

# Personality, Attitudinal, and Demographic Predictors of Non-consensual Dissemination of Intimate Images

Journal of Interpersonal Violence  
2022, Vol. 37(21-22) NP19265–NP19289  
© The Author(s) 2021



Article reuse guidelines:  
sagepub.com/journals-permissions  
DOI: 10.1177/08862605211043586  
journals.sagepub.com/home/jiv



V. Karasavva<sup>1</sup>  and A. Forth<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Non-consensual intimate image dissemination (NCII), or else better known as “revenge pornography” is a form of technology-facilitated sexual violence that can have devastating effects on the victim. This is one of the first studies examining how demographic characteristics (gender, sexual orientation), personality traits (Dark Tetrad), and attitudes (aggrieved entitlement, sexual entitlement, sexual image abuse myth acceptance) predict NCII perpetration and victimization. In a sample of 810 undergraduate students (72.7% female and 23.3% male), 13.7% of the participants had at some point in their life, distributed nude, or sexual pictures of someone else without consent and 28.5% had experienced such victimization. NCII perpetration was predictive of NCII victimization and vice versa. Using binomial logistic regression, we found that women, members of the LGBTQ+ community, those scoring higher in sadism, and participants with a history of NCII perpetration were more likely to report that someone had distributed their nude or sexual image without consent. Further, we found that those scoring higher in narcissism and sadism, along with those with a history of NCII victimization were more likely to report they had distributed the nude or sexual image of someone else without consent. Finally, the findings suggest that the relationship

---

<sup>1</sup>Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, Canada

### Corresponding Author:

Vasileia Karasavva, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6, Canada.

Email: vasiakaras@gmail.com

between victims and perpetrators is quite a bit more varied than the term “revenge pornography” implies.

### Keywords

image-based sexual abuse, technology-facilitated sexual violence, revenge pornography, non-consensual sexual image dissemination, cybercrime, dark tetrad

### Introduction

Sexual violence and harassment constitute serious public health issues and are recognized as significant human rights problems (World Health Organization, 2013). It is perhaps not surprising that as the ways we communicate and form relationships evolve, so do the ways sexual harm is perpetuated. Thus, there is a real need to extend the boundaries of what is considered sexual violence and to acknowledge how the cyber environment can cultivate such behaviors. Technology-facilitated sexual violence (TFSV) refers to criminal, civil, or otherwise harmful, sexually aggressive, harassing, or coercive behaviors that are perpetrated with the aid of technology (Henry & Powell, 2018). One form of TFSV is image-based sexual abuse (IBSA), which includes the non-consensual creation of someone else’s nude or sexual image, like in deep faked pornography (Karasavva & Noorbhai, 2021) or the dissemination of nude or sexual images of someone else without their permission or even knowledge (NCII; McGlynn et al., 2017). The disseminated images may then be shared via private channels, like texts, or posted on host websites that are dedicated to IBSA-related material (Clancy et al., 2020; Hearn & Hall, 2018).

In general, TFSV challenges the notion of the need for physical proximity for harm to occur (Walker & Sleath, 2017). NCII may be perpetrated online but its harm on the victim is very real and just as pronounced as if it was experienced face-to-face, or as Brown (2006), put it: “[the] endlessly circulating, shifting, pixels affect *real lives*... *real humiliations* and human pains are generated” (p. 233, emphasis original). For instance, 1 in 3 employers said that finding provocative images of a prospective employee online is one of the main reasons that would prevent them from hiring them (Ryan, 2010). Research also suggests that those who have experienced NCII show levels of psychological distress consistent with a diagnosis of a depressive or anxiety disorder, or even of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD; Bates, 2017; Cripps, 2016).

The prevalence of sexting, the consensual exchange of sexually explicit material including nude or partially nude photographs or videos, has increased over the past decade, with a recent meta-analysis reporting that as many as 1 in 2 young adults sext (Mori et al., 2020). Concerns have been raised that sexting can leave individuals vulnerable for future NCII victimization (Döring, 2014). Recent work found that sending a sext was positively correlated with NCII victimization and requesting sexts was correlated with NCII perpetration (Clancy et al., 2021). Although anyone who has ever sent a sexual image of themselves to someone else could potentially experience NCII victimization, women may be more likely to be victimized and to experience negative effects directly related to their victimization (Walker & Sleath, 2017). Some researchers have argued that NCII can be seen as a vehicle to reinforce gender hierarchies (Hearn & Hall, 2018). They note that the perceived loss of power in a relationship may leave the male counterpart feeling emasculated (Hearn & Hall, 2018). Hence, disseminating sexual pictures of the female ex who “embarrassed” them, could be seen as a way to turn power and control back to them (Hearn & Hall, 2018). Victim-blaming in the context of sexual abuse is also generally accepted to be heavily influenced by gender biases, like the double standards that prescribe women being judged more harshly for expressing their sexuality and engaging in sexual behaviors than men (Gentry, 1998; Landström et al., 2016). Although a shirtless picture of a man where his chest is showing disseminated online can produce significant distress on the victim, as his sense of trust and privacy is violated, it may be viewed very differently in the general public compared to a shirtless image of a woman where her breasts are showing. Female victims of NCII who are deemed as “promiscuous” are punished with ridicule and personal attacks, despite them never giving permission for their pictures to become public (Hall & Hearn, 2019; Mckinlay & Lavis, 2020; Papp et al., 2015).

Taken together, it is clear that there is a great need for research into the prevalence of NCII and its dynamics with other generally accepted risk factors of offline sexual abuse. In this study, we aimed to investigate the relationship between dark personality traits, attitudes, and demographic characteristics with NCII.

## **Potential Factors Influencing NCII**

### ***Dark Personality Traits***

The Dark Tetrad, comprising of psychopathy, narcissism, Machiavellianism, and sadism is a cluster of subclinical personality traits united by overlapping

themes of callous disposition, social manipulation, and a drive for ruthless self-advancement (Buckels et al., 2013; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Despite the core traits of the Dark Tetrad intuitively making those with narcissistic, Machiavellian, psychopathic, or sadistic tendencies excellent candidates for NCII perpetration, research on the topic is limited. That being said, dark personality traits were shown to be predictive of exacting revenge on a romantic partner following infidelity, which is reminiscent of the context within NCII is thought to often take place (Brewer et al., 2015). Pina et al. (2017) found that all of the Dark Tetrad personality traits, except for sadism, were correlated with higher rates of revenge porn proclivity. That being said, NCII proclivity does not guarantee NCII perpetration, and as such, we cannot extrapolate the results by Pina et al. (2017) on the relationship between the Dark Tetrad and actual NCII perpetration. Additionally, Clancy et al. (2019) found that dark personality traits were correlated with a higher likelihood of showing a sext to another person, however, this definition of sext dissemination is restrictive and does not capture the full range of contexts that NCII may take place.

### *Types of Entitlement*

One of the main offense-related schemas among sexual offenders is entitlement (Polaschek & Ward, 2002). Two main forms of entitlement have been identified: sexual entitlement and aggrieved entitlement. Sexual entitlement may lead individuals to believe they deserve sexual favors and to ignore the wants and needs of their sexual partners (Richardson et al., 2017). Further, aggrieved entitlement refers to the tendency of individuals who feel entitled to certain benefits to feel humiliated and angry when what they perceive as their “birthright” is denied to them (Kimmel, 2013). The act of distributing someone else’s sexual pictures without permission can be viewed as a method of controlling an ex-partner who chose to leave the relationship, especially when legal, economical, or other reasons preclude the perpetrators from seeing them face-to-face (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2016). Alarming, such behaviors might be viewed as justifiable by those who perpetrate them (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2016). Online spaces, like the “manosphere,” might act as a forum where NCII, is encouraged, justified, and supported, especially in situations where masculinity is perceived to be slighted (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2016). For instance, in a recent study, after reading a series of NCII-related scenarios, male participants attributed most of the responsibility to the victims, especially when they deemed the victim as “aggressive” (Zhong et al., 2020). Thus, taken together aggrieved entitlement and sexual entitlement are factors that deserve more focus when examining NCII.

## *IBSA-related Myth Acceptance*

While most people would find NCII morally wrong, adopting beliefs that focus on blaming the victim or minimizing the impact of NCII, can help rationalize the act and make it more acceptable (Mckinlay & Lavis, 2020). Acceptance of similar beliefs and myths about rape has been linked with rape proclivity (Bohner et al., 2005). Recent findings suggest that false stereotypical beliefs may not be restricted to in-person sexual violence. For instance, NCII is often downplayed as “harmless” and “funny” (Clancy et al., 2019), while victims of NCII are routinely blamed for their victimization (Mckinlay & Lavis, 2020). However, to date, the topic of IBSA-related myth acceptance and NCII remains understudied.

## **The Current Study**

The goals of this study were (a) gauge the prevalence of NCII perpetration and victimization among a sample of undergraduate students, (b) assess the personality, attitudinal, and demographic characteristics predictive of NCII perpetration and victimization, (c) examine the relationship between perpetrators and victims, and (d) explore the relationship between awareness of the fact that NCII is illegal in Canada and NCII perpetration.

It was hypothesized that women would be more likely to have experienced NCII victimization and men to have engaged in NCII perpetration. Additionally, it was hypothesized that dark personality traits would be associated with a higher likelihood of perpetrating NCII. Those holding entitled attitudes or false beliefs about IBSA were also hypothesized to be more likely to perpetrate NCII. We also hypothesized that the victim-perpetrator relationship would vary greatly and would not be restricted to ex-partners, as the term “revenge pornography” would imply. Finally, we hypothesized that simple awareness of the fact that NCII is illegal in Canada would not be related to NCII perpetration.

## **Method**

### *Participants*

Participants were 816 undergraduate students from a Canadian university who participated in exchange for course credit between October 2019 and February 2020. Due to the small number of participants who self-identified as transgender, non-binary, or other ( $n = 6$ ), these participants were excluded from the analyses. The final sample consisted of 810 participants, ranging in

age from 16 to 60 ( $M = 20.08$ ,  $SD = 4.29$ ). Most participants self-identified as female (72.7%) and heterosexual (81.4%). More specifically, 2.6% of the sample identified as homosexual, 11.8% as bisexual, 0.6% as asexual, 2.5% as pansexual, 0.4% as queer, and 0.6% as other. Given that the majority of the sample was heterosexual, all other sexual orientations were binned into one category. A broad range of ethnicities was represented in this sample (12.5% Asian, 10.6% Black, 2.6% East Indian, 33.5% Hispanic/Latinx, 1.7% Indigenous, First Nation, Inuit, Métis, 34.2% White, 3.4% Other).

## Measures

*Sexual Image-based Abuse Myth Acceptance (SIAMA; Powell et al., 2019).* The SIAMA has two subscales: The Minimize/Excuse subscale containing 12 items and the Blame subscale containing 6 items. Participants rated their agreement to each item using a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (“*Strongly Disagree*”) to 7 (“*Strongly Agree*”). The score for each subscale and the total score were computed by summing the participants’ responses to the relevant questions. To date, there is no research on the psychometric properties of the scale, but Powell and colleagues found it has good reliability in an adult sample with Cronbach’s alphas ranging from 0.86 to 0.94.

*Short Dark Tetrad.* The Short Dark Tetrad (SD4; Paulhus et al., 2021) is comprised of 4 subscales of 7 items each, assessing Machiavellianism, narcissism, psychopathy, and sadism. Participants rate their agreement to each item using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (“*Strongly Disagree*”) to 5 (“*Strongly Agree*”). Scores are computed for each subscale by summing participants’ responses for each item. All subscales have been shown to have adequate reliability in student and university samples, with  $\alpha$ 's ranging from .71 to .83 (Paulhus et al., 2021). The structure of the SD4 has also been validated in a large sample of young adults ( $n = 3,975$ ; Neumann et al., 2021).

*Hanson Sex Attitude Questionnaire (HSAQ)–Sexual Entitlement Subscale (Hanson et al., 1994).* The Sexual Entitlement Subscale of the HSAQ contains 9 items. Participants rate their agreement using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (“*Strongly Disagree*”) to 5 (“*Strongly Agree*”). After the relevant items are reversed, the total score is computed by averaging the participants’ ratings across all items. Regarding the psychometric properties of the subscale, it was found to have adequate reliability in a community sample with Cronbach’s alpha being .81 (Hanson et al., 1994). Support for the validity of the subscale has also been provided, as it was found to be positively correlated with other measures of entitlement, as well as with the likelihood to accept rape myths, or to commit rape (Hill & Fischer, 2001).

*Aggrieved Entitlement Scale (AES)*. A scale measuring aggrieved entitlement was developed for this study (Appendix). Participants were rated their agreement on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (“*Strongly Disagree*”) to 5 (“*Strongly Agree*”) to 9 statements such as: “It is my birthright to achieve greatness” and “White men are the ones who are truly persecuted in today’s culture.” Items were created after discussions with colleagues. The total score was computed by averaging the participants’ ratings across all items. In a preliminary unpublished study of 1,100 undergraduate students, AES was shown to have strong convergent validity with measures of sexism, right-wing authoritarianism, racism, and transphobia ( $r$ ’s ranged from .46 to .70; Reynolds, 2021). As for divergent validity, AES was shown to be negatively correlated with measures of feminism, honesty-humility, compassion ( $r$ ’s ranged from  $-.11$  to  $-.67$ ; Reynolds, 2021).

*IBSA victimization—distribute subscale and IBSA perpetration—distribute subscale* (Powell et al., 2019). Participants were asked whether someone had ever distributed their nude or sexual image without their permission, since they were 16, in a series of 9 contexts. Additionally, they were asked whether they had distributed the nude or sexual image of someone else ever since they were 16 without permission in a series of 8 contexts. Composite variables were created by summing the number of “yes” responses. For statistical analysis purposes, these composite variables were then used to create dichotomous variables: NCII victimization and NCII perpetration. Participants who self-reported at least one instance of NCII victimization were asked about the gender of their perpetrator and their relationship with them. Similarly, those who self-reported NCII perpetration, were asked about the gender of their victim and their relationship with them. Finally, after both IBSA victimization (distribute) and IBSA perpetration (distribute) subscales were completed, participants were asked whether they were aware that the non-consensual distribution of a nude picture is illegal in Canada.

## Procedure

The study was approved by the university’s Research Ethics Board-B (CUREB-B). Data collection took place entirely online on Qualtrics. Before the beginning of the study, participants were informed about the purpose, content, and potential triggers of the study. After indicating their consent, participants provided demographic information. Then, they completed a series of surveys in random order. At the end of the study, participants were thoroughly debriefed and given a list of resources in case their participation in the study had caused them distress.

## Results

### *Descriptive Statistics*

Table 1 presents the mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach's alpha values for all measures in the study. All variables showed adequate reliability except for the HSAQ (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .56$ ). Thus, care should be taken when interpreting results about the HSAQ.

### *Extent of NCII Victimization and Perpetration*

In our sample, 28.5% self-reported that someone had distributed their nude or sexual image without consent at least once since they were 16 (26.6% of males, 29.2% of females, 26.1% of heterosexual participants, and 38.0% of LGBQ+ participants). Across participants, the most common context of victimization was a picture where they were partially clothed or semi-clothed (22.3%; 22.5% of males, 22.4% of females, 20.2% of heterosexual participants, and 31.3% of LGBQ+ participants). Moreover, 13.7% of participants self-reported they had distributed the nude or sexual image of someone else without consent at least once since they were 16 (17.4% of males, 12.7% of females, 14.6% of heterosexual participants, and 10.8% of LGBQ+).

**Table 1.** Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistencies of Self-report Measures.

	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>Cronbach's <math>\alpha</math></i>
AES	19.24 (6.65)	.85
Sexual Entitlement Subscale–HSAQ	19.70 (4.69)	.56
SD4		
Sadism	16.64 (5.93)	.80
Machiavellianism	22.53 (5.04)	.79
Narcissism	20.03 (5.22)	.80
Psychopathy	14.11 (5.18)	.82
SIAMA		
Minimize/excuse	22.01 (9.86)	.87
Blame	11.57 (9.00)	.88
Total	39.56 (16.18)	.89

Note. AES = Aggrieved Entitlement Scale; HSAQ = Hanson Sex Attitude Questionnaire (Hanson et al., 1994); SD4 = The Short Dark Tetrad (Paulhus et al., 2021); SIAMA = Sexual Image-based Abuse Myth Acceptance (Pina et al., 2017).



participants). The most common context of NCII perpetration was also a picture of the victim where they were partially clothed or semi-clothed (10.7%; 15.1% of males, 9.2% of females, 11.3% of heterosexual participants, and 8.1% of LGBQ+ participants). Finally, 7.7% of all participants in the sample reported experiencing both NCII perpetration and victimization (8.3% of males, 7.5% of females, 8.0% of heterosexual participants, and 6.2% of LGBQ+ participants). More specifically, 28% of NCII victims also had a history of NCII perpetration (31.0% of males and 25.3% of females; 30.4% of heterosexual participants and 15.8% of LGBQ+ participants), and 57% of NCII perpetrators also had a history of victimization (47.4% of males, 58.9% of females, and 54.7% of heterosexual and 56.3% of LGBQ+ participants).

### *Nature of NCII Victimization and Perpetration*

Most of those who self-reported NCII victimization completed the follow-up questions about the gender of their perpetrator (Table 2; 90.9%,  $n = 210$ ; 76.9% of male victims, 87% of female victims, and 81.7% of heterosexual victims, 93.1% of LGBQ+ victims). Across the sample, three-quarters of those who completed the follow-up questions reported that the person who distributed their nude or sexual image was male (75.2%). Women (85.6%), and both heterosexual (71.2%) and LGBQ+ participants (87.0%), overwhelmingly reported that their perpetrator was male. On the other hand, most males identified their perpetrator as female (58.0%). We conducted a series of chi-square tests of association between the gender (male, female) or sexual orientation (heterosexual, LGBQ+) of the victim and the reported gender of the perpetrator (male, female). We found a statistically significant association between the gender of the perpetrator and both the gender,  $\chi^2(1, N = 210) = 38.92, p < .001, \phi = .43$ , and sexual orientation of the victim,  $\chi^2(1, N = 210) = 5.43, p = .003, \phi = .16$ .

Further, 85.2% ( $n = 213$ ) of those who reported NCII victimization completed the follow-up questions about their relationship with the perpetrator (Table 2; 81.5% of male victims, 87.0% of female victims, 84.8% of heterosexual victims, and 87.9% of LGBQ+ victims). Over half of those who experienced NCII victimization and completed the follow-up questions reported the perpetrator was their intimate or ex-partner (56.9%). Moreover, 64.3% reported the perpetrator was their friend or family member, and 15.9% reported they did not know who their perpetrator was. We conducted a series of chi-square of association between the relationship with the perpetrator (romantic partner, friends, and family, strangers or unknown) and the gender (male, female) and sexual orientation of the victim (heterosexual, LGBQ+), but no significant relationship was found.

**Table 2.** Nature of NCII Victimization.

What Is the Gender of the Person(s) Who Distributed Your Nude or Sexual Image Without Your Consent?						
	Total % (n)	Males % (n)	Females % (n)	Hetero-sexual % (n)	LGBQ+ % (n)	
Male	75.2 (158)	42.0 (21)	85.6 (137)	71.2 (111)	87.0 (47)	
Female	24.8 (52)	58.0 (29)	14.4 (23)	28.8 (45)	13.0 (7)	
What Was Your Relationship With the Person(s) Who Distributed Your Nude or Sexual Image Without Your Consent?						
	Total % (n)	Males % (n)	Females % (n)	Hetero-sexual % (n)	LGBQ+ % (n)	
<b>Romantic Partner</b>						
Intimate partner	20.7 (44)	18.9 (10)	21.3 (34)	19.8 (32)	23.5 (12)	
Ex-partner	36.2 (77)	30.2 (16)	38.1 (61)	35.2 (57)	39.2 (20)	
<b>Friends and Family</b>						
Family member	1.4 (3)	5.7 (3)	0 (0)	1.2 (2)	2.0 (1)	
Friend (face-to-face)	39.9 (85)	43.4 (23)	38.8 (62)	41.4 (67)	35.3 (18)	
Friend (online)	10.8 (23)	5.7 (3)	14.4 (23)	8.0 (13)	19.6 (10)	
Work colleague	1.4 (3)	1.9 (1)	1.3 (2)	1.2 (2)	2.0 (1)	
Acquaintance	10.8 (23)	1.9 (1)	13.8 (22)	6.2 (10)	25.5 (13)	
<b>Stranger or Unknown</b>						
Stranger	7.0 (15)	9.4 (5)	6.3 (10)	4.9 (8)	13.7 (7)	
Unknown	8.9 (19)	9.4 (5)	8.8 (14)	9.9 (16)	5.9 (3)	

Only 36.9% ( $n = 41$ ) of those who self-reported NCII perpetration completed the follow-up questions about the gender of their victim (Table 3; 23.3% of male perpetrators, 39.7% of female perpetrators, 32.7% of heterosexual perpetrators, and 41.2% of LGBTQ+ perpetrators). The majority of the perpetrators who completed the follow-up questions reported their victim was female (58.5%). The majority of male (60.0%) and LGBTQ+ participants (85.7%) reported their victim was female, while the majority of female (65.5%) and heterosexual participants (52.9%), reported that their victim was male. Using chi-square tests of association, we only found a significant relationship between the reported gender of the victim (male, female), and the gender of the perpetrator (male, female),  $\chi^2(1, N = 41) = 10.82, p = .002, \phi = -.41$ .

Finally, 33.9% of the self-reported perpetrators completed the follow-up questions about their relationship with the victim (Table 3; 25.6% of male perpetrators, 55.1% of female participants, 45.2% of heterosexual perpetrators, and 41.2% of LGBTQ+ perpetrators). Almost two-thirds (65.9%) of the perpetrators reported the victim was a friend or family member, while 39.1% said it was a romantic partner, while almost, and approximately a quarter (26.8%) reported that they did not know who their victim was or that it was a stranger. We ran chi-squares of association between the relationship status with the victim (romantic partner, friends, and family, stranger or unknown) and the gender (male, female) and sexual orientation (heterosexual, LGBTQ+) of the perpetrator, but found no statistically significant relationship.

## Correlations

Bivariate correlational analyses of NCII victimization and NCII perpetration with attitudinal (SIAMA, Sexual Entitlement, Aggrieved Entitlement) and personality (SD4) factors are shown in Table 4. All Dark Tetrad personality traits, except for Machiavellianism, yielded a positive relationship with both NCII perpetration and NCII victimization. Acceptance of IBSA-related myths was also positively correlated with NCII perpetration. Finally, aggrieved, and sexual entitlement yielded positive correlations with NCII perpetration.

## Predictors of NCII Victimization and Perpetration

Next, a series of binomial logistic regressions were performed to ascertain the effects of demographic characteristics (gender, sexual orientation), attitudes (SIAMA, aggrieved/sexual entitlement), and personality (Dark Tetrad) on the likelihood of self-reporting NCII victimization or perpetration. For each binomial regression, the linearity of the continuous variables concerning

**Table 3.** Nature of NCII Perpetration.

What Is the Gender of the Person(s) Whose Nude or Sexual Image You Distributed Without Consent?						
	Total % (n)	Males % (n)	Females % (n)	Heterosexual % (n)	LGBQ+ % (n)	
Male	58.5 (24)	40.0 (4)	64.5 (20)	52.9 (18)	85.7 (6)	
	41.5 (17)	60.0 (6)	35.5 (11)	47.1 (16)	14.3 (1)	
What Was Your Relationship With the Person(s) Whose Nude or Sexual Image You Distributed Without Consent?						
	Total % (n)	Males % (n)	Females % (n)	Heterosexual % (n)	LGBQ+ % (n)	
<b>Romantic Partner</b>						
Intimate Partner	17.1 (7)	9.1 (1)	14.0 (6)	12.8 (6)	14.3 (1)	
Ex-partner	22.0 (9)	18.2 (2)	16.3 (7)	19.1 (9)	0 (0)	
<b>Friends and Family</b>						
Family Member	4.9 (2)	0 (0)	4.7 (2)	4.3 (2)	0 (0)	
Friend (face-to-face)	36.6 (15)	27.3 (3)	27.9 (12)	27.7 (13)	28.6 (2)	
Friend (online)	17.1 (7)	18.2 (2)	11.6 (5)	10.6 (5)	28.6 (2)	
Work colleague	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	
Acquaintance	7.3 (3)	0 (0)	7.0 (3)	6.4 (3)	0 (0)	
<b>Stranger or Unknown</b>						
Stranger	9.8 (4)	9.1 (1)	7.0 (3)	4.3 (2)	28.6 (2)	
Unknown	17.1 (7)	18.2 (2)	11.6 (5)	14.9 (7)	0 (0)	

**Table 4.** Bivariate Correlations Between NCII Victimization and NCII Perpetration and SD4, SIAMA, Aggrieved Entitlement and Sexual Entitlement.

	NCII Victimization (95% CI)	NCII Perpetration (95% CI)
<b>SD4</b>		
Machiavellianism	.03 (-.05 – .11)	.05 (-.01 – .12)
Narcissism	.09* (.02 – .16)	.16** (.09 – .22)
Psychopathy	.17*** (.09 – .24)	.19*** (.12 – .27)
Sadism	.17*** (.10 – .25)	.18*** (.10 – .25)
<b>SIAMA</b>		
Minimize/excuse	.06 (-.01 – .13)	.12** (.05 – .20)
Blame	.01 (-.06 – .07)	.07 (.01 – .13)
Total	.04 (-.03 – .10)	.11** (.04 – .18)
Sexual entitlement	.05 (-.03 – .12)	.08* (.01 – .14)
AES	.01 (-.06 – .09)	.07* (.001 – .14)

Note. N = 816.

SD4 = The Short Dark Tetrad (Paulhus et al., 2021); SIAMA = Sexual Image-based Abuse Myth Acceptance (Powell et al., 2019); AES = Aggrieved Entitlement Scale.

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

the logit of the dependent variable was assessed via the Box & Tidwell (1962) procedure. Additionally, a Bonferroni correction was applied using all terms in each model resulting in statistical significance being accepted when  $p < .004$ . Based on this assessment, all continuous independent variables were found to be linearly related to the logit of each of the dependent variables. Finally, all models were found to be a good fit according to the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test of goodness (all  $p$ 's  $> .05$ ).

The model for NCII victimization (distribute) was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(10) = 77.88, p < .001$ , explained 14.0% of the variance and correctly classifying 73% of the cases. Sensitivity was 22.6%, specificity was 93.3%, positive predictive value was 58%, and negative predictive value was 75%. Gender, sexual orientation, psychopathy, and sadism were all statistically significant (Table 5). Males were approximately 37% less likely to experience victimization compared to females, and heterosexual participants were almost 50% less likely to experience victimization compared to LGBTQ+ participants. Additionally, scoring higher in psychopathy and sadism was associated with a higher likelihood of victimization. Finally, those with no history of NCII perpetration (total) were approximately 70% less likely to report NCII victimization (distribute).

**Table 5.** Binomial Logistic Regression of NCII Victimization and NCII Perpetration.

Variable	Victimization					Perpetration						
	B	SE	Wald	p	OR	95% CI for OR	B	SE	Wald	p	OR	95% CI for OR
<b>Demographics</b>												
Gender	-.46	.21	4.58	.032	.63	.41 – .96	-.01	.26	.001	.980	.99	.59 – 1.66
Sexual orientation	-.66	.22	9.20	.002	.52	.34 – .79	.49	.33	2.26	.133	1.63	.86 – 3.10
<b>Personality</b>												
Psychopathy	.29	.15	3.90	.048	1.34	1.00 – 1.78	.32	.18	3.29	.070	1.38	.97 – 1.95
Sadism	.41	.13	10.15	.001	1.51	1.17 – 1.93	.35	.16	4.85	.028	1.42	1.04 – 1.95
Narcissism	.07	.14	.23	.633	1.07	.81 – 1.41	.49	.19	6.87	.009	1.63	1.13 – 2.36
Machiavellianism	-.20	.15	1.93	.165	.82	.31 – 1.09	-.29	.19	2.33	.127	.75	.51 – 1.09
<b>Attitudinal</b>												
Sexual entitlement	.06	.20	.08	.784	1.06	.71 – 1.58	-.09	.25	.13	.714	.91	.56 – 1.50
Aggrieved Entitlement	-.10	.15	.44	.509	.91	.68 – 1.21	-.17	.19	.85	.355	.84	.58 – 1.21
SIAMA	.00	.01	.01	.941	1.00	.99 – 1.01	.01	.01	1.89	.169	1.01	1.00 – 1.03
History of Perpetration	-1.18	.22	28.22	<.001	.31	.20 – .48	-1.07	.23	22.36	<.001	.34	.22 – .53
Constant	-.33	.59	.32	.570	.72	–	-3.59	.75	22.85	<.001	.00	–

Note. Gender is for males compared to females. Sexual orientation is for heterosexual compared to LGBTQ+. History of perpetration is for no compared to yes. SIAMA = Sexual Image-based Abuse Myth Acceptance (Powell et al., 2019) OR = Odds Ratio; 95% CI = 95% Confidence Interval for Odds Ratio.

We also examined NCII perpetration–distribute. The model was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(10) = 69.152$ ,  $p < .001$ , explained 15.7% of the variance, and correctly classified 85.6% of cases. Sensitivity was 3.8%, specificity was 98.9%, positive predictive value was 36%, and negative predictive value was 86%. Of the ten independent variables, three were statistically significant: sadism, narcissism, and history of victimization (refer to Table 5). Increasing the sadism or the narcissism score was associated with an increased likelihood of engaging NCII perpetration (distribute). Those with no history of victimization (total) were approximately 65% less likely to engage in NCII perpetration (distribute).

### *NCII and Awareness of the Law*

Participants were asked whether or not they were aware that NCII is illegal in Canada. There was a pretty even split, with 54.4% ( $n = 444$ ) of the participants confirming they were aware of this and 45.6% ( $n = 372$ ) reporting they were not. A series of chi-square tests of independence were conducted to investigate whether awareness of the law was associated with the likelihood of engaging in NCII perpetration. There was no significant relationship between awareness of the law and NCII perpetration–distribute ( $\chi^2 = 2.67$ ,  $p = .102$ ,  $\phi = -.006$ ).

## **Discussion**

The goals of the study were: (a) gauge the prevalence of NCII perpetration and victimization in a sample of young adults, (b) assess the predictors of NCII perpetration and victimization, (c) examine the relationship between victim and perpetrator in NCII, (d) explore the relationship between NCII and awareness of the law.

### *NCII Victimization and Perpetration Prevalence*

We found that in our sample, 28.5% had experienced NCII victimization since the age of 16. Establishing an accurate estimate of NCII victimization and perpetration is challenging, especially given the variability in the way participants are asked about their experiences with NCII (Walker & Sleath, 2017). A similar 1 in 3 prevalence was found in an international sample that used the same scale to capture NCII victimization (Powell et al., 2020). We also found the prevalence of NCII perpetration and found that approximately 13.7% had distributed the intimate image of someone else without permission. Similar rates of perpetration were previously reported in other adult samples (Clancy et al., 2019; Powell et al., 2019, 2020).

In Canada, since the introduction of Bill C-13 that criminalized the non-consensual sharing of intimate images, approximately 5,000 cases have been reported (Government of Canada, 2019). Although we are limited in our ability to generalize our results on the entire Canadian population, comparing the total number of reported cases with our estimated prevalence could imply that there is under-reporting at play. The reasons behind this are multifaceted. First, victims may not be aware of who distributed their pictures to report them. For example, in our sample, 15.9% of the NCII victims, stated that they did not know who their perpetrator was or that it was a stranger. Alternatively, similarly to cases of in-person sexual abuse like rape, victims may be wary of the justice system or afraid they will be blamed for their victimization (Maier, 2008). NCII victims may also feel like they cannot find justice through the authorities. In Canada, only 851 of the reported NCII cases have resulted in criminal charges (Allen, 2019). Moreover, in our sample we found no association between awareness of NCII being illegal and NCII perpetration, suggesting that perhaps perpetrators do not consider the legal system a deterrent to their actions. Therefore, it is clear that research and policy alike should work together to find ways to better support NCII victims.

### *Gender and NCII*

Our predictions on gender were partially supported since we found the incidence of NCII victimization was higher among women. Previous research also found women were more likely to have a history of IBSA victimization compared to men (Henry, Powell, et al., 2018). The majority of websites that host NCII-related material, publish exclusively nude or sexual images of cis-gender women (Henry & Flynn, 2019). In fact, on some of these host websites, the posting of men is explicitly prohibited (Henry & Flynn, 2019). This could be a reflection of the fact that men participate at higher rates both as contributors and as the audience of such websites (Hall & Hearn, 2019; Henry & Flynn, 2019). Henry and Flynn (2019), argue that this consistent sharing, viewing, and discussing IBSA content of women by mostly heterosexual men, may be a method of hypermasculinity consolidation. Still, the effect of gender on NCII perpetration in the empirical literature is mixed. In our sample, although gender was not an independent predictor of NCII perpetration, 75% of the victims identified their perpetrator(s) as male, and in a large sample of Australian adults, men were 78% more likely to have engaged in some form of IBSA perpetration (Powell et al., 2019).

The conflicting results on the effect of gender on NCII perpetration may reflect gendered dimorphic motivations and methods of distribution. For



example, in previous research, men most commonly endorsed bragging or getting attention as reasons for sharing sexts (Clancy et al., 2020). On the other hand, women were more likely to endorse “roasting” and “gossip” (Clancy et al., 2020). Taken together, it could be that men who perpetrate NCII for attention, may choose public dissemination channels, thus explaining the over-saturation of female victims on NCII-websites. Conversely, women may choose more private channels, like instant messaging apps. Unfortunately, to date, no research has investigated private channels of NCII distribution, who choose them, why, and how they differ from those who choose more public modes of dissemination.

### *Sexual Orientation and NCII*

The results of this study found that sexual orientation was predictive of NCII victimization but not perpetration. More specifically, heterosexual participants were 35% less likely to report some form of NCII victimization. Our results are in agreement with previous work that found higher rates of NCII victimization among LGBTQ+ participants compared to heterosexual participants (Powell et al., 2020; Priebe & Svedin, 2012). This could be a derivative of LGBTQ+ individuals being more likely to engage in sexting (Dir et al., 2013; Ouytsel et al., 2019). It is important to highlight that the sharing of nude or sexual images between two consenting adults is not in and of itself problematic and that most people who engage in sexting do not necessarily perpetrate NCII or experience NCII victimization, but it could leave them vulnerable for future victimization (Walker & Sleath, 2017).

### *Attitudes and NCII*

Sexual and aggrieved entitlement were both positively correlated with NCII perpetration. However, neither remained as an independent predictor of NCII perpetration in the logistic regression. It could be the case that entitlement is more predictive of other forms of IBSA like cyber flashing (i.e., the unsolicited sending of nude or sexual images using digital media; Henry & Powell, 2018). Higher acceptance rates of IBSA-related myths were also positively correlated with NCII perpetration and approached significance for its prediction. In a large community sample ( $n > 4,000$ ), a one-point increase in the SIAMA blame score was associated with a 15% increase in the likelihood of IBSA perpetration (Powell et al., 2019). Previous work has demonstrated that education can play an important role in combating rape myth acceptance (Anderson & Whiston, 2005). Therefore, education efforts should also focus on combatting IBSA-related myths. Generally, there is a

dearth in the literature investigating attitudes and public views on what constitutes IBSA and how the law should deal with its perpetrators. Nonetheless, gauging public opinion, as well as taking into consideration the views of those who have lived experience with NCII and IBSA, can be a powerful tool when drafting policy.

### *The Dark Tetrad and NCII*

Narcissism, psychopathy, and sadism but not Machiavellianism, were positively correlated with NCII perpetration. Some have argued that current measures of dark personality traits cannot accurately assess Machiavellianism since they put too much focus on impulsivity, lack of discipline, and sensation seeking and conflating the construct with psychopathy (Miller et al., 2019). This could partially explain why we found no significant relationship between Machiavellianism and NCII. Previous research found dark triad traits to be positively correlated with sext dissemination (Clancy et al., 2019) and revenge pornography proclivity (Pina et al., 2017). We also found that higher psychopathy and narcissism scores significantly predicted NCII perpetration. This suggests that specific characteristics that are associated with psychopathy and/or narcissism, like lack of empathy or incessant need for attention, could be used as starting point to inform research on the motivations associated with NCII perpetration. By contrast, surprisingly, a higher endorsement of sadistic tendencies was predictive of NCII victimization. Care should be taken when interpreting these results to avoid victim-blaming. Instead, this could be explained by a higher tendency of those with sadistic traits to engage in sexually risky online behaviors, like sexting or cyber flashing (March & Wagstaff, 2017), thus leaving them vulnerable for future victimization.

### *Nature of NCII*

We found NCII victimization is a significant predictor of NCII perpetration and vice versa. This relationship is reminiscent of bully/victims (i.e., individuals who are both bullies and are bullied.) In our study, 28% of the victims also had a history of NCII perpetration, and 57% of perpetrators also had a history of victimization. Although it is tempting to say that these results suggest a bidirectional relationship between victimization and perpetration, it is important to highlight that the study design does not allow for causal inferences. That being said, the relationship between the two, leaves ample room for future research and may give a new meaning to the “revenge” in revenge pornography.

As the literature evolves the term “revenge pornography” appears to be restrictive, both in the behaviors it describes, as well as the victim-perpetrator relationship. In our study, we found that the relationship between NCII victims and perpetrators is quite varied. More than half of the NCII victims identified their NCII perpetrator as a friend or family member, and more than a quarter of NCII perpetrators ascertained they did not know who their victim was, or stated it was a stranger. These results also highlight the nature of the internet and how once an image is uploaded online, it may be shared or reshared multiple times by various different people. Therefore, in cases like these, an intimate image may be initially disseminated by a person the victim knows, like for instance someone that was engaging in reciprocal sexting with the victim, but ultimately it is also shared by multiple strangers too. Taken together, the study results support the notion that the term “revenge pornography” is a misnomer, as the victim-perpetrator relationship is a lot more diverse than the term would suggest. Further, even in situations where an intimate image is disseminated by a current or former intimate partner, the term “revenge pornography” remains a misnomer, since individuals who engage in reciprocal sexting do not intend for their image to be shared with a wider audience and are not producing pornography.

### *Limitations, Future Directions, and Implications*

The current study is not without limitations. Firstly, given the sensitive and personal nature of some of the questions, it is possible that some of the answers were exaggerated, withheld, or skewed due to social desirability bias. The majority of the sample was heterosexual, and so to be able to make meaningful comparisons, all other sexual orientations were binned into one category. Doing so, rich information about different sexual orientations was lost. Given the very low number of transgender and non-binary participants ( $n = 6$ ), non-cisgender participants were excluded from the analysis. Future work should investigate NCII perpetration and victimization among trans folks and examine the differences in NCII between different sexual orientations. For most of the measures, there is only limited information regarding their psychometric properties since they are fairly new. Additionally, the measures we used to capture NCII perpetration and victimization do not make a distinction between direct dissemination with another person and viral dissemination. Although there may be some common core factors predictive of both viral and direct dissemination, there are bound to be some just as important distinctions between the two, and future research should examine this. Research should also examine the proportion of NCII cases that are

shared through private channels compared to those that are posted in public forums, like host websites dedicated to IBSA-related material.

Research on NCII, is limited, with multiple research avenues that are yet to be explored. Research on the topic should try to put the experiences of those affected most by NCII at the forefront. A participatory design method that would actively involve victims of NCII in the entirety of the research process as equal voices should be considered. Further, more qualitative work is needed to explore the unique insights of perpetrators and victims of NCII in general and to inform future quantitative work. Efforts should also be concentrated on ways to help victims come forward. Currently, one of the biggest hurdles facing victims is the extended timescale procedures. While the eventual potential conviction of the person who disseminated their sexual images may provide moral satisfaction, it does not guarantee the swift take-down of the images or their complete removal from the internet (Henry, Flynn, et al., 2018; Karasavva & Noorbhai, 2021). Moreover, a recent report showed that police were unable to provide practical support to NCII victims, including ensuring the removal of the images of the victim from the internet (North Yorkshire Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner, 2018). Another way to support NCII victims is through resources specifically tailored for them. To date, most resources available are generic to sexual abuse, with very few including information about NCII. Although these resources may be valuable to many, more could be done. Crisis line intervention, legal advice, and information on NCII could have a huge impact on victims. Such resources could also represent educational hot spots to dispute myths related to IBSA and provide accurate information to the public.

## **Conclusion**

In summation, NCII victimization and perpetration may be relatively common. Additionally, the line between victim and perpetrator may not be as clear, with many experiencing both NCII victimization and perpetration. The need for more work that explores the extent, nature, and legal ramifications of NCII is evident. Ultimately, this line of work seems to have generated a greater number of questions than the ones it set out to answer, which only highlights the importance of a greater understanding of the topic. One thing to keep in mind is that as sexting behaviors become increasingly common, a greater number of people become vulnerable to future NCII victimization. This means that from both a policy and a research standpoint, action needs to be taken swiftly to create a framework to better support victims.

## Appendix

### Aggrieved Entitlement Scale

*Instructions:* Rate your agreement with each statement using a 5-point scale. You may skip any questions you do not want to answer.

1. It is my birthright to achieve greatness.
2. Women and minorities actually have more rights.
3. White men are the ones who are truly persecuted in today's culture.
4. Reverse sexism and reverse racism are real and valid problems that I or people I know often have to deal with.
5. Our government should prioritize helping real citizens first, instead of immigrants who offer nothing of value to our country.
6. If our culture was not so politically correct, I would have achieved great things.
7. Race and gender quotas in jobs and universities are taking jobs away from well-deserving White men.
8. I believe I have been cheated out of opportunities that have been given to undeserving minorities instead so the employer can appear to be politically correct.
9. I believe that the invasion of immigrants is a threat to our way of life.

### Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### ORCID iD

V. Karasavva  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0778-8454>

### References

- Allen, B. (2019). *Revenge porn and sext crimes: Canada sees more than 5,000 police cases as law marks 5 years*. CBC News. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/revenge-porn-and-sext-crimes-canada-sees-more-than-5-000-police-cases-as-law-marks-5-years-1.5405118>
- Anderson, L. A., & Whiston, S. C. (2005). Sexual assault education programs: A meta-analytic examination of their effectiveness. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29(4), 374–388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00237.x>

- 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.
- Bohner, G., Jarvis, C. I., Eyssel, F., & Siebler, F. (2005). The causal impact of rape myth acceptance on men's rape proclivity: Comparing sexually coercive and noncoercive men. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*(6), 819–828.
- Box, G. E., & Tidwell, P. W. (1962). *Transformation of the independent variables. Technometrics, 4*(4), 531–550.
- Brewer, G., Hunt, D., James, G., & Abell, L. (2015). Dark Triad traits, infidelity and romantic revenge. *Personality and Individual Differences, 83*, 122–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.04.007>
- Brown, S. (2006). Integration by way of the criminology of hybrids. *Criminology: An Integrated Approach, 118–121*.
- Buckels, E. E., Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). Behavioral confirmation of everyday sadism. *Psychological Science, 24*(11), 2201–2209.
- Clancy, E. M., Klettke, B., Crossman, A. M., Hallford, D. J., Howard, D., & Toumbourou, J. W. (2021). Sext dissemination: Differences across nations in motivations and associations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18052429>
- Clancy, E. M., Klettke, B., & Hallford, D. J. (2019). The dark side of sexting: Factors predicting the dissemination of sexts. *Computers in Human Behavior, 92*, 266–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.11.023>
- Clancy, E. M., Klettke, B., Hallford, D. J., Crossman, A. M., Maas, M. K., & Toumbourou, J. W. (2020). Sharing is not Always Caring: Understanding motivations and behavioural associations with sext dissemination. *Computers in Human Behavior, 112*, 106460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106460>
- Cripps, J. (2016). *Forms of technology-facilitated sexual violence and university women's psychological functioning* [Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Toronto.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2016). Thinking sociologically about image-based sexual abuse: The contribution of male peer support theory. *Sexualization, Media, & Society, 2*(4), 237462381668469. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2374623816684692>
- 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, and Social Networking, 16*(8), 568–574. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2012.0545>
- Döring, N. (2014). Consensual sexting among adolescents: Risk prevention through abstinence education or safer sexting? *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace, 8*(1).
- Gentry, M. (1998). The sexual double standard: The influence of number of relationships and level of sexual activity on judgments of women and men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*(3), 505–511.
- Government of Canada, S. C. (2019, July 22). *Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2018*. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2019001/article/00013-eng.htm>

- 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>
- Hanson, K. R., Gizzarelli, R., & Scott, H. (1994). The attitudes of incest offenders: Sexual entitlement and acceptance of sex with children. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 21*(2), 187–202.
- Hearn, J., & Hall, M. (2018). This is my cheating ex. Gender and sexuality in revenge porn. *Sexualities: Studies in Culture and Society, 22*(5–6), 860–882.
- 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., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2018). Policing image-based sexual abuse: Stakeholder perspectives. *Police Practice and Research, 19*(6), 565–581. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2018.1507892>
- Henry, N., & Powell, A. (2018). Technology-facilitated sexual violence: A literature review of empirical research. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 19*(2), 195–208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838016650189>
- Henry, N., Powell, A., & Flynn, A. (2018). *Not just "revenge pornography": Australians' experiences of image-based abuse a summary report.* <https://doi.org/10.13140/rg.2.2.29903.59045>
- Hill, M. S., & Fischer, A. R. (2001). Does entitlement mediate the link between masculinity and rape-related variables? *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*(1), 39.
- Karasavva, V., & Noorbhai, A. (2021). The real threat of deepfake pornography: A review of Canadian policy. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 24*(3), 203–209.
- Kimmel, M. (2013). *Angry White men: American masculinity at the end of an era.* Hachette.
- Landström, S., Strömwall, L. A., & Alfredsson, H. (2016). Blame attributions in sexual crimes: Effects of belief in a just world and victim behavior. *Nordic Psychology, 68*(1), 2–11.
- Maier, S. L. (2008). "I have heard horrible stories...." Rape victim advocates' perceptions of the revictimization of rape victims by the police and medical system. *Violence Against Women, 14*(7), 786–808. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801208320245>
- March, E., & Wagstaff, D. L. (2017). Sending nudes: Sex, self-rated mate value, and trait Machiavellianism predict sending unsolicited explicit images. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8.* <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02210>
- McGlynn, C., Rackley, E., & Houghton, R. (2017). Beyond "Revenge Porn:" The continuum of image-based sexual abuse. *Feminist Legal Studies, 25*(1), 25–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10691-017-9343-2>
- Mckinlay, T., & Lavis, T. (2020). Why did she send it in the first place? Victim blame in the context of "revenge porn." *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, 27*(3), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2020.1734977>

- Miller, D. J., McBain, K. A., Li, W. W., & Raggatt, P. T. F. (2019). Pornography, preference for porn-like sex, masturbation, and men's sexual and relationship satisfaction. *Personal Relationships, 26*(1), 93–113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/perc.12267>
- 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, 1*–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-020-01656-4>
- Neumann, C. S., Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2021). Examining the Short Dark Tetrad (SD4) across models, correlates, and gender. *Assessment, 26*(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191120986624>
- Police, North Yorkshire Fire Commissioner., Crime (2018). *Suffering in silence: Why revenge porn victims are afraid and unwilling to come forward because of a fear they'll be named and shamed and why that needs to change*. <https://www.northyorkshire-pfcc.gov.uk/content/uploads/2018/11/Suffering-in-Silence-Report.pdf>
- Ouytsel, J. van., Walrave, M., & Ponnet, K. (2019). An exploratory study of sexting behaviors among heterosexual and sexual minority early adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 65*(5), 621–626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2019.06.003>
- Papp, L. J., Hagerman, C., Gnoleba, M. A., Erchull, M. J., Liss, M., Miles-McLean, H., & Robertson, C. M. (2015). Exploring perceptions of slut-shaming on Facebook: Evidence for a reverse sexual double standard. *Gender Issues, 32*(1), 57–76.
- Paulhus, D. L., Buckels, E. E., Trapnell, P. D., & Jones, D. N. (2021). Screening for dark personalities. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 37*(3), 208–222. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000602>
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*(6), 556–563.
- Pina, A., Holland, J., & James, M. (2017). The malevolent side of revenge porn proclivity: Dark personality traits and sexist ideology. *International Journal of Technoethics, 8*(1), 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJT.2017010103>
- Polaschek, D. L., & Ward, T. (2002). The implicit theories of potential rapists: What our questionnaires tell us. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 7*(4), 385–406.
- 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.
- Powell, A., Scott, A. J., Flynn, A., & Henry, N. (2020). *Image-based sexual abuse: An international study of victims and perpetrators*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.35166.59209>
- Priebe, G., & Svedin, C. G. (2012). Online or off-line victimisation and psychological well-being: A comparison of sexual-minority and heterosexual youth. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 21*(10), 569–582. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-012-0294-5>
- Richardson, E. W., Simons, L. G., & Futris, T. G. (2017). Linking family-of-origin experiences and perpetration of sexual coercion: College males' sense



- of entitlement. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 26(3), 781–791. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-016-0592-5>
- Ryan, E. M. (2010). Sexting: How the state can prevent a moment of indiscretion from leading to a lifetime of unintended consequences for minors and young adults. *Iowa Law Review*, 96, 357.
- 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*, 36, 9–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.06.010>
- World Health Organization. (2013). *Global and regional estimates of violence against women: Prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence*. [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/85241/WHO\\_RHR\\_HRP\\_13.06\\_eng.pdf?sequence=1](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/85241/WHO_RHR_HRP_13.06_eng.pdf?sequence=1)
- Zhong, L. R., Keibell, M. R., & Webster, J. L. (2020). An exploratory study of Technology-Facilitated Sexual Violence in online romantic interactions: Can the Internet's toxic disinhibition exacerbate sexual aggression? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 108, 106314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106314>

### Author Biographies

**Vasileia Karasavva**, MA, is a Clinical Psychology Graduate Student. Her research focuses on online interactions and online antisocial behaviors, including technology-facilitated sexual violence. She is interested in research on the cybersphere that can then be applied in policy, treatment, and educational material with the ultimate goal of creating the blueprint for healthier scripts for online communications.

**Adelle Forth**, PhD, is an Associate Professor of Forensic Psychology at the Department of Psychology at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada. Her research centers on studying the early manifestations of psychopathy, investigating the cognitive and affective mechanisms underlying psychopathy, development of assessments to identify psychopaths, and most recently, studying victims of psychopaths.