

Proceed with Caution: How Emerging Adults are  
 Testing the Water in Just Talking Romantic Relationships  
 D. Scott Sibley, Amber Vennum, Jordyn Saddler, & Pelin Keceli  
 IARR 2024 Conference – Boston, MA

Table 1

*Participants' Agreement with Statements Concerning the Phenomenon of Just Talking (N = 655)*

Item	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
1. <i>Just talking</i> is difficult to explain.	23.4%	23.2%	53.5%
2. Everyone has a different definition of <i>just talking</i> .	5.2%	12.4%	82.4%
3. <i>Just talking</i> is a step in entering a committed relationship.	11.6%	27.4%	60.9%
4. <i>Just talking</i> involves hooking up.	35.6%	33.7%	30.7%
5. <i>Just talking</i> involves casual sex.	51.1%	27.3%	21.5%
6. <i>Just talking</i> can lead to a committed relationship.	2.6%	11.3%	86.1%
8. Commitment is a part of <i>just talking</i> .	46.9%	34.5%	18.7%
9. <i>Just talking</i> serves as a necessary screening process for potential romantic partners.	15.6%	28.4%	56.0%
10. <i>Just talking</i> means you are just friends.	53.4%	25.3%	21.3%
11. Technology is important with <i>just talking</i> .	5.7%	16.0%	78.3%
12. It is acceptable for someone to be <i>just talking</i> to multiple people at the same time.	45.9%	25.8%	28.2%
13. <i>Just talking</i> is not dating.	4.1%	15.4%	80.5%
14. <i>Just talking</i> offers a safe alternative to a committed relationship.	43.6%	26.1%	30.2%
15. I would rather be <i>just talking</i> to someone than be asked/ask them on a date.	75.4%	17.0%	7.6%
16. <i>Just talking</i> serves as a gateway to determining what kind of relationship you want to have with a person.	10.9%	19.1%	70.0%
17. <i>Just talking</i> favors the less interested person.	20.8%	32.0%	47.0%

*Note.* The response options *strongly disagree* and *disagree* were combined in the above table to represent how many emerging adults disagreed with the statements about *just talking* relationships. The same was done for the response options of *strongly agree* and *agree*.

Table 2

*Inductively Developed Categories and Themes about Just Talking*

Categories	Themes
<p>Characteristics of <i>Just Talking</i></p>	<p>Ambiguous Definition Pre-Dating</p>
<p>The Purpose of <i>Just Talking</i></p>	<p>Screening Process Keeping Options Open Lesson the Blow</p>
<p>The Role of Technology in <i>Just Talking</i></p>	<p>Technology Facilitates <i>Just Talking</i> Constant Communication Image Crafting</p>

Table 3

*Differences in Beliefs about Just Talking Between Males and Females (N = 655)*

Item	Male		Female		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
1. <i>Just talking</i> is difficult to explain.	3.13	1.00	3.44	1.02	11.54	.001
2. Everyone has a different definition of <i>just talking</i> .	3.85	0.71	4.04	0.78	7.55	.006
3. <i>Just talking</i> is a step in entering a committed relationship.	3.70	0.88	3.59	0.95	1.74	.187
4. <i>Just talking</i> involves hooking up.	2.90	0.96	2.87	1.07	0.08*	.781
5. <i>Just talking</i> involves casual sex.	2.62	0.99	2.49	1.11	1.93*	.166
6. <i>Just talking</i> can lead to a committed relationship.	4.14	0.74	4.11	0.73	0.11	.737
8. Commitment is a part of <i>just talking</i> .	2.78	0.91	2.58	0.93	5.82	.016
9. <i>Just talking</i> serves as a necessary screening process for potential romantic partners.	3.48	1.02	3.48	0.96	0.01	.933
10. <i>Just talking</i> means you are just friends.	2.68	0.92	2.63	0.93	0.29	.594
11. Technology is important with <i>just talking</i> .	3.88	0.83	3.97	0.78	1.53	.216
12. It is acceptable for someone to be <i>just talking</i> to multiple people at the same time.	2.69	1.01	2.77	1.02	0.66	.417
13. <i>Just talking</i> is not dating.	3.81	0.72	4.02	0.75	9.26	.002
14. <i>Just talking</i> offers a safe alternative to a committed relationship.	2.83	1.06	2.76	1.10	0.46	.498
15. I would rather be <i>just talking</i> to someone than be asked/ask them on a date.	2.26	1.00	1.89	0.87	17.68*	<.001
16. <i>Just talking</i> serves as a gateway to determining what kind of relationship you want to have with a person.	3.69	0.91	3.69	0.89	0.00	.957
17. <i>Just talking</i> favors the less interested person.	3.35	0.99	3.37	1.03	0.05	.821

\*Welch's F-statistic used when variances between groups were not homogenous.

Table 4

*Differences in Just Talking Beliefs Based on Previous Participation in a Just Talking Relationship (N = 655)*

<i>While in college, I have personally "just talked" to someone:</i>		Yes		No		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Item</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
1. <i>Just talking</i> is difficult to explain.	3.40	1.00	3.32	1.06	0.83	.363	
2. Everyone has a different definition of <i>just talking</i> .	4.00	0.77	3.99	0.76	0.02	.893	
3. <i>Just talking</i> is a step in entering a committed relationship.	3.71	0.87	3.49	1.00	8.53*	.004	
4. <i>Just talking</i> involves hooking up.	2.95	1.02	2.77	1.07	4.59*	.033	
5. <i>Just talking</i> involves casual sex.	2.56	1.08	2.48	1.09	0.89	.345	
6. <i>Just talking</i> can lead to a committed relationship.	4.20	0.62	4.00	0.84	12.37	<.001	
8. Commitment is a part of <i>just talking</i> .	2.69	0.92	2.56	0.93	3.02	.083	
9. <i>Just talking</i> serves as a necessary screening process for potential romantic partners.	3.59	0.93	3.33	1.03	10.94*	.001	
10. <i>Just talking</i> means you are just friends.	2.61	0.94	2.70	0.92	1.56	.213	
11. Technology is important with <i>just talking</i> .	3.96	0.81	3.92	0.77	0.28	.599	
12. It is acceptable for someone to be <i>just talking</i> to multiple people at the same time.	2.89	1.00	2.56	1.01	17.28	<.001	
13. <i>Just talking</i> is not dating.	3.94	0.75	4.01	0.74	1.35	.245	
14. <i>Just talking</i> offers a safe alternative to a committed relationship.	2.88	1.06	2.64	1.12	7.24	.007	
15. I would rather be <i>just talking</i> to someone than be asked/ask them on a date.	2.08	0.95	1.85	0.85	10.34	.001	
16. <i>Just talking</i> serves as a gateway to determining what kind of relationship you want to have with a person.	3.78	0.80	3.56	0.99	9.27	.002	
17. <i>Just talking</i> favors the less interested person.	3.47	1.01	3.23	1.02	9.25	.002	

\*Welch's F-statistic used when variances between groups were not homogenous.