

City University of New York (CUNY)

**CUNY Academic Works**

---

Student Theses

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

---

Spring 6-2023

## **The relationship between sexting behaviors and Image-Based Sexual Abuse (IBSA): Does sexting predict IBSA?**

Seunghye Yang

*CUNY John Jay College*, [seunghye2016@gmail.com](mailto:seunghye2016@gmail.com)

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: [https://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj\\_etds/273](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_etds/273)

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

---

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: [AcademicWorks@cuny.edu](mailto:AcademicWorks@cuny.edu)

The Relationship between Sexting Behaviors and Image-Based Sexual Abuse (IBSA):

Does Sexting Predict IBSA?

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of

Master of Arts in Forensic Psychology

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

The City University of New York

Seunghye Yang

May 2023

The relationship between sexting behaviors and Image-Based Sexual Abuse (IBSA):

Does sexting predict IBSA?

Seunghye Yang

This thesis has been presented to and accepted by the Office of Graduate Studies, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Forensic Psychology

Thesis Committee:

Thesis Advisor: Elizabeth Jeglic, Ph.D.

Second Reader: Cynthia Calkins, Ph. D.

Third Reader: Lisa Fischel-Wolovick, Ph.D.

### **Abstract**

With development of technology, Image-Based Sexual Abuse (IBSA), a new type of sexual abuse, has emerged. It is defined as nonconsensually creating nude or sexual images of others; nonconsensually distributing nude or sexual images of others; and threatening to distribute nude or sexual images of others (Henry & Flynn, 2019; Powell et al., 2019). As this is a relatively new phenomenon, risk factors for IBSA are not yet well understood. It has been suggested that sexting may be a risk factor for IBSA as the two behaviors share some common characteristics. For example, both sexting and IBSA involve sending or receiving sexually explicit materials, and both are often conducted between intimate partners. In fact, when sexts are forwarded to a third party, it can be considered IBSA. To further examine the relationship between sexting and IBSA, 451 participants completed an online survey examining their sexting behavior and their experience of IBSA. Using the data, the relationship between characteristics of sexting behavior (e.g., gender and relationship between sexting sender and receiver) and IBSA experiences was examined. The results showed that many of individuals who sent or received sexts also experienced IBSA. It was notable that gender, but not the relationship between sexting sender and receiver, was able to predict IBSA. This study adds to literature examining risk factors for IBSA and can further be utilized to provide guidance on prevention.

*Keywords:* sexting; image-based sexual abuse; revenge porn; nonconsensual porn

**Table of Contents**

Title Page	1
Committee Page	2
Abstract	3
Table of Contents	4
List of Tables	5
Introduction	6
Sexting	6
Image-Based Sexual Abuse (IBSA)	10
Methods	17
Research Design	17
Participants	17
Procedures	18
Measures	18
Results	20
Discussion	27
Implications	29
Limitations	30
Future Directions	31
References	32
Table	38

**List of Tables**

<b>Table 1.</b> Number of Times Participants Have Sent Sexually Explicit Messages	38
<b>Table 2.</b> Number of Times Participants Have Received Sexually Explicit Messages	39
<b>Table 3.</b> Number of Times Participants Have Sent Sexually Explicit Images or Videos of Themselves	40
<b>Table 4.</b> Number of Times Participants Have Received Sexually Explicit Images or Videos	41
<b>Table 5.</b> Number of Times Participants Have Shared Sexually Explicit Images or Videos	42
<b>Table 6.</b> Number of Times Participants Have Had Their Sexually Explicit Images or Videos Shared by Others	43
<b>Table 7.</b> Percentages of Participants who Reported Having Experienced IBSA among Participants who Reported Having Sent or Received Sexually Explicit Messages	44
<b>Table 8.</b> The Odd Ratios of Sending Sexually Explicit Photos or Videos Based on Gender and Relationship to Sender and Receiver of Sexting	45
<b>Table 9.</b> The Odd Ratios of Receiving Sexually Explicit Photos or Videos Based on Gender and Relationship to Sender and Receiver of Sexting	46
<b>Table 10.</b> The Odd Ratios of Sharing Sexually Explicit Photos or Videos Based on Gender and Relationship to Sender and Receiver of Sexting	47
<b>Table 11.</b> The Odd Ratios of Sexually Explicit Photos or Videos Being Shared Based on Gender and Relationship to Sender and Receiver of Sexting	48

The relationship between sexting behaviors and Image-based sexual abuse (IBSA):

Does sexting predict IBSA?

In the United States (U.S.), one in three women and one in six men report having experienced contact sexual violence during their lifetime (Smith et al., 2017). Contact sexual violence is defined as sexual violence that involves direct contact between perpetrator and victim (Smith et al., 2017). Examples of contact sexual violence include forced penetration, sexual coercion, and unwanted fondling (Smith et al., 2017). Advances in technology, however, changed the methods in which sexual violence takes place. For example, the Internet is now used to view, possess, produce, and distribute child sex abuse material (CSAM; Henshaw et al., 2017; Najdowski, 2017). Furthermore, some individuals experience digital sexual harassment by receiving unwanted sexually explicit messages, comments, or emails (Powell & Henry, 2019). Given the long-term consequences of sexual violence on victims, it is important to conduct research on online sexual abuse, its prevalence, and associated risk factors so that it may be prevented.

## **Sexting**

### ***Definition***

Sexting is the most studied form of online sexual behavior that is especially prevalent in younger generation (Gordon-Messer et al., 2013). Sexting is defined as sharing of personal, sexually suggestive text messages, or nude or nearly nude photographs or videos via electronic devices (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). One meta-analysis analyzed 50 studies that researched sexting in emerging adults (i.e., ages ranging from 18 to 29) and found that, on average, 38.3% of emerging adults reported that they have sent sexts, and 41.5% reported that they have received sexts before (Mori et al., 2020). It was also reported that most of the sexts occurred between

romantic partners, suggesting that sexting is likely to be a reciprocal behavior (Gordon-Messer et al., 2013).

However, consensual sexting can become abuse when a sext is forwarded to someone else without consent. Forwarding sexts without consent is a form of Image-Based Sexual Abuse (IBSA; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020), which can be defined as nonconsensually creating and/or distributing sexual images or videos of others (Henry & Flynn, 2019; Powell et al., 2019). IBSA was originally known as revenge pornography (Eaton et al., 2020; Henry & Flynn, 2019; McGlynn & Rackley, 2017). However, revenge is not an appropriate term to define IBSA as the term implies that the perpetrators take and distribute the sexual images or videos of the victims in response to the victims' wrongful behaviors (Eaton & McGlynn, 2020; Henry & Flynn, 2019; Uhl et al., 2018). Not only that, the term pornography implies that only 'pornographic' images or videos should be regulated, or only the offenders who create such images or videos for the purpose of their sexual gratification should be penalized (McGlynn & Rackley, 2017). Pornography also implies a sense of choice, which is not true in cases of IBSA (McGlynn & Rackley, 2017). It shows that neither revenge pornography nor nonconsensual pornography precisely reflects the nature of this phenomenon, and therefore a new term, IBSA is used to describe these behaviors (McGlynn & Rackley, 2017)

A recent meta-analysis found that, on average, 15% of emerging adults reported having forwarded sexts to a third party, and 7.6% reported having received forwarded sexts (Mori et al., 2020). It is known that women are more likely to be victims of nonconsensually forwarded sexting than men (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). Additionally, Gordon-Messer and colleagues (2013) found that males are more likely to receive forwarded sexts. More specifically, they found that 40% of male participants have received second-hand sexts while only 24% of their female



counterparts reported the same. Moreover, it was found by the same team that males (14%) were more likely to receive mass sexts than females (9%). These findings suggest that when males receive sexts, it may not be a part of reciprocal relationship behavior but rather a form of sexual objectification induced by technology development (Gordon-Messer et al., 2013; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020).

”Forwarded sexting” is clearly sexual abuse, and thus should not be referred to as sexting, as sexting is often considered a consensual behavior (Gordon-Messer et al., 2013). This indicates that, if “forwarded sexting” was to be identified as sexting, it would mean that the creator gave consent to forward the sext to a third party. In New York State, however, it was indicated that posting or disseminating an intimate image of others is both a criminal and civil offense (Civil Rights Law, 2019; Penal Law, 2019). Nonetheless, many literatures have referred to such abuse as a form of sexting (Burkett, 2015; Gordon-Messer et al., 2013; Mori et al., 2020; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). Since the definition of IBSA (Henry & Flynn, 2019; Powell et al., 2019) show that sharing sexually explicit photos or videos is a type of sexual abuse, “forwarded sexting” should be called sexual abuse or IBSA to make it clear that it is different from consensual sexting.

### ***Motivation of Sexting***

If sexting occurs outside of a reciprocal relationship, it is essential to understand the motivation for this behavior. According to Van Ouytsel and colleagues (2020), there are three different possible motivations for sexting: to express sexual interest, to gossip about an ex-partner, and to harm the creator of the sexts. Sexting is often used to express sexual interest, especially in the early stage of a romantic relationship (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). Those who engage sexting as flirting often do not perceive sexting as a dangerous behavior but think that sexting can make them physically and emotionally closer to their romantic partner (Van Ouytsel

et al., 2020). Therefore, if sexting happens in an existing romantic relationship, it is often done for physical intimacy or sexual tension (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020).

However, when individuals forward or post sexts without the creator's consent, it is often done to gossip about a former partner with peers (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). Especially for teenagers, they often think that sexting is a source of humor that can be used to build peer bonding (Burkett, 2015). Burkett (2015) conducted a qualitative study on everyday sexting behaviors among young adults (i.e., ages ranging from 18 to 25 years old). In the interview, it was revealed that many young people, especially males, purposefully share sexts without the creator's consent because they considered it a mere joke and a tool to prove that they are desirable. In other words, they considered sexts as a form of trophy to help them gain or maintain peer status (Burkett, 2015; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020).

In some cases, if not most, those sexts are intentionally used to harm former partners by coercively controlling or threatening them (O'Malley & Holt, 2020; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). Perpetrators threaten victims to disseminate sexts if they do not comply with their demands (O'Malley & Holt, 2020). Those demands are not always sexual, but can be behavioral such as forcing the victims into getting back together or staying in unwanted romantic relationship (O'Malley & Holt, 2020). However, some demands may be sexual, such as obtaining additional sexual images (O'Malley & Holt, 2020; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). In some cases, perpetrators even use sexts as a tool for blackmail to extort money from victims if they do not wish their sexts to be disseminated to their family and friends (O'Malley & Holt, 2020; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020).

### ***Impact of Sexting on Victims***

When sexts are consensually sent for physical intimacy or sexual tension between a reciprocal relationship, it usually does not cause any problem to the senders (Van Ouytsel et al.,

2020). However, even when sexts are sent in a reciprocal relationship, it can be problematic when perpetrators coerce the victims to send sexts since victims usually feel pressured to do as asked in order to preserve their relationship or to avoid argument (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). Even when victims simply send sexts without any pressure, it has been reported that they felt unsafe, threatened, and harassed (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020).

Regardless, it is important to note that even consensual sexting always has underlying risks as such sensitive messages are sent out to creators' potential and/or current partners and there is always a possibility for those messages to be forwarded to a third party without the creators' consent (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020).

There are more psychological consequences to victims when nonconsensual sexts are forwarded or shared online (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). Victims may experience bullying or harassment, which could possibly result in negative psychological problems including depression, anxiety, and stress (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). If their sexually explicit photos or videos were shared with classmates, they could also be distributed to schools in surrounding areas (Strassberg et al., 2012). In extreme cases, there have been reports where forwarded sexts led to the victims committing suicide (Strassberg et al., 2012). Oftentimes such contents are shared with the victims' identity, such as name, age, and more, which lead to more severe problems in carrying on with their daily lives, like dropping out of school (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020), or the occurrence of secondary assaults like stalking (Uhl et al., 2018).

### **Image-Based Sexual Abuse (IBSA)**

#### ***Definition of IBSA***

Image-based sexual abuse (IBSA) is a form of online sexual violence. It can be defined as the following: nonconsensually creating nude or sexual images of others; nonconsensually

distributing nude or sexual images of others; and threatening to distribute nude or sexual images of others (Henry & Flynn, 2019; Powell et al., 2019). Unlike in-person sexual abuse, online sexual abuse does not always require direct contact with the victim because perpetrators can threaten the victim to film and upload their own sexual images or videos using electronic devices (Henshaw et al., 2017; Najdowski, 2017). Advances in technology also allow the widespread use of hidden cameras so that the perpetrators can remotely record other individuals' intimate body parts without their consent (Najdowski, 2017). When such pictures or videos are uploaded to the Internet communities, the public can easily consume the material with anonymity (Uhl et al., 2018).

### ***Prevalence of IBSA***

The nonconsensual creation and distribution of sexual images of others without their consent is growing in prevalence (Eaton & McGlynn, 2020). In a national telephone survey conducted by Lenhart and colleagues (2016), they asked a sample of 3,002 U.S. internet users aged 15 or older about cyber-abuse and found that roughly 4% reported that they have had someone threaten to post or actually posted sexually explicit images without their consent. Another study using a social media found that 12.8% of 3,044 U.S. adults had someone else post or threaten to post their sexually explicit images, while 5% reported having threatened or shared sexually explicit images of others without consent (Eaton et al., 2017). Overall, women and young adults were most likely to be victimized, while men and former intimate partners were more likely to be perpetrators (Branch et al., 2017; Dardis & Gidycz, 2017; Lenhart et al., 2016; Najdowski, 2017; O'Connor et al., 2018; Powell et al., 2019; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020).

### ***Perpetration of IBSA***

The perpetration of IBSA can take many forms. For instance, perpetrators can use various methods such as emails, text messages, social media, applications, websites, DVDs, or printed photos to distribute the sexual images or videos of victims (Eaton et al., 2017). Sexual images or videos of victims were found to be obtained through the use of threats; one study found that 60% of victims took and sent their own sexual photos or videos to the perpetrator following threats (McAfee, 2013, as cited in Nadjowski, 2017).

Another way of obtaining photos or videos of victims was by using photos or videos consensually taken by the victim themselves (Uhl et al., 2018). Those photos or videos are often consensually shared with the perpetrator who is, at most times, a former intimate partner (Uhl et al., 2018). The perpetrator then proceeds to share these images and videos publicly without the owner's consent (Uhl et al., 2018). There have been cases reported where perpetrators shared intimate videos that were filmed during an intercourse under the victims' assumption that those images or videos would remain private (Uhl et al., 2018). The perpetrators argue that, since the images or videos were given to them, it is only natural that they had ownership over them, and thus can use the images or videos for any purpose without consent (Uhl et al., 2018).

However, not all intimate images or videos are taken by someone known to the victim; some cases of IBSA involve complete strangers (Uhl et al., 2018). For example, the perpetration often take the form of upskirting and downblousing (Uhl et al., 2018). Upskirting happens when photographing underneath women's skirts while downblousing happens when photographing above women's blouses (Bell et al., 2006). More specifically, to film underneath the skirts or above the blouses, perpetrators often set up small cameras in public areas—such as toilets—to film the victims' bodies (Bell et al., 2006). Especially for upskirting, perpetrators hide their cameras in their bag and film underneath the skirts by standing close to victims who are wearing

skirts and waving bag underneath the skirt (Bell et al., 2006). Other methods often used to obtain victims' intimate images and/or videos is by hacking into the victims' digital devices, cloud drives, or their personal computer camera, or creating such images by Photoshop (Uhl et al., 2018). Powell and Henry (2019) examined the prevalence of technology-facilitated sexual abuse (TFSA) in Australia and found that 28.2% of perpetrators of online sexual crimes were strangers, while 21.8% of them were friends that victims knew face-to-face, and 16.6% of victims reported not knowing the identity of the perpetrators.

### ***Motivation of IBSA Perpetration***

IBSA perpetrators create, distribute, or threaten to distribute sexually explicit images of others for a variety of reasons. The most well-known motivation for perpetrating IBSA is revenge against ex-partners (Uhl et al., 2018). When revenge is the purpose, perpetrators use explicit photos or videos in an attempt to humiliate or harm the victims (Hall & Hearn, 2019; Uhl et al., 2018). They often justify their acts by claiming that the victims deserved such humiliation for reasons such as attempting manipulation, cheating on them, infecting them with sexually transmitted disease (STD), stealing money, engaging in prostitution, or stealing 'his' children, and such (Hall & Hearn, 2019). The act of blaming victims allows the perpetrators to rationalize their wrongdoings by victimizing themselves (Hall & Hearn, 2019).

Others are motivated by financial gain (Powell et al., 2019; Uhl et al., 2018). Some obtain advertising revenue by posting explicit images or videos on online pornography websites (Henry & Flynn, 2019; Uhl et al., 2018) while some may blackmail the victims for money in exchange for not publicizing their photos or videos (Powell et al., 2019). In worse cases, perpetrators may even ask for more images or force sexual acts on victims in place of money (Powell et al., 2019).

Other motivations may come from the sexual gratification they can gain from those images or videos (Henry & Flynn, 2019; Powell et al., 2019), or the desire to prove their hypermasculinity, which is dominance over women, to their peer male groups by posting women's sexually explicit images (Henry & Flynn, 2019). It was notable that not all perpetrators share these sexually explicit items of other individuals with the intention to harm the victims. In Eaton et al.'s study (2017), it was found that the majority of perpetrators (79%) did not intend to hurt the victims, but rather just simply wanted to share those images or videos with friends (12%). However, it is crucial to note that even though they did not intend to harm anyone, the consequences of their actions may be harmful because IBSA may impact victims' wellbeing (Bates, 2017; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020).

### ***Impact of IBSA on Victims***

IBSA affects victims both physically and psychologically. When the victims of IBSA were compared with non-victims, they exhibit worse physical and mental health outcomes (Bates, 2017; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020). More specifically, the victims often suffer symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anxiety, depression, shame, fear, embarrassment, self-blame, substance abuse, and denial/avoidance (Bates, 2017; Najdowski, 2017). In more extreme cases, these victims may also end up engaging in self-harm or suicide (Short et al., 2017; Najdowski, 2017).

Short et al. (2017) conducted an online survey on the nature and impact of 'revenge pornography.' They recruited 64 participants and found that 22% of responders reported to have their work performance impacted by victimization, with 12% changing their jobs. It was also found that 38% of victims had their relationship with family and friends impacted by victimization, while 40% reported feeling extremely isolated from others. The trauma is often

further compounded as it is nearly impossible to eliminate these images once they are posted and even if removed, the fear that they may be reposted remains (McGlynn et al., 2021; Uhl et al., 2018). The fear usually deepens with worries that their personal information that spread with the images and videos may lead to not only a downfall of their reputation, but also impose a threat to their safety (Najdowski, 2017).

In addition to the trauma of IBSA, there is also the stigma. Media, the general public, and law enforcement repeatedly put the blame on victims, arguing that they should not have sent the images in the first place if they did not want to be victimized (Eaton & McGlynn, 2020). Some even believe that women who voluntarily send their intimate pictures to others are considered more sexually assertive, and thus deserve the punishment (Uhl et al., 2018). In the legal system, there are stereotypes surrounding women that women need to be dressed moderately to avoid victimization while male victims tend to be ignored from this discourse due to the beliefs that men cannot be victims of sexual violence and that women are more likely to be victimized by IBSA (Branch et al., 2017; Najdowski, 2017; O'Connor et al., 2018; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020).

### **IBSA and Sexting**

The literatures of both sexting and IBSA suggest that there is an overlap between the constructs of IBSA and sexting. Both types of online sexual violence are involved sending sexually explicit images or videos to someone else (Henry & Flynn, 2019; Powell et al., 2019; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). Although sexting has been considered more as a reciprocal behavior, sexts can be used for criminal purposes as well (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). Especially when sexts are forwarded to a third party or posted online without consent, they can be considered a form of IBSA.



Several studies discussed that sexting is a possible risk factor for IBSA. For example, Pedersen and colleagues (2023) found that when sexting happens non-voluntarily and under pressure, it is more likely to develop into IBSA. More specifically, female adolescents (i.e., ages ranging from 16 to 18) are often solicited for sexually explicit images while male adolescents (i.e., ages ranging from 16 to 18) are often pressured to share sexually explicit images of others to prove their heteronormative homosexual masculinity status (Ringrose & Regehr, 2023).

In terms of motivations, both sexting and IBSA can be used to retaliate against former intimate partners (Uhl et al., 2018; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020). Another shared characteristic is that the perpetrators can use sexts and sexually explicit images of victims to coerce them back into the relationship, to obtain more sexual images, or to threaten victims for money in exchange for deleting the images (Uhl et al., 2018; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020).

### **Current Study**

Due to the many similarities both sexting and IBSA share, it can be inferred that sexting behaviors are highly associated with IBSA. Even though sexting is often regarded as a form of flirting (Gordon-Messer et al., 2013; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020), it is important to note the underlying risks of sexting behaviors. Since sexting is a prevalent behavior in younger generation (Gordon-Messer et al., 2013), it is of great concern as exposure to sexting could lead to a higher risk of being perpetrated by IBSA. To observe the correlation between sexting and IBSA, existing survey data on sexual misconduct has been analyzed in this study. We hypothesized that, if individuals are engage in sexting behaviors, then they are likely to experience IBSA. As it is often known that females are more likely to be victims of both nonconsensual sexting and IBSA (Gordon-Messer et al., 2013; Lenhart et al., 2016), we also hypothesized that females are more likely to become victims (i.e., send sexually explicit images

of videos or having someone else sharing their sexually explicit images or videos) while males are more likely to be perpetrators of IBSA (i.e., receiving sexually explicit images or videos of others or sharing sexually explicit images or videos of others). Lastly, given the fact that both sexting and IBSA are known to occur more often between intimate partners (Gordeon-Messer et al., 2013; Uhl et al., 2018), we hypothesized that sexting between intimate partners is more likely to develop into IBSA.

## **Methods**

### **Research Design**

The current study employed a quantitative correlational design to explore the relationship between sexting behaviors and IBSA perpetration and/or victimization. To examine whether sexting could be a risk factor for IBSA, we analyzed whether gender and the relationship between the sender and receiver of sexts could predict IBSA perpetration and/or victimization for those who engaged in sexting behavior. For this study, we used an existing database examining sexual misconduct, which included data for both sexting and IBSA as well as demographic data of participants.

### **Participants**

Participants in the database were 485 undergraduate students who were attending a large urban university in the Northeast U.S. To be included in the sample for this study, participants were required to be 18 years old or older. Therefore, three participants who reported to be 17 years old were excluded from the sample. Also, due to the reasons that very few participants reported to be identified with non-binary gender ( $n = 8$ ), and that gender was an independent variable for statistical analysis, they were excluded from the final sample as well. Lastly, because this study was designed to explore the relationship between sexting behaviors and IBSA, those

who did not answer the sexting and/or IBSA questions were excluded ( $n = 23$ ). The final sample included 451 participants.

The age of sample ranged from 18 to 51 with the mean age of 20.11 ( $SD = 3.89$ ). A majority of sample identified their race/ethnicity as Hispanic/Latino ( $n = 209$ ; 46.3%), followed by White/European ( $n = 75$ ; 16.6%), Asian and/or Pacific Islanders ( $n = 73$ ; 16.2%), Black/African Americans ( $n = 54$ ; 12%), biracial ( $n = 15$ ; 3.3%), multiracial ( $n = 8$ ; 1.8%), and ‘other’ ( $n = 17$ ; 3.7%). In terms of gender identity, 27.5% ( $n = 124$ ) identified as male, while 72.5% ( $n = 327$ ) identified as female. Most participants described their sexual orientation as heterosexual ( $n = 350$ , 77.6%) while 2.7% ( $n = 12$ ) identified as homosexual, 14.2% ( $n = 64$ ) as bisexual, 2.9% ( $n = 13$ ) as pansexual, 0.9% ( $n = 4$ ) as asexual, and 1.8% ( $n = 8$ ) as ‘other.’

## **Procedures**

The online survey of the existing database included a series of questions regarding current and past sexual behaviors. After completing the online informed consent form, participants were asked to answer demographic questions (age, race/ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation), followed by a series of questions regarding their sexting behavior and IBSA experiences. Additionally, researchers also asked the relationship to the person whom they have sent or received the sexts from. Participants were instructed to skip any question they did not want to answer.

## **Measures**

### ***Sexting***

Sexting questions consisted of two questions. One asked “how many times have you sent a sexually explicit message?” and the other one asked “how many time have you received a sexually explicit message?” For clarification, researchers provided the participants with the

definition of sexually explicit messaging, which is sexually explicit messages include text, email, or other typed messages about sexual topics without the use of images. There were eight response options: never, one time, two to four times, five to nine times, 10 to 19 times, 20 to 49 times, 50 to 99 times, and more than 100 times. It was followed by a pair of questions that asked the participants' relationship to the person they sent sexually explicit messages to or they received sexually explicit messages from. Participants were allowed to choose multiple responses. The response options for both questions consisted of six choices: romantic partner, casual dating partner, dating prospect, friend, acquaintance, and other. Researchers also provided definitions of romantic partner, casual dating partner, and dating prospect to differentiate them more precisely. Romantic partner was defined as the relationship where participants were in a committed and exclusive relationship while casual dating partner was defined as the relationship where participants were not in a committed and exclusive relationship, but have been on dates with. Additionally, researchers defined dating prospect as someone who participants have not been on a date yet.

### ***IBSA***

IBSA questions were comprised of four questions. The first one was "how many times have you sent a sexually explicit photograph and/or videos of yourself? The second one was "how many times have you received a sexually explicit photograph and/or video?" The third one asked "how many times have you shared a sexually explicit photograph and/or video that you received from another person?" The last question asked "how many times have you received a sexually explicit photograph and/or video that the sender received from another person?" The response options consisted of eight choices which included: never, one time, two to four times, five to nine times, 10 to 19 times, 20 to 49 times, 50 to 99 times, and more than 100 times. For

clarity of the questions, researchers provided definitions of sexually explicit photographs and videos to include any images or videos showing suggested or actual sexual behavior or nudity/partial nudity.

### Results

Of the entire sample who answered the question that asked about the number of times they have sent sexts ( $n = 448$ ), 46.9% ( $n = 210$ ) participants reported having never sent any sexts before and 53.1% ( $n = 238$ ) participants reported having sent sexts at least once. More specifically (see Table 1), 6.9% ( $n = 31$ ) reported having sent sexts once while 15% ( $n = 67$ ) reported having sent sexts twice to four times. Additionally, 10.9% of participants ( $n = 49$ ) said they have sent sexts five times to nine times while 9.4% ( $n = 42$ ) said they have sent sexts 10 times to 19 times. 5.6% ( $n = 25$ ) of participants reported that they have sent sexts 20 times to 49 times while 2.2% ( $n = 10$ ) reported having sent sexts before 50 times to 99 times. Lastly, 3.1% ( $n = 14$ ) reported having sent sexts before more than 100 times. Also, among this sample, 72.3% ( $n = 324$ ) was women and 27.7% ( $n = 124$ ) was men. Of women, 44.1% ( $n = 143$ ) reported having never sent sexts before while 65.9% ( $n = 181$ ) reported having sent sexts before. Of men, 54% ( $n = 67$ ) reported having never sent sexts before while 46% ( $n = 57$ ) reported having sent sexts before.

A total of 242 participants answered to the question that asked the relationship the person they have sent the sexts to. As they were allowed to choose multiple response, a total of 378 responses were recorded. Among them, 190 participants reported that they have sent sexts to their romantic partners, while 69 participants reported having sent sexts to casual partners, 55 participants to dating prospects, 49 participants to friends, 13 participants to acquaintances, and two participants to 'other.'

Four-hundred forty-nine participants answered the question asking about the number of times they have received sexually explicit messages. Among them, 28.7% ( $n = 129$ ) reported that they have never received sexts before while 71.1% ( $n = 320$ ) reported having received sexts at least once. More specifically (see Table 2), 5.1% ( $n = 23$ ) of participants reported having received sexts once and 16.7% ( $n = 75$ ) reported having received sexts twice to four times. Twelve percent of participants ( $n = 54$ ) reported having received sexts five times to nine times while 12.9% ( $n = 58$ ) reported that they have received sexts 10 times to 19 times. Also, 11.8% ( $n = 53$ ) has been observed to have received sexts 20 times 49 times and 4.7% ( $n = 21$ ) have received sexts 50 to 99 times. Lastly, 8% ( $n = 36$ ) reported that they have received sexually explicit messages from others more than 100 times. Also, among this sample, 72.6% ( $n = 326$ ) was women and 27.4% ( $n = 123$ ) was men. Of women, 24.2% ( $n = 79$ ) reported having never received sexts before while 75.8% ( $n = 247$ ) reported having received sexts before. Of men, 40.7% ( $n = 50$ ) reported having never received sexts before while 59.3% ( $n = 73$ ) reported having received sexts before.

Additionally, of the entire sample ( $n = 451$ ), 331 participants answered the question that asked about the relationship to the person they have received sexts from. Among them, 207 participants reported having received sexts from their romantic partners, 110 participants from casual partners, 91 participants from dating prospects, 86 participants from friends, 74 participants from acquaintances, and 51 participants from 'other.'

As to the questions regarding IBSA, 448 participants of the entire sample ( $n = 451$ ) answered the question that asked about the number of times they have sent sexually explicit images or videos of themselves. Among them, 51.8% ( $n = 232$ ) reported having never sent sexually explicit images or videos of themselves while 48.2% ( $n = 216$ ) reported having sent the

sexually explicit images or videos at least once., It was also observed that 7.6% ( $n = 34$ ) reported having sent the images or videos once while 15.2% ( $n = 68$ ) reported having sent the images or videos twice to four times. Also, 9.4% ( $n = 42$ ) reported having sent the images or videos five to nine times and 6.7% ( $n = 30$ ) reported having sent the images or videos 10 to 19 times.

Additionally, 7.1% ( $n = 32$ ) reported having sent sexually explicit images or videos 20 to 49 times; 1.1% ( $n = 5$ ) reported having sent sexually explicit images or videos 40 to 99 times; and another 1.1% ( $n = 5$ ) reported having sent sexually explicit images or videos more than 100 times. Also, among this sample, 72.5% ( $n = 325$ ) was women and 27.5% ( $n = 123$ ) was men. Of women, 48.3% ( $n = 157$ ) reported having never sent sexually explicit image or videos before while 51.7% ( $n = 168$ ) reported having sent sexually explicit images or videos before. Of men, 61% ( $n = 75$ ) reported having never sent sexually explicit images or videos before while 39% ( $n = 48$ ) reported having sent sexually explicit images or videos before.

Out of the 447 participants who answered the question asking about the number of times they have received sexually explicit images or videos, 34% ( $n = 152$ ) reported having never received the sexually explicit images or videos, 6% ( $n = 27$ ) have received those images or videos once while 17% ( $n = 76$ ) reported having received the images or videos twice to four times. Also, 14.5 % ( $n = 65$ ) reported having received sexually explicit images or videos five to nine times; 11% ( $n = 49$ ) reported having received those images or videos 10 to 19 times; 9.2% ( $n = 41$ ) reported having received sexually explicit images or videos 20 to 49 times; 3.6% ( $n = 16$ ) reported having received sexually explicit images or videos 50 to 99 times; and 4.7% ( $n = 21$ ) reported having received IBSA more than 100 times. Moreover, among this sample, 72.5% ( $n = 324$ ) was women and 27.5% ( $n = 123$ ) was men. Of women, 29.3% ( $n = 95$ ) reported having never received sexually explicit image or videos before while 70.7% ( $n = 229$ ) reported having

received sexually explicit images or videos before. Of men, 46.3% ( $n = 57$ ) reported having never received sexually explicit images or videos before while 53.7% ( $n = 66$ ) reported having received sexually explicit images or videos before.

A total of 446 participants answered the question that asked about the number of times they have shared sexually explicit images or videos. Among them, 89% ( $n = 397$ ) reported having never shared the sexually explicit images or videos while 2% ( $n = 9$ ) reported they have shared sexually explicit images or videos once. Also, 5.4% ( $n = 24$ ) reported having shared the images or videos twice to four times; 1.6% ( $n = 7$ ) reported having shared the images or videos five to nine times; 1.1% ( $n = 5$ ) reported having shared the images or videos 10 to 19 times; .4% ( $n = 2$ ) reported having shared the images or videos 20 to 49 times; no one reported having shared IBSA 50 to 99 times; and .4% ( $n = 2$ ) reported having shared IBSA more than 100 times. Additionally, among this sample, 72.2% ( $n = 322$ ) was women and 27.8% ( $n = 124$ ) was men. Of women, 88.8% ( $n = 284$ ) reported having never shared sexually explicit image or videos before while 11.8% ( $n = 38$ ) reported having shared sexually explicit images or videos before. Of men, 91.1% ( $n = 113$ ) reported having never shared sexually explicit images or videos before while 8.9% ( $n = 11$ ) reported having shared sexually explicit images or videos before.

Lastly, 445 participants answered the question about the number of times they have their sexually explicit images or videos shared by others. Among them, 76% ( $n = 397$ ) reported having never having their sexually explicit images or videos shared while 6.3% ( $n = 28$ ) reported having their images or videos shared once. Also, 10.8% ( $n = 48$ ) reported having their images or videos shared twice to four times; 2.9% ( $n = 13$ ) reported having their images or videos shared five to nine times; 2.9% ( $n = 13$ ) reported having their images or videos shared 10 to 19 times; .4% ( $n = 2$ ) reported having their images or videos shared 20 to 49 times; .2% ( $n = 1$ )



reported having IBSA shared 50 to 99 times; and .4% ( $n = 2$ ) reported having their images or videos shared more than 100 times. Further, among this sample, 72.4% ( $n = 322$ ) was women and 27.6% ( $n = 123$ ) was men. Of women, 73.9% ( $n = 238$ ) reported having never had their sexually explicit image or videos shared by others before while 26.1% ( $n = 84$ ) reported having had their sexually explicit images or videos shared by others before. Of men, 81.3% ( $n = 100$ ) reported having never had their sexually explicit images or videos shared by others before while 18.7% ( $n = 23$ ) reported having had their sexually explicit images or videos shared by others before.

In order to analyze what percentage of sexting behavior ends up with IBSA experiences, we conducted a crosstab analysis. The crosstab analysis showed the number of participants who reported having sent or received sexts in relation to the number of participants who reported having sent, received, shared sexually explicit photos or videos, or having the sexually explicit photos or videos shared. Among those who reported having sent sexts ( $n = 448$ ; see Table 7), 209 participants (88.2%) reported having sent sexually explicit photos or videos of themselves while 236 participants (92.8%) reported having received the sexually explicit photos or videos of themselves or others. Additionally, 44 participants (18.8%) reported having shared the sexually explicit photos or videos while 78 participants (33.3%) reported that their sexually explicit photos or videos have been shared by others.

Aside from that, among participants who reported having received sexts ( $n = 449$ ; see Table 7), 211 participants (66.1%) reported having sent sexually explicit photos or videos of themselves or others while 285 participants (90%) reported having received sexually explicit photos or videos of themselves or others. Moreover, 47 participants (14.9%) reported having

shared the sexually explicit photos or videos and 102 participants (32.4%) reported their photos or videos were shared by others.

For a more in-depth study, binary logistic regression was performed to analyze whether gender and relationship between sender and receiver of sexting can predict IBSA experiences. Here, gender and relationship were dummy coded. Also, we recoded each IBSA experience as 0 (never experienced IBSA) and 1 (experienced IBSA at least once) for binary logistic regression.

There were four different types of IBSA experiences: participants sent, received, shared sexually explicit photos or videos, or had sexually explicit photos or videos shared by others. When dependent variable was whether or not participants have sent sexually explicit photos or videos of themselves (see Table 8), the overall model was found to be statistically significant ( $X^2(11) = 140.64, p < .001$ ), with Nagelkerke  $R^2$  of .36. Gender ( $X^2(1) = 8.56, p = .003$ ) and sexting sent to casual partner ( $X^2(1) = 15.41, p < .001$ ), dating prospect ( $X^2(1) = 9.25, p = .002$ ), friend ( $X^2(1) = 8.10, p = .004$ ), and acquaintance ( $X^2(1) = 4.27, p = .37$ ) were found to be statistically significant in predicting odds of sending sexually explicit images or videos. Specifically, the odds of sending sexually explicit images or videos will be, on average, decreased by 55% for men compared to women, after controlling for relationship to receiver and sender (OR = .45, 95% CI [.27, .77]). It was noticed that, after adjusting for gender and relationship to sender, the odds of sending sexually explicit images or videos will be, on average, 9.64 times (95% CI [3.11, 29.86]) for casual partner, 5.56 times (95% CI [1.84, 16.78]) for dating prospect, 4.59 times (95% CI [1.61, 13.01]) for friends, and 11.02 times (95% CI [1.16, 104.54]) for acquaintance more than romantic partner. There were no statistically significant odd ratios when predictor variable was the relationship to sender of sexting.

When the dependant variable was whether or not participants have received sexually explicit photos or videos (see Table 9), the overall model was statistically significant ( $X^2(11) = 154.06, p < .001$ ) with Nagelkerke  $R^2 = .41$ . Gender ( $X^2(1) = 11.27, p < .001$ ) and sexting received from casual partner ( $X^2(1) = 7.61, p = .006$ ), dating prospect ( $X^2(1) = 9.03, p = .003$ ), friend ( $X^2(1) = 4.55, p = .033$ ), acquaintance ( $X^2(1) = 8.31, p = .004$ ), and other ( $X^2(1) = 9.46, p = .002$ ) were found to be statistically significant in predicting the odds of receiving sexually explicit photos or videos. Especially, the odds of receiving sexually explicit images or videos will be decreased by 60%, on average, for men compared to women, after controlling for relationship to receiver and sender (OR = .40, 95% CI [.29, .68]). Additionally, after adjusting for gender and relationship to receiver, the odds of receiving sexually explicit images or videos will be, on average, 3.91 times (95% CI [1.48, 10.30]) for casual partner, 8.82 times (95% CI [2.13, 36.46]) for dating prospect, 2.78 times (95% CI [1.09, 7.11]) for friends, and 4.44 times (95% CI [1.61, 8.81]) for acquaintance more than romantic partner. There were no statistically significant odd ratios when predictor variable was the relationship to receiver of sexting.

When dependant variable was whether or not participants have shared sexually explicit photos or videos, the overall model was statistically significant ( $X^2(11) = 45.66, p < .001$ ) with Nagelkerke  $R^2 = .20$ . Sexts received from friends were found to be statistically significant predictor of sharing sexually explicit photos or videos,  $X^2(1) = 8.96, p = .003$ . More specifically, the odds of sharing sexually explicit images or videos will be, on average, 3.49 times for sexting received from friend more than romantic partner, OR = .40, 95% CI [.29, .68], after adjusting for gender, relationship to receiver of sexting, and other types of relationship to sender (casual partner, dating prospect, acquaintance, and other). There were no statistically significant odd ratios when predictor variable was the relationship to receiver of sexting.

Finally, when dependant variable was whether or not participants' sexually explicit photos or videos were shared, the overall model was statistically significant ( $X^2(11) = 51.71, p < .001$ ) with Nagelkerke  $R^2 = .17$ . Sexts received from friends ( $X^2(1) = 8.94, p = .003$ ) and acquaintances ( $X^2(1) = 5.02, p = .025$ ) were found to be statistically significant predictors of sexually explicit photos or videos being shared. To be specific, the odds of having their sexually explicit images or videos shared by others will be, on average, 2.78 times (95% CI [1.42, 5.42]) for friend and 2.10 times (95% CI [1.10, 4.03]) for acquaintance more than romantic partner, after adjusting for gender, relationship to the receiver of sexting, and other types of relationship to the sender (casual partner, dating prospect, and other). There were no statistically significant odd ratios when the predictor variable was the relationship to the receiver of sexting.

### **Discussion**

The aim of this study was to examine whether sexting behaviors increased the risk of experiencing IBSA, and whether characteristics of sexting behaviors can be used to predict IBSA experiences. The results showed that sending or receiving sexts are likely to result in sending or receiving sexually explicit photos or videos. However, there were only small percentages of participants who shared sexually explicit photos or videos or whose sexually explicit photos or videos were shared among those who have sent or received sexts before. The reason behind this could be because sharing sexually explicit photos or videos and having sexually explicit photos or videos shared are relatively rarer events than sending and receiving the sexually explicit photos or videos. Nevertheless, our data showed that sexting behaviors are associated with at least some of IBSA experiences.

It is further deducible from the results that gender could be a predictor of some IBSA experiences. Especially for sending and receiving sexually explicit images or videos, the results

suggested that males are less likely to send or receive those images or videos. Although the results supported the literature where females are more likely to be victims of IBSA (e.g., sending sexually explicit photos or videos of themselves), some of the results were interesting as they opposed the literature, which states that males are more likely to be the perpetrator of IBSA (e.g., receiving sexually sexually explicit photos or videos from others; Branch et al., 2017; Dardis & Gidycz, 2017; Lenhart et al., 2016; Najdowski, 2017; O'Connor et al., 2018; Powell et al., 2019; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020). This may be due to the gender bias as 72.5% were females and 27.5% were males in the final sample. Nonetheless, it still suggested that males may be less likely to be perpetrators of IBSA than literature has suggested so far, and therefore gender is a nuanced predictor of IBSA experiences. Moreover, for sharing sexually explicit photos or videos and sexually explicit photos or videos being shared, gender did not show statistically significant results. These results suggested that gender did not contribute to the prediction of sharing sexually explicit images or videos or having sexually images of vidoes shared by others.

As to relationship between sender and receiver of sexting, some results were statistically significant, and thus suggested that some types of relationship between sender and receiver of sexting may predict IBSA. However, it is important to note that the odd ratios for relationship to receiver and sender did not seem to be precise as confidence interval ranges were very wide. Therefore, it was hard to say that the relationship between sender and receiver of sexting can predict IBSA experiences. A small sample size could be the explanation for such a wide confidence interval range.

Regardless, the obtained statistically significant results suggest several possible interpretations. For sending sexually explicit photos or videos, it was suggested that if sexts were sent to individuals in less intimate relationships than romantic partners (e.g., casual partner,

dating prospect, friend, or acquaintance), it may be more likely for individuals to send their sexually explicit photos or videos to others. As for receiving sexually explicit photos or videos, it was similarly suggested that if sexts were received from individuals in less intimate relationships than romantic partner (e.g., casual partner, dating prospect, friend, acquaintance, or other), it may be more likely for individuals to receive sexually explicit photos or videos of others. Similar results were observed for sharing sexually explicit photos or videos and sexually explicit photos or videos being shared. For sharing sexually explicit photos or videos, the results showed that when sexts were received from friends, it was more likely to end up in sharing sexually explicit photos or videos with others compared to when sexts were received from romantic partners. Lastly, for sexually explicit photos or videos being shared, the results indicated that when sexts were received from friends and acquaintances, individuals' sexually explicit photos or videos were more likely to be shared compared to when sexts were received from romantic partners.

The results of this study showed that individuals who feel more comfortable sending sexually suggestive messages or photos to individuals in relatively less intimate relationships were more likely to send, receive, share sexually explicit photos or videos, or having sexually explicit photos or videos shared. It can be assumed that those who send sexts to people in less intimate relationships do not consider sexting as a dangerous behavior, but in fact regard it as a form of flirting (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020).

### **Implications**

The current study was the first to explore the relationship between sexting behaviors and IBSA experiences. It showed that engagement in sexting behaviors can lead to IBSA perpetration and/or victimization. It was also notable that, although the relationship between the sext sender and receiver did not predict IBSA experiences, it was found that, if females are engaged in

sexting behaviors, it is more likely for them to engage in both sending and receiving sexually explicit images or videos. Given that there is still a lack of understanding IBSA, this study adds to the literature of IBSA.

A better understanding of the relationship between sexting behaviors and IBSA may also help develop strategies to prevent further victimization of IBSA. The sexting literature pointed out that sexting is very prevalent in younger generation (Gordon-Messer et al., 2013). Therefore, the fact that sexting is related to IBSA implies that identification of sexting behaviors in younger generation could be utilized to prevent sexting from developing to IBSA at an earlier stage.

### **Limitations**

There were several limitations of this study. First, this study used secondary data, which was existing online survey data containing information about sexting and IBSA experiences. However, since the survey was not specifically designed to study the relationship between sexting and IBSA experiences, some wordings of the questions did not precisely reflect the definitions of sexting and IBSA. Especially for IBSA, IBSA questions in this survey failed to reflect the nonconsensual and threatening aspects of IBSA. For example, when asking about the number of times participants have shared sexually explicit photos or videos of others or number of times participants had their sexually explicit photos or videos shared, researchers did not specify if sharing was nonconsensual. Therefore, participants could answer to those questions either when they had consent or did not have consent to sharing the photos or videos.

Moreover, the main definition of IBSA in this study was the nonconsensual creation, distribution, and/or act of threatening to distribute nude or sexual images of others. Although the threatening aspect of IBSA is crucial, none of the IBSA questions asked if participants were

threatened to send or distribute the sexually explicit photos or videos. Therefore, it is unsure if the results of this study included those IBSA experiences in the analyses.

Another limitation to this study was that the IBSA questions could have been perceived to be quite sensitive, as they were asking the participants several extremely personal experiences that they possibly felt shameful about. This leads to the possibility that participants became reluctant to answer some questions, or not answer with complete honesty. This indicates that some of the data collected could be doubtful as it may not reflect reality, meaning that the results of analysis could be inaccurate.

### **Future Directions**

For future study, it is suggested to conduct a primary research using the survey questions that are specifically designed to explore the relationship between sexting behaviors and IBSA. If primary data were used, the results would not only be able to reflect the relationship between sexting and IBSA more precisely, but also a more precise definition of IBSA may be implied with the original survey questions. Additionally, the statistically insignificant odd ratios for the gender and the wide 95% confidential interval ranges of odd ratios for relationship could be due to the small sample size, especially for rare events, such as IBSA. Therefore, a larger sample size is suggested to be used to obtain better results,.



### References

- Bates, S. (2017). Revenge porn and mental health: A qualitative analysis of the mental health effects of revenge porn on female survivors. *Feminist Criminology, 12*(1), 22-42.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085116654565>
- Bell, V., Hemmens, C., & Steiner, B. (2006). Up skirts and down blouses: A statutory analysis of legislative responses to video voyeurism. *Criminal Justice Studies, 19*(3), 301-314.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14786010600921746>
- Berwick, D. M., Murphy, J. N., Goldman, P. A., Ware, J. E., Barsky, A. J., & Weinstein, M. C. (1991). Performance of a five-item mental health screening test. *Medical Care, 29*(2), 169-176. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005650-199102000-00008>
- Branch, K., Hilinski-Rosick, C., Johnson, E., & Solano, G. (2017). Revenge porn victimization of college students in the United States: An exploratory analysis. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology, 11*(1), 128–142. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.495777>
- Burkett, M. (2015). Sex(t) talk: A qualitative analysis of young adults' negotiations of the pleasures and perils of sexting. *Sexuality & Culture, 19*, 835-863.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-015-9295-0>
- Chapman, H., & Gillespie, S. M. (2019). The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): A review of the properties, reliability, and validity of the CTS2 as a measure of partner abuse in community and clinical samples. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 44*, 27-35.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.10.006>
- Civil Rights Law, Ny. Stat. §52-B (2019). <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/CVR/52-B>

- Cole, T., Policastro, C., Crittenden, C., & McGuggee, K. (2020). Freedom to post or invasion of privacy? Analysis of U.S. revenge porn statutes. *Victims and Offenders, 15*, 483–498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2020.1712567>
- Dardis, C. M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2017). The frequency and perceived impact of engaging in in-person and cyber unwanted pursuit after relationship break-up among college men and women. *Sex Roles, 76*(1-2), 56–72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0667-1>
- Dodge, A., & Spencer, D. C. (2018). Online sexual violence, child pornography or something else entirely? Police responses to non-consensual intimate image sharing among youth. *Social and Legal Studies, 27*(5), 636–657. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663917724866>
- Eaton, A. A., Jacobs, H., & Ruvalcaba, Y. (2017). *2017 nationwide online study of nonconsensual porn victimization and perpetration*. Cyber Civil Rights Initiative. [www.cybercivilrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/CCRI-2017-Research-Report.pdf](http://www.cybercivilrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/CCRI-2017-Research-Report.pdf).
- Eaton, A. A., & McGlynn, C. (2020). The psychology of nonconsensual porn: Understanding and addressing a growing form of sexual violence. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 7*(2), 190-197. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732220941534>
- Eaton, A. A., Noori, S., Bonomi, A., Stephens, D. P., & Gillum, T. L. (2020). Nonconsensual porn as a form of intimate partner violence: Using the Power and Control Wheel to understand nonconsensual porn perpetration in intimate relationships. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 22*(5), 1140-1154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838020906533>
- Gordon-Messer, D., Bauermeister, J. A., Grodzinski, A., & Zimmerman, M. (2013). Sexting among young adults. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 52*, 301-306. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.05.013>

- Hall, M., & Hearn, J. (2019). Revenge pornography and manhood acts: A discourse analysis of perpetrators' accounts. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 28(2), 158–170.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2017.1417117>
- Henry, N., & Flynn, A. (2019). Image-based sexual abuse: Online distribution channels and illicit communities of support. *Violence Against Women*, 25(16), 1932–1955.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219863881>
- Henry, N., & Powell, A. (2015). Embodied harms, gender, shame, and technology-facilitated sexual violence. *Violence Against Women*, 21(6), 758–779.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215576581>
- Henshaw, M., Ogloff1, J. R. P. & Clough, J. A. (2017). Looking beyond the screen: A critical review of the literature on the online child pornography offender. *Sexual Abuse*, 29(5), 416–445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063215603690>
- Koss, M. P. (2006). Restoring rape survivors: Justice, advocacy, and a call to action. *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*, 1087(1), 206-234.  
<https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1385.025>
- Lenhart, A., Ybarra, M., & Price-Feeney, M. (2016). *Nonconsensual image sharing: One in 25 Americans has been a victim of “revenge porn.”* Data & Society Research Institute.  
[https://datasociety.net/pubs/oh/Nonconsensual\\_Image\\_Sharing\\_2016.pdf](https://datasociety.net/pubs/oh/Nonconsensual_Image_Sharing_2016.pdf)
- McGlynn, C., Johnson, K., Rackley, E., Henry, N., Gavey, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2021). “It’s torture for the soul”: The harms of image-based sexual abuse. *Social & Legal Studies*, 30(4), 541-562. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663920947791>
- McGlynn, C., & Rackley, E. (2017). Image-based sexual abuse. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 37(3), 534-561. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqw033>

- Moreau, C., Boucher, S., Hébert, M., & Lemelin, J. (2015). Capturing sexual violence experiences among battered women using the revised sexual experiences survey and the revised conflict tactics scales. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *44*(1), 223-231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-014-0345-8>
- Mori, C., Cooke, J. E., Temple, J. R., Ly, A., Lu, Y., Anderson, N., Rash, C., & Madigan, S. (2020). The prevalence of sexting behaviors among emerging adults: A meta-analysis. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *49*, 1103-1119. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-020-01656-4>
- Najdowski, C. J. (2017). Legal responses to nonconsensual pornography: Current policy in the United States and future directions for research. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, *23*(2), 154–165. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000123>
- O'Connor, K., Drouin, M., Davis, J., & Thompson, H. (2018). Cyberbullying, revenge porn and the mid-sized university: Victim characteristics, prevalence and students' knowledge of university policy and reporting procedures. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *72*(4), 344–359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12171>
- O'Malley, R. L., & Holt, K. M. (2020). Cyber sextortion: An exploratory analysis of different perpetrators engaging in a similar crime. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *37*(1-2), 258-283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520909186>
- Pedersen, W., Bakken, A., Stefansen K., & von Soest, T. (2023). Sexting victimization in the digital age: A population-based study of physical and image-based sexual abuse among adolescents. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *52*, 399-410. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-02200-8>
- Penal Law, Ny. Stat. § 245.15 (2019). <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/PEN/245.15>

- Powell, A., & Henry, N. (2019). Technology-facilitated sexual violence victimization: Results from an online survey of Australian adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 34*(17), 3637-3665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516672055>
- Powell, A., Henry, N., Flynn, A., & Scott, A. J. (2019). Image-based sexual abuse: The extent, nature, and predictors of perpetration in a community sample of Australian residents. *Computers in Human Behavior, 92*, 393–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.11.009>
- Reed, L. A., Tolman, R. M., & Ward, L. M. (2016). Snooping and sexting: Digital media as a context for dating aggression and abuse among college students. *Violence Against Women, 22*(13), 1556–1576. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801216630143>
- Ringrose, J., & Regehr, K. (2023). Recognizing and addressing how gender shapes young people’s experiences of image-based sexual harassment and abuse in educational settings. *Journal of Social Issues. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12575/>*
- Rumpf, H., Meyer, C., Hapke, U., & John, U. (2001). Screening for mental health: Validity of the MHI-5 using DSM-IV Axis I psychiatric disorders as gold standard. *Psychiatry Research, 105*, 243-253. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1781\(01\)00329-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1781(01)00329-8)
- Ruvalcaba, Y., & Eaton, A. A. (2020). Nonconsensual pornography among U.S. adults: A sexual scripts framework on victimization, perpetration, and health correlates for women and men. *Psychology of Violence, 10*(1), 68-78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000233>
- Short, E., Brown, A., Pitchford, M., & Barnes, J. (2017). Revenge porn: Findings from the Harassment and Revenge Porn (HARP) survey – preliminary results. *Annual Review of Cybertherapy and Telemedicine, 15*, 161-166. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3709306>
- Smith, S. G., Chen, J., Basile, K. C., Gilbert, L. K., Merrick, M. T., Patel, N., Walling, M., & Jain, A. (2017). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS):*

*2010-2012 State Report*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/nisvs-statereportbook.pdf>

Strassberg, D. S., McKinnon, R. K., Sustaíta, M. A., & Rullo, J. (2012). Sexting by high school students: An exploratory and descriptive study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *42*, 15-21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-9969-8>

Uhl, C. A., Rhyner, K. J., Terrance, C. A., & Lugo, N. R. (2018). An examination of nonconsensual pornography websites. *Feminism and Psychology*, *28*(1), 50–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353517720225>

Van Ouytsel, J., Punyanunt-Carter, N. M., Walrave, M., & Ponnet, K. (2020). Sexting within young adults' dating and romantic relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *36*, 55-59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2020.04.007>

**Table 1***Number of Times Participants Have Sent Sexually Explicit Messages*

Number of times	<i>n</i>	%
Never	210	46.9
One time	31	6.9
Two to Four times	67	15.0
Five to nine times	49	10.9
10 to 19 times	42	9.4
20 to 49 times	25	5.6
40 to 99 times	10	2.2
More than 100 times	14	3.1
Total	448	100

**Table 2***Number of Times Participants Have Received Sexually Explicit Messages*

Number of times	Frequency	Percent
Never	129	28.7
One time	23	5.1
Two to Four times	75	16.7
Five to nine times	54	12.0
10 to 19 times	58	12.9
20 to 49 times	53	11.8
40 to 99 times	21	4.7
More than 100 times	36	8.0
Total	449	100



**Table 3***Number of Times Participants Have Sent Sexually Explicit Images or Videos of Themselves*

Number of times	Frequency	Percent
Never	232	51.8
One time	34	7.6
Two to Four times	68	15.2
Five to nine times	42	9.4
10 to 19 times	30	6.7
20 to 49 times	32	7.1
40 to 99 times	5	1.1
More than 100 times	5	1.1
Total	448	100

**Table 4***Number of Times Participants Have Received Sexually Explicit Images or Videos*

Number of times	Frequency	Percent
Never	152	34.0
One time	27	6.0
Two to Four times	76	17.0
Five to nine times	65	14.5
10 to 19 times	49	11.0
20 to 49 times	41	9.2
40 to 99 times	16	3.6
More than 100 times	21	4.7
Total	447	100

**Table 5***Number of Times Participants Have Shared Sexually Explicit Images or Videos*

Number of times	Frequency	Percent
Never	397	89.0
One time	9	2.0
Two to Four times	24	5.4
Five to nine times	7	1.6
10 to 19 times	5	1.1
20 to 49 times	2	.4
40 to 99 times	0	0
More than 100 times	2	.4
Total	446	100

**Table 6**

*Number of Times Participants Have Had Their Sexually Explicit Images or Videos Shared by Others*

Number of times	Frequency	Percent
Never	338	76.0
One time	28	6.3
Two to Four times	48	10.8
Five to nine times	13	2.9
10 to 19 times	13	2.9
20 to 49 times	2	.4
40 to 99 times	1	.2
More than 100 times	2	.4
Total	446	100

**Table 7**

*Percentages of Participants who Reported Having Experienced IBSA among Participants who Reported Having Sent or Received Sexually Explicit Messages*

	IBSA Sent (%)	IBSA Received (%)	IBSA Shared (%)	IBSA Shared From (%)
Sexting Sent	88.2	92.8	18.8	33.3
Sexting Received	66.1	90.0	14.9	32.4

**Table 8***The Odd Ratios of Sending Sexually Explicit Photos or Videos Based on Gender and**Relationship to Sender and Receiver of Sexting*

Covariates	Beta	SE Beta	X <sup>2</sup>	p	OR	95% CI	
						Lower	Higher
Man	-.80	.27	8.53	.003	.45	.27	.77
Relationship to receiver							
Casual partner	2.27	.58	15.41	<.001	9.64	3.11	29.87
Dating prospect	1.72	.56	9.25	.002	5.56	1.84	16.78
Friend	1.52	.54	8.10	.004	4.59	1.61	13.10
Acquaintance	2.40	1.15	4.37	.037	11.02	1.16	104.54
Other	-3.81	2.44	2.44	.118	.022	.00	2.64
Relationship to sender							
Casual partner	.52	.37	2.20	.157	1.69	.82	3.47
Dating prospect	.14	.40	.12	.730	1.15	.53	2.51
Friend	.17	.37	.20	.655	1.18	.57	2.45
Acquaintance	.64	.35	3.28	.070	1.90	.95	3.78
Other	.27	.37	.01	.941	1.03	.50	2.12
Constant	-.69	.16	18.77	<.001	.50		

Note: The reference group for gender was woman, and the reference group for the relationship was romantic partner.

**Table 9**

*The Odd Ratios of Receiving Sexually Explicit Photos or Videos Based on Gender and Relationship to Sender and Receiver of Sexting*

Covariates	Beta	SE Beta	X <sup>2</sup>	p	OR	95% CI	
						Lower	Higher
Man	-.93	.28	11.27	<.001	.40	.23	.68
Relationship to receiver							
Casual partner	1.59	.86	3.37	.067	4.88	.90	29.56
Dating prospect	.78	.89	.77	.379	2.19	.38	12.55
Friend	.25	.62	.17	.685	1.29	.38	4.35
Acquaintance	19.36	9438.81	.00	.998	255540934	.00	
Other	16.61	23380.55	.00	.999	16419902.7	.00	
Relationship to sender							
Casual partner	1.36	.49	7.61	.006	3.91	1.48	10.30
Dating prospect	2.18	.72	9.03	.003	8.82	2.13	36.46
Friend	1.02	.48	4.54	.033	2.78	1.09	7.11
Acquaintance	1.49	.52	8.31	.004	4.44	1.61	12.24
Other	1.33	.43	9.46	.002	3.78	1.62	8.81
Constant	-.10	.16	.37	.544	.91		

Note: The reference group for gender was woman, and the reference group for the relationship was romantic partner.

**Table 10***The Odd Ratios of Sharing Sexually Explicit Photos or Videos Based on Gender and**Relationship to Sender and Receiver of Sexting*

Covariates	Beta	SE Beta	X <sup>2</sup>	p	OR	95% CI	
						Lower	Higher
Man	-.21	.40	.27	.603	.81	.37	1.77
Relationship to receiver							
Casual partner	.65	.63	1.07	.299	1.92	.56	6.54
Dating prospect	.13	.53	.06	.810	1.14	.40	3.22
Friend	.41	.47	.77	.381	1.51	.60	3.82
Acquaintance	-.15	.86	.03	.860	.86	.16	4.60
Other	-20.86	26620.14	.00	.999	.00	.00	.
Relationship to sender							
Casual partner	-.32	.59	.28	.596	.73	.23	2.34
Dating prospect	.67	.48	1.96	.162	1.95	.77	4.94
Friend	1.25	.42	8.97	.003	3.49	1.54	7.91
Acquaintance	.69	.41	2.76	.097	1.99	.88	4.46
Other	.29	.54	.29	.591	1.34	.46	3.86
Constant	-2.91	.27	112.97	<.001	.05		

Note: The reference group for gender was woman, and the reference group for the relationship was romantic partner.



**Table 11**

*The Odd Ratios of Sexually Explicit Photos or Videos Being Shared Based on Gender and Relationship to Sender and Receiver of Sexting*

Covariates	Beta	SE Beta	X <sup>2</sup>	p	OR	95% CI	
						Lower	Higher
Man	-.42	.29	2.07	.150	.66	.37	1.16
Relationship to receiver							
Casual partner	.37	.44	.73	.394	1.45	.62	3.41
Dating prospect	.003	.44	.00	.995	1.00	.42	2.36
Friend	-.71	.45	2.51	.113	.49	.21	1.18
Acquaintance	-.28	.73	.15	.702	.76	.18	3.16
Other	-20.75	28330.61	.00	.999	.00	.00	.
Relationship to sender							
Casual partner	-.70	.38	3.47	.062	2.02	.96	4.23
Dating prospect	.35	.37	.89	.347	1.41	.69	2.91
Friend	1.02	.34	8.94	.003	2.78	1.42	5.42
Acquaintance	.74	.33	5.02	.025	2.10	1.10	4.03
Other	.31	.38	.69	.408	136	.65	2.85
Constant	-1.71	.19	85.59	<.001	.18		

Note: The reference group for gender was woman, and the reference group for the relationship was romantic partner.