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Dating and hooking up in America have always been specific regimes of recreational sexuality for youth, although the sexual practices in dating remained lighter. In the early 20th century, youth developed as a distinct identity from adulthood, with its own institutions and its own culture. This culture incubated within the autonomous youth enclaves of residential colleges, which were largely devoid of parental control. Sex was a prime marker of this new youth identity that distinguished it from adulthood. In the adult world, sex was confined to stable committed relationships and primed to procreation. In youth culture, sex was a recreational, public status game that was embedded in casual relationships. In Hong Kong, a distinct youth identity also developed in which intimate relationships were a prime identity marker. Sex, however, was not a marker of distinction between youth and adulthood; instead, it was the aspirations within the relationship that distinguished relationships of youth from those of adulthood. On the surface, it initially appeared that youth in Hong Kong had an autonomous space in which to develop a distinct youth culture. However, a more thorough inspection revealed that the elder generation maintained a firm grip over this cultural domain, which included youth sexuality.

In recent decades, many sociologists have started to explore the new sexual regime of hooking up on US college campuses. The rise of this new sexual culture has been linked to the gender imbalance on many current-day campuses (Bogle, 2008; Heldman and Wade, 2010:328; Kimmel 2008:202; Regnerus, 2012). In this ‘battle of the sexes’ argument, hooking up is construed as a male sexual norm. Women, on the other hand, are supposedly primed towards sex in committed relationships. This line of reasoning argues that men have the power to define the terms of sexual encounters because they are a minority on campus and are in short supply in the sexual economy.

Another line of reasoning links hookup culture to the specific infrastructure of college campuses (Allison and Risman, 2014; Bogle, 2007; Ray and Rosow, 2010). In these environments, a large number of youths live outside of the parental gaze,
surrounded by peers of the same age who are nearly all sexually active and unmarried. The tight social integration in these places generates a sense of trust and a feeling of familiarity among students, which makes the campus arena feel like a safe haven for socializing and sexual experimentation. College is a time of relatively few obligations, and an alcohol-fueled party is always around the corner. Hookup culture flourishes in these specific infrastructural arrangements.

Both arguments are problematic. The battle of the sexes argument supposes that hooking up is a male sexual standard, while research on female students shows that as many women as men want to hook up (Hamilton and Armstrong, 2009). Furthermore, the reasoning is somewhat simplistic; both men and women can have a variety of relational and sexual aspirations, and individuals can long for casual sex and emotional intimacy at the same time (Paik, 2013:177). The infrastructural argument is also insufficient to explain the emergence of hookup culture. The infrastructure on most college campuses has changed little in the last decade, while college sexual culture has changed dramatically. Other social changes must thus account for the rise of a new sexual culture among youth.

In this project, I have tried to infer the conditions in which hookup culture emerged. I have historically contextualized the changes in sexual regimes among youth in America. The transition from dating to hooking up coincided with dramatic changes in gender relations, in which women gained power and control on many fronts, including their bodies and their sexuality. At the same time, the changing economic tide in the 1970s increased economic insecurity. Educational achievements became more relevant for attaining a middle-class lifestyle. This gave rise to an imperative among youth to devote their college years to self-development. The demands of committed relationships could potentially jeopardize this project. These conditions enabled hooking up to emerge as a dominant norm on numerous college campuses.

A question I addressed in this research is whether hookup culture is specific to college campuses. I have explored this question in my chapters on ‘game’ practitioners in the Bay Area. (Semi-) professional players are primed to casual sex and skim the urban erotic contact zones for sexual adventure. If hookup culture existed outside of the college arena, I expected to find it among these men. I found that even the most accomplished ‘game’ practitioners did not hookup that often. For hookup culture to emerge, other conditions need to be present. The specific infrastructural arrangements of college campuses, as adherents of this theorem argue, could be essential for hooking up to emerge as a dominant norm of intimate coupling among youth. I have researched this idea more thoroughly by looking at a commuter college in the Bay Area, which lacked many of the infrastructural arrangements linked
to hookup culture. Indeed, hooking up was not an omnipresent part of college life for most students at this institute. Hooking up occurred, but it was linked to specific nodes of student life that were not easily accessible; it nested in the college party scene that largely happened off-campus, in the houses of upperclassmen. The specific spatial arrangements of residential colleges form the infrastructure in which hookup culture can emerge, while larger social transformations are foundational to this new sexual culture.

Scripts of youth sexuality travel, for instance, through the global dissemination of popular cultural productions and via the transnational movement of people. In this project, I have explored whether the hookup script has been appropriated by youth in another corner of the world. Hong Kong has seen many similar changes in gender and intimate relationships as the US, and on the surface, seemed to have a fertile matrix for a decoupling of sex and committed relationships. This process, however, has not occurred in the domains of youth culture that I investigated in the city-state.

Sexual arenas comprise a variety of ‘sexual scripts’. Some of these are prioritized and enacted frequently, while others are held in disregard and mostly avoided. This is a tenet running through the empirical chapters within this book. College students and ‘game’ practitioners in the Bay Area and Hong Kong were knowledgeable about a variety of different sexual scripts and drew on a variety of these in their intimate interactions with others. This, however, did not mean that all of these sexual scripts were enacted as frequently as others, and some sexual scripts were prioritized. The dominant script within a particular field often referred to a specific regime of intimate relationships, for instance ‘hooking up’ on American college campuses or ‘ceot pool’ on college campuses in Hong Kong; however, there were other familiar, though less practiced, sexual scripts that were also enacted in these arenas. The concept of ‘orderings of sexual scripts’ does justice to the variety and organization of different sexual scripts that are positioned in relation to a dominant or normative script in the symbolic repertoire of people within a specific field. Changes in sexual cultures can be conceptualized as a re-configuration of this ordering of scripts. This conceptualization points to the question of how the ordering of sexual scripts within specific fields changes. Thus, it questions how a particular sexual script that was once marginal becomes the dominant norm of intimate interactions within a specific field.

In the United States, the partial transition from a regime of dating to one of hooking up coincided with changing power relations between the sexes, whereby women gained power vis-à-vis men in work and education as well as their intimate relationships. Within the dating regime, women had relatively little power over the
intimate encounter. Men initiated dates, decided on the activities and how much money he would spend and ultimately defined the terms of the relationship (Bailey, 1988:110). A woman could rebuff or acquiesce to the arrangement, and in the latter case agreed on an exchange. She had to repay the investment of her partner with attention, care and often some light sexual activity. Dating was comparable to an economic exchange in many respects. The more a man spent, the more he could expect in terms of emotional and sexual services. Penetrative sex, however, was off limits within dating, and women were responsible for maintaining this boundary. This is exemplified by the story of a female student of the University of Michigan who got raped on her date in the late 1940s. Both the perpetrator and the victim got suspended from the university. Officials reasoned that she had brought this situation upon herself and was thus responsible for the committed ‘vice’ (Bailey, 1988:91). The structural gender inequality in dating limited women’s options to set the terms of the intimate encounter. This was especially pronounced in sexual matters, with a much smaller range of acceptable sexual activities for women as compared to what was acceptable for men. Furthermore, it was the woman who was responsible for maintaining sexual boundaries and who carried the burden when borders were crossed.

In the sixties, the relation between the sexes went through great upheaval. An extended period of economic growth spurred a demand for workers. Women were needed in the labor force, especially in white-collar jobs. Women entered the labor market and higher education en masse. At the same time, a new cultural wind blew through America and brought feminist politics to the forefront. This led to a grand reconfiguration of the power balance between the sexes. Women gained power vis-à-vis men on many fronts: women increasingly worked in paid employment, had high educational attainments, and demanded new arrangement in intimate relationships that granted them more control over the terms of the encounters and over their own bodies. From the 60s onwards, dating progressively lost its ground in youth culture, and a new sexual code took root with a new configuration of sexual scripts.

The changing power balance between men and women resulted in what sociologist Cas Wouters calls an ‘informalization’ of contact between the sexes (2012:104). Relationships between young men and women became marked by higher degrees of openness, less formality and more emotional intimacy than male-female interactions of the previous generation. Friendships between young men and women started to be more common in the sixties, and this was obvious in the campus arena, where socializing in mixed peer groups became a frequent sight (Bogle, 2008:20; Horowitz, 1987:226). This is still the case today. At the moment when relationships between the sexes became less formal, a new prevalent sexual script emerged on college campus:

Conclusions
two friends or acquaintances would have sex without expectations of commitment or a more in-depth development of emotional intimacy.

From the 1970s onwards, a drastic restructuring of the American economy increased job insecurity, financial precarity and economic inequality. In this new economic environment, the relevance of educational qualifications for financial security increased. Many young Americans experienced enhanced pressures to get the most out of their college years. They prioritized the educational attainment needed to secure a well-paying job, the accumulation of precious social capital, the development of a broad range of social and cultural skills for today’s complex work environment, and additionally, their enjoyment of these years of relative freedom as much as possible. Among college youth, the self-development imperative felt pressing. Students experienced college as a time in which they uncompromisingly needed to focus on their own development, and committed relationships were seen as events that could jeopardize this project.

The importance of the self-development imperative was eminent for the students I spoke with at BAU. For both middle and upper-middle-class students, college was a time to focus on their own interests, make new friends and experiment with sex. Committed relationships, according to students, demanded compromises and large time and emotional investments. They conflicted with ‘students’ expectations of college life as a time to be uncompromisingly ‘selfish’. Structural economic changes in the latter half of the 20th century shaped a college culture in which a self-development imperative was paramount. Privileged students, in particular, prioritized investing in their own identities and securing their futures before committing to a partner. In this new environment, college students valued sex outside of a relationship context. They prioritized a sexual script that allowed for sexual experimentation without the emotional and time investments of a committed relationship. Within this context, hooking up became a dominant script within the college arena.

The aforementioned social, cultural and economic changes did not solely affect college students. The power balance between men and women changed throughout society, and increased precarity and economic insecurity made practices of self-development more relevant for all Americans (McGee, 2005). In this dissertation, I asked if these macro-social, cultural and economic changes spurred the development of hookup culture among youth outside of the college arena. The chapters on ‘game’ practitioners in the Bay Area indicate that this did not occur. Although players of the ‘game’ were primed to hookup and dedicated time to study and practice the pursuit of such sexual adventures, few practitioners had frequent casual sexual encounters. Furthermore, many of these sexual escapades followed a sexual script that was unlike the college hookup script. Instead, it followed a rather gradual progression of
emotional and physical intimacy. This shows that hookup culture is not omnipresent in urban erotic contact zones but is likely confined to specific spatial niches such as college campuses.

College campuses in America are often rather autonomous ‘youth villages’ with tightly integrated social environments, severe peer pressure and a high degree of conformity (Wouters, 2012:297). Particular infrastructural arrangements on campus result in a distinct environment in which hookup culture can flourish. One of the most important conditions is a large and active social scene with an abundance of alcohol-infused partying. A number of studies, including my examination of intimate relationships on BAU, show that hooking up predominantly happens in this party scene (Allison and Risman, 2014:108; Armstrong and Hamilton, 2013; Bogle, 2008:167). Not all colleges in the US have a dominant party scene, which seems to be particularly present at large residential State colleges that offer an abundance of easy majors (Bogle, 2008; Armstrong and Hamilton, 2013). One reason why BAU lacked a dominant hookup culture was because of the absence of a pronounced party scene on campus. Alcohol and drug-infused parties happened in the homes of students living outside of the campus arena. These parties were often small scale and restricted to a close circle of friends of the hosts.

Residential patterns also impact the ecology of hookup culture. Students living at their parents’ homes seldom hooked up. An adage of American parenting is ‘not under my roof’, which is a rule that children should not have sex in their parents’ homes (Schalet, 2011). This maxim is an effort by parents to control the sexuality of teenagers and young adults, in the hope that they will not engage in serious sexual activity until later in life. Furthermore, on-campus residency often resulted in tightly integrated communities with a dominant peer culture and severe social control. This is illustrated by Armstrong and Hamilton’s (2013:190) finding that some students who were not initially interested in partying and hooking up were drawn into this scene by peer pressure. Tightly integrated residential colleges also establish a ‘general sense of familiarity’ and trust between students, facilitating their casual interactions and hookups (Bogle, 2008:132). At BAU, only a small fraction of the total student body lived on campus, while most students were dispersed around the city, living with peers or with parents. The student community was loosely integrated, social control was shallow and the sexual culture was diverse.

Not all students hookup, even though this is a dominant script in the sexual culture on many college campuses. Hooking up is largely a practice of upper and middle-class students, while working-class students often find it a foreign sexual practice and are primed to committed relationships (Allison and Risman, 2014; Armstrong and Hamilton, 2013; Bogle, 2008:61). This link between social class
and sexual culture was also pronounced in my study on intimate relationships at BAU. Privileged students were primed to the party and hookup scene because it resonated with their understanding of college life. Working-class students had a different understanding of college and relationships. Moreover, a larger fraction of these students resided in their parents’ homes, and this greatly affected their opportunities to partake in the party and hookup scene around campus.

In the campus arena, socioeconomic structures and infrastructural arrangements impacted hookup culture, along with the development of students’ career trajectories. I found that freshmen students in particular are primed to party and hookup, while upperclassmen were far less interested in this scene and more geared towards committed relationships. This resonates with other studies that found a similar trend in the development of students’ sexual careers (Allison and Risman, 2014:111; Wade and Heldman, 2012). The reputation of college life as a time marked by fun, excitement, parties, relative freedom and sexual play is appealing for young men and women in America. This understanding is partly acquired as a result of experiences of American adolescence, during which many youths are subjected to authoritative parental control that drastically limits their social and sexual experiences (Schalet, 2011). When they enter college, this parental control diminishes, and youths are free to explore the excitement of college parties and sexual play. As students progress through college, they often ‘grow out’ of the party and hookup scene. They move from a position in which sexual codes were enforced by authoritative control to one where they are maintained through self-regulation (Wouters, 2012:103-104). In college, the adult sexual codes within a relationship context are replaced by a new sexual code of uncommitted sexual experimentation. Slowly, as students progress through college, the adult sexual code is accepted again and is maintained through self-regulation rather than authoritative, parental control.

21st-century hooking up is markedly different from the conventional dating of mid-20th century America. However, some dynamics are found in both regimes. A lot has been written on the persistense of gender inequality in hookups. The tenacious sexual double standard of dating persists in hookup culture, male and female sexuality continuous to be judged along different standards, and the sexual practices in hookups are more geared towards men's sexual pleasure than that of women (Armstrong et al., 2012:456; Currier, 2013:717; England et al. 2008:535; Kalish and Kimmel, 2011:147). More parallels can be drawn between the dating and hookup regimes. Dating, like hooking up, is a public status game between competitors in which popularity could be won. At BAU, this status dynamic of hookup culture existed in the party and hookup scene, although the lack of social integration and the weak social control at BAU made this dynamic less visible and less pressing,
compared to the popularity game of hookup culture described by other authors (Armstrong and Hamilton, 2013; Sweeney, 2014; Wade, 2017).

This connotation of hooking up as a status game found even more vehement expression in ‘seduction communities’. Within these groups, the competitive dynamic of hookup culture was magnified tenfold, enhanced by its professionalism. Sexual adventures within this distinct field acquired a similar dynamic as that seen in sports; it was a game played between competitive players in which money and status could be won. ‘Game’ practitioners construed their trade as a highly technical craft, like most sportsmen see their game, comprising techniques of the body and mind that could be learned through dedicated study and incessant, repetitive practice. Like in sports, virtuosi showed in the performance of field-specific techniques of the body, the ability to read the ‘game’ and strategically maneuver within the field, control it, and ultimately outcompete other players by setting records.

A COMPARISON BETWEEN SEXUAL REGIMES

Hong Kong has seen many similar socioeconomic changes as the US. The booming economy in the second half of the 20th century encouraged many women to find paid employment, and tertiary education has expanded tremendously and attracted an increasing number of female students. At the same time, financial insecurity is rampant and remains a freighting specter for many Hong Kongese, increasing the relevance of higher educational attainments for youth. The intersection of these forces shaped intimate life in the city-state, and some trends in gender and intimate relations parallel developments in America, while others are markedly different. Concomitant to America, the age of first marriage has risen tremendously in Hong Kong, fertility rates have dropped, divorce rates have increased, and premarital sex is more accepted as are diverse sexual practices (Davis and Friedman, 2014). On the other hand, child birth outside of wedlock is infrequent, and sex remains rooted in committed relationships to a much greater extent than in the US.

A changing economy has made labor market-orientated self-development among youth in Hong Kong increasingly relevant. Chinese parents, compared to their American counterparts, were vehement in inculcating this imperative on their children. The adage of Hong Kong parenting was ‘no boy/girlfriend at all’. Hong Kong parents not only tried to control their children’s sexuality, like American parents, but they aimed for a more total form of control over their children’s activities. By setting rules against romantic relationships, Hong Kong parents tried to channel all of their children’s energy and focus towards school work. The increasing complexity
of the economy and the lack of social welfare provisions in the city-state heightened the relevance of high educational attainments for maintaining, or rising, class positions. In this period of continuous economic insecurity, parents held a tight grip on their children and, by means of soft and hard persuasion, encouraged them to study hard and secure a prosperous future. This prioritization for youth to acquire skills and qualifications to benefit their future prospects in the competitive labor market continued in college, although this was less through authoritative control by parents and more through self-regulation. Most students continued to work hard in university and joined all sorts of student organizations to learn skills that would benefit their future employment. This self-development imperative seemed similar to that seen in the US at first, but it did not translate into a hookup culture at colleges in Hong Kong.

In contrast to the US, the dominant sexual script at college in Hong Kong was one in which an intimate relationship developed out of a longstanding friendship, and a gradual buildup of emotional intimacy coincided with a slow progression of sexual activity. Intercourse was confined to a committed relationship and preferably marriage. This, however, did not mean that students were not aware of the hookup script. The hookup script was largely a symbolic entity that students referred to in reflecting on their own relationships and those of peers. Hooking up had a low position within the ordering of sexual scripts on campus. It was a debased practice, seldom enacted, and in comparison to hooking up, their own intimate practices seemed successful and acquired a veneer of respectability. Hookups were seldom enacted at UHK, but the sexual script offered insight. Students used it as a symbolic resource for identity politics, to construct boundaries between themselves and peers in America and Europe.

In the US, the sexual norms on college campuses differed greatly from those in the urban erotic contact zone outside of this arena. At college, hooking up was a prevalent sexual script, while in the urban erotic contact zone it was not. In Hong Kong, however, sexual norms at college seemed to overlap with those in the urban nightlife. In both settings, hookups seldom happened and the sexual code was that emotional and physical intimacy should progress slowly and in tandem. The chapter on ‘game’ practitioners in Hong Kong gave insight into the dominant sexual mores of the urban erotic contact zone in Hong Kong. These men were not representatives of a mainstream sexual culture but were an extreme case. ‘Game’ practitioners in Hong Kong, just like their counterparts in the US, were primed to hookup and actively sought casual sex encounters with Chinese women. Within their attempts, they often violated sexual norms within the city-state, and their violations elucidated the dominant sexual code within this arena of youth.
The dominant sexual mores in Hong Kong corresponded in some ways to a conventional dating script of mid-20th century America, but there were also important distinctions. Both regimes had stringent gendered rituals of romance. A man asked a woman out, usually paid for dates, opened doors, escorted her home, and initiated light sexual contact. In Hong Kong, however, dating is first and foremost a vestibule for a committed monogamous relationship that ideally evolves into marriage, although this does not always happen. Dating in Hong Kong is generally a short transitional period between friendship and a committed relationship, in which partners make their romantic interest in each other explicit, talk about the expectations of a relationship, open up to each other emotionally, and decide if they wanted to be a couple. In contrast, dating in the US was first and foremost an arrangement that allowed for ‘safe’ sexual experimentation, comprised of sexual stimulation but not intercourse, which remained associated with adult sexual practices. Dating in mid-20th century America was a status game between competitors in which popularity could be won. It was about consumptive leisure in the public spaces frequented by youth. The dating relationship, at least in the last phase of the dating era, was exclusive, and partners often stayed with each other for months or years without an expectation that this would evolve into an engagement and marriage (Bailey, 1988:51).

In order to understand differences in intimate cultures of youth in Hong Kong and America, it is important to understand the power balance between the sexes and how it has changed. In America, the extraordinary achievements of the gender revolution translated into a lifting of restrictions on female sexuality, which made hookup culture possible. Although women have also gained much ground in Hong Kong, sexual norms in the city-state are still profoundly different for men and women. Sex outside of a relationship context is much more accepted for men than for women. Women’s sexuality is more strictly controlled, and penalties for sex outside of relationships are more severe for women than for men. Gender relations in Hong Kong are more similar to mid-20th century America than to the current state of affairs, for instance in ideals concerning role-patterns in the family. The dominant sexual regime of contemporary youth in Hong Kong, however, is markedly different from the dating regime of mid-20th century America. How can we understand the differences in the two sexual regimes?

Within Hong Kong, as well as in America, college campus life had its own cultural institutions and a distinct student culture. This was exemplified in the eminence of ‘the five things students needed to do in college’, which all students were familiar with and most students enacted. In this distinct youth culture at University Hong Kong, forging intimate relationships with peers, to ceot pool, was important.
This was perceived similarly to dating in the sense that both were used by youth to mark their differences from the adult world.

Like many college campuses in America, the campus of University Hong Kong was a tightly integrated community with a dominant culture and intense social control. This tight social integration of student life at University Hong Kong resulted in a stringent peer control of gender and sexuality. In my analysis of the symbolic gender identities gun jam, gun jam bing and gau gung, I showed that these functioned as mechanisms of control, with which students policed the gender and sexual behavior of fellow students and through which they reinvigorated dominant sexual norms on campus. Women who signaled a relational interest in a variety of men were prone to the gun jam label and risked stigmatization and marginalization on campus. Similarly, men who made explicit advances on more than one woman risked the gau gung label and faced similar penalties. Thus, these labels also controlled their sexuality and revived the norm of long-term committed relationships. The stark social integration of University Hong Kong resulted in a stringent social control, through which dominant sexual norms were maintained.

Alongside these profound similarities in the social conditions in Hong Kong and America, there were tacit differences. Colleges in America had always been rather autonomous ‘youth villages’ outside of the realm of parental control (Wouters, 2012:297), while in Hong Kong, parental control never waned completely. A large part of the student body at University Hong Kong continued to live in their parents’ homes. Furthermore, campus residency in Hong Kong was often for one or two years, after which students moved back to their parents’ homes. Even those students residing on campus often moved back to their parents’ homes for a number of days per week. In the small city-state, it was never a long commute between the university and the residences of students’ families. Hong Kongese youth thus remained in the sphere of parental control, which prolonged the adult grip on youth sexuality. In contrast, American students moved away from parental controls when they entered college.

The highly institutionalized nature of relationship formation on the Hong Kong campus implied that the norms of the older generation resonated in students’ intimate culture. University Hong Kong had notorious institutions of relationship formation, such as O-camps and Secret-Angel-programs, in which students were encouraged to ceot pool and form an intimate relationship with peers. These institutions were conservative by nature. They solidified patterns of interaction and consolidated the norms of previous students. Furthermore, these institutions operated under the auspices of university administrators, who belonged to an older generation. By supporting these arrangements, they made sure that the sexual norms es-
poused in these institutions corresponded with those of their own generation. Older generations maintained their control over your sexuality through these conservative institutions for forming relationships at University Hong Kong.

HOOKUP CULTURE AND ‘SEDUCTION COMMUNITIES’

‘Seduction communities’ are a heterosexual male reaction to the rise of hookup culture. In the dating era, men and women experienced different restrictions on their sexuality. Men were expected to push for and engage in sex, while women were expected to withhold sexual intercourse until marriage. In hookup culture, sex outside of a relationship context became the norm for both men and women. For the first time in history, women were actually sexually available in uncommitted and unrestricted relationships devoid of emotional intimacy. In theory, hookup culture is a heterosexual men’s paradise; in reality, however, it poses new challenges for young men. Sexual relations with women have always been central to heterosexual manhood, especially in young adulthood. Heterosexuality needs to be proven constantly, and in hookup culture this is achieved through the continuous sexual conquest of women. In the dating era, men could hide behind the adage that women were not sexually available, but in the hookup era this is no longer the case. Young adult men need to hook up in order to prove their heterosexual manhood. While some men succeed, often due to their good looks, high-class background and sophisticated social skills, many others do not. These are the men that flock to self-help groups to learn the heterosexual skills to hook up with women. ‘Seduction communities’ are such self-help groups.

While ‘seduction communities’ are fueled by a fantasy of the omnipresent possibilities of hookup culture, the vast majority of ‘game’ practitioners do not hookup often. Only the most skillful players of the ‘game’, and this was a fraction of the total population of practitioners, had frequent sexual adventures. In chapter four, I explained that most of these adventures followed a blueprint that resembled a contemporary dating script more than a college hookup. These encounters often had a gradual buildup of emotional intimacy that coincided with a gradual intensification of physical intimacy over a number of hours and often over a number of days, despite dedicated and persuasive efforts to speed up the process. This shows that hookup culture is not omnipresent among youth outside the college campus arena. Dominant sexual norms, at least in the urban erotic contact zone of San Francisco, resonated with a contemporary dating script. Hooking up
is thus predominantly the practice of college students in tightly integrated and autonomous youth communities.

In ‘seduction communities’, hookup culture is thus primarily a fantasy about unlimited potential sexual possibilities. This is understandable in the US, where a large percentage of young adults have been to college or have at least heard about college culture from friends or the media. The tales of fantastic, free-for-all sexuality among youth fuel the fantasies of young men within and beyond the campus arena. Some come to expect that hooking up is the norm in intimate interactions with women within and outside of the college context. It is particularly peculiar that young adult men fantasize about uncommitted sex with women in societies where dominant sexual norms, even those on campuses, do not allow for casual sex. ‘Game’ practitioners in Hong Kong, for instance, fantasize about casual sex with Hong Kong Chinese women, while a hookup script is not prevalent among youth in the city-state. This fantasy about casual sexual adventures with East Asian women is informed by Orientalist imaginaries.

Orientalism conveys a discourse about the East and the exotic, sensuous Asian women that are sexually available to White men. Perhaps Orientalism has always sustained a fantasy about casual sexual relationships with Asian women. Authors like Flaubert and Burton have written about myriad sexual adventures with Asian women. Regardless of these historical continuities, an Orientalist imaginary continues to color the sexual fantasy of expat men, as shown in my chapter on ‘game’ practitioners in Hong Kong. For these men, Orientalist fantasies about sexually available Asian women spurred their interest in ‘seduction communities’ in Hong Kong. This cultural fantasy about Asian women, however, was not confined to White expat men. Some of my respondents were Chinese men who had spent their formative years in the Anglo-Saxon world. They also drew on this orientalist fantasy about Asian femininity to explain their interest in Hong Kong Chinese women.

The lamented loss of male privilege in the ‘west’ is intimately entwined with this Orientalist fantasy about Asian women. In some ways, ‘game’ practitioners in Hong Kong were correct in that gender relations had changed astonishingly in the last half a century in Europe and the Anglo-Saxon world. While most people in the ‘west’ welcomed these changes with open arms, some men turned their backs to gender change and lamented the days of unchallenged patriarchy. This was the case for ‘game’ practitioners in Hong Kong. They bemoaned changing gender relations and bore grudges against White women in particular. While residing in Hong Kong, they had no interest in women from Europe and the Anglo-Saxon world, and this was not confined to White women but also included Asian women who had lived in these regions. In Hong Kong, ‘game’ practitioners sought a hyper-feminine partner.
that could grant them unrestricted male privileges in intimate relations. This was more available to them in Hong Kong than in Europe, America and Australia. Ironically, ‘game’ practitioners in Hong Kong applauded hookup culture but denounced the same forces that made casual sex possible for women. Feminism spurred changes in the power relations between men and women and resulted in more relaxed restrictions on women’s sexuality. ‘Game’ practitioners celebrated the latter, but they condemned the reconfiguration of power between men and women.

The reality of intimate relationships in Hong Kong was at odds with the Orientalist fantasy of sexually available Asian women. ‘Game’ practitioners went to great lengths to pursue Hong Kong Chinese women for casual sexual adventures. At times, these strategies were successful, but usually they were not. ‘Game’ practitioners offered an extreme case to investigate the dominant sexual mores of the urban erotic contact zone in Hong Kong. Their pursuit of casual sexual adventures often resulted in a violation of sexual mores, and these violations illuminated the codes for intimate coupling. The hegemonic sexual script in the urban erotic contact zone of Hong Kong entailed a gradual progression of emotional intimacy that coincided with a gradual intensification of sexual activity. Intercourse, however, was confined to committed relationships and preferably even marriage. Hookup culture in Hong Kong largely remained an ideational construct, which was true for both students of UHK and ‘game’ practitioners in Hong Kong.

**FINAL REMARKS**

Dating and hooking up were distinct sexual regimes of youth in America. The adaptation of the dating regime by the middle classes coincided with the development of youth as a distinct and autonomous life phase with its own institutions and its own culture in the early 20th century. As specialists started writing about youth as a distinct life phase, with its own psychology, its own development trajectory and its own trials and tribulations, youth began to think of themselves as having a distinct identity. A number of developments increased segregation between youths and adults. Changing demographic patterns in the family meant that youth grew up in families with brothers and sisters of the same age; the expansions of tertiary education meant that an increasing number of young Americans spent a number of years in youth enclaves of residential coed facilities. In this important period in their lives, youth lived outside of their parents’ homes and beyond parental control, in a setting where they were surrounded by peers. These ‘youth villages’ were tightly socially integrated communities with a dominant culture that was maintained
through stark social control. Within these distinct environments, an autonomous youth culture could develop, devoid of the control of older generations. Within this youth culture, sexuality became a prime identity marker and offered a regime of intimate relationships that contrasted the sexual codes of the adult world. Dating and later, hooking up were recreational sexualities, contrasting the committed and durable bonds of adulthood.

Like in America, college men and women in Hong Kong had a distinct youth culture with its own institutions. However, youth culture in Hong Kong was not autonomous from the adult world like it was in America. The older generation had a firm grip on the terms in which a youth identity developed, and this extended to the realm of sexuality. This grip manifested itself on campus through a prolonged residence in parents’ homes and through dominant institutions of relationship formation. Sexuality was not a prime identity marker of Hong Kongese youth; instead, they distinguished themselves from older generations in terms of their aspirations in their relationships. Hong Kongese youth construed the intimate relationships of older generations as cold, formal and rooted in tradition. Instead, the younger generation valued close emotional ties with their partners and warm, tender relations with their intimate relations, based on a sincere appreciation of their partner’s personality.

Interestingly, hookup culture in the US has not resulted in an increase in the number of sexual partners of youth. One would expect that the prevalence of casual sex across myriad American college campuses would imply that youth are having sex with a larger number of partners. This seems evident when compared with an older generation who predominantly confined sex to the context of committed relationships. However, the contrary seems to be happening. In comparison to older cohorts, youth are engaging in intercourse later, and they have fewer sexual partners. These trends in youth sexuality does not seem to be confined to the US, as recent research in The Netherlands shows (RSAN, 2017). I have offered a tentative explanation for this trend in this dissertation and argued that the changed power balance between men and women resulted in a ‘culture of sexual consent’, suggesting that youth are increasingly careful about engaging in sexual activities. This desexualization of youth is a trend that demands a closer examination. Why is it occurring? Under what conditions do youth engage in sex? And, how is sexual abstinence perceived among youth?

During fieldwork, new technologies to find intimate partners were adopted by the masses. Applications like Tinder and Happn attracted millions of users worldwide, in the course of months. Initially, my plan was to incorporate a chapter on how youth have used these new technologies in my research, but this was too am-
bitious for the current project. I believe, however, that this is a fascinating area for future research. A re-occurring theme in popular media is that this technological innovation fueled a culture of casual sex. This needs to be explored more thoroughly. In particular, research should address the dependencies between sexual scripting and technologies. How do technological affordances condition sexual scripting? And, on the other hand, what inspires the designers of these applications? How do sexual regimes shape the design of technological aids for intimate coupling?
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