

Abstract

Although content analytic research has examined casual sexual scripts in television programming, less is known about how the relational context of sexual behaviors is depicted by age. Using a sample of U.S. tween, teen, and young-adult television programs from 2016, we analyzed how relational status varies by type of sexual behavior and presumed age of the target audience. Results show sexual intercourse behaviors are most frequently depicted within the context of a hookup or casual sex interaction, whereas precursory sexual behaviors (flirting, kissing, and touching) are more commonly portrayed in committed relationships. Findings further suggest tween shows exclusively depicted sexual behaviors in the context of committed relationships, hookups are just as frequent in teen shows as they are in young-adult shows, and casual sex relationships are more likely to occur in young-adult shows than in teen shows.

Keywords: Television, sexual behaviors, relationship status, adolescents

Defining the Relationship: An Examination of Sexual Behaviors and Relational Contexts Across
Tween, Teen, and Young Adult U.S. Television

Teens and young adults want to know what is expected of them and others in sexual and romantic encounters (Finnerty-Myers, 2011), and research demonstrates they turn toward media models for information regarding this area of life (Wright, 2009, 2011). In particular, fictional television programs illustrate important procedural elements of sex – the who, what, when, and where of sexual interactions – in the form of sexual scripts (Kim et al., 2007). According to sexual script theory (SST; Simon & Gagnon, 1984), sexual scripts exist on three levels: cultural scripts, in which the media and other cultural vehicles provide guidelines for appropriate sexual behaviors and encounters; interpersonal scripts, in which behaviors play out in actual sexual encounters between partners; and intrapsychic scripts, in which the individual manages their sexual desires. Thus, television viewers observe depictions of sexual behaviors in television programming. These cultural scripts might then be encoded into memory and used as cues to guide their own sexual behaviors (interpersonal scripts) and desires (intrapsychic scripts) in similar contexts (Wright, 2011). Cultural scripts are particularly elucidative to those who have little to no first-hand sexual experience (Finnerty-Myers, 2011).

Content analytic studies reveal that casual sexual experiences are common in popular television, particularly for teenage and young-adult viewers (Fisher, Hill, Grube, & Gruber, 2004; Kunkel, Eyal, Finnerty, Biely, & Donnerstein, 2005; Malacane & Martins, 2017; Timmermans & Van den Bulck, 2018). Further, some television programs targeted to teens are *more likely* to depict sexual behaviors and sexual talk than shows targeted toward broader audiences (Kunkel et al., 2005). Television portrayals of sexual behaviors also regularly feature sexually active characters with little emphasis on themes of sexual risk and responsibility (Cope-

Farrar & Kunkel, 2002). Such portrayals frequently depict sexual interactions as recreational and gender stereotypical (i.e., men as hypersexual and women as passive participants; Kim et. al, 2007). Based on SST (Simon & Gagnon, 1984), these findings imply that younger viewers are likely exposed to cultural sexual scripts portraying sexual behaviors in casual contexts.

In a representative sample of general-audience television shows, the majority of characters who engage in sexual activities are in established romantic relationships, but a sizable minority of television portrayals (35%) of sexual intercourse occur between people who are *not* in an established relationship (Kunkel et al., 2005). More recently, Timmermans and Van den Bulck (2018) found that sexual behaviors in adult-oriented television programs are almost as frequent within the context of non-committed relationships (49%, $n = 192$) as they are within the context of a committed relationship (45%, $n = 201$). Specifically, 31% of sexual behaviors occur within the context of a hookup, and 18% of sexual behaviors are in casual sex relationships. For committed relationships, the majority of sexual behaviors are passionate kissing and intimate touching, whereas for hookups and casual sex relationships, the majority of sexual behaviors include portrayals of oral, vaginal, or anal sexual intercourse.

However, a gap in the literature exists in how the relational context of sexual behaviors differs according to the presumed age of the target audience. Even though characters in Timmermans and Van den Bulck's (2018) study are most likely to engage in sexual behaviors in non-committed relationships, the programs in their sample were specifically chosen because they contain "abundant and vivid sex scenes" and are considered "pioneers with regard to cultural changes related to sexuality" (p. 1485). In addition, the programs in their sample primarily target an adult audience (*Friends*, *The Big Bang Theory*, *New Girl*, *Grey's Anatomy*, *Gossip Girl*, *Orange Is the New Black*, *Sex and the City*, *Californication*, and *Girls*). Knowing that adolescent

and young-adult viewers are likely to seek out and identify with television characters whom they perceive to be of a similar age (Wright, 2011), we assess the relational context of sexual behaviors depicted in wider range of television programs scripted for younger audiences.

In the present study, we examine the age of the characters in the principal cast, subdividing our sample based on whether characters in the principal cast were tweens (i.e., pre-teenagers between the ages of 8-12 years old; Common Sense Media, 2015), teenagers (13-19 years old; Common Sense Media, 2015), or young adults (20-29 years old). It is important to note that we are using marketing language (e.g., tweens, teens, young adults) to delineate among age groups. “Tweens” do not constitute a developmental stage, but they can be thought of as roughly equivalent to pre-adolescents, in the stage following early childhood and preceding adolescence (Corsaro, 2005). Likewise, in our typology, teens are roughly equivalent to adolescents, and young adults are roughly equivalent to emerging adults (Arnett, 2000). To understand what messages younger audiences are receiving about the relational context of sexual encounters, it is necessary to examine the programming that shows script involving characters of these age groups.

Understanding the types of sexual messages depicted in television programs targeting different age groups and the relational context of such depictions puts previous content analyses into important context. The media often are blamed for perpetuating a hookup culture (e.g., Garcia, Reiber, Massey, & Merriwether, 2012). However, the common wisdom that hookups are deteriorating the romantic and sexual well-being of young people, sometimes referred to as a “moral panic” about the hookup culture (Armstrong, Hamilton, & England, 2010), may be fueled by a mediated exaggeration rather than an actual phenomenon, as young adults are having *less* sex than previous generational cohorts (Twenge, Sherman, & Wells, 2017). This discrepancy

between the televised portrayals of casual sex and actual sexual behavior calls for a more nuanced understanding of the relational context of sexual behaviors. For example, if casual sex is primarily the domain of adult television, then worries about the media perpetuating a hookup culture can be tempered by knowing that this is not the message scripted for younger characters.

Although we reject the assumption that sexual activities are inherently risky, we nevertheless argue it is important to examine the relational context of sexual behaviors. Research suggests hookups and casual sex are associated with other risk-taking behaviors (e.g., intoxication while hooking up, condomless sex; Braithwaite, Coulson, Keddington, & Fincham, 2015). Further, televised depictions of sexual interactions do not often include messages of sexual consent (Kunkel et al., 2005). As such, we believe it is important to understand the variance of sexual behaviors in television programs featuring characters of younger age groups, notably within the relational context of hookups and casual sex. By doing so, we can better understand the types of sexual scripts which younger viewers are likely consuming and encoding for their own sexual interactions. This analysis further illuminates factors impacting young people's sexual socialization and provides insight into the media's role in hookup culture.

Research Questions

First, we examined whether the frequency of sexual behaviors differed according to the presumed age of the target audience for the television programs.

RQ1: Does the frequency of sexual behaviors vary among shows that are presumably targeting tween, teen, and young-adult viewers?

We next assessed the relational context of sexual behaviors in the general sample, and then by the presumed age of the target audience for the television programs.

RQ2a: How often do sexual behaviors occur in hookups, casual sexual relationships, or committed sexual relationships?

RQ2b: Does the frequency of hookups, casual sexual encounters, and committed relationships differ among programs scripted for tween, teen, and young-adult viewers?

Next, we examined the relations between type of sexual behaviors and relational context. Based on the findings of Timmermans and Van den Bulck (2018), we tested the following hypotheses:

H1: Sexual intercourse is more frequent in hookups and casual sexual relationships than in committed relationships.

H2: Kissing and touching behaviors are more frequent in committed relationships than in hookups or casual sex relationships

We also tested whether the types of sexual behaviors varied by relational context and the presumed age of the target audience depicted in the television programs.

RQ3: Does the relationship between the type of sexual behaviors and relational context differ among programs presumably targeting tween, teen, and young-adult viewers?

Method

Sample

The sample was constructed using a three-stage process. First, the 2016 program offerings for broadcast networks (ABC, CBS, NBC, Fox, and The CW), premium cable networks (HBO and Showtime), basic cable networks (A&E, MTV, Freeform, Comedy Channel, Disney XD, and Nickelodeon), and streaming service platforms (Netflix, Hulu, and Amazon Prime) were compiled. Second, from these offerings, any program with at least one tween character (8-12 years old), teen character (13-19 years old), or young adult character (20-29 years old) in the principal cast was included in the sampling frame. The age of the characters in the cast was

identified through three sources: IMDb, Wikipedia, and fandom wikis. Third, three episodes which aired in 2016 were randomly selected from each program; research finds that three episodes are adequate to demonstrate a representative analysis of sexual content on television programs for behavior-level variables (Manganello, Franzini, & Jordan, 2008). The initial sample included 70 series with 210 coded episodes. This strategy allowed for a sample that was diverse and widely representative of television offerings.

Categorizing each show based on its presumed target audience according to the age of the characters in the principal cast was used in previous content analyses (Aubrey, 2004; Aubrey, Yan, Terán, & Roberts, 2019). This approach is grounded in the idea that viewers are more likely to be influenced by models who are perceived to be similar to them (Bandura, 2009). In shows with teen characters, for example, we assumed there were more sexual scripts about sexual behaviors involving teen characters than in shows with young adult characters, and we further assumed teen characters would attract the attention of teen viewers. The same reasoning applies to tween and young-adult shows. Although it is possible young adults watch tween and teen shows, teens watch young-adult shows, and so forth, we contend that even if a viewer is not of the age group of the characters in the show, they are still encoding cultural sexual scripts for members of that age group. In the present study, we refer to this categorization as shows with a presumed audience of either tweens, teens, or young adults.

Units of Analysis

We coded the current sample on two levels of analysis. The first was the episode (excluding recap segments, opening/closing credits, and commercials). For this unit of analysis, we coded how many sexual behaviors occurred in each of the 210 episodes of television sampled. A sexual behavior was defined as physical actions denoting a feeling or possibility for

sexual intimacy. To address context of sexual behaviors (type and relational status), the second unit of analysis was sexual behavior. Each sexual behavior was coded as a separate unit, and the context unit (i.e., the information surrounding the coding unit that one needs to decipher how to code the coding units; Krippendorff, 2014) was the entire episode. A total of 504 sexual behaviors were coded.

Measures

Type of sexual behavior. Based on Kunkel et al. (2005), sexual behavior was coded into the following categories: physical flirting (behavior meant to arouse or promote sexual interest), romantic kissing (kissing that conveys a sense of sexual intimacy), intimate touching (touching of another's body in a way that is supposed to be sexually arousing), implied sexual intercourse (intercourse clearly inferred from narrative device), and explicit sexual intercourse (at least one person is shown in act of intercourse). Following Timmermans and Van den Bulck's (2018) analysis, we combined physical flirting, romantic kissing, and intimate touching into one category called "kissing and touching" and implied and explicit sexual intercourse into the sexual intercourse category. When more than one sexual behavior occurred simultaneously or sequentially, the most advanced behavior was coded (i.e., precursory sexual behavior versus sexual intercourse behavior). A sexual behavior was coded from when the behavior commenced until it naturally ended or was interrupted by a scene change.

Relational status of characters involved in sexual behaviors. Coders used the context of the entire episode, not just the behavior, to gauge the relationship status of the partners engaging in the sexual behavior. Following Timmermans and Van den Bulck's (2018) typology, each sexual encounter was coded into one of three relationship types: hookups, casual sex relationships, or committed relationships. Hookups were operationalized as "a spontaneous

sexual interaction in which (1) the individuals are explicitly not in a traditional romantic relationship with each other (i.e., not boyfriend/girlfriend), (2) there are no a priori agreements regarding what behaviors will occur, and (3) there is explicitly no promise of any subsequent intimate relations or relationships” (Garcia & Reiber, 2008, p. 193). Casual sex relationships were characterized as non-traditional romantic relationships in which characters held a pre-existing familiarity with one another (e.g., friends, classmates, co-workers). For example, a “friends with benefits” relationship was one in which the partners were friends before engaging in sexual behaviors. Booty calls or “fuck buddies” were relationships in which sex forms the primary basis for the relationship. Characters in the midst of transitioning out of a committed relationship, such as the case of “breakup sex,” were also considered a casual sex relationship. A committed relationship described characters who were in ongoing, established, and committed relationships (e.g., marriage, steady boyfriend/girlfriend; Kunkel et al., 2005).

Coding and Reliability

Four undergraduate students were trained for approximately 30 hours over eight weeks. These training hours included practice sessions with episodes not in the final sample and sessions continued until acceptable levels of intercoder reliability were reached (Krippendorff $\alpha > .667$). After training was complete, the coders began to independently code the sample. This process took six weeks with three checks of intercoder reliability (i.e., coder progress and coder drift; Krippendorff, 2014). Intercoder reliability was determined by Krippendorff’s alpha; an alpha above 0.80 was considered good. The individual coefficients were as follows: type of sexual behaviors ($\alpha = 0.85$) and relationship status ($\alpha = 0.81$).

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Of the 210 episodes of television, 31.9% ($n = 67$) had no sexual behaviors depicted. In the remaining episodes, the number of sexual behaviors varied from one to 18. Of the 504 coded sexual behaviors, most sexual behaviors belonged to the kissing and touching category (83.1%, $n = 419$); the remaining were depictions of sexual intercourse (16.9%, $n = 85$).

Hypothesis and Research Question Testing

For RQ1, examining the frequency of sexual behaviors by the presumed age of the target audience, we found a statistically significant omnibus effect, $F(2, 209) = 10.46, p < .001$. Post hoc tests employing the Scheffé procedure indicated that tween-scripted shows had significantly fewer sexual behaviors per episode ($M = 0.69, SD = 1.28$) than teen-scripted ($M = 2.83, SD = 3.12$) or young-adult-scripted shows ($M = 2.92, SD = 2.98$). There was not a statistically significant difference in the frequency of sexual behaviors between teen and young-adult shows.

For RQ2a, the relational context could be identified in 63.6% ($n = 320$) of the sexual behaviors. This means that in 36.4% of the sexual behaviors, the episode did not provide enough context for the coders to determine relational status. Committed relationships were the most frequent (65.0%, $n = 208$), then hookups (26.3%, $n = 84$), and casual sex relationships (8.8%, $n = 28$), $\chi^2(2, N = 320) = 159.10, p < .001$. Committed sexual behaviors compared to non-committed sexual behaviors occurred at a rate of about 2:1.

To address RQ2b, the frequency of hookups, casual sex relationships, and committed relationships were analyzed among tween, teen, and young-adult shows. Sexual behaviors that occurred in unidentifiable relational contexts were excluded from this analysis. Using a $3 \times 3 \chi^2$ test of independence, a statistically significant relationship was found between the presumed age of the target audience and relational context: $\chi^2(4, N = 320) = 9.55, p = .049$, Cramer's $V = .122$. In the 13 times that sexual behaviors in a defined relationship occurred in tween shows it was

always in the context of a committed relationship. Each of these cases were initiated by a teen character and were all coded as “kissing and touching.” For instance, one episode of *Austin and Ally* showed two teen characters who were dating almost kissed twice, embraced three times, and kissed once. In contrast, hookups and casual sex relationships only occurred in teen and young adult shows. Follow-up z-tests (see Table 1) further showed there were no differences in the occurrence of hookups between teen and young-adult shows, but young-adult shows had more casual sex relationships than teen shows.

In testing the hypotheses, a $3 \times 2 \chi^2$ test of independence showed a statistically significant relationship between the types of sexual behaviors and relational context: $\chi^2(2, N = 320) = 16.21, p < .001$, Cramer’s $V = .23$. Sexual behaviors that occurred in unidentifiable relational contexts were excluded from this analysis. To examine the differences between cells, we conducted follow-up z-tests with Bonferroni corrections. In line with our hypothesis, sexual intercourse was portrayed proportionately more in the context of hookups (22.6%, $n = 19$) and casual sex relationships (28.6%, $n = 8$) than in committed relationships (8.2%, $n = 17$). Conversely, kissing and touching behaviors were depicted in the context of committed relationships more frequently (91.8%, $n = 191$) than hookups (77.4%, $n = 65$) and casual sex relationships (71.4%, $n = 20$). The hypotheses were supported. See Table 2.

For RQ3, we examined whether the portrayals of kissing and touching versus sexual intercourse varied by relational status and the presumed age of the target audience. To test this three-way interaction, a loglinear analysis was conducted due to the categorical nature of the variables. Each interaction effect was tested using a hierarchical model in which the first step considered the effect of removing the main effects, the second step evaluated the effect of removing the two-way effects, and the third step examined the effect of removing the three-way

effects. The three-way interaction between type of sexual behavior, relational context, and presumed age of target audience was not statistically significant: $\chi^2(4, N = 320) = 0.87, p = .93$. These results suggest the relationship between relational context and type of sexual behavior did not vary by the presumed age of the target audience.

Discussion

Not only do sexual behaviors occur less often in tween-scripted shows, it seems sexual scripts depicting sexual behaviors in casual relationships are absent in shows scripted for tween viewers. Because pre-adolescents are oftentimes pre-pubertal, and thus not as keenly interested in sex as adolescents and emerging adults (Thornburg, 1974), it seems appropriate that the behavioral sexual scripts available to them are mild and uneventful, at least with regard to relational status. Based on SST (Simon & Gagnon, 1984), we suggest viewers of tween television shows are unlikely consumers of sexual scripts pertaining to sexual intercourse or casual and hookup relationships.

Comparatively, behavioral sexual scripts of the hookup culture are more present in television shows whose presumed target audiences are teens or young adults. There is a drastic difference in the relational status of sexual behaviors from tween to teen shows. In tween shows, sexual behaviors are exclusively committed, but in teen shows about 33.1% of sexual behaviors occurred in either hookups or casual sex relationships. This occurrence is not significantly different from young-adult shows, in which 39.2% of sexual behaviors occur in non-committed relationships. Therefore, teen television shows portrayed sexual behaviors in a casual context in about one of every three sexual behaviors, reflecting a sizable minority of sexual behaviors. The frequency of casual sex is slightly higher in shows scripted for young adults (about two of every five) but not significantly. In light of relational and sexual concerns becoming salient during

adolescence and emerging adulthood, these viewers, attracted to the similarly-aged role models in these shows, are likely learning casual sex is a substantial part of the cultural sexual script.

Although scholars argue that the media play a role in the perpetuation of the hookup culture (e.g., Garcia et al., 2012), two caveats should be applied to this notion. First, based on the current findings, casual sex does not become a substantial aspect of televised behavioral sexual scripts until the presumed target audience is comprised of teenagers. Although this finding is developmentally significant, as it is during one's teenage years when sexual concerns are salient to viewers, casual sex is not the predominant portrayal; it is outnumbered 2:1 by committed sexual behaviors. Indeed, the rate of committed to casual sexual relationships is remarkably similar to Kunkel et al.'s (2005) findings, providing some evidence that the portrayal of casual sex is somewhat stable between samples. Second, and more in line with a hookup culture, is the finding that sexual intercourse is most likely to occur in casual sex relationships and hookups, whereas the precursory behaviors happen in committed relationships. Thus, sexual intercourse often occurs before the establishment of a romantic relationship, or outside of one altogether. This finding sheds light on the role of sexual intimacy and closeness as depicted in televised behavioral sexual scripts. Precursory sexual behaviors (i.e., kissing and intimate touching) are tied with notions of commitment, sexual intimacy, and closeness, while sexual intercourse behaviors are connected with themes of sexual arousal and temporary desire. Thus, committed relationships portray sexual behaviors in the form of physical intimacy and affection while non-committed relationships showcase sexual behaviors as arousing, recreational, and relatively emotion-free.

Limitations and Future Research

Our analyses only apply to sexual scripts depicting a sexual behavior. We cannot generalize to all sexual scripts, such as verbal messages, which were not coded in the present study. Verbal messages also play an important role in the socialization of sexual scripts on TV. Additional variables, such as perceptions of characters' race, gender, and sexual orientation, could be incorporated in future research to determine how sexual behaviors differ across groups. Again, it is important to note that people do not always view television content in line with their age (i.e., tweens may watch young-adult television shows while young adults may watch teen television shows). Thus, our study presents sexual behaviors among differing age groups, but we do not claim the target age group is the highest consumer of those television programs.

The measures of sexual behaviors were created in previous research and may not easily translate to younger shows targeting tween viewers. Although this limits the understanding of differing sexual behavior contexts among tween, teen, and young-adult television shows, we believe it is useful in mapping out the trajectory when sexual scripts become available. Also, despite coders being able to reliably code relational status, in 36.4% of the sexual behaviors, relational status could not be coded because the episode did not provide enough context for coders to determine it. A possible solution in future research is for coders to watch sequential episodes of a television program so they can use the arc of several episodes to gauge relational status. Finally, future researchers should consider including romantic scripts in their analyses to assess behaviors that might be more readily available in tween shows. While the present study provides an examination of the types of messages found in popular U.S. television programming, we cannot make inferences about effects as a result of exposure to such media messages. Future research should consider examining the effects of such sexual messages on viewers' sexual behaviors and relationships.

Conclusion

Across tween, teen, and young adult scripted U.S. television programs, there are significant differences regarding the types of sexual behaviors portrayed in varying relational contexts. Results show that sexual intercourse is most frequently depicted outside the context of committed relationships and such depictions are common in television targeting teen and young adult viewers. Overall, our findings suggest television does play a role in the depiction of the hookup culture by perpetuating the frequency of impersonal sexual encounters characterized by sexual intercourse behaviors. Yet, the frequency of casual sex portrayals does not become a prominent type of sexual script until the presumed target audience is comprised of teenagers.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by authors.

Endnote

¹ The final samples of shows are listed here. Tween shows: *Austin & Ally*, *Best Friends Whenever*, *Gamer's Guide to Pretty Much Anything*, *I Didn't Do It*, *Liv and Maddie*, *Mighty Med*, and *Project Mc²*. Teen shows: *Awkward*, *Beyond*, *Dead of Summer*, *Degrassi: Next Class*, *East Los High*, *Faking It*, *Finding Carter*, *The Fosters*, *Glee*, *Guidance*, *Pretty Little Liars*, *Recovery Road*, *Red Band Society*, *Reign*, *Scream*, *Shadowhunters*, *Switched at Birth*, *Teen Wolf*, *The 100*, *The Get Down*, *The Originals*, and *Vampire Diaries*. Young-adult shows: *Another Period*, *Bates Motel*, *Beauty and the Beast*, *Between*, *Broad City*, *Chewing Gum*, *Crazyhead*, *Freakish*, *Fresh Meat*, *Girls*, *Guilt*, *Idiot Sitter*, *Insecure*, *iZombie*, *Jane the Virgin*, *Jessica Jones*, *Love*, *Lovesick*, *Man Seeking Woman*, *Mary & Jane*, *My Crazy Ex-Girlfriend*, *New Girl*, *Resident Advisors*, *Scream Queens*, *Shameless*, *Shannara Chronicles*, *Stitchers*, *Sweet/Vicious*, *Workaholics*, *You're the Worst*, *Young and Hungry*, *Younger*, and *You're the Worst*.

References

- Armstrong, E. A., Hamilton, L., & England, P. (2010). Is hooking up bad for young women? *Contexts*, 9, 22–27. doi:10.1525/ctx.2010.9.3.22
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55, 469-480. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.
- Aubrey, J. S. (2004). Sex and punishment: An examination of sexual consequences and the sexual double standard in teen programming. *Sex Roles*, 50(7/8), 505-514. doi:10.1023/b:sers.0000023070.87195.07
- Aubrey, J. S., Yan, K., Terán, L., & Roberts, L. (2019). The heterosexual script on tween, teen, and young-adult television programs: A content analytic update and extension. *The Journal of Sex Research*. doi:10.1080/00224499.2019
- Bandura, A. (2009). Social cognitive theory of mass communication (3rd edition). In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 94-124). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Braithwaite, S. R., Coulson, G., Keddington, K., & Fincham, F. D. (2015a). The influence of pornography on sexual scripts and hooking up among emerging adults in college. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 44, 111-123. doi:10.1007/s10508-014-0351-x
- Common Sense Media (2015). Media use by tweens and teens. <https://www.commonsensemedia.org/research/the-common-sense-census-media-use-by-tweens-and-teens-2019>
- Cope-Farrar, K. M., & Kunkel, D. (2002). Sexual messages in teens' favorite prime-time television programs. In J. Brown, J. R. Steele, & K. Walsh-Childers (Eds.), *Sexual teens, sexual media* (pp. 59-78). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Corsaro, W.A. (2005). *The Sociology of Childhood* (2nd edn). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Finnerty-Myers, K. (2011). Understanding the dynamics behind the relationship between exposure to negative consequences of risk sex on entertainment television and emerging adults' safe-sex attitudes and intentions. *Mass Communication & Society, 14*, 743-764. doi:10.1080/15205436.2010.540057
- Fisher, D. A., Hill, D. L., Grube, J. W., & Gruber, E. L. (2004). Sex on American television: An analysis across program genres and network types. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 48*, 529-553. doi:10.1207/s15506878jobem4804_1
- Garcia, J. R., & Reiber, C. (2008). Hook-up behavior: A biopsychosocial perspective. *Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology, 2*(4), 192-208. doi:10.1037/h0099345
- 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.
- Kim, J. L., Sorsoli, C. L., Collins, K., Zylbergold, B. A., Schooler, D., & Tolman, D. L. (2007). From sex to sexuality: Exposing the heterosexual script on primetime network television. *Journal of Sex Research, 44*, 145-157. doi:10.1080/00224490701263660
- Krippendorff, K. (2014). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Kunkel, D., Eyal, K., Finnerty, K., Biely, E., & Donnerstein, E. (2005). *Sex on TV 4: A Biennial report to the Kaiser Family Foundation*. Menlo Park, CA: Kaiser Family Foundation.
- Malacane, M., & Martins, N. (2017). Sexual socialization messages in television programming produced for adolescents. *Mass Communication and Society, 20*(1), 23-46. doi:[10.1080/15205436.2016.1203436](https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2016.1203436)

- Manganello, J., Franzini, A., & Jordan, A. (2008). Sampling television programs for content analysis of sex on TV: How many episodes are enough? *Journal of Sex Research, 45*, 9-16. doi:10.1080/00224490701629514
- Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1984). Sexual scripts. *Society, 22*, 53-60. doi:10.1007/BF02701260
- Thornburg, H. D. (1974). Educating the preadolescent about sex. *The Family Coordinator, 23*, 35-39. doi:10.2307/582521
- Timmermans, E., & Van den Bulck, J. (2018). Casual sexual scripts on the screen: A quantitative content analysis. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 47*, 1481-1496. doi:10.1007/s10508-018-1147-1
- Twenge, J. M., Sherman, R. A., & Wells, B. E. (2017). Sexual inactivity during young adulthood is more common among U.S. millennials and iGen: Age, period, and cohort effects on having no sexual partners after age 18. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 46*, 433-440. doi:10.1007/s10508-016-0798-z
- Wright, P. J. (2009). Sexual socialization messages in mainstream entertainment mass media: A review and synthesis. *Sexuality & Culture, 13*, 181-200. doi:10.1007/s12119-009-9050-5
- Wright, P. J. (2011). Mass media effects on youth sexual behavior: Assessing the claim for causality. *Communication Yearbook, 35*, 343-385. doi:10.1080/23808985.2011.11679121

Table 1

Relational Context of Sexual Behaviors and Presumed Age of the Target Audience

	Tween Shows	Teen Shows	Young-Adult Shows	Total
Hookups	0% (<i>n</i> = 0)	26.5% _a (<i>n</i> = 36)	28.1% _a (<i>n</i> = 48)	26.3% (<i>n</i> = 84)
Casual Sex Relationships	0% _a (<i>n</i> = 0)	6.6% _a (<i>n</i> = 9)	11.1% _b (<i>n</i> = 19)	8.8% (<i>n</i> = 27)
Committed Relationships	100.0% _a (<i>n</i> = 13)	66.9% _b (<i>n</i> = 91)	60.8% _b (<i>n</i> = 104)	65.0% (<i>n</i> = 208)
Total	100% (<i>n</i> = 13)	100% (<i>n</i> = 136)	100% (<i>n</i> = 171)	100% (<i>n</i> = 320)

Notes. Pairwise comparisons were done by investigation of *z* tests with Bonferroni correction. Frequencies in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $p < .05$.

Table 2

Relational Context of Types of Sexual Behaviors

	Hookups	Casual Sex Relationships	Committed Relationships	Total
Touching and Kissing	77.4% _a (<i>n</i> = 65)	71.44% _a (<i>n</i> = 20)	91.8% _b (<i>n</i> = 191)	86.3% (<i>n</i> = 276)
Sexual Intercourse	22.6% _a (<i>n</i> = 19)	28.6% _a (<i>n</i> = 8)	8.2% _b (<i>n</i> = 17)	13.8% (<i>n</i> = 44)
Total	100% (<i>n</i> = 84)	100% (<i>n</i> = 28)	100% (<i>n</i> = 208)	100% (<i>n</i> = 320)

Notes. Pairwise comparisons were done by investigation of *z* tests with Bonferroni correction. Frequencies in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $p < .05$.