

ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

SEXUAL EXPERIENCES AND SEXUAL BEHAVIORS OF UNIVERSITY  
STUDENTS IN TURKEY

Ece HATTAT İŐERİ

116628001

Assist. Prof. Alev AVDAR SİDERİS

İSTANBUL

2021

Sexual Experiences and Sexual Behaviors of University Students in Turkey

Türkiye’deki Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Cinsel Deneyim ve Cinsel Davranışları

Ece Hattat İşeri

116628001

Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. Alev Çavdar Sideris (İmzası) .....

Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

Jury Member: Prof. Hale Bolak Boratav (İmzası) .....

Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

Jury Member: Assoc. Prof. N. Selcan Kaynak (İmzası) .....

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih : 29/ 06/ 2021

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 137

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

1) Cinsel mesaj

2) Cinsel roller

3) Cinsel davranışlar

4) Çevrim-içi seks

5) Cinsel onay

Keywords (English)

1) Sexual messages

2) Sexual stereotypes

3) Sexual behaviors

4) Online sex

5) Sexual Consent

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank Alev Cavdar Sideris for supporting and guiding me all throughout this journey to become a clinical psychologist including her astounding supervision in the process of writing this thesis.

I would also like to thank Hale Bolak Boratav for her help and advice for the completion of this research as well as my jury member Selcan Kaynak for her time and contributions.

I would like to thank all the instructors and supervisors of the clinical psychology program for their warm-hearted guidance.

I would sincerely like to express my gratitude to Ferda İşeri for his gratifying support, encouragement and love from the very first day of setting off to a new career. None would have happened without his amazing support and holding.

I am forever grateful to Can İşeri, now 7, for inspiring me how a state of mindfulness can so effortlessly come alive through art and love.

I want to thank Alp İşeri, now 3, whose courage is contagious to everyone I know and surely to me since I have found strength with his even in-utero presence during my training.

I would like to thank all my classmates to infuse me with pure, hopeful, bold and inspirational new ways seeing and holding. Kaan and Gizem, this journey would not end in this high note without your support, motivation, holding and advice.

I would like to thank İrem Hattat and Prof. Dr. Halim Hattat for their introduction of sexual medicine to my professional career.

Last but not least, I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Neş'e Hattat, my mother, whom I lost during my training, for giving me the motivation to expand who I am both personally and professionally.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	1
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	viii
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	x
<b>ÖZET</b> .....	xi
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>CHAPTER I</b> .....	3
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	3
<b>1.1. UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD SEXUALITY</b> .....	3
<b>1.1.1. Messages About Sexuality</b> .....	4
<b>1.1.1.1. Parental Influence</b> .....	4
<b>1.1.1.2. Religion</b> .....	4
<b>1.1.1.3. Place of Residence</b> .....	5
<b>1.1.1.4. Peer Groups</b> .....	5
<b>1.1.1.5. Media</b> .....	6
<b>1.1.2. Sexual Stereotypes</b> .....	6
<b>1.2. SEXUAL BEHAVIOR OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS</b> .....	8
<b>1.2.1. Off-line Sexual Activities</b> .....	8
<b>1.2.1.1. Non-coital and Coital Activities</b> .....	8
<b>1.2.1.2. Token Resistance</b> .....	10
<b>1.2.1.3. Consent to Unwanted Sex</b> .....	12
<b>1.2.2. Online Sexual Activities</b> .....	14
<b>1.3. SEXUAL EXPERIENCES OF TURKISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS</b> 16	
<b>1.3.1. Sexual Norms in Turkey</b> .....	16
<b>1.3.2. Sexual Attitudes of Turkish University Students</b> .....	18
<b>1.3.3. Offline Sexual Behaviors of Turkish University Students</b> .....	21
<b>1.3.3.1. Dating Violence, Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex</b> .....	22
<b>1.3.4. Online Sexual Behaviors in Turkish University Students</b> .....	24
<b>1.4. CURRENT STUDY</b> .....	24

1.4.1. Study I: Replication of Bolak and Cavdar’s (2012) Study .....	25
1.4.2. Study II: Exploration of Online Sexual Behaviors.....	27
CHAPTER 2 .....	29
METHOD .....	29
2.1. PARTICIPANTS.....	29
2.2. INSTRUMENTS .....	31
2.2.1. Messages about Sexuality .....	31
2.2.2. Offline Sexual Experiences .....	32
2.2.3. Online Sexual Experiences .....	34
2.2.4. Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex.....	35
2.2.5. Sexual Stereotypes.....	38
2.2.6. Demographic Information Sheet.....	38
2.3. PROCEDURE .....	39
CHAPTER 3 .....	40
RESULTS .....	40
3.1. MESSAGES ABOUT SEXUALITY .....	40
3.1.1. Source and Valence of Messages about Sexuality .....	40
3.1.2. Sexual Stereotypes.....	45
3.1.3. Associations of Messages with Sexual Stereotypes, Religiosity, and Conservatism .....	45
3.2. OFFLINE SEXUAL PRACTICES.....	47
3.2.1. Frequency of Offline Sexual Experiences .....	47
3.2.2. Number of Partners .....	48
3.2.3. Age of First Sexual Experience .....	48
3.2.4. Reasons for First Sexual Experience .....	49
3.2.5. Associations of Offline Sexual Experiences with Messages about Sexuality, Sexual Stereotypes, Religiosity, and Conservatism .....	52
3.3. ONLINE SEXUAL PRACTICES.....	53
3.3.1. Frequency of Online Sexual Experiences.....	53
3.3.2. Number of Partners of Online Sexual Experience .....	55
3.3.3. Age of First Online Sexual Experience.....	55

3.3.4. Reasons of Sexual Experience .....	55
3.4. TOKEN RESISTANCE AND CONSENT TO UNWANTED SEX .....	58
3.4.1. Frequency of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex .....	58
3.4.2. Context of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex.....	59
3.4.3. Reasons of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex .....	61
3.4.4. Effect Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex on Relationship .....	63
3.5. COMPARISON OF THE CURRENT FINDINGS WITH BORATAV & CAVDAR'S STUDY .....	64
3.5.1 Comparison of Messages about Sexuality .....	65
3.5.2 Comparison of Sexual Stereotypes .....	69
3.5.3. Comparison of Token Resistance, and Consent to Unwanted Sex Frequencies .....	71
CHAPTER 4 .....	73
DISCUSSION .....	73
4.1. SEXUAL MESSAGES AND SEXUAL STEREOTYPES.....	73
4.2. DYNAMICS OF SEXUAL EXPERIENCES .....	77
4.2.1. Offline Sexual Experiences .....	77
4.2.2. Online Sexual Experiences .....	79
4.2.3. Experiences of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex.....	82
4.3. CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS .....	85
4.4. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	86
CONCLUSION.....	88
REFERENCES.....	89
APPENDICES .....	108
Appendix A: Informed Consent Form .....	108
Appendix B: Messages About Sexuality.....	110
Appendix C: Offline Sexual Experiences .....	113
Appendix D: Online Sexual Experiences .....	115
Appendix E: Token Resistance & Consent to Unwanted Sex .....	118
Appendix F: Sexual Stereotypes .....	121

<b>Appendix G: Demographic Information Sheet .....</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>Appendix F: Psychological Help Resources.....</b>	<b>125</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

**Table 2.1.** *Background Characteristics of the Sample*

**Table 3.1.** *Tests of within-subjects effects for source and valence of messages and their interactions with gender*

**Table 3.2.** *Estimated Marginal Means (95% Confidence Interval) of messages as a function of source, valence, and gender.*

**Table 3.3.** *Descriptive statistics for the ranking of the sources of sexual messages from 1 = most important to 6: least important.*

**Table 3.4.** *Descriptive statistics of the subscales of Sexual Stereotypes Scale*

**Table 3.5.** *Spearman's correlation coefficients of Permissive and Restrictive Messages about sexuality with Religiosity, Conservatism, and Sexual Stereotypes.*

**Table 3.6.** *Spearman's correlation coefficients of Sexual Stereotypes with Religiosity and Conservatism.*

**Table 3.7.** *Descriptive statistics for the age of first offline sexual experiences.*

**Table 3.8.** *Frequencies and percentages of the reasons for first non-intercourse sexual experience*

**Table 3.9.** *Frequencies and percentages of the reasons for the first sexual intercourse.*

**Table 3.10.** *Mean rating of frequencies for each type of online sexual activities.*

**Table 3.11.** *Descriptive statistics for different routes of online sex.*

**Table 3.12.** *Reasons for online sex*

**Table 3.13.** *Frequencies and Percentages of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex*

**Table 3.14.** *Setting and Context of Token Resistance*

**Table 3.15.** *Setting and Context of Consent to Unwanted Sex*

**Table 3.16.** *Reasons of token resistance*

**Table 3.17.** *Reasons of consent to unwanted sex*

**Table 3.18.** *The effect of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex on the relationship*



**Table 3.19.** *Descriptive statistics of demographic characteristics of 2005 and 2021 samples*

**Table 3.20.** *Tests of within-subjects effects for source and valence of messages and their interactions with gender and study cohort*

**Table 3.21.** *Estimated Marginal Means (95% Confidence Interval) of messages as a function of source, valence, and cohort.*

**Table 3.22.** *Estimated Marginal Means (95% Confidence Interval) of messages as a function of source, valence, cohort, and gender.*

**Table 3.23.** *Descriptive statistics of sexual stereotypes for 2005 and 2021 samples.*

**Table 3.24.** *Frequencies and percentages of sexual experiences.*

**Table 3.25.** *Frequencies and percentages of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex*

## ABSTRACT

This study was based on the sexuality of university students in Turkey. The aim of the study was to investigate messages about sexuality, sexual beliefs, offline and online sexual behaviors with a special focus on the issues of resistance and consent, religiosity and conservatism, both in a descriptive and comparative fashion. A total 430 students (305 women, M age = 21.5 years, and 125 men, M age = 21.5 years) participated in a follow-up online survey replicated from the original study of Boratav & Cavdar (2012) with measures about restrictive and permissive sexual messages, sexual stereotypes and offline sexual behaviors as well as a second section with questions to explore online sexual behaviors. The findings showed an increased level of liberalism among young adults in regards to the received sexual messages and sexual stereotypes over the last decade with the prevalence of more restrictive attitudes for women. The most important sexual message source was online media and same-sex friends. Compared with the original study, the university students engaged in more offline sexual behaviors and they were highly involved in online sex behaviors. Men engaged in more sexual intercourse as well as online sexual behaviors and at an earlier age than women. Men also had more offline and online sexual partners. The most frequent online practice for both men and women were sex-texting followed by sharing seminude/nude self-photos for women and live-chatting for men. Messaging Applications were the most used route, while e-mail is the least used route for online sex for both women and men. The rates of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex has increased over the years and were higher for women. Resistance and consent issues were experienced both in offline and online sexual contexts being more frequent in serious relationships for women and casual relationships for men. The interrelation of the current results and the comparisons are discussed, and recommendations for future research are proposed.

*Keywords:* Sexual messages, sexual stereotypes, sexual behaviors, online sex, sexual consent

## ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı Türkiye'deki üniversite öğrencilerinde cinsel mesajları, cinsel inançları, çevrim-dışı ve çevrim-içi cinsel davranışları, direnç ve cinsel onay ile din ve muhafazakarlık konuları gözetilerek tanımlayıcı ve karşılaştırmalı şekilde sunmaktır. 430 üniversite öğrencisi (305 kadın, M yaş= 21.5 yıl, ve 125 erkek, M yaş = 21.5 yaş), birinci bölümünde Boratav & Cavdar'ın 2012 yılında kullandıkları ve içeriğinde kısıtlayıcı ve izin verici cinsel mesajların, cinsel rollerin, çevrim-dışı cinsel deneyimlerin sorgulandığı, ikinci bölümünde ise bu çalışma için yeni eklenen ve çevrim-içi davranışların sorgulandığı soru formunu, devam çalışması bağlamında, çevrim-içi olarak doldurmuştur. Sonuçlar üniversite öğrencilerinde alınan cinsel mesajların ve cinsel inançların eskiye göre liberalleştiğini ortaya koymuştur. Ancak kadınlar için kısıtlayıcı cinsel normların devam ettiği görülmüştür. Gençlerde en önemli cinsel mesaj kaynakları çevrim-içi medya ve hemcins arkadaşlardır. Orijinal çalışmaya kıyasla, günümüzde üniversite öğrencileri daha fazla çevrim-dışı ve sık çevrim-içi cinsel davranışlarda bulunmaktadır. Erkekler, kadınlara göre, daha genç yaşlardan itibaren, daha fazla cinsel birleşme ve çevrim-içi cinsellik yaşamaktadır. Erkeklerin kadınlara göre daha fazla çevrim-dışı ve çevrim-içi partneri olmuştur. En sık kullanılan çevrim-içi cinsellik cinsel içerikli mesajlaşmadır. Bunu kadınlarda yarı-çıplak/çıplak kişisel fotoğraf paylaşımı, erkeklerde ise çevrim-içi canlı sohbet takip etmektedir. En sık kullanılan çevrim-içi cinsellik yolu mesajlaşma uygulamaları iken, en az kullanılan yol e-postadır. Direnç ve cinsel onay konularının eskiye oranla sıklaştığı ve kadınlarda daha sık görüldüğü bulunmuştur. Ayrıca bu cinsel deneyimler hem çevrim-dışı hem çevrim-içi cinsel ortamda gerçekleşmektedir. İlişkisel olarak, kadınlar daha fazla ciddi ilişkilerde, erkekler ise ciddi olmayan ilişkilerde bu cinsel deneyimlerle karşılaşmaktadır. Çalışmada bu sonuçlar arası bağlantılar ve karşılaştırmalar tartışılmakta ve gelecek araştırmalar için öneriler sunulmaktadır.

*Anahtar Kelimeler:* Cinsel mesaj, cinsel roller, cinsel davranışlar, çevrim-içi seks, cinsel onay

## INTRODUCTION

The passage to university constitutes a major transformation in the sexual lives of young adults since they step into a new era of casual and serious bonds, intimate and sexual relations as well as different sexual experiences (Bancroft, 2009; Lyons et al., 2014; Paul et al., 2000; Sieving et al., 2006). University students form new sexual relationships in college life in the light of their sexual knowledge, sexual expectations and sexual desires. Their assumptions and prospects regarding sexuality show a reflection of societal norms, familial values, religious teachings, peer correspondence and media influence which shape their sexual attitudes from early years (Wiederman, 2005). In turn, young adults engage in a repertoire of sexual behaviors (Daniels et al., 2002), not just offline but also online (Cooper et al., 2016; Klein & Cooper, 2019; Mori et al., 2020).

On this note, although much diversity is present within Turkey due to a wide range of urbanization, education level and social class (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012); the majority of university students in Turkey grow up in a sexual milieu influenced by the teachings of Islam (Leo, 2014), conservatism (Askun & Ataca, 2007), gendered sexual stereotypes (Kagitcibasi & Sunar, 1992) and restrictive sexual attitudes (Ergun, 2007). With almost one third of Turkish university students engaging in sexual intercourse (Cok et al., 2001; Golbasi & Kelleci, 2011; Gökengin et al., 2003, Saracoglu et al., 2014), and up to half of the university students engaging in online sex (Ozan et al., 2010), the university life offers a rapid change in the students' sexual experiences and sexual behaviors toward more liberal and favorable norms. However, gender segregation is still prevalent among university students and like the rest of the society, consent issues are frequent especially among young women (Dikmen et al., 2018; Toplu-Demirtaş & Fincham, 2020; Kayı et al., 2000). Token resistance and consent to unwanted sex experiences are prevalent in the Turkish university life (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012).

This is why, this study aims to explore how the sexual norms and gendered beliefs effect the sexual experiences of Turkish university students. It is intended to provide an insight to the current sexual attitudes and the present offline and

online sexual behaviors of Turkish university students with a special focus on token resistance and consent to unwanted sex experiences. Taking the work of Boratav and Cavdar (2012) as a standpoint, the study purposes to show how these sexual attitudes and behaviors changes over the last decade. Additionally, as online sex is becoming a normative sexual behavior for university students (Symons et al., 2018), Covid-19 pandemic also increased the use of internet as a medium of sexual relationships (Döring, 2020). This study also aims to shed light to the online sexual practices of Turkish university students again focusing on both resistance and consent issues.

## **CHAPTER I**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **1.1. UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD SEXUALITY**

The attitudes of university students toward sexuality are influenced by social and cultural norms. Aligned with social script theory (Gagnon & Simon, 1973), it is indicated that young men and women internalize certain gendered scripts regarding what is normative in the society for sexual feelings, thought and behaviors. These scripts act on the cultural, interpersonal and intrapsychic levels, influencing the acceptability, the occurrence and the desirability of sexual interactions. Social scripts also assign aims, reasons, suitable settings and selection of acceptable sexual behaviors (Wiederman, 2005).

Traditionally, socially constructed sexual scripts assign gender based double standards in sexuality (LaPlante et al., 1980), consider heterosexuality as the only acceptable form of sexual orientation (Miceli, 2006), include sexual intercourse and male ejaculation as the defining element in sex (Kaye, 2006) and regard any behavior differing from these norms as disorderly (McGann, 2006).

These scripts are transferred both by the structure as well as the members of the society (Wiederman, 2005). They might pass on from parents, peers, media and religious teachings; usually communicated in a more unspoken, non-verbal way in families (Kim & Ward, 2007). They are internalized in the form of sexual messages and myths effecting sexual attitudes, expression and behaviors (Daniels et al., 2002).

As university life signifies a change in sexual attitudes and behaviors toward more liberal norms (Lyons et al., 2014), traditional sexual scripts and sexual double standards still shape the sexual lives of adolescents and young adults (Kreager et al., 2016).

### **1.1.1. Messages About Sexuality**

#### **1.1.1.1. Parental Influence**

In traditional settings, parents are usually the primary basis of sexual information but communication about sex is usually prohibited (Darling & Hicks, 1982). In fact, nearly 40% of university students are dissatisfied with the information they gained from their parents and one third do not find themselves enough knowledgeable about sexuality. A review about parental sex messages and communication by Flores and Barroso (2017) found that parents usually pass on inhibiting messages about sexuality and emphasize risks like unwanted pregnancies, sexually transmitted diseases and sexual assault. Permissive sexual messages given by parents are usually scarce and college women usually remember being subjected to conservative sexual scripts like the prohibition of premarital sexuality. On the other hand, men are usually subjected to messages emphasizing more permissive but masculine and heterosexual behavior.

It is seen that parents' educational status also plays a role people with higher educational degrees tend to have more liberal attitudes toward sexuality and support a variety of sexual patterns besides coitus like manual-genital and oral-genital contact in contrast to lower education groups who are more coitus-oriented (Bancroft, 2009).

#### **1.1.1.2. Religion**

Religious and moral teachings also promote more conservative sexual attitudes and put an emphasis on marital sexuality as well as monogamy (Grove, 2006). Religiosity has been found to be a predictor of sexual conduct in young adults (Lefkowitz et al., 2004; Luquis et al., 2011). Religious affiliated university students have more conservative attitudes regarding premarital sex, they report less sexual intercourse and fewer number of sexual partners (Davidson et al., 2019; Pluhar et al., 1998).

### **1.1.1.3. Place of Residence**

Restrictive sexual messages as well as traditional views about masculinity and femininity are more prominent in rural communities (Little, 2003). University students who were brought up in more urban settings and a higher socio-economic status are found to be more liberal in their sexual attitudes (Higgins & Sun, 2007). In low socio-economic families, messages about the risks of sexuality are emphasized especially for daughters (Flores & Barroso, 2017). As acculturation is found to be linked to more liberal attitudes and an increase in the permissive sexual attitudes among college students (Ahrold & Meston, 2010; Leiblum et al., 2003); change of residency to a more urban setting might not change the internalized restrictive sexual messages in young adults (Meston et al., 1996).

### **1.1.1.4. Peer Groups**

Peer groups are an important source of sexual information and transmission of sexual messages. Peer approval and frequent discussions about hook-ups and sexual activity; an exaggerated estimate of peer's sexual performance and number of partners as well as peer pressures increase the likelihood of hook ups and sexual activity among adolescents and university students (Holman & Sillars, 2012; Martens et al., 2006; Nogueira Avelar E Silva et al., 2020; van de Bongardt et al., 2015). Trin and Arbor (2016) found that although commonly thought otherwise, university students usually have traditional values regarding sexuality. Most of the same-sex peer messages about sexuality are parallel with traditional sex roles, with women conveying mostly restrictive and relational messages and men highlighting heterosexual, masculine and recreational aspects of sexuality. Additionally peer groups tend to favor non-coital sexual behavior for girls and coital behavior for boys (Kreager et al., 2016).



### **1.1.1.5. Media**

Media also influences sexual attitudes among adolescents and young adults even if it involves non-explicit sexual content (Coyne, 2019). Media might reinforce genderized sexual scripts among university students by implying the sexual objectification of women and sex-drivenness of men (Ward, 2002). Escobar-Chaves et al. (2005) express that media provides a model for sexual behaviors among younger populations by creating new and more disinhibiting attitudes. In their review, they found that more than 80% of media programs popular with teens have sexual content and an increase in the exposure to sexual media increased the teens' likelihood of becoming sexually active. Baams et al. (2015) also found that young people who view sexualized media have more permissive sexual attitudes especially if they view this content as realistic. It is indicated that young people who receive parental disapproval of sex usually turn to media for sexual information (Bleakley et al., 2008) especially if they were raised in religious families (Hetsroni, 2008).

### **1.1.2. Sexual Stereotypes**

In parallel with the social script theory, gender-based sexual scripts inflict double standards in sexuality. Internalization of restrictive sexual messages and myths (Daniels et al., 2002) act as an obstacle to sexual pleasure (James, 2006; Tiefer & Kling, 1995) especially for women (Sanchez et al., 2012a; Emmering et al., 2016).

Considering these gender differences, it is stated that patriarchal supremacy split sexuality into active and passive parts, assigning the former to men and the latter to women; in other words, reinforcing male dominance and female submission in sexuality (Hawkes, 1996; MacKinnon, 2002).

Women are socialized to have an obedient and recipient sexual role. They are upbrought to value their partner's sexual satisfaction more than their own pleasure and they might feel pressured to comply with their partner's sexual

demands (Daniels et al., 2002; Barber, 2006; Frith & Kitzinger, 2001). In the traditional settings, women are supposed to grant pleasure to men (Millett, 1973) and are expected to hide their sexual desire due to the belief that only loose women would express sexual interest and show pleasure (Butler & Lewis, 1993). Moreover, women learn to wait for their partners to initiate and lead sex (Sanchez et al., 2012a). On the contrary, men are socialized to be assertive, masculine and active initiators of sexuality; seeing sex as a pleasure on its own and for personal satisfaction (Daniels et al., 2020; Emmering et al., 2016; Frith & Kitzinger, 2001). As a result, sexual scripts regard men and women as having high vs. weak sexual drives, seeking recreational sex vs. relational sex, pursuing vs. resisting sexual initiatives, acceptance of more vs. less sexual partners respectively (Masters et al., 2013).

There are a number of consequences of these traditional sexual scripts. Gendered sexual scripts decrease the pleasure and the satisfaction of women in sexuality, causing sexual desire as well as arousal problems and in some cases sexual pain and vaginismus (Bancroft, 2009). Again, these norms can justify the sexual aggressiveness of men (Weiss, 2009) and increase the likelihood of intimate partner violence (Santana et al., 2006). The discrepancy of sexual desire rooted in gender scripts also result in sexual miscommunication, sexual consent problems and anticipating legal issues (Powell, 2010). Even in a consensual context, sexual scripts might result in conflicts in couples where each partner has a different set of scripts regarding sexual desire, acts and behaviors (Wiederman, 2005). The assessment of sexual scripts is thus suggested to be a direct focus in therapy as well (Gagnon et al., 1982).

It is stated that the difference in the sexual roles and the inhibition of women's sexuality started to decline (Bancroft & Graham, 2011). Education, labor force participation and modernization caused a more egalitarian approach to gender roles (Blau et al., 2013). However, traditional gender conditioning can still be observed in modern relationships (Bordini & Sperb, 2013; Sanchez et al., 2012b).

As passage to university is usually a milestone in sexual life, with college students having more permissive attitudes toward sexuality (Davidson et al., 2008),

gender differences in sexual scripts and stereotypes still account for many university students (Canan et al., 2018). Many young women still take to role of being a gatekeeper in sexuality where young men accept being a pursuer of sexual activities (Kreager, 2016).

## **1.2. SEXUAL BEHAVIOR OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

Transition to university life and being away from parental home signifies a major change in sexual behaviors. Experiences like hooking up, casual sex with an acquaintance and recreational sex show an increase to almost 50% of university students. Sexual enjoyment, having fun and being free from emotional commitments might become primary motivations for sexual activities (Lyons et al., 2014). Together with the fact that university life offers more liberal sexual attitudes (Davidson et al., 2008), due to the decreased socio-cultural suppression of women's sexuality, more young women engage in sexual behaviors (Bancroft, 2009). Additionally, most young adults engage not only in offline but also online sexual practices (Mori et al., 2020). However, as gender socialization is still evident for university students, issues of resistance and consent are prevalent among college students.

This section will give a review of literature regarding both the offline sexual practices and the online sexual behaviors of young adults. Non-coital sexual experiences, sexual intercourse, token resistance, consent to unwanted sex will be covered within offline sexual activities and online sex will be discussed in the second part.

### **1.2.1. Off-line Sexual Activities**

#### **1.2.1.1. Non-coital and Coital Activities**

Studies show that a substantial number of the sexually active university students have had sex already during their teenage years. Looking at the first age of

intercourse, since 1990's, there has been a significant decrease (Bancroft, 2009) with CDC reports (2017) showing half of adolescents having their first sex before the age of 18. It is seen that peer sexual activity level influence and predict first age of sexual intercourse for adolescents and young adults (Sieving et al., 2006).

However, gender differences in sexual behaviors can be noticed. For instance, young men usually have a higher number of partners than young women (Bancroft, 2009) and have casual sex experience more often (Peterson & Hyde, 2010). Young men initiate sex more than young women (Vannier & O'Sullivan, 2011) and they find sex with a new partner more gratifying (Wiederman, 2005). For young women with more conservative attitudes toward sexuality, being sexually active and practicing casual sex led to lower sexual well-being. Young women might pursue sexual activities due to partner pressures and experience negative feelings. Again, young women tend to prefer relational sex and recreational sexual desire is linked to lower sexual satisfaction (Kaestle & Evans, 2018), sexual pleasure and orgasm (Wongsomboon et al., 2020). Young women might have concerns about their sexual reputation if they have casual sex or a high number of sex partners (Farvid et al., 2017).

In reference to preferred sexual activities, young people practice both non-coital activities like kissing, caressing and coital activities like oral, vaginal or anal sex (Paul et al., 2000). However, non-coital activities are usually regarded as a precursor of sexual intercourse among young people (Bancroft, 2009). According to Kreager (2016), in parallel to sexual double standards, there is tendency of young women to favor non-coital sexual activities and young men to pursue sexual intercourse. In fact, compared with men, twice as many young women express that they regret their first sexual intercourse and they were the less desiring partner on the occasion (Wellings et al., 2001). These negative emotions were linked to later sexual difficulties, like sexual communication difficulties, dissatisfaction with sexual life and unstable relationships in young adults (Rapsey, 2014). Again, young women report genital sexual behaviors more in romantic relationships whereas men more in casual relationships (Welsh, 2006).

### **1.2.1.2. Token Resistance**

One of the key points of sexual script theory is its reference to token resistance. As gender stereotypes assign men the role of initiating and pursuing sexual activities where women are expected to resist and refuse sex, sexual miscommunication arise. Token resistance, a term coined by Muehlenhard and Hollabaugh (1988), imply a form of sexual miscommunication in which a person rejects sexual activity while intending to engage and participate. Token resistance mostly involves the feminine aspects of sexual scripts where women are expected to say 'no' to sex. In other words, token resistance in sex is saying 'no' while meaning 'yes'. Although men can also report token resistance, studies show a prevalence of token resistance in women from 37% to as much as 59% (Krahe & Scheinberger-Olwig, 2000; Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988; Muehlenhard & McCoy, 1991; Sprecher et al., 1994 ).

Muehlenhard and Hollabaugh (1988) found three reasons for women to engage in token resistance: First, for practical reasons as women might fear of being seen as loose; next due to inhibition as women might have moral distresses and finally because of manipulative reasons as women might want to be in control in their relationship. Those women who had moral reasons for token resistance were found to be more accepting toward traditional gender roles. Women's perception of their partner as endorsing sexual double standards also led them to express token resistance more (Muehlenhard & McCoy, 1991). Moral concerns, adding an interest to an ongoing relationship, wanting not to be taken for granted, testing a partner's response and power over the other were found to be other reasons for both men and women to engage in token resistance (Muehlenhard & Rodgers, 1998).

When it comes to the perceptions of men and women regarding token resistance, it is seen that men are more likely to take a woman's 'no' as token resistance in contrast to women who are less likely to take a man's 'no' as token resistance. This difference points out the traditional sexual scripts where men are usually the active part in sexuality whereas women are the reactive part (Emmers-

Sommer, 2016). In fact, token resistance might be perceived as a confirmation and permission by men. This might lead to consent issues and even rape (Osman, 2003) due to myths that endorse token resistance like “She wanted it” (Muehlenhard & Peterson, 2005). This is also evident in the university students as men might pressurize women even after a refusal by referencing the ambiguity of consent (Jozkowski et al., 2017).

In the recent years, affirmative consent, demonstrating verbally or behaviorally a clear permission to sex, has gained an importance to reduce this ambiguity and increase sexual communication among university campuses to prevent sexual assault cases. As affirmative consent has been critiqued for giving the responsibility of consent solely to women, reinforcing the notion that men cannot control their sexual desire and arousal, it states that men will believe and take a ‘no’ for an answer (Pugh & Becker, 2018). However, as gender scripts still reside in young adults’ relationships, for most university students, non-verbal behaviors or a giving-in attitude represents a sexual consent and a verbal refusal is often interpreted as a token resistance (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999; Jozkowski et al., 2017; Muehlenhard et al., 2016).

Although many people who refuse sex really mean so (Muehlenhard & Rodgers, 1998) and young men usually realize both non-verbal and verbal refusals of women in a very correct fashion (O’Byrne et al., 2006), a ‘no’ is usually not taken as a ‘no’. In a study, 78% of women university students indicated that they faced repetitive demands, lies and threatening after their refusal (Struckman-Johnson et al., 2003). Miscommunication hypothesis that claims a reduction in assault cases with an improved sexual communication between parties is thus disproved (Beres et al., 2014). As most of the university students believe in rape myths like “she asked for it” and “it wasn’t a rape” and have rape scripts that portrait a rape by a violent stranger, the understatement of a rejection as token resistance by an acquaintance results in rape which more common than un-acquaintance rapes (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004).

### **1.2.1.3. Consent to Unwanted Sex**

Another issue that arises with the social scripting of sexuality is consent to unwanted sex. This subject is also in line with the gendered sexual scripts where women are assigned the role of pleasing men and responding to the men's desire at all times (Barber, 2006; Butler & Lewis, 1993; Daniels et al., 2002; Frith & Kitzinger, 2001; Millett, 1973). However, consent to sex has both social as well as political aspects and the definition needs a better understanding (Powell, 2010).

The new model of sexual desire by Basson (2000) has been discussed widely in literature as it shows women's sexual desire in a reactive and cyclical pattern in the sense that it does not develop simultaneously but in response to cues and triggers like emotional intimacy, physical stimulation or erotic conversation. If sex is satisfactory, this builds up a motivation for women to be more responsive in the next sexual cue. Meston and Buss (2007), showed in their research, more than two hundred reasons why women engage in sex. These research establish more of a motivational and outcome oriented sexual desire. Some of the reasons for women to want sex is to have an orgasm, to control the partner, to be experienced, to be pregnant, to feel attractive, to make partner jealous, to finalize an argument. Consenting in this manner might result in positive outcomes as motives of sexual activity are established (O'Sullivan & Allgeier, 1998).

However, wanting or not wanting sex might happen concurrently during a sexual encounter: For instance, a woman might want sex yet at the same time she might not want it due to a fear of sexually transmitted disease (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2007). It is therefore argued that wanting or not wanting sex shows a dichotomous model of sexual desire and when it comes to subjective experience of people, desire is mostly ambivalent. Still, it is the consent that matters and wanting sex vs. consenting should be separated to understand individual experiences (Muehlenhard & Peterson, 2005).

So, the issue comes to the other end of the spectrum where unwanted sex becomes a sexual coercion. Muehlenhard et al. (2017) draw attention to the difficulties to define sexual assault. In their review, they found that approximately

one in five undergraduate women experienced sexual assault. As forced or incapacitating vaginal, oral or anal penetration usually implies rape; forced or incapacitating non-penetrative acts are termed as sexual battery, sexual contact, unwanted sexual contact. They point that sexual assault covers both forced or incapacitating penetrative and non-penetrative acts and some researchers also include verbal pressures in the definition, too. However, they exclude these verbal pressures from the definition and define these acts as coercion. Still, both sexual assault and sexual coercion imply a forced sexuality in the relational context which results in a negative outcome. Verbal sexual coercion might be in the form of psychological pressure, displaying discontent, nagging, trying to persuade, arguing, frightening to break up, showing rage, shouting. In fact, in university students these verbal coercion tactics have been found to be the most prevalent method of sexual assault (Pugh & Becker, 2018).

Sexual coercion might occur in an established relationship when a partner's verbal pressures lead a woman to consent unwanted sex (Livingston et al., 2004). If there is a history of giving in to these pressures, women might re-consent to unwanted sex, believing that it would be useless to resist and it would protect them from sexual coercion (Gutzmer et al., 2016; Katz & Tirone, 2010). This is evident in undergraduate relationships as 40% to nearly 50% of university students consent to unwanted intercourse (Katz & Tirone, 2010; Sprecher et al., 1994).

Bay-Cheng and Eliseo-Arras (2008) identified common themes that lead to unwanted sex in serious relationships. Beliefs like "Good girlfriends always say Yes" and "Once a Yes always a Yes"; being verbally convinced by male partner; overriding of a woman's non-sexual symptoms like fatigue or resistance by her partner were listed as reasons (pp. 391-392). Frith and Kitzinger (1997) argue that women tend to use miscommunication theory and label these unwanted sex experiences as mutually wanted, in order not to feel victimized. In fact, women tend to avoid labelling an unwanted sex experience as an assault or a coercion especially if it involves an acquaintance, low intensities of force or not enough resistance (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2011). Many women cannot do an aftermath of the incident with their partners due to men's avoidance and repudiation; they do



not disclose their experience to health care or law force professionals and even when they reveal their experience to third parties like their friends, they might have feelings of loneliness and self-blame (Gutzmer et al., 2016).

So, the result of an unwanted sex is often not favorable as reasons like guilt and fear of harm to image does not provide such satisfactory outcomes (Muehlenhard et al., 2002). Women might indicate that they consent to sex with the goal of relationship protection but at the same time they might believe that they have no choice as it is useless to refuse sex when the men are too aroused. Women might fear of losing their partner if they do not comply, which in turn might cause negative emotions (Impett & Peplau, 2002). It is found that women who repeatedly consent to unwanted sex due to partner pressures have low relationship and sexual satisfaction (Katz & Tirone, 2009) as well as anxiety and depression (Bay-Cheng & Bruns, 2016).

### **1.2.2. Online Sexual Activities**

The use of internet as a medium to exchange sexual material has become increasingly popular among young adults (Klein & Cooper, 2019). Internet is becoming the most frequent source for sexual information among young adults (Black et al., 2018) and the triple A's -Access, Affordability, and Anonymity- of the internet make it a common ground for sexual practices (Cooper, 1998). Online sexual practices can be for educative purposes, solitary arousal or partnered arousal (Byers & Shaughnessy, 2014); isolated or social (Ballester-Arnal et al., 2014). Given names like online erotica (Drouin & Miller, 2016), sex tech (Delmonico, 1997) and technology-mediated sexual interactions that include cybersex, virtual sex, electronic sex, chat sex, cam sex and sexting; these practices encompasses a variety of sexual interactions including sending-receiving sexually explicit messages, photos, pictures, calls, live or recorded videos, pornographic material via cell phones, dating apps, chat rooms, fantasy role-play rooms and/or other internet sites (Courtice & Shaughnessy, 2017).

Online sex is a common practice for young adults. In a meta-analysis of 50 studies on sexting behaviors (defined as sexually explicit photos, videos and messages) from more than 18,000 individuals aged 18-29, it was found that 38.3% of emerging adults engaged in sending a sext, 41.5% in receiving a sext, 47.7% in reciprocal sexting, 15.0% in non-consensual forwarding of another individual's sext, 7.6% non-consensual receiving of a sext (Mori et al., 2020). In fact, Symons et al. (2018) argue that, for adolescents and emerging adults, online sex and sexting is becoming a normative script concurrent with gender stereotypes and sexual scripts in society.

In the times of Covid-19 outbreak, the internet has gained an additional importance for sexual behaviors as sexual relations for single adolescents and young adults decreased due to the lock-downs and the fear of corona transmission during sex (Döring, 2020). Entrance rates to porn sites increased exponentially during the lock-down for many countries and "covid" was even included as a search term in porn sites (Mestre-Bach & Blycker, 2020). Online sex through Skype, Zoom, Facetime etc. are advised as the best safe sex option during the pandemic (ISSWSH, 2020).

In their review, Cooper et al. (2016) found four most reoccurring reasons for sexting as flirtation, partner request and consensual sexting in relationships, experimentation, pressures from partner or peers. It is found that, young adults with low religiosity, erotophilic sexual attitudes and prior online sex practices usually have more permissive attitudes. Gender socialization is also evident as young men usually have more permissive attitudes toward online sex. In the relational context, young men are more open to online sex with strangers, whereas young women tend to prefer this practice with their partners (Byers & Shaughnessy, 2014). Additionally, those young adults who perceive their peers to be practicing online sex are more likely to practice it themselves and become more likely to practice offline sexual activities, too (Doornwaard et al., 2015).

There have been numerous concerns about the effects of this emerging phenomena on adolescents and young adults as cybersex-sexting has been associated with concerns like cybervictimization and depressive symptoms

(Medrado et al., 2018) as well as lack of contraception use, multiple sexual partners, anxiety, smoking, alcohol and drug addiction (Mori et al., 2019).

As sex-tech has been associated with more positive outcomes especially in the case of mutual consent (Courtice & Shaughnessy, 2017), consent to unwanted online sex can be a concern for young women who give in to avoid arguments and to guarantee the continuance of their relationships (Drouin & Tobin, 2014). Furthermore, young women might pursue online sex due to partner pressures and coercion strategies going from asking repetitively to threats or actual physical force (Drouin et al., 2015). Sexts including nude photos and videos might be tools for control and power over young women. Non-consensual spreading of nude photos, videos, sexts is another concern as young women usually face the negative consequences like being labelled promiscuous due to sexual double standards. In a similar case, young men might get peer praise and reputation (Cooper et al., 2016). Additionally, there is a tendency of victim-blaming in cybervictimization which neglects the effect of gendered power inequalities. To decrease non-consensual and risky cybersex practices family communication about the outlines of online sex are advised (Bianchi et al., 2019).

### **1.3. SEXUAL EXPERIENCES OF TURKISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

#### **1.3.1. Sexual Norms in Turkey**

Sexuality in Turkey is shaped by the traditional sexual norms and gender inequality. Negative sexual messages are related to sexual dogmatism, validating sexual double standards as well as restrictive sexual attitudes and behaviors. This conservatism is especially evident in rural areas and in case of women's sexuality (Askun & Ataca, 2007). In Turkey, a patriarchal family structure is evident where boys are upbrought to be dominant and girls to be dependent and submissive. The men often control women's sexuality for the sake of morality. As modernization and mass education started to lessen these norms, gender role segregation is still prevalent among Turkish people, even in urban areas and western cities

(Kagıtcıbası & Sunar, 1992). Traditional scripts on hetero-normativity still remain in society (Boratav, 2006). Furthermore, being a predominantly Muslim country, Turkey is affected by the religious teachings of Islam which endorse restrictive sexual attitudes especially for women (Leo, 2014). In the current socio-political milieu, there is a rise of authoritarianism, conservatism, repressive sexual norms, and emphasis of traditional gender roles (Cindoglu & Unal, 2017). In the last couple of years, a high number of women were killed by their partners (Kadın Cinayetlerini Durduracağız Platformu, 2020) and almost 40% of women being subjected to sexual abuse (UN Women, n.d.).

Regarding premarital sexuality, many Turkish people still have restrictive attitudes especially if they have been influenced by religious sexual inhibitions (Ergun, 2007). Virginity is an important part of female sexuality and a representation of honor for most of the society (CETAD, 2006a), even for people with higher educational degrees (Sakalli- Ugurlu & Glick, 2003). It is indicated that especially women in rural regions do not have an understanding about their bodies, nor their genitalia and are regarded as a vehicle for childbirth which causes anxiety and feelings of desperation (Boyacıoglu & Turkmen, 2008).

Most of the society do not have enough sexual information and indicate that their sexual knowledge did not help them in their sexual lives. For many, peer groups are the primary source of sexual information. Majority of the society believe in sexual myths and associate sexuality with success and intercourse; assign the leading role in sexuality to men; think that men always think and want sex; assume that men always know how to pleasure women in sex and look up to simultaneous orgasm as the ultimate goal in sex. It is seen that these myths as well as traditional conditioning led to sexual dissatisfaction, as about third of the Turkish people indicate that they suffer from a reproductive/ sexual problem or lack an active sex life and show lack of information, prejudices and myths as the reasons (CETAD, 2006b).

### **1.3.2. Sexual Attitudes of Turkish University Students**

The passage to university constitutes a major transformation in the sexuality of Turkish people as almost one third of Turkish university students engage in sexual activity (Cok et al., 2001; Golbasi & Kelleci, 2011; Gökengin et al., 2003, Saracoglu et al., 2014) with lower rates as 8% (Yazici et al., 2012) to higher rates as 61.2% (Aras et al., 2007). However, although modernism decreases patriarchal morals among younger generations, traditional sexual scripts still reside in young adults' relationships (Gelbal et al., 2008). Social, cultural and familial norms continue to be a source of their heterosexual identity for young adults (Boratav, 2006).

Top three primary sources of information about sexuality in Turkey are family, friends and media where some studies show a higher ranking for parents and friends (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012; Saraçoğlu et al., 2014; Yazici et al., 2012) and some for media and friends (Cok et al., 2001; Gelbal et al., 2008). In more recent studies, internet and friends are ranked as primary sources (Avci et al., 2016; Evcili & Golbasi, 2017). It is seen that majority of university students do not have a formal sexual education and usually return to either media (Cok et al., 2001; Saraçoğlu et al., 2014; Yazici et al., 2012) or internet (Evcili & Golbasi, 2017) for sexual health information. In fact, it is noted that parental information about sex is more restrictive compared with media resources for university students (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012).

Religiosity is also linked to restrictive sexual attitudes and endorsement of sexual myths in Turkish college students (Aker et al., 2019; Sumer, 2015). The relations of religiosity, endorsement of sexual stereotypes and double standards as well as the level of sexual activity are found to be evident especially for women. Religiosity is related to dating, non-penetrative and penetrative partners where it is linked only to dating and non-penetrative partners in men (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012).

With regards to gender, Boratav and Cavdar (2012) found that college women and men both get restrictive messages but show gender differences

regarding the source, the level of permissiveness and implications of these messages. For instance, women rank parents and men cite peers as their primary source of sexual information. College women get more restrictive messages from their same-sex friends in contrast to men who get mainly permissive messages from other men. Again, college women are found to get more permissive messages from their opposite-sex friends compared to men who get more restrictive messages from women. The effect of permissive messages also differs by gender. For instance, permissive messages are related to dating and non-penetrative partners in both genders where they are related to penetrative partners and ideal partners only in men. In another research, it is found that college women have more conservative sexual attitudes, and they are more affected by restrictive maternal messages about sexuality. These messages in turn lead to less permissive sexual behaviors and more negative emotions at first intercourse (Askun & Ataca, 2007). It is also noted by Ebeoğlu and Karacan (2019) that women's permissive sexual attitudes increase in more senior years in college especially if they have peer approval of sexuality.

About sexual myths, college men, students in rural regions and students with low educated mothers have lower sexual information scores and higher sexual myth scores than college women, students in urban regions and students with high educated and employed mothers. It is seen that these students endorse sexual myths that give the control of sexuality to men, regard sex as a duty of women and assign non-consensual sex to be natural in marriages (Evcili & Golbasi, 2017). Additionally, Eriş and Yazıcı (2019) found that majority of university students believe sexual myths like “a man should know how to pleasure a woman”; and respond undecisive to sexual myths like “men should initiate sexual activity”, “it is a man's duty to lead sexual activity”, “sexual activity means sexual intercourse” and “woman cannot say no to sex” (pp. 1436-1437). The study of Avci et al. (2016) showed in an Eastern University in Turkey that one third of female students and half of the male students expect women to obey husbands' sexual wishes and initiations. In senior year of college, 98.5% women and 71.4% of men in senior year of college believe that women cannot and should not enjoy sex.

Regarding attitudes toward premarital sexuality, Aras et al. (2007) found that while practicing more sex, college men oppose premarital sexuality more than women. In Yazici and colleagues' study (2012) social norms and family structure are cited as the most common reasons to refrain from sexual activity among university students. In this study, 51.7% of college women and 70.3% of college men do not accept premarital sexuality while 38.5% of women and 68.9% of men regard virginity as a virtue for women. Kukulcu et al. (2009) found out that more than 50% of college women and 70% of college men believe that virginity increases men's satisfaction at marriage. In align with this, Askun and Ataca (2007) reported that college men endorse sexual double standards more than young women and regard premarital sex, sexual activity and casual sex as acceptable only for men. Furthermore, students from more rural regions endorse more restrictive sexual attitudes and have a higher age at first sexual intercourse. However, it is noted that restrictive attitudes toward premarital sexuality decrease in senior years of college although rates are lower regarding women's premarital sexual activity (Ozan et al., 2010).

Traditional gender stereotypes are still transmitted among Turkish university students. Boratav and Cavdar (2012) found that for both college women and men, acceptance of male stereotypes was more evident than female stereotypes or double standards. In the study of Kul-Uçtu and Karahan (2016), it is seen that nuclear family structure, higher parental education and better family income increase the adoption of more liberal gender norms. Still compared with college women who showed a more egalitarian approach to gender roles, almost 40% of men accepted masculine gender roles. In this research, being a college man increased the likelihood of accepting traditional gender norms by 16.3 and tendency for violence 34.3 times. This difference was found to be significant among those who accept masculine roles compared with feminine roles. In fact, Sakalli-Ugurlu et al. (2010) found that sexist attitudes still convey among male students and lead to the belief that sexual harassment is a women's fault. Acceptance of violence myths is linked to dating sexual violence in Turkish university students, too (Toplu-Demirtaş et al., 2020). Additionally, college women and those who accept male

roles are found to be more likely to experience token resistance (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012).

### **1.3.3. Offline Sexual Behaviors of Turkish University Students**

For sexual behaviors, gender differences on first age of intercourse and frequency of sexual activity are evident among Turkish university students with men having sex at an earlier age and more frequent sexual activity. The first age of sexual intercourse is around the age 19 (CETAD, 2006b), with other surveys showing the age of 17 (Golbaşı & Kelleci, 2011), 16 (Saracoğlu et al., 2014) and 15 (Gökengin et al., 2003). It is seen that men are approximately 2 years younger than women at age of first sexual intercourse (Askun & Ataca, 2007; Erenel & Golbasi, 2011; Gelbal et al., 2008).

In a study conducted in an Eastern university in Turkey, a dramatic difference was found in the sexual frequency of students with 10 times more men having practiced sexual foreplay/ intercourse than women (Yasan et al., 2009). This difference was more than 15 times in a Middle Anatolian University (Golbasi & Kelleci, 2011). In more Western regions, this disparity shows a decline but still remains. For instance, in an Ankara university, this difference was found to be two times (Cok et al., 2001); in a multi-centered study about two and a half times (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012); in an Izmir university four times (Aras et al., 2007) and in a Tekirdağ University, it was found that five times more men having practiced sexual intercourse (Saraçoğlu et al., 2014).

Regarding the reasons for engaging in first sexual intercourse, gender differences were noticed in the study of Özan et al. (2004) where physical pleasure, curiosity and gaining experience were listed as primary reasons compared with women who cite love and partner's pressures as main motives. Boratav and Cavdar (2012) found that both men and women cite personal wish and choice as the most important reason for first sexual intercourse. However, for women "to be close to partner" and for men "I was supposed to do so" were listed as a second ranking (p. 276). Again, peer experience of sex was cited as a third ranking for men.



For the rates of non-penetrative and other penetrative sexual behaviors, Cok et al. (2001) found that around half of university students engage in kissing, wet-kissing, necking, petting over clothes with college men having slightly higher percentages than women. Approximately 38% of men and 26% of women engaged in unclothed petting. About 20% of students engaged in receiving-giving oral sex, with men's rates to be higher; and 13.4% men and 4.3% women report anal intercourse. In the study of Boratav and Cavdar (2012), no gender differences were noticed for the rates of non-penetrative activities. Both women and men cited personal wish and choice as the main reason for non-penetrative sex but more than 75% of women listed partners' pressures and physical coercion as a major reason, too.

Gender differences are noticed regarding the choice and number of partners. For instance, women tend to prefer their first sexual intercourse to be in the context of a romantic relationship compared with men who tend to have their first sexual intercourse with a casual partner (Askun & Ataca, 2007; Gelbal et al., 2008; Saraçoğlu et al., 2014; Özan et al., 2014). Golbasi and Kelleci (2011) found that 59.3% of students had more than one partner in the previous year with 3.3 partners for college men and 2.2 for college women in the study of Cok et al. (2001) and 20% of students having 5 to 10 partners (Siyez & Siyez, 2009). Gelbal et al. (2008) found that throughout the years 58.5% of women remain with one partner compared to 76.3% of men who have at least two partners. Boratav and Cavdar (2012) also found that college men are more likely to be in relationships involving sex and have more dating, non-penetrative sex, penetrative sex partners and more partners that fit their ideal sexual experience descriptions.

### **1.3.3.1. Dating Violence, Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex**

Dating violence is a common phenomenon in Turkish university life with 45.8% of university students indicating dating violence of which 39.5% is psychological, 8.5% physical and 3.9% sexual violence (Selcuk et al., 2018). Again, in another study, these rates were 89.9%, 5.9% and 2.5% for emotional,

physical and sexual violence respectively (Aydin et al., 2014). Higher rates of sexual violence with 7.1% (Karatay et al., 2018) and 31.6% (Toplu-Demirtaş et al., 2013) were also found among university students.

Significantly higher number of women report sexual violence from their dating partners ranging from 7.2% to 84% (Dikmen et al., 2018; Toplu-Demirtaş & Fincham, 2020; Kayı et al., 2000). It is seen that this violence takes the form of being disrespectful to sexual limits, pressurizing for sexual intercourse, threatening to end the relationship if there is no sex, threatening to tell others about personal sexual details and using sex for emotional manipulation (Dikmen et al., 2018). In a qualitative study by Fidan and Yeşil (2018), similar forms of sexual violence were noticed where men pressure their dating partners to kiss, touch and perform penetrative sex. In fact, the main reasons for dating violence were cited as “Girls don’t obey” by men and “Men expect women to obey” by women (Fidan & Yeşil p.22). It is also noticed that the victims of sexual violence tend to normalize it, more than 80% do not end their relationships and do not report the abuse.

In align with this, Boratav and Cavdar (2012) found the rate of token resistance to be 33% among university students. In their study, 40% of women and 24% of men had at least one incident of token resistance. It is seen that 60% of women encountered token resistance within a serious relationships whereas men faced token resistance equally (41%) in serious relationships and in non-serious relationships. Of the total participants, 60% indicated that this event did not affect their relationship and no statistical difference was found between men and women. As women were found to experience token resistance significantly more, no difference was observed for consent to unwanted sex: 9% of women and 11% of men had an experience of consent to unwanted sex. Regarding the relational context, 70% of women encountered consent to unwanted sex within a serious relationships compared to 40% men who faced consent to unwanted sex in a non-serious relationship.

### **1.3.4. Online Sexual Behaviors in Turkish University Students**

Regarding sexting and online sexual behaviors of university students, research is scarce in Turkey. Ucar et al. (2016) found that 30.5% Turkish university students use erotic and pornographic websites, and 21.1% engage in online sex with men having higher ratings and women showing more restrictive attitudes toward online sex. In a comparative study, it is found that internet usage for sexuality increased from 2.8% to 51.5% between 2001 and 2006 among medical students (Ozan et al., 2010). In a cross-cultural study of ten countries, among 591 Turkish participants with a mean age of 22.65 (+/- 2.93), 30.6% reported sending their own sexts, 42.5% sending risky sexts, 9% engaging in non-consensual sexting and 35.9% sexting under pressure. In comparison with other countries, Turkey ranked in the top for sexting under pressure and Turkish participants reported more pressure from peers and partners to send sexts (Morelli et al., 2020).

## **1.4. CURRENT STUDY**

This study aims to study the gendered sexual lives of university students in both a descriptive and comparative manner with a special focus on online sexual activities. Taking the review of literature into account, it is anticipated that this research will provide insight to the young adults' attitudes and experiences regarding sexuality in the Turkish community.

The study has two sections, Study I that focus on sexual stereotypes and behaviors of university students and Study II that focus technology-based sexual behaviors. The primary aim of Study I is to describe sexual messages, stereotypes, and university students today and compare it with what they were approximately 10 years ago. The primary aim of Study II is solely exploratory in terms of taking a snapshot of the frequency of technology-based sexual behaviors.

#### **1.4.1. Study I: Replication of Bolak and Cavdar's (2012) Study**

To investigate the sexual lives of university students in Turkey and how their attitudes and behaviors changed over the last decade, the first part of this research is a follow-up study based on the previous research conducted by Boratav and Cavdar (2012) regarding the sexual stereotypes and practices of university students in Turkey.

For this preliminary study, Boratav and Cavdar carried out a research on 471 students from four different universities (Bilgi University, Boğaziçi University, Uludağ University and Mersin University) in Turkey and examined the correlations between gender, religiosity, messages about sexuality, sexual behaviors, sexual attitudes, and sexual stereotypes with a special attention on token resistance and consent to sex. They implemented a survey with questions about permissive and restrictive messages about sexuality, beliefs about sexual roles of men and women in relationships and questions about sexual experiences including both coital and non-coital behaviors. The survey also included specific questions about token resistance and consent to unwanted sex. The details of this research's methodology will be discussed further in the next sections and the results are listed in the previous literature section.

By replicating this research after almost 10 years, it is intended to understand the current sexual attitudes and behaviors of university students in Turkey as well as to compare the outcomes with the past results to see how these attitudes and behaviors changed over time. The major research questions of the study are the following:

1. How do women and men differ regarding the permissiveness of sexual messages obtained from different sources of information? Boratav and Cavdar (2012) had anticipated in their research that both women and men obtain more restrictive messages than permissive ones, but men would receive more permissive messages compared to women. They also expected gender differences for the permissiveness of sexual messages from same-sex and opposite-sex peers. These hypotheses were confirmed in their

research. In this study too, similar findings are expected in regard to the unweighting of restrictive messages in both genders with men receiving more permissive messages. Again, gender differences on peer messages are expected like the previous research. However, a change towards permissiveness and liberal messages are expected since the last decade.

2. How do women and men differ on the number of partners, frequency of sexual activity, non-coital and coital behaviors, motivations for sexuality, token resistance and consent to unwanted sex? Boratav and Cavdar (2012) had anticipated that men would have more partners, more frequent sexual activity, more experience of different types of sexual behaviors. They also expected motivations for sex, experiences of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex would change as a function of gender. These hypotheses were confirmed except the frequency and the reasons of non-intercourse sexual activities and the incidence of consent to unwanted sex. In this study, too, gender differences regarding the listed sexual behaviors are expected with men being anticipated to exceed women on the number of partners, frequency and variety of sexual behaviors. However, sexual experience is expected to be higher for women both for non-coital and coital activities compared with the previous study. Motivations regarding sexual activities are expected to be similar to the previous findings. Experience of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex experiences are expected to be higher for women compared with men.
3. How do women and men differ on their attitudes toward gender stereotypes in sexual relationships? Boratav and Cavdar (2012) expected no gender differences regarding the acceptance of traditional sexual roles and this hypothesis was confirmed. In this study, too, it is anticipated that no gender differences regarding sexual stereotypes will emerge as a finding. However, a lessening in the acceptance of sexual stereotypes compared with the preliminary research is expected.
4. How do religiosity and sexual messages relate to sexual stereotypes and sexual behaviors? Boratav and Cavdar (2012) had anticipated that

religiosity would be linked to the acceptance of more traditional stereotypic roles and low sexual experience where permissive messages would be linked to high sexual experience. These hypotheses were confirmed in their research with the exception of the link between permissive messages with coital behaviors in women and the link of religiosity with coital behaviors in men. In this research, it is also anticipated that religiosity will be linked to the acceptance of more traditional stereotypic roles and low sexual experience where permissive messages will linked to higher level of sexual experience. However, a lessened effect of religiosity compared with the previous study is anticipated especially in urban settings for women.

5. How do sexual stereotypes link with the experience of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex? Boratav and Cavdar (2012) anticipated that gender specific stereotypes would be linked with token resistance in women and consent to unwanted sex in men. As a result, they found out that being a woman, higher acceptance of male stereotype and lower endorsement of double standards were linked with token resistance. However, no link was found with consent to unwanted sex with any variables. In this study, it is hypothesized that gender specific stereotypes will be linked with token resistance in women and consent to unwanted sex in both women and men.

#### **1.4.2. Study II: Exploration of Online Sexual Behaviors**

As online sexual behaviors are becoming a part of the young adults' sexual repertoire, a second part is added to the original research, to investigate the online sexual experiences of university students. Study II is a new addition to the preliminary study to see in what ways and how often university students engage in online sex with written, photographic or video materials through mobile phone, e-mail, web-sites and applications. The major research questions are the following:

1. How do women and men differ on the incidence, frequency, motivations, the sources, the content of online sexual activities as well as online token resistance and online consent to unwanted sex? It is expected that men will

have a higher incidence and frequency of online sexual practices; the motivations and sources of online sex behaviors will be whereas content of online sexual activities will vary as function of gender.

2. How does permissiveness of sexual messages, religiosity and sexual stereotypes influence online sex behaviors? It is anticipated that those with more restrictive messages, high religiosity and higher endorsement of male stereotypes will engage in more online sex behaviors.

## CHAPTER 2

### METHOD

#### 2.1. PARTICIPANTS

The participants of this study are university students between the ages 18-25 who are currently studying at an undergraduate program. The sample selection technique is convenience sampling in which the participants were recruited via announcements on email groups and social media accounts. Minimum sample size was determined on the basis of university students in Turkey, being over 7,500,000 in 2019-2020 for undergraduate students in two- and four-year programs (Yüksek Öğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi, 2020). With 95% confidence level, 5% margin of error, the calculated minimum sample size was 385. Considering the possibility of invalid data, this study aimed to reach 400 participants.

Out of 786 participants who responded the online survey, 270 had not filled in any of the questions, 62 had not given any demographic information and 24 were over the age of 25. The remaining 430 participants were included for the data analysis in this research. For the background characteristics (see Table 2.1.), 305 (70.93%) of the participants were women and 125 (29.07%) were men. The age of the participants ranged between 18 and 25 ( $M=21.55$ ,  $SD=1.87$ ), with  $21,50\pm 1.88$  for women and  $21.67\pm 1.86$  for men. 57 (19.5%) of the participants were from Class 1, 84 (28.8%) Class 2, 74 (25.3%) Class 3 and 77 (26.4%) from Class 4. 381 (88.6%) described their sexual orientation as heterosexual, 7 (1.6%) homosexual, 32 (7.4%) bisexual and 10 (2.3%) as do not know/ not sure. 209 (49%) of participants have a romantic relationship. The duration of relationship was on average 24 months ( $SD = 21.31$ ) for the total. An independent t-test showed no significant differences for the duration of current relationship between men and women.

320 of the participants (75.3%) were living their parents and/ or their siblings and 353 (82.5%) indicated metropole as their longest place of residence.



Regarding parental characteristics of the participants, 317 (74.2%) of the participants' parents were married. On parental education level, 211 participants (49.6%) rated a university or a masters graduation for their mothers and 235 (55.4%) for their fathers.

**Table 2.1.**

*Background Characteristics of the Sample*

		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Woman	305	70.9%
	Man	125	29.1%
Under-graduate Class	1	57	19.5%
	2	84	28.8%
	3	74	25.3%
	4	77	26.4%
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	381	88.6%
	Homosexual	7	1.6%
	Bisexual	32	7.4%
	Do not know/ Not sure	10	2.3%
Romantic Relationship	No	221	51%
	Yes	209	48.6%
Residency	With parents/ siblings	320	75.3%
	With spouse/ children	6	1.4%
	Student dormitory	3	0.7%
	With flat mate	42	9.9%
	With partner	14	3.3%
	Other	40	9.4%
Longest Place of Residence	Metropole	353	82.5%
	City	40	9.4%
	District	33	7.7%
	Village	2	0.5%

The level of religiosity was  $2.34 \pm 1.31$  and the level of conservatism was  $1.90 \pm 1.14$  on a range of zero to six. 246 participants (57.5%) and 326 participants (76.2%) rated two or less points for their level religiosity and conservatism, respectively.

To sum up, women were more represented compared to men as did heterosexual individuals compared to homosexual and bisexual individuals. The participants were predominantly raised in a metropole and currently living with their parents and/ or siblings. About half of their mothers and fathers had at least a university degree. Additionally, more than half of the sample had low levels of religiosity and conservatism.

## **2.2. INSTRUMENTS**

As this research is a follow up study based on the preliminary study by Boratav and Cavdar (2012), the instruments are a modified version of the original research to compare the findings with the past results.

In the preliminary study by Boratav and Cavdar (2012), the researchers had constructed a survey with measures of messages about sexuality, sexual stereotypes and sexual experiences as well as a demographic information sheet. For this research, a few changes were made regarding the wording of some questions as described below. Additionally, online experiences were included in the original questions and as a new set of questions. The original instruments, the revisions and the newly included questions are described below.

### **2.2.1. Messages about Sexuality**

The first set of questions of the survey is regarding messages about sexuality (See Appendix B). To investigate the messages about sexuality, Boratav and Cavdar (2012) conducted a pilot study among university students with an open-ended question about the different messages they received about sexuality in order to identify the common themes. The questions of this instrument are built on those

themes which include three restrictive and three permissive messages. The restrictive messages are “*a disgrace and sin, unless you are married,*” “*something disturbing,*” “*a risk that one should be cautious of*” The permissive messages are “*something to be comfortably and naturally experienced,*” “*an experience of pleasure and gratification,*” “*an opportunity to taste, discover.*” The participants are asked to indicate on a four-point scale (1 = not at all to 4 = very much) the extent to which they received these messages from their *same-sex friends, opposite-sex friends, parents, media (written publications, newspapers, TV, etc.)* and *religious sources*. Overall, Boratav and Cavdar’s (2012) study supported the validity of the measure.

For this follow-up study, an additional source of sexual messages, the *online media (online publications, video platforms, social media, etc.)* is added to this question. So, the participants rated this source for each of the six sexual messages in addition to the five sources of the original study.

In this study, the means of all sources for each message were calculated. Internal consistency, as assessed by Cronbach’s Alpha, was found to be .89 for the three items that refer to permissive messages; and .81 for the three items that refer to restrictive messages. Internal consistencies were also checked separately for each source and ranged between .68 and .89; supporting that the items would provide a reliable estimate when used as permissiveness and restrictiveness scores both for each source and for the mean score.

At the end of the message ratings for each source, participants ordered six sources of sexual messages -same sex friends, cross-sex friends, parents, offline media, online media and religious sources- and an option “Other” from 1 = most important to 7 = least important in terms of their influence on their sexual attitudes and behaviors.

### **2.2.2. Offline Sexual Experiences**

In the original study (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012), the participants were asked to fill in a set of questions to investigate sexual experiences including non-

intercourse sexual activities and sexual intercourse. These questions are kept the same in the current study (See Appendix C).

First, same as the original survey, the participants were asked how many dating relationships they had from the options 0 to 5 or more.

Next, again same as the original survey, the participants were requested to indicate on two separate questions if they had experienced any non-intercourse sexual activity or sexual intercourse.

Differing from the original survey, the original wording for the question about non-intercourse activities is changed from “*Have you ever engaged in a sexual activity that did not go all the way to sexual intercourse (e.g., kissing, fondling of the genitals)?*” to “*Have you ever engaged in a sexual activity that did not involve sexual intercourse (e.g., kissing, fondling of the genitals)?*”. This change aims to reduce any implication that sexual behaviors should lead to intercourse. The question about sexual intercourse remains the same in the original survey: “*Have you ever had a sexual intercourse (oral, anal or vaginal) experience?*”

Those who answer “*Yes*” to these questions, were asked to indicate the age at which their first experience took place. Then, they chose two most important reasons to engage in these activities from the options (1. *I wanted to*, 2. *Curiosity*, 3. *To promote closeness in the relationship*, 4. *To please my partner, to maintain the relationship* 5. *The persistent pleas by my partner*, 6. *My partner’s physical coercion*, 7. *Because I thought I needed to do so*, 8. *Experiences of my friends*). For these two questions, on the follow up survey, an additional 9<sup>th</sup> option “*Other*” is added and the participants were asked to fill in their reasons if it is not one of the above options.

For the offline sexual experience, a last set of questions were asked to investigate the participant’s own preference for sexual relationships. The question “*If it is only up to you (without the influence of your family or your partner), what kind of sexual relationship (for instance sexual behaviors.) would a dating relationship that you would feel at most comfortable include ?*” is kept the same as the original survey. Next, same as the original survey, the participants were asked

to indicate the actual number of relationships that matched their preferences on a scale from 1 to 6 and more.

### **2.2.3. Online Sexual Experiences**

To investigate their online sexual experiences, participants were requested to fill in a set of questions regarding sharing text messages, photographs or videos with sexual content via mobile phones, e-mails, web-sites and applications (See Appendix D). This part is newly added to the prior survey.

The participants were asked to indicate their frequencies of sexual online content sharing for sex-texting, sharing seminude/nude photos-videos of themselves, pornographic photos or videos, online sex- video-chatting and online seminude/nude video-chatting on a five-point scale (1 = Not at all to 5 = Very much). A last option “*Other*” is also added and the participants are asked to fill in their reasons if it is not one of the above options. These options were chosen after reviewing the literature about online sexual activities, focusing on the articles by Drouin and Miller (2016), Delmonico (1997) and Courtice and Shaughnessy (2017).

Then, the participants were asked to rate the frequency of their use of routes for online sex for each of the options including *SMS, telephone call, messaging applications (e.g., WhatsApp, Messenger, Zoom), social media applications (e.g., Instagram, Snapchat), dating applications (e.g., Tinder, Badoo), e-mails, internet chat rooms, and Other* on a five-point scale (1 = Not at all to 5 = Very much).

Next, the participants were asked the first age that they had an online sex experience. As a last question, they were asked to indicate the two most important reasons to engage in these activities from the options (*1. I wanted to, 2. Curiosity, 3. To promote closeness in the relationship, 4. To please my partner, to maintain the relationship 5. The persistent pleas by my partner, 6. My partner’s physical coercion, 7. Because I thought I needed to do so, 8. Experiences of my friends*). These options were adopted from the list Boratav and Cavdar (2012) used to assess the reasons to engage in sexual non-intercourse and intercourse activities, as

described above. A last option “*Other*” is also added and the participants are asked to fill in their reasons if it is not one of the above options.

#### **2.2.4. Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex**

In the original study (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012), the participants were asked a set of questions about token resistance and consent to unwanted sex. In this survey, online experiences are also added to these questions (see Appendix E).

First, the participants were asked to fill a set of questions on token resistance. The question for token resistance in the original survey was “*Has the following situation ever happened to you? You were with a person who wanted to be with you in a sexually intimate way (e.g., kissing, fondling, oral sex etc.) and you also wanted to, but, for some reason, you indicated that you did not want to, although you had every intention to and were willing to do so. In other words, you said “No.” but you meant “Yes.” Has this ever happened to you?*”.

Boratav and Cavdar (2012) based the original wording of this question on the works of Muehlenhard and Hollabaugh (1988) and Sprencher et al. (1994). The wording was almost identical to these previous research except that Boratav and Cavdar (2012) conducted a pilot study and after identifying that sexual intercourse was a relatively low experience among college women, they also included non-intercourse sexual activities to this wording.

For this study, to investigate the experience of token resistance for online sexual activities, the wording of this question is revised further. The experience of token resistance might provoke negative feelings in the participants and if this question would have been repeated in the survey a second time for online token resistance, this effect would be amplified. So, this revision aims to reduce the reoccurrence of any distressing material that these two questions might have imposed if asked separately. Again, the wording was modified to emphasize the verbal consent part of the experience.

The final phrasing of the question in this study is as follows: “*Has the following situation ever happened to you? You were with a person who wanted to*

*be with you in a sexually intimate way (e.g., kissing, fondling, sexual intercourse, sharing online sexual texts, photographs or videos) and you also wanted to. But for some reason, although you had every intention to and were willing to do so, you indicated that you did not want to. In other words, you wanted to say “Yes.” but you said “No.” Has this ever happened to you?”.*

In the original research, the question for consent to unwanted sex was “*Has the following situation ever happened to you? You were with a person who wanted to be with you in a sexually intimate way (e.g., kissing, fondling, oral sex, etc.) and you did not want to, but, for some reason, you indicated that you did want to. In other words, you indicated “Yes.” but you meant “No.” Has this ever happened to you?”.*

Boratav and Cavdar (2012) adopted the wording of this question on the work of Sprencher et al. (1994). Again, based on their pilot study, Boratav and Cavdar (2012) included non-intercourse sexual activities to this wording. In the current study, like the question on token resistance, online sexual experiences are also added to this section to reduce the repetition of any disturbing material. The final question is as follows: “*Has the following situation ever happened to you? You were with a person who wanted to be with you in a sexually intimate way (e.g., kissing, fondling, sexual intercourse, sharing online sexual texts, photographs or videos) and you did not want to. But, for some reason, you indicated that you did want to. In other words, you wanted to say “No.” but you said “Yes.” Has this ever happened to you?”.*

After these primary questions, differing from the original survey, those who answer “Yes” were asked to specify during which occasions they have encountered this experience from the options *during sexual contact (kissing, fondling, sexual intercourse...), during online sharing of sexual text, photographs or videos, or during both occasions.*

In the former study, the participants were then asked to indicate how many times and with how many partners they have experienced token resistance and consent to unwanted sex on a scale of from 1 to 5. For this section, on the follow up survey, instead of indicating how many times and the number of partners on a

scale of 1 to 5 scale, the participants are asked to indicate the how many times they had encountered such experiences in an open question form. This change aims to reduce any negative emotions that the participants might feel if they have encountered these experiences ‘more than’ 5 times and/or with ‘more than’ 5 partners.

Additionally, the original questions that Boratav and Cavdar (2012) based their questions were examined by Muehlenhard (2011) who pointed out that it is important to give an opportunity to the participants to explain their experience in order to reduce any ambiguity about the terms wanting or not wanting and meaning no while saying yes and vice-versa. On this note, the original survey included a set of open questions like “What was the reason why you wanted to be sexually involved?,” “What was the reason why you did not want to be sexually involved?,” “What was the reason why you said something different from what you wanted?,” “How did the event unfold? What happened?,” “What did you feel and think during the experience?,” and “What did you feel and think afterwards?” However, as the follow-up survey was designed for online administration, only one of these open questions was included to increase participants’ answer rates. The wording of this questions is kept the same as the original study and is as follows: “*What was the reason why you said something different from what you wanted?*”

Next, the participants were asked to think back the type of relationship they have encountered these experiences and indicate from the options *serious relationship, casual relationship, acquaintance, family-relatives, foreigner, and other*. Then they were asked to indicate whether this experience affected their relationship on a five-point scale (1 = not at all to 5 = very much).

In the original survey, the use of alcohol or drugs during the incident was asked but this question is removed in the follow up survey as it might sound judgmental or victim-blaming.



### **2.2.5. Sexual Stereotypes**

To investigate the sexual stereotypes, a 7-item scale was developed to be used in the original study by Bolak and Cavdar (2012; See Appendix F). The scale has two items on the stereotypical male sexual role as “*A man is always willing and ready to have sex with a woman,*” and “*Men are expected to have sexual relationships before marriage*”; and two items on female sexual role as “*In relationships, an important role for women is to set limits on men’s sexual advances,*” and “*Women sometimes mean ‘yes’ when they say ‘no’.*” The last three items of the scale refer to the double standard: “*Women should not be in a sexual relationship unless they are married or in a serious relationship that will lead to marriage,*” “*In sexual relationships, taking initiative and advancing the pace of the relationship is mostly a man’s role,*” and “*Compared to women, men have a stronger sex drive that they need to satisfy.*” Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with each item on a five-point scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree.

Internal consistency of the total scale as assessed by Cronbach Alpha was reported to be at an acceptable level of .58 in the original study (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012). The associations of stereotypes with other variables supported the validity of the measure (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012). Internal consistency of the total scale for the sample of this study was found to be .77, indicating good reliability.

### **2.2.6. Demographic Information Sheet**

The last section of survey (See Appendix G) includes questions about age, gender, place of longest residence, parents’ educational level and marital status, the current living situation and sexual orientation. The name of their university and the course type are requested. Participants were also asked to rank their level of religiosity and conservatism on a six-point scale (1 = not at all to 6 = very much) in order to obtain a broad idea about the sample.

### **2.3. PROCEDURE**

In the original study (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012), data was collected from Istanbul Bilgi University, Boğaziçi University, Uludağ University, and Mersin University in a paper-and-pencil survey format.

In this replication study, data collection was planned to be online as all the universities had been proceeding with online education due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Additionally, as different from the original study, no universities were specified in order to increase the diversity of the sample. Prior to data collection, an ethical approval was received from Ethics Committee Board of Istanbul Bilgi University.

Survey materials were delivered by an online survey platform SurveyMonkey. Participants first approved an informed consent (See Appendix A) that asks for voluntary participation. In this consent form, they were provided with brief information about the aims of the study, anonymous structure of the survey and confidentiality of the data. Additionally, taking into the consideration that experiences of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex might evoke negative emotions, participants were informed about their right to quit anytime they feel like. It was also pointed out that they could choose not to answer any of the questions. The researcher's contact information was provided, and the participants were encouraged to contact the researcher in case of questions or concerns. Upon the approval of Informed Consent Form, the instruments (Appendix A-G) listed above were presented in the same order to all the participants. It took approximately 10-20 minutes to fill in all the questions.

At the end of the survey, a list of psychological help resources (See Appendix F) was added with telephone numbers and/ or website information. The participants were again reminded to contact the researcher if they feel distress and/or have further questions or comments.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **RESULTS**

In the results section, first the analyses of messages about sexuality including source, valence, and gender differences as well as associations of messages with beliefs and attitudes are presented. In the next parts of this section the analyses of offline and online sexual behaviors are presented. For online and offline behaviors, the frequencies, number of partners, and age and reasons of first experiences are described; and further their associations with messages, beliefs, and attitudes are presented. In the fourth part, experiences of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex as well as their correlates are reported. Finally, statistical comparisons between the current study and the original study of Boratav and Cavdar (2012) are shown.

#### **3.1. MESSAGES ABOUT SEXUALITY**

##### **3.1.1. Source and Valence of Messages about Sexuality**

Messages were assessed via rating of the participants for 3 restrictive messages (a disgrace and sin, unless you are married; something disturbing; risk that one should be cautious of) and 3 permissive messages (something to be comfortably and naturally experienced; an experience of pleasure and gratification; an opportunity to taste, discover) for 6 different sources (same-sex friends, opposite-sex friends, parents, conventional media, online media, and religious sources). In this study, for all participants, the most received message was '*is a risk that one should be cautious of*' ( $M = 2.57, SD = 0.58$ ) and the least received message was '*is something disturbing*' ( $M = 2.29, SD = 0.53$ ). On the other hand, overall, the level of Permissive Messages ( $M = 2.45, SD = 0.44$ ) was slightly higher than Restrictive Messages ( $M = 2.39, SD = 0.46$ ).

As to the source, highest level of Restrictive Messages and lowest level of Permissive Messages were received from Religious Sources ( $M = 3.50, SD = 0.73$ ;

$M = 1.34$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ , respectively); whereas lowest level of Restrictive Messages and highest level of Permissive Messages were received from Opposite-sex Friends ( $M = 1.70$ ,  $SD = 0.62$ ;  $M = 3.25$ ,  $SD = 0.80$ , respectively).

The first aim of this study was to identify how women and men differ regarding the permissiveness of sexual messages obtained from different sources of information. A Mixed ANOVA was conducted to examine this aim with Gender as between-subjects factor, and Source and Valence of the Message as within-subjects factors. The sphericity assumption was violated, thus, calculations with Greenhouse-Geisser correction were reported and interpreted for the tests of within-subjects effects (See Table 3.1). For group comparisons, estimated marginal means (*EMM*) and standard errors (*SE*) are reported.

**Table 3.1.**

*Tests of within-subjects effects for source and valence of messages and their interactions with gender*

Source	Type III SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Source	42.010	4.6	9.063	37.280	0.000
Source x Gender	2.421	4.6	0.522	2.149	0.062
Error (Source)	473.284	1946.8	0.243		
Valence	11.615	1.0	11.615	8.122	0.005
Valence x Gender	31.166	1.0	31.166	21.794	0.000
Error (Valence)	600.614	420.0	1.430		
Source x Valence	1721.113	3.9	437.084	491.610	0.000
Source x Valence x Gender	74.816	3.9	19.000	21.370	0.000
Error (Source x Valence)	1470.408	1653.8	0.889		

The results revealed that the level of messages significantly differed as to the Source of the message, but these differences did not vary as a function of Gender. Both men and women, regardless of the valence of the messages, received the highest level of messages from Online Media ( $EMM = 2.53$ ,  $SE = .023$ ),

followed by Same-sex ( $EMM = 2.47, SE = .021$ ) and Opposite-Sex friends ( $EMM = 2.45, SE = .020$ ) that were not significantly different from each other. Friends were followed by Religious Sources ( $EMM = 2.41, SE = .021$ ) and Conventional Media ( $EMM = 2.39, SE = .022$ ) that also were not significantly different from each other. The lowest level of messages received were from Parents ( $EMM = 2.21, SE = .024$ ).

Regarding the Valence of the message, both the main effect and its interaction with Gender were significant (See Table 3.1). It was observed that for men, the level of Restrictive Messages ( $EMM = 2.25, SE = .040$ ) were significantly lower than Permissive Messages ( $EMM = 2.52, SE = .039$ ), whereas for women Restrictive Messages ( $EMM = 2.47, SE = .025$ ) were significantly higher than Permissive Messages ( $EMM = 2.40, SE = .025$ ).

It was further noted that the two-way interaction of Source and Valence was significant as well as the three-way interaction with Gender (See Table 3.1). The source and valence interaction indicates that for Same-sex Friends, Opposite-sex Friends, and Online Media, the level of Permissive Messages is significantly higher than Restrictive Messages, and on the contrary for Parents, Conventional Media, and Religious Sources, the level of Restrictive Messages is significantly higher than Permissive Messages (See Table 3.2).

The highest discrepancy between the Permissiveness and Restrictiveness of the messages was observed for Religious Sources with a mean difference of 2.07; and the lowest discrepancy was noted for Parents with a mean difference of .44.

When Gender enters the interaction, the pattern of the difference between Permissiveness and Restrictiveness of the messages for each source significantly varies (See Table 3.2). The most prominent interaction effect of Gender was observed for messages from the parents. It was observed that Restrictive Messages received from the Parents is significantly higher than Permissive Messages for women ( $EMM = 2.77, SE = .052, EMM = 1.77, SE = .048$ , respectively), however for men the Restrictiveness and Permissiveness of the messages they receive from their parents are very close to each other, the latter being slightly higher ( $EMM = 2.08, SE = .081, EMM = 2.21, SE = .074$ , respectively).

**Table 3.2.**

*Estimated Marginal Means (95% Confidence Interval) of messages as a function of source, valence, and gender.*

		Women	Men	Total
Same-sex Friend	Restrictive	1.91 ± 0.07	1.67 ± 0.11	1.79 ± 0.07
	Permissive	3.01 ± 0.09	3.29 ± 0.15	3.15 ± 0.09
Opposite-sex Friend	Restrictive	1.64 ± 0.07	1.87 ± 0.11	1.75 ± 0.06
	Permissive	3.36 ± 0.09	2.94 ± 0.14	3.15 ± 0.08
Parent	Restrictive	2.77 ± 0.1	2.08 ± 0.16	2.43 ± 0.09
	Permissive	1.77 ± 0.09	2.21 ± 0.15	1.99 ± 0.09
Conventional Media	Restrictive	2.88 ± 0.1	2.61 ± 0.15	2.75 ± 0.09
	Permissive	1.92 ± 0.1	2.14 ± 0.15	2.03 ± 0.09
Online Media	Restrictive	2.01 ± 0.08	1.95 ± 0.12	1.98 ± 0.07
	Permissive	3.06 ± 0.09	3.09 ± 0.14	3.07 ± 0.08
Religious Sources	Restrictive	3.59 ± 0.08	3.29 ± 0.13	3.44 ± 0.07
	Permissive	1.27 ± 0.06	1.47 ± 0.1	1.37 ± 0.06

For men, the mean difference between the Permissiveness and Restrictiveness of the messages received from Same-sex friend is higher than it is for the Opposite-sex friend, whereas for women the mean difference between the Permissiveness and Restrictiveness of the messages received from Opposite-sex friend is higher than it is for the Same-sex friend. In other words, although friends of both gender give more permissive messages to participants of all genders, both men and women receive a higher level of permissive messages from their male friends as compared to their female friends.

On a final note, the participants were asked to rank order the sources of sexual messages in terms of their prominence from 1 to 7, 1 being the most important and 7 being the least important source. There was an addition of ‘other’ as an option. However, the other option was omitted from the analysis due to low response rate. The mean and standard deviations of the rankings are shown in Table 3.3 in ascending order on mean ranks.

**Table 3.3.**

*Descriptive statistics for the ranking of the sources of sexual messages from 1 = most important to 6: least important.*

Source	Men		Women	
	<i>Mean Rank</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean Rank</i>	<i>SD</i>
Same-sex Friend	2.3	1.52	2.0	1.40
Opposite-sex Friend	2.4	1.54	2.9	1.29
Parent	3.3	1.39	3.0	1.58
Online Media	3.6	1.22	4.1	1.19
Conventional Media	4.9	1.12	5.1	1.15
Religious Sources	5.7	1.79	5.5	1.94

For both men and women, the sources ended up in the same order with Same-sex Friends being ranked highest and Religious Sources being the lowest ranked. This is in line with the finding noted above that when the valence is not considered, just the source did not significantly differ for gender.

On the other hand, the order on the basis of the amount of the messages received from a source was different than the self-reported prominence of a source. Although the highest level of messages was received from Online Media, the most prominent source was rated to be Friends. Similarly, although the lowest level of messages was received from Parents, the least prominent source was rated to be Religious Sources.

Lastly, men and women were compared in terms of the mean rank for each source. As there was no non-parametric test that allowed for a mixed-method comparison, gender difference for each source was tested separately via Kruskal-Wallis tests. The findings revealed gender differences for the prominence given to Opposite-Sex Friend,  $H = 25.878$ ,  $p = .000$ , and Online Media,  $H = 12.908$ ,  $p = .000$ . Both Opposite-Sex Friend and Online Media were ranked as less prominent for women, as compared to men (See Table 3.3).

### 3.1.2. Sexual Stereotypes

Stereotypical beliefs of participants about sexuality were assessed by Sexual Stereotypes Scale. The descriptive statistics for the subscales of Male Sexual Role, Female Sexual Role, and Double Standard are shown in Table 3.4.

**Table 3.4.**

*Descriptive statistics of the subscales of Sexual Stereotypes Scale*

	Women		Men		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Male Sexual Role	3.06	1.67	3.18	1.60	3.10	1.65
Female Sexual Role	1.95	1.01	1.92	0.99	1.94	1.00
Double Standard	1.96	1.19	2.33	1.20	2.07	1.21

A MANOVA was conducted to see how the stereotypical beliefs about sexual roles differed for men and women. Although the multivariate test was significant,  $F(3, 426) = 4.486, p = .004$ ; univariate analyses demonstrated that the effect was significant only for the Double Standard subscale,  $F(1, 428) = 8.749, p = .003$ . Men and women scored approximately equally higher on Male Sexual Role and approximately equally lower on the Female Sexual Role. However, on Double Standard, men ( $M = 2.33, SD = 1.20$ ) scored significantly higher than women ( $M = 1.96, SD = 1.20$ ).

### 3.1.3. Associations of Messages with Sexual Stereotypes, Religiosity, and Conservatism

Participant rated how religious they were and how conservative they were on single 6-point Likert items. The associations of messages about sexuality with sexual Stereotypes, religiosity, and conservatism were examined via Spearman Correlation analyses (See Table 3.5).



**Table 3.5.**

*Spearman's correlation coefficients of Permissive and Restrictive Messages about sexuality with Religiosity, Conservatism, and Sexual Stereotypes.*

	Permissive			Restrictive		
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total
Male Sexual Role	.020	.395**	.103*	.095	-.234**	-.004
Female Sexual Role	-.063	.141	.002	.072	-.014	.048
Double Standard	-.124*	.287**	.017	.078	-.160	-.023
Religiosity	-.138*	-.068	-.120*	.146*	.181*	.172**
Conservatism	-.124*	-.114	-.119*	.084	.319**	.165**

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Stereotypical sexual beliefs were associated with messages about sexuality only for men. It was observed that for men, Permissive Messages about sexuality was positively correlated with Male Sexual Role,  $\rho = .395$ ,  $p = .000$ , and Double Standard,  $\rho = .287$ ,  $p = .001$ . On the other hand, Permissive Messages about sexuality was only weakly negatively correlated with Double Standard for women. Regarding Restrictive Messages, a negative correlation with Male Sexual Role was observed,  $\rho = -.234$ ,  $p = .009$ , again only for men.

For all participants, Religiosity and Conservatism had weak positive correlations with Restrictive Messages,  $\rho = .172$ ,  $p = .000$  and  $\rho = .165$ ,  $p = .001$ , respectively. When the correlations are examined separately for women and men, it was observed that this association was stronger for men. Especially Conservatism had a moderate positive correlation with Restrictive Messages for men,  $\rho = .319$ ,  $p = .000$ , but no correlation for women.

Finally, the correlations of Religiosity and Conservatism with Stereotypes were also inspected via Spearman correlations. Both Religiosity and Conservatism were significantly positive correlated with Male Role, Female Role, and Double Standard (See Table 3.6).

**Table 3.6.**

*Spearman's correlation coefficients of Sexual Stereotypes with Religiosity and Conservatism.*

	Religiosity			Conservatism		
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total
Male Sexual Role	.250**	.030	.179**	.151**	.052	.119*
Female Sexual Role	.348**	.184**	.304**	.321**	.217**	.293**
Double Standard	.430**	.188**	.326**	.413**	.197**	.337**

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

When correlations are examined separately for women and men, it was observed that for women, Religiosity and Conservatism were associated with higher levels of all three stereotypical beliefs, especially Double Standard. On the other hand, for Men, no association was observed for Male Sexual Role and neither Religiosity nor Conservatism. Besides, rest of the correlations of men were weaker in strength as compared to women (See Table 3.5).

## 3.2. OFFLINE SEXUAL PRACTICES

### 3.2.1. Frequency of Offline Sexual Experiences

As a total, 373 participants (87%) had non-intercourse sexual experience and 294 (68%) had sexual intercourse. Among 305 female participants, 261 (86%) had non-intercourse sexual experience and 199 (67%) had sexual intercourse. Within 125 male participants, 112 (90%) had non-intercourse sexual experience and 95 (76%) had sexual intercourse.

Chi-square test showed no significant difference between women and men on the frequency of non-intercourse sexual experiences. However, compared with women, men had significantly higher rates of sexual intercourse at  $\chi^2(1, N = 430) = 4.38, p = .04$ .

### 3.2.2. Number of Partners

Number of partners were rated on 6 ordered categories between '0' and '5 or more' for dating partners and '1' and '6 or more' for non-intercourse sexual experience, sexual intercourse, and ideal sexual relationship. To allow for comparisons, all partner ratings were recoded to establish 5 ordered categories between '1' and '5 or more'.

Regarding dating partner, 7% of women and 3% of men did not have any partners, while 44% of women and 50% of men had more than 5 dating partners. An Independent T-test comparing the mean rating showed no significant difference between women and men regarding the mean number of dating partners. For participants who had sexual experience, men had significantly higher mean of non-intercourse sexual experience partners  $t(371) = 3.13, p = .003$  and sexual intercourse partners  $t(294) = 3.93, p = .000$ .

Additionally, the participants were asked to explain their ideal sexual scenario and indicate with how many partners they had such an ideal sexual experience. Approximately one fourth of women (24%) and one third of men (32%) did not have any partners with whom they shared their ideal experience. On the other hand, the proportion of men who had this experience with 5 or more partners was 18%, whereas for women it was just 4%. As to the mean rating, men had a significantly higher mean for the number of relationships that fit their ideal in terms of sexual experience than did women  $t(428) = 4.57, p = .000$ .

### 3.2.3. Age of First Sexual Experience

The first age of sexual experience for offline sexual activities are listed in Table 3.7. For the whole sample, the first age of non-intercourse sexual experience was on average 16.46 years ( $SD = 2.47$ ) and the first age of sexual intercourse was on average 18.19 years ( $SD = 2.18$ ). An Independent T-test showed that the age of first non-intercourse experience was lower in men,  $t(355) = -4.46, p = .000$ , as did the first age of sexual intercourse,  $t(276) = -6.91, p < .001$ .

**Table 3.7.***Descriptive statistics for the age of first offline sexual experiences.*

	Men		Women		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Non-intercourse experience	15.57	2.42	16.83	2.4	16.46	2.47
Sexual Intercourse	16.95	1.79	1876	2.12	18.19	2.18

**3.2.4. Reasons for First Sexual Experience**

Participants were asked to select the most important and second most important for their decisions to have non-intercourse sexual experience and sexual intercourse from a list ('I wanted to', 'Out of curiosity', 'To promote closeness in the relationship', 'To please the partner and maintain the relationship', 'Persistent pleas of the partner', 'Partner's physical coercion', 'Feeling obliged to do so', 'Experiences of friends', and 'Other'). The frequencies for each reason are listed in Table 3.8. Since there were just 4 participant who selected other as a reason, the option was omitted from the table and further analyses. Additionally, partner's insistence and physical intimidation were combined into partner's coercion due to their low frequencies.

It was observed that Desire was by far the most important reason to have a non-intercourse sexual experience for both women (68%) and men (77%); and Curiosity was the second most important reason again for both women (31%) and men (50%).

The combined percentages were calculated by determining the number of women and men who identified a reason as either most or second most important reason. A Chi-square analysis was conducted to see if men and women differed significantly on selecting a reason as important in deciding to engage in non-intercourse sexual activity. The analysis proved a border level of significance,  $\chi^2(6, N = 744) = 12.80, p = .05$ .

**Table 3.8.***Frequencies and percentages of the reasons for first non-intercourse sexual experience*

	1 <sup>st</sup> Reason		2 <sup>nd</sup> Reason		Combined	
	Women <i>n</i> = 262	Men <i>n</i> = 112	Women <i>n</i> = 262	Men <i>n</i> = 112	Women <i>n<sub>c</sub></i> = 524	Men <i>n<sub>c</sub></i> = 224
Desire	177 (68%)	86 (77%)	34 (13%)	12 (11%)	211 (81%)	98 (88%)
Curiosity	39 (15%)	13 (12%)	81 (31%)	56 (50%)	120 (46%)	69 (62%)
To Feel Closer	15 (6%)	4 (4%)	67 (26%)	24 (21%)	82 (31%)	28 (25%)
Felt Ought to	5 (2%)	3 (3%)	25 (10%)	9 (8%)	30 (11%)	12 (11%)
Peer Influence	8 (3%)	1 (1%)	26 (10%)	5 (4%)	34 (13%)	6 (5%)
To Please Partner	5 (2%)	4 (4%)	15 (6%)	3 (3%)	20 (8%)	7 (6%)
Partner's Coercion	12 (5%)	1 (1%)	11 (4%)	3 (3%)	23 (9%)	4 (4%)

Examination of the descriptive statistics indicate a slightly higher tendency for men to select Curiosity as a reason than women (62% and 46%, respectively). It could also be said that more women than men selected Peer Influence (13% and 5%, respectively) and Partner Coercion (9% and 4%, respectively) as reasons, yet the frequencies are low.

The participants' reasons for having sexual intercourse for the first time are listed in Table 3.9. Since there were just 6 participants who selected the other option as a reason, it was omitted from the table and further analyses. Additionally, as above, partner's insistence and physical intimidation were combined into partner's coercion due to their low frequencies.

It was observed that again Desire was by far the most important reason to engage in sexual intercourse for both women (67%) and men (74%). Curiosity was mentioned as the second most important reason for men (47%) whereas to Feel Closer (34%) and Curiosity (31%) were mentioned by women.

**Table 3.9.***Frequencies and percentages of the reasons for the first sexual intercourse*

	1 <sup>st</sup> Reason		2 <sup>nd</sup> Reason		Combined	
	Women <i>n</i> = 201	Men <i>n</i> = 95	Women <i>n</i> = 201	Men <i>n</i> = 95	Women <i>n<sub>c</sub></i> = 524	Men <i>n<sub>c</sub></i> = 224
Desire	135 (67%)	70 (74%)	22 (11%)	14 (15%)	157 (78%)	84 (88%)
Curiosity	23 (11%)	10 (11%)	62 (31%)	45 (47%)	85 (42%)	55 (58%)
To Feel Closer	12 (6%)	5 (5%)	68 (34%)	19 (20%)	80 (40%)	24 (25%)
Felt Ought to	6 (3%)	3 (3%)	16 (8%)	9 (9%)	22 (11%)	12 (13%)
Partner's Coercion	12 (6%)	(0%)	10 (5%)	2 (2%)	22 (11%)	2 (3%)
To Please Partner	7 (3%)	3 (3%)	12 (6%)	3 (3%)	19 (9%)	6 (6%)
Peer Influence	4 (2%)	4 (4%)	7 (3%)	3 (3%)	11 (5%)	7 (7%)

A Chi-square analysis with combined frequencies was conducted to see whether men and women differed significantly on selecting a reason as important in deciding to engage in sexual intercourse. The analysis showed that the distributions among reasons were significantly different for men and women,  $\chi^2(6, N = 592) = 15.44, p = .017$ . More women than men selected Feeling Closer as a reason to have sexual intercourse. Again, although the overall frequencies were low, the ratio of women who mentioned Partner's Coercion as most or second most important reason was markedly higher than men who did so (11% and 3%, respectively).

### 3.2.5. Associations of Offline Sexual Experiences with Messages about Sexuality, Sexual Stereotypes, Religiosity, and Conservatism

The associations of having a non-intercourse sexual experience and sexual intercourse, number of partners, and age of the first experience with messages, beliefs, and self-rated levels of religiosity and conservatism were further explored.

As the number of participant who did not have any non-intercourse experience were markedly lower than the ones who had, group comparisons could not be ensued. Two-way ANOVAs were conducted to see whether men and women who had and did not have sexual intercourse differed as to the aforementioned variables. The significance level was set to .007 with Bonferroni correction.

It was observed that for both men and women, the Religiosity,  $F(1, 424) = 20.550, p = .000$ , and Conservatism,  $F(1, 424) = 43.457, p = .000$ , of the participants who did not have sexual intercourse ( $M = 2.92, SD = 1.39$ ;  $M = 2.54, SD = 1.36$ , respectively) were significantly higher than those who did ( $M = 2.08, SD = 1.19$ ;  $M = 1.61, SD = 0.89$ , respectively). Double Standard was also significantly higher for the participants who did not have sexual intercourse and this effect significantly interacted with gender,  $F(2, 424) = 12.200, p = .000$ . Although the direction of the difference was the same, the mean difference was larger for women.

The associations of number of partners and age of first experience with messages, stereotypes, religiosity, and conservatism were examined via Spearman correlations. The significance level was set to .007 with Bonferroni correction. No associations were observed for messages or stereotypes and number of non-intercourse sexual experience partners. Besides, it was observed for Women but not for Men that the number of non-sexual intercourse partners increased with Religiosity,  $\rho = -.194, p = .002$ , and Conservatism,  $\rho = -.225, p = .000$ . Number of intercourse partners and ideal sex partners did not have any significant correlation with any of the measures.

Regarding the age of first experience, the only significant association was the positive correlation of the age of first non-intercourse experience with

Conservatism,  $\rho = .221$ ,  $p = .000$  for women; indicating older ages of first sexual experience as conservatism increases.

### 3.3. ONLINE SEXUAL PRACTICES

#### 3.3.1. Frequency of Online Sexual Experiences

Among women participants, 166 (54%) had online sex and among men, 83 (66%) had online sex. On a total base, 249 participants (58%) had online sex experience. Compared via a Chi-square test, men had significantly higher rates of online sex than women,  $\chi^2(1, N = 430)$ ,  $p = .02$ .

Participants were also asked to rate how frequently they engaged in different types of online sex on a 5-point scale. Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 3.10.

**Table 3.10.**

*Mean rating of frequencies for each type of online sexual activities.*

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>(N = 167)</i>		<i>(N = 83)</i>		<i>(N = 250)</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Sex-texting	3.02	1.19	3.24	1.19	3.09	1.19
Sharing seminude / nude self-photos	2.53	1.04	2.57	1.04	2.54	1.04
Live chatting	2.35	1.39	2.80	1.38	2.50	1.40
Pornographic photos	1.62	1.03	2.39	1.33	1.88	1.19
Sharing seminude / nude self-videos	1.78	1.04	2.01	1.12	1.86	1.07
Live video-call	1.64	1.02	1.90	1.22	1.73	1.07
Pornographic videos	1.41	0.89	2.02	1.24	1.62	1.06

The most frequent online practice was sex-texting for both women ( $M = 3.02$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ) and men ( $M = 3.24$ ,  $SD = 1.22$ ), followed by sharing seminude /



nude self-photos for women ( $M = 2.53$ ,  $SD = 1.04$ ) and live chatting for men ( $M = 2.80$ ,  $SD = 1.38$ ).

A MANOVA was conducted with Gender as the factor and online sexual behaviors as dependent variables. The multivariate test for gender was significant,  $F(7, 240) = 4.403$ ,  $p = .000$ ; indicating that overall, men engaged in online sexual behavior more frequently than women. When the difference for each behavior is inspected via the univariate tests, it is seen men used pornographic photos  $F(1, 246) = 23.074$ ,  $p = .000$ ; pornographic videos  $F(1, 246) = 18.673$ ,  $p = .000$ ; and online video chatting  $F(1, 246) = 6.089$ ,  $p = .014$ , more than women did (See Table 3.7).

Another aspect of frequency of online sexual behavior was the routes. Participants were asked to rate how often they use different routes (e.g., SMS, date applications) for online sex on a 5-point scale. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3.11. It is noted that Messaging Applications are the most used route, while e-mail is the least used route for online sex for both women and men.

**Table 3.11.**

*Descriptive statistics for different routes of online sex.*

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>(N = 167)</i>		<i>(N = 83)</i>		<i>(N = 250)</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Messaging applications	3.06	1.39	3.23	1.22	3.13	1.34
Social media applications	2.45	1.42	2.65	1.39	2.52	1.41
SMS-Telephone call	1.92	1.17	2.23	1.21	2.02	1.19
Dating applications	1.36	0.87	2.07	1.4	1.6	1.13
Chat rooms	1.2	0.7	1.61	1.19	1.34	0.91
E-mails	1.07	0.4	1.07	0.47	1.07	0.42

A MANOVA was conducted with Gender as the factor and online sexual behaviors as dependent variables. The multivariate test for gender was significant,

$F(6, 234) = 3.800, p = .001$ ; indicating that overall men used routes for online sex more than women did. Univariate tests for each route revealed that men use dating applications  $F(1, 239) = 23.177, p = .000$ ; and chat rooms  $F(1, 239) = 10.179, p = .002$  as routes of online sex more frequently than women (See Table 3.11.).

### **3.3.2. Number of Partners of Online Sexual Experience**

Among 249 participants who had online sex experience, 165 (66%) had more than one online sex partner and 50 (20%) had six or more partners. For the whole group, the number of online sex partners was 2.94 ( $SD = 1.9$ ). As revealed by an Independent t-test, men who had a mean of 3.84 ( $SD = 1.94$ ) for online sex partners that is significantly higher than women who had a mean of 2.5 ( $SD = 1.72$ ),  $t(248) = 5.59, p = .000$ .

### **3.3.3. Age of First Online Sexual Experience**

The first age of online sexual experience was on average 16.91 years ( $SD = 1.97$ ) for men, 18.11 years ( $SD = 2.44$ ) for women and 17.71 years ( $SD = 2.36$ ) for the whole sample. Independent t-test showed that the age of first online sexual experience was significantly lower for men compared with women  $t(229) = -3.74, p = <.001$ .

The ages of first online and offline experiences were compared via Repeated-measures ANOVA and found to be significantly different,  $F(2, 189) = 87.999, p = .000$ . Mean age of first non-intercourse sexual experience (16.46) was significantly lower than first online sexual experience (17.71); and both were significantly lower than the mean age for first sexual intercourse (18.19).

### **3.3.4. Reasons of Sexual Experience**

As in offline sexual experiences, the reasons for engaging in online sexual experiences were also selected as the most and second most important reasons,

given the same list. The frequencies and percentages for each reason for first time online sex experience are listed in Table 3.12.

**Table 3.12.**

*Reasons for online sex*

	1 <sup>st</sup> Reason		2 <sup>nd</sup> Reason		Combined	
	Women (n = 167)	Men (n = 83)	Women (n = 166)	Men (n = 83)	Women (n <sub>c</sub> = 333)	Men (n <sub>c</sub> = 166)
Desire	97 (57%)	55 (66%)	16 (10%)	7 (8%)	112 (67%)	62 (75%)
Curiosity	18 (11%)	15 (18%)	38 (23%)	33 (40%)	56 (34%)	48 (58%)
To Feel Closer	11 (7%)	3 (4%)	48 (29%)	18 (22%)	59 (35%)	21 (25%)
To Please Partner	20 (12%)	2 (2%)	25 (15%)	7 (8%)	45 (27%)	9 (11%)
Partner's Coercion	11 (7%)	4 (5%)	19 (11%)	1 (1%)	30 (18%)	5 (6%)
Peer Influence	5 (3%)	2 (2%)	7 (4%)	13 (16%)	12 (7%)	15 (18%)
Felt Ought to	6 (4%)	1 (1%)	10 (6%)	4 (5%)	16 (10%)	5 (6%)

As in offline experiences, Desire was the most important reason to engage in online sexual activities for both women (67%) and men (75%). Again, Curiosity was mentioned as the second most important reason for men (58%) whereas to Feel Closer (35%) and Curiosity (34%) were mentioned by women. On the other hand, to Please Partner and Partner's Coercion were more pronounced as reasons of online sexual experiences as compared to offline, especially for women. Partners Coercion was mentioned by 9% and 11% of women as reasons for non-intercourse and intercourse, respectively; whereas by 18% of women as reason for online sexual experience. Similarly, to Please the Partner was mentioned by 8% and 9% of women as reasons for non-intercourse and intercourse, respectively, whereas it was mentioned by 27% of women as reason for online sexual experience. For men, a similar pattern was observed for Peer Influence. While Peer Influence was

mentioned by 5% and 7% of men as reasons for non-intercourse and intercourse, respectively, it was mentioned by 18% of men as a reason for online experience.

A Chi-square analysis with combined frequencies was conducted to see if men and women differed significantly on selecting a reason as important in deciding to engage in online sexual activity. The analysis showed that the distributions among reasons were significantly different for men and women,  $\chi^2(6, N = 495) = 29.234, p = .000$ . Although the highest three reasons, namely Desire, Curiosity, and Feeling Closer, are common for both men and women; there are some differences (See Table 3.9). Men mentioned Curiosity and Peer Influence more than women; and women mentioned Feeling Closer, Pleasing the Partner, and Partner's Coercion more than men as reasons for engaging in online sexual activity.

### **3.3.5. Associations of Online Sexual Experience with Messages about Sexuality, Sexual Stereotypes, Religiosity, and Conservatism**

The associations of having an online sexual experience, number of online partners, and age of the first online experience with messages, beliefs, and self-rated levels of religiosity and conservatism were further explored.

Two-way ANOVAs were conducted to see whether men and women who had and did not have online sexual intercourse differed as to the aforementioned variables. The significance level was set to .007 with Bonferroni correction. It was observed that for both men and women, the Permissive Messages of the participants who had online sexual experience ( $M = 2.60, SD = 0.52$ ) were significantly higher than those who did not ( $M = 2.40, SD = 0.49$ ),  $F(1, 424) = 8.730, p = .002$ . For Restrictive Messages and Double Standard, the differences between participants who had and did not have online sexual experience varied as to gender,  $F(2, 424) = 1.941, p = .000$  and  $F(2, 424) = 9.090, p = .000$ , respectively. It was observed that Restrictive Messages received by men were lower for those who had an online sexual experience ( $M = 2.22, SD = .56$ ) than those who did not ( $M = 2.32, SD = 0.48$ ); whereas for women the Restrictive Message means were closer for those who did ( $M = 2.44, SD = 0.42$ ) and did not have ( $M = 2.46, SD = 0.39$ ) sexual intercourse.

For Double Standard, a more marked interaction effect was observed that women who had online sex had lower Double Standard scores ( $M = 1.76$ ,  $SD = 1.8$ ) than those who did not ( $M = 2.18$ ,  $SD = 1.23$ ); while men who had online sex had higher Double Standard scores ( $M = 2.43$ ,  $SD = 1.25$ ) than those who did not ( $M = 2.12$ ,  $SD = 1.06$ ).

The associations of number of online partners and age of first online experience with messages, stereotypes, religiosity, and conservatism were examined via Spearman correlations. The significance level was set to .007 with Bonferroni correction. No associations were observed for Religiosity or Conservatism and number of online sexual experience partners. Regarding messages, only higher level of Permissive Messages was associated with a younger age of first online experience for Men,  $\rho = -.356$ ,  $p = .002$ . Regarding stereotypes, only Male Role was associated with a higher number of online sex partner for Men,  $\rho = .327$ ,  $p = .003$ .

### **3.4. TOKEN RESISTANCE AND CONSENT TO UNWANTED SEX**

#### **3.4.1. Frequency of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex**

The participants were asked whether they had experienced token resistance, saying 'No' to sex while wanting to say 'Yes'; and consent to unwanted sex, saying 'Yes' to sex while meaning to say 'No'. The frequency of participants who had experiences of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted sex as a function of gender is shown in Table 3.13. As a total, participants had a higher frequency of token resistance (42%) than consent to unwanted sex (30.5%).

Chi-square analysis showed that the percentage of women who had at least one Token Resistance experience was significantly higher than men  $\chi^2(1, N = 430) = 20.44$ ,  $p = .000$ . Again, compared with men, the percentage of women who had at least one experience of Consent to Unwanted Sex was significantly higher  $\chi^2(1, N = 430) = 17.41$ ,  $p = .000$ .

**Table 3.13.***Frequencies and Percentages of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex*

	Women ( <i>N</i> = 305)	Men ( <i>N</i> = 105)	Total ( <i>N</i> = 430)
<i>Token Resistance</i>			
Yes	150 (49%)	32 (26%)	182 (42%)
No	154 (51%)	93 (74%)	247 (58%)
<i>Consent to Unwanted Sex</i>			
Yes	111 (36%)	20 (16%)	131 (30.5%)
No	194 (64%)	105 (84%)	299 (69.5%)

Additionally, Token resistance was experienced on average 3.52 times ( $SD = 3.86$ ) and Consent to Unwanted sex 4.21 times ( $SD = 5.52$ ) by the whole group. When gender difference was tested via Independent t-tests, the equality of variance assumption was violated; thus, the corrected calculations were interpreted. Token Resistance was experienced on a significantly higher number of occasions by women ( $M = 3.73$ ,  $SD = 4.15$ ), as compared to men ( $M = 2.54$ ,  $SD = 1.77$ ),  $t(97.678) = -2.445$ ,  $p = .016$ . Consent to Unwanted Sex was also experienced on a significantly higher number of occasions by women ( $M = 4.64$ ,  $SD = 5.93$ ), as compared to men ( $M = 2.1$ ,  $SD = 1.45$ ),  $t(115.999) = -3.471$ ,  $p = .000$ .

### 3.4.2. Context of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex

For those who reported having experienced token resistance and/or consent to unwanted sex, the setting (online, offline, both) and relational context (serious relationship, casual relationship, family/relative, acquaintance, stranger) of the sexual encounter were also reported by the participants. Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 3.14. for Token Resistance and in Table 3.15. for Consent to Unwanted Sex.

When the participants were asked in which sexual setting they had experienced Token Resistance, 44% of those who had at least one experience of token resistance indicated offline sexual activities, 9% indicated online sex, and 47% indicated both occasions. Chi-square demonstrated no significant gender difference.

**Table 3.14.**

*Setting and Context of Token Resistance*

	Women (N <sub>yes</sub> = 150)	Men (N <sub>yes</sub> = 32)	Total (N <sub>yes</sub> = 132)
<i>Setting</i>			
Offline	66 (44%)	13 (41%)	81 (44%)
Online	13 (9%)	4 (12.5%)	17 (9%)
Both offline and online	71 (47%)	14 (44%)	86 (47%)
<i>Relational Context</i>			
Serious relationship	82 (55%)	9 (28%)	91 (50%)
Casual relationship	73 (49%)	19 (59%)	92 (21%)
Acquaintance	10 (7%)	7 (22)	17 (4%)
Stranger	6 (4%)	2 (6%)	8 (2%)

As to relational context, only one participant reported a Token Resistance experience with a family member or relative, thus the category was omitted from the descriptive statistics and further analysis. A Chi-square analysis was conducted and revealed that the relational context of token resistance and gender were significantly associated,  $\chi^2(3, N = 160) = 17.491, p = .001$ . As presented in Table 3.11, the most frequent relational context for the experience of token resistance was serious relationships for women (55%) and casual relationships for men (59%). A higher percentage of men (22%) also had experienced token resistance with acquaintances compared to women (7%).

For those who had at least one experience of Consent to Unwanted Sex, 54% reported to have the experience in an offline setting, 10% in an online setting, and

36% on both occasions (See Table 3.12). Chi-square analysis showed no significant differences regarding the distribution of settings as to gender.

**Table 3.15.**

*Setting and Context of Consent to Unwanted Sex*

	Women ( $N_{yes} = 111$ )	Men ( $N_{yes} = 20$ )	Total ( $N_{yes} = 131$ )
<i>Setting</i>			
Offline	57 (51%)	14 (70%)	71 (54%)
Online	12 (11%)	1 (5%)	70 (10%)
Both offline and online	42 (38%)	5 (25%)	97 (36%)
<i>Relational Context</i>			
Serious relationship	62 (56%)	9 (45%)	71 (53%)
Casual relationship	48 (43%)	13 (65%)	61 (47%)
Acquaintance	8 (7%)	0	8 (6%)
Stranger	7 (6.3%)	1 (5%)	8 (6%)

There were no participants who had an experience of Consent to Unwanted sex with family members or relatives. As presented in Table 3.12., the most frequent relationship context for the experience of Consent to Unwanted Sex was serious relationships for women (55.9%) and casual relationships for men (65%). Still, Chi-square analysis showed no significant differences between men and women for the distribution of different relationship contexts for Consent to Unwanted Sex experience.

### **3.4.3. Reasons of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex**

The participants were asked in an open-ended question form to explain their reasons for the experience of token resistance and the answers were grouped together according to their content. The reasons for Token Resistance are



summarized in Table 3.16. and the reasons for Consent to Unwanted Sex are summarized in Table 3.17.

For women, the top three reasons for token resistance were “not sure / not ready” (35%), “unsuitable for sex” (14%), and “religious teachings” (12%) and “shame” (12%). For men, the top reasons for token resistance were “not sure / not ready” (21%) and “fear of regret” (21%), “to protect the partner” (17%), and “not wanting sex” (10%). None of the men mentioned “not to be seen as promiscuous,” and none of the women mentioned “not wanting sex” as a reason for token resistance.

**Table 3.16.**

*Reasons of token resistance*

	Women (N <sub>yes</sub> = 150)	Men (N <sub>yes</sub> = 32)	Total (N <sub>yes</sub> = 132)
Not sure / not ready	54 (35%)	6 (21%)	60 (32%)
Unsuitable for sex	22 (14%)	1 (3.5%)	23 (12%)
Religious teachings	19 (12%)	2 (7%)	21 (11%)
Shame	19 (12%)	2 (7%)	21 (11%)
Not trusting the partner	18 (11.5%)	2 (7%)	20 (11%)
Fear of regret	14 (9%)	6 (21%)	20 (11%)
To protect the partner	1 (1%)	5 (17%)	6 (3%)
Not to be seen as promiscuous	5 (3%)	-	5 (3%)
Friendship	3 (2%)	1 (3.5%)	4 (2%)
Not wanting sex	-	3 (10%)	3 (2%)
Sexual problems	1 (1%)	1 (3.5%)	2 (1%)

For consent to unwanted sex, the top three reasons of women were “to please the partner” (48%), “becoming aroused” (38.2%), and “verbal coercion” (28%). For men, the top three reasons were “verbal coercion” (37.5%), and “becoming aroused” (25%) and “fear of break up” (25%).

**Table 3.17.***Reasons of consent to unwanted sex*

	Women ( $N_{yes} = 111$ )	Men ( $N_{yes} = 20$ )	Total ( $N_{yes} = 131$ )
Fear of break up	2 (25%)	9 (16.4%)	11 (17.5%)
To please partner	1 (12.5%)	12 (48%)	13 (20.6%)
Verbal coercion	3 (37.5%)	7 (28%)	10 (15.9%)
Feeling obligated	0 (0%)	6 (10.9%)	6 (9.5%)
Becoming aroused	2 (25%)	21 (38.2%)	23 (36.5%)

**3.4.4. Effect Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex on Relationship**

Participants were asked to rate on a 5-point scale how much their relationship with the partner(s) with whom they have experienced token resistance or consent to unwanted sex was affected by that experience. Although it was observed that the mean rating by men was slightly higher for Token Resistance and the mean rating by women was slightly higher for Consent to Unwanted Sex (See Table 3.18), Independent t-tests did not support a significant gender difference.

**Table 3.18.***The effect of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex on the relationship*

	Women		Men		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Token resistance	2.49	1.34	2.75	1.22	2.54	2.32
Consent to unwanted sex	2.98	1.48	2.76	1.38	2.95	1.46

### **3.4.5. Associations of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex with Messages about Sexuality, Sexual Stereotypes, Religiosity, and Conservatism**

The associations of having token resistance and consent to unwanted sex with messages, beliefs, and self-rated levels of religiosity and conservatism were further explored. It was observed for Women, only number of Consent to Unwanted Sex experiences was negatively associated with Permissive Messages,  $\rho = -.292$ ,  $p = .003$ , and positively associated with Restrictive Messages,  $\rho = -.209$ ,  $p = .034$ . The setting, relational context or the effect of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex experiences were not associated with messages, stereotypes, religiosity, and conservatism.

### **3.5. COMPARISON OF THE CURRENT FINDINGS WITH BORATAV & CAVDAR'S STUDY**

The raw data that was collected for the original study by Boratav and Cavdar (2012) in 2004-05 was shared by the authors with permission to use in this study. To allow for a clearer comparison, non-heterosexual participants were removed from the current data and participants with ages over 25 were removed from the original data. In order to simplify the finding reports, original data will be referred to as 2005, as the data collection was completed in 2005; and similarly current data will be referred to as 2021, as the data collection was completed in 2021. Basic descriptive statistics for demographics of each sample are summarized in Table 3.19. It is noted that mean age is slightly higher, women and participants from private universities are more represented in the current sample.

The comparisons were done for the messages about sexuality, sexual stereotypes, and frequencies of non-intercourse sexual experience, sexual intercourse, token resistance, and consent to unwanted sex. As the questions regarding the details of these experiences had different response options, statistical comparisons were not conducted.

**Table 3.19.***Descriptive statistics of demographic characteristics of 2005 and 2021 samples*

	2005 ( <i>N</i> = 446)	2021 ( <i>N</i> = 338)
<i>Age</i>		
Min - Max	18 – 25	18 – 25
Mean ( <i>SD</i> )	20.59 (1.51)	21.55 (1.85)
<i>Gender</i>		
Women <i>N</i> (%)	263 (59%)	269 (71%)
Men <i>N</i> (%)	183 (41%)	109 (29%)
<i>Longest Residence</i>		
City <i>N</i> (%)	342 (77%)	309 (82%)
District <i>N</i> (%)	100 (23%)	67 (18%)
<i>University</i>		
Private	148 (33%)	233 (81%)
Public	298 (67%)	55 (19%)

**3.5.1 Comparison of Messages about Sexuality**

In order to identify whether the source and valence of messages received about sexuality as well as their interaction with gender differed for 2005 and 2021 samples, A Mixed ANOVA was conducted with Cohort (2005 vs. 2021) and Gender as between-subjects factor, and Source and Valence of the Messages as within-subjects factors. The sphericity assumption was violated, thus, for the tests of within-subjects effects calculations with Greenhouse-Geisser correction were reported and interpreted (See Table 3.20). Only the effects involving the Cohort were interpreted for the comparison aim of the analysis. For group comparisons, estimated marginal means (*EMM*) and standard errors (*SE*) are reported (See Table 3.18).

**Table 3.20.**

*Tests of within-subjects effects for source and valence of messages and their interactions with gender and study cohort*

Source	Type III SS	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Source	48.022	3.888	12.353	46.985	0.000
Source x COHORT	6.098	3.888	1.569	5.966	0.000
Source x Gender	4.201	3.888	1.081	4.11	0.003
Source x COHORT x Gender	0.266	3.888	0.069	0.261	0.899
Error(Source)	823.778	3133.342	0.263		
Valence	93.195	1	93.195	67.487	0.000
Valence x COHORT	36.478	1	36.478	26.416	0.000
Valence x Gender	16.971	1	16.971	12.29	0.000
Valence x COHORT x Gender	16.385	1	16.385	11.866	0.001
Error(Valence)	1113.021	806	1.381		
Source x Valence	1911.988	3.532	541.391	674.865	0.000
Source x Valence x COHORT	378.599	3.532	107.203	133.632	0.000
Source x Valence x Gender	109.99	3.532	31.144	38.822	0.000
Source x Valence x COHORT x Gender	16.133	3.532	4.568	5.695	0.000
Error(Source x Valence)	2283.512	2846.484	0.802		

The level of messages received from the five sources significantly differed between 2005 and 2021 samples. It is noted that Parents were the source with the lowest mean level of received messages both in 2005 and 2021, with a lower mean in 2021. On the other hand, level of messages received from Conventional Media was highest among other sources in 2005 ( $EMM = 2.46$ ,  $SE = .023$ ), whereas the lowest after Parents in 2021 ( $EMM = 2.39$ ,  $SE = .025$ ). On the contrary to Parent and Conventional Media with lower current levels, Same-sex Friend, Opposite-sex Friend, and Religion were rated higher in 2021 (See Table 3.21).

**Table 3.21.**

*Estimated Marginal Means (95% Confidence Interval) of messages as a function of source, valence, and cohort.*

Source	Valence	2005	2021
Same-sex Friend	Permissive	2.47 ± 0.08	3.10 ± 0.10
	Restrictive	2.34 ± 0.07	1.81 ± 0.08
	<i>Total</i>	<i>2.41 ± 0.04</i>	<i>2.46 ± 0.05</i>
Opposite-sex Friend	Permissive	2.56 ± 0.08	3.13 ± 0.10
	Restrictive	2.21 ± 0.07	1.75 ± 0.08
	<i>Total</i>	<i>2.39 ± 0.04</i>	<i>2.44 ± 0.05</i>
Parents	Permissive	1.66 ± 0.08	1.98 ± 0.09
	Restrictive	2.80 ± 0.08	2.40 ± 0.10
	<i>Total</i>	<i>2.23 ± 0.05</i>	<i>2.19 ± 0.05</i>
Media	Permissive	2.79 ± 0.08	2.06 ± 0.10
	Restrictive	2.14 ± 0.08	2.72 ± 0.09
	<i>Total</i>	<i>2.46 ± 0.04</i>	<i>2.39 ± 0.05</i>
Religion	Permissive	1.41 ± 0.06	1.40 ± 0.10
	Restrictive	3.26 ± 0.07	3.43 ± 0.09
	<i>Total</i>	<i>2.34 ± 0.04</i>	<i>2.41 ± 0.05</i>
All sources	Permissive	2.18 ± 0.04	2.34 ± 0.05
	Restrictive	2.55 ± 0.05	2.42 ± 0.05

The valence of messages also significantly differed as a function of the Cohort, and further, this effect had different patterns for Men and Women (See Table 3.19). Overall, Permissive Messages were found to be higher in 2021 than in 2005 ( $EMM = 2.34$ ,  $SE = .027$ ;  $EMM = 2.18$ ,  $SE = .023$ , respectively); whereas Restrictive Messages are lower in 2021 than in 2005 ( $EMM = 2.42$ ,  $SE = .028$ ;  $EMM = 2.55$ ,  $SE = .024$ , respectively).

For Women, the level of Permissive Messages was slightly lower in 2005 ( $EMM = 2.16$ ,  $SE = .030$ ) than in 2021 ( $EMM = 2.66$ ,  $SE = .029$ ); whereas Restrictive messages were the same in 2005 ( $EMM = 2.54$ ,  $SE = .30$ ) and in 2021 ( $EMM = 2.55$ ,  $SE = .030$ ). In other words, despite the slight increase in Permissive

Messages, women in 2021 still received more Restrictive Messages than permissive. On the other hand, for Men, the level of Permissive Messages was found to be higher in 2021 than 2005 ( $EMM = 2.40$ ,  $SE = .046$ ;  $EMM = 2.19$ ,  $SE = .036$ , respectively); and the level of Restrictive Messages is lower in 2021 than 2005 ( $EMM = 2.30$ ,  $SE = .047$ ;  $EMM = 2.56$ ,  $SE = .036$ , respectively). Thus, the gender gap seems to have increased by 2021 in terms of the messages about sexuality.

**Table 3.22.**

*Estimated Marginal Means (95% Confidence Interval) of messages as a function of source, valence, cohort, and gender.*

Source	Valence	Women		Men	
		2005	2021	2005	2021
Same-Sex	Permissive	2.26 ± 0.1	2.98 ± 0.1	2.68 ± 0.14	3.23 ± 0.18
Friend	Restrictive	2.47 ± 0.08	1.92 ± 0.08	2.22 ± 0.11	1.7 ± 0.14
Opposite-Sex	Permissive	2.79 ± 0.1	3.34 ± 0.1	2.33 ± 0.13	2.91 ± 0.16
Friend	Restrictive	2.01 ± 0.08	1.64 ± 0.08	2.4 ± 0.12	1.87 ± 0.15
Parents	Permissive	1.63 ± 0.09	1.78 ± 0.09	1.69 ± 0.13	2.19 ± 0.16
	Restrictive	2.84 ± 0.11	2.74 ± 0.1	2.76 ± 0.13	2.06 ± 0.16
Media	Permissive	2.77 ± 0.1	1.96 ± 0.1	2.81 ± 0.14	2.17 ± 0.18
	Restrictive	2.10 ± 0.09	2.85 ± 0.09	2.17 ± 0.12	2.59 ± 0.15
Religion	Permissive	1.38 ± 0.07	1.27 ± 0.06	1.45 ± 0.1	1.52 ± 0.13
	Restrictive	3.27 ± 0.09	3.59 ± 0.09	3.26 ± 0.12	3.27 ± 0.16
All sources	Permissive	2.16 ± 0.05	2.27 ± 0.05	2.19 ± 0.08	2.40 ± 0.10
	Restrictive	2.54 ± 0.06	2.55 ± 0.05	2.56 ± 0.08	2.30 ± 0.10

Lastly, the Source and Valence interaction also varied as to Cohort; as well as the Source and Valence and Gender interaction. As presented in Table 3.22, Permissive Messages received from Same-sex and Opposite-sex friends are higher than Restrictive Messages both in 2005 and in 2021. Moreover, as Permissive Messages from friends seem to have increased and Restrictive Messages to have decreased; this difference between them is much more pronounced in 2021. Further,

this pattern is more markedly observed for women, as their messages from Same-Sex friends were slightly more Restrictive in 2005 and became markedly more Permissive in 2021.

On the other hand, for men, messages from Same-Sex friends were more Permissive than Restrictive for both years, and the mean difference slightly increased in 2021. The reverse was observed for messages from Opposite-sex Friends that men received almost equal levels of Restrictive and Permissive Messages from them in 2005, whereas more clearly Permissive messages in 2021. In other words, both men and women received more Permissive and less Restrictive Messages from their female friends by 2021.

For both cohorts, Restrictive Messages were higher than Permissive Messages from Parents. However as Permissive Messages were slightly higher and Restrictive Messages were lower in 2021 than in 2005, the difference is less pronounced in 2021. When women and men were considered separately, it is observed that as a result of this pattern the Permissive Messages received from Parents could slightly exceed the Restrictive by 2021, but only for men.

Religious Sources, with a marked inclination towards Restrictiveness for both cohorts, remained almost the same. However, Conventional Media not only became a lower rated source as mentioned above, but also the valence of the messages received from Media was reversed (See Table 3.18). In other words, while Conventional Media was more Permissive ( $EMM = 2.79, SE = .042$ ) than Restrictive ( $EMM = 2.14, SE = .039$ ) in 2005; it became more Restrictive ( $EMM = 2.72, SE = .045$ ) than Permissive ( $EMM = 2.06, SE = .050$ ) in 2021. These patterns were observed to be same for both genders.

### **3.5.2 Comparison of Sexual Stereotypes**

In order to identify whether the sexual stereotypes, as assessed by the subscales of Male Role, Female Role, and Double Standard and their association with gender differed for 2005 and 2021 samples, A MANOVA was conducted with Cohort (2005 vs. 2021) and Gender as between-subjects factor and stereotype



scores as dependent variables. The multivariate test for Cohort was significant,  $F(3, 816) = 108.509, p = .000$ ; and Gender as well as Gender and Cohort interaction were not significant.

Univariate tests further confirmed that all subscales, regardless of gender, demonstrated significant differences as to cohort;  $F(1, 818) = 66.188, p = .000$  for Male Role,  $F(1, 818) = 275.133, p = .000$  for Female Role, and  $F(1, 818) = 186.995, p = .000$  for Double Standard. The descriptive statistics presented in Table 3.23 indicate that all dimensions of stereotypical sexual belief were lower in 2021 than in 2005.

**Table 3.23.**

*Descriptive statistics of sexual stereotypes for 2005 and 2021 samples.*

	2005		2021	
	M	SD	M	SD
Male Sexual Role	4.14	1.40	3.19	1.66
Female Sexual Role	3.40	1.25	2.00	1.02
Double Standard	3.49	1.23	2.15	1.24

### 3.5.2 Comparison of Sexual Experience Frequencies

Frequencies and percentages of the participants who had a non-intercourse sexual experience and had sexual intercourse for both 2005 and 2021 samples are demonstrated in Table 3.24. Chi-square analyses were conducted to see whether these samples significantly differed. It was observed that the number of participants who had a non-sexual intercourse were higher in 2021 as compared to 2005,  $\chi^2(1, N = 819) = 30.935, p = .000$ . The difference was also significant and even more striking for sexual intercourse,  $\chi^2(1, N = 816) = 60.012, p = .000$ .

**Table 3.24.**

*Frequencies and percentages of sexual experiences.*

	2005	2021
<i>Non-Intercourse Experience</i>		
No	134 (30%)	53 (14%)
Yes	307 (70%)	325 (86%)
<i>Sexual Intercourse</i>		
No	265 (60.5%)	126 (33%)
Yes	173 (39.5%)	252 (67%)

As seen in Table 3.24, while the majority (60.5%) of the sample reported that they did not have a sexual intercourse experience in 2005; a slightly higher majority (67%) reported that they did have sexual intercourse in 2021. These patterns were observed in the same way for women and men.

### **3.5.3. Comparison of Token Resistance, and Consent to Unwanted Sex Frequencies**

Frequencies and percentages of the participants who had Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex experiences for both 2005 and 2021 samples are demonstrated in Table 3.25.

Chi-square analyses were conducted to see whether these samples significantly differed. The percentages of participants who experienced Token Resistance,  $\chi^2(1, N = 821) = 5.445, p = .021$ , and Consent to Unwanted Sex,  $\chi^2(1, N = 813) = 41.626, p = .000$ , were higher in 2021 as compared to 2005.

When the differences as to Cohort were explored separately for men and women, it is observed that the increase in Consent to Unwanted Sex was significant for women but not for men. The percentage of women who reported to have consented to unwanted sex was 10% in 2005 and 32% in 2021.

**Table 3.25.**

*Frequencies and percentages of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex*

	2005	2021
<i>Token Resistance</i>		
No	294 (66%)	221 (58.5%)
Yes	149 (34 %)	157 (41.5%)
<i>Consent to Unwanted Sex</i>		
No	389 (89%)	271 (72%)
Yes	48 (11%)	107 (28%)

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **DISCUSSION**

The basic aim of this study was to study the gendered experience of sexuality among university students in Turkey. It was intended to present the sexual lives of Turkish university students both in a descriptive and comparative manner with a special focus on online sexual activities. The study was based on the original study of Boratav and Cavdar (2012) and explored messages about sexuality, sexual beliefs, sexual experiences, issues of consent and resistance with their relation to religiosity and conservatism. In this section, the findings are discussed with a reference to the literature and comparisons are made with the original study to see the changes in the sexual lives of university students over the years.

#### **4.1. SEXUAL MESSAGES AND SEXUAL STEREOTYPES**

As university life brings a liberation in sexual attitudes and behaviors (Lyons et al., 2014), traditional sexual scripts and sexual double standards still shape the sexual lives of young adults (Kreager et al., 2016). This is crucial for the Turkish community as sexual attitudes in Turkey has been shaped by traditional sexual norms, conservatism and gender inequality (Askun & Ataca, 2007; Cindoglu & Unal, 2017; Kagitcibasi & Sunar, 1992) as well as the restrictive teachings of Islam (Leo, 2014). In fact, the findings of the current study confirmed a gender segregation in regards to the sexual attitudes of the university students as young men were found to be influenced by a high level of permissiveness in contrast to young women who encountered more inhibitory sexual messages. Moreover, the gender gap regarding the messages about sexuality has increased between 2005 and 2021: Where men have started to get more permissive messages over the years, women still received more restrictive messages. This finding did not support the hypothesis that both genders would have received more restrictive messages than permissive ones pointing to an ongoing inhibition in regards to women's sexuality in Turkey. However, as hypothesized, the level of permissiveness was overall

higher for the whole group and an increase in permissiveness was observed over the years indicating a change towards more liberal norms.

Looking at the sources of sexual messages, similar to recent studies (Avci et al., 2016; Evcili & Golbasi, 2017), online media and friends were the top sources of sexual messages for young adults in this study and these messages were more of a permissive nature. This is an important shift from 2005 as over the years young adults started receiving fewer sexual messages from their parents and conventional media but more from their friends.

In the traditional settings, parents are the main source of sexual messages (Darling & Hicks, 1982). However, in comparison to the original study (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012), since 2005, the extent of the received parental messages showed a decline. In fact, in the current study, parents consigned the lowest level of sexual messages. Parents with higher educational degrees are found to have and pass on more liberal attitudes toward sexuality (Bancroft, 2009). As parental messages became slightly more permissive by 2021 and the parental education level was high in the current study, it is seen that parental sexual messages were still more restrictive. Looking at the gender differences, parents conferred predominantly restrictive sexual messages for women and slightly more permissive ones for men. This points out to a current gender discrepancy that parental sexual messages are usually inhibiting and risk-oriented for women (Flores and Barroso, 2017). This is an important aspect since parents were still rated as a top prominent source of sexual messages along with friends as they did in 2005, although the amount of sexual messages offered by parents decreased over the years. So, young people still valued the gendered sexual messages offered by parents.

Peer groups are an important source of sexual information and transmission of sexual messages. Peer approval, peer pressures, an estimate of peer's sexual activity and the number of partners increase sexual permissiveness and the likelihood of sexual activity (Holman & Sillars, 2012; Martens et al., 2006; Nogueira Avelar E Silva et al., 2020; van de Bongardt et al., 2015). In the current study too, peer groups offered a very high level of sexual messages and these messages were more permissive. In fact, compared with the original study (Boratav

& Cavdar, 2012), these sexual messages became more permissive since 2005. Additionally, young adults predominantly took into account of their friends' sexual messages more than other sources. However, as hypothesized, gender differences were observed. Although the permiseveness of sexual messages offered by women increased by 2021; similar to the findings of Trin and Arbor (2016), same-sex messages regarding sexuality were found to be still more restrictive for women. On the contrary, for men, same-sex friends gave out more permissive sexual messages. Additionally, both men and women gave at most importance to these gendered sexual messages received from their same-sex friends. So as there is a move towards more permissiveness regarding peer sexual messages, there is an ongoing gender discrepancy which points out to the persistence of traditional scripts in the Turkish society (Boratav, 2006).

Similar to the findings of Black et al. (2018), online media was the most frequent source of sexual messages among young adults in the current study. It seems that young people turn to online content for sexual information when the other sources of information are more restrictive (Bleakley et al., 2008; Evcili & Golbasi, 2017; Hetsroni, 2008). This might also refer to the contextual change of conventional media over the years from being a source of permissiveness to restrictiveness in regards to sexual messages. As young people started giving less importance to the discouraging sexual messages offered by conventional media, the encouraging sexual messages of online media seem to be more valued by young people. Additionally, it is stated that media can effect young adults' sexuality either by reinforcing traditional scripts (Ward, 2002) or by creating new and permissive attitudes (Baams et al., 2015; Chaves et al., 2005). In the current milieu, this discrepancy seems to appear between the conventional and the online media for young people. Another discrepancy is observed between the genders, as men gave a higher importance to the sexual messages of online media.

Religious and moral teachings promote more conservative sexual attitudes (Grove, 2006). In this study too, religious sources offered the most inhibitory sexual messages. However, young adults of the current study ranked religious sources as the least important source of sexual messages. Interestingly, as the

sample was of very low levels of religiosity, the amount of sexual messages offered by religious sources, which were predominantly restrictive, showed an increase over the years. This points out to an increased exposure of religious messages regarding sexuality by 2021 when compared with the original research (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012). An interesting finding of the current study is the link of religiosity and conservatism with restrictive messages for men. Surprisingly, the gender discrepancy which was presumed in the favor of men (Askun & Ataca, 2007) was not supported especially in the case of conservatism.

Compared with the original research (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012), the traditional beliefs about gendered roles in sexual relationships showed a decrease since 2005. Still, in the current study, there was a higher endorsement of the male sexual stereotype by both men and women. This suggests a higher acceptance of men's willingness for sex and men's premarital sexuality by university students. Stereotypic expectations for women were not as highly endorsed by the young adults which might be explained by the more liberal nature of the university setting. There was a gender discrepancy regarding the sexual double standard as it was more endorsed by men. For men, encouraging sexual messages were linked with a higher acceptance of the sexual double standard indicating more restrictive attitudes toward women's premarital sexuality as well as showing more acceptance of men's sexual desire as being stronger and men's role in sex as leading. This is in align with the findings of Askun and Ataca (2007), Kukulcu et al. (2009), Yazici et al. (2012) that college men endorse sexual double standards and oppose women's premarital sexuality more often than women. Again, similar to the results of Ergun (2007), religiosity and conservatism were linked with the sexual double standards as well as the other sexual stereotypes as expected.

## 4.2. DYNAMICS OF SEXUAL EXPERIENCES

### 4.2.1. Offline Sexual Experiences

In the current study, as expected, the number of university students who had both non-intercourse sexual experiences and sexual intercourse has increased since 2005. The majority of the participants had non-intercourse sexual activities with rates higher than earlier studies (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012; Cok et al., 2001). Additionally, more than half of the participants (68.37%) had sexual intercourse. This frequency was also higher than other Turkish studies where sexual intercourse rates were around 30% among university students, ranging between 8% to 61% (Aras et al., 2007; Boratav & Cavdar, 2012; Cok et al., 2001; Golbasi & Kelleci, 2011; Gökengin et al., 2003, Saracoglu et al., 2014; Yazici et al., 2012). Supporting the hypothesis, the frequency of women who had sexual intercourse in this study (67%) was much higher from previous studies which showed rates between 3% to 25% (Aras et al., 2007; Askun & Ataca, 2007; Boratav & Cavdar, 2012; Cok et al., 2001; Golbasi & Kelleci, 2011; Saracoglu et al., 2014; Yazici et al., 2012). Still, the hypothesis that more men would have sexual experiences was supported except for the rates of non-intercourse sexual activities.

As for the age of first sexual experience, it is seen that women started non-intercourse sexual activities at an older age ( $M = 16.83$ ,  $SD = 2.4$ ) than men ( $M = 15.57$ ,  $SD = 2.42$ ). This finding points out that young women and men usually have their first offline sexual interactions before their time at the university as depicted by Bancroft (2009). For penetrative activities, the age of first sexual intercourse was on average 18,19 ( $SD = 2.18$ ) for the total group with men starting to have sexual intercourse at a younger age ( $M = 16.95$ ,  $SD = 1.79$ ) than women ( $M = 18.76$ ,  $SD = 2.12$ ). These findings were similar to the results of other Turkish surveys which showed a first age of sexual intercourse between ages of 15-19 with men experiencing sexual intercourse about two years younger than women (Askun & Ataca, 2007; CETAD, 2006b; Erenel & Golbasi, 2011; Gelbal et al., 2008; Golbaşı & Kelleci, 2011; Gökengin et al., 2003; Saracoğlu et al., 2014).



Regarding the current relationships, about half of the participants indicated having a partner with a relationship duration of almost two years. So, even if Covid-19 restrictions prevented university students to socialize and date in person, about half of the participants had a steady partner and remained in their intimate relationships. While the number of dating partners did not differ between men and women, as predicted, men had more non-intercourse and sexual intercourse partners as well as partners that fit their ideal sexual scenario. These findings were similar to the original study of Boratav & Cavdar (2012). However, compared with the original study, for both men and women, the mean number of partners were much higher in the current study, showing a dramatic increase for women. Additionally, the majority of the students had more than one non-penetrative as well as penetrative sex partners and these rates were also higher than prior Turkish studies (Cok et al., 2001; Golbasi and Kelleci, 2011; Siyez & Siyez, 2009).

Sexual pleasure and having fun become primary motivations for sexual activities in university relationships (Lyons et al., 2014). Similarly, for both women and men in this study, Desire and Curiosity were the top reasons for both non-intercourse experiences and sexual intercourse. This was a departure from the original study as Curiosity came to the picture in the act of a sexual motivation. However, it is suggested that young women's sexuality is motivated mostly by relational factors (Kaestle & Evans, 2018; Wongsomboon et al., 2020). Also, love (Özan et al., 2004) and closeness to the partner (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012) are listed among the top reasons for the sexual experiences of Turkish college women. For the current study too, Closeness to the Partner was found to be a major motive for sexual intercourse among women. Additionally, it is suggested that verbal and physical coercion are important reasons for the sexual experiences of young women (Gutzmer et al., 2016; Katz & Tirone, 2010; Livingston et al., 2004; Muehlenhard et al., 2017; Pugh & Becker, 2018). Likewise, in the current study, compared with men, more women indicated Partner's Coercion as a reason for non-intercourse experiences and sexual intercourse. This points out to an ongoing consent issue within the sexual relationships for women. So, the hypothesis that motivations of sex would vary among men and women was supported except for the most

important reasons for non-intercourse sexual activities and sexual intercourse.

Looking at the interactions of sexual messages, sexual stereotypes, religiosity and conservatism with offline sexual behaviors, the effect on coital experiences is noticed. It is seen that religiosity and conservatism were higher for individuals who did not have sexual intercourse. The increase in sexual double standards linked with not having sexual intercourse, especially for women. Additionally, women with higher conservatism started the first sexual experiences at an older age. The number of non-sexual intercourse partners also increased for women with higher religiosity and conservatism. These results are in parallel to the findings that the traditional gender conditioning and the inhibitory religious scripts depict women to refrain from coital activities (Aker et al., 2019; Davidson et al., 2019, Kreager; 2016; Pluhar et al., 1998; Sumer, 2015). As another emerging finding, the permissiveness of sexual messages did not predict a higher number of non-coital and sexual intercourse partners, not supporting the hypothesis.

To sum up, it seems that university students and especially young women, were engaged in more frequent non-penetrative sex, got more involved in penetrative sex and had a higher total number of partners as compared to the past results of Boratav & Cavdar (2012). University students showed personal factors like Desire and Curiosity as main reasons for both non-coital and coital sexual behaviors along with more relational motivations among women. Partners' Coercion still effected the sexual experience of young women. As the effect of sexual messages seem to diminish, the religious scripts and sexual double standards continue to color the offline sexual experience of women.

#### **4.2.2. Online Sexual Experiences**

Online sex has become an emerging phenomena for young adults (Ballester-Arnal et al., 2014; Black et al., 2018; Byers & Shaughnessy, 2014; Klein & Cooper, 2019) and the findings of the current research confirm the high frequency of online sex practices among Turkish university students. It is seen that more than half of both women (54%) and men (66%) and again more than half of the total sample

(58%) in the current study had practiced online sex. These rates were higher than other Turkish studies which showed a frequency of online sex between 21% to 51% (Morelli et al., 2020; Ozan et al., 2010; Ucar et al.2016). It is suggested that in the times of Covid-19 outbreak, young adults use internet more for online sexual practices due to restrictions and the fear of corona transmission during sex (Döring, 2020). In this sense, the Covid-19 lock-downs in Turkey might have influenced the increased reliance on online sex during restrictions. Moreover, similar to the findings of Ucar et al. (2016) in the current study, men exceeded women on the frequency of online sex as expected.

Online sex can be practiced in a number of ways including sending or receiving sexuality explicit messages, photos, pictures, calls, live or recorded videos, pornographic material via cell phones, dating apps, chat rooms, fantasy role-play rooms and/or other internet sites (Courtice & Shaughnessy, 2017). In the current research, the most frequent online practice for both men and women were sex-texting followed by sharing seminude/ nude self-photos for women and live-chatting for men, revealing gender differences. Additionally, similar to the findings of Ucar et al. (2016), men used pornographic material more often. They also engaged in online video chatting more frequently. Furthermore, the most common routes of online sex were messaging applications and the least used route was emails. Men also used the routes of online sex more than women as hypothesized.

To the acknowledgement of the researcher, as there has been prevalence studies regarding online sex among teens and young adults, this study was the first to determine the first age of online sexual practices in Turkey. The first age of online sexual experience was found to be on average 16.91years ( $SD = 1.97$ ) for men, 18.11 years ( $SD = 2.44$ ) for women and 17.71 years ( $SD = 2.36$ ) for the whole sample. It is seen that women were found to start online sex at an older age than men, similar to offline sexual practices. Additionally, it is noticed that young adults start non-sexual intercourse experiences at an earlier age than online sex and they experience sexual intercourse at older ages than both of these sexual practices. As non-coital activities are usually regarded as a precursor of sexual intercourse among

young people (Bancroft, 2009), this finding might suggest the use of online sex has become an additional step before sexual intercourse.

Again, to the acknowledgement of the researcher, this was the first study to determine the number of online sex partners for young adults in Turkey. For the number of partners in online sex, it is seen that 66% of the participants indicated having more than one online sex partner and 20% had six or more online sex partners. As it was hypothesized, the number of online sex partners were higher for men who had average 3.84 partners ( $SD = 1.94$ ) compared to women who had on average 2.5 partners ( $SD = 1.72$ ). For the whole group, the number of online sex partners was on average 2.94 ( $SD = 1.9$ ).

Cooper et al. (2016) found flirtation, partner request, experimentation and partner pressures to be the most reoccurring reasons for online sex. In this study, similar to offline sexual experiences, Desire was listed as the top reason for online sex for both men and women. However, there were gender differences regarding the motivations of online sex. As men mentioned Curiosity and Peer Influence more than women; women mentioned Feeling Closer, Pleasing the Partner and Partner's Coercion more than men as reasons for engaging in online sex. In fact, Pleasing the Partner and Partner's Coercion were more mentioned by women when compared with offline sexual experiences. As Turkey ranks in the top for sexting under pressure among 10 other countries (Morelli et al., 2020), the results of this research showed that partner pressure is an important incentive for women to engage in online sex. On the other hand, compared with offline sexual experiences, Peer Influence was a greater motivator for online sex among men. As Doornwaard et al. (2015) found that young adults who perceive their peers to be practicing online sex are more likely to practice it themselves, the findings suggest that online sex was a discussed topic within male peer groups and evoked curiosity. Overall, the results suggest the emphasis of more recreational aspects of online sex for men and more relational aspects of online sex for women. This is in parallel to the finding that young men are more open to online sex with strangers, whereas young women tend to prefer this practice with their partners (Byers & Shaughnessy, 2014).

It is indicated that young people who receive parental disapproval of sex usually turn to media for sexual information (Bleakley et al., 2008) especially if they were raised in religious families (Hetsroni, 2008). However, in contrast to the expectations, religiosity, conservatism or restrictive messages did not predict the first age of online sex and the number of online sex partners. On the contrary, participants who had more permissive messages engaged in more frequent online sex and started online sex at a younger age. The most dramatic gender difference was observed for the link between sexual double standards and online sex. Lower sexual double standard scores in women and higher sexual double standard scores in men were associated with more frequent online sex activities. Additionally, those men who endorsed male sexual stereotypes more also engaged in more often online sex as expected. This is align with the findings of Symons et al. (2018) that, for young adults, online sex and sexting is becoming a normative script concurrent with gender stereotypes and sexual scripts in society.

All in all, the results of this study show that online sex is a popular sexual activity among Turkish university students who usually have had multiple online sex partners for this practice. Moreover, a higher number of young men were engaged in online sex, with more partners and personal motivations as well as more recreational routes of online sex. It is seen that the sexual scripts that regard men and women as having high vs. weak sexual drives, seeking recreational sex vs. relational sex, pursuing vs. resisting sexual initiatives, acceptance of more vs. less sexual partners (Masters et al., 2013) are also evident in the experience of online sex.

#### **4.2.3. Experiences of Token Resistance and Consent to Unwanted Sex**

Token resistance was a common experience in the current study and compared with the original research (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012), the rate of token resistance has increased since 2005. As expected, more women had experienced token resistance and within a higher number of occasions. Women's prevalence of token resistance (49%) was in align with other studies which had rates between

37% and 59% (Krahe & Scheinberger-Olwig, 2000; Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988; Muehlenhard & McCoy, 1991; Sprecher et al., 1994).

According to Muehlenhard and Hollabaugh (1988), token resistance highlights the feminine part of sexuality where women are expected to refuse sex not be seen as loose or promiscuous (Butler & Lewis, 1993; Masters et al., 2013). In this study too, it is seen that women experienced token resistance especially within serious relationships, suggesting a concern of expressing desire with serious partners. Muehlenhard and Hollabaugh (1988) had found the reasons of token resistance to be either practical, moral or manipulative and emphasized the predominance of moral reasons. Muehlenhard & Rodgers (1998) added relational motivations of token resistance like adding an interest to the relationship or exerting power over the partner. In this research, practical reasons like Not Sure/ Not Ready and Unsuitable for Sex as well as moral concerns like Religious Teachings and Shame held women to express their desire freely. On the other hand, it seems that men experienced token resistance more within casual relationships. They have also encountered this experience with acquaintances more than women. Men's refusals seemed to focus on both practical reasons like Not Sure/ Not Ready and Not Wanting Sex as well as relational concerns like To Protect the Partner and Fear of Regret. These findings suggest a general concern regarding women's sexuality by both genders.

Compared with token resistance, consent to unwanted sex was less experienced by the whole group (30.5%). As the ratio of consent to unwanted sex experience was lower compared to other studies that show a frequency between 40% to nearly 50% among college students (Katz & Tirone, 2010; Sprecher et al., 1994), it was much higher than other Turkish studies with rates of 2.5% to 10% (Dikmen et al., 2018; Aydin et al., 2014; Selcuk et al., 2018). Additionally, compared with the original research (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012), it is seen that the rate of consent to unwanted sex has increased for women since 2005. As expected, more women experienced consent to unwanted sex and within a higher number of occasions.

It is suggested that partner's verbal pressures, a history of giving in to these pressures and social scripts that depict women as always accepting their partners' sexual advances might lead to consent to unwanted sex experiences (Bay-Cheng and Eliseo-Arras, 2008; Gutzmer et al., 2016; Katz & Tirone, 2010; Livingston et al., 2004). Additionally, Boratav & Cavdar (2012) found in their original research that for consent to unwanted sex, women indicated more relationship related intentions and men more impulse related reasons. However, in this search, as women encountered consent to unwanted sex more in serious relationships and men in more casual relationships; both gave consent to unwanted sex with more relational reasons like To Please the Partner, Fear of Break-up and Verbal Coercion. Men's concern of relationship preservation might be explained by the sample's move toward a more egalitarian outlook that emphasize relational aspects of sexuality. An interesting finding was that a majority of men and women gave consent to unwanted sex due to Sexual Arousal. This points to the ambiguity of sexual desire where wanting and not wanting sex might happen concurrently during a sexual encounter (Muehlenhard & Peterson, 2005; Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2007).

In contrast to hypotheses, the number of times that token resistance or consent to unwanted sex were experienced by the participants did not link with sexual messages, religiosity or conservatism except the positive link between the restrictive sexual messages and the experience of consent to unwanted sex for women. This contrasted the results of the original research (Boratav & Cavdar, 2012) which had shown a positive link between permissive sexual messages and consent to unwanted sex. This difference might suggest that the restrictive messages that emphasize the dangers and consequences of sex might have resulted in giving up to the partner's Verbal Coercion. This is also indicated by previous researchers (Gutzmer et al., 2016; Katz & Tirone, 2010) that if there is a history of giving in to verbal pressures, women might re-consent to unwanted sex, believing that it would be useless to resist and it would protect them from sexual coercion. The restrictive messages might lead women to indicate that they consent to sex with the goal of relationship protection but at the same time they might believe that they

have no choice as it is useless to refuse sex. Women might fear of losing their partner if they do not comply, which in turn might cause negative emotions (Impett & Peplau, 2002).

As a last note, to the researcher's acknowledgement this is the first study to recognize the online sexual contexts for the experience of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex besides offline situations. With 47% of the participants having token resistance and 36% of the participants having consent to unwanted sex experiences both in offline and online sexual occasions, it seems that token resistance and consent to unwanted sex are not only offline but also common online sexual experiences.

### **4.3. CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS**

This study offered several contributions to the existing literature on young adults' sexuality. First of all, the results revealed a snapshot of the current sexual attitudes, offline and online sexual experiences as well as resistance and consent issues of the university students. Also, by replicating the study of Boratav and Cavdar (2012) after over a decade, the change of sexual norms among younger generations was discovered. Furthermore, the previous research on token resistance and consent to unwanted sex was extended with the involvement of online context of these sexual experiences.

The findings of this research pointed to the liberalization of sexuality among Turkish university students. As seen from the results, over the last decade, university students, especially young women, became more liberal in regards to their sexual attitudes. They are found to be experimenting more offline sex and they are highly involved in online sex behaviors. University students get influenced by the sexual messages conveyed in the online media and they shape their sexual lives by the sexual norms offered within their entourage. However, gender discrepancies still prevail among young adults resulting in sexual double standards, an inhibition of women's sexuality and consequently consent issues. These findings suggest



that sexual education and sexual counselling both in biological and psychological terms should become a priority for the well-being of young adults.

An important aspect of the increased sexual experimentation is the amplified frequency of token resistance and consent to unwanted sex. It is seen that young adults have conflictual feelings over sexual initiations and often have a hard time to express their sexual desires and wishes openly in their sexual encounters. As these experiences point to a continuation of sexual double standards within the young generations, they also designate a hesitancy of sexual communication among young adults. In this sense, the results point to the necessity of expanding the vocabulary of sexual consent and giving more information on the consensual and non-consensual aspects of sexual desire.

Contributing to the existing literature, the results show that online sex is an emerging feature of sexual experimentation among young adults and offers a novel space for sexual behaviors. However, as online sex has been associated with cybervictimization, depressive symptoms (Medrado et al., 2018), anxiety (Mori et al., 2019) and consent issues (Cooper et al., 2016; Drouin & Tobin, 2014; Drouin et al., 2015), these findings might be an important means to target the age groups for cyber-education. Being an under-researched topic, the issues of resistance and consent within online sexual relationships emerged within this research pointing out to the requisite of including online sexual resistance and consent matters within the proposed informative psycho-sexual programs.

#### **4.4. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

The major limitation of this study is the demographic characteristics of the participants. As the closure of the universities due to Covid-19 pandemic foreclosed the opportunities to reach university students in more Anatolian regions face to face; the requests to universities in more Eastern locations for the spread of the research's online survey were either non-responsive or refused. Consequently, the difficulty to reach and engage university students in more rural regions for an online survey effected the overall demographic features of the participants. The majority

of the participants were women, they were raised in urban settings by highly educated parents and they had low levels of religiosity and conservatism. These depict a more urbanized view of sexuality, more liberal sexual attitudes and a more active sexual life in college. However, the sample characteristics were similar in most ways to the original study of Boratav & Cavdar (2012), including a slightly more representation of young women and students from private universities. Even in this milieu, the results pointed to the continuation of sexual stereotypes and gender differences in regards to sexual attitudes, behaviors, resistance and consent issues which are in align with the existing literature. Nevertheless, the results of this research could be expanded with a more heterogeneous group of university students.

The reasons for offline and online sexual behaviors are important aspects of sexual experimentation for young adults. The results of the survey pointed out to the gender discrepancies for the contextual and relational aspects of these sexual activities. However, qualitative research can further explore the subjective sexual experience of young adults in response to sexual messages and sexual stereotypes. The ambiguity of sexual desire is a topic of importance as it was related to consent to unwanted sex experiences in this study. Moreover, again for the issue of consent, verbal coercion of women toward their partners emerged as a new finding. These subjects might also be investigated further. In this sense, online sex is a fairly new topic to examine which showed high rates of resistance and consent issues in this research.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study aimed to investigate the sexual lives of university students both in an exploratory and comparative fashion, focusing on sexual attitudes, offline and online sexual behaviors as well as issues of resistance and consent. The findings showed an increased level of liberalism among sexual attitudes and sexual behaviors over the last decade with more students being active in non-intercourse sexual experiences and sexual intercourse. Additionally, a high frequency of online sex was noticed among the young adults. However, gender discrepancies and sexual double standards were found to prevail among younger generations. Token resistance and consent to unwanted sex were found to be common experiences both in offline and online sexual encounters. The current study was the first study to follow up resistance and consent issues in Turkish university students as well as the first study to study online token resistance and online consent to unwanted sex experiences in university students which brings along crucial clinical implications for the well-being of young adults.

## REFERENCES

- Aras, S., Orcin, E., Ozan, S., & Semin, S. (2007). Sexual behaviours and contraception among university students in Turkey. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 39 (1), 121-135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021932006001258>
- Aker, S., Şahin, M. K., & Oğuz, G. (2019). Sexual myth beliefs and associated factors in university students. *Turkish Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 13(4), 472-480. <https://doi.org/10.21763/tjfm.653462>
- Askun, D., & Ataca, B. (2007). Sexuality related attitudes and behaviors of Turkish university students. *Archives of Sex Behavior*, 36 (5), 741-752.
- Avci, D., Şahin, H.A., & Guvendi, G. (2016). The determination of health school students' knowledge, attitudes and behaviors on the matter of sexual health in Eastern Turkey. *Eastern Journal of Medicine*, 21(3), 131-137. <https://doi.org/10.5505/ejm.2016.98608>
- Aydın, I.A.; Yıldırım, Ö.Ö., Durdane, Y., & Eren, D. (2014). University students' problem-solving behaviors and exposure to dating abuse in their romantic relationship. *Progress in Health Sciences*, 4 (2), 123-130.
- Baams, L., Overbeek, G., Dubas, J. S., Doornwaard, S.M., Rommes, E., & van Aken, M.A. (2015). Perceived realism moderates the relation between sexualized media consumption and permissive sexual attitudes in Dutch adolescents. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 44 (3), 743-754. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-014-0443-7>
- Ballester-Arnal, R., Castro-Calvo, J., Gil-Llario, M.D., & Giménez-García, C. (2014). Relationship status as an influence on cybersex activity: Cybersex, youth, and steady partner. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 40 (5), 444-456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2013.772549>
- Bancroft, J. (2009). *Human Sexuality and Its Problems* (3rd ed.). London: Churchill Livingstone Elsevier.
- Bancroft, J., & Graham, C.A. (2011). The varied nature of women's sexuality: unresolved issues and a theoretical approach. *Hormones and Behavior*, 59 (5), 717-729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2011.01.005>

- Barber, K. (2006). Sex and Power. In S. Seidman, N. Fischer, & C. Meeks (Eds.), *Introducing the New Sexuality Studies* (pp. 59-63). New York: Routledge Taylor&Francis Group,.
- Basson, R. (2000). The female sexual response: A different model. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 26 (1), 51-65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/009262300278641>
- Bay-Cheng, L.Y., & Bruns, A. E. (2016). Yes, but: Young women's views of unwanted sex at the intersection of gender and class. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40, 504-517.
- Bay-Cheng, L.Y., & Eliseo-Arras, R.K. (2008). The making of unwanted sex: Gendered and neoliberal norms in college women's unwanted sexual experiences. *Journal of Sex Research*, 45(4), 386-397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490802398381>
- Beres, M.A., Senn, C.Y., & McCaw, I. (2014). Navigating ambivalence: How heterosexual young adults make sense of desire differences. *Journal of Sex Research*, 51(7), 765-776. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2013.792327>
- Bianchi, D., Morelli, M., Baiocco, R., Cattelino, E., Laghi, F., & Chirumbolo, A. (2019). Family functioning patterns predict teenage girls' sexting. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 43(6), 507–514.
- Black, A., Rouhani, S., Todd, N., & Cook, J. (2018). Sources of sexual health information among adolescent females: Ten-year trends. *Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology*, 31(2), 217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpag.2018.02.010>
- Blau, F. D., Brummund, P., & Liu, A. Y. H. (2013). Trends in occupational segregation by gender 1970 –2009: Adjusting for the impact of changes in the occupational coding system. *Demography*, 50, 471– 492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-012-0151-7>
- Bleakley, A., Hennessy, M., Fishbein, M., & Jordan, A. (2008). It works both ways: The relationship between exposure to sexual content in the media and adolescent sexual behavior. *Media Psychology*, 11 (4), 443-461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213260802491986>

- Boratav, H. B. (2006). Making sense of heterosexuality: An exploratory study of young heterosexual identities in Turkey. *Sex Roles*, 54, 213-225. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9339-x>
- Boratav, H. B., & Cavdar, A. (2012). Sexual stereotypes and practices of university students in Turkey. *Archives of Sex Behavior*, 41 (1), 271-281.
- Bordini, G.S., & Sperb, T. M. (2013). Sexual double standard: A review of the literature between 2001 and 2010. *Sexuality & Culture*, 17, 686-704. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-012-9163-0>
- Boyacioglu, A.O., & Turkmen, A. (2008). Social and cultural dimensions of pregnancy and childbirth in eastern Turkey. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 10(3): 277-285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691050701673925>
- Butler, R. N., & Lewis, M. I. (1993). *The New Love and Sex after 60* (3rd ed.). New York: Ballantine Books
- Byers, E. S., & Shaughnessy, K. (2014). Attitudes toward online sexual activities. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 8 (1), article 10. <https://doi.org/10.5817/CP2014-1-10>
- Canan, S.N., Jozkowski, K.N., & Crawford, B.L. (2018). Sexual assault supportive attitudes: Rape myth acceptance and token resistance in Greek and non-Greek college students from two university samples in United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33 (22), 3502-3530. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516636064>
- CETAD. (2006a). *Sexual Health and Reproductive Health Research Part II*. Retrieved December 07, 2020, from [https://www.cetad.org.tr/CetadData/Books/10/2692011155537-Arastirma\\_sonuclari\\_Dosyasi\\_2\\_v2.pdf](https://www.cetad.org.tr/CetadData/Books/10/2692011155537-Arastirma_sonuclari_Dosyasi_2_v2.pdf)
- CETAD. (2006b). *Sexual Health and Reproductive Health Research Part I*. Retrieved December 07, 2020, from [https://www.cetad.org.tr/CetadData/Books/10/2692011154421-Arastirma\\_sonuclari\\_Dosyasi\\_1.pdf](https://www.cetad.org.tr/CetadData/Books/10/2692011154421-Arastirma_sonuclari_Dosyasi_1.pdf)
- CDC- Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2017). *Sexual activity and contraceptive use among teenagers in the United States, 2011–2015*.

- National Health Statistics Reports, 104. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr104.pdf>
- Cindoglu, D., & Unal, D. (2017). Gender and sexuality in the authoritarian discursive strategies of 'New Turkey'. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 24(1): 39-54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506816679003>
- Cok, F., Gray, L. A., & Ersever, H. (2001). Turkish university students' sexual behaviour, knowledge, attitudes and perceptions of risk related to HIV/AIDS. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 3 (1), 81-99.
- Cooper, A. (1998). Sexuality and the internet: Surfing into the new millennium. *Cyberpsychology Behav. Soc. Netw.*, 1, 187-193.
- Courtice, E. L., & Shaughnessy, K. (2017) Technology-mediated sexual interaction and relationships: a systematic review of the literature. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 32 (3-4), 269-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681994.2017.1397948>
- Cooper, K., Quayle, E., Jonsson, L., & Svedin, C.G. (2016). Adolescents and self-taken sexual images: A review of the literature. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 55, 706-716. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.10.003>
- Coyne, S., Ward, L., Kroff, S., Davis, E., Holmgren, H., Jensen, A., Erickson, S., & Essig, L. (2019). Contributions of mainstream sexual media exposure to sexual attitudes, perceived peer norms, and sexual behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 64 (4), 430-436. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2018.11.016>
- Daniels, K. C., Zimmerman, T. S., & Bowling, S. W. (2002). Barriers in the bedroom: A feminist application for working with couples. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 14 (2), 21-50.
- Darling, C. A., & Hicks, M. W. (1982). Parental influence on adolescence sexuality: Implications for parents as educators. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 11(45), 231-245.
- David L., & Delmonico, M. (1997). Cybersex: High tech sex addiction. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 4(2), 159-167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10720169708400139>

- Davidson, C.R., Turner-McGrievy G.M., Hilfinger Messias, D.K., Friedman, D.B., & Robillard, A.G. (2019). A pilot study examining religious organization affiliation, sexual health information sources and sexual behaviors among college students. *American Journal of Sexuality Education*, 14 (1), 32-54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15546128.2018.1518176>
- Davidson, J.K. Sr., Moore, N.B., Earle, J.R., & Davis, R. (2008). Sexual attitudes and behavior at four universities: Do region, race, and/or religion matter?. *Adolescence*, 43 (170), 189-220. PMID: 18689097.
- Davis A., Carrotte E., Hellard M., Temple-Smith M., & Lim M. (2017). Pornography as a source of education about sex and sexuality among a sample of 15–29 year old Australians. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 14 (5), e272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2017.04.685>
- Dikmen, H.A., Özaydın, T., & Yılmaz, S.D. (2018). Üniversitedeki Kadın Öğrencilerde Yaşanan Flört Şiddeti ile Anksiyete ve Umutsuzluk Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki. *Acıbadem Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9 (2), 170-176. <https://doi.org/10.31067/0.2018.9>
- Doornwaard, S. M., ter Bogt, T.F.M., Reitz, E., & van den Eijnden, R.J.J.M. (2015). Sex-related online behaviors, perceived peer norms and adolescents' experience with sexual behavior: Testing an integrative model. *PLoS ONE*, 10 (6): e0127787. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127787>
- Döring, N. (2020). How is the covid-19 pandemic affecting our sexualities? An overview of the current media narratives and research hypotheses. *Archives of Sex Behavior*, 49, 2765–2778. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-020-01790-z>
- Drouin, M., & Tobin, E. (2014). Unwanted but consensual sexting among young adults: Relations with attachment and sexual motivations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 31, 412–418. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.11.001>
- Drouin, M., & Miller, D. (2016). Online erotica usage as a mediator between internet addiction and engagement in risky online sexual behaviors. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research*, 10 (3), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.5817/CP2016-3-2>



- Drouin, M., Ross, J., & Jenkins, E. (2015). Sexting: A new, digital vehicle for intimate partner aggression?. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 50, 197-204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.04.001>
- Ebeođlu, M., & Karacan, E. (2019). Cinsellikle ilgili konularda iletiřim ile evlilik öncesi cinselliđe yönelik tutum: Üniversite sınıf düzeyinin ve cinsiyetin rolü. *Ege Eđitim Dergisi*, 20(1), 01–19. <https://doi.org/10.12984/egeefd.442010>
- Emmerink, P.M., van den Eijnden, R.J., Vanwesenbeeck, I., & Ter Bogt, T.F. (2016). The relationship between endorsement of the sexual double standard and sexual cognitions and emotions. *Sex Roles*, 75(7), 363-376. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0616-z>
- Emmers-Sommer, T.M. (2016). Do men and women differ in their perceptions of women’s and men’s saying “no” when they mean “yes” to sex: An examination between and within gender. *Sexuality & Culture*, 20, 373-385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-015-9330-1>
- Erenel, A., & Golbasi, Z. (2011). Unprotected sexual intercourse and unplanned pregnancy experience of Turkish university students. *Sexuality and Disability*, 29, 75-80. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11195-010-9186-0>
- Ergun, M. (2007). “Social determinants of attitudes towards women's premarital sexuality among female turkish university students”. *Sexuality & Culture* , 11 (3), 1-10.
- Eriř, Ö., & Yazıcı, A. (2019). Üniversite yařamının cinsel mit ve tutumlara etkisi. *Çukurova Medical Journal*, 44 (4), 1432-1441. <https://doi.org/10.17826/cumj.598807>
- Escobar-Chaves, S.L., Tortolero, S.R., Markham, C. M., Low, B. J., Eitel, P., & Thickestun, P. (2005). Impact of the media on adolescent sexual attitudes and behaviors. *Pediatrics*, 116(1), 303-26.
- Evcili, F., & Golbasi, Z. (2017). Sexual myths and sexual health knowledge levels of Turkish university students. *Sexuality & Culture*, 21, 976-990. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-017-9436-8>

- Farvid, P., Braun, V., & Roney, C. (2017). 'No girl wants to be called a slut!': Women, heterosexual casual sex and the sexual double standard. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 26(5), 544-560. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2016.1150818>
- Fidan, F., & Yeşil, Y. (2018). Nedenleri ve sonuçları itibariyle flört şiddeti. *Balkan ve Yakın Doğu Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 04 (01), 16-24.
- Frith, H., & Kitzinger, C. (1997). Talk about sexual miscommunication. *Womens' Studies International Forum*, 20 (4), 517-528. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-5395\(97\)87415-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-5395(97)87415-8)
- Frith, H., & Kitzinger, C. (2001). Reformulating Sexual Script Theory. *Theory & Psychology*, 11, 209-232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354301112004>
- Gagnon, J., & Simon, W. (1973). *Sexual conduct: The social sources of human sexuality*. Chicago: Aldine
- Gagnon, J.H., Rosen, R.C., & Leiblum, S.R. (1982). Cognitive and social aspects of sexual dysfunction: sexual scripts in sex therapy. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 8, 44-56.
- Gelbal, S., Duyan, V., & Ozturk, A. B. (2008). Gender differences in sexual information sources, and sexual attitudes and behaviors of university students in Turkey. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 36(8), 1035-1052.
- Gokengin, D., Yamazhan, T., Özkaya, D., Aytuğ, Ş., Ertem, E., Arda, B., & Serter, D. (2003). Sexual knowledge, attitudes, and risk behaviors of students in Turkey. *Journal of School Health*, 73(7), 258-263.
- Golbasi, Z., & Kelleci, M. (2011). Sexual experience and risky sexual behaviours of Turkish university students. *Archives of Gynecological Obstetrics*, 283(3), 531-537. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00404-010-1363-y>
- Grove, J. (2006). Christianity and the Regulation of Sexuality in the United States. In S. Seidman, N. Fischer, & C. Meeks (Eds.), *Introducing the New Sexuality Studies* (pp. 342-348). New York: Routledge Taylor&Francis Group.

- Gutzmer, K., Ludwig-Barron, N.T., Wyatt, G.E., Hamilton, A.B., & Stockman, J.K. (2016). "Come on baby. You know I love you": African American women's experiences of communication with male partners and disclosure in the context of unwanted sex. *Archives of Sex Behavior*, 45, 807-819. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-015-0688-9>
- Hawkes, G. (1996). *The Sociology of Sex and Sexuality*. Berkshire: Open University Press, McGraw Hill House
- Hetsroni, A. (2008). Dependency and adolescents' perceived usefulness of information on sexuality: A cross-cultural comparison of interpersonal sources, professional sources and the mass media. *Communication Reports*, 21(1), 14-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08934210802019330>
- Hickman, S.E., & Muehlenhard, C.L. (1999). "By the semi-mystical appearance of a condom": How young women and men communicate sexual consent in heterosexual situations. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 36 (3), 258-272.
- Higgins, L.T., & Sun, C. (2007). Gender, social background and sexual attitudes among Chinese students. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 9(1), 31- 42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691050600963914>
- Holman, A., & Sillars, A. (2012). Talk about "hooking up": The influence of college student social networks on nonrelationship sex. *Health Communication*, 27(2), 205-216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2011.575540>
- Impett, E.A., & Peplau, L.A. (2002). Why some women consent to unwanted sex with a dating partner: Insights from attachment theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 360-370.
- ISSWSH—International Society for the Study of Women's Sexual Health. (2020). *ISSWSH releases updated position statement on sexual activity and COVID-19* [Press release]. Retrieved December 07, 2020 from <https://www.isswsh.org/news/349-isswsh-releases-updated-position-statement-on-sexual-activity-and-covid-19>

- James, K. (2006). Sexual Pleasure. In S. Seidman, N. Fischer, & C. Meeks (Eds.), *Introducing the New Sexuality Studies* (pp. 45-50). New York: Routledge Taylor&Francis Group.
- Jozkowski, K.N., Marcantonio, T.L., & Hunt, M.E. (2017). College students' sexual consent communication and perceptions of sexual double standards: A qualitative investigation. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 49 (4), 237-244. [https://doi.org/ 10.1363/psrh.12041](https://doi.org/10.1363/psrh.12041)
- Kadın Cinayetlerini Durduracağız Platformu. (2020). 2020 Raporu. Retrieved March 08, 2021 from <http://kadincinayetlerinidurduracagiz.net/veriler/2947/kadin-cinayetlerini-durduracagiz-platformu-2020-raporu>
- Kaestle, C. E., & Evans, L. M. (2018). Implications of no recent sexual activity, casual sex, or exclusive sex for college women's sexual well-being depend on sexual attitudes. *Journal of American College Health*, 66 (1), 32-40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2017.1369090>
- Kagıtcıbaşı, C., & Sunar, D. (1992). Family and Socialization in Turkey. In I. E. Sigel, J. L. Roopnarine, & D. B. Carter (Eds.), *Advances in Applied Developmental Psychology* (Vols. 5- Parent Child Socialization in Diverse Cultures) (pp. 75-88). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Cooperation.
- Karatay M, Karatay G, Gürarşlan Başı N, & Başı K. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine ilişkin tutum ve davranışları. *Sted*, 27(1): 62-71.
- Katz, J., & Tirone, V. (2009). Women's sexual compliance with male dating partners: Associations with investment in ideal womanhood and romantic well-being. *Sex Roles*, 60, 347-356.
- Katz, J., & Tirone, V. (2010). Going along with it: Sexually coercive partner behavior predicts dating women's compliance with unwanted sex. *Violence Against Women*, 16(7), 730-742. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210374867>

- Kaye, K. (2006). Sexual intercourse. In S. Seidman, N. Fischer, & C. Meeks (Eds.), *Introducing the New Sexuality Studies* (pp. 121-126). New York: Routledge Taylor&Francis Group.
- Kayı, Z., Yavuz, M.F., & Arıcan, N. (2000). Kadın üniversite gençliği ve mezunlarına yönelik cinsel saldırı mağdur araştırması. *Adli Tıp Bülteni*, 5(3), 157-163. <https://doi.org/10.17986/blm.200053421>
- Kim, J. L., & Ward, L. M. (2007). Silence speaks Volumes.: Parental sexual communication among Asian American emerging adults. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 22(1), 3–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558406294916>
- Klein, J. L., & Cooper, D. T.(2019). Deviant cyber-sexual activities in young adults: Exploring prevalence and predictions using in-person sexual activities and social learning theory. *Archives of Sex Behavior*, 48(2), 619-630. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1251-2>
- Krahe, B., & Scheinberger-Olwig, R. (2000). Ambiguous communication of sexual intentions as a risk marker of sexual aggression. *Sex Roles*, 42(5), 313-337. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007080303569>
- Kreager, D.A., Staff, J., Gauthier, R., Lefkowitz, E.S., & Feinberg, M.E. (2016). The double standard at sexual debut: Gender, sexual behavior and adolescent peer acceptance. *Sex Roles*, 75(7), 377-392. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0618-x>
- Kukulu, K., Gürsoy, E. & Sözer, G.A. (2009). Turkish university students' beliefs in sexual myths. *Sexuality and Disability*, 27, 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11195-009-9108-1>
- LaPlante, M.N., McCormick, N., & Brannigan, G.G. (1980). Living the sexual script: College students' views of influence in sexual encounters. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 16(4), 338-355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224498009551090>
- Lefkowitz, E. S., Gillen, M.M., Shearer, C. L., & Boone, T. L. (2004). Religiosity, sexual behaviors, and sexual attitudes during emerging adulthood, *The*

- Journal of Sex Research*, 41 (2), 150-159.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490409552223>
- Leiblum, S., Wiegel, M., & Brickle, F. (2003). Sexual attitudes of US and Canadian medical students: The role of ethnicity, gender, religion and acculturation. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 18(4), 473–491.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14681990310001609813>
- Leo, S. E. (2005). Islamic Female Sexuality and Gender in Modern Feminist Interpretation. *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 16 (2), 129-140.
- Little, J. (2003). Riding the rural love train: Heterosexuality and the rural community. *Jo. Sociologia Ruralis*, 43 (4), 401-418.
- Livingston, J. A., Buddie, A. M., Testa, M., & VanZile-Tamsen, C. (2004). The role of sexual precedence in verbal sexual coercion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28, 287–297.
- Luquis, R. R., Brelsford, G. M., & Rojas-Guyler, L.R. (2011). Religiosity, spirituality, sexual attitudes and sexual behaviors among college students. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 51, 601-614.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-011-9527-z>
- Lyons, H. A., Manning, W.D., Longmore, M.A., & Giordano, P.G. (2014). Young adult casual sexual behavior: Life course specific motivations and consequences. *Sociological Perspective*, 57 (1), 79-101.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121413517557>
- MacKinnon, C.A. (2002). Pleasure under Patriarchy. In C.L. Williams & A. Stein (Eds.), *Sexuality and Gender* (pp. 33-43). Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Martens, M.P., Page, J.C., Mowry, E.S., Damann, K.M., Taylor, K.K., & Cimini, M.D. (2006). Differences between actual and perceived student norms: An examination of alcohol use, drug use and sexual behavior. *Journal of American College Health*, 54(5), 295-300.  
<https://doi.org/10.3200/JACH.54.5.295-300>
- Masters, N.T., Casey, E., Wells, E.A., & Morrison, D.M. (2013). Sexual scripts among young heterosexually active men and women: Continuity and

- change. *Journal of Sex Research*, 50(5): 409-420.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558406294916>
- Medrano, J. L. J., Rosales, F. L., & Gamez-Guadix, M. (2018). Assessing the links of sexting, cybervictimization, depression, and suicidal ideation among university students. *Archives of Suicide Research*, 22 (1), 153-164.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2017.1304304>
- Meston, C., & Buss, D. (2007). Why humans have sex. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 36, 477-507. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-007-9175-2>
- Meston, C.M., Trapnell, P.D. & Gorzalka, B.B. (1996). Ethnic and gender differences in sexuality: Variations in sexual behavior between Asian and non-Asian university students. *Archives of Sex Behavior*, 25, 33–72.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02437906>
- Mestre-Bach, G., Blycker, G. R., & Potenza, M. N. (2020). Pornography use in the setting of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of behavioral addictions*, 9(2), 181–183. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.2020.00015>
- McGann, P.J. (2006). Healing (disorderly) desire: medical-therapeutic regulation of sexuality. In S. Seidman, N. Fischer, & C. Meeks (Eds.), *Introducing the New Sexuality Studies* (pp. 365-376). New York: Routledge Taylor&Francis Group.
- Miceli, M.S. (2006). Schools and the social control of sexuality. In S. Seidman, N. Fischer, & C. Meeks (Eds.), *Introducing the New Sexuality Studies* (pp. 357-364). New York: Routledge Taylor&Francis Group.
- Millett, K. (1973). *Sexual Politics*. (S. Seckin, Trans.). Istanbul : Payel Publishing.
- Nogueira Avelar E Silva, R., Raat, H., Reitz, E., Plat, M., Deković, M., & Van De Bongardt, D. (2020). Longitudinal associations between sexual communication with friends and sexual behaviors through perceived sexual peer norms. *Journal of sex research*, 57(9), 1156–1165.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2019.1691969>
- Morelli, M., Chirumbolo, A., Bianchi, D., Baiocco, R., Cattelino, E., Laghi, F., Sorokowski, P., Misiak, M., Dziekan, M., Hudson, H., Marshall, S. A., Nguyen, T., Mark, L., Kopecký, K., René, S., Toplu, E., Van Ouytsel, J.,

- Ponnet, K., Walrave, M., & Drouin, M. (2020). The role of HEXACO personality traits in different kinds of sexting: A cross-cultural study in 10 countries. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 113, 106502. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106502>.
- Mori, C., Cooke, J.E., Temple, J.R., Ly, A., Lu, Y., Anderson, N., Rash, C., & Madigan, S. (2020). The prevalence of sexting Behaviors Among Emerging Adults: A Meta-Analysis. *Archives of Sex Behavior*, 49, 1103–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-020-01656-4>
- Mori, C., Temple, J. R., Browne, D., & Madigan, S. (2019). Association of sexting with sexual behaviors and mental health among adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 173(8), 770–779. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2019.1658>
- Muehlenhard, C. L. (1988). “Nice women” don’t say yes and “real men” don’t say no: How miscommunication and the double standard can cause sexual problems. *Women & Therapy*, 7, 95–108.
- Muehlenhard, C. L. (2011). Examining stereotypes about token resistance to sex. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35 (4), 676-683.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Hollabaugh, L.C. (1988). Do women sometimes say no when they mean yes? The prevalence and correlates of women’s token resistance to sex. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (5), 872-879. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.872>
- Muehlenhard, C.L., Humphreys, T.P., Jozkowski, K.N., & Peterson, Z.D. (2016). The complexities of sexual consent among college students: A conceptual and empirical review. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 53 (4-5), 457-487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2016.1146651>
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & McCoy, M. L. (1991). Double standard/double bind: The sexual double standard and women's communication about sex. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15(3), 447–461. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1991.tb00420.x>
- Muehlenhard, C.L., & Peterson, Z.D. (2005). Wanting and not wanting sex: The missing discourse of ambivalence. *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (1), 15-20.



- Muehlenhard, C.L., Peterson, Z.D., Humphreys, T.P., & Jozkowski, K.N. (2017). Evaluating the one-in-five statistic: Women's risk of sexual assault while in college. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 54(4-5), 549-576. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1295014>
- Muehlenhard, C.L., Peterson, Z.D., Macpherson, L.A., & Blair, R.L. (2002). First experiences with sexual Intercourse: Wanted, unwanted, or both? Application of a multidimensional model. Paper presented at the *Midcontinent-Eastern Region Conference of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality*, June, Big Rapids, MI.
- Muehlenhard, C.L., & Rodgers, C.S. (1998). Token resistance to sex: New perspective on an old stereotype. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22(3), 443-463. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1998.tb00167.x>
- O'Byrne, R., Rapley, M., & Hansen, S. (2006). 'You Couldn't Say "No", Could You?': Young Men's Understandings of Sexual Refusal. *Feminism & Psychology*, 16(2), 133–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959-353506062970>
- Osman, S. L. (2003). Predicting men's rape perceptions based on the belief that "no" really means "yes." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 683-692.
- O'Sullivan, L. F., & Allgeier, E. R. (1998). Feigning sexual desire: Consenting to unwanted sexual activity in heterosexual dating relationships. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 35(3), 234–243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499809551938>
- Ozan, S., Timbil, S., Aras, S., Bilgin, A. C., Orcin, E., & Semin, S. (2010). Sexual attitudes, behaviour changes and opinions of interns in Izmir, Turkey. *The European Journal of Contraception and Reproductive Health Care*, 15, 367–375.
- Özan, S., Aras, Ş., Şemin, S., & Orçın, E. (2004). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi öğrencilerinin cinsel tutum ve davranış özellikleri. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18 (1), 27-39.

- Paul, E. L., McManus, B., & Hayes, A. (2000). "Hookups": Characteristics and correlates of college students' spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *The Journal of Sexual Research*, 37, 76-88.
- Petersen, J. L., & Hyde, J. (2010). A meta-analytic review of research on gender differences in sexuality, 1993–2007. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 21–38.
- Peterson, Z. D., & Muehlenhard, C.L. (2004). Was it rape? The function of women's rape myth acceptance and definitions of sex in labelling their own experiences. *Sex Roles*, 51 (3-4).
- Peterson, Z. D., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (2007). Conceptualizing the “wantedness” of women's consensual & nonconsensual sexual experiences: Implications for how women label their experiences with rape. *Journal of Sex Research*, 44, 72–88.
- Peterson, Z. D., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (2011). A match-and-motivation model of how women label their nonconsensual sexual experiences. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35, 558–570. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684311410210>
- Pluhar, E., Frongillo, E. A., Stycos, J.M., & Dempster-McClain, D. (1998). Understanding the relationship between religion and the sexual attitudes and behaviors of college students. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*, 23 (4), 288-296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01614576.1998.11074264>
- Powell, A. (2010). *Sex, Power and Consent: Youth Culture and the Unwritten Rules*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511777080>
- Pugh, B., & Becker, P. (2018). Exploring definitions and prevalence of verbal sexual coercion and its relationship to consent to unwanted sex: Implications for affirmative consent standards on college campuses. *Behavioral Sciences*, 8 (8), 69. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs8080069>
- Rapsey, C.M. (2014). Age, quality and context of first sex: associations with sexual difficulties. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 11(12), 2873-2881. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsm.12690>

- Sakalli-Ugurlu N., & Glick P. (2003). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward women who engage in premarital sex in Turkey. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40 (3), 296-302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490309552194>
- Sakalli-Uğurlu, N., Salman, S., & Turgut, S. (2010). Predictors of Turkish women's and men's attitudes toward sexual harassment: Ambivalent sexism, and ambivalence toward men. *Sex Roles*, 63(11-12), 871–881. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9847-6>
- Sanchez, D.T., Phelan, J.E., Moss-Racusin, C.A., & Good, J.J. (2012a). The gender role motivation model of women's sexually submissive behavior and satisfaction in heterosexual couples. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38 (4), 528-539. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211430088>
- Sanchez, D.T., Fetterolf, J.C., Rudman, L.A. (2012b). Eroticizing inequality in the United States: the consequences and determinants of traditional gender role adherence in intimate relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 49 (2-3), 168-183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2011.653699>
- Santana, M.C., Raj, A., Decker, M.R., La Marche, A., & Silverman, J.G. (2006). Masculine gender roles associated with increased sexual risk and intimate partner violence perpetration among young adult men. *Journal of Urban Health*, 83(4), 575-585. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-006-9061-6>
- Saraçoğlu, G. V., Erdem, İ., Doğan, S., & Tokuç, B. (2014). Youth sexual health: Sexual knowledge, attitudes, and behavior among students at a university in Turkey. *Noro psikiyatri arsivi*, 51(3), 222–228. <https://doi.org/10.4274/npa.y6768>
- Selçuk, K.; Avcı, D., & Mercan, Y. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinde flört şiddetine maruziyet: Flört şiddetine yönelim tutumların ve toplumsal cinsiyet algısının şiddete maruziyet ile ilişkisi. *Acıbadem Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9 (3), 302-308. <https://doi.org/10.31067/0.2018.29>
- Sieving, R.E., Eisenberg, M.E., Pettingell, S., & Skay, C. (2016). Friends' influence on adolescents' first sexual intercourse. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 38 (1), 13-19. <https://doi.org/10.1363/psrh.38.013.06>

- Siyez, D.M., & Siyez, E. (2009). Evaluation of the knowledge levels of university students about sexually transmitted diseases. *Turkish Journal of Urology*, 35(1):49-55
- Sprecher, S., Hatfield, E., Cortese, A., Potapova, E., & Levistkaya, A. (1994). Token resistance to sexual intercourse and consent to unwanted sexual intercourse: College students' dating experiences in three countries. *Journal of Sex Research*, 31 (2), 125-132.
- Struckman-Johnson, C., Struckman-Johnson, D., & Anderson, P.B. (2003). Tactics of sexual coercion: When men and women won't take no for an answer. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40, 76–86.
- Sumer, Z. H. (2015). Gender, religiosity, sexual activity, sexual knowledge, and attitudes toward controversial aspects of sexuality. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 53, 2033-2044. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-014-9831-5>
- Symons, K., Ponnet, K., Walrave, M., & Heirman, W. (2018). Sexting scripts in adolescent relationships: Is sexting becoming the norm?. *New Media & Society*, 20(10), 3836-3857. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818761869>
- Tiefer, L., & Kring, B. (1995). Gender and the organization of sexual behavior. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 18 (1), 25-37.
- Toplu-Demirtaş E., & Fincham, F.D. (2020). I don't have power, and I want more: Psychological, physical, and sexual dating violence perpetration among college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 886260520951319. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520951319>.
- Toplu-Demirtaş, E., Öztemür, G., & Fincham, F.D. (2020). Perceptions of dating violence: Assessment and antecedents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 886260520914558. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520914558>
- Toplu-Demirtaş, E., Hatipoğlu-Sümer, Z., & White, J. W. (2013). The relation between dating violence victimization and commitment among Turkish college women: Does the investment model matter?. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 7(2), 203-2015.
- Trinh, S.L., & Ward, L.M. (2016). The nature and impact of gendered patterns of peer sexual communications among heterosexual emerging adults. *The*

- Journal of Sex Research*, 53 (3), 298-308.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2015.1015715>
- Kul-Uçtu, A., & Karahan, N. (2016). Sağlık Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Cinsiyet Rollerini, Toplumsal Cinsiyet Algısı ve Şiddet Eğilimleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5 (8), 2882-2905.
- Ucar, T., Golbasi, Z., & Senturk, E. A. (2016). Sexuality and the internet: A study of the perspectives of Turkish university students. *Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw*. 19(12), 740-745. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2016.0433>
- UN Women. (n.d.). Retrieved March 08, 2021 from <https://evaw-global-database.unwomen.org/es/countries/asia/turkey#1>
- van de Bongardt, D., Reitz, E., Sandfort, T., & Dekovic', M. (2015). A meta-analysis of the relations between three types of peer norms and adolescent sexual behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 19, 203–234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314544223>
- Vannier, S.A., & O'Sullivan, L.F. (2011). Communicating interest in sex: Verbal and nonverbal initiation of sexual activity in young adults' romantic dating relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 40, 961-969.
- Walker, S. J. (1997). When “no” becomes “yes”: Why girls and women consent to unwanted sex. *Applied & Preventive Psychology*, 6, 157– 166.
- Ward, L.M. (2002). Does television exposure affect emerging adults' attitudes and assumptions about sexual relationships? Correlational and experimental confirmation. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014068031532>
- Weiss, K.G. (2009). “Boys will be boys” and other gendered accounts: an exploration of victims' excuses and justifications for unwanted sexual contact and coercion. *Violence Against Women*, 15(7), 810-834. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801209333611>
- Wellings, K., Nanchahal, K., Macdowall, W., McManus, S., Erens, B., Mercer, C.H., Johnson, A.M., Copas, A. J., Korovessis, C., Fenton, K.A., & Field,

- J. (2001). Sexual behavior in Britain: Early heterosexual experience. *Lancet*, 358 (9296), 1843-1850. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(01\)06885-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(01)06885-4)
- Welsh, D.P., Grello, C.M., & Harper, M.S. (2006). No strings attached: the nature of casual sex in college students. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 43 (3), 255-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490609552324>
- Wiederman, M. W. (2005). The Gendered Nature of Sexual Scripts. *The Family Journal*, 13(4), 496–502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480705278729>
- Wongsomboon, V., Burleson, M. H., & Webster, G. D. (2020). Women’s orgasm and sexual satisfaction in committed sex and casual sex: Relationship between sociosexuality and sexual outcomes in different sexual contexts. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 57(3), 285-295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2019.1672036>
- Yasan, A., Essizoglu, A., & Yildirim, E. A. (2009). Predictor factors associated with premarital sexual behaviors among university students in an Islamic Culture. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 21 (3), 145- 152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19317610903113813>
- Yazici, S., Dolgun, G., & Zengin, N. (2012). The determination of university students’ knowledge, attitudes and behaviors on the matter of sexual health. *Sexuality and Disability*, 30, 67-75. . <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11195-011-9246-0>.
- Yüksek Öğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi. (2020). Öğrenim düzeyine göre öğrenci sayısı. Retrieved December 11, 2020, from <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/>

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A: Informed Consent Form

#### Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Cinsel Deneyim ve Online Cinsel Davranışlar Yüksek Lisans Tez Anketi

Bu çalışma İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Klinik Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı kapsamında, yüksek lisans tezi olarak, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Alev Cavdar Sideris danışmanlığında, Ece Hattat İşeri tarafından yürütülmektedir. Çalışma, Türkiye'deki üniversite öğrencilerinin cinsel deneyimlerini ve çevrim içi cinsel davranışlarını araştırmaktadır.

Amacı, 18-25 yaş arası lisans öğrencilerinin cinselliği öğrenme kaynaklarını, aldıkları cinsel mesajları, cinsel rollere bakışlarını, çevrim içi ve çevrim dışı cinsel davranışlarını incelemektir. Bu çalışma sayesinde üniversite öğrencilerinin cinsel yaşamları konusunda fikir sahibi olunması ve genç yetişkinlerin cinsel hayat ve ilişkilerine yeni bir bakış açısı getirilmesi beklenmektedir.

Araştırmaya katılım gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır ve soruları tamamlamak yaklaşık 20-30 dakika sürmektedir. Bu çalışmaya katılmanın herhangi bir olumsuz etkisi olması beklenmemektedir. İsim ve kimlik bilgilerinizi paylaşmanıza gerek olmadığından mahremiyet ve özel yaşamınızla ilgili bir risk bulunmamaktadır. Araştırma esnasında istediğiniz zaman araştırmadan çekilme hakkınız vardır. Rahatsızlık duyduğunuz soruları cevaplamadan geçebilirsiniz. Çalışma sonunda ihtiyaç duyduğunuzda ulaşabileceğiniz bazı yardım kuruluşlarının telefon numaraları ve/ veya e-posta adresleri bulunmaktadır. Bunların yanında kendinizi iyi hissetmediğiniz herhangi bir konu, soru veya yorumunuzda araştırmacıya ulaşabilirsiniz.

Bu formu imzalayarak araştırmaya katılma onayı vermiş olacaksınız. Kimlik bilgileriniz araştırmanın hiçbir aşamasında sorulmayacak ve kullanılmayacaktır. Araştırmaya dair sorularınız veya iletmek istedikleriniz olduğu

takdirde arařtırmacıya [ece.hattat.iseri@bilgi.edu.net](mailto:ece.hattat.iseri@bilgi.edu.net) adresi üzerinden ulařabilirsiniz.

Arařtırmaya katılım onayı: Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve anladım. İstediyim zaman bu arařtırmadan çekilebileceğimi biliyorum. Bu arařtırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum.



## Appendix B: Messages About Sexuality

1. Toplumda farklı kişiler (örneğin anne-babanız, arkadaşlarımız) ya da farklı etki kaynakları (örneğin medya ya da din) cinsellik söz konusu olduğunda farklı farklı görüşler yansıtıyor ya da mesajlar veriyorlar. Örneğin “cinsellikten keyif ve haz almak doğaldır” ya da “karşı cinsle ilişkilerinizde temkinli olun” ya da “evlilik dışı ilişki ayıptır, günahdır” gibi... Aşağıda sıralanan kişi veya etki kaynaklarından, kendi cinsel hayatınızla ilgili olarak ne gibi görüş, mesaj ya da tepkileri, ne ölçüde aldığınızı, ayrı ayrı değerlendirin.

<b>a. Aynı cinsten arkadaşlarınızdan</b>	<b>Hiç</b>	<b>Biraz</b>	<b>Oldukça</b>	<b>Çok</b>
Evlilik dışında ayıp ve günah				
Rahat yaşanacak, doğal karşılanacak bir durum				
Temkinli olunması gereken bir risk				
Keyif ve haz alınacak bir deneyim				
Tedirginlik duyulacak bir şey				
Denemek, keşfetmek gereken bir fırsat				

<b>b. Karşı cinsten arkadaşlarınızdan</b>	<b>Hiç</b>	<b>Biraz</b>	<b>Oldukça</b>	<b>Çok</b>
Evlilik dışında ayıp ve günah				
Rahat yaşanacak, doğal karşılanacak bir durum				
Temkinli olunması gereken bir risk				
Keyif ve haz alınacak bir deneyim				
Tedirginlik duyulacak bir şey				
Denemek, keşfetmek gereken bir fırsat				

<b>c. Anne-babanızdan</b>	<b>Hiç</b>	<b>Biraz</b>	<b>Oldukça</b>	<b>Çok</b>
Evlilik dışında ayıp ve günah				

Rahat yaşanacak, doğal karşılanacak bir durum				
Temkinli olunması gereken bir risk				
Keyif ve haz alınacak bir deneyim				
Tedirginlik duyulacak bir şey				
Denemek, keşfetmek gereken bir fırsat				

<b>d. Geleneksel Medyadan (TV Kanalları, Dergiler, Gazeteler, vb.)</b>	<b>Hiç</b>	<b>Biraz</b>	<b>Oldukça</b>	<b>Çok</b>
Evlilik dışında ayıp ve günah				
Rahat yaşanacak, doğal karşılanacak bir durum				
Temkinli olunması gereken bir risk				
Keyif ve haz alınacak bir deneyim				
Tedirginlik duyulacak bir şey				
Denemek, keşfetmek gereken bir fırsat				

<b>e. Çevrim-içi Medyadan (Çevrim-içi yayın ve/veya video paylaşım platformları, sosyal medya, vb.):</b>	<b>Hiç</b>	<b>Biraz</b>	<b>Oldukça</b>	<b>Çok</b>
Evlilik dışında ayıp ve günah				
Rahat yaşanacak, doğal karşılanacak bir durum				
Temkinli olunması en bir risk				
Keyif ve haz alınacak bir deneyim				
Tedirginlik duyulacak bir şey				
Denemek, keşfetmek gereken bir fırsat				

<b>f. Dini etki kaynaklarından (Kitaplar, din görevlileri, hocalar, vb.):</b>	<b>Hiç</b>	<b>Biraz</b>	<b>Oldukça</b>	<b>Çok</b>
Evlilik dışında ayıp ve günah				
Rahat yaşanacak, doğal karşılanacak bir durum				

Temkinli olunması en bir risk				
Keyif ve haz alınacak bir deneyim				
Tedirginlik duyulacak bir şey				
Denemek, keşfetmek gereken bir fırsat				

2. **Kendiniz** için düşündüğünüzde, sizin cinsel tutum ve davranışlarınızı etkilemeleri açısından bu kaynaklara **göreceli önemlerine** göre (yani 1'den 7'ya kadar, 1=en önemli, 7= en önemsiz olmak üzere) **bir değer verin, yani 1'den 7'ya kadar sıralayın.**

- 1) \_\_\_\_\_ a. Aynı cinsten arkadaş
- 2) \_\_\_\_\_ b. Karşı cinsten arkadaş
- 3) \_\_\_\_\_ c. Anne-baba
- 4) \_\_\_\_\_ d. Geleneksel Medya
- 5) \_\_\_\_\_ e. Çevrim-içi Medya
- 6) \_\_\_\_\_ f. Dini etki kaynakları
- 7) \_\_\_\_\_ g. Diğer

## Appendix C: Offline Sexual Experiences

### 1. Şimdiye kadar kaç kişiyle çıkma veya flört deneyiminiz oldu?

0 1 2 3 4 5 ya da daha fazla

### 2. Şimdiye kadar hiç cinsel birleşme içermeyen herhangi bir cinsel deneyiminiz oldu mu/ herhangi bir cinsel temasta buldunuz mu (örn. öpüşme, cinsel organların okşanması)?

Evet  Hayır

Şimdiye kadar kaç kişiyle cinsel birleşme içermeyen cinsel deneyiminiz oldu?

1 2 3 4 5 6 ya da daha fazla

Cinsel birleşme içermeyen ilk cinsel yakınlaşma deneyiminiz hangi yaşta oldu? \_\_

Bu deneyimi o zaman yaşamak istemenizin en önemli 2 nedeni neydi? (Lütfen aşağıdaki nedenleri okuyup 1=en önemli neden, 2=ikinci önemli neden yazmak sureti ile yalnızca 2 şikkı işaretleyin).

İstediğim için \_\_\_\_

Meraktan \_\_\_\_

İlişkide daha yakın olmak için \_\_\_\_

Partnerimi memnun etmek, ilişkiyi korumak için \_\_\_\_

Partnerimin bu konudaki ısrarı nedeniyle \_\_\_\_

Partnerimin fiziksel zorlaması ile \_\_\_\_

Öyle yapmam gerektiğini düşündüğüm için \_\_\_\_

Arkadaşlarımdan deneyimlerinden etkilendiğim için \_\_\_\_

Diğer \_\_\_\_ (Lütfen Belirtiniz \_\_\_\_\_ )

**3. Şimdiye kadar herhangi bir cinsel birleşme (oral, anal veya vajinal) deneyiminiz oldu mu?**

Evet  Hayır

Şimdiye kadar kaç kişiyle cinsel birleşme (oral, anal veya vajinal) deneyiminiz oldu?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 ya da daha fazla

İlk cinsel birleşme deneyiminiz hangi yaşta oldu? \_\_\_\_

Cinsel birleşme deneyimini o zaman yaşamak istemenizin en önemli 2 nedeni neydi? (Lütfen 1=en önemli neden, 2=ikinci önemli neden yazmak sureti ile yalnızca 2 şikkı işaretleyin).

İstediğim için \_\_\_\_

Meraktan \_\_\_\_

İlişkide daha yakın olmak için \_\_\_\_

Partnerimi memnun etmek, ilişkiyi korumak için \_\_\_\_

Partnerimin bu konudaki ısrarı nedeniyle \_\_\_\_

Partnerimin fiziksel zorlaması ile \_\_\_\_

Öyle yapmam gerektiğini düşündüğüm için \_\_\_\_

Arkadaşlarımdan deneyimlerinden etkilendiğim için \_\_\_\_

Diğer \_\_\_\_ (Lütfen Belirtiniz \_\_\_\_\_ )

**4. Sadece size kalsa (yani aile veya partnerinizin etkisinde kalmadan), kendinizi en rahat hissedeceğiniz bir flört ilişkisi nasıl bir cinsel birlikteliği (örn. ne gibi cinsel davranışları) içerirdi? \_\_\_\_\_**

Şimdiye kadar, böyle bir birlikteliği yaşadığınız kaç partneriniz oldu?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 yada daha fazla

## Appendix D: Online Sexual Experiences

1. Şimdiye kadar romantik veya cinsel bir ilişkide olduğunuz veya olmayı düşündüğünüz bir partner ile telefon, e-posta, internet sitesi veya herhangi bir uygulama (WhatsApp, Snapchat, Instagram, Facebook, Tinder, Badoo...) üzerinden çevrimiçi cinsel içerikli mesaj veya fotoğraf veya video paylaşma deneyiminiz oldu mu?

Evet  Hayır

Şimdiye kadar kaç kişiyle çevrim-içi cinsel içerikli mesaj veya fotoğraf veya video paylaşma deneyiminiz oldu?

1 2 3 4 5 6 ya da daha fazla

Lütfen aşağıdaki cinsel içerikli paylaşımları ne sıklıkla yaptığınızı 1: Hiç ve 5: Çok Sık arasında bir sayıyı işaretleyerek değerlendirin.

a . Cinsel içerikli yazılı mesaj:

Hiç Çok Sık  
1 2 3 4 5

b. Kendi yarı çıplak- çıplak fotoğraflarım:

Hiç Çok Sık  
1 2 3 4 5

c. Kendi yarı çıplak- çıplak videolarım:

Hiç Çok Sık  
1 2 3 4 5

d. Pornografik fotoğraf:

Hiç Çok Sık  
1 2 3 4 5

e. Pornografik video:

Hiç Çok Sık

1 2 3 4 5

f. Çevrimiçi karşılıklı cinsel içerikli canlı konuşma:

Hiç Çok Sık

1 2 3 4 5

g. Çevrimiçi karşılıklı çıplak-yarı çıplak canlı görüşme:

Hiç Çok Sık

1 2 3 4 5

h. Diğer ( Lütfen belirtiniz\_\_\_\_\_)

Hiç Çok Sık

1 2 3 4 5

Lütfen aşağıdaki araçları cinsel içerikli mesaj veya fotoğraf veya video iletişimleriniz için ne sıklıkta kullandığınızı 1: Hiç ve 5: Çok Sık arasında bir sayıyı işaretleyerek değerlendirin.

a. SMS veya telefon araması:

Hiç Çok Sık

1 2 3 4 5

b. Yazılı-sesli-görüntülü mesaj ve arama uygulamaları (WhatsApp, Messenger, Zoom, Teams,...):

Hiç Çok Sık

1 2 3 4 5

c. Sosyal medya uygulamaları (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat...):

Hiç Çok Sık

1 2 3 4 5

d. Arkadaşlık uygulamaları (Badoo, Tinder, Fatch...):

Hiç Çok Sık

1 2 3 4 5

e. E-posta:

Hiç Çok Sık

1	2	3	4	5
f. Sohbet siteleri:				
Hiç				Çok Sık
1	2	3	4	5
g. Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz ___):				
Hiç				Çok Sık
1	2	3	4	5

İlk çevrim-içi cinsel içerikli mesaj veya fotoğraf veya video paylaşma deneyiminiz hangi yaşta oldu? \_\_\_\_\_

Çevrimiçi cinsel içerikli mesaj veya fotoğraf veya video paylaşma deneyimi o zaman yaşamak istemenizin en önemli 2 nedeni nedir? (Lütfen aşağıdaki nedenleri okuyup 1=en önemli neden, 2=ikinci önemli neden yazmak sureti ile yalnızca 2 şikkı işaretleyin).

İstediğim için \_\_\_\_

Meraktan \_\_\_\_

İlişkide daha yakın olmak için \_\_\_\_

Partnerimi memnun etmek, ilişkiyi korumak için \_\_\_\_

Partnerimin bu konudaki ısrarı nedeniyle \_\_\_\_

Partnerimin fiziksel zorlaması ile \_\_\_\_

Öyle yapmam gerektiğini düşündüğüm için \_\_\_\_

Arkadaşlarımın deneyimlerinden etkilendiğim için \_\_\_\_

Diğer \_\_\_\_ (Lütfen belirtiniz \_\_\_\_\_)



## Appendix E: Token Resistance & Consent to Unwanted Sex

1. Şu durumu hiç yaşadınız mı? Sizinle cinsel temasa girmek (örneğin öpmek, okşamak, cinsel birleşme, çevrimiçi cinsel içerikli mesaj veya fotoğraf veya video paylaşma) isteyen bir kişiyle birlikteydiniz ve siz de istiyordunuz. Ama şu veya bu nedenle, tam niyetli ve istekli olduğunuz halde, istemediğinizi ifade ettiniz. Başka bir deyişle “evet” demek istediniz ama “hayır” dediniz. Böyle bir şey hiç başınıza geldi mi?

Evet  Hayır

Bu durumu ne zaman yaşadınız?

- Cinsel temasa girmek (örneğin öpmek, okşamak, cinsel birleşme, vb.) isteyen bir kişiyle birlikteyken yaşadım
- Çevrim-içi cinsel içerikli mesaj veya fotoğraf veya video paylaşmak isteyen bir kişiyle yaşadım
- Her iki durumu da yaşadım

Kendinizi yaklaşık kaç kez böyle bir durumda buldunuz? \_\_\_\_\_

İstedikinizden farklı bir şey söylemenizin sebebi neydi? \_\_\_\_\_

Böyle bir durumu yaşadığınız bir ilişkinizi düşünün. Bu ilişkinin niteliği neydi?

Ciddi bir ilişki \_\_\_\_\_

Ciddi olmayan bir ilişki \_\_\_\_\_

Tanıdık \_\_\_\_\_

Aile-akraba \_\_\_\_\_

Yabancı \_\_\_\_\_

Diğer \_\_\_\_\_

Evet demek istediğiniz halde hayır demiş olmak bu kişi ile ilişkinizi ne kadar etkiledi? Lütfen 1:Hiç Etkilemedi ve 5:Çok fazla etkiledi arasında bir değer vererek belirtin.

Hiç Etkilemedi

Çok Etkiledi

1

2

3

4

5

2. **Şu durumu hiç yaşadınız mı? Sizinle cinsel temasa girmek (örneğin öpmek, okşamak, cinsel birleşme, çevrimiçi cinsel içerikli mesaj veya fotoğraf veya video paylaşma) isteyen bir kişiyle birlikteydiniz, siz ise istemiyordunuz. Ama şu veya bu nedenle, cinsel temasta bulunmak istediğinizi ifade ettiniz. Başka bir deyişle “hayır” demek istediniz ama “evet” dediniz. Böyle bir şey hiç başınıza geldi mi?**

Evet  Hayır

Bu durumu ne zaman yaşadınız?

- Cinsel temasa girmek (örneğin öpmek, okşamak, cinsel birleşme, vb.) isteyen bir kişiyle birlikteyken yaşadım
- Çevrimiçi cinsel içerikli mesaj veya fotoğraf veya video paylaşmak isteyen bir kişiyle yaşadım
- Her iki durumu da yaşadım

Kendinizi kaç kez böyle bir durumda buldunuz? \_\_\_\_\_

İstedikinizden farklı bir şey söylemenizin sebebi neydi? \_\_\_\_\_

Böyle bir durumu yaşadığınız bir ilişkinizi düşünün. Bu ilişkinin niteliği neydi?

Ciddi bir ilişki \_\_\_\_\_

Ciddi olmayan bir ilişki \_\_\_\_\_

Tanıdık \_\_\_\_

Aile-akraba \_\_\_\_

Yabancı \_\_\_\_

Diğer \_\_\_\_\_

Hayır demek istediğiniz halde evet demiş olmak bu kişi ile ilişkinizi ne kadar etkiledi? Lütfen 1:Hiç Etkilemedi ve 5:Çok fazla etkiledi arasında bir değer vererek belirtin.

Hiç Etkilemedi

Çok Etkiledi

1

2

3

4

5

## Appendix F: Sexual Stereotypes

1. Lütfen, aşağıdaki cümlelere ne kadar katıldığınızı, özellikle kendi deneyimlerinizi de düşünerek belirtin:

**a. Cinsel beraberliklerde inisiyatif almak, cinsel ilişkiyi ilerletmek daha çok erkeklere düşer.**

Hiç katılmıyorum Tamamen  
katılıyorum  
1 2 3 4 5 6

**b. Kadınlar bazen cinsel ilişkiye ‘hayır ’dediklerinde aslında ‘evet’ demek istiyorlardır.**

Hiç katılmıyorum Tamamen  
katılıyorum  
1 2 3 4 5 6

**c. Erkeklerin tatmin etmeleri gereken cinsel ihtiyaçları kadınlarınkinden daha fazladır.**

Hiç katılmıyorum Tamamen  
katılıyorum  
1 2 3 4 5 6

**d. İlişkilerde kadına düşen önemli bir rol, erkeklerin cinsel taleplerine sınır ve ölçü getirmektir.**

Hiç katılmıyorum Tamamen  
katılıyorum  
1 2 3 4 5 6

**e. Evlilik veya evliliğe giden ciddi bir ilişki yoksa kadınların cinsel ilişkiye girmemeleri gerekir.**

Hiç katılmıyorum Tamamen  
katılıyorum

1 2 3 4 5 6

**f. Erkekler bir kadınla cinsel ilişkiye girmeye hemen her zaman hazır ve isteklidirler.**

Hiç katılmıyorum Tamamen katılıyorum

1 2 3 4 5 6

**g. Erkeklerin evlilikten önce cinsel deneyimleri olması beklenir.**

Hiç katılmıyorum Tamamen katılıyorum

1 2 3 4 5 6

## Appendix G: Demographic Information Sheet

1. Yaşınız: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Cinsiyetiniz: Kadın \_\_\_ Erkek \_\_\_ Diğer \_\_\_ Belirtmek istemiyorum \_\_\_

3. Okuduğunuz Üniversite: \_\_\_\_\_ Bölümünüz: \_\_\_\_\_  
Sınıfınız: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Cinsel yöneliminiz/İlgi duyduğunuz cins:

Karşı Cins \_\_\_

Aynı Cins \_\_\_

Hem karşı hem aynı cins \_\_\_

Diğer \_\_\_

Bilmiyorum /Emin değilim \_\_\_

Belirtmek istemiyorum \_\_\_

5. Şu anda bir ilişkiniz var mı? Evet \_\_\_ Hayır \_\_\_ Diğer \_\_\_ (Lütfen Belirtiniz) \_\_\_

6. İlişkiniz ne kadardır devam ediyor? Yıl \_\_\_\_\_ Ay \_\_\_\_\_

7. Lütfen anne ve babanızın medeni durumunu belirtin.

Birlikteler \_\_\_

Ayrılar ve bekarlar \_\_\_

Ayrılar, biri veya her ikisi başkalarıyla evli \_\_\_

Birisi veya her ikisi de vefat etti \_\_\_

8. Lütfen anne ve babanızın eğitim durumunu belirtin.

	<b>Anne</b>	<b>Baba</b>
İlkokul mezunu:	_____	_____
Ortaokul mezunu:	_____	_____
Lise mezunu:	_____	_____
Üniversite mezunu:	_____	_____
Lisansüstü derecesi var:	_____	_____

**9. Lütfen şu anda kiminle / nerede yaşadığınızı belirtin.**

Ebeveyn(ler)imle ve/veya kardeş(ler)imle oturuyorum \_\_\_\_\_

Eş ve/veya çocuklarımla yaşıyorum \_\_\_\_\_

Yurtta kalıyorum \_\_\_\_\_

Ev arkadaşı ile yaşıyorum \_\_\_\_\_

Partnerimle yaşıyorum \_\_\_\_\_

Diğer (Lütfen belirtin) \_\_\_\_\_

**10. Lütfen şimdiye kadar en uzun süre yaşadığınız yeri en iyi tanımlayan seçeneği işaretleyin.**

Büyükşehir \_\_\_\_\_ Şehir \_\_\_\_\_ İlçe \_\_\_\_\_ Köy \_\_\_\_\_

**11. Kendinizi ne kadar dindar buluyorsunuz? Lütfen “1: Hiç dindar değilim” ve “6: Çok dindarım” arasında bir sayı vererek değerlendirin.**

Hiç dindar değilim \_\_\_\_\_ Çok dindarım \_\_\_\_\_

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6

**12. Kendinizi ne kadar muhafazakar buluyorsunuz? Lütfen “1: Hiç dindar değilim” ve “6: Çok dindarım” arasında bir sayı vererek değerlendirin.**

Hiç muhafazakar değilim \_\_\_\_\_ Çok muhafazakarım \_\_\_\_\_

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6

## **Appendix F: Psychological Help Resources**

Mor Çatı Kadın Sığınağı Vakfı: [www.morcati.org.tr](http://www.morcati.org.tr), (212) 292 52 31-32

Cinsel Şiddetle Mücadele Derneği: [info@cinselsiddetlemucadele.org](mailto:info@cinselsiddetlemucadele.org) ,

Kadınlarla Dayanışma Vakfı (KADAV): Acil Destek Hattı: 0545 220 10 22

KAMER Vakfı: 24 Saat Destek Hattı: 0530 664 44 10

Sosyal Politika Cinsiyet Kimliği ve Cinsel Yönelim Çalışmaları Derneği (SPOD):

[info@spod.org.tr](mailto:info@spod.org.tr), LGBTI + Danışma Hattı: 0850 888 54 28

Bilgi Üniversitesi Psikolojik Danışmanlık Merkezi: [pdm@bilgi.edu.tr](mailto:pdm@bilgi.edu.tr)



## **ETHICS BOARD APPROVAL**

Ethics Board Approval is available in the printed version of this dissertation.