

A systematic review of the current knowledge regarding revenge pornography and non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit media

Walker, K & Sleath, E

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

Original citation & hyperlink:

Walker, K & Sleath, E 2017, 'A systematic review of the current knowledge regarding revenge pornography and non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit media' *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, vol 36, no. September-October, pp. 9-24
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.06.010>

DOI 10.1016/j.avb.2017.06.010

ISSN 1359-1789

Publisher: Elsevier

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, [36, September-October, (2017)] DOI: 10.1016/j.avb.2017.06.010

© 2017, Elsevier. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

Abstract

The aim of this review was to synthesize the current literature regarding revenge pornography and the non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit media. A systematic search was made of five databases using relevant search terms. From these searches, 82 articles were retained for inclusion within the systematic review. The literature spanned areas of research including legal, theory, as well as psychology related empirical papers. The findings show that particularly in the U.S., but in other countries as well, there are significant concerns regarding the implementation of revenge pornography legislation, despite this being recognized as an important endeavor. Non-consensual sharing perpetration and victimization rates can vary considerably according to how the behavior is defined and measured, however, these behaviors were evident for a considerable number of individuals across both genders.

Key words: Technology-facilitated sexual violence; sexting coercion; image-based sexual abuse; sharing sexually explicit media

A systematic review of the current knowledge regarding revenge pornography and non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit media.

1. Introduction

With the recent proliferation of smartphones and digital media, the sending of text messages, the production and distribution of photographs, and the use of webcams in communication has become commonplace, especially among young adults. International estimates suggest that between 18-68% of young adults (18-24 year olds) use this technology to engage in sending and receiving explicit messages and pictures (Dir & Cyders, 2015). Research examining the sending and receiving of such media, known as sexting, has frequently highlighted that a potential negative outcome of this behavior is the further non-consensual distribution of this content including publication on the internet (e.g., Döring, 2014). In an age when 2.8 billion people are connected to the Internet (Internet World Stats, 2015) and “you are what Google says you are,” (Angelo, 2009), the permanence of personal/private or compromising (e.g., sexually explicit) information about individuals on the internet is a troubling prospect. Revenge pornography is a category of online pornography that while usually created with the consent of those depicted, are then distributed without their consent (Salter & Crofts, 2015). Research in the United States (U.S.) has shown that the online posting of such media has a significant negative impact on victims including: debilitating loss of self-esteem, anxiety, panic attacks, crippling feelings of humiliation and shame, discharge from employment, verbal and physical harassment, and even stalking (Citron & Franks, 2014). In England and Wales, the Criminal Justice and Crime Act (2015) criminalizes revenge pornography or the sharing of “photographs or films which show people engaged in sexual activity, or depicted in a sexual way, or with their genitals exposed, where what is shown would not usually be seen in public” (CJCA 2015 s33 (1); The National Archives 2015). Similar legislation has also been introduced in certain states within the U.S. and also countries such as Japan (Dawkins, 2015; Matsui, 2015).

With the recent emergence of revenge pornography and the non-consensual distribution of private sexual media, there has been a proliferation of discussion and publication of literature regarding these topics. However, one of the key challenges in drawing together this knowledge is the variation in terminology used within this area. In relation to sexting, the broadest definitions refer to the use of technology to create, send, and receive sexually explicit texts, images or video messages (see Fleschler-Peskin et al., 2013). Some definitions are more specific with regards to the type of technology, by specifying primarily either through the use of a mobile phone (e.g., Diliberto & Matthey, 2009; Klettke, Hallford, & Mellor, 2014), or both a mobile phone and/or the Internet (e.g., Ahern & Mechling, 2013; Yeung, Horyniak, Vella, Hellard, & Lim, 2014). Furthermore, sexting definitions can differ according to the behaviors and content that is specified. In relation to content, Dir and Cyders (2015) specify sexually suggestive or provocative content, whereas others specify nudity or partial nudity (Cooper, Quayle, Jonsson, & Svedin, 2016). In assessing the content that is included, these definitions can vary according to whether text and/or images are considered sexting. For example, some researchers include both text messages and images together within their definition (Cooper et al. 2009; Diliberto & Matthey, 2009; Drouin et al., 2013) whereas Doring (2014) includes sexual images only. Finally, behaviors can vary according to whether the act of sexting includes only sending (e.g., Dir & Cyders, 2015), sending and receiving (Yeung et al., 2014) or sending, receiving and forwarding (Diliberto & Matthey, 2009). This last definition draws in behaviors that would fall within revenge pornography, but given that no motivation is specified, it is simpler to consider this behavior as non-consensual sharing.

Similar challenges are apparent when defining revenge pornography; this act is frequently described as either involuntary (Ronay, 2014; Tungate, 2014) or non-consensual (Dawkins, 2015) pornography. With regards to the type of content, it is usually described as sexually explicit, with some authors limiting their definition to images only (e.g., Bloom, 2014; Matsui, 2015), while others extend the content to include both images (including photographs) and videos (e.g., Cannon, 2015; Cecil, 2014; Osterday, 2016). The vast

majority describe the behavior as posting or publication of this content to an online environment (e.g., Larkin, 2014; Matsui, 2015), although most authors are more specific in identifying that this occurs without the consent of the depicted individual (e.g., Barmore, 2015; Daniels, 2014; Salter & Crofts, 2015). The majority of authors also specify that this behavior usually occurs in the context of relationship breakdown (Bloom, 2014; Dawkins, 2015; Larkin, 2014; Matsui, 2015; Osterday, 2016; Tungate, 2014). The inference from the inclusion of the relationship breakdown does begin to draw on revenge as a motivation for the posting of the material, however this is rarely made explicit within the definition, with the exception being those definitions that include the sharing being carried out by scorned ex-partners (Bloom, 2014; Osterday, 2016) or where the relationship breakdown is highlighted as being acrimonious (Daniels, 2014) or vicious (Salter & Crofts, 2015). Furthermore, other authors when examining and defining this phenomenon use the broader term “image-based sexual abuse” (e.g., DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2016; McGlynn & Rackley, 2016), as they suggest it is not only ex-partners seeking revenge who non-consensually share, but a variety of other people who do this for different reasons e.g., a joke, money or indeed for no particular or specified reason. By using this broader term, it is also suggested that this recognizes the impact that this behavior has on victims (McGlynn & Rackley, 2016). In drawing these terms and definitions together, it seems clear that there are several important aspects to defining non-consensual sharing or revenge pornography (or “image-based sexual abuse”).

2. The current review

Given the recent spread of literature in this area, whilst noting the challenges above, this is a key point in time to draw together the current knowledge regarding revenge pornography and non-consensual sharing of private sexual media. Such a review can be used to guide researchers and practitioners to key issues within this area and also to identify the gaps/challenges that this area currently presents. As such, the aim of this current review is to systematically identify and review the current knowledge regarding revenge pornography. However, in setting this aim, it became clear when scoping the literature, that the lack of

definitional clarity surrounding the terms of revenge pornography and sexting meant that the scope of the review had to be broadened. For example, it became evident that although some literature referred to revenge pornography as the motivation for the non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit media (e.g., Salter & Crofts, 2015), many authors did not determine the motivation for the sharing of the images beyond the intended recipient (e.g., Marganski & Melander, 2015). Therefore, this review will seek to synthesize our knowledge regarding revenge pornography but will also extend this to non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit images (including photographs) and videos. Based on the previous literature reviewed above, revenge pornography is defined as non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit images (including photographs) and/or videos, with an underlying motivation linked to revenge. The definition used for non-consensual sharing was the sharing of sexually explicit images (including photographs) and/or videos, without the consent of those depicted, where the motivation is unclear or is not linked to revenge. The definition of this behavior is distinct to that of revenge pornography because the motivation for the sharing is unspecified. This accounts for behaviors discussed by McGlynn and Rackley (2016) where the reasons for sharing are unclear or varied e.g., as a joke. This will ensure that the review has sufficient scope in drawing together the limited literature in this area, so that the findings can inform our understanding of these behaviors.

3. Review selection methodology

A research protocol was written prior to any formal literature search being carried out. Using Torgerson's (2003) guidelines, this protocol specified the focus of the literature review in identifying all the available published literature in relation to revenge pornography and also non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit images and video. A systematic literature search of the available literature was carried out using the following databases simultaneously: Academic Search Complete, CINAHL, Medline, PsycArticles, and PsycInfo. Given the lack of clarity to terminology within this area, a number of searches were carried out using the following terms: "Revenge porn*", "Technology AND sexual violence", "Internet AND sexual violence", "Online sexual victimi*ation", "Sexting", "Cyberbullying

OR Cyber aggression”, “Revenge AND internet”. Following each search, the inclusion and exclusion criteria from the protocol were applied to the results. Due to terminology issues within this area, it was not always clear that sharing was with or without the explicit consent of the depicted individual, the decision was taken to include all articles if they discussed or investigated the sharing (forwarding, sending, and receiving) of sexually explicit images or videos in the following situations. Therefore, this included: (i) senders having their photos/videos distributed to people beyond the intended recipient; (ii) receiving images/videos of individuals other than the sender; and (iii) forwarding images/videos onwards from their intended recipient. The inclusion criteria were very broad, given the contemporary nature of the research. The following criteria were therefore applied: texts had to (i) be published in English, (ii) refer to adult and/or child populations, (iii) include male and/or female samples, (iv) be journal articles or books/book chapters, and (v) use qualitative or quantitative methodologies. Duplicates from previous searches were removed. For this initial data screening stage, the above inclusion criteria were applied by reading the title and abstract of the article. Articles were excluded if it was clear that they did not meet the above criteria. However, articles were retained if they met or if it was unclear whether they met the inclusion criteria. The first search term “Revenge porn*” produced 22 results, which resulted in 17 articles being retained following the application of the inclusion criteria. This procedure was followed for the next searches. The second search term “Technology AND sexual violence” resulted in 442 results, with two duplicates, with 23 articles retained. The third search term “Internet AND sexual violence” resulted in 418 results, with eight duplicates, with 11 articles retained. The fourth search term “Online sexual victimi*ation” resulted in 248 results, no duplicates, with ten articles retained. The fifth search term “Sexting” resulted in 345 results, with 15 duplicates, with 59 articles retained. The sixth search term “Cyberbullying OR Cyber aggression” resulted in 167 results, with one duplicate, with six articles retained. The final search “Revenge AND internet” resulted in 46 results, with 10 duplicates, with three articles retained. In total, this meant that 129 articles were progressed to the next stage of screening. This stage involved reading each article in full to make a full

determination as to whether the article met or did not meet the inclusion criteria for the review. In reading the full text of the article, hand searching of the reference lists was also carried out to include articles that had not been discovered through the electronic searches. This resulted in 17 additional articles being added to the results of the electronic searches, meaning a total of 146 articles were included in the second stage of sifting. These articles were then screened in full to ensure that they did meet the criteria for inclusion within the review by discussing either revenge pornography or non-consensual sharing as defined above. After the review was completed, one further qualitative paper was published which was not identified in initial searches as it was not published at the time of searching. Due to its relevance, it has since been added to this review. This resulted in 82 articles being retained for the published review (see figure 1 for a summary of this process).

[Figure 1 here]

3.1. Risk of bias in selection methodology

In a bid to reduce bias in the review undertaken, clear inclusion and exclusion criteria were put in place and an extensive number of databases were examined. However, some issues regarding bias are of note. It was decided for reasons of quality control, that only peer reviewed published literature would be included, thereby meaning that grey literature and unpublished dissertation theses and research would not be included. This means that potentially some information could have been omitted. In addition published literature may result in reporting bias, in that statistically significant effects are more likely to be reported than non-significant effects resulting in within-study publication bias. Although we used several databases for the search, there is the risk of location bias in that papers not indexed in the databases searched were not included. We also only selected papers written in English potentially resulting in language bias. Finally, inherent in these reviews, is a time-lag bias between initial searching, writing the review and publication. However, to minimise this, papers identified after this paper had initially been written, were subsequently added.

4. Results

Of the 82 articles included within the review, 33 were empirical papers, 29 were legal reviews, eight were theory and comment papers, six were literature reviews, and six were practice notes. Of the 33 empirical papers, 21 were quantitative studies, nine were qualitative studies, and three used mixed methodologies. Papers were published in a broad range of countries including: U.S. ($n = 48$), Australia ($n = 13$), U.K. ($n = 5$), Spain ($n = 5$), Italy ($n = 2$), Canada ($n = 3$), Sweden ($n = 1$), Thailand ($n = 1$), Germany ($n = 1$), Switzerland ($n = 1$), Belgium ($n = 1$), and three from multiple/not identified countries. The non-empirical papers are summarized within Table 1.

[Table 1 here]

4.1. Literature/Narrative reviews

The six published literature reviews (2 systematic; 4 narrative) covered a range of topics that aligned with the issue of revenge pornography i.e., sexting, development of online technologies (Atkinson & Newton, 2010; Döring, 2014). These reviews identified that the rise of online technologies have facilitated the sharing of materials amongst individuals in general (McCartan & McAlister, 2012), but that concerns about the sharing of sexual images have arisen in light of these developments (Atkinson & Newton, 2010). All of the reviews identified that non-consensual sharing is a negative outcome from sexting that was, sometimes, perceived as inevitable as a result of sharing such imagery (Döring, 2014). However, in discussing the motivations for non-consensual sharing, the reviews identified that these were not always clear, nor was it consistently linked to revenge (see Reid & Weigle, 2014 as an exception). Both Cooper, Qualyle, Jonsson, and Svendine (2016) and Klettke, Hallford, and Mellor (2014) strongly suggest that more research is needed regarding non-consensual sharing, particularly in relation to prevalence and outcomes for those involved.

4.2. Legal reviews

The 29 papers discussing legal components of revenge pornography/non-consensual sharing were predominantly from the U.S., discussing several challenges to enacting revenge porn legislation that is effective and that does not raise constitutional issues. For example, eight articles (seven from the U.S., one from multiple countries) discuss the issue of protection of freedom of speech/expression in developing legislation that addresses revenge pornography behaviors (Barmore, 2015; Daniels, 2014; Dawkins, 2015; Gissell, 2015; Humbach, 2014; Larkin, 2014; Matsui, 2015; Ronay, 2014). For example, both Humbach (2014) and Daniels (2014) highlight the challenges of developing revenge pornography legislation that does not impinge on First Amendment rights in the U.S.. Daniels (2014) questions whether recent amendments to legislation that deals with revenge pornography in California could face challenges in relation to the First Amendment. Barmore (2015) proposes that any revenge pornography legislation may not affect freedom of speech protection, as the images could be considered obscene (and as such are not protected by the First Amendment). Under the definition developed in *Miller vs. California*, there are three components to an image being defined as obscene: (i) the work must appeal to the prurient interest of an average person; (ii) the images must be patently offensive; (iii) the imagery must lack literary, artistic, political or scientific value. Barmore (2015) discusses how imagery involved in revenge pornography would fulfil (i) and (iii), however may not meet criterion (ii), as nudity alone does not render an image offensive. Barmore (2015) argues that the non-consensual distribution of these images may render them being considered obscene. However, Ronay (2014) does not support this view, and considers that the distribution of the images is protected under the First Amendment. Matsui (2015) critiqued the Revenge Porn Victimization Prevention Act introduced in Japan. Similar to arguments from the U.S., Matsui (2015) argues that this Act impinges on freedom of expression, suggesting that concerns about freedom of speech are not solely a concern within the U.S.

A key focus for eight of the legal reviews (Lorang, McNiell, & Binder, 2016; McEllrath, 2014; Myers, 2014; Osterday, 2016; Sabbah-Mani, 2015; Shah, 2010; Slane, 2013; Zhang, 2010) was the use of child pornography laws to prosecute adolescents (under the age

of 18 years) in cases of sexting and in some cases, subsequent non-consensual sharing. These reviews discuss legislation in the U.S. and Canada, where sexting is illegal for individuals under the age of 18 years, even when the behavior is consensual (Myers, 2014). Although Lorang et al. (2016) suggest that these types of legal responses are only usually implemented when there are aggravating circumstances e.g., when non-consensual sharing occurs. The majority of these authors express concerns with the use of these laws as a disproportionate response, particularly when the sexting is consensual, but even when non-consensual sharing has occurred (Zhang, 2010). Shah (2010) describes this legal response as “criminalizing immaturity” (p. 203). In focusing specifically on situations where there is non-consensual sharing, these authors argue that the use of child pornography laws over-punish individuals (Osterday, 2016), particularly where this results in adolescents being placed on a sex offender register (McEllrath, 2014). Shah (2010) suggests that there needs to be a federal sexting law so that all minors in the U.S. are treated equally in cases of non-consensual sharing, however Lorang et al. (2016) notes that there is no consensus so far in the way in which legislation is implemented or used across U.S. states.

In proposing solutions for revenge pornography victims, three papers (Cannon, 2015; Cecil, 2014; Tungate, 2014) discuss the challenges that face victims and legal professionals in seeking the permanent removal of images from revenge pornography websites. In the U.S., section 230 of the Communications Decency Act (CDA) provides a level of immunity from prosecution for the hosts of such sites under certain circumstances. For example, website operators are protected from prosecution when content is provided by third parties, as is usually the case in such sites. Cannon (2015) argues that the CDA should not protect hosts when they have purposefully aided the development of the material that is published on the website. This paper discusses cases in which this has been upheld within the court system in the U.S., but then reversed by the U.S. Court of Appeal. Both Cecil (2014) and Tungate (2014) argue for amendments to the CDA to facilitate victims of revenge pornography submitting takedown notices, once they know that content has been uploaded to such websites. Both authors acknowledge that there are significant challenges to ensuring that a

takedown notice is effective, particularly with the ease at which content can be spread to other websites. However, they consider that amendments to the CDA would at least provide victims with a formalized process through which some content could be removed. Any non-compliance by website hosts was argued to be responded to by a loss of immunity from prosecution (Cecil, 2014).

Three papers (Ahrens, 2012; Mayers & Desiderio, 2013; Willard, 2011) discuss the legal challenges that U.S. schools may face when dealing with sexting amongst students. This discussion considers the issue of non-consensual sharing, as this was perceived to be the method by which sexting comes to the notice of the school officials. These articles highlight that the key issues that schools need to consider are: (i) constitutional issues associated with the approach that the school adopts i.e., privacy rights, First Amendment (freedom of speech); and also (ii) whether child pornography legislation should be used in school cases.

In providing an alternative perspective to the predominant U.S. view, three authors (Albury & Crawford, 2012; Powell, 2010; Salter & Crofts, 2015) discuss Australian legislation in relation to non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit images. However, the issues identified within the U.S. papers are echoed here with (i) a call for any legislation to focus on the non-consensual distribution of the images rather than the initial creation of the image, (ii) a need to focus on consent and the context in which these images are produced and shared and (iii) a need for new legislation that reflects the seriousness of the harms that can occur as a result of revenge pornography.

Although these legal authors have identified challenges in enacting revenge pornography legislation, a substantial majority emphasize the importance of enacting such legislation, as it will reinforce the importance of consent within relationships, particularly that consent to have a picture taken (or to create a picture) does not extend to consent to distribute the image (Barmore, 2015; Gissell, 2015). Furthermore, Slane (2013) argues that legislation would be an effective way of shifting the focus away from the original sender of the sexually explicit image to the individual who then intentionally decides to share the image more broadly. In addition, Dawkins (2015) and Larkin (2014) argue that legislation should always

reflect the ways in which people communicate in this modern day (Dawkins, 2015; Larkin, 2014). Finally, Dawkins (2015) suggests that there is a need not only for legislators to discuss revenge pornography, but also for meaningful dialogue amongst consenting romantic partners in terms of rights and responsibilities both during and after a relationship in relation to sexually explicit imagery.

4.3. Theory/Comment

Two viewpoints emerge from the theory and comment papers. The first is that revenge pornography and non-consensual sharing of images and videos should be considered within a continuum of sexual and/or intimate partner violence. The second point arises out of the first, with authors proposing gender-based frameworks for understanding this behavior with male (perpetrator) and female (victim) dyads (Henry & Powell, 2015a; Henry & Powell, 2015b; Salter & Crofts, 2015). In exploring the first point, Henry and Powell (2015a) suggest that technology is being used as a new way to carry out ‘old’ crimes i.e., sexual violence (see also Stroud, 2014). In supporting this point, Henry and Powell (2015b) state that revenge pornography does not only occur in the context of relationship breakdown but is also being used to threaten and control current or ex-partners. This connects the behavior within a continuum of intimate partner violence behaviors, where technology may be being used to expand the repertoire of behaviors that can be enacted against victims. In examining the second point, Stroud (2014) counters Henry and Powell’s (2015a; 2015b) gendered discussion of revenge pornography by arguing that revenge pornography sites feature both male and female victims. Stroud (2014) also questions the reliability of the current prevalence studies of non-consensual sharing and so suggests that we should not rely on some of these cited statistics. As such, Stroud (2014) concludes that it is an over-simplification of this behavior to ground it in solely misogynistic endeavors.

One of the key outcomes from this second point is the blaming by others of the (predominantly) female victims (Barmore, 2015; Dawkins, 2015; Franks, 2011; Gissell, 2015; Slane, 2013). Three papers (Angelides, 2013; Karaian, 2014; Lee & Crofts, 2015) discuss this in terms of the ‘deviant discourse’ surrounding sexting that problematizes this behavior. As

with earlier papers, these authors argue that instead of focusing on the (female) sexter (Lee & Crofts, 2015), educational campaigns should focus on the non-consensual distribution of the image as the problematic behavior that needs to be addressed (Angelides, 2013; Karaian, 2014).

4.4. Practice notes

Six practice notes were gathered as part of the literature review process providing guidance for relevant professionals focusing specifically on those who would be working with adolescents and children. The target audiences were: school nurses (Diliberto & Matthey, 2009) or nurses in general (Ahern & Mechling, 2013; Harris, 2011), clinicians (Houck, 2013), pediatricians (O’Keeffe & Clarke-Pearson, 2011), and schools (Van Ouytsel, Walrave, & Van Gool, 2014). The point that these practice notes exist highlights that a range of different areas of practice have recognized that non-consensual sharing and revenge pornography are an important issue, however the focus is on young people rather than adults. All of these papers (bar one) were published for U.S. audiences, suggesting that this may be considered more an issue within the U.S. at this point in time within the literature. The majority of these papers discuss sexting within the ‘deviant discourse’ framework with non-consensual sharing as a frequently cited outcome (e.g., Harris, 2011; O’Keeffe & Clarke-Pearson, 2011) with some suggesting abstinence from sexting as a solution (e.g., Diliberto & Matthey, 2009). Van Ouytsel et al. (2014) propose framing non-consensual sharing of sexual images and videos within anti-bullying interventions. Whilst discussing sexting as a risky behavior, the authors argue that any school based prevention strategy should not focus on blaming the victim and instead frame the non-consensual sharing of images as bullying behavior where third parties can discourage the sharing of these images.

4.5. Empirical papers

In total, 33 empirical papers were identified (see Table 2). Of the studies identified, where a quantitative approach was taken, the majority ($n = 18$), have generally focused on the prevalence of the forwarding of sexually explicit images and videos, but in all of these studies, the motivation for these behaviors was not explored. This means that while an insight

of the prevalence of the types of behaviors that are associated with revenge pornography can be examined, in the absence of a motivation or rationale for the sharing, it is not possible to directly classify these actions as revenge pornography, but they fall under our definition of non-consensual sharing. Please refer to table 2 for a summary of these studies.

[Table 2 here]

4.5.1. Prevalence of non-consensual sharing.

An overview of the types of questions that have been used to identify the sharing of sexually explicit images and videos, the different experience of these behaviors i.e., victim, perpetrator or received as a third party, and prevalence of these behaviors experienced, split by adult and adolescent samples and split by gender where available, is presented in Table 3.

[Table 3 here]

The following section reports the prevalence of victimization, which refers to the frequency at which the behavior measured was reported to occur at in the relevant study. As seen in Table 3, the types of questions used, number of questions used, the population examined, and time frames over which the behaviors were measured varies greatly, as do the prevalence rates thereby reported. When determining the prevalence of victimization, it is pertinent to note that the variations in terminology and definitions of non-consensual sharing that exist are reflected in the range of different questions/measures used to capture this information. In the absence of a uniform measure, some of the behaviors being examined may vary, and when referring to 'lowest' and 'highest' rates, findings could be seen as somewhat arbitrary in the absence of the context within which the questions have been asked. For example, Borrajo et al. (2015) use a broad question e.g., has a partner "Disseminated intimate information or compromising images" which is open to interpretation in relation to "intimate information" and "compromising images"; however, Gámez-Guadix, Almendros, Borrajo, and Calvete (2015) specifically ask if participants have experienced: "Somebody has disseminated or uploaded onto internet photos or videos with erotic or sexual content from you without your consent." The prevalence rates that follow need to be interpreted by taking this variation in to account and by referring to Table 3, which presents the contexts and

contents of the questions used to measure these victimization behaviors across different studies.

Prevalence rates for victimization in adult samples ranged from 1.1% (based on if ever experienced) (Gámez-Guadix et al., 2015) to 6.3 % (based on past 12 months) (Marganski & Melander, 2015). In both cases the questions specified that the sharing was without consent/permission. However, the lower rate referred to sharing including dissemination or being uploaded to the internet, whereas, the higher rates referred to privately sharing with others. In the three studies (two of which used the same data) where adolescent populations were studied, rates ranged from 1.5% (posted or publically shared, last 3 months) (Dick et al., 2014) to 32% (was message shared with anyone else, ever) (Stanley et al., 2016; Wood, Barter, Stanley, Aghtaie, & Larkins, 2015)¹. Where the lower rates were reported, this might be partly explained by the prevalence rates being based on the sample as a whole ($N = 873$), whereas the higher figures reported are based on a proportion of the whole sample who had identified that they sext.

By gender, for the adults, prevalence ranged between 1.8% (disseminated or uploaded onto internet photos or videos with erotic or sexual content from you without your consent, ever) (Gámez-Guadix et al., 2015) to 10.4% (others disseminated sexual pictures/films of you electronically, last 12 months) (Priebe & Svedin, 2012) for males, and 0.5% (disseminated or uploaded onto internet photos or videos with erotic or sexual content from you without your consent, ever) (Gámez-Guadix et al., 2015) to 3.3% (others disseminated sexual pictures/films of you electronically, last 12 months) (Priebe & Svedin, 2012) for females. Across the four studies that examined gender differences in adult populations, the victimization rates were higher for males than females, although this difference was reported as being significant in only two studies (Borrajo et al., 2015; Priebe & Svedin, 2012). In the adolescent studies, by gender, prevalence ranged from 2.1% for males and 1.3% for females (posted or publically shared, last 3 months) (Dick et al., 2014), to 13% for males and 42% for females (was

¹ Please note, these are the two studies report on the exact same data set and therefore present the same results in relation to the variable of interest for this review

message shared with anyone else, experienced ever) (Stanley et al., 2016; Wood et al., 2015). In these two studies, which used the same data set, collected from five European countries, (Wood et al. 2015; Stanley et al. 2016), for England and Norway victimization prevalence was significantly higher for females than males. The authors report that it is not clear why the rates of female victimization were so high in England and Norway, compared with the rates that males reported in the same study, and compared with the other studies that have reported rates of female victimization.

Some of the studies using adult populations examined prevalence levels by specific groups; for example, Priebe and Svedin (2012), assessed if prevalence rates differed based on sexual identity, i.e., heterosexual or sexual minority (homosexual, bisexual, unsure, none of these). They found that for both males and females, victimization levels were significantly higher in the sexual minority population. It was found that male sexual minority youths had almost six-fold increased odds of having sexual images or videos of them shared compared to their heterosexual counterparts, where for females the increased odds were two-fold. Drouin, Vogel, Surbey, and Stills (2013) analyzed whether prevalence varied based on type of relationship: committed, casual, or cheating. When asked if partners had forwarded sex pictures or videos, this was most prevalent amongst those in cheating relationships (21%), then casual (15%), followed by committed (3%). Interestingly, the participants were also asked if they feared that their partners would do this, revealing much higher percentages for casual (53%), cheating (46%), and committed (26%) relationships. This suggests that the perceived risks about these behaviors are far higher than the actual occurrence, but that these rates vary by the type of relationship that individuals are in.

The following section reports the prevalence of perpetration, which refers to the frequency at which the behavior measured was reported to occur at in the relevant study. As explained when determining the prevalence of victimization, the same issues are evident in this literature in relation to variations in terminologies, definitions and measures used to capture these behaviors. This means that comparisons across studies can be difficult to meaningfully interpret at times. So, for example, Strohmaier, Murphy, and DeMatteo (2014)

are broad in their questioning by asking if participants have “Forwarded or shared a sext with an acquaintance” whereas, Gámez-Guadix et al. (2015) are more specific when they ask if “Somebody has disseminated or uploaded onto internet photos or videos with erotic or sexual content from you without your consent.” The prevalence rates that follow need to take these variations into account and be interpreted by referring to Table 3, where the different types of questions used and the timeframes they capture are presented.

In the studies using adult samples, where the recipient of the sharing was not specified (i.e., to ‘another’ or ‘third party’), the prevalence rates ranged from between 1.4% (shared a sexually suggestive image of your partner without permission, ever) (Hudson, Fetro, & Ogletree, 2014) to 16.3% (shared a sexually suggestive message or picture with someone other than the person it was originally meant for, ever) (Thompson & Morrison, 2013). Likewise in the adolescent sample, when recipient was not specified, rates ranged from 3.0% (forwarded or posted any nude or nearly nude pictures or videos of other kids who were under the age of 18 that someone else took, ever) (Mitchell et al., 2012), to 24% (did you share the message [received from partner/ex-partner] with anyone else, ever) (Stanley et al., 2016; Wood et al., 2015). The study by Strohmaier et al. (2014) identified that prevalence rates differed greatly depending on who the image/video was forwarded to. In this study, although the questionnaires were distributed to an adult population, the questions asked about their behaviors as adolescents. The authors examined data from 175 undergraduates aged 18-22, who were asked to report retrospectively about their sexting behaviors as a minor (i.e., under 18). Prevalence ranged from 3% when videos and images were forwarded to an acquaintance, but were much higher at 26% when they were forwarded to a good friend.

In the adult samples, only one study examined prevalence by gender (Reed et al., 2014) asking if participants had “Shared a sexually suggestive image of your partner without permission.” They found that for both “ever” and “in the last year” 0.7% males reported perpetrating this behavior and that for females the rates were 1.1% and 0.5% for “ever” and “in the last year” respectively. The differences between the perpetration rates for males and females in this study were not significant. For the adolescent populations, the lowest and

highest figures reported were from the two same studies for males and females; prevalence rates ranged from 6.8% for males and 1.8% for females (send a picture you took of someone else's genitals [or breasts, if they were female] to a third person's cell phone, ever) (Strassberg et al., 2014) to 30% for males and 18% for females (did you share the message [received from partner/ex-partner] with anyone else, ever) (Wood et al., 2015; Stanley et al., 2016). All of the adolescent studies (four in total) that examined the perpetration of forwarding videos and images without permission by gender, reported that males perpetrated this behavior more than females. This was significant in two of the studies (Patrick, Heywood, Pitts, & Mitchell, 2015; Strassberg, Rullo, & Mackaronis, 2014), whereas in the other two studies, significance varied depending on the specific group being examined. For example, based on ethnicity, Fleschler-Peskin et al. (2013) found that Black males reported significantly higher prevalence rates than Black females, but no significant gender difference was found in Hispanic participants. In the studies that reported data from five European countries (Stanley et al., 2016; Wood et al., 2015) males perpetrated the sharing of sexually explicit videos and images significantly more than females in Bulgaria, but no other significance differences were found across the other four countries.

Finally, two studies, one in an adolescent sample (Fleschler-Peskin et al., 2013) and one in an adult sample (Hudson et al., 2014) examined those who have experienced having images and videos shared with them that were originally meant to be private (i.e., receiver as a third party). Fleschler-Peskin et al. (2013) reported prevalence rates of 18.2% in their sample of 1034 youths. However, Hudson et al. (2014) found that in their 697 undergraduate participants, 35.2% had experienced this over the last 30 days but that 63.7% had ever experienced this. The authors speculated that this figure is high because of the increased popularity of smartphones among this specific population, which give individuals the ability to send image/video messages easily and provide instant and quick access to multiple mediums through which these can be posted/sent.

4.5.2. Outcomes associated with non-consensual sharing of images/videos.

Of the quantitative articles reviewed, 13 of them offered an insight in to the outcomes that are associated with non-consensual sharing. Within these studies it was identified that online harassment (that included sharing of videos and images within a range of behaviors categorized as online abuse) has been associated with higher levels of psychiatric symptoms (e.g., depression, anxiety), lower levels of self-esteem, lower levels of sense of coherence (Priebe & Svedin, 2012), and higher levels of rape supportive beliefs, peer approval of forced sex, number of sexual partners and exposure to pornography (Thompson & Morrison, 2013), and alcohol, cigarette and drug use (Patrick et al., 2015). However, this literature does not examine outcomes of non-consensual sharing/ revenge pornography in isolation, which means that it is challenging to draw conclusions about the impact of these individual behaviors on victims.

Likewise, associations between online and offline behaviors have been found (e.g., Marganski & Melander, 2015; Ojanen et al., 2015; Reed et al., 2016). For example, Reed et al. (2016) found an association between digital dating abuse and offline physical, psychological, and sexual abuse (perpetration, victimization) in a group of undergraduates. Marganski and Melander (2015) found that cyber victimization predicted in-person IPV; those who experienced cyber-victimization by an intimate partner were 28 times more likely to experience in-person psychological IPV, 52 times more likely to experience in-person physical IPV, and four times more likely to experience in-person sexual IPV.

Morelli, Bianchi, Baiocco, Pezzuti, and Chirumbolo (2016) examined the sharing of someone else's sexts without his/her consent (labeled 'not-allowed sharing') and dating violence perpetration. It was found that not-allowed sharing of sexts was weakly, but significantly related to both dating violence perpetration and benevolent and hostile sexism. The relationship between not-allowed sharing and dating violence was moderated by benevolent sexism and hostile sexism meaning benevolent sexism could act as a protective factor (reduces the relationship), whereas hostile sexism was a risk factor (increases the relationship). Also, age and gender were related to not-allowed sexting with females showing

lower levels and younger participants showing higher levels of not-allowed sharing. There was no effect of sexual orientation.

Borrajo et al. (2015) developed and validated the Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CDAQ), within which one of the scale items assessed ‘sending and/or uploading photos, images and/or videos with intimate or sexual content without permission.’ The response scale for the questionnaire had four possible options: 0 (never); 1 (1 or 2 times); 2 (3 or 4 times); 3 (5 or more times). Within the analysis of the scale itself, a four-factor structure was identified: two for victimization and two for perpetration. The components identified for perpetration and victimization were *Direct Aggression* and *Control/Monitoring*. The sharing of images and videos, loaded within *Direct Aggression*, alongside threats and identity theft through electronic means, which were identified as behaviors that are intended to harm partners. The mean scores for sharing images and/or videos without permission were low for perpetration and for victimization, but were equivalent to other behaviors measured in this factor. The component called *Control/Monitoring* related to partner surveillance and privacy invasion, which was seen as a distinct type of online abuse and very different from the deliberate and direct behaviors associated with *Direct Aggression* component. The prevalence of *Control* victimization was 75%, and perpetration was 82%, whereas *Direct Aggression*, prevalence for victimization was 14%, and perpetration was 10.6%. The authors conclude that individuals are using new technologies to channel different behaviors, control and direct aggression, which previously occurred exclusively face-to face.

4.6. Qualitative Studies

The literature search yielded 11 qualitative studies (see Table 3), three of which were mixed methodological (only the qualitative elements will be reported in this section). The general themes discussed considered the risks and negative consequences associated with sexting and the gendered nature associated with non-consensual sharing/revenge pornography.

4.6.1. Risks and negative consequences.

The qualitative data revealed that sharing of images and videos within the context of a

healthy relationship was not perceived to be problematic and for some was considered a positive ‘normal’ part of a dating relationship. However, there was evidence that this behavior could have risks and negative consequences associated with it. For example, Bond (2010) examined how children viewed mobile phones and their associated risk in their everyday life. The author highlighted that there was a “blurring of the boundaries between the public and the private” (p. 595), and that the naked body and sexual acts, which could be perceived as private (and healthy), are transformed to becoming public (and then unhealthy) due to technology. This was particularly emphasized in the context of relationships change – e.g., one participant discussed that pictures sent to a boyfriend (private) were shared by the boyfriend when they split up (public). It was suggested that the sharing of such materials in the context of trusting private relationships, is actually a high risk activity as these materials can become public and therefore the boundaries of public and private become “blurred.”

Other authors found that individuals face a dilemma regarding the consensual sharing of sexually explicit images and videos, as they recognize the risk and the potentially detrimental impact of the content being shared non-consensually (Lucero, Weisz, Smith-Darden, & Lucero, 2014; Renfrow & Rollo, 2014; Stanley et al., 2016; Wood et al., 2015). Renfro and Rollo (2014) found that the majority of the participants perceived there was a high risk associated with healthy sexting, (particularly images), which was the potential of them being shared without consent. Participants recognized that non-consensual sharing could lead to embarrassment and loss of reputation. Participants did agree consensual sexting was a perfectly acceptable behavior, but that sharing without consent was not and was a violation of trust.

Lippman and Campbell (2014) identified conflicting views from their participants about sexting (defined as sending of nude pictures and/or videos), grounded in a theme they called “the normal context of sexting.” While the majority (41%) of their participants saw sexting as “no big deal” a small proportion (10%) indicated that sexting was a “big deal” in some circumstances; that is when it was distributed to others without permission. The authors noted that even those who saw sexting as “no big deal”, normal, and a behavior that they

engaged in, still highlighted the potential negative consequences of doing this. For some, the fact that sexting was seen as the norm was more influential on their behaviors than the recognized negative consequences of forwarding and distributing sexts without permission.

A recent qualitative, interview-based study by Bates (2017), which aimed to understand the experiences of revenge pornography survivors, examined how revenge pornography affected survivors' mental health. Bates (2017) interviewed 18 female survivors, who had experienced a broad range of incidents from widespread web release of naked photos, to photos shared on a smaller scale (e.g., social circle), to those being blackmailed and threatened. Using inductive analysis, Bates (2017) found that the negative impact on individuals' mental health included: trust issues; PTSD, anxiety and depression; and destroyed self-esteem and confidence and loss of control. In addition, following their experiences they implemented negative coping mechanisms including avoidance/denial, excessive drinking of alcohol and obsession over victimization. However, there were also positive coping mechanisms found such as seeing a counselor, speaking out and helping others, family and friends and moving on. Bates (2017) concluded overall that the mental health consequences of revenge pornography are like those experienced by a rape survivor, as were the negative coping mechanisms used. Revenge pornography therefore leaves those who experience it feeling the same way that sexual assault survivors feel after their experience of victimization, leading Bates (2017) to conclude that revenge pornography should be classified criminally as a sexual offense.

4.6.2. Gendered nature of non-consensual sharing.

A notable feature of the qualitative data was perceptions regarding the gendered nature of non-consensual sharing (Burkett, 2015; Dobson & Ringrose, 2016; Lucero et al., 2014; Ringrose & Harvey, 2015; Walker, Sancu, & Temple-Smith, 2013; Yeung et al., 2014). Lucero et al. (2014) found that although both male and female groups discussed sexting, the male groups focused more on this topic area. Young women felt that generally sexting is very private and occurs within intimate relationships. Males agreed that sexting occurs frequently and that there was nothing wrong with this behavior, but that it was not appropriate to forward

such images. However, the males perceived that it was common for men to forward images from their girlfriends, whereas the female participants stressed the private nature of sexting.

Dobson and Ringrose (2016) used focus group discussions about the film 'Exposed' (cautionary tale about of a girl's images being circulated at school), with young people from three different schools in London, to examine gendered norms. They reported that individuals felt that it was risky for women to consensually share images of themselves, as there was a high likelihood they would be distributed further, particularly following a relationship breakdown or for revenge. However, the authors noted a strong theme was that females are attributed responsibility for the non-consensual sharing of their images by initially voluntarily posing and sending the images. It was suggested that "not thinking" and "poor choices" by females (Dobson & Ringrose, 2016, p. 17) resulted in non-consensual sharing. In a similar vein, Burkett (2015) explored the relevance of gender based on individuals' perceptions and experiences of sexualized culture. A specific discourse 'Unauthorized Production and Dissemination of Nude/Sexual Images by Friends and Partners' represented how participants adopted the female subject position of naïve "silly" young female victim or of "sexting going wrong" to attribute blame and responsibility towards a female victim. In this discourse as it was the young female who initially sent the sext, she was positioned as deviant because of her "wrong" and "silly" choices, rather than the male who actually forwarded the image without consent.

Yeung et al. (2014) found that non-consensual sharing was considered a problematic aspect of sexting, which was more common among males than females, who engaged in this behavior as a means to demonstrate their sexual success. Likewise, Ringrose and Harvey (2015) found that sexting was considered as acceptable by boys, yet could result in girls being seen in a negative way i.e., labeled as a "slut." Discussions revealed that boys routinely shared images that girls had sent them as part of a process of showing off and providing evidence to others that they could secure girls. However, online posting was far rarer and not commonly engaged with. Some boys did challenge the sharing of images, suggesting they would not respect a boy who did this and that such behaviors result in lack of trust by girls.

However, males were concerned that if they challenged the practice of forwarding in public this presented a further risk i.e., they could be labelled as “gay.” The authors concluded there were gendered representations of sexting and sharing behaviors. Similarly, Walker et al. (2013) identified the gendered nature of sexting as a key theme. It was reported that girls felt particularly coerced, bribed, or threatened by boys to send images, and these images could then be used as blackmail or for revenge and posted on social networking sites such as “Rate My Ex-girlfriend.” Girls who send such pictures were seen as “slutty girls,” “whores,” “skanky little girls,” or “just an idiot for sending it in the first place” (Walker et al., 2013, p. 699) and are therefore responsible for any negative outcomes i.e., non-consensual sharing. The findings suggest that girls are routinely blamed by males forwarding sexts, based upon their decisions to consensually share in the first place.

5. Discussion

This review has identified multiple perspectives in relation to the issues of non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit media and revenge pornography. From the legal reviews, it was clear that U.S. legal scholars consider that there are significant challenges to implementing revenge pornography legislation that does not impinge on constitutional rights (e.g., Humbach, 2014). These concerns were somewhat echoed in papers from other countries including Japan and Australia (e.g., Matsui, 2015; Powell, 2010), where the important but challenging nature of implementing valid and useful legislation was discussed. A key concern that was identified related to using child pornography laws for prosecuting adolescents who sext (which can be part of a normal healthy relationship) and those who non-consensually share, as this was perceived to be “criminalizing immaturity” (Shah, 2010, p. 203). In light of these concerns, there needs to be some clarity about where the boundaries exist in relation to healthy use of technology in romantic relations and when this behavior becomes unhealthy and something that needs to be legislated against and where legal action needs to be taken.

The empirical papers identified that the sharing of sexual images was commonplace (hence the need for the practice notes), particularly for those in consensual intimate

relationships. Worryingly, these papers reported that non-consensual sharing/forwarding of these images was potentially commonplace. However, it was difficult to accurately determine prevalence levels as estimates of this varied greatly in both adult and adolescent populations. This was in part accounted for by the fact that there is no consistency in the research in relation to the populations examined, questions/measurements used, definitions employed, time periods over which the behaviors were measured, and how prevalence was calculated. Indeed it was noted that when attempting to synthesize the literature on prevalence (victimization and perpetration) rates, comparisons could be seen as somewhat arbitrary due to the lack of a uniform measure for sharing of explicit images without consent. For example, in adult studies, lower victimization prevalence rates of 1.1% were found when asked if participants had experienced “Somebody has disseminated or uploaded onto internet photos or videos with erotic or sexual content from you without your consent” (Gámez-Guadix et al., 2015), compared to rates of 6.3% which were found when the question enquired if an individual’s partner has “Sent to others a private, intimate picture, or video that you shared with him or her without your permission” (Marganski & Melander 2015). There is obviously a distinction between distributing images without consent on a website and sharing an intimate picture with another known person.

In relation to non-consensual sharing, prevalence rates for both victimization and perpetration did appear to be higher in adolescent samples in comparison with studies that reported data from adult samples. This may represent the proliferation of use of online and mobile technologies by adolescents, in comparison with adults (Valkenburg & Peter, 2011). However, to our knowledge, no direct comparison of prevalence of victimization and perpetration between adult and adolescent samples has been carried out. This would establish whether these differences in non-consensual sharing are significant, and determine whether they need to be explored further.

In relation to gender, a broad range of frequencies were also reported (again, due to issues highlighted above) for both victimization and perpetration. In adults, victimization range by gender was found to be from 1.8% -10.3% for males and 0.5% -3.3% for females;

for adolescents this ranged from 2.1%-13% in males and 1.3%-42% in females. In relation to perpetration in adults, only one study has examined this by gender, reporting 0.7% ever perpetrated for males and 1.1% ever perpetrated for females. However, for adolescents there was a broad prevalence range of 6.8%-30% for males, and 1.8%-18% for females. It was generally evident in adult and adolescent populations that both perpetration and victimization were more frequent and prevalent in males (with the exception of adolescent female victimization). However, not all of these differences were significant. Although there is a commonly held belief that males are more likely to be perpetrators of non-consensual sharing and so females the most likely victim (Henry & Powell, 2015a, 2015b), the findings from prevalence studies summarized in this current review suggest that this is not necessarily the case. However, the qualitative studies included in this review were more indicative of a gendered nature to non-consensual sharing in that females were seen to be held responsible if their images are shared (e.g., Burkett, 2015; Dobson & Ringrose, 2016; Walker et al., 2013) by virtue of the fact that they voluntarily posed for and sent these images in the first place. In doing this it was suggested that females were the deviants, not the males that share the images. Previous research has explored the issue of sexting coercion or consensual but unwanted sexting, which has suggested that females may be more susceptible or feel more pressure to engage in this behavior (e.g., Drouin & Tobin, 2014; Drouin, Ross, & Tobin, 2015; Englander, 2015). The gendered nature of non-consensual sharing of images therefore needs to be examined more fully, both to establish accurate prevalence, but also to understand how the behaviors are perceived across the genders and if experiences and outcomes are fundamentally different by gender.

In moving the research forward in this area, it is clear that there is a body of literature that exists regarding the prevalence of aspects of non-consensual sharing, although this is limited by the variance in measurement of these behaviours. Current questioning regarding prevalence does not identify the motivation behind the act as being linked to revenge, which is important for the classification of such behaviors as revenge pornography. This, and the other limitations identified (e.g., sample size, length of reporting), means what we actually

know about revenge pornography and non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit materials is sparse and difficult to quantify and summarize. This suggests that a consistent approach is required where clear definitions are in place, and valid and reliable questionnaires are developed that specifically capture non-consensual sharing of images and videos and revenge pornography to enable us to gain some meaningful accurate data about victimization and perpetration of these behaviors.

Secondly, the research needs to move beyond focusing solely on prevalence to determine the pathways to both victimization and perpetration. Specifically, no current research has examined the perpetrators of such behaviours in terms of antecedents, characteristics, motivations, and decision-making to engage in these behaviours. All of this knowledge is important to understand how we can develop effective primary, secondary, and tertiary interventions. In relation to victimization outcomes, this review also revealed that online harassment has been associated with negative outcomes (e.g., depression, anxiety, emotional distress, alcohol, cigarette and drug use). Likewise associations between cyber victimization and in-person IPV have been identified. However, researchers that have examined these different associations have done so using a variable that is a general measure of on-line harassment (i.e., includes a range of behaviors), and not specifically by isolating non-consensual sharing and revenge pornography. Therefore, research is needed to establish whether there are any specific and unique negative outcomes that individuals experience as a result of being a victim of non-consensual sharing or revenge pornography. The research by Bates (2017) is an important starting point to this literature, however we need to develop this knowledge within numerous populations and also to understand what interventions are effective in supporting victims of these behaviors.

Finally, the legal papers synthesized in this review have highlighted the significant challenges that arise when attempting to criminalize these behaviors. The legislative approaches across the world do not seem to currently acknowledge that non-consensual sharing and revenge pornography should be considered as part of intimate partner and/or sexual violence. The above body of research will provide tangible evidence of this link

(proposed by Bates, 2017; Henry & Powell, 2015a; McGlynn & Rackley, 2016) and therefore policy and legislative developments will need to acknowledge this link in the future.

In conclusion, research regarding the non-consensual sharing of images is in its infancy, and subsequently as is the research regarding revenge pornography. As such, neither of these behaviors have been thoroughly explored thus far. We now live in an ever developing technological landscape, where mobiles, computers and internet usage are a prominent feature in most people's lives, and while this comes with enormous benefits for individuals, communities and society as a whole, it also provides an easily accessible platform open to misuse and that can have serious consequences for individuals, communities and society. To progress in our understanding of non-consensual sharing and revenge pornography, a consensus is required regarding the definitions of these behaviors and how we accurately operationalize and measure them. Certainly this could be guided by Powell (2015b) who define revenge pornography as the intentional non-consensual distribution of sexually explicit images or video (whether self or other-generated) with the motivation for the sharing being malice or revenge. This emphasizes the importance of consent, or importantly *intentional non-consent* as well as the relevance and importance of understanding the motivations behind such behaviors. Studies therefore need to focus specifically on the behavior of intentional non-consensual sharing and not examine this as part of a general 'cyber-harassment' variable. In addition, the negative outcomes that arise specifically from these behaviors warrants further attention as do the motivations for and the decision making processes that are followed when individuals perpetrate this behavior. Such findings could be used to inform primary interventions to prevent these behaviors from happening as well as secondary and tertiary interventions to help those who have already perpetrated and/or experienced this phenomenon. It is clear that we need to educate and intervene (where necessary) with individuals about consensual and non-consensual sharing of images, but it is also apparent that more research is required to enable us to do this effectively and within an evidence-based framework.

References

* Indicates papers included in the review

- *Ahern, N. R., & Mechling, B. (2013). Sexting: Serious problems for youth. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health Services, 51*, 22-30. doi: 10.3928/02793695-20130503-02.
- *Ahrens, D. (2012). Schools, cyberbullies, and the surveillance state. *American Criminal Law Review, 49*, 1669-1722.
- *Albury, K., & Crawford, K. (2012). Sexting, consent and young people's ethics: Beyond Megan's story. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 26*, 463-473.
doi:10.1080/10304312.2012.665840
- *Angelides, S. (2013). 'Technology, hormones, and stupidity': The affective politics of teenage sexting. *Sexualities, 16*, 665-689. doi:10.1177/1363460713487289
- Angelo, M. (2009). You are what google says you are. Retrieved from
<http://www.wired.com/2009/02/you-are-what-go/>.
- *Atkinson, C., & Newton, D. (2010). Online behaviors of adolescents: Victims, perpetrators and web 2.0. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 16*, 107-120.
doi:10.1080/13552600903337683
- *Barmore, C. (2015). Criminalization in context: Involuntariness, obscenity, and the first amendment. *Stanford Law Review, 67*, 447-478.
- *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.
doi:10.1177/1557085116654565
- *Bloom, S. (2014). No vengeance for 'revenge porn' victims: Unraveling why this latest female-centric, intimate-partner offense is still legal, and why we should criminalize it. *Fordham Urban Law Journal, 42*, 233-289.
- *Bond, E. (2010). The mobile phone = bike shed? Children, sex and mobile phones. *New Media & Society, 13*, 587-604. doi:10.1177/1461444810377919

- *Borrajó, E., Gámez-Guadix, M., & Calvete, E. (2015a). Cyber dating abuse: Prevalence, context and relationship with offline dating aggression. *Psychological Reports: Relationships and Communications*, *116*, 565-585. doi:10.2466/21.16.PR0.116k22w4
- *Borrajó, E., Gámez-Guadix, M., Pereda, N., & Calvete, E. (2015b). The development and validation of the cyber dating abuse questionnaire among young couple. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *48*, 358-365. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.063
- *Burkett, M. (2015). Sex(t) talk: A qualitative analysis of young adults' negotiations of the pleasures and perils of sexting. *Sexuality and Culture*, *19*, 835-863. doi:10.1007/s12119-015-9295-0
- *Cannon, L. (2015). Indecent communications: Revenge porn and congressional intent of § 230(c). *Tulane Law Review*, *90*, 471-493.
- *Cecil, A. L. (2014). Taking back the internet: Imposing civil liability on interactive computer services in an attempt to provide an adequate remedy to victims of nonconsensual pornography. *Washington & Lee Law Review*, *71*, 2513-2556.
- Check, J. V. P., Malamuth, N. M., Elias, B., & Burton, S. A. (1985). On hostile ground. *Psychology Today*, *19*, 56-61.
- Citron, D. K., & Franks, M. A. (2014). Criminalizing revenge porn. *Wake Forest Law Review*, *45*, 101-140.
- *Cooper, K., Quayle, E., Jonsson, L., & Svedin, C. G. (2016). Adolescents and self-taken sexual images: A review of the literature. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *55*, 706-716. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.10.003
- *Daniels, M. (2014). Chapters 859 & 863: Model revenge porn legislation or merely a work in progress? *McGeorge Law Review*, *46*, 297-320.
- *Dawkins, J. T. (2015). A dish served cold: The case for criminalizing revenge pornography. *Cumberland Law Review*, *45*, 395-447.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2016). Thinking sociologically about image-based sexual abuse: The contribution of male peer support theory. *Sexualization, Media and Society*, doi:10.1177/2374623816684692

- Derogatis, L. R. (1993). *Brief symptom inventory (BSI). Administration, scoring, and procedures manual*. Minneapolis: National Computers System.
- *Dick, R. N., McCauley, H. L., Jones, K. A., Tancredi, D. J., Goldstein, S., Blackburn, S., . . . Miller, E. (2014). Cyber dating abuse among teens using school-based health centers. *Pediatrics, 134*, e1560-e1567. doi:10.1542/peds.2014-0537
- *Diliberto, G. M., & Matthey, E. (2009). Sexting: Just how much of a danger is it and what can school nurses do about it? *NASN School Nurse, 24*, 262-267. doi:10.1177/1942602X09348652
- Dir, A. L. (2012). *Understanding sexting behaviors, sexting expectancies, and the role of sensation seeking in sexting behaviors*. (Unpublished Masters). Purdue University, Indianapolis, Indiana.
- Dir, A. L., Coskunpinar, A., Steiner, J. L., & Cyders, M. A. (2013). Understanding differences in sexting behaviors across gender, relationship status, and sexual identity, and the role of expectancies in sexting. *CyberPsychology, Behavior & Social Networking, 16*, 568-574. doi:10.1089/cyber.2012.0545
- *Dir, A. L., & Cyders, M. A. (2015). Risks, risk factors, and outcomes associated with phone and internet sexting among university students in the United States. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 44*, 1675-1684. doi:10.1007/s10508-014-0370-7
- *Dobson, A. S., & Ringrose, J. (2016). Sext education: Pedagogies of sex, gender and shame in the schoolyards of tagged and exposed. *Sex Education, 16*, 8-21. doi:10.1080/14681811.2015.1050486
- *Döring, N. (2014). Consensual sexting among adolescents: Risk prevention through abstinence education or safer sexting? *Cyberpsychology, 8*, 1-18. doi:10.5817/CP2014-1-9
- Drouin, M., Ross, J., & Tobin, E. (2015). Sexting: A new, digital vehicle for intimate partner aggression? *Computers in Human Behavior, 50*, 197-204. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.04.001

Drouin, M., & Tobin, E. (2014). Unwanted but consensual sexting among young adults:

Relations with attachment and sexual motivations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *31*, 412-418. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2013.11.001

*Drouin, M., Vogel, K. N., Surbey, A., & Stills, J. R. (2013). Let's talk about sexting, baby:

Computer-mediated sexual behaviors among young adults. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*, A25-A30. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2012.12.030

Englander, E. (2015). Coerced sexting and revenge porn among teens. *Bullying, Teen*

Aggression & Social Media, 19-21.

Eysenck, S. B. G., Pearson, P. R., Easting, G., & Allsopp, J. F. (1985). Age norms for

impulsiveness, venturesomeness and empathy in adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *6*, 613-619. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(85)90011-X

*Fleschler Peskin, M., Markham, C. M., Addy, R. C., Shegog, R., Thiel, M., & Tortolero, S.

R. (2013). Prevalence and patterns of sexting among ethnic minority urban high school students. *CyberPsychology, Behavior & Social Networking*, *16*, 454-459.

doi:10.1089/cyber.2012.0452

*Franklin, Z. (2014). Justice for revenge porn victims: Legal theories to overcome claims of

civil immunity by operators of revenge porn websites. *California Law Review*, *102*(5), 1303-1335.

*Franks, M. A. (2011). Unwilling avatars: Idealism and discrimination in cyberspace.

Columbia Journal of Gender and Law, *20*, 224-261.

*Gómez-Guadix, M., Almendros, C., Borrajo, E., & Calvete, E. (2015). Prevalence and

association of sexting and online sexual victimization among Spanish adults. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy: A Journal of the NSRC*, *12*, 145-154. doi:10.1007/s13178-

015-0186-9

Gómez-Guadix, M., Villa-George, F., & Calvete, E. (2014). Psychometric properties of the

cyberbullying questionnaire (CBQ) among Mexican adolescents. *Violence and Victims*, *29*, 232-247. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-12-00163R1

- *Gissell, T. E. (2015). Felony count 1: Indecent disclosure. *Houston Law Review*, *53*, 273-301.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491-512.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491
- Goldberg, D. P., & Hillier, V. F. (1979). A scaled version of the general health questionnaire. *Psychological Medicine*, *9*, 139-145. doi:10.1017/S0033291700021644
- Grych, J. H., Seid, M., & Fincham, F. D. (1992). Assessing marital conflict from the child's perspective: The Children's perception of interparental conflict scale. *Child Development*, *63*, 558-572. doi:10.2307/1131346
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- *Harris, A. L. (2011). Media and technology in adolescent sexual education and safety. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic & Neonatal Nursing*, *40*, 235-242.
doi:10.1111/j.1552-6909.2011.01218.x
- *Henry, N., & Powell, A. (2015a). Beyond the 'sext': Technology-facilitated sexual violence and harassment against adult women. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *48*, 104-118. doi:10.1177/0004865814524218
- *Henry, N., & Powell, A. (2015b). Embodied harms: Gender, shame, and technology-facilitated sexual violence. *Violence Against Women*, *21*, 758-779.
doi:10.1177/1077801215576581
- *Houck, C. (2013). Youth sexting: Balancing media representations and emerging data. *Brown University Child & Adolescent Behavior Letter*, *29*, 4-6. doi:10.1002/cbl.20179
- *Hudson, H. K., Fetro, J. V., & Ogletree, R. (2014). Behavioral indicators and behaviors related to sexting among undergraduate students. *American Journal of Health Education*, *45*, 183-195 13p. doi:10.1080/19325037.2014.901113
- *Humbach, J. A. (2014). The constitution and revenge porn. *Pace Law Review*, *35*, 215-260.

Internet World Stats. (2015). Internet usage statistics. Retrieved from

<http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm>

Kalichman, S. C., & Rompa, D. (2001). The sexual compulsivity scale: Further development and use with HIV-positive persons. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 76*, 379-395.

doi:10.1207/ S15327752JPA7603_02

*Karaian, L. (2014). Policing 'sexting': Responsibilization, respectability and sexual subjectivity in child protection/crime prevention responses to teenagers' digital sexual expression. *Theoretical Criminology, 18*, 282-299. doi:10.1177/1362480613504331

Kinsey, A. C. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.

*Klettke, B., Hallford, D. J., & Mellor, D. J. (2014). Sexting prevalence and correlates: A systematic literature review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 34*, 44-53.

doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2013.10.007

Knight, R. A., Prentsky, R. A., & Cerce, D. D. (1994). The development, reliability, and validity of an inventory for the multidimensional assessment of sex and aggression.

Criminal Justice and Behavior, 21, 72-79. doi:doi:10.1177/0093854894021001006

Koss, M. P., & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). Sexual experiences survey: Reliability and validity.

Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53, 422-423. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.53.3.422

*Larkin, P.J. (2014). Revenge porn, state law, and free speech. *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review, 48*, 57-118.

*Lee, M., & Crofts, T. (2015). Gender, pressure, coercion and pleasure: Untangling motivations for sexting between young people. *British Journal of Criminology, 55*, 454-473. doi:10.1093/bjc/azu075

*Levendowski, A. (2014). Using copyright to combat revenge porn. *Journal of Intellectual Property & Entertainment Law, 34*(2), 422-446.

- *Lippman, J. R., & Campbell, S. W. (2014). Damned if you do, damned if you don't...If you're a girl: Relational and normative contexts of adolescent sexting in the United States. *Journal of Children and Media*, 8, 371-386. doi:10.1080/17482798.2014.923009
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical reexamination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 704-711. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.704
- *Lorang, M. R., McNeil, D. E., & Binder, R. L. (2016). Minors and sexting: Legal implications. *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 44, 73-81.
- *Lucero, J. L., Weisz, A. N., Smith-Darden, J., & Lucero, S. M. (2014). Exploring gender differences: Socially interactive technology Use/Abuse among dating teens. *Affilia: Journal of Women & Social Work*, 29, 478-491. doi:10.1177/0886109914522627
- *Marganski, A., & Melander, L. (2015). Intimate partner violence victimization in the cyber and real world: Examining the extent of cyber aggression experiences and its association with in-person dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, doi:10.1177/0886260515614283
- *Matsui, S. (2015). The criminalization of revenge porn in japan. *Washington International Law Journal*, 24, 289-317.
- *Mayers, R. S., & Desiderio, M. F. (2013). Not lol: Legal issues encountered during one high school's response to sexting. *Brigham Young University Education & Law Journal*, 1, 1-19.
- *McCabe, K. A., & Johnston, O. C. (2014). Perceptions on the legality of sexting: A report. *Social Science Computer Review*, 32, 765-768. doi:10.1177/0894439314520668
- *McCartan, K. F., & McAlister, R. (2012). Mobile phone technology and sexual abuse. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 21, 257-268. doi:10.1080/13600834.2012.744223

- *McEllrath, R. (2014). Keeping up with technology: Why a flexible juvenile sexting statute is needed to prevent overly severe punishment in Washington State. *Washington Law Review*, 89, 1009-1034.
- McGlynn, C., & Rackley, E. (2016). Not “revenge porn,” but abuse: Let’s call it image-based sexual abuse. Retrieved from <https://inherentlyhuman.wordpress.com/2016/02/15/not-revenge-porn-but-abuse-lets-call-it-image-based-sexual-abuse/>
- *Mitchell, K. J., Finkelhor, D., Jones, L. M., & Wolak, J. (2012). Prevalence and characteristics of youth sexting: A national study. *Pediatrics*, 129, 13-20. doi:10.1542/peds.2011-1730
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, & Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Med* 6, e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097
- *Morelli, M., Bianchi, D., Baiocco, R., Pezzuti, L., & Chirumbolo, A. (2016a). Not-allowed sharing of sexts and dating violence from the perpetrator's perspective: The moderation role of sexism. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 56, 163-169. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.11.047
- *Morelli, M., Bianchi, D., Baiocco, R., Pezzuti, L., & Chirumbolo, A. (2016b). Sexting, psychological distress and dating violence among adolescents and young adults. *Psicothema*, 28, 137-142. doi:10.7334/psicothema2015.193
- *Myers, M. N. (2014). Texas legislative implications for minors accused of sexting. *St.Mary's Law Journal*, 45, 73-102.
- National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy & CosmoGirl.com. (2008). Sex and tech: Results from a survey of teens and young adults. Retrieved from http://www.thenationalcampaign.org/sextech/pdf/sextech_summary.pdf
- *Ojanen, T. T., Boonmongkon, P., Samakkeekarom, R., Samoh, N., Cholratana, M., & Guadamuz, T. E. (2015). Connections between online harassment and offline violence

among youth in central Thailand. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 44, 159-169.

doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2015.04.001

*O'Keeffe, G. S., & Clarke-Pearson, K. (2011). Clinical report--the impact of social media on children, adolescents, and families. *Pediatrics*, 127, 800-804. doi:10.1542/pecls.2011-0054

*Osterday, M. (2016). Protecting minors from themselves: Expanding revenge porn laws to protect the most vulnerable. *Indiana Law Review*, 49, 555-577.

*Patrick, K., Heywood, W., Pitts, M. K., & Mitchell, A. (2015). Demographic and behavioral correlates of six sexting behaviors among Australian secondary school students. *Sexual Health*, 12, 480-487. doi:10.1071/SH15004

*Powell, A. (2010). Configuring consent: Emerging technologies, unauthorised sexual images and sexual assault. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology (Australian Academic Press)*, 43, 76-90. doi:10.1375/acri.43.1.76

*Priebe, G., & Svedin, C. (2012). Online or off-line victimization and psychological well-being: A comparison of sexual-minority and heterosexual youth. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 21, 569-582 14p. doi:10.1007/s00787-012-0294-5

*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*, doi:10.1177/1077801216630143

*Reid, D., & Weigle, P. (2014). Social media use among adolescents: Benefits and risks. *Adolescent Psychiatry*, 4, 73-80. doi:10.2174/221067660402140709115810

*Renfrow, D. G., & Rollo, E. A. (2014). Sexting on campus: Minimizing perceived risks and neutralizing behaviors. *Deviant Behavior*, 35, 903-920.

doi:10.1080/01639625.2014.897122

*Ringrose, J., & Harvey, L. (2015). Boobs, back-off, six packs and bits: Mediated body parts, gendered reward, and sexual shame in teens' sexting images. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, 29, 205-217. doi:10.1080/10304312.2015.1022952

*Rollins, J. (2015). Sexting cyberchildren: Gender, sexuality, and childhood in social media and law. *Sexuality & Culture*, 19(1), 57-71. doi:10.1007/s12119-014-9243-4

*Ronay, J. (2014). Adults post the darndest things: [ctrl + shift] freedom of speech to [esc] our past. *University of Toledo Law Review*, 46, 73-94.

Rosenberg, M. (1989). *Society and the adolescent self image*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

*Sabbah-Mani, J. (2015). Sexting education: An educational approach to solving the media fueled sexting dilemma. *Southern California Interdisciplinary Law Journal*, 24, 529-560.

*Salter, M. (2013). Justice and revenge in online counter-publics: Emerging responses to sexual violence in the age of social media. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 9(3), 225-242. doi:10.1177/1741659013493918

*Salter, M., & Crofts, T. (2015). Responding to revenge porn: Challenges to online legal impunity. In L. Comella, & S. Tarrant (Eds.), (pp. 233-253). Santa Barbara, CA, US: Praeger/ABC-CLIO.

*Shah, K. (2010). Sexting: Risky or [F]risky? An examination of the current and future legal treatment of sexting in the United States. *Faulkner Law Review*, 2, 193-216.

*Slane, A. (2013). Sexting and the law in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 22, 117-122. doi:10.3138/cjhs.22.3.C01

*Stanley, N., Barter, C., Wood, M., Aghtaie, N., Larkins, C., Lanau, A., & Överlien, C. (2016). Pornography, sexual coercion and abuse and sexting in young people's intimate relationships: A European study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, doi:10.1177/0886260516633204

*Strassberg, D. S., Rullo, J. E., & Mackaronis, J. E. (2014). The sending and receiving of sexually explicit cell phone photos ('sexting') while in high school: One college's students' retrospective reports. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 41, 177-183. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.09.008

- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2). *Journal of Family Issues*, *17*, 283-316.
doi:10.1177/019251396017003001
- *Strohmaier, H. I., Murphy, M., & DeMatteo, D. (2014). Youth sexting: Prevalence rates, driving motivations, and the deterrent effect of legal consequences. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy: A Journal of the NSRC*, *11*(3), 245-255. doi:10.1007/s13178-014-0162-9
- *Stroud, S. R. (2014). The dark side of the online self: A pragmatist critique of the growing plague of revenge porn. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, *29*, 168-183.
doi:10.1080/08900523.2014.917976
- The National Archives. (2015). Criminal justice and courts act, 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/2/part/1/crossheading/offences-involving-intent-to-cause-distress-etc/enacted>
- *Thompson, M. P., & Morrison, D. J. (2013). Prospective predictors of technology-based sexual coercion by college males. *Psychology of Violence*, *3*, 233-246.
doi:10.1037/a0030904
- Tolman, R. M. (1999). The validation of the psychological maltreatment of women inventory. *Violence and Victims*, *14*, 25-37. doi: 10.1037/t02499-000
- Torgerson, C. (2003). *Systematic reviews*. London: Continuum.
- *Tungate, A. (2014). Bare necessities: The argument for a 'revenge porn' exception in section 230 immunity. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, *23*, 172-188.
doi:10.1080/13600834.2014.916936
- Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2011). Online communication among adolescents: An integrated model of its attraction, opportunities, and risks. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *48*, 121-127. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2010.08.020
- *Van Ouytsel, J., Walrave, M., & Van Gool, E. (2014). Sexting: Between thrill and Fear - How schools can respond. *Clearing House*, *87*, 204-212.
doi:10.1080/00098655.2014.918532

- *Walker, S., Sanci, L., & Temple-Smith, M. (2013). Sexting: Young women's and men's views on its nature and origins. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 52*, 697-701.
doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.01.026
- Whiteside, S. P., & Lynam, D. R. (2001). The five factor model and impulsivity: Using a structural model of personality to understand impulsivity
Personality and Individual Differences, 30, 669-689.
- *Willard, N. (2011). School response to cyberbullying and sexting: The legal challenges. *Brigham Young University Education & Law Journal, 2011*, 75-125. Downloaded from <http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/elj/vol2011/iss1/5>
- *Wolak, J., Finkelhor, D., & Mitchell, K. J. (2012). How often are teens arrested for sexting? Data from a national sample of police cases. *Pediatrics, 129*, 4-12. doi:10.1542/peds.2011-2242
- Wolfe, D. A., Scott, K., Reitzel-Jaffe, D., Wekerle, C., Grasley, C., & Straatman, A. L. (2001). Development and validation of the conflict in adolescent dating relationships inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 13*, 277-293. doi:10.1037//1040-3590.13.2.277
- *Wood, M., Barter, C., Stanley, N., Aghtaie, N., & Larkins, C. (2015). Images across Europe: The sending and receiving of sexual images and associations with interpersonal violence in young people's relationships. *Children & Youth Services Review, 59*, 149-160.
doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.11.005
- Ybarra, M. L., Espelage, D. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2007). The co- occurrence of internet harassment and unwanted sexual solicitation victimization and perpetration: Associations with psychosocial indicators. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*, S31-S41.
doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.09.010
- *Yeung, T. H., Horyniak, D. R., Vella, A. M., Hellard, M. E., & Lim, M. S. C. (2014). Prevalence, correlates and attitudes towards sexting among young people in Melbourne, Australia. *Sexual Health, 11*, 332-339. doi:10.1071/SH14032

- *Zhang, X. (2010). Charging children with child pornography – using the legal system to handle the problem of “sexting”. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 26, 251-259.
doi:10.1016/j.clsr.2010.03.005