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Introduction

Casual Sexual Relationships and Experiences (CSREs), particularly in emerging adulthood, have received a growing amount of attention due to their potentially damaging consequences (see Bersamin et al., 2014; Fielder & Carey, 2010; Sandburg-Thoma & Dush, 2014). The term “Casual Sexual Relationships and Experiences” has been used to describe experiences and relationships which occur outside the context of a formal romantic relationship (Claxton & van Dulmen, 2013). More specifically, CSREs are noncommittal relationships or experiences that include “sexual overtones/behavior” (Claxton & van Dulmen, 2013, p. 138). Claxton and van Dulmen (2013) also indicate that CSREs can encompass a number of sexual relationships such as one-night stands (sexual relationships usually with a stranger or acquaintance that occur only one time), booty calls (relationships in which sexual intent is communicated to a non long-term partner), and friends with benefits relationship (nonromantic sexual relationships between friends).

As students enter emerging adulthood, a range of ages from about 18-29 that involves exploration before adulthood (Arnett, 2000), they may begin experimenting with these new types of experiences, which can lead to a number of negative psychological reactions. Claxton and van Dulmen (2013) reviewed some of the consequences linked to CSREs including guilt, regret, anger, and increased risk of depression. For example, Eshbaugh and Gute (2008) reported hookups were significantly linked to sexual regret in college females. Likewise Grello, Welsh, and Harper (2006), described casual sex as being associated with depressive symptoms in; males who participated
in casual sex also reported depressive symptoms, although fewer depressive symptoms than females. Similar results were found by Bersamin et al. (2014) who reported an association between casual sex and psychological distress as well as diminished well-being; specifically, individuals reported increased symptoms of depression and loneliness after participating in casual sex. Generally the previously listed studies have found a number of negative effects that occur in both genders after participating in a CSRE. These consequences (e.g., depression, loneliness, and regret) could be especially detrimental to students as they adjust to the new roles and responsibilities associated with college. While research has examined consequences, to date, less focus has been on social aspects thus the current paper will examine the interpersonal construct of mattering as it predicts CSRE engagement.

Accordingly, many studies suggest that participation in CSREs can result in negative consequences; however these consequences are often found to differ between men and women. In fact, the existence of double standards which view women who participate in casual sex more harshly than men may suggest that men who participate in CSREs might experience fewer negative effects than women who participate in CSREs (Grello et al., 2006). For instance Paul, McManus, and Hayes (2000) found differences in regards to rates of male and female hookups, defined as sexual behaviors ranging from kissing to intercourse that take place outside the context of a committed relationship and hold no expectations for a future relationship. Males participated in more coital hookups while females participated in more noncoital hookups. Likewise, Bersamin and colleagues (2014) found that men are more likely to report casual sexual encounters than
women. Paul and Hayes (2002) and Owen and colleagues (2010), on the other hand, found rates of coital hookups were similar in both men and women.

Overall, research has been inconsistent on the differences in rates of CSRE engagement in women and men, but the research on varying reactions to hookups has been more cohesive. For example, distress in men seems to be more closely related to a lack of hookup experiences. Fielder and Carey (2010) found evidence that men who experienced fewer hookups had higher distress than those men who had more experiences with sexual hookups. Although both genders have reported sexual regret after engagement in casual sex (Eshbaugh & Gute, 2008), women who have engaged in penetrative sex report higher rates of distress than men who engaged in penetrative sex (Fielder & Carey, 2010). Given gender differences in effects of CSREs, it is important to assess how predictors of CSREs may also differ for men and women.

Considering the possible negative effects of CSREs along with the fact that the lifetime prevalence rates of various CSREs (as reported by Claxton and van Dulmen, 2013) is over 50%, it is more important than ever to understand what factors predict engagement in CSREs. Current research has identified situational triggers, alcohol consumption and previous sexual hookups as predictors of CSREs (Fielder & Carey, 2010; Owen, Fincham, & Moore, 2011; Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000). For example, alcohol and previous sexual experiences have been shown to consistently predict CSREs (Claxton, DeLuca, & van Dulmen, 2015; Fielder & Carey, 2010). While Paul et al.’s (2000) study of 555 undergraduate students found no significant differences in predictors (e.g., social, personality, and individual psychological variables) for males and females,
Owen, Fincham and Moore (2011) found alcohol was a stronger predictor of CSREs for females than males. Furthermore, alcohol use was highest in those participants who engaged in penetrative CSREs. Overall, alcohol use and previous sexual experiences appear to be important predictors of CSRE engagement across a number of studies.

Although research has begun to investigate CSREs as well as predictive measures and their relationship to gender, there has been a startling lack of analysis on social elements as they affect CSRE engagement. Specifically, participation in CSREs may involve interpersonal factors that have not yet been studied in depth. One potential interpersonal predictor of CSREs is mattering. Mattering is the tendency to evaluate oneself, based social interaction, as significant to specific others; i.e. being needed by a specific other or feeling others are concerned with our fate (Marshall, 2001; Mak & Marshall, 2004; Rosenberg & McCullough, 1981). Mattering is not only linked to satisfaction in relationships but also to providing a sense of relatedness and certainty of the position in a relationship (Mak & Marshall, 2004).

Marshall (2001) also stated that mattering has the ability to change during times of stress, such as when individuals are adapting to the expected roles of university during emerging adulthood. The idea of levels of mattering changing when entering university is demonstrated by Marshall and colleagues’ (2010) longitudinal study, which evaluated how mattering to mother, father, and friends changed throughout the transition to university. Marshall and colleagues (2010) found that although mattering to friends and fathers stayed relatively stable, mattering to mothers deceased over time. Universities are unique settings because they provide a unique combination of independence while
surrounding students with their peers making universities a setting for CSREs. Therefore, it is possible that as students experience decreases in mattering when entering university, they will increase their participation in CSREs or romantic relationships as a way to increase mattering in a new area.

Mak and Marshall (2004) discuss attending behavior as a major component of mattering. Mattering is founded in social interaction and can be built and maintained based on how we view attending behavior; an example of attending behavior in romantic contexts is a kiss (Mak & Marshall, 2004; Marshall, 2001). Therefore, students may use sexual attention gained through CSREs or romantic relationships in order to bolster their sense of mattering. Due to the fact that college age students must exert time and energy to adapt to the new responsibilities of college, CSREs may be used more often than romantic relationships because their limited commitment may provide a quick low-energy way to increase mattering. In fact, Paik’s (2010) study of 890 adults from ages 18-59 provided evidence that adults, including emerging adults, are aware of the expected commitment in CSREs versus romantic relationships. More specifically, Paik observed expectations for hookups matched the outcomes in terms of sexual activity, and therefore “individuals self-select into relationships that are about sex, not love” (p.749). This enforces the idea that individuals who choose CSREs do so with different relationship expectations than those seeking a dating relationship. Expectations for hookups are also clearer than expectations for dating which saves individuals the time of defining a relationship, again making participation in CSREs affordable without distracting from other aspects of life (Paik, 2010).
Mattering has been evaluated in families, friendships, and romantic relationships, but there is a lack of research linking mattering to CSREs (Marshall et al., 2010; Mak & Marshall, 2004). The current study seeks to identify first, if mattering is a significant predictor of CSREs, such that low levels of mattering predict more engagement in CSREs, and second, if a specific form of mattering (mattering to family) has a more negative association to CSREs than other forms of mattering (mattering to friends and mattering to a romantic partner). Marshall and colleagues’ (2010) three year longitudinal study suggests mattering to mothers, and therefore family mattering, decreases the most, compared to mattering to friends, as students enter college. This decrease in family, maternal, mattering may spark the need to compensate by increasing other forms of mattering, and therefore mattering to family should have the greatest association to CSRE participation.

A secondary issue this study will consider is gender differences. As Rosenberg and McCullough (1981) stated mattering is a social obligation based on interdependence (p.165). It is important to note that mattering does not replenish automatically; however when mattering is low associated negative outcomes may compel the individual to replenish their mattering potentially by seeking attending behaviors mentioned previously. According to Marshall et al. (2010), females score higher on mattering measures than males, and females tend to experience more negative effects from low mattering. Similarly a study by Taylor and Turner (2001) found mattering was negatively linked to symptoms of depression, but that this link was more obvious in females because females experienced higher levels of both mattering and depressive symptoms. Another
study by Rayle (2005) observed related results: females experienced higher levels of mattering overall and mattering predicted wellness in females. Due to the findings that females are more adversely affected by low mattering than males, it is plausible that females may present a stronger association between mattering and CSREs than males because they would have a greater desire to increase mattering and avoid the negative effects of having low levels of mattering (Marshall et al., 2010; Taylor & Turner, 2001; Rayle, 2005). On the same note, gender differences in the association between CSREs and mattering may explain the negative outcomes for females who participate in CSREs, in that regret may be high when CSREs do not match a female’s expectations for mattering (Galperin et al., 2012). It is possible that even if a female knows she will react negatively to a CSRE she may engage anyways because according to Elliot (2009) even negative attention is better than not mattering at all (p.3). Based on the research cited above, the current study has developed the following hypotheses (controlling for gender, lifetime CSRE engagement, and alcohol use):

**Hypothesis 1:** Mattering is negatively and longitudinally associated with CSRE engagement.

**Hypothesis 2:** Mattering to family will have a stronger negative association with CSREs than mattering to a romantic partner and mattering to friends.

**Hypothesis 3:** Females will have a stronger negative association between mattering and CSREs than males.
Methods

Procedure

The data analyzed in this thesis was gathered from the Attraction within Casual Dating on Campus study (or ACDC study). The ACDC study is a longitudinal study which examines relationships in emerging adulthood at baseline (wave 1) and for two follow-up assessments, including wave 2 which occurred one month post-baseline. The current study utilizes information from the Sexual Behavior Questionnaire and the Mattering Scale at baseline, and the Adult Self Report and Sexual Behaviors Questionnaire at wave 2, and examines mattering as a predictor of CSRE engagement while controlling for previous sexual experience, alcohol use, and gender.

Participants

Participants in this study were undergraduate students at Kent State University and were recruited using the Kent State Sona System, a campus subject pool where students received class credit for participating in research. Of the sample of 225 participants, I used the data from the sub-sample of individuals who were not currently in an ongoing dating relationship and who had full data on all study variables, leaving a sample of 76 participants. Of these 76 participants, 58 were female. The average age of the sample was 19.75 (SD = 1.26) with 4 non-heterosexual participants. Of the participants, 80.3% were Caucasian/white.

Measures

Lifetime CSRE engagement. Several types of CSREs are examined in the ACDC study using the Sexual Behaviors Questionnaire, which asks about sexual
interactions over a participant’s lifetime. Specifically for this study, this questionnaire includes questions on the number of each type of CSREs a participant has experienced within his/her lifetime. These CSREs include one-night stands, booty calls, and friends with benefits defined to participants as follows:

**One Night Stands**: a sexual encounter with another individual that only occurs one time;

**Friends with Benefits**: friends who have sex but do not consider themselves to be in a romantic relationship;

**Booty Calls**: individuals available for free sex on an as-needed basis.

The total of all reported CSREs [combining one-night stands (for which 48.7% of the sample reported at least one), booty calls (37.2%), and friends with benefits relationships (67.8%)] was calculated for each participant. Given the skewed nature of the data (i.e., the data demonstrated a positive skew), this variable was transformed using a square root function.

**Follow-up CSRE Engagement.** Participants were also asked about their CSRE engagement in the past month at the follow-up assessment. Specifically, participants reported if they had engaged in any friends with benefits relationships, booty calls, or one night stands. A total CSRE engagement in the past month was created by summing the number of friends with benefits relationships, booty calls, and one night stands participants reported. Given the low base-rate, this variable was dichotomized (yes or no) to represent whether a participant had engaged in any form of CSRE since baseline (17 participants reported engaging in a friends with benefits relationship, 7 engaged in a
booty call, and 11 engaged in a one night stand).

**Mattering.** Single item measures of mattering (based on similar scales used by Mak & Marshall, 2004) were also included in the study in order to determine how significant participants felt in relation to their family, friends, and partner(s). The measure includes the following statements: “I matter to my family;” “I matter to my friends;” and “I matter to my romantic partner”. These statements were rated on a five-point scale ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

**Alcohol use.** As part of the Adult Self Report (Achenbach, Dumenci, & Rescorla, 2003), participants were asked “In the past month on how many days were you drunk?” This question was used as an indicator of frequency of drinking to intoxication.
Results

Preliminary Analyses

A Pearson’s $r$ was used to examine the relationship among all continuous main study variables (the three types of mattering, lifetime CSRE engagement, and alcohol use). No significant correlations between the mattering variables and CSRE engagement at baseline or follow-up were found. There were significant correlations between family and friends mattering variables ($r = .39, p = .001$). There were significant correlations between the number of days an individual was drunk and the number of CSREs that individual engaged in at baseline ($r = .39, p = .001$). (See Table 1).

At the Wave 2 follow up, a total of 29 people reported participating in CSREs in the past month. Differences in mattering, drinking, and lifetime CSRE engagement between individuals who did and did not engage in a CSRE at follow-up were examined using an independent samples t-test. Significant differences were found in alcohol use, $t(38.76) = -3.03, p = .004, d = .97$, and lifetime CSRE engagement, $t(74) = -2.82, p = .006, d = .66$. Specifically individuals who engaged in a CSRE at follow-up reported more days drinking to intoxication ($M = 3.30, SD = 1.39$) than individuals who did not ($M = 1.13, SD = 1.96$). Additionally, individuals who engaged in a CSRE at follow-up reported more lifetime CSRE engagement ($M = 2.22, SD = 1.39$) than individuals who did not ($M = 1.36, SD = 1.25$).

Gender differences in the three mattering variables, lifetime CSRE engagement, and alcohol use were also examined using independent samples t-tests. No significant gender differences were found. Additionally, a chi-square test was used to examine
gender differences in follow-up CSRE engagement. A significant association between gender and CSRE engagement at follow-up was found, \( \chi^2(1) = 5.37, p = .022 \).

Specifically, a greater percent of the men than women (61.1% versus 31% respectively) reported engaging in a CSRE at follow-up.

**Logistic Regression**

I conducted a logistic regression in order to determine if mattering to family, friends, and romantic partners at Wave 1 predicted engagement in CSREs at Wave 2 controlling for gender, alcohol use, and lifetime CSRE engagement. Due to the fact that the predictor variables (mattering) were continuous and the outcome variable (CSRE engagement) was categorical (i.e. participated in a CSRE or did not participate in a CSRE) logistic regression was the most suited statistical analysis.

Results of the logistic regression can be found in Table 2. The overall model was statistically significant, \( \chi^2 (6) = 17.47, p = .01 \), and correctly classified 75% of individuals. However, the addition of the mattering variables to the model did not result in a significant increase in model’s fit compared to a model including only control variables (\( \Delta \chi^2 = 1.06, p = .79 \)). The results of this analysis consequently did not support hypothesis 1 or hypothesis 2. There was no significant main effect for mattering to family \( (B = .11, SE = .54, p = .84, e^b = 1.12) \), mattering to friends \( (B = -.21, SE = .22, p = .33, e^b = .81) \), or mattering to a romantic partner \( (B = -.14, SE = .44, p = .76, e^b = .87) \) on CSRE engagement. Alcohol use was the only significant predictor of CSRE engagement \( (B = .26, SE = .11, p = .02, e^b = 1.29) \). The odds of having a CSRE increased by 29% for each additional day of drinking to intoxication over the month.
To assess the third hypothesis, I conducted follow-up analyses to examine if gender moderated the association between the mattering variables and CSRE engagement. I tested the moderations using bootstrapping procedures in the PROCESS macro for SPSS (Hayes, 2013).

I ran three separate models examining interactions between each form of mattering with gender individually while controlling for the other two forms of mattering. Unstandardized effects were computed for each of 10,000 bootstrap samples. None of the tested interactions were statistically significant ($p > .05$) (see Table 3). This suggests that gender does not significantly moderate the relationship between mattering and CSRE engagement.
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between mattering and CSREs, and how gender moderates this relationship, while considering background control variables. The hypotheses were not supported by the results as none of the forms of mattering significantly predicted CSRE engagement above and beyond alcohol use, gender, and lifetime CSRE engagement. Likewise, there were gender differences in CSRE engagement in the bivariate analysis (such that a significantly higher proportion of males than females reported engaging at a CSRE at follow-up), but these differences were not significant after controlling for important background variables, particularly alcohol use.

Alcohol may be a more important predictor of CSRE engagement than gender, and therefore it is possible that alcohol use accounts for the gender differences. In fact previous studies, such as Owen et al. (2011), have found interaction effects of gender affecting alcohol’s predictive ability on CSRE engagement. Specifically, when alcohol is involved, women may be more likely to engage in CSREs. Thus, alcohol use may account for the gender differences especially in this largely female sample. Based on the independent samples t-tests, there were no significant gender differences in mattering, contrary to previous literature.

Similarly, I did not find any significant interactions between mattering variables and gender in predicting CSRE engagement. Although there were no statistically significant moderation effects, Figures 1 – 3, demonstrate which outcomes follow the hypothesized pattern. More specifically, mattering to a romantic partner followed the
predicted pattern such that there was a negative association between mattering and CSRE engagement for females. As previous research has suggested, if mattering scores are high, there is no need to compensate with casual relationships, therefore participants who score highly on mattering to romantic partner wouldn’t be expected to seek out CSREs (Marshall et al., 2010; Taylor & Turner, 2001; Rayle, 2005). Males, on the other hand, had almost no association between mattering and CSRE engagement; this finding is in line with hypothesis 3 and follows previous research that states mattering is less important to males as compared to females (Marshall et al., 2010).

While this interaction was in the expected direction, the small male sample (n = 18) may have been a limiting factor in detecting significant interaction effects. A potential explanation for the lack of interactions between mattering and gender for the other variables is that mattering to partner was the only mattering variable that demonstrated variability in responses. More specifically, mattering to family had a mean score of 4.78, and friends had a mean score of 4.54 (out of 5). Given that most participants reported high mattering in these areas, there may not have been sufficient variability to detect effects.

My study also included background control variables based on commonly supported predictors of CSREs, such as alcohol use and previous sexual experience. As supported by previous research (Claxton et al., 2015) alcohol use was a significant predictor of future participation in CSREs. Alcohol was also the only significant predictor in my study controlling for the other variables. Previous CSRE engagement was associated with follow-up CSRE engagement in bivariate analyses, although it did not
predict CSRE engagement over and above alcohol use.

Limitations

My study should be interpreted with its limitations in mind. To start, the sample I used was relatively small and, as I previously mentioned, had a limited number of male participants. This may have reduced the ability to detect interactions with mattering. The participants in my study also scored relatively high on the mattering variables, especially to family and friends. These high scores may be related to the high number of in-state students attending the university who may have a stronger support system than those who travel out of state for college. Similarly, mattering to friends may be higher in this college-based sample than it would be in non-college adults who may lack a built in support system.

Finally there may be some limitations within the measures themselves. Each type of mattering was measured using only one item. Thus, I was unable to examine different aspects of mattering (e.g. attention) (Marshall et al., 2010). Additionally, mattering was taken from the baseline assessments, and therefore change in mattering was not examined. It is important for future studies to analyze this change because previous literature suggests that change in mattering to family, rather than overall mattering levels, may predict CSRE engagement (Marshall et al., 2010).

Future directions

Given these limitations, future studies could benefit by including a more gender balanced sample and a comparison group of non-college adults. Future studies should also continue to examine mattering with a more nuanced measure including aspects of
mattering such as attention in order to better examine mattering as a construct. Besides adding a measure with more items, future studies could expand on previous literature, which notes that mattering has the ability to change in times of high stress (Marshall, 2001), and examine how changes in mattering over time affect CSRE engagement.

Finally, future studies should continue to examine the social aspects of CSREs potentially including loneliness and belonging in order to broaden the knowledge of social constructs as they affect CSRE engagement.

**Conclusions and Implications**

The current study presents a number of unique strengths that contribute to the research. To begin, this study supports previous findings in that alcohol use was a significant predictor of CSRE engagement. In addition, this study expands upon previous research by incorporating interpersonal predictors of CSREs. Another strength is that the current study involves a longitudinal design that asks about CSRE engagement over a one-month period. This design makes participants less susceptible to forgetting, and was particularly beneficial because it allowed for the prediction of CSREs over time as compared to previous studies which have utilized cross-sectional designs. The longitudinal design is also important because it established a sequence of events which allowed me to determine if there was support for a causal relationship between CSREs and mattering.

Overall, this study provided a longitudinal examination of the association between mattering and CSRE engagement. Given that CSRE’s are social interactions, interpersonal aspects of CSRE engagement need proper consideration. This study
examines CSREs in an interpersonal context, which extends the current research and begins to fill in the gap in predictive knowledge.
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Table 1.

Bivariate correlations, means, and standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Matter - Family</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Matter - Partner</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Matter - Friends</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lifetime CSRE</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alcohol Use</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean          | 4.78  | 3.12  | 4.54  | 1.69  | 1.96  |
SD             | .53   | 1.29  | .66   | 1.37  | 2.86  |

Note. * p < .05. ** p < .01
Table 2.

Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Casual Sexual Relationships and Experiences in Emerging Adulthood (n = 76), Controlling for Background Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>e^B</th>
<th>95% CI (e^B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matter - Family</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.39, 3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter - Friends</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.37, 2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter – Romantic Partner</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.53, 1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Variables

| Lifetime CSRE Engagement             | .32 | .22  | .15 | 1.38| .89, 2.13    |
| Alcohol Use                          | .26*| .11  | .02 | 1.29| 1.04, 1.61   |

Constant - .04  2.12  .99  .96

Note: Controls are alcohol use, lifetime CSRE engagement, and gender (omitted from the table). e^B = exponentiated B. Mattering predictors (family, friends, romantic partner) scored from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 3.
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Including Variables Interactions Between Mattering and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$e^B$</th>
<th>95% CI (e^B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1 – Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering - Family</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.51, 5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (Family mattering X gender)</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.02, 2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.77, 9.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering - Partner</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.49, 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering - Friends</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.33, 1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.04, 1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime CSREs</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.92, 2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2 – Partner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering - Partner</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.52, 1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (Partner mattering X gender)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.57, 3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.84, 9.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering - Friends</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.37, 2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering - Family</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.41, 3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.05, 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime CSREs</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.89, 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3 – Friends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering - Friends</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.30, 1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (Friend mattering X gender)</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.03, 4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.85, 11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering - Family</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.39, 3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering - Partner</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.52, 1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.04, 1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime CSRE</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.89, 2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $e^B$ = exponentiated B. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001
Figure 1. Interaction of Gender and Mattering to Family on CSRE Engagement
Figure 2. Interaction of Gender and Mattering to Partner on CSRE Engagement
Figure 3. Interaction of Gender and Mattering to Friends on CSRE Engagement