2021

Let's Talk About Sex: Healthy Sexuality Programming at Faith-Based Institutions

Kenedy M. Kieffer

LET'S TALK ABOUT SEX: HEALTHY SEXUALITY PROGRAMMING AT FAITH-BASED INSTITUTIONS

A thesis

Presented to

The School of Social Sciences, Education & Business

Department of Higher Education and Student Development

Taylor University

Upland, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Higher Education and Student Development

By

Kenedy M. Kieffer

May 2021

Higher Education and Student Development
Taylor University
Upland, Indiana

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

MASTER'S THESIS

This is to certify that the Thesis of

Kenedy Kieffer

entitled

Let's Talk About Sex: Healthy Sexuality Programming at Faith- Based Institutions

has been approved by the Examining Committee for the thesis requirement for the

Master of Arts degree
in Higher Education and Student Development

May 2021

Kelly Yordy, Date
Thesis Supervisor

Scott Barrett, Date
Member, Thesis Hearing Committee

Todd Ream, Date
Member, Thesis Hearing Committee

Tim Herrmann, Ph.D. Date
Director, M.A. in Higher Education and Student Development

Abstract

College is a time in life where students grow and develop inside and outside of the classroom. Attitudes that students develop related to healthy sexuality should not be different from anything else learned in college, as it is a central part of who they become by the time they graduate. This research study explores the methods faith-based institutions are employing to educate students toward healthy sexuality when requiring specific sexual behavior expectations to which students adhere. These methods included institutional commitment to educating students, educating through relationships with students, specific groups being educated, and educating in curricular and cocurricular spaces at institutions. Although programming was occurring at all institutions in these areas, student development professionals expressed many themes that recognized the educational gaps that still occur at faith-based institutions that aim to prepare students for lives of healthy sexuality post-graduation.

Acknowledgements

Words cannot begin to describe the amount of gratitude I have for the community of cheerleaders, encouragers, and deep thinkers that surrounded me during grad school and throughout this thesis process. Your support means so much more than you will know.

Thank you to my *family.* Thank you for asking me questions, editing hundreds of drafts, questioning my methodology, celebrating milestones along the way, and pushing me toward excellence. There was not a time when I didn't feel the ability to reach out for support, and for that, I am so thankful.

Thank you to *my cohort.* Without you, this grad school and thesis process would feel meaningless. Thank you for choosing to engage in difficult conversations, offering your perspectives even when they may be different than those around you, learning how to live with soft eyes, and teaching me how to love those around me better.

Thank you, *Jessica, Kelly, Julia, and Debbie*. Thank you for choosing to invest and come alongside me in my journey. I am so grateful for supervisors, faculty members, and mentors that are solid female leaders and seek to know who I am and where I am going.

Thank you to my *English Hall* residents. You made Taylor home. Thank you for letting me join in airband performances, wing retreats, virtual COVID talent shows, and wing churches. Your willingness to engage deeply in those around you and fully invest in a place will forever change how I interact with the world.

Finally, my *friends.* Whether it be coffee, late nights at the library, hugs during meltdowns, or asking me a million questions about my thesis, I couldn't have done it without you. Big 3, Stanley, Emily, Maddie, Kimie, Shelby, and Mike, you will be world changers.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

Picture move in day for first-year students on campus. After a long day of moving personal belongings into the residence hall, meeting new people across campus, and leaving family members, first-year students attend a mandatory floor meeting where they are welcomed again and given some ground rules for their living environment. The Resident Assistant (RA) reads the code of conduct aloud to the floor and gets to the sentence on the behavioral expectations that the students will have to adhere to for the remainder of the time they are at the institution. Sexual relationships and expectations around visiting members of the opposite gender comes up, and you can see the confusion surfacing. Uncomfortable glances can be seen around the room as the RA explains why they have expectations at the institution that are counter-cultural to many of the places students had been prior to arriving on campus.

Specific Sexual Behavior Expectations

The narrative above demonstrates a common scene at many faith-based institutions across America. Behavioral expectations for students are common and provided within the residence hall context. The behaviors are explicit and presented with potential corresponding conduct consequences. Many Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) institutions have specific expectations that can be identified through community covenants, handbooks, or codes of conduct. Often times these expectations

are upheld by all in the community, and one's signature of agreement is required in order to be included as a member of the institution.

Statement of the Problem

The aforementioned behavioral expectations at many faith-based institutions are established to encourage students to uphold standards that align with the institutional mission and foundational documents. Education on healthy sexuality can sometimes be influenced by these policies since abstinence is expected within most of the behavioral expectations. This presents a challenge for educators who are planning developmental programs for students who may have different perspectives on healthy sexuality.

Healthy Sexuality

Healthy sexuality is often defined as the way one integrates the many different aspects of sexuality he or she possess. Firestone and Catlett (1999) stated that healthy sexuality may include integration of healthy sexuality components of affection, tenderness, and companionship between two people. According to some researchers, healthy and natural sexuality should also include an acceptance of one's animal nature and a positive attitude toward bodies, nudity, and sexual urges (Firestone et al., 2006).

The way humans are able to talk about, realize, and attach meaning to sexual experiences can holistically add to health. Some theorists have described healthy sexuality as including a component of being able to attach emotions and meaning to sexual experiences (Schnarch, 1991). In addition to the tremendous variance among people's sexual behaviors, determining what is normal or healthy is further complicated by several types of categorical variables that also impact sexuality such as gender, age, and religion. Thus, from person to person, what constitutes healthy sexuality may be very

different. Sexuality—specifically sexual activity—is impacted by many factors. When considering health from a holistic perspective, one begins to recognize that both mental and physical health factors significantly impact healthy sexual functioning and one's views on the role it plays in identity.

The role of higher education in identity formation and student outcomes can be observed in many mission statements institutions have today. "Ideally the college experience helps young adults learn how to navigate adult responsibilities and become the kind of self-aware, intelligent, tolerant citizens that university mission statements boast their campuses turn into the world" (Freitas, 2013, p. 27). Many higher education institutions have lofty expectations about hopes and desires for their students during their time of enrollment. For example, the University of Notre Dame states that they want to "promote disciplined sensibility to the poverty, injustice and oppression that burden the lives of so many… and create a sense of human solidarity and concern for the common good that will bear fruit as learning becomes service to justice" (University of Notre Dame, 2021). Additionally, North Carolina University aspires "to serve as a center for research, scholarship, and creativity and to teach a diverse community of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students to become the next generation of leaders" (University of North Carolina, 2021). The hope and expectations of holistic student development present at many institutions like the institutions mentioned above help guide and direct the way higher education professionals engage in work and the commitment to those outcomes.

Despite the fact that higher education professionals have the desire to educate students holistically, there are times that preparation for post-graduation social lives are

missed. Freitas (2013) states, "we cannot encourage our students and children to become whole, integrated, empowered, virtuous people if we fail to adequately address hookup culture and to articulate how it works against these goals" (p. 14). According to Freitas (2008), a surprising number of students are entering faith-based colleges with a much lower connection between sex and religion. Faith-based schools are often counter-cultural with behavior expectations around sexual behaviors and sexuality (Freitas, 2008).

Purpose of the Study

The debate about whose role it is to educate about healthy sexual relationships and sexuality in the educational system has long been missing in America and many times can cause a gap in students' knowledge entering college. If students are not receiving comprehensive healthy sexuality education prior to or during the college years, students will be graduating from institutions with very little healthy sexuality education. Minimal research has been conducted on institutional responsibility in educating college students for lives of healthy relationships or healthy sexuality in the context of faith-based higher education institutions with specific sexual behavioral expectations. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to provide an exploratory examination into how educators at faith-based institutions that have specific behavioral expectations provide educational programming around healthy sexuality that aligns with their mission statement while also preparing students for life after college.

Conclusion

With mission- and value-driven specific expectations surrounding student sexual behavior at faith-based institutions, complicated definitions of sexuality, and minimal education regarding healthy sexuality from previous learning spaces, students are likely

receiving an incomplete education on healthy sexuality. To provide insight into the research gap surrounding healthy sexuality programming specifically at faith-based institutions, the following research question will guide this study: How do student development professionals at faith-based institutions provide healthy sexuality programming for students?[1]

[1] For the purpose of this study, the researcher will be looking at healthy heterosexual sexual relationships. If expectations for students on campus are different in same-sex relationships, this will be noted but is beyond the scope of this study.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Education on healthy sexuality is important to engage in as higher education professionals. One of the purposes of higher education involves college professionals successfully caring for and developing students. This chapter will examine the literature surrounding the sexual behaviors of college students particularly at faith-based institutions. This review of the literature will also explore the importance of educational programming for college student learning and explore the definition of healthy sexuality.

Sexual Behaviors of College Students

College is often portrayed in the media as a playground for bad decisions. In movies, television shows, and the news, viewers play witness to the latest sex scandal, copious amounts of alcohol being consumed, and passionate relationships that often start and progress quickly. Media portrayal can often exaggerate or give a different view of reality; however, in reviewing studies conducted on college students' engagement in sexual behavior, the media correlation seems to align well with what is actually occurring on college campuses. According to Earle et al. (2007), between 78% and 94% of college females and between 83% and 86 % of college males are engaging in premarital sexual intercourse. Students are highly involved sexually with their peers across college campuses in America today and are portrayed throughout media as a group that is engaging at a high level in sexual behaviors. Hookup culture at many institutions is one

of the most prominent ways in which this student population is deciding to engage in sexual behaviors.

Hookup culture dominates the sexual behaviors and lives of college students today. "Hooking up" is often defined differently from person to person but can include varied activity from a make-out session to having sexual intercourse. Hookup culture at many institutions focuses far more on the physical than the emotional connection between the individuals. At many institutions, allowing any emotional connection to a hookup would be breaking the societal norms. This societal norm is very different than the healthy sexuality earlier referred to as healthy behavior that involves attaching emotions and meanings to sexual experiences (Schnarch, 1991).

In addition to a lack of emotional connection comes the stress and expectation of what weekend hookups will come to: "Most students spend hours agonizing over their hopes for Friday night and, later, dissecting the evening's successes or failures often wishing the social contract would lead to more" (Freitas, 2013, p. 32). This can be an issue for many college students and could be linked to the high levels of anxiety and depression seen across the United States today (Kitzrow, 2003). High engagement in sexual behaviors can be detrimental and stress-inducing to many students; however, many continue to engage in this behavior due to many factors. Freitas (2013) explains that "many students perform sexual acts because it's just what people do, because they are bored, because they have done it once so why not, or because they are too trashed to summon any self-control" (p. xviii). The physical and emotionless engagement with the opposite gender has created many issues among college students and the way that students engage with sexuality and members of the opposite gender.

Sexuality at Faith-Based Institutions

Sexual behaviors look differently when examining the demographic of students at a faith-based institution in comparison to a secular higher education institution. Hookup culture at many non-religiously affiliated institutions is counter-defined by what many students at evangelical institutions ascribe to as "purity culture." Within contemporary evangelical Christianity, there is a so-called purity culture, which places strict regulations on sexual beliefs and behavior. This purity culture was first introduced during the 1970s as a reaction against the sexual revolution of the 1960s (Anderson, 2015). Purity culture began to grow in popularity during the 1990s and was taught to adolescents in youth groups across the United States. Many people attribute the prevalence of purity culture in evangelicalism to various curricula taught to adolescents at church, the most popular of which is entitled, "True Love Waits" (Barbee, 2014; Deneson, 2017). As part of this curriculum, adolescents are separated into gendered groups and are educated on the importance of maintaining "sexual purity" until marriage. After the completion of the curriculum, there is often a ceremony where the adolescents sign a pledge. The pledge states: "Believing that true love waits, I make a commitment to God, myself, my family, my friends, my future mate and my future children to be sexually abstinent from this day until the day I enter a biblical marriage relationship" (Pugsley, 2014). The acceptance of the purity culture is split since not all Christian adolescents grew up in this purity culture, and thus the messages taught within purity culture are not universal among all Christians (Anderson, 2015).

Traditional Christianity has long placed certain restrictions on sexual behavior. Christians' beliefs about sexuality are often based upon a biblical interpretation, which

states that sex is only to be had within the bond of marriage. Genesis 2:24 states, "Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh" (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001, Gen. 2:24). The words "become one flesh" refer to sexual intercourse. Christians then take this verse to mean that sexual intercourse is to be had only within the bounds of marriage (Lawton, 1986). Another common Bible verse explicit to sexual expectations that is often linked to this belief is found in 1 Corinthians:

> Now concerning the matters about which you wrote: "It is good for a man not to have sexual relations with a woman." But because of the temptation to sexual immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband. The husband should give to his wife her conjugal rights, and likewise the wife to her husband. For the wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does. Likewise, the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does. (*King James Version*, 2017, 1 Cor. 7:1–4)

Christian students at evangelical institutions often feel as though they should adhere to these restrictions because they want to live in accordance with what they believe is God's desire and what the Bible says is appropriate Christian conduct. This often leads to students believing that abstaining from sexual activity before marriage will lead to greater flourishing. Indeed, the messages proposed by traditional Christian views have been linked to positive outcomes, such as lower risky sexual behavior and increased sexual satisfaction (Hardy & Willoughby, 2017; Hernandez et al., 2011; Murray-Swank et al., 2005).

Christian students often ascribe very specific meanings to sexual intercourse and other sexual behaviors. Lastoria (2011) states, "most students would consider sexual behavior appropriate only within a marriage" (p. 71). Many college students that are attending evangelical institutions are concerned about purity and avoiding sexual temptations that are considered sinful and wrong in nature due to morals taught to them through their religious experiences and connections (Brelsford et al., 2011). Results from a national survey showed that in contrast to the high sexual involvement at other institutions (as noted previously), those at evangelical institutions have a 35% involvement rate of engaging in sexual behaviors with the remaining 65% claiming virginity (Freitas, 2013). These findings should not be surprising as most found in the virginity demographic from ages 18 to 25 are enrolled or have graduated from a four-year institution, are more religious with their faith being central to their identity, avoid getting drunk, and do not usually consider themselves among the popular population. Students at the CCCU institutions generally fit this demographic.

In 2011, the Association for Christians in Student Development (ACSD) conducted a student survey studying sexual behaviors involving 6,000 students at 19 faith-based universities (Davis, 2015). This study concluded that 78.5% of students considered themselves virgins and 34% of students were engaging in sexual behaviors including oral, anal, and sexual intercourse. The ACSD findings supported the Lastoria (2011) and Freitas (2013) studies in which student body populations at faith-based institutions were less engaged in sexual activity than non-faith-based institutions.

Shame and guilt are often a response experienced by evangelical students who have engaged in sexual activity during their time enrolled at the institution (Davis, 2015).

Along with shame, feelings of being stained, damaged, rejected, and separated from God can accompany many students' thoughts after engaging in sexual behavior. With around 75% of students in their community not engaging in this behavior, sense of belonging and satisfaction with oneself can also decrease. In conversations with many students at evangelical institutions around sexual behaviors, Freitas (2008) discovered that students held deep convictions to the subject. Freitas (2008) states, "many students I talked to said that sex was the worst of all sins" (p. 180). More stories told to Freitas were about times of shame and guilt after kissing a loved one and not knowing if that was too far with them. One student stated, "I think sex is damaging just because you feel so much shame. In every sexual act shame is in company with it" (Freitas, 2008, p. 39). This student then stated, "God becomes less of a loving God and more of a God that hates you because you made a mistake" (Freitas, 2008, p. 40). The shame and depth of the sexual stress put on evangelical students is something that should be acknowledged and is often hard to navigate.

As previously mentioned, faith-based institutions are often counter-cultural with behavior expectations around sexual behaviors and sexuality. "Only at evangelical schools is religion an important factor when deciding whether or not to engage in sex. It is important to understand how institutions talk about and engage with sexuality with the cultural norms changing" (Freitas, 2008 p. 32). The way students are engaging and thinking about biblical expectations and how to incorporate healthy sexuality is often confusing and difficult to navigate.

Healthy Sexuality

While there are many sources regarding healthy sexuality within the LGBTQIA+ community and early childhood healthy sexuality expression as well as studies conducted in other cultures, there remains a gap in the literature on how healthy sexuality is defined in America. Firestone and Catlett (1999) define the engagement of healthy sexuality around college-aged students' heterosexual relationships as "the ability to integrate sexuality into one's daily life, as opposed to it being an external event that occurs on its own. It may include components of affection, tenderness, and companionship between two people" (p. 3). Some theorists have described healthy sexuality as including a component of being able to attach emotions and meaning to sexual experiences (Schnarch, 1991). Healthy sexuality can be difficult to define and has evolved over time in definition and breadth of meaning. Soble (2013) states, "judging sexual behavior by a criterion of 'healthy sexuality' is turning passé, in favor of a definition of health in terms of sex: having it is healthy, not having it is not. 'Healthy sexuality' is becoming redundant" (p. 112). As complex and problematic as Soble's statement is, one can conclude that sexuality and what makes sexuality healthy is not a dualistic topic when considering the definition of healthy sexuality.

Healthy sexuality is defined in many different ways. Healthy sexuality can be interpreted differently depending on a person's life experiences and religious beliefs. Healthy sexuality can vary from student to student and, like many other aspects of life, is complex in nature. The specific sexual behaviors that are expected can be an aspect in one's concept and definition of healthy sexuality.

Specific Sexual Behavior Expectations

In higher education institutions, it is not uncommon for enrolled students to have to adhere to a covenant or code of conduct. This covenant or code of conduct articulates the institution's expectations of student's behaviors as community members. These documents often include rules related to respect, academic integrity, and anti-harassment. In addition to the aforementioned rules and expectations, faith-based institutions are often accompanied by further written codes of conduct or student handbooks with specific behavior expectations. These often counter-cultural expectations can include drinking on- or off-campus, having required spiritual practices, and requirements related to Christian character and integrity. Though they are not always easy to find, faith-based institutions often include in their statements specific behavioral expectations around sex, sexuality, and the ways in which students are expected to engage with the opposite gender while enrolled at their institution. These expectations range in what is expected and how explicitly these expectations are documented, however the range is reflective of the purity culture.

For this exploratory study, specific behavior expectations are identified as behaviors that are clearly and explicitly worded. Additionally, the covenants and code of conduct documents state which behaviors are explicitly allowed and prohibited when a student is enrolled in that institution and result in a disciplinary action. Failure to adhere to those guidelines could result in a disciplinary action.

Sex Education

Sex education and the role the educational system plays in educating a student on sex has long been debated in America. In the K–12 school system, there have been many

different approaches and ways that schools educate students. Depending on the school, education around sex, sexuality, and the way people engage with those of the opposite gender can vary greatly. The role of the school, parents, church, friend groups, sports teams, and social settings can impact the way a student feels about the topic and how they engage in conversations around them. The educational system also has difficulty in establishing who the best educators are. Topics around sexuality, sex, and relationships are often crammed into a health class or gym class curriculum to meet state standards and requirements. With this varied student experience and differentiated ways of educating students in the K–12 system, it is difficult to conclude whether or not students benefit from and are impacted by education on healthy sex (Feigenbaum et al., 1995).

For schools that have decided to include this education in their curriculum, most reported changes that occurred because of a sexual education course were attitudinal involving a higher tolerance of masturbation, gender identity, and contraception (Feigenbaum et al., 1995). Attitudes on abortion and premarital, oral, and casual sex, on the other hand, have been shown not to change as a result of a sexual education course (Feigenbaum et al., 1995; Weis et al., 1992).

As previous studies have shown, sex education courses are not providing adequate preparation and understanding of premarital, oral, and casual sex. Statistically, students will engage in these activities without the education surrounding them (Feigenbaum et al., 1995; Weis et al., 1992). In a study conducted in 2002, Kirby found there are at least three important reasons why effective programs are not implemented more broadly.

First, schools devote relatively little time to health education more generally, and to sex and HIV education more specifically. Because the effective programs last

> for numerous class periods, teachers have difficulty fitting them into their semester curricula. Second, the effective programs include activities that some parents and communities oppose, because they fear they will sanction and encourage sexual activity. Third, many teachers and school districts do not realize that some sex- and HIV-education programs have strong evidence for their success. (p. 31)

It should also be noted that schools are primarily educating students on how to have safe sex and the dangers of unprotected sex. Schools in the K–12 system in America are rarely educating on healthy sexuality when considering the definition of "including a component of being able to attach emotions and meaning to sexual experiences" (Schnarch, 1991). Educational programing from K–12 through higher education institutions could be more proactive in providing wholistic sexual education that would contribute to a student's development.

Educational Programming

Educational programming related to healthy sexuality for undergraduate students is important to their development. Educational programing is defined as programs delivered by the institution with particular learning outcomes for students and evaluated through assessment to demonstrate the effectiveness of the programs. Although very little research has been conducted on college students' knowledge and source of sexuality education prior to entering college, in looking at the systematic variability in the K–12 educational offerings, one can conclude it is varied and, thus, a baseline or foundational education may be helpful in furthering college students' knowledge and development of healthy sexuality.

College is a time when students at all types of institutions are exploring and figuring out their sexuality (Lefkowitz et al., 2004). Students are forming sexual behaviors and attitudes and are figuring out what decisions they want to make regarding their sexuality during college and in life post college. In light of the college years being the place where many students are discovering and exploring their sexuality, higher education professionals should consider intentionally seeking ways to educate around healthy sexuality. Conversations around sexuality may occur between students in residence hall rooms, eating around the dining table, or in the locker room; and yet, those conversations are not often occurring with educators. In addition, Weis et al. (1992) report, "there may be little or no change in sexual behavior as a result of sex education courses" in the classroom (p. 44). The responsibility may not be with educators inside the classroom but rather with the educators that in are in the locker rooms, eating alongside students, and engaging in residential life.

One of the most significant questions surrounding the issue of healthy sexuality programming is related to who is responsible for initiating these sexual education classes and who teaches these classes. According to York (2010), 37.3% of students at Christian institutions report receiving information regarding sex from professors or educators. Who and where information regarding healthy sexuality is coming from at institutions and what programming is being done around healthy sexuality will be explored in this study. This exploration of programming at faith-based institutions will be discussed further in the next chapter and will guide the framework for how to best educate students in the future.

Chapter 3

Methodology

After reviewing the literature and identifying a gap in healthy sexuality education at the higher education level—and more specifically at faith-based institutions—the researcher determined the need for further study. This study will demonstrate how educators at faith-based institutions that have specific behavioral expectations related to sexuality provide educational programming around healthy sexuality that aligns with their mission statements while also preparing students for life beyond college. This research question was explored through an ethnographic qualitative research study.

Qualitative research is a means of study for exploring and understanding the meaning behind individuals or groups that ascribe to a social or human problem (Creswell, 2018). The process of research involves "emerging questions and procedures; collecting data in the participants setting; analyzing the data inductively, building from particulars to general themes; and making interpretations of the meaning of the data" (Creswell, 2018 p. 204). This method is rooted in the field of anthropology and for years has allowed researchers in their study to compare, replicate, catalogue, and classify the object of study (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Qualitative research differs from quantitative design by focusing on the process that is occurring as well as the product or outcome. Researchers conducting qualitative studies are interested in understanding how things occur (Fraenkel et al., 1993; Merriam, 1988). In the current ethnographic study, the

researcher explored the research question utilizing a qualitative research methodology to gain further understanding.

Research Design

This study utilized the ethnographic research design under the qualitative research design umbrella to gain an understanding of how educators at faith-based institutions with specific sexual behavioral expectations educate toward healthy sexuality. The ethnographic design came out of the field of anthropology from well-known researchers Bronislaw Malinowski, Robert Park, and Franz Boaz (Creswell, 2018). This type of qualitative research study was conducted by interviewing participants to gain a holistic picture of the subject studied by looking at day-to-day experiences of a given group (Creswell, 2018). Further, in ethnographical research, the researcher studies a particular cultural group in a natural setting over a prolonged amount of time by collecting observational and interview data. In this study, the researcher examined information through interviews of the particular group of Vice Presidents for Student Life or Student Development and sexuality educators at institutions with shared cultural expectations. The researcher explored the shared groups' experiences in how they educationally program to help students become educated toward healthy sexual relationships.

Context

In order to get a cross section of faith-based institutions, the researcher used the narrowed group of the Christian College Consortium (CCC) to collect research data. The CCC is a group of 13 Christian colleges and universities located across North America. The institutions selected had a shared culture and commitment to the mission of "serving the cause of Christ in the world of higher education by encouraging and assisting

members in the pursuit of their respective missions" (Christian College Consortium, 2021). Since its establishment in 1971, the CCC has facilitated a variety of initiatives including educational conferences, faculty development, and student scholarship and exchange programs between the different institutions (Christian College Consortium, 2021). The CCC is a facilitative body that works together to encourage member institutions in their commitment to the "centrality of Christ, promotion of human flourishing, and the full exploration of the meaning and implications of faithful scholarship" (Christian College Consortium, 2021). This mission is carried out by "creating and nourishing sustaining conversations, fostering a relational community that enhances effective collaboration as well as personal and professional development" (Christian College Consortium, 2021).

All schools within the CCC are faith-based institutions that vary in expectations of students' sexual behavior while enrolled in the institution, but all have explicit behavioral expectations to which students are expected to adhere. Schools in the CCC range in geographical regions in the United States. Getting a cross section of faith-based institutions with a shared mission was important to this study and was able to be achieved by studying CCC institutions.

Initially, the data for this research study were to be collected during the annual conference of the Association for Christians in Student Development in the summer of 2020. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, this conference was cancelled. Therefore, data was instead collected through one-on-one phone calls or video conference interviews (e.g., Skype, FaceTime, Zoom) with participants.

Participants

To collect the data that would best answer the research question, it was imperative to identify educators that would be knowledgeable about existing programming regarding sexuality at each individual CCC institution. The participants in this study represented ten of the 13 CCC member institutions. Participants in this study included Vice Presidents for Student Life or Student Development and, when applicable, a separate educator in either cocurriculum or academics who oversaw programming around sexuality education. Participants in this study ranged from new professionals (those who have worked in higher education for five or fewer years) to experienced professionals (those who have worked in higher education for more than five years). The participants were both male and female and represented various ages. This study represented seven Vice President participants and 10 Student Development professional participants. In order to make the participants' stories and experiences more personal and to protect confidentiality, each school was given a number to represent their institution.

Procedure

Due to the ethnographic nature of this study, participants were identified for an interview regarding their work around sexuality programming. After approval was received from the researcher's Institutional Review Board, participants were identified by position at CCC institutions and contacted via email to consider participation in the study. After participants agreed to participate in the study, interview times were set up with participants using the Calendly scheduling platform. Interview times varied between subjects due to availability ranging between December 2020 and February 2021. Prior to conducting the interviews with the participants, a pilot study was conducted with a higher

education professional who teaches research methods. The purpose of the pilot study was to help the researcher refine the interview protocol and guard against leading questions while preventing strong or confusing wording. In addition, the technology was tested to ensure a smooth process for all participants.

At the commencement of each interview, the researcher presented the informed consent document to each participant verbally and in writing. The informed consent (Appendix A) was geared toward understanding the participants' experiences as educators in deciding how students are receiving educational programing around sexuality. This informed consent also ensured the confidentiality of each participant, provided a list of potential risks of participating in the study, and communicated the option to withdraw from the study at any point without any repercussions.

Each interview began with general questions regarding the participant's specific title, educational credentials, and work experience. Following these questions, the interviewer asked questions about their communication of expectations to students as institutions, specific ways in which their institutions were programming toward lives of healthy sexuality, and how they were preparing students to leave institutions and engage in healthy sexuality post-graduation. When possible, further questions were asked to obtain a more in-depth and holistic examination. Throughout all interviews, the researcher used a digital recording device to collect data and recorded a video call if the platform the participant chose allowed, along with a record of details kept in a field notebook. This field notebook was used to document the researcher's own thinking, feelings, expressions, and links seen between institutions. Digital records were only used by the researcher and supervisor for further analysis.

Data Analysis

The data analysis process began by the researcher at the conclusion of all interviews. The recorded data was transcribed from the recordings using an online transcription program. The transcription fee used for this data analysis was supported through the Association for Christians in Student Development scholarship grant for further research on areas of study relevant to the field. Following the initial digital transcription, the researcher looked through transcriptions for accuracy and compared side-by-side to field notes taken during the interview to ensure quotes and statements were correctly represented through the transcription service.

The researcher reviewed the transcribed data in order to gain a general perspective of the responses. Coding was then utilized to draw out concepts beyond the general responses. Coding is a process of analyzing the data by which the researcher ascribes labels to emerging themes (Creswell, 2007). Labels were further given to help aid the researcher in coding and sorting individual parts of responses in comparison to other institutions' responses. Codes were then added, changed, and deleted as determined by the researcher due to having an abundance of information and in distinguishing what was helpful in answering the research question.

Several strategies were used to ensure the validity of the research study. Triangulation of data was used to cross-check data acquired through interviews at each institution. By interviewing two people from each institution, when possible, the researcher was able to compare notes between the exact same interviews with the same questions. Documents around healthy sexual expectations and any past programming that was communicated externally (e.g., via social media, school newspapers) was also looked

into to further confirm that programming had happened if mentioned through documented analysis.

Member checking was also used to ensure that information was recorded correctly, and an ongoing relationship between the interviewer and interviewee was created and dialogue continued throughout the study if either participant or researcher had further questions. The last validity test used was an examination conducted by a cocurricular educator at a medium sized state school located in the Midwest. This educator does not align institutionally or personally with a faith background and was helpful in checking for researcher bias and terminology that would be understandable to professionals working outside of Christian higher education.

The researcher's qualitative study of a cross section of faith-based institutions with a shared mission was informative in answering the research question of how faith-based institutions provide educational programming designed to help students live lives of healthy sexuality. Through coding and theming of responses of faith-based institutions, the researcher found themes among the shared CCC group.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to provide an exploratory examination into how educators at faith-based institutions with specific sexual behavioral expectations provide educational programming toward healthy sexuality. Furthermore, the researcher studied healthy sexuality programming that aligns with each institution's mission statement while also preparing students for life after college. After analyzing the data, the researcher saw four themes emerge from the shared ethnographical group of student affairs professionals at CCC institutions: institutional commitment to educating students, educating through relationships with students, educating specific groups of students, and educational programming through curricular and cocurricular spaces on campus. The themes discovered in this study revealed how faith-based institutions educate students toward healthy sexuality. It should be noted that if institutions had two interviewees, the data were condensed into one institutional response. It should also be noted that there were no conflicting answers between any VP and corresponding educational programmer.

Institutional Commitment

The first theme identified was an institutional commitment to educating students. Participants from all ten institutions mentioned the importance of communicating healthy sexual behavioral expectations to students through the admissions process, handbooks, or codes of conduct. Six out of ten institutions had a specific sexuality policy that further unpacked the institutional perspective and policies. These statements varied in how and

where they were articulated, including handbooks and specific sexuality statements. They also varied in how explicit the sexual behavioral expectations were articulated. At two institutions, designated educators were assigned to design and plan specific educational programming related to sexuality. One participant that had a specific staff member designated to program at Institution #9 stated,

> Faith-based institutions are just behind best practices. If we are not integrating sexual education and sexuality, I don't even know if positivity is the right word, but like space and acknowledgement that educates [students on sexuality] we're not even doing prevention work. We can't talk about being anti-sexual discrimination, anti-sexual violence, the entire abuse in the churches, against harmful experiences on our campuses because that's such a key component to prevention.

All institutions mentioned that they have a task force or committee designated to sexuality either focused on healthy sexuality or LGBTQ+ topics. Institutional commitments, although varied in how articulated, demonstrated a desire for transparency and candor related to their commitments and values.

Education Through Relationships With Individuals

The second theme that consistently emerged among all ten institutions interviewed was the importance of both individual and communal relationships in educating students on this topic. All ten institutions mentioned that one of the primary ways this topic is engaged is through one-on-one conversations that demonstrate care and compassion around the topic of healthy sexuality and the individual pursuing questions. Five of the ten institutions demonstrated this commitment to relationship through a

program designed for students to share their personal stories. A participant from Institution #8 provided the following explanation:

> I think making sure they feel like this is a place that they belong, regardless of who they are, their experiences or what they believe is step one, step two, I think is giving them space to help develop their identity, and giving them space to tell their story and their experience in a way that's safe with adults, maybe for the first time for some people or even think about people who've been sexually violated, um, growing up and maybe have been sexualized far too early in their [lives].

Opportunities for students to express themselves within a trusted relationship was an important aspect of education for all of these faith-based institutions.

Education for Specific Groups

The third theme that emerged from the data was that institutions educated students toward healthy sexuality by nature of them being part of a particular group. How these expectations were communicated to students varied; however, the following sub-themes of educating students during their first weeks on campus, counseling centers/support groups, educating through student leadership positions/athletic participation, and educating through the conduct process emerged in the research.

First-Year Students/Orientation

At eight of the ten institutions researched, education on community behavioral expectations related to healthy sexuality took place during welcome week at an orientation session. A participant from Institution #3 stated,

> So at the beginning of each year, during our new student orientation we have a town hall meeting where all the students come together and we talk about what it means to be in a healthy relationship… It has taken more of a Title IX approach in recent years but the initial idea was for that to be more focused on healthy sexuality and what our view is on that whether it be hetero or homosexual behavior expectations.

Education for students in specific student population groups can be beneficial in having more intimate groups and in positions that might interact with behavioral expectations being broken at faith-based institutions. Healthy sexuality programming was often done during orientation with first-year students and in line with federal guidelines at many of the institutions. Amongst the busyness of trainings, newness of college, and pockets of students that could be overlooked, further training is an area for growth found in the research.

Counseling Centers and Support Groups

Counseling centers and support groups were often mentioned as a place that provides education toward healthy sexuality. Six out of the ten institutions mentioned that within their counseling center there were confidential resources or support groups that could assist students who had questions around sexuality or wanted to engage in the topic of sexuality.

Athletics

Student athletes were a sub-population mentioned as receiving education beyond the average student at five out of ten institutions. Football teams were specifically

mentioned by three institutions as a team that receives targeted education related to appropriate sexual behavior.

Conduct Processes

Many times the ways in which Student Development VPs and sexuality programmers engaged in educating students was after a sexual behavioral expectation had been broken by a student. Seven out of ten schools interviewed discussed the importance of the student conduct process. A participant from Institution #2 stated,

> That's where the sausage is made. Incredible lessons come out of the cognitive dissonance that's created from, I did X, whatever the behavior is, and, the expectation was something else. And that, that can create a real internal dissonance for people that can lead to important developmental commitments and changes. So we see that potential, how we handle those conversations is really important.

Institutions reported having a much more reactive approach to discipline when students broke the sexual behavioral expectations versus a proactive educational approach.

Curricular and Cocurricular Educational Programming

When asked about educational programming, many of the institutions stated that education on healthy sexuality was occurring across their campus in the classroom. Four out of the ten institutions mentioned that a healthy sexuality class is offered at their institution but often fills up within the first few minutes of course registration making it unavailable to many students who wanted to take the class. Six out of the ten institutions mentioned that education on healthy sexuality was addressed in a few courses overall on campus including first-year courses, Bible courses, or social science courses limited to

students in that major. One institution mentioned that this education is delivered to all students at their institution through a health and wellness required course but there is no consistency in how that course is taught or by whom it is taught.

All institutions indicated that they provided healthy sexuality programming in spaces outside of the classroom for students. Eight out of ten participants mentioned that their specific institutions used panels and brought in speakers who represent varying opinions on topics regarding healthy sexuality. Six out of the ten institutions mentioned passive programing occurs in residence life to educate students and that creativity is given to residence life staff to meet the unique needs of the students with whom they interact. Four out of the ten institutions stated healthy sexuality education was interwoven within chapel programming that students are required to attend. Three institutions stated that they had sexuality weeks annually to engage in the topic. A participant from Institution #3 stated,

> Annually we have a sexuality week that includes panels, conversations around sexuality and really tries to get the conversation started. Last year we had around 750 participants. Students are excited about this topic and we need to do more with it.

Although programming may look different at various institutions, research showed that programming through many areas on campus on healthy sexuality is happening and institutional commitment is present.

Conclusion

After analyzing the data from the ten participating institutions, the researcher identified four primary themes: institutional commitment to educating students, educating

through relationships built with students, educating specific groups of students, and educating through curricular and cocurricular spaces on their respective campus. In the next chapter, these themes will be further discussed and recommendations on how to implement them further will be given.

Chapter 5

Discussion

College is a time in life in which students grow and develop inside and outside of the classroom. Attitudes that students develop related to healthy sexuality should not be different from anything else learned in college, as they are central to who they become by the time they graduate. The methods that faith-based institutions are employing to educate students toward healthy sexuality were described in Chapter 4. These methods included institutional commitment to educating students, educating through relationships with students, specific groups being educated, and educating in curricular and cocurricular spaces at institutions. Although programming was occurring at all institutions in these areas, student development professionals expressed many themes that recognized the educational gaps that still occur at faith-based institutions that aim to prepare students for lives of healthy sexuality post-graduation. This chapter will further explain those themes, implications for future research, and limitations of the study.

As described in literature presented in Chapter 2, Soble (2013) states, "judging sexual behavior by a criterion of 'healthy sexuality' is turning passé, in favor of a definition of health in terms of sex: having it is healthy, not having it is not. 'Healthy sexuality' is becoming redundant" (p. 112). Within the ethnographical group of the CCC institutions, the definition and expectations of students enrolled also varied. Each interviewee responded to questions through the lens of their institutional understanding. Even so, every participant acknowledged wanting to do more with education toward

healthy sexuality. They also described barriers or challenges to providing specific education.

Institutional Commitment

In researching the CCC institutions, it is evident that there is an institutional commitment to caring for students and engaging in whole-person development including sexuality. From documents, handbooks, codes of conduct, sexuality policies, and task forces committed to defining institutional position on sexuality, students should be aware of expectations prior to even being admitted to the institution. Based on interviews and document review, it would be beneficial to students and other community members if the institution would spell out what they view as healthy sexuality in a way that is clear, concise, and known to all members.

Firestone and Catlett (1999) define the engagement of healthy sexuality around college-aged students' heterosexual relationships as "the ability to integrate sexuality into one's daily life, as opposed to it being an external event that occurs on its own. It may include components of affection, tenderness, and companionship between two people" (p. 3). By attaching a definition like Firestone and Catlett's to an institution that expects a heterosexual relationship, it would open the door for more conversations beyond just LGBTQIA+ conversations. At the two intuitions that had specific student development professionals designated to create programs for healthy sexuality, both explained the unique opportunity to engage with students well beyond any programming that would happen without that position. Through this finding it would be important to note that this could a beneficial position at a faith-based institution to navigate these institutional commitments alongside student needs.

Educating Through Relationships

As previously cited, in 2011 the Association for Christians in Student Development conducted a student survey studying sexual behaviors involving 6,000 students at 19 faith-based universities (Davis, 2015). This study concluded that 78.5% of students considered themselves virgins and 34% of students were engaging in sexual behaviors including oral, anal, and sexual intercourse. With a majority of students not engaging in sexual behavior at faith-based institutions, many participants mentioned a lack of large-scale programming. The participants believed this was due to fear of straying from institutional values or not wanting to bring up shame or guilt for sensitive stories.

Educators at faith-based intuitions care well for students, and meaningful conversations occurred when educators did engage in these conversations and where space was created within a trusted relationship. Continued story sharing, safe relationships, and expression of care from educators will be helpful in the sexuality conversation. Opportunities for students to express themselves within a trusted relationship was an important aspect of education for all of these faith-based institutions. As faith-based institutions program toward healthy sexuality, the importance of engaging with individual students in relationship will be important in helping students feel cared for and supported.

Educating Through Specific Student Groups

The institutions that were interviewed were clear that education around expectations or conversations of sexuality did occur on campus within specific student groups. Education in specific groups can be beneficial to those who are participating but

often were geared toward conversations federally mandated to review Title IX expectations and processes. These opportunities could be a great time to educate at faith-based institutions on specific behavioral expectations the institution holds, views of healthy sexuality and relationships desired by the institution, and hopes that students would learn from engaging in sexuality conversations and educational programming at their institution. In coming alongside Title IX training, especially for first-year students, this healthy sexuality conversation would open the door to further exploration in the future.

Healthy sexuality programming when conducted for only specific student groups allows for fewer students to become educated or receive further training on healthy sexuality. Many students are educated to the extent that they engage in those specific student groups or programming on camps. Education would be strong at these institutions if a student went through a conduct process and happened to find meaning or a mentor out of that process. It would also be strong if a student were a student leader or an athlete who was specifically spoken to about healthy sexuality more often.

Many institutions also mentioned the counseling center having groups or confidential services that students could reach out to for support and engagement in conversations. Similarly, these were students that chose to participate and expand the conversation on healthy sexuality. If students are not choosing to engage in any of those steps or become involved in any of those specific groups, students are not leaving faith-based intuitions with a uniform education about their sexuality and sexual identity. Students often times receive education, but that depends directly on who they know and in what way they get involved.

Curricular and Cocurricular Educational Programming

When asked about educational programming, many of the institutions stated that education on healthy sexuality was being conducted across their campus inside and outside of the classroom. Curricular courses around the topics of healthy sexuality were available at many institutions; however, they were full within minutes of registration. This points to the desire of students at faith-based institutions to have access to formational education on healthy sexuality. York (2010) stated that 37 % of Christian college students engaged in sexual education conversations with professors during their time in undergrad. It is not that students do not want to engage in the conversation, but rather they have limited spaces to do that inside and outside of the classroom. College is a time when students at all types of institutions are exploring and figuring out their sexuality (Lefkowitz et al., 2004). As students are wanting to be involved in conversations around these topics, opening up spaces beyond the few classes offered would allow for more students to engage in this process.

Although programming may look different at various institutions cocurricular programming occurred through residence life, chapel programming, and annual events that aim to get the healthy sexuality conversation started. As mentioned in an earlier theme, these are usually opt-in opportunities; however, when presented opportunities do arise, high student engagement and curiosity surrounds the events.

Due to limited spaces in the curricular realm and high engagement in healthy sexuality programming in cocurricular settings, one can surmise that there is little space that is allotted in faith-based communities to question, acknowledge, and explore healthy sexuality conversations. Through collaboration of the curricular and cocurricular spaces,

implications of these findings could lead to further education of healthy sexuality at faith-based institutions.

Further Identified Themes

Several themes emerged that highlight the need for more education to be conducted, as well as the unique challenges that exist for this specific group of higher education institutions. These themes fell into two major categories: unique characteristics of institutions and student-centered considerations. These further themes are significant due to the impact that they could have in preparing students for life beyond college.

Institutional Characteristics

Each institution discussed factors that keep them from programming in the way they want. Six out of ten institutions mentioned the geographical location helping or hindering resources for students. Location of institution played a significant factor in the expectations that students have about how they will experience conversations around sexuality. A participant from Institution #2 stated,

> I do think it really comes down to institution and what the institution values. I think the fact that we are in [this geographical location] does also speak for itself. There are a ton of folks that will decide to come [here] and will kind of hold the Christian part to the side and love the school because of the size, the fact that it's a liberal arts college or the fact that it is in the epicenter. I mean I have had students that have come to me and say they were concerned about sexuality but because they were in [this location] that conversation will be nurtured well in the surrounding area. I do think students can speak openly due to a mix of institution and what they think is foundational and also the location of the institution.

Institutional values were mentioned by five out of ten institutions as playing a major role in how they do sexuality programming. The institution's Board of Trustees was mentioned by four out of ten participants. The institutional values varied among the institutions, but knowing what an institution values and expects of students is important in creating a consistent message to students.

Student-Centered Considerations

In today's culture it is important to recognize that students are talking and thinking about matters around sexuality. They are bringing their own understanding, experience, and beliefs to the table. As mentioned in Chapter 2, these students are shaping their own perspectives based on a variety of experiences. In keeping within a Christ-centered mission statement, student affairs professionals are now faced with the tension of needing to do better. An interviewee from Institution #12 stated,

> I don't think we're doing enough and this is the conversation we're having on our campus now, as important as this topic is, it's not the most important I want to, I don't want to say it is the most important topic for a Christian, but if, if we take seriously that we bear the image of God, our creator, and he's created us as sexual persons, that some of us will live out as single unmarried people. Some of us will live out as married people that together, that combined vision is pretty important for people to understand some part of God's character. So if we're not equipping people to live it out faithfully, what does that ultimately do for, for our Christian community.

Ten out of ten institutions mentioned the importance of this conversation, and wanting to be more intentional about sexual education was a common theme. An interviewee from Institution #7 stated,

> Wow. I am here thinking more about this. Students are talking about sexuality. We are sexual beings and embodied creatures. It's not to say that students aren't having this conversation organically with their peers but we don't know what, we are not guiding that conversation and assessing that gap.

The gap that this interviewee speaks of was mentioned by the participant from Institution #5 when he stated, "there are very, very few issues that we have in the history of faith-based higher education that have been so filled with tension that haven't taken more than just a student involvement perspective on how to address." With every institution mentioning this tension and gap, and ten out of ten institutions stating the desire for collaboration, it is clear that the CCC institutions need to work together to meet the needs of students in healthy sexuality programming.

Implications for Practice

Along with many of the recommendations listed above with individual themes and findings, the researcher identified implications for practice that faith-based institutions should consider when educating students for lives of healthy sexuality.

Inclusion of Heterosexual Healthy Sexuality

A significant finding throughout the study was the lack of inclusion of heterosexual definitions of sexuality or programming. In nine out of ten institutions, LGBTQIA+ was the first topic that participants discussed. When participants were asked about healthy sexuality it was obvious there was a deep concern about how to care for the

LGBTQIA+ community while upholding institutional values and behavioral expectations. Reflective of the purity culture and sexual expectations held by the Evangelical faith, many of these institutions gave clear expectations of sexual expression held within the bounds of marriage between one man and one woman. Emphasis of programming and educating was highly given on the latter part of that expectation. Task forces and programming were often mentioned around tensions with LGBTQIA+. With high consideration for student care and programming, heterosexual healthy sexuality programming was often left out unless further questioned by the researcher. With specific behavioral expectations of heterosexual students at many of these institutions, healthy sexuality programming definitions need to be expanded to include heterosexual sexuality as well. The way institutions talk about healthy friendships, relationships between genders, and healthy sexual decision making is important and will impact students beyond their college years.

Collaboration Between Curricular and Cocurricular Educators

This study discovered that healthy sexuality education was occurring inside and outside of the classroom at many CCC institutions. Where classes on sexuality were discussed, it was noted that classes are offered but not available to many due to the fact that space was limited and classes filled up quickly. If healthy sexuality was able to be discussed in classroom settings that students were required to take and further discussed in the spaces where students are spending time outside of the classroom (e.g., residence halls, athletic fields, dining halls), students would be able to gain education in a holistic way on healthy sexuality. These conversations could be used as a springboard for conversations with higher education professionals across different realms of our

institutions. Classroom curriculum on healthy sexuality should be rooted in the institution's established values. These values typically established an upheld by the Board of Trustees should have a clearly defined statement of sexuality that outlines expectations of students and is congruent across all areas on campus. Under these values and mission statements of the institution, a set of outcomes for student learning in healthy sexuality is suggested. Institutions should consider making consistent required learning outcomes for students across the curricular and cocurricular dealing with sexuality and relationships that are consistent with institutional mission, values, and location.

Space to Tell Stories and Ask Questions

Students are interested in talking about sexuality, sex, and relationships. Sexuality is an intriguing part of a students' life at colleges and universities today, whether faith-based or not. Spaces that encourage students to speak freely about sexual desires and histories in order to deal with them in a healthy way and affirm the reality that what they experience is critical. This suggested space differs from the promise ring and purity culture talk that is commonly occurring on campus or the Title IX training that is federally mandated. Relying on these limited conversations results in educators missing a huge segment of students that are wanting to further engage in the discussion. Faith-based institutions need to offer a space for students, faculty, and staff to talk and share their stories of sexuality. Authentic stories of where members of the institutional community have come from, what they have learned about sexual expectations, gender roles, and the role their church has played in this construction of what they believe about healthy sexuality is important to students shaping their own journeys. While many voices are a lot more comfortable jumping to "this is what you need to know" and "this is what you

need to believe," for healthy development institutions need to create spaces that offer a new set of prescriptions from what students may previously know. The more faith-based institution higher education professionals engage in these conversations and offer space to students, the more holistically they can develop and support students.

Limitations of Study

One potential limitation of this study was the size of the population studied. Although ten out of 13 institutions were able to participate in this study, there are many faith-based institutions beyond the 13 CCC schools. Many institutions interviewed mentioned one institution in particular that was really benchmarking and doing well in regards to sexuality programming.

Another limitation was there was not a working common definition of healthy sexuality presented by the researcher when asking questions about sexuality programming. A common working definition of healthy sexuality responses varied and were very institution-centric and may not easily be translated to other contexts. This limited the study by the participants tending to focus on LGBTQIA+ students, making it difficult to translate to the healthy sexuality definition utilized in this study.

Finally, the last limitation this study had was the COVID-19 global pandemic. This prevented the researcher from traveling to interview participants in person. Instead, interviews had to be conducted over Zoom.

Implications for Further Research

The CCC cross section of faith-based institutions was helpful in selecting a sample of faith-based institutions, but there are many other faith-based institutions. Research involving more institutions could further explore other ideas and methods of

programming. Another area where more research could be done is to include students in the study. By involving students, data could be collected on where students are receiving education on healthy sexuality and what programs they identify as helpful in the process of learning about healthy sexuality.

Asking alumni to share their reflections on their experiences post-graduation and what their understanding of healthy sexuality is would be interesting for future study. It would be beneficial to collect data from alumni who are one year, five years, and ten years post-graduation. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see what programming at faith-based institutions helped prepare them for lives of healthy sexuality, and in what ways faith-based institutions were missing important opportunities for education. Finally, it would be beneficial to the larger conversation on healthy sexuality programming to put into place learning outcomes aimed at healthy sexuality, allow spaces for intentional conversation to occur, and establish a strong collaboration between the academic and cocurricular areas, followed by assessing how the learning outcomes were met and what students learned and applied about healthy sexuality.

Conclusion

Faith-based schools are often counter-cultural with behavior expectations around sexual behaviors and sexuality. Students at faith-based institutions are coming into schools less educated on healthy sexuality and making uniformed decisions about engaging sexual behavior.

Findings of this study provide faith-based institutions with ideas and insight on how to best program students toward healthy sexuality while still maintaining specific sexual behavioral expectations that they want students to follow. Through this shared

expectation of students, institutions should be aware of the importance of this education and work together to best teach about healthy sexuality. As higher education professionals at faith-based institutions prepare students for lives beyond college, healthy sexuality needs to be prioritized and discussed.

References

Anderson, D. (2015). *Damaged Goods*. FaithWords.

Barbee, A. (2014, March 3). Naked and ashamed: Women and evangelical purity culture [Blog post]. Retrieved from http://theotherjournal.com/2014/03/03/naked-andashamed-women-and-evangelical-purity-culture/

Brelsford, G. M., Luquis, R., & Murray-Swank, N. A. (2011). College students' permissive sexual attitudes: Links to religiousness and spirituality. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, *21*(2), 127–136.

Christian College Consortium. (2021). *About: Mission statement of the CCC*. https://www.ccconsortium.org/about/

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE.

Creswell, J. W. (2018*). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Pearson.

Davis, A. (2015). *St Dev sex and shame*. prezi.com. https://prezi.com/1fekhcolhtn5/st-dev-sex-and-shame/

Deneson, A. (2017, February 18). True love waits? The story of my purity ring and feeling like I didn't have a choice [Blog post]. https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2017/feb/18/purity-ring-virginityabstinence-sexual-educatiion

Earle, J. R., Perricone, P. J., Davidson, Sr., J., Moore, N. B., Harris, C. T., & Cotten, S. R. (2007). Premarital sexual attitudes and behavior at a religiously-affiliated university: Two decades of change. *Sexuality & Culture, 11*(2), 39–61.

English Standard Version Bible. (2001). ESV.org. https://www.esv.org/

Feigenbaum, R., Weinstein, E., & Rosen, E. (1995). College students' sexual attitudes and behaviors: Implications for sexuality education. *Journal of American College Health, 44*(3), 112–118.

Firestone, R. W., & Catlett, J. (1999). *Fear of intimacy.* American Psychological Association.

Firestone, R. W., Firestone, L. A., & Catlett, J. (2006). Sex and love in intimate relationships. American Psychological Association, 11–27.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (1993). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (Vol. 7). McGraw-Hill.

Freitas, D. (2008). Sex and the soul: America's college students speak out about hookups, romance, and religion on campus. Oxford University Press.

Freitas, D. (2013). *The end of sex: How hookup culture is leaving a generation unhappy, sexually unfulfilled, and confused about intimacy*. Basic Books.

Hardy, S. A., & Willoughby, B. J. (2017). Religiosity and chastity among single young adults and married adults. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 9*(3), 285–295. https://doi.org/10.1037/rel0000112

Hernandez, K. M., Mahoney, A., & Pargament, K. I. (2011). Sanctification of sexuality: Implications for newlyweds' marital and sexual quality. *Journal of Family Psychology, 25*(5), 775–780. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025103

King James Bible. (2017). King James Bible Online. https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/

Kirby, D. (2002) The impact of schools and school programs upon adolescent sexual behavior. *Journal of Sex Research*, *39*(1), 27–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490209552116

Kitzrow, M. (2003). The Mental Health Needs of Today's College Students: Challenges and Recommendations. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *41*(1), 167–181. https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1310

Lastoria, M. (2011). *Sexuality, religiosity, behaviors, attitudes: A look at religiosity, sexual attitudes and behaviors of Christian college students*. ACSD Research Series.

Lawton, R. B. (1986). Genesis 2:24: Trite or tragic?. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *105*(1), 97–98.

Lefkowitz, E. S., Gillen, M. M., Shearer, C. L., & Boone, T. L. (2004). Religiosity, sexual behaviors, and sexual attitudes during emerging adulthood. *Journal of Sex Research*, *41*(2), 150–159. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490409552223

Merriam, S.B. (1988) *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: Toward a shared craft. *Educational Researcher*, *13*(5), 20–30. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X013005020

Murray-Swank, N., Pargament, K., & Mahoney, A. (2005). At the crossroads of sexuality and spirituality: The sanctification of sex by college students. *International*

Journal for the Psychology of Religion, *15*(3). 199–219. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327582ijpr1503_2

Pugsley, S. (2014, August 1). It happened to me: I waited until my wedding night to lose my virginity and I wish I hadn't [Blog post]. https://www.xojane.com/sex/true-love-waits-pledge

Schnarch, D. M. (1991). *Constructing the sexual crucible: An integration of sexual and marital therapy.* W W Norton & Co.

Soble, Alan (Ed.) (2002). *The philosophy of sex: Contemporary readings.* Rowman & Littlefield.

University of North Carolina. (2021). *About UNC*. Retrieved February 21, 2021, from https://catalog.unc.edu/about/#:~:text=We%20embrace%20an%20unwavering%20commitment,the%20next%20generation%20of%20leaders

University of Notre Dame. (2021). *University of Notre Dame mission statement*. Retrieved February 27, 2021, from https://dulac.nd.edu/university-mission-and-vision/mission/

Weis, D. L., Rabinowitz, B., & Ruckstuhl, M. F. (1992). Individual changes in sexual attitudes and behavior within college-level human sexuality courses. *Journal of Sex Research, 29*(1), 43–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499209551633

York, T. T. (2010). Millennial sex habits: The sexual attitudes and behaviors of unmarried undergraduate men at a small, private, Christian institution. *Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development, 9*, 2–17.

Appendix A

Informed Consent

TAYLOR UNIVERSITY

INFORMED CONSENT

You are invited to participate in a research study of the Sexuality Programming at Faith-Based Institutions. You were selected as a possible subject because you are either a Senior level administrator or the person in charge of sexuality programming at your CCC institution. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you many have before agreeing to be in the study. The study is being conducted by Kenedy Kieffer for her master's thesis research at Taylor University.

STUDY PURPOSE
The purpose of this study is to provide an exploratory examination into how educators at faith-based institutions provide educational programming around healthy sexuality that aligns with their mission statement.

NUMBER OF PEOPLE TAKING PART IN THE STUDY:
If you agree to participate, you will be one of 26 subjects who will be participating in this research. If you agree to participate you will be asked to conduct an individual interview with the primary researcher.

PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY:
If you agree to be in the study, you will do the following things:

1. Agree to participate in an individual interview lasting approximately 40-60 minutes.
2. Agree to have your responses recorded during the interview.
3. Agree to be quoted and/or have your experience referenced in the results of the researcher's study under a pseudonym.
4. This study will take place during the fall 2020 semester, but your participation will simply consist of your individual interview.

RISKS OF TAKING PART IN THE STUDY:
There is minimal risk involved with taking part in this study. While participating in this study, there is the risk of discomfort or an emotional response associated in reflection of institutional decisions. For this reason, participants may choose to not answer any interview question.

BENEFITS OF TAKING PART IN THE STUDY:
The benefit to participation is the opportunity to reflect on the role of sexuality programming and education your institution provide and how that has impacted students you work with.

ALTERNATIVES TO TAKING PART IN THE STUDY:
There is no alternative to taking part in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Efforts will be made to keep your personal information confidential. We cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality. Your personal information may be disclosed if required by law. Your identity will be held in confidence in reports in which the study may be published. Only the researchers will have access to the recordings of the interviews or focus groups and the recordings will be deleted following the completions of the research study. Organizations that may inspect and/or copy your research records for quality assurance and data analysis include groups such as the study investigator and his/her research associates, the Taylor University Institutional Review Board or its designees, and (as allowed by law) state or federal agencies, specifically the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) etc., who may need to access your research records.

COSTS
There is no cost to participate in this study.

PAYMENT
You will not receive payment for taking part in this study.

.
CONTACTS FOR QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS
For questions about the study or a research-related injury, contact the researcher or faculty advisor:

Researcher:
Kenedy Kieffer
(717) 919-0605
kenedy_kieffer@taylor.edu

Faculty Advisor:
Dr. Kelly Yordy
klyordy@taylor.edu

Inquiries regarding the nature of the research, your rights as a subject, or any other aspect of the research as it relates to your participation as a subject can be directed to Taylor University's Institutional Review Board at IRB@taylor.edu or the interim IRB Chair, Edwin Welch, at 756-998-4315 or edwelch@taylor.edu

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF STUDY

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part or may leave the study at any time. Leaving the study will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. You decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your current or future relations with Taylor University or any of the researchers involved in this study

SUBJECT'S CONSENT
In consideration of all of the above, I give my consent to participate in this research study.

I will be given a copy of this informed consent document to keep for my records. I agree to take part in this study.

Subject's Printed Name: _____

Subject's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name of Person Obtaining Consent: _____
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: _____ Date: _____

Appendix B

Interview Protocol

Sexuality Programming at Faith-Based Institutions
Interview Protocol
Taylor University

Intro: Each Interview

Thank you for taking part in this research study. The purpose of this study is to explore how educators at faith based institutions with specific behavioral expectations provide educational programming around healthy sexuality. Your participation is voluntary and you may opt to stop at any point in this process. Your participation will be kept confidential and at no time will your name or any identifying information about you be reported to anyone outside of the research group.

All interviews are being audio recorded and then transcribed. The research team will analyze the transcriptions and only the team will have access to any of this information. The results of the analysis will be reported in aggregate form with the use of unattributed quotations for support (i.eStaff Member B, Student Personnel C, etc.). Code names will be given to the quotations with no individual identifying information reported.

The use of an audio recording for this study has been chosen in addition to written notes in order to assist with accurately documenting your responses. You have the right to withdraw from this study if you choose to not be audio recorded. In order to ensure confidentiality, the researchers will take the precautions listed in your informed consent form. The researcher would like to remind participants to respect the privacy of your fellow participants and to not discuss questions asked outside of the interview.

If at any time during the interview you have any questions, please ask. Do you have any questions before we begin?

General Questions:

1. How does your institution define healthy sexuality?

2. Does your institution have educational programming related to healthy sexuality in the curriculum or cocurriculum?
    - If yes, can you describe that programming?
    - If yes, how does your programming align with behavioral expectations of students?

3. How are students prepared to leave your institution and engage in healthy sexuality post-graduation?

4. How do you think faith based institutions serve or nurture students who do not align with the institution's beliefs and policies on healthy sexuality?

Is there any other information that you would deem helpful and would like to make sure gets said?

End of Interview:
Thank you again for your participation in this research. If you have any questions regarding this project, please address them to me Kenedy Kieffer and I will be happy to respond.