires and couple-level sexual activity, as well as both partners' consequent

mental health outcomes. Within the context of an adolescent relationship, asymmetry in the desire for sexual activity means that one party to the relationship will either engage in behavior s/he did not desire unless the other party agrees to defer participation in the behavior, or will be blocked from engaging in behavior s/he desires unless the other party agrees to engage in that behavior. The resolution of asymmetries thus sheds light on the nature of the adolescent relationship, the motivations underlying the decision to engage in (or refrain from) sexual activity, and, potentially, variation in the mental health effects of engaging in sexual activity.

In this study, we examine the relationships between and among adolescent desire, adolescent desire asymmetries, adolescent sexual behavior, and depression. Situated within theories of social exchange and rational choice, as well as perspectives on gender socialization, our study advances existing research in several important ways. First, we use unique data from Waves I and II of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) consisting of a subset of matched heterosexual adolescent romantic couples. These data are linked to individual adolescents' responses to the Add Health Survey, permitting a couple-level analysis that also controls for individual demographic characteristics and known correlates of adolescent sexual activity and depression at the individual and family levels. Second, we employ a measure of adolescents' self-reported desires for sexual activity to assess concordance with partners' desires and behavioral outcomes, and are thus able to evaluate the process by which asymmetric sexual desires are adjudicated. Finally, our analyses shed light on potential reasons for variation in the mental health consequences that follow from adolescent sexual activity—if an adolescent's sexual experiences depart from his/her stated desires, the effects on mental health may be quite different than for an adolescent whose desires for sex are fulfilled. As a result, our study helps to elucidate the reasons underlying recent research findings indicating wide variation in the effects of sexual activity on adolescent well-being.

Research Hypotheses

Our hypotheses are as follows:

1. Girls have lower desire for sex than boys, on average.

2. Girls' desire for sex is more socially conditioned than boys' desire for sex, the latter primarily being a function of biological maturity.
3. Boys' desire for sex more strongly predicts couple-level sex than girls' desire for sex.
4. Girls who did not desire sex, but had sex in the relationship, will have greater increases in depression than girls whose desires match their future sexual experiences.

Data

We test our hypotheses with data from Waves I and II of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health). Add Health is a school-based longitudinal survey of US adolescents enrolled in grades 7 through 12 in the 1994-1995 school year. The nationally representative sample of respondents was drawn from 80 high schools stratified by region, urbanicity, size, type, and ethnic composition. For schools not containing grades 7 through 12, a feeder middle school was also sampled, bringing the total number of schools to 132.

All students listed on the school enrollment roster were eligible for the first in-home survey. Approximately 200 students, stratified by grade and gender, were sampled from each of the 80 school pairs and comprise the nationally representative sample (N~12,000). Between December and April of 1995, students were interviewed in their homes for 1-2 hours. Less sensitive questions were asked aloud by interviewers, with answers recorded on laptop computers. More sensitive questions, including the romantic and sexual items, were pre-recorded so that respondents listened via headphones and responded directly on the computer.

The second in-home survey was administered about one year after the first in-home survey, between April and August of 1996. The format and items included in the Wave II survey replicated or added to the Wave I survey. Except for graduating seniors and respondents in the Wave I disabled sample, all students who completed the first in-home interview were eligible for a second in-home questionnaire, totaling 14,738 respondents.

Romantic Pair Data

In the Wave II questionnaire, students identified and provided relationship-specific information for up to three “special romantic relationships” occurring in the 18 months prior to the survey. Romantic partners who attended the same school or sister feeder school were identified from school rosters, allowing us to match respondents’ characteristics with the characteristics of their partner(s). Of the 14,738 Wave II respondents, 4,261 students nominated 4,490 romantic partners identifiable on school rosters, resulting in 2,245 within-school romantic dyads. Of these, 713 couples had partners who completed both the in-school and Wave II surveys and were part of the nationally representative sample. Four of these couples were homosexual and excluded from the analyses. Of the 709 remaining heterosexual couples, 138 (20%) were duplicates because the partner reciprocated the respondent’s romantic nomination. Removing one of the duplicate dyads resulted in 571 unique pairs.

Some dyads (N=112) included a respondent’s second or third romantic nomination or included a partner nominated by multiple respondents. To remove unobserved between-couple correlations, we selected only one couple per student. Where possible, reciprocated couples were retained in the sample (there were five instances where respondents were in more than one reciprocated couple). For unreciprocated dyads, the first (i.e., most recent) reported relationship was retained. In cases where a partner was nominated by more than one respondent and the relationship orders were identical, one of the couples was retained at random. As we are interested in relationships that began between Waves I and II, we restrict our analyses to couples where at least one partner reported the start date of the relationship and this date followed the Wave I survey date. The final sample consisted of 419 couples and 838 respondents. Due to missing data, analyses of individual-level Wave II depression consisted of 385 girls and 358 boys.

Measures

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for our dependent and independent variables, by gender. Our primary dependent variables are dichotomous measures of self-reported sexual desire at Wave I, couple-level intercourse at Wave II, and self-reported depression at Wave II. Desire is measured from a single item, referenced to the respondent’s “ideal romantic relationship in the next year,” and captures whether

the respondent would desire to have sex in that hypothetical ideal romantic relationship. Sexual intercourse is measured at the couple level and coded as 1 if either of the partners kept the card labeled “you had sexual intercourse” when provided cards that described their relationship. Sexual intercourse is coded 0 if both partners rejected the card. Finally, depression is measured from an abridged Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) of 16 items (see Meier 2007). Individual items were recorded on a 0 to 3 ordinal scale and summed to produce an index ranging from 0 to 57. To model change in depression, an identical index was constructed at Wave I.

We include a variety of demographic, sexual experience, and sexual attitude measures as predictors of desire and to reduce spuriousness in models of sexual intercourse and depression. Descriptive statistics, by gender, for these variables are listed in Table 1. The full paper will include descriptions and justifications for these variables.

Analytic Strategy

Our analyses begin with descriptive statistics on gender differences in self-reported desire at Wave I, and the concordance of desire among the couples in our sample. We then examine predictors of Wave I desire, in analyses disaggregated by gender. Next, we consider determinants of Wave II couple-level sex, by gender and self-reported desire. Finally, we consider determinants of Wave II individual-level depression, by gender as well an interaction of desire and an indicator of sexual activity at the couple-level.

Results

Figure 1 presents a cross-tabulation of self-reported sexual desire by gender. As can be seen, boys in romantic couples are over twice as likely as girls to desire sex in a future ideal romantic relationship (63% vs. 31%). This provides evidence in support of hypothesis 1, in that girls, on average, have lower desire for sex than boys.

Table 2 provides logistic regression results for predictions of sexual desire, split by gender. We see mixed evidence for hypothesis 2: that girls’ desire is more socially conditioned than boys’ desire. The strongest predictor for boys is age, which is a good proxy for biological maturity. The youngest aged boys

(12-14 years old) have significantly lower desire than older boys (>14 years old). Girls show no similar age effect, suggesting that experiential or social forces shape female sexual desire more than biological maturity. For girls, the strongest predictor of desire is sexual experience (i.e., virgin status). Girls who are non-virgins have significantly higher desire than virgins. We suspect this is because girls who recognize their body's responses to desire are more likely to have intercourse, and that experience also increases their desire for future sex. Interestingly, parents' sexual attitudes have similar estimates for boys and girls, and fears of pregnancy and marital expectations have larger inhibitory effects for boys than girls. These estimates will be explored further in future analyses.

Tables 3a and 3b present multiple logistic regression models of sexual intercourse, split by gender. The models step in respondent's and partner's sexual desire, and the final model looks at the interaction of partners' desires, with neither partner desiring sex as the reference category. Overall, a look at the R-square values shows that the background variables explain more of the girls' intercourse than the boys'. However, being on birth control, which applies only to girls, is a strong positive correlate of sexual intercourse and is absent from the boys' analyses. Other than religiosity, which is inhibitory only for girls, the correlates of sex are fairly similar across boys and girls. This also applies to the estimates of respondent and partner sexual desire. Regardless of your gender or own desire, having a partner who desires sex significantly increases the likelihood of sex. As can be seen in Model 4, having both partners desire sex significantly increases the likelihood of sex compared to neither partner desiring sex (reference). It also appears that the boy desiring sex and the girl not desiring sex is a larger coefficient for girls ($b=1.06$) than boys ($b=.35$). However, this difference is not statistically significant ($z=1.52$). In sum, partner's sexual desire appears to increase the likelihood of intercourse in the couple, and this effect does not vary by respondents' gender (counter to hypothesis 3).

Tables 4a and 4b present results from logistic regression models of Wave II depression, by gender. The models control for prior depression, so they approximate change in depression over time. For both boys and girls in romantic relationships, we see that neither sex nor desire have independent effects on depression, net of prior depression. However, for girls, we find that the interaction between her

desiring sex and having sex in the couple is significant and negatively related to future depression (Model 3). This suggests that the association between sex and depression varies by the girls' sexual desire. In other words, girls who have sex, but did not desire sex, have greater depression than girls whose desires met their actual sexual behavior. A similar pattern was not found for boys, suggesting that desire and sex have neither additive or multiplicative associations with depression.

Summary

In this manuscript, we introduced and tested a mechanism for the gendered link between intercourse and depression. We argued that gender differences in the meaning and socialization toward sexual desire and romance result in relationally asymmetrical romantic relationships where girls are uncomfortable with intercourse and boys are motivated to secure sex. In this context, girls who do not desire sex but who comply or are coerced are more likely to feel guilt, shame, and depression as a result. Our results primarily bear out this pattern, in that girls are less likely to experience sexual desire and more likely to experience increased depression should they have sex when they did not initially prefer it. We thus find evidence that gender differences in depression are related to gender differences in sexual desire. Counter to our hypothesis, we did not find that partner's desire increased intercourse for girls more than boys. Partner's desire appeared to have independent and additive effects regardless of gender. This, along with large mean differences in desire, suggest that the reason that boys' desires are thought to have greater impacts on couple-level sex is that boys are more likely to enter the relationship with greater sexual desire, and not that boys' desires have greater effects than girls' desires on the likelihood of sexual intercourse. The implications of these findings for feminist theories and adolescent health will be discussed.

References

- Abma, Joyce, Anne Driscoll, and Kristin Moore. 1998. "Young Women's Degree of Control Over First Intercourse: An Exploratory Analysis." *Family Planning Perspectives* 30(1): 12-18.
- Baumeister, Roy F., Kathleen Catanese, and Kathleen D. Vohs. 2001. "Is There a Gender Difference in Strength of Sex Drive? Theoretical Views, Conceptual Distinctions, and a Review of Relevant Evidence." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 5 (3): 242-273.
- Diamond, Lisa M. and Ritch C. Savin-Williams. 2009. "Adolescent Sexuality." Pp. 479-523 in *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology, Volume 1: Individual Bases of Adolescent Development* (Third Edition), edited by Richard M. Lerner and Laurence Steinberg. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Fine, Michelle. 1988. "Sexuality, Schooling, and Adolescent Females: The Missing Discourse of Desire." *Harvard Educational Review* 58: 29-53.
- Fine, Michelle, and Sara I. McClelland. 2006a. "Sexuality Education and Desire: Still Missing After All These Years." *Harvard Educational Review* 76: 297-338.
- Giordano, Peggy C. 2003. "Relationships in Adolescence." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 257-281.
- Giordano, Peggy C., Wendy D. Manning, and Monica A. Longmore. 2006a. "Gender and the Meanings of Adolescent Romantic Relationships: A Focus on Boys." *American Sociological Review* 71: 260-287.
- Giordano, Peggy C., Wendy D. Manning, and Monica A. Longmore. 2006b. "Adolescent Romantic Relationships: An Emerging Portrait of Their Nature and Developmental Significance." Pp. 127-150 in *Romance and Sex in Adolescence and Emerging Adulthood*, edited by Ann C. Crouter and Alan Booth. New York, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hankin, Benjamin L., Lyn Y. Abramson, Terrie E. Moffitt, Phil A. Silva, and Rob McGee. 1998. "Development of Depression from Preadolescence to Young Adulthood: Emerging Gender Differences in a 10-Year Longitudinal Study." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 107 (1): 128-40.
- Madkour, Aubrey S., Tilda Farhat, Carolyn T. Halpern, Saoirse N. Gabhainn, Emanuelle Godeau. 2010. "Early Adolescent Sexual Initiation and Physical/Psychological Symptoms: A Comparative Analysis of Five Nations." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 39(10):1211-1225.
- Meier, Anne. 2007. "Adolescent First Sex and Subsequent Mental Health." *American Journal of Sociology* 112(6):1811-47.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, Susan. 1987. "Sex Differences in Unipolar Depression: Evidence and Theory." *Psychology Bulletin* 101: 259-82.
- Spriggs, Aubrey L. and Carolyn Tucker Halpern. 2008. "Sexual Debut Timing and Depressive Symptoms in Early Adulthood." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 37:1085-1096.
- Tolman, Deborah L. 2002. *Dilemmas of Desire: Teenage Girls Talk About Sexuality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Tolman, Deborah L. and Lisa M. Diamond. 2001. "Desegregating Sexuality Research: Combining Cultural and Biological Perspectives on Gender and Desire." *Annual Review of Sex Research* 12: 33-74.
- Udry, J. Richard, Luther M. Talbert, and Naomi M. Morris. 1986. "Biosocial Foundations for Adolescent Female Sexuality." *Demography* 23: 217-230.

Table 1. Descriptions and Descriptive Statistics for Romantic Couples

Variable	Girls			Boys	
	Mean(%)	SD	t-test	Mean(%)	SD
<i>Dependent Variables</i>					
Desire for Sex (Wave 1, N=419)	.31		***	.63	
Couple Had Sex (Wave 2, N=419)	.38			.38	
Depression (Wave 2, N=385 girls, 358 boys)	11.88	8.41	**	10.32	6.76
<i>Independent Variables (Wave 1)</i>					
Black	.17		*	.20	
Hispanic	.12			.11	
Other Race/Ethnicity	.10		*	.07	
Age 12-14	.34		***	.20	
Age 17-19	.20		***	.37	
Intact Family	.67			.67	
Family Education	3.13	1.20		3.05	1.24
Parent Attachment	4.59	.55	**	4.68	.48
Rated Attractiveness	3.84	.86	***	3.57	.84
Physical Development	.03	.72	*	.13	.66
Virgin	.70		***	.51	
BMI	21.05	3.38	***	22.39	3.55
Vocabulary Test Score	102.90	13.42		103.84	12.53
Grades	2.96	.74	***	2.70	.76
Religiosity	3.03	1.01		2.97	1.11
Parents' Sex Attitudes	4.12	.85	***	3.46	.97
Pregnancy Fears	2.33	1.79	***	2.70	1.56
Marital Expectations	3.32	1.05		3.21	1.12
Virginity Pledge	.17		**	.10	
Prior Depression	11.95	8.16	**	10.39	6.99
Sexual Victimization ^a	.05				
Birth Control Pill ^a	.05				

^a Asked only of girls

Table 2. Logistic Regressions of Desire for Sex, by Gender

Variable	Girls (N=419)		Boys (N=419)	
	Coef.	(SE)	Coef.	(SE)
Black	.58	(.40)	-.01	(.39)
Hispanic	.81 *	(.41)	-.26	(.44)
Other Race/Ethnicity	.62	(.45)	-.40	(.97)
Age 12-14	-.20	(.74)	-2.80 ***	(.79)
Age 17-19	.31	(.34)	-.15	(.29)
Intact Family	.13	(.30)	-.17	(.30)
Family Education	.05	(.13)	.00	(.12)
Parent Attachment	-.22	(.24)	-.11	(.30)
Rated Attractiveness	-.13	(.15)	.00	(.15)
Physical Development	.01	(.19)	.24	(.21)
Virgin	-1.98 ***	(.32)	-.98 ***	(.27)
BMI	-.10 *	(.05)	.10 *	(.04)
Vocabulary Test Score	.02	(.01)	.00	(.01)
Grades	-.41 *	(.20)	-.22	(.19)
Religiosity	.03	(.13)	-.11	(.13)
Parents' Sex Attitudes	-.43 *	(.18)	-.44 **	(.16)
Pregnancy Fears	-.05	(.19)	-.59 **	(.20)
Marital Expectations	.03	(.12)	-.29 *	(.13)
Virginity Pledge	-.80	(.42)	-.67	(.43)
Depression	.01	(.02)	.05 *	(.02)
Sexual Victimization	-.01	(.54)		
Birth Control Pill	.23	(.59)		
Constant	4.43 *	(2.23)	4.89 *	(2.33)
Pseudo-R ²	.24		.27	

Table 3a. Logistic Regressions of Female Sexual Intercourse in Romantic Couple (N=419)

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Coef.	(SE)	Coef.	(SE)	Coef.	(SE)	Coef.	(SE)
Black	.61	(.36)	.57	(.37)	.56	(.37)	.57	(.37)
Hispanic	-.34	(.40)	-.46	(.41)	-.47	(.42)	-.49	(.42)
Other Race/Ethnicity	.14	(.44)	.08	(.45)	.10	(.46)	.10	(.46)
Age 12-14	-.27	(.71)	-.28	(.72)	-.28	(.74)	-.30	(.74)
Age 17-19	.35	(.32)	.31	(.33)	.31	(.34)	.31	(.34)
Intact Family	-.35	(.28)	-.37	(.28)	-.27	(.29)	-.27	(.29)
Family Education	-.05	(.12)	-.05	(.12)	-.07	(.13)	-.07	(.13)
Parent Attachment	.10	(.24)	.15	(.24)	.26	(.25)	.27	(.25)
Rated Attractiveness	-.03	(.14)	-.02	(.14)	-.07	(.15)	-.08	(.15)
Physical Development	.48 **	(.18)	.49 **	(.18)	.46 *	(.19)	.46 *	(.19)
Virgin	-.89 **	(.30)	-.67 *	(.31)	-.48 *	(.33)	-.47	(.33)
BMI	-.03	(.04)	-.02	(.04)	-.02	(.04)	-.02	(.04)
Vocabulary Test Score	.00	(.01)	-.01	(.01)	-.01	(.01)	-.01	(.01)
Grades	-.27	(.19)	-.23	(.19)	-.17	(.19)	-.17	(.19)
Religiosity	-.25 *	(.13)	-.26 *	(.13)	-.31 *	(.13)	-.31 *	(.13)
Parents' Sex Attitudes	-.28	(.17)	-.23	(.17)	-.24	(.18)	-.24	(.18)
Pregnancy Fears	-.04	(.18)	-.04	(.19)	-.04	(.19)	-.04	(.19)
Marital Expectations	-.11	(.12)	-.11	(.12)	-.12	(.12)	-.12	(.12)
Virginity Pledge	-1.27 **	(.41)	-1.21 **	(.41)	-1.25 **	(.42)	-1.23 **	(.42)
Depression	.02	(.02)	.02	(.02)	.03	(.02)	.03	(.02)
Sexual Victimization	-.12	(.56)	-.12	(.56)	.00	(.57)	.00	(.58)
Birth Control Pill	1.51 *	(.74)	1.49 *	(.75)	1.52 *	(.77)	1.50	(.77)
Desire for Sex			.60 *	(.28)	.49	(.29)		
Boy Desire for Sex					1.18 ***	(.28)		
Both Desire							1.67 ***	(.39)
Girl Desire/Boy Not							.16	(.56)
Girl Not/Boy Desire							1.06 **	(.32)
Constant	4.09	(2.11)	3.26	(2.16)	2.11	(2.24)	2.15	(2.24)
Pseudo-R ²	.22		.22		.26		.26	

Table 3b. Logistic Regressions of Male Sexual Intercourse in Romantic Couple (N=419)

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Coef.	(SE)	Coef.	(SE)	Coef.	(SE)	Coef.	(SE)
Black	.34	(.35)	.33	(.35)	.35	(.35)	.39	(.36)
Hispanic	.08	(.37)	.12	(.37)	-.03	(.39)	-.04	(.39)
Other Race/Ethnicity	.36	(.90)	.44	(.90)	.31	(.95)	.26	(.95)
Age 12-14	-1.62 *	(.65)	-1.40 *	(.66)	-1.37 *	(.68)	-1.35 *	(.68)
Age 17-19	.43	(.25)	.45	(.25)	.45	(.26)	.44	(.26)
Intact Family	-.20	(.26)	-.18	(.26)	-.17	(.27)	-.16	(.27)
Family Education	-.03	(.11)	-.04	(.11)	-.06	(.11)	-.07	(.11)
Parent Attachment	.17	(.26)	.19	(.26)	.17	(.27)	.18	(.27)
Rated Attractiveness	-.10	(.14)	-.11	(.14)	-.12	(.15)	-.12	(.15)
Physical Development	.41 *	(.20)	.37	(.20)	.34	(.20)	.35	(.20)
Virgin	-.51 *	(.25)	-.41	(.26)	-.34	(.26)	-.33	(.26)
BMI	.01	(.03)	.01	(.03)	.00	(.04)	.00	(.04)
Vocabulary Test Score	-.02	(.01)	-.02	(.01)	-.02	(.01)	-.02	(.01)
Grades	-.21	(.17)	-.19	(.17)	-.08	(.18)	-.07	(.18)
Religiosity	-.19	(.11)	-.18	(.11)	-.15	(.12)	-.15	(.12)
Parents' Sex Attitudes	-.20	(.15)	-.15	(.15)	-.15	(.15)	-.15	(.15)
Pregnancy Fears	-.23	(.16)	-.19	(.16)	-.20	(.16)	-.19	(.17)
Marital Expectations	-.09	(.11)	-.06	(.11)	-.06	(.11)	-.07	(.11)
Virginity Pledge	-1.38 *	(.57)	-1.31 *	(.58)	-1.30 *	(.59)	-1.29 *	(.59)
Depression	.00	(.02)	.00	(.02)	-.01	(.02)	-.01	(.02)
Desire for Sex			.59 *	(.29)	.53	(.29)		
Girl Desire for Sex					.94 ***	(.26)		
Both Desire							1.44 ***	(.38)
Boy Desire/Girl Not							.35	(.34)
Boy Not/Girl Desire							.47	(.53)
Constant	3.65	(2.05)	2.82	(2.09)	2.63	(2.14)	2.92	(2.28)
Pseudo-R ²	.17		.18		.21		.21	

Table 4a. Negative Binomial Regressions of Wave 2 Female Depression (N=385)

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coef.	(SE)	Coef.	(SE)	Coef.	(SE)
Black	.18	(.11)	.13	(.10)	.10	(.10)
Hispanic	.24 *	(.11)	.09	(.10)	.08	(.10)
Other Race/Ethnicity	.25 *	(.13)	.11	(.11)	.11	(.11)
Age 12-14	-.06	(.21)	-.04	(.18)	-.06	(.18)
Age 17-19	.06	(.10)	.03	(.09)	.05	(.09)
Intact Family	-.06	(.08)	.00	(.07)	.01	(.07)
Family Education	-.02	(.04)	.00	(.03)	.00	(.03)
Parent Attachment	-.26 ***	(.07)	-.03	(.07)	-.04	(.06)
Rated Attractiveness	.07	(.04)	.05	(.04)	.05	(.04)
Physical Development	.06	(.05)	.07	(.04)	.08	(.04)
Virgin	.15	(.10)	.14	(.09)	.14	(.09)
BMI	.00	(.01)	.00	(.01)	.00	(.01)
Vocabulary Test Score	.00	(.00)	.00	(.00)	.00	(.00)
Grades	-.18 **	(.05)	-.10 *	(.05)	-.10 *	(.05)
Religiosity	-.07 *	(.04)	-.07 *	(.03)	-.06	(.03)
Parents' Sex Attitudes	-.09	(.05)	-.10 *	(.05)	-.11 *	(.05)
Pregnancy Fears	-.05	(.05)	-.05	(.05)	-.06	(.05)
Marital Expectations	.03	(.03)	.04	(.03)	.04	(.03)
Virginity Pledge	.05	(.10)	.10	(.09)	.11	(.09)
Sexual Victimization	.46 **	(.17)	.35 *	(.15)	.38 *	(.15)
Birth Control Pill	-.15	(.18)	-.11	(.16)	-.05	(.16)
Prior Depression			.05 ***	(.00)	.05 ***	(.00)
Desire for Sex			-.06	(.08)	.10	(.10)
Boy Desire for Sex			.06	(.07)	.09	(.08)
Couple Had Sex			-.06	(.07)	.14	(.13)
Desire * Couple Had Sex					-.34 *	(.14)
Boy Desire * Couple Had Sex					-.12	(.15)
Constant	4.60 ***	(.59)	2.59 ***	(.55)	2.60 ***	(.55)
Alpha	0.37		0.26		0.25	

Table 4b. Negative Binomial Regressions of Wave 2 Male Depression (N=358)

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coef.	(SE)	Coef.	(SE)	Coef.	(SE)
Black	-.06	(.10)	-.05	(.09)	.00	(.09)
Hispanic	.08	(.11)	.09	(.09)	.12	(.09)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-.04	(.28)	-.14	(.25)	.23	(.12)
Age 12-14	-.11	(.18)	-.03	(.16)	-.03	(.16)
Age 17-19	.10	(.07)	.01	(.07)	.00	(.07)
Intact Family	-.21 **	(.07)	-.13 *	(.07)	-.13	(.07)
Family Education	-.04	(.03)	-.04	(.03)	-.05	(.03)
Parent Attachment	-.32 ***	(.07)	-.14 *	(.07)	-.15 *	(.07)
Rated Attractiveness	-.04	(.04)	-.05	(.03)	-.05	(.03)
Physical Development	-.06	(.05)	-.07	(.05)	-.04	(.05)
Virgin	-.23 **	(.07)	-.20 **	(.07)	-.19 **	(.07)
BMI	.03 **	(.01)	.02 *	(.01)	.02 *	(.01)
Vocabulary Test Score	-.01 *	(.00)	.00	(.00)	.00	(.00)
Grades	-.08	(.05)	-.05	(.04)	-.05	(.04)
Religiosity	-.03	(.03)	-.03	(.03)	-.02	(.03)
Parents' Sex Attitudes	-.02	(.04)	.00	(.04)	.00	(.04)
Pregnancy Fears	-.03	(.04)	.00	(.04)	.00	(.04)
Marital Expectations	.03	(.03)	.04	(.03)	.04	(.03)
Virginity Pledge	.16	(.11)	.16	(.10)	.15	(.10)
Prior Depression			.04 ***	(.00)	.04 ***	(.00)
Desire for Sex			.02	(.07)	.01	(.08)
Girl Desire for Sex			.02	(.07)	.05	(.09)
Couple Had Sex			.02	(.07)	-.02	(.13)
Desire * Couple Had Sex					.11	(.15)
Girl Desire * Couple Had Sex					-.10	(.13)
Constant	4.74 ***	(.53)	2.76 ***	(.51)	2.81 ***	(.51)
Alpha	0.25		0.17		0.16	

		Boys		
		Desire Sex	Don't Desire Sex	Total
Girls	Don't Desire Sex	160 (38%)	128 (31%)	288 (69%)
	Desire Sex	104 (25%)	27 (6%)	131 (31%)
Total		264 (63%)	155 (27%)	

Figure 1. Cross-Tabulation of Desire for Sex and Gender