



**'Being one of the "boys"': understandings of how young
heterosexual male students construct their experiences of the Night
Time Economy**

By

Rune Shannan Murphy

A Thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

Faculty of Earth and Life Sciences

Aberystwyth University

Supervised by

Dr Alison Mackiewicz

Dr Saffron Passam

31st of March 2023

Word count: 48,096

Abstract

This study aimed to give a deeper understanding of how young heterosexual male students construct their experiences in the Night Time Economy and used a post-feminist, neoliberal perspective to explore how discourses of power impacted these understandings and their subsequent opportunity for experience. In interviews with 10 heterosexual male students, we explored the behaviours of their 'typical' nights out and how they made sense of experiences such as drinking and sexual attention. Narratives were analysed using a Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) as this enabled a deepening of the analysis of power at different levels. The initial talk centred on discourses of brotherhood and masculine power which have been found to be central to the discussed themes. These themes showed how the young men attempted to understand their positions as lads within their social groups, the construction of their experiences through social memory making and how they talked about consent through the lens of the night out. Limitations and avenues for future research are discussed.

Acknowledgements

I would especially like to thank my partner, Morgan, whose endless patience and unwavering support has kept me going throughout this long and challenging journey. I am grateful that throughout every bump in the road, every long night of studying and every moment I had doubt, you have been there to reassure me that you have never had any doubt in me. Thank you for believing in me.

I would also like to thank my family, the Murphys and the Brownlows, who have not only supported me but have always reminded me that the best care is being kind to myself and remembering to relax once in a while. Thank you for your patience.

And last but by no means least, I would like to give my heartfelt thanks to my supervisors, Dr Alison Mackiewicz and Dr Saffron Passam. Your endless patience and guidance have been a gift these past few years. I would especially like to thank you both for never doubting me and for always pushing me to do my best. It has been a pleasure and I will take what I have learned from you both with me throughout my career. Thank you for everything.

Contents

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	5
Chapter 2: The Student Night Out.....	12
Chapter 3: Gendered Drinking.....	22
Chapter 4: Masculinity and Sex.....	36
Aims.....	45
Chapter 5: Methodology	46
Findings.....	69
Chapter 6: It’s okay, I’m one of the Boys.....	70
Chapter 7: Creating the Memory Bank.....	91
Chapter 8: Lines of Consent in pursuit of a way of talking about Unwanted Sexual Attention..	112
Chapter 9: A Summary of Key Findings.....	134
Conclusions.....	160
Reflections.....	162
References	168
Appendices.....	183

Chapter 1: Introduction

British student culture has become the subject of much debate, given that intoxication is seen as essential to the experience of students (Tarrant et al., 2019) whilst also increasing the risk of adverse experiences within the nighttime economy (Leith, 2017). Britain became notorious for young people's participation in the culture of intoxication (Measham & Brain, 2005) and this continues almost 20 years later (Carlisle & Ritchie, 2021). The night time economy is comprised of night time venues that market alcohol consumption primarily to young people (Roberts, 2006). For students, the nighttime economy provides an avenue to form groups (Gunby et al., 2020) and identities through collective drinking experiences (Hotten, 2017). This is particularly important for those engaging in Societies, or Sports Clubs, that offer membership to groups that have collective values and provide a sense of belonging (Maclean et al, 2021), which run hand in hand with student culture (McClellan, 2013). These Societies provide frameworks for drinking behaviour (Stevens et al, 2021) such as pre-drinking, or drinking at home to prepare for drinking on the night out, which has become a typical behaviour of British students (Barton & Husk, 2014). However, participation in the nighttime economy is fraught with risk, as will be discussed. To understand the behaviours and the risks involved, it is important to explore the implications of gender and power during nights out, especially as many Societies are segregated by binary genders.

As student identities are constructed through group membership, so too are gender identities and the labelling of others from members of the group, and outsiders (Sunderland & Litosseliti, 2002). Gender has been described as performative (Hammond, 2013) and constructed

through social process and functions (Patton, 1989). Gender stereotypes are present as early as childhood (Reby et al., 2022) and as with the Societies, segregated by sex category for many, based on gendered performance (West & Zimmerman, 1987). The development of neoliberalism, a market based political approach, has led to an era of individualism and the move from objectification to subjectification, where individuals, such as students, monitor their own behaviour rather than it being monitored by authorities (Gill, 2007). It is unclear how this has impacted men, particularly heterosexual men, despite their more predominant use of drinking spaces (Dumbii, 2022) to engage in masculine, group behaviours to solidify social bonds during nights out (Vaynman et al, 2020).

Drinking has been constructed as a social activity for women that brings peer pressure to engage (Nicholls, 2020) but has potential social consequences if women are seen to be drinking like a man, resulting in self-control in their engagement in the nighttime economy (Griffin et al., 2013). These same behaviours have been described as “Lad Culture” for young men (Jordan et al., 2022) because they use alcohol to engage in gendered performances (Bolton et al., 2021) and the embodiment of traditional masculinity (Bolton et al., 2021) as a group (Gunby et al., 2020). Status is built through performances of heterosexual masculinity (Bolton et al., 2021) which negates their responsibility for their behaviour on nights out (Diaz-Fernandez & Evan, 2020). To understand these behaviours, it is important to understand theories of masculinity and how they impact on their experiences of drinking culture which is entrenched in student Lad culture and is thought to increase the risk of adverse experiences (Leith, 2017).

Student Lad Culture is built on understandings of collective masculinity and enacted identities based on what their group sees as acceptable (Jeffries, 2020). One avenue that has been deemed acceptable is the performance and experience of sexual activity, which has been

constructed as an essential component of masculinity (Weiss, 2010). Some young men engage in misogynistic behaviours as a result, such as “girl hunting”, where male groups specifically seek out female sexual partners within the nighttime economy (Grazian, 2007). Misogynistic behaviours and intoxication have become group activities for young men, particularly in sports clubs, through the act of collectively retelling these stories (Vaynman et al., 2020). These behaviours can be explained through several theories of masculinity which will be discussed. Hegemonic masculinity constructs masculinity as relational, based on a heterosexual man’s dominance over women and non-conforming men in a gender hierarchy (Connell, 2005).

Inclusive Masculinity Theory suggests that masculinities have become more inclusive towards homosexual masculinities but has neglected to explore how this has developed for the treatment of women (Anderson & McCormack, 2018). Toxic Masculinity, a more recent concept, was designed to encapsulate all misogynistic and negative behaviours of heterosexual men but has been criticised as lacking definition and counter productively reinforcing gender hierarchies by pitting genders against each other (Harrington, 2021). Given that heterosexual men are constructed as the typical dominant aggressors in relation to women it is important to explore the differing narratives (Vaynman et al., 2020) and consider that these masculine behaviours may restrict men’s behaviour in a negative way (Gunnarsson, 2018) so they should be considered against broader power relations (Anitha et al., 2020) and the how this leads them to construct their experiences in the night time economy (MacLean et al., 2020). There is still very little known about how young heterosexual men construct their experiences in the nighttime economy and so research has recommended that qualitative research be conducted to unpack lad culture and the effects this has on behaviours they engage in, in nightclubs (Bolton et al., 2021).

This research is crucial because young people such as students are significantly more at risk of adverse experiences in the nighttime economy (Gunby et al., 2017) and women's experiences have been explored very recently, with the outcome suggesting that understandings of men's experiences are still lacking (Gunby et al., 2021). The use of alcohol as a collective social tool, particularly in student lad culture in Britain, has caused concern given that global surveys suggest that young men under 25 are more at risk of alcohol use disorder (Davies et al., 2020). Willingness to engage in sexual activity has been found to be presumed by the act of participating in the nighttime economy and alcohol consumption which caused concern for how men construct these experiences and the potential for them to be at risk (Orchowski et al., 2020).

If student culture and participation within the Nighttime Economy elevate the risk, then we may be able to understand and contextualise unwanted sexual attention against men through drinking culture which is entrenched in student Lad culture and has been theorised as also increasing the risk of violence (Leith, 2017). Men aged 18-24 years old are estimated to be more at risk of unwanted sexual attention, at significantly more at risk if they are students (Forsman, 2017). Scholars in this area have suggested that this is because of their participation in student clubs within the nighttime economy, which have become entrenched in student culture (McClellan, 2013). There has been a historic neglect of understanding heterosexual men's perspectives of alcohol and unwanted sexual experiences due to their societal positions and gender roles that construct them as sexual aggressors. It is still unclear how men construct their experiences of their nights out and so it is unclear to what degree young, heterosexual male students understand experiences of unwanted sexual attention. Therefore, it is important to explore and understand how masculinity and intoxication are used to construct experiences in the nighttime economy (MacLean et al., 2020). Many instances of unwanted sexual attention for

students occur in the night time economy and both research and society are accustomed to sexual scripts positioning heterosexual men as the typical aggressor, so it is important to provide a succinct understanding of how they construct their experiences in the night-time economy, including intoxication and sexual experiences. This will be explored in the following thesis and for the purposes of clarity the term unwanted sexual attention will be used to encompass all manner of unwanted sexual experiences. In considering the above, this led to the research question; how do young heterosexual male students construct their experiences of the night-time economy?

Ten heterosexual male students, including undergraduates and postgraduates, were interviewed in person and over skype following a transition in data collection due to the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent British lock downs. They were interviewed about their nights out, including behaviours they engaged in and saw as part of their membership to Student Union Sports Clubs. These interviews were manually transcribed by the researcher then analysed using Foucauldian Discourse Analysis according to Willig's 6 stages which will be discussed (Willig, 2012). The discourses and power relations constructed within the young men's talk were formulated into correlating discourses and themes before being laid out and discussed as below. Ethical considerations of risks to the researcher and risks to the participants will be discussed.

This thesis will explore the findings, with data from 10 qualitative interviews being analysed for the discourses used to construct and understand the men's experiences in the night time economy. Discourses of collective identity, brotherhood and hegemonic masculinity were predominantly found and will be discussed. In understanding their experiences in the night out, they used these discourses to construct their identities as one of the boys, which was predicated on masculine hierarchies, hegemonic masculinity and the use of women to engage in social

bonding. They used intoxication to build upon their identities within their social groups which created expectations for behavior and the use of both intoxication and sexualized behaviours to engage in self validation and coping. This was with the aim of creating a memory bank of their experiences because they feared missing out on “funny stories” they called “The Goss”, a colloquial term for social currency based on the exchange of recalled events from the nights out.

This was linked with the construction of “cctving”, a modern method of surveillance in which members of their groups documented experiences through pictures or videos that would be placed on social media group chats, to not only extend the behaviours but ensure that group members were participating as expected. These discourses and themes had implications for how the young heterosexual men understood experiences of unwanted attention, or rather how they did not understand them. It became apparent that some men could not understand how unwanted attention could be possible and did not have the language to be able to define the concept. They predominantly relied on discourses of responsibility and hegemonic masculinity to conceptualise unwanted attention through notions of boundaries and consent. This was also modified by intoxication, which was used to negate responsibility within hegemonic ideals and enable behaviours through the reinforcement of positions of authority.

They key findings explored the development of the “Pure Lad” and “Good Club Mate” subjectivities that created expectations and opportunities for actions for the young men engaged in sports clubs. The use of intoxication as a functional tool to both cope with stress and negate responsibility will be explored, feeding into what they described as “drinking for the sake of it”, as part of their student identities. The Fear of Missing Out has been explored before in research but the “Goss” is an emerging concept that to our knowledge has not been explored in research on Lad Culture to date. Most notable were the understandings of unwanted attention and

unwanted sexual attention and how they were understood through discourses of hegemonic masculinity and notions of masculine power. Sex was used for social bonding by some of the young men and provided stories, or the “Goss”. This meant that some men could not conceptualise unwanted attention or how it could possibly happen to someone, because they did not have the language to be able to construct it.

Some men have begun to construct it through the idea of the Line, the concept of self-imposed boundaries that were modified by sexuality, gender and intoxication. This has implications for universities and policies to be able to address intoxication and ambiguous sexual experiences within their student bodies which will be discussed. Future research suggests the use of focus groups and focused demographics, such as the exploration of experiences for minority sexualities and the intersection of race. Limitations for the sample and method of analysis will be discussed before an outline of the rigour of this study based on the TACT approach (Davies, 2019). This thesis answers the research question in exploring how young heterosexual male students construct their experiences of the night-time economy. It provides a key foundation for future research to explore conceptualisations of Lad Culture, consent and sexual negotiation. Reflections will then be discussed.

Chapter 2: The Student Night Out

Moving to university often brings about change and can be fraught with unknown experiences, something which is described as a wonderland of complex intersections of new identities (Riordan & Carey, 2019), something which is only compounded by alcohol use (Riordan & Carey, 2019). In recent years, university experiences have been shaped by neoliberal ideals which suggest that students should be independent and responsible for themselves (Diaz-Fernandez & Evan, 2020) within a culture forged by consumption, leisure and identity (Riley, 2008). Attendance at social drinking events in universities reinforce norms surrounding student drinking culture (Tarrant et al., 2019) and heavy drinking has become a normative part of the university experience. In America, high intensity drinking has been shown to peak at 21 years of age which is the legal drinking age (Patrick & Azar, 2018), compared to the UK where it is 18, leading to a younger peak in drinking on average in the UK. The normalisation of excessive intoxication is seen as an integral part of the “Typical British Student Experience”, especially for young people (Riordan & Carey, 2019).

The recommended limit for alcohol consumption is often surpassed by university students (Patrick & Azar, 2018). Subsequently, concerns have been raised with the norms surrounding alcohol consumption and the perception of drinking being associated with being a student in Britain (Tarrant et al., 2019). Heavy drinking is seen as a mandatory requirement of the student night out (Carlisle & Ritchie, 2021) and excessive, frequent drinking is seen as an essential component to the “higher education experience for many students at university (Tarrant et al., 2019). Students, especially first year “Freshers” are often thrust straight in to orchestrated heavy drinking (Brown & Murphy, 2020) and excessive alcohol use has been found to be the key to peer relations within universities in the United Kingdom (Tarrant et al., 2019). a study has

shown that half of the population of UK students taking part were at a much higher risk of using alcohol excessively (Tarrant et al., 2019) and surveys of majority first year students showed that the normalisation of heavy drinking within university populations as well as perceived popularity placed them at an elevated risk of intoxication and subsequent complications (DiGuseppi et al., 2018). Alcohol and heavy drinking are extremely influential on the construction of not only individual identities but the student identity overall (Hotten, 2017) and the subsequent neoliberal student identities that are constructed through the experience of university drinking (Diaz-Fernandez & Evan, 2020).

The construction of identity in this way often results in homogenous student bubbles (Hotten, 2017) and when combined with the neoliberal culture of individuality and pleasure, often results in neo-tribalism within atmospheres constructed in the night out. Neo-tribalism suggests that the groups forming within the night time economy are generated through collective meaning (Green, 2021) and so are forced to rely on each other to construct their identities, often engaging in camaraderie (Gunby et al., 2020) and territorial behaviours (Hotten, 2017). Students form their identities through alcohol consumption (Tarrant et al., 2019) and group drinking experiences (Hotten, 2017). Students will often engage in shared rituals and in the case of undergraduate women, focus on the experience of partying within female groups and their experience of their nights out (Andrejek, 2021), something that is far less documented in male groups. These drunken group parties are seen as a rite of passage within the university experience (Carlisle & Ritchie, 2020) and the perceptions of peer drinking often increase the level of consumption in their peers, which subsequently increase the complications associated with heavy drinking (Kenney et al., 2018). The intrinsic nature of alcohol in the students' identities means that their social identities are often formed through the environments that they

drink (Tarrant et al., 2019) and many reach the tipping point without intending to and this is more common in pubs and clubs, likely due to the appeal of the culture of intoxication and party culture (Davies et al., 2021).

A sense of belonging

For many young people, collective alcohol consumption creates feelings of togetherness (Nicholls, 2020). Narratives used to construct the students' identity often encourage heavy drinking (Torronen et al., 2021) and so these identities are also important to the enactment of peer relations, with many relying on their perceptions of other to reconstruct their drinking behaviours (Tarrant et al., 2019). Perceived norms within the university population are essential to the beliefs and behaviours surrounding drinking (Dumas et al., 2019) and both norms and personal attitudes towards drinking often predicted not only the level of intoxication but the side effects that follow (DiBello et al., 2018).

Perceptions of peer drinking increased the level of consumption for young people (Kenney et al., 2018) and social norms further predicted both alcohol consumption and motivations for engaging in drinking and subsequently intoxication (Simons et al., 2017). Research has also shown that many young people often overestimate their peers' habits of heavy drinking and this results in an increased likelihood of the person engaging in heavy episodic drinking despite their beliefs being overestimated (Dumas et al., 2019). In a recent study, the level of persons overestimating their peers drinking behaviours was up to 84.4% which suggests that many young people participating drank more because they believed their peers were doing so, despite their beliefs being unfounded (Cox, 2019). This suggests that inadvertent peer

pressure increased the number of drinks consumed and the consequences of such (Kenney et al., 2018).

In the context of the student night out, this peer pressure and crafting of identity through alcohol has constructed ritualistic group behaviours through the framework of University Societies. These groups are emboldened by the loyalty and integration of their members and so it could be argued that this group membership is what gives the student members a sense of identity and belonging (Maffesoli, 2012). University populations often operate within tribal groups devoted to drinking and partying (Dumbii, 2022) and these social networks are seen as essential to not only their alcohol use but the university experience (Cox, 2019). These students exist within social categories because other group members recognise them as such (Maffesoli, 2012) and it appears that many young students engage in modern tribalism by creating close friendship groups in the way of societies that are devoted to drinking (Dumbii, 2022).

Tribalism in student groups based on alcohol consumption results in the ostracisation of the outgroups, may this be nonstudents such as “Locals” (those who live locally and do not attend university) who were constructed as dangerous, aggressive rivals (Swann, 2021) or members of their own student population (Hotten, 2017). Tribalism has become an aesthetic, or set of principles underlying a movement, for these young people (Maffesoli, 2012) and the social world within which the students operate is constructed through societies who share collective commitments and goals (MacLean et al., 2020). This has given way to ritualistic group behaviours, because although many students seem to be at risk due to their immersion into the Nighttime Economy, fraternities and social clubs that run hand in hand with student culture (McClellan, 2013), high levels of alcohol consumption have been seen to increase social status (Dumbii, 2022). Group loyalty exists within all groups in society (Clark et al., 2019) and this

presents an even more strenuous challenge for students who have been conditioned to believe that they should bow to the peer pressure surrounding drinking. This places students within subjectivities made available to them by their societies, which in turn provides their frameworks for ritualised drinking behaviours and so the intentions for intoxication need to be further researched and assessed (Stevens et al., 2021).

Situating the Student Night Out within the Culture of Intoxication

Clubbing is seen as particularly essential for the nighttime economy (Edland-Gryt, 2021) and pubs are seen as crucial to social functions and the construction of social identities (Thurnbell-Read, 2021). These nighttime venues are sites for carnivalesque; lively or exciting, behaviours that elicit excitement and fun (Carlisle & Ritchie, 2021) as well as providing an environment for achieving the pursuit of a good time in party cultures (Lopez-Moralez et al., 2021). These venues encourage hypersexuality; the preoccupation with sexual behaviour (Gunby et al., 2017), in a neoliberal environment that reconstructs the expectation of individuality and responsibility through notions of sexual activity, seemingly allowing the participant to exercise control or even resist the obligations of the atmosphere (Diaz-Fernandez & Evan, 2020). Alcohol further compounds the hedonistic environment available to young adults such as students, because it is seen as enhancing their nights out by giving them the capacity to instigate sexual encounters (Bohling, 2015). So, the culture of intoxication and the night out becomes a space for enacting gender (Mackiewicz, 2013) and traditional gender roles are contextualised against a neoliberal, nighttime economy (Gunby et al., 2020).

The Night-time economy is a term used to describe the compilation of hospitality and entertainment venues that are active at night and most likely to involve alcohol consumption (Shaw, 2015). This has been specifically focused on 18-24-year-old people (Roberts, 2006) such as students, and clubs and pubs have capitalised on this as a means of financial gain by exploiting young peoples' need for intoxication and hedonism (Szmigin et al., 2008). Intoxication is constructed as essential to the experience of going out (Mackiewicz, 2013) which reinforces the British culture of intoxication (Carlisle & Ritchie, 2021). Research has found that people drinking in clubs were more likely to reach the ideal level of intoxication, which was found to be a higher level than other types of venues, thus generating more profit (Davies et al., 2021). However, the patrons of nightclubs were also found to be more likely to reach their tipping points of being too drunk, something which was also found to be higher than all other venues (Davies et al., 2021). For the ideal level of intoxication whilst in nightclubs, many young people in Britain have been found to need to drink the equivalent of more than two thirds of the recommended weekly allowance for low risk drinking in the UK (Davies, 2021). Clubs have the highest levels of consumption and the atmospheres marketed in these venues can make the patrons feel as though they need to drink more in order to reach the ideal level of intoxication or tipping points (Wilkinson & Wilkinson, 2018).

Atmospheres in the night time economy are areas and experiences, through venues and collective experience, that create sensation and experience for their patrons. And so, drinking in nighttime venues is a perceived freedom and neoliberal liberation that is still laden with risk (Brooks, 2008). A further negative consequence for the nighttime economy is that pubs and bars have been found to increase violence (Povey & Allen, 2003) with some research deducing that the peak time for violent crime coincides with licenced hours for drinking venues (Finney, 2004).

The preoccupation with intoxication has resulted in some young people engaging in alcohol spiking in order to force their peers into engaging in this culture (Sheard, 2011). This is the act of putting alcohol in someone's drinking to get them drunk and this was seen as a worse problem than drug spiking in the UK's culture of heavy drinking, because it was often seen as humorous to get friends intoxicated without their knowledge in a culture of intoxication (Sheard, 2011).

In the UK there is a culture of intoxication that used to be described as alcohol-based weekend leisure but is now understood as the constructed amalgamation of drugs, dance and “determined drunkenness”, which is the process of drinking with the intention of becoming intoxicated; all of which are seen as essential to the “Good Night Out” (Measham & Brain, 2005). This understanding has developed through a postfeminist, neoliberal society that suggests that appropriate intoxication has become the marker of cultural competence (Ayres & Taylor, 2020) and this is facilitated by venues within the nighttime economy (Shaw, 2015).

Neoliberalism is the commodification of modern cultures and practices where establishments are pushed to engage in a competitive free market and consumers are not only encouraged to engage in certain practices but are led to believe that they do this out of choice for their own benefit (Shaw, 2015). Britain's culture of intoxication has paved the way for neoliberal practices in government that encourage drinking as a “rational consumer”, suggesting that they should engage in this market but are responsible for their own consumerism (Haydock, 2014). In the context of the young person's night out and drinking behaviours, this has created a conception of “personal responsibility” (Tinner et al., 2021) in an environment that has commodified the experience of intoxication (Geary, 2020). Research has shown that these identities and participation in hedonistic environments are negotiated and reconstructed through the use of alcohol (Mackiewicz, 2013) and the focus of engaging in this hedonistic environment

is the ideal of having a good time (Lopez-Moralez et al., 2021). Whilst a neoliberal culture of intoxication affords a participant the opportunity and means to negotiate their participation as well as their intoxication, it also holds some form of governance over their subjectivities (Shaw, 2015).

Excessive or sessional drinking practices are rarely referred to as binge drinking despite its acceptability within society (Ross-Houle & Quigg, 2019), but in some cases it has been labelled as “The Sesh” (a colloquial term for a drinking session), by some young people, such as students (Parkes et al, 2021). Alcohol consumption and drinking practices have become dependent on the day of the week or the event involved in some cases (Roberts, 2015), but it is the experience of intoxication that takes precedence, with many young people even consuming alcohol on the go to maximise drinking opportunities and construct the process of transportation as part of the experience (Wilkinson & Wilkinson, 2018). For the purposes of clarity in this thesis, excessive drinking episodes, sometimes referred to as binge drinking, the Sesh, or determined drunkenness, will be referred to as intoxication.

Engaging in intoxication has become central to the identities of many young Brits, and a survey of 18409 members of the British public and found that there is still a cultural association of intoxication attached to British identities (Stevely et al., 2021). However, as the culture of intoxication becomes more focused on the experience rather than the feelings of intoxication, some researchers have put forward criticism to the use of intoxication to understand young peoples’ drinking behaviours. There has been an emerging normalisation of sex and recreational drug use (McCormack et al., 2021) as many young people are more focused on the experience (McCormack et al., 2021) and the influence of their heavy drinking peers (Cox, 2019) than a personal motivation for intoxication and sexual activity.

The desire for the experience of intoxication subconsciously encourages them to construct new means of attaining intoxication (Stevens et al., 2021) such as pre-drinking, which is especially important for considering the initiation of and participation in high intensity drinking (Patrick & Azar, 2018). The process of engaging intoxication is difficult to negotiate but also essential to the construction of a young persons' identity, especially the student drinking identity (Tarrant et al., 2019). Younger people are more likely to take advantage of the cheaper nights out that are marketed by clubs and bars in order to attract this clientele group (Roberts, 2015). Some bars and nightclubs have even banned drinks on the dancefloor which results in young people consuming their drinks in one go to avoid their drinks being left and tampered with (Sheard, 2011). As previously explored, the night out is something that is relational to the people drinking within it, and as such many young people have found ways to control the experience of intoxication within the big night out.

Pre-drinking, the act of pre-loading with alcohol before going into the nighttime economy, has become more than a cost-efficient way to get drunk and has become a typical behaviour of British students (Barton & Husk, 2014). Qualitative research into British drinkers has found that not only do they pre-drink to save money, but also to exert control over their experience of intoxication within the private sphere, before moving onto the pub, then the club; a ritualistic "pub crawl" (Barton & Husk, 2014). This method of moving on has become routine, with many young people visiting pubs, bars and dance bars before ending up at night clubs (Roberts, 2015). It is important, however, to note that the ritualistic nature of these forms of drinking behaviours is that it now extends from pre-drinking in the home, through pubs and bars into nightclubs to conclude the evening (Barton & Husk, 2014). It appears then, that pre-drinking and bar drinking are used to prepare or gear up for entry into the nightclub, and this has led to

nightclub venues marketing themselves into commercial environments that capitalise on the atmospheres they provide in order to encourage drinkers to see them as the main event (Wilkinson, 2017). This has evidently led to many young people seeing nightclubs as the conclusion of the night out and thus the place where they must engage in the maximum level of drinking and hedonistic behaviours in an environment where they believe they are free from social judgement (Wilkinson, 2017). As nightclubs have been identified as venues that encourage sexual behaviour and intoxication (Gunby et al., 2017) and they are seen as the climax of the night out for many students, it is important to consider how the culmination of intoxication and sex are navigated through notions of gender and power.

Chapter 3: Gendered Drinking

Gender identities, in a social constructionist perspective, are constructed through attributions ascribed to individuals by others around them (Sunderland & Litosseliti, 2002). Following this assumption, gender should be addressed as a multivariable concept, rather than constructing gender as a single attribute (Knaak, 2004). Gender identities are multiple attributions and labels built through relationships in a fluid and ever-changing way (Sunderland & Litosseliti, 2002) and so it has been suggested that theorists should reconfigure gendered binaries by approaching this subject from a social constructionist perspective (Knaak, 2004). Put simply, we should not analyse gender differences on their own to understand gender, but we should explore how society “does” gender (Knaak, 2004).

In adopting a social constructionist approach to gender identity, we would argue that as gender is something you “do” (Knaak, 2004), and much in the same way as drinking, it is performative in that it is a usable attribute designed to construct and display our own identity (Hammond, 2013). Gender identity is constructed through social processes employed within the discourses we use and under Foucault’s assumptions, the discourses we subsequently use become active social functions (Patton, 1989). Discourse is defined as language which communicates meaning (Sunderland & Litosseliti, 2002), meaning that as gender is performative, masculinity and femininity should be seen as social processes (Rodino, 1997). These identities are something done within discourse, but this is rarely explicit, as found in a qualitative study in the UK that found that gender was constantly negotiated through gendered discourses in everyday conversation (Hammond, 2013). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume

that gender should be reconfigured as a spectrum of available positions within social interaction that are only made available through the use of gender as an active process as well as outcome of social interaction (Knaak, 2004).

Identities are constructed in everyday conversation through covert negotiation and this is still present in modern research and particularly salient for gender identities. Research has found that masculine identity was embedded in success (Swail & Marlow, 2018) and feminine identities are constructed in relation to the hegemonic ideal despite being marketed as agentic and so these identities are constructed with the “postfeminist masquerade”, where consumers are led to believe that these identities are their choice (Cook & Hasmath, 2014). However, these constructions have still led to inherent attributions being made. A quantitative study analysing children’s perceptions of gender stereotypes found that children predominantly assigned traditional roles by gender in terms of distribution and competency in occupations, which suggests that children generate gender stereotypes based on their development and societal perceptions (Reby et al., 2022). The separation of gendered identities has been found to be fundamental to creation of female identities (Priola, 2004) and it is evident that these traditional notions of gender, sexuality and femininity are still in place (Bailey, Griffon & Shankar, 2015). Many young people often reinforce and reconstruct these stereotypes (Priola, 2004). In this culture of intoxication, this creates a dilemma where marketing encourages heavy alcohol consumption through discourses of empowerment and sassy femininity (Bailey, Griffon & Shankar, 2015).

Contemporary understandings of gender are now often constructed through social media (Cook & Hasmath, 2014) and its fundamentality in drinking behaviours. Drinking is central to the construction of identity for young people, but it is seen as inherently masculine behaviour

(Lennox et al., 2018). This concept further compounds the postfeminist masquerade (Cook & Hasmath, 2014) where young people are encouraged to engage in the correct gender performance and the optimum level of intoxication which are both often unattainable (Bailey et al., 2015). There is difficulty in navigating these expectations because drinking is seen as masculine behaviour (Lennox et al., 2018). These post-feminist perspectives of contemporary femininity in the culture of intoxication found an impossible dilemma between hypersexual heterosexual femininity and the optimum level of being drunk (Bailey et al., 2015). And so, it is important to understand how alcohol is used to “do gender” and how this further affects the construction of gendered identity within the Nighttime Economy.

Alcohol use is a practice utilised within both gendered performances and participation in neo-tribal behaviours (Lebreton et al., 2017), moulding the nighttime economy into a key arena for enacting gendered power relations (Vaadal, 2020). Alcohol has become gendered in nature (Lebreton et al., 2017) despite there being little gender difference in the physical effects on their memory and motor function (Gant & Terry, 2017). It is important to consider not only how gender is enacted through drinking and social worlds the participants create for themselves but also the discourses surrounding alcohol and gendered drinking (MacLean et al., 2020). For example, women use the nighttime economy to perform femininities (Gunby et al., 2020) and alcohol often allowed these gendered performances to transform throughout the night (Bohling, 2015).

Girls' night Out

Gender is the negotiation and performance of social attributes, such as drinking behaviours, that create gendered identities and a sense of routine achievement that patrons are continuously seeking out (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Post feminism suggests that feminism has achieved what it set out to do and so it has resulted in the construction of the postfeminist, neoliberal women that is both agentic and conscious of maintaining her feminine image in these night time environments (Gill, 2007). However, doing gender in this way can result in social consequences that are determined by the membership to the sex category that is denoted by the gender that they perform (West & Zimmerman, 1987). The neoliberal current of individualisation has also resulted in a move from the objectification of women to the subjectification of women, bringing with its self-surveillance that leads women to construct themselves as strong, but still subject to objectification (Gill, 2007). This has been described as a postfeminist sensibility, where young women are subject to a neoliberal set of ideals centred on empowerment and subjectivity, constructed through neoliberal ideals of individualisation (Gill, 2007). Research into digital culture in modern society has found an emerging pattern that women are being constructed through a new, youthful ideal of femininity that is empowered and fun loving (Dobson, 2015), interrelated by a complex arrangement of interrelated themes (Gill, 2007).

In terms of understanding how postfeminist neoliberalism affects identity, it is important to consider gender as a marker of status that is achieved through psychosocial interactions and performances (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Doing gender is a complex process of enacting an arrangement of activities in the pursuit of “performing gender”, something which reproduces and legitimises gender stereotypes and institutional arrangements based on these sex

categories (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Female subjectivity and empowerment are continuously re-constructed in society (Gill, 2007), and the affect that this has had is that contemporary femininity now employs the use of consumption and normative drinking cultures to enact gendered performances (Griffin et al., 2013). In some ways, it appears that neoliberalism within a postfeminist society is gendered in nature and women are the ideal subjects (Gill, 2007). As such, women are constructed to be agentic and fun loving in their performances, but still bearing and individualist responsibility for their identities despite the constraints that neoliberal methods of informal social control have on their opportunity for action (Gill, 2007).

Alcohol consumption has been found to have become central to young women's leisure and identity in a qualitative study conducted in Scotland (Brooks, 2008) and women are now reframing a typically masculine past time into the respectable, feminine act of drinking (Nicholls, 2020). Autonomy and choice are still constructed as parallel to surveillance and vilification for the wrong choices (Gill, 2007), however, and so whilst young women are encouraged to engage in these liberated behaviours, they are constrained in that the wrong type of drinking, which is sexual or shameful, becomes unacceptable (Brooks, 2008). Intoxication is constructed as sociable and thus positioned as expected for young women (Nicholls, 2020), which makes the performance of acceptable intoxication all the more pressured. Thus, femininity in the nighttime economy is a contradictory and dilemmatic space where women are encouraged to be independent, agentic and even sassy, but only if this is not feminist or perceived as unacceptable (Griffin et al., 2013). Drinking has consequently become an informal social regulator in that if it is not done in a feminine way, then it can be used as a tool to denote and question a person's identity and character (Brooks, 2008). The dilemma arises in that because drinking is constructed as a sociable activity (Nicholls, 2020), a refusal to buy into these drinking

cultures often results in social consequences such as peer pressure or even social exclusion (Nicholls, 2020).

The way in which women “do drinking” is a complex navigation and avoidance of potential social consequences in which women should be up for drinking but should not engage in drinking like a man (Griffin et al, 2013). They should be agentically sexy but not acting in a way that results in them enacting the identity of the “drunken slut”, who is not classy in her gendered performance (Griffin et al., 2013). Controlling and maintaining a respectable femininity has become essential for young women in drinking spheres (Nicholls, 2020). So, whilst alcohol and collective intoxication are important for negotiating feminine identity and friendships (Nicholls, 2020), the idea that post feminism offers freedom to drinking women and a post structural signifier of liberation is contrasted by the fact that drinking is still weighed down by concepts of gender and social risk, thus covertly masking what is simply a further form of social control (Brooks, 2008). Therefore, it is still essential to understand how postfeminist neoliberalism affects gender relations and how the postfeminist sensibility re-centres heterosexuality in the nighttime economy (Gill, 2007). Whilst it is important to further explore how young women inhabit the terrain of the nighttime economy (Griffin et al., 2013), it is also important to consider that whilst drunken women are constructed as responsible for their own safety and actions on a night out because they were drunk, men received less attribution of responsibility for the same reason, and alcohol consumption has been used to excuse their choices (Brooks, 2008). As such, further exploration of these subjects is essential to understanding gendered drinking performances (Gill, 2007).

The Lads Night Out

Many of the young people engaging in this culture of intoxication have reported that they plan specifically for the feeling of intoxication rather than an ideal of a certain number of drinks (Stevens et al., 2021). Research suggests that young men are more likely to reach the tipping point, where they became more drunk than they intended (Davies et al., 2021). The amalgamation of lad culture with Britain's culture of intoxication has had lingering, negative effects on the male student population as evidenced by global surveys that suggest that young men under 25 are more a risk of alcohol use disorder (Davies et al., 2020). Many young men are combining sex, drugs and alcohol in the pursuit of having a good time (Lopez-Moralez et al., 2021) and some of those who drink heavily within this atmosphere believed that sexual interest is presumed by participation in the nighttime economy, as well as shared alcohol use, which appears to be elevating the risk faced by male students in the nighttime economy (Orchowski et al., 2020). If student culture and participation within the Nighttime Economy elevate the risk, then we may be able to understand and contextualise their experiences through drinking culture which is entrenched in student Lad culture and has been theorised as also increasing the risk of violence (Leith, 2017).

The formations of the groups within this culture are often gendered and this is only magnified through the nighttime economy and drinking as an avenue for gender (Lebreton et al., 2017), as well as compounded by the influence of a postfeminist, neoliberal society (Mackiewicz, 2013). Many of these neo-tribal groups are reconstructing and negotiating gendered rituals of drinking (Dumbii, 2022) and conformity to the obligations and requirements of the gendered groups they find themselves in (Lebreton et al., 2017) and as gender identity is fluid and consistently changing (Kraus et al., 2019) they are often re-constructed through social

norms and the performance of gender (Vaadal, 2020). In particular, men often occupy drinking spaces (Dumbii, 2022) and engage in masculine performances and behaviours (Bolton, 2021). Traditional forms of masculinity often prevail in everyday life (Halvorsen & Ljunggren, 2021), but they are especially prevalent when reinforcing the social bonds that young men build through degrading talk and derogatory stories arising from events during “nights out” (Vaynman et al., 2020).

The culture of young men’s engagement within the nighttime economy and on campus has been termed Lad Culture and is the subject of much debate and research at present (Jordan et al., 2022). Young men construct and embody their masculinity vicariously through alcohol consumption (Lebreton et al., 2017), with their respective groups not only encouraging these behaviours (Bolton et al., 2021) but utilising alcohol and substances to transform their identities and gendered performances (Bohling, 2015). Male peer groups are well established within this culture with many engaging in a carnivalesque bravado (Gunby et al., 2020), that is based on them demonstrating exciting behaviours and actions for the entertainment of their group. Status is not only built through heterosexuality (Bolton et al., 2021) but reinforced by alpha males’ behaviour and performances of male bonding (Vaynman et al., 2020). These performances reconstruct their experiences of gendered power (Grazian, 2007) and traditional lad culture still typically incorporates animalistic discourses, discourses used to construct themselves as subject to their baser instincts to replicate neoliberal influences on masculinity (Diaz-Fernandez & Evan, 2020) and negate their responsibility for their behaviour. Male group bonding is also often constructed through drinking stories produced by the drinking events where something exciting happens (Vaynman et al., 2020), something often termed as banter.

Banter has been defined as masculine and sexist behaviours constructed through discourses of humour and through male competitiveness in social groups, such as lads going on a night out (Phipps & Young, 2015). Due to the nuanced nature of banter, it can be difficult to identify but is usually recognisable as a playful and friendly exchange of words, sometimes called ‘teasing’ (Jeffries, 2020). Group banter can be used to signify “laddishness” and membership to the lad group through solidifying (Jeffries, 2020). Banter is also used to operationalise team building in sports groups, particularly (Lawless & McGrath, 2020). But there are also critiques of banter as an unproblematic form of communication. Banter can take the form of insults, forfeits, drinking games or engaging in group routines (Jeffries, 2020). Banter can also be framed as ‘just having a laugh’ in order to make sexism, racism, and other forms of prejudice more subtle, although this declined for some men as they aged (Nichols, 2018).

Women are also more likely to believe banter was used to excuse engagement in sexist behaviours (Phipps & Young, 2015), while more recent research has explored the nuanced nature of banter. Some research has shown data suggesting the men found insults, or banter, to be bullying when used against members outside of the group (Jeffries, 2020), whereas other research has shown it to be used as an effective means of exclusion to reinforce the sanctity of the group in sports (Lawless & McGrath, 2020). This shows the complexity of banter, its definitions, and its functions within masculine groups and their subsequent behaviours, something that is exemplified by the co-ordination of university social groups, called Societies or Sports Clubs in the UK, or fraternities and sororities in America.

University Sports Societies, Fraternities and Sororities.

The typical university experience includes academic study but also a whole range of extracurricular activities such as sports and special interest clubs, called ‘societies’ in the UK (Groves et al., 2012). While the named focus of a society can be anything from football to playing board games, the student participants will often engage in a range of social activities that are carried out in the name of the society. A Football Society, for example, will be expected to play football but also may socialise in the nighttime economy as a group of football society members. Sport and leisure groups at university tend to amplify current society norms and problems because they tend to be groups of young people socialising independently for the first time. University Societies are a global phenomenon, although they may go by different names. In North America, for example, fraternities and sororities are groups that offer members the opportunity to create strong identities through sports affiliated with their groups in single gender groups, segregated by men and women (Zernechel & Perry, 2017). In the UK, they are referred to as societies or sports clubs.

Societies provide an opportunity for students to build a sense of community and identity through collective sports and societies focused on their interests or hobbies (Abell et al., 2023). Societies often have specific norms or identities attached to the sports they are attached to such as the “jock” identity, which categorised a certain type of man that engaged in sports, masculinity and binge drinking (Sønderlund et al., 2014). There can be varying degrees of allegiance to a group. Members of fraternities and sororities formally pledge loyalty to the group and to each other, within discourses of brotherhood and sisterhood that are demonstrated through physical acts such as drinking or hazing, the act of forcing a new member to engage in behaviours or situations as a means of proving their loyalty to the group (Zernechel & Perry,

2017). In the UK hazing is referred to as “initiations”, where new members are coerced into engaging in certain behaviours like binge drinking (Groves et al., 2012). However much of what we know about university groups and societies in the UK comes from research on fraternities in the US. This study will explore UK students in order to build on this research.

The implications of hazing and pledging loyalty, such as the pressure felt by their members to comply with risky behaviours such as drinking, has led to university societies and sports groups in particular gaining reputations. The hypermasculine environments of university society nights out have led to men demonstrating their masculinity and bonding through behaviours such as fighting, sexism and alcohol consumption (Sønderlund et al., 2014). Some men participating in university social groups have described feeling unfairly labelled due to the reputation gained by the behaviours of other and instead felt that their connection to the group motivated them to be “good men”, challenging racism, sexism and homophobia (Harris & Harper, 2014). However, a study on 2678 undergraduate men in US and Canada that collective masculine norms have led to climates of risk taking in fraternities (McCready et al., 2022). Research has shown that there is the potential for emotional and cognitive pressure attached to competitive sports being associated with increased negative consequences such as aggression (Sønderlund et al., 2014), which may explain why these groups are associated with negative behaviours. Although research on North American fraternities has shown that membership is also built on positive values (Harris & Harper, 2014) and a longitudinal study of first year undergraduates in the UK found that moral values and education were not impacted by fraternity membership (Martin et al., 2011).

The use of banter was key to creating the group membership found in fraternities and sports groups (Abell et al., 2023) as well as contextualising the use of hazing (Campo et al.,

2005). A qualitative study on UK university sports clubs found that banter is part of the sport club culture, so has become an accepted and expected means of excusing inappropriate behaviours, although led to fatigue for the members when taken to far (Abell et al., 2023). The expectations of banter extend to both online and offline interactions created through group norms within sports contexts (Abell et al., 2023). There was complexity in members accepting banter, as hazing is banned but seen as acceptable, and there were boundaries for banter but not they were vocalised when personal boundaries were breached or repeated (Abell et al., 2023). However, it remains unclear whether it the membership to the group that leads members to engage in unethical or negative behaviour, or whether the behaviour is indicative of them being the type of people who would be recruited (Martin et al., 2011).

The pledging of loyalty to the group and the secrecy involved in maintaining their norms and activities allows aggressive behaviours to go unnoticed (Zernechel & Perry, 2017). Some fraternity members showed awareness that banter was a means of masking this harmful behaviour, as well as misogyny and sexual harassment (Abell et al., 2023). However, the use of banter allows group members to frame hazing and negative behaviours as means of prosocial acceptance (Abell et al., 2023). Overall, the research on fraternities and sororities is inconsistent (Martin et al., 2011) and it is important to ascertain how these norms function and what this means for the groups.

Research has found that some sports members drink to alleviate the pressure of competitive sports (Martens et al., 1990). This maintains the hypermasculinity in the groups and the hegemonic masculinity enacted when performing masculinity (Zernechel & Perry, 2017). A study of 776 undergraduate men found that being a playboy, risk taking and the concept of winning in sports was positively associated with risk of alcohol related problems (Iwamoto et al.,

2011). Further research has found that the masculine hierarchies generated within these groups are also linked to sexual assault, alcohol and homophobia (Zernechel & Perry, 2017).

Fraternity status and perceived norms regarding drinking has led to members being at increased risk of getting drunk and alcohol related consequences (Iwamoto et al., 2011). A systematic review conducted on alcohol related violence and sports found a significant relationship between sports, aggression and alcohol, but the dynamics of this relationship were unclear (Sønderlund et al., 2014). Women in sororities used empowering feminist discourses to differentiate the sorority girls and used alcohol to construct gendered hegemony and indoctrinate new members (Sasso et al., 2023). Fraternity members and college men are more at risk of problematic drinking (Iwamoto et al., 2011) and in sororities alcohol is used to transmit feminine norms and expectations, influenced by fraternity masculinities (Sasso et al., 2023). However, the fraternity norms had negative relationships with violent collective norms, as well as endorsement of socially dominant hazing, suggesting that it is not necessarily the membership or violent norms that influence the other, or the act of hazing (McCready et al., 2022). It is also important to consider how these norms influence misogyny and sexual violence, particularly within the context of gender performances.

Men having sex with multiple women has gained respect in fraternities (Seabrook et al., 2018) and fraternity memberships are associated with greater perpetration and acceptance of sexual violence but less is known about why (Seabrook et al., 2018). Conformity and pressure to uphold masculine norms as well as acceptance of objectification of women mediated the relationship between fraternity membership and acceptance of sexual violence (Seabrook et al., 2018). This reinforces the suggestion that masculine hierarchies are linked to sexual assault, alcohol and homophobia (Zernechel & Perry, 2017). Fraternity members have been found to be

more likely to objectify women members of fraternities experienced pressure to engage in masculine norms and heterosexual sex (Seabrook et al., 2018).

Masculinity is performed in nightclubs through sexual behaviour and banter, particularly within university society nights out (Abell et al., 2023), so there is a need to investigate gender issues and risk factors because conforming to masculine norms could explain the problematic behaviours (Iwamoto et al., 2011). There is limited literature on the use of banter and perceptions of it in UK sports clubs (Abell et al., 2023). Some fraternities had strategies to address sexism, racism and homophobia, as well as conditions attached to the fraternities that enabled them to act in a way that contradicts stereotypes through their collective responsibility to help their brothers be the best men they can be (Harris & Harper, 2014). Research has predominantly focused on problematic behaviours in fraternities and sororities (Harris & Harper, 2014) and has not focused on when hegemony and hypermasculinity becomes the focus of the groups (Zernechel & Perry, 2017). The research on UK sports clubs is also limited and little is known about the intricacies of how masculinity is enacted and performed. Therefore, it is important to consider the implications that masculinity and group behaviours have for these clubs, as well as others impacted by their behaviours, such as women.

Chapter 4: Masculinity and Sex

The gendered performances within the nights out appear to be creating tension within the culture of intoxication (Hutton et al., 2016), as many young women are attempting to balance their experiences of drinking and fun with their socially constructed identities of respectability (Hutton et al., 2016), something research has not yet found in men. Young men, however, have also begun to enact different identities, especially those engaging in lad culture. Some men will engage in performances of masculinity that they deem acceptable avenues of lad culture whilst denouncing perceivably unacceptable performances of masculine identities (Jeffries, 2020). If we are to understand how Lad culture and drinking contribute to their understandings of their experiences in the nighttime economy, it is important to understand the role of sexual activity within modern masculinity.

Research into sexual scripts has demonstrated that men are constructed as obsessed with sex, whereas women are constructed as the gatekeepers of sexual access (Weiss, 2010). These sexual scripts would contextualise the act of “girl hunting”, where male groups specifically seek out female sexual partners within the nighttime economy (Grazian, 2007). Intoxication and sexual pursuit have been found to be collective, group activities for young men (Grazian, 2007), with their friends playing active roles within the sexual acts through storytelling and vicarious recollections of the event (Vaynman et al., 2020). Ambiguous sexual transgressions are also constructed as funny (Vaynman et al., 2020) and less agency was attributed to those who were under the influences of alcohol (MacLean et al., 2020).

Male group bonding is also often constructed within drinking stories produced through sexual activity (Grazian, 2007) and men are themselves constructed within sexual norms that

define them as sex-obsessed (Weiss, 2010) and predators (Gunby, Carline & Taylor, 2017). Despite the minimisation of these behaviours, sexual interactions are used to construct masculinity which has resulted in men being more concerned with the involvement of their male friends in the experience than the experience or the sexual partners themselves (Vaynman, Sandberg & Pederson, 2020) and so it appears that sexual activity within the nighttime economy has become, within lad culture, focused on the experience of the group rather than the individuals involved. This is further complicated by rape myths, such as those suggesting that men are sex-obsessed (Weiss, 2010) that are both used to construct these experiences and are perpetuated by the experiences themselves. These are experiences such as the combination of intoxication, banter and the sexualisation within the lads night out, leading to increased salience of sexual violence through stories that are performed within the group.

Rape myths were initially defined as false attitudes about rape and sexual violence that were persistent and widely held by society (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). They were designed to deny male aggression towards women and perpetuate the notion that women were either lying about it, or that only a certain “type” of women would be victim to it, covertly suggesting that it was deserved (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). Modern definitions of rape myths have developed discourses that account for developments in modern society. For example, this has progressed into understandings of male behaviour that move the focus towards the innate obligations of masculinity, such as the male sexual drive discourse which constructs men through a biological discourse suggesting that for their masculinity to be healthy, they must always want sex (Jeffrey & Barata, 2020). The rape myths for men and for women have been found to be similar but the research on male victims is still limited (Walfield, 2021). The implications of this are that even though there is more knowledge and objection to many rape myths, in some cases, men saying

no to sex is simply not heard (Meenagh, 2021) and some rape myths even have fostered the attitude that men cannot be raped (Walfield, 2021).

This results in gendered forms of power which interact with intoxication and combine to reconstruct understandings of sex and gender within the nighttime economy (Moore et al., 2021). The intersection of sex and recreational substance misuse, including alcohol, has become normalised (McCormack et al., 2021) and in some cases sexual interactions have become artificial by using substances and alcohol to enhance the experience (Aldridge, 2020). Many young people employ drinking stories as a method of bonding (Hutton et al, 2016) and for some young men, the retelling of sexual encounters as a form of storytelling has become a social norm (Vaynman, Sandberg & Pederson, 2020) and in some ways reinforces rape myths. The male sexual drive discourse suggests that men should always be eager for sexual activity (Gunnarsson, 2018) and so it appears that this way of constructing masculine identity has combined with the social act of storytelling to form an essential component of bonding in male friendship groups (Gunby, Carline, Taylor and Gosling, 2020). There are several theories of masculinity that can explain why this phenomenon occurs, but few have explored how the men construct these experiences within the context of power, as this thesis intends to do.

Distinct separations of feminine and masculine behaviours are observed as early as infancy (Stroud, 2012), presenting women as submissive while men are constructed as dominant aggressors (Kalish & Kimmel, 2010). The concept of hegemonic masculinity originated in the 1980s but was most notably influence and re-contextualised, in 2005 by R.W Connell and James Messerschmidt to give a critical understanding of a theory of masculinity that encapsulated the concept of multiple masculinities and complex gender hierarchies (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). This theory of masculinity suggests that masculinity is a collection of practices and

actions that are constructed and ever changing, but are predicated on gendered power, causing conflict for the individual. This gendered power can cause gendered hierarchies, in which the dominant identity, often traditional masculinity dominates and subjugates other genders through hegemonic masculinity, a pattern of practices that reinforce gender hierarchies that support the patriarchy and traditional gender roles (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). These hierarchies and gendered power differentials form methods of cultural and social control (Eisenstein, 1979), the goal of which is to ensure that men retain power over other subjectivities (Donaldson, 1993). Hegemonic masculinity has become essential to understanding many masculinities, because it identifies the complex nature of how these identities are formed on the essentiality of sexual prestige (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005) and dominance (Pringle, 2005), and how these components are used to construct and maintain power (Thorpe, 2010).

Young men in particular are often conditioned to assert dominant masculinities through a variety of means, particularly aggression and violence (Kimmel, 2008). The initial theories positioned hegemonic masculinity as relational in the way that this dominant form of masculinity is constructed in relation to femininity and dominated masculinities, such as identities occupied by homosexual men, to provide a submissive comparison within the gender hierarchy (Connell, 2005). The sexual objectification of women and denigration of nonconforming masculinities is a normalised practice within hegemonic masculinity theories and has embodied heteronormative practices aimed at achieving dominant positions in social hierarchies (Haslop & O'Rourke, 2021). Some men, although not practicing these behaviours, may not disagree with the hierarchies and the benefits of gendered dominance, so instead do not actively challenge the norms, something described as “complicit masculinity” within the hegemonic theory (Connell, 1995). This is not to say that all men benefit from hegemonic masculinity, however, as the

collective benefit often marginalises the individual (Grindstaff & West, 2011). Women being positioned as submissive sexual objects subsequently positions men as not, so homosexuals become “othered” by their perceived contravention of the dominant social norm (Grindstaff & West, 2011). In terms of how this applies to the student experience, male sports have often been linked to socially acceptable, masculine performance of aggression that are judged against their masculine identities (Dworkin & Messner, 2002). Many students' social groups, such as sports clubs and fraternities, are based on the concept of collective sport (Anderson 2008), aggression, and objectifying women (Dempster, 2008), embodying the staples of hegemonic masculinity.

Theories of masculinity have developed from the emergence of more tolerant, masculine behaviours that are more likely to be inclusive of homosexual masculinities, aptly termed Inclusive Masculinity Theory (Anderson & McCormack, 2018). This theory suggests that the social change has arisen from declining homophobia; the fear of being perceived as homosexual, and that instead homophobia has been used as a constructive tool to police and govern men (McCormack & Anderson, 2014). Inclusive Masculinity Theory combines the homophobia seen in hegemonic masculinity with an emerging masculinity that is more tolerant of homosexual men arising from generational shifts in attitudes towards masculinity (Anderson & McCormack, 2016). However, this theory of masculinity has drawn criticism for its lack of attention towards the feminine (O’Neill, 2015), and its failure to explore how this theory reproduces agents of patriarchy (Bridges & Pascoe, 2014). The relevance here is that sport has been found to be a structural means of engaging in and reinforcing patriarchal behaviours and values (McDonagh & Pappano, 2007), as seen in the earlier mentioned studies exploring fraternities and lad groups.

If young men are becoming more tolerant of homosexual men but are not shifting in overt patriarchal behaviours, this begs the question of how inclusive masculinity theory would explain the power differentials between heterosexual men in particular, and women. Recent research has found that young men in a predominantly gay UK rugby team spoke of emerging inclusive masculinity, despite their difficulties overall, demonstrating declining homophobia (Gaston & Dixon, 2020). More recent research has found that young men in undergraduate university football team in England spoke of collective team values and openness towards sexual minorities, (Magrath, 2021). However, research and theories of inclusive masculinity, have continued to neglect how the emergence of inclusive masculinities has changed approached towards women and misogyny.

Perhaps a more recent theory, and particularly more salient in the media, is the theory of toxic masculinity. This theory emerged from feminist movements that attributed homophobia, violence and misogyny against women to “toxic masculinity”. This is a term designed to encapsulate these attitudes and behaviours in a way that focuses on the domination of women but has been criticised as individualising responsibility and reinforcing gender hierarchies (Harrington, 2021). There is currently no definition of toxic masculinity that is universally agreed upon, but it is generally used to explain misogynistic behaviours that are harmful in nature, particularly towards women (Sculos, 2017). However, constructing masculinity as “toxic” as a means of positioning it in opposition of “healthy” masculinities, pathologizes men who are positioned as good or bad and constructed as possessing behaviours akin to a disease that can be caught or transmitted (Waling, 2023).

Although the theory of toxic masculinity explores the negative impacts on men’s health and help seeking behaviours (McGlashan & Mercer, 2023), it neglects the fluidity that

hegemonic masculinity and inclusive masculinity theories had, in terms of the grey area between overt and covert behaviours, as well as how young men construct these behaviours and attitudes. Theories of toxic masculinity provide apt explanations of male violence, but by pathologizing the behaviours they neglect the delicacy needed to unpick exactly how they are formed. It also neglects to explore the power differentials that original theories of hegemony explored and so as discussed, may in fact reinforce hegemonic and patriarchal ideals.

As discussed, research has shown that sex is an essential component of many formulations of masculinity and this has translated into misogynistic behaviours in general, but particularly in the nighttime economy. We know that women must navigate these experiences, but we still know very little about how young men construct these experiences on a night out. As previously mentioned, some groups of men engage in “girl hunting,” a group activity focused on sexual pursuit (Grazian, 2007) and research has suggested the nighttime economy evokes a culture that is tolerant of aggression (Anitha, Jordan, Jameson & Davy, 2020). So, when this is combined with environments rife with compulsory heteronormativity (Vaadal, 2020) aggression is normalized despite the recognition that it is wrong (Anitha et al., 2020).

The Good Night Out campaign found that staggeringly, 53.1% of their participants had experienced unwanted sexual attention within the nighttime economy (Quigg & Bigland, 2020) and young people aged 18-24, such as students, are significantly more at risk of being victimised in this way (Gunby et al., 2017). A campaign more recently employed in England revealed that in populations of people who experienced unwanted sexual attention, at least 31.9% of those people had experienced it within venues in the Nighttime Economy (Quigg & Bigland, 2020) and so it is essential to consider influence of social contexts in clubs and how this relates to unwanted sexual attention (Hotten, 2019). A systematic review of research conducted between

2009-2018 found that on average, 50% of the population of these studies experienced unwanted sexual attention while participating in nightlife (Orchowski et al., 2020) and, more concerningly, many victims are unlikely to report these events as demonstrated by 65.8% of the victims in the Good Night Out campaign disclosing that they had not reported these incidents (Quigg & Bigland, 2020). However, it is still unclear how men construct their experiences of their nights out and so it is unclear to what degree young, heterosexual male students understand experiences of unwanted sexual attention.

Heteronormative ideals construct consent as an individual's responsibility within a neoliberal discourse (Anitha et al., 2020) and many of the young men rely on an "intoxication parity" to understand inebriated sexual consent. This means that the perception of equal levels of intoxication indicates sexual consent and balances the power differentials created by intoxication (Hutton et al., 2016). Some men have been found to generally be more concerned with sexual performance when considering aspects of consent (Hutton et al., 2016) and are less likely to employ safety strategies as a means of preventing unwanted sexual attention (Zhou et al., 2018). There is a significant need to explore both male and female narratives (Vaynman et al., 2020) but men face issues of consent in that whilst they may say no and may actively not want the experience, there are gendered, masculine expectations that lead them to believe they must want it (Gunnarsson, 2018). Therefore, it is important to connect these specific experiences to their broader power relations (Anitha et al., 2020) and consider how both masculinity and intoxication are used to rationalise experiences in the nighttime economy, in particular unwanted sexual attention (MacLean et al., 2020).

The term "unwanted sexual attention" is taken from Fileborn's classification (2012), as used in recent research exploring how young women understand and negotiate unwanted sexual

attention (Gunby et al., 2020) in that “unwanted sexual attention is any unwanted advances or behaviours that participants interpreted as being sexual in nature or intent” (Fileborn, 2012). Although this research focused on women, it gave a less restrictive exploration of unwanted sexual attention and given that little is still known about men’s experiences and how they use language to construct them, this provides a non-committal definition that the men could use to construct their own understandings without restrictive connotations. Research has shown that women often employ safety strategies to avoid adverse behaviours in the nighttime economy (Zhou et al., 2018) and often identify unwanted sexual attention more than men do (Lopez-Moralez et al., 2021), but little is still known about how men understand their experiences in the nighttime economy. Therefore, it has been recommended that more qualitative work is necessary to understand and unpack lad culture and the effects this has on behaviours they engage in, in nightclubs (Bolton et al., 2021). We would argue that research on heterosexual men’s understandings of their experiences is still limited (Walfield, 2021), so it is important to explore this in order to provide an in-depth exploration of how they construct their experiences within social groups of the behaviours that they engage in and see.

Aims

The nighttime economy is an important part of the student experience and factors linked to this, such as hedonism and ritualistic drinking, are often factors in unwanted sexual attention. Understandings of lad culture have been well documented, but explorations of how they use and construct their understandings of this in the nighttime economy is yet to be explored in detail. Research has explored unwanted sexual attention within higher education as well as men's experiences of sexual attention that is unwanted but has rarely explored the constructions of the demographic used in this study, with heterosexual men's constructions of unwanted sexual attention in the nighttime economy being an under researched area (Gunby et al., 2020).

Therefore, this study aims to explore how young heterosexual male students construct their experiences of the night time economy. This is intended to explore many nuanced topics such as drinking behaviours and sexual attention from the lens of the "typical lad", according to hegemonic theories. The nighttime economy presents as critical in understanding and exploring young men's sense-making practices. And so, this study will use interviews with undergraduate and postgraduate male students to discuss the night time economy as an experience, with men engaging in these locations. Foucauldian discourse analysis will be used to analyse the discourses employed to describe and construct their experiences, to provide an analysis that considers the power relations that are used to negotiate subject positions and construct gender and subsequent behaviours.

Chapter 5: Methodology

Research question

How do young heterosexual male students construct their experiences of the night-time economy?

Approach

To understand how heterosexual men enrolled at university construct their experiences of the nighttime economy, we have adopted a social constructionist approach based on Foucauldian understanding of power relations. This is to give ample consideration to the relationship between power and gender that the young men operate within, particularly in relation to sexual experiences. The intersection of power and sex operates through constructed gender roles and sexual relations, opening or closing opportunities for action (Gill & Orgad, 2018). This is important to understanding how young men construct their experiences of unwanted sexual attention in relation to their positions and identities as men. Michel Foucault's approach to social constructionism pays particular attention to how sex and gender are explored through constructs of power and allowed the research to scrutinise how the young men constructed and reconstructed power relations. Given that acts of unwanted sexual attention are predominantly power driven for social dominance, discourse analysis provided an essential avenue to analyse how young men take up positions and negotiate power relations, using discourses to construct sexual behaviour in the nighttime economy.

A Foucauldian approach suggests that constructs of the self are embedded in institutional structures, culture and societies, so is crucial to understanding how the young men conceptualise their experiences within these structures. Foucault also believed that gender, sex

and power are constructed through language and reinforced by the discourses that are adopted and employed, which is an important approach given that research has demonstrated how language is used to categorise and segregate people who experience unwanted sexual attention. Foucault believed that gender, sex and power are reciprocal concepts, but that they are not inherent attributes of the self; he believed that these concepts are constructed by our environment and interpersonal interactions. The Foucauldian approach to constructionism focuses heavily on institutional structures and how language and discourse opens up opportunities for action. Though it may be easy to argue that discourses are products of inherent practices within society, social constructionism argues the contrary; that issues of sex and power are only practices within society because they are perpetuated by participants within that society. The way knowledge is constructed creates practice associated with identity, and subsequently fuels interpretations and reconstructions of the self through social hierarchies and gender (Foucault, 1992).

Power is not inherent but is a social and contextual way of doing and being, created through discourse and subject positions that prescribe power. For example, a young heterosexual man on a night out constructs themselves in response to interactions with others and may reconstruct themselves into a position of power in response to social tension or transgression. Foucault's perspective allows us to explore these negotiations of discourse and power, something that is particularly salient when traversing complex experiences of gender and sex. It has long been argued whether sex creates power, or power is inherent in sex, but Foucault's approach suggests that it is neither. Sex only enacts power because cultures ascribe power to sexual relations and reinforce this knowledge through gendered discourse and the positions of power that they afford. This approach and the use of Foucauldian Discourse Analysis are intended to scrutinise how the young men construct unwanted sexual attention in relation to power structures

that can be related to wider understandings of sex and gender. This thesis draws upon Foucauldian social constructionism, and concepts of post feminism (Gill, 2007).

Epistemology

This thesis operates under the approach of neoliberal, postfeminist epistemology. Neoliberal post feminism suggests that society operates through individualistic social markets that encourages sexual agency for women under the guise that the goals of feminism have been achieved, whilst reinforcing social hierarchies and interpersonal domination (Butler, 2013). In the context of this research, we would suggest that there is little scope to construct the postfeminist, neoliberal man because constructions of modern, sexual agents experiencing unwanted sexual attention are built through women's experiences.

Foucauldian Discourse Analysis provided a method of analysis that explored how men constructed their experiences of the night time economy in relation to others, and this method is critical of how individuals position themselves and others in discourse to create positions of power (Foucault, 1982). It also explored the discourses used within talk to provide an account of how the young men in the study construct their experiences within the situated context of social power relations. This analysis focused on how participants used discourse to position themselves within social hierarchies thus displaying how they perceive their own social standing in relation to others but also how they build these perceptions of themselves and others within everyday discourse. This was essential to understanding how the young men constructed their experiences in relation to social and power structures, as well as epistemological knowledge that they already held. My own epistemological knowledge is addressed within the final reflections of the thesis.

As previously stated, our understanding of unwanted sexual attention is taken from Fileborn's 2012 classification, and was used in recent research exploring how young women understand and negotiate unwanted sexual attention (Gunby et al., 2020) in that "unwanted sexual attention is any unwanted advances or behaviours that participants interpreted as being sexual in nature or intent" (Fileborn, 2012, p.244), as this will give particular attention to men's experiences of non-consensual experiences (Gunnarsson, 2018).

Research design

This was a qualitative study using semi-structured interviews. The data was analysed using Foucauldian Discourse Analysis.

Participants

I interviewed ten male students aged between eighteen and twenty-six. The men were all registered undergraduate and postgraduate students at a rural British university across a range of academic disciplines. They were all involved with some form of sports society, however, sports affiliation was not reported to maintain anonymity, given the detailed nature of their experiences. Participants were all voluntary respondents to advertisements on social media and via emails to sports clubs that asked them to email me if they were interested in participating. Participants varied in background and demographics, including nationality (i.e., English, Welsh, Irish) and ethnicity (i.e., white, black and minority ethnic). I did not formally record the ethnicity of participants due to concerns that this would make them identifiable, but it is important to note that it was explored as part of the discussion with some of the participants.

The study advertisement requested that the men self-identify as heterosexual in line with the literature review and because research has shown that male heterosexual complainants are less likely to be believed than homosexual complainants when the perpetrator is female, suggesting that there may be different issues involved in the experiences and sex of both the complainant and perpetrator (Law & McCarthy, 2017). We asked no further questions regarding sexuality or gender and reflected on whether sexuality was required as an exclusion criterion in the study design process, ultimately determining that we may not be able to fully do justice to the experiences of gay/bi-sexual young men's experiences, which may or may not have included experiences of unwanted sexual attention without centralizing their experience. However, we note that this approach may leave some experiences uncovered, a point that we will return to in the limitations.

Rationale

Interviews were used for this research to allow the researcher to build greater rapport with the participant in an environment that is controlled, confidential and supportive. While this study aimed to explore their constructions about the night time economy, participants were asked about sensitive experiences in this environment and so the use of one-to-one interview allowed the participant to discuss potentially sensitive topics without the pressure to be socially desirable in front of their peers. Interviews are also more for exploratory research as they provide the inner constructions that the participants were engaging in (Ryen, 2002). Interviews can be useful in providing a demonstration of inner monologues in that it is an account constructed by the participants own understanding of the subject, untainted by the influence of others. It has been recommended that one-to-one interviews are particularly useful for using Foucauldian Discourse

Analysis to explore how athletes construct and negotiate their identities (Kavoura et al., 2015). The research aims to give understanding to the way this demographic understands and constructs their experiences of the Nighttime Economy, so discourse analysis is intended to give a nuanced understanding of gender politics and behaviours in this setting.

Development of the Interview Schedule

The interview schedule was developed with the intention to maximise the opportunity for the participants to explore the topics in a way that resembled their inner monologues and natural thoughts as much as possible. I aimed to gain a self-reflection of what they did, their experiences, the impact and how they understood their nights out in the night time economy. This largely builds on the work of Gunby et al., 2020, who explored unwanted attention and performances of gender in the Night Time Economy with focus groups of women. Gunby's research (2020) developed understanding of the forms of unwanted behaviours, safety strategies and the practices underpinning gender performances in the Nighttime Economy from the perspectives of women. According to Gunby et al., (2020) little is known about unwanted sexual attention and its role within gendered drinking practices; they also acknowledged that this needs further development for men, as cited by Christmas & Seymour (2014). The current research aimed to explore this and so the interview schedule was built upon the themes explored in Gunby et al.,s research and developed to elicit considerations of the power relations potentially in play. Gunby et al., (2020) found that women spoke of their nights on the town in relations to sexual attention, safety strategies, their motivations for going out, pick up routines, men showing off for

the lads, emotional management and several performances of both masculine and feminine genders. The questions will be explored sequentially.

“Can you describe, in as much detail as you would like to share, your experiences on a typical night out in (TOWN OMITTED FOR CONFIDENTIALITY). So, from preparing for the night out, right through until your discussion/recollection of it at the end of the night or the next morning.”

This question was asked with the aim of allowing participants the freedom to talk about the night out as whole, from the start of their preparation to the conclusion of what they considered to be the “night out”. Participants could explore their experiences in a free flowing way that allowed them to feel more comfortable in talking about what they chose to talk about, whilst also volunteering their typical nights out and the potential rituals they engaged in.

“What are your motivations for going out drinking?”

This question was asked to encourage participants to explore their motivations for going out in the Night Time Economy. Gunby et al., (2020) found a theme that the women in their research believed the men they encountered would participate in the Night Time Economy and enact certain gendered performances in attempts to both pursue sexual partners and to solidify social bonds with their male friends. This question is designed to explore these themes from the perspectives of the young men that participating in similar environments to the young women in Gunby et al.,s (2020) study.

“Can you describe your experiences of men and women on nights out? (Suggested probes - Impressions? Males? Females? Behaviours? Aggression?)”

This question was asked in order to elicit the participants' perspectives of gendered performances in the Night Time Economy. The prompts were not always used as the conversation flowed from what the participants chose to talk about but were designed to prompt them to speak about their understandings of the behaviour that occurs during the night out.

“Please describe how men and women interact within the bars you drink in?”

This question was designed to explore how participants viewed the relational behaviours between men and women based on Gunby et al.,s (2020) themes of gendered identities and ‘pick up’ routines; pick up routines were approaches to imply sexual interest in the recipient and ascertain the likely response. This explored observed gender relations with the aim of having participants talk about experiences within the Night Time Economy in an open ended way from the perspective of heterosexual men. By describing how they interact, the participants could construct the people they observed and what they believed their behaviours to be. This was intended to allow greater exploration of how they perceived the interactions and the potential power or gender relations being enacted.

“Can you define unwanted attention? (Suggested probes - what are your experiences? If any?)”

Participants were not directly asked about their experiences of unwanted sexual attention for ethical reasons discussed later in the methodology section. They were instead asked to define unwanted attention to provide an understanding of what they perceived general unwanted behaviours to be without the pressure of the sexual element. Participants were asked if they had any experiences of unwanted attention that they wished to explore, which could have been observations of others or direct experiences as the question was open. This was asked this

way in order to understand how they constructed the concept and their possible experiences of such, but the prompt was not always used.

“To what extent do you feel as though unwanted sexual attention is a problem in (TOWN OMITTED FOR CONFIDENTIALITY) (Suggested probes - Why do you feel that way?)”

Participants were asked about general unwanted sexual attention within the university town in order to explore how they constructed unwanted sexual attention within the environment they would drink and perform gender in.

“How do you think local authorities feel about unwanted sexual attention in (TOWN OMITTED FOR CONFIDENTIALITY)?”

This last question was asked in order to explore how the participants constructed their navigation of unwanted sexual attention within their town and the assumed power differentials they may have believed existed between them as patrons and local authorities within the night Time Economy. Particular reference was given to the perceptions of authority, such as legal authorities like the police, or venue authorities such as bouncers. By asking participants how they thought local authorities felt about the issue, this encouraged the participants to construct the beliefs of agents who hold power as perceived authority. Their constructions of perceived beliefs were designed to evoke natural explorations of how they experienced the power within the situation and potentially how they hypothetically felt about the ability to report or disclose incidences of unwanted sexual attention to themselves or others.

Due to the nature of the questions asked, the notorious difficulty in recruiting heterosexual men in studies exploring some of the topics, and the constraints of the degree

discussed later on, the interview schedule was not piloted. The interview schedule was based on the literature review and relevant, recent research exploring similar concepts in female populations. Therefore, while not piloted, the interview schedule gave sufficient data and can be considered a pilot for the future research suggested later in the thesis.

Procedure

Adverts were placed on social media and emails were sent to the Union Sports Clubs (See appendix F) to recruit Participants. They were asked to contact the researcher via their university email to register their interest in the project. Participant information packs (see appendix B), consent forms (see appendix A) and the interview schedule (see appendix D) were emailed to the participants. All participants who were provided with the information sheet chose to participate. The data storage processes were explained to participants in the participant information sheet and by signing the consent form they declared that they gave consent for the data to be stored. Audible statements of consent were cropped and stored in a separate encrypted file on the university OneDrive following the end of the interview.

Participants were asked to read these documents thoroughly and to direct any questions they had to the researcher. Participants were asked to sign the consent forms, virtually by emailing the signed form or physically in the interview, once they agreed to participate. Interviews were organised once the participants confirmed that they fully understood all aspects of the study. Participants were reminded that sending consent forms by email is not completely secure, and so there was no obligation to participate if they were concerned. Participants were made aware prior to agreeing to participate that they were also required to give audio consent at

the beginning of all interviews. Both methods of obtaining consent were employed to ensure that the participants gave fully informed consent. All participants gave both written and verbal consent and the recording began following consent being given. The audio consent was then cropped from the recordings to maintain confidentiality. Participants were also provided the option to select their own pseudonyms and were reminded of their right to withdraw at any stage prior, during or until four weeks after the interview concluded.

Three participants were initially asked to take part in person for the interviews. These interviews took place in person in private and suitable university rooms. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic the remaining interviews took place via the Skype online communication platform but were conducted in a private place. All interviews took place during office hours of 9am-5pm in accordance with the University lone-worker policy. The interviews were conducted as informal conversations and the participants were first engaged in a short informal conversation to build a rapport for a period before any details of the study were discussed. This was for the participants comfort and to engage them in a conversation before the interview to facilitate natural conversation. They were given time to review the questions and informed that they could decline to answer any questions they were uncomfortable answering. It was expressed to participants that this was not a problem, and that participant comfort was of the utmost importance.

The questions detailed in the interview schedule (see appendix D) were asked, beginning with asking the participant to detail their “nights out” from start to finish. This was to give an overall account of their nights, and to ease the participant into answering the questions. Open questions were asked with the intention of letting the participants answer or talk about the subject in as much detail as they deemed appropriate. The researcher maintained the role of an active listener, and only responded to probe questions or clarify responses (Brayda & Boyce,

2014). The concept of active listening it used to ignite a verbalised inner monologue for the participant because semi structured interviews provide stimulating questions regarding the subject, but the questions are worded in a way that allows the participant to talk about the subject with little input from the researcher (Ryen, 2002). Open ended questions were asked to create conversation and gain the necessary information, but participants were given the opportunity to talk about the subject in as much or as little detail as possible. The priority during data collection was the comfort of both the participant and the researcher due to the sensitive topic and the array of ethical issues presenting risks if they were not mitigated.

Participants were given an opportunity to raise anything they wanted to discuss further at the end of the interview. The recording was stopped once the participant was happy to close the interview and they were asked for the final time whether they were happy for their data to be stored. All participants were happy for their data to be stored and used. Participants were then provided with a debrief sheet, which outlined the study and recorded the deadline for withdrawal, which was located on all documents provided to participants. The aims of the study were then discussed with the participants in order to allow them a personal understanding of the study with the intention of ensuring that participants felt involved in the study and able to contact the researcher with further questions. However, participants were reminded that this may break their confidentiality and should only do so understanding this. Audio recordings were stored on the University personal OneDrive and deleted from the recording device. Email correspondence with all participants was deleted from the researcher's email account but their email addresses were stored in an encrypted file in the researchers University OneDrive for the purposes of withdrawal. Participants were required to email the principal researcher with their pseudonym to request a withdrawal from the study. No participants withdrew their data from the study.

Audio recordings were transcribed verbatim by the researcher. A Foucauldian Discourse Analysis was then conducted following Willig's six steps. Post transcription the data was read and listened to for familiarisation with the data and to facilitate a comprehensive analysis. The analysis was reviewed several times to develop the data and key discourses were compiled to provide a rounded understanding of the discourses before narrowing this down to the most salient quotes. This ensured objectivity and quality assurance of the data. The final quotes depicting the discourses were then discussed thoroughly in the Analysis section of this thesis.

Analysis

Foucauldian Discourse Analysis was used to identify the discourses employed to construct their experiences within the Night-Time Economy. This gave insight into participants' constructions and how they may relate to wider discourses of power (Driver, 2002). This method analysed the discursive constructions explored within the young, heterosexual man's nighttime economy and how this both opens up and closes opportunity for belief and action.

The methodology used follows Carla Willig's 6 steps to conduct a Foucauldian Discourse Analysis.

(Willig, 2013) The 6 Stages

1) Discursive construction - This involves identifying all references to the discursive object, which is the focus of the research question. In this study, this would be unwanted sexual attention. The discursive object depends on the research question and this stage focuses on identifying the different ways that the object is constructed. This focuses on shared meaning

rather than lexical identification and includes both implicit (unwanted sexual attention) and explicit (it, that) references. Even a lack of reference can be considered a construction.

2) Discourses – This involves identifying the differences between the constructions before locating them within wider discourses. For example, Ryan’s construction utilises discourses of consent, but other participants have located unwanted sexual attention outside of discourses due to their inability to construct the concept.

3) Action Orientation - This requires a deeper analysis of what discursive contexts are being deployed and what this means for action. This allows us to identify what the function of the discourse is and is gained by deploying it. This provides a clearer understanding of what is achieved through the use of that discourse for the constructor.

4) Positionings – This involves identifying the subject positions that are created through the constructions of the object. This suggests that constructions of discursive objects make available positions within a network of combined meaning that offer locations for speakers to act and speak from. In short, discursive constructions and discourses determine what position in society that someone can speak and act from, as discussed below.

5) Practice – This requires a systematic exploration of the relationship between discourse and practice. This involves exploring the ways that discursive constructions and subject positions open up or close down opportunities for action. This stage operates under the premise that the resulting discourses limit what can be said or done by those placed within specific subject positions or discursive constructions.

6) Subjectivity – These focus on the relationship between discourse and subjectivity. Willig suggests that social constructions make available specific ways of viewing the world as

well as constructing social and psychological realities. Therefore, stage 6 focuses on identifying the consequences of the subject positions found within the study and subsequently what can be thought or felt by the participants based on their discursive constructions and subject positions.

I identified that talk about the night-time economy was very complex and often involved several shifts in footing in a single extract. We provide the extract below to illustrate this complexity and how we applied Willig's steps in order to understand more about the constructions and sense-making.

In the example below Ryan provides a definition of unwanted attention:

Ryan: Line 186-188

“Like it all comes down to being like actually saying look can you just stop doing that please erm... Which I guess is like my own fault in a way. Well, it’s not my own fault... but erm... yeah those are the main ones.?”

- 1) "It" covertly references Unwanted Sexual Attention (Discursive Construction).
- 2) “It” is contextualised within wider discourses of consent and blame (Discourses)
- 3) He maintains his power (Action Orientation)
- 4) He does this by positioning himself as responsible for maintaining boundaries of consent (Positioning), but this creates inner conflict.

5+6) By positioning himself with power he cannot be positioned as a victim. This makes some actions unavailable such as identifying and acknowledging his experiences, nor reporting or disclosing them. (Practice and Subjectivity)

If he cannot construct himself as a victim, he cannot seek help.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for this study was awarded by the University Psychology Ethics Board in accordance with BPS ethical guidelines (BPS, 2021). All participants received full study information, provided informed consent, and were provided with withdrawal information as detailed in the procedure. This study presented several ethical concerns due to its sensitive nature, and so they were mitigated through departmental ethics board approved procedures designed to minimise any potential risks to participants and researchers.

Informed consent

In the interest of full transparency, adverts placed for the study and all documents made clear the intentions of the study, and detailed that it would contain a question regarding unwanted sexual attention in the Night-Time Economy. Participants were made aware of the full details of the study at all points to ensure they gave informed consent if they did decide to participate.

Sensitivity

The nature of the study is sensitive because although the questions do not ask participants directly about unwanted sexual attention and the primary intention was to talk about their night out unwanted attention became the focus at times through discussions of the subject in general. Given that this subject has the potential to result in the disclosure of serious incidents and entails discussions of sensitive topics that are in the public's interest at present, all attempts were made to protect the wellbeing of both the participants and the researcher.

Withdrawal

It was recognised that participants may retrospectively be uncomfortable with their data, which included discussions of sex and consent, being stored or used. Participants were also reminded that they could choose to stop the interview at any point or decline to answer any question that they found to be uncomfortable. All participants were informed prior to and post interview that they could withdraw at any time before, during and after participation until four weeks post interview. This was made clear within the participant information sheet and consent form and was discussed with the participant. It was explained that this would ensure the researcher ample time to collect and analyse if needed. A debrief sheet was provided after the interview had concluded to reiterate the aims of the study and the withdrawal date.

Data Management

Consent forms were stored in a secure encrypted file within the researcher's university issued one drive. Audio files and transcripts were also stored separately in encrypted files within the one drive. Data will be stored until the thesis is assessed and a grade has been given to allow the researcher access until this moment. Data was collected through in-person and Skype interviews. Audio was recorded on a recording device, then immediately transferred to the Researcher's University OneDrive into an encoded and password protected file. Data was immediately deleted from recording devices. Participants were asked before and after recording took place if they were happy for the researcher to store and use the data and made aware that at any point within 4 weeks following the day of the interview that they could email the researcher with their chosen pseudonym to request that their data be removed from the entire thesis and

destroyed. All data pertaining to this participant would then be destroyed. All data was stored in the University OneDrive securely in compliance with GDPR and can be permanently destroyed if the participant requests to withdraw within the agreed timeframe, or after the final degree grade has been awarded. Participants were informed of all data storage procedures before consenting to the interview.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality was crucial to this study's ethics due to the sensitive nature of the study. Interviews and qualitative research cannot be obtained anonymously, and all participants were made aware of this before agreeing to participate. It was imperative that their identities are protected and their privacy respected, so data was collected, stored and reported confidentially under pseudonyms that participants chose for themselves. All identifiers within the data including names, places and personal identifiers were removed or substituted where possible to protect the participants' identities. Quotes presented in the written thesis contained no means of identifying the participants. Allowing participants to choose their pseudonyms provided the participants with a sense of control over their presentation in the research because a lack of control during sensitive studies can have adverse long-term effects for participants (Pitfield, 2013). All data were stored under these pseudonyms to further maintain confidentiality and security. In-person interviews took place in a purpose-built qualitative laboratory room and online interviews were conducted from the researcher's home in a private, locked room that would not be disturbed or overheard. It was also ensured that the participant was also in a place that would not be disturbed and would be quiet. This was to ensure that professional and

confidential conduct was always maintained to prevent the discussion of sensitive topics being overheard.

Risks to the researcher

There are two distinct ethical concerns for the researcher as a young heterosexual woman interviewing young heterosexual men about topics of male behaviour, sex and potentially unwanted sexual attention. The first ethical concern regarded face-to-face interviews as there was a potential risk of the researcher feeling intimidated or harassed in a lone physical environment with young men who may talk about issues of sex in an inappropriate manner. As a young heterosexual woman conducting interviews about sexual activity, it presented difficulty in interviewing young heterosexual men of a similar age group. This is because some participants may have volunteered for the purpose of talking about sex with a woman for potentially inappropriate reasons. This meant that the risks of intimidation or harassment extended emotionally into online interview. These risks were moderated in several ways.

All participants are familiar with the researcher due to them all being students at a small, rural university. This created a potential risk of coercion, but it was mitigated through the reiteration that participation was voluntary, and withdrawal was acceptable. This balance was necessary, as familiarity with the researcher was crucial to ensuring participants felt comfortable discussing sensitive data. This familiarity also ensured that there was less risk of inappropriate behaviour during the interviews. However, this ethical issue needs consideration in future research to mediate any effects that being participant familiarity may have, such as the potential risks of coercion that we have attempted to reduce. Eliminating these potential risks in an ethical

way may provide more objective research in future. Consent forms and information sheets included sections asking for respectful language and behaviour as this aimed to limit the risk of psychological harm towards the researcher. Although some expletives were used this was contextual to their recounts and most participants ensured that the researcher was comfortable with this language before they continued. All interviews took place during office hours and with a supervisor available for support if needed.

The second ethical concern for the researcher was emotional distress. Discussing sensitive topics such as unwanted sexual attention presented the risk of researcher fatigue and emotional distress (Sherry, 2013). This was heightened by the need to spend long amounts of time dissecting sensitive literature and transcribing data that could potentially involve serious accounts of unwanted sexual attention experienced by people familiar to the researcher. Guidelines for sensitive research suggest that qualitative researchers immerse themselves in the experiences of others, and with the nature of this research being particularly emotive and sensitive it is easy to find it difficult to separate oneself from the researcher. As a qualitative researcher of a sensitive topic, it was important to “nurture and protect” themselves from the emotionally difficult stories that they bared witness to (Sherry, 2013). To mitigate this, the researcher kept in contact with their supervisor and regularly debriefed without jeopardising the confidentiality of any participants. Regular breaks were taken from the literature review and alternated with other aspects of work to prevent burnout. A break in data collection of at least a week was taken after every three interviews to ensure that the content of these interviews did not take a toll, ensuring that they were able to take a step back from the data and maintain objectivity without becoming too involved. A reflective journal was also used to maintain integrity and ground themselves as they conducted the research.

Risks to the participants

Prospective participants were made aware that the study would include questions about sensitive issues involving unwanted sexual attention in the Nighttime Economy, so they were able to make an informed decision regarding participation. The risks posed for the participants were issues of sensitivity and potential distress, but these risks were managed through rigorous risk assessments and mitigation. It was made clear several times before actual participation that the interview would include questions regarding unwanted sexual attention and participants were provided with a full breakdown of the study and the interview questions prior to agreeing to participate. This meant that participants may rehearse answers or act in a socially desirable way, but it was deemed necessary to mitigate and avoid potential psychological harm because the participants were aware that while the focus would be on their experiences on nights out, there may be discussion of things that could potentially be distressing. The information sheet and debrief sheet both contained links to support services so that in the event a participant withdrew part way through the study or after, they would have links to these services at any point they may need them. Steps were taken to ensure that all participants felt in control of the process throughout, something that was demonstrated to be conducive to conducting interviews with young men by catering to their needs constructed through their own masculinity (Pitfield, 2013).

Discussion of potentially distressing incidents

It is important to recognise that the participants in this study were talking about past experiences that could have been harmful to them at the time they occurred. Some of the talk

could be considered serious, especially if it is something they felt they needed to report at the time. However, the interviews formed retrospective discussions and concerns for participants welfare did not arise during the interview and participants were asked if they wished to continue when talking about what seemed to be negative experiences. The young men talked about their experiences as retrospective stories but did not consider their talk to be disclosures of serious incidents. Although it is important to recognise that their experiences should be taken seriously, it is also important to recognise that researchers are not an authority to decide how participants should perceive or react to their experiences. Research has shown that some men who have been the subject of unwanted attention do not seek an official disclosure (McCauley & Casler, 2015), but want to talk about their experiences with someone who is willing to listen to them (Griswald et al., 2020) and deciding how to label experiences for participants may be counterproductive and in turn cause harm. Regardless, contacts for support services were provided to participants before and after participation to ensure they had support available if necessary.

Participants were reminded that they could decline to answer any question and the word “sexual” was not included in the question that asked them about their experiences to avoid pressuring participants to discuss sensitive sexual incidents. The question querying how authorities feel about unwanted sexual attention and whether the participant believes it is a big problem in their town was again deliberately asked to elicit their perspectives of the issue without pressuring them into disclosing. Participants were sometimes prompted about their experiences if they alluded to having any, but predominantly chose to talk about them themselves, demonstrating that they wanted to talk about their experiences but did not believe that they were making disclosures of serious incidents. Confidentiality was maintained in this thesis and will be in any publications. The university town is small and rural, something

reiterated by many of the participants, and so in the interest of protecting the identities of participants, all identifying information was removed or amended.

Findings

This study explored how young, heterosexual, male students used discourses to understand and negotiate their experiences in the nighttime economy. It aimed to explore the young men's sense making practices using Willig's approach to Foucauldian discourse analysis. The findings are explored below.

The findings are presented in themes devised from the analysis of the data. In answering the research question of how young heterosexual men constructed their experiences of the nighttime economy it became apparent that the components of the night out, namely lad culture, memory making, intoxication, and experiences of unwanted attention were all linked and fed into understandings of the night out. Therefore, the themes below outline the sense making of young men engaging in lad culture who felt pressured to engage in behaviours that created a memory bank, and how both their identities as a Lad, or "one of The Boys", and practices of memory making had implications for how the young men understood unwanted attention and negotiated consent.

This research was conducted, written and submitted within many contexts. The data was collected and analysed during the COVID-19 pandemic and the global movement raising awareness of unwanted sexual attention, #MeToo. Data was collected while British drinking practices shifted to more home drinking due to the closure of British universities and establishments during a government sanctioned lockdown that prohibited physical socialisation. Whilst the data represent typical drinking behaviour prior to the pandemic it does not negate the context that they were retrospectively talked about in. It is also important to note that the talk may have been constructed with media attention towards unwanted sexual attention in mind.

Chapter 6: It's okay, I'm one of the Boys

In aiming to understand how the participants talked about their experiences of the night time economy they were asked to outline their typical nights out. The young men predominantly talked about going out with “the boys” and how their group membership constructed the routines of their night out in an effort to reinforce masculine hierarchies. The group membership was crucial to their construction of their identities, leading to some of the participants identifying themselves through subjectivities associated with their group. They used these positions to construct their experiences through the tribal perspective of the group, and to talk about how being one of the boys made it okay to use alcohol as a functional tool to cope with stress.

The “Pure Lad” versus the “Good Club Mate”

To understand their experiences of the night out, the young men constructed themselves and others as male subjectivities defined by the type of Boy that they were in their group. Being one of the boys, and in particular a “Good Club Mate”, sanctioned risky or humiliating behaviours that were considered to be banter. These behaviours were often misogynistic in nature and related to the humiliation of women, or men that did not adhere to traditional masculinities. They were prescribed as acceptable and part of their identity.

Frank, Line 238-291: “Like one of our freshers is a pure like lad. Very nice fella. He was speaking to this girl; I'm guessing one of the lads like wing manned him because he's always been shy. Erm and I remember he went back with her I think... I dunno I- I think they went back into the house. Walked back with him or what. Very gentlemanly. But yeah so that's a good

interaction you know, I guess. But the I've seen- I've heard stories of one of my good club mates... erm... hahaha apparently, I don't know if its 100% true. Had gone back to a girl's I think he had been so drunk he had erm... defecated... and then I think they both woke up or something or he woke her up and said I think you've defecated the bed and left. And like said you know I'm gonna go and left. He left her to clean it. So obviously technically not on the night out. But obviously just after, so."

Frank talks of his team mates as distinct but changing masculinities, one who is a "Pure Lad" that is gentlemanly, who is to be coached by one of the other lads and will progress into the "Good Club Mate", someone who is funny and engages in dangerous levels of intoxication and ambiguous sexual experiences; someone who provides banter. Whilst the first teammate is still constructed as a "Lad" he is not held in as high regard as his teammate who engages in risky behaviour and recounts it to the Boys. Frank constructs the Pure Lad in relation to the Good Club Mate, suggesting that engaging in chivalrous behaviour and needing to be coached makes him a "very nice fella", but by talking about how he is shy, and they assumed he must have been "wing manned" suggests that he is naïve and needs support from the group to develop into a "good" club mate who is able to confidently engage in sexual and misogynistic behaviours. Frank laughs before describing how this mate "defecated himself" and then blamed it on the girl he had gone home with, leaving her to clean up the mess. This suggests he is retelling it as something humorous and subsequently positioning the story as just banter, without considering the emotional implications on the story's participants. The Good Club Mate has recounted a story where he has been so intoxicated that he has lost control of bodily functions before telling the woman he was implied to have engaged in sexual intercourse with that it was her and forcing her to clean the mess that was left.

Franks talks of how this story is told despite them not knowing if it is “100% true”, and it is a story that involves the humiliation of a woman following a sexual encounter, suggesting that the opportunity to engage in these subject positions and sexist behaviours is something seen as inherent in group membership. This is important to being “one of the boys”. The use of intoxication and sexual relations to solidify platonic bonds whilst simultaneously humiliating an unknown woman alludes to a covert method of social dominance that reinforces traditional hegemonic masculinities. The Good Club Mate recounting this story would cause humiliation for the woman, and if known, may be used as a method of reputational manipulation (Masquelier, 2013) in a potential effort to prevent other men from engaging in sexual relations with her. Franks construction of his club mates’ story through the lens of “Banter” makes it acceptable for these stories to be told and retold. Constructing these behaviours as banter makes them acceptable and Frank appears to not see any issue with recounting this as a story during the interview, or with the behaviour itself. Reconstructing this story reinforces Frank’s feelings of belonging and this opens up opportunities for Frank to disclose embarrassing stories to his club mates as provided they are “funny”, and something to be jeered at.

Frank uses discourses of brotherhood in describing being one of the boys and discourses of banter to make the behaviours that they engage in acceptable. By constructing group members in relation to the team as a whole and positioning them with subjectivities, it makes the use of humiliating events and ambiguous sexual encounters part of the expected behaviours of their group members to solidify their group bonds. This is similar to previous research finding that men engaging in lad culture typically used sexual encounters to solidify their positions in the group (McAndrews, 2014) and engage in male group bonding (Jordan et al., 2022). Frank positioned them as “Pure” or “Good”, with pure lads being gentlemanly and engaging in

chivalrous masculine behaviours and good club mates being ones who engage in traditional misogynistic behaviours. This is similar to research finding that Lads would construct banter as light and playful or dark and nasty (Owen, 2020). The findings of this study further Owen's research by demonstrating that for some Lads, neither mode of banter was constructed as bad. Both were constructed as functional aspects of necessary roles within the group, although it was acknowledged that the behaviours of the Good Club Mate were not necessarily positive and were constructed in comparison to "good interactions", giving the implication that they were potentially bad interactions that produced a good subjectivity.

By positioning their teammates as pure or good, Frank assigns them to subjectivities that are both necessary to establish hierarchy in the group, which supports previous research (Jeffries, 2020), and while Frank talks of his teammates he likely constructs them this way to reconstruct and solidify his own position with the group. This fed into how Frank constructed himself and his group members both in their group and in the context of their interactions with groups of women. Frank later talked of the Joint Social, which was used to intentionally have their group interact with an all-female social club that their group members were known to have sexual relations with. This was done to solidify their positions within their own group and enact performances of hegemonic masculinity in a public spectacle that reinforced possessive behaviours and public humiliation of sexually agentic women.

Frank, Line 212-230: "Erm... I would always love a joint social. I would- I think it's just hilarious. Erm... I didn't think it would be... I suppose that would be wrong- there would be people it would be hilarious at peoples' expense. I wouldn't lie. Like... erm... coming into this club one though there was quite a lot of... ahaha cross play. Err... so to speak... a lot of uh tangles and- and- sort of... things that were gonna... crop up. Erm... which were... gonna be said and make jokes out of- out of people involved. Erm... at their expense on the night. Whereas before... this year there was joint socials in my other years with uh other female clubs and I did know a few of the boys that had been with a few of the girls... it wasn't anywhere near as much erm... Some... my mate JOHN DOE would say incest or whatever links and ties and whatnot. There was never that much with the other society so... it would unfold a lot less erm... there would be a lot less drama I guess you could say... haha it would more just be funny because you're put- you're putting a bunch of boys and a bunch of girls who don't really know each other, getting them drunk with each other it can be quite funny really. Erm... friendly I think... so I would always- I would always think it was hilarious. Just good fun. Meeting people. And it would be a different dynamic to your normal Wednesday. Which is something I always looked forward to anyway. Cus.. As much as I love drinking with the boys the same thing every week can get quite... samey. I'd love it but like this one just gone... erm... there was- it was coming into a lot of... drama that was gonna come out. I know one of the social secs went on holiday just before, conveniently. Erm... because- not because but conveniently because of just so much drama was gonna kick off."

When asked how men and women interact on nights out, Frank explores the subjectivities of group members and how banter is used when he talks about the “Joint Social”. The Joint Social is an organised event where two sports clubs join together for one night, typically comprised of an all-male group and an all-female group, termed the Boys and the Girls respectively. This combination of gendered groups is designed to create a sensational event that exploits the underlying socio-sexual behaviours at the expense of both groups’ members. Frank talks about how a few of the boys have engaged in sexual relations with some of the girls from the other group, something described as “tangles” and “cross-play”. “Cross play” and “tangles” are euphemisms for opposing group members who have engaged in sexual relations with members from the other group.

The cross play is also referred to by Frank as incest, suggesting that he constructs sexual relations through discourses of brotherhood. He talks about how someone who has engaged in sex with multiple members of the same groups constitutes an incestual relationship, therefore constructing the members as his brothers and covertly reinforcing discourses that position women as the possessions of men. This dynamic is exploited within the Joint Social and used to create a spectacle for the group, building on Frank’s previous talk of how the “Good Mate” generated popularity by recounting humiliating experiences. He talks about this in a way that constructs sexual exploits as banter and positions group members as providing an essential role, constructing them as Good Club Mates without overtly referring to them as such.

Rather than organically letting these stories happen they position members as “players” in a game, or characters in a drama that they can manipulate and control to create a spectacle on behalf of the group. By positioning the participants as characters in a drama, they can detach themselves from the consequences of emotional manipulation and diminish the impact of

exploiting group members for the entertainment of the group. Franks talks about how this dynamic is novel but also constructed as a ritualistic part of the night out that creates sexual anticipation of the unknown. Drama and sex are tools to exploit group members in a mixed-gender group environment bolstered by intoxication, something that is constructed as banter but gives the sense that the women are used to create sexual embarrassment and reinforce possession of the women involved. The presence of the group and the construction of humiliation as banter makes it acceptable to ritualistically unpick and reconstruct stories of sexual encounters. By constructing these encounters as banter and a joke and group members as characters in a drama, they can ridicule others without recourse. Group members such as Frank may construct it this way to detach themselves from the social consequences that this form of banter has, because by participating in the Joint Social the group members have subjected themselves to the ritualistic behaviours of this event, which inherently involve the exploitation of group members. By constructing group members as inherently consenting participants, this shifts responsibility for the behaviour to those being exploited and positions them as both subject to the group, who has the power as a collective to exploit their experiences for banter, and responsible because they have chosen to participate.

These findings relate to previous research in several ways. The concept of “cross-play” sexual encounters, or “incest”, suggests that Frank constructs the orchestration of sexual drama through a lens that is intended to reinforce sexual possession of the women involved and creates real time sexual competition, which has been found to be an important part of Lad Culture (Davis et al., 2018). The Joint Social is organised with the purpose of combining the gendered groups for the purpose of entertainment, but also as an opportunity to confirm their sexual encounters and gain “Lad Points”, which reinforce socio-sexual hierarchies and solidify their

position as “one of the boys”. This supports recent research that found that gaining this notoriety in the form of Lad points, which are given by achieving typically masculine, laddish behaviours, was the purpose of engaging in the behaviours themselves (Jordan et al., 2022).

Contemporary banter, such as the exploitation of intergroup relations in this study, has been found to be important to reinforcing masculine, laddish identities (Jeffries, 2020) and the exploitation of others is something that has been reconstructed into new subjectivities, but remains a staple of the typical Lad. This is supported by decades old research finding that men used banter to deprecate others and enhance their own mate selection strategies (Buss, 1990), something that was described when Frank talked of how the intention of the Joint Social was to exploit established sexual relations and humiliate others. This made encouraging intoxication acceptable because it reinforced their sense of brotherhood through banter (Jordan et al., 2022). This is a modern method of doing gender, in that the stories they exploited were exchanged as social currency and appeared to be a covert method of exerting social dominance over the women involved, because it gave the sense that while the men’s engagement in “cross-play” was seen as banter, it was intended to humiliate the women involved (Jeffries, 2020). The use of hegemonic discourses to reinforce social hierarchies and public displays of gendered behaviours as banter not only caused humiliation for women, but for men who were seen as not embodying hegemonic ideals, such as the conceptualization of unwanted attention from women as “banter”, as Oscar discussed.

Oscar, Line 90-92: "A lot of the time they're jeering and laughing and it's like hahaha you know... you're getting sort of followed by this girl... and... its- it seems a bit of banter I think but it can... really make you feel quite uncomfortable"

Oscar talks about a further subjectivity which is centred outside of the "Good Club Mate" or the "Pure Lad", that describes a teammate who is receiving unwanted attention from a "girl". He talks of how this is constructed as banter and the man is laughed and jeered at by the group, specifically because he is being objectified by a woman. Similarly, to Frank's construction of the group members as being responsible for the behaviours because they are engaging in that environment, Oscar describes how the man receives the behaviour, subconsciously positioning the man in control of the interaction rather than positioning the "girl" as an agentic party. Oscar talks of how "it", unwanted attention, makes the person uncomfortable but is seen as banter by the group, presumably because the concept of a man being harassed or pursued is unnatural for one of the lads and thus humiliating, which provides the blueprint for what is seen as banter by contemporary lads. This demonstrates the difficulty in navigating banter within this context, because while Oscar clearly describes how it is uncomfortable to watch someone be laughed at, he acknowledges that it is seen as banter and did not go on to describe any intervention or support for the hypothetical person being followed by a girl. As the group laughs and jeers at the person being followed, something Oscar reconstructs in his talk, it suggests that the experiences are thus constructed as normal parts of their night out. This suggests that it is difficult to publicly acknowledge uncomfortable behaviours when it involves attention from women.

Seeing his peer group laugh at men who are subjected to unwanted attention by women may subconsciously reinforce internalised sexual scripts and rape myths predominantly relating to the male sexual drive discourse dictating that men should always want and be ready for sexual engagements (Gunnarson, 2018). Although sexual aggression and unwanted attention are typically seen as the marker of “Laddism” (Jordan et al., 2022), a man being followed by a “girl” is constructed as funny and seen as banter, presumably because it reverses typical gender roles and positions the man as less masculine. This would impact the man’s masculine identity (Javaid, 2019), particularly within the group, and is a form of banter that presents as natural but covertly reinforces misogynistic behaviours and hegemonic masculinity, reinforcing previous research finding that gender-based harassment is typically dismissed as banter (Jordan et al., 2022).

By constructing unwanted attention as banter, it minimises the impact of the experience and positions them as the subjects of story that can be used as social currency whilst reinforcing gendered norms through the concept of banter (Jeffries, 2020). This internalises perceptions of power and is likely employed to maintain control in the situation, because by positioning the person as a subject of banter whilst simultaneously in control of the interaction, Oscar can understand it through his own masculine identity and reinforce feelings of internalised social dominance that prevent him from being labelled as victim (Rosenthal et al., 2012). Rather than being a potential victim, the hypothetical man, and subsequently Oscar if he experiences this behaviour, would be positioned within new subjectivities that denigrate their masculine status but solidify their place in the group as a subject of banter. This has implications for their ability to acknowledge and disclose their experiences.

In summary, the identity of these young men was constructed through their label and position with their groups' hierarchy, notably defined as the "Pure Lad" and the "Good Club Mate". This relied on discourses of hegemonic masculinity that positioned shy, polite young group members as inexperienced in order to coach them into becoming a group member that was confident and engaged in laddish behaviours that were predicated on banter and misogyny. This made humiliating women acceptable and ambiguous sexual encounters were used as social currency to maintain status in the group. This was demonstrated by the Joint Social, an event where a male sports club would pair up with a female sports club with the intention of using sex and intoxication to create a spectacle. This was at the expense of both men and women because sexual relationships were used to publicly humiliate the female counterparts by exposing what they called "incest", the concept of a female group member engaging in sexual relations with multiple members of the main group, which had a twofold effect. They relied on discourses of brotherhood to not only bring them together, but to reinforce possessive behaviours to exemplify masculine, sexual competition and publicly humiliate female group members which may have subconsciously been intended to reinforce traditional gender roles that construct sexually agentic women as abnormal. This was constructed as drama to minimise the effect this may have, and so sexual competition was made acceptable and constructed as just part of the Joint social.

Their identities had implications for how they constructed unwanted sexual attention because men who experienced it from women were mocked and laughed at, thus constructing it as humorous banter. They again relied on discourses of hegemonic masculinity to reinforce their positions as one of the boys by publicly ridiculing men who did not exemplify a hegemonic masculine identity. They cannot publicly acknowledge that attention from women could be unwanted so mocked men who experienced it as a means of reinforcing masculine expectations

of sexual competition. This again constructed the men as not conforming without constructing the women as agentic in order to reinforce their masculine power and identity as one of the boys. By constructing unwanted attention as humorous, it reinforces discourses of banter that were used to minimise the experience and reinforce gender roles.

Tribalism; It's okay to be intoxicated when it's with the boys

Building on from the emerging subjectivities of Lad Culture and the implications that this had for their understandings of the night out was their exploration of how discourses of brotherhood drove their understandings of intoxication and the behaviours that were subsequently made acceptable. The young men talked of intoxication and constructed nights out as done for the sake of the boys, their tribe. The participants felt pressured to live up to the typical “uni experience” of their social groups, partying and participation in the nighttime economy, to the point they would go out sober and felt they needed redemption if they did not live up to constructed expectations of their social group. They engaged in drinking and the nighttime economy because of predefined expectations set by their position as one of “the boys” and this made intoxication and ritualistic behaviours acceptable.

Ryan, Line 7-18: “So we’d- in the day we’d either have a match or we’d probably erm day drink watching some SPORT or some other sport. Erm... and... erm... so we’d either be riled up from a SPORTS game or we’d be already a bit tipsy. Probably- I’d probably go home then, get ready for the night, we’d make our way to the SOCIAL PLACE which is where our socials were held erm... so erm those socials are sort of like a pre drinks to a night out but they tend to

be very heavy erm... as you'd quite imagine with a SPORTS team err and then we'd move on into town afterwards but these erm at these socials we'd do lots of drinking games... erm... which generally involved haha more copious drinking or taking the piss out of each other. Erm... yeah it's a good laugh. Then we'd make our way into town and do a bit of a bar crawl. Err see- do even more drinking. Erm... until we- we end up at the uh club at the end, where we'd continue drinking and dancing and probably chatting shit to each other until the early hours of the morning."

When asked to describe his typical night out, Ryan talks about how he goes out with his sports club because it is typically attached to engaging in sport, which develops understandings of pre-loading because he talked of how sports fuel the night out and their behaviour, covertly alluding to aggression through his talk of being "riled up". The night out is completed in a specific order with pre-loading (sports or drinking) preparing them for the night out. Ryan constructs himself through his sports affiliation, suggesting that because hedonistic behaviours are expected of group members, they must participate to be considered part of the group. And so, the purpose of the night out is to have a good laugh and make fun of each other, creating ritualistic expectations of tribal behaviour.

Ryan talks of how they pre-load at socials to get tipsy or "riled up", by playing drinking games to increase their intoxication or "take the piss out of each other", then they move to town to drink in different pubs before ending at the club for dancing and "chatting shit". The night out is carefully constructed and completed with the expectations of engaging in tribal behaviours together, that involve intoxication, collective dancing, and banter. These tribal behaviours are centred on discourses of brotherhood that sanction behaviours by constructing them as essential to having a "good laugh", meaning that the pressures of having fun can result in dangerous

drinking behaviour and insulting behaviours. By constructing these behaviours as ritualistic and tribal, it positions them as expected and leaves little room for deviation from the norms. This subsequently makes group members vulnerable to risky and potentially unwanted behaviors.

Ryan positions himself and his teammates as subject to the expectations of group members through his talk of how these behaviours are things you would “*quite imagine with a sports team*”. This gives the sense that the focus of the night out is less the behaviours themselves, and more focused on the experience of tribal behaviours; the feeling of belonging (Maffesoli, 1996). Ryan uses the collective pronoun “we” to describe his experiences which suggests that he constructs them through the perspective of the group and his attachment to it, rather than his individual experiences. This supports previous research finding that sports affiliations were used to negotiate identity (Kivel & Johnson, 2009) and suggests that sport and intoxication are used to perform masculine identities for Ryan. The collective perspective was also found in research on women drinkers (Mackiewicz, 2013) and suggests that the discourses of brotherhood used to enforce tribal identities are similar to concepts of sisterhood for groups of women. This subsequently positions behaviours such as intoxication and aggression, described as being “riled up”, as expected behaviours of group members. By positioning these behaviours as expected, this prevented some men from feeling able to say no to the night out, as David talks about.

David, Line 32-35: “err usually like I can't really- I can say no- but if someone says like- the boys wanna meet up I like just spending time with them or whatever being- I've been out and like got drunk with the boys and also when they've like asked me do you wanna go out I've gone out sober as well so like I just like the- like seeing everyone out”

David also talks of the expectations set for him by being one of “the boys”. He constructs himself and his participation through the discourse of brotherhood, covertly describing the tribal, or group behaviours, that increases the pressure to engage. It is so important to be involved and belong to the group that he will participate without drinking and remain sober, indicating that it is less the intoxication that matters and more the event of going out with the boys and spending time together. By constructing his identity through discourses of brotherhood, it positions the engagement in the nighttime economy as expected, tribal behaviours that reinforce group membership. Being subject to the expectations of the group means that David does not have the power to refuse to engage in these behaviours, but he positions himself as in control by suggesting that he chooses to stay sober and when to drink.

Going out is constructed as a social activity inherent to their identity as one of the boys and so is positioned as expected, demonstrated by David’s conflict. He immediately states that he “can’t really” before cutting himself off and asserting that he can say no, but he goes out because he enjoys spending time with them. Therefore, it is the sense of belonging that motivates him, enhanced by the neo-tribal expectations associated with their social groups. While attempting to construct himself as independent and able to choose, he covertly subjects himself to social control because he talks of how refusing to engage is not something he wishes to consider. This begs the question of whether legitimately saying no to the nighttime economy is possible, if not

taking part impacts on their sense of belonging and drinking environments are the main opportunity for socialising.

David's talk builds on previous research on neo-tribalism that found that drinking and intoxication were used to pull the community together for modern youth (Green, 2021) and research finding that people must drink if they want to socialise (Griffin, 2005). For David, the tribal group behaviour here is focused on just belonging to the group in the environment, even if he is sober. This presents a difference to the motivations previously found and suggests that socialising in the nighttime economy is the focus, similar to more recent research on socialising in university social circles (Ogilvie, 2018). David seeks to justify his giving in to peer pressure, suggesting that it is an essential part of socialising and focused on just being with everyone, a distinct link to neo-tribal feelings of belonging (Green, 2021). Here, male group bonding and the discourse of brotherhood is positioned as synonymous with participation in the nighttime economy, presenting implications for how drinking culture is navigated and how intoxication is used in the night time economy.

In conclusion, sports affiliation and intoxication were used to construct their identities as one of the boys by using them as tools to prepare for the night out, which relied on discourses of tribalism to make intoxication okay if it was with the boys. Aggression was constructed as essential to their identities which reinforced traditional forms of hegemonic masculinity, creating expected behaviours that would be seen to exemplify their masculinity as part of their groups to other groups on their nights out. Drinking was constructed as ritualistic and created the expectation and pressure to be seen to be having fun which led to some men talking about their abilities to say no to a night out with the sense that it was not an available option to them because it was a key means of constructing their identity and solidifying their position within their

groups. This enhanced their sense of belonging by using discourses of brotherhood that reinforced the expectation to perform masculine behaviours such as drinking and aggression. For some this led to inner conflict and a need to justify the peer pressure they felt through their sense of brotherhood and the ramifications for their sense of identity if they felt they were not conforming to the group. This had implications for how intoxication was used on the night out to reinforce their masculine identities and membership to the group, so their experiences were understood through the expectations they believed were attached to their identity as one of the boys.

Drinking for the sake of it; using intoxication as a functional tool

Participation in the nighttime economy was constructed as synonymous with socialising for the individuals in sports clubs and so intoxication was not only encouraged but used as a functional tool to manage the difficulty they experienced whilst navigating the nighttime economy and their university experience. For some young men alcohol was constructed as an escape and for some it was used to engage in self validation through sex. This had implications for how they constructed their identities and their experiences of their nights out.

Ryan, Line 34-39: "Erm but- but more so now at university it was more of- much more of a... a social thing. Erm... I wasn't going out- I mean I did get drunk all of the time but I wasn't going out specifically to get drunk. I was going out for the social aspect. With the- with the (Sportsclub) lads or my flat mates or another group that I'm a part of. Erm... so that would be my main motivation and I guess towards the end of my time at uni it was more of an escape as well. Erm... I don't know if that goes under getting drunk for the sake of it."

When asked about his motivations for drinking, Ryan talks about alcohol as a functional tool, used first to facilitate socialisation, then to escape out of habit, described as “getting drunk for the sake of it”. This suggests that Ryan has constructed alcohol as an enabler, something that can be used to modify his experiences and his mood. Intoxication and the nighttime economy have previously been constructed as synonymous with socialising within lad culture and so when faced with difficulty socialising or coping with life alcohol has become the appropriate solution. Ryan’s construction of intoxication as an enabler gives the sense of conflict as he talks about the difficulties navigating collective intoxication and being drunk “all of the time” because it was a social activity. By constructing intoxication as synonymous with socialising Ryan positions it as expected, which has created the expectation that it is the solution for those who have difficulty socialising and coping. This makes risky and excessive drinking acceptable, as well as any behaviours engaged in while intoxicated. Ryan talks of how the motivation changes from socialising to getting drunk to escape with any group he went out with, which creates the sense that it was less about the group specifically and more about going out to retain the sense of belonging that drinking in the nighttime economy gave, relating back to discourses of brotherhood and tribalism (Green, 2021). Subsequently, intoxication is constructed as not just an enabler, but as a cure, used to relax and engage in the experience (Cornilov et al., 2019).

This supports previous research finding that drinking is for the purpose of socialising rather than the experience itself (Ogilvie, 2018), but the data from this study also contrasts Ogilvie’s research, instead finding that the participants also used intoxication to cope. The use of intoxication as a coping mechanism is closer to more recent research finding that men talked of this when asked about their drinking motivations (Cornilov et al., 2019), but the use of intoxication as self-medication in British undergraduates has also been found in older research as

well (Mobach & Macaskill, 2011). Intoxication as a form of escapism is less documented but has been explored (Nealis & Mackinnon, 2018) and research finding that young men use intoxication and humour as coping mechanisms (Duncan et al., 2022), both which have been found in the current research and suggest that these aspects of the group as a tribe form comfort for the young men involved. The notion of comfort was not only modified through intoxication, but the behaviours and feelings that intoxication made accessible to these young men.

Oscar, Line 44-52: "Erm there's definitely been points where I have gone out drinking with the intent to pull so to speak. Erm... but a lot of the time it is just for the social aspect and to spend time with my friends and enjoy myself. A lot of the time its if you've had a particularly stressful week or whatever it's nice to just have that blow out and... erm... enjoy yourself and let loose. Erm... but there have also been points where I've used it as a crutch in a sense... if I have been having a particularly bad time there is a difference I think between erm... between doing it to blow off steam and doing it to cope. And... sometimes that line gets blurred and often erm... the sort of sexual thing melts into that as well. Erm... I think a lot of people use that as a form of validation erm... and I know I've been guilty of that in the past erm... which may well lead into why people might find it offensive when you... say no."

Oscar explores the concept of intoxication as a coping mechanism further, describing it as a “crutch” used to relax and facilitate sexual encounters. Intoxication and sex are constructed through a medicinal discourse, used as enablers to “blow off steam” and use sex as a “form of validation”. Risky behaviours become socially acceptable because they are positioned as expected parts of the nighttime economy that are linked to identity. By constructing intoxication and sex in this way he legitimises “Pulling”, the act of securing sexual activity, and suggests that the use of sex as validation results in some people becoming “offended” when they are rejected.

It is implied that this is because the ability to pull is tied to self-identity and alludes to experiences of unwanted sexual attention. The use of intoxication as an enabler sanctions risky behaviour and alleviates the guilt of participation because they are inseparable means of enhancing their identity. Oscar talks of this as a line, differentiated between using these enablers to relax and to cope, something that is sometimes indistinguishable. Talking about intoxication as a form of escapism positions Oscar responsible for the use of it in this way, and this is something that he translates into his understandings of unwanted sexual attention. He talks of how he will go on nights out intending to “pull”, sometimes as a coping mechanism, and how this can result in adverse reactions when he rejects sexual advancements. This likely relates to a perceived male sexual drive and discourses of consent that are used to construct sexual activity and intoxication as the responsibility of the individual; things which can be used to alleviate negative feeling and enhance validation.

Oscar positions intoxication and sex as interchangeable enablers, used to validate the self, relax and cope with life. This supports previous research finding that self enhancement and coping were the strongest predictors of alcohol misuse (Bresin & Mekawi, 2021) and used to inhibit unpleasant experiences and emotions (Nealis & Mackinnon, 2018). Nealis and Mackinnon (2018) suggested that self-enhancement is a covert method of coping with interpersonal difficulties which is highlighted by the current study. The use of sex for validation positions Oscar’s body as subject to the gazes of others creating a sense of surveillance from others (Monahan, 2009) and could lead to unwanted attention. This is complicated by sexual prowess being used to gain Lad Points (Jordan et al., 2022) and create gossip, thus enhancing their reputation as one of the boys (Masquelier, 2013). The use of intoxication and sexual

validation as enablers not only reinforces their identities but makes them expected, which has implications for their ability to say no to drinking and sex.

To summarise, many young men engaged in drinking and intoxication as this was the main method their groups used to socialise which was their primary motivation for participating. However, some talked about what was defined as “drinking for the sake of it”, the use of intoxication to escape their stress and encourage drinking out of habit. Intoxication was constructed as an enabler available to them as one of the boys to modify their collective experience and reinforce their commitment to the group. Intoxication was constructed as synonymous with socializing and sports clubs, so it was positioned as expected by the young men.

The concept of escapism for young drinkers has been less explored but some of the young men talked about intoxication as a crutch to rely on when they were struggling which suggested that by positioning it as a tool to enhance the night out it also became a tool with which to cope or create comfort. For some, intoxication was used to facilitate sexual encounters to enhance their self-validation and so intoxication and sex were tied to the men’s sense of self identity, likely because they are positioned as expected of one of the boys, as has been discussed. They talked about the use of intoxication as a functional tool to increase their sexual prowess and enhance the night out in ways that were reinforced by discourses of hegemonic masculinity focused on the male sexual drive being positioned as inherent. This meant that sexual activity was both expected and a marker of their masculinity, which has seemingly led to the sense of sexual prowess being tied to their identity as one of the boys.

Chapter 7: Creating the Memory Bank

When talking about their understandings of their experiences during a night out and their motivations for participating in the night time economy, many of the young men talked about creating experiences that they could remember, whether that be the next morning or when their time at university ended. This was referred to as a memory bank of their time at university and the need to make memories was contextualized within their identities as one of the lads. They were scared of missing out on experiences that would be used to solidify social bonds through storytelling and what the lads called “The Goss”, something they referred to colloquially as “FOMO”. The fear of missing out on the experiences that defined their group memberships and identities as both Lads and students was only increased by the use of social media and modern surveillance to document and share these experiences with their groups, something referred to as CCTVing. The discourses used had implications for what they felt they had to do, what they could not do and how they constructed their experiences.

The Fear of Missing Out

Another key theme was the motivation of experience and memory. In aiming to explore how they understood their experiences the men talked of memories and the need to create a memory bank of their time as one of the boys. Their exploration of FOMO (the Fear Of Missing Out) and their group behaviours gave important context for their motivations to engage in the nighttime economy and how their positions as lads contextualised their understandings of their experiences. The implications of missing out on these experiences related to their feelings of identity and a sense of belonging that drove the need to solidify their positions within their

groups and prove their identity as one of the boys. William talks about how the inability to have proof that they had achieved this created a sense of failure that needed redemption, which suggests that this has impacted on his sense of identity.

William, Line 32-40: "Just socialising really, socialising, tryna make good uni memories, you know I mean university a lot of people it's about partying and going out having fun, so it would be kind of... I'm such a big photo person I take photos or like in all the clubs every time people are dressed up and stuff take selfies with people it's all about kind of like building up a memory bank of my time here really"

RESEARCHER: yeah like sentimental value?

William: pretty much yeah I had two pretty terrible first years like my first and second year at uni were pretty... terrible especially this year like my phones full of photos of nights out and stuff

RESEARCHER: so you're making good memories now?

William: yeah, tryna redeem what I had been through."

The tribal discourses of brotherhood previously discussed are employed to contextualise their need to belong, and for William, this manifests as a need to create a "Memory Bank" of his experiences to live up to the expected experience and redeem the fact that he did not enjoy his first two years at university. He positions himself as a failure for not going out or having a memory bank of photos, talking about how "going out having fun" is perceived as inherent to the socialising and making "good uni memories". By constructing memories as social activities, he positions them as expected achievements, resulting in a feeling of failure when he did not experience university as expected. This covertly refers to the Fear of Missing Out, because

William positions himself as a failure for missing out on the experiences he now has as one of the boys.

This builds on previous research finding that fitting in was paramount to student identity (Ogilvie, 2018) and in the case of William, this was predicated on being able to prove that they had gone out and “had fun”. Photos were used to build a physical memory bank that William could use to redeem his identity and support previous research on collective memory making, namely the use of memory banks to relive collective experience (Kivel & Johnson, 2009). Clubbing and fun were positioned as the marker of success and closes down the opportunity for sobriety, which is in line with research finding that drinking behaviours were seen to be integral to the classic “uni experience” (Crawford & Novak, 2010). Frank talks about how missing out on the drama and banter of the night out was unthinkable, even if it caused physical symptoms, because the experience of being drunk and engaging in “funny stories” was part of being one of the boys.

Frank Line 86-103: " hahaha erm... my motivations... usually... well one of the massive things that drives me to go is a huge fear of missing out. Missing out on these funny stories. Erm... like especially in the past sort of year or so when my body is awful at dealing with booze now. It's at the point where I'm just like ugghh. What like- I- I don't know if I go on nights out because I enjoy them so much that it's worth the hangover or whether it's just fear of missing out. Erm... so that was prob- that was probably more of a driving factor this year. And I'd have to say- some weeks I'd have to say no I'm not going out because my body would be in bits. Erm... but I'd say like especially like in first year it was just to like socialise with your mates and it was always fun. Erm... like it was- it was always just a laugh. Something was always going on something was always... kicking off. For no reason. There'd always be some form of drama

whether its within your group or... one of your group with someone else or... whatever. Erm... yeah, I dunno there'd be times where the boys were going out in first year, I remember JOHN DOE 4 wanting to hit me for something. Erm... and that lasted all night he was in a sulk with me... I didn't- I can't remember what it was about erm... but erm the other boys were loving that and I was just confused. But I erm... I couldn't- it was fine for me. But erm... things like that I dunno... built this drama which was just hilarious. I supp- I suppose if you're not actually involved. Erm... but yeah so... I guess fear of missing out though would be more recently why I've been wanting to go out. Enjoy... I do enjoy being drunk. I think- I think everything's more funny. And I'm quite a funny bloke. I like things that are funny."

When asked about his motivations for participation, Frank talked of how he was afraid of missing out on “funny stories” that arose during the nighttime economy, and as previously discussed, solidified their group bonds. Frank again uses neo-tribal discourses of brotherhood to construct his motivation and experiences, contextualised within the need to create memories. This relates to the contemporary understanding of banter and how essential this is to their position as one of the boys. If Frank stays at home, he cannot participate in collective activity, which involved risky behaviours such as intoxication resulting in his body being “in bits” or violence. These behaviours were constructed as “drama” and thus minimised, which sanctioned the use of violence and severe intoxication and made the loss of inhibitions acceptable, because it was seen as funny. This is likely to reinforce traditional forms of hegemonic masculinity; drinking and violence, which were subject to the surveillance of other members of the tribe.

These behaviours were constructed as normal aspects of drama on a night out and so positioned as essential to the experience provided a member of the group was watching and found it funny. Constructing intoxication and violence as symbiotic effects of socialising and

creating memories absolves group members of responsibility for their behaviours and creates a sense of accomplishment because they have participated in the night out despite the serious effects on their bodies physically. Frank talks of how self-inflicted harm and the hangover are “worth it” to participate in the night out as a group, further exploring how tribal behaviours drive the pressure to engage in collective experience. Although Frank talks about sometimes saying no due to the physical effects, he goes on to talk about all the experiences he fears missing out on, which creates the impression that he can say no, but saying no would result in missed experiences and thus is not something he considers unless physically necessary.

FOMO has been explored in previous research, which described it as the apprehension that others may have experiences that you have missed out on (Pryzybylski et al., 2013). Frank admits the fear he has of missing out on “funny stories” which builds on this research and demonstrates how potentially negative experiences were reframed as positive to reinforce social bonds, which also builds on lad culture research (Griffin et al., 2018). Frank was subject to threats of violence from a teammate but constructs this as drama to reframe the experience as collective because it provided entertainment for his teammates. This was likely done so to build lad points (Jordan et al., 2022) and sanction violence through a fear of exclusion (Crawford et al., 2022).

By constructing intoxication and violence as group experiences he makes participation in the nighttime economy expected and makes them acceptable enablers of socialising. This builds on research finding that young people often preferred regrettable experiences were preferable to FOMO and for men, health concerns were less important than the risk of not conforming and being ostracised (Crawford et al., 2022). The construction of intoxication and violence as acceptable enablers and prescriptive to their position as one of the boys is

concerning, because there is the potential that this perception is extended to other forms of risky behaviour and violence.

Henry, Line 23-29: "I dunno we'll just meet up for breakfast or something and then we'll, erm... just talk about the night before and if there's any Goss or drama we'll just... talk about that really. Not kinda like the whole... night out, more the scenario.

RESEARCHER: okay. So, erm... what are your motivations for going out drinking then?

Henry: erm... so... it's changed in my time there. In my first 2 years it was probably a real bad case of FOMO. So, fear of missing out."

For Henry, the night out culminated in the group convening for breakfast the next day to discuss any "Goss", a colloquial term for drama or sensational events, from the night out. He talks of gossiping as the sober social event and implies that they were focused on reconstructing events from the night out, before discussing FOMO as the motivation to go out. This implies that discussing the night out and being the subject of its stories was something inherent to the group but was also used as a covert method of peer pressure. Those who did not participate in the night out would be unable to provide stories at the sober event the next morning, and this is what Henry alludes to in his talk of FOMO. He calls it a "real bad case of FOMO", using a medicinal discourse to construct the feeling of peer pressure and neo-tribal belonging that drives him to participate in the night out and its experiences. This subsequently constructs the Goss as the cure to FOMO, solidifying his position in the group and constructing the reckless behaviours that other participants spoke of, as just drama.

Being unable to provide stories for the Goss would result in Henry being positioned as an outsider and in contravention of the expected experience, because storytelling is constructed

as an essential part of this groups' structure. Whilst overt peer pressure is not mentioned, the implication that they participate out of fear creates the sense that the boys do not necessarily have the power to resist the night out, because they risk missing out on the collective experience. It seems that by essentialising participation in drinking and hedonism as a means of socialising in sober events, these young men have, possibly unknowingly, reinforced the peer pressure to engage in intoxication. Henry talks of himself as an active participant but covertly positions himself as obliged to engage through his fear of not have experience and it appears that this is driven by a need to belong to the group.

This builds on Frank's talk and relates further to research exploring the fear of being labelled as someone who "misses out", something which is seen as worse than victimisation (Crawford et al., 2022). Henry talks about reconstructing "scenarios" which appears to be a reference to the stories that other participants have talked about. They are constructed as the "Goss", which is a novel term for gossiping, reconstructed as a masculine activity embedded in lad culture. It appears that this is a further avenue with which to perform gender on a night out and reinforced by feelings of belonging that are solidified at their post night out discussions. This supports previous research finding that nonparticipation in nights out could result in unintended social ostracization (Masquelier, 2013) and leaves little room for the young men to reject drinking events. In understanding his motivation to go out through discourses of missing out on experiences, Frank calls the "funny stories" that he may miss out on "Goss", a colloquial term for gossiping. The idea of "The Goss" is one of storytelling, in that it was a term used by group members to refer to significant or humorous events during the night out that could be used to solidify social bonds and their positions within their groups.

The concept of the memory bank, a tangible library of documented experiences, was essential to understanding their experiences on the night out because it encapsulates their motivations for engaging, how they understood their experiences and the ramifications that their identity as one of the boys had. In summary, FOMO, the fear of missing out, was used to understand their motivations for engaging in the night out as one of the boys. Memories to add to the memory bank were constructed as achievements, proof that they had had a successful university experience by participating on nights and being one of the boys. Some of their talk created the sense that to not have a memory bank of evidence was considered to be a failure. As the primary means of socializing was becoming intoxicated in the nighttime economy, this limited opportunities for sobriety and reinforced expectations of drinking and aggression, both markers of successful hegemonic masculinity. This reduces their responsibility for their behaviours because if they did not participate, this affected their sense of belonging and positions within their groups.

Not going out on nights out led to feelings of FOMO, especially when the group would collectively recount their experiences. This is because those men who did not participate could not contribute to the experience and so inadvertently became outsiders who had not fulfilled the groups expectations, which drove the need to participate and limited the opportunity to reject drinking. This again reinforced hegemonic expectations of intoxication and aggression to maintain their masculine identities. For some, this was called the “Goss”, a colloquial term that several participants used to construct the notion of their social currency, based on banter and humiliating stories that they could exchange to solidify their positions as one of the boys.

The “Goss”; a novel approach to storytelling

The pressures to create a memory bank led to a theme called “The Goss”, which developed from understandings of FOMO. This is gossip reconstructed as a male activity in which male students used storytelling as social currency to bond with each other. Contents of these stories usually involved intoxication and sensational events that group members could collectively reconstruct after the night out. The Goss was used to reinforce the expectation of masculine behavior and behavioural expectations related to their identities as one of the boys.

Andrew, Line 41-46: “yeah just anything that’s happened. Any “Goss” as a friend of mine put. Erm just... cus often some people remember certain bits of the night and some people remember other bits and you just sort of... piece it together depending on the state you were in erm... it's always fun to find out where other people have ended up after a night out if they’ve gone home if they’ve done something they shouldn’t have done it's just a bit like a bit of a social... recollection I guess”

For many, feelings of FOMO were created when they could not participate in what some of the young men called the “Goss”, a colloquial term for their form of storytelling, derived from understandings of gossip. Andrew has adopted this term from his friend, and it has been used by several different participants which suggests it may be a widely understood term in the collective social sphere at the university. The “Goss” refers to drama or significant events from the night out, with Frank comparing it to drama, and Andrew describing it as “anything that’s happened”, that can be collectively pieced together. It seems that the Goss is the stories that the young men use to engage in collective recollections with the aim of contributing information to reconstruct the event. The Goss is constructed through discourses of brotherhood and used to

create the sense of belonging that they have with the groups, positioning them all as subjects of the group. This method of storytelling solidifies male group bonds and extends to the use of sexual encounters, with Andrew suggesting they would usually discuss “where people have ended up” and “if they’ve gone home if they’ve done something they shouldn’t” with the implication being that if they haven’t gone home, or they have done something they shouldn’t, they must have gone home with someone.

The construction of sexual encounters through discourses of banter here implies that the notion of sexual regret is what is crucial to the reconstruction, likely because it forms humiliation for the subject, who is the subject of the story, whether this is the group mate or their sexual partner. Sexual encounters become a group activity used to construct performances of gender and subsequently becomes an expected behaviour, linking back to the subjectivity of the “Good Club Mate”. This is something that is coached through collective reconstructions of ambiguous sexual encounters as banter and so the group members bodies are positioned as a tool for group bonding and communal banter, as seen previously in Frank’s construction of his Mate who defecated himself in the aftermath of a sexual encounter, something that would likely be considered the Goss.

Goss appears to be a colloquial word for gossip, which has previously been found to be traditionally feminine behaviours (Michelson et al., 2010). Reconstructing the concept of gossiping as “The Goss” positions it through a masculine lens that makes the behaviour acceptable, which is likely a solution to the fact that men have been found to be resistant to gossiping (Eckhaus & Ben-Hader, 2017). The Goss appears to be interchangeably used to refer to a story, as contributions to a story and as the collective activity of reconstructing and it seems provides them with a means of sharing collective values through the construction of a collective

story, something that supports previous research findings that collective values was important to the use of gossip for men (Poranen, 2018). Their lived experiences were used as social currency to solidify their positions within the group and to enhance this feeling of belonging, which contrasts previous research finding that this was done to enhance their popularity (Keblusek, 2018). This suggests that while previous research also found that gossiping was focused on achievement for men (Davis et al., 2018) this study shows that in contrast to Davis et al.,s findings that women engaged in social gossip, the men in this study used gossiping about others' social lives as an inherent part of their group dynamic. The Goss was not only the telling of stories, but the use of social media and physical documentation in group chats to extend the groups' nights out and reinforce the expectations of their behavior post night out as Ryan talks about.

Ryan, Line 21-25: "Yep so we're in a group chat of all of the team and if anything, silly happens the night previous or if someone goes home with someone... erm they tend to be brought up in this group chat the next day. Erm, very often there tends to be a small group of people that go to food place for food or somewhere for food the next morning as well, where we also recollect the events as we can remember it. If we can remember them."

Ryan talks about how the group documents "anything silly" that happens for the purpose of bringing it up in their social media group chats and when they convene for food the next morning, similar to Henry's previous talk of breakfast. Ryan's description is constructed through his group's identity because he uses the collective pronoun "we" to talk about the experience. "Anything silly" refers to stories from the night out that are sensational and by constructing them as a puzzle that they must collectively piece together, it positions intoxication and memory loss as an acceptable and expected part of the night out. These stories provide a

mode of bonding that again reinforces feelings of belonging for the group, suggesting that they will willingly engage in risky behaviours in order to create and document Goss. Even those who were too intoxicated to remember the events can join the recollection because only having partial memories or discovering the events the morning after was seen to be part of the collective experience.

By constructing intoxication and risky behaviours such as “going home with someone”, as necessary tools for bonding in the group, it makes these behaviours acceptable and alleviates any responsibility for the outcomes of the night. Constructing sexual experiences as ‘silly’ positions the person as the subject of humour, suggesting that presumed sexual encounters are simply foolish which minimises the seriousness of the events despite the implied levels of intoxication potentially resulting in memory loss. This suggests that the behaviours and potential negative outcomes from the night out are worth it because they are necessary to participate in the sober event the next morning. They may potentially be constructed as outsiders if they are not able to contribute to the recollection, which links back to their understandings of FOMO.

By using collective pronouns to construct their recollection of events, Ryan engages in collective memory making which reinforces neo-tribal feelings of belonging and positions himself as inseparable from the group, which was also found in early research on lad culture (Kivel & Johnson, 2009). Research has found that the purpose of gossiping is to create salacious knowledge (Berkos, 2003) and the themes from the current study support this finding and build on it, with the men using intoxication to create more challenging, collective reconstructions of gossip from their nights out. However, research has also found that gossiping is a covert strategy of social competition by denigrating others (Masquelier, 2013), so can be used as a form of social dominance (Keblusek, 2018) and control (Davis et al., 2018). This intersection of social

media provides a modern method of intragroup social control, because everything is done with the risk of it being documented on social media. The use of gossiping through social media has previously been found (Masquelier, 2013) but this study develops understanding of their use as a modern method of creating a memory bank. This is something explored further in the next sub-theme.

In essence, the concept of the “Goss” arose from discourses of brotherhood and the sense of belonging this brought for the young men to encapsulate this new method of reinforcing group identity through collective reconstructions of their experiences in the night time economy. Humorous events were labelled the Goss and were exchanged and used in group activities to enhance their identity as one of the boys, but also to reinforce expectations that the young men should be engaging in certain behaviours in the nighttime economy. Sexual encounters were constructed as the Goss, meaning that they were perceived as humorous group events, whether through observation or reconstruction. This reinforced discourses of hegemonic masculinity by positioning sexual encounters as subject to the group’s surveillance and markers of banter that could be mocked. It also created the expectation for sexual prowess as a marker of their position as one of the boys in the same way that social media posts in online group chats were used to mock each other through collective humour, the minimizing the implications of exploiting group members’ sexual experiences.

Most notably, many of the young men used collective pronouns such as “we” to construct their experiences in relation to the Goss and the creation of the memory bank, suggesting that their understandings of their experiences in the nighttime economy were understood through their position within a group identity, rather than through their individual perceptions. This had implications for how they constructed the concepts of modern surveillance

through physical documentation, which was needed to create the memory bank, and the use of social media to extend this outside of the nighttime economy.

Cctving and the pressures of modern surveillance

The young men talked of being encouraged to engage in humorous behaviours and how their “embarrassing” experiences were not only mocked by physically documented and redistributed on social media. This introduces the concept of “cctving”, a form of modern surveillance in which young men in the nighttime economy drank and engaged in “funny” behaviours because of the perceived gaze of their peers. Cctving creates the sensation of constant surveillance, resulting in degrees of acceptability and obligations through expected behaviours, because they are constructed as being part of the group dynamic, even after the night out has ended.

Kevin, Line 214-229: “or erm... quite a lot of just nights out of... people just err being told to do something it’s like someone saying oh X do Y

RESEARCHER: yeah

Kevin: and then they go and do it. So, we’re kind of saying ah do this stuff and we’ll film it it’ll be funny they go, and do it and we have a good laugh at it as well then, but we’ve also got it, so we can have a good laugh at it afterwards in our group chats as well

RESEARCHER: yeah? So, you, uh, talk about it afterwards?

Kevin: yeah, yeah! The big, erm- in our group chats there's um loads of err videos that still get put round um and photos that are used from nights out in our group chats to mean certain things

RESEARCHER: okay

Kevin: so uhm if someone has erm if someone has ermm done something and there's a particular screenshot of someone pulling a face or something someone might screenshot that and it'll get put through the group chat multiples of times you know again and again and again

RESEARCHER: okay

Kevin: or a video of someone doing something that's maybe a little bit embarrassing for themselves on a night out that will get put through times and times and times"

Kevin talks about the group dynamic within his sports club and describes how the nights activities, particularly funny moments, are documented for the purpose of using them in social media groups to create meaning and memories. Group members are instructed to do “embarrassing” things specifically so that the group can watch it happen, document it and reconstruct the event through social media “group chats”. Collective pronouns are used to construct these behaviours through the group's identity and group members are positioned as subject to the directives and surveillance of the group. Kevin's exploration of group surveillance suggests that individual identities are synonymous with the groups' identity through collective pronouns, and performances are subject to the whims of their collective identity. It is implied that the behaviours are done without contest and by constructing it as a social behaviour inherent to the group, they discourage the ability to challenge them.

Events described as “funny” are used for social bonding and they were generally comprised of what can be described as orchestrated humiliation, where memories are created through the objectification and humiliation of group members. This is how social bonds are solidified within the sports club and Kevin talked of how the documentation meant that they could relive the stories time and time again at the expense of their teammates. On a physical level, these stories have been permanently documented on the internet and it is interesting that while constructing themselves as subject to non-consensual surveillance, they used collective pronouns to negate this because it created a sense of neo-tribal belonging.

The prospect of engaging in behaviours for the entertainment of others is not a new prospect, but the concept that group members embarrass themselves without challenge for the sake of identity construction is interesting. Previous research has found that young men use group activities to construct their identity (Duffy & Chan, 2019) and seek to be the perfect lad (Jeffries, 2020), but the current study shows that young men will actively use self-humiliation to bolster their identities through embarrassing story telling. This is potentially because of the development of social media and group chats where these libraries of banter and memories can be permanently shared and used and potentially supports research finding that young men engaged in documentation on social media groups to cultivate their online personas (Duffy & Chan, 2019).

However, documentation of experience was used to reinforce their social bonds and feelings of belonging which suggests that this is more likely an extension of their masculine identities (Jeffries, 2020), reinforced by proof that they are engaging in laddish behaviours and banter. If Kevin does not engage in these behaviours, or does not do as he is told, he may be inadvertently subjected to the scrutiny of the group (Masquelier, 2013) and so it is implied that

this form of memory making is necessary to feel part of the group. This demonstrates that as previously discussed, social media provides a means to reinforce feelings of FOMO and vicarious experience for those who did not participate. As previously found, the recollections were used to laugh at the subject and research has found that gossip is often exaggerated for the reaction of the audience (Crawford et al., 2022), which would not only serve to further embarrass the subject but would reinforce the pressure to engage for those who are reluctant to participate. Group chats form libraries of embarrassment used to reignite social bonding by reconstructing stories in order to relive the experience, forming a social, virtual panopticon. This is a concept of imagined surveillance, where participants either act in ways they are directed to or engage in behaviours because they believe they are being watched (Waycott et al., 2017), providing continued surveillance and social control (Monahan, 2009). This is something that, as discussed below by Charlie, was not always received as positive and was met with conflict by some participants.

Charlie, Line 48-64: "I'm very against like all this "cctving" where it's like on a night out people are like recording what's happening

RESEARCHER: like documenting?

Charlie: yeah there's no need for that like if it happened it happened try to remember the night there's no need for a hard copy especially if it's just someone- like someone doesn't want to like remember the next day or something like that so I'm very against it

RESEARCHER: yeah? Do a lot of people do that then?

Charlie: erm... less people now because I've been very vocal about it like I'm generally like- I've slapped peoples phones a lot of them hand over their camera on nights out and I'm like

what are you doing like... just leave them be like there's some certain situations where it's like funny yeah like that will be a laugh but it's like if someone's getting with someone... they're talking to someone and you're recording them it's just like no

RESEARCHER: yeah so it doesn't seem like it's very fair without their consent?

Charlie: yeah! It's just... it's just when people are drunk yeah they're probably doing stuff they wouldn't sober but at the same time... yeah its funny- you can laugh about it but the next day... like it's like weeks and months ahead, you pulling out that video it's just... it's just not needed. And that's like... so... that the way I am, haha"

When talking about the use of Goss in the night out and how this amounts to unwanted attention, Charlie provides a different perspective of the use of social media as a method of surveillance within their group. Intoxicated activities were watched and physically documented, which Charlie calls "cctving", suggesting that this creates a hard copy that can be used to humiliate group members outside of the night out. The distinction Charlie makes is that watching and laughing at people during the night out is acceptable, but the behaviour becomes unacceptable when there is physical proof that can be stored permanently on social media. This is a distinct contrast to the concept of the memory bank, turning it into something more sinister. Charlie constructs a line of acceptability here, talking about how he is comfortable laughing at people in the moment specifically because they are constructed as drunk activities which make them acceptable, and laughing about them during their recollection is also acceptable, but physical proof is not. Subsequently, Charlie's understanding of the memory bank is constructed through discourses of consent and surveillance.

By constructing his understanding of surveillance through discourses of consent, he supersedes the expectations of banter, and this allows him to reject obligations of the group by positioning himself as a socially dominant protector of vulnerable group members. For example, ambiguous sexual activity was constructed as banter and subject to the groups jeering, but it was specifically sexual activity that Charlie declared as unacceptable to permanently document. This demonstrates conflict when constructing experiences as banter, because Charlie admits there are *“certain situations where it’s like funny,”* but has prevented people from documenting these stories when he deems it unacceptable and a violation of the line between banter and permanent humiliation, because *“they’re probably doing stuff they wouldn’t sober”*. It seems that he does this because if Charlie allows people to be documented against their will and does not publicly oppose these behaviours, it may leave him vulnerable to surveillance himself.

Charlie talks of the collective activity within discourses of tribalism with further complicates this negotiation of consent, which builds on previous research exploring collective humour in lad culture (Jeffries, 2020). This surveillance is explored through understandings of unwanted attention but is constructed through degrees of acceptability that it set by personal boundaries, as seen in research (Steer et al., 2020). Charlie uses this to position himself in a place of power by suggesting that he defines and enforces the line between acceptable surveillance, leaning on a caring masculinity that positions men as able to care for their intoxicated friends (Duncan et al., 2022). This allows him to dissent from the group under the guise of a soft masculinity but should be contextualised against recent research finding that performances of the “good guy” subject position were still used to enforce social dominance (Jordan et al., 2022).

Constructing banter through degrees of acceptability, based on the experiences only being performed within the nighttime economy, suggests that the environment itself makes

certain behaviours acceptable that would not generally be engaged in whilst sober. This suggests that whilst research has found that people engage in atypical behaviours to engage in group banter (Crawford et al., 2022), it may also be that the nighttime economy itself makes risky behaviours acceptable.

To conclude, the concept of CCTVing was to encapsulate the sense that creating a physical memory bank created for those that were being observed or saw the physical documentation of others. Group members took videos of their team mates engaging in “embarrassing” things they may not have done had they been sober. Collective pronouns were used to talk about the creation of the memory bank through group surveillance for those who did not contest it, whereas individual pronouns were used for those who were conflicted and did not see it as acceptable. Some group members orchestrated the embarrassing experiences through peer pressure through discourses of brotherhood and socialising so that the behaviours could not be contested. Discourses of banter were used to reinforce this, creating the sense that this was seen as a natural part of the group’s experiences on the night out.

However, some participants built on the conflict they felt by distinguishing the act of laughing in the moment, which was seen as acceptable, and having physical proof of the event that could be used as social currency after the night out, which was not seen as acceptable for some participants. Although the memory bank was important to their identity as one of the boys, some of the talk explored ideals of consent and the construction of intoxicated behaviours as ones that could be mocked within their group, but only during the night out. This complicates their understandings of consent, particularly when the observed behaviours were of a sexual nature. This exemplifies the conflict that came with attaching intoxication and sex to a masculine identity in that only some of the men talked of unwanted attention as unacceptable, whereas

others talked about it as an inherent part of their identity as one of the boys within the nighttime economy.

Chapter 8: Lines of Consent in pursuit of a way to talk about Unwanted Sexual Attention

In aiming to understand how young heterosexual men constructed their experiences, they were asked to first define unwanted attention, something that has been a documented phenomenon in the night time economy, then to talk about how they thought authorities felt about unwanted sexual attention in their town, something that is also well documented. Heterosexual men are often constructed as the typical perpetrators of unwanted attention on nights out, so it was important to understand how they constructed these experiences. What was found, however, was that some of the young men talked about how they engaged in unwanted attention, but many talked of how they had experienced it themselves.

The men typically struggled to construct these experiences because they did not have the language to talk about it from their own perspectives. Discourses of hegemonic masculinity predominantly drove their understandings which developed into themes that some men struggled to define consent, some understood it through concepts of boundaries and control labelled the “Line” and some talked again of how intoxication was used within the night time economy to understand their experiences and enable certain behaviours.

It is what it is; The struggle to define consent

Participants were asked to define unwanted attention and many of the men initially struggled to construct and define the concept at all. There was talk of boundaries and comfort, or how the concept was not possible to them because it depended on choices someone made in the night out. Although some of the men did talk about it and gave answers to the request for a

definition, they predominantly talked about what they thought it could be within a large scope of possibility. This suggests that they could not define it because they did not have the language to be able to construct it from their perspectives as heterosexual men, rather they listed possibilities because it is something that just exists.

Ryan, Line 130-137: "Unwanted attention. It's hard to define it because it's exactly what it says it is. Erm... I don't know. When someone's coming up to you. Talking to you. Perhaps being a_bit too forward. Uh outsi- and putting you outside of your comfort zone. Something you've not asked for. Erm... maybe you've already erm, said that you're not interested or don't want attention and they're persistent. Erm... yeah. Erm... yeah its attention you_don't want haha. Erm... yeah when someone's talking to you or it could be messaging_you or I don't know. It's quite a big scope. Erm... interacting with you and your life in_ways that you'd prefer them not to."

Ryan was asked to define unwanted attention and talked about it using discourses of hegemonic masculinity and boundaries that allow him to explain it in a way he understands, and in doing so he covertly talks about rationalising consent. Ryan tries to find the words to explain the concept but demonstrates that he cannot construct a cohesive definition, instead listing a degree of possibilities that is "quite a big scope". This leaves ambiguity in not only the definition, but how it is negotiated in the nighttime economy. Ryan constructs it as obvious after saying he does not know what it is, but "it is what it is". Ryan alludes to a hierarchy of acceptability by suggesting that it is the responsibility of the person to set and enforce their boundaries. This implies that it is acceptable to engage in these behaviours, but this understanding is driven by conflict, with Ryan repeatedly saying, "I don't know" and seemingly doubting his own knowledge.

By describing unwanted attention as “*interacting with you and your life in ways that you’d prefer them not to*” he minimizes the experiences and suggests that they are just being “persistent” and “interacting”, with persistent minimising the experience by suggesting it is a mutual interaction. Through constructing unwanted attention as an annoyance that he does not reject, Ryan positions himself as indirectly consenting which allows him to feel in control. However, it appears that Ryan does not have the language to confidently construct consent and so positions himself in control of the situation, demonstrating the difficulty he faces in negotiating and rejecting sexual advances.

Ryan’s suggestions of what unwanted attention could be, demonstrates how it is situated within understandings of personal boundaries, supporting previous research on consent (Lazard, 2009). More recent research has found that men, and society, do not have the sexual scripts to be able to understand heterosexual men’s refusals of sexual activity and this is why they often make excuses or feel forced to give reason for their rejection (Meenagh, 2021), as Ryan does above. By constructing consent within the discourses of hegemonic masculinity and boundaries, Ryan relies on traditional scripts suggesting that the absence of a refusal can be seen as providing consent (Wignall et al., 2022). This is situated within his masculinity, representing masculine discourses that position men as always sexually willing and so unable to withhold consent (Lazard, 2009). This is possibly because the presumed attention is from a woman without explicitly stating so, as was found in more recent research (Gunnarsson, 2018). This reinforces traditional gender roles by suggesting that sexual initiation is a violation of a boundary, with women “*being a bit too forward*”, constructed as uncomfortable, likely because men have been found to be more likely to believe that men should be more sexually dominant than women (Rosenthal et al., 2012).

Similarly to previous research exploring women's conceptions of unwanted sexual attention, it is the persistence of the behavior for Ryan that makes the behaviours unwanted (Gunby et al., 2020). However, this subjects him to unwanted behaviours that he cannot rationalise, likely because women are typically placed in positions of control over deploying consent in heterosexual interactions (Beres, 2007). Research on consent has often failed to explicitly define consent (Beres, 2007) and it is clearly not explicitly defined by the young heterosexual men in this study. The inability to situate consent in a place they understand is further explored by David who talks about how he cannot see unwanted sexual attention or contextualise it as possible, because it is something prevalent in the nighttime economy that people are responsible for allowing to happen to them.

David, Line 226-233: "I can't see how... like... anyone would get unwanted sexual attention because like at any point when you're... like if you're gonna go like if you're gonna go home with someone... someone like erm you don't know that well or like you're speaking to... like I think you're putting yourself in the situation there where... you're gonna get some sort of attention and if you don't want that sort of attention then you shouldn't have really gone with them- gone there especially if you're both drunk as well because I think there's ways... there is ways around it but yeah"

When asked how comfortable he would feel reporting unwanted sexual attention in the nighttime economy, David talks about instances of people going home with each other intoxicated through social discourses of responsibility and blame. He suggests that if you do not want attention, then you should not have "gone with them", implying that a person is responsible for unwanted sexual attention if they imply consent by going home with someone. Constructing unwanted sexual attention in this way means that David is talking from a subject position that

does not have access to this understanding, which is exemplified when he talks about how he cannot “see” how someone could get unwanted attention, as if it were an impossible concept. This renders unwanted sexual attention as something he cannot become the victim of. By suggesting that choosing to “*go home with someone*”, a euphemism for sexual activity, whilst drunk makes a person culpable for whatever follows “*especially if you’re both drunk as well*” he positions it as a choice, subconsciously victim blaming intoxicated people who experience unwanted sexual attention.

David rationalises that concept of unwanted sexual attention through understandings of concept to position himself in control, because if unwanted sexual attention is a choice, it is one that he can choose to prevent. David’s talk suggests that he does not believe unwanted sexual attention exists, which could be a means of preventing himself from being victimised and is reflective of the individualistic culture at a British University. This could be hypothetical, but the use of the hypothetical “you” suggests it is directed at someone or internalised constructions that legitimise what could have been ambiguous sexual experiences where consent was not explicitly given. Although it is spoken of as hypothetical, David talks about specific instances that would render unwanted sexual attention as impossible, which demonstrates that David does not have the language or discourses to construct and understand unwanted sexual attention himself, instead conceptualising it through hypothetical scenarios, which is reminiscent of Ryan’s list of possibilities.

David believes there are ways around unwanted sexual attention) and by constructing it as avoidable David relies on understandings of implied consent, which solidifies his position as someone unable to be assaulted, something that has also been found in recent research on unwanted sexual attention (Gunnarsson, 2018). It also supports very recent research finding that

the act of “going home with someone” has been viewed as a nonverbal cue for giving consent to sexual activity in a population of British students (Wignall et al., 2022). David uses tacit knowledge of the environment to understand consent, relying on the hypersexual venues of the nighttime economy to make judgements on consent (Marcantino et al., 2022). This may link to the intoxication parity that has recently been found in further research, as shown by David’s suggestion that consent is implied if both parties are drunk (Hunt et al., 2022). This contradicts research finding that heterosexual men constructed consent as impossible to give if one or more parties were intoxicated (Marg, 2020) but supports research finding that men were more likely to blame alcohol on their loss of control in order to rationalise their victimisation through a masculine lens (Javaid, 2015). It is possible that David may be relying on masculine discourses to construct his inability to be victimised. These discourses of consent are used to construct consent and sexual attention not as something wanted or unwanted, but as something that is controlled in a hypersexual gendered environment associated with sexual activity (Gunby et al., 2020) and subsequently not possible for this man.

In summary, some of the young men’s talk explored how they understood unwanted attention within the nighttime economy and they verbalized their own lack of understanding of the concept, with some men overtly saying they did not know what it was. Some men talked about how they could not “see how it could happen” and doubted their own knowledge. They relied on discourses of hegemonic masculinity to understand their positions as one of the boys, which in turn impacted on their ability to construct unwanted attention. their masculine identities acted as a buffer to acknowledging that men could experience unwanted attention of a sexual nature and so men’s refusals of sex were not seen or heard, particularly as sex was constructed as important to their own masculine identities. They spoke of unwanted attention as a large scope of

possibility, or simply said “it is what it is”, as though they should know what it means despite their inability to definitively define it. Many of the young men talked about what unwanted attention could be because they did not have the language to be able to define it as something they could experience because of their identity as one of the boys.

Drawing the Line

Upon further discussion of unwanted attention and consent, the men explored the concept of “the line”, which was an individually set concept of consent that they generated when attempting to define unwanted attention. This “line” was the boundary for which behaviour became unacceptable to the recipient but was set by themselves based on their feelings and personal perceptions. The line was dependent on predefined relationships and the environment within which the incident occurred, demonstrating that not only did the young men construct unwanted attention in relation to their masculine identities, but that the environment also influenced their understandings of consent.

Ryan, Line 292-296: “Like a girl putting their hands down my trousers. Like that would- I think that’s too far. Where are someone grabbing my arse or something I’d probably would be like okay that’s a bit weird, like I don’t know you. And probably just get on with my evening. The fact- of- I think there’s a line. And people set their own lines.”

In further discussions of unwanted sexual attention, Ryan talks about it through discourses of consent, suggesting that it is the imposition of boundaries that defines what constitutes unwanted sexual attention, thus placing responsibility on to the subjected individual, rather than the aggressor. This approach is constructed through neoliberal ideals of individuality,

portrayed as independence. Ryan talks about unwanted sexual attention in terms of a “Line”, which is drawn depending on a combination of the action and the familiarity of the person. Ryan compares types of unwanted sexual attention, such as “grabbing an arse” versus “putting their hands down my trousers”, as too far or a bit weird respectively. This suggests that there is a line between uncomfortable behaviour and abnormal behaviour, and that they are not the same thing. Both behaviours could be constituted as unacceptable, but here they are defined by Ryan’s perception of his own boundaries of acceptability, something he calls the “Line”. He explicitly states that “people set their own lines”, which leaves ambiguity in terms of what is acceptable and what is not.

Ryan talks about consent as the setting and enforcement of personal boundaries by suggesting he just “gets on with his night” if a behaviour is abnormal, but he defines it as acceptable because it has not crossed the Line. This is also further differentiated by the degree of familiarity of the person engaging in the behaviour, because whilst grabbing an arse is not considered “too far” it is described as weird because the person is a stranger, suggesting it may be acceptable behaviour from a friend. Talking about consent in this way has two outcomes, in that Ryan both positions women who are sexually agentic as unnatural and he also maintains control over the situation by implying that he allows certain behaviours to happen, subsequently making them acceptable behaviours to engage in. Ryan’s talk of consent is aimed at making him feel in control through the concept of the “Line” which is individually set, but minimises the behaviours and likely prevents him from adopting the subjectivity of someone who has been subject to unwanted attention, reinforcing traditional gender roles that position sexually aggressive women as unfeminine and men as dominant.

This demonstrates a novel negotiation of consent for young heterosexual men, in that it contravenes the male sexual drive discourse, which dictates that only women are in a position to deploy consent due to a heterosexual men's innate need for sex (Beres, 2007), in a way that reconstitutes hegemonic dominance in a situation where they refuse sexual attention (Rosenthal et al., 2012). Policing the boundaries of consent is typically the role of a woman in heterosexual engagements (Meenagh, 2021) and so whilst Ryan's use of boundaries to construct his refusal of unwanted sexual attention contravenes traditional gender roles, it allows him to operate within a position of power and thus prevent the possibility of him being labelled as a victim, making him both the subject and the agent of power within this context (Javaid, 2015).

Talking about consent this way protects his masculinity by constructing it through understandings of giving permission for the act (Bednarchik et al., 2021), through the absence of rejection (Wignall et al., 2022), which supports recent research. This also extends to the way he talks about the women, because Ryan labels the girls as "*weird*" because they don't know him, suggesting that not only are lines based on familiarity but that women who are sexually aggressive are positioned as abnormal. This diverts the attention away from the contravention of masculine norms that Ryan experiences whilst being dominated by a woman (Gunnarsson, 2018), to a sexual double standard that identifies sexually agentic women as deviant (Coy et al., 2016) and reinforces gender roles (Hirsch et al., 2019).

And so, the way in which traditional gendered discourses reproduce themselves within the talk of young heterosexual men is, as previously found, insidious (Meenagh, 2021) and is contextualised with his conceptualisation of personal responsibility. Henry talks further about this and how his experiences were laughed about despite his assertion that it crossed the boundaries of acceptability, until it was confirmed by a female friend in retrospective discussions

that it had, in fact, been unacceptable to them. This further demonstrates that his experienced were constructed within the context of his group identity until his feelings were validated by a woman outside of that context. This demonstrates how the group in the context of the night time economy reinforces hegemonic masculinity to the point that the woman was not able to challenge this in the moment either.

Henry, Line 60-75: "Erm... but this girl, who, like, had been- nothing like- nothing was going on between us. Just chatting. And she was trying to get off with another club boy. But as soon as he pried her off and went home, she came over to me and... as I was sitting down basically like started groping me in the SPORTS club area. Erm... and like- there was like 10/15 people around like watching this. Err... I was kinda just like, a bit shocked by it. Kinda just laughing it off though cus I didn't want to make a massive deal of it. Cus I was like- I knew she was drinking. Erm... but at the same time, I knew like, this is not right what's happening. She went over then and did the same to another boy. Not to the extent though in fairness. Erm... so I went- I walked home. And I walked home with a different female sports girl. And like she even agreed with me that like her friend had totally crossed the line. And like... if it was me... who had done that to her... and if she was sober... erm... it wouldn't have been... it wouldn't have ended the same way. It wouldn't have been, like, looked at. If we got to it in the morning, say, and we both like, thinking about it- cus I never even got like, an apology of her or anything for it. And there was just like... if I did that, I'd have the police knocking on my door. Erm... but that was probably the most extreme situation I had like in... the 4 years. Erm... Don't think she meant anything bad by it. Cus- you're... cus it's easy for me to say that but if that was me in the other- on the other hand. I'd be in a lot of trouble."

Henry's talk further explores the concept of the Line and how this is used to construct his understanding of unwanted sexual attention and consent, as well as how understandings of tribalism and lad culture fed into his construction of the night's events. He talks about a night out that he went on as part of his sports club's social, and how they had a designated area in the club for his group. As they were sat in a group, a girl from a specific sports team entered the group and whilst intoxicated, groped Henry before groping another of his teammates in front of the group because she had been rejected by a different teammate. Henry talks about how he knew it was "not right", but Henry "laughed it off" because she was intoxicated, and he was in his group.

Henry then talks about how on the way home with one of the girls' teammates, they retrospectively discussed it as "crossing the line", but in the moment of the interview, Henry talks about how she likely did not mean "anything bad" but had it been reversed, it would have different consequences for him. Henry's talk suggests that in the moment, this unwanted sexual attention is constructed as acceptable and "laughed off" because it occurs in front of his group of male friends, giving the impression that he laughs with his friends to avoid becoming the subject of unwanted banter. Henry talks about consent in a conflicted way, balancing his position as one of the boys and his emerging understanding of what he decides is acceptable.

Henry's talk suggests that this is potentially the first time he has experienced unwanted sexual attention of this degree and because he does not have language to draw upon to understand his experiences, he has to construct them in the moment, afterwards with a female friend, and again in the process of the interview. He talks about the experience retrospectively and seems to use his female friend's confirmation that the behaviour was unacceptable to understand and construct his own idea of the line, which was not possible during the moment. This suggests he does not want to publicly display that she has overpowered him or that he did

not enjoy the experience, likely due to internalised masculine expectations and a male sexual drive discourse perpetuated by his social group. Only being able to “laugh” as a reaction in the moment may reinforce perceptions that experiences of unwanted sexual attention for men are simply banter and suggests that Henry understands his position as an aggressor, but because he could not understand his position as the recipient of sexual aggression, he reverts to a response that he understands.

Gendered discourse is used to understand the concept of the line and the ramifications of traversing it in a three-step process, used to maintain control of the situation. Henry understands his position as a perpetrator, so the steps following his sexual aggression would be for it to be reported then police would become involved. However, in this scenario, the girl is sexually aggressive, so they are laughed at before being expected to apologise for inappropriate behaviour. Henry does this to rationalise the experience and minimise the agency of the girl involved, which is exemplified by his insistence that she must not have meant anything by it, and she was intoxicated at the time. The insistence for excuses of why the girl has engaged in this behaviour seems to be used to reassert his control over the situation, because although he has retrospectively set a line that has been crossed, he finds reasons for why the girl is not in control of her actions and how her position as an intoxicated woman justifies his lack of response and why he did not enforce his lack of consent in the moment. It suggests that he does not perceive unwanted sexual attention to be equal between the genders and that one is automatically worse than the other because of gender roles, something he reports another “girl” understood as well. These are drastically different perceptions of the results to this event and suggests that the perceptions of unwanted sexual attention as different degrees of severity for these two genders

may be an internalised perception for this person as a result of the events he has experienced above.

Research has found that heterosexual men are the most common perpetrators of sexual aggression at British universities (Hales & Gannon, 2022) and so it seems that understandings of unwanted sexual attention are constructed with this in mind for heterosexual men as well.

Henry's talk shows that his conceptualisations of consent rely on understandings of gender roles and boundaries, but this still had to be confirmed by a female bystander after the event. Henry understands consent through his conceptualisation of the line and confirmation that it was crossed, but whilst he initially thought of it as "not right", it was a woman in the aftermath who agreed it had crossed the line, suggesting that whilst he recognises the behaviours as negative, he was not able to fully construct the line without confirmation from a woman. His understandings are conceptualised through a comparison to the outcomes for male perpetrators, which suggests that although he talks about consent through an understanding of boundaries of acceptability, he does not have the language to be able to construct unwanted sexual attention.

By using the concept of the line to understand the experience, Henry conceptualises why the behaviour is unacceptable, because although consent was framed through his absence of refusal in the moment (Wignall et al., 2022), he must rely on the subject positioning of a woman and the female discourses of victimhood (Lazard, 2009) to conceptualise why his absence of refusal was not, in fact, consent at that time. Henry talks about not publicly rejecting her because he did not want to make a "massive deal" about it, supporting research finding that some men fear publicly rejecting women's advances and the potential ramifications of this (Gunnarsson, 2018). He also uses alcohol to rationalise the experience through a masculine lens (Javaid, 2015) by suggesting the girl was only able to do this because of her intoxication, which reproduces

gendered assumptions of sexualised behaviour (Lazard, 2009). This supports research finding that men conceptualise victimisation differently (Javaid, 2015) and the fact that it is laughed at in the moment reinforces research finding that unwanted sexual attention is often constructed as banter by groups of heterosexual lads (Jordan et al., 2022).

By constructing consent through conceptualisations of the line, Henry can move the definition of what is acceptable to prevent him from being labelled as a victim or subject to the laughter of his group. This suggests that social dominance affects his recognition of the events as found in recent research (Rollero et al., 2019), and reinforces traditional gendered discourses that position women who engage in inappropriate behaviour as othered within a gender hierarchy (Rosenthal et al., 2012), without positioning the man as less masculine and solidifying their heterosexist positionings (Lazard, 2009). This reinforces internalised masculine scripts that require heterosexual prowess (Coy et al., 2016) and the use of banter to construct unwanted sexual attention in groups of men (Jordan et al., 2022).

However, the concept of the line also supports research finding that men experience internalised victim blaming that prevent them from being able to conceptualise their experiences as victimising (Javaid, 2015), as evidenced by Henry's construction of the experience as minimised and simply a violation of a personal boundary he did not know he had until it was validated by a woman. This demonstrates that whilst society has identified the sexual double standard of sexual activity ostracizing women for being sexually agentic (Coy et al., 2016), the other side of this patriarchal coin ostracizes men for being victims (Meenagh, 2021), freezing both into patriarchal subject positions and gendered sexual scripts that are enhanced by intoxication (Hunt et al., 2022) and constructed through postfeminist, neoliberal ideals of sexual experience.

The concept of “drawing the line” was used to contextualise unwanted attention within masculine understandings of consent through the idea of boundaries and their responsibility as a man to make sure they are not dominated. Discourses of hegemonic masculinity resulted in a conceptualization of unwanted attention as behaviours that cross a line, or a boundary of acceptability, that is set and enforced individually. This was positioned in relation to people, particularly women, who were constructed as “going too far” and subsequently unnatural for being sexually aggressive towards heterosexual men. This was laughed at and mocked when conducted by a woman as had been previously discussed, relying on internalized masculinity and discourses of the male sexual drive to ensure they remained positioned in control of sexual encounters.

Intoxication and gender were used to reconstruct the line in ways that ensured the men remained in the position of power and consent was constructed as given through the absence of refusal because the men could not publicly reject a sexual encounter with a woman. This resulted in complex negotiations of their understandings because they were forced to shift footings in their talk from constructing women as unnatural for their sexual aggression whilst also resisting acknowledging their sexual agency to prevent themselves from being labelled as dominated or mocked within their groups. So, intoxication was used to mediate this in ways that did not impact on their masculine identities and maintained their positions of power by constructing unwanted attention as acceptable within their self-imposed Lines of acceptability and public absence of refusal for sexual encounters. This is likely because sexual prowess has been constructed as important to building masculine identities and being one of the boys, through sexual achievement or its use within the construction of banter and collective experience.

Understanding consent through intoxicated masculinity

Not only is alcohol constructed as expected and a necessary cure for stress, but the discourses of consent that facilitate these understandings are also used to construct alcohol as a defence against consent. Alcohol and intoxication were used to construct perpetrators of unwanted sexual attention as not in control of their actions due to their alcohol consumption, and so positioned them as without responsibility for their actions. This was not only used by those who perpetrated, but also by authority figures in the nighttime economy to justify their actions.

Ryan, Line 187-194: "Well I know- erm... I... err... I knew a few uh gay guys. One... in partic- when they're drunk- thinks it's okay to like to grab my dick. Hahaha to put it bluntly hahaha. Erm... and... this is uh where I- uh- I didn't say it's not okay... erm... however I think... one night I was drunk enough where I- like- I did it back to him. Not in any- not like in any- I did it like it's not fun is it. Erm... more like punched him in the ball- in the balls rather than grabbed him. But erm I remember one time he did it and I turned round and be like if I- if you- if I did that to somebody else... like id- I would be out of here like so quickly and I supp- he was just like oh! I'm drunk! I'm drunk!"

Ryan talks about an experience of unwanted sexual attention where a homosexual man used alcohol as an opportunity to be sexual with Ryan, and how alcohol is used as a tool not just to facilitate the man's sexual aggression, but to give Ryan the courage to engage in violence as a response. Ryan talks about consent here, and how it is navigated through discourses of gender and intoxication, which makes the behaviours acceptable components of the night out in the moment. He talks about how he has physically retaliated to the behaviour and has vocalised how if the man engaged in this behaviour with someone else he would "be out of here". This suggests

that Ryan relies on understandings of the line to construct the experience, suggesting that his lack of response allows the behaviour to a certain point because of his personal boundaries, which positions him in control.

Ryan talks about how he did not verbalise it wasn't okay at the time, instead resorting to physical retaliation, but retrospectively suggests the behaviour is unacceptable. His talk gives the sense that he defines the behaviour as unacceptable because it jeopardizes his sexuality and may assert to others that he is not heterosexual if he does not respond violently, rather than the behaviour itself being unacceptable. Ryan appears concerned that this may present him as homosexual through a misunderstanding of his intention when he says, "*Not in any-not like in any- I did it like it's not fun is it*" and clarifying that he punched the man rather than "grabbing" him.

A misrepresentation of his response may compromise his hegemonic, masculine identity so he highlights the use of physical violence to assert his dominance of the other man, assuring that it is presented as violent rather than sexual. Ryan explores how intoxication is used by others to excuse their behaviour but also how he uses it to engage in performances of his masculinity and so the use of alcohol within this discourse makes it acceptable to impose on other people's bodies against their will and diminishes responsibility for both sexual aggression and physical violence. This is something that Ryan believes all parties are aware they can use, as it appears that it is common knowledge in this sphere that intoxication can be used to negotiate and negate consent by implying that being drunk both removes responsibility for an act and makes them acceptable. This alludes to the fact that Ryan constructs his response as a choice and by constructing himself as in control, he minimises the experience to not feel as though he has been victimised, nor positioned as a victim. It is also interesting that Ryan laughs as he describes the

entire experience, because this suggests that as with others, he is relying on understandings of banter to construct the experience.

Ryan constructs the experience in a way that others the homosexual man in order to save face without losing his dominance in the situation, which supports key theories of hegemonic masculinity that create hierarchies of masculinity, and subsequently acceptability (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), through a sense of intoxicated masculinity. More recent research has also found that some men used discourses of masculinity to justify violence as a means of reasserting power (Meenagh, 2021), but Ryan still hinted at excusing the man's behaviour because of his intoxication, which support research finding that heavy intoxication is often used to mitigate responsibility in the nighttime economy (Marg, 2020). This is also compounded by the male environment, which relies on unwanted sexual attention as a medium of banter (Jordan et al., 2022), something which is seen in Ryan's talk of the subject, as he laughs while describing it. This is likely because this is an environment where consent is impeded by intoxication (Marcantano et al., 2022) and often assumed in sexual settings (Wignall et al., 2022), such as nightclubs (Gunby et al., 2020).

Ryan relies on masculine understandings of responses to a violation of his boundaries, through his talk of physical retribution to reassert dominance (Javaid, 2018), but also to understand how intoxication affects performances of gender. Intoxication is used here to minimise the seriousness of incidents and prevent him being labelled as homosexual or a victim which has also been found in research on lad culture (Gunnarsson, 2018). Intoxication is also positioned as an avenue to perform gender and sexuality, and so both violence and unwanted sexual attention become acceptable until he decides that this violates his personal line, making it an individualistic boundary rather than a moral or legal law (Berez, 2007).

Research has found that intoxication is typically used as both a defence in court and a tool to discredit victims (Javaid, 2015), so it is interesting that he perceives intoxication as a reasonable facilitator of violence while recognising that it is being used against him. This suggests that in this case especially, people may not only be consciously negotiating degrees of acceptability in intoxication in sexual encounters (Hunt et al., 2022), but may also be actively aware of their ability to use alcohol as a constructive tool to evade accountability in the nighttime economy. This was explored further by Brian, who talks about how he tried to address his experiences during the night out with a position of authority, a bouncer, and both intoxication and sexuality were used to justify unwanted sexual attention, and Brian's experiences were subsequently minimised.

Brian, Line 205-210: "And I went to- and I went to a lady bouncer eventually and this is where... it sort of started... this is where it really started to pee me off. Cus... it- it- again it's just like that societal view of... of how women... of how women treat men like that and it not being an issue like. I went up to her and I told her about it... and said like you know she needs to be kicked out. Like, look what she was doing. And... she went over to speak to her. And she ca- and it- it was a lady bouncer. And she came back and was like... aw she's a- aw she's a lesbian. Like... no she's- you know she's really drunk."

By constructing unwanted sexual attention through the discourses of hegemonic masculinity and consent, Brian demonstrates the complexities of identifying and reporting unwanted sexual attention for himself and others to positions of authority within the nighttime economy. Brian talks of unwanted sexual attention through ideals of consent that rely on an intoxication parity to understand the responsibility that is attributed in the situation. Intoxication

is used to construct his understanding of consent and situate it in a subjectivity that he understands.

Brian talks about how he approached a “lady bouncer” for support when he experienced unwanted attention through what he calls the “societal view” of how woman treat men. He relies of discourses of hegemonic masculinity to understand the process, believing that retribution is necessary, but the intoxication parity outweighs this because he constructs the authority figure as believing that intoxication meant the woman was not responsible for her behaviour. He talks about woman as not sexually agentic because they are unable to dominate sexually because of their gender, intoxication and assumed sexuality, whilst also relying on his understanding of masculine responses to a violation of his boundaries.

Brian talks about unwanted sexual attention and consent through gendered discourses of hegemonic masculinity because he uses the position of the bouncer as a woman to reinforce that she should understand that unwanted sexual attention is unacceptable specifically because she is a woman. Although this talk is aimed at constructing an understanding of unwanted sexual attention it also reinforces traditional masculine discourses that position the bouncer as not conforming to the norms he expects and also positions women as the inherent victims of unwanted sexual attention. Here, Brian uses this to assert the appropriate outcome for the woman to be removed from the venue, because that is the outcome that he would have as a man. This demonstrates that while talking about consent and unwanted sexual attention in ways that they can understand, they reinforce misogynistic views about women. This is all contextualised through wider societal structures of gender roles, which seem to be situated within postfeminist discourses of gender through his talk of how women do not have the same consequences for behaviours because of how society views them.

Brian's talk of the "societal view" of how women treat men gives the impression that he is talking about the issue from a subjectivity that feels victimised by postfeminist understandings of unwanted sexual attention. This is supported by traditional gendered scripts that position women as non-threatening (Beres, 2007) and discourses that construct men as sexual aggressors and women as victims (Gunnarsson, 2018). The woman in the situation is constructed as unable to dominate sexually because of her subject positions and intoxication is used to position the women as passive and unable to control her actions. This supports recent research exploring intoxication parities and how intoxicated persons are positioned as not in control of their intoxicated actions, and so are not responsible for their behaviour (Marg, 2020).

Talking about unwanted sexual attention and consent in this way also reinforces discourses of hegemonic masculinity that position men as dominant over women (Rosenthal et al., 2012). This is all contextualised within current societal understandings of unwanted sexual attention that relies on traditional gendered discourses to construct the phenomenon. Knowing that many young men, especially heterosexual men, are positioned as the most common perpetrators of unwanted sexual attention in UK universities and so are reticent to acknowledge victimisation from a woman let alone report it, the use of intoxication as a defence against consent will likely make him feel unable to report in future and has served to reinforce masculine rape myths that women are the only "true victims" (Lazard, 2009).

In summary the men were generally in pursuit of a way of talking about consent so relied on their understandings of intoxicated masculinity and a personal sense of boundaries to understand unwanted sexual attention and their position as one of the boys. For example, unwanted attention from a homosexual man was deemed unacceptable and met with violent retribution but unwanted attention from a woman was met with disapproval and verbal rebuttal

rather than violence. This was because it was acceptable to demonstrate hegemonic masculinity through physical aggression and the denigration of public displays of homosexuality, but because women were not constructed as agentic in an effort to remain socially dominant, it was only acceptable to signify disapproval at their perceived sexual agency. This was also modified through intoxication which was described as either being overtly used to evade accountability or covertly used to reinforce gender roles. These constructions were used to maintain their social dominance and positions of power by reinforcing gender roles through the attribution, or lack thereof, of responsibility to those who are intoxicated. This was referred to generally as the “societal view” of gender roles in relation to unwanted sexual attention, with the men’s talk giving the sense that the implications for these unacceptable behaviours were different based on gender.

Women were still constructed as unable to dominate sexually due to the conflict their experiences had with their internalized feelings of masculinity and the hegemonic masculinity they had used to understand their experiences in the nighttime economy. This was also talked about as being reinforced by positions of authority in the town, such as bouncers, who also did not consider the behaviours of women to be unacceptable because of their positions in society. Whilst this served to reinforce notions of patriarchy and male dominance over women, their positions as one of the boys closed down opportunity to acknowledge their experiences without being seen to have jeopardised their masculine identities. This had implications for their responses and opportunities for action, as was seen in the difference in response dependent on the gender of the sexual aggressor.

Chapter 9: A Summary of the Key Findings

This study aimed to explore how young, heterosexual, male students use discourses to understand and negotiate their experiences in the nighttime economy. It aimed to explore the discourses used within higher education and the nighttime economy to make sense of these experiences, using Willig's approach to Foucauldian discourse analysis. The research question of how heterosexual male students construct their experiences of the night-time economy arose from discussions of the precarious nature of language in research on masculinity and how this influences their understandings of lad culture and intoxication as heterosexual male students.

The data showed an incredibly complex and interlinked negotiation of masculine identities through experiences of being one of the boys which was driven by the need to make memories and had implications for their understandings of intoxication and consent. There were complex and conflicted attempts to construct unwanted sexual attention and consent in groups and positions in society that do not provide them with subject positions with which to speak from, nor discourses with which to construct them. Many of the young men struggled to identify unwanted sexual attention for what it was and when they did, their understandings sometimes conflicted with dominant discourses positioning women as the victim, but not men.

The understandings of lad behaviour, or "being one of the boys" and the construction of the roles they played, specifically the subjectivities of the "Pure Lad" and the "Good Mate", provided important understandings for their sense making practices and how they feed into group behaviour and constructions of unwanted sexual attention. Conceptualisations of banter were distinguished by the subjectivities they assigned to each other, with the Pure Lad engaging in

gentlemanly behaviour as a younger member, and the Good Mate engaging in potentially embarrassing, ambiguous sexual encounters as an older member of the group. Both subjectivities were necessary roles to fill within the group in order to uphold its hierarchy, because the Pure Lad offered a “light” alternative to the Good Mate, who engaged in typical hegemonic masculinity designed to degrade the women involved in the talk. As the group members progress in age and university year, the Pure Lad is coached and will eventually become the Good Mate, to give all members opportunity to engage in traditional, misogynistic behaviours that are excused because they are balanced by their “gentlemanly” group members.

Gauging understandings of lad culture through sense making practices in self-proclaimed lads provides an avenue with which to provide space for non-judgemental discussion (Owen, 2020), as the current research has done. The conceptualisation of the “Pure Lad” provides an interesting avenue of exploration because it is a subjectivity representing chivalrous behaviour and potentially predicated on the “good guy” masculinity (Jordan et al., 2022), but differs from previous research in that although seen as “pure” it was not “good” and needed coaching from a “wing man” who would coach them in to the “Good Mate” position, which exemplified misogynistic, laddish behaviours.

This was situated within the discourses of brotherhood that they used to reinforce group behaviours and social hierarchies. These social hierarchies provided important scaffolding for how the young men made sense of not only their behaviour, but unwanted attention as well. Research has found that sports affiliation and intoxication are both constructed as synonymous with lad culture (Kivel & Johnson, 2009) which is supported by the theme found in this study. Understandings of tribal group behaviours and the need to belong drove the motivations of participation in the nighttime economy for these young men and gave a succinct exploration of

Green's concept of neotribalism that combined the need for collective belonging with neoliberal ideals of individualism (Green, 2021). This satisfied the need for collective belonging whilst reinforcing conceptualisations of lad culture and unwanted sexual attention within individual responsibilities, which made participation mandatory but the consequences of such the fault of the individual. This is built through the co-creation of experience as supported by research on British youths participating in clubbing culture (Goulding & Shankar, 2011). The convergence of the need for collective experience and clubbing culture gave way to the use of intoxication as a tool, which furthers research on alcohol as a medicinal way of coping through the documentation of young men talking about intoxication and sex for validation and escape. This provides important understanding for how intoxication is used and negotiated by young heterosexual male students, and how this explicitly fed into understandings of unwanted sexual attention.

The concept of intoxication just for the sake of it, to our knowledge, has not been overtly captured in this way in research, and this is an important step to understanding the culture of drinking for British students. Comparatively, the use of intoxication for self-medication has been documented in research (Mobach & Macaskill, 2011) and the current study supports further research finding that young men also used humour to cope (Daruk et al., 2015). The current study exemplifies the use of banter and intoxication to not only escape from daily stressors, but also to understand and negotiate uncomfortable experiences, such as unwanted attention, through the scope of lad culture and banter.

The participants' talk gave the sense that alcohol was a functional tool to control their experiences with, to modify their intoxication and attempt to engage in sexual experiences for self-validation and group prowess. Participants were often reluctant to identify intoxication as a tool, but they talked about how it was used to escape, to facilitate sexual encounters and to

enhance their night out. Whether this is simply a form of escapism (Nealis & Mackinnon, 2018), seen as an affordable means of relaxation (Cornilov et al., 2019) or whether it is seen as necessary for social self enhancement (Bresin & Mekawi, 2021), it is important to understand this phenomenon. This is especially prudent given that the findings support a metanalyses of drinking motivations that documented how coping mechanisms are the strongest predictors for drinking problems (Bresin & Mekawi, 2021).

The participants talked about their motivations for participating in the nighttime economy and this was driven through their need for belonging and sense of brotherhood. There was complexity of the young men's construction of their place within the nighttime economy, and the conflict that emerged when they discussed their motivations for drinking and their need to create a memory bank of their experiences as students. This provided important understanding of their difficulties navigating intoxication and how it was used by different subject positions within the nighttime economy to construct themes of making meaning. Many participants talked about how they participated in the nighttime economy because they feared missing out on important collective experiences that they would see posted on social media or talked about within their social groups.

Participants were more concerned about missing out on events that they would willingly subject their bodies to physical abuse through excessive intoxication or violence from others. This supports previous research finding that online social groups played an integral part in why the young men felt so much pressure to engage in tribal drinking behaviours (Przybylski et al., 2013) and builds on research exploring how British university students engage in experiences that they would not whilst sober and are driven to attend future drinking events by the FOMO they experience when missing out on an experience (Crawford et al., 2022). This was fuelled by

the concept of the Goss, which emerged through the men's talk of collective meaning making and social bonding using banter. To our knowledge, this concept has not been documented in research to date. The Goss was a colloquial term for male gossip or dramatic banter that solidified social bonds and was used to negotiate both consent and their masculine subjectivities. There is little research on gossiping in men, and the label of "The Goss", has not yet been explored in research on young heterosexual men's group behaviours, although it was apparent that this term was common knowledge amongst some of the men taking part.

The young men in this study typically engaged in light, playful banter or a harsher level of banter that appeared to border nasty banter, such as when one participant talked about how his friend had blamed his loss of bodily function on a woman he had "gone home with", and how this was re-told and laughed about within the group. These findings support previous research finding that lad culture often involved light and dark banter (Owen, 2020), but the men usually distinguished this as light or dark, which was not found in the current study. Some researchers have criticised the binary assumption of lad culture and banter as too simplistic (Jordan et al., 2022) and this data provided the sense that at times, the men were left with a lingering feeling that they had engaged in something not entirely positive despite talking about how it was important to their experience. In this sense, their talk, or gossip, was difficult to analyse because some participants would talk about the experience as a bad thing whilst laughing and describing it through a narrative that constructed the experience as functional to the group experience, subsequently positioning the banter as good. It was evident that this was how the young men understood banter and the roles they played within this sense making practice.

A particularly interesting finding was the concept of "cctving" which was a term used to describe modern surveillance within social groups that opened up or closed down opportunity for

action within a social panopticon that used sports clubs and social media as structures of social control (Bignall, 2002). This was the concept that individuals always felt like they were being observed or in this case, documented through pictures and videos. The concept of constantly or suddenly being filmed without warning has created a modern method of internal surveillance that is focused on capturing ambiguous sexual experiences of young men drinking in social groups, leading to a novel method of social governance. This governmentality creates the illusion of constant surveillance through self-regulation, domination and exploitation by others (Foucault, 1982). In this context, it is constructed under the guise of social bonding. In this way, the young men have adopted the use of social media as micro groups that provide permanent libraries of banter and memories, that they used to negotiate their identities and roles within the groups.

The need to make memories made them vulnerable to documentation but they felt they needed to participate to prevent missing out on the Goss. Some of the participants in this study talked about conflicting feelings regarding the documentation of funny events on the night out for the purpose of reliving them after the night out in groups or on social media groups. Whilst they thought of these things as banter and a library of memories for the night out, some young men felt it was unacceptable, which is reminiscent of previous research that found that some British teenagers considered online banter to be cyberbullying (Steer et al., 2020). Whilst the participants of this study did not overtly refer to it as such, it does demonstrate that the emergence of online banter and social groups is difficult to navigate. Some understood it to be unacceptable to document embarrassing experiences, but others found this “online banter” to be a comical and acceptable part of their group experience because it was used to recreate the evening and bond, but this could be attributed to the group affiliation and differences in age.

Some researchers have criticised the individualist approach to understanding surveillance because it assumes that behaviours are individual and set, rather than embedded in everyday routines (Meier et al., 2018). However, it is important in this context to understand how surveillance and group behaviours translate through discourses of consent and lad culture into understandings of intoxication and unwanted sexual attention. In aiming to explore how young men construct the notion of unwanted sexual attention, it became apparent through their talk that their understandings were also constructed through discourse surrounding brotherhood which compelled them to engage through the threat of surveillance. This research, alongside another recent British study of a similar fashion (Steer et al., 2020), provided a good position with which to begin to understand young men's conceptualisations of modern surveillance in university social groups, and how these findings impacted conceptualisations of gender identity and consent in the nighttime economy.

The young men understood surveillance and banter through lines of acceptability (Steer et al., 2020) which was also how they made sense of consent and unwanted sexual attention. Understandings of surveillance, as well as conceptualisations of banter, were talked about in degrees of acceptability that were defined as "Lines". This is important in understanding how the young men used their subjectivities and collective motivations to understand unwanted sexual attention, because it parallels how they talked about consent. The combination of understandings of lad culture, memory making, and intoxication led to conflicted understandings of unwanted sexual attention that were derived from a lack of language available to the young men and the influences of the views around them. When asked to define unwanted attention, the young men often struggled to define it due to difficulties navigating the concept within their masculine identities. They predominantly talked about what unwanted sexual attention could be, rather than

what it is. This is especially important considering that heterosexual men's views are often excluded from research on sexual consent and negotiation.

The data provides an exploratory understanding of the conflict young men face during sexual negotiation, particularly when asked to define what unwanted sexual attention is. They often covertly referred to consent but often listed what it could or could not be based on situational factors and the learned experience of others (Bednarchik et al., 2021). Research has found that men often define victimisation differently to women due to the differences in vocabulary (Javaid, 2015) but more recent research suggests that this occurs because of the lack of socio-sexual scripts available to understand heterosexual men's refusals of sex (Meenagh, 2021). The current research suggests that it is likely a combination of both, given that they could not accurately define the concept and often struggled with conceptualising their refusals of women's sexual advances.

The same patriarchal ideals position men as players with their sexual prowess gaining them "lad points" (Coy et al., 2016) and subsequently positioning women as in control of deploying consent (Beres, 2007), with the aim for lads being the achievement of sexual activity. This has made the representation of masculine sexuality one that is continually active, and so they do not hold a subject position with which to withhold consent (Lazard, 2009). These young men did not have a subject position to speak from when it came to them experiencing unwanted sexual attention and as such their consent remained not contestable (Beres, 2007) which evidently affected their ability to recognise experiences that violated their ability, or lack thereof, to give consent (Rollero et al., 2019). It is our suggestion that this arises from the complexities of social bonding and negotiating intoxication in an environment and society that reinforces traditional, sexual scripts informing young men that they should dominate sexually (Rosenthal et

al., 2012) and that their masculine identities are framed through their inability to be victimised (Gunnarsson, 2018).

The male sexual drive discourse in this environment has encouraged hypersexualised behaviour (Gunby et al., 2020) and creates the idea that female sexual aggression as a gift due to their position as sexual gatekeepers (Gunnarsson, 2019). In relation to the current findings, many of the participants talked of how the goal of the night out was to engage in a sexual encounter with a woman, with some even talking about how unwanted sexual attention was laughed at and sexual encounters were documented so that they could be relived within the groups. This demonstrates how unwanted sexual attention was not just seen as a gift, but an opportunity for banter and male group bonding, to the point that men being subject to unwanted sexual attention were ridiculed. In short, the individual was sacrificed for the sake of the group, because sexual attention was seen as an important part of the night, unwanted or not.

Leading on from their struggle to define unwanted attention and consent, the young men talked about how they used social hierarchies and power dynamics to understand and implement the use of socio-sexual boundaries. This evidenced attempts to re-contextualise sexual rejections, which would typically garner ostracisation and questions to their masculine identity (Meenagh, 2021). In doing so, the young men introduced the concept of the “Line”, a euphemism for individualistic boundaries which demonstrated that moral and legal implications of consent had little influence on their understanding, especially as it was complicated by intoxication as other research has found (Marg, 2020). This seems to be a reversal of the typical gatekeeping discourse, in that the men believed it was their responsibility to draw the line and set “boundaries”, especially when their sexual partners traversed the acceptability of the situation

they were in, which also appears to be a sexual double standard policing women's behaviour (Coy et al., 2016).

The construction of the line as a masculine understanding of consent, used to reconstitute sexual rejection as a socially acceptable behaviour, seems to be representative of hegemonic social forces suggesting that whilst this neoliberal market portrays itself as sexually progressive, that women are not in fact free subjects and cannot give consent due to the social structures in force (Beres, 2007). It appears that patriarchal double standards are still negotiated in this environment (Gunby et al., 2020) and these traditional gendered discourses are reproducing themselves insidiously (Meenagh, 2021) through discourses of victimisation that normalise women as the only true victims (Lazard, 2009) and freeze them into positions of victimhood (Gunnarsson, 2018). Although some of the research used to contextualise the findings did not focus on male victims of female aggression and used small samples from larger studies, they were largely taken from a diverse range of perspectives and provide important context for the current findings.

The concept of the Line provides an important understanding for emerging conceptualisations of consent for young heterosexual male students and aligns with Lazard's (2009) suggesting that instead of considering consent a binary concept, it should be understood as a boundary construction. It is evident from the current research that although legal definitions render consent impossible to give if one or more parties are intoxicated (Marg, 2020), their construction of consent as a boundary that was personal and set by each person meant that legal impositions had little influence on their understandings. This is likely because, as will be explored, many felt that legal recourse was not applicable to them, associating femininity with

victimhood to make sense of their interactions in the nighttime economy by suggesting that this was available only to women who were the only “true” victims (Lazard, 2009).

This study aimed to explore how experiences were constructed in the nighttime economy because there is still little work exploring the negotiations of intoxication in these environments and in particular, in relation to sexual encounters. There is also still little research on when it becomes unacceptable for the sexual encounters to begin or continue as the person is deemed too intoxicated to consent (Hunt et al., 2022) and limited understanding of the realities of how consent is enacted (Wignall et al., 2022). The themes found in this study provided an important avenue of understanding how these young men used discourses to negotiate unwanted sexual attention, as well as how their sense making practices, social hierarchies and drinking behaviours fed into their understandings of consent.

Participants talked of how intoxication could be used to mitigate responsibility and it was actively constructed as being used by aggressors and bystanders to defend against consent when unacceptable behaviours were challenged. Some participants talked of how people overtly stated or implied they were intoxicated to mitigate responsibility when challenged and it created the sense that when intoxication was used as justification for unacceptable behaviour, the recipients’ need to give consent for the experiences was negated. This provided a distinct representation of how intoxication was used to manipulate subjectivities and open up the opportunity to engage in otherwise unacceptable behaviours, reinforcing previous research which found that intoxication was used to deflect responsibility (Marg, 2020).

It was also interesting to find that some participants talked of how sexuality and gender could also be used to negate consent, with talk of how homosexuality made unwanted sexual attention okay with the implication that it was less harmful, and the position of a woman being

used to excuse behaviours because they could not cause harm. Some participants talked about how young men and authority figures used women's positions in a gendered hierarchy to excuse their behaviour and the need for men to give consent which exemplifies the impact of gendered power relations in demonstrating that men could not acknowledge their experiences or access support. This was further explored in how friends who were girls needed to assure the men that a behaviour had been unacceptable because many of the participants talked through discourses of hegemonic masculinity and engaged in patriarchal behaviours that prevented them from identifying unwanted sexual attention.

Men, in terms of traditional masculinities, are supposed to be physically stronger, so they should be able to protect themselves and the male sexual drive discourse urges them to always want sexual attention. This means that the men cannot access typical avenues of support and so must rely on women to mitigate these experiences in ways that do not affect their masculinity. In navigating their place in the nighttime economy and their experiences of intoxication, some of the men found when attempting to enact consent that intoxication, which was typically used to justify their own disruptive behaviours, could also be overtly used against them to defend against the boundaries of consent that they attempted to enforce. This understanding related back to their conceptualisations of lad culture and the need for experience, with many participants using intoxication to negotiate their identities and motivations to engage, which subsequently made them vulnerable to this unwanted attention. Some participants talked of how participation in the experience created implied consent. To answer the research question, this suggests that at all levels of structural hierarchies, identity and the creation of experience, the key themes fed into understandings of consent and unwanted attention for these young, heterosexual men.

Future Research

Future research should replicate this study with a larger sample and using thematic analysis to explore the phenomenon of the Lads Night Out, as well as unwanted sexual attention in sports clubs and night clubs. Investigations of “The Goss” and the “Fear of Missing Out” would provide important avenues to better understanding drinking behaviours and lad culture in British students as well as how this relates to instances of unwanted sexual attention. It is also important for future research to explore the concept of drinking to escape, which may benefit from a mixed methods approach in British students, using focus groups to explore what “*drinking for the sake of it*” is, and surveys supplied to universities to explore the national frequency.

There should also be scope for exploration of this phenomenon in other demographics, such as students from the LGBTQ+ community and students from exclusively ethnic minorities. As previously explored, this research could not accurately represent the experiences of marginalised communities without centralising the heterosexual experience due to the focus on the rape myth that men are the predators and women are the victims. Future research should therefore explore how unwanted sexual attention is understood in different demographics, such as same-sex interactions, nonbinary interactions and by those who are not of white heritage. This would further allow researchers to explore and understand the intersectionality of gender, sexual orientation and race in experiences of unwanted sexual attention. It is also suggested that researchers conduct a mixed-methods analysis of unwanted sexual attention in student populations, with a survey using nonsuggestive language such as “unwanted sexual attention” to

understand the prevalence of the phenomenon in conjunction with qualitative interviews to understand the motivations behind it in populations of multiple genders.

As previously discussed, further research should be conducted to explore the language used within masculine spheres and lad culture. We have suggested, based on the data, that generally heterosexual men lack the language to be able to construct and understand their experiences of unwanted sexual attention in particular. This has implications for the validity of previous research using questionnaires generated through research on women, as they may obscure the data of men who do not identify with the language used. Therefore, further research should explore what language these young men need to be able to understand and use in order to construct their experiences in a more direct way. The current research suggests their experiences are understood through the gaze of women or hypotheticals, where constructions are built through imagined and assumed experiences, such as when participants listed possibilities of what they thought unwanted attention could be. This research must explore whether direct language addressing the implications for genders (such as targeting perceived men or women), or whether indirect language (using non-binary language), is more appropriate to make the campaigns accessible for all people affected by these experiences. If the language is not available to young men to be able to understand their experiences, this suggests that campaigns or policies designed to address unwanted sexual attention may not be accessible to this demographic in a way they would personally understand them.

Implications for practice

The implications for practice in this study are threefold, in that whilst the issues are combined in student populations, it provides implications for socialisation, alcohol consumption and unwanted sexual attention interventions for male students in UK universities. They will be addressed below.

In terms of socialisation, this research demonstrates that many students, young men especially, drink to excess because they believe it is what is expected of them as not only a member of a sports club, but as a student in general. Some drank to escape, but the majority of participants drank for the sake of socialising. Universities should continue to work with societies and sports clubs to minimise the risk of hazing and peer pressure, as well as develop interventions for first year students to assist them in resisting peer pressure. There is much work to be done in terms of normalising sobriety, especially for freshers.

In terms of alcohol consumption, the themes found showed concerning discourses surrounding the use of alcohol and intoxication as a medicinal “crutch” for what is presumed to be responsibilities and stress during university. Because some students have endured normalised behaviours surrounding alcohol consumption, some used the feeling of intoxication to cope with mental health needs during their time at university. In terms of the applications for practice, there should be more outreach towards students of the alternatives to substance misuse in order to cope with their mental health. As above, interventions and workshops developed for first year students that focus on developing wellbeing and coping strategies is an important step to take to address alcohol dependency in students. Some students indicated that they drank because there was no

alternative, and it seems that this is a concern faced by many students in the United Kingdom, especially with its culture of intoxication.

In terms of unwanted sexual attention and how male students perceive, understand and even report it, it is crucial to reiterate that in our sample the men generally did not have the language to be able to construct and contextualise their experiences. As one participant suggested; *“I think advertising something so even when you’re drunk you know where it’s like at the back of a bar? You’ve just ordered a drink and you look up and you see that- you think okay well this happened to me, and maybe this counts, and maybe that’s not right.”* They reflected that there was no exposure for men who experienced this behaviour and so as we suggested, there is no position or exposure for a Lad who is attempting to construct their experiences, especially as they lack the language to do so. It appears from the quote above that knowledge of unwanted sexual attention is built through media exposure and validation of their experiences. “As an example, participant, Ryan, asked about initiatives designed to tackle unwanted sexual attention, although he could not name them. He discussed the premise of Ask Angela, an initiative where signs are placed in female toilets encouraging young women in bars to ask a staff member for “Angela” if they feel at risk; a codeword to suggest they need help to evade an unwanted pursuer. What was interesting is that Ryan asked whether that is enough, suggesting that people may not be comfortable approaching staff members in fear that ejecting a well-known person may have ramifications for their social lives.

The fact that some participants were aware of initiatives tackling unwanted sexual attention, but queried whether they were enough, suggested that their awareness did not equate to accessibility. To my knowledge, there are no similar initiatives for men, and it seems that more work must be done to understand the accessibility of the language used in campaigns for young men. Some participants spoke of dual experiences where they were both exposed to ambiguous behaviours and engaging in ambiguous behaviours, creating further implications for how they understood their experiences and a potential

avenue with which to drive campaigns targeting perpetrators of unwanted sexual attention as well. We would suggest that once sufficient work has been done to understand the language needed to make campaigns accessible, funding should be sought from the government to create and implement consent workshops across universities. As Gunby et al., (2020) stated, consent workshops and bystander intervention campaigns are still in their infancy in the UK, meaning that this is the perfect time to implement workshops that are designed to be accessible, tackling rape myths suggesting that men cannot be victims and women are the only true victims, both of which reinforce misogynistic attitudes towards unwanted sexual attention.

In addition to workshops in universities, we would recommend that both night time venues and students should be enlisted to work with the government to create campaigns for night time venues that are similar to that of Ask Angela for men. Licenced venues and government initiatives must make their positions against unwanted sexual attention clear and provided avenues for men to seek help or report incidents through visible campaigns, such as avenues for report on posters behind the bar or in the male toilets. It is hoped that by making language available to men so that they may express their express and obtain the appropriate support, as well as implementing more public, visible campaigns more men may be able to acknowledge their experiences. Through this, we may address Meenagh's, (2021) research showing that men's "no"s were not heard and build on their consciousness of their problematic behaviours, as Nichols, (2018) found. However, this requires coordination with licenced venues in the night time economy and with universities, so thorough research and planning is needed to make campaigns effective."

We would also suggest that workshops are developed that deescalate the use of strong language in interventions to incorporate the use of non-categorical language (such as unwanted sexual attention, rather than sexual violence) to address instances of sexual harassment and violence in the nighttime economy. By using terms such as "unwanted sexual attention" we have

demonstrated that those who do not conceptualise their experiences as violent and those who do not have the language to identify as victims are able to vocalise their experiences. This would need to be done precariously so as not to minimise the experiences of those who have experienced serious violence, but this provides a meaningful way of progressing interventions for survivors of harassment and unwanted sexual attention.

In applying the findings to real world events, there have been several salient movements within societies understandings of unwanted sexual attention and gender in recent years. One participant, Kevin, references the #MeToo movement for understandings of how authorities feel about the issue, questioning whether it is effective if unwanted sexual attention is still occurring in licenced venues. The #MeToo movement was an online campaign driven by women, declaring their experiences of unwanted sexual attention to publicise the scale of the issue and bring attention to have prevalent it is in society in order to try and change the norms surrounding unwanted sexual attention; encompassing sexual harassment and violence (Lindgren, 2019). Kevin mentioning this campaign as reference for his understanding of how authorities feel about the issue show that he is aware of public campaigns and believes that should be fixing the issue, feeling it may not be taken seriously because unwanted sexual attention is still happening. It is possible that men perceiving campaigns as not working for women impacts men's understandings of the issue and their opportunity to both acknowledge their own experiences and opportunity for action.

This also has implications for our understanding of men's responses to campaigns for gender equality and the backlash against it. The #MeToo movement is referenced for example. However, other participants spoke of the "double standard" found in their experiences, as previously discussed. This potentially provides context for understanding post-feminist movements for men, in an effort to recuperate what some men believe they have lost following feminist movements for gender equality. Alongside the progression of technology and the media have been self-proclaimed male experts, providing advice for young men on the internet on how to approach and talk to women. Andrew Tate, for

example, is a notable, current media figure, who has been described as providing misogynistic views against women under the guise of advice for men who struggle to connect with them. The data in this thesis, particularly the feeling of double standard in response to their experiences of unwanted sexual attention, may provide clarity on how young men may be susceptible to the influence of misogynistic influencers online.”

Limitations

Sample

One of the limitations of this study is the small sample size. Only ten participants took part in this study and 2 men who approached the researcher to take part declined to participate after receiving the participant information sheet. Similarly, to Catherine Pitfield's (2013) reflection, I found that despite my focus on the Lads Night Out as the research topic, the questions relating to unwanted attention in the local town meant that it was difficult to recruit men to participate. Much of the recruitment arose from social media and snowball sampling, which meant that several participants were from the same clubs. Whilst this provided an interesting dynamic of having the perspectives of members from the same group and was a strength of the study, future research exploring this topic should endeavour to have a wider variety of sports clubs involved and a larger sample of participants. This also meant that we could not formally record the ethnicity of participants as many of the participants came from the same groups and had distinctive demographics that they were well known for in their social circles, so it was necessary to not record this data in order to protect their confidentiality. This has been addressed in the section for future research but is recognised as a necessary limitation for the exploratory nature of this research.

Although it was a small sample initially, this research furthers Meenagh's (2021) research which found that the men involved clearly understood the need to respect women's rejection towards themselves, but that they could not conceptualise making rejections themselves. Not only does this demonstrate their inability to conceptualise consent, but a double

standard in sexual consent that is fuelled by the male sexual drive discourse (Gunnarsson, 2018). Without the language to define consent or unwanted attention, he cannot identify himself as a possible victim or even part of the conversation, but the concept is predefined for him through the constructs of others. Ryan believes he should know what it is, so it is not something that he considers he can construct or describe because the words, language and discourses are not available to him. The sample, although small, provided an essential step in understand how young heterosexual men talk about consent. Whilst this research is exploratory and provides a novel understanding for unwanted sexual attention both experienced and perpetrated by heterosexual men, the participants volunteered for the study and so wanted to talk about these issues.

While some spoke of just wanting to talk and vocalise their experiences, it is likely that some also took part for the notoriety that they may gain in retelling their stories as “Goss” because they knew it would be published. Due to this, there is a possibility that some of the experiences they spoke of were embellished in the interview, so as to appear more Laddish or impressive, especially as the researcher was female. It would be an interesting concept to ponder, of whether similar stories would be more or less embellished had the researcher been male. However, it has been suggested that in qualitative research, truth emerges from research and becomes a process of generalisability in that by progressing research and replicating studies, generalisability is built (Guenther & Falk, 2019). Therefore, whilst this research is not entirely generalisable to larger populations, it is an important foundation with which to build more generalisability in qualitative research on young, male students.

Analysis

Foucauldian Discourse Analysis is a complex method of qualitative analysis and takes repeated and rigorous study. FDA explores how language and discourse is used to enact power relations in social relationships, as well as defining how the use of these discourses impacts the possibility for action in specific positions within society. This provided a useful means of understanding how young men in student populations understood their positions within society and micro social hierarchies, as well as how they constructed and understood their own experiences. However, a limitation is that Foucauldian Discourse Analysis is still debated in qualitative research due to the subjective nature of the analysis. As with this research, it is still questioned whether power is produced by discourse or whether it is a resource that is maintained through discourse (Willig, 2003). FDA can be an unstable method of analysis at times, because it has been divided between relativists, who believe that reality is a construct, and realists, who believed that reality is a known concept.

So, when using FDA to explore and understand power relations within a sensitive topic, it is difficult to separate our own known realities from the realities constructed within the research. This effect is double pronged, in that being unable to separate these conceptualisations can mean that the participants' known realities may not be the same as the way they are constructing the discursive constructions. As such, we can't account for the emotional investments that participants not only have in the subject matter, but participation in the research itself (Frosh et al., 2003). As such, these theological debates often detract from the subject matter of the phenomenon itself, and so this research should be replicated using thematic analysis as an analysis so that more focus is placed on what the participants are saying, in an effort to explore

why they are engaging in behaviours or why they think behaviours happen, rather than how they understand them.

Rigour

In order to ensure that this research is as rigorous as possible, Daniel's TACT framework (2019) was adopted as it provides a systematic method of assessing rigour in qualitative research that is novel, such as this research. This framework uses Trustworthiness, Auditability, Credibility and Transferability to scope the rigour of a qualitative research study and is an appropriate method of critiquing this research (Daniel, 2019). These measures of rigour will be addressed below.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness in qualitative research is the overall ability to trust that the research is genuine and as objective as possible, considering the subjective nature of psychological research conducted by qualitative means. In short, the trustworthiness of qualitative research is built through a systematic approach to the research, the neutrality of the researcher and their reflexivity throughout the project (Daniels, 2019). This research has been conducted as neutrally as possible and I have not only acknowledged my prior assumptions and how my experiences have shaped my interpretations, but I have also used a systematic approach to data analysis, as evidenced in my methodology section. I have reflected on how I felt about the research and throughout the research and analysis I regularly consulted with my supervisors to discuss my

process, the themes and how I came to the conclusions discussed in the analysis and discussion. Therefore, it can be agreed that trustworthiness of the research has been evidenced.

Auditability

Auditability in qualitative research refers to the ability of the researcher and the readers to identify and audit trail within the research, that is, the processes are documented well enough that the research could be progressed or replicated (Daniels, 2019). This research clearly identified the rationale and explored how I engaged with the process of data collection, analysis and exploration of how the findings relate to the wider literature and implications for practice. From the justification for the research in the literature review, to the process of data collection, to the use of Foucauldian Discourse Analysis and an explanation of how I systematically dissected the verbatim quotations to come to my conclusions using Willig's (2003) methodology. The sampling method was clearly explained and justified why certain decisions not to record demographics were made so that it can be replicated or amended in future research. I engaged with this process in a systematic manner in order to compartmentalise my interpretations and maintain as much objectivity as possible during the process. Therefore, it can be agreed that the auditability of this research has been evidenced.

Credibility

Credibility refers to the appropriateness of the procedures used and is evidenced through documentation of the research and is credible when a different methodology could be applied in order to answer the research question through a different approach to verify the outcomes (Daniels, 2019). It is important to note that due to the nature of the candidacy for the MPhil qualification, time constraints and relevant real-world factors, other methods of data collection and analysis could not be conducted for this research. However, in the discussion of the limitations it has been identified and suggested that alternative methods be conducted to progress and validate this research in further studies, such as the use of focus groups, thematic analysis and quantitative research methods. It is our prediction that external triangulation, the use of alternative methods, of this research will verify the findings and progress the field further. The appropriateness of the data collection, sample and method of analysis have been well justified within the methodology and although the analysis was not discussed with the participants, the themes and processes were regularly discussed with the supervisors to provide a degree of inter-rater reliability on the decision-making processes. Objective attention was paid to all the research, especially negative cases, and verbatim quotes were used to ensure that participants were accurately represented. In the methodology, an example of the dissection and analysis process was used on a genuine verbatim quote from one of the participants to evidence the decision-making process and demonstrate that participants were being analysed on their discourse, rather than substituting or contracting quotes to fit the research question. Therefore, it can be agreed that this research has evidenced its credibility.

Transferability

According to Daniels, transferability refers to the ability to transfer the research to other demographics or research questions, as we have suggested above. Put more simply, transferability is when research offers valuable lessons that can be applied to other fields, topics and studies (Daniel, 2019). The choices made in this study, and the context with which it was conducted, have been reflected on and discussions were had of how applicable the findings are to those who have not taken part in the study. This study has explored the implications for practice and how this could be replicated or progressed in the field to benefit those who have not taken part, especially as it has been recognised and reflected on that some men may not take part because they do not want to be identified or do not recognise that they have experienced what is discussed in the research. This research provides progression on previous research exploring the effects of language and discourse on conceptualisation of experience and provides a novel approach with which to address experiences for young men who, as our research shows, do not have the language to discuss ambiguous experiences. It was discussed in depth who these men were, how they were recruited, why their full demographics were not recorded and how their experiences could be representative of their peers or embellished for their participation. These considerations provide an important starting block for academics to consider the methodology of this research and how this affects the findings. Therefore, it can be agreed that this study has transferability.

Conclusions

This study aimed to explore how young, heterosexual, male students use discourses to understand their experiences in the nighttime economy. The sense making practices and understandings of both identity, memory making, and conceptualisations of unwanted sexual attention were explored through ten interviews with young, heterosexual male students at a small university town in Britain. Data was analysed using Willig's approach to Foucauldian Discourse analysis which provided rich exploration of Lad Culture, memory making and they both scaffolded constructions of unwanted sexual attention. The key findings showed that they positioned themselves within key roles that required specific behaviours to provide the "Goss". This was a new method of hegemonic gossiping, providing the men with the means to engage in banter and memory making in masculine ways. The concept of "cctving" was used to understand the documentation of experience through social media records and provided insight into why they felt obligated to engage in certain behaviours; they felt they were being watched.

These themes fed into the young men's understandings of unwanted sexual attention because their constructions were built on masculine discourses of tribalism that positioned unwanted sexual attention as just a part of the night out. They struggled to define unwanted sexual attention because they did not have the language to construct the concept. Some participants used boundary constructions, referring to the "Line", which could be applied to understandings of banter and intoxication in respect of heterosexual male groups. Another key finding was that some participants-built understandings of consent through intoxication, because some of the participants explicitly talked about the use of intoxication to negate consent and believed that those who allowed unwanted sexual attention to happen to them because they were intoxicated had "placed themselves in that position". This gives crucial understandings for how

young heterosexual men in these clubs understand and negotiate consent within their power structures. The limitations of this study involve a small rural population and limited phenomenological understanding due to the use of Foucauldian Discourse Analysis. However, it provides a key foundation for future research to explore conceptualisations of Lad Culture, consent and sexual negotiation. Suggestions for future research include the use of focus groups, thematic analysis and exploration of different demographics.

Reflections

It is ultimately recognised that I, as a researcher and as a person, am bearing witness to, in some cases, previously untold stories and experiences that have shaped these young men's lives. Research has found that it can be difficult to bear witness to these experiences which can impact the ability to approach the study objectively (Pitfield, 2013). To ensure that I remain an active listener and limit the impact of my own experiences, I have frequently reflected on my position as a researcher and as an individual. I have learned that it is impossible to not be influenced by my experiences and so in this reflection I have contextualised my own subject position and my experiences.

I am a young, white, working-class, heterosexual woman. I am educated to postgraduate degree level and worked alongside my studies so had little time to participate in the nighttime economy myself. During my undergraduate degree I was Social Secretary then President of the Psychology Society so although academic, I have participated in the social groups that I have researched. My experiences were of mixed-gender groups, but in my third year I entered a relationship with a man who was part of a sports club, which gave my direct and second-hand experiences of binary social clubs. My experiences were of groups who comprised of different genders and relationship status but being exposed to these binary groups led to my discussions of the concept of unwanted sexual attention with different friends I had made through these groups. The controlled nature of the socials and the experiences some had told me about generated an interest in how these experiences were understood and built upon my undergraduate thesis which focused on rejection sensitivity to platonic and romantic relationships.

This study found that self-esteem impacted rejection sensitivity and so I was interested in how this translated into men's experiences of the night time economy because several of my male friends had talked about the difficulties that they found rejecting women. Whilst it can be reasoned that women are conditioned to be sensitive to social and sexual rejection, it also brought about the question of whether these understandings were born from unintentionally misogynistic sexual scripts. On reflection, I believe that it is a combination of both, but it became clear that there were discrepancies in how I and other women I knew understood unwanted sexual attention, and how heterosexual men understood the concept.

Prior to this study, I thought I understood Lad culture perfectly but on reflection, this experience has changed how I perceive Lad culture and the men that engage in it. I felt privileged at times, because it felt like these Lads were telling me stories and letting me in on secrets that I would not have been privy to had they not taken part in my research. Much of their talk reinforced my perceptions of their behaviour and use of banter, but I realised that it was built through incredibly complex social negotiations and the implications it had for their identities contextualised most of their behaviour. At times I felt second-hand embarrassment listening to their constructions of their experience but was fortunate in a way that their constructions seemingly replicated the way they constructed their experiences with their social clubs. Their talk was riddled with conflict, however, and this made navigating their experiences extremely difficult. My perceptions had been built on my experience of witnessing these behaviours, but they were so much more complex than I could have imagined because there was no position for a postfeminist, neoliberal man to speak from.

I have participated in social clubs and drinking rituals myself, and I have experienced unwanted sexual attention, all of which has impacted my motivation to engage in this research and my understanding of the data. It was essential to remind myself that my understandings were not universal, but I often found myself focusing on specific points rather than the data as a whole. Postfeminist, neoliberal discourses that I experience in my own life suggest that the goals of feminism have been achieved despite my experiences of sexism and sexual harassment and so navigating society from this position has made me keenly aware of these issues, which is one of the motivations for the research that has taken place. I am a young woman in Britain during the #MeToo era, and so I have experienced these issues while being raised to be independent, something that has made navigating the current research with objectivity a complex experience, especially with recent media attention towards gender-based violence.

At times this was difficult to compartmentalise against the fact that I was engaging in research prioritising the heterosexual male experience, particularly as they are situated as the predominant aggressors, but this research was essential because it gave voices to men who felt like their stories had gone unheard. Men's experiences of unwanted sexual attention remain under researched and so whilst recognising the importance of my experiences, and that of other women, the experiences of these men were no less important. It was important to recognise my position of power as the interviewer and researcher, as well as the vulnerability they experienced while talking about sensitive experiences. I was especially conscious of this during my interactions with them and the documentation of their experiences. Some men asked whether their experiences would be shared as they did not want to be linked to the data, and it became apparent that they were relying on their understandings of social storytelling to understand the interview, so required reassurance that their participation was confidential.

During a conference for undergraduates, I was asked why I had not reported some of the experiences that were talked about, and this is something I have often reflected on. Ultimately, my position as a researcher of such a sensitive topic required a precarious balance of care and objectivity. The experiences that were discussed could be viewed as serious and do have the potential to cause distress, but the way they were discussed showed that they did not recognise their talk as disclosures, with many participants actively stating that they had avoided formal disclosure. These stories were reflections of historical experiences that were just part of a night out and their Lad culture for these young men. I reflected on this several times during debriefs with my supervisors, and as stated in my methodology, it would have been unethical to violate their anonymity when many of them took part specifically because they believed they could talk about these experiences in a confidential environment.

Further to this, some participants talked of experiences where they had reported incidents at the time and received negative responses so did not feel comfortable reporting incidents to authorities, meaning that to go against their wishes may have traumatised the participant. For those who did not recognise their experiences as serious, or as incidents at all, reporting their experiences and forcing them to believe that they had been serious would likely have been equally harmful. On balance with my ethical responsibilities as a researcher were my ethical responsibilities to my participants and I am not an authority to decide how they understand or respond to their experiences. This created the “I just want to talk” dilemma, because I had to balance my own understandings of unwanted sexual attention and how I would respond, with their understandings of the same phenomena and the fact that they just wanted to talk.

To reflect on my feelings throughout this process, I kept a journal of my thoughts. The experiences we traversed were difficult to listen to at times because the participants spoke of a rich range of experiences, some presented as positive, some as negative. Engaging with the data, I found their raw accounts challenging at times and learned how incredibly complex and emotive both qualitative research and the ethics involved are. I spoke with my supervisors early on and we agreed to debrief regularly, with short periods spent on my analysis, interchanged with periods of work focused on writing the less emotive parts of my thesis to avoid burnout. I inadvertently became a sounding board for experiences, so I was careful to avoid being construed as providing counsel, especially as some of the men deferred to me for understanding of their experiences. It was also important to reflect on the fact that I could not discern whether their motivation to participate was built on their desire to talk about the subject matter or whether this was an avenue for help seeking that bypassed wider structures that close down opportunities for men to talk about mental health without ridicule. This is an important consideration for potential talking therapies for men.

Reflecting methodologically, the use of Foucauldian Discourse Analysis was appropriate in exploring the power relations involved and provided rich data, but it is notoriously difficult due to the conflicting and overlapping discourses and how they are used within this niche context. FDA is time consuming due to its in-depth nature (Tenorio, 2011) and it is susceptible to subjective interpretation (Graham, 2011). This means that researcher bias is more likely (Lee, 2017) and so the use of a journal to manage my own thoughts was paramount to objectivity (Lee, 2017). A criticism of its theoretical standpoint is that it both proves and disproves itself, because in the same way that the participants experiences are interpretations, so is the data that was gleaned from their talk (Foucault, 2002).

It is also important to reflect on the real-world events influencing this data because two months into the research project the COVID-19 pandemic began. Four months later, at the start of data collection, the universities closed with Britain's first national lockdown, halting all data collection and delaying the project by several months. Initially participants took part in person and were offered either interviews or focus groups, but the use of focus groups was discarded as they were assessed as not viable through online methods of data collection. A Minor Changes Amendment Form (See Appendix E) was approved by the Chair of the Ethics Board, allowing the research to continue virtually. This required revision of all ethics documents and a move to virtual recruitment. This also provides important context for the data itself, because the data related to experiences from before the lockdown, but some of the participants were recounting them whilst experiencing extreme isolation. For many, it seemed, they used the opportunity to relive these experiences and for some, they talked of the "last night out" before lockdown, which was a pivotal ending of their university career for some participants. This research continued through the pandemic, through several lockdowns, and so it cannot be separated from this worldwide experience despite the retrospective data. Much of the research since 2020 shows that COVID-19 has directly impacted drinking behaviours, and on reflection, it has impacted how the research itself has taken place and is understood.

This was overall a very challenging and stimulating piece of research that not only has theoretical and real world applications, but has very much developed my skills as a researcher.

References

- Abell, L., Buglass, S. L., Betts, L. R., & Morohunfola, T. (2023). "It's all part of the culture": undergraduate students' experiences of banter in university sports clubs and societies. *Current Psychology*, 1-13.
- Aldridge, A. (2020). Intoxicating the 'charmed circle': Constructions of deviance and normativity by people who combine drugs and sex. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 20(5), 564-576.
- Anderson, E. (2008). Inclusive masculinity in a fraternal setting. *Men and masculinities*, 10(5), 604-620.
- Anderson, E., & McCormack, M. (2018). Inclusive masculinity theory: Overview, reflection and refinement. *Journal of gender studies*, 27(5), 547-561.
- Anderson, E., & McCormack, M. (2018). Inclusive masculinity theory: Overview, reflection and refinement. *Journal of gender studies*, 27(5), 547-561.
- Anderson, R. E., Cahill, S. P., & Delahanty, D. L. (2018). The psychometric properties of the Sexual Experiences Survey–Short Form Victimization (SES-SFV) and characteristics of sexual victimization experiences in college men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 19(1), 25.
- Andrade, S. B., & Järvinen, M. (2021). Moderate stable, fling or chronic high: alcohol trajectories among young people in an intoxication-oriented drinking culture. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 29(4), 306-315.
- Andrejek, N. (2021). Girls' Night Out: The Role of Women-Centred Friendship Groups in University Hook-up Culture. In *Sociological Forum*.
- Anitha, S., Jordan, A., Jameson, J., & Davy, Z. (2020). A balancing act: Agency and constraints in university students' understanding of and responses to sexual violence in the night-time economy. *Violence against women*, 1077801220908325.
- Ayres, T., & Taylor, S. (2020). Media and intoxication: Media representations of the intoxicated. *Cultures of intoxication: Key issues and debates*, 239-261.
- Bailey, L., Griffin, C., & Shankar, A. (2015). "Not a good look": Impossible dilemmas for young women negotiating the culture of intoxication in the United Kingdom. *Substance use & misuse*, 50(6), 747-758.
- Barton, A., & Husk, K. (2014). "I don't really like the pub [...]": reflections on young people and pre-loading alcohol. *Drugs and Alcohol Today*, 14(2), 58-66.
- Bates, E. A. (2020). "Walking on egg shells": A qualitative examination of men's experiences of intimate partner violence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 21(1), 13.
- Bednarchik, L. A., Generous, M. A., & Mongeau, P. (2022). Defining sexual consent: Perspectives from a college student population. *Communication Reports*, 35(1), 12-24.

- Berdahl, J. L. (2007). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 425.
- Beres, M. A. (2007). 'Spontaneous' sexual consent: An analysis of sexual consent literature. *Feminism & Psychology*, 17(1), 93-108.
- Bøhling, F. (2015). Alcoholic assemblages: Exploring fluid subjects in the night-time economy. *Geoforum*, 58, 132-142.
- Bolton, R., Edwards, C., Leane, M., Ó Súilleabháin, F., & Fennell, C. (2021). 'They're you know, their audience': How women are (ab) used to cement the heterosexual bonds between men. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 07916035211034355.
- Brayda, W. C., & Boyce, T. D. (2014). So you really want to interview me?: Navigating "sensitive" qualitative research interviewing. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 13(1), 318-334.
- Bresin, K., & Mekawi, Y. (2021). The "why" of drinking matters: A meta-analysis of the association between drinking motives and drinking outcomes. *Alcoholism: clinical and experimental research*, 45(1), 38-50.
- Bridges, T., & Pascoe, C. J. (2014). Hybrid masculinities: New directions in the sociology of men and masculinities. *Sociology compass*, 8(3), 246-258.
- Brignall, T. (2002). The new panopticon: The Internet viewed as a structure of social control. *Theory & Science*, 3(1), 1527-1558.
- Brooks, O. (2008). Consuming Alcohol in Bars, Pubs and Clubs: A risky freedom for young women?. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 11(3-4), 331-350.
- Brown, R., & Murphy, S. (2020). Alcohol and social connectedness for new residential university students: Implications for alcohol harm reduction. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 44(2), 216-230.
- Buglass, S. L., Binder, J. F., Betts, L. R., & Underwood, J. D. (2017). Motivators of online vulnerability: The impact of social network site use and FOMO. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 66, 248-255.
- Butler, J. (2013). Gender as performance. In *A critical sense* (pp. 109-125). Routledge.
- Caluzzi, G., MacLean, S., & Pennay, A. (2020). Re-configured pleasures: How young people feel good through abstaining or moderating their drinking. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 77, 102709.
- Campo, S., Poulos, G., & Sipple, J. W. (2005). Prevalence and profiling: Hazing among college students and points of intervention. *American journal of health behavior*, 29(2), 137-149.
- Carlisle, S., & Ritchie, C. (2021). Permission to rebel: A critical evaluation of alcohol consumption and party tourism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Leisure*, 4(1), 25-44.
- Clark, C. J., Liu, B. S., Winegard, B. M., & Ditto, P. H. (2019). Tribalism is human nature. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 28(6), 587-592.

- Connell, R. W. (2005). Change among the gatekeepers: Men, masculinities, and gender equality in the global arena. *Signs: journal of women in culture and society*, 30(3), 1801-1825.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & society*, 19(6), 829-859.
- Cook, J., & Hasmath, R. (2014). The discursive construction and performance of gendered identity on social media. *Current sociology*, 62(7), 975-993.
- Cornilov, G. A., Ilkevich, K. B., Shalomova, E. V., Kartushina, I. G., Musharatsky, M. L., Mashkin, N. A., & Altukhov, S. A. (2019). Features of alcohol consumption motives and practices by full-time and part-time training students. *Journal of Environmental Treatment Techniques*, 7(3), 438-444.
- Cox, M. J., DiBello, A. M., Meisel, M. K., Ott, M. Q., Kenney, S. R., Clark, M. A., & Barnett, N. P. (2019). Do misperceptions of peer drinking influence personal drinking behavior? Results from a complete social network of first-year college students. *Psychology of addictive behaviors*, 33(3), 297.
- Coy, M., Kelly, L., Vera-Gray, F., Garner, M., & Kanyeredzi, A. (2016). From 'no means no' to 'an enthusiastic yes': Changing the discourse on sexual consent through sex and relationships education. *Global perspectives and key debates in sex and relationships education: Addressing issues of gender, sexuality, plurality and power*, 84-99.
- Crawford, J., Jones, A., Rose, A., & Cooke, R. (2022). 'You see the pictures the morning after and you're like I wish I was in them': an interpretative phenomenological analysis of university student's alcohol-related regrets. *Psychology & health*, 37(4), 490-506.
- Crawford, L. A., & Novak, K. B. (2010). Beliefs about alcohol and the college experience as moderators of the effects of perceived drinking norms on student alcohol use. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 69-86.
- Davies, E. L., Cooke, R., Maier, L. J., Winstock, A. R., & Ferris, J. A. (2020). Drinking to excess and the tipping point: An international study of alcohol intoxication in 61,000 people. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 83, 102867.
- Davies, E. L., Cooke, R., Maier, L. J., Winstock, A. R., & Ferris, J. A. (2021). Where and what you drink is linked to how much you drink: an exploratory survey of alcohol use in 17 countries. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 56(13), 1941-1950.
- Dempster, S. (2009). Having the balls, having it all? Sport and constructions of undergraduate laddishness. *Gender and education*, 21(5), 481-500.
- Dempster, S. (2011). I drink, therefore I'm man: Gender discourses, alcohol and the construction of British undergraduate masculinities. *Gender and Education*, 23(5), 635-653.
- Diaz-Fernandez, S., & Evans, A. (2020). Lad culture as a sticky atmosphere: navigating sexism and misogyny in the UK's student-centred nighttime economy. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 27(5), 744-764.

- DiBello, A. M., Miller, M. B., Neighbors, C., Reid, A., & Carey, K. B. (2018). The relative strength of attitudes versus perceived drinking norms as predictors of alcohol use. *Addictive behaviors*, 80, 39-46.
- DiGuiseppi, G. T., Meisel, M. K., Balestrieri, S. G., Ott, M. Q., Clark, M. A., & Barnett, N. P. (2018). Relationships between social network characteristics, alcohol use, and alcohol-related consequences in a large network of first-year college students: How do peer drinking norms fit in?. *Psychology of addictive behaviors*, 32(8), 914.
- Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity?. *Theory and society*, 643-657.
- Donne, M. D., DeLuca, J., Pleskach, P., Bromson, C., Mosley, M. P., Perez, E. T., ... & Frye, V. (2018). Barriers to and facilitators of help-seeking behavior among men who experience sexual violence. *American journal of men's health*, 12(2), 189-201.
- Dossey, L. (2014). FOMO, digital dementia, and our dangerous experiment. *Explore: The Journal of Science and Healing*, 10(2), 69-73.
- Driver, F. (2002). Bodies in space: Foucault's account of disciplinary power. In *Reassessing Foucault* (pp. 123-141). Routledge.
- Duffy, B. E., & Chan, N. K. (2019). "You never really know who's looking": Imagined surveillance across social media platforms. *New Media & Society*, 21(1), 119-138.
- Dumas, T. M., Davis, J. P., & Neighbors, C. (2019). How much does your peer group really drink? Examining the relative impact of overestimation, actual group drinking and perceived campus norms on university students' heavy alcohol use. *Addictive behaviors*, 90, 409-414.
- Dumbili, E. W. (2022). 'I just drink to feel abnormal for some time': Reconfiguring heavy drinking and intoxication as pleasurable. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 99, 103454.
- Duncan, D., Keane, H., Moore, D., Ekendahl, M., & Graham, K. (2022). Making gender along the way: women, men and harm in Australian alcohol policy. *Critical policy studies*, 16(1), 1-18.
- Dworkin, S. L., & Messner, M. A. (2002). Introduction: Gender relations and sport. *Sociological perspectives*, 45(4), 347-352.
- Eckhaus, E., & Ben-Hador, B. (2018). To gossip or not to gossip: reactions to a perceived request to gossip—a qualitative study. *Trames: A Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 22(3), 273-288.
- Edland-Gryt, M. (2021). Cocaine Rituals in Club Culture: Intensifying and Controlling Alcohol Intoxication. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 51(2), 391-408.
- Eisenstein, Z. R. (1979). *Capitalist patriarchy and the case for socialist feminism*. Monthly Review Press.
- Feltmann, K., Elgán, T. H., Strandberg, A. K., Kvillemo, P., Jayaram-Lindström, N., Grabski, M., ... & Gripenberg, J. (2021). Illicit drug use and associated problems in the nightlife scene: a potential setting for prevention. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(9), 4789.

- Fileborn, B. (2012). Sex and the city: Exploring young women's perceptions and experiences of unwanted sexual attention in licensed venues. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 24(2), 241-260.
- Fileborn, B. (2016). Reclaiming the night-time economy: Unwanted sexual attention in pubs and clubs. Springer.
- Finney, A. (2004). *Alcohol and sexual violence: key findings from the research*. London: Home Office.
- Forsman, R. L. (2017). Prevalence of sexual assault victimization among college men, aged 18–24: A review. *Journal of evidence-informed social work*, 14(6), 421-432.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Gant, R., & Terry, P. (2017). Narrative of the night-out: Student engagement in the night-time economy of Kingston upon Thames. *Local Economy*, 32(5), 467-481.
- Gaston, L., & Dixon, L. (2020). A want or a need? Exploring the role of grassroots gay rugby teams in the context of inclusive masculinity. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 29(5), 508-520.
- Geary, P. (2020). An-aesthetic: Performed philosophies of sensation, confusion, and intoxication. *Performance Philosophy*, 5(2), 293-302.
- Gill, R., & Orgad, S. (2018). The shifting terrain of sex and power: From the 'sexualization of culture' to # MeToo. *Sexualities*, 21(8), 1313-1324.
- Gray, H., Stern, M., & Dolan, C. (2020). Torture and sexual violence in war and conflict: The unmaking and remaking of subjects of violence. *Review of International Studies*, 46(2), 197-216.
- Grazian, D. (2007). The girl hunt: Urban nightlife and the performance of masculinity as collective activity. *Symbolic interaction*, 30(2), 221-243.
- Griffin, C., Freeman, M., Adams, S., & Smith, P. (2018). 'All suffering together': student drinkers' experiences of alcohol hangover. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 26(6), 533-540.
- Griffin, C., Szmigin, I., Bengry-Howell, A., Hackley, C., & Mistral, W. (2013). Inhabiting the contradictions: Hypersexual femininity and the culture of intoxication among young women in the UK. *Feminism & Psychology*, 23(2), 184-206.
- Griffin, C., Szmigin, I., Bengry-Howell, A., Hackley, C., & Mistral, W. (2013). Inhabiting the contradictions: Hypersexual femininity and the culture of intoxication among young women in the UK. *Feminism & Psychology*, 23(2), 184-206.
- Griffin, M. L. (2005). Women as breadwinners: The gendered nature of side-bets and their influence on correctional officers' commitment to the organization. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 17(1), 1-25.
- Grindstaff, L., & West, E. (2011). Hegemonic masculinity on the sidelines of sport. *Sociology Compass*, 5(10), 859-881.

- Griswold, S. R., Neal Kimball, C., & Alayan, A. J. (2020). Males' stories of unwanted sexual experiences: A qualitative analysis. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 21(2), 298.
- Groves, M., Griggs, G., & Leflay, K. (2012). Hazing and initiation ceremonies in university sport: setting the scene for further research in the United Kingdom. *Sport in Society*, 15(1), 117-131.
- Guidelines and documents | BPS. (2021, 08 December). BPS. <https://www.bps.org.uk/guidelines-and-documents>
- Gunby, C., Carline, A., & Taylor, S. (2017). Location, libation and leisure: An examination of the use of licensed venues to help challenge sexual violence. *Crime, media, culture*, 13(3), 315-333.
- Gunby, C., Carline, A., Taylor, S., & Gosling, H. (2020). Unwanted sexual attention in the night-time economy: Behaviors, safety strategies, and conceptualizing "feisty femininity". *Feminist criminology*, 15(1), 24-46.
- Gunnarsson, L. (2018). "Excuse me, but are you raping me now?" Discourse and experience in (the grey areas of) sexual violence. *NORA-Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 26(1), 4-18.
- Hales, S. T., & Gannon, T. A. (2022). Understanding sexual aggression in UK male university students: An empirical assessment of prevalence and psychological risk factors. *Sexual Abuse*, 34(6), 744-770.
- Halvorsen, P., & Ljunggren, J. (2021). A new generation of business masculinity? Privileged high school boys in a gender egalitarian context. *Gender and Education*, 33(5), 499-513.
- Hammond, J. A. (2013). *Doing gender in physiotherapy education: a critical pedagogic approach to understanding how students construct gender identities in an undergraduate physiotherapy programme in the United Kingdom* (Doctoral dissertation, Kingston University).
- Hammond, L., Ioannou, M., & Fewster, M. (2017). Perceptions of male rape and sexual assault in a male sample from the United Kingdom: Barriers to reporting and the impacts of victimization. *Journal of investigative psychology and offender profiling*, 14(2), 133-149.
- Hansen, M., Stefansen, K., & Skilbrei, M. L. (2021). Non-reporting of sexual violence as action: acts, selves, futures in the making. *Nordic Journal of Criminology*, 22(1), 42-57.
- Harrington, C. (2021). What is "toxic masculinity" and why does it matter?. *Men and Masculinities*, 24(2), 345-352.
- Harris III, F., & Harper, S. R. (2014). Beyond bad behaving brothers: Productive performances of masculinities among college fraternity men. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 27(6), 703-723.
- Haslop, C., & O'Rourke, F. (2021). 'I mean, in my opinion, I have it the worst, because I am white. I am male. I am heterosexual': questioning the inclusivity of reconfigured hegemonic masculinities in a UK student online culture. *Information, Communication & Society*, 24(8), 1108-1122.

- Haydock, W. (2014). The rise and fall of the 'nudge' of minimum unit pricing: The continuity of neoliberalism in alcohol policy in England. *Critical Social Policy*, 34(2), 260-279.
- Haydock, W. (2016). The consumption, production and regulation of alcohol in the UK: The relevance of the ambivalence of the carnivalesque. *Sociology*, 50(6), 1056-1071.
- Herzig, A., & Maffre, F. (2017). How to share knowledge by gossiping. *AI Communications*, 30(1), 1-17.
- Hirsch, J. S., Khan, S. R., Wamboldt, A., & Mellins, C. A. (2019). Social dimensions of sexual consent among cisgender heterosexual college students: Insights from ethnographic research. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 64(1), 26-35.
- Holton, M. (2017). Examining student's night-time activity spaces: identities, performances, and transformations. *Geographical research*, 55(1), 70-79.
- Hotten, J. (2019). Bianca Fileborn (2016) *Reclaiming the Night-Time Economy: Unwanted Sexual Attention in Pubs and Clubs*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Humphreys, T., & Herold, E. (2007). Sexual consent in heterosexual relationships: Development of a new measure. *Sex Roles*, 57, 305-315.
- Hunt, G., Sanders, E., Petersen, M. A., & Bogren, A. (2021). "Blurring the Line": Intoxication, Gender, Consent, and Sexual Encounters Among Young Adults. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, 00914509211058900.
- Hunt, G., Sanders, E., Petersen, M. A., & Bogren, A. (2022). "Blurring the Line": Intoxication, Gender, Consent, and Sexual Encounters Among Young Adults. *Contemporary drug problems*, 49(1), 84-105.
- Hutton, F., Griffin, C., Lyons, A., Niland, P., & McCreanor, T. (2016). "Tragic girls" and "crack whores": Alcohol, femininity and Facebook. *Feminism & Psychology*, 26(1), 73-93.
- Iwamoto, D. K., Cheng, A., Lee, C. S., Takamatsu, S., & Gordon, D. (2011). "Man-ing" up and getting drunk: The role of masculine norms, alcohol intoxication and alcohol-related problems among college men. *Addictive behaviors*, 36(9), 906-911.
- Jacobs, L., Conroy, D., & Parke, A. (2018). Negative experiences of non-drinking college students in Great Britain: an interpretative phenomenological analysis. *International journal of mental health and addiction*, 16(3), 737-750.
- Javaid, A. (2015). The dark side of men: The nature of masculinity and its uneasy relationship with male rape. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 23(3), 271-292.
- Javaid, A. (2018). Out of place: Sexualities, sexual violence, and heteronormativity. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 39, 83-89.
- Jeffries, M. (2020). 'Is it okay to go out on the pull without it being nasty?': lads' performance of lad culture. *Gender and Education*, 32(7), 908-925.
- Jeffrey, N. K., & Barata, P. C. (2017). "He didn't necessarily force himself upon me, but...": Women's lived experiences of sexual coercion in intimate relationships with men. *Violence Against Women*, 23(8), 911-933.

- Jordan, A., Anitha, S., Jameson, J., & Davy, Z. (2022). Hierarchies of Masculinity and Lad Culture on Campus: “Bad Guys”, “Good Guys”, and Complicit Men. *Men and Masculinities*, 25(5), 698-720.
- Kalish, R., & Kimmel, M. (2010). Suicide by mass murder: Masculinity, aggrieved entitlement, and rampage school shootings. *Health Sociology Review*, 19(4), 451-464.
- Kavoura, A., Ryba, T. V., & Chroni, S. (2015). Negotiating female judoka identities in Greece: A Foucauldian discourse analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 17, 88-98.
- Keblusek, L. M. (2018). *Socio-sexuality, self-reported physical formidability, and the dark triad: Predictors of gossip behavior and cognitions*. University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Kenney, S. R., DiGuiseppi, G. T., Meisel, M. K., Balestrieri, S. G., & Barnett, N. P. (2018). Poor mental health, peer drinking norms, and alcohol risk in a social network of first-year college students. *Addictive behaviors*, 84, 151-159.
- Kivel, B. D., & Johnson, C. W. (2009). Consuming media, making men: Using collective memory work to understand leisure and the construction of masculinity. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41(1), 110-134.
- Knaak, S. (2004). On the reconceptualizing of gender: Implications for research design. *Sociological Inquiry*, 74(3), 302-317.
- Kosakowska-Berezecka, N., Besta, T., Bosson, J. K., Jurek, P., Vandello, J. A., Best, D. L., ... & Žukauskienė, R. (2020). Country-level and individual-level predictors of men's support for gender equality in 42 countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(6), 1276-1291.
- Kosakowska-Berezecka, N., Besta, T., Bosson, J. K., Jurek, P., Vandello, J. A., Best, D. L., ... & Žukauskienė, R. (2020). Country-level and individual-level predictors of men's support for gender equality in 42 countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(6), 1276-1291.
- Kraus, L., Room, R., Livingston, M., Pennay, A., Holmes, J., & Törrönen, J. (2020). Long waves of consumption or a unique social generation? Exploring recent declines in youth drinking. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 28(3), 183-193.
- Law, C. L., & McCarthy, K. (2017). *Sexual Orientation and Harassment: The Role of Sexism in Predicting Reactions to Harassment*. Department of Psychology, Florida Southern College Lakeland.
- Lawless, W., & Magrath, R. (2021). Inclusionary and exclusionary banter: English club cricket, inclusive attitudes and male camaraderie. *Sport in Society*, 24(8), 1493-1509.
- Lazard, L. (2009). Moving past powerlessness? An exploration of the heterosexualisation of sexual harassment. *Psychology of Women Section Review*, 11(1), 3-11.
- Lebreton, F., Peralta, R. L., Allen-Collinson, J., Wiley, L. C., & Routier, G. (2017). Contextualizing students' alcohol use perceptions and practices within French culture: An analysis of gender and drinking among sport science college students. *Sex Roles*, 76(3-4), 218-235.
- Leith, J. (2017). Male Sexual victimization: Victim response, reporting barriers, and treatment. *Bemidji State University Honors Program. Department of Psychology*, 24.

- Lennox, J., Emslie, C., Sweeting, H., & Lyons, A. (2018). The role of alcohol in constructing gender & class identities among young women in the age of social media. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 58, 13-21.
- Lindgren, S. (2019). Movement mobilization in the age of hashtag activism: Examining the challenge of noise, hate, and disengagement in the # MeToo campaign. *Policy & Internet*, 11(4), 418-438.
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1994). Rape myths. In review. *Psychology of women quarterly*, 18(2), 133-164.
- López-Morales, J., Álvarez-Bernardo, G., & Romo-Avilés, N. (2020). Gender-Based Violence and Alcohol Consumption in Youth Leisure Contexts: Challenges for Spanish Social Work. *Affilia*, 0886109920963018.
- Mackiewicz, A. (2013). 'New' femininities in the culture of intoxication: exploring young Women's participation in the night-time economy, in the context of sexualised culture, neo-liberalism and post feminism (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bath).
- MacLean, S., Demant, J., & Room, R. (2020). Who or what do young adults hold responsible for men's drunken violence?. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 81, 102520.
- MacLean, S., Dwyer, R., Pennay, A., Savic, M., Wilkinson, C., Roberts, S., ... & Room, R. (2021). The 'social worlds' concept: a useful tool for public health-oriented studies of drinking cultures. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 29(3), 231-238.
- Maffesoli, M. (2012). Tribal aesthetic. In *Consumer tribes* (pp. 43-50). Routledge.
- Magrath, R. (2021). Gay male football fans' experiences: Authenticity, belonging and conditional acceptance. *Sociology*, 55(5), 978-994.
- Marcantonio, T. L., Willis, M., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2022). Effects of typical and binge drinking on sexual consent perceptions and communication. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 48(3), 273-284.
- Marg, L. Z. (2020). College men's conceptualization of sexual consent at a large, racially/ethnically diverse Southern California University. *American Journal of Sexuality Education*, 15(3), 371-408.
- Martens, R., Vealey, R. S., & Burton, D. (1990). Competitive anxiety in sport.
- Martin, G. L., Hevel, M. S., Asel, A. M., & Pascarella, E. T. (2011). New evidence on the effects of fraternity and sorority affiliation during the first year of college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52(5), 543-559.
- Masquelier, A. (2013). Teatime: Boredom and the temporalities of young men in Niger. *Africa*, 83(3), 470-491.
- McCauley, H. L., & Casler, A. W. (2015). College sexual assault: A call for trauma-informed prevention. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 56(6), 584-585.
- McCormack, M., & Anderson, E. (2014). Homohysteria: Definitions, context and intersectionality. *Sex Roles*, 71, 152-158.

- McCormack, M., Measham, F., & Wignall, L. (2021). The normalization of leisure sex and recreational drugs: Exploring associations between polydrug use and sexual practices by English festival-goers. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, 48(2), 185-200.
- McCready, A. M., Schutts, J., & McCreary, G. R. (2022). Fraternities as settings for sexual assault: The relationships of traditional masculine norms climates and sexual assault attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 23(2), 222.
- McDonagh, E., & Pappano, L. (2007). *Playing with the boys: Why separate is not equal in sports*. Oxford University Press.
- McGlashan, M., & Mercer, J. (2023). Toxic masculinity: An introduction. In *Toxic Masculinity* (pp. 1-7). Routledge.
- Measham, F. (2004). The decline of ecstasy, the rise of 'binge' drinking and the persistence of pleasure. *Probation Journal*, 51(4), 309-326.
- Measham, F., & Brain, K. (2005). 'Binge' drinking, British alcohol policy and the new culture of intoxication. *Crime, media, culture*, 1(3), 262-283.
- Meenagh, J. L. (2021). 'She doesn't think that happens': When heterosexual men say no to sex. *Sexualities*, 24(3), 322-340.
- Meier, P. S., Warde, A., & Holmes, J. (2018). All drinking is not equal: how a social practice theory lens could enhance public health research on alcohol and other health behaviours. *Addiction*, 113(2), 206-213.
- Mobach, T., & Macaskill, A. (2011). Motivation to drink alcohol in first year university students: having a good time or simply coping?. *Health Psychology Update*, 20(2).
- Monahan, T. (2009). Dreams of control at a distance: Gender, surveillance, and social control. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, 9(2), 286-305.
- Moore, D., Duncan, D., Keane, H., & Ekendahl, M. (2020). Displacements of gender: Research on alcohol, violence and the night-time economy. *Journal of Sociology*, 1440783320970639.
- Morris, S., Stewart, D., Madden, M., & McCambridge, J. (2021). A scoping review of qualitative research on perceptions of one's own alcohol use. *European journal of public health*, 31(2), 432-436.
- Nealis, L. J., & Mackinnon, S. P. (2018). "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times": A qualitative investigation of perfectionism and drinking narratives in undergraduate students. *Psychological reports*, 121(6), 1013-1036.
- Nicholls, E. (2017). 'Dulling it down a bit': Managing visibility, sexualities and risk in the night time economy in Newcastle, UK. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 24(2), 260-273.
- Nichols, K. (2018). Moving beyond ideas of laddism: Conceptualising 'mischievous masculinities' as a new way of understanding everyday sexism and gender relations. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 27(1), 73-85.

- Nicholls, E. (2020). 'I feel like I have to become part of that identity': Negotiating femininities and friendships through alcohol consumption in Newcastle, UK. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 81, 102524.
- O'Neill, R. (2015). Whither critical masculinity studies? Notes on inclusive masculinity theory, post feminism, and sexual politics. *Men and masculinities*, 18(1), 100-120.
- Ogilvie, H. (2018). *Student narratives of drinking and transition to university* (Doctoral dissertation, Manchester Metropolitan University).
- Orchowski, L. M., Edwards, K. M., Hollander, J. A., Banyard, V. L., Senn, C. Y., & Gidycz, C. A. (2020). Integrating sexual assault resistance, bystander, and men's social norms strategies to prevent sexual violence on college campuses: A call to action. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 21(4), 811-827.
- Orchowski, L. M., Oesterle, D. W., Moreno, O., Yusufov, M., Berkowitz, A., Abbey, A., ... & Borsari, B. (2020). A qualitative analysis of sexual consent among heavy-drinking college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260520958658.
- Owen, C. (2020). How do we defeat the 'dark side'? Analysing a call to tackle lad culture at a UK university. *British Educational Research Journal*, 46(3), 653-669.
- Parkes, T., Carver, H., Matheson, C., Browne, T., & Pauly, B. (2022). 'It's like a safety haven': considerations for the implementation of managed alcohol programs in Scotland. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 29(5), 477-489.
- Patrick, M. E., & Azar, B. (2018). High-intensity drinking. *Alcohol research: current reviews*, 39(1), 49.
- Patton, P. (1989). Taylor and Foucault on power and freedom. *Political Studies*, 37(2), 260-276.
- Phipps, A., & Young, I. (2015). Neoliberalisation and 'lad cultures' in higher education. *Sociology*, 49(2), 305-322
- Pitfield, C. (2013). *Male Survivors of Sexual Assault: To tell or not to tell?* (Doctoral dissertation, University of East London).
- Poranen, L. (2018). How gender affects gossip and conversation: examining the assumptions in Deborah Tannen's "You just don't understand!" (1990).
- Povey, D., & Allen, J. (2003). Violent crime in England and Wales. *Crime in England and Wales 2002/2003*.
- Pringle, R. (2005). Masculinities, sport, and power: A critical comparison of Gramscian and Foucauldian inspired theoretical tools. *Journal of sport and social issues*, 29(3), 256-278.
- Priola, V. (2004). Gender and feminine identities—women as managers in a UK academic institution. *Women in Management Review*, 19(8), 421-430.
- Przybylski, A. K., Murayama, K., DeHaan, C. R., & Gladwell, V. (2013). Motivational, emotional, and behavioural correlates of fear of missing out. *Computers in human behavior*, 29(4), 1841-1848.

- Quigg, Z., & Bigland, C. (2020). The Good Night Out Campaign: evaluation of a nightlife worker training programme to prevent sexual violence in Liverpool.
- Quigg, Z., Bigland, C., Hughes, K., Duch, M., & Juan, M. (2020). Sexual violence and nightlife: a systematic literature review. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 51, 101363.
- RAINN, (2014)
- Ramsden, R., Hewitt, D., Williams, J., Emberton, L., & Bennett, C. (2021). Tackling student drinking within the drinking subculture of a university sports competition: a culture change approach. *Health Education*.
- Reby, D., Banerjee, R., Oakhill, J., & Garnham, A. (2022). The development of explicit occupational gender stereotypes in children: Comparing perceived gender ratios and competence beliefs. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 134, 103703.
- Riley, S. (2008). Identity, community and selfhood: Understanding the self in relation to contemporary youth cultures. *Beyond Current Horizons* review paper.
- Riley, S., More, Y., & Griffin, C. (2010). The ‘pleasure citizen’ Analyzing partying as a form of social and political participation. *Young*, 18(1), 33-54.
- Riordan, B. C., & Carey, K. B. (2019). Wonderland and the rabbit hole: A commentary on university students’ alcohol use during first year and the early transition to university. *Drug and alcohol review*, 38(1), 34-41.
- Riordan, B. C., & Carey, K. B. (2019). Wonderland and the rabbit hole: A commentary on university students’ alcohol use during first year and the early transition to university. *Drug and alcohol review*, 38(1), 34-41.
- Roberts, M. (2006). From ‘creative city’ to ‘no-go areas’—The expansion of the night-time economy in British town and city centres. *Cities*, 23(5), 331-338.
- Roberts, M. (2015). ‘A big night out’: Young people’s drinking, social practice and spatial experience in the ‘liminoid’ zones of English night-time cities. *Urban Studies*, 52(3), 571-588.
- Rodino, M. (1997). Breaking out of binaries: Reconceptualizing gender and its relationship to language in computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 3(3), JCMC333.
- Rollero, C., Bergagna, E., & Tartaglia, S. (2021). What is violence? The role of sexism and social dominance orientation in recognizing violence against women. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 36(21-22), NP11349-NP11366.
- Romo-Avilés, N., García-Carpintero, M. Á., & Pavón-Benítez, L. (2020). Not without my mobile phone: alcohol binge drinking, gender violence and technology in the Spanish culture of intoxication. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 27(2), 154-164.
- Rosenthal, L., Levy, S. R., & Earnshaw, V. A. (2012). Social dominance orientation relates to believing men should dominate sexually, sexual self-efficacy, and taking free female condoms among undergraduate women and men. *Sex roles*, 67, 659-669.

- Ross-Houle, K., & Quigg, Z. (2019). Content, perceptions and impact of alcoholic drink promotions in nightlife venues that are targeted towards students. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 9, 100163.
- Ryen, A. (2002). Cross-cultural interviewing. *Handbook of interview research: Context and method*, 17, 335-355.
- Sasso, P. A., Rowan, S., & Ryan, C. K. (2023). “Brunch So Hard:” Liquid Bonding and Unspoken Rules of Feminine Hegemony Through Alcohol Use Among National Panhellenic Conference Sorority Women. *Journal of Sorority and Fraternity Life Research and Practice*, 18(1), 1-22.
- Sculos, B. W. (2017). Who’s afraid of ‘toxic masculinity’. *Class, Race and Corporate Power*, 5(3), 1-5.
- Seabrook, R. C., Ward, L. M., & Giaccardi, S. (2018). Why is fraternity membership associated with sexual assault? Exploring the roles of conformity to masculine norms, pressure to uphold masculinity, and objectification of women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 19(1), 3.
- Shaw, R. (2015). ‘Alive after five’: Constructing the neoliberal night in Newcastle upon Tyne. *Urban Studies*, 52(3), 456-470.
- Sheard, L. (2011). ‘Anything could have happened’: Women, the night-time economy, alcohol and drink spiking. *Sociology*, 45(4), 619-633.
- Sherry, E. (2013). The vulnerable researcher: Facing the challenges of sensitive research. *Qualitative Research Journal*.
- Simons, R. M., Hahn, A. M., Simons, J. S., & Murase, H. (2017). Emotion dysregulation and peer drinking norms uniquely predict alcohol-related problems via motives. *Drug and alcohol dependence*, 177, 54-58.
- Skrzynski, C. J., & Creswell, K. G. (2020). Associations between solitary drinking and increased alcohol consumption, alcohol problems, and drinking to cope motives in adolescents and young adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Addiction*, 115(11), 1989-2007.
- Sønderlund, A. L., O’Brien, K., Kremer, P., Rowland, B., De Groot, F., Staiger, P., ... & Miller, P. G. (2014). The association between sports participation, alcohol use and aggression and violence: A systematic review. *Journal of science and medicine in sport*, 17(1), 2-7.
- Steer, O. L., Betts, L. R., Baguley, T., & Binder, J. F. (2020). “I feel like everyone does it”- adolescents' perceptions and awareness of the association between humour, banter, and cyberbullying. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 108, 106297.
- Stemple, L., Flores, A., & Meyer, I. H. (2017). Sexual victimization perpetrated by women: Federal data reveal surprising prevalence. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 34, 302-311.
- Stevley, A. K., Holmes, J., & Meier, P. S. (2021). Combinations of Drinking Occasion Characteristics Associated with Units of Alcohol Consumed among British Adults: An Event-Level Decision Tree Modeling Study. *Alcoholism: clinical and experimental research*, 45(3), 630-637.

- Stevens, A. K., Boyle, H. K., Miller, M. B., Carey, K., Jackson, K. M., Barnett, N. P., & Merrill, J. E. (2021). A qualitative examination of intentions and willingness for heavy drinking among young adult high-intensity drinkers. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*.
- Stroud, A. (2012). Good guys with guns: Hegemonic masculinity and concealed handguns. *Gender & Society, 26*(2), 216-238.
- Sunderland, J., & Litosseliti, L. (2002). Gender identity and discourse analysis. *Gender identity and discourse analysis*, 1-343.
- Swail, J., & Marlow, S. (2018). 'Embrace the masculine; attenuate the feminine'—gender, identity work and entrepreneurial legitimation in the nascent context. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 30*(1-2), 256-282.
- Swann, R. (2021). 'Watching out for my boo': Understanding women's aggression in a night-time economy. *Criminology & Criminal Justice, 21*(1), 57-71.
- Szmigin, I., Griffin, C., Mistral, W., Bengry-Howell, A., Weale, L., & Hackley, C. (2008). Re-framing 'binge drinking' as calculated hedonism: Empirical evidence from the UK. *International journal of drug policy, 19*(5), 359-366.
- Tarrant, M., Smith, J., Ball, S., Winlove, C., Gul, S., & Charles, N. (2019). Alcohol consumption among university students in the night-time economy in the UK: A three-wave longitudinal study. *Drug and alcohol dependence, 204*, 107522.
- Thorpe, H. (2010). Bourdieu, gender reflexivity, and physical culture: A case of masculinities in the snowboarding field. *Journal of sport and social issues, 34*(2), 176-214.
- Thurnell-Read, T. (2021). 'If they weren't in the pub, they probably wouldn't even know each other': Alcohol, sociability and pub based leisure. *International Journal of the Sociology of Leisure, 4*(1), 61-78.
- Tinner, L., Caldwell, D., Hickman, M., & Campbell, R. (2021). Understanding adolescent health risk behaviour and socioeconomic position: A grounded theory study of UK young adults. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 43*(2), 528-544.
- Törrönen, J., Samuelsson, E., Roumeliotis, F., & Månsson, J. (2021). Negotiating Emerging Adulthood With Master and Counter Narratives: Alcohol-Related Identity Trajectories Among Emerging Adults in Performance-Oriented Neoliberal Society. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 07435584211052986*.
- Turchik, J. A. (2012). Sexual victimization among male college students: Assault severity, sexual functioning, and health risk behaviors. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13*(3), 243.
- Tutenges, S., Sandberg, S., & Pedersen, W. (2020). Sexually violent effervescence: Understanding sexual assault among youth. *Sexualities, 23*(3), 406-421.
- Vaadal, K. (2020). Navigating nightlife: women's discourses on unwanted attention in nightlife settings in Norway. *Gender, Place & Culture, 27*(7), 1023-1043.

- Valentine, G., Holloway, S., Knell, C., & Jayne, M. (2008). Drinking places: Young people and cultures of alcohol consumption in rural environments. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24(1), 28-40.
- Vaynman, M. J., Sandberg, S., & Pedersen, W. (2020). 'Locker room talk': male bonding and sexual degradation in drinking stories. *Culture, health & sexuality*, 22(11), 1235-1252.
- Walfield, S. M. (2021). "Men cannot be raped": Correlates of male rape myth acceptance. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 36(13-14), 6391-6417.
- Waycott, J., Sheard, J., Thompson, C., & Clerehan, R. (2013). Making students' work visible on the social web: A blessing or a curse?. *Computers & Education*, 68, 86-95.
- Weiss, K. G. (2010). Too ashamed to report: Deconstructing the shame of sexual victimization. *Feminist Criminology*, 5(3), 286-310.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & society*, 1(2), 125-151.
- Wignall, L., Stirling, J., & Scoats, R. (2022). UK university students' perceptions and negotiations of sexual consent. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 13(3), 474-486.
- Wilkinson, S. (2017). Drinking in the dark: shedding light on young people's alcohol consumption experiences. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 18(6), 739-757.
- Wilkinson, S., & Wilkinson, C. (2018). Researching drinking "with" young people: a palette of methods. *Drugs and Alcohol Today*.
- Willig, C. (2013). *EBOOK: introducing qualitative research in psychology*. McGraw-hill education (UK).
- Wilson, J., Ogeil, R. P., Lam, T., Lenton, S., Lloyd, B., Burns, L., ... & Allsop, S. (2018). Re-thinking pre-drinking: Implications from a sample of teenagers who drink in private settings. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 52, 20-24.
- Wrightson-Hester, A. R., Allan, A., & Allan, M. (2021). Kissing, Grabbing and Grinding: Young Australians' Personal and Social Norms regarding Nightlife Sexual Behavior. *Deviant Behavior*, 1-17.
- Zernechel, A., & Perry, A. L. (2017). The final battle: Constructs of hegemonic masculinity and hypermasculinity in fraternity membership. *College Student Affairs Leadership*, 4(1), 6.
- Zhou, J., Droste, N., Curtis, A., Zinkiewicz, L., & Miller, P. (2018). Playing it safe: Patron safety strategies and experience of violence in night-time entertainment districts. *Drug and alcohol review*, 37(3), 340-347.

Appendices

Appendix A : Consent Form

A qualitative study exploring Male Students' experience of unwanted sexual attention from females in the Night Time Economy.

CONSENT FORM

The date you can withdraw until with be: _____

Rune Shannan Murphy

Department of Psychology

Your Chosen Pseudonym:		Please sign each box below using the initials of your name.
1.	I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the project in which I have been asked to take part, and have had the opportunity to ask questions.	
2.	I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, up until 4 weeks after the interview has commenced without giving any reason. This date will be:	
3.	I understand that in exceptional circumstances confidentiality may have to be breached in cases where persons are considered to be at risk or if required by law.	
4.	I understand that all personal data about me (e.g., contact details), digital consent, verbal consent and audio files will be kept confidential and stored securely within the researchers university OneDrive, and that only the research team will have access to it.	
5.	I understand that my data will be fully anonymized so that I cannot be identified in the research in anyway, or in any extracts that might be used in the reporting of the results and in future publications.	
6.	I understand that should I wish to withdraw, my personal data will no longer be anonymous.	
7.	I understand that the fully anonymised dataset may be deposited in an approved data repository.	

8.	I understand that the researcher must conduct the research in accordance with the Code of Ethics and Conduct set down by the British Psychological Society.	
9.	I agree to take part in the above research project.	
10.	I understand that the interview will be recorded for the purposes of transcription.	
11.	I understand that I do not have to disclose anything I would feel uncomfortable disclosing.	
12.	I understand that I must use appropriate and respectful language in the interview.	
13.	I understand that potentially sensitive topics may discussed, particularly issues of unwanted sexual attention on Nights Out.	
14.	I understand that this interview will take place over the social media platform Skype.	
15.	I understand that technological means of data collection are not 100% secure.	
16.	I understand that I may choose to be interviewed visually or just by audio.	
17.	I understand that once the recording has begun, I will be asked to verbally reiterate my consent to taking part in the following format: "I (legal name), hereby consent to taking part in this study. I have chosen the pseudonym: (chosen pseudonym)".	
18.	I understand that I should take part in the interview from a secure place and ask for minimal noise disruption where necessary in order to preserve my own confidentiality.	

Name of Participant (PLEASE PRINT): Date:

Signed:

Name of Researcher (PLEASE PRINT): Date:

Signed:

RUNE MURPHY

RMurphy

Appendix B : Participant Information Sheet

A qualitative study exploring Male Students' experience of unwanted sexual attention from females in the Night Time Economy.

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Rune Shannan Murphy

Department of Psychology

You are being invited to take part in a study on Male Students' experience of unwanted sexual attention in the Night Time Economy. Before you decide, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and email me at rur3@aber.ac.uk if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Thank you for reading this.

What is the purpose of the project?

I am conducting a piece of research that is looking at Male Students' experience of unwanted sexual attention in the Night Time Economy. The aim of this research is to explore male students' experiences of unwanted sexual attention in the Night Time Economy. The night time economy includes experiences within night time drinking culture; pubs, clubs and bars. This research aims to explore the experiences heterosexual men have in relation to their interactions with the opposite sex, and whether experiences of sexual harassment; particularly from women, are experienced in local drinking culture. This research project is being carried out as part of my MPhil degree. The findings may be disseminated at conferences and in published articles.

Why I have been asked to take part?

You have been asked to take part because you have identified as a heterosexual male who regularly drinks out socially at least once per month. Taking part in this research is entirely voluntary. If you do not want to take part, please say so. You will be able to keep this consent form whether you decide to take part or not. If you decide to take part you can change your mind at any time and may withdraw from the study up until 4 weeks post the interview without giving a reason and without penalty. This date will be written on this sheet, the digital consent form and the debrief sheet you will be sent after participation. After the 4 week deadline the research will have been prepared for analysis and write-up, and your data will not be retrievable. To withdraw from the study please email the researcher at rur3@aber.ac.uk stating that you wish to withdraw along with the pseudonym you will have assigned to yourself upon completing the consent form or beginning the interview.

What will happen to me if I take part?

You will be asked to take part in an interview over Skype regarding your experiences of a typical night out on the town. You will be sent the interview schedule and consent form alongside this sheet. You will be asked to sign a digital written consent form and asked to assign yourself a sensible pseudonym. You

will also be asked to give verbal consent at the beginning of the interview with your name; a statement of consent and your chosen pseudonym.

In the interview you will be asked to describe and talk about your experiences of a typical night out from start to finish, including preparing for the night out to your recollection and discussion of it the next day. You will be asked specific questions regarding your experiences of unwanted sexual attention in the Night Time Economy. This will take approximately 45 minutes to 1.5 hours. Your interview will be audio recorded and transcribed for the purpose of analysis. You may be asked to elaborate by the researcher on things you discuss within the interview.

This will then be reported in the thesis written for my MPhil.

What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?

There are moderate risks involved in taking part.

Calls conducted over internet mediums/telephone cannot be guaranteed to be 100% secure. Every attempt will be made to ensure complete confidentiality. The researcher will conduct the interview from a secure room isolated from others, with signs requesting noise be kept to a minimum in order to prevent disruption. It is requested that you do the same in order to minimise disruption where possible. Due to reduced security via online means compared to in person interviews, you may feel uncomfortable giving consent digitally over email. You may choose to only give verbal consent at the beginning of your interview if you are uncomfortable sending your consent form via email. Verbal consent recorded will be cropped and securely stored in a separate file to the main audio file.

You may be uncomfortable with a visual interview. You are free to choose whether the interview is conducted visually, or audibly alone (via Skype's call function). Please indicate to the research upon your confirmation of participation which you would prefer.

All interviews will be conducted within registered office hours of 9am-5pm from Monday through to Friday. This is to ensure that you have increased access to tutors/supervisors or support contacts should you need following the interview.

It may be possible that sensitive issues are discussed within the interview, particularly issues of unwanted sexual attention/harassment. It may also be possible that upon discussing issues of sexual harassment, you may realise that you have experienced sexual harassment. In the event this happens, this will be made note of and you will be provided with the relevant support contacts and services you should need them, all of which are also provided on this sheet and the debrief sheet, which you will all be provided with at the end of the Interviews as a standard.

Should the interview prove too distressing, the recording will be stopped, and you will be asked if you wish to continue. If you wish to continue, the recording will begin again, and the interview will resume. Should you not wish to continue then the interview will be stopped, and the recorded data will be deleted. Should you withdraw at any point during the interview, anything recorded will not be stored by the researcher, it will be fully deleted along with your personal documents and contact.

Should you, at any time, be uncomfortable with a topic of conversation or wish to skip a question, this is perfectly fine. You will be sent the interview schedule so may let the researcher know in advance if you wish for any questions to be removed. You may also let the researcher know that you are uncomfortable with answering a particular question during the interview and are free to withdraw at any time.

Should anything illegal or of risk to yourself or others be disclosed during the interview, the researcher has a duty to disclose this information with their supervisor and potentially report them to the university and/or authorities if necessary. Please be mindful of this when disclosing information in the interview and consider this before taking part.

Your data and personal data will remain anonymous unless you wish to withdraw.

In the unlikely event that you have cause for complaint, please contact Dr Alison Mackiewicz at the address below.

Will my taking part in this project be kept confidential?

All personal information relating to you (e.g., name, contact details) including consent forms, audio files and transcriptions will be kept confidential within a password protected encrypted file on the researchers University OneDrive. The data for my project will be in the form of anonymized quotes taken from the transcriptions. You will have assigned yourself your own sensible pseudonym; this will be used instead of your birth name. Only this will link your contact details to your data for the purposes of withdrawal.

Verbal consent will be required at the beginning of the interviews, with your name and chosen pseudonym. This will be cropped from the audio file and stored separately within an encrypted file in the University OneDrive. Your digital written consent will also be stored in another separate encrypted file in the University OneDrive.

Your data and personal data will remain anonymous unless you wish to withdraw.

All identifiers within the data, such as names/places will be replaced by pseudonyms to keep your input in the data completely anonymous.

Only the research team including the researcher and their two supervisors will have access to your personal details and/or data, In accordance with the terms and conditions of funded research, it is possible that the research data (not personal contact details data) collected within this project may be required to be deposited in an approved data repository for archiving and sharing. All data will be fully anonymized before it is deposited, and no individual will be identified in the archived data. Please note that should you wish to withdraw; your data will no longer be anonymous but will remain confidential. Should you withdraw your data it will be fully destroyed.

Please note that in exceptional circumstances confidentiality may have to be breached in cases where persons are considered to be at risk or if required by law.

The researcher cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality, the limits of confidentiality will be discussed with each potential participant prior to their signing of the consent form. In the event of a perceived immediate and serious threat of the health or safety of the student, or if there is concern for others involved, the researcher will stop the interview immediately and seek the advice of her dissertation supervisor, which will then breach confidentiality per University Procedures on Confidentiality and sharing of student information, 2016. (TOWN OMITTED FOR CONFIDENTIALITY University, 2016).

The duty of confidentiality is not absolute in law and may in exceptional circumstances be overridden by more compelling duties such as the duty to protect individuals from harm. (British Psychological Society's *Code of Ethics and Conduct*, Section 1.2., 2020)

What happens immediately after data collection?

You will have the opportunity to ask further questions regarding the study should you wish to do so. You will be provided with debrief sheets containing withdrawal details and relevant support contacts. You will be able to withdraw until this date:

It is offered that you may contact the researcher via their email post interview should you wish to gain updates on the study's progress. It is hoped that this allows you to feel more involved in the research process. This will be reiterated to you following conclusion of the interview, once the recording has stopped.

Who has reviewed the project?

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Psychology's Research Ethics Committee, OMITTED University, in accordance with the British Psychological Society's Code of Ethics and Conduct. As the researcher, I am required to conduct the research in accordance to these guidelines.

Does the project conform to GDPR guidelines?

This research is being conducted in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation guidelines. The data controller for this project will be OMITTED University (AU). The AU Data Protection Manager provides oversight of AU activities involving the processing of personal data, and can be contacted at infocompliance@aber.ac.uk. Your personal data will be processed for the purposes outlined in this notice. The legal basis that would be used to process your personal data will be 'a task in the public interest'. If you are concerned about how your personal data is being processed, please contact AU in the first instance at infocompliance@aber.ac.uk. If you remain dissatisfied, you may wish to contact the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO). Contact details, and details of data subject rights, are available on the ICO website at: <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/data-protection-reform/overview-of-the-gdpr/individuals-rights/>

Contact for further information

Rune Shannan Murphy, rur3@aber.ac.uk

Supervisor: Dr Alison Mackiewicz, alm53@aber.ac.uk

Support Services:

University Student Support

Mid Wales Rape Support Centre: 01970610124

Mind: 01970626225

Crossroads Mid & West Wales: 01970627966

Samaritans: 116123

Appendix C : Debrief Sheet

A qualitative study exploring Male Students' experience of unwanted sexual attention from females in the Night Time Economy.

PARTICIPANT DEBRIEF SHEET

Rune Shannan Murphy

Department of Psychology

Thank you for taking part in this study.

The aim of this research was to explore male students' experiences of unwanted sexual attention in the Night Time Economy. This research project is being carried out as part of my MPhil degree.

The research will analyse the themes and discourses male students use to discuss their management of nights out and unwanted sexual attention.

It is hoped that you enjoyed taking part.

Should you wish to withdraw, you may email the researcher at rur3@aber.ac.uk 4 weeks from the date of this interview. This is to account for the time needed for transcription and analysis of data.

Your data will be completely destroyed should you wish to withdraw.

Should you wish to withdraw, you MUST email the researcher at their email address above stating that you wish to withdraw along with your chosen pseudonym. This will be used to identify your data.

The date you can withdraw until with be:

We would like to thank you again for your participation.

If you have any question post study or would like to request updates on the research, please feel free to contact the researcher for more information at rur3@aber.ac.uk.

Contact for further information

Rune Shannan Murphy, rur3@aber.ac.uk

Supervisor: Dr Alison Mackiewicz, alm53@aber.ac.uk

Support Services:

University Student Support

Mid Wales Rape Support Centre: 01970610124

Mind: 01970626225

Crossroads Mid & West Wales: 01970627966

Samaritans: 116123

Appendix D : Interview Schedule

The interview schedule:

The interviews will be semi structured. These are the questions that will be asked:

- Can you describe, in as much detail as you would like to share, your experiences on a typical night out in (TOWN OMMITTED FOR CONFIDENTIALITY). So from preparing for the night out, right through until your discussion/recollection of it at the end of the night or the next morning.
- What are your motivations for going out drinking?
- Can you describe your experiences of men and women on nights out?

(Impressions? Males? Females? Behaviours? Aggression?)

- Please describe how men and women interact within the bars your drink in?
-
- Can you define unwanted attention?

(what are your experiences? If any?)

- To what extent do you feel as though unwanted sexual attention is a problem in (TOWN OMMITTED FOR CONFIDENTIALITY)?

(Why do you feel that way?)

- How do you think local authorities feel about unwanted sexual attention in (TOWN OMMITTED FOR CONFIDENTIALITY)?

Appendix E: Minor Changes Amendment Form

MINOR CHANGES AMENDMENT FORM FOR STAFF AND POSTGRADUATES

AU Online Assessment Number:	14743
Name:	Rune Shannan Murphy
Project Title:	A qualitative study exploring Male Students' experience of unwanted sexual attention in the Night Time Economy.
Date:	2/4/2020

Nature of amendment:
Participant interviews will be moved to the medium of online Skype interviews.

Reason for amendment:
Due to the current COVID-19 Pandemic, face to face research is unable to continue. Therefore, changing interviews to the medium of online Skype interviews is necessary to continue research.

Ethical issues to consider as a result of the amendment and how they will be addressed:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skype is not guaranteed to be a completely secure medium of data collection: It will be detailed to prospective participants that we cannot guarantee complete security in Skype interviews. This will be explicitly stated in the participant information sheet that participants will receive before they decide to take part, and the digital consent form. This will again be reiterated before any recording begins once the participant is contacted via Skype, and they will be given the option to terminate the interview before it begins and withdraw from the study without penalty if they are unhappy with the security of the interview. Excludes those without this platform: Using Skype inherently excludes those that do not have or are uncomfortable using this medium of interview. However, participants who had scheduled interviews before the social distancing laws came into effect assured the

researcher that they have access to this platform and would be happy to continue the interviews through this platform. For further data collection if needed, participants will be made aware that data collection will take place over Skype in any advertisements placed on social media/ through email. As these adverts are placed through social media or email, it is only advertised to those with internet connection and an online presence prior to this amendment, and so it is hoped that all prospective participants have access to this platform. To preserve confidentiality issues and complications of security through using different platforms only Skype will be used to attempt to contain these potential ethical issues as much as is possible.

Participants who wish to take part, but are not comfortable with a Skype video call will be given the option of using Skypes call function, rather than the video call function to ensure their comfort. All recordings will only be recorded via audio (not visual in order to protect their identity) regardless, and this will be explicitly stated to the participants.

- **Consent over email:**

Participants may be uncomfortable giving consent for the study over email, and so whilst consent forms will be sent over email for them to fill out prior to the study, they will be asked to give verbal consent at the beginning of the interview. Verbal consent will be cropped from the interview recording and stored separately in a secure encrypted file in the OneDrive, along with digital consent forms. Participants will be made aware in the participant information sheet they receive prior to the interview that email is not completely secure, and so they do not need to give consent this way, but will be required to give consent verbally at the beginning of the interview. Details of how this will be stored will be included in the participant information sheet, and the digital consent form as an extra measure.

The consent forms will contain a withdrawal date 4 weeks post the scheduled interview date to ensure they have at least 4 weeks or more to withdraw.

As with face to face interviews, participants will be reminded that their interviews will remain confidential under a self-chosen pseudonym, and that transcripts will be confidentially stored under this pseudonym. They will be reminded that transcripts will be anonymised with identifiers in the data being changed for neutral terms/names for anything that may potentially identify them. They will also be reminded that any published data in the thesis will be anonymous.

- **Participant distress is harder to support over Skype:**

Participants will be sent the updated participant information sheet at first expression of interest in the study. They will also be sent the interview schedule along with the participant information sheet so that they are able to consider what will be asked before agreeing to participate, and let the researcher know if there is anything they wish to not be asked before the interview commences. This is to ensure, with the added ethical ramifications of online data collection, that they have ample time to consider the details of the study before they commit to taking part. This participant information sheet also includes various

support service links; they will have this information should they need at any point during the interview or if the connection is lost/they decide to withdraw immediately without notice during the study.

Once the skype call has begun, the researcher will engage the participant in an informal conversation before the formal interview begins to build rapport, and ensure they feel comfortable with participation before any interview questions are asked. All participants will again be reminded before any recording begins that they are entitled to withdraw at any point during the study without penalty. They will also be reminded, that should they be uncomfortable with a topic, or not wish to answer a specific question, that this is also fine and they may ask the researcher to move onto the next question without recourse from the researcher.

As with face to face interviews, the researcher will stop recording should they believe the participant shows any signs of distress, or if the participant expresses that they are uncomfortable/distressed, the recording will be stopped and the participant will be asked if they wish to continue, and reminded of their right to withdraw without penalty. If they feel happy to continue, the recording will be continued and the interview resumed. Should they not wish to continue, the interview will be stopped, and the recording will be deleted.

Once the interview is completed, the recording will be stopped, and the participant will be again reminded of the withdrawal processes, and asked if they are happy for the recording to be stored and used in the research. They will be informally asked if they have any further questions regarding the study, and spoken to about the aims of the study more in depth (as has been done in previous research to make the participants feel more included in and in control within the research process). They will be told that they may contact the researcher for updates on the studies progress should they wish, but reminded that this may compromise their confidentiality.

- **Confidentiality and professionalism:**

As the research will take place at home for the researcher (and presumably the participant, given the current Pandemic circumstances even though this may not entirely be the case), all steps will be taken on the researchers part to ensure that confidentiality and complete professionalism is maintained. Interviews will take place (on the researcher's behalf) in a contained, lockable room, to ensure that no interruptions occur within this time. This room is away from the rest of the house and so will be less likely to receive noise interruption. A privacy notice will be placed on the door asking for quiet and not to be interrupted, and the door locked. The interviewee will also be asked to conduct the interview in a private room where they cannot be overheard.

All interviews will take place within 9am-5pm office hours to maintain working hours, and to ensure that there are others present in the house (on the researchers behalf) should the interview prove distressing. This also allows the participant easier access to their tutors working hours should they wish to

contact them regarding the parameters of the study. This also applies to contacting the researcher's supervisor should they have need for complaint.

To clarify:

- All changes will be adjusted on the participant information sheets, consent forms and debrief sheets in order to keep prospective participants fully informed of the process.
- The focus groups included in the original study will not be moved to an online platform. Focus groups are difficult to manage in person, and would be extremely difficult to manage and ensure wellbeing on a temperamental platform with several participants. To rely on several servers and WIFI's of several people would be too difficult to manage. This may compromise data if there are lags or technological issues, wasting time and effort not only for the participants but the researchers. The researcher believes attempting to do focus groups through online research would leave participants vulnerable to being inadequately supported during the interview process due to potential technological difficulties. Following this, it is believed that if focus groups are needed post interviews, that they should continue in person once the current restrictions are lifted and the university and governing bodies believe it is safe to continue face to face research. Focus groups will not take place until it is unequivocally safe to do for all involved.
- These changes and involved concerns will be reflected upon in the write up of the thesis.

Do these changes now require you to complete a travel risk assessment? NO

If yes, please confirm you have submitted your form to Elaine Lowe [ell@aber.ac.uk] NO

Do these changes now require you to complete a lone researcher risk assessment? NO

If yes, please confirm you have submitted your form to Matt Wilby [mlw11@aber.ac.uk] NO

Do these changes require you to put in place additional considerations relating to GDPR? (e.g., are you now transferring/storing data outside of the EEA) NO

If YES, please state what they are and how you will address them:

All data will still be stored on the University issued personal encrypted OneDrive.

Outcome:	Minor changes APPROVED
Chair of Ethics Committee:	Dr Antonia Ivaldi
Date:	08-04-20

Appendix F: Advert to University Sports Clubs

From: Rune Murphy [rur3] <rur3@aber.ac.uk>

Sent: 02 March 2020 11:31

To:

Subject: Mphil Thesis

Hi,

My name is Rune Murphy, I am a current MPhil student in the psychology department. This is an advert for research I am conducting for my MPhil thesis, and I am emailing this to you in the hope you would be able to forward this to your members.

If you identify as a heterosexual male student in this University who drinks at least once per month; preferably more, and preferably from a Sports Club here at the University, I would be interested in speaking to you about your experiences of Nights Out in Town including experiences of unwanted sexual attention. This would be in the form of Focus Group conducted in the Psychology department. The focus groups will be arranged in terms of sports teams where possible, so you will likely be familiar with the people in your focus group.

If you are interested in participating, please can you email me at rur3@aber.ac.uk to express your interest, with the club you are from.

Thank you in advance,

Rune Murphy

Appendix G: Theme Tables

Theme Tables

Discourse	Example
What it means to be one of the boys	
<p>Understandings of their identity and position as one of the boys through discourses of hegemonic masculinity and brotherhood.</p>	<p><i>Frank: "Like one of our freshers is a pure like lad. Very nice fella. He was speaking to this girl; I'm guessing one of the lads like wing manned him because he's always been shy. Erm and I remember he went back with her I think... I dunno I- I think they went back into the house. Walked back with him or what. Very gentlemanly. But yeah so that's a good interaction you know, I guess. But the I've seen- I've heard stories of one of my good club mates... erm... hahaha apparently, I don't know if its 100% true. Had gone back to a girl's I think he had been so drunk he had erm... defecated... and then I think they both woke up or something or he woke her up and said I think you've defecated the bed and left. And like said you know I'm gonna go and left. He left her to clean it. So obviously technically not on the night out. But obviously just after, so."</i></p>
<p>How group membership reinforced tribal and ritualistic behaviours.</p>	<p><i>Ryan: "So we'd- in the day we'd either have a match or we'd probably erm day drink watching some SPORT or some other sport. Erm... and... erm... so we'd either be riled up from a SPORTS game or we'd be already a bit tipsy. Probably- I'd probably go home then, get ready for the night, we'd make our way to the SOCIAL PLACE which is where our socials were held erm... so erm those socials are</i></p>

sort of like a pre drinks to a night out but they tend to be very heavy erm... as you'd quite imagine with a SPORTS team err and then we'd move on into town afterwards but these erm at these socials we'd do lots of drinking games... erm... which generally involved haha more copious drinking or taking the piss out of each other. Erm... yeah it's a good laugh. Then we'd make our way into town and do a bit of a bar crawl. Er see- do even more drinking. Erm... until we- we end up at the uh club at the end, where we'd continue drinking and dancing and probably chatting shit to each other until the early hours of the morning."

Intoxication as an enabler and a motivator for social Lad Culture.

Ryan: "Erm but- but more so now at university it was more of- much more of a... a social thing. Erm... I wasn't going out- I mean I did get drunk all of the time but I wasn't going out specifically to get drunk. I was going out for the social aspect. With the- with the (Sportsclub) lads or my flat mates or another group that I'm a part of. Erm... so that would be my main motivation and I guess towards the end of my time at uni it was more of an escape as well. Erm... I don't know if that goes under getting drunk for the sake of it."

 Creating the Memory Bank

The use of collective reconstruction and discourses of brotherhood to solidify social bonds and make participation mandatory for group members.

Henry: "I dunno we'll just meet up for breakfast or something and then we'll, erm... just talk about the night before and if there's any Goss or drama we'll just... talk about that really. Not kinda like the whole... night out, more the scenario.

RESEARCHER: okay. So, erm... what are your motivations for going out drinking then?

Henry: erm... so... it's changed in my time there. In my first 2 years it was probably a real bad case of FOMO. So, fear of missing out."

The use of intoxication as an enabler to enhance their experience and reassert hegemonic ideals of masculinity.

Ryan: "Yep so we're in a group chat of all of the team and if anything silly happens the night previous or if someone goes home with someone... erm they tend to be brought up in this group chat the next day. Erm, very often there tends to be a small group of people that go to food place for food or somewhere for food the next morning as well, where we also recollect the events as we can remember it. If we can remember them."

Hegemonic masculinity and covert surveillance as a means of within group social control.

Kevin: "or erm... quite a lot of just nights out of... people just er being told to do something it's like someone saying oh X do Y

RESEARCHER: yeah

Kevin: and then they go and do it. So we're kind of saying ah do this stuff and we'll film it it'll be funny they go and do it and we have a good laugh at it as well then but we've also got it so we can have a good laugh at it afterwards in our group chats as well

RESEARCHER: yeah? So you, uh, talk about it afterwards?

Kevin: yeah, yeah! The big, erm- in our groupchats there's um loads of er videos that still get put round um and photos that are used from nights out in our group chats to mean certain things

RESEARCHER: okay

Kevin: so uhm if someone has erm if someone has ermm done something and theres a particular screenshot of someone pulling a face or something someone might screenshot that and it'll get put through the group chat multiples of times you know again and again and again

RESEARCHER: okay

Kevin: or a video of someone doing something that's maybe a little bit embarrassing for themselves on a night out that will get put through times and times and times"

Lines of Consent in pursuit of a way to talk about Unwanted Sexual Attention

Understanding unwanted attention as a violation of consent and a challenge to masculine status.

Ryan: "Unwanted attention. It's hard to define it because it's exactly what it says it is. Erm... I don't know. When someone's coming up to you. Talking to you. Perhaps being a bit too forward. Uh outsi- and putting you outside of your comfort zone. Something you've not asked for. Erm... maybe you've already erm, said that you're not interested or don't want attention and they're persistent. Erm... yeah. Erm... yeah its attention you don't want haha. Erm... yeah when someone's talking to you or it could be messaging you or I don't know. It's quite a big scope. Erm... interacting with you and your life in ways that you'd prefer them not to."

The use of hegemonic masculinity and the concept of control to construct unwanted sexual attention as a violation of boundaries set by the individual.

Ryan: "Like a girl putting their hands down my trousers. Like that would- I think that's too far. Where are someone grabbing my arse or something I'd probably would be like okay that's a bit weird, like I don't know you. And probably just get on with my evening. The fact- of- I think there's a line. And people set their own lines."

Constructing unwanted attention through intoxicated consent and unchangeable hegemonic social roles.

Brian: "And I went to- and I went to a lady bouncer eventually and this is where... it sort of started... this is

where it really started to pee me off. Cus.... it- it- again it's just like that societal view of... of how women... of how women treat men like that and it not being an issue like. I went up to her and I told her about it... and said like you know she needs to be kicked out. Like, look what she was doing. And... she went over to speak to her. And she ca- and it- it was a lady bouncer. And she came back and was like... aw she's a- aw she's a lesbian. Like... no she's- you know she's really drunk.”

Appendix H: Mandatory Layout of Declaration

Mandatory Layout of Declaration/Statements

Word Count of thesis: DECLARATION	48,096
This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.	
Candidate name	<u>Rune Shannan Murphy</u>
Signature:	Rune Murphy
Date	23/03/2023

STATEMENT 1

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Where ***correction services** have been used, the extent and nature of the correction is clearly marked in a footnote(s).

Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signature:	Rune Murphy
Date	23/03/2023

[*this refers to the extent to which the text has been corrected by others]

STATEMENT 2

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signature:	Rune Murphy
Date	23/03/2023

NB: *Candidates on whose behalf a bar on access (hard copy) has been approved by the University should use the following version of Statement 2:*

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loans after expiry of a bar on access approved by Aberystwyth University.

Signature:	
Date	