



Jill Lewis and Stephen Clift

Challenging Gender Issues

Report on findings from the
Living for Tomorrow project about young people's
attitudes to men, women and sex



The **Living for tomorrow: Youth, sexual health and the cultural landscapes of gender and sexuality in Nordic/Baltic/N.W. Russian times of transition: an HIV/AIDS era** initiative was a three year action research project (1998 - 2000) funded by NIKK, the Nordic Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Research. The project has produced the following resources:

Reports

Challenging Gender Issues: report on findings from the Living for Tomorrow project about young men's and young women's attitudes to men, women and sex by Jill Lewis & Stephen Clift, NIKK, Oslo, 2001.

The report presents and reflects on the perceptions of gender and sexual relationships between men and women, gathered by self-completion questionnaire from a sample of young people living in Tallinn. It also explores how perceptions of gender influence young people's thinking about sexual relationships and actual sexual behaviours.

Mobilising Gender Issues - in HIV/AIDS prevention work report by Jill Lewis, NIKK, Oslo, 2002.

This is an overview of the project - what concerns it had to consider, and what issues it had to navigate. It discusses the wider challenges faced in developing its focus on gender issues, describes its vision, planning, building, designing and different actions it undertook to achieve its ends. It presents the outcomes and discusses some of the learning processes the project brought into focus.

Booklet

How to Bridge the Gap between Us? Gender and Sexual Safety, NIKK & The Living for Tomorrow NGO, Tallinn 2000.

A booklet written and illustrated by Estonian and Russian teenagers. Themes include: *Being man or woman, Attraction, Stereotypes, Jobs men and women do, Why young people have sex, HIV/AIDS, Marriage and the family, Condoms; Excuses, excuses*. The text is in English, Russian and Estonian – and the booklet ends with a vocabulary of words to do with gender and sex. Copies are available from NGO Living for Tomorrow, c/o AIDS Prevention Centre, Narva Mnt 48, Tallinn 10150, Estonia, e-mail: aek@aids.ee, tel: +372 6273500.

Web resources

The Living for Tomorrow Questionnaire on Young People's Attitudes to Men, Women and Sex, 1999 & 2000.

This questionnaire was used by the project. A version was revised by sexual health educators and gender researchers from 8 countries – as a cross-cultural tool that can be used and adapted as desired for teachers and researchers anywhere. The questionnaire is a useful tool as a basis for discussion within groups of young people.

The Living for Tomorrow Bibliography, 2001.

A bibliography of background information useful to the project.

All documents can be ordered and/or accessed from the Living for Tomorrow website:
<http://www.nikk.uio.no/forskningsprojekt/livingfortomorrow/>

Notes on the authors

Jill Lewis was Project Co-ordinator and researcher at NIKK, the Nordic Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Research, and has been in charge of the design, development and implementation of strategies of the Living for Tomorrow Project. She has been actively involved in HIV prevention initiatives with young people since the mid 1980s. To undertake the NIKK project, she was on leave from her position as Professor of Literature and Gender Studies at Hampshire College, Amherst, MA in the United States.

Stephen Clift worked as consultant to the Living for Tomorrow Project, with particular collaboration in the mounting and facilitation of its Capacity Building work in Tallinn, project evaluation strategies and work on all aspects of the survey of young people described in this report. He is Professor of Health Education in the Centre for Health Education and Research at Canterbury Christ Church University College, Canterbury in the United Kingdom.

Foreword

Living for tomorrow: Youth, sexual health and the cultural landscapes of gender and sexuality in Nordic/Baltic/N.W.
Russian times of transition: an HIV/AIDS era initiative was a three year action research project (1998 - 2000) funded by NIKK, the Nordic Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Research.

NIKK, founded in 1995, is a transnational research institute funded by the Nordic Council of Ministers, that serves as a platform for co-operation for Women's Studies and Gender Research in the five Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and the autonomous territories Greenland, the Faroe Islands and the Åland Islands). NIKK's activities are also based on co-operation with the Baltic countries, Northwest Russia, the Arctic and with the rest of Europe.

The Living for Tomorrow project was initiated by researcher Jill Lewis, who has been its leader and co-ordinator. It has fit well with NIKK's regional focus, our keen interest in dialogue with international research and also with our commitment to working with the politics of gender. The networking and collaboration that has taken place within the context of the project, has been a significant contribution to forwarding discussions of gender equality and new collaborations between men and women around gender issues.

The project also focused on another question of international concern and urgency: the HIV/AIDS pandemic. NIKK has been glad to contribute to the linking of research with implementation of more effective HIV prevention and education, and to underline the importance of bringing fruits of gender research, feminist explorations and women's movements' energies into such work with young people. Twenty years into this pandemic, it is increasingly evident that there is an urgent need to focus more on gender issues in approaches to HIV and AIDS.

This is one of two reports produced by the project. It serves to complement the overview report that provides an account of the vision, planning, implementation, outcomes and learning processes of the practical work of Living for Tomorrow that took place in Estonia between 1998 and 2000.

NIKK thanks our researcher Jill Lewis, Stephen Clift, from The Centre for Health Education and Research at Canterbury Christchurch University College, Canterbury, and all the people who have so willingly worked with us on this challenging initiative.

Fride Eeg-Henriksen
Director of NIKK

Content

Foreword.....	3
Content.....	4
Tables.....	6
Appendices.....	6
Acknowledgements.....	7
Preface.....	8
Executive Summary.....	9
1. Introduction.....	13
1.1 The Living for Tomorrow project.....	13
1.2 The Living for Tomorrow research strategy.....	13
1.3 The Living for Tomorrow questionnaire.....	15
2. Method.....	17
2.1 Questionnaire design.....	17
2.2 Questionnaire content.....	18
2.2.1 A critical note on the questionnaire.....	19
2.3 Translation into Estonian and Russian.....	19
2.4 Sample and procedure.....	20
2.5 Analysis.....	21
2.5.1 Quantitative data.....	21
2.5.2 Qualitative data.....	22
3. Results.....	23
3.1 Introduction.....	23
3.2 Are men and women equal?.....	23
3.2.1 Young people who believe that men and women are not equal.....	23
3.2.2 Young people who believe men and women are equal.....	25
3.2.3 Images of change in comments the young people made.....	26
3.3 Can men and women be equal?.....	27
3.3.1 Young people who believe men and women cannot be equal.....	27
3.3.2 Young people who believe men and women can be equal.....	28
3.4 Differences between men and women.....	30
3.5 Valued characteristics of men and women.....	34
3.5.1 Valued characteristics in men.....	34
3.5.2 Valued characteristics in women.....	34
3.6 What is expected of men and women?.....	36
3.7 What makes a good lover?.....	38
3.8 What men and women want from sex.....	41
3.9 What aspects of sex are important?.....	45
3.10 Gender and sexual relationships.....	49
3.11 Risks associated with casual sexual intercourse.....	50
3.12 Men and women and unprotected sex.....	51
3.13 Young people's sexual activity and condom use.....	58
4. Discussion.....	60
4.1 Introduction.....	60
4.2 Equality and inequality.....	61
4.3 Differences between men and women.....	62
4.4 Expectations of men and women.....	63
4.5 Perspectives on love and sex.....	64
4.6 Gender and what is important in sex.....	66
4.7 Sex, risks and condom use.....	70
4.8 Concluding thoughts.....	72
5. Postscript: The Living for Tomorrow questionnaire as a cross-cultural research and education tool.....	74
5.1 Widening the gender net: new dialogues and new scope for gender-focused initiatives.....	75
6. Bibliography.....	77
Appendices.....	81

Tables

1.	Young people's views on what characteristics are valued in men and women (percentage of young people mentioning each characteristic)	40
2.	Different expectations for men and women in Estonian society: percentage agreement by young men and women	41
3.	What men and women want from sex	50
4.	The importance of different aspects of sex for women and for men (mean ratings)	53
5.	Importance attached to different aspects of sex: young men's ratings for men and women	54
6.	Importance attached to different aspects of sex: young women's ratings for men and for women	55
7.	Gendered aspects of sexual relationships (mean ratings)	57
8.	Risks associated with unprotected casual sex (mean ratings)	58
9.	Examples of young women giving different reasons for a man and a woman having sex without a condom	66
10.	Examples of young men giving different reasons for a man and a woman having sex without a condom	67
11.	Sexual activity and condom use of young men and women	69

Appendices

A-1	Do you believe that men and women are equal in Estonia today ("no" answers)	95
A-2	Do you believe that men and women are equal in Estonia today ("yes" answers)	96
A-3	Do you believe that men and women can be equal ("no" answers)	97
A-4	Do you believe that men and women can be equal ("yes" answers)	98
A-5	Young people's views on ways in which men and women are different	99
A-6	Characteristics of men valued in Estonian society	100
A-7	Characteristics of women valued in Estonian society	101
A-8	What makes a man a good lover?	102
A-9	What makes a woman a good lover?	103
A-10	What men want from sex	104
A-11	What women want from sex	105
A-12	Why men have sex without condoms during casual sex	106
A-13	Why women have sex without the man using a condom during casual sex	107

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank the following for their assistance, support and influence in the design and development of the Living for Tomorrow Project questionnaire:

Researchers AnnaStina Henriksson (Swedish Board of Education and Nordic School of Public Health), Dagmar Kutsar (Department of Family Studies and Social Work, University of Tartu, Estonia), Rachel Thomson (Women/Men Risk AIDS Project - WRAP & Southbank University, London), Bente Traaen (Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo) gave invaluable support in discussion and development of the questionnaire.

The work of the Women/Men Risk AIDS Project, of researchers Anu Laas, Krista Papp, Anu Narusk, Mari Jarvelaid; of Bronwyn Davies (James Cook University, Australia), and of Estonian student researchers Pille Kuusvere, Ave Toots, Margit Rosental, provided useful contexts for discussion of the questionnaire focus.

Nelli Kalikova, the Estonian AIDS Prevention Centre & the Living for Tomorrow 1999 'Core Group' for their advice and co-ordination of data collection:

For their active participation in development and piloting of the questionnaire: Elvyra Gedraitiene (Klaipeda University, Lithuania); Marija Caplinskiene (AIDS Prevention, Lithuania); Kristen Halvorsen (Trondheim University); Marguerite Howick (Health Promotion Isle of Wight, UK); Bengt Sundbaum (Swedish Institute of Public Health); Marjut Jyrkinen, (National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health, STAKES, Helsinki, Finland); Andrei Khanzin and Katja Guerassimova (Centre for Independent Social Research, St. Petersburg); Amir Hodzic, (Center for Education and Counselling of Women CESI), Zagreb, Croatia; Medisinernes Seksualopplysning, Norway, Aleksandr Samarin (NGO

Living for Tomorrow, Estonia); Elisabeth Tveito (Norwegian AIDS Association / Body Positive); colleagues at NIKK and the Centre for Feminist Studies, Oslo University; Translation processes: Kristel Weidebaum, Kadri Hollo, Andrei Khanzin, Katja Guerassimova, Tarmo Tank, Julia Samarina.

Data processing: Edmund Clift

Invaluable support, input and co-ordination: Diana Anders and Elisabeth Lorenzen who worked as assistants to the project at NIKK.

For their critical feedback in last stages of editing the report: Natasa Bijelic (Zagreb), Sirle Blumberg (Tallinn), Elvyra Gedraitiene (Klaipeda), Katja Guerassimova (St. Petersburg), Andrei Khanzin (St. Petersburg / Budapest), AnnaStina Henrikson (Örebro), Marjut Jyrkinen (Helsinki), Dagmar Kutsar (Tartu), Elisabeth Lorenzen (NIKK, Oslo), Elisabeth Tveito (Oslo), Inna Vyshemirska (Kaliningrad) - and, especially, Eva Magnusson (NIKK, Oslo).

Preface

The aim of this report is twofold. First, it presents and reflects on the perceptions of gender and sexual relationships between men and women, gathered by self-completion questionnaire from a sample of young people living in Tallinn, the capital of Estonia. Second, it explores ways in which engaging with questions about “how gender functions”, how perceptions about men and women circulating among young people, can influence how young people think about their sexual relationships and actual sexual behaviours. We draw on the responses of the young people to illustrate the urgent need for a critical focus on gender to inform sex and HIV awareness education processes.

The findings from the questionnaire underline that young people’s understanding and embodiment of gender needs to be explored, researched and debated much more deeply and critically within sex education. The findings illustrate how critical discussions of heterosexual ‘norms’ of sexual behaviours need to be linked actively to wider gender equality concerns. The young people’s replies open a door for exploring and debating why the conscious questioning of gender norms, how society organises and imagines men and women, needs to be an integral part of safer sex education. In this respect, the research reported on here presents a challenge to safer sex education processes for young people everywhere. We hope that the data provided by this exploratory questionnaire can help generate new kinds of discussions with sexual health educators and with young people themselves. Used in this way, the feedback from young people can provide a basis for their involvement in defining as well as addressing a problem that is central to sexual safety and HIV prevention.

The questionnaire has proved a useful tool for the Living for Tomorrow project, in strengthening discussion of gender in sexual safety and HIV awareness with young people in a range of new initiatives. It is our hope that a revised version, based on the study reported here, already amended by researchers and educators from 8 countries and available through the NIKK web-site, will continue to provide a stimulus and an adaptable resource for the development and implementation of more gender-focused and thus more effective education on sexual safety with young people.

Jill Lewis and Stephen Clift.

January 2001.

Executive Summary

- Living for Tomorrow was a three-year project that worked in Estonia from 1998 to 2000. It explored ways that developing a more critical focus on gender could actively mobilise the interest and Involvement of young people in sexual safety concerns and HIV prevention awareness.
- As part of Living for Tomorrow, a small-scale exploratory research project investigated views of young people about gender issues and sexual relationships. The theoretical position guiding this was that heterosexual sexual risk behaviours can only be understood and effectively engaged with through deeper discussions of the gendered relationships between men and women in the wider society. In practical terms, this means that if sexual health education and HIV prevention with young people are to be successful, they need to give much closer attention to the politics of gender. The education process needs to engage young people actively in exploring problems in how gender differences are 'normalised' in their society, and help them address the socially shaped map of heterosexual sexual behaviours that they carry in their minds.
- Preliminary versions of a questionnaire in English were widely piloted and discussed with groups of young people, gender researchers and sexual health educators before a final version of the questionnaire was translated into Estonian and Russian.
- The questionnaire explored perceptions of some young people in Tallinn about the following issues: the positions of men and women in Estonian society; differences between men and women; socially valued characteristics of men and women; expectations in Estonia regarding the behaviour of men and women; what makes a man and a woman a good lover; what men and women value in sexual relationships; gendered dimensions of sexual relationships; anticipated outcomes of casual unprotected sex; reasons for non-use of condoms by men and by women; and aspects of young people's own sexual histories.
- The questionnaire consisted of open-ended questions requiring a written response and sets of statements requiring a response on pre-structured scales.
- The questionnaire was completed in June 1998 by a convenience sample of 213 young people, (50 Russian speaking and 163 Estonian speaking; 79 males, 134 females) aged 16-17 years. They attended two Russian and two Estonian schools in Tallinn.
- Comparison of answers given by the Russian speaking and the Estonian speaking young people revealed very few statistically significant differences (e.g. young Russians perceived greater risks of sexually transmitted infections in a casual unprotected encounter). Given the small size and non-randomly drawn nature of the sample investigated, it was decided to present findings for the sample as whole, restricting comparisons to the sex of respondents.
- Written answers to open questions were translated into English. The main ideas expressed became the basis of content analyses. The nature of the data (e.g. in some cases particular words were counted, in other cases themes identified and comments categorised) guided the precise form of the ensuing analysis.
- Numerical coding of the answers to structured questions allowed simple forms of statistical analysis that were used to describe the results and to make comparisons between the young men and young women.
- The principal findings to emerge were:
 1. Two-thirds of these young people believed that men and women are not equal in Estonian society today. Images most frequently given to illustrate this shared men as political leaders and public figures, preferred and higher paid employees, and with roles of authority at home, whereas women were seen as absent from or marginalized in spheres of public influence.
 2. While some 60 per cent of them saw equality between men and women was possible, some 40 per cent claimed it impossible for men and women to be equal, basing this primarily on a "natural" order of male superiority in physical strength, skill, rationality and leadership abilities.
 3. The young people identified a wide range of differences between men and women; the major ones mentioned were that men are seen as: less emotional, less expressive and less caring; while women are considered: weaker, more feeling, more communicative and more caring. Men were associated with a stronger interest in sex, irresponsible behaviour and a need to earn and provide rather than care. Women, in contrast, were described as more interested in relationships and romance, more delicate, vulnerable and dependent.
 4. Young people of both sexes considered wisdom and honesty as characteristics valued for both men and women. However, they differed in their perceptions of what is most valued for each sex in their society. The young men saw wealth and a strong and healthy physique as most valued in men, while the young women considered men valued for a more diverse range of emotional, moral and caring capacities. The young women thought women most valued for competence, capabilities and kindness as well as attractive appearance and submissiveness, while the young men saw them valued most significantly for attractive, sexy appearance and for submissiveness.

5. Over two-thirds of the respondents agreed that different expectations for the sexual behaviour of men and women are held in Estonia. The main normative expectations they identified were that: men are more focused on sex and sexual pleasure, men need and desire sex more and initiate and control sex more, have freer licence to have more partners. Women, in contrast, are seen to be judged more negatively for sexual interest or freedom, as being less interested in sex, more interested in ensuring men's pleasure, and more aware of with risk.
 6. The young people's views of what makes a man or a woman a good lover had some elements in common, but also substantial differences. From the young women's point of view a good male lover needs more detailed physical strategies and skill, experience and, most importantly, a nuanced and wide emotional capacity. The good male lover, from the young men's perspectives, however, needed good physical condition and abilities, experience, capacity to initiate action and general willingness to love and care for his partner. While the women's view of a good female lover placed greater emphasis on empathy for her partner's needs and desires, and a willingness to take initiative, the men imaged the good female lover most frequently in terms of bodily attributes. Women mentioned "Satisfying one's partner" as important for both male and female lovers, while the men did not mention this for either.
 7. Some 60 % of the young people, and especially the women, claimed there are contrasting agendas at the heart of the heterosexual encounter. The young men refrained more often from saying what they thought men and women want from sex. The young people agreed, however, that they saw men's interest in sex primarily motivated by physical pleasure, whereas women's concern is more for emotional and caring relationships as well as physical pleasure in sex.
 8. There were both strong consensus and substantial differences between the young men and women in their responses to a set of statements regarding the importance for men and women of specific aspects of sexual interaction. Both sexes rated the emotional aspects of sex as more important for women than for men. However, the young men perceived certain physical acts of sex (e.g. penetration) as more important for women, than the young women rated them for women. The young women also assessed the significance of building emotional intimacy as much less important for men than the young men in fact rated it.
 9. A strong consensus between all the respondents emerged in response to a set of statements about gender and sexual relationships. Both sexes agreed that: "men tend to want sexual intercourse more than women" and "women want to be guided by sexually experienced men", and disagreed that: "sex usually continues until the woman has an orgasm" and "women tend to want sexual intercourse more than men".
 10. The young people read an imaginary scenario in which a young man and woman have unprotected sex shortly after meeting for the first time. Responses revealed that men and women both considered it more likely that the woman would feel regret than the man. Both sexes considered pregnancy a more likely outcome from the encounter than infection with a STD. HIV infection was, on average, considered an unlikely outcome.
 11. When asked to explain why young men and young women might not use condoms, a wide range of reasons were identified. The most commonly given for a man not using a condom concerned degrees of pleasure, non-availability of condoms, and lack of care for partner. The most common reasons for a women having sex not using a condom concerned effect on pleasure, trust, use of other contraception, thoughtlessness, getting carried away and fear of asking the partner to use one. Interestingly the young women being much more likely to suggest that condoms actually spoil sex for men, than young men themselves suggested.
 12. Just over a third of the young men and women had experienced sexual intercourse and of these over half had had two or more partners. Very few of the young women had had first partners aged under 16, whereas just under half the young men's first sexual partners were under 16. The young men were also significantly more likely to describe their first sexual relationship as a casual one than the young women.
- The report discusses these results in terms of the general thesis underpinning the Living for Tomorrow project and their implications for educational work people and further research. We explore the deeper gender issues in sexual relationships between men and women that these responses highlight. We argue that the findings underscore the need to have a more central, critically informed focus on gender in the processes of sex education and HIV prevention work with young people. The absence of engaged, research-informed discussions of gender as a changing and socially constructed phenomenon leave young people entering heterosexual sexual relations with a map of gender behaviours they think of as "natural" and inevitable rather than socially shaped and changeable.
 - The questionnaire was the subject of a 2-day meeting of researchers and sexual health educators in Tallinn. They produced a revised version of it that could be used in larger scale, more carefully controlled research in the future. Data generated by the revised questionnaire and strategies for linking its research to educational practice could also provide a vehicle for enabling young people to consider the implications of gendered relationships for sexual risk and safety.

I. Introduction

1.1 The Living for Tomorrow project

Living for Tomorrow was a three-year pilot project co-ordinated from NIKK, the Nordic Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Research, based at in Oslo. It worked from 1998 - 2000 in close collaboration with colleagues in Estonia to explore ways of bringing a critical focus on gender into active mobilisation of young people for sexual safety and HIV prevention awareness.

A report describing the development, activities and outcomes of the project and copies of its teenage-made booklet *How to Bridge the Gaps Between Us? Gender and Sexual Safety* are available from NIKK. More information about the vision and work of the project can be found on the project web page on the NIKK website:

<http://www.nikk.uio.no/forskningsprojekt/livingfortomorrow/>

1.2 The Living for Tomorrow research strategy

The Living for Tomorrow project was an action research initiative concerned with the planning, running and evaluation of an innovative approach to working on gender and sexual health with young people. Its aim was both to put into circulation research ideas about ways of understanding, questioning and analysing gender and to gain knowledge from:

- The process of developing and implementing the project
- The feedback gained in the process of the work itself
- The experience and evaluation of its education strategies and collaboration with educators
- The experience and evaluation of workshops and activities with young people

We also wanted to conduct secondary research by gathering and analysing information pertinent to the project's concerns, and disseminating this information for discussion with practitioners in the field. Such research included:

- Compiling HIV/AIDS and sexual health statistics and related information for the Nordic-Baltic region, other post-soviet countries and globally, for use within the project, to enable closer contextual and a wider perception of the HIV pandemic;
- Compiling bibliographies of material relating to the Baltic states, youth culture, gender and sexuality of in order to resource the work with participants and to provide material for future use beyond the confines of the project;
- Reviewing key gender theory and research that could inform HIV awareness work and stimulate interesting and challenging discussions of gender for people whose work is not centred on gender-focused issues.

The project also wanted to gather original data from young people on their views and experiences relevant to its concerns. It worked to locate studies already undertaken, but not neces-

sarily published or in wide circulation, which focused on aspects of gender issues and sexual safety in the Estonian context. To date, little research has been undertaken on issues of gender, sexual relationships and risk, and contemporary youth culture in Estonia. The survey on Knowledge of Sexual Issues, Moral Beliefs, and the Sexual Experiences among Adolescents in Estonia and Finland conducted by Krista Papp (Papp 1997) on the basis of the Finnish KISS survey; the recent work of Mari Jarvelaid from Tartu University (unpublished), a Gender Dialogue study published at Tartu University by Dagmar Kutsar in 1998, and studies of young people's experience of sexual harassment and of attitudes to sexual relationships undertaken by students at Tartu University and in Tallinn, were some of the related Estonian research that was gathered to resource the capacity building (initial training / workshops) process and the work with young people. It gave culturally specific anchoring to guide discussions in the ensuing development of the Living for Tomorrow questionnaire.

Papp's work on aspects of sexual experience and knowledge was invaluable, not least in providing evidence indicative of gender differences among Estonian youth. However, it is based on quantitative methodology and does not centre theoretical perspectives exploring gender.

Research that was key for the Living for Tomorrow concerns was the qualitative work and gender theory-informed research by the Women Risk AIDS Project (WRAP). WRAP published research papers throughout the 1990's (Holland and al. 1991; Holland, Ramazanoglu et al. 1991; Holland, Ramazanoglu et al. 1993) and a their book 'The Male in the Head' (Holland, Ramazanoglu et al. 1998) provides a challenging critical analysis of the workings of gender in the accounts young women gave of heterosexual sexual experiences.

The WRAP researchers interviewed a cross-section of young women in England about their experiences of sexual relations with men. They drew on these, and on feminist interrogations of the workings of gender systems, to explore how behaviours associated with "normal" femininity within the expected conventions of heterosexual interactions undermined the young women's sexual safety agenda - arguing that, where safer sex interests are concerned, "femininity is a high risk activity". Examining the women's accounts of power, agency and sexual agenda setting, the WRAP researchers argued that heterosexual norms position men and women in a complicity favouring behaviours scripted by assumptions about male needs and preferences ('the male in the head') in heterosexual relations.

These analyses and arguments galvanised ideas at the heart of the Living for Tomorrow project. We wanted to develop strategies to resource ways to critically interrogate how gender works within heterosexual sexual relations.

The man/woman, heterosexual focus of the Living for Tomorrow questionnaire was a deliberate decision and warrants some explanation. HIV became associated first with man to man transmission due to the initial discovery of the

virus within gay networks, and because gay men carried the brunt of infection levels in the first decade of the epidemic in influential Western countries. Homophobia has bolstered both discrimination against gay youth as well as a sense of “immunity” within heterosexual networks - feeding images that mainstream people (not the marginal, ‘different’ or minority people) are sensible and safe. The “ok-ness” of normal heterosexuality, the lack of mainstream political questioning of the traditions of “normal”, relationships between men and women has hampered the visualisation and embodiment, for men and for women, of safer sex practices between men and women.

The expectations of heterosexual relationships are overwhelmingly influence how young people acquire and perform their sense of a gendered self. Young people who go on to have sexual relations with partners of the same sex still have to navigate, across their childhood, adolescence and adulthood the framework of gender differences that is normalised, condoned and expected with reference to the norms of contrasts between men and women. The “vive la différence!” theme of the man/woman encounter is intrinsic to heterosexuality and the “institutional” framework of heterosexualised gender differences (laws, economics, sexual divisions of labour, cultural expectations) on which it is based.

Men who have sex with men are often sexually linked with women also. Intravenous drug users also transmit HIV through sexual acts with partners - though often HIV and sexual safety work categorises these constituencies separately. Sex between men and women is however the most frequent medium of HIV transmission globally. The vast majority of HIV infections are through sexual transmission of the virus, and sex between man and women the majority route - and one that interweaves with drug use and the sexual practices of many men who have sex with men.

We have wanted with this questionnaire to open up questions about how young people perceive the map and scripts of gender difference around them - since the very terms though which difference is understood and “normalised” are perhaps at the heart of persistent unsafe sexual acts between men and women. The problematic terms of masculinity and femininity, expected within the norms of heterosexual behaviour, are also key in stigmatising homosexuality and legitimising homophobia.

Only when asking young people about their own sexual experience did we open up possibilities for recording same sex experience. Otherwise the questionnaire chose to focus on trying to chart some of the assumptions or perceptions about men and women that circulate with familiarity for the young people - assumptions or perceptions familiar whether they thought of themselves as gay or straight.

1.3 The Living for Tomorrow questionnaire

The project wanted to explore ways that wider issues of gender inequality might be an active component of unsafe sexual behaviours. In Living for Tomorrow we wanted to find ways

of critically interrogating how beliefs about gender difference, that are often assumed to be “natural”, inform the norms and expectations that young people bring to sexual behaviours.

While capacity building, research networking and youth workshops were underway, we developed a questionnaire to begin to identify some of the beliefs that young people hold regarding gender and sexuality. The aim was to gather “data” about attitudes and beliefs that could help galvanise discussion and debate among both educators and young people about gendered sexual expectations and implicit gendered conventions of behaviours that might reinforce unsafe sex.

We therefore designed a questionnaire to gather feedback from young people about:

- Their attitudes to gender equality and gender difference, and perceptions of these in Their society around them;
- Their beliefs about differences in sexual attitudes and behaviours for men and women, and
- Their feelings about men, women and sexual risk behaviours.

A central dilemma of the HIV/AIDS epidemic is the failure of the majority of sexually active people to cease risk sexual behaviours and adopt safe ones (despite the increased circulation of “information” and the investments in education). We wanted to initiate a process for gathering data that could highlight how, within the terms of heterosexual relationships, the gender system frames and permeates assumptions about sexual behaviour in ways that might be significant in understanding sexual risk behaviours. The questionnaire was to be an exploratory mechanism for gathering information on the beliefs, attitudes, assumptions about gender and gendered sexuality that are familiar to young people. While very aware of the limitations of the method of using the questionnaire format for data collection, we wanted to begin nonetheless to sketch what notions of gender young people invoke and draw on to “explain” what constitutes “men” and “women” - the actors in the heterosexual encounter.

As the project progressed, however, the questionnaire emerged as a potentially useful educational strategy for involving young people and their sexual health educators in more active questioning of links between gender and safer sexual behaviour. We saw that data gathered from this instrument, in this small pilot project in Estonia, could help deepen discussion of gender differences that young people see as normal in society around them, and that are reproduced in sexual risk behaviours.

This report focuses on the findings from the questionnaire and their implications. We argue that questions and problems they identify confirm the urgent need for deeper discussion of gender issues with young people within sexual health education. These findings, alongside the learning outcomes of the other areas of the NIKK Living for Tomorrow Project, suggest that a more radical questioning of cultural conventions of gender difference may be crucial for effective sexual safety and HIV prevention education with young people.

2. Method

2.1 Questionnaire design

Through the questionnaire we wanted to chart young people's perceptions of the different social and sexual positions of men and women. The questions themselves needed to be simple, direct and relevant. We found it important to include a combination of open-ended questions, which provided commentary by young people in their own words, with pre-formulated statements with multiple-choice answers that could chart tendencies identified from previous research.

A wider bibliography of readings that can stimulate exploring gender issues and looking at gender in relation to sexual safety and HIV prevention has been assembled within the Living for Tomorrow project and can be accessed through the project's web page.

The issues and themes explored through the questionnaire were informed by arguments and discussions identified in international gender research - in both gender theory and analyses drawing on empirical studies. Some significant sources for analysing and interrogating gender are listed here in this report's bibliography: (Goffman 1979; Holloway 1983; Irigaray 1983; Holloway 1984; Connell 1987; Butler 1990; Butler 1993; Chodorow 1994; Connell 1995; Dammert 1995; Thompson 1995; Holland and Adkins 1996; Richardson 1996; deLauretis 1997; Dunne 1997; Barker 1999; Jackson 1999; Neimanis 1999).

The particular focus on gender in relation to sexual risk behaviours and the spread of HIV / AIDS was developed on the basis of recent literature that analyses the gendering of the AIDS epidemic. Some such recent discussions of gender and HIV are again listed in the bibliography (Reid 1992; Berer and Ray 1993; Hamblin and Reid 1993; Doyal, Naidoo et al. 1994; Patton 1994; Carovano 1995; Berer 1996; Faber 1996; Gorna 1996; Sherr, Hankins et al. 1996; Wilton 1997; Lewis 1998; Rivers and Aggleton 1998; UNAIDS 1998; Foreman 1999; Whelan 1999).

Exploratory discussions held with young people in the Living for Tomorrow Youth Workshops, other informal discussions with a peer education initiative and with students, and debates between participants and researchers in the Living for Tomorrow capacity building workshops reinforced the decision to focus an early section of the questionnaire on wider perceptions of gender differences in Estonia. We also took account of issues identified in recent research on the different situations of men in women in newly independent Estonia (Grøgaard 1996; Laas 1996; Kutsar 1999; Narusk 1996; UNDP 1996; Laas 1997;) Rajasaar and Annunziata 1994; Lauristin 1996; Lauristin and Vihalemm 1997) and other recent research exploring some of the differential impacts on men and women of the economic and social changes generated in different post-Soviet societies (Baalsrud 1992; Einhorn 1993, 1997; Funk and Mueller 1993; Kupryashkina 1996; Koroleva 1997; Scott and et.al 1997).

Parts of the questionnaire, focusing on gender and sexuality, were importantly informed by the findings and concerns of the Women Risk AIDS Project (WRAP) the findings of whose qualitative research with young women and men in Britain have highlighted significant ways in which normative gender beliefs are invisibly fused into risk behaviours. Workshops based on the WRAP findings with the Living for Tomorrow capacity building group involving people from Estonia, Lithuania and Russia gave strong indications that the WRAP research issues had important cross-cultural significance.

In order to reflect critically on the ways its questions were framed and the kinds of responses it generated, developing versions of the questionnaire were trialed and discussed with several groups, including:

- gender researchers at a Norwegian Women's Studies Centre
- 15-16 year old participants who volunteered for the Living for Tomorrow youth workshops in Tallinn
- a class of 16 year old pupils in a Norwegian school
- medical students who volunteer to run sex education courses with Norwegian school pupils
- gender researchers and students in Oslo
- young people in a small study undertaken by students from the University of Tartu in Estonia
- teenagers with educational difficulties by students from Örebro university Sweden
- students of social and family studies in courses at Tartu University
- gender researchers from the Centre for Independent Social Research in St. Petersburg
- education faculty and students at Klaipeda University, Lithuania

People willing to participate in its piloting answered critical questions about the questionnaire itself, suggested modifications where they thought appropriate. They often also participated in discussion of their responses to and reflections about the framing of individual questions. We then revised the questionnaire in ways that incorporated recurrent or particularly insightful critical feedback.

Detailed discussion and input from Estonian, Norwegian and British researchers with experience in gender or young people's sexual behaviour surveys also helped refine and prepare the final version in English.

From a research point of view, we have been very aware of the limitations of the questionnaire format, and in particular, the way in which questions can embody assumptions and response formats and constrain participants' answers. For example, the questionnaire asks young people about differences between men and women - so their answers provide data on distinguishing perceptions of difference - rather than a cataloguing of perceived similarities.

The aim, however, was not to reify or reinforce particular conceptual frameworks, or to accept the data generated at face value, but to begin a process for letting often unspoken, and even unconscious social constructions of gender surface, in order to generate debates about them. Our intention is to facilitate critical contestation of a stock of unquestioned common knowledge about gender polarisations that limit people within contrasted scripts of masculinity and femininity. It is these scripts, unthinkingly performed, that can inhibit the possibilities of men and women becoming allies in sexual safety rather than accomplices in sexual risk and damage.

The piloting processes of the questionnaire signalled that this kind of questionnaire does provoke enormous interest and debate among young people. They appreciate with huge curiosity and intense passion the possibility to interrogate the normative assumptions about gender differences that they have imbibed from their culture and register from the world around them.

2.2 Questionnaire content

In order to explore young people's understanding of gender relations and their connection with sexuality and sexual risk, we asked the young people:

- to answer yes or no to two questions about equality between men and women in Estonian society, and to explain their answer. *Do you believe that men and women are equal in Estonia today? Do you believe men and women can be equal?*
- to identify what they considered being important differences between men and women and what they saw as valued characteristics of men and women in Estonian society. *Apart from obvious physical differences, what do you think are the main differences between men and women? What characteristics are most valued in men in Estonian society? What characteristics are most valued in women in Estonian society?*
- whether they thought that different expectations exist for men and women in various areas of social life, and to explain/illustrate their answers. *Do you think there are different expectations for men and women in Estonian society today in any or all of the areas listed: education and training, employment, socially acceptable behaviour, family responsibilities, sexual behaviour.*
- to explain what makes a man a good lover and what makes a woman a good lover, and what they believed men and women want from sex. *What makes a man a good lover? What makes a woman a good lover? Do you think men and women want different things from sex? If yes, can you explain: What you think men want from sex? What do you think women want most from sex? What do you think men and women want in common from sex?*
- to consider a list of different aspects of sex and to rate their importance for men and for women. *How*

important are the following aspects of sex for men/for women? e.g. feeling intimacy and trust, being touched sexually by partner, having penetration.

- to consider a list of statements about the possible experiences and positions of men and women in sexual relationships and rate whether they were true or false. For example: *Men tend to want sexual intercourse more than women; Sex usually continues until the woman has an orgasm.*
- to consider a scenario in which a young man and woman meet one evening for the first time, and later have sex without using condoms, and then rate the likelihood of a list of possible consequences. For example: *The man feels regret at having sex; The woman becomes infected with an STD.* They were then asked to give possible reasons why young men and women sometimes have sex without using condoms: *Why do you think men sometimes have sex without using a condom? Why do you think women sometimes have sex without the man using a condom?*
- to answer a number of questions about their own experience of sexual relationships, sexual intercourse and condom use. For example: *Have you ever had sexual intercourse? Are you currently in a sexual relationship?*

2.2.1 A critical note on the questionnaire

We are very conscious of the limitations of questionnaires, and the need for caution in interpreting the data it produced. This questionnaire was developed to gather information on young people's perceptions and beliefs that relate to heterosexual encounters, with a clear focus on perceptions of differences in the ways men and women are positioned. We acknowledge the limits of focusing on 'differences', and the need for complementary research that explores perceptions of similarities. But we were interested to sketch perceptions of difference, since the wider gender system is organised around these circulating beliefs about difference. Heterosexuality is also fundamentally invested in differences between men and women and builds on assumptions about them.

We see the questionnaire as generating material to be debated. We hope it will inform critical discussion within sex and HIV education work and will generate further research that serves to critically interrogate gendered sexual behaviours and their consequences.

2.3 Translation into Estonian and Russian

In the post-Soviet situation in Estonia, a significant percentage (about 37%) of the country's population is of non-Estonian origin. This population has as its first language Russian - the official Soviet Union era language. Families with Russian as first language had no need in the Soviet era to learn Estonian. The population of Tallinn comprises approximately equal numbers of people from Russian and Estonian backgrounds. Most live linguistically, socially and

educationally separate lives. Current educational policy is working towards greater universality of use of the Estonian language. There is also frequent discussion of integration between the communities, with particular concern coming from the European Union about 'ethnic' tension, inequality and discrimination that are experienced in the period following the earlier Russian ascendancy and linguistic privilege promoted by the Soviet Union.

Estonian teenagers are resistant to, if not disdainful of, speaking Russian and even when they study it at school, never use it and only very rarely have direct interaction with Russian teenagers. Russian teenagers feel excluded by their lack of fluent Estonian, feel that access to good Estonian teaching is very limited and resent the second-class status that the independent Estonia offers them. Many of them have alien status, with no passport, because they do not meet the language requirement.

The situation that Living for Tomorrow worked with was one where the polarised tensions between Estonians and Russians established under the Soviet era was still highly influential. It was considered essential, therefore, in the practical work of the project to find ways of encouraging joint working between Estonian and Russian speaking adults and young people, and to gather data using Estonian and Russian versions of the questionnaire.

The process of producing two versions of the questionnaire entailed:

- translations from English into Estonian and Russian by translators working into their first language

- back-translations into English by different translators working from their first language

- detailed discussion of the text of each question, comparing original and back-translations by the authors

- detailed notes on mis-representations of meaning and nuance, which were then worked through in collaborative discussions with the two sets of translators leading to the final revision of Estonian and Russian versions

Since the language of gender analysis is relatively new in Estonia, and the language of sexual behaviour also less explicit following the censorship of the Soviet era, gender researchers and sexual health educators were consulted in debates over choice of wording at certain key points and were involved in reviewing the translations. It is worth noting that the linguistic negotiations on these subjects over language, detail and nuance produced intense discussions and a huge amount of hilarity.

2.4 Sample and procedure

The information from the questionnaire we present here was collected from young people in schools in Tallinn by colleagues from the Tallinn AIDS Prevention Centre, with help from the Living for Tomorrow Core Group (who had undertaken the Capacity Building and run the project's follow-up

Youth Workshops). The Director of the AIDS Centre and the Living for Tomorrow co-ordinator negotiated access to the schools. Willingness to involve the schools' pupils was agreed after discussion with school principals and key teachers, where it was clearly understood that some of the questions had explicit sexual focus. Our plan was for 240 pupils, aged 16 - 17 from 2 Estonian and 2 Russian schools to complete the questionnaire. The young people would be given an hour in school time, supervised by volunteers from the AIDS Centre, who were to deliver, administer and collect the questionnaire, in ways that were attentive to issues of confidentiality.

The introductory page to the questionnaire clarified that the questionnaire was anonymous, that information was confidential - and that pupils were completing it voluntarily. It also explained that the data would hopefully help strengthen strategies for sexual safety and HIV prevention education for young people in Estonia - and was part of an international initiative.

Despite clear guidelines being established and agreed, the administering of the questionnaire in reality faced various obstacles that affected the sample achieved. Communication within the schools, to teachers, was unclear. Teachers told some of the Russian young people to take the questionnaire home, rather than using time in school hours, and this resulted in a lower return rate because of unreturned questionnaires. It proved difficult for the volunteers administering the questionnaire to renegotiate the terms initially established further up the school system with individual teachers. It also emerged that some Russian parents then vetted the questionnaire and deemed it inappropriate for their children to complete or return. Because of these difficulties in maintaining the planned strategy for data collection, the questionnaires were completed by more Estonian than Russian young people.

Given the profiles of the schools selected, data collected included responses from both Russian and Estonian young people from a cross-section of current economic backgrounds. Though intending to have equal representations of young people of both sexes, from both communities, in both Estonian and Russian samples, less boys than girls returned the questionnaire. This possibly reflected the greater number of girls in the randomly selected school sixth forms, but also the possibility that the 'theme' of the questionnaire (gender, sexuality) itself resulted in more boys deciding not to complete it.

In the final sample 163 Estonian speaking and 50 Russian speaking young people, (134 female and 79 male) returned completed questionnaires. Comparison of answers given by Russian speaking and Estonian speaking young people to the structured questions revealed very few statistically significant differences (e.g. young Russian speakers perceived greater risks of sexually transmitted infections in the context of a casual unprotected encounter). Bearing in mind the small size and non-randomly drawn nature of the sample investigated, it was decided to present findings for the sample as whole,

restricting comparisons only to sex of young people.

We want to stress that the findings are presented below not as data to be generalised, but as exploratory indications of significant concerns that haunt the terrain of sexual safety and health of young people. The questionnaire should be seen as allowing a consultative process with young people, providing preliminary information on some of the recurrent images of gender in the social context in which they are, or are becoming, sexually active adults. We argue that this feedback suggests the need for further research in larger, more carefully selected and differentiated samples, and that critical literacy about gender issues should be given central priority in processes of sexual health education.

In reporting our findings from the qualitative analysis, we have often given many examples of young people's comments related to an identified theme. We appreciate that this may, at times, present difficulties to the reader. However, we believe that it is important to document vividly the variations in a general theme in comments made by young people, and to underline that the general issues identified were often expressed, in one form or another, by many of the young people. In addition, we were very attentive to looking for counter-examples in our data, and evidence of contrasting opinions on the same issue, if they were expressed. If this issue is not raised in the text, the reader can take it as read that no counter-examples were apparent in the data to qualify the generalisations made.

2.5 Analysis

2.5.1 Quantitative data

Responses to those sections of the questionnaire that included questions and statements requiring a pre-structured response were numerically coded and entered into an SPSS 9 data file. We then employed simple descriptive statistics to summarise the responses of young men and women (frequency distributions, means and standard deviations) and used appropriate inferential statistical techniques to test for differences in replies given by the two sexes (chi-square and independent t-tests). Given the limitations of the sample in terms of size, composition and non-representativeness, tests were applied very cautiously to reduce the likelihood of rejecting the null hypothesis of no differences in response between young men and women. Statistical significance was judged on the basis of 2-tailed tests with a probability value of one per cent or less. It should be noted that while we cannot claim that the sample is representative of the broader population of Estonian and Russian speaking young people in Tallinn, we assume that comparisons between the samples of young men and women do provide meaningful indications of wider sex differences in beliefs and perceptions.

2.5.2 Qualitative data

In many sections of the questionnaire, young people wrote in response to a direct question or scenario, or explained or illustrated their response to previous question requiring a pre-structured answer. Respondents wrote their answers and comments in Estonian or Russian. These were translated into English and transcribed before applying different forms of content analysis. Our basic strategy was to identify distinct themes expressed by young people in their answers and to use these as a set of categories for systematically analysing the textual material. Alongside the indicators that surfaced from quantifying the themes, we at times have discussed the implications of specific words or phrases used. Details of the approach adopted are given as appropriate in reporting on the findings.

3. Results

3.1 Introduction

This section reports the findings from each of the questions in the questionnaire in the order outlined in section 2.2 above.

The detailed results from the content analyses of written answers can be found Appendices. For some of the open questions, some of the young people did not give written answers, or gave very brief replies. In addition, it was generally the case that young women were more fluent than young men and produced a wider variety of answers. For all of these reasons, we did not consider it appropriate to apply any form of statistical analysis to the qualitative data, and in this section we discuss only the principal discernable trends in the open question replies, together with illustrative quotations from the young people.

For the closed questions and items with pre-structured response scales, responses rates were generally very high with few missing values. Tables of findings from these sections of the questionnaire are reported in this section. Elementary statistical techniques were applied to assess whether the responses given by young men and women were significantly different. As noted earlier, the results of these analyses were treated with caution given the size and nature of the sample investigated. The use of 2-tailed tests and adoption of a relatively stringent criterion for statistical significance mean that we focus on the strongest indications of difference between young men and women.

3.2 Are men and women equal?

“Do you believe that men and women are equal in Estonia today?”

The sense of self an individual brings into the terms of physical contact in sexual encounters is imbued with associations of gender difference offered by their society. It is important, therefore, to chart some of the images of differences between men and women that the young people claim to observe, since these are part of the implicit visualisations that frame the heterosexual encounter.

In response to the question “Do you believe that men and women are equal in Estonia today?” thirty three per cent of the young men and 37 per cent of the young women answered “yes” (chi-square = 0.26; n.s.). Thus approximately two thirds of the young people believed that men and women are not equal. We looked at the main themes expressed in their comments illustrating their opinion, and used these to undertake a content analysis the results of which are reported in Appendices. Table A-1 reports an analysis of the comments offered by 127 of the young people answering that men and women are not equal. The most common answer given by these young men and women in justifying their opinion is that more men than women have political power or are in

positions of leadership or authority. Table A-2 reports a breakdown of the comments offered by the 73 young people who believe that men and women are equal in Estonia today. Over a fifth justified their view by arguing that men and women have equal opportunities, rights or capabilities.

This simple approach to categorising the young people’s answers is elaborated further in the interpretive commentary below, which attempts to draw out the implications of young people’s views of gender for issues of sexual safety.

3.2.1 Young people who believe that men and women are not equal

The images the young people used to explain their opinion that men and women are not equal frequently stressed that men in Estonian society occupy positions that embody leadership, power, control and authority, whereas women are absent from, or marginalized in, spheres of key public influence - in particular politics. Such images are significant in helping us to understand the texture of inequality within which these young people absorb an understanding of what it means to be female or male in Estonia today.

Here are some typical examples of how this sense of a visible inequality of power was expressed:

Most of the ministers and people in leading positions are men (m); Men hold the leading positions in the society (m); Men have the leading positions and women look after the home (f); Most of the top politicians are men (f); In politics there are all men (f); Estonia is men-centred. All the leading positions in society are occupied by men (f); All the power in Estonia belongs to men (f).

Other young people chose to give examples of how unequal leadership, power, control and authority are normalised in private, domestic arrangements between men and women:

I know families where the women have to obey men and follow their orders. In Estonia men are those who bring money home and decide how to use it (f); In some families women have to keep their mouths shut if the man has decided something In the course of time it has been established that the men have the power and women have to obey (m); Usually men are better paid, are breadwinners of the family and give orders to their wives (m); Men think that they are the most important member of the family and all the others have to take into account their position (f); Women are easy to use and most of the men just use them (m); Women are not so aggressive (m); Women have to keep in the background (m).

These images of men occupying the role of authoritative decision-makers, providers and earners within the domestic sphere carry with them an assumed legitimacy on the part of men to set the terms of personal relationships between men and women. Women, in contrast, are expected to accommodate and comply to a male-centred agenda, since the women’s place, at public and private levels, is associated with an absence of power. Within these accounts of male control, the position of the woman is haunted by fear of transgression of

the rules, by compliance to regulations set by assumed male prerogative, and by the absence of choice - since the gender dynamic excludes her from the right to decide and implicitly involves her in mechanisms of obedience.

Many of the young people saying men and women are not equal in Estonian society, illustrated this observation by claiming that in employment men are preferred over women, and that men have more earning power:

Men are usually preferred in spite of women's high qualifications – almost everywhere (f); Men are better paid and get higher positions at work (m); Men are better paid and preferred (f); Men are better paid for the same work (f); Women do hard work and are paid less (f); Women's income is not equal to men's (f); Man is considered more important (f); Women are not valued so highly (f).

These young people expressed their sense of invisible rules by which men are preferred and worth more, while simultaneously implying that women's capabilities are limited and their qualifications of lesser merit. These comments showed them observing a normative discounting of women's worth in the economy in society around them, perceiving as fact that women are excluded from positions of authority and control.

Some young women and men illustrated their opinion that men and women are unequal with comments on how women are sexualised:

Women are considered sexual objects. Men are more important. Women are not considered to be so capable as men (m); All leading positions are occupied by men, women are used as sex symbols or for looking after the home (m); There are some privileges for beautiful and young women (m); Women have to be beautiful, but men are judged by how wise they are. Women don't need brains (m); In Estonia men don't take women as equal - only thing they want is sex (f).

In comments such as these, some of the young people associate the sexualisation of women in their society with attitudes that devalue women and undermine their human capabilities. In observations like this, the gender conventions of sexually attractive femininity that a girl may feel are necessary to have currency in heterosexual relationships (the images associated with possibilities of being wanted, desired, loved) are interwoven with connotations of female inferiority. To have power and authority, to collaborate with equally acknowledged integrity in the setting of agendas or decision-making, are not associated with femininity. To be sexy might give access to individual men, but not to a position of equality in decision-making within relationships.

Many women respondents, particularly, explained the lack of equality by reference to commonly held attitudes in Estonian society. The following beliefs, attitudes and desires held by men were identified as persisting obstacles to equality:

Men don't want their wives to go to work and want them to be at home (f); Men want to rule (f); Men want to be leaders (f); Women are underestimated (f); Not much belief in women's capabilities (f); Men think that they are the most important and

that women are ready to die for love. Especially those who have money, beautiful body and sexy eyes. They think they can buy women (f); Men think they are most important, they don't listen to women and do what they want and what they please to do. That's why we can't be equal (f); Men believe that women are worse than they are (m); [men believe] that women are weaker (m); [Men believe] that women can't do anything, they are only for satisfying men and giving birth to children (f).

But some women were also seen as holding attitudes that served to maintain inequality:

Very often it is the fault of the women because they lack the ambition to move on in life (f); There are men and women who don't want men and women to be equal, even in Estonia (f).

In addition, contemporary social conditions were identified by some as specific influences on resistance to gender inequality (e.g. rural traditions, lack of education and generational differences):

In the world of the "bold and beautiful" there is equality. Sometimes women even dominate. In the countryside there is no equality. For these men animals are even more important than women (f); People with little education are stuck in the old understanding that man is the leader (f); Old-minded think women should stay at home (f).

3.2.2 Young people who believe men and women are equal

Just over a third of the respondents agreed that men and women are equal in Estonian society, and it is interesting to reflect on the images and ideas they presented to illustrate this belief.

Some asserted that equality exists because they believe equal opportunities are available and equal rights are enshrined now in Estonian society, e.g. Men and women are given equal rights in Estonia nowadays (m).

More young women than men expressed the view that opportunities are the same, suggesting that more women than men might consciously expect to have their lives, and encounters with men, framed by terms of gender equality:

Work possibilities are equal for men and women (f); Women can get the same things as men (f); Women can reach everything men can (f).

The young women invoked more frequently than men that women can be found in power positions as a proof of women's equal capabilities, and more claimed that sexual discrimination does not exist. Some young people decontextualised individual experience from any larger social influences by claiming that access to equality in Estonia depends not on societal conditions or contexts, but on individual initiative:

Depends on personality (f); All have the same possibilities to prove themselves and to do what they want to (f); At the present moment there doesn't exist strong discrimination of women (m); No discrimination. men and women are equal at work (f); Men

and women are accepted at work according to their possibilities not according to their gender (m).

Some Russian respondents signalled that language and nationality significantly affect the opportunities available to individuals. Many respondents claimed however that free choice and individual initiative influence lives, not social conditions of gender inequality:

Nowadays all people are equal. You don't have to think about gender. We are all people. Both sexes are treated equally. Rules are the same for all (f); Men are more ambitious and occupy better positions - but women have all the possibilities (m); Because both men and women occupy positions in Estonian society according to their possibilities (m); All have the same possibilities to prove themselves and to do what they want (f).

Some pondered the question as if it was a new concept for them to consider, commenting that they themselves had not experienced inequality, and did not perceive it happening around them:

I haven't heard that men have been preferred to a woman if they had the same qualifications (f); I haven't noticed that men thought they are better than women (f); In Estonia the situation is quite OK (f).

As noted earlier, gender inequality in Estonian society has been documented by recent research, and in this survey some two-thirds of the young people agreed that inequalities between men and women do exist and were able to illustrate their view. It is of considerable interest, therefore, that approximately one third of the respondents claimed that men and women are equal, and were able to comment with confidence on equality of opportunity and egalitarian attitudes which neutralise gender differences. If there are real systems at work in society (its culture, histories of social and economic organisation) that differentiate between men and women in ways that inequality and power issues are at stake, then the belief that "people are people", and that gender is not a discriminating factor, could leave the individual young woman or man unprepared for the active mobilisation of gender differentiated expectations. These discourses of "degendered" individualism (what happens is up to me and you as an individual) have interesting resonances in the languages of desire, romance and love, and may be of crucial significance in romantic and sexual encounters between men and women.

3.2.3 Images of change in comments the young people made

It was notable that some of the young people responded to the question of equality by providing images of change and of new possibilities in social relations between men and women. And in some cases, responses to the question of gender inequality in their society did provoke some challenging reflections about the modern world and the possibilities for creating new conditions for the transformation of gendered relationships.

One young woman expressed a sense that the restrictive order

of gender differentiations was becoming more flexible and less sexist:

Many men have been successful in fields that were considered to belong only for women and the other way round. Nowadays men can be cosmeticians, hairdressers etc. Women can be construction workers, welders, plumbers etc. (f).

Another commented on the untenable absurdity for her of the sexual division of labour:

People still believe that there are women's jobs and men's jobs. It is stupid (f).

Others suggested that gender inequality was changeable: At the moment men are still more important (f), and expressed an awareness that gender equality in public and domestic spheres has far reaching implications for individuals:

At school or in the family neither boys nor girls are preferred. That is very important in order not to feel yourself undervalued (f).

Some young women imagined the future development of a context in which new discussions of gender differences could create social change, or expressed a sense of living through a time of social reform which would create desirable new terms of equality:

At the present moment they are not equal because Estonia has not fully reformed yet. There is no stability or values according to which we can talk about equality (f).

And one young woman expressed a confident image of hope about possibilities of shifting current disabling prejudices and attitudes:

Women can't be absolutely equal with men - because of existing prejudices. But times are changing and in the new Millennium everything will be possible (f).

Finally, one young woman showed her awareness of how gender systems normalise male primacy by wryly taking us to task for embedding male primacy in our questionnaire:

In this questionnaire the questions about men come before the questions about women (f)!

3.3 Can men and women be equal?

"Do you believe men and women can be equal?"

While only approximately a third of the young men agreed that men and women are equal in Estonia today, 61 per cent of the young men and 63 per cent of the young women answered "yes" to the question "Do you believe that men and women can be equal?" (chi-square = 0.13, n.s.). Again, we identified the principal themes expressed and explored them in a content analysis of the young people's explanations of their views. Table A-3 in Appendices reports an analysis of the comments of 77 young people who answered "no" to this question. The most commonly given reason was that men and women have different or unequal capacities, with men generally being superior. Table A-4 reports a breakdown of

the answers given by 130 of the young people who believed that men and women could be equal. A much wider variety of answers is given in justifying the possibility of equality than in explaining why it is not possible. The most common argument is that men and women have equal capabilities and are able to undertake the same kinds of work. This simple approach to categorising answers is again elaborated in the following interpretive account.

3.3.1 Young people who believe men and women cannot be equal

Thirty-eight per cent of the young people asserted that men and women could not be equal. This view of unchangeable inequality was frequently justified in terms of a fixity of male physical strength and female weakness, and a co-related factor of differences in intelligence. Different sexes within the same species, men, they claimed, are stronger and women weaker, in body and brain:

Men and women can never be equal – because men are physically stronger. They are wiser too (f); Women are weaker and (as a rule) more stupid than men (m); According to nature women are weaker than men. There can't be equality between them (f); Most women can't make right and good decisions (m).

The male body was associated with superior capacities in skill, speed and power, and superior body strength easily connects with a sense of greater power in social control and agenda setting:

Men are always considered to be the stronger sex and women the weaker. Men feel themselves superior, don't pay attention to what they say and think women cannot influence (f).

From this point of view, physical and cognitive superiority lie intrinsically with men, and gender equality becomes utterly inappropriate, if not absurd. People who want equality are the problem, not the unequal relations of power themselves, which are regarded as natural:

There can't be equality. There are areas where they (women) don't suit – politics for instance. And women's sport – it is ridiculous. What do they want to achieve? (m)

The view that an unequal distribution of powers between the sexes is embedded in nature is visualised in terms of a number of polarisations where the man is hunter, provider, earner and defender, while the woman is a dependent, care-giving, mother figure. Where the young people expressed ideas of there being “natural” power differences in capacities between men and women, they invoked the normality of male dominance and female subservience. Social relations where masculinity embodies being strong and responsible for women, and femininity embodies being vulnerable and dependent and reliant on male protection and provision, are seen as part of an unchangeable, nature-given order of things.

For some young men in particular, the greater power held by men is linked with their higher social value:

Men are more important as personalities and more useful to soci-

ety (m); Men have been better all the way along (m); Men have a more important role in life (m); Men should occupy more important positions / roles in this life (m).

Many young women also invoked images of male domination and female subservience within this “natural” inequality vision. Some suggested that equality is impossible because men want to hold on to well-established advantages and control and are prepared to use pressure or force to do. In addition, women have advantages in being provided for and are invested in upholding or not contesting male power:

They don't want to give up the leading position they have had for centuries (f); They want to dominate (f); Men use pressure to get their will (f); Men always get what they want (f); Men want to dominate and some women still want men to take care of them and look after them (f); I have quite a strong character. But... I have met women who can't do anything without their men and are very submissive (f).

It was interesting to find, within these assertions of fixed natural differences, a pessimistic comment from one young man about deep incompatibilities between the sexes: Men and women don't belong together (m). Another suggested that heterosexuality depends on the inequalities and differences that exist between men and women: If there were no differences - all were equal - no differences between man and women, then there would be many homophiles (m). This notion that gender equality undermines the desired dynamic of heterosexuality raises questions that need to be kept in mind.

The accounts of biologically based differences between men and women offered by the young people who believe that gender equality is not possible, hold many important implications for the ways in which sexual relationships might be understood. A man entering into sexual relationship with a woman, for example, is seen as possessing natural capacities for action and responsibility and greater abilities, skill and strength. A woman entering a relationship, in contrast, is viewed as comparatively vulnerable, relatively disempowered, and dependent on the protection and knowledge of a male partner invested with ‘natural’ superiority and power.

The difference between man and women is envisaged here as inevitably reproducing inequality, hierarchy, and a sexual division of powers. Belief systems such as these that chart gender difference in terms of a natural order, where inequalities are non-contestable because against nature to change, provide rather infertile ground for the enactment of collaborative safer sexual behaviours.

3.3.2 Young people who believe men and women can be equal

It is interesting then to consider the images that emerge in responses from the majority (62%) of the young people who asserted that men and women can be equal. The main proof for the possibility of creating this equality was presented in images of workplace equality. For these young people it is

society, not nature that inhibits the emergence of equality between men and women. For them, the existence of some women who do access jobs of influence confirms that gender equality is a real possibility. The body is an incidental difference for them, not a determinant of the roles and power allocated to individuals:

Women can very well do men's work and the other way round. The difference is only in body (f); They are both humans and women have the right to the same legal rights as men (the only difference between them are sex-organs) (f); Both sexes are able to do everything; they can do everything if they want to (f); Besides physical differences and the ability to give birth, women don't differ from men (m).

Where the natural differences of the body are seen by some not to signify a polarisation of strength and power, for others the intelligence factor is not gender-bound either:

Women are not worse in the sense of intellectual or professional characteristics – women can be good leaders (m); Men and women are mentally equal (m).

Some young people who believed that men and women can be equal, but accepted that currently they are not, presented accounts of the conditions needed for gender equality to be established. These included: shared recognition, the embracing by both men and women of the significance of equality, and the dislodging of attitudes that privilege men and limit and relegate women:

It is possible when both parties accept the equality. Not possible when men consider women to be created for them and only for the home (f).

Some young men, in particular, identified social progress with gender equality, evoking images of the legitimacy of women demanding equal human rights and gaining equal access to politics, business and other zones of power and success:

The more society develops the less women are discriminated against (m).

Signs of change were seen by some in the new possibilities being established in an Estonia emerging out of Soviet totalitarianism and moving towards being part of a wider political landscape - for:

in many other countries there are equal rights for men and women (f).

The advantages of gender equality, suggested by both young male and female respondents, would be to see women becoming less helpless, more confident, less expectant of men taking the lead and less invested in bolstering male dominance.

Occasionally images of role 'democratisation' are given. One young woman suggests that: *Women can do men's work and the other way round. Men cook and do housework as well (f)*. A young man argues: *There is no place for discrimination - all the rights and duties must be shared equally (m)*, and others imagine a new gender topography emerging with equality: *They should be man-woman and women-man (m); Women can*

behave in a very manly way and men can be very womanly (m).

However, it is interesting that there is a noticeable relative absence of images of male advantages to be gained from greater gender equality. There recur comments like: Women are capable of everything (f) but these are less frequently echoed by male-focused affirmations. More often, the positive gains for women imply a ceding of position by men. Men are seen as evacuating positions of privilege and power in order to allow women in to occupy such positions too. It appears more difficult for young people to think of greater gender equality as leading to new positions and pleasures for men.

The two most frequent categories of response affirming that gender equality is possible underlined that human capabilities are not pre-determined by fixed sex differences, and that equality between men and women is possible if men and women want it; if an effort is made to create it and there is a commitment to changing attitudes:

All is possible if we really want it (f); If men consider women equal and the other way round, it is equality (f); People have to feel it in themselves (f).

Emotions and values associated with the possibility of equality that are mentioned by both male and female respondents include: love, trust and respect, understanding, politeness, emotional commitment, moral commitment to equal human opportunity not based on body difference, and listening to the other.

The motivation and desire to create the conditions of equality are mentioned as factors able to override apparent differences. As one young woman says:

They are basically different from the outside. They could do everything equally if they wanted to (f).

The contrasts in the "equality impossible"/"equality possible" discourses interestingly suggest questions that could be explored about polarised tendencies concerning the possibilities for male and female behaviours. Does interpreting the differences of the male and female body as "natural" markers of differently allocated powers limit the possibility of jointly shared negotiation and responsibility? Does prioritising consciousness and commitment to envisaging possibilities of created (not nature fixed) equalities between men and women produce a different visualising of equal collaboration around the encounter of differently sexed bodies?

3.4 Differences between men and women

"Apart from obvious physical differences, what do you think are the main differences between men and women?"

This question warrants a few comments before we present the findings and think about some of the implications they might suggest. There is no doubt that the phrasing of this question invited an active 'seeing' of difference and therefore a down-playing of possibilities of similarity. Our concern here stemmed from the recognition that heterosexuality, the sexual relations between men and women, is articulated along para-

digms of difference. Young people grow up in cultures that do not offer them scripts of falling in love or having sex with “someone” (man or woman) - but with someone of the opposite sex. The relations between men and women are constructed out of notions of difference. We thought it important to map some of the ways that these differences are perceived. We thought it potentially useful to produce a map, from this small sample, that can be debated, contested, reflected on, set in relation to other data or questions about the way gender is organised in society and in sexual relations. In order to construct a new script, there have to be moments where the terms of the old or “given” scripts are made explicit - even if that very process artificially rigidifies (and even risks momentarily normalising even more) the terms of that established script.

When the young people in our sample were asked to list some of the main differences between men and women, a powerful set of contrasts were suggested which together form a landscape of polarisations. Any individual will, of course, provide their own set of gender associations, but it does appear that young people draw upon a pool of common knowledge in which heterosexual interaction is understood as predicated on a set of polarised values, emotions and dispositions.

Many young people felt that men and women can be identified as different in a number of wide-reaching areas and ways, but did not specify differences explicitly. Rather they mentioned the following diverse aspects of human experience within which they suggested men and women are significantly different:

Ways of thinking, ways of making decisions, sexuality, needs, feelings, desires, interests, values, principles, soul and emotional life, nerves, psychology, ways of influencing others, - view of life, attitudes to life, attitudes to people, to work and to family, earning, mental abilities, character, behaviour, pose and attitude, way of talking, logic, morals, ways of communicating, word capacity, manners, practical thinking, ability to make decisions, maturity, understanding of life and the world, enjoyment of what life has to offer, sex, orgasms, ways of dressing, interests and hobbies, emotions, relationships, what is valued, emotional life, what is thought about and how.

These responses suggest that young people have in their heads an intricate map of obstacles to shared communication and collaboration between men and women. There is here a very clear sense that being female and being male situates an individual within significantly different agendas, values, abilities and priorities.

Many of the respondents did, however, detail gender-specific markers that signify key contrasts between men and women. It is important to underline when looking at the images they gave that where they describe men as more this or that - it is always being implied that women are less the same this or that. Where they list women as more this or that - it is always being implied that men are less the same this or that.

The young people’s responses overwhelmingly profiled a shared set of contrasts in their understanding of what it is “to be a woman” and what it is “to be a man”. The quantitative breakdown of the responses (see Table A-5 in Appendices) showed that the most frequent contrasts agreed on by both young men and young women are:

- men are stronger, women are weaker
- men are less emotional, women are more emotional
- men are less expressive, women are more expressive
- men are less caring, women are more caring

Young women (who wrote longer replies generally) also frequently indicated that they saw:

- men are more interested in sex, women are more interested in romance and relationships
- men are more inclined to exhibit irresponsible or poor social behaviour, women are more inclined to exhibit responsible social behaviour
- men are positioned in the role of earners / providers, women are positioned in the role of carers

Even before gendered behaviours are activated in sexual interactions, the norms that we found circulating in the responses that ‘recognise’ masculinity and femininity as contrasting in these ways, bode ill for collaborative agency in ensuring sexual safety. It is maybe important to mention again here that the concern of Living for Tomorrow focuses on the reality that international research shows a majority of sexually active young people (of whom the majority are having heterosexual sexual relations) are not engaging in safer sex. The concern of this project has been to explore how the gendering of these sexual relations can be understood to affect the reproduction of sexual risk behaviours between men and women.

According to the prevailing general sense of the images provided by the teenage respondents (taking into account that these characteristics are both explicitly named as specific to one sex, or inferred by contrast to the other) a ‘woman’ is expected to be vulnerable, tentative, weaker, fragile, and to lack resilience or bravery. A ‘man’, in contrast is expected to be strong, take charge, display confidence, know what he wants, and is expected not to display hesitation, anxiety or vulnerability. Here we will give a selection of quotes that illustrate attitudes that recurred strikingly.

Women are often described as:

Weaker (f); allowed to show weakness more (f); weaker nervous system (f); more delicate (f); the weaker sex (f); scared - need protection (f); delicate (f); more fragile (f); weaker & need men’s protection (f); more easily frightened (f); more tender (f); more fragile (f); more nervous (f); weaker (m); the weaker sex – women (m).

While men are often described as:

Stronger (f); more aggressive (f); have to be stronger (f); stronger and give women feeling of security (f); more powerful (f); have to be strong (f); power and strength (f); have to be braver (f); can bear pain better (f); more stamina (m); greater endurance (m); stronger (m); braver (m).

“Being a woman”, was associated in many comments with an ability to access and express feelings, to imagine solutions via words, to value and seek emotional experience and anticipate ability to articulate it. “Being a man”, in contrast, was seen associated with legitimate non-investment in verbal communication and repression of vulnerabilities or insecurity, with the downplaying or restraint of emotions and a dislike of talking about personal feelings.

Many young women described women as:

more expressive (f); feel better in company (f); talk more, to show and express feelings (f); more forthcoming (f); much easier to talk about their feelings (they have richer word capacity) (f); can solve their problems talking with words (f); show their feelings (f); want to be loved and want to share their feelings (f); show more their emotions (f); more emotional (f); trust intuition more (f); better intuition (f); more sensitive (f); can understand others better (f); thinks with her heart (f); feelings more important (f); tender (f); emotional (f); more emotional life (f); more sensitive in every sense (f); think with their heart and have a 7th sense (f); trust their feelings (f); are easily offended (f); more kind at heart (f).

And young men described them as:

more feeling (m); better at discussing & listening (m); more sensitive (m); more emotional - take things to heart more (m); more sensitive (m); cry more (m); tender (m); understanding (m); kind-hearted (m); gentler (m); more easily offended (m); able to talk personally (m); often expressing feelings (m); show emotions more (m).

Men, in contrast, are described as:

less expressive (f); don't talk so much (f); talk less (f); don't share their emotions between themselves (f); keep emotions to themselves (f); less emotional (f); ashamed of emotions (f); cold at heart (don't cry) (f); don't show feelings (f); not expressing feelings (m); not liking to talk of personal matters (m); don't show feelings (m).

Women are expected to adhere more to moral conventions, “holding the fort” of socially approved decency and stabilities, guarding reputation with an adherence to “proper” behaviour rules. Women are invested in more stable social structures where their behaviour needs to be carefully monitored:

more inclined to responsible social behaviour (not smoke, drugs, drink; not dirty words) (f); greater sense of duty (f); more responsibilities: family, home, reputation, greater sense of duty, more conservative (f); greater sense of duty (m).

“Being a man” in contrast, implies a licence to be inconsequential in behaviour, take risks, and to behave in ways that need not be answerable or responsible. Men are seen as having permission to act without thinking of consequences, explore freedoms, and have access to multiple sites of uncommon behaviours where risk activities are condoned as markers of masculinity. The young women expressed this eloquently, invoking men as:

more irresponsible (f); less sensible (f); have less responsibility (f); careless (f); take life easier (f); act without thinking (f); lower morals (f); more able to leave woman easily (f); doesn't feel responsible for baby from one night stand, freer (f); value freedom more (f); take more risks (f); take more liberties (f); have more freedom to decide (f); eager to take risks (f); permitted more to make mistakes (f); bad behaviors (f); boast more (f); big egoists (f); not self critical enough (f); only think about themselves (f); think higher of themselves than women (f); find it difficult to apologise (f); can talk dirty (f); behave loosely (f).

Men are seen to have permission to access different zones of exploration and sexual experience, and have relationships outside publicly socially condoned rules, while expecting obedience and appropriate behaviour from women. Men, according to some young women respondents, are described as:

more interested in sex (f); want more sex (f); when in love more eager to go to bed (f); leaders in sexual relationships (f); think more about sex (f); want real women not dream of them (f); sex is the most important thing (f); all they think about is bed (f); it seems that men think about sex all the time (f); get excited more easily (f); want more sex (f); always want sex (f); more able to have relationships without rules (f); more interested in one night stands (f).

Whereas women, according to some young women, are imagined as:

more interested in romance & relationships (f); in flirting (f); just want closeness and romance without sex, more (f); dream a lot (f); able to just dream about men (f); are more modest in talking about sex (f); I don't mean women don't want sex but they can do without it (f).

According to the landscape respondents mapped out, a woman is positioned on the side of caring – for men, children, family, others, the home, with expectations that she is altruistic, attentive to and concerned about others:

more caring (f); value home and cosiness more (f); think about others more (f); value family more (f); have more altruism (f); care more than men (f); don't leave the children (f); more caring and loving (f); responsible for children (f); married women have more work (f); the family is important (f); have to look after men (f); more careful about work and home (m); more caring (m); carers of children (m); value family more (m).

To be positioned as a man involves, in contrast, expectations of providing for others in concrete, financial ways and to protect members of the family in a physical sense:

responsible for supporting the family (f); head of family (f); breadwinners (f); take care of wife (f); can choose women and must protect them (f).

So while “women” are described as positioned on the side of dreams, romance, modesty, relationships, intimacy and rituals of flirting – “men”, not interested in these preoccupations, are perceived to be on the side of action, risk, non-communication and control. “Women” are the chosen, not the choosers, are to be led by men, dependent and expected to cede authority, to yield to others needs or desires. “Men” are described as the choosers, the leaders, the head or authority figure who can expect obedience. They access money and status, can expect to set the terms and have their own agendas.

It is striking that when asked to note the main differences they perceive between men and women, the young people evoke a vivid set of polarised and contrasting behaviours that they overwhelmingly agree are associated with masculinity and femininity. This question followed ones that asked them to reflect on gender equality in Estonia and on whether they thought equality between men and women was possible. It asked them to list here what they saw as significant differences between men and women. Their answers made visible the infrastructures of behaviours offered by the gender map that they have become familiar with, growing up in Estonia. The complexity of heterosexual collaboration on sexual safety and responsibility starts to surface here as embedded in and reinforced by this wider landscape of gender differences.

3.5 Valued characteristics in men and women

“What characteristics are most valued in men in Estonian society?”

“What characteristics are most valued in women in Estonian society?”

In order to explore from different angles how norms of masculinity and femininity were perceived by young people, we included this question about the respondents perceptions of what they felt is valued in men and women in their society. As with the question on differences between men and women, a very wide range of characteristics emerged. A number of certain kinds of descriptions did recur fairly often however, and Tables A-5 and A-6 in Appendices report the most commonly given valued qualities for men and for women respectively. In both tables we have grouped these under three headings: competence and success; socio-emotional characteristics, and physical characteristics.

3.5.1 Valued characteristics in men

Both the young women and men equally often mentioned wisdom and honesty as highly valued in men in Estonia. The young men, however, most often mentioned wealth as the most valued characteristic of men - listing money nearly twice as often than women. They also listed the significance of

male physical qualities twice as often as women. The valued physical characteristics for men included a range of physical condition (being in good shape) and strength terms that connote health and agency - the able body in action. The valued importance of appearance and attractiveness of men was mentioned more frequently by the young men than by the young women. So from the young men’s point of view, it appears that to be rich, strong, fit and attractive gives men affirmed currency in Estonia.

From the young women’s responses a different profile of valued characteristics in men emerged. They listed characteristics they saw as valued that were hardly mentioned by the young men – such as kindness, good manners and domestic qualities, and felt being loving and caring gave men approved currency. The young women named a more diverse range of characteristics that involved more moral and emotional values and more caring behaviours. So from the young women’s point of view, men gain currency in society by being honest, fun, kind, able in daily life, behaving well, caring – as well as having money and intelligence.

3.5.2 Valued characteristics in women

Beauty is the characteristic seen as valued for women in Estonia most frequently mentioned by both young women and young men, and nearly twice as often listed by the men than the women. Following beauty, the young men most often mentioned sexiness (suggesting communication of sexual interest or potential) and submissiveness (suggesting communication of affirmation of men’s dominance) as positively valued attributes for women. Women’s physical characteristics most often mentioned as highly valued focused on looks and appearance. It is the spectacle of the female body that is perceived as giving women currency, a body to be seen and judged and validated by its communication of attractiveness, not its strength or action potential.

While young women most often suggested attractiveness in body and appearance as valued in women, the next set of attributes they most often listed are markers of competence and capabilities (intelligence and independence), kindness and submissiveness.

How the society around young people appears to distinguish between men and women, by valuing them differently, surfaces suggestively from replies to this question. Markers of power and competence (like wealth, decision making, self confidence) were not mentioned as valued attributes in women. Yet “submissiveness” (which does not appear at all in relation to men), is identified as a characteristic that both the young men and women perceive to be valued in women in Estonia. Wisdom and intelligence though perceived to be valued in women by both the young men and women, are mentioned relatively much more frequently by both for men.

Thus, from the young men’s point of view a combination of beauty, sexiness and submissiveness would appear most highly valued in women. Whereas, from the young women’s points of view a combination of beauty/ appearance, wisdom, sense,

kindness, sense of humour, submissiveness and independence are most significantly valued for women. Also, from men's point of view it appears that money, wisdom and physical attributes as most highly valued in men. Whereas from the young women's point of view the valued attributes for men are wisdom, honesty, sense of humour, kindness, manners and domestic qualities, with a more diverse range of other characteristics including wealth, physical attributes, manners, caring also valued. To illustrate the differences of perception emerging from replies to this question, Table 1 below gives the most valued characteristics of men and women suggested by young people.

Table 1: Young people views on what characteristics are valued in men and women (% of young people mentioning each characteristic)

Valued characteristics in men		Valued characteristics in women	
By young men	%	By young women	%
Money	20.3	Wisdom	20.9
Wisdom	19.0	Honesty	14.9
Honesty	12.7	Humour	14.9
Physical condition	12.7	Kindness	11.9
Beauty	11.4	Domestic qualities	11.9
Humour	8.9	Money	11.2
Appearance	7.6	Intelligence	9.7
Strength	7.6	Strength	9.0
		Good manners	9.0
		Caring	9.0
		Faithfulness	7.5
		Physical condition	7.5
		Beauty	15.7
		Sexiness	11.9
		Submissiveness	11.9
		Wisdom	11.2
		Faithfulness	9.7
		Intelligence	9.0
		Sense	8.3
		Appearance	8.2
		Domestic qualities	7.5
		Honesty	7.5
		Independence	7.5

The replies to this question are particularly interesting as they open up discussion of the different map of valued characteristics that young men and young women might be carrying into heterosexual relationships. What young men see as valued in men are often not what women consider valued in men. What women perceive as valued in women, are not in line with what young men see most valued in women. The gendering of valued characteristics thus gives different languages to the terms of heterosexual exchange for young men and women.

3.6 What is expected of men and women?

“Do you think there are different expectations for men and women in Estonian society today in any or all of the areas listed?”

This question was located as a bridging question between the general questions about gender differences and expectations, and the move to the next set of questions that were focused on issues of gender and sexuality.

Here the young people's understanding of cultural expectations for men and women were explored in the areas of: education and training, employment, socially acceptable behaviour, family responsibilities and sexual behaviour. They first indicated agreement or disagreement – then were given space to give images that supported their perception.

Table 2 reports the percentages of young men and women agreeing that there are different expectations.

The percentages of young men and women agreeing were very similar for each category and none of the differences in opinion apparent in the table above is statistically significant.

The young people are fairly evenly divided in their opinion of whether different expectations are held with respect to education and training – so this was a conflicted response, half clearly feeling men and women face similar expectations in education and training, while half disagreed. For the remaining areas of social life listed, however, a clear majority of both sexes agree that different expectations are held in society for men and women. This is particularly true for family responsibilities and sexual behaviour. It is striking that the “private”, inter-personal areas of life are seen to have the strongest gender differentiations in expected behaviours for men and women. But it is also important to note how the differences in expectations in sexual behaviour for men and women (observed by nearly 70 per cent of all respondents) exist in a context where the majority perceive different expectations for men and women in Estonian society in other spheres of life.

Table 2: Different expectations for men and women in Estonian society – percentage agreement by young men and women

	young men (n=79) %	young women (n=134) %	chi-square
Different expectations for men and women?			
education and training	51	47	0.30
employment	67	61	0.67
socially acceptable behaviour	58	62	0.28
family responsibilities	76	77	0.05
sexual behaviour	70	67	0.18

The percentages of young men and women agreeing were very similar for each category and none of the differences in opinion apparent in the table above is statistically significant.

The young people are fairly evenly divided in their opinion of whether different expectations are held with respect to education and training – so this was a conflicted response, half clearly feeling men and women face similar expectations in education and training, while half disagreed. For the remaining areas of social life listed, however, a clear majority of both sexes agree that different expectations are held in society for men and women. This is particularly true for family responsibilities and sexual behaviour. It is striking that the “private”, inter-personal areas of life are seen to have the strongest gender differentiations in expected behaviours for men and women. But it is also important to note how the differences in expectations in sexual behaviour for men and women (observed by nearly 70 per cent of all respondents) exist in a context where the majority perceive different expectations for men and women in Estonian society in other spheres of life.

The comments made with respect to different sexual behaviour expectations are of particular interest in considering the role of gender in sexual relationships. Where young people agreed that there are different sexual expectations for men and women in Estonian society, they expressed, either explicitly or implicitly, a number of interrelated contrasts. Such contrasts were illustrated much more frequently and in greater detail by the young women than the young men.

In all of the comments made about men and women and sexual behaviour, it is important to stress that the large majority of respondents had not had relationships involving sexual intercourse – yet had very clear visualisation of the codes of behaviour that were considered appropriate or normal for relationships involving sex, according to social expectations, for men and women. The expectations they mentioned exist as part of perceived scripts in circulation - that young people might therefore draw on or refer to in anticipating or structuring future sexual relations. In particular encounters or relationships individuals contest or comply with these scripted expectations differently. But behaviour is nonetheless affected by what people think is expected from them or from others. And how they themselves expect to behave is affected by the

assumptions and attitudes they perceive in circulation in the world around them.

The script for expected sexual behaviour for men and women (based on the comments the young people gave), focused on the following features:

The young people perceive it is expected of men to be more interested in sex and it is more legitimate for them to express that interest. The young people think that in Estonia it is believed that men want or need sex more, think more about sexual pleasure and have more freedom in seeking sexual partners. The respondents see men viewed positively for being sexually active and having many sexual partners, and being more likely to be excused if they are unfaithful. They suggest men are commonly expected to be more active in sex, to make the first move and to take the lead in relationships. They suggest there are expectations that men are more interested in their own satisfaction than in the woman’s feelings and think less about the possible negative consequences of sexual activity. Men can be expected to be more sexually aggressive or violent, and dominate women.

The young people observe that in Estonia it is expected that women are less interested in sex, get more disapproval for expressing that interest, and need sex less. They are expected to present arousing sexiness to men and to flirt – yet to be more modest, calm, controlled and sensible, concealing their own sexual desire. Women are to be less active and more passive in sexual interactions. They do not initiate sex, but have to wait until a man makes the first move and then follow his lead, or even subordinate their behaviour to the man’s desires. Women are viewed negatively if they take the initiative in sex, are judged harshly and condemned with bad reputations if they have several partners, and are less likely to be excused if they are unfaithful. Women are expected to be more interested in romance and relationships than sex itself, and more concerned about the risks that sex might entail. They can be expected to be more interested in ensuring the man’s pleasure than in seeking their own.

Before the questionnaire went on to pose more structured questions about perceptions of priorities for men and women within sexual interactions, this very vivid script of gender differentiations in anticipated sexual behaviours was clearly

delineated by the young people. In particular, young people's comments reflected a number of key normative assumptions which serve to organise men's and women's sexuality differently. While not quoting exhaustively here, we thought it important to give the reader illustrations of typical comments by the young people themselves on the different sexual expectations for men and women they perceive in Estonian society around them. The young women are quoted more because they were more verbally forthcoming in their descriptions.

Men are expected to take the initiative and women are expected to follow:

Women expect the men to take the first step and make the first move (m); Men have to start the relationship, it is considered weird when woman calls the man first. (f); Men should make the first move (f); In sex he should have the leading role (f); Men do all the work (m); Women are expected to be more passive. Men have to make the first move (f); Bold behaviour is considered to be inappropriate – she is considered easy and should have more modesty (f); If a woman starts to approach a man she is considered a slut (f); Usually men take the first move and start the sexual intercourse (f); Up to these days it is still expected that men take the initiative and make the start. If women act like that they are considered – you know (f); Men are expected to be the active party and women are more passive. I don't like it. (f)

Men are expected to exert power and control and women are expected to concede:

Men have more aggressive sexual behaviour.(m); Only men rape. (f); Men are the rulers (f); Men should have the last word (f); Some men are rather violent (more than women). They want satisfaction and don't think about the consequences and about women's feelings. (f); Men are more aggressive, women want "soft" and nice romance. (f); Men are more outspoken and more aggressive (f); (Her) subordination is expected (f); Usually men seem to dominate in bed also; he thinks it is normal (but isn't it?) (f)

Men are expected to have greater sexual freedom and women are policed and monitored:

If a woman has had many relationships, she is considered "easy"; when man has had many girls it is OK. (f); When a woman has made a mistake she would never get rid of the label and get her good reputation back. With men it is not so severe. They are allowed to do what they please. (f); When a man has many partners he is Don Juan. When woman, she is prostitute.(f); When a woman dates many men, she's just a bitch (f); Women have to be faithful and when not she is not excused. When the man has a lover it is not considered a big issue. Men have more freedom. (f); When a man is fed up with the woman he goes on to the next one (f); Men can visit other women – women can't (m); If a man changes women often – it is okay. When woman dates many men, she is just a bitch. (f); Women get easier labelled bitch when men are just called "playboy" (f); More modesty is expected from women. Women can't date with many men at the same time – she is automatically considered to be a bitch, while men who see many women at the same time are considered to be

charmers, men have here more freedom (f); If a woman sleeps around she is automatically a bitch, but when man does it, he is considered to be just untrue. It is unfair. They should be treated in the same way (f)

Men's sexual needs are expected to be more important, women's needs less so:

Women have to provide pleasure for men. Women wait for closeness. (f); (Men) care for their own satisfaction and that's all they think about (f); Men think if they want sex women have to agree right away (f); Men show when they want to have sex, women usually not (f); They want satisfaction and don't think about the consequences and about women's feelings (f)

Some suggestions of sameness:

A minority suggested that sexual behaviour expectations do not differ for men and women in Estonian society and the following kinds of statements suggested the possibility of there not being different scripts that guide sexual relationships between men and women:

All have to be active and creative (m); Both have to be equally active (m); Both sexes are expected to be active (f); In sexual behaviour they are both equal (m); Expectations are equal (f); Men want women and women want men (m); Women have become braver, they don't wait that somebody notices them, they try to win attention (f).

However, an important issue here is that the perceived differences in sexual expectations for men and women, expressed by a majority of young people, echo themes that emerged earlier. In particular, the leadership, power, initiative and higher value accorded to men in contrast with images of women's narrower boundaries, marginality, compliance, dependency and submissiveness, mirrors the contrasts that surfaced in responses to earlier questions which do not focus on sexual behaviour.

3.7 What makes a good lover?

"What makes a man a good lover?"

"What makes a woman a good lover?"

In order to explore further the young people's assumptions and expectations about sexual relationships between men and women, they were asked the following questions: "What makes a man a good lover?" and "What makes a woman a good lover?" The principal themes emerging from their answers were identified and results are reported in Tables A-8 and A-9 in Appendices.

The views of young men and young women on what makes a man a good lover were markedly different.

The most commonly identified qualities by the young men (10% or more) were: physical characteristics (e.g. good body, physical condition, good health, stamina, appearance, handsome and large penis), experience, being active (e.g. confident, energetic, kisses well, skilful, bold and powerful) and love, care and feeling for the woman. Among the young

women, in contrast, a more diversified list of seven qualities were commonly identified (10% or more): love, care and feeling for the woman, tenderness, being active and satisfying partner were mentioned more often than the highest quality the men most frequently listed – and physical characteristics, experience and passion were also mentioned by 10 per cent or more.

Beyond the most frequently listed qualities, some young men expressed quite thoughtful and varied concerns as significant for the “good male lover”. Being loved by his partner, fidelity, capacity to communicate and show his feelings, ability to satisfy her fully, living up to her wider expectations (when she is satisfied with his life and appearance(m)), ability to make decisions, patience, good manners – and a good salary, money, a stable financial situation. Some expressed the importance of attentiveness and understanding of his partner:

When he understands his partner and knows her needs (m); When a man cares about the woman and knows what she wants (m); Understanding the emotional and sensual world of the women (m).

None of the young men listed notions of force or domination or deployment of strength over women as features of the good male lover, although one mentioned the absence of this as significant: tenderness towards the woman, not using force(m). The general trend was to focus on the good enough body, on knowledgeable skills and the quality of caring connection to the woman partner.

Two comments by young men merit particular mention however. One simply replied: They have to be “MEN” in bed to be interesting to their girlfriends. Another responded by saying that what it is that makes the man a good man is what makes him a good lover – implying the rallying of the characteristics of masculinity into the relationship. Looking back at how these masculine traits and qualities are perceived through earlier responses to the questionnaire, his comment draws attention to the wider reservoir of connotations from which sexual behaviours are scripted. Gender attributes perceived to be normal or expected filter into notions of how relationships are expected to be.

The young women have a more extensive set of vocabulary to suggest what makes a man a good lover. Skill and experience were mapped in more detail:

Good foreplay, gentle touch, soft movements, compliments, clear breath. Knows the art of love (f); Kisses well and caresses women often (f); he has to know how to do it. He has to know me, my body, my needs (f).

The young women visualise the range of attributes appreciated in a man as a lover with much greater and more affective detail. Where the young men had a more abstract list of emotional words like love, caring, understanding etc., the young women expanded these features with a range of more detailed expressions: delicacy, honesty, gentleness, considerateness, respect, sincerity, willingness to help, generosity, passion, mutual understanding, friendliness, commitment, trust,

romantic dinner with candlelight, charm, kind-heartedness, compliments, nice words, joyfulness etc.

The young women also repeatedly emphasised a more insistent and passionate emotional investment:

Be gentle, love her (f); Love, love, love (f); when the person he is with is really important to him and he loves and cares for her (f); if you really love (f); if you really love the other person you can't be a bad lover (f); he has to love her – not choose her by the shape of her tits (f); really love for partner (f); be in love (f).

One young woman vividly spelled out the issue of trust: The woman should feel confident about the man and not be afraid of mistakes she can make when having an intercourse.

Some young women articulated strongly the importance of the attitude of the man to the woman, the interactive process and in particular the significance of attentiveness to women's wishes, needs and pleasures:

Wants me as much as I want him. Takes account of my wishes(f); Taking care of partner, providing pleasure (f); When he cares what I want (f); When you trust him caring (f); Taking account of partner's wishes (f); When a man is considerate and takes account of women's needs. He must satisfy her needs (f); Willingness to help her with her problems (f).

A few young women also mentioned some typically “masculine” characteristics (though not in their extreme versions) as desirable in the good lover:

Protective (f); Not too pushy (f); Not too obstinate (f); Knows own worth(f); Not afraid of anything (f); Stern (f); Protective (f); He should be the active side, women might not be so experienced (f); Purposeful (f); Financially well off (f); caring and tender, but at the same time powerful (f); Strength (then you feel protected and he is able to take care of you) (f); The man has to drive the women (f).

One young woman explicitly noted that it is when the usual conventions of masculinity are not activated that the good male lover emerges: Not usual behaviour (in good sense), not macho like.

The differences in the views of the young men and women about what makes a man a good lover are very marked for some qualities. For example, the women were five times more likely to mention “tenderness”, nearly three times more likely to mention “love, care and feelings for the woman”, and more than twice as likely to mention “satisfying partner” than men are. Women mentioned passion, but no men mentioned it. Men, in contrast, are nearly twice as likely to mention “physical characteristics” as women. Within physical characteristics the young women mention, they do not list particular organs, nor emphasize as much the athletically conditioned body – but mention more generally beauty, “nice” body and appearance.

Marked differences were also apparent in the views of the men and women on what makes a woman a good lover.

For young men, the most commonly identified qualities (10% or more) for the good female lover were: physical char-

acteristics (e.g. attractiveness, beauty, body and big tits), experience, and love, care and feeling for the man. For women, in contrast, the main qualities mentioned (10% or more) were: love, care and feeling for the man, being active, satisfying partner and tenderness.

The most mentioned qualities by the young men for a woman to be a good lover are physical qualities – a rating of the body, with particular images of that body:

Big tits (m); nice arse (m); blond hair (m); perfect body (m) nice body to please man (m); long legs (m)..

What is interesting here is the way the valued features of the female body are nothing to do with her experience of her body – but about a body that relates to some impersonal narrative of “the sexy female body”. Given the sense of pressures young women feel about the judgements on their sexual activity and experience, it is interesting that the young men list experience as a significant feature of the good women lover. A sense of know how, that perhaps takes the pressure for knowledge off the man, matters. Love, care and feeling are mentioned by young men a third of the rate that physical attributes are mentioned, but images of the emotional connection are listed (some of them interestingly referencing the family/husband – men as lovers as never referenced in relation to family or wives):

If they love man as well as possible (m); existence of handsome, caring tender husband (m); when she truly loves (m); the love of a beautiful man (m); man's fidelity and children (m); to be able to take care of the family (m).

Two comments by men suggest indirect references to the risks involved for women as lovers:

When they don't fear(m); The ability to cope with difficult situations(m).

There are two particular aspects that appear in the responses from the young women, which exist in tension with each other on the spectrum between pleasing/compliance with the men's perceived needs and desires, and women's own desires and initiatives. On the one hand, empathy for the man's anticipated wants and vulnerabilities is clearly articulated by some as very important for the good woman lover:

If she can identify with man's position and think, before her own opinion, what man thinks (f); comes forward for the man to do what man likes (f); can take care of her man so he is satisfied (f); when she cares about the man's desires (f); ready to sacrifice (f); she should be nice, to make the man feel comfortable so that everything is perfect (f); taking care of the man (f); when she can kiss well and accepts everything (f); women should be modest and mild and take account of what the man wants. She is a good lover when the man feels OK about himself (f); can support men when they have problems (f); she should provide satisfaction to the man (f); when she is not complaining and nagging over men's mistakes... but helps solve them (f).

Other women respondents, however, stress that it is the activity and initiative of women and recognition of woman's own

needs and desires that makes them good lovers:

Not submissive (f); active (f); says what she likes (f); boldness (f); independence (f); courageous (f); outspoken (f); if she dares to say to the man what she wants (f); if she does it under her own will (f); Actually she should control the situation (f); Absolute freedom and a little power (f); freedom; equal participation in sexual acts (f); when she is not so painfully altruistic(f); energy (f); she should be active and take initiative (f); More self confidence (f); men like when women can express their pleasures (f).

Some of the differences in emphasis between the young men's and women's views are very marked. The young women are over four times as likely to identify “being active”, and over twice as likely to identify love, care and feelings for men than the young men are. In contrast, the young men are three times more likely to identify “physical characteristics” and nearly twice as likely to identify “experience” as the women are.

It is interesting that for the young women, “satisfying partner” is identified as a quality of a good lover irrespective of sex, whereas young men do not identify this quality commonly for either sex. This perhaps points to a greater importance attached to reciprocity in sexual relationships by women (e.g. collaboration with man; doing what is good for both) and is consistent with the fact that five women mention “equality” as being a factor which make a woman a good lover, and being active also gets high ratings for women from women.

Women abstained from commenting on what makes a woman a good lover three times more frequently than they did about men – suggesting that “the woman as a good lover” may be a less well scripted notion for women.

None of the respondents mentioned commitment to ensure sexual safety as an attribute of a good man or women lover.

3.8 What men and women want from sex

“Do you think men and women want different things from sex? If yes, can you explain: “

“What do you think men want most from sex?”

“What do you think women want most from sex?”

“What do you think men and women both want in common from sex?”

To explore further what young people perceive sex to mean for men and women, we asked them for their ideas about what men and women want from sex.

In response to the first question, “Do you think men and women want different things from sex?” 54 per cent of young men and 62 per cent of young women agreed. The difference between men and women here was not statistically significant (chi-square = 0.99, n.s.). It is worth noting that 41 per cent of male respondents did not answer the question about what men want, and 44 per cent made

no comment about what women want. Higher percentages of young women (66% and 70% respectively) responded to both questions. This again suggests young men's reticence or unwillingness to articulate the images, or a more sparse, less detailed visualisation of what the responses might be.

The comments made in reply to the next questions: "What do you think men want most from sex?" "What do you think women want most from sex?" began to chart the differences in underlying desires or goals that are perceived to position men and women differently. The responses were analysed initially by counting commonly occurring words. The results are given in Tables A-10 and A-11 in Appendices.

These tables show that the most commonly used word for both men and women was "satisfaction", but that young men and women used this word much more commonly in relation to what men want from sex. For men also, the next two most common words relate to physical aspects of sex – pleasure and orgasm. For women, in contrast, the second and third issues identified related to emotional issues – tenderness and love, aspects of sex that are scarcely mentioned in relation to what men want.

Both young men and young women perceived men's desired satisfaction in terms of the achievement of physical pleasure. Men's motivations for sex are anticipated as involving little interest in seeking the "tenderness, closeness, love" cluster of emotional connotations. The quest for variety and also proving something were seen as significant on the map of men's desires.

Women's desired satisfaction in sex is seen by both the young men and women as woven into a more multi-faceted fabric of emotional and caring desires, including physical pleasure. The words *security* and *gentleness* surfaced within envisaged women's desires – suggesting that roughness and risk were possibilities.

As an alternative approach to analysis, the answers to each question were coded into one of four categories: "physical", "physical and emotional", "emotional" and "other". These results are reported Table 3 below.

The "physical" category includes all comments that refer to the physical pleasures of sex and which make no reference to any emotional and relationships terms (*e.g. to get rid of the sexual pressure; men like fantasies and variety in sex; to feel the woman's naked body; pleasure; satisfaction; orgasm.*)

The "physical & emotional" category includes all comments that refer to the above words, plus any words which relate to emotional or relationship aspects of sex, its personal significance, or which use words such as: gentleness, caresses, closeness, and tenderness, which have a physical reference but which imply something about the emotional quality of the relationship. Also included are references to both own and partner satisfaction (*e.g. satisfaction and mutual support; want to feel closeness with the man they love; satisfaction, knowledge that she is loved; woman want orgasm also, they want to feel wanted; closeness of body and soul; more tenderness and caresses; to feel nice and to make their partner feel the same way.*)

The "emotional" category includes all comments that refer only to the emotional or relationship qualities of sex such as love, security, commitment, faithfulness, relationship. Comments which refer to partner's satisfaction were also included if no reference was made to any benefits for the self (*e.g. the feeling that somebody needs them; they show their feelings more; make the partner happy; for the woman it means love and dedication; security; want to provide satisfaction for the men.*)

The "other" category includes all other comments (*e.g. satisfaction, but when a family of course children; ask them!; all the people are different and there are men and women who have different expectations; depends, some want tenderness, the others brutality.*)

Table 3: What men and women want from sex

	Young men's views (n=79)		Young women's views (n=134)	
	n	%	n	%
Men want				
Physical	34	43	69	51
Physical & emotional	8	10	13	10
Emotional	1	1	2	1
Other	4	5	6	5
No comment	32	41	44	33
Women want				
Physical	19	24	20	15
Physical & emotional	13	16	37	28
Emotional	9	11	30	22
Other	3	4	7	5
No comment	35	44	40	30

The results in the table 3 reveal an interesting pattern of similarities and differences between young men and women in their views, and also similarities and differences in the views expressed regarding what men and women want from sex.

Young men and women agree very closely in their views of what men want, with the most common opinion being that men are primarily interested in physical satisfaction. Phrases such as “instincts”, “natural needs”, “to get rid of sexual pressure” surface within this categorical “knowledge” that for a man the act of sex is focused on physical pleasure. Hardly any young men or women suggest that men are primarily looking for the satisfaction of emotional needs. The relational aspects of negotiating the “site” for the enactment of this pleasure are perceived to be of low priority.

With respect to what women want from sex, in contrast, both the men and women are much less likely to suggest that women are only interested in physical satisfaction, and are more likely to refer to both physical and emotional issues, or exclusively emotional issues as important to women. This view is more accentuated among young women than young men, with twice as many young women (22%) referring exclusively to emotional issues as important for women, than young men (11%).

What is of interest here is young people’s assumptions that the heterosexual encounter mobilises agendas for men and women that are relatively at odds with each other. Some of the more elaborated answers given by the young people illustrate the contrasts commonly drawn very clearly:

What young men say men want:

Men want it more than women, they use women to get satisfaction (m); Feeling that they have somebody and orgasm (m); Sex itself (m); Quick satisfaction and go on with their life (m); To get rid of the sexual pressure (m).

What young women say men want:

Men value more the physical side of sex (f); To satisfy his instincts (f); To satisfy their needs (f); Satisfaction and orgasm (f); They just can’t do without it (f); Want to show they are strong, powerful and certain (f); Orgasm (f); It is more for pleasure (f); Most important for men is to get satisfaction (not important with whom) (f); It is a strong need for them, it has very often nothing to do with love (f); The physical part is important (f); To prove himself, satisfaction (f); Satisfaction and plain sex (f).

What young men say women want:

They want to sleep with men who are in love with them and care about them (f); Security (f); Love (f); Long act like in a movie (f); Tenderness, the beauty of satisfaction (f).

What young women say women want:

Women think more about the emotional side of sex (f); The knowledge that her partner really loves her (f); Want to feel closeness with the man they love (f); Love (f); Tenderness and closeness (f); Romance, pleasure (f); Be with a man she loves

(f); For women it means love and dedication (f); Women consider love as the ultimate proof of love. They hope that with sex men shows how much they love the woman (f); Security (f); Closeness of soul and body (f); Women want tenderness and security – they want to feel that this is my man (f).

Considering the comments expressed by the young people about what men and women want from sex, it becomes clearer how the management of safer sex is framed within very different scripts for men and women. Safer sex is, therefore, being navigated within perceived sets of desires and agendas where young men and young women may not share a common language about sex itself. This suggests that questioning the wider gender codes and social organisation of gender difference (at work, at home, in politics etc.) that consolidate different understandings of masculinity and femininity is very important within sexual safety education. These contrasting placements of the young man and the young woman, that young people visualise so vividly (even before most have had sexual relationships) are crucially connected to the (non) visualising of possibilities for sexual safety.

3.9 What aspects of sex are important?

In order to further explore young people’s ideas on what is important for men and women in sexual relationships and sexual activity, the questionnaire included a list of different aspects of sex. Respondents were asked firstly to indicate the extent they believed each aspect was important for men in general, and then to rate their importance for women in general (aspects of sex were judged on a four point scale: 1=very important, 2=fairly important, 3=fairly unimportant, 4=very unimportant). Table 4 reports the mean ratings given by both sexes in relation to women and men (the lower the means the more important the aspect is judged).

Some interesting contrasts emerge from these data. In relation to women, the young men and women generally agree in their importance rating for different aspects of sex. However, the young men assess three aspects of sex as having greater importance for women than the young women do themselves. The young men are more likely to say that for women “touching their partner” or “having penetration” is important for women, whereas the young women are less likely to believe that these aspects of sex are important for women.

In relation to men, in contrast, there is rather less consensus between young men and women in the ratings they give. Ratings for eight aspects of sex are significantly different, with differences all in the direction of lower means given by young men. In other words, the young men are more likely to say that the following aspects of sex are important for men, than the young women are: “feeling intimacy and trust”, “strengthening the relationship”, “talking about feelings”, “telling their partner they love them”, “ensuring safety from pregnancy”, “giving pleasure to their partner”, “ensuring safety from disease” and “ensuring partner has an orgasm”.

Table 4a: The importance of different aspects of sex for women (mean ratings)

	young men	young women	t
for women			
feeling intimacy and trust	1.3	1.2	0.98
strengthening relationship	1.5	1.6	-1.00
talking about feelings	1.5	1.6	-0.04
touching their partner sexually	1.9	2.5	-4.39***
telling their partner they love them	1.6	1.6	-0.45
being touched sexually by partner	1.4	1.6	-1.52
ensuring safety from pregnancy	1.2	1.4	-1.61
being in control of how sex goes	2.1	2.5	-2.58*
having penetration	2.0	2.6	-3.93***
giving pleasure to their partner	1.5	1.7	-1.41
ensuring safety from disease	1.2	1.1	0.19
being spontaneous	1.6	1.6	0.47
ensuring partner has an orgasm	1.6	1.8	-1.61
experiencing orgasm	1.4	1.6	-1.77

Table 4b: The importance of different aspects of sex for men
(mean ratings)

	young men	young women	t
for men			
feeling intimacy and trust	1.5	2.0	-4.39***
strengthening relationship	1.9	2.4	-3.95***
talking about feelings	2.2	2.7	-3.94***
touching their partner sexually	1.8	1.6	1.41
telling their partner they love them	1.9	2.4	-3.81***
being touched sexually by partner	1.5	1.5	0.69
ensuring safety from pregnancy	1.7	2.0	-2.76*
being in control of how sex goes	2.0	2.0	0.44
having penetration	1.9	1.8	0.92
giving pleasure to their partner	1.6	1.9	-2.74*
ensuring safety from disease	1.3	1.6	-3.09**
being spontaneous	1.7	1.9	-2.03
ensuring partner has an orgasm	1.7	2.2	-4.22***
experiencing orgasm	1.3	1.3	-0.34

Variances significantly different, t-test for unequal variances applied
 *p< 0.01 **p< 0.005 ***p< 0.001

As young people were asked to rate the importance of different aspects of sex for men and for women, it is possible to compare the ratings given for each sex by young men and young women. The results of such comparisons using correlated t-tests are reported in Tables 5 and 6 below.

Table 5 shows that for most aspects of sex listed, young men give similar ratings for men and women. Significant differences do emerge, however, for four aspects which are considered more important for women than for men: “strengthening the relationship”, “talking about feelings”, “telling partner they love them” and “ensuring safety from pregnancy”.

Table 5: Importance attached to different aspects of sex:

Young men's ratings for men and for women.

Young men: mean ratings (n = 46-51)

	For men	For women	t
Feeling intimacy and trust	1.5	1.3	1.48
Strengthening the relationship	2.0	1.5	3.70***
Talking about feelings	2.1	1.6	3.33**
Touching partner sexually	1.6	1.9	-2.33
Telling partner they love them	1.9	1.6	3.07**
Being touched sexually	1.5	1.4	1.27
Ensuring safety from pregnancy	1.7	1.2	3.42***
Being in control of how sex goes	2.1	2.1	-0.24
Having penetration	1.9	2.0	-0.54
Giving pleasure to their partner	1.5	1.6	-0.73
Ensuring safety from disease	1.3	1.2	1.83
Being spontaneous	1.7	1.6	0.68
Ensuring partner has orgasm	1.5	1.6	-0.97
Experiencing orgasm	1.2	1.4	-2.36

** p <0.005 *** p<0.001

Table 6, in contrast, shows that the ratings given by young women for men and women are markedly different. They agree with young men in considering the following issues more important for women than for men: “strengthening the relationship”, “talking about feelings”, “telling partner they love them” and “ensuring safety from pregnancy”. In addition, they consider a further four issues more important for women than for men: “feeling intimacy and trust”, “ensuring safety from disease”, “being spontaneous” and “ensuring partner has an orgasm”.

In contrast to young men, however, young women judge the following aspects of sex are more important for men than for women: “touching partner sexually”, “being in control of how sex goes”, “having penetration” and “experiencing orgasm”. Three aspects in this last group relate to physical pleasure, whereas most of the other aspects judged by women to be more important for women relate to emotional/relationship issues and safety.

The responses to this question also indicate that there are discrepancies in how young people are predisposed by gender assumptions to read their partner's wants and needs. Young women's tendency to underestimate the possible significance

for young men of building intimacy and emotional texture in sexual relations is a pivotal example of this, and raises an issue that warrants deeper discussion in sexual safety education. Perceptions of gender differences like these, where young men and women perceive differently the script of behaviours and priorities of the other sex, involve shared stereotyping that predisposes them to embody sexual activity in certain gender-specific ways and project onto their partner certain gender-specific expectations. This highlights the significance of opening up these discussions in an educational process targeted towards changing risk behaviours.

Table 6: Importance attached to different aspects of sex:
Young woman's ratings for men and for women.
Young woman: mean ratings (n = 87-109)

	For men	For women	t
Feeling intimacy and trust	2.0	1.2	10.71***
Strengthening the relationship	2.4	1.6	9.36***
Talking about feelings	2.7	1.6	11.33***
Touching partner sexually	1.6	2.5	-9.56***
Telling partner they love them	2.4	1.6	9.54***
Being touched sexually	1.5	1.5	-0.72
Ensuring safety from pregnancy	2.0	1.4	5.71***
Being in control of how sex goes	1.9	2.5	3.42***
Having penetration	1.8	2.6	-7.61***
Giving pleasure to their partner	1.9	1.7	2.20
Ensuring safety from disease	1.6	1.1	5.60***
Being spontaneous	1.9	1.5	4.11***
Ensuring partner has orgasm	2.2	1.8	3.85***
Experiencing orgasm	1.3	1.6	-5.67***

*** p <0.001

3.10 Gender and sexual relationships

“Here are some statements about sexual relationships between women and men. Do you think they are true or false?”

The questionnaire next presented a series of statements regarding differences or similarities between men and women in the context of heterosexual sexual relationships. These statements were formulated from the findings that surfaced in the WRAP research. The aim of this question was to explore again what suggestive differences there might be in the information young men and women have acquired about sex through the grid/lenses of perceptions of gender difference.

Young people were asked to judge whether the statements were true or false on a four-point scale (1=definitely true, 2=true to some extent, 3=false to some extent and 4=definitely false). The table below reports the mean ratings given by young men and women. The lower the mean the more that young people tend to regard the statement as being true.

When comparisons were made between young men and women using independent t-tests, for all statements except one, opinions of the truth or falsity of the statements are similar in the two groups. So there is striking similarity in the numbers of young men and women agreeing or disagreeing with the statements. The one significant difference appeared for the statement “men know what they want from sex more than women” with men more likely to regard the statement as true than women. This suggests a greater assumed assuredness by men concerning what men's sexual agenda is about than seemed apparent to the young women.

Low means indicate that the statement tended to be regarded as true. Means below 2 were observed for both sexes for the following statements, so the young men and women tended to agree that:

- “men tend to want sexual intercourse more than women”
- “women want to be guided by sexually experienced men”

High means conversely indicate that the statement tended to be judged as false. The statements with the highest means from both sexes, suggesting shared disagreement, were:

- “sex usually continues until the woman has an orgasm”
- “women are more concerned to please a man during sex”
- “women tend to want sexual intercourse more than men”

It is a striking consistency in the findings that both sexes tend to agree that men want sexual intercourse more than women and tend to disagree that women want sexual intercourse more than men. There is strong consensus here that the experience of intercourse is more important for men than for women.

Table 7: Gendered aspects of sexual relationships (mean ratings)

	Young men (n=79)	Young women (n=134)	t
Men tend to want sexual intercourse more than women	1.8	1.7	-0.87
Sex usually continues until woman has orgasm	2.8	2.9	0.77
Women are more active in sex than men	2.5	2.5	0.65
Women want to be guided by sexually experienced men	1.9	1.7	-1.92
Men prefer women who are less assertive	2.5	2.3	-2.01
Women are more concerned to please a man during sex	2.8	2.6	-1.35
Sex is something men find it difficult to talk about	2.5	2.6	0.72
Sex tends to stop when a man has had an orgasm	2.4	2.3	-0.29
Women tend to feel more uncomfortable during sex	2.4	2.2	-1.86
Men have just as many anxieties about sex as women	2.4	2.4	-0.23
Women enjoy the physical side of sex just as much	2.0	1.9	-0.81
Emotional closeness just as important to men	2.1	2.2	0.87
Women tend to want sexual intercourse more than men	2.6	2.8	1.94
Men want to be guided in sex by sexually experienced	2.4	2.6	1.94
Men know what they want from sex more than women	2.1	2.5	2.70*
Women find it difficult to tell partners what they enjoy	2.2	2.2	0.08
More important for men to have an orgasm	2.3	2.3	-0.09

Variances significantly different, t-test for unequal variances applied * p<0.01

3.11 Risks associated with casual sexual intercourse

“Imagine that In Estonia a man and woman in their late teens meet for the first time at a disco. They go off and spend the night together and have sexual intercourse twice. The woman is not using contraception and the man does not use a condom. The next day, they part and do not see one another again. How likely is it that...”

In order to explore young people's perceptions of the risks associated with casual sexual intercourse, they were presented with a scenario in which a young man and woman met at a party or disco and had sex without using a condom. They were then asked to judge the likelihood that a range of possible consequences would arise after the encounter (e.g. the young woman becomes pregnant). Ratings were made on a four-point scale: 1 = very likely, 2 = fairly likely, 3 = fairly unlikely, 4 = very unlikely. Thus, the lower the mean score the more likely an outcome is judged to be.

Table 8 reports the mean responses of young men and young women.

Table 8: Risks associated with unprotected casual sex (mean ratings)

	Youngmen (n=79)	Young women (n=134)	t
the man feels regret at having sex	2.9	3.1	-1.95
the woman feels regret at having sex	2.0	1.8	2.64*
the woman becomes pregnant	1.9	1.8	1.33
the man becomes infected with an STD	2.2	2.2	0.37
the woman becomes infected with an STD	2.2	2.0	1.92
the man becomes infected with HIV	2.6	2.5	0.39
the woman becomes infected with HIV	2.5	2.4	0.40

Variances significantly different, t-test for unequal variances carried out. * p< 0.01

Only one significant difference emerged between young men and women, with women considering it more likely that the woman in the scenario would feel regret at having sex, than the men do. So the young women are much more attune to the probability that the young woman would have reason to wish she had not done this, while for young men this is perceived as a relatively less likely outcome.

Both the young men and women give considerably higher ratings for the man in the situation - indicating that they believe it unlikely that the man would feel regret. The difference for young women is particularly striking as they believe that women are likely to feel regret whereas the man is not. The same pattern of contrast between the man's and woman's reaction is present for the young men – but less dramatically so.

There is a prevailing perception among young people that in the context of such a sexual encounter, young men get what they want while not needing to consider the consequences of sexually unsafe acts. After the event, they can get on with their lives affirmed by having "done it". Young women, in contrast, are perceived as likely to be marked by regret, and not having achieved what they might have wanted. For them, engaging in unsafe sex leaves in its wake uncertainty, doubt and a range of anxieties.

The questionnaire gathered the feedback in summer 1999, when the HIV statistics (despite STD, drug-use and unsafe sex indicators) for Estonia seemed to prove realistic this sense of HIV not being thought as a strong risk anxiety. In 2000, there was a sudden huge rise in the number of newly registered HIV infections in Estonia (over 300 instead of about

10 for the same time period in earlier years) - as more people came forward to be tested following the discovery of a significant number of new infections linked to an increase in heroin use. It could be anticipated that the response to HIV risk will fluctuate according to how and what data circulates in popular awareness.

3.12 Men and women and unprotected sex

"Why do you think men sometimes have sex without a condom?"

"Why do you think women sometimes have sex without the man using a condom?"

In order to explore young people's understanding of why men and women might have unprotected sex they were asked the following questions following on from a description of a scenario in which two young people have casual sex without using condoms: "Why do you think men sometimes have sex without a condom?" and "Why do you think women sometimes have sex without the man using a condom?" The principal themes expressed in answers to these questions were identified and the results reported in Tables A-12 and A-13 in Appendices.

With respect to why men have sex without a condom, the most common reasons (10% or more) identified by young

men were: pleasure greater without condoms (35%), condoms interfere with pleasure (11%) and not having a condom available (10%). The most common reasons identified by young women were: pleasure greater without condoms (31%), condoms spoil pleasure (35%) and doesn't care about partner (10%). It is notable that the young women were just as likely to suggest that sex is more pleasurable for the man when condoms were not used, but they were over three times more likely to suggest that condoms actually spoil sex for the man, than were the young men themselves. Some of the young women's comments on this issue are interesting for the degree to which they seem to exaggerate the disruptive effects of condoms in relation to the man's experience of sex. Such beliefs would clearly make it difficult for a young woman to suggest to a man that he uses condoms:

With the condom it is not comfortable and not so pleasant – men want to be satisfied in everything. (f); It spoils everything and is not so pleasant. (f); They keep telling that they can't get orgasm. (f); Using it destroys foreplay and one part of the pleasure disappears – without it there is more freedom. (f); It is the same as smelling a rose through a gas mask. (f)

The image of men's better sexual pleasure from young women's perspective co-exists with a vivid sense of active discomfort:

It causes discomfort. (f); it is most certainly uncomfortable for men with it. (f); he can't get satisfaction with it. (f)

and actual elimination of sexual pleasure – as verbs used, like "destroys" or "spoil" or "disappears" suggest. The "eating a candy with its paper on", "the rose smelt through a gas mask", "the kiss through a pane of glass" images were more often invoked by the young women – as self evident explanations – all stressing an inability to access pleasure because of an artificial barrier. How they hear and interpret the accounts they feel are in circulation from men influences these beliefs. The sense of higher pleasure: they keep telling that it is much better without it (f) is interwoven with images of prevented pleasure: They keep saying that they can't get orgasm (f).

It is also notable that while 10 per cent of young women suggest that a man's non-use of condoms may signal a lack of care for their sexual partner, only one young man suggests this reason: They don't care about the woman and don't care if she gets pregnant. They don't care, they don't have a sense of responsibility (m).

The women's replies sketched out a sense that men do not consider the negative consequences of unsafe sex for themselves or for their partners:

They don't care about the consequences (f); they are not interested in using one because they know they will never meet again (f); They don't have any responsibilities later (f); They don't care about the woman and don't care if she gets pregnant (f); They don't care because they don't get pregnant (f); They don't care, they don't have a sense of responsibility (f); Men don't care so much about STDs, that don't have to be afraid of becoming pregnant (f); They don't care about the partner – just sex (f); They just don't care about their partner (f); they are not afraid

of STDs, don't care if the girl becomes pregnant (f); men are not afraid of STDs and they don't care about pregnancy (f).

Comments like this suggest men are often perceived as having a pre-scripted disconnection from concern for consequences, focusing the agenda on the immediacy of the experience rather than the wider contextual damage to themselves or to their partners. These phrases suggest that there is in circulation a curious sense of immune masculinity, impervious to risk consequences – a “women can't do anything to me attitude”, a lack of grasp of the potential impact of infection, a feeling that those sorts of things are women's agendas – with a hope she's dealing with it.

All other suggested reasons are given occasionally by both the sexes. Some are nonetheless worthy of comment.

Some young women imagined, and a few young men mentioned, men's nervousness or embarrassment about using condoms. The young women invoked men's possible lack of ease or insecurity at manoeuvring condom use or fear that inexperience or lack of skill would expose them:

Lots of men don't know anything about sex (f); Maybe they are afraid to buy one or they can't put it on (f); Maybe they are scared or afraid to be laughed at (f); They want to feel superior(f); because they think its not the right way to do it (f).

This might suggest an implicit need felt by women to bolster male confidence and support male control in the situation as an implicit reason for their hesitancy to raise the issue. It also underlines the importance of men being very clear about details of condom use and made familiar with the detailed handling of condoms – not simply advised or exhorted to “be sure and use one”. Women would also need to be more informed about the details of condom use, and also engaged in active, shared discussions of the real male body.

Young men do not mention stupidity as a reason why men don't use a condom while the young women mention it for men and women, and young men mention it for women.

Some young men mentioned anxiety about the cost of condoms, while young women neglected it, so expect the man to finance safety. This echoes the economy of dependence and agenda setting associated with contrasted positions held by women and men.

With respect to why women might have sex with a man who does not use a condom, the most common reasons given by the men (10% or more) were: pleasure greater (25%), trusts partner/relationship (11%) and doesn't think/careless (11%), and by women were: trusts partner/relationship (18%), using a contraceptive method (13%), pleasure greater (15%), doesn't think/careless (13%), carried away/no time (12%) and afraid to ask partner (11%).

Many issues raised by the answers to these questions, which could usefully be researched in greater depth – and brought more actively into discussion and debate with young people.

Young men perceived women's pleasure lessened by condom use more frequently than young women do. It is interesting

that when male respondents say women have sex without condom because of better pleasure for women – these respondents have always given the same reason for men, thus paralleling or projecting the commonly held notion of male pleasure being greater without a condom onto the female body.

Young women prioritised avoidance of pregnancy as if it legitimised non-condom use and occluded risk of STD infection:

When she has a stable partner and she is on the pill there is no need (f); When there is a relationship (and she takes the pill) then why not?(f); They forget when she has/lives with a partner and they trust each other (f).

Both sexes, and particularly young women, believe that emotional and relationship factors are highly significant in accounting for the woman's preparedness to have sex without a condom being used. The concept of “trust”, frequently invoked by young men and particularly young women warrants specific discussion. Without the use of a condom a physical connection between body fluids – sperm and vaginal fluids – occurs. “Trust” is a curiously common element invoked to allow this fluid exchange to occur. It foregrounds notions of the claimed absence of STD infection in the partner.

This has to mean:

- lack of own or partner's other sexual experience– so risk of their infection absent;
- former sexual experience by self or partner that did not risk infection (condom use or “not that kind of partner”);
- fidelity and monogamy a permanent state within the actual relationship;
- a commitment on the part of the partner not to put you at risk (to test after “infidelity” and undergo treatment until cured or inaugurate condom use or inform you if HIV).

The problem is that the codes of “trust” that monitor relationships and avoid putting them at risk of argument or break-up depend on absolute adherence to all of these – which in the globalised discourses of modern sexual freedoms and “desires” is becoming a rarer experience for young people. Or, they are maintained by non-communication and secrecy about individual behaviours that do not adhere to these codes.

To understand the relevance of safer sexual behaviours personally, young people need more information about social realities of sexual behaviours, and need access to debates about the problematic ways that sexuality becomes gendered within social expectations of gender difference and reproduction of gender inequalities.

It is interesting that trust is often invoked as a significant factor for young women without mention of contraceptives.

Young men wrote:

She trusts the man (m); She is certain of her partner (m); They trust their partner (m); They are certain about their partner (m).

Given that this is an explanation of unsafe sex participation, it does beg the question: she trusts him in what way? – since

the risk of pregnancy and STDs has already occurred.

Young women wrote statements such as:

Maybe trust (f); They trust their partner (f); They like the man so much that they hope he is clean and next time he will use one (f); They trust(f); They don't believe that their partner has been untrue to them (f); Woman trusts the man, knows him well and believes in him (f).

Here it is as if trust is based on some certainty of knowing fixed criteria of behaviour of the other, and having sex with a “known” or “trusted” or “committed” partner eliminates risk consequences. It seems implicit in some of the young women’s replies that they trust their partner will not initiate acts that will put them at risk – that is, unprotected penetrative sex. In reality, though, the spectrum of sexual activities young women enter into takes them along a path where penetrative sex is going to take place. Some of the young women respondents wrote:

They think that nothing happens (f); They count on men (f); They are confident that nothing will happen (f).

The emotional criteria of the relationship comes even to justify risk in young women’s replies:

They love the man too much (f); They love the man (f); Love-the wish to come forward and meet man’s wishes (f); The passion is so big (f); She loves and trusts him (f); maybe love is too big or they just trust him (f).

The narrative of trust that circulates among the young women is that the “chosen” man cannot represent risk – but has an emotional investment placed in him that anticipates his protection, his care and his motivated interest in the well-being of “his” woman. This co-exists then in tension with circulating perceptions that men do not care, are not committed to the strengthening of emotional and communicative intimacy with women, do not think of the consequences of their private actions with women, are (by the very power and privilege society concedes to them) depended on by women for their support.

Several young women suggest either, in a pair of possibilities, drink or trust as significant factors for young women. They present an extreme imagining of women either feeling utterly safe in a “controlled” situation (the “known”, trusted man) or at risk in an out of control state. The fact is, however, that in neither situation do women actually control or know the context from which the man and his experience come.

The following comments from the young men and women illustrate a perception that the prioritising of the man’s pleasure and the conceding the agenda-setting to him is seen to play a significant role in young women’s disregard for condom use:

To satisfy the partner or they just don't care. (m); Maybe they want to do it, or want to satisfy the man whom she cares about. (m); Because men don't like it with it. (f); She wants to please the man(m); Men like it more that way(m); Sometimes only because of the man (m); To satisfy the partner(m); they want to

please the man (f); they want the man to enjoy it (f) Love – the wish to come forward and meet man’s wishes (f).

They both perceive women having fears about inhibiting or interfering with the male sexual agenda and preferences:

They are afraid to contradict the man. (m) Are afraid to say (m); Are afraid to tell the man (m); They are afraid to look if the man uses one or not, they are even afraid to ask about it (f); they are afraid to ask the man to use one (f); They are afraid to tell (f); They are too scared to say anything (f); Maybe they are scared to ask (f); They are afraid to remind the man (f); Afraid to ask partner to use one (f)

A number of interesting differences also emerged in the reasons given with respect to the men’s and women’s perspective. Thus, no young man or woman suggested that the man might not use condoms for the following reasons: “to please partner”, “afraid to ask partner”, “contraceptives used by partner” and “being drunk”, whereas these were all reasons given in explaining why a woman might have sex with a man who didn’t use a condom. Conversely, no young person suggested the following as reasons for a woman having sex without a condom: “doesn’t care about partner”, “couldn’t afford one” and “easier without”, whereas these were all given as reasons why a man might not use a condom.

The questions about men’s non-use of condoms were presented separate from the same question concerning women in the questionnaire. One striking feature of the responses to these questions is that the overwhelming majority of young people (85%) juxtaposed vividly contrasting reasons for why a man and why a women might not use a condom. Only 15 per cent saw men and women sharing the same reasons. Among these, the most frequently mentioned shared reason was greater pleasure (e.g. better feeling, bigger satisfaction, better orgasm), and the next most frequently and equally often mentioned shared reasons were some form of hesitancy or complication in actual condom use and trust in their partner.

The other 85 per cent responded with contrasting reasons. The very terms of these contrasts could be useful to reflect on to open up deeper and more vivid discussions of how the gender differentiated scripts. These systems of polarising men and women in narratives of difference become active components in the sabotaging of condom use as a safer sex practice. Some examples given below in Tables 8 and 9 show typical contrasts that individual young women and men made between the reasons they suggested for the man not using a condom and the women having sex without a condom being used.

It is interesting to see, through these many examples, how disparate a set of reasons for not using condoms are imagined to co-exist. For the young women here in these examples: the man is imagined focusing on his own best pleasure, while the women’s reason is wanting him to have it too; while his reason is imagined as being better sex, hers is being drunk or trust; while he is imagined feeling he has no negative consequences to fear for himself, she is envisaged trusting and believing in him; while he is maybe nervous of putting one

on, or in a hurry to get to the sex or thinking sex is better without – she is envisaged not thinking it would go that far and fearful of mentioning it to him – and so on...

For the young men, similarly: while he is imagined focusing on avoiding some discomfort – she is imagined scared of raising the issue with him; while he is imagined having anxiety about putting it on, she is imagined wanting the excitement risk brings; while he couldn't afford one or forget to get them, she is imagined thinking he just doesn't want to use one; while he is imagined prioritising conditions for the perfect or best orgasm possible, she is seen as an easy lay; while he might be thinking it interferes with the process, she is thinking about loving him and pleasing him - and so on.

What emerges here is the diversity and complexity of imagined reasons that normalise or legitimise non-condom use. These young people, mostly with no or limited penetrative sex experience, already have a vivid sense of the scripts that actively inhibit or prevent condom use, and the ways that men and women are positioned within the gender expectations illustrate clear gendered behaviours that can be referred to, drawn on to make "normal" the avoidance or abdication of condom use in the moment of sexual engagement.

It is interesting how condom use is measured along a very linear spectrum of more or better pleasure or satisfaction. This neglects the fact that the experience of sex from one occasion to another is always different since it is framed by different circumstances, moods and contextual influences in each partner's life. In addition, every experience of orgasm is different, involving more or less intense, more or less diffuse, longer or shorter climaxing sensation. This sense that satisfaction and pleasure have some direct mechanical relationship to the use or non-use of a condom is central to the prevailing mythology of condom use that young people re-circulate and invoke in their own behaviours.

The fact that sexual satisfaction and pleasure could be greater with condom use does not seem to circulate actively among the young people. Images of condom use enhanced by sense of security or by communication of caring demonstrated by its use, or prolonging physical interactions with longer lasting erections or signalling trust through investment in own and partner's safety or by eroticising processes of condom use are, however, possible texts implicit in what the young people say.

Table 9: Examples of young women giving different reasons for a man and a woman having sex without a condom

	Why man doesn't use a condom	Why woman has sex with man not using a condom
1	They say it's better without, some might be ashamed to put it on, some are in a hurry	They think nothing is going to happen and are afraid to remind the man
2	More pleasure without it	She uses pill/coil, is afraid to tell the man, doesn't think about the future
3	Because using one is uncomfortable and annoying	Love – the wish to come forward and meet the man's wishes, not wanting to annoy him
4	They are afraid of putting it on	Afraid to say to the man
5	They don't care because they don't get pregnant	Maybe they are afraid to tell the man
6	They don't care. It doesn't feel the same.	It takes time Maybe they are afraid to ask
7	It is better without it	They might be drunk or trust him
8	Men don't care so much about STDs. They don't have to fear becoming pregnant. Sometimes to have sex with anyone at all is the most important thing for them	The women trusts the man, knows him well and believes in him. I think they are stupid.
9	He might not have one. She might use other contraceptives. He doesn't like them (are uncomfortable). They trust each other. They want children	She wants to get pregnant. She is on the pill. She didn't think it would go so far. She is immune to STDs
10	To get orgasm quicker	She loves and trusts her partner
11	They have more pleasure and get orgasm quicker	When she has a stable partner and she is on the pill there is no need for it
12	When they have none and they want the girl – there is no time to wait	Sex with a condom is the same as kissing through a window pane
13	It is certainly uncomfortable for men	Maybe love is too big or they just trust him
14	They don't want to use one. They think that without it it's better and there is no need for it	They are afraid to look to see if the man uses one or not, they are even afraid to ask about it
15	Maybe they enjoy sex more, or want to try how it is without a condom	They don't think about STDs and they want to please the man

Table 10: Examples of young men giving different reasons for a man and a woman having sex without a condom

	Why man doesn't use a condom	Why woman has sex with man not using a condom
1	No money to buy them	More risk makes it more exciting
2	When women don't want to use it. Without is more comfortable. They don't have any.	She wants to get pregnant, or the "get" the man. When the man is categorically against it and the woman has been without sex for a long time
3	To get better orgasm	Because they are "easy to get"
4	They think a condom prevents full satisfaction	They are afraid to contradict the man
5	Couldn't afford one, was in a hurry	The man didn't want to
6	You get better satisfaction without it and the feeling is cleaner and better just don't have condoms	They want to get the man no matter what, or they
7	It's easier and more comfortable	They don't care about it
8	It is a better feeling without it, but also careless behaviour	Maybe she wants to use it, but wants to satisfy the man she cares about
9	His bank account doesn't allow such big expenditure	Too drunk
10	Doesn't manage to put it on	Wants risk
11	He gets better satisfaction and when you're in action there's no time to think about it	Are afraid to ask, satisfaction
12	It gives better feelings	Women like it more without and they want men to care and take the responsibilities
13	It is more natural without it	She wants to please the man
14	Want to get better satisfaction	Are afraid to tell the man or just don't care
15	They think it is uncomfortable	They are afraid to refuse

3.13 Young people's sexual activity and condom use

The final issue to be addressed in the questionnaire was young people's experience of sexual relationships and sexual risk behaviour. The questions asked and results obtained are given in Table 1. As the questions are clearly personal, it was stressed to young people on the questionnaire that they were free to leave these questions unanswered if they wished, and some did so. In addition, some of the questions were linked such that they were only relevant if a "yes" answer than been given to the previous question. For example, the question of age of first sex is only relevant to sexually experienced young people. Table 1, therefore, reports the number of cases on which the percentages are based question by question.

Just over a third of young women and men in the sample have had experience of sexual intercourse. Among those who are have 'had sex', 61% of women and 71% of men did for the first time below the age of 16, and just over half of the sexually experienced women and 65% of the men report 2 or more sexual partners. None of these differences between the sexes is statistically significant. A marked sex difference is apparent, however, for the age of the partner at first sex, with young men much more likely to report that their partner was under the age of 16 than were young women. In addition, young men were significantly more likely to describe their first sexual experience as happening in a casual relationship than were women. They were also more likely to describe

their most recent experience of unprotected sex as taking place in a casual relationship.

A substantial minority of both young men and young women report not using any form of protection during their first experience of sex. Young people were also asked in relation to the last time they had sex without a condom, whether they had worried about pregnancy and sexual disease. No sex differences emerged for either question, but it is clear that more young people were worried about pregnancy than were worried about sexual infection.

Finally, just over twice as many young women as young men reported being in a sexual relationship currently.

Table 11: Sexual activity and condom use of young men and women

	young men	young women	chi-square
Have you ever had sexual intercourse? (yes)	25/74 34%	45/126 36%	0.08
How many partners (2 or more) (Range. female/male: 1-100)	13/20 65%	20/38 53%	1.23
Age of first sex (<16) (Range. female: 12-17; male 10-17))	17/24 71%	17/24 61%	0.31
Age of partner at first sex (<16) (Range. female 15-30; male 10-20))	11/24 46%	1/42 2%	22.27***
First sex in a casual relationship? (yes)	10/24 42%	5/45 11%	9.53**
First sex without any form of protection? (yes)	12/25 48%	17/44 39%	0.26
Last time you had sexual intercourse with no condom, did you worry about pregnancy? (yes)	8/17 47%	19/32 59%	0.68
Last time you had sexual intercourse with no condom, did you worry about sexual disease? (yes)	3/17 18%	6/32 19%	0.01
Most recent unprotected sex causal? (yes)	7/17 41%	1/31 3%	10.2**
Currently in a sexual relationship? (yes)	9/72 13%	21/77 27%	4.19

** $p < 0.005$ *** $p < 0.001$

4. Discussion

4.1 Introduction

The argument presented in the introduction to this report is that heterosexual sexual risk behaviours crucially need to be understood within the context of the structure of gendered relationships between men and women in the wider society. This view is informed by research and analysis generated by a wide body of gender studies that have been galvanised by women's movements and feminist interrogations in many countries since the 1970's that have explored how men and women are positioned in societies and how the institution of heterosexuality is organised. The significance of gender issues, and the urgency of addressing them in sexual safety and health areas have been highlighted more and more frequently in mainstream international dialogues, as illustrated by recent United Nations publications. This has also been substantiated significantly in quantitative and qualitative studies conducted in different parts of the world in recent years. The research element in *Living for Tomorrow* sought to inform the practical elements of its work, by building on this body of theory and research in gathering relevant data from young people in Estonia on their views of gender and sexuality. The development of the questionnaire used in this research was particularly influenced by the WRAP research conducted in the UK during the early 1990s that culminated in 1998 in the publication of their book "The Male in the Head".

In the Estonian context we were aware that a small network of researchers had begun, since independence, to examine issues of gender. Important empirical work on young people and sexuality had been undertaken by Krista Papp (1997) based on the methodology and instruments constructed for the earlier Finnish KISS studies. This research highlights a number of statistically significant differences between boys and girls in their knowledge, attitudes and behaviours in relation to sexual matters, but it does not set such comparisons explicitly within a broader conceptualisation of gender relations in Estonian society.

On the basis of previous work, and following our experience of trailing and discussing early versions of the questionnaire, we arrived at a number of decisions about the content and approach of the final version of the questionnaire that was to be translated into Estonian and Russian and used with young people in Estonia.

Firstly, that before addressing specific issues of sexual relationships and behaviour, it should: explore young people ideas about wider issues of equality and inequality between men and women by posing direct questions and also ask young people to explain the reasons for their answers; explore young people's ideas of how men and women differ, and of what characteristics and qualities are particularly valued in men and women, and explore young people's views on social expectations for males and females in key areas of social life.

Secondly, it should then focus on what young people believe

men and women are looking for in intimate, sexual relationships by asking them to answer open-ended questions on: what makes a man/woman a good lover, and what men and women want from sex, before presenting in a structured format: a list of aspects of sex and asking young people how important they felt each was for men and women, and a list of statements about how men and women might regard or experience sexual relationships and asking young people to judge whether they were true or false.

Thirdly, it should ask young people to consider issues of risk in the context of heterosexual relationships by posing structured questions about an imaginary scenario in which a casual sexual encounter takes place in which condoms are not used, and more generally by asking why young men might have sex without a condom, and why young women might be prepared to have sex with a man without using a condom.

Finally, at the end of the questionnaire, it should ask a few questions that could chart indicators of their sexual experience and relationships, and, in particular, their use of protection during sex.

In the remainder of this section, findings from the principal sections of the questionnaire will be discussed to bring out their inter-connections and the implications they hold for understanding the relevance of the wider context of gender relations for sexual risk behaviour.

4.2 Equality and inequality

Approximately two-thirds of the young people in the survey rejected the idea that men and women are equal in Estonia today. Their illustrations of gender inequality stressed that men are more powerful both in the public spheres of politics and the world of work, as well as in more private spheres of the domestic setting and their relationships in the family with women and children. Women, in contrast, were described as lacking power, as more often discriminated against and as being less valued than men. However, a third of the young people agreed that men and women are equal and explained their view in terms of equal rights in law and equal opportunities through education in Estonia. When asked whether men and women can be equal, the responses shifted considerably, with approximately 40% of young people rejecting this idea, but with over 60% of young people asserting that equality is possible. In explaining their rejection of equality even as a possibility, young people often appealed to the idea of natural, biologically based differences between men and women in strength, abilities and skills. Those asserting the possibility of equality in contrast, while not necessarily denying the existence of physical differences between males and females, argued that men and women have equal capabilities and were of equal importance and value in society.

Answers to these two questions logically define three positions that may have quite different implications when considered in relation to romantic and sexual relationships between young people and the negotiation of safer sex.

The first position is that equality is possible and actually exists. This view, as noted earlier, flies in the face of evidence that the situation of men and women in Estonian society is full of differences that relate to forms of inequality unequal in power, responsibility, imagined worth and abilities and caring. The denial of gender differences within the social fabric could have particular implications for sexual safety. If there are economic and political systems and cultural traditions that bolster certain notions of male power and control, that discriminate against women and disempower them relative to men, then individual young men or women who believe everything is equal might assume that they and their sexual partner have equal access to setting sexual agendas. Individual freedom and choice may well prove inadequate, however, when confronted with the gendered differentiations of power and control, and be too generalised and ineffective for negotiations of private sexual safety.

The second position, that equality is impossible and so cannot exist (and currently does not exist) may be the most problematic with respect to the possibility of negotiated safety within sexual relationships which rests upon the assumption of two agents entering into joint decision-making to avoid risks. Positions assumed here see gender polarised differences as in some way naturally fixed and not open to challenge and change. Here men are regarded as stronger and more able, and are expected by women to take the lead and make decisions within relationships, while women constitute themselves within a framework of beliefs that stresses dependence, weakness, reticence, non-assertion and less active or able responsibility for agenda setting. Men look for these features in women's behaviour and judge or resist contrasting ones in women. These attitudes or beliefs become part of a specific kind of 'gender pact' that reinforces collusion in behaviours that do not anticipate equal collaborative participation, worth or abilities in setting the sexual agendas. These do not bode well for a process of two-way communication and shared responsibility for safety.

The third position, that equality is possible but does not at present exist, may be the most positive stance when considered in relation to sexual safety. Young people adopting this position appear realistic in acknowledging the existence of inequalities and yet optimistic in endorsing the possibilities, and need, for change. This position was indeed reflected in some of the comments given by young people, to the first question, to the effect that equality did not exist, but that it could exist if people wanted it, and that "in future" greater equality was more likely. The sense here is that gender inequalities are not fixed, and social realities are open to change and improvement. Young people entering into sexual relationships with this frame of mind towards gender relations may be less fixed in their views about how to embody masculinity and femininity sexually, and more open to communication about risks and strategies for sexual safety.

What is important here is the ability to recognise that there are problems in the way gender difference is organised, that things need to change in society regarding men's and women's

position. Acknowledging that changes are happening and can happen provides a more viable framework for thinking about intimate interactions between a man and a woman, between the heterosexual "me" and "you", grasping difficulties that lead to risk or (health) abuse behaviours and envisaging ways of changing or preventing them.

4.3 Differences between men and women

To explore further young people's mental images of masculinity and femininity, the young people were asked to name what they considered important differences between men and women (apart from obvious physical differences), and to identify what they felt were socially valued characteristics of men and women. Their responses charted many general ways of being and behaving that differentiate men from women. Young people produced an extremely wide array of descriptions and valued characteristics in response to these questions, but in response to the first, the most commonly recurring constructs offered by young men and women to differentiate men and women were:

Men are stronger	vs.	Women are weaker
Men are less emotional	vs.	Women are more emotional
Men are less expressive	vs.	Women are more expressive
Men are less caring	vs.	Women are more caring
In addition, young women more so than young men, suggested further contrasts:		
Men are more interested in sex	vs.	Women are more interested in romance
Men are more responsible	vs.	Women are more irresponsible
Men are expected to be providers	vs.	Women are expected to be carers

Of course, the young people were asked for differences, and they generally obliged by providing them. The contrasts identified are clearly "stereotypical" in nature, but this does not undermine their importance as indicators of the ideas guiding young people's perceptions of how men and women might be expected to behave. Given that heterosexuality is socially and emotionally organised around differences, the need to start having discussion and perhaps interrogation of the terms of these differences seems an important place to start to deconstruct and destabilise the passive assumptions that these difference beliefs holding place. In particular the young people's perceptions of difference here highlight the difficulties which young women might be expected to encounter in resisting the demands of young men and ensuring safety in the context of sexual relationships. If indeed, men are expected to be or perceived as more interested in sex than romance, but at the same time are anticipated as being less emotional, less expressive, less caring, more irresponsible and stronger – the com-

bined picture that emerges is one of vulnerability for young women in sexual relationships, and of difficulty for her in negotiating sexual safety. The behaviours of the young men have to navigate these expectations of masculinity that men and women reinforce, that limit their mechanisms for visualising safer sexual practices for themselves - while positioning them to demote or be inattentive to safer sex agendas women might suggest.

These contrasts are to some extent further reinforced by the trends emerging from the second question about socially valued characteristics. “Strength” and “physical condition” for example, were mentioned by both sexes as valued characteristics of men, but not of women. Similarly, the idea that men are more interested in sex, is reflected in the finding that 12.7 per cent of men identify “sexiness” as a valued characteristic of women, but this is rarely mentioned by women as a valued characteristic in men.

The findings from the second question also serve to extend the results from the first question, and point towards important disparities in the valued characteristics of each sex that may have important implications for sexual safety. The most striking example of this is the finding that both young men and young women identified “submissiveness” as a valued characteristic of women, but this is never mentioned as a valued characteristic in men. The idea that women should be submissive, combined with the image of men as more interested in sex, suggests that in the context of sexual encounters, men will take the lead, and their needs and desires will be given greater priority and be ceded to. This can only generate complications that interfere problematically with shared negotiation of sexual safety. It is hard to imagine the self as an agent of sexual safety without changing this expected script of priorities and dependencies.

A further striking finding is that young women commonly identify kindness, domestic qualities, and caring as valued qualities of both men and women, but that young men rarely identified these qualities for either sex. This suggests that while young women might wish for similarities between the sexes in these more homely, relational virtues, that might support greater communication of feelings and openness about sexual safety, these qualities are not uppermost in young men’s minds.

4.4 Expectations of men and women

The links drawn above between gender inequality, differences between men and women and issues of sexual safety, are further strengthened by young people’s answers to the question of different expectations for men and women in Estonian society. We paid particular attention to young people’s answers regarding sexual behaviour, where the survey showed that over three-quarters of young men and women agreed that different expectations do operate for males and females in respect to sex. What emerge strongly from a consideration of the young people’s comments are the stark differentiations drawn in characterising the positions of men and women and

sexual relationships. The normative framework is one that gives greater priority to agency, power, freedom and desires of men. As noted earlier in presenting the young people’s comments:

- Men are expected to take the initiative and women are expected to follow
- Men are expected to exert power and control and women are expected to concede
- Men are expected to have greater sexual freedom and women are policed and monitored
- Men’s sexual needs are expected to be more important, women’s needs less so

If any one of these assumptions actively serves to guide young people in their sexual relationships with one another, it is likely that open and equal communication about sexual risks and safety will be difficult. If several or all of them operate in a mutually reinforcing system, open communication about sexual needs, risks and the need for protection from sexual infection may be quite impossible.

What is particularly interesting here is how the perceptions, priorities and preferences of women remain by definition secondary and unexplored. What both young men and women are communicating in the map of this expected complementary imbalance of power and agency highlights the complexity of what needs to be managed in heterosexual interaction. These gender polarisations they invoke here can clearly be seen as significant in the sabotaging collaborative safer sex behaviours.

Yet what are perceived as significantly contrasting male and female sexual agendas “logically” echo the young people’s earlier perceptions of how men’s and women’s positions in society, specifically mentioned in relation to work, politics and the domestic sphere, place them unequally in relation to leadership, initiative, value and preference.

4.5 Perspectives on love and sex

Before asking specific closed questions about sex and sexual risks, we thought it important to pose open questions to explore the young people’s ideas of what is important in “making love” with a partner, and in “having sex”. This was intentionally to invite comments across the tension between the emotional and physical dimensions of heterosexual relationships that appear to be significantly associated with culturally constructed gender scripts. Since the young men and women were asked to comment on what they saw as important for men and women in relation to love and sex, we have again four possibilities to consider: young men and women’s view of men and young men and women’s views of women.

As documented fully in the results section above, the young men and women gave markedly different accounts of what makes a man a good lover and what makes a woman a good lover. With respect to men as lovers, the most frequently mentioned quality mentioned by young men was “physical

characteristics”, whereas young women most frequently mentioned “love, care and feeling”. With respect to women as lovers, young men again most frequently mentioned “physical characteristics”, and young women “love, care and feeling”. For the young men, therefore, the most common response to the idea of being a good lover emphasised the physical aspects of the relationship, while for the young women, the commonest response emphasised the emotional dimension. This is not to say that men did not mention emotional issues, nor women the physical side of sex, but the relative emphases were different. For young men “love, care and feeling” emerged second as a quality of a good male lover, along with “being active” and “experience”, and third in their view of what makes a woman a good lover. Young women, in contrast, placed “physical characteristics” much lower in order of priority in describing a good male lover along with “experience” and “passion”, and placed “physical characteristics” much lower in priority in describing a good female lover. It is worth remembering here how little experience of having a lover the respondents had - so this script charting what matters to men and women is one that predates and thus actively informs potential approaches to sexual relationships between men and women.

One area of difference in perception of the young men and women that is of particular interest in the dynamics of heterosexual relationships and sexual safety appeared for the qualities of “being active” and “satisfying partner”. Both the young men and young women ranked “being active” highly for a good male lover, and were similar in their ratings of “satisfying partner” for men. The picture was very different, however, in accounts of a good female lover. “Being active” was scarcely mentioned at all by young men, but was ranked highly by young women. Similarly, “satisfying partner” was scarcely mentioned by young men, but was ranked highly by young women. Thus, while young men and women hold similar expectations of men being active and satisfying partners, the perceptions of a good female lover are different, with more young women seeing the woman’s role as an active one, while young men appear more likely to implicitly regard a good female lover as relatively passive. As issue surfacing here is that an image of confident and affirmed masculinity (here from the perspective of the male lover), is not associated with women’s agency – or is associated with the downplaying of female agency. If, as suggested from earlier question responses, men are leaders and higher earners – or rather leaders and higher earners are to be men – then those who are NOT, are women. If men are initiators, controllers, free to circulate with prioritised sexual agenda, then to be a woman is not to be these things, in other words, “not to assume these capacities” is to enact being a woman.

The young women respondents demonstrated a more imaginative, more closely scripted and more easily articulated emotional intensity in response to this question.

The high expectations of the young women for the emotional and attitudinal content (tenderness, love caring) are at odds with the more sparsely scripted masculinity where caring for

others, based on empathy and understanding of the other’s feelings and desires, is not prioritised in the expectations of the young men. Some young women see the good woman lover associated with her empathy towards men and their wishes and pleasures, and the downplaying of her own wishes (thus a self-effacing of women’s sexual desires). Others associate the good woman lover with counter-stereotypical challenging images of defiant assertiveness and shared agenda-setting. Young men encounter then a complex contradictory agenda of “lover” attributes valued in women by young women. They bring to sexual relations with women a valued set of “male good lover” associations which are not prioritised in the same way by the women – who, in turn, are valuing attributes that the young men do not perceive as so significant for the male lover.

The fact that young men define the good women lover predominantly by her appearance sets an anxiety about self-image at the heart of the heterosexual encounter for young women – undermining the confidence that might seek to collaborate to set the sexual agenda. It also lends emphasis to the spectacle of the sexual encounter (arousal linked to body parts, not person) – or public currency of having the woman on display as signs of performance. The spectacle of the attractive woman is at odds with notions of the emotionally and physically active woman that many young women value.

Responses to this question could open important discussion of these differently scripted attributes that young women and young men associate with the “good lover” within the heterosexual polarisations of gender. The wider society remains invested in differentiating between women and men in terms of power, opportunities and sexually divided spheres of “abilities”. Young people apprehend these differently allocated spheres, their own gendered positioning within them – and the sets of behaviours and contrasting values that are expected from them and from the opposite sex. The entry into sexual relations carries with it logical consequences of the gender belief and attitude systems observed and experienced, as well as associated extensions or familiar echoes of these expected norms of gendered behaviours.

These mechanisms of gender performance powerfully frame what young people encounter as limited, fragmentary and didactically “rational” or “moral” sex education information or exhortations. While the media circulates images of the importance of “good sex” with highly gender-polarised visualisations, the sex education class usually explains what an STD is, what HIV is, how women get pregnant and how to prevent all these. It is unlikely that the sexual health educator talks about pleasure, about visualisation of real women’s bodies or men’s bodies. It is probable that she or he makes common assumptions about girls and boys digesting factual information in similar ways, and has very little time to generate discussions or open up new forms of debate, listening or communication. But how does factual knowledge connect to this gender map of possible behaviours - the expectations and sense of the individual young man or young woman wanting to be “successful” as a lover and wanted “as a woman/man”,

wanting to act so both she and he are affirmed as “her” and “him” and within these value-laden gender scripts?

The contrasts that emerged in response to the question about being “a good lover” are reinforced still further by the questions on what women and men want from sex. Again, a wide range of views were expressed by both young women and men that present substantially the same themes, but nevertheless a clearly different picture emerged for what men are thought to want, and what women want from sex.

The most commonly used word for both men and women was “satisfaction”, but both the young men and women used this word much more often in describing what men want from sex. In addition, for men, the next two most commonly expressed ideas, “pleasure” and “orgasm”, related to the physical aspects of sex. For women, in contrast, the second and third issues mentioned were “tenderness” and “love”, emotional aspects of sex that are scarcely mentioned in relation to what men want. A whole question of what women and men mean by the very term “satisfaction” is a question begged within the limits of the questionnaire format - and might merit important discussions with young people to diversify the agenda both women and men visualise.

When the comments given by young people were categorised according to whether they referred to solely physical issues, jointly physical and emotional issues, or solely emotional issues, a clear pattern emerged: both young men and women saw men as primarily interested in the physical side of sex, with virtually no young person describing men as solely interested in sex for its emotional significance, while women in contrast, were seen as much more likely to be interested in the physical and emotional aspects of sex in combination, or in solely the emotional dimensions of sex.

4.6 Gender and what is important in sex

Having asked young people to respond to open questions about love and sex, the next sections of the questionnaire presented a set of descriptions of different aspects of sexual relationships and activities and asked young people to judge how important they felt each to be for men and for women. Again, this gives rise to four sets of data: young men’s and women’s views of what is important to men, and their views on what is important to women. Since the questions are presented in a common format for both sexes and a pre-structured response format is provided, response rates were very high for this section of the questionnaire (as compared to fairly high levels of non-response to some of the open-ended questions requiring a written response).

It was particularly striking that young men had difficulty answering open ended questions about what men and women look for in sex. This opens what we consider crucial discussion of the ways that the culture young men develop in (the boy/man talk, the things they read or watch, the activities that the social codes of masculinity invites them into) offers them a more sparse, less active vocabulary of visualisations of possibilities on the map of sexual behaviours and desires.

When, late in the questionnaire they were offered specific images of behaviours, the young men were more willing and able to engage in thinking about and assessing their importance. This suggests that the actual visualisation of more diverse and multi-faceted ways of engaging in sexual relations might be highly significant to enable young men to approach sexuality with more flexibility and less anxiety. Given that the young women were much more prolific in volunteering images of what might be important in sex, educational practices that facilitate more active, collaborative dialogues, better ways of communicating and listening to each other, between young men and women could be quite pivotal in enabling access for the young men to possibilities of safer sexual behaviour. It might be extremely important to take into account that safer sex ‘facts’ land on quite silent, unarticulated grounds in the male culture boys imbibe - so workshops emphasising agency in saying and acting, presenting and discussing in pairs may be extremely important to give young men the chance to embody speaking about sex and relationships

Furthermore, statistical comparisons were possible not only between young men’s and women’s views of what is important for men and women, but also within the groups of men and women to compare their perceptions of what is important for each sex.

Responses to this section of the questionnaire thus allow us to assess some of the trends emerging from the earlier open-ended questions producing textual data. As we have seen, the young men and women appear to have been in agreement that men are more interested in the physical aspects of sex, while women are seen as giving greater priority to emotional and relationship issues. Additional themes of relevance from earlier sections of the questionnaire are that men are more active and take the lead and that men are less caring and responsible in the context of sexual relationships.

How then, did the young men and women rate the various aspects of sex for men and women in general? If we consider young men’s views first, we find that four significant differences emerged in their ratings for men and women, and that three of these are consistent with the view emerging earlier that emotional aspects of sex are more important for women than for men. Strengthening the relationship, talking about feelings and telling their partner they love them, were all seen by young men as more important for women than for men. In addition, women were seen as more concerned about “ensuring safety from pregnancy” than were men, which suggests that men are less likely to see this as their responsibility. What is interesting in these results, however, is that there is no indication that the young men see the more physical side of sex as more important for men than for women. This is not just with respect to physical pleasure, but also in terms of the nature of sexual activity and taking an equal and active part in sex. In fact, many of the mean ratings for the aspects of sex listed indicate that they are, on average, rated as “fairly important” to “very important”. The young men appear to be saying that they reckon that certain physical aspects of sex are

equally important for men and for women. An important discrepancy between the perspectives of young women and men surfaces here when this is contrasted with what young women say about this. The young men's responses show that they perceive emotional dimensions of sex as the woman's agenda. This implies that for men the "core" physical acts (accessing the woman's body, penetration and orgasm) are imagined (perhaps are referred to allusively "among men" and scripted in cultural images of 'men doing it' in the media) dissociated from emotional interactions of disconnected from their own subjective emotional processes. Their gendered positioning as men, within the stories of how men and women "are", that they have absorbed, has them anticipate sexual experience that dissociates these physical acts from their own and women's emotional textures.

There is a sense in which the young men appear to express a relatively simple, clear-cut picture of gender differences in which they perceive women to differ from men in being more emotion-oriented, but are otherwise similar to men in terms of the value they place on sexual pleasures and the role they are able to adopt in the context of sexual relationships. When we turn to the ratings given by young women for men and women, however, the picture is more complex in itself, and becomes much more interesting when considered in relation to these views expressed by the young men.

Firstly, the idea that women are more "emotion" and "relationship" oriented receives resounding affirmation from young women. All four emotion items are endorsed more strongly for women than for men, and indeed one of the mean ratings for men on the item "talking about feelings" is closer to 3 than 2 suggesting that this is considered, on average, as "fairly unimportant" for young men.

Secondly, the more physical aspects of sex are seen as by the women as much more important for men than for women. Men are said to give greater value to "having penetration", "experiencing orgasm" and "touching partner sexually" than women are, and indeed, average ratings for touching and having penetration for women are between 2 and 3 suggesting that these activities are rated between fairly important and fairly unimportant, while for men the mean ratings are below 2.

Thirdly, men are also seen by the young women as giving greater value to "being in control" of how sex goes, which is consistent with the higher value given to touching and penetration for men, as "male-centred" activities. The positioning of women as a passive recipients in the sexual encounter, by young women themselves, is further underlined by the fact that "ensuring partner has orgasm" is more highly rated for women than men, presumably by allowing the male valued penetration leading to orgasm, neither of which young women believe are as highly valued by women.

Fourthly, no significant differences in value emerge for "being touched sexually" and "giving pleasure to their partner" both of which are seen as valued equally by men and women. While young women see touching and being touched as

equally valued by men, they see being touched as more valued by women than touching. Young women, therefore, see women as desiring to be touched, while being less invested in an active role in touching the male body. Touching the female body, performing sexual acts onto the female body is condoned though images of sex in the culture – and echoes notions of male initiative, control and leadership.

Heterosexual acts by women onto the male body are however significantly more censored and tabooed. They risk activating notions of impropriety and risky transgression of the compliant, acquiescent, receptive, 'nice girl' femininity that stages the supportive, protected (innocent) and dependent positions women are welcomed into so much more easily. While the young men's responses here show them to perceive women and men both wanting to be active in sexual exchange, women perceive men as wanting to encounter an exchange where the man's active engagement in physical initiative is more significant and desirable/permissible than women's.

Finally, safety from pregnancy and disease is the area of control in which women are more decidedly invested. While young women see men as also concerned about safety, women are seen as significantly more concerned about these matters.

Thus, a complicated situation comes into focus, with women seen by men as being more concerned with certain kinds of physical satisfaction of their partners than what is perceived by women as their own more multi-faceted script for emotionally connected sexual pleasure. Women are perceived by women as less actively invested in what are considered the "core acts" of physical sex (exploring the other's body, penetration, orgasm) and less actively involved in controlling "how it goes". Yet the concern for ensuring sexual safety from pregnancy and sexual infections is seen of prime importance for women – suggesting that the presence of this concern is problematically associated with a disconnection from active involvement in the physical implementation of the acts that bring risk of these.

The picture becomes even more complex when the ratings given by young men and women for each sex are compared. This, in fact, provides a different perspective on the relatively simple view of young men of gender positions in sexual relationships, and the more complex and conflicted images provided by young women. The young men and women tend to agree in their perceptions of what women value in sex, particularly with respect to the emotional side of sexual relationships, physical pleasure and sexual safety. Young men, however, appear to over-estimate the value placed by women on being active in sex, experiencing intercourse and in controlling "how sex goes", since young women see these are relatively unimportant for women in their experience of sex compared with young men's view. So the young men might tend to interpret women as mirroring their impetus to initiate physical interactions leading to intercourse, and might tend to see women as having their own agendas that lead in the same prioritised direction. The young women meanwhile indicate in their responses, however, that they tend to concede to men the relevance and initiative for these concerns.

Their ratings imply that these activities will happen but rather from a perception of the terms thought 'normal' to the male agenda, rather than from desire or agency seen as a script for women. This does need important further exploration - since it might have very significant facilitation of different kinds of discussions about rape as well as safer sex behaviours. The blame/victim spectrum may be set up as the wrong paradigm through which to explore all the complexities of heterosexual interactions - and though which to engage young women and men in deconstructing the socially gendered set of expectations that seem to legitimise certain kinds of heterosexual interactions.

The ratings given by the young men and women for what men consider important in sex are very different since young men regarded most aspects of sex as more important for men than did young women. This is worthy of comment - since it indicates that in the perception of aspects of sex being less important for women, the heterosexual choreography towards sexual intercourse is perceived as happening through some kind of imposition of the partner for whom the internal strategies of sex are more important, normalising an overriding of the less motivated partner.

There is one aspect of the finding here that we want to highlight particularly. For the four emotional items, "feeling intimacy and trust", "strengthening the relationship", "talking about feelings" and "telling their partner they love them", young men give average ratings, for men, of very important to fairly important, while young women give ratings, for men, of fairly important to fairly unimportant.

These results are perhaps among the most striking and challenging to emerge from the questionnaire, as they serve to problematise the somewhat stereotypical patterns found in the answers to earlier open-ended questions. It may be, however, that the pattern reflects the relative youth of the sample investigated and their lack of sexual experience (see below), combined with the existence at this age of differences between the sexes in social awareness and maturity. The young women being more mature, and generally more oriented towards relationships with men older than themselves, may have absorbed a different set of images of "how men are", compared with their male contemporaries. There seems however to emerge here an important issue that would merit further research with larger samples, a wider age range and a more complex, multivariate approach to analysis - with focus groups, interviews - than was possible in this project. We were struck when piloting the questionnaire (for example in England, and in Norway) that this pattern seemed to emerge in different small groups - the girls being unanimously pessimistic about the significance of emotional engagement by young men, and a significant per cent of the boys claiming an optimism for young men's desire for emotional intimacies. For young women, the script that prioritises love surfaces as also invested with a fatalistic sense of the odds against the masculine partner coming through with the emotional goods - giving a doomed anticipation of defeat of hopes, a "making do with less than what you wanted". While the young men, if

they harbour hopes for emotional engagement and intimacy, will be discouraged not only by the physical performance scripts that are expected of them, but also by the undercurrents of anticipation (and disappointment) from the young women's scripts.

The questionnaire contained a further set of statements regarding gender and sexual relationships closely based on the issues raised by the WRAP publication "The Male in the Head". These statements contained "ready-made" assumptions about experience of different dimensions of sexual interaction being similar or different for men and women. The striking feature of these results is the general lack of statistically significant differences in the ratings given by young men and women, thereby indicating a lack of gendered differentiation in endorsement or rejection of these statements. Many of these statements already contained some kind of differentiation between men and women - and the male and female respondents generally agreed or disagreed in the same direction.

The gendered sexual script emerging from responses to these questions suggests that there is shared belief among young men and women that:

- men want sexual intercourse more,
- women want to be guided by men in sex (with the women agreeing more often),
- women are not more active than men (so could be as or less active), and
- sex usually does not continue until women orgasm.

Though tending to agree or disagree in unison on other questions, without statistically significant differences, the tendencies we could see reading through all the responses were in similar directions, so we think merit some discussion here. It can be important to pause with nuances like this (and deviate momentarily from the statistical borders) to help open up the next layer of issues that might be quite crucial to bring onto the agenda of future exploration. In responses to the statements presented, inflections in the extent of agreement or disagreement relative to each other were interesting in that:

- The women tended to disagree more often than men that men want to be guided by sexually experienced women and also disagreed more often than men that women want intercourse more than men. These statements appear less digestible among women than men. This corroborates tendencies that surfaced already in other responses - that a script condoning sexually active women is more familiar to men than women, or that men acquire difficulties imagining someone wanting to do different things from themselves.
- Both the men and women respondents disagreed that women are more concerned to please a man during sex - though more women than men appeared to agree with this. This suggests again that a script for women centring the man's experience of sexual pleasure is more familiar to women than to men

- Women disagreed less often than men that women tend to feel more uncomfortable during sex, suggesting that young men read young women's ease with the expected activities of sexual activity, while young women experience more ill-ease with its anticipated agenda
- Though both disagreed that men prefer women who are less assertive, women were less inclined to disagree, suggesting that while both carry abstract notions of women's agency being a good thing, women are more invested in the idea of their agency being welcomed by men than men are in welcoming it
- Though both agreed that women want to be guided by sexually experienced men, this appeared truer from women's perspectives than men's. This response echoes earlier perceptions of the social value and approval given to male leadership and authority, while suggesting how young women experience the significance of this more vividly than young men.

These symptomatic indications perhaps begin to sketch out in greater detail the landscape we saw emerging already formulated in ideas about "men" and "women". Growing up within the normative gender referents of their society young people absorb and personally distil the "gender beliefs" they perceive or are projected onto them, or merely surround them. These gender beliefs crystallise into the norms and expectations that the young person takes into intimate physical relationships. These very gender beliefs raise the challenging questions about how sex education facts, "information" or even advice needs to be related dynamically - and challengingly - to these gender perceptions and the social conditions of gender. If safer sex education inadequately engages with the wider gender issues and the way they echo into the gendered sexual scripts young people acquire from their culture, it risks sabotaging its intent every step it takes.

4.7 Sex, risks and condom use

In the penultimate section of the questionnaire, a scenario was presented in which two young people have sex without a condom shortly after meeting for the first time. Young people were asked to rate the likelihood of a number of different outcomes from this encounter. The first related to the possibility that after the event the young man and woman involved might feel regret for what they had done. The results demonstrate very clearly that both young men and women consider it unlikely that the man would feel regret over such an experience, but fairly likely that a woman would. Statistical comparison between young men and women also revealed significant differences, with young women more likely to suggest that the woman would feel regret than the young man.

The feeling of regret may of course arise for several reasons (e.g. moral or social judgement and disapproval; disappointment in quality of experience physically or emotionally; risk of pregnancy and infection). Conversely, a lack of regret may reflect a variety of factors (e.g. sense of triumph over moral codes; gain in social reputation and access to approval from

peer group; gladness at physical experience itself; a sense of achievement or exhilaration at risks defied). As young people were not asked to give reasons for their judgement, it is unclear what issues they had in mind, but whatever considerations guided their answers, it is clear that the possibility of problematic outcomes from sex are seen as more salient for the woman than the man.

The remaining items in this section, all relate to possible physical outcomes. No significant differences were apparent in the ratings of young men and women, and in general no differentiation is made between the risks of infection to which the man and woman in the scenario may have been exposed (though piloting sessions several times produced feedback where women where the young woman was perceived at being more at risk of infections than the young man) Nevertheless, the overall pattern of answers was in one way a sensible one, with pregnancy given ratings of very likely to fairly likely, STDs rating of fairly likely and HIV ratings between fairly likely to fairly unlikely. The wild card factor with STDs and HIV is however a key factor on down-playing concern about it.

It is important to reflect here on how volatile the information about presence of STDs or HIV is. Awareness of HIV risk often tends to be based on subjective impressions of the Russian roulette odds (eg it's bad in Africa, not here) and also on an optimistic reading of the in fact unknown invisible spread of the HIV virus - whose asymptomatic latency period can extend up to 10 years. For example, the low rating of risk of HIV infection by these young respondents in June 1999 seemed realistic in Estonia. However, the explosion of the Estonian epidemic in 2000, where by the end of the year the infection rate was registered already as over 30 times the rate of previous years, with majority of new infections among young people, would indicate a problematic perception of what is in fact an illusory and unknowable stability in the ways HIV moves. This itself, often based on the ways governments invoke retrospective epidemiology, and deprioritise the crucial preventive importance of good, clearly funded sexual safety education and HIV understanding, is an important aspect of continued unsafe behaviours among young men and women.

The results confirm that for young people risks of pregnancy are more salient than risks of STDs and certainly of HIV. For this reason alone, without considering the many specific barriers to condom use, if any form of protection is used, contraception is likely to be prioritised above use of condoms as a prophylactic. Given the importance of intervening preventatively with safer sexual behaviours in the face of the advance of HIV and other STDs, such as chlamydia, this contraceptive-prioritising "norm", that in fact still prevails separated from condom use in "western countries" sexual safety agendas (and may be being reinforced by the non-prescription availability of the morning-after pill - there being no morning-after pills for STDs), needs to be challenged as a problematically causal factor in non-condom use.

Following on from this scenario, young people were asked directly for their views on why young men and young women

might have sex without using condoms. The most striking issue to emerge from these results was that, while both young men and young women agreed that sex is more pleasurable for a man without a condom, young women were over three times more likely to suggest that condoms actually spoil pleasure for the man, than were the young men. The way some young women hear complaints of how condoms interfere with full untrammelled pleasure from men's point of view, circulates among some young women interpreted as condoms destroying pleasure - so incompatible with male sexual pleasure. Young women who hold this view are clearly likely to find it difficult to suggest that a man uses a condom. Here again is evidence that young women give greater emphasis to the man's pleasure, and in doing so may over-exaggerate the disruptive consequences of condom use for men during sex.

Gender differences in perceptions of emotional dimensions of sex also emerged in response to these questions, with women being more likely to suggest that a man's lack of condom use may signal a lack of caring on his part. In addition, both young men and women suggested that a woman might have sex with man not using a condom because of feelings of "trust", whereas this factor was scarcely mentioned in accounting for a man not using a condom during sex. This opens important discussion of some aspects of femininity being invested in a kind of emotion, the love/trust scenario (that haunts women's popular fiction) that obliterates self-protection and abdicates on safety as proof of feeling the real emotions. Alongside this, there was a recurrence of a suggestion, mostly from women, that a woman might be afraid to ask a man to use a condom. No young person however suggested that a man might feel afraid of suggesting condom use during sex to a female partner. The issue of power and the anxious need to hold the balance of decision-making in the man's hands has again challenging echoes from the earlier responses to perceptions of gender inequality and difference. None of these three factors: assumed interference with a partner's pleasure, feelings of trust in the partner, and fear of the partner's reactions to being asked about condom use - are gender neutral. They are all considerations that young people believe women are more likely to take into account in a sexual encounter, and they all serve to render it less likely that condoms will actually be used during sex.

The final section of the questionnaire included a range of personal questions about young people's experience of sexual activity. The information requested is clearly very personal, and respondents were assured that they could leave this section of the questionnaire unanswered if they wished. In fact, however, the response rate was high to the question Have you ever had sexual intercourse? With 200 of 213 giving an answer, and of these just over a third of each sex claiming to have had sexual intercourse. Of those claiming to "have had sex", however, only 58/70 were prepared to indicate how many partners they had had. The information given by those who did respond indicates that over half had experienced sexual intercourse with two or more partners. Thus, the more sexually experienced young people are in a small minority in

our sample, with most young people (almost two-thirds) not having experienced intercourse, approximately a sixth having had sex with one partner, and approximately a sixth having had sex with two or more partners.

Sexually active young people were forthcoming about their age of first intercourse and the age of their first partner, and here a remarkable sex difference emerges. Approximately two-thirds of young people were under the age of 16 at first intercourse (with no difference between the sexes), but significantly more of the young men's first partners were under the age of 16 too (46%) when compared with young women's partners (only 2% of whom were under 16 at first sex). It would appear therefore, that young women are more likely to experience first sex with an older partner, whereas young men's first experience of sex tends to be with a partner of a similar age. The age disparity for young women must surely carry a greater likelihood of differences in sexual experience and in agenda-setting influence in the sexual relationship then potentially render the woman more open to risks of unprotected sex. It also means that young women experience sex with men who have navigated their way through the gender expectations and beliefs for a longer time, and circulated more within the codes of masculinity available in their culture. In addition, young men and women differed significantly in whether they characterised their first sexual experience as casual or not: 10 out of 24 men said their first experience of sex was in a casual relationship, compared with only 5 out of 45 women. Equally, 7 out of 17 young men described their most recent experience of unprotected sex as being "casual" compared with only one woman out of thirty-one. It may be, of course, that women are less willing to acknowledge having "casual" sexual relationships, and that this in part accounts for the difference. But, if it is the case that young women are more likely to experience sex in relationships that have emotional significance for them, this may make it more difficult for them to suggest condom use. As noted above, young people themselves suggested that a woman's feelings of trust may be one factor that accounts for them having sex without a man using a condom.

No data was gathered on the extent to which condoms were used or not in sexual intercourse, but young people were asked whether, during their last experience of sex without a condom, they had worried about pregnancy and sexual infection. No significant differences emerged between the two sexes, but levels of concern about pregnancy were decidedly higher for both sexes than concern over sexually transmitted diseases. These results mirror the findings reported earlier from the sexual risk scenario that pregnancy was considered a more likely outcome from a casual sexual encounter, than was an STD or HIV infection. They serve to emphasize again that risk of pregnancy is a greater concern for young people than risk of sexual infection, and this again is likely to encourage them to think primarily about the need for contraception to avoid pregnancy, and the use of condoms to avoid infection.

4.8 Concluding thoughts

The large majority of the young people who completed the questionnaire had not experienced having sexual partners. Of the 214 in the sample, about 23 indicated that they had had 2 or more partners. This is interesting here not so much in terms of who is doing what at what age, but in terms of how vividly primed these young people are about what men and women “are”, what kinds of behaviours associated with masculinity and femininity they are familiar with – in other words what the gender script for behaviours are that guide them into what they perceive as recognisable currency for the ways men and women interact sexually. What kind of compass is given to young people to navigate their gendered positions in sexual interaction? What stories do they draw on, from the world around them, to assemble their actions and interactions, to perform their gendered selves and interpret their gendered partner?

The response of young people in Western countries where there has been huge investment in “sex education”, spurred by waves of anxiety about the AIDS epidemic, appears to indicate that factual information and clearer knowledge of risk and exhortations to manage their sexual interaction safely has limited impact on their sexual behaviours in terms of strategies that avoid “exchange of body fluids”. The sex education is primarily not interwoven with critical gender education - of a kind that connects to issues of history, politics, human rights, community and citizenship values and social change. Yet young people access their understanding of sexuality, not through simple biologically driven needs, but through the gender conventions they acquire from the world around them, and the stories the world offers - and sells them.

If the normative terms of heterosexual sexual interaction generate difficulty embodying safer sex, then discussion and questioning of those normative terms need to be central to the safer sex education process. This means that adults who are in positions to engage young people in thinking about sexual safety need to be themselves encouraged and facilitated into looking more critically at the ways gender differences between men and women are organised in the society around them. Sexual safety awareness needs to incorporate deeper, wider and more radical concerns about gender equality, informed by a wider spectrum of gender research. Rather than sex being seen primarily as a private moment where individuals must take responsibility or blame, the interactions between men and women need to be discussed critically as a relational site where the gender expectations and norms that embody beliefs and conventions of gender inequality come to affect and reinforce unsafe, risk behaviours. To have useful resources to change unsafe behaviours that are scripted out of heterosexual norms within gender inequality, young people need to have access to thinking about and critically reflecting on the wider contexts of gender norms. They need to be able to understand that gender (the social construction of differences between men and women that is embedded in institutions, economy, ways of thinking and seeing) is cultural, historical and debatable and, most important, can therefore be

changed. If the underpinnings of understanding what men “are” and what women “are” is natural, imbued with essentially pre-determined behaviours, then a fatalism about the inevitability of certain behaviours prevails within the sexual sphere. If gender is understood as something formed by society by its laws, traditions and conventions – and that these change, can be changed – and indeed need to change when they produce injustice or damaging behaviours – then young people have a more viable framework for envisaging changing their own behaviours against a culture that most frequently leans them towards norms of inequality and risk.

5. Postscript:

The Living for Tomorrow questionnaire as a cross-cultural research and education tool

The Living for Tomorrow questionnaire was also set in active dialogue for revision and refinement with gender researchers and sexual health education practitioners from 8 countries, in order to explore its potential for adaptable cross-cultural use as a relevant tool for stimulating gender awareness in sexual health education processes.

In November 1998, with extra support from the Nordic Research Co-operation Fund (Norfa), gender researchers and sexual health educators from each of the following countries - Estonia, NW Russia, Lithuania, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, England and Croatia - met for 3 days in Tallinn. We discussed, and, where deemed necessary, "reworked" the questionnaire in detail, question by question, with cross-cultural debate and input. The combination of researchers and sexual health promoters was deemed crucial to explore the complexities of what the questionnaire was aiming to do, helping focus discussions about the practical (and social) considerations that needed to take into account in its strategy and design. This strategic collaboration of researchers and sexual health promoters was seen as key to both the development and implementation possibilities of the questionnaire, as well as to ensuring that throughout the conceptualising process, findings from the study could be linked into action with young people.

Generating this collaboration between the eight countries aimed to strengthen dialogue and co-operation regionally while taking the Living for Tomorrow interrogation of gender issues into wider reflections. It opened discussions, from different cultural perspectives, of aspects of sexual health prevention and prevailing gender beliefs that are not often explored together.

Working in workshops that modelled the methods used in Living for Tomorrow's Capacity Building, we were, as a group, immediately involved in experiencing together the participatory, interactive ways of working that are more effective in encouraging active youth participation and mobilisation on sexual health issues. The similarities and differences in the various national responses raised interesting questions about gender traditions in different and changing societies, as well as about the "globalising" of sexual risk behaviours though common media references that all were interested to discuss.

Some preliminary findings from a piloting of the original questionnaire with young people on the Isle of Wight in England, and feedback from earlier piloting in Estonia (with the project teenagers), Sweden (with teenagers, undertaken in a student project) and in Norway (with medical students who run school sex education programmes, with gender researchers and high school pupils) were drawn on to stimulate discussion.

Discussions at the Tallinn meeting explored how wording of different questions and translation of terms needed to be considered in relation to the social acceptance and cultural framing of the subject. The word "gender" and its understanding raised all kinds of issues in different cultural contexts and stimulated heated discussion and debate that clarified and deepened thinking about gender. It was acknowledged that no country has a population of young people literate in gender politics or gender critical concepts. "National" differences, religious influences, polarised communities had to be turned and tossed, highlighting the diversities of young people. Sex education needs to find flexible and relevant ways to engage actively with these diversities. Differences in language use, social acceptance of sexual explicitness, the structuring of school sex education and curriculum, parents' roles and expectations were debated.

These issues were important to clarify if the questionnaire, as a research and education tool, was to be envisaged as a common "core" tool for generating useful information about the symptomatic gender concerns haunting preventive sexual health in many different countries. If collaborative, cross-cultural work were to be undertaken "using" the questionnaire as a common tool, care in establishing common ground and delineating well co-ordinated strategies and methods is crucial for the research to have cross-cultural significance. To this end participants worked to establish ideas for draft guidelines for such an endeavour. Participants from seven countries committed themselves to developing the project further and exploring ways of seeking funding to support its co-ordinated implementation.

Following this meeting, the questionnaire was revised incorporating agreed detailed revisions, and guidelines were drafted for agreed strategies of deployment. This collaboratively revised version of the questionnaire has since gone into new rounds of informal re-piloting, with focus group discussions, in Sweden, Norway, Russia, Croatia, Estonia and England in order to explore a little further young people's responses to these questions and issues that the questionnaire addresses.

The new Estonian NGO Living for Tomorrow is developing its own strategies for using the questionnaire in ongoing dynamic educational work with schools. Colleagues at AIDS Prevention Lithuania, Vilnius, and at the Department of Education, Klaipeda University, Lithuania also undertook the translation and distribution of the questionnaire linked to the development of new sexual health education courses for teacher training, and Family Planning Associations projects in both Latvia and Lithuania hope to use the questionnaire as a basis for new work with young people and sexual safety.

5.1 Widening the gender net: new dialogues and new scope for gender-focused initiatives

The initial aim of the Living for Tomorrow questionnaire was as part of the action research undertaken simultaneous to other dimensions of the NIKK Living for Tomorrow project. Its immediate goal was to gather original, local information

that related to the gender concerns of the project, and could inform the work that Living for Tomorrow might generate. Comments and feedback from the questionnaire were anticipated as useful to stimulate discussion and ideas of direct work with Estonian colleagues and teenagers. Its data indeed came to provide useful input to the booklet *How to Bridge the Gap between Us? Gender and Sexual Safety* that the teenage participants made. This is now available for new rounds of intensive workshops with newly recruited teenage volunteers as well as work in schools planned by the independently established Estonian NGO comprised of people who volunteered to work with the NIKK project.

As the project advanced, however, the wider significance of such a tool came into greater focus. The interest and response from colleagues in a range of different countries and cultures suggested its significance as a strategic tool for activating local debates with researchers, educators and the young people themselves in many different contexts.

The later, cross-culturally revised version of the questionnaire is circulating not as a "final" version of a definitive tool - but as a "core version" of a potentially adaptable tool that can be revised for specific take-up in different countries and different cultural contexts. Colleagues working in many diverse cultures have already engaged with keen interest in discussion of the implications of its gender-focused strategies. The questionnaire has been used as a resource for initiatives in schools in England (the Isle of Wight and Canterbury); with young adult representatives from the newly established, cross-ethnic Balkan Dialogue Centres in Bosnia, Montenegro, Serbia, Kosovo and Macedonia; and with seventeen year olds in Oslo in workshops on an international AIDS-focus day. It is seen as a useful resource for generating new possible initiatives in Sweden - following the recent survey of dilemmas in sex education processes in Swedish schools. It will be being deployed in a WHO-funded 2001 project in Croatia. The approach and strategy of the questionnaire is being discussed for adaptation and use by two Norwegian research institutes in their development of new HIV intervention projects - one working in Estonia, targeting young adults 20 - 25 (students, first time employees and unemployed) and the other working with HIV prevention and youth education in Sub-Saharan African countries. Its use is also being explored for possible co-ordinated implementation in a initiative involving collaboration from Baltic, Russian, Norwegian, Swedish and British colleagues. Its significance will be piloted during Capacity Building in Sierra Leone later in 2001.

These links are significant to mention in the wider set of gender political concerns that Living for Tomorrow has been committed to activating in sexual safety and HIV prevention work. Culturally diverse interest and enthusiasm has met this work at each stage. This suggests that a gender focus strategy, linking research on wider cultural beliefs about gender differences to new critical literacy among young people about how society locates man and women differently with problematic sexual health outcomes is seen as both relevant and urgent for concrete sexual safety and HIV prevention educational inter-

ventions with young people in diverse cultural and national contexts. It also suggests there is a need - and thirst - for more concrete tools for strategic implementation of more radical gender-focused strategies.

6. Bibliography

Human development Report: Estonia. Tallinn:United Nations Development Program (UNPD), 1996

Gender and HIV/AIDS. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), 1998. (UNAIDS Technical Update.)

Baalsrud, E.S., ed. 1992. *Free and Equal? Female Voices from Central and Eastern Europe.* Oslo: Norwegian Equal Status Council.

Barker, G. (1999), *Listening to Boys "Research on Brazilian boys formative early experiences of gender"*. Unpublished paper presented at the "Masculinity and Sexuality" seminar Ligestillingst adet, Oslo.

Berer, M. 1996. Men. *Reproductive health matters* 7:7-10.

Berer, M., and S. Ray, eds. 1993. *Women and HIV/AIDS : An international resource book : Information, action and resources on women and HIV/AIDS, reproductive health and sexual relationship.* London: Pandora Press.

Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble : Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* Edited by L. J. Nicholson, *Thinking Gender.* New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. 1993. *Bodies that Matter : On the Discursive Limits of "Sex".* New York-London: Routledge.

Carovano, K. 1995. *HIV and the Challenges Facing Men.* Vol. No. 15, *Issues Paper.* New York: United Nations Development Programme, HIV and Development Programme.

Chodorow, N. 1994. *Femininities, Masculinities, Sexualities : Freud and Beyond:* The University Press of Kentucky.

Connell, R.W. 1987. *Gender and Power.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R.W. 1995. *Masculinities.* Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Dammert, L., ed. 1995. *Towards New Masculinities - Report from a Nordic conference on men and gender equality.* Vol. 1995:26, *Nord.* Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers.

de Lauretis, T. 1997. The Violence of Rhetoric : On Representation and Gender. In *The Gender Sexuality Reader : Culture, History, Political Economy,* edited by R. Lancaster and M. di Leonardo. New York: Routledge.

Doyal, L., J. Naidoo, and T. Wilton, eds. 1994. *AIDS : Setting a Feminist Agenda.* London: Taylor & Francis.

Dunne, G.A. 1997. *Lesbian Lifestyles : Women's Work and the Politics of Sexuality.* Basingstoke: MacMillan Press.

Einhorn, B. 1993. *Cinderella Goes to Market : citizenship, gender and the women's movement in East Central Europe.* London: Verso.

Einhorn, B. 1997. The Great Divide? Women's rights in Eastern and Central Europe since 1945. In *Becoming Visible: Women in European History,* edited by R. Bridenthal and et al. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Faber, M. 1996. *But then my feelings ran away with me... : A report on the sexual behaviour of Swedish men abroad.* Stockholm: The National Institute of Public Health.

Foreman, M., ed. 1999. *AIDS and Men: Taking Risks or Taking Responsibility?* London: The Panos Institute and Zed Books.

Funk, N. , and M. Mueller, eds. 1993. *Gender Politics and Post-Communism : Reflections from Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union.* New York: Routledge.

Goffman, E. 1979. *Gender Advertisements.* London: MacMillan.

Gorna, R. 1996. *Vamps, Virgins and Victims : How Can Women Fight AIDS?* London: Cassell.

Gr gaard, J.B. 1996. *Estonia in the Grip of Change : The NORBALT Living Conditions Project.* Vol. No. 190, *Fafo report.* Oslo: Fafo Institute for Applied Social Science.

Hamblin, J., and E. Reid. 1993. *Women, the HIV Epidemic and Human Rights: A Tragic Imperative.* Vol. No. 8, *Issues Paper.* New York: UNDP - United Nations Development Programme.

Holland, J., and L. Adkins, eds. 1996. *Sex, Sensibility and the Gendered Body.* Vol. 46, *Explorations in Sociology.* Basingstoke: MacMillan Press.

Holland, J., and et al. 1991. *Learning about sex: Young women and the social construction of sexual identity.* Vol. No. 4, *WRAP Paper (Women Risk AIDS Project).* London: The Tufnell Press.

Holland, J., C. Ramazanoglu, S. Scott, S. Sharpe, and R. Thomson. 1991. *Pressure, Resistance, Empowerment : Young women and the negotiation of safer sex.* Vol. No. 6, *WRAP Paper (Women Risk AIDS Project).* London: The Tufnell Press.

Holland, J., C. Ramazanoglu, and S. Sharpe. 1993. *Wimp or Gladiator: Contradictions in Acquiring Masculine Sexuality.* London: Tufnell Press.

Holland, J., C. Ramazanoglu, S. Sharpe, and R. Thomson. 1998. *The male in the head: young people, heterosexuality and power.* London: The Tufnell Press.

Holloway, W. 1983. Heterosexual sex : Power and Desire for the Other. In *Sex and Love: New Thoughts on Old Contradictions,* edited by S. Cartledge and J. Ryan. London: Women's Press.

Holloway, W. 1984. Gender difference and the production of subjectivity. In *Changing the subject : Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity,* edited by J. Henriques, W. Holloway, C. Urwin, C. Venn and V. Walkerdine. London: Methuen & Co.

- Irigaray, L. 1983. *Ethique de la difference sexuelle (An ethics of sexual difference)*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- Jackson, S. 1999. *Heterosexuality in Question*. London: Sage Publications.
- Koroleva, I., ed. 1997. *Invitation to Dialogue Beyond Gender (In) equality*. Riga: Institute of Philosophy and Sociology (Latvian Academy of Sciences).
- Kupryashkina, S. 1996. Possibilities for Women's Studies in Post-Communist Countries: Where are we Going? In *New Frontiers in Women's Studies: Knowledge, Identity and Nationalism*, edited by M. Maynard and J. Purvis. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Kutsar, D., ed. 1997. *Peegliraamat : Kuidas sind/mind mõista? [Gender Dialogue : A Mirror Book : How to understand you/me?]*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Laas, A. 1996. *Facts on Estonian Women in 1996*. Tartu: Unit of Gender Studies, University of Tartu.
- Laas, A. 1997. *Status of Women in Estonia*. unpublished draft ed. Tartu: Unit of Gender Studies, University of Tartu.
- Lauristin, M. 1996. Women in Today's Estonia. *Idäntutkimus* (3-4 (Special issue: Women and Transition - The Case of Estonia)):8-12.
- Lauristin, M., and P. Vihalemm, eds. 1997. *Return to the Western World : Cultural and Political Perspectives on the Estonian Post-Communist Transition*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Lewis, J. 1998. Visualizing desire: HIV prevention dilemmas for women's sexual safety. *NORA Nordic Journal of Women's Studies* 6 (2):122-132.
- Maynard, M. and J. Purvis (eds.). 1996. *New Frontiers in Women's Studies : Knowledge, Identity and Nationalism*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Narusk, A. 1996. Gendered Outcomes of the Transition in Estonia. *Idäntutkimus* (3-4 (Special issue: Women and transition : The case of Estonia)):12-39.
- Neimanis, A. 1999. *Gender and Human Development in Latvia*. Riga: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
- Papp, K. 1997. *Knowledge of Sexual Issues, Moral Beliefs, and the Sexual Experiences among Adolescents in Estonia and Finland*. Helsinki: National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health (STAKES).
- Patton, C. 1994. *Last Served? Gendering the HIV Pandemic*. Edited by P. Aggleton, *Social Aspects of AIDS series*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Rajasaar, I., and A-R.I. Annunziata, eds. 1994. *Estonian Children and Families*. Tallinn: Estonian National Committee for UNICEF.
- Reid, E. 1992. *Gender, Knowledge and Responsibility*. Vol. No. 10, Issues Paper. New York: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), HIV and Development Programme.
- Richardson, D., ed. 1996. *Theorising Heterosexuality*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Rivers, K., and P. Aggleton. 1998. *Men and the HIV epidemic*. London: Thomas Coram Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Scott, J., C. Kaplan, and D. Keates, eds. 1997. *Transitions, environments, translations*. New York-London: Routledge.
- Sherr, L., C. Hankins, and L. Bennett, eds. 1996. *AIDS as a gender issue : psychosocial perspectives*. Edited by P. Aggleton, *Social aspects of AIDS*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Thompson, S. 1995. *Going all the way : Teenage girls' tales of sex, romance, and pregnancy*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Whelan, D. 1999. *Gender and HIV/AIDS: Taking stock of research and programmes, UNAIDS Best Practice Collection : Key Material*. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS).
- Wilton, T. 1997. *Engendering AIDS: Deconstructing Sex, Text and Epidemic*. London: SAGE.

Appendices

Table A-1: Do you believe that men and women are equal in Estonia today?
("no" answers)

	young men (n=51)		young women (n=76)		total sample (n=127)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Men in power	11	22	18	24	29	23
Bias in favour of men	8	16	19	25	27	21
Bias against women	1	2	15	20	16	13
Attitudes held by men and women	2	4	11	14	13	10
Different qualities and roles	6	12	5	7	11	9
In future will be different	2	4	4	5	6	5
It depends on...	1	2	4	5	5	4
Simple assertion*	4	8	0	0	4	3
Miscellaneous**	10	20	9	12	19	15
No comment	5	10	8	11	13	10

* In this table and in others in Appendices, the simpleassertion category contains all statements which simply re-state the answer given in the structured response e.g. "Because they are not equal"

** In this table and in others in Appendices, the miscellaneous category contains very varied, infrequent and sometimes idiosyncratic comments that could not be coded in the main categories distinguished.

Table A-2: Do you believe that men and women are equal in Estonia today?
("yes" answers)

	Young men (n=26)		Young women (n=47)		Total sample (n=73)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Equal opportunities, rights, capabilities	5	19	12	26	16	22
No discrimination	3	12	12	26	15	21
Women in power, leading positions	1	4	5	11	6	8
Simple assertion	2	8	2	4	4	5
Miscellaneous	8	31	6	13	14	19
No comment	6	23	12	26	18	25

Table A-3: Do you believe that men and women can be equal
("no" answers)

	Men (n=30)		Women (n=47)		Total (n=77)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Unequal capacities	9	30	14	30	23	30
Moral/sociological differences	8	27	10	21	18	23
Male domination	1	3	10	21	11	14
Biologically different	3	10	6	13	9	12
Created different	0	0	2	4	2	3
Different in complementary ways	0	0	2	4	2	3
Depends on meaning of equality	1	3	1	2	2	3
Simple assertion	2	7	3	6	5	6
Inconsistent	2	7	2	4	4	5
Miscellaneous / unclear	5	17	2	4	7	9
No answer	1	3	2	4	3	4

Table A-4: Do you believe that men and women can be equal
("yes" answers)

	Men (n=47)		Women (n=83)		Total (n=130)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Equal capabilities (differences only physical)	6	13	14	17	20	15
Both humans/people	3	6	8	10	11	8
Social change, possible in the future	6	13	2	2	8	6
Equal rights/opportunities exist	3	6	9	11	12	9
Possible if... really wanted, women fight for it	4	9	12	15	16	13
Possible in some ways but not others	1	2	4	5	5	4
Equal by being complementary	1	2	2	2	3	2
Created equal	0	0	2	2	2	2
Miscellaneous / unclear	4	9	6	7	10	8
Inconsistent	3	6	3	4	6	5
Simple assertion / agreement	5	11	9	11	14	11
No answer	8	17	14	17	22	17

Table A-5 Young people's views on ways in which men and women are different

	Characteristics of men		Characteristics of women		
	n	%	n	%	
Young men (n=79)					
Stronger	7	9	Weaker	3	4
Less emotional, caring, expressive	9	11	More emotional, caring, expressive	17	22
Young women (n=134)					
Stronger	21	16	Weaker	8	6
Less emotional, caring, expressive	16	12	More emotional, caring, expressive	52	39
More interested in sex	15	11	More interested in romance	9	7
Irresponsible social behaviour	21	16	Responsible social behaviour	26	19
Role of earners, providers, protectors	8	6	Role of carers, in need of protection	16	12

Table A-6: Characteristics of men valued in Estonian society

	Young men		Young women		Total sample	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Competence and success						
Wisdom	15	19	28	21	43	20
Wealth	16	20	15	11	31	15
Intelligence	5	6	13	10	18	9
Communication	3	4	6	5	9	4
Education	5	6	4	3	9	4
Will power	4	5	5	4	9	4
Reason	1	1	7	5	8	4
Hard working	3	4	6	5	9	4
Decision making	1	1	5	4	6	3
Sense	1	1	5	4	6	3
Self confidence	1	1	5	4	6	3
Socio-emotional characteristics						
Honesty	10	13	20	15	30	14
Sense of humour	7	9	20	15	27	13
Elaborativeness	5	6	14	11	19	9
Kindness	1	1	16	12	17	8
Caring	5	6	12	9	17	8
Domestic qualities	1	1	16	12	17	8
Good manners	3	4	12	9	15	7
Faithfulness	2	3	10	8	12	6
Understanding	2	3	9	7	11	5
Masculinity	2	3	6	5	8	4
Loving	1	3	6	5	7	3
Care for women	0	0	6	5	6	3
Physical characteristics						
Physical condition	10	13	10	8	20	9
Strength	6	7	12	9	18	9
Beauty	9	11	6	5	15	7
Appearance	6	7	6	5	12	6
Sexiness	4	5	1	1	5	2
No response	7	9	8	6	15	7

Table A-7: Characteristics of women valued in Estonian society

	Young men		Young women		Total sample	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Competence and success						
Wisdom	8	10	16	12	24	11
Sense	6	8	16	12	22	10
Intelligence	7	9	13	10	20	9
Independence	2	3	10	8	12	6
Communication	5	6	6	5	11	5
Educated	4	5	3	2	7	3
Hard working	3	4	4	3	7	3
Socio-emotional characteristics						
Submissiveness	10	13	12	9	22	10
Kindness	3	4	15	11	18	9
Honesty	5	6	10	8	15	7
Faithfulness	7	9	8	6	15	7
Domestic qualities	5	6	10	8	15	7
Sense of humour	1	1	11	8	12	6
Good manners	4	5	7	5	11	5
Femininity	3	4	7	5	10	5
Understanding	2	3	7	5	9	5
Caring	3	4	6	5	9	4
Modesty	0	0	7	5	7	3
Elaborativeness	4	5	2	2	6	3
Physical characteristics						
Beauty	23	29	21	16	44	21
Sexiness	10	13	4	3	14	7
Appearance	1	1	11	8	12	6
No response	9	11	15	11	24	11

Table A-8: What makes a man a good lover?

	Young men (n=79)		Young women (n=134)		Total sample (n=213)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Love, care, feeling	11	14	54	40	65	31
Tenderness	5	6	44	33	49	23
Being active	11	14	32	24	43	20
Satisfying partner	6	8	26	19	32	15
Physical characteristics	14	18	14	10	28	13
Experience	11	14	14	10	25	12
Understanding	3	4	12	9	15	7
Fidelity	6	8	8	6	14	7
Passion	0	0	13	10	13	6
Romance	3	4	5	4	8	4
Fantasy	3	4	4	3	7	3
No response	21	27	18	8	39	18

Table A-9: What makes a woman a good lover?

	Young men (n=79)		Young women (n=134)		Total sample (n=213)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Love, care, feeling	8	10	32	24	40	19
Being active	4	5	30	22	34	16
Physical characteristics	22	28	12	9	34	16
Experience	11	14	11	8	22	10
Satisfying partner	3	4	14	10	17	8
Tenderness	2	3	13	10	15	7
Understanding	2	3	8	6	10	5
Passion	3	4	7	5	10	5
Equality	1	1	5	4	6	3
Romance	3	4	1	1	4	2
Fantasy	2	3	2	1	4	2
Fidelity	2	3	3	1	5	2
No response	18	23	36	27	54	25

Table A-10: What men want from sex

	Young men (n=79)		Young women (n=134)		Total sample (n=213)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Satisfaction	25	32	56	42	81	30
Pleasure	3	4	14	10	17	8
Orgasm	3	4	5	4	8	4
Sex	5	6	3	2	8	4
Partner satisfaction	2	2	4	3	6	3
Tenderness	1	1	2	1	3	1
Closeness	2	3	1	1	3	1
Love	1	1	1	1	2	1
No answer	32	41	44	33	76	36

Table A-11: What women want from sex

	Young men (n=79)		Young women (n=134)		Total sample(n=213)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Satisfaction	14	18	24	18	38	18
Tenderness	7	9	16	12	23	11
Love	5	6	17	13	22	10
Pleasure	2	3	13	10	15	7
Closeness	1	1	9	7	10	5
Orgasm	5	6	3	2	8	4
Partner satisfaction	2	3	5	4	7	3
Security	1	1	6	4	7	3
Caresses	1	1	5	4	6	3
Gentleness	0	0	4	3	4	2
Sex	2	3	1	1	3	1
No answer	35	44	40	30	75	35

Table A-12: Why men have sex without using condoms during casual sex

	Young men (n=79)		Young women (n=134)		Total sample (n=213)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Pleasure greater	22	28	36	27	58	27
Spoils pleasure	10	13	48	36	58	27
Neglects consequences	6	8	28	21	34	16
Doesn't have one	5	6	11	8	16	8
Complicated to use	4	5	14	10	18	8
Trusts partner/relationship	5	6	9	7	14	7
Doesn't care about partner	1	1	14	10	15	7
Doesn't want to use	3	4	10	7	13	6
Carried away/no time	5	6	8	6	13	6
Forgets to use	0	0	7	5	7	3
Couldn't afford one	5	6	2	1	7	3
Wants child	2	3	4	3	6	3
Hopes woman on pill	0	0	5	4	5	2
Better for partner	4	5	0	0	4	2
Miscellaneous	11	14	15	11	26	12
No response	9	11	12	9	21	10

Table A-13: Why women have sex without the man using a condom during casual sex

	Young men (n=79)		Young women (n=134)		Total sample (n=213)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Trusts partner/relationship	10	13	26	19	36	17
Pleasure greater	19	24	10	7	29	14
Afraid to ask partner	7	9	16	12	23	11
Contraceptives used	3	4	18	13	21	10
Carried away / no time	7	9	13	10	20	9
Wants child	6	8	15	11	19	9
To please partner	7	9	7	5	14	7
Doesn't think / careless	7	9	7	5	14	7
Spoils pleasure	2	3	10	8	12	6
Doesn't see risk	1	3	11	8	12	6
Drunk	2	3	7	5	9	4
Doesn't have one	2	3	6	4	8	4
Doesn't want to use	0	0	3	2	3	1
More natural	2	3	1	1	3	1
Forgets to use	0	0	2	2	2	1
Miscellaneous	9	11	3	2	12	6
No response	10	13	20	15	30	14

Notes:



NIKK

Nordic Institute for
Women's Studies and
Gender Research

P.O: Box 1156 Blindern
NO-0317 Oslo
Norway

Tel: +47 22 85 89 21
Fax: +47 22 85 89 50
nikk@nikk.uio.no
www.nikk.uio.no



Nordic

COUNCIL & COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

- NIKK is financed by the Nordic Council of Ministers. • The Nordic Council of Ministers is a forum for cooperation between the Nordic governments.
- The Nordic Council of Ministers implements Nordic cooperation. • The Prime Ministers have the overall responsibility.
- The activities are coordinated by the Nordic ministers for cooperation, the Nordic Committee for Cooperation and portfolio ministers. Founded 1971.

ISBN: 82 7864 010 6