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Abstract

Moving from high school and the family home to living in a communal university residence can be a significant transition, especially in regard to sexual activity and knowledge. The influence of variable sexuality education programmes, family context, and personal experiences, means that young students come to university with a wide range of sexual knowledge and experiences. The purpose of this thesis is to represent the current narratives about sexuality and heterosex that are both prevalent and important for university students living in the residential community setting.

This research utilised a qualitative approach, with participants who were living in a University of Waikato Halls of Residence taking part in a men-only, or a women-only, focus group. Semi-structured group interviews were also conducted with key informants who work and live in residential halls. Multiple themes were explicated from the focus groups and group interviews, with some discourses overlapping groups (e.g. all groups discussed contraception) and some discourses being distinct to particular groups (e.g. women talked about sexual coercion).

One key finding was the dominant narratives that impact young women’s sexual pleasure. Following on from this were the ramifications of the sexual double standard for young women when living in a community setting. An additional key point of attention was the prominence of problematic sexual narratives when transitioning to the ‘adulthood’ of living in university halls. While participants were primarily happy with residential halls, information was shared regarding how residential staff can impact on student living and contentment. Above all, it seemed that the year in residential halls appeared to be a year of liminality, or transition between ‘youth’ and ‘adult’. The findings from this research suggest a need for further investigation into sexuality discourses that profoundly impact young women and men, as well as the novel experiences of residential living.
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Chapter One: Introduction

My Research Topic Overview

Described by Karp and Holstrom (1998, p.1), as “…structurally in between new and old statuses”, the transition from living in the family home and attending high school, compared to living on campus and attending university, creates many transformations for students. Factors such as shifts in identity, changes in friendships, increased responsibility, and changes in social and living environment, can create both excitement and uncertainty for students making the transition to living in university campus accommodation. My research focuses on this physical and personal transition from high school to halls of residence, with a specific focus on students’ experiences and understandings of sexuality and intimate relations.

It is worth noting that when discussing students’ shared experiences, I primarily make use of the word ‘sexuality’ throughout my thesis. Rather than using ‘sex’, which primarily relates to biology and behaviour, I have chosen to use the word ‘sexuality’ as it encompasses aspects such as biology, behaviour, gender, and desire (Rutter & Schwartz, 2012). This multifaceted term better aligns with the range of information provided by the participants, and more accurately describes the experiences and knowledge which they shared with me.

The content and delivery of the sexuality education curriculum is entirely at the discretion of individual high schools (Ministry of Education, 2015). Consequently, there is a significant variability between the type of sexuality education that students receive prior to living in residential halls. Within residential halls, there are rules regarding appropriate student behaviour, however sexual behaviour is less controlled. Arnett (2000) suggests that due to students living together in an environment which is only regulated to a certain extent, this is a stage that is infused with chancy behaviour in an attempt to understand one’s identity. This chancy behaviour is worth considering when regarding the variability in sexual knowledge, norms, and behavioural understandings that students may have.
Universities have varying configurations of residential housing. Campus accommodation varies, with research suggesting that to best create the feel of ‘home’ for residential students, accommodation needs to be small yet clustered, thus giving a sense of community, while also providing students with the opportunity to create identity (Lawless, 2012). At the University of Waikato, there are four options for residential housing: Orchard Park, Student Village, College Hall, and Bryant Hall. All of these residences are made up of single person rooms, with micro-communities within each. There are singular buildings (e.g. block one, block two), and in each building there are floors (e.g. ground floor, first floor), and the floors are sometimes then split in half into ‘pods’ of around six individual rooms (e.g. as one goes up the central stairway there is a pod on the left and a pod on the right). There is the option within the residential halls to live in a single-sex pod or floor should one wish to do so, as well as the option for an alcohol friendly/alcohol free pod or floor. Within each residence, most students eat in a communal dining area, and there are many communal activities (games room, quiz nights etc.) available to the students. Within these communities lives a diverse range of first year students, as well as the residential staff.

Each hall of residence is primarily run by its own residential manager, who directs the staff and sets the rules in the hall (in conjunction with the overarching residential polices). Subordinate to the managers are the senior residential assistants, who are experienced staff members who live in residence, and act as a guiding figure for the residential assistants. Residential assistants are the primary residential staff who live within the residential community. Each residential assistant is in charge of a specific area in the residence hall (e.g. in charge of ‘Block One’ at Student Village), and lives in that block with the students. Both the senior residential assistants, and the residential assistants are previous residents themselves, giving them the unique perspective of both living and working in the residential setting.

The New Zealand Tertiary Education Strategy 2014-2019 (2014), includes no policies relating to student housing or accommodation, despite all New Zealand universities having accommodation available for students. Specific to Waikato University, residential staff have a hand book for the rules and policies that they must follow (Residential Manager Policy Manual, 2012). The most
recent version (published 2012) covers everything from alcohol, to mental illness, and food poisoning. There is only a small section on sexual assault, and no mention of rules regarding relationships (sexual or romantic) between staff and students. Having been in contact with residential staff about their policies, I was informed that an updated policy manual will be implemented as part of a restructure when a new Associate Director of Student Accommodation is appointed.

Distinct to the staff policy manual, the residents have their own rules and regulations policy, which also has no information specific to sexuality (Accommodation and Conference Services, 2016). The lack of sexuality policies means that there are no official guidelines about what constitutes appropriate and inappropriate behaviour. A combination of unclear rules and alcohol culture within a residential setting can often result in a high number of sexual assaults that are perpetrated by residential acquaintances (Neidig, 2009).

Recent research into halls of residence has been conducted regarding sexual violence and binge drinking, with findings that have perspectives and recommendations relevant to the local context (Cashell-Smith, Connor, & Kypri, 2007; Connor, Gray, & Kypri, 2010; McEwan, 2009; Keene, 2015). However, I chose to specifically look at sexuality and intimate relations in an all-encompassing manner, because this covers a broad range of experiences, both positive and negative, and is an area that is important in the lives of many young people.

My own personal interest, and experiences of living in a halls of residence, influenced the choice of this research topic. Living in a residence has the feeling of having a second family, and although five years has passed, I still remain close friends with many people whom I lived with in halls. Residential halls brought friendships, relationships, and marriages which would never have occurred otherwise in the group of people who I lived with there. Also, having been brought up with significant value placed on the freedom to make personal choices, I was very confident in handling the transition from the family home to attending university and living in residence. Because I found this transition relatively easy, I was interested to get a deeper understanding from the perspectives of students
who may not have had the same autonomy as I did, and whether this influenced their subjective perspectives and choices.

**Thesis Overview**

The initial aim of this research was to gain a deeper understanding of whether heterosexual first year students living in the halls of residence felt that their knowledge of sexual relations prior to attending university had helped or failed to help them navigate experiences of intimate relations when living outside of the family home for the first time. I also intended to investigate whether high school sexuality education classes discussed topics relevant to students’ potential sexual experiences. The topics included; violence, rape, consent, regret, and pleasure, in the context of sexuality and sexual behaviour. By talking to young women and men living in residences about their experiences, I hoped to gain an understanding of how young people view their intimate relations and sexuality.

Written when considering these original research aims, the investigation of students’ perspectives was guided by the following objectives;

1. Where did students gather information and learn about sexual relations (e.g. sexuality education classes, parents, friends, internet) prior to living in halls of residence?
2. To what extent do students feel that what they learnt has taught/prepared them for the reality of any sexual relations they have experienced or talked about in halls of residence?
3. What (if anything) did students learn relating to violence, rape, regret, pleasure, and consent in the context of sexual relations during high school education classes?
4. Have they gained any further knowledge or experience regarding the above-mentioned topics while in halls of residence?

After conducting the focus groups, it became apparent that these aims did not reflect the primary concerns of the young men and women to whom I spoke. While the participants shared their perspectives on my initial aims to an extent, much of the focus of their discussion was about sexuality issues and discourses that are relevant to them while living in residence, which was also reflected when coding and interpreting key themes from the focus group transcriptions. Due to
this unregulated dialogue about sexuality in residential halls being shared, I now hope this thesis will provide a richer source of knowledge and information about current student sexuality, with the aim that my research will provide a starting point of understanding both sexual discourses, and sexuality experiences for halls of residence students within the Aotearoa/New Zealand context.

I also made the decision to have residential managers, senior residential assistants, and residential assistants as key informants. The purpose of interviewing these employees was to get a differing perspective on student sexual behaviour from key informants who live in the same community.

This thesis is divided into five core sections. Having already explained the background of my study, in Chapter Two I review the modest amount of literature relevant to the initial aims of my study. I also review literature that is germane to the key themes that were constructed from the key informant interviews and student focus groups. Where possible, literature from the Aotearoa/New Zealand context is included. Chapter Three discusses my methodology, as well as the decision making process that influenced it, and thus my data collection. Also discussed are the ethics of my research. Chapter Four examines the findings of the interviews and focus groups, with the flow of this section being largely influenced by the themes that I identified during my data analysis. The aforementioned themes are also related to relevant literature, while highlighting narratives from the participants that deviate or expand on what is currently known. My final chapter concludes this thesis, and remarks on my reflections of the research process. Also mentioned are future research options and implications that are drawn from the findings, which are relevant for both residential halls and their students, as well as for young people in the New Zealand context.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Overview

This chapter begins with literature that covers sexuality education in high school, which then gives context to my review of literature covering the transition to living in a university setting. I also review literature that relates to the key sexuality themes that I identified during my data analysis. Aotearoa/New Zealand specific literature, both about the transition to university and sexual knowledge, is limited, but is included wherever relevant.

Sexuality Prior to University

Sexuality education in schools.

Sexuality education in Aotearoa/New Zealand is part of the health and physical education curriculum, which is compulsory in New Zealand schools up to year ten (second year of high school) (Ministry of Education, 2015). In some ways this label of ‘compulsory’ is a misnomer, as sexuality education is the one section of the school curriculum (other than religious education in state schools) where parents are able to withdraw the participation of their child. Sexuality education is also the only part of the curriculum where the school’s board of trustees are required to ask for (at least once every two years) and consider the input of the school community, though the schools still have the final say on how their sexuality education programs are run (Ministry of Education, 2015). This means that schools are able to provide as much, or as little, about sexual education as they deem appropriate. This has historically led to the dominance of an abstinence based approach to sexuality education, with the intent of trying to prevent sexually transmitted infections and teenage pregnancies (Allen, 2005; Allen, 2006b; Caldwell, 2015; Giami, Ohrichs, Quilliam, & Wellings, 2006; Willig, 1999). As of 2015, the Ministry of Education’s updated guidelines on sexuality education included Māori and Pasifika perspectives on sexuality, consent, and coercion (Ministry of Education, 2015). However, because sexuality
education is at the discretion of individual schools, this means that these changes do not have to be implemented.

Sexuality education from other sources.

There is considered to be a ‘deficit’ in New Zealand sexuality education by students and researchers, as schools primarily choose to teach sexuality in a way which ignores the erotic and pleasurable aspects of sex (Allen, 2006a; Allen, 2006b). This lack of holistic sexuality education in formal education processes can lead to the use of increasingly available pornography as a source of information for students (particularly male students) due to its visible sexual nature (Allen, 2006a). This can also be seen at an international level, where young people stated that even after having sexuality education classes at school, there was a lot of information about engaging in sexuality that they did not know, such as how to give oral sex (Rothman, et al., 2015). Some young people then use pornography as a source of information to try to understand how sexual acts work (Rothman & Adhia, 2015; Rothman, et al., 2015; Tjaden, 1988). There are a variety of consequences from this practise, including young men pressuring their partners into imitating scenes they had viewed in pornography. Young men and women suggested that the actors they had seen in pornographic videos seemed to be enjoying the sexual acts they were engaging in, however when the young people themselves tried them, young women specifically reported feeling uncomfortable or physically hurt as a result (Rothman & Adhia, 2015; Rothman, et al., 2015).

When reviewing additional sources that young people gather sexuality information from, ‘friends’ were considered to be the most useful source regarding sexual knowledge (Allen, 2001; Tjaden, 1988). Overall, there is suggestion in the literature that the variable nature of sexuality education has led to a deficit in student knowledge, and as a result young people are utilising alternative sources in an attempt to learn about sexuality.

The Transition to University

Liminality is the concept of transitioning between two different states, whether that liminal state is a social role, category, or position (Neumann, 2012).
It can also be thought of as a rite of passage. When conceptualizing life within a residential hall, it could arguably be considered as a year of liminality. The years prior to living in residential halls are generally spent in a family home, with any rules and structures that might include. Within residential halls there are rules in place for residents’ safety, however residents are afforded the (arguably subjective) freedom to make their own decisions otherwise (University of Waikato, n.d.). Most students who live in residential halls only do so for one year before moving off campus. This period in residential halls could be considered an in-between state, that generally comes after the period of being a ‘youth’ in a family home, and before the freedoms and responsibilities of ‘adult’ life.

When considering the transition to university, New Zealand high school students thought greater responsibility might be placed on their learning within a tertiary environment (Walker, 2010). Although learning is the focal point of university, the students were most looking forward to making new friends. Additional to this is the positive effect on university retention rates that result from students having social integration and positive platonic relationships (e.g. with friends, lecturers, tutors) within a university setting (Rubin & Wright, 2014; Yorke & Thomas, 2003; Zepke, et al., 2005). While useful to look at factors that influence a smooth transition to university, it was surprising to find that the literature lacks consideration of the effect that romantic and sexual relationships can have on a student’s transition or retention, especially considering the probable change that occurs from living in a family environment to the relative freedom of university. I was unable to find information related to sexuality and the transition to university, however there are a number of studies looking at sexuality in undergraduate students, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Literature about living on a university campus is dominated by research that has been conducted in an American setting. Halls of residence is the New Zealand equivalent of American college dormitories, although there are some notable differences which affects the relevance of the literature in relation to my study. One key difference is that American dormitories are primarily shared rooms, and as a result most literature focuses on room-mate relationships (Sacerdote, 2001; Stinebrickner & Stinebrickner, 2006; Van Laara, Levin, Sinclair, & Sidanias, 2005). In New Zealand, the majority of rooms in
universities’ halls of residence are singular, and at the University of Waikato specifically, all available accommodation is in single rooms (University of Waikato, n.d.). While some of the American based literature is relevant, having research specific to New Zealand’s single room context would be useful for understanding student sexuality.

**Constructions of Young People’s (Hetero)sex**

**Romantic relationships and hook up culture.**

Earlier research that recognised young people’s sexuality often contrasted it to more ‘adult’ understandings of relationships; a person’s age was thought to dictate how committed they are to relationships (Griffiths, 1995). Young people were thought to be ‘less serious’ about relationships, and on the other end of the continuum, adults were thought to be engaging in more ‘mature’ relationships (Griffiths, 1995). This was a short lived theory, with the creation of a continuum based on relationship status replacing the continuum based on age and maturity (Morris & Fuller, 1999). At one end of the relationship status continuum is casual sexual encounters, and at the other end is have a steady partner. Although more relevant, this continuum was only applied to young people’s relationships, which suggests that there was still the assumption that adults had ‘matured’ and therefore did not engage in any kind of relationship outside of a committed one.

This assumption that monogamous and committed relationships are the end goal for people has been supported by young people who engage in casual sex (Allen, 2004; Farvid, 2011). Prior to having the pursued monogamous relationship, young people define a variety of casual sexual encounters that one can engage in while ‘waiting’. Terms like ‘one-night stand’, ‘friends with benefits’ or a ‘quick fling’, amongst many others, are terms that describe various constructions of heterosex that are relevant to young people today (Allen, 2004; Farvid, 2011). All of these terms come under the umbrella of ‘hook up culture’, which describes the culture of engaging in casual sexual contact that is more prevalent in current times (Arms特朗, England, & Fogarty, 2009; Bogle, 2008; Hekelman & Wade, 2010; Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000). Some young women have suggested that hook ups are marked by a lack of communication, which often results in confusion about whether a hook up fits into one of the ‘hook up’
categories, or if it has the potential to develop into something more sustained (Lovejoy, 2015). This is relevant when considering what actually constitutes ‘hooking up’.

Definitions of ‘hooking up’ are varied. Almost all ‘hook ups’ include kissing (Fielder & Carey, 2010). A majority of hook ups also incorporate sexual behaviour, of which a wide range of behaviours are labelled by young people (Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000; Reiber & Garcia, 2010). The use of the word hook up therefore encompasses a wide range of activity; however, all hook ups are defined by a lack of commitment between the participants (Hatfield, Hutchison, Bensman, Young, & Rapson, 2012; Lewis, Granato, Blayney, Lostutter, & Kilmer, 2011). When considering these definitions in relation to casual sexual intercourse, casual sex can always be defined as ‘hooking up’, but not all hooking up is casual sex. While these terms are often used interchangeably when reviewing literature (Garcia, Reiber, Massey, & Merriwether, 2012; Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000), this distinction is useful to note when interpreting young people’s personal perspectives on their sexuality experiences, particularly since young people define (hetero)sexual intercourse as qualitatively different to non-coital sexual activity (Allen, 2004).

When considering a more rounded view of sexuality on campus, hook up behaviour is often part of public student narratives. “‘The campus as a sexual arena’”, (Bogle, 2008, p. 72) describes how student sexual activity often occurs on campus, with fellow residents witnessing the lead up to said sexual activity, and discussing it afterwards. Gossip about fellow residents’ sexual activity was described by participants as a staple part of living on residence. The young men and women often judged and gossiped about others’ sexual behaviour, while also suggesting that their own personal behaviour should be their own business, and not subject to gossip (Bogle, 2008).

Within neighbourhoods, there are also sexuality narratives that have an influence on young people (Warner, Giordano, Manning, & Longmore, 2011). Adolescents within a geographical neighbourhood are influenced by the attitudes that their peers have regarding sex, which is arguably relevant to the community setting that a residential hall provides. Sexual scripting theory is particularly
relevant in connection to these community attitudes about sexuality (Simon & Gagnon, 1986; Simon & Gagnon, 2003). Sexual scripting theory suggests that there are sexuality scripts at the macro level (gender roles and enactment of heterosex), the interpersonal level (socialisation, and sexual norms), and intrapsychic scripts (individual level of sexual desires and gender roles). While an individual may have their own personal understandings of sexuality, the influence of other young people within a community residence will define the dominant narratives that are portrayed regarding sexuality.

Hegemonic masculinity was a dominant narrative in relation to young people’s sexuality (Allen, 2004; Allen, 2007). Although young men will sometimes show a form of ‘romantic masculinity’ when talking about steady romantic relationships, typical hegemonic masculinity is often shown by young men when discussing sexuality, as they often refer to agentic male sexuality, and relative to that, passive female sexuality (Allen, 2007). This is relative to the fact that men are normatively regarded as active sexual agents, whereas women are portrayed as the passive recipients of heterosex (Hird & Jackson, 2001; Holland, Ramazanoglu, Sharpe, & Thomson, 1998). In relation to this, young men often hold more power and agency when engaging in (hetero)sexual activity (Allen, 2003). Gendered heterosexual relationships are changing in that women are beginning to express more sexual agency and power; however, it appears that there is still the underlying presence of patriarchal male power in young people’s narratives of heterosex (Allen, 2003). This is notable regarding sexual pleasure, with young women often prioritising men’s sexual pleasure above their own during heterosex (Allen, 2003; Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). Although young women express sexual agency and desire on a level similar to young men, young women themselves still characterise their sexual desire as more transitory than men’s sexual desire (Reid, Elliott, and Webber, 2011).

**Sexual pleasure.**

The coital imperative\(^1\) is a key narrative in New Zealanders’ experiences

---

\(^1\) The ideal that ‘normative’ heterosex consists of vaginal penetration by the penis. For more information on this, see Jackson, 2004.
with heterosex (Hird & Jackson, 2001; McPhillips, Braun, & Gavey, 2001; Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). ‘Sex’ commonly means intercourse, with the coital imperative also being linked specifically to male orgasm. Orgasms for men were almost exclusively linked to intercourse, whereas for women, orgasms were usually achieved prior to coitus (Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). Sexual enjoyment still occurs for young women when they do not experience an orgasm during heterosex, however there is a significant, positive relationship between receiving an orgasm, and women enjoying their sexual experience (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012).

The idea of reciprocity during sexual activity is primarily linked to an exchanging of orgasms, rather than reciprocating general sexual enjoyment (Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003; McPhillips, Braun, & Gavey, 2001). “Ideal reciprocity” (Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003, p. 245) is when both partners are able to orgasm simultaneously, however this was considered to be something ‘special’, rather than the norm. This reciprocity, however, seems to relate primarily to men. Giving a steady romantic partner orgasms has been linked to a man’s sense of masculine identity and sexual accomplishment (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012), however when men do not receive an orgasm from their partner in return, it is likened to ‘manipulation’ or ‘selfishness’ on behalf of the woman partner (Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). In contrast, women can receive a reciprocal orgasm, however it is not something that is automatic, women generally need to ‘assert themselves’ and ask for one (Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003).

Specific to a university setting, some young women students stated that orgasms are more likely to occur for them within the context of a relationship (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012). In contrast to this, orgasms are less likely to occur for women when they have repeated hook ups with the same person, and a casual one-off hook up was least likely to lead to orgasm (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012). Young men who engage in casual sexual activity are unlikely to feel obliged to sexually pleasure a hook up partner. A range of reason were given for this by the participants, including the young men suggesting that a casual hook up is a selfish indulgence (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012).
There remains the narrative that men’s sexual pleasure is the priority during sexual activity, particularly casual sexual activity, and therefore women have limited entitlement to sexual pleasure (Lovejoy, 2015). Relational to this is the notion that male orgasm is ‘normal’, and usually the end point of sexual activity (Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). As a result, men are more likely to gain sexual pleasure from their casual sex experiences than women (England, Schafer, & Fogarty, 2008).

Should sexual pleasure not be offered by a woman’s partner, there is the suggestion that young women should assert their sexual agency and ask for it (Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). Supplementary to this, women have more than double the chance of experiencing an orgasm during sexual activity (with a partner) when they engage in self-stimulation (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012). New Zealand specific research also suggests that women who are more autonomous during casual sex, (compared to engaging in sex with a lack of agency) are more likely to report enjoying their casual sex experiences (Beres & Farvid, 2010). While women’s autonomy is obviously helpful for women’s pleasurable experiences, suggesting that women ‘should’ take more responsibility for their sexual behaviour places less of the accountability for a mutually pleasurable experience on young men. This is particularly relevant when considering that young women are often also ‘responsible’ for young men’s pleasure during sexual activity (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2009; Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012; Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003).

Overall, there appears to be clear, gendered differences in the way sexual activity is experienced, regarding; orgasming, expectations of previous sexual activity, and expectations of sexual agency. These points are particularly relevant when comparing steady sexual relationships to casual sexual activity.

**Challenges of Young People’s (Hetero)sex**

The dominant discourse when researching young people’s sexuality is to place their behaviour within a framework of ‘risk’, with researchers often suggesting that young people, particularly women, engage in adverse sexual behaviours (Bogle, 2008; Cashell-Smith, Connor, & Kypri, 2007; Connor, Gray, & Kypri, 2010; Fielder, Walsh, Carey, & Carey, 2013; Kypri, Langley, &
Stephenson, 2005; Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000; Warner, Giordano, Manning, & Longmore, 2011). While acknowledging and discussing these risks, this section focuses less on young people’s active engagement in ‘risk’ behaviour, and more on the challenging discourses and narratives that affect young people’s engagement in heterosex. This framework (i.e. lack of ‘risk’ prioritisation) of the literature better aligns with my focus on constructions of masculinity, which arguably provides a more encompassing understanding of young people’s heterosex experiences (Allen, 2004).

**Heterosex narratives.**

In spite of some significant shifts in heterosex narratives in recent decades, gendered narratives regarding sexual activity remain prevalent (Lovejoy, 2015). Women are still subjected to the sexual double standard in terms of being criticized for their engagement in sexual activity, in contrast to men who acceptably engage in the same behaviour (Crawford & Popp, 2003; England, Schafer, & Fogarty, 2008; Smith, Mysak, & Michael, 2008; Zaikman & Marks, 2014). Expanding on this is the finding that there is a link between a person’s sexist attitude (and to an extent, endorsement of traditional gender roles) and their endorsement of the sexual double standard (Zaikman & Marks, 2014). Sexist attitudes and traditional gender roles are primarily targeted towards women in a negative manner, which combined with the sexual double standard, means that women face the majority of the negative repercussions for having active sexual agency. The sexual double standard and women’s sexual agency are also linked to the competition hypothesis, which suggests that women judge other women more critically for their sexually active behaviour, because other women represent competition for a potential male partner (Clayton & Trafimow, 2007; Zaikman & Marks, 2014).

The sexual double standard is also an issue in the local context, with young women confirming they worry about the possibility of gaining a negative sexual reputation when engaging in casual sex (Farvid, Braun, & Rowney, 2016). It appears that engaging in casual sex is acceptable to an extent, but when a young woman “goes along with anyone” (Farvid, Braun, & Rowney, 2016, p. 11), and therefore engages in ‘too much casual sex’, a negative sexual reputation and label
is usually given. This can result in a loss of peer acceptance over time, whereas engaging in a lot of sexual activity for young men has the opposite effect, with young men often gaining popularity with their peers based on their sexual behaviours (Kreager, Staff, Gauthier, Lefkowitz, & Feinberg, 2016). As a whole, it is clear that for young women, there are acceptable and not acceptable ways to engage in casual sexual activity. In contrast, however, it seems acceptable for young men to engage in as much casual sexual activity as they wish.

In relation to young men’s sexuality, it has been suggested that if a male student enters halls of residence as a virgin, he would not continue to be a virgin for long (Bogle, 2008), and men in residential settings are shamed if they are, or remain, virgins. This can be understood in relation to the stereotype that young men have a natural, permanent state of sexual desire (Hird & Jackson, 2001; Reid, Elliott, and Webber, 2011). Related to this is the pressure that young men can face in regards to ‘displaying’ their heterosexuality (and therefore their masculinity) by engaging in sexual intercourse (Hird & Jackson, 2001). When young men deviate from this norm (by being/remaining a virgin), it conflicts with young people’s constructions of normative heterosexuality (Reid, Elliott, and Webber, 2011).

Regarding the earlier note about young men’s virginity in a residential setting, the research was conducted in an international context, and it would be interesting to note whether students within a New Zealand residential setting also have similar experiences.

Sexual victimization and coercion.

Research with New Zealand undergraduate students conducted in the 1980s/90s reported that 52% of the young women students interviewed had experienced sexual victimization, with rape or attempted rape being experienced by 25% of the women (Gavey, 1991). Most of this sexual victimization occurred within the context of heterosexual relationships, with less than 20% of incidences being perpetrated by strangers (Gavey, 1991). This is still a current issue, with women that took part in more recent research describing personal experiences of sexual violence in New Zealand halls of residences, which were perpetrated by fellow residents (Keene, 2015). Regarding this issue of sexual victimization in a university setting, Keene identified universities as having only a reactive response
to sexual violence, and indicated the lack of research into sexual violence in relation to institutional risk, with such research often putting a negative light on the university in question (2015).

Sexual victimization and coercion is not all physical or violent in nature, however, with young women often experiencing non-violent coercion tactics from young men (Hird & Jackson, 2001; Beres, 2010). Sexual coercion can take on the form of emotional manipulation, particularly with young men suggesting that a young woman’s ‘love’ for them should be proved through sexual intercourse (Hird & Jackson, 2001). In a New Zealand based research project, a young woman aptly described this form of sexual coercion when recounting a personal experience: “and if you say no, [a young man will say] ‘oh but if you love me you’d let me [have sex with you]” (Hird & Jackson, 2001, p.34). Participants in this research also stated that almost all incidents of emotional and physical sexual coercion happened at social events, and were perpetrated by an acquaintance, friend, or partner. While only one study, this form of coercion within the New Zealand context is worth noting when looking at sexuality within a residential community setting, due to the continuous contact and shared experiences of residents.

On another note, students in both New Zealand and Canada were asked to imagine themselves in a given scenario about a heterosexual couple on a date, in which sex was refused by the woman partner at the beginning, yet sex still occurred at the end of the date. Often, students suggested that the change could be explained by the young woman consenting to sexual behaviour later in the date after resolving their previous ambivalence. Some stories offered by male student participants, however, portrayed coercion and persistent sexual advances, with no mention of whether the woman partner actually changed her mind about wanting to engage in sexual activity (Beres, Senn, & McCaw, 2013). Overall, however, none of the stories showed any form of miscommunication between the partners, concluding that the young men participants clearly understood the notion that, when a woman says no, it is a definitive ‘no’ at that point in time. The suggestion that men clearly understand when women do not consent (either verbally or non-verbally) to heterosex is not a novel idea, and has been supported by multiple investigations into young people’s understandings of sexual consent (Beres, 2010;
McCaw & Senn, 1998; O’Byrne, Rapley, & Hansen, 2006; O’Byrne, Hansen, & Rapley, 2008).

Young women in the New Zealand context also have the problem of being labelled as a ‘cock tease’ or ‘leading a guy on’, based on their supposed interest in sexual intercourse with young men, which they do not ‘follow through with’ (Hird & Jackson, 2001). This supposed interest of young women was linked to the discourse that suggests women passively take part in heterosex, and do not overtly show sexual desire to the young man that is actively pursuing them. The issue here is that the young men in the study often overestimated the young women’s interest in sex, and then failed to recognise that young women may genuinely have no interest in sexual activity with them (Hird & Jackson, 2001). While there has been robust research that found men overestimate women’s interest in sex (DeSouza & Hutz, 1996; Fisher & Walters, 2003; Henningsen, Henningsen, & Valde, 2006; Hird & Jackson, 2001) this to an extent contradicts the earlier suggestion that men understand verbal and non-verbal cues of sexual consent by women (Beres, 2010; McCaw & Senn, 1998; O’Byrne, Rapley, & Hansen, 2006; O’Byrne, Hansen, & Rapley, 2008). It would be worth investigating this further when reviewing young people’s sexuality.

Alcohol.

When attempting to find a sexual partner, University of Waikato residential students often reported using alcohol as a facilitation method (McEwan, 2009). Specifically, students reported that alcohol lowers their inhibitions, which makes it easier to act on sexual desires (Lovejoy, 2015; Reid, Elliott, & Webber, 2011). Despite this, a key narrative from students was the relationship between sexual activity and sexual harm, with 24% of participants saying they had “ended up in a sexual situation [they] weren’t happy about” as a result of drinking (McEwan, 2009, p. 231). Alcohol related sexual harm has also been raised as a substantial issue within student culture generally (Connor, Gray, & Kypri, 2010; Cashell-Smith, Connor, & Kypri, 2007). Undergraduate students in New Zealand stated that they had experienced unwanted sexual advances, sexual assault, and date rape, in relation to other people’s drinking behaviours.
Heavy drinking by the students themselves was also related to regrettable or unpleasant sexual activity.

New Zealand undergraduate students have suggested that when a young woman engages in too much alcohol use, someone else needed to look out for her sexual safety, whereas this was not considered an issue for young men (McEwan, 2009). Although alcohol influenced inappropriate sexual behaviour (e.g. unwanted sexual advances) is deemed as socially unacceptable by residential students (McEwan, 2009), young women stated lowered inhibitions from alcohol use can lead to sexual victimization of young women by men due to the laissez-faire narrative (Lovejoy, 2015). The lack of inhibitions from alcohol meant the young women were sometimes placed in vulnerable positions, with the suggestion that men often viewed these women as expendable or available due to their intoxication.

Also relevant to the topic of alcohol, young New Zealand men reported higher levels of unprotected sexual activity following drinking (Connor, Gray, & Kypri, 2010; Cashell-Smith, Connor, & Kypri, 2007; McEwan, 2009). Although student engagement in unprotected sex is often linked to alcohol, other research argues that New Zealand’s national ‘she’ll be right’ (things will work out in the end) narrative was used by their participants as an explanation of New Zealand’s high STI rate compared to other countries, and may be an influence on (lack of) safe sex during casual sexual activity (Braun, 2008).

It seems that for young people, alcohol is often intricately linked to instances of sexual activity, and in addition, sexual harm. Sexual harm without alcohol is also relevant to young women’s experiences particularly, with sexual coercion and victimization being experienced, including in a university setting. Also relevant are the challenging norms and narratives related to young people’s sexuality, such as the sexual double standard, and understanding of men’s ‘natural’ portrayal of heterosexuality. All of these challenging aspects of sexuality are worth consideration in relation to the way I approach my research.

---

2 The expectation that casual sex involves a lack of emotional or romantic connection (Lovejoy, 2015).
Summary

A review of sexuality literature (Bogle, 2008; Fielder, Walsh, Carey, & Carey, 2013; Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000; Warner, Giordano, Manning, & Longmore, 2011) shows a conceptual framework that portrays young people’s sexuality (particularly young women’s) as ‘risky’, with focus placed on the negative consequences that may result from engaging in sexuality behaviour. In contrast, it can be argued that conducting research which focuses on young people’s positive understandings of sexuality can be equally as insightful as using a ‘risk’ framework (Allen, 2004). Aligned with this is the suggestion that focusing on young people’s conceptualisations of sexuality will provide a better space for understanding, in contrast to the risk frameworks or statistical categorizations that can often be used for analysing youth sexual behaviour (Allen, 2004). My research aims to amalgamate all of these approaches by portraying young people’s perspectives of both the positive aspects of their sexuality, as well as the ‘risky’ aspects of sexuality as the participants describe them. The purpose of this is to give an all-encompassing discussion of young people’s sexuality from their perspective.

While wanting to understand sexuality from young peoples’ perspectives, it is also worth noting that sex and sexuality do not occur within a vacuum; there are many norms, expectations, and understandings that influence how sexuality is enacted. This review underlines some of the themes that are influenced by these shared constructions, such as alcohol, the sexual double standard, and the social constructions of heterosex and hook ups. Within halls of residence there are also customs that are specific to living in a community setting with fellow students, and this review highlights the lack of research that is specific to university student’s sexuality in a residential setting (outside of a risk framework). This research aims to contribute to this area of knowledge, by portraying the perceptions and understandings (as told by students) of sexuality within a residential setting specific to the Aotearoa/New Zealand context.
Chapter Three: Methodology

This chapter navigates my chosen methodology for this research project through five key sections. The first section discusses the frameworks for my approach to the research, and the decision-making process I went through when choosing my approach. Following this, the second section describes how this approach influenced my research method, and the subsequent criteria and recruitment of participants before gathering data. The third section describes the data collection process in detail, followed by the analysis section, which explains the procedure I used to transcribe and analyse said data. Additionally, there is a section regarding the ethics of my study.

My biases and value systems are an interconnected part of my research process. My cultural lens likely leads to an interpretation of the data that reflects understanding from a tertiary educated, Pākehā perspective. Having previously lived in a hall of residence with my own recollections and ideas also potentially influenced my understanding of student’s perspectives. Also, given the gendered nature of the narratives and experiences that were discussed by the participants, my feminism will have brought a distinct perspective to the interpretation of the data.

Approach to Research

As mentioned earlier, there is a limited amount of research into the lives of Aotearoa/New Zealand halls of resident students, particularly in relation to sexuality. Because of the lack of information about residents’ sexual experiences, I wanted to use an approach that would let me listen to residents’ perspectives, with the intention of giving a student perspective on how prepared they felt for the transition from attending high school and living in the family home, to living in co-gendered halls of residence. I also wanted to talk to key informants (i.e. residential assistants that lived in residence) to gain alternative perspectives on student sexual behaviour, and gather a potentially more rounded view of students’ sexuality.

Because of the aforementioned lack of research, and my own research aims, I chose to use a qualitative approach for my study. A qualitative approach is
able to give a richness of information, as well as having a subject centred focus (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This gave me the opportunity to gather a wealth of valuable information from participants, while still focusing on their perspectives and subjective understandings of their life in residential halls. I also used an inductive thematic analysis approach to my research, which is a useful tool for beginning researchers such as myself because of the clear guidelines (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Inductive thematic analysis allows flexibility in understanding discourses and perspectives, with the information shared by the participants informing the themes, rather than themes being guided by previous research.

**Research Method**

I started by contacting the Manager of each residential hall at the University of Waikato, and their joint primary manager (the Associate Director of Student Accommodation). I described my research project, explaining why I wanted to talk to their employees as key informants, and students as participants. I discovered that one hall (Orchard Park) was unsuitable for my study due to no students fitting my criteria. However, the other three residences (Student Village, College Hall, and Bryant Hall) were suitable and the residential managers were willing to co-operate with my research.

Group interviews were undertaken with staff, rather than individual interviews, because the primary manager suggested that it would be simpler to attend the weekly staff meeting in each of the three residential halls (which the key informants are required to attend as part of their work role), rather than attempting to recruit individual key informants and find a suitable meeting time. Although key informant interviews would normally be held on a one-one basis, this group format helped build a collective view on relevant issues, particularly in view of the fact that I was looking for information from a targeted group of community members (i.e. the staff), rather than a wide range of community members. The semi-structured group interviews were held at the end of each residential meeting, giving me the opportunity to gain insights into student behaviour in specific halls, and about student sexual behaviour generally.

I chose to conduct focus groups with the student participants. Focus groups give the opportunity for participants to explore views together, and share
issues of importance, while still giving me the opportunity to facilitate the discussion (Kitzinger, 1995). Participants were able to collaborate and discuss what they thought about life within their shared hall of residence in relation to sex. While focus groups have the potential to suppress diversity in opinions, there is also the possibility that the participants may offer mutual support for individual group members who raise contentious or difficult issues (Kitzinger, 1995). I used a semi-structured format, as I had key questions and topics I wanted to discuss, but I also wanted to hear about unique experiences that I may not have considered, thus giving more insight into student knowledge.

Single-sex focus groups were chosen for participants because the company of same-sex peers can help students to feel more comfortable in sharing information (Smith & Bowers-Brown, 2010). It would also give me the opportunity to understand gendered experiences regarding sex in the halls of residence context. Due to the sensitive nature of my chosen topic, I aimed for small sized focus groups, with a minimum of four participants in each, and a maximum of six.

Overall, this gave me a total of three key informant group interviews, and two focus groups; one with young women only, and one with young men only. I both intended and attempted to get more focus groups, however this did not eventuate. Consideration was given to the idea of including further measures for data collection (e.g. online surveys), however when reviewing the focus group and group interview transcriptions, it was clear that the existent data was rich and wide-ranging, and would provide enough material on which to base the thesis.

**Participant criteria.**

Because the original purpose of my research was to understand student preparedness, I specifically chose to talk to students who had moved straight from attending high school and living the family home, to living in a residential halls environment. This potentially removed some of the variables that could come from either living in a non-supervised environment, or from gaining further sexual knowledge from sources outside of high school. Within these criteria, I chose to
specifically focus on heterosexual students due to the limited scope of a Master’s thesis.

Regarding key informants, I primarily wanted to hear perspectives from staff that live on campus with the students, as they are mostly likely to be witness student sexual behaviour and narratives. Residential assistants and senior assistants both live in residence with the students, and are former residents themselves; therefore, they potentially have an understanding of student sexual behaviour that other staff members may not be aware of.

**Data Collection**

Data collection had two main components; group interviews with key informants (residential assistants, senior residential assistants, and/or residential managers), and focus groups with student participants.

I started by attending a weekly staff meeting in each halls of residence, which was attended by residential assistants, senior residential assistants, the residential manager, and other key staff. I informed the staff members about who I am, and why I was wanting to interview them at the end of their meeting if they were willing to take part. Following their meeting, I held a semi-structured group interview with any of staff who were willing to stay behind and talk to me. At the meeting, I provided the staff members with more in-depth details about my research (Appendix 3) and gave them the option to leave if they did not want to take part. This process was very effective as it meant all staff members were already in the same place, and most were willing to stay for a slightly longer time after their usual meeting to talk to me. I then gave the consent sheet (Appendix 5) to the people who stayed behind. Overall, I talked to twenty-two key informants, with eight informants at the first and second group interviews, and six informants at the third interview.

At this point I undertook preliminary analysis of the key informant data, prior to conducting the student focus groups. The purpose of analysing the key informant interviews prior to talking to student participants was so I could identify some important themes (as mentioned by key informants) about sexual behaviour in halls, and include these themes (where relevant) in the focus group discussions.
Volunteer focus groups were used for student participants, with the intention of having a minimum of four people per focus group, with the flexibility to change group size if needed. Each hall helped to distribute information about my study through their Facebook page and/or paper flyers (Appendix 1), and I also distributed flyers around the halls of residence. Participants who contacted me were sent an information sheet (Appendix 2) about the study, and given the option to accept or decline based on the more detailed information.

I was given access to a residential lounge in each hall to conduct the focus groups in, which meant that I could speak with the participants in an environment that was familiar, and accessible, for the participants. When participants arrived, I supplied them with another copy of the information sheet (Appendix 2) and the consent form (Appendix 4) so we could look over them together, giving the participants another opportunity to ask questions. I gave the participants some background information about myself (including that I am a past resident), and my research, as well as an approximate time for how long the focus group process would take. I informed them that there are no ‘correct answers’ and a consensus did not need to be reached, and finished by giving them a reminder about privacy and confidentiality.

I chose to conduct an icebreaker to get the participants talking to each other, and also to get them thinking about key areas related to sex. I made use of an activity suggested by a sexuality workshop resource (Calder-Dawe, 2014), and then tailored the activity to suit my research objectives. Participants were given an outline of two cookie cutter people, with one labelled ‘man’ and one labelled ‘woman’. I then asked them to write on the cookie cutters what was expected of each gender regarding sex, including things in both cookie cutters if they thought anything was expected of both genders. This was successful in the women’s focus group, generating key discussion points. The young men found it confusing and therefore lacked consideration of sex related topics, however the humour they got from it made for a comfortable atmosphere when starting further discussion.

Following the icebreaker, I opened up the discussion using the semi structured focus group guide (Appendix #7), while also giving participants the opportunity to bring up anything they considered important to the topic of sexuality. I asked my key questions and prompts (if needed, sometimes topics
were brought up without facilitation), as well as asking for clarification or further explanation when needed. Otherwise, I stayed in the background and used non-verbal and verbal encouragers. Each focus group was finished with a reminder about privacy.

Analysis

Both key informant interviews and focus groups were recorded using a dictaphone and my laptop. These were strategically placed on different parts of the table when conducting the key informant interviews, which had a greater number of group members. I chose to record using two different methods in case one failed to work, and also because I am partially deaf and have trouble hearing particular sounds when there are many voices speaking. This also gave the opportunity to focus fully on the participants without note-taking or further distractions, and meant I had accurate information about what the participants said.

All recordings were subsequently transcribed verbatim (including relevant non-verbal utterances, e.g. laughter). From the verbatim transcriptions, I made preliminary interpretive summaries of what I thought were the key themes within the focus group transcriptions. To ensure focus group participants were comfortable with my interpretive summaries of their transcriptions, I followed up with a respondent validation process (Bryman, 2008). The participants received a summary of the key points that I generated from their focus groups, and had the opportunity to give feedback within two weeks. I also used this as an opportunity to check in with the participants and make sure no harm was caused through the focus group process. I received no response from any participants, and thus assumed the summary of points for each group was accurate.

Thematic analysis was used to code the transcribed data from all the focus groups and group interviews (Braun & Clarke, 2006). It was clear from the transcriptions that the key informants and residential participants had very different narratives. Because the young women’s focus group had more than double the content of the other groups (approximately three hours) I primarily focussed on coding their transcription, and reviewing the young men’s transcript, and key informants’ transcripts in relation to this. I coded the data manually, with
an inductive, ‘data-driven’ approach being used (Braun & Clarke, 2006). I wrote short notes in the margin of the transcriptions, and worked towards separating segments of data into different, distinct codes. I ended up with many different codes, which I wrote on individual pieces of paper. I then used these pieces of paper to make piles of related codes, which I then narrowed down to multiple key themes. My original findings draft had all these key themes in their own sections, however when rereading it, it appeared too disjointed. The key themes were then narrowed down to five overarching sections, with relevant, distinct themes labelled in each section.

**Ethics**

My research project was approved by the University of Waikato’s School of Psychology Research and Ethics Committee. My application was prepared after preliminary discussions with the Associate Director of Student Accommodation. There were several ethical issues I had to consider, as discussed below.

**Student participants.**

There were some ethical considerations that I found to be particularly relevant to the student participants in my research. Minimising potential risks and discomfort was my main concern, as sexual experiences are often considered to be a taboo subject of a personal nature. There was also the potential that conversation about sensitive topics, including negative sexual experiences, might take place. I made sure to explicitly state on my recruitment flyers that my research was on sexual expectations and preparedness, as well as making sure it was clear that it was a volunteer focus group with fellow participants identifying as the same gender, and from the same residence. This was again explained in further detail on the information sheet. The purpose of this was to ensure that I had participants who were comfortable talking about sex in a group situation with people they potentially know. I also made it clear that the participants were welcome to share personal stories, but that this was not a requirement. As mentioned earlier, I used the respondent validation process to check in with participants and also share links to help services, should the participants wish to use them.
Another key consideration was privacy. The participants lived in the same hall, so they potentially knew each other or people that could be mentioned in the group discussion. Because of this, privacy was mentioned in the information sheet that they were both sent, and given before the commencement of the focus group. Respecting privacy and the confidentiality of fellow participants was also included in the consent form they were required to sign before taking part in the focus group. I also made sure to address the issue verbally at both the beginning and the end of each focus group, with emphasis placed on not discussing information outside of the focus group, especially if it may identify a fellow participant.

**Key informants.**

Key informants had similar ethical considerations to student participants, in regards to the risk of them not feeling comfortable talking to me about the topic of sex, and issues of privacy. Because of this, I stated at the beginning of their staff meeting who I was and what I was researching, and how they would be involved if they chose to participate. Staff had the option of leaving at the end of the meeting as normal, and for the staff that stayed I handed out my information sheets, which clearly restated that I wanted to discuss student sexual behaviour, and verbally reminded them about respect of people’s privacy and confidentiality. I also verbally stated that they were welcome to ask questions, or leave should they decide not to participate after reviewing the information. Only after this process did I collect consent forms and start the group interview.

**Summary**

My research used a qualitative, inductive thematic analysis approach, with the specific use of key informant interviews, and participant focus groups. The purpose of this was to gather rich data about the subjective perceptions of sexual experiences for residents living in a university hall, following their transition from living in a family home and attending high school. Mentioned are the sensitive ethics around the topic of sex, as well as how potential harms were ameliorated.
Chapter Four: Findings

Overview

When taking into consideration the research objectives, it was most fitting to start the findings by discussing participants’ ‘Sexuality Prior to University’, before tying this section into participants’ experiences of ‘Moving into a Residential Community’. Although the transition to halls of residence was an integral part of the research objective, the majority of the participants’ discussions were dominated by current narratives that are affecting them while they live in residence, with these being discussed in ‘Norms of Sexuality within Halls of Residence’. Following this, it seemed logical to examine the ‘Challenges and Tensions’ that can occur in a residential setting.

Sexuality Prior to University

I started the focus groups by asking the participants about how they had acquired sexual knowledge during their time at high school. A common belief which emerged during this discussion was that they ‘just knew’ about sex:

We just knew. It was weird, like my year was [sic] very, very already knew (Young Woman)

At first, there was no explanation or understanding of where the knowledge they ‘just knew’ had come from. However, when probed, some of the young men stated that they remembered one or two classes between years 8-11 of high school, but that they did not receive any information at school beyond that point:

We had a year 9 [sexual education assembly], a year 10 one, and year 11 I think I only ever had like one health class
Only in like year 9
Yeah, that was like year 8, year 9 (Young Men)

In comparison, the young women remembered their sexuality education classes more clearly, but considered them to be largely negative learning experiences. They compared their sex education classes to drug education classes,
with the main theme for teaching sexuality being to ‘just say no’ to sex, and actions leading up to sex being compared to ‘gateway drugs’:

But it was all just trying to scare us, like, showing you awful photos, awful videos, and being like don’t-
It’s like the whole drug education thing, and being like “don’t do it”
Ours was just like the lead up to it, and then it was like this is what happens, this is how you guys…it starts with the contact, it starts with the touch of the hand, with the hug, and then they were just like-
-It’s like those are gateway actions (Young Women)

This abstinence-based approach was seen as a negative and non-productive way to teach students about sex, because it failed to acknowledge that many young people would be engaging in sexual activity anyway. This view is consistent with findings by Allen (2006), regarding the dearth of sexuality and pleasure in sex education in schools, and supports recent research which highlights the ineffectiveness of abstinence based education for student learning (Allen, 2005; Allen, 2006b; Caldwell, 2015; Giami, Ohrichs, Quilliam, & Wellings, 2006; Willig, 1999). The young men and women’s accounts of sexuality education also emphasised the ineffective approach that some schools take when given the autonomy to teach sexuality, as is authorised by the current legislation (Ministry of Education, 2015).

While the schools did not provide an adequate curriculum for the participants, the young women did discuss the value of a school health nurse who was willing to acknowledge and respond to young people’s sexual activity:

We had like, a health nurse at our school who was really, really good and you would basically just pop in and be like ‘hey can I have some condoms’, or ‘hey I need the pill’, or ‘hey I need [the Emergency Contraceptive] pill.’ And she would just be like ‘all good come in at 10’ and then yeah (Young Woman)

Although the nurse did not provide information, she did provide access to contraception, which was considered important by the young women. In regards to useful sexuality education, most participants suggested they had learnt more about sexuality from other sources outside the curriculum. For example, some of the young men utilized the internet:
I: I heard you say internet [earlier], did you learn anything from the internet?
[Awkward Laughter]
How to pay for a free pizza³ (Young Men)

The ‘how to pay for a free pizza’ comment suggests the young men watched pornography as a way to learn about sexual activity. This is in line with the small body of research that has been done regarding young men’s pornography usage (Rothman & Adhia, 2015; Rothman, et al., 2015; Tjaden, 1988). In comparison, however, the young women were more likely to learn about sex from real-life experiences, with the internet as a source for written information (rather than visual pornography):

…in year 10 and 11 we had to do all that sex stuff in PE but a lot of it came from the internet, and like learning from personal experiences and having to deal with your friends’ problems and stuff [while] going through high school. Like something would happen to one of my friends, and we would be like “Well shit what do we do?” and then you learn from that experience what to do next time it happens and it’s like “Oh, okay” (Young Woman)

This reflects the practise of using ‘friends’ as rich sources for understanding sexual experiences (Allen, 2001), as well as personal experiences, in comparison to school based sexuality education. It also highlights a generally reactive stance to sexuality, with sexuality being learnt as one goes along, rather than gaining knowledge prior to experiences.

Neither the men nor the women participants mentioned parents as a resource for sexuality education without prompting. When I asked about parents as a resource, participants’ responses varied, but the common factor among them was that none of the participants had had comfortable or educational discussions with their parents about sexuality. The young men described their parents giving them advice, though even then it was limited:

My mum always tried to push it on me, but like every time she did it I was like nah

³ This is in reference to a common starting scene in online pornographic videos
Dad told me not to get girls pregnant pretty much
(Young Men)

This is different to the experiences of the women participants, who reached the consensus that fathers are generally aware that their daughters are engaging in sexual activity, but prefer to turn a blind eye to it:

Like I’m his little girl, like he accepts that I’m old and I will like do stuff like that, but just he doesn’t want to know about it (Young Woman)

Even when fathers were confronted with evidence, it appeared that avoiding the subject was preferable to facing up to the fact that young women choose to engage in sexual activity:

Me and dad have never talked about it. One time me and my ex thought that he was out, and we were like going at it in the house...and dad gets home, and we didn’t realise. I was like, did you hear someone downstairs? And he was like I think so. And I was like, hello? And dad’s like uh uh um I’m going [out to the shops] (Young Woman)

To an extent, mothers responded the same way as fathers to their daughter’s sexuality. Avoiding the topic was the usual response, until some kind of event occurred where they had to acknowledge their daughter’s sexuality. It seemed that mothers were often ‘disappointed’ when they found out their daughters had lost their virginity, but from that point, sex was almost an acceptable event:

So she lost her absolute shit [when I lost my virginity] but after that, she’s been...it’s kind of like the complete opposite and she’ll be like okay, have any boys lately? And like fist bump me
Yeah, I know what you mean (Young Women)

As one young woman aptly stated in response to mothers’ reactions:

It’s like you get emotional whiplash from this shit (Young Woman)

There were clear gendered differences in how parents attempted to engage in sexuality education with their children. Young men received active responses that showed an awareness from the parents that the young men would potentially be engaging in sexual activity, which could arguably be linked to the assumption that young men have a natural and permanent state of sexual desire (Hird &
Jackson, 2001; Reid, Elliott, and Webber, 2011). Whereas for the young women, sexuality was actively avoided by parents until it was explicitly brought to the forefront, which may be due parents holding the stereotype that young women do not have sexual agency, or actively desire to engage in sex (Hird & Jackson, 2001; Holland, Ramazanoglu, Sharpe, & Thomson, 1998).

**Transition to Living in Halls of Residence**

Participants talked about a number of ways in which being at high school was different to being in halls of residence. Participants discussed not engaging in as much sexual activity in the family home compared to halls, due to the potential of parents or community members finding out:

At home we all knew each other. Coz [participant’s hometown] is really small. So my parents knew everyone so there was no ‘I’m gonna booty-call with that person’ coz then another person would find out and then that would just go round

Yeah [participant’s hometown] is the same (Young Men)

In relation to this, the young women suggested that sexual activity was a lot more prominent in the residential halls environment:

It’s just the only difference is some girls hit the mad whore phase once they get to uni

Yeah

Guilty

[Agreement]

Especially being in the Halls. It’s so easy to just…everyone’s like right there.

If you wanna go and have a booty call, just walk up a flight of stairs and

Exactly

It’s like being on a diet at a smorgasbord (Young Women)

The term ‘mad whore’ is a reference to engaging in a lot of sexual activity, although without necessarily all the negative connotations or judgements usually attached to the term. The young women thus appeared to feel comfortable agreeing to the statement (if applicable). The ‘diet at a smorgasbord’ reference suggests that it would be easy to overindulge in all of the sexual activity that is accessible within the residential community, but that it is best to limit sexual behaviour to a more ‘normative’ level. The ways in which the young women
talked throughout the focus group suggest that a normative level here means engaging in some sexual activity, but not so much that a person is engaging in it with no discrimination. This is discussed further in the ‘Sexual double standards’ sub-section.

The close proximity to sexual activity was also discussed in a more immediate physical sense, with a key informant reporting they often hear sexual activity:

I live next door to residents so I sometimes hear things. It’s quite interesting. You’ve got to make it obvious that you’ve heard them without trying to like barge in on them or something like that. So you’ve gotta like, you know, slam the doors so they get the idea (Key Informant)

Another key informant shared a similar experience regarding hearing sexual activity:

Things like walking down the hallway and hearing people in the shower and then kinda being like…feeling a bit like ‘I get this is your home but there is 27 other people here, it’s not just your home’ (Key Informant)

This behaviour was not typical when the residents lived in their family home prior to university. It seems that due to the lack of regulation of sexual behaviour in a residential setting, there was also a shift in the narratives about acceptable sexual behaviour. Because sexual activity is tolerated, and arguably expected, by staff and fellow residents (whereas it was not expected in the family home by parents), residents are less discreet about engaging in it. Both the young women and men made statements relating to this:

I guess back at high school when we were at the party age we were able to go out and stuff, we just expected, I dunno, most people had only just hooked up. That was just expected at parties and all that. But now here they’ll hook up and it kinda just pushes on to more, so for some people it might be different to back home

Yeah (Young Men)

Similarly, one of the young women commented:
And especially like when I was at home, like in high school and stuff, and I’d go out drinking [and] at the end of the night you just go home. And whoever you were hooking up with at a bar or whatever, they’re not there because you go home with your friends. But here you go home, and the person you’re hooking up with in town is the same person that you come home with, because like you live together. And that’s probably what accounts for like 60% of the stuff that goes on coz people are drunk and then they just end up in the same bed coz the hooking up never stops…it just escalates (Young Women)

These scenarios specifically define ‘hooking up’ as sexual activity that does not develop into coital sex. This non-coital hooking up often happened at high school aged parties because of the limited space provided to participate in sexual intercourse, and also because it was only considered acceptable to go home from parties with your friends. Within the residential community, the key to hooking up turning into sexual intercourse is the fact that young people had their own private bedrooms. These bedrooms give them an acceptable space for engaging in sexual activity away from their parents’ rules that govern sexual behaviour. This relates to the liminality concept (transition between states) that was highlighted earlier (Neumann, 2012), as the residential setting appears to be a distinct transition period from the norms and expectations of the family home and high school. Due to the community setting playing a part in the ‘easy access’ to sexual activity, it is unlikely that residents will have similar experiences when they move out of the residential halls.

There was also a distinct lack of mention of monogamous relationships by the participants. While some research suggests that monogamy is portrayed as the ‘end goal’ of sexuality for young people (Allen, 2004; Farvid, 2011), none of my participants (excluding one who was in a relationship) expressed the desire or interest to be in a monogamous relationship.

Interestingly, both young men and women talked about knowing people from their hometowns ‘too well’, which makes it harder to engage in sexual activity with them. In relation to this, it was easier to engage in sexual activity when first moving into residential halls because residents do not know the other residents very well:
I gotta say it’s easier than home here [to engage in sex]
Yeah nah it is
Yeah
…Just coz everyone knows everyone at home, and here it’s not so much like you know people but you don’t know them (Young Men)

This can also be considered in relation to liminality (Neumann, 2012). When in the earlier stage of attending high school, participants had spent a lot of time with the other people their own age at school, and everyone knew each other ‘too well’ to engage in sexual activity. While in this transition stage at university, there is more access to sexual activity (as highlighted earlier), and residents have not spent enough time together to know each other ‘too well’. Key informants, who had lived in residential halls previously, had insight into how this viewpoint changes as the year continues:

Coz you’re in halls you see a lot more potential like people you would go out with than you would in high school. Like in high school you sorta just see like one face of them but when you live next door to them you see like all their good and bad moods…sorta like a fuller picture (Key Informant)

A fellow key informant expanded on this:

You live in more like the proximity of seeing people every day as well, it’s a lot closer, like I mean, think about when you’re at home you have six hours of your day at school and you see all your school mates, you hardly see your family until you get home. And it’s like, coming back home here it’s like a family, but it’s not a family as such: because it’s at that level where we’re not all related and there is [sexual activity] going behind the scenes that people either do know of or they don’t know of (Key Informant)

It was close to the beginning of the year when I talked to the student participants, and none of them expressed views aligned with this opinion. The young men and women primarily talked in terms of the ‘here and now’, whereas the key informants-who had more of an ongoing experience of life in residential halls and the annual cycles that residents went through-were more likely to discuss future possibilities. A good example of this is:

People just don’t think long term ‘If I have sex with that person who I live two metres from and I have to live with them for another nine months’ (Key Informant)
Overall, this section notes nuanced sexual behaviours and discourses that are specific to a residential setting, as discussed by participants and key informants. The community setting of residential halls means these behaviours and understandings are less likely to be found in other student contexts, such as family homes or flatting situations. Again, it can be argued that the period of time spent in halls of residence is a year of liminality (Neumann, 2012), as the residents are transitioning from previous understandings and norms of sexuality, to those experienced within a residential setting.

**Preparedness for the transition to halls of residence.**

The theme of preparedness for the transition to halls of residence is interwoven throughout the findings. However, there were some key responses by participants that were particularly germane to this theme, and are worth discussing in conjunction with each other.

When I specifically asked how prepared participants felt for the transition to residential halls, I received varying answers. For example, one young woman felt fairly well prepared for the transition:

I was like really curious about basically everything when I was in high school, so I did like a lot of research. So I felt like it, it hasn't really changed, and I like know how to handle stuff (Young Woman)

In contrast, other young women talked in ways that suggested they felt less prepared:

I feel like I was naive when I was younger. It’s like when you hit 18 and you start in that drinking environment like not drinking at high school parties, like drinking in public with people that are adults. Like you know there’s older people around and that’s when it really sinks in that holy shit like [sexual victimization] does go down. (Young Woman)

While this statement was more in relation to drinking and going out to bars in the city, it is worth noting in this section, because drinking culture is an integral part of socialising in a residential halls community (Kypri, Langley, & Stephenson, 2005; McEwan, 2009). Most participants did not mention experiencing adverse sexual events at high school age, and as a result felt ill-equipped for such events occurrence when transitioning to an ‘adult’ setting. The
young men and women referred to themselves (and fellow residents) as ‘boys’ and ‘girls’, however they labelled the other people who visit bars as adults, and suggested that young people (such as themselves) are not accustomed to the explicit sexual victimization that happens in an adult setting. While the women participants were aware that sexual assault occurs at high school age, the majority expressed a lack of personal or acquainted awareness of its occurrence prior to the university setting.

When considering sexual activity in residential halls, the majority of key informants did not believe that students were well prepared for the ramifications of sexual activity with fellow residents:

We have a lot of issues with residents obviously sleeping together. And that causes a lot of social...like social stressors and anxiety later on. Coz they are just out of home and a lot of them do have freedom for the first time, are experimenting and...we’ve had...other issues within blocks, between blocks... (Key Informant)

The young men and women themselves suggested that they were aware of the issues and stressors that can come from sexual activity, but felt that the issues and stressors were good learning experiences for later life:

You’re pretty prepared if you’ve been to halls because if you haven’t had to deal with it personally, you’ve seen it or you’ve witnessed
Heard about it
You’ve had to counsel someone through it
You’ve had to be like, okay that actually happens rather than, coz if I went flatting, firstly you’d have bugger all friends, so you’d only have to live off your own mistakes...coz we all live through each other and try to like you know, do the best for everyone else (Young Women)

These contrasting perspectives are of interest because they suggest that the young people themselves do not label sexuality stressors and issues as ‘problems’, but rather view adversity as an inevitable life experience. Particularly of note is the use of friends as learning forums, which was preferable to learning from personal mistakes. The young women mentioned some of these negative aspects of personal sexuality experiences, that had occurred within residential halls, as the discussion continued. Because of this, I was curious about whether they felt they had made the right decision by choosing to live in halls:
Interviewer: So are you guys glad you came to Halls or-
Oh yeah
[Laughter]
Like I’ve made some really good friends
The friends save it (Young Women)

This was an intriguing point on behalf of the women, because it reflects suggestions that positive platonic relationships and social integration help support retention rates at university (Rubin & Wright, 2014; Yorke & Thomas, 2003; Zepke, et al., 2005). Although the young women’s statements were not specific to the academic aspect of university, it highlights the importance of good friendships within challenging academic environments.

Norms of Sexuality Within the Halls of Residence

Within the residential setting, there are constructions and discourses regarding what is considered normative heterosexuality. Some of these norms are influenced by residents’ past understandings, and some are novel to the residential hall environment. The subthemes describing these norms include; “gaining experiential knowledge”, “virginity”, “screwing the crew”, “unprotected sex”, “gossip”, “pornography”.

Gaining experiential knowledge.

Learning about sex in this section is related to engaging in actual sexual activity, rather than primarily learning through theory (as discussed in ‘Sexuality prior to university’). Young women first discussed experiencing sexual activity at high school:

I had a boyfriend once in high school and he didn’t last very long…I remember my friend had a boyfriend at the time and she’s like oh no I tell my boyfriend when I need to continue or I put his hand down there and he finds it really sexy. I was like okay, maybe I can try something like that. Bad idea, he was so offended. He was so hurt that the 30 seconds was not enough. He was really, really upset and I was like okay I’m never going to do that again (Young Woman)
This story shows contrasting experiences between reported positive sexual experiences (as in the case of the friend) and not so positive experimenting with sex (as in the case of the participant).

When considering young residents’ experimentation with sexual activity in a residential setting, it was chiefly seen as a positive by the key informants:

A lot of kids grow up here…a lot of kids finally lose their virginity and they’re stoked about it. A lot of kids try heaps of stuff…sexual things and grow up and they have an awesome time (Key Informants)

Bogle (2008) also suggests that young men specifically are likely to lose their virginity once entering a residential setting. This could be linked to the earlier discussion about there being ‘easy access’ to sexual activity in a residential setting. However, key informants also suggested that experimenting with sexual activity was not always a positive experience. Because of the wide range of students in residence, all with differing levels of sexual knowledge, there were instances where experimenting led to unexpected consequences:

There was a girl in my first year as well and she had a pregnancy scare and she’s like but I didn’t even have sex with him. So she was completely like I don’t even know what caused that, like she hadn’t been taught, she went to I think a Catholic school and she was just like had no idea what it requires to get pregnant. Like what was what as far as sex goes, so she had a pregnancy scare and she thought she was in the clear (Key Informant)

Key informants suggested it is common for residential assistants to help manage consequences of residents’ sexual activity (be that physical, emotional, or social), which coupled with the quote, highlight the need for more comprehensive sexuality education (Allen, 2006a; Allen, 2006b).

Virginity.

Relatable to experimentation with sexual activity, are the residents who come into a residential setting as virgins. Virginity is a topic widely discussed in halls, with the main connotation being that virgins are pitiable:

…and then one of my friends who is a virgin, and she was all like ‘no’ [I have not had sex], and then you could see their faces change to like oh my god, you’re a virgin, like this is so awkward, like have sex already too-
Or like I feel sorry for you, like oh my god, are you okay? Nobody’s loved you...don’t you feel like you’re missing out
-Coz I could see it on all their faces, and I could see she felt quite uncomfortable and I just turned to her and I said, ‘good for you, you wait until you’re ready’ (Young Women)

Although this instance focused on young women’s experiences, it seems that virginity (or lack of it) was primarily an issue for young men:

I reckon it definitely affects guys. There are a heap of guys that I know that as soon as they’d had sex were just so much more like ‘ahhhh finally I can be like a normal person and I actually fit in with everyone’
[General Agreement]
I know someone that lost their virginity here a couple weeks ago just because they’d been getting ribbed so much from all the boys here …I talked to him afterwards and…he was like honestly like I mostly did it just to get everyone to leave me alone…
I know quite a few guys who are pretending that they’ve had sex when they haven’t so they don’t get ribbed like that
[General Agreement] (Young Women)

This was not surprising, and echoes other research that has found that young men are stigmatized for being virgins within a residential setting (Bogle, 2008). This supports the notion that young men are expected to ‘display’ their heterosexuality through intercourse (Hird & Jackson, 2001) and to remain a virgin is to deviate from the constructions of normative heterosexuality (Reid, Elliott, and Webber, 2011).

As the year continued, it seemed that it was more acceptable for young women to remain virgins, whereas the pressure for young men to lose their virginity continued over time:

For guys I think it’s a lot more pressure-
[General agreement]
-Than girls. All the girls that I know, they haven’t lost it, because they are quite strong people and that …usually people that have a lot of stuff going on like sport or you know, cultural things going on all the time. And so they’re quite busy with other people outside of [Residential Hall] and so they don’t get caught up in the kind of sex culture that [Residential Hall] brings. But guys definitely yeah. There’s a huge pressure on them I feel- You can see if they’re not lying about [having had sex] then they’re trying to lose it as fast as possible (Young Women)
Again echoing other research, it seemed that young men were far more likely to give into the pressure to lose their virginity (Bogle, 2008). This means that like young women (although for different reasons) young men are not necessarily losing their virginity because of an active and individual decision to engage in sexual activity. This is discussed in detail by a woman participant:

But now he just regrets throwing [his virginity] out because he didn’t stay true to who he was. Like he just regrets it now coz he’s like I just did what everyone else wanted me to do and not what I wanted to do. And then one of the girls I know that is a virgin, she’s come pretty close a couple of times to losing it but she’s got all the rest of us rallied there being like NO! Don’t do it! Not with him! No! We’re like make sure it’s special because otherwise you’re going to regret it if you just throw it away. So I feel she is being more protected coz the girls are trying to make her not waste it, whereas the boys are all like no, do it (Young Woman)

Intriguingly, it seems that for young women, there is still the presumption that losing your virginity is a special event that should take place with a special person, whereas the young men suggest that it is more of an event that should take place as soon as possible. This reflects the suggestion that young men often gain acceptance from peers when they engage in sexual activity (Kreager, Staff, Gauthier, Lefkowitz, & Feinberg, 2016), as it ‘displays’ their heterosexuality, and therefore, their masculinity (Hird & Jackson, 2001). These points are highlighted in the following narrative about one young woman’s boyfriend:

When I first got with [my boyfriend], I told him my number [of sexual partners] and he told me his, which was two. And then I found out it was actually none.

Awwww
When he told me I was like, I kinda feel really bad because I should have made it really special for you
[Laughter]
And he was like no it’s okay
Aw that’s so cute. He shouldn’t have lied though
But that’s the whole thing, the fact that guys feel like you know, it’s emasculating to not have. And I’m like be the unicorn, everyone else is a horse
[Laughter]
Own it (Young Women)
In this instance, ‘be the unicorn’ means be the unique man that stands out and owns the fact that they are a virgin, where ‘the horse’ are the normative young men who perpetuate the ideology that men should be actively engaging in sexual activity as often as possible (Hird & Jackson, 2001; Holland, Ramazanoglu, Sharpe, & Thomson, 1998; Reid, Elliott, and Webber, 2011).

**Screwing the crew.**

The accessibility of sex and experimentation that occurs within a residential setting often results in what is colloquially known as ‘screwing the crew’. ‘Screwing the crew’ is a term used to describe sexual relations of any kind between people who share a residence, workplace, or similar setting. In this situation, it is used primarily to describe sex between people who live in the same pod or block. Discussions about ‘screwing the crew’ were somewhat ambivalent, as students considered it almost inevitable when living in a residence, whereas the key informants usually saw it in negative terms:

Don’t screw the crew. We have a lot of issues with residents obviously sleeping together (Key Informant)

Only one key informant thought screwing the crew was acceptable, but on the condition there were ground rules in place:

Don’t screw the crew
I can’t agree with that one
You don’t?
No
Really?
Yeah coz in my first year I screwed some of the crew
[General Laughter]
You need to establish fair ground first. If you like...you’ve gotta at least you know set up good relationships with people first, like get the foundations. Once the foundations are down, then you can do the building.
Don’t go straight into the building (Key Informants)

The participants articulated similar feelings to this key informant. The young men discussed screwing the crew in relation to accessibility:

Some people screw the crew you know...
Living so close makes it easier
Yeah
You see them more
They’re right there (Young Men)

In addition to this, the women participants indicated that screwing the crew does not necessarily mean that things get uncomfortable:

One of the guys in my pod that I’ve got with, it’s hard to look at him like I got with him. It’s like, you’re my brother now. I can’t look at you like…
Interviewer: So does it tend to stay fairly civil in blocks despite all the screwing the crew or d-
I think in blocks it’s pretty civil aye?
Yeah (Young Women)

This suggestion that ‘it’s pretty civil’ is contrary to how the majority of key informants discussed screwing the crew. Most key informants suggested that sex between students living in close proximity with each other generally does not keep residential halls civil, and thus has repercussions for the wider residential community:

I’ve had to deal with a situation where we had one block against another block because the guy from one block had sex with a girl from another block. She thought that the relationship was deep and meaningful and for him she was a notch on his belt and because of that we had a young girl that was very upset and she did her utmost to get back at the guy and the way she did that was through her friends and through his friends. So we ended up having this situation where we had one block against the other which was not a particularly nice situation (Key Informant)

For the key informants, screwing the crew is considered adverse because it causes tension and anxiety within the residential setting – their concern is less about the actual sexual activity, and more about the social repercussions that may occur as a result. These social repercussions are especially relevant in a residential setting where everyone lives in close proximity to each other. Despite this, young residents saw screwing the crew as inevitable and fairly acceptable. Similar to ‘Preparedness for the transition to halls of residence’, adverse outcomes from sexual activity were framed as a part of residential life, and as useful learning experiences for future sexual situations. Both of these sections suggest that residential staff may want to reconsider their standpoint on sexuality related stressors. Also relevant again is the link to liminality (Neumann, 2012), with
‘screwing the crew’ being a term that was not used prior to living within a residential community.

**Unprotected sex.**

As mentioned earlier, key informants often have to manage repercussions of sexual activity, including the potential consequences of unprotected sex:

You’re living in a hall environment so things can pass round pretty fast (Key Informant)

Another key informant expanded on this point:

I’ve had problems with ‘you gave me blah blah blah’ and then the strain that puts on the entire block… like [sexually transmitted] diseases going round (Key informant)

The key informants do give residents access to condoms, but the process seems to be trial and error:

We have condoms [sic] available for them
We’ve tried a number of things; we’ve tried going to your RA to get condoms. But that doesn’t work (Key Informants)

I queried the young male participants about their contraceptive use, and how (or if) it was negotiated:

…but I don’t know about any girls on contraception here, like it’s just like a lucky dip aye
Most of them are I think
Nah, nah, nah
I see it in their rooms

...Interviewer: Do you ask before you get with them or-
Yes. Should I put on a condom or are you on the pill or something and they’ll be like yes or no or whatever
Maybe (Young Men)

It appeared that each of the young men in the focus group had a different response to how they broached the subject of contraception, and what they chose to use as a contraceptive (if at all). Condoms were seen as an alternative to the contraceptive pill, rather than as additional form of protection against transmittable infections. The ‘lucky dip’ comment, which refers to engaging in
sexual activity, and potentially being ‘lucky’ (if the young woman is on the pill), or not being lucky (if the young woman is not), is because of perceived need to only use condoms to prevent unintended pregnancies. Braun’s (2008) notion of New Zealanders having a ‘she’ll be right’ attitude to contraception (in relation to not using condoms in an effort to prevent sexually transmitted infections) is evident within the young men’s narratives.

Contraception was primarily talked about in a humorous context, and as in this narrative, it becomes part of the sexual environment rather than a specific aspect of sexual activity:

...Interviewer: Here in Halls do you guys get given anything? We only get condoms here. Like they’ve got condoms on supply that always run out coz people just run in there and grab them as soon as they’re put up. Do they even put them in there? I don’t think they put them in anymore. I’ve seen them there once but I took them all...I use them. Most of them. Blow some up, put them out the side of the car just for a laugh. All viable options (Young Men)

The key informants were aware of these ‘humorous’ behaviours, and accepting of this practise:

...So I mean I think that we’ve just gotta-we’ve got to accept that we are going to get some people that take those things and blow them up and have fun with them (Key Informants)

My interviews revealed a broad range of knowledge and maturity regarding the use of contraception. While ‘having fun with condoms’ was considered humorous and harmless, there were other ‘joke’ situations that were of greater concern:

In my first year as a resident myself during O week⁴, [someone] thought it would be funny to put holes in all the condoms, and we found out after O week. And because they were left in the laundry in a dispenser, and so we

---

⁴ This refers to ‘orientation’ week, where events are held around campus to help familiarise students with the university.
had a big Hall meeting about how anyone who had used one of those condoms has to go and have a meeting with family planning and stuff like that because they only found out at the end not before (Key Informants)

This has much wider ramifications than the previous condom related humour, and suggests a serious lack in understanding of potential consequences of such behaviour. It is also notable that such incidents, while not the fault of the residence in question, are not issues that students would have to contend with if living in a different environment. This again highlights the liminality (Neumann, 2012) of the residential hall environment.

Gossip.

Gossip in relation to sexual activity was discussed at length in the young women’s focus group, with residents’ sexual activity being widely discussed within the residential community:

But yeah. But like you can’t really...I think in this environment you really quickly become aware that everything you do everyone’s going to know Yeah it’s public knowledge, everything As much as you don’t want people to know, everyone knows Yeah even if only a couple people see something, it spreads like so fast- Coz some like everyone’s got a couple best friends that they’ll tell stuff to, but then those best friends have their own best friends and they’ll be like you can’t say anything but this happened and then they have best friends...it just goes like whoosh (Young Women)

Gossip was depicted as unavoidable for residents, and endurable (although never pleasant). It was accepted by participants that their personal sexual activity would even be gossiped about by their best friends. This is in contrast to the suggestion that gossip in a residential setting is acceptable so long as it is not about one’s own personal sexual behaviour (Bogle, 2008). It seems that the participants were accepting that people would gossip about them, however it was only seen as unacceptable when the gossip was incorrect. When gossip was not truthful, it was upsetting:

And then the rumour mill just starts up and the-
And next thing you know you're [engaging in a specific sexual activity]5

5 Specific details are omitted to keep participant’s anonymity.
Exactly
But I didn’t [engage in said activity] …And like I wouldn’t care, but just the fact that it wasn’t true made me so angry…It’s bullshit and if [fellow residents talked to] me first I wouldn’t care. Or I’d set them straight. But they don’t. So it’s not a very good environment (Young Women)

Multiple participants talked about gossip either exaggerating sexual events, or misinterpreting sexual events. It was also suggested that gossip is gendered, with men and women enacting gossip in different ways:

...Interviewer: Guys and girls gossiping or?
Guys are just like-
…there’s no gossip it’s just like [statements]
Or they’re like ‘yuck bro why’d you do that?’
…but yeah. I dunno. Guys just don’t really care as much (Young Men)

The young women also suggested that the way men gossip is preferable to the way women gossip:

I can take crap from the boys but I can’t take it from the girls [General Agreement]
It’s easier to deal with from the boys than it is from the chicks….
It’s sort of like a game for them
They won’t say anything behind your back
They’ll say it to you and they’ll say it jokingly. You feel like girls say it to hurt you. They say it to make you feel bad. But all of the guys are just like oh yeah… (Young Women)

It was unclear why there was such a difference, although it could be related to competition theory, with the more sexually active women being perceived to undercut other women, while also ‘taking’ the limited amount of available men within the community setting (Clayton & Trafimow, 2007; Zaikman & Marks, 2014). Above all, there were clearly gendered differences in the way that gossip is both enacted, and experienced.

Pornography.

Pornography, like contraception, was primarily used as a source of humour. Young women also linked pornography to men’s lack of interest in the use of condoms:
Interviewer: Do you [women] feel like pornography’s influenced-
Oh yes
-all the way that boys try and-
You know how in pornography the guy always comes all over the girl, all over her body or her face and shit like that. And just the way that they’re like in and out
How they never wear condoms
When you’re sucking them off and they grab the back of your head
And they’re like ‘uh uh’, and it’s like ‘no’
…I feel like some guys know that pornography is fake and there literally for them to jerk off to. And then other guys really believe it. So I think it depends on the guy
[General agreement] (Young Women)

The ways in which the women participants talked suggests that pornography has an effect on some young men’s sexuality choices (e.g. interest in condom use). There is limited research regarding young people’s understanding of pornography, with research suggesting that some (but not all) young people have adverse experiences as a result of their partner wanting to imitate activities seen in pornography (Rothman & Adhia, 2015; Rothman, et al., 2015). It was suggested by participants that there is a sub-group of young men (but not young women) who cannot differentiate between pornography and real-life:

But I think [pornography] kinda, it messed with [friends] perception of sex or whatever…But the porn these days gives younger people who have access to it kind of an idea behind what they’re watching, like it’s like if [porn stars are] doing that it’s okay for me to do it sorta thing
…Yeah nah like I dunno, I guess it jades your opinion but then like when you actually have sex you kinda know it’s not really the same thing
[Agreement]
Especially if you have enough bro, you just realise those [porn stars] are just ridiculous (Young Men)

The general consensus of both the men and women was that ‘some’ people know the difference between pornography and real life, and ‘some’ people do not.

Although using pornography as a source of humour was not mentioned in the literature reviewed earlier, both young men and women talked in the interviews about pornography primarily in relation to humour. The young men described how pornography is used as a joke:
Interviewer: What about here at halls, does [pornography] come up much or not really?
Oh yeah. Actually, speaking of pornography. We got a mate who like, if you leave your room unlocked sometimes. Back in the day, at the start of the year I left my room unlocked and the laptop open and he just runs straight in there and there’s pornography all on [my computer screen]. Gay, black, whatever, whatever he thinks is funny. He just leaves it on, leaves the door open and I’m gone. I come back and everyone’s just crowded outside my room laughing. I’m like ‘oh god, not again. Not again’
That happened to everyone (Young Men)

As with contraception, it seems that aspects of sexuality which are not normally discussed in the public forum, such as pornography, are then turned into humour in an attempt to be more acceptable:

…Yeah so there’s a pranking aspect of it. Where it’s not usually acceptable so you use it (Young Men)

The young women believed pornography to be tolerable as humour to an extent, but felt that young men did not understand when the limit of that humour is exceeded:
One of the guys in my block decided to hack into someone else’s computer and play pornography like really, really, loudly. You could hear it outside the block-
You could hear it from [another block]
-And I remember just sitting in my room…and I was just like, ‘I can’t deal with this, I don’t care if it’s a joke, I don’t care what they’re doing’-
I was the person that walked in and shut it off…Coz it was like 45 minutes of just really loud-and the [other male residents] were like ‘no, it’s funny’, and I was like ‘no. No.’ (Young Women)

Although humour can initially be found in such behaviour, this only holds true to a certain degree. When crossing the line of acceptability, it seems this humour can have unpleasant or adverse effects on young people. This is an area that lacks relevant research, and it would be worth further investigating the motives behind such humour, with the only insight gained in this research being the use of pranking for topics that are not normally acceptable.
Challenges and Tensions

This section examines the sexuality challenges and tensions that participants described contending with while living in a residential setting. Included in this section are the subthemes; “sexual double standards”, “gendered expectations”, “women’s pleasure”, “men’s entitlement and sexual coercion”, and “alcohol”.

Sexual double standards.

The sexual double standard was a key theme described by the women participants. The women commenced the focus group with judgement of sexually active girls:

All sorts of [sexual behaviour] has gone down already this year, and I’m just like…you can’t look at them the same. Like you see someone in the dining hall
It’s the same here
And it’s just like
You’re filthy
I know what’s been in your mouth
…I just look at them and I just think about what I’ve heard about them
Yeah
I can’t look at them the same anymore
Especially people I don’t know that well and then they walk in and I’m like you think I don’t know you but I know things about you (Young Women)

This aligns with the judgement that women often receive for engaging in casual sexual behaviour (Crawford & Popp, 2003; England, Schafer, & Fogarty, 2008; Smith, Mysak, & Michael, 2008; Zaikman & Marks, 2014). However, the young women’s judgements of other women’s ‘inappropriate’ sexual behaviour seemed to be linked to choosing to engage in sexual activity with no agency, or no discrimination in partner choice:

Guys see chicks they have slept with…as easy. It’s like…[a woman] may have slept with lots of people, doesn’t mean you’re easy.
Maybe you just want to
Yeah it’s the difference between being easy and wanting to (Young Women)
There was no judgement or comment on young men’s amount of casual sexual behaviour by the women, even though men were engaging in similar levels of sexual activity to women. Also, women’s active sexuality was pigeon-holed into two distinct categories by the young women; ‘being easy’ and ‘wanting to’. ‘Being easy’ refers to engaging in sexual activity passively, by saying yes to almost anyone who offers sex, without discrimination. In comparison, ‘wanting to’ means actively having agency, and taking part in sexual experiences as a result of active choice. This labelling is not unusual, with these women echoing current discourses that suggest there are ‘acceptable’ and ‘not acceptable’ ways for women to do heterosex (Farvid, Braun, & Rowney, 2016). Intriguingly, when the ‘acceptable’ and ‘non acceptable’ ways to engage in heterosex were utilised by fellow residents towards the women participants’ personal sexual activity, it was labelled as an unnecessary judgement:

I remember within the first couple of nights I had my group of friends that I had made and stuff and the subject of sex comes up obviously and they were like, wanted to know how many people you’d been with and stuff. And I was like, why? In my head I was thinking why? Why does it matter? Like, if my number’s too high, are you gonna make fun of me? Or if my number’s not high enough?

… Coz everyone thought that some other girl in my group had had a lot more partners. And they were like ‘oh my god, you’ve only slept with two guys like oh my god, we thought you were’…basically, they were like we thought you had had more, which means we thought you were a slut. You could see it on their faces and then it was my turn, and I don’t think they thought they thought I’d slept with…like hardly any, if any. And then I gave my number and they were like, ‘oh shit’
And the way they look at you completely changes (Young Women)

This last point regarding how people look at you can be theorized in relation to the dichotomy of ‘sluts’ and ‘angels’; where women tread a fine line between the two terms, and certain (sexual) behaviour that women engage in can change peoples’ perceptions of them from the ‘expected’ angel, to the ‘undesirable’ slut (Hird & Jackson, 2001).

These statements by the young women seemed somewhat at odds with the discussions earlier in the focus group interview, in which the young women appeared to endorse the sexual double standard. This apparent contradiction may
be explained by considering the discourse that examining others sexuality is an internalised part of living in a residential environment (Bogle, 2008). There is also the potential that diversity in opinions about sexual behaviour were initially quelled due to the focus group environment (Kitzinger, 1995). When the above exchange occurred later in the interview, once the women were more comfortable with both the topic and each other, there seemed to be a shift in assessment of the sexual double standard, and from then forward the sexual double standard was only expressed as a negative for young women.

Continuing from this shift in insight, the young women discussed the clear gender differences (and sexual double standard) when young women have sexual agency:

Don’t do it if you don’t want to wear it for the rest of the year  
[Agreement]
Because I feel like with guys yea it eases after a few days and everyone kinda goes oh yeah they fucked some person and it doesn’t really matter but yeah everyone will be adding up the people that [girls have been] sleeping with
It defines you
It’s not good
And being judged your worth on how many people you’ve fucked, and it’s like the more the girl has, the less you are, and the more a guy has the more he is (Young Women)

This is an acknowledgement that women will be judged on their sexual behaviour. Although the women did not believe the double standard to be fair, they suggested that women should be prepared to own their sexuality, double standards or otherwise, should they choose to have sexual agency. The young women expanded on this with the following:

There’s a lot of shaming for girls
I also feel like people will get annoyed with girls if they’re like with a lot of guys or whatever
Boys just go high five...another girl bagged
Aw I slept with the prettiest girl in this block

The persistent narrative that men gain status for heterosexual activity, while a woman’s status lessens, remains prevalent for young people today (Crawford & Popp, 2003; England, Schafer, & Fogarty, 2008; Kreager, Staff,
Gauthier, Lefkowitz, & Feinberg, 2016; Smith, Mysak, & Michael, 2008; 
Zaikman & Marks, 2014). This is particularly relevant in a residential setting, 
where the liminal (Neumann, 2012) setting of close proximity means that an 
individual’s sexual activity is available for public consumption and judgement 
(Bogle, 2008). Key informants also observed exercising of the sexual double 
standard in residential halls:

I know of a girl who was sleeping around quite a bit this year...and 
she...not defamed her name but just like everyone looks at her differently now 
And people talk 
Things spread like wildfire so you hear - 
Some pretty nasty stuff 
You hear some nasty stuff. Oh such and such is such a- 
For the girls, such and such is such a slut. Whereas the boys it’s like ‘aw 
they scored another one.’[sic]. So like there is that stereotypical like the 
dudes are the studs and the girls are the sluts and that’s really [dominant]- 
like really obvious in an environment with 250 teenagers that that 
stereotype and that socialization is there (Key Informants)

There was no mention from the key informants about whether they have a 
role regarding the regulation of this kind of behaviour, and as noted in the later 
sub-section ‘Residential assistants’, it appears that they, at times, endorse it.

The young men who participated did not explicitly mention the sexual 
double standard, although they did speak in ways that appeared to uncritically 
endorse it. There was a singular story shared by a male participant that highlights 
the differences in how genders are expected to behave regarding current sexual 
norms:

Coz I also remember my cousin, she’s down in [another city] now and she 
...She was saying how she hated being with a guy and then when they 
tried to cuddle her for some reason. She just didn’t want to be cuddled. 
And she’d been out there for so long she kinda just wanted to get up and 
go sleep on the couch by herself. I was like, ‘what?’ I just laughed at her Jesus 
I just told her, ‘you need a boyfriend. You need someone who can love 
you coz they’re just gonna fuck you and you’re going to be lonely all the 
time.’ She kinda just told me to shut up (Young Men)
This highlights the discourse that women are allegedly only supposed to be interested in sexual activity within a romantic and passive capacity (Hird & Jackson, 2001; Holland, Ramazanoglu, Sharpe, & Thomson, 1998). When women enact sexual behaviour that is outside of the perceived norm (‘didn’t want to be cuddled’), it is considered a flaw (‘I just told her, you need…’), with supposed detrimental effects should the woman not heed the man’s advice (‘going to be lonely’). The young women were aware of this ‘romantic’ and non-sexual discourse, and disputed it:

It's like they don’t take into account that it’s our choice to do it. They're like aw they got romanced by this guy and I’m like…they didn’t [romance me, I] actually made a conscious decision like I want to do this (Young Women)

Women disputed that their sexuality is passive and submissive, which is both how the young men viewed women’s sexuality, and how it is customarily constructed within societal norms (Hird & Jackson, 2001; Holland, Ramazanoglu, Sharpe, & Thomson, 1998; Powell, 2010). A concluding statement by a woman participant was:

I don’t understand why [the number of people you have had sex with] should define anyone. Like why is it an important thing to know when you are getting to know someone? (Young Woman)

It seems that young women still worry about being defined (and consequently given a negative reputation) by their engagement with casual sex (Farvid, Braun, & Rowney, 2016), as well as having to negotiate the gendered expectations and supposed sexual passivity that they get burdened with (Hird & Jackson, 2001; Holland, Ramazanoglu, Sharpe, & Thomson, 1998; Powell, 2010). As can be seen from the perspectives of the participants, the sexual double standard is still a prevalent issue for young women today, particularly in a residential ‘sexual public arena’ setting (Bogle, 2008).

**Gendered expectations.**

The narrative of gendered expectations is reported throughout the findings. However, mentioned in this section are points of note that warranted including this as a specific theme.
Parents tend to assume that young women are unlikely to be having sex without a steady partner:

My mum just assumes that if I don’t have a boyfriend then I’m not having sex
Yeah I think my parents think the same
She like messages me and stuff and she’ll be like do you have a boyfriend yet and I’m like aw no, because I didn’t at the time, and then she’s like oh good, so no sex. Do you want me to send up some batteries?
[Laughter] (Young Women)

Interestingly, these reported comments from parents imply that mothers are aware that their daughters are sexual beings, even in the absence of a partner. Some of the young women’s parents also assumed that should a young woman have a boyfriend, then they will automatically be engaging in sexual activity. In some respects, this is a shift in thinking from when the young women were high school age, suggesting that parents assume a certain inevitability to young women being sexually active from university age onwards. However, it still highlights the negative connotation that is frequently associated with women’s casual sexual behaviour (Crawford & Popp, 2003; England, Schafer, & Fogarty, 2008; Smith, Mysak, & Michael, 2008; Zaikman & Marks, 2014).

Within a university setting, the ‘walk of shame’ was also portrayed as a gendered concept. The ‘walk of shame’ is when a resident spends the night in a fellow resident’s room, and then has return to their own room in the morning. The communal nature of residential halls means this is usually seen by other residents, who then know that the student engaged in sexual activity the night before. This further supports my hypothesis that the year spent in residential halls is a year of liminality (Neumann, 2012) for students as it is unlikely that this type of experience could occur at the same level elsewhere.

The key informants mentioned witnessing residents that do the ‘walk of shame’:

The walk of shames that people do in the morning
Interviewer: With other residents or people that they bring home?
It’s a mix
Yeah
It’s always a mix
I think it’s funnier when it’s people that you actually know and you’re like heeeeeey I see you coming out of that block. I know you live in that [other block] .... I see you carrying your heels at 8 in the morning (Key Informants)

The young men who participated also commented on their experiences with the ‘walk of shame’:

Walk of shame’s bad aye
[General agreement]
Oh yeah
[Fellow Student] walked all the way from [Another Residential Hall] in the rain (Young Men)

Although the young men concurred that the ‘walk of shame’ is bad, the main point following was related to the fact that the young man in question had to walk home in the rain. In contrast, the ways in which the young women talked about the ‘walk of shame’ suggested that it was part of the overall sexual double standard:

Or like there’s someone in our block and it’s always like ‘aw haha he was over in another hall lol. Getting more girls haha.’ But then it’s like if a girl comes back in the morning everyone’s like ‘ohhh’ Where have you been?
Yeah
Mmm I get that a lot. I’ve done the walk of shame a lot of times and everyone was like [judgemental sound] (Young Women)

The earlier reference to ‘I see you carrying your heels’ (as stated by key informants) also indicates the gendered nature of the walk of shame. So it seems that young women who engage in sexual activity are ‘shamed’ for it the next day, whereas it does not have the same gendered ramifications for young men.

With respect to specific sexual activities, the young women also suggested there were gendered expectations:

Do you guys feel like it’s more common for girls to give head\(^6\) than for boys to give head?
Mhmm
It’s more expected of you

---

\(^6\) ‘Head’ is a slang term for oral sex.
Like they don’t want to reciprocate it
Not for me [reciprocation being an issue]
[Laughter]
Yeah like not all the time but
I feel like in general you’re more likely to be asked to give a blow job than
[sic] can they go down on you
[Agreement]
And girls don’t expect it of guys anyway
[Agreement] (Young Women)

So young women acknowledged that men were less likely to reciprocate oral sex, with indications being made that it was due to men’s sexual agency, and male pleasure being the normative part of sexual activity, which is supported by other research in the field (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012; Lovejoy, 2015). The young women also stated that the ‘norm’ is for young men to receive oral sex, but not young women, and suggested that young women purportedly lack the agency to ask for it. Comments from the young women support the suggestion that women generally have to assert their agency if they want sexual pleasure, because while it is legitimate to ask for reciprocal pleasure, it is not always automatically given (Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003).

Gendered norms were also discussed in regards to body hair:

I don’t understand why girls are expected to shave and guys aren’t expected to
Girls have to be…
We are expected to be hairless from the eyebrows down
The whole manscaping\(^7\) thing becoming more of a-
Yeah thank god
Yeah but it’s not like get rid of all of it, it’s like cut it back so you don’t like choke (Young Women)

While there is the suggestion that men’s grooming of body hair is becoming more normal, this seems to be more for the benefit of male pleasure, i.e. so young women ‘don’t choke’ while performing oral sex on a young man. The notion that body hair removal is (at times) about being considerate towards one’s sexual partner (Braun, Tricklebank, & Clarke, 2013) is relevant, as in a way young men are trying to make young women more comfortable while engaging in

\(^7\) ‘Manscaping’ is a slang word for men’s trimming or removal of public hair.
oral sex, however, the young women participants suggested the primary motive was selfish pleasure on behalf of men. While men remove body hair for personal pleasure, there is also still the expectation that women remove body hair also for men’s pleasure. This places men’s expectations at the forefront of sexual activity, and privilege their preferences over young women’s.

Related to this are expectations about how each gender discusses sex. While the young women appeared to feel comfortable talking about sex as part of the focus group, this is not the case when in the public forum:

Guys you know, you can talk about sex in public and stuff, but girls it’s like you have to talk about it behind closed doors with you best girl friends-
You’re just taught to shame yourself. Like everything is wrong. Like you’re not allowed to go and do what you want or be happy or whatever because that’s what guys do (Young Women)

This is a strong statement, which highlights the current expectations of young women. So while young men acceptably engage in sexual activity with young women, young women are still more vilified for not only engaging in it, but also discussing it and enjoying it. Related to enjoying sexual activity is the following statement:

I think I’m like that one girl ever that when I’ve come\textsuperscript{8}, I’ve been like okay that’s enough. And I’ve been like okay I’m [finished having sex]. And then I’ve told people and they’ve been like that’s so mean. (Young Woman)

When women choose to have sexual agency and prioritise their pleasure, it is considered selfish and callous (Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003), despite the same behaviour (i.e. suggesting sex is over after they orgasm) being typical for young men, highlighting that the ‘norm’ of male orgasm being the end of sexual activity.

---

\textsuperscript{8} ‘Come’ is a slang word for orgasm, which in current times is used interchangeably for both men’s and women’s orgasms. This word is used throughout the following chapters.
activity is still prevalent. This will be expanded on in the next section, ‘women’s pleasure’.

**Women’s pleasure.**

The women participants were in general agreement that the dominant discourse during sex was the importance of men’s pleasure, and the deprioritizing of women’s pleasure:

*Interviewer: So do you think pleasures another thing that’s not talked about or something that’s- *

I feel like nobody really gives a shit about the girl

Yeah

...Boys always get to finish, and when they’re done, it’s done

[General Agreement]

...They asked [Participant’s boyfriend] if he had a good night and then they just made noises at me

Like you’re a tool

Yeah

It’s like being a walking fleshlight^9^  

Some guys are okay, like some of the people I’ve been with are alright, coz they kind of genuinely care (Young Women)

The young women were quite clear that men were regarded by the general public as the gender that enjoys sex, whereas women were passive participants in the event, which is supported by previous research (Hird & Jackson, 2001; Holland, Ramazanoglu, Sharpe, & Thomson, 1998). Male pleasure was considered normative by young people, and therefore their sexual behaviour is considered normative. It also supports the suggestion that young men are more likely to gain pleasure from casual sex experiences (England, Schafer, & Fogarty, 2012). Although women are necessary for heterosex, the participants suggested that the women’s pleasure does not seem to be an important consideration for young men in casual sexual activity, which research suggests is due to men not feeling as obliged to sexually pleasure a casual sex partner (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012). Relative to this, I brought up women’s pleasure with the young men I talked to:

---

^9^ Fleshlights are masturbatory aids for men, which are similar in shape to a flashlight, except they have an artificial orifice (usually a vagina) on the end.
Interviewer: So is the girl’s pleasure important?

Yeah I think so

[Long silence]

[General Laughter]

Yeah I think it is. Yea I hate it, feeling like you didn’t do enough to make them happy as well. Like I kind of don’t like just going bang, and then being done and saying goodbye. Like I think that’s kind of ratshit. Try do other stuff aye.

Yeh

I dunno

Interviewer: What do you [other young men who did not respond] think?

Aw yeah

[Laughter]

Bang and goodbye. Another perspective (Young Men)

As the excerpt above indicates, only one young man in the group expressed explicit feelings that young women should also be enjoying heterosex. The other young men appeared to have genuinely not considered women’s pleasure, and when asked to consider it, decided it was not worthy of much attention. Because the young men did not have steady sexual partners, this could be a result of men’s frequent lack of obligation to casual sexual partners, with selfish pleasure being the main imperative for men in relation to casual sex (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012). In contrast, young women reported experiences where men were sometimes interested in giving young women pleasure, they were just unsure how to do so:

… I feel like for a lot of the guys here, we’re like the test dummies, you know like when learn to do CPR on a dummy. We’re like the sex CPR dummies because they don’t know how to do anything with their fingers, or whatever, and they’re like I’ll just figure it out on you coz uni is the time to experiment, but it’s like ow

Yeah

[General Laughter]

I had someone [where I said] ‘no, no, that’s not how you do that. Don’t put that there’

[General Laughter]

…a chart, and I’ll show you the female anatomy

Like no, no, no, stop, down (Young Women)

This suggests that, at least some of the time, young men are attempting to figure out the ‘right’ way to engage in sexual activity and pleasure. This also
positions the young women as having sexual agency, which was described as resulting in positive sexual experiences. This supports prior research which had similar findings regarding the positive link between women’s agency, and women’s sexual pleasure (Beres & Farvid, 2010; Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). Women’s pleasure can also be linked to a man’s sense of sexual accomplishment and identity in steady relationships (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012). However, in these young women’s narratives, men’s identity and accomplishment was more noticeably linked to the ability to ‘properly’ engage in sex that involved pleasure for both parties. Despite this, the young women suggested that young men often resort to ‘jackhammering’ movements, meaning fast and active sex movements on behalf of the young men, solely for their own pleasure:

Boys think that it’s all just jackhammer. It’s like, it’s not. That’s not how it works.
[Agreement]
They think that their dick is the best thing on earth
Or the faster they go the better it is
You don’t feel anything
After a while, you’re kind of just like…
My friend does this thing, she’s had more experience than myself and most people I know. She’s so funny, she’s like “yeah, sometimes if I’m in bed with a guy and he’s just being really boring, jackhammering me, I do this thing where I go limp and I see if they’ve noticed”-
[Laughter]
And sees if they’ve noticed that she’s pretending to have had a stroke or something. She said she’s done it eleven times, and no one has even stopped and been like “Are you okay?” Because they were just like [sex noise] (Young Women)

These young women are aware of the lack of interest some men have in women’s pleasure, and while dissatisfying, they make humour out of an otherwise reportedly deplorable interaction. I discussed this further with the young women, questioning why young men might have a lack of interest in young women’s pleasure:

...Interviewer: So do you think it finishes when the guy finishes because they just don’t know any better or-?
Yeah
Either that, or they don’t realise that it needs to continue for the girl. But then again some girls aren’t very…they don’t voice what’s happening for them. And you can see what happens when a guy comes, whereas if a girl comes, it’s like well how the fuck was [the man] supposed to know, [the woman] sounded like [they] were enjoying it.

…A lot of boys are under the impression that every girl they’ve ever been with has come. And I’m like, that is highly unlikely (Young Women)

Linked to this is the following discussion by the young women:

…it just baffles me, because my come to having sex ratio is probably 90%. So I’m pretty good.

What the fuck

But I don’t know if it’s just because I’m extremely comfortable with myself and so I’m like well if you’re not doing it, I’m doing it. (Young Women)

This links in with the young men’s earlier responses, with it seeming that young men potentially just do not know any better, or are not considering the young women as actively taking part in heterosex. It was interesting that the young women in part placed the onus of lack of enjoyment on young women, suggesting that if young women want more sexual pleasure, they need to exercise more agency, which supports previous research (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012; Beres & Farvid, 2010; Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). This also ties into the young women earlier suggesting that women need more agency should they want more reciprocal oral sex. Although young women are more likely to enjoy sexual activity when they have autonomy (Beres & Farvid, 2010), this assertion that women be more explicit in stating their sexual desires places the accountability on the young women, rather than acknowledging young men’s lack of regard for their partner’s sexual pleasure.

Also discussed was men’s general naivety regarding women’s sexuality, which is explicitly highlighted in the following report of an exchange between a young woman and a young male friend she has:
One of the guys that I’m quite good friends with, has been like okay, so how do I make my girlfriend squirt everywhere?

[Laughter]

He’s like, that’s what I want. That’s all I want her to do. He’s like, [my girlfriend has] never come before but she can squirt right? And I was just like... I don’t know what fucking source you have been researching on-

[a pornography website]

Yeah [well known porn website]

[Laughter]

...If she’s never come before, how is she gonna come from a normal orgasm to like a squirting orgasm?

[Laughter]

There’s a step he’s got to get to first

It’s like jumping between buildings (Young Women)

This young man appears ignorant to that fact that his girlfriend may enjoy on orgasm, and yet for his own personal pleasure wants her to ‘squirt’. The wider conversation about this situation highlights the influence that porn can have on young men, which was discussed in the earlier section ‘Pornography’. Following this conversation, the young women started discussing women’s orgasmic pleasure:

...that’s one of the few things I’ve found out at uni, that girls coming was a rare thing and I’m like that shouldn’t... no

I’ve never come before

Really?

Yeah, never

That’s so upsetting for me

I know, I find it so upsetting

Have you tried it yourself?

Yeah, I find it so upsetting. I’m just like...

...When I first started sexual experiences, I couldn’t [orgasm]. It really frustrated me to the point that I think I cried with one of my ex boyfriends and I was like I can’t finish, somethings wrong with me type thing. And basically I just spent like a good two or three days just sorting myself out by myself and then-

You got your stuff going

-I got my stuff, and now I know what works for me (Young Women)

Squirt is a slang term for female ejaculation, and the portrayal of young men ‘enjoying’ watching squirting is a dominant narrative in pornography.
For these young women, an orgasm was located as the ‘goal’ of sexual activity. While sexual activity was still generally considered fun to engage in, the main objective appeared to be achieving an orgasm, which is not an uncommon assumption in heterosex (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012; Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). The young women (while generally trying to experience orgasm with a partner initially) discussed trying self-stimulation in an attempt to achieve orgasm, with the ultimate goal seeming to be partnered sexual pleasure.

**Men’s entitlement and sexual coercion.**

Although I had planned to prompt the young women to open up discussion about rape culture, they began talking about sexual entitlement and coercion autonomously in relation to almost every aspect and narrative that emerged during the focus group.

Men’s entitlement had two different meanings; men’s entitlement to sexual behaviour based on their own interest in women, and also men’s entitlement based on women’s perceived interest in them. Men’s entitlement based on their own interest was discussed in a variety of ways, such as the following narrative:

I found out that two guys in my block had a bet on who would sleep with me first. And I found out because I was getting quite close with one of the guys and then the other guy came up to me and was like ‘no I’ve got $50 on you, you can’t go home with him’ type thing. And I was like ‘excuse me?’ And then I didn’t go home with the [first] guy. And he was like are you okay, and I’m like ‘yep I’m just going to go to bed, sorry for losing you $50.’ (Young Woman)

While both young men were interested in the woman, there appeared to be no comprehension on their behalf that the young woman may not be interested in them, thus supporting the suggestion that men overestimate women’s interest in sex with them (DeSouza & Hutz, 1996; Fisher & Walters, 2003; Henningsson, Henningsen, & Valde, 2006; Hird & Jackson, 2001). It is also aligned with the assumption that women are passive objects in sex with no agency (Hird & Jackson, 2001; Holland, Ramazanoglu, Sharpe, & Thomson, 1998), which was implied in the following statement:

There’s that whole thing with guys calling shotgun on girls too (Young Woman)
‘Calling shotgun’ is a colloquial term that means making a claim on something (in this case, women residents). The first male resident to call shotgun on a particular woman resident gets first ‘claim’ on her, and no other man is allowed to show sexual or romantic interest in the woman resident during that time. ‘Calling shotgun’ could be implied through young men flirting, or actively pursuing young women. This values men’s entitlement over women’s agency. ‘Calling shotgun’ on young women prioritizes men’s entitlement to make a claim, over a women’s sexual agency. Similarly, men often assume entitlement to a woman based on the man’s interest in her:

No [male resident] hates me…Coz I had a thing with someone, and [male] is like, ‘oh why won’t you go for me.’ And I was like ‘oh but I like this guy’. And then I didn’t like that guy anymore and I went for someone else and he was like ‘oh but why would you go for someone else, what about me?’
It’s like oh I was waiting in line and then you just skipped me
I put nice coins into you and sex didn’t fall out (Young Woman)

When some men show interest in women, it is automatically assumed that women should reciprocate, regardless of whether they are interested or not. This is again part of the trope of women passively taking part in sexuality as objects, rather than as autonomous human beings (Hird & Jackson, 2001; Holland, Ramazanoglu, Sharpe, & Thomson, 1998). In contrasting instances, entitlement meant some young men’s rights to sexual activity based on the assumed interest of young women:

Some of my friends say that I’m leading people on when I just talk to them. How is that leading someone on if you just talk?
…Or if someone gets a haircut, I’m like that’s a cool haircut. I’m not like that’s a cool haircut, please put your dick in me
…Just because a girl is nice, does not mean they want to get in your pants (Young Women)

In these circumstances, there appears to be an assumption that young women are engaging in discussion with men because they are sexually interested in them. This also supports men’s overestimation in women’s sexual interest in them (DeSouza & Hutz, 1996; Fisher & Walters, 2003; Henningsen, Henningsen,
& Valde, 2006; Hird & Jackson, 2001) while also discounting the potential of platonic relationships between men and women.

Also relevant in this exchange is women’s supposed passivity, with it being assumed that the women’s talking to men is sexual interest, because women lack the agency to explicitly state sexual interest (Hird & Jackson, 2001). This consequentially leads to women being labelled as ‘leading a guy on’, despite young women not actually showing sexual interest in the first place (Hird & Jackson, 2001).

The significance of men’s entitlement was also discussed in relation ‘adult’ environments. The young women suggested that there was a difference between being younger and having a lack of knowledge/experience with sexual coercion, compared to their experiences with ‘adults’. It seems the ‘adult’ settings of halls of residence and city bars are contexts in which coercive sex is more likely to be attempted (and often carried out) compared to participants’ home settings:

Yeah I took one of my friends to town on her 18th and she was like drunk off her face. She started dancing with this guy and then he started putting his hands up her dress and I was like “Don’t fucking touch her like that, she doesn’t want it.” He was like, “Did you see how she was dancing? Of course she wants it” and I was like, “Did she say you could do that? No, so back the fuck off.” He was like, “What’s your problem?” …I was like “What’s your problem? Like Jesus.” It’s not good. People think that they have the right to do it but you don’t have the right (Young Woman)

Sexual harassment by men was unfortunately not an uncommon experience for the young women, particularly when in city bars and clubs. There is the assumption that young women are interested in sexual activity based on men’s skewed entitlement to treat women as passive sexual objects, with physical coercion being treated as almost normative by young men. This assumption of women’s interest (on the behalf of men) strongly denotes the findings of some bodies of research which suggest that men are aware of consenting cues by women (Beres, 2010; McCaw & Senn, 1998; O’Byrne, Rapley, & Hansen, 2006; O’Byrne, Hansen, & Rapley, 2008).

One young woman reflected on a similar experience:
We went to this club ...And there was this guy there that we didn’t know and he came and danced with us. And then next thing I know he like… he came up to me and held me against my throat and backed me into a dark corner of the club and started saying all this shit to me. And I was like ‘get off get off.’ And he was like ‘what, don’t you like being roughed up and stuff.’ And I was like ‘no, get off of me.’ …I scooted off very quick, and we went and told the bouncer. And the bouncer didn’t even stop him from following us down the street…. But it was like…I was shocked that the bouncer was just like yeah whatever, like he didn’t care (Young Woman)

Although not supported by research, it is potentially the context in which these interactions take place which has an effect on men’s understanding of consent. There seems to be the assumption that women who dance in bars and clubs, and dance with men specifically, are available and willing to engage in sexual activity. The young women also suggested that such sexual harassment and coercion is somewhat normalised – for example, in the above quote the bouncer failed to respond to what seemed to be clear risk to the young women concerned.

The young women described this general normalisation of unwanted sexual advances in the ‘adult’ setting of the bars and clubs in central Hamilton:

And people in town…like the fact that girls have to be prepared. I didn’t wear underwear to town one night and one of my friends said well that’s risky, what if somebody touches you, and I’m like yeah but the thing is, I shouldn’t prepare myself for something like that to happen. Coz it was a long tight dress so I was like fuck undie lines. But the fact that we have to prepare ourselves for that shit. Coz I didn’t think that it was something that happened (Young Woman)

The friend in this situation said ‘what if someone touches you’, with harassment and actions that amount to assault by young men in bars and clubs being considered almost normal or expected. Portraying such possessive behaviour as normative, privileges young men’s entitlement to engage in such behaviours, as well as placing the responsibility of controlling men’s behaviour on women.

Most of the young women suggested that they did not have adverse sexual experiences prior to university. This meant the women felt unprepared for experiences that have occurred while in halls of residence and visiting bars in the city, with sexual harassment and coercion being quite prevalent for the young
women. This further emphasises the liminality (Neumann, 2012) when transitioning to residential halls from a family setting.

Relative to sexual coercion, all the experiences of sexual assault that participants knew of that had occurred in residential halls, had only happened in relation to alcohol:

I’ve only heard about it happening with alcohol involved so far since I’ve been here. I haven’t heard any experiences with no alcohol, but I can imagine that would be like, 10 million times worse (Young Woman)

This supports findings of prevalent alcohol related sexual harm (Cashell-Smith, Connor, & Kypri, 2007; Connor, Gray, & Kypri, 2010; McEwan, 2009). In relation to this, one young man shared a story about a school friend’s (lack of) understanding of consent and alcohol (mis)use:

Interviewer: And so your friends that kind of got influenced by pornography, what kind of things were they thinking?
I dunno, one of my mates, was a real bad experience with him back at school at a party. He was like, coz this girl was real drunk and he was like, they were at the back and he was like forcing her on her knees sorta thing with his willy hanging around. And so I just stepped in aye and I was like ‘yo bro, you all good, you all good’ and then just let her get up and let her go back to her friends and then...said you ‘all good bro?’ ‘Yeah, yeah all good bro’ and walked off. And that kinda saved one instance of her having a bad experience. But yeah I think with him, he’s just an idiot so, it’s expected kinda

The prevalence of men sexually victimizing women who are affected by alcohol use is well established (Lovejoy, 2015), with alcohol related sexual harm being articulated by numerous young people in New Zealand (McEwan, 2009; Connor, Gray, & Kypri, 2010; Cashell-Smith, Connor, & Kypri, 2007). It is noteworthy that this participant said that he stepped in and stopped any further potential events from occurring. The comment ‘he’s just an idiot, so it’s expected kinda’ would be worth further expansion to understand the underlying meaning, however the conversation unfortunately changed track at that point in time.

The young men who participated in my focus group spoke in ways that suggested a lack of understanding of aspects of sexual coercion and sexual consent. This was particularly concerning when considering the relationship
between alcohol and sexual activity (as will be further discussed in ‘Alcohol’) – in this discussion, the young men suggest that women’s claims of not remembering sexual activity (and therefore not being capable of providing clear consent) were fabricated:

Like does that actually happen, like do [women] all just forget everything [when drinking too much]?
Surely it can’t
…Yeah I’m sure you can’t like fully forget aye you must know some point
Yeah (Young Men)

Despite the young men who participated clearly stating that they did not believe women could forget sexual activity, this discussion happened directly after, in respect to a young man going to town in a taxi with a woman resident:

…I don’t remember like the ride to town in the taxi but apparently, some shit happened I don’t really remember and then [female resident] was fucking angry with me the next day so…
[General Laughter]
Awesome
I literally don’t remember any of it. I like got to town and then…
Yeah
But I don’t care you know. It’s all good. All for the fun of it.
[General Laughter]
For me it’s all a dream when you’re drunk like I forget it all and then someone reminds me, and it just all starts clicking (Young Men)

This is in complete contradiction to the young men’s earlier statements about alcohol induced amnesia in relation to young women and sex. This situation also denotes some form of unwanted romantic or sexual activity taking place in the taxi which the young woman in question was unhappy with. The young woman’s angry response was seen as laughable, with no understanding by the young men of the potential similarities between this story, and the story mentioned earlier by a young man (p. 68) that likely would have resulted in sexual assault. The ways in which these young men talk about alcohol-induced amnesia and unwanted sexual activity trivialise young women’s experiences, while privileging young men’s behaviour as normative and ‘expected’. Thus, men place the burden of unwanted male behaviour at the feet of women. While alcohol related harm within a residential setting has been highlighted in previous research
(McEwan, 2009) it was limited to statistics, which did not display gendered differences.

Significant here is that all of the experiences in this section are related to the heavy consumption of alcohol and the settings in which heavy drinking is likely (i.e. city bars and clubs). Although there is currently a small body of literature related to this, alcohol related sexual harm is in need of further research within the New Zealand context (McEwan, 2009; Cashell-Smith, Connor, & Kypri, 2007; Connor, Gray, & Kypri, 2010).

**Alcohol.**

None of the discussions about alcohol were positive in nature. Alcohol was primarily linked to the negative consequences of drunken sexual activity:

Or when you get too drunk as a guy and you wake up in the morning and there’s no condom on the ground so you’re pretty scared because you didn’t use a condom and I’ve heard a resident say that as well (Key Informant)

This is not a unique experience, with previous studies finding that fellow New Zealand students have had similar experiences regarding alcohol influenced unprotected sex (Connor, Gray, & Kypri, 2010; Cashell-Smith, Connor, & Kypri, 2007; McEwan, 2009). Linked to this ‘too drunk’ situation is the following perspective by another key informant:

The other thing that can be concerning is they just get too drunk. And I’m not being sexist but it is often the girls. And I’m not using that as an excuse for them to…but they get very drunk and then the regrets afterwards, you see them crying the next day (Key Informant)

While it was acceptable for men to be ‘pretty scared’ about lack of contraceptive use while too drunk, there seemed to be less understanding for young women who regretted drunken sexual behaviours, with a lack of understanding on the part of the key informants about intoxication compromising the ability to consent. This is potentially linked to the notion that young women in vulnerable positions (i.e. intoxicated) are more likely to be viewed by young men as available or willing to engage in sexual activity at point of intoxication (Lovejoy, 2015).
However, in other instances, key informants demonstrated awareness of drunkenness compromising a female student’s ability to consent to sexual activity:

When we got a call, coz girls didn’t think a guy should be staying in another girl’s room, because she was too intoxicated. So we got him out of there. They came to us. It was good. It was good of the neighbours to look after her coz they knew she was intoxicated. And they knew that in previous incidences, she had been sober and not wanted him to be there…and so he was taking advantage of the situation. So yeah, they came to us and we got him out because they were a bit scared too I think. And yeah that wasn’t a one-off…that’s a couple of times (Key Informants).

While removing the young man was notable, it is alarming that it was labelled as the young man ‘taking advantage of the situation’, particularly since it ‘wasn’t a one-off’. This could potentially be related to the lack of clarity in the residential policies about what is and is not acceptable sexual behaviour (Accommodation and Conference Services, 2016; Residential Manager Policy Manual, 2012), which has been shown to result in sexual victimization in relation to alcohol consumption (Neidig, 2009).

**Noteworthy Issues**

In addition to the substantive themes discussed above, there were two topics that warrant brief mention, despite them not being a focus of my study. The first is residential assistants, and the second is sexual orientation.

**Residential Assistants**

Residential assistants were my primary key informants, and their alternative insights into student behaviour were invaluable to this research. This was particularly due to their experience with, and understanding of, the cyclical nature of the year spent in the halls. However, the participants shared information about their residential assistants that was at times worrying. It was suggested that residential assistants were often involved in conflicts that occurred in residence:
Interviewer: Are the RA\textsuperscript{11}'s helpful [with personal problems] or-?

[General Disagreement]

Definitely not

They make it worse

…[I] told [particular RA’s] [something personal] and then they tell the other RA’s

The RA’s fucking gossip just as much as we do

Yeah the RAs are still kids

The only drama we ever have in our block is either caused by the RA or made ten times worse by the RA (Young Woman)

This perspective was interesting, especially considering the emphasis key informants placed on avoiding tension within the residential community (as can be seen in sections such as ‘Screwing the crew’). Residents also expressed anger at residential assistants gossiping:

I had a huge go at [specific residential assistant] about that, because he was one of the ones that was telling everyone about [contentious sexual incident in Hall\textsuperscript{12}]. And I was like, it’s not your place to talk to people about this, like you don’t have any right. Like if people want to discuss it with someone they can come and talk to me about it. I’ll be happy to tell them what actually happened. But the fact that you’re going around perpetuating a lie, perpetuating something that like I don’t want people talking about, it doesn’t make the situation better (Young Woman)

Participants suggested that not only were residential assistants gossiping about residents, but that they were also publicly shaming residents for personal choices:

There’s one RA that I don’t particularly am not particularly fond of. They’ve called me a slut a few times. They’ve taken the piss out of my sex life. And they’re just not the nicest person in the world

…At dinner, [two specific RA’s] really loudly were naming every single person I had slept with being here. At dinner, in front of everyone. It was just like no. You don’t do that (Young Woman)

This is particularly worrying since residential assistants are expected to be engaging in pastoral care, and also because the behaviour of residential assistants creates the environment that residents will have to live in for the entire university

\textsuperscript{11} RA is an acronym for residential assistant

\textsuperscript{12} Specific details are omitted to protect the anonymity of the participant.
year. There were also further situations identified that were physically dangerous for young residents:

I don’t trust [specific male residential assistants] after what happened at block party with [fellow resident] - she got really drunk and she wasn’t allowed into the club… and then two male RA’s were like ‘no we’ll look after her, go and enjoy the party, it’s our job, this is what we do.’ And then they left her. And the cops found her in a puddle, and one of the senior RA’s got called and had to bring her home. She doesn’t remember the whole night. She remembers getting found in the puddle and that was it. (Young Woman)

Unfortunately, this was not the only situation where participants reported a residential assistant placing a resident in physical danger and discomfort:

Yeah there’s one [male RA] that like everyone knows
He tried to take my dress off. I was at a party and he took me into a room and like kissed me and stuff and then tried to take my dress off
Seriously?
Yep. And I was like ‘what the fuck are you doing you’re my friend’s RA’ and then got out of the room. But I was like really drunk, and like hanging out with him and stuff, but like didn’t think he’d do that and I sort of freaked out after that (Young Woman)

This is a serious cause for concern, especially considered the power imbalance between residential assistants and residents. Not only are residential assistants in a position of authority, but they also have the ability to make life very difficult for residents should they choose to, as can be seen in the name calling incident earlier. I queried the young women participants if sexual relations did occur between residents and residential assistants:

...Interviewer: Does it happen, students and RA’s?
[General Agreement]
There is an RA that has slept with someone from every block except their own in [Residential Hall]. Not even exaggerating. And [another RA] from [a different Hall] he apparently, he’s the one that was the reason for the rule being brought in that students aren’t supposed to drink with residents anymore. Because at the start of the year our RA’s could drink with us when they weren’t on duty, like before town and stuff. It wasn’t encouraged but they were allowed to. But now they’ve been told not to (Young Women)
While the University of Waikato has a policy against student and staff relationships, this seems to be lacking from the policy manual that residential assistants adhere to (Residential Manager Policy Manual, 2012). This lack of policy is worth examining when considering residential assistants also wield a level of power over students, while additionally living in the same vicinity as students.

Despite these issues with residential assistants, the residents suggested it was difficult to have these matters addressed, because of the position of authority that residential assistants had:

I hate how there’s that one person who bullies everyone and they’re an RA. There’s so many of us individuals [being bullied]. But I feel like if we all actually said something then, you know. But I also feel like if I said that and then I went and said something then no one else would. (Young Woman)

The incidents in this section, as well as events mentioned in previous sections (such as residential assistant’s permissiveness and dismissiveness of sexual coercion) are both concerning and problematic. Because residential assistants are the key point of contact for residents, they have the potential (and ability) to adversely affect a student’s entire year in the environment that is supposed to be a student’s home. The narratives shared by residents indicate a serious need to re-evaluate the expectations and regulations of staff behaviour.

Sexual Orientation and Experimentation

Neither sexual orientation nor related experimentation were a focus of my research. This was due to the narrow scope of a master’s thesis, and my focus on the understanding of gendered differences. However, I feel sexual orientation and experimentation is an important topic that needs to be mentioned. I queried the young men and women about experimentation, which I meant to refer to new heterosexual experiences. However, because my question was quite vague, the young women also discussed experimenting in relation to sexual orientation:

Interviewer: Is there much experimenting that goes on, like people that are coming here and trying new things?
Yup
Definitely heard about it
Threesomes, girl on girl…bed action, like [slang term for a sex act involving three people].

[Agreement] (Young Women)

When asking the participants to expand on this, the young women suggested that sexual experimentation with the same sex happens more in residential halls (compared to home) due to the close proximity:

I think it’s an accessibility thing again coz like it’s so easy for people to find other people to do things with…some of the girl on girl experimenting that I’ve heard of I’m just like that probably would have never happened unless they…like it happened because they’re in such close proximity… (Young Woman)

Key informants noted that it was not uncommon for them to help students with issues around sexual orientation, although did suggest that they felt ill-equipped in these situations:

I think…and it’s something you can’t be trained for, but like I see students discover themselves a little bit and are experimenting. So I had a boy come up to me last year, like 2am banging on my door “I think I’ve made a mistake I think I’ve made a mistake” and I’m like what’s happened. He’s like I’ve bought a boy home. This is a male resident and he’d been like having issues with his sexuality and it had got to the stage where he had brought a boy home… And it’s like, you can’t be trained for that situation. But when you’re dealing with so many emotions and so many teenagers and the huge hormonal aspects that go with sexuality yeah… [you learn to] deal with it step by step (Key Informants)

Key informants also talked about finding sexual orientation a difficult topic to appropriately attend to:

The big thing is…providing [non-heterosexual people] with an environment they feel comfortable in. And if that [environment] is comfortable to come out and whatever. But that’s a very big ask isn’t it? Being able to provide that… (Key Informant)

Sexual orientation and experimentation with sexuality was an important topic within a residential setting, with a prominent amount of students engaging in sexuality experimentation. This highlights a notable area that would be worth further investigation.
Chapter Five: Conclusion

It’s funny that we all have the same perception of what’s going on here…And I’m wondering if everyone sat down in a focus group like this, if a lot of groups of girls, little groups, sat down and talked like this…and everyone just talked and got over everything, if it would smooth stuff over?

It would make it worse (Young Women)

Rich discussion about sexuality is not common among young people. This is particularly true of sexual knowledge and experiences prior to university. When considering the transition to university, life within a residential setting has many norms and narratives that would be less likely to occur in other living situations. Prior research in residential halls has primarily focused on sexual violence, alcohol and the associated sexual harm, and, predominantly in the United States, room-mate relationships. There is, however, a lack of research focused on residents’ perspectives and experiences of sexuality and intimate relations.

Through use of focus groups with residential staff, and residential students, the aim of this research was originally to understand how un/prepared student participants felt for the transition from the family home and high school, to living in a university residential setting, specifically in relation to sexuality and intimate relations. While this was still discussed in my thesis, my reading of the focus group transcriptions suggested that participants felt their current experiences in residential halls were of more significance than their ‘preparedness’ for the transition to residential halls. Because of the nature of participants’ focus points, I broadened my research aims to include the narratives and issues relating to sexuality that were prevalent and relevant to young people living within the University of Waikato Residential Halls.

Beginning with experiences prior to university, the ways in which the participants talked suggests that there are still gendered narratives shaping discussions of sexuality. They suggested that parents are more likely to assume that their sons are engaging in sexual activity, whereas they are less likely to acknowledge young women’s potential interest in sexuality. In support of previous research findings, participants spoke of how schools tend to disregard the
'sexuality' in sex education, and often promote an abstinence-based discourse around sexual behaviour (Allen, 2005; Allen, 2006b; Caldwell, 2015; Giarni, Ohlrichs, Quilliam, & Wellings, 2006; Willig, 1999). As a result, sexuality education in schools was not seen as a useful source of information or advice by the participants. (Allen, 2006a; Allen, 2006b). Also consistent with previous findings is that the young men and women in this research stated they primarily learnt about sexuality through the internet, and friend’s shared experiences and problems (Allen, 2001; Tjaden, 1988). One point the participants made that is not addressed in prior research is that personal sexual experiences are also a foundation for sexual knowledge and understanding. Since studies often use an approach that lists possible pre-determined sources of sexual education for participants to choose from (Allen, 2001; Tjaden, 1988), researchers are potentially not considering that the sexual experiences participants have had can help inform their future sexual activity.

Preparedness for the transition to residential halls was generally discussed in relation to residential halls and associated environments being more ‘adult’. Frequenting city bars and clubs was more prominent when living in residences, and it seemed that the presence of primarily older people was an indicator of a significant change in environment for participants. Women residents talked about receiving unwanted sexual coercion by adults in club and bars, which was contrasted to a ‘naivety’ about these behaviours when in high school. These findings support literature that suggests sexual harm is a problem within the New Zealand residential halls and university setting (Gavey, 1991; Keene, 2015; McEwan, 2009). However, there is a dearth in literature that addresses sexual coercion and harassment in New Zealand clubs and bars.

Key informants stressed a general lack of preparedness among residents in regards to the consequences of sexual behaviour, with suggestions that many negative issues and stressors in residences are the result of immature sexual behaviour. In contrast to this, the residents suggested that sexuality related stressors are normative, and a good learning experience for later life. These differences in participant perspectives highlight the usefulness of gaining information from both the students, and the key informants: although the key informants have legitimate concerns about residents’ sexual behaviour (e.g.
miscommunication about the meaning of specific sexual encounters), the residents themselves consider negative stressors to be a normative and informative part of engaging in heterosex, albeit with sometimes problematic aftermaths. This normalisation of stressors is also of note regarding research approaches, as the dominant stance in research regarding young peoples’ sexuality is to suggest that stressors are risky and negative (Bogle, 2008; Cashell-Smith, Connor, & Kypri, 2007; Connor, Gray, & Kypri, 2010; Fielder, Walsh, Carey, & Carey, 2013; Kypri, Langley, & Stephenson, 2005; Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000; Warner, Giordano, Manning, & Longmore, 2011).

Participants described the ease of access to sexual activity within the residential halls. Unlike high school, where ‘hooking up’ generally did not involve sexual intercourse, hooking up in residential halls usually lead to sexual intercourse because residents are living (and sleeping) in such close proximity to each other, and have access to their own private space. Because of the change in type of authority, from parents to residential assistants, the regulation of sexual behaviour also changed. This resulted in a shift of discourses, with residents being less discreet about actively engaging in sexual activity. The liminality (Neumann, 2012) of these shared narratives suggest that residents are faced with discourses about heterosex that are unique to a residential hall environment.

The focus groups discussions – particularly in the young women’s focus group – revealed that ‘traditional’ gendered narratives continue to inform discourses and experiences of heterosex. The sexual double standard is still common, with the women participants highlighting the status that men gain for engaging in heterosex, compared to the negative judgement that women receive for participating in the same activities. This aligns with previous research (e.g. Crawford & Popp, 2003; England, Schafer, & Fogarty, 2008; Smith, Mysak, & Michael, 2008; Zaikman & Marks, 2014). Young women condemned this narrative. Nevertheless, they did at times judge how other young women chose to engage in heterosex, suggesting there are acceptable and unacceptable ways for women to have sexual agency. A distinction was constructed between a woman who ‘wants to’ have sex, (i.e. engages in sex with autonomy and agency) and a woman who is ‘being easy’ (i.e. engaging in non-discriminatory sex). The former was regarded with approval by the young women, while the latter was
condemned. This categorization echoes the finding that there are acceptable and not acceptable ways for women to engage in casual sex in the New Zealand context (Farvid, Braun, & Rowney, 2016). However, it is unclear why women who engage in non-discriminatory heterosex are judged harshly compared to women who may engage in an abundance of heterosex that is more autonomous.

Young men often perpetuated the sexual double standard, stating that it was aberrant of women to not want romance with sexual activity. This highlights the typical constructions that young men may have regarding normative heterosexuality (Reid, Elliott, and Webber, 2011). This discourse overlooks the fact that these young men themselves engaged in sexual activity that was non-romantic, while also lacking acknowledgement of young women’s sexual agency. Key informants were generally aware of the stigmatizing discourses about women’s sexuality, but did little to regulate it, and at times they endorsed it. This endorsement by staff arguably helps contribute to the perpetuation of gendered constructions of heterosex within the residential setting.

Unfortunately, gendered constructions extend beyond the sexual double standard. Young women described the influences that pornography has on young men (e.g. ‘jackhammering movements’), and how young men’s assumptions from pornography can effect sexual experiences, which supports the small amount of research conducted in this area (Rothman & Adhia, 2015; Rothman, et al., 2015). Young men’s imitation of pornography can contribute to a lack of enjoyment that some women experience in sexual activity (e.g. lack of orgasm). These gendered constructions are also apparent in the discourses regarding oral sex, which is considered primarily as something for men to receive but not give. Young men reciprocating by giving a woman partner oral sex is seen as desirable, but not expected. This too aligns with previous research (Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). Interestingly, the young women described; the lack of pleasure when they are expected to imitate pornography, and when they do not receive oral sex, as a problem for young women to fix. That is, they felt that the responsibility lay with young women who do not actively express their agency by making explicit sexual requests. Although potentially true, this position disregards the privileges that young men receive in relation to what is considered normative in heterosex, and places the onus on young women to be responsible for their own pleasure, as well
as men's pleasure. Research also suggests that women need to vocalise their sexual agency more (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2009; Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012; Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). However, the existent literature echoes dominant norms in terms of failing to address the accountability of young men in relation to women’s pleasure during heterosex.

Women’s pleasure was a significant concern for the young women. They suggested that young men usually lack an understanding of, and consideration for, women’s pleasure. Young men’s sexual prerogative and pleasure dominantly seems to take precedence, with male orgasm usually being the goal and end-point of a sexual encounter. This supports previous research findings (e.g. Hird & Jackson, 2001; McPhillips, Braun, & Gavey, 2001; Braun, Gavey, & McPhillips, 2003). Young women are still usually treated as passive participants or objects in sexual activity, with young men often failing to recognise that women have sexual agency and autonomy. When young women attempt to engage in the sorts of behaviour that is normative for men (e.g. suggesting sex is finished after they orgasm), they are generally shamed for it by other residents. This is consistent with research which suggests that women get more enjoyment when engaging in autonomous heterosex (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012; Beres & Farvid, 2010). However, my findings show that while this may be true at the time, there appear to be repercussions for the young women afterwards for stepping outside of the typical construction of women’s sexual passivity.

Other aspects of sexuality within the residential halls were discussed. There was a generally blasé attitude towards contraception by young men. Contraception and pornography were discussed by both the residential participants and key informants primarily as a form of humour, with the young men suggesting that humour about sexuality is used to place topics in the public forum that are otherwise not acceptable. While this humour was tolerated by the young women and residential assistants, at least to some extent, the young women participants felt that some residents went well beyond the point where the humour could be seen as acceptable (or funny), and became offensive. This is an original finding, and is particularly of note due to the liminal environment within a residential setting that arguably creates a shared space where this humour can occur.
The privileging of young men’s entitlement was a key issue within the findings. Narratives regarding what is normative have led some young men to assume they are entitled to gratify their own sexual interest, regardless of young women’s desires and rights, supporting the theory that young men often overestimate women’s sexual interest in them (DeSouza & Hutz, 1996; Fisher & Walters, 2003; Henningsen, Henningsen, & Valde, 2006; Hird & Jackson, 2001). This also contrasts with the suggestion that men do understand cues of verbal sexual consent (Beres, 2010; McCaw & Senn, 1998; O’Byrne, Rapley, & Hansen, 2006; O’Byrne, Hansen, & Rapley, 2008). Participants talked in ways that suggest young women were often seen as sexually passive and lacking in autonomy, and in conjunction were obliged to reciprocate men’s sexual interest, which supports assumed discourses about how men and women engage in heterosex (Hird & Jackson, 2001).

Both the key informants and young men seemed to have some understanding of women’s adverse experiences of sex. Examples of young women having sexual intercourse while intoxicated, and then being upset and regretful about it the next day were discussed. They attributed such events to young women’s personal choices to engage in heavy drinking, rather than acknowledging issues of consent, and potential male predatory behaviour. Sexual coercion was almost inevitably associated with heavy drinking. All the incidents of sexual coercion that were discussed by participants were somehow linked to alcohol use. Alcohol related sexual harms were prominent, and inherently gendered, with young women experiencing sexual harm, and young men’s behaviour while inebriated often being dismissed as inconsequential. These findings supplement previous research in the New Zealand context, and it seems that further research into young people’s alcohol related sexual harms would be useful (Connor, Gray, & Kypri, 2010; Cashell-Smith, Connor, & Kypri, 2007; McEwan, 2009).

Much of what was discussed in the focus groups was unique to residential halls. This included such things as the assumed rights or wrongs of “screwing the crew”, the important role of residential assistants, the close proximity of a large number of potential sexual partners, the changed nature of hook ups, the intensity of sex-related gossip, and particular forms of sexual humour. All of these are far
less likely to occur in a non-communal environment. These points all emphasize halls of residence as a year of liminality, with students having moved beyond the environment of living at home and attending high school, while also not yet experiencing living as adults in smaller, self-policing households. In the residential halls environment, students are in a state of transition.

**Reflections**

Due to the limited scope of a Master’s thesis, my research specifically focused on the University of Waikato Halls of Residences. While I have a generalised account of sexuality narratives within Waikato University Halls of Residences, this could differ at other universities, and in different residential settings (e.g. residential flatting situations, or residences for international students).

It is also likely that I did not get a cross section of participants due to the sensitive nature of my research topic. Only a small number of students (nine) volunteered to take part in my research; and while they did provide ample information, it is possible that these participants were likely more comfortable talking about sexuality (since they volunteered) compared to the general population of hall residents.

The use of a sexuality related ice-breaker was particularly useful in the context of this research. It gave the participants the opportunity to discuss sexuality generally, before delving into personal perspectives and experiences. It also gave me as the interviewer the chance to engage with the participants and build rapport before starting the interview questions. I feel thankful that the key informants, and young women particularly, appeared to feel quite comfortable talking candidly to me. In addition, the young women discussed having a good opinion of each other (despite not being friends) prior to participating in the focus group, and went so far as to suggest they would not have been so open with discussion if other residents had been participating. The focus group with the young women specifically went for just over three hours, and provided a wealth of information and personal reflections that highlight many of the constructions and discourses about heterosex. However, there was the potential that participants may have been selective in what they said in the focus groups due to living in the same
community with the other group members. I think this is particularly true for the young men who participated, as they were all friends, and there were moments where they chose not to finish or expand on their sentences. I do not feel that being a woman interviewer was in any way a hindrance (as they still appeared comfortable corroborating gendered topics such as the sexual double standard), however I think one-on-one interviews may have provided more beneficial insight into young men’s perspectives and understandings of sexuality.

My previous experience of being a resident was particularly helpful when conducting this research. It meant that I understood some of the slang terms used by participants, as well as the liminal nature of information that was shared. However, it did make me give pause to consider the negative experiences that participants had with residential assistants, as this was not an experience that I had to deal with during my own residential year.

Unfortunately, my study only focused on heterosexual activity. This turned out to be a pertinent limitation, as non-heterosexual sexual experimentation was mentioned by both key informants and student participants. From the data received, this appears to be a key experience in the lives of a significant number of residential students, particularly due to the close proximity (and therefore opportunities to engage in sexual activity) within a residential setting.

My research raised an interesting ethical issue. In the women’s focus group, I heard several stories about residential assistants engaging in sexual activity with the residents in their care. Also, one young woman shared a story about a residential assistant trying to coerce her into non-consensual sexual activity. On the one hand, this raised obvious safety concerns. On the other, in the absence of imminent danger to identifiable individuals, there were no grounds for breaching the privacy of the focus group by alerting university authorities. Moreover, as the participants were going to be living in the halls for the rest of the academic year, informing managers could easily have had negative repercussions on my participants. After all, I could not be certain that their participation would not become more widely known. However, after presenting my research to a class the following year, I was approached by residents who shared the same concerns about a particular residential assistant who had featured in some of the stories in
the focus group and was still working and living in one of the halls. That allegedly coercive sexual behaviour was continuing was obviously a concern. However, by now, the circumstances had changed: my participants were no longer living in the residential halls. After discussion with my supervisors, it was decided that they would meet a Student Accommodation Manager and advise the manager in general terms of the sort of alleged behaviour which had been disclosed. Because we felt that we did not have a mandate to make specific allegations, the concerns were discussed without identifying any individual. Nevertheless, we believe that alerting the manager was useful. Being made aware of the concerns meant that the manager could review relevant policies and practices; potentially these could include those relating to the selection, training and supervision of residential assistants. This, we felt, did not compromise my commitment to protect the privacy of the research participants.

**Further Research and Implications**

It was clearly noted by participants that the models of sex education within their previous high schools were not useful in providing them helpful knowledge or advice about sexuality. Having a model of education which accounts for sexuality, and how to engage in, and respond to, sexual activity was highlighted as being more useful. There also needs to be an acknowledgement of women’s agency and sexual desires, as the current discourses of women’s passivity are still prevalent, and as a result, are negatively affecting women’s sexual experiences. ‘Sex & Ethics’ is a programme that is specifically targeted towards young adults, and has been positively evaluated as effectively addressing sexuality issues that young people may face (Carmody, 2009). Some of the sexuality issues that ‘Sex & Ethics’ addresses are; negotiating sexuality with the ‘self’ and the ‘other person’ (sexual partner), effective partner communication, dealing with conflict, and managing conflicting sexual desires.

The young men, young women, and key informants shared quite candid narratives that helped give a more well-rounded perspective on sexuality in a residential halls setting. However, it was the young women in my research who particularly conveyed a need for their voices to be shared, and were particularly
keen to talk about aspects of sexual life which had a negative impact on them, such as the sexual double standard. The young women seemed to carry most of the negative burden of norms and expectations that are associated with heterosex. It would be worth further investigating young women’s experiences of sexuality in relation to gendered experiences. As a parallel issue, it would be worth researching young men’s experiences in individual interviews to see if this offsets any potential norms of hegemonic masculinity that may be occurring within a conventional focus group setting.

There was a clear theme in my study that some young men feel entitled to take advantage of, or sexually coerce, young women who are inebriated. For the young women, sexual coercion and harm, and other experiences shaped by men’s sense of entitlement were a significant concern, which supports suggestions that alcohol related sexual harm is an area in need of further exploration (McEwan, 2009; Cashell-Smith, Connor, & Kypri, 2007; Connor, Gray, & Kypri, 2010). Typically, such experiences were seen as being part of the ‘adult’ environment of university, and city bars and clubs. This would be worth further investigation, as participants highlighted the connection between sexual coercion, and what are considered normative behaviours (i.e. male entitlement) within ‘adult’ settings.

Conflicting opinions between staff and residents suggest a lack of insight by staff into residents’ perspectives. Narratives shared by participants suggested that it would be beneficial for staff to focus less on issues of sexuality that residents did not see as a problem, such as screwing the crew (which residents consider a learning experience), and focus more on prevalent adversities such as sexual coercion and inappropriate staff behaviour, which have the potential for significant harm. It would also be advisable for residential managers to consider the impact that permissiveness has, as incidences of sexually predatory behaviour were being overlooked (and in one case enacted) by residential assistants. Further research into the impact residential assistants have on resident’s living satisfaction would also be of value, as residents shared many unfavourable experiences with residential assistants. Also of note is the fact that the participants felt unable to share their unfavourable experiences with staff due to the tight knit community environment of residential halls; it would be worth residential staff considering that this is an unspoken issue that needs addressing.
Linked to residential assistants is the unique liminality of the living environment within residential halls. Further study into the specific constructions and understandings of sexuality within a residential environment would be worthwhile, particularly in relation to the effects this may have on resident’s experiences and understandings of sexuality. A particular aspect of this is the non-heterosexual experimentation that reportedly occurs in a residential setting due to the close proximity: this too would be worthy of investigation.

Arguably the most important implication is the ongoing normalisation of women’s passivity and objectification by men, and the gendered privileging of men’s rights and entitlement. Within a residential setting specifically, it is clear that the constructions of heterosex by some residential staff and young men are perpetuating norms of women’s passivity, and the privileging of men’s sexual satisfaction. The young women resisted this narrative, and wanted their sexual agency, pleasure, and autonomy to be recognised, without judgement. Undoubtedly linked to this was the suggestion by the young women, that women need to express their sexual agency more. This places the burden of changing the discourse on women, and renders invisible the privileging of men’s behaviour, while minimising men’s responsibility for engaging with the outdated perceptions they have of women. However, it is encouraging to see the young women speaking about their own sexual agency, desire and pleasure. These narratives were prevalent throughout the discussions with the residential participants and key informants, and would all be worthy of further investigation.
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Appendix 1. Recruitment Flyer

DID YOU RECENTLY MOVE OUT OF HOME AND INTO A HALLS OF RESIDENCE?

Then I would love to speak with you!

As part of my Master’s thesis I am looking at the knowledge and expectations that Halls of Residence students have about sex, and how prepared you felt for the transition from high school to living away from home. I would specifically like to speak to heterosexual students who moved directly from a family home into a Halls of Residence for their first year at University.

If you would be willing to take part in a focus group and tell me about your expectations/knowledge of sexual relations before and after living in Halls of Residence, then please get in touch with me. I'd also really like to know how prepared you felt for the adjustment from living at home, to living in close proximity with other students. The focus groups will be composed of four people, all of the same sex (i.e. all male or all female). All personal information will be kept strictly confidential.

If you would like to participate or want to know more then please contact me:

Juliana Brown
Juliana.Brown@outlook.com
0278701039

Supervised by Neville Robertson and Johanna Schmidt

This study has received approval from the School of Psychology Research and Ethics committee, University of Waikato.
Appendix 2. Participant Information Sheet

School of Psychology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Te Kura Kete Aronui
The University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton, New Zealand 3240

Negotiating Sex: The Transition from High School to Halls of Residence

What is the purpose of this project?

The aim of my project is to gain a deeper understanding of whether you, as Halls of Residence students feel that your knowledge of sexual relations before attending University has helped/failed to help you with any experiences of intimate relations you have had while living in Halls. I also want to know what you have learnt in school about violence, rape, consent, regret, and pleasure in the context of sexual relations, and whether you know more about these topics now. Did you have expectations about the transition to living with members of the opposite sex? Did you feel prepared to move away from your family and live with other students?

Who are the researchers?

My name is Juliana Brown and I am a post-graduate student with the Department of Psychology at the University of Waikato. I am doing this research for my Master’s thesis and my supervisors for this project are Neville Robertson and Johanna Schmidt. Our contact details can be found at the end of this information sheet, and you are welcome to contact any of us for further information regarding this project.

Why am I being asked to participate?

Because you are a heterosexual student who has moved straight from your parental home to live in Halls of Residence for your first year at University. By hearing your experiences, I aim to produce research that gives a student perspective on sex and sexuality, and your knowledge and experiences before and after living in Halls of Residence.

What will I be expected to do?

I would like you to take part in a focus group with three other people of the same sex from your Halls of Residence. It would be in a private room at your Halls of Residence at a time that would be convenient for you and your fellow participants. I expect the focus group will take about an hour.

What will I have to talk about?

I would like to talk to you about your knowledge and experiences regarding sex and sexuality, both before and after you started living in your Halls of Residence. I would like to hear how prepared you felt for the change from living at home to living in a Halls of Residence with members of the opposite sex and possibly more freedom in having sexual relations. I would like to
hear what your expectations were about this transition, and whether your expectations were met. I would also like to talk to you about any information that you have learnt at school or know now regarding violence, rape, consent, regret, and pleasure in relation to sex.

What happens to the information that I share?

Our meeting will be audio recorded, and then transcribed into written form. I will then send you a summary of the notes from our meeting, so you can comment and give feedback on statements should you wish to do so. Any feedback received within two weeks will be taken into account. You will be anonymous in my research, and I will also omit any specific names, places, or obvious events that could lead to identification of you where possible. My research will become publically accessible via my thesis, and possibly submitted to academic publications as journal articles and/or conference presentations. I can also send you a summary of the results of my thesis if you would like one. All consent forms and information obtained will be kept securely at the University of Waikato until three years after the thesis has been completed, at which point all data will be destroyed.

What rights do I have?

If you decide to participate in my study then you have the right to:

- Contact me or my supervisors and ask for more information, or ask any further questions you may have about the study
- Have access to a summary of the results of my research
- Decline answering questions that you do not wish to answer
- The option to withdraw from the study, up until the end of the two week feedback period
- Your privacy and anonymity protected throughout and after the research process is completed

Contact Information

Juliana Brown (researcher)  Juliana.Brown@outlook.com  0278701039
Neville Robertson (supervisor)  scorpio@waikato.ac.nz  838 4466 Ext. 8300
Johanna Schmidt (supervisor)  jschmidt@waikato.ac.nz  838 4466 Ext. 6811

This research project has been approved by the School of Psychology Research and Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Waikato. Any questions about the ethical conduct of this research may be sent to the convenor of the Research and Ethics Committee (Dr James McEwan, phone 07 838 4466 ext. 8295, email: jmcewan@waikato.ac.nz)
Appendix 3. Key Informant Information Sheet

School of Psychology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Te Kura Kete Aronui
The University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton, New Zealand 3240

Negotiating Sex: The Transition from High School to Halls of Residence

What is the purpose of this project?
The aim of my project is to gain a deeper understanding of whether Halls of Residence students feel that their knowledge of sexual relations before attending University has helped/failed to help them with any experiences of intimate relations they have had while living in Halls. I would also like to talk to you, as an employee of a Halls of Residence, to get an alternative perspective on what you have witnessed regarding students’ sexuality and behaviour, and whether you think students were prepared for the change of living away from home.

Who are the researchers?
My name is Juliana Brown and I am a post-graduate student with the Department of Psychology at the University of Waikato. I am doing this research for my Master's thesis and my supervisors for this project are Neville Robertson and Johanna Schmidt. Our contact details can be found at the end of this information sheet, and you are welcome to contact any of us for further information regarding this project.

Why am I being asked to participate?
Because you are an employee for a Waikato University Halls of Residence. By hearing your experiences, I aim to produce research that gives a comprehensive perspective on sex and sexuality within the Halls of Residence population.

What will I be expected to do?
I would like you to attend your weekly Residential Hall meeting, so I can listen to your discussion and gain a deeper understanding of how you feel about the weekly life of managing Halls of Residence students. I would then like to talk to you and your fellow employees at the end of the meeting about the transition for the students from High School and the parental home to living in a Halls of Residence regarding sexual behaviour you have heard about or witnessed. I would like you to answer questions and make comments about this only if you feel comfortable doing so.

What will I have to talk about?
In terms of your meeting, I would not want you to change or edit anything that you would normally discuss. When I talk to you at the end of your meeting, I would like to talk to you about student behaviour (regarding sex and sexuality) that you have witnessed while
working for a Halls of Residence. Including any comments, commendations, and concerns that you may have. I would also like to hear your thoughts on the transition process, and whether you think students are adequately prepared for living away from home with members of the opposite sex.

What happens to the information that I share?
Our meeting will be audio recorded, and then transcribed into written form. I will then send you a summary of the notes from our meeting, so you can comment and give feedback should you wish to do so. Any feedback received within two weeks will be taken into account. You will remain anonymous, and I will omit any specific names, places, or obvious events that could lead to identification of you where possible. My research will become publically accessible via my thesis, and possibly submitted to academic publications as journal articles. I can also send you a summary of the results of my thesis if you would like one. All consent forms and information obtained will be kept securely at the University of Waikato until three years after the thesis has been completed, at which point all data will be destroyed.

What rights do I have?
If you decide to participate in my study, then you have the right to;

- Contact me or my supervisors and ask for more information, or ask any further questions you may have about the study
- Have access to a summary of the results of my research
- Decline answering questions that you do not wish to answer
- The option to withdraw from the study, up until the end of the two-week feedback period
- Your privacy and anonymity protected throughout and after the research process is completed

Contact Information
Juliana Brown (researcher) Juliana.Brown@outlook.com 0278701039
Neville Robertson (supervisor) scorpio@waikato.ac.nz 838 4466 Ext. 8300
Johanna Schmidt (supervisor) jschmidt@waikato.ac.nz 838 4466 Ext. 6811

This research project has been approved by the School of Psychology Research and Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Waikato. Any questions about the ethical conduct of this research may be sent to the convenor of the Research and Ethics Committee (Dr James McEwan, phone 07 838 4466 ext. 8295, email: jmcewan@waikato.ac.nz)
### Appendix 4. Participant Consent Sheet

**Research Project:** Negotiating Sex: The Transition from High School to Halls of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read the Participant Information Sheet (or it has been read to me) and I understand it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been given sufficient time to consider whether or not to participate in this study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the answers I have been given regarding the study and I have a copy of this consent form and information sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that taking part in this study is voluntary (my choice) and that I may withdraw from the study at any time up until the end of the feedback period without penalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the right to decline to participate in any part of the research activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know who to contact if I have any questions about the study in general.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that the focus group I am participating in will be audio recorded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my participation in this study is confidential and that no material, which could identify me personally, will be used in any reports on this study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to receive a summary of the findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Declaration by participant:**

I agree to participate in this research project and I understand that I may withdraw at any time. If I have any concerns about this project, I may contact the convenor of the Psychology Research and Ethics Committee (Dr James McEwan, Tel: 07 838 4466 ext. 8295, email: jmcewan@waikato.ac.nz)

Participant’s name (Please print): 
Signature: Date:

**Declaration by member of research team:**

I have given a verbal explanation of the research project to the participant, and have answered the participant’s questions about it. I believe that the participant understands the study and has given informed consent to participate.

Researcher’s name (Please print): 
Signature: Date:
Appendix 5. Key Informant Consent Sheet

**CONSENT FORM** A completed copy of this form should be retained by both the researcher and the participant.

**Research Project:** Negotiating Sex: The Transition from High School to Halls of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please complete the following checklist. Tick (✓) the appropriate box for each point.</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read the Participant Information Sheet (or it has been read to me) and I understand it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been given sufficient time to consider whether or not to participate in this study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the answers I have been given regarding the study and I have a copy of this consent form and information sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that taking part in this study is voluntary (my choice) and that I may withdraw from the study at any time up until the end of the feedback period without penalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the right to decline to participate in any part of the research activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know who to contact if I have any questions about the study in general.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my weekly Residential meeting and any feedback and discussion that I partake in afterwards will be audio recorded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my participation in this study is confidential and that no material, which could identify me personally, will be used in any reports on this study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to receive a summary of the findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Declaration by participant:**

I agree to participate in this research project and I understand that I may withdraw at any time. If I have any concerns about this project, I may contact the convenor of the Psychology Research and Ethics Committee (Dr. James McEwan, Tel: 07 838 4466 ext. 8295, email: jmcewan@waikato.ac.nz)

Participant's name (Please print): __________________________
Signature: __________________________ Date: ____________

**Declaration by member of research team:**

I have given a verbal explanation of the research project to the participant, and have answered the participant’s questions about it. I believe that the participant understands the study and has given informed consent to participate.

Researcher’s name (Please print): __________________________
Signature: __________________________ Date: ____________
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Negotiating Sex: The Transition from High School to Halls of Residence

Background to my topic:
One quantitative New Zealand study looked at sexual health risks and experiences, with 20% of their participants' being Halls of Residence students (Psutka, Connor, Cousins, & Kyprì, 2012). They found that 66% of the students in their survey last had sex with someone they were in a steady relationship with, whereas 14% last had sex with a person they had just met.

Beyond this, there is limited research into the experiences of Halls of Residence students’ regarding intimate relations in the New Zealand context, so I am hoping to investigate young people's perspectives on their intimate relations and sexuality.

My purpose for researching:
The aim of this research would be to gain a deeper understanding of whether Halls of Residence students (specifically heterosexual, first year students) feel that their knowledge of sexual relations prior to attending University has helped/failed to help them navigate experiences of intimate relations when living outside of the family home for the first time. It would also be investigating whether the current approach (abstinence-based, and suggestively out-of-date) used in schools lacks in education about topics relevant to current times: including violence, rape, consent, regret, and pleasure in the context of relations.

How I want to research:
I hope to conduct two single-sex focus groups within each Halls of Residence. I would want to sneak a maximum of four males and four female students from each Halls of Residence (those being Student Village, Bryant Hall, and College Hall), giving a total of six focus groups and 24 participants.

I would specifically want to only talk to students who had just left high school to attend University, as this way they will still have fresh knowledge of their high school curriculum and any new knowledge they have gained while attending University. I would also want to conduct focus groups at the different Halls of Residence to see what the contrasts and comparisons are between each Residence.

I would also like to conduct a focus group with key informants, specifically six employees from the Halls of Residence, with at least one Residential Assistant and one Security Guard. The purpose of this would be to get a differing perspective on student behaviour.

Who the researchers are:
I am a post-graduate student with the Department of Psychology at the University of Waikato. My supervisors for this research project are Neville Robertson, and Johanna Schmidt. Our contact details can be found below, and you are welcome to contact any of us for further information regarding this project.

Juliana Brown (researcher)        Juliana.Brown@outlook.com  0278701039
Neville Robertson (supervisor)    scorpion@waikato.ac.nz        838 4466 Ext. 8300
Johanna Schmidt (supervisor)      jschmidt@waikato.ac.nz       838 4466 Ext. 6811
Appendix 7. Focus Group Guide

TURN AUDIO ON

Intro
- Thank you
- About me (past HOR student) and research (limited)
- Can disagree; be respectful
- No right/wrong, doesn’t have to be personal story
- Not necessarily negative
- Length of time, cell phone off
- Privacy (sensitive topic)

Ice Breaker
Having three drawings, one of a ‘woman’, one of a ‘man’ and one that is ‘non-gendered’. Five minutes to bullet point in each: what they think is important to (or maybe expected of) men regarding sex, what they think is important to (or maybe expected of) women, and what they think is important to and expected of both genders. The main hope would be to get them thinking about topics related to sex, and give them potential discussion ideas.

Starting Questions
So back when you were at high school where did you mostly learn about sex?

- Sex ed
- Parents
- Friends
- Internet
- Experience

Did this knowledge help prepare you for any experiences that you have had or witnessed others having while living in Halls?

- Effect of close proximity living
- Possible new freedom?
- Social connotations; gossip and discussion
- Experimenting
- Violence
- Pleasure
- Rape, consent and Coercion

When you think of the sexual experiences that you have had/heard about this year, is there any advice or knowledge that you would have wanted your high school self/others to know?

- Positive comments to your past self?
- Contraception

A common saying when I was in Halls was ‘Don’t Screw the Crew’. Has this been something you have witnessed or experienced while living in Halls?

- Future problems
- Regret/Miscommunication

Is there anything important that we didn’t talk about?
Do you have any comments that you would like to add?

Privacy reminder and thank you