Goldsmiths Research Online

Goldsmiths Research Online (GRO)
is the institutional research repository for
Goldsmiths, University of London

Citation

Persistent URL

Versions

Goldsmiths
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

A multi-country study of image-based sexual abuse: Extent, relational nature and correlates of victimisation experiences

Anastasia Powell

Department of Criminology & Justice Studies, RMIT University

Adrian J. Scott

Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths, University of London

Asher Flynn

School of Social Sciences, Monash University

Sarah McCook

Department of Criminology & Justice Studies, RMIT University

Abstract

This study examined image-based sexual abuse (IBSA) victimisation in the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand ($n = 6,109$). Findings showed that 37.7% ($n = 2,306$) of respondents had at least one IBSA victimisation experience since 16 years of age. Logistic regression analyses further identified that demographic characteristics (age, sexuality, disability/assistance), attitudes towards IBSA, and experiential variables (online dating and sexual self-image behaviours, IBSA perpetration) were each predictors of IBSA victimisation. Though gender did not predict the overall extent of IBSA victimisation, the relational contexts and impacts of IBSA remained gendered in particular ways. Implications of the study are discussed with respect to conceptualising gendered violence and future research.

Keywords: image-based sexual abuse; technology-facilitated sexual violence; victimisation; gendered violence.

Practical impact statement

This article demonstrates both the diversity of victim experiences of image-based sexual abuse (IBSA), as well as gendered and other patterns in the relational contexts in which it occurs. The findings presented here may assist researchers and practitioners by promoting understanding of the diverse contexts of IBSA, and in turn informing policy, response options and ultimately prevention of IBSA victimisation that are targeted for different abuse experiences.

Introduction

Image-based sexual abuse (IBSA) describes an increasingly criminalised form of technology-facilitated sexual violence that centres on the creation, distribution, or threat to distribute, nude or sexual photos or videos of someone without their consent (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2016; Henry et al., 2020; McGlynn & Rackley, 2017; Powell et al., 2018). A rapidly developing field of research is demonstrating how IBSA is being experienced beyond the contexts of partner, dating or sexual violence, with diverse motivations underpinning the abuse, similar to those emerging patterns in other gendered forms of interpersonal victimisation (Douglas et al., 2019; Dragiewicz et al., 2018; Eaton et al., 2020; Henry et al., 2020; Maddocks, 2018; Marganski & Melander, 2018; McGlynn et al. 2017; Powell et al. 2018; Powell & Henry, 2017; Reed et al., 2016). However, many studies have found little or no gendered patterns of IBSA victimisation (Douglass et al., 2020; Gassó et al., 2020; Henry et al., 2019a; Powell & Henry, 2019; Reed et al., 2016; Walker et al., 2019; Walker & Sleath, 2017), suggesting a need to further examine the gendered nature and correlates of IBSA victimisation experiences.

This article presents original analyses from the first multi-country community survey to comprehensively examine all three subtypes of IBSA, namely: the creation, distribution, and threats to distribute, nude or sexual photos or videos of a person without consent. The study comprised an online panel survey of residents across the United Kingdom (UK), Australia and New Zealand (NZ) (*n* = 6,109) aged 16 to 64 years. This article proceeds as follows. First, we present an overview of current research into IBSA victimisation, briefly summarising definitions and conceptualisation of IBSA, before providing a summary of studies examining the extent, nature and relational contexts of IBSA. Then, we summarise the aims, methods and analysis conducted for the study. Next, we present the key findings with a focus on the extent, gendered nature and correlates of IBSA victimisation among

respondents. Finally, we discuss the implications of the study, as well as directions for continued research and efforts to address IBSA.

IBSA: Definition and Concept

For the purposes of the present study, victimisation of IBSA includes having experienced someone *creating or taking* an intimate (nude or sexual) image without the person's consent; having intimate (nude or sexual) images *distributed* or shared with others without the person's consent (including where the images were created with or without consent); and/or experiencing *threats* from another person to distribute or share intimate (nude or sexual) images without consent (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2016; Flynn & Henry, 2019; Henry et al., 2020; McGlynn & Rackley, 2017; Powell & Henry, 2017). IBSA can thus encompass 'upskirting' and 'down-blousing', voyeurism and the covert filming of consensual or non-consensual sex acts; sharing of image-based 'sexts' without permission; and digitally altering someone's face or body to create a nude or sexual image (also known as 'deepfakes') (Flynn, Powell et al., 2021; Maddocks, 2018; McGlynn et al., 2017). It is worth noting that this operational definition is broad in scope so as to encompass several aspects of IBSA that are increasingly, though not universally, conceptualised as criminal conduct under legislative reforms within Australian jurisdictions, and to a lesser extent in both the UK and NZ. Arguably, Australia has some of the most inclusive criminal provisions addressing IBSA; with legislation in the State of *New South Wales* and the *Australian Capital Territory*, specifically including digitally altered or manipulated images that depict a person's private parts or their engagement in a private act, within the definition (Flynn, Clough et al, 2021). Furthermore, all Australian jurisdictions (except Tasmania) include specific offences of *threatening* to distribute a nude, sexual or 'intimate image'. This is not the case, at the time of writing, in either the UK (*Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015)* or NZ (*Harmful Digital*

Communications Act 2015), whose offences focus foremost on the *distribution* of 'private sexual photographs or films' or an 'intimate visual recording' of a person without their consent.

Noting the range of experiences that can fall within the scope of IBSA, feminist scholars have argued to conceptualise IBSA itself as a continuum of abuse (Fido & Harper, 2020; Henry et al., 2020; McGlynn e al., 2017), and one that forms part of the wider 'continuum of sexual violence', first developed by Liz Kelly (1987). Kelly described her concept of a continuum of sexual violence as two-fold. First, that there is a common underlying character to much sexual violence which is used largely by men to control women through abuse, coercion and force. Second, that there are not always discrete categories of sexual violence and non-violence into which women's various experiences can be easily placed; rather sexual violations and intrusion take many forms. Conceptualising IBSA in this way recognises not only that many victim/survivors experience similar harms and consequences as other forms of sexual violence (see Boyle, 2018; Henry et al., 2020; McGlynn et al., 2017; Vera-Gray, 2018), but arguably that IBSA may be one form of sexual violation experienced alongside many others, which *together* carry cumulative harms for victim/survivors. It further positions IBSA as a form of gendered violence; one whose underlying nature can be well (if not always completely) understood as an artefact of gendered power relations and inequalities. However, unlike most contact sexual offences and sexual harassment that are largely (though not exclusively) perpetrated by men against women, a rapidly emerging field of research into IBSA reports mixed rates of victimisation between women and men, raising potential questions as to the applicability of gendered violence conceptualisations of this particular form of criminal sexual abuse (Douglass et al., 2020; Gassó et al., 2020; Henry et al., 2019a; Powell & Henry, 2019; Reed et al., 2016; Walker et al., 2019; Walker & Sleath, 2017).

Extent and nature of IBSA Victimisation

Victimisation studies have found varying IBSA prevalence rates, in large part reflecting inconsistent definitions, measures, samples and timeframes used across the literature, and whether data is from primary or secondary reports. A recent meta-analysis and systematic review identified victimisation rates across the three types of IBSA (Patel & Roesch, 2020). It identified only three studies with relevant measures (namely, Henry et al., 2019a; Powell & Henry, 2019; Snaychuk & O'Neill, 2020), and these had a pooled prevalence of 17.6% for the non-consensual creation of images, 8.8% for the non-consensual distribution of images and 7.2% for threats to distribute images. Individual studies included in this meta-analysis differed in terms of items used to measure IBSA victimisation, sample size, method, population and setting, contributing to a considerable variance in prevalence rates from 1.1% (Gámez-Guadix et al., 2015) to 24.1% (Englander & McCoy, 2017; see also Abraham, 2015; Lenhart et al., 2016). As Walker and Sleath (2017) highlighted in an earlier systematic review, reporting a range of IBSA prevalence is 'somewhat arbitrary' given the different measures used, and because studies have rarely examined the broader context of victimisation.

These inconsistent approaches to measuring IBSA have also led to mixed findings regarding the nature of experiences, victim/survivor characteristics, and impacts of victimisation. Victimisation studies have frequently found that young adults (e.g., 18 to 29 years), and specifically, younger women within this age group, are significantly more likely to experience IBSA compared with older adults (Henry et al., 2019b; Lenhart et al., 2016; Powell & Henry, 2019; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020). While some studies focus only on IBSA that occurs within an intimate relationship (e.g., Reed et al., 2016), others are broader, or do not include follow-up questions on victim-perpetrator relationship or context. Where such questions have been included, participants most commonly describe the perpetrator as

someone they know, such as a friend (both face-to-face and online), a partner or ex-partner, a family member, or a stranger (e.g., Henry et al., 2019a; Powell & Henry, 2019; Powell et al., 2022; Walker et al., 2019). Such research is suggestive of a range of different relational contexts in which IBSA victimisation occurs.

There are further inconsistent findings as to the role of gender in shaping patterns and the nature of IBSA victimisation. When comparing women and men, several studies have found relatively similar rates of IBSA victimisation or no statistically significant differences (Douglass et al., 2020; Gassó et al., 2020; Henry et al., 2019a; Powell & Henry, 2019; Reed et al., 2016; Walker et al., 2019; Walker & Sleath, 2017). However, some victimisation research has shown that women are at greater risk of IBSA when compared with men in their samples (e.g., Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020, 9.2% and 6.6% respectively). Despite these mixed findings regarding gender and the prevalence of IBSA victimisation, few quantitative studies have examined the gendered nature or contexts of IBSA, though some qualitative research suggests women in particular may experience severe and long-lasting harms as a result (e.g., Bates, 2017; McGlynn et al., 2021).

Some preliminary research indicates that sexual minorities, and other marginalised social groups experience higher rates of IBSA victimisation. For example, some studies have found significantly higher rates of IBSA victimisation among lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) participants, compared with heterosexual participants (Douglass et al., 2020; Henry et al., 2019a; Lenhart et al., 2016). In the US, Lenhart et al. found that Black (non-Hispanic) respondents were more likely to report someone sharing a nude or nearly nude image of them without their permission, compared with White respondents (5% and 2% respectively). While in Australian research, First Nations identifying participants were more than twice as likely to experience IBSA compared with non-Indigenous participants (50% and 22% respectively) (Henry et al., 2019a). These findings are not surprising given the higher rates of gender-based

violence and sexual abuse experienced by Aboriginal women and other women of colour, for whom risk of victimisation is compounded by systemic racism and legacies of colonial violence (Olsen & Lovett, 2016). Henry et al. (2019a) further report that, among the Australian respondents surveyed, IBSA was three times more common among respondents who reported requiring some daily assistance with living activities, body movement activities or communication, compared with those who did not require such assistance (56% and 18% respectively).

It is also worth noting that there is a hidden side to IBSA, with non-consensual sexual imagery being circulated, traded and exchanged on a range of closed 'member only' online communities and dark web spaces (Dekeseredy & Corsianos, 2015; Henry & Flynn, 2019; Mass et al., 2021). This in turn means that some victim/survivors of IBSA may not be aware that their images are circulating, or may only become aware sometime later, if the images are reshared in mainstream online spaces. This hidden side to IBSA victimisation may obscure its gendered nature, as emerging research suggests that it is predominantly images of women and girls that feature in such closed and dark web sites of distribution (Mass et al., 2021), further highlighting the importance of ongoing research into IBSA perpetration (see Powell et al., 2019, 2022).

In summary, while IBSA is a growing field of research, there remains limited data that examines the gendered patterns of victimisation, particularly for the non-consensual creation of images and threats to share images without consent. Additionally, items on IBSA victimisation are often situated within broader surveys on sexting and digital dating practices or online harassment, such that studies do not always report on specific associations between IBSA and key correlates, nor do they provide nuanced consideration of the contexts and impacts of these harms. This study addresses this research gap to advance understanding of

the gendered nature and correlates of IBSA victimisation among different community populations and countries.

The current study

The study described in this article represents one component of a larger research project investigating all three subsets of IBSA victimisation and perpetration: the non-consensual taking or creation of a nude or sexual image; the non-consensual distribution or sharing of a nude or sexual image; and threats made to distribute a nude or sexual image. Reporting on a 2019 multi-country online panel survey of general community members in the UK, Australia and NZ (n = 6,109, aged 16 to 64 years), we examine self-reported IBSA victimisation, presenting original multivariate analyses of its extent, gendered nature and correlates. In light of the emerging state of empirical evidence in the field, the analyses reported here are exploratory in nature and sought to examine: (1) the overall extent of IBSA victimisation across country sites and by gender, (2) the gendered nature and relational contexts of IBSA victimisation, and (3) additional potential correlates of IBSA victimisation. The three foci of the current article address and contribute to gaps in the extant literature seeking to elucidate the specific role, if any, of gender in IBSA victimisation, whilst acknowledging the potential role of other factors in explaining its extent and nature.

Materials and methods

The survey instrument utilised for this study drew on an existing measure that was previously developed by the researchers and administered in an Australian-only general community sample in 2016 (Powell et al., 2019). As such, for this 2019 study our multi-country survey likewise comprised a range of items including those pertaining to: (1) demographic characteristics; (2) attitudes towards IBSA; (3) online dating behaviours; (3)

sexual self-image behaviours; (4) IBSA victimisation; (5) IBSA perpetration; and (6) the

nature of the 'most significant' IBSA victimisation experience. An online panel provider,

Qualtrics Panels, was contracted for recruitment (described further below), and the study was

approved by the RMIT University Human Research Ethics Committee, following guidelines

as prescribed by the *Australian National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Researc*h.

A brief description of each of the measures in the survey instrument follows (for further

description of items see Powell et al., 2022).

Measures

    Demographics. The demographic items surveyed included: respondent country (UK,

Australia, NZ), respondent gender (female, male, transgender, non-binary gender identity),

respondent age (in years), respondent sexuality (heterosexual, LGB+), respondent

racial/ethnic identity (White/European/Pākehā,[1] Indigenous and/or BAME), and respondent

disability/assistance (requiring assistance with daily body movement and/or communication

activities, not requiring assistance).

    Attitudes towards IBSA. Attitudes towards IBSA were measured using the sexual

image-based abuse myth acceptance (SIAMA) scale (Powell et al., 2019; Song, 2021), which

is modelled on rape myth acceptance (Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999; see also Powell

& Webster, 2018 for a review). The SIAMA scale has 18 items and has been found to have

two components: the 'minimise/excuse' component, which contains 12 items (M = 2.50, *SD*

= 1.25, range 1 to 7, α = .93) and the 'blame' component, which contains six items (M = 3.79,

SD = 1.60, range 1 to 7, α = .87). Example minimise/excuse items included: 'It's only natural

for a guy to brag to his mates by showing them a nude or sexual image of his partner', and

'Women tend to exaggerate how much it affects them if a nude or sexual image of them gets

---

[1] Pākehā is a Maori term referring to New Zealanders who are primarily of White European descent.

out online'. Example blame items included: 'A woman who sends a nude or sexual image to her partner, should not be surprised if the image ends up online', and 'If a man sends a nude or sexual image to a partner, he can't expect it will stay private'. The items were all rated on the same 7-point Likert scale where 1 = 'strongly disagree' and 7 = 'strongly agree' (no labels were provided for points 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on the scale). Higher scores indicate greater respondent adherence to attitudes that minimise/excuse the harms of IBSA and blame the victims.

Online dating behaviours. Respondents were asked whether they had ever experienced or engaged in nine different online dating behaviours via a 5-point Likert scale, where 0 = 'never,' 1 = 'rarely,' 2 = 'sometimes,' 3 = 'often,' and 4 = 'frequently'. Example items included: 'Used a dating or hook-up app on your mobile phone', 'Asked someone you first met online to meet-up for sex', and 'Went on a date with someone you met through an online dating website or app'. A dichotomous (no, never; yes, one or more) 'online dating behaviours' variable was created for the purpose of data analysis.

Sexual self-image behaviours. Respondents were also asked whether they had ever experienced or engaged in 10 different sexual self-image behaviours via a 5-point Likert scale, where 0 = 'never,' 1 = 'rarely,' 2 = 'sometimes,' 3 = 'often,' and 4 = 'frequently'. Example items included: 'Sent someone you just met a nude or sexual photo or video to flirt with them', 'Made a nude or sexy video with a sexual partner', and 'Asked someone to send you a nude or sexual photo or video'. Again, a dichotomous (no, never; yes, one or more) 'sexual self-image behaviours' variable was created for the purpose of data analysis.

IBSA victimisation. Respondents reported whether they had ever (since 16 years of age) experienced a nude or sexual image of themselves being taken, distributed, and/or threatened to be distributed without their consent. Respondents answered 10 items describing the content of the image for each of three subtypes of IBSA victimisation (taken, distributed,

and threatened), using a dichotomous (yes, no) question format. Five dichotomous (no, yes) variables were created for the purpose of analysis: 'IBSA victimisation (taken)'; 'IBSA victimisation (distributed)'; and 'IBSA victimisation (threatened)', and 'IBSA victimisation (any)' which referred to having had at least one IBSA victimisation experience across *any* of the three subtypes; and 'IBSA victimisation (all)' which referred to having experienced at least one IBSA victimisation experience in *all* three subtypes of IBSA victimisation.

IBSA perpetration. Respondents also reported whether they had ever (since 16 years of age) taken, distributed, and/or threatened to distribute a nude or sexual image of another person without consent. Respondents answered nine items describing the content of the image for each of three subtypes of IBSA perpetration (taken, distributed, and threatened), using a dichotomous (yes, no) question format. Three dichotomous IBSA perpetration variables were created for the purposes of analysis: 'IBSA perpetration (taken)'; 'IBSA perpetration (distributed)'; and 'IBSA perpetration (threatened).'

Nature of IBSA victimisation. Respondents who reported ever having experienced the taking, distributing, and/or threats to distribute a nude or sexual image of themselves without their consent were asked to complete additional items regarding their most significant IBSA victimisation experience. These items included perpetrator gender (i.e., female, male, female and male, other/don't know), and victim-perpetrator relationship (i.e., intimate partner, ex-intimate partner, friend, other known person, stranger/unknown). Respondents were also asked whether the IBSA victimisation experience was accompanied by any of six other forms of abuse from the same person (i.e., additional IBSA, unwanted communications, threats of harm, controlling behaviour, physical harm, fear for safety). Finally, respondents were asked to rate how worried or concerned they were in response to the IBSA about a range of possible emotional, reputational and safety impacts.

12

Sample and recruitment

Qualtrics Panels recruited general community respondents (aged 16 to 64 years) in each of the three study sites, namely, the UK, Australia and NZ. Research has previously shown that when efforts are put in place to reduce bias in sampling, prevalence rates in non-representative panel samples tend to approximate those in population-based samples (see e.g., Mellins et al., 2017; Mullinex et al., 2015). In order to reduce such potential bias in sampling, we utilised quota categories according to census data on age and gender to approximate the population across the three study sites. This, along with utilising an online panel recruitment method (as opposed to general advertising or sub-population samples such as in colleges or discrete communities), provided additional confidence in the findings.

The resulting sample of 6,109 respondents comprised: 2,028 from the UK, 2,054 from Australia, and 2,028 from NZ. With respect to gender, 3,181 women (52.1%) and 2,928 men (47.9%) responded, with a mean age of 39.02 years (*SD* = 13.47, range 16 to 64). An additional 53 respondents identified either as transgender (*n* = 26) or non-binary gender identity (*n* = 27), though unfortunately the number of respondents in these categories was insufficient for comparable analyses and so was removed from the current study. Most respondents identified as heterosexual (88.9%, *n* = 5,430), while 11.1% (*n* = 679) identified as sexuality diverse, including lesbian, gay or bisexual (LGB+). Respondents mostly identified as White, European or Pākehā (73.6%, *n* = 4,498), while 26.4% (*n* = 1,611) identified as racially and ethnically diverse, including Indigenous and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME). Finally, 22.2% (*n* = 1,359) of respondents reported requiring assistance with daily body movement and/or communication activities. This compared favourably with census data across the UK, Australia and NZ on key markers such as gender (51%, 51%, 51% women), median age (40, 38, 37) and disability (18%, 14%, 18%).

Analytic strategy

The sample was analysed in three stages using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 27. In the first stage, descriptive and chi-square analyses, with phi or Cramer's V as measures of effect size, were performed to examine the extent of self-reported IBSA victimisation. Chi-square analyses were performed to determine whether or not there were differences in the five IBSA victimisation variables, first according to respondent country, and then respondent gender. In the second stage, descriptive and chi-square analyses, with phi and Cramer's V as measures of effect size, were performed to examine the nature of self-reported IBSA victimisation. Chi-square analyses were performed to determine whether or not there were differences in perpetrator gender and victim-perpetrator relationship according to respondent gender.

Finally, in the third stage, logistic regression analyses were performed to examine the correlates of self-reported IBSA victimisation. The analytic approach followed Hosmer et al.'s (2013) seven step 'purposeful selection' model building process, and examined the relationship between 13 respondent characteristics and the dichotomous IBSA victimisation variable. The 13 respondent characteristics comprised six demographic characteristics (respondent country, respondent gender, respondent age, respondent sexuality, respondent racial/ethnic identity, and respondent disability/assistance), two attitudinal characteristics (minimise/excuse and blame), and five experiential characteristics (online dating behaviours, sexual self-image behaviours, IBSA perpetration [taken], IBSA perpetration [distributed], and IBSA perpetration [threatened]). Assumption testing was performed prior to assessment of the initial and final models to ensure no violations had an undue influence on the models.

Results

Extent of IBSA victimisation

Overall, 37.7% (*n* = 2,306) of respondents reported experiencing one or more of the 30 IBSA victimisation behaviours during their lifetime. Behaviours involving the non-consensual taking or creation of a nude or sexual image (33.2%, *n* = 2,029) were the most common, followed by the non-consensual distribution of a nude or sexual image (20.9%, *n* = 1,278), and threats to distribute a nude or sexual image (18.7%, *n* = 1,142). Table 1 presents the lifetime prevalence of IBSA victimisation for each of the respondent countries.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

A series of chi-square analyses were performed to examine whether or not there were significant differences in the lifetime extent of IBSA victimisation by respondent country. These analyses revealed two significant between-country differences in respondents' extent of IBSA victimisation experiences. First, that Australian respondents (31.1%, *n* = 638) were less likely than NZ respondents (35.1%, *n* = 712) to report experiencing intimate images *taken or created* without consent, $\chi^2(2, n = 6109) = 7.70$, *p* = .021, φ_c = .04. There were no significant differences between Australia and the UK, nor NZ and the UK. Second, that Australian respondents (35.2%, *n* = 724) were less likely than their UK (39.0%, *n* = 791) or NZ (39.0%, *n* = 791) counterparts to report experiencing *any* lifetime IBSA victimisation, $\chi^2(2, n = 6109) = 8.226$, *p* = .016, φ_c=.04. Notably, the effect sizes for respondent country were very small (e.g., considerably below.07, indicating only a small effect for 2df).

A further series of chi-square analyses were performed to examine differences in the lifetime extent of IBSA victimisation according to respondent gender, as shown in Table 2.

Male respondents were more likely than female respondents to report experiencing images distributed (24.1%, $n = 707$ vs. 18.0%, $n = 571$), $\chi^2(1, n = 6109) = 35.38, p < .001, \varphi = .08$; images threatened (20.6%, $n = 603$ vs. 16.9%, $n = 539$), $\chi^2(1, n = 6109) = 13.36, p < .001, \varphi = .05$; and all three subtypes of IBSA (17.1%, $n = 500$ vs. 11.4%, $n = 362$), $\chi^2(1, n = 6109) = 40.82, p < .001, \varphi = .08$). Notably, the effect sizes for respondent gender were also very small (e.g., considerably below .10, indicating only a small effect for 1df).

Gendered Nature and Relational Context of IBSA victimisation

Respondents who had reported any IBSA victimisation were further asked about the nature of their most significant experience. Of those that completed these additional questions, 61.1% ($n = 584$) said the perpetrator was male, while 34.6% ($n = 331$) said the perpetrator was female. The remaining respondents reported that the perpetrator/s included both females and males, or that they did not know the perpetrator's gender (4.3%, $n = 41$). Chi-square analyses were performed to examine whether or not there were significant differences regarding perpetrator gender by respondent gender (data not shown). These analyses revealed that male respondents who experienced IBSA (50.3%, $n = 223$) were more likely than female respondents (21.1%, $n = 108$) to be targeted by a female perpetrator, whilst female respondents who experience IBSA (76.8%, $n = 394$) were more likely than male respondents (42.9%, $n = 190$) to be targeted by a male perpetrator. Male respondents (6.8%, $n = 30$) were also more likely than female respondents (2.1%, $n = 11$) to report that the perpetrator/s was a mixed group, other gender or that they did not know the perpetrator's gender, $\chi^2(2, n = 956) = 115.51, p < .001, \varphi_c = .35$.

With regard to victim-perpetrator relationship, most respondents were targeted by a well-known person, such as an intimate partner (33.5%, $n = 321$), an ex-partner (27.4%, $n = 262$), or a friend (15.4%, $n = 147$). The remaining respondents were targeted by either other known persons (including acquaintances and colleagues, 13%, $n = 124$), or strangers/unknown persons (10.8%, $n = 103$). Chi-square analyses revealed that female respondents (30.1%, $n = 155$) were more likely than male respondents (24.2%, $n = 107$) to be targeted by an ex-intimate partner, whilst male respondents (17.9%, $n = 79$) were more likely than female respondents (13.2%, $n = 68$) to be targeted by a friend, $\chi^2(4, n = 957) = 10.08$, $p < .039$, $\varphi = .10$). There were no significant gender differences for victimisation by a current partner, other known person, or strangers/unknown persons.

Additionally, respondents were asked to indicate whether their most significant IBSA victimisation experience had been a one-off incident, or co-occurred with further abuse from the same perpetrator, as well as whether they had experienced emotional concerns, reputational concerns and/or safety concerns as a result (see Table 3). Again, a series of chi-square analyses were performed to examine whether or not there were significant differences in co-occurring abuse experiences from the same perpetrator, and resulting concerns arising from the IBSA victimisation, by respondent (victim/survivor) gender.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

These analyses revealed that while overall, female and male respondents were equally likely to have experienced any co-occurring abuse, there were some significant differences according to the types of abuse. Female respondents were more likely than male respondents to report that, in addition to IBSA, the same perpetrator had attempted to limit or control them (22.1%, $n = 114$ vs. 15.0%, $n = 66$), $\chi^2(1, n = 956) = 7.99$, $p = .005$, $\varphi = -.09$; physically

harmed them (10.1%, $n = 52$ vs. 6.1%, $n = 27$), $\chi^2(1, n = 956) = 4.95$, $p = .026$, $\varphi = -.07$; and/or caused them to fear for their safety (11.7%, $n = 60$ vs. 4.8%, $n = 21$), $\chi^2(1, n = 956) = 14.54$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = -.12$. Meanwhile, male respondents were more likely than female respondents to report that the same perpetrator had engaged in additional subtypes of IBSA (24.5%, $n = 108$ vs. 17.7%, $n = 91$), $\chi^2(1, n = 956) = 6.70$, $p = .010$, $\varphi = .08$. There were no significant differences by respondent gender for threats of harm and persistent unwanted communications.

There were again significant differences by respondent gender regarding concerns experienced as a result of their IBSA victimisation. Specifically, female respondents were more likely than male respondents to report that in response to the IBSA they had experienced emotional concerns (90.3%, $n = 465$ vs. 77.6%, $n = 164$), $\chi^2(1, n = 957) = 29.14$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = -.17$; reputational concerns (72.8%, $n = 375$ vs. 63.5%, $n = 280$), $\chi^2(1, n = 956) = 5.30$, $p = .021$, $\varphi = -.07$; and safety concerns (80.4%, $n = 414$ vs. 74.1%, $n = 327$), $\chi^2(1, n = 956) = 9.57$, $p = .002$, $\varphi = -.10$. Notably, the effect sizes for respondent gender were again very small.

Correlates of IBSA victimisation

Logistic regression analyses were performed to examine the relationship between 13 respondent characteristics and the lifetime prevalence of IBSA victimisation. Six characteristics were demographic: respondent country, respondent gender, respondent sexuality, respondent age, respondent racial/ethnic identity, and respondent disability/assistance. Two respondent characteristics were attitudinal: minimise/excuse and blame. The remaining five were experiential: online dating behaviours, sexual self-image behaviours, IBSA perpetration (taken), IBSA perpetration (distributed) and IBSA perpetration (threatened).

Univariable analyses. A series of chi-square and t-test analyses were performed to identify which of the 13 respondent characteristics to include in the initial model; and 12 characteristics were identified: respondent country ($p = .016$), respondent sexuality ($p < .001$), respondent age ($p < .001$), respondent racial/ethnic identity ($p = .001$), respondent disability/assistance ($p < .001$), minimise/excuse ($p < .001$), blame ($p = .004$), online dating behaviours ($p < .001$), sexual self-image behaviours ($p < .001$), IBSA perpetration (taken; $p < .001$), IBSA perpetration (distributed; $p < .001$), and IBSA perpetration (threatened; $p < .001$). Respondent gender ($p = .588$) was the only characteristic to not reach the required level of significance and was therefore excluded from the initial model. Table 4 presents frequencies and descriptives for the 13 respondent characteristics by lifetime prevalence of IBSA victimisation.

[Insert Table 4 about here].

Logistic regression analyses. The initial model contained 12 respondent characteristics and was statistically significant, $F(13, n = 6109) = 2352.84, p < .001$. It correctly classified 92.2% of cases (98.1% with no self-reported IBSA victimisation, 56.4% with self-reported IBSA victimisation), and explained between 32.0% (Cox & Snell R square) and 57.4% (Nagelkerke R square) of variance. Two non-contributing demographic characteristics were removed from the model (respondent country, respondent racial/ethnic identity), and no additional characteristics or interaction effects were found. The final model therefore contained ten respondent characteristics and was statistically significant, $F(10, n = 6109) = 2352.07, p < .001$. It correctly classified 92.1% of cases (98.1% with no self-reported IBSA victimisation, 56.1% with self-reported IBSA victimisation), and explained between

19

32.0% (Cox & Snell R square) and 57.4% (Nagelkerke R square) of variance. A summary of the initial and final models is presented in Table 5.

[Insert Table 5 about here].

Three demographic characteristics were significant predictors of self-reported IBSA victimisation. LGB+ respondents had 61% greater odds than heterosexual respondents, and respondents with disability/assistance needs had 163% greater odds than respondents without disability/assistance needs, to report having experienced IBA victimisation (OR = 1.61, 95% CI: 1.23, 2.10 and OR = 2.63, 95% CI: 2.11, 3.28 respectively), controlling for other respondent characteristics in the model. Furthermore, a one-point decrease in respondents' age was associated with 1% greater odds of reporting experiences of IBSA victimisation (OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.97, 0.99). Two attitudinal characteristics were significant predictors of self-reported IBSA victimisation: a one-point increase in respondents' minimise/excuse scores was associated with 78% greater odds of reporting experiences of IBSA victimisation (OR = 1.78, 95% CI: 1.60, 1.98), controlling for other respondent characteristics in the model. Conversely, a one-point decrease in respondents' blame scores was associated with 1% greater odds of reporting experiences of IBSA victimisation (OR = 0.89, 95% CI: 0.81, 0.98), controlling for other respondent characteristics in the model.

Finally, all five experiential characteristics were significant predictors of self-reported IBSA victimisation. Respondents who had engaged in or experienced online dating behaviours had 210% greater odds than respondents who had not engaged in or experienced these behaviours, and respondents who had engaged in or experienced sexual self-image behaviours had 403% greater odds than respondents who had not engaged in or experienced these behaviours, to report having experienced IBSA victimisation (OR = 3.10, 95% CI:

1.77, 5.45 and $OR = 5.03$, 95% CI: 3.46, 7.30 respectively), controlling for other respondent characteristics in the model. Furthermore, respondents who had taken a nude or sexual image of another person without consent had 196% greater odds than respondents who had not engaged in this subtype of IBSA perpetration to report having experienced IBSA victimisation ($OR = 2.96$, 95% CI: 2.25, 3.88), controlling for other respondent characteristics in the model. Similarly, respondents who had distributed a nude or sexual image of another person without consent had 102% greater odds, and respondents who had threatened to distribute a nude or sexual image of another person without consent had 178% greater odds than respondents who had not engaged in these subtypes of IBSA perpetration, to report having experienced IBSA victimisation ($OR = 2.02$, 95% CI: 1.39, 2.94 and $OR = 2.78$, 95% CI: 1.85, 4.17 respectively), controlling for other respondent characteristics in the model.

Discussion

In this article, we have presented data from the first multi-country study comprehensively examining three subtypes of IBSA victimisation in a community sample of adults (aged 16 to 64 years). Overall, we found that IBSA victimisation was relatively common, with some overlaps between victimisation and perpetration experiences. Furthermore, unlike much prior research which has focused foremost on the age and gender of victim/survivors (often only including younger victim/survivors in their samples), we found that the sexuality and disability/assistance status of victim/survivors significantly related to IBSA victimisation. These are important findings that extend beyond our exploratory concern with the gendered nature of IBSA victimisation. In addition, we found that attitudes that minimise/excuse the harms of IBSA and blame the victim/survivors significantly related to IBSA victimisation. IBSA victim/survivors were more likely to *minimise* and/or *excuse* the harms associated with IBSA and were less likely to displace

21

responsibility or *blame* the victim/survivors of IBSA. Little research has examined attitudinal factors as they relate to IBSA victimisation, however, it is possible that there is a self-protective psychological mechanism at play (see Powell & Webster, 2018) whereby victim/survivors have an interest in minimising its harms, despite their own experiences of harmful impacts. This is an aspect that would benefit from further research in future.

A key implication of this study is that the gendered extent or nature of IBSA is not clear-cut, but rather the associated harms appear to have strong parallels in their nature and impacts to other patterns of abuse for female victim/survivors in particular. This is despite the overall prevalence of IBSA victimisation found here demonstrating either no significant differences or higher rates for male respondents in some instances (consistent with other studies, e.g., Douglass et al., 2020; Gassó et al., 2020; Henry et al., 2019a; Powell & Henry, 2019; Reed et al., 2016; Walker & Sleath, 2017). Specifically, the *nature and relational contexts* of IBSA presented patterns that were consistent with gendered forms of abuse particularly with regard to male perpetration, as well as safety concerns and co-occurring forms of abuse being more likely to be experienced by female victim/survivors. Indeed, these findings add weight to prior qualitative research that shed light on female victims' experiences of IBSA victimisation, including severe and long-lasting harms, and its overlap with intimate partner and sexual violence (see Bates, 2017; McGlynn et al., 2020; Rackley et al., 2021; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020). However, it is also noteworthy that men's victimisation experiences are likewise common, albeit with different contexts and impacts to those reported by women. Men were most likely to be victimised by other men, either in intimate partner or peer relationships. Moreover, men were less likely to report experiencing fear for safety or other negative impacts as a result of their IBSA victimisation experiences; itself potentially suggestive of greater normative acceptance of these behaviours in homosocial contexts (Henry et al., 2021), or indeed reflective of normative masculine traits of minimising

experiences of sexual harms (see Reed et al., 2020). These findings suggest that justice and support responses to IBSA need to be inclusive and flexible enough to respond to the potentially different contexts and impacts of these harms for both male and female victim/survivors.

The findings reported additionally suggest some nuanced conceptualisation is warranted to examine IBSA with respect to gendered understandings of violence. Drawing on both Kelly (1987) and recent adaptations by Boyle (2018), 'continuum thinking' may prove particularly useful here. Elaborating on Kelly's concept, Boyle (2018) highlights "the importance of continuum thinking as a means of making connections, whilst noting the importance of clarity in relation to the *nature* of these connections and the necessity of distinction within this" (p. 28, emphasis in original). In this sense, continuum thinking, according to Boyle, ought to take place in the plural, recognising that multiple continua may well intersect in different ways. In this instance, whilst technology-facilitated forms of violence and abuse may represent one continuum, when these intersect with a continuum of sexual violence and indeed with a continuum of intimate partner abuse, then that is arguably at this nexus in which experiences of IBSA appear to be most gendered in their nature and impacts. Indeed, it might be precisely because of these intersecting continua of abuse that women tend to report greater impacts of IBSA victimisation experiences. Similarly, as Dekeseredy and colleagues (2019) have argued, repeated abuse of varying types, or *polyvictimisation*, may have cumulative impacts on victim/survivors, invoking greater harms or responses to victimisation than might otherwise be the case (see also Dekeseredy, 2021). This in turn highlights the importance of quantitative studies that gather further contextual and impact data in relation to the harms examined. Boyle (2018) has further argued that the term gendered violence itself focuses not only on whether women experience harms disproportionately, but rather the ways in which those harms "relate to and embody particular

– often normative – constructions of gender *roles*" (p. 31, emphasis added). As such, men's greater engagement in perpetration, both in the contexts of intimate partner abuse and in peer contexts (Dekeseredy & Schwartz, 2016; Powell et al., 2019), might yet be understood with respect to normative constructions of *masculinities* in different settings (see also Ptacek, 2021). Qualitative research with perpetrators of IBSA is a substantial gap in current research that might shed further light on these conceptual developments in the field.

Limitations and future research

While this survey has provided unique insights into the possible extent and nature of IBSA victimisation, there are limitations that should be mentioned to guide future research efforts. For instance, the study involved a non-representative community sample recruited via an online panel. Whilst online panel providers make efforts at recruiting a diverse respondent pool from which to sample, some research suggests that online panel samples may under-represent marginalised subgroups compared with some others (AAPOR 2010). Though research with a generalisable community sample is often extremely costly, future research in the field could seek to further validate the findings presented here with a representative community sample. Additionally, this study has demonstrated the importance of capturing sufficient numbers of a range of intersecting demographic variables to enable a more nuanced understanding of the patterns of IBSA victimisation, in particular with respect to marginalised social groups. The findings reported here have sought to do so, yet there were some further comparative analyses by gender identity, sub-population groups within sexuality diverse respondents and racial/ethnic identity that were not able to be undertaken due to relatively small numbers for some population sub-groups. To date, such characteristics are rarely reported in the empirical literature on IBSA, and this should be a priority for both quantitative and qualitative research moving forward. Indeed, future research might consider

booster sampling methodologies to proactively include underrepresented populations. Finally, due to differences in the broader scholarly literature regarding the conceptualisation of IBSA, and its measurement, it is difficult to make comparative claims with samples from other studies across different country sites. The current study draws on an earlier measure by Powell and colleagues (2019) to provide a comprehensive examination of the three subtypes of IBSA (images *taken/created*, *distributed* and/or *threatened*), that are specific to non-consensual nude or sexual imagery and increasingly criminalised internationally. As such, future research into the extent and nature of IBSA might consider the measures drawn upon here.

Conclusion

IBSA is an increasingly criminalised form of technology-facilitated sexual violence. Importantly, the findings here indicate that each of the three subtypes of IBSA, be they the taking/creation, distribution, or threats to distribute a nude or sexual image without consent, are commonly and similarly experienced forms of victimisation in each of the country sites surveyed. This further highlights the vital importance of continuing legislative and policy reform across various jurisdictions to ensure that victim/survivors of IBSA have adequate recourse to justice and support services that accurately reflect the subtypes of victimisation being experienced. Currently, few jurisdictions provide comprehensive legal protection and redress in response to all three subtypes of IBSA, so correcting this imbalance in justice responses should be a priority for legislators.

This study additionally found that IBSA may not be a straight-forward extension of more traditional forms of gender-based abuse into a digital domain. Rather, the extent, relational patterns and impacts of IBSA appear complex with respect to gender, with males in the study reporting higher or similar levels of victimisation to females, whilst females were

more likely to experience co-occurring forms of abuse, as well as impacts such as concerns for their safety. These findings suggest that victim/survivor support services and policy makers need to be flexible and inclusive in their responses to IBSA, responding to both male and female victim/survivors, whilst recognising the additional risks that some victim/survivors of IBSA may experience with respect to more sustained patterns of multiple abuse victimisation. Future research should build upon these findings to develop deeper, contextualised understandings of IBSA with respect to a wider range of characteristics that may influence its nature and impacts.

Acknowledgements

Declaration of interest statement

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

References

Abraham, A. E. (2015). *Sexting uncensored: An exploratory study on the behaviours, experiences, and perceptions of sexting among college students*. Master's thesis, California State University.

American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). (2010). Research synthesis AAPOR report on online panels. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 74*(4), 711-781.

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

Boyle, K. (2018). What's in a name? Theorising the inter-relationships of gender and violence. *Feminist Theory, 20*(1), 19-36.

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.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (2021). Image-based sexual abuse: Social and legal implications. *Current Addiction Reports*, *8*(2), 330–335.

DeKeseredy, W., & Corsianos, M. (2015). *Violence against women in pornography*. Routledge.

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), 1–8.

Douglas, H., Harris, B., & Dragiewicz, M. (2019). Technology-facilitated domestic and family violence: Women's experiences. *British Journal of Criminology*, *59*(3), 551–570.

Douglass, C. H., Wright, C. J. C., Davis, A. C., & Lim, M. S. C. (2020). Non-consensual sharing of personal sexually explicit imagery among young people in Australia:

Results from an online survey. *Sexual Health*, *17*(2), 182–186.

Dragiewicz, M., Burgess, J., Matamoros-Fernández, A., Salter, M., Suzor, N. P., Woodlock, D., & Harris, B. (2018). Technology facilitated coercive control: Domestic violence and the competing roles of digital media platforms. *Feminist Media Studies*, *18*(4), 609–625.

Eaton, A. A., Noori, S., Bonomi, A., Stephens, D. P., & Gillum, T. L. (2020). Nonconsensual porn as a form of intimate partner violence: Using the Power & Control Wheel to understand nonconsensual porn perpetration in intimate relationships. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 22*(5), 1140–1154.

Englander, E., & McCoy, M. (2017). Pressured sexting and revenge porn in a sample of Massachusetts adolescents. *International Journal of Technoethics*, *8*(2), 16–25.

Flynn, A., & Henry, N. (2019). Image-based sexual abuse: An Australian reflection. *Women and Criminal Justice*. *31*(4), 313–326.

Flynn, A., Clough, J. & Cooke, T. (2021) Disrupting and preventing deepfake abuse: Exploring criminal law responses to AI Facilitated Abuse. In A. Powell, A. Flynn & L. Sugiura (Eds.). *The Palgrave Handbook of Gendered Violence and Technology* (583-602). Palgrave Macmillan.

Flynn, A., Powell, A., Scott, A. J., & Cama, E. (2021). Deepfakes and digitally altered imagery abuse: A cross-country exploration of an emerging form of image-based sexual abuse. *The British Journal of Criminology*. Advanced online publication.

Fido, D., & Harper, C. A. (2020). *Non-consensual image-based sexual offending: Bridging legal and psychological perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Gámez-Guadix, M., Almendros, C., Borrajo, E., & Calvete, E. (2015). Prevalence and association of sexting and online sexual victimisation among Spanish adults. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, *12*(2), 145–154.

Gassó, A. M., Mueller-johnson, K., & Montiel, I. (2020). Sexting, online sexual
victimisation, and psychopathology correlates by sex: Depression, anxiety, and global
psychopathology. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public
Health*, *17*(3).

Henry, N., & Flynn, A. (2019). Image-based sexual abuse: Online distribution channels and
illicit communities of support. *Violence Against Women*, *25*(16), 1932–1955.

Henry, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2018) Policing image-based sexual abuse: Stakeholder
perspectives. *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal*, *19*(6), 565-
581.

Henry, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2019a). Image-based sexual abuse: Victims and
perpetrators. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, No. 572. Canberra:
AIC.

Henry, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2019b). *Responding to 'revenge pornography':
Prevalence, nature and impacts*. Criminology Research Grants, Criminology
Research Advisory Council.

Henry, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2020). Technology-facilitated domestic and sexual
violence: A review. *Violence Against Women*, *26*(15–16), 1828–1854.

Kelly, L. (1987). The continuum of sexual violence. In M. Maynard & J. Hanmer (Eds.).
Women, violence and social control (pp. 46–60). Springer.

Lageson, S. E., McElrath, S., & Palmer, K. E. (2019). Gendered public support for
criminalizing "Revenge Porn". *Feminist criminology, 14*(5), 560-583.

Lenhart, A., Ybarra, M., & Price-Feeney, M. (2016). *Non-consensual image sharing: One in
25 Americans has been a victim of 'revenge porn.'* Data & Society Research Institute
and the Center for Innovative Public Health Research.

Maddocks, S. (2018). From non-consensual pornography to image-based sexual abuse:

Charting the course of a problem with many names. *Australian Feminist Studies*, *33*(97), 345–361.

Marganski, A., & Melander, L. (2018). Intimate partner violence victimisation 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*, *33*(7), 1071–1095.

Maas, M. K., Cary, K. M., Clancy, E. M., Klettke, B., McCauley, H. L., & Temple, J. R. (2021). Slutpage use among US college students: the secret and social platforms of image-based sexual abuse. *Archives of sexual behavior*, *50*(5), 2203–2214.

McGlynn, C., & Rackley, E. (2017). Image-based sexual abuse. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, *37*(3), 534–561.

McGlynn, C., Rackley, E., & Houghton, R. (2017). Beyond 'revenge porn': The continuum of image-based sexual abuse. *Feminist Legal Studies*, *25*(1), 25–46.

McGlynn, C., Johnson, K., Rackley, E., Henry, N., Gavey, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2021). 'It's Torture for the Soul': The Harms of Image-Based Sexual Abuse. *Social & Legal Studies, 30*(4), 541–562.

Mellins, C. A., Walsh, K., Sarvet, A. L., Wall, M., Gilbert, L., Santelli, J. S., & Hirsch, J. S. (2017). Sexual assault incidents among college undergraduates: Prevalence and factors associated with risk. *PLoS one, 12*(11), e0186471.

Mullinix, K. J., Leeper, T. J., Druckman, J. N., and Freese, J. (2015), 'The Generalizability of Survey Experiments'. *Journal of Experimental Political Science, 2*(2), 109–138.

Olsen, A., & Lovett, R. (2016). *Existing knowledge, practice and responses to violence against women in Australian Indigenous communities: State of knowledge paper* (Issue 02; Landscapes). Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety.

Ptacek, J. (2021). Hidden dramas of masculinity: Women's perspectives on intimate violence

    in different social classes. *Violence Against Women*, *27*(5), 666–687.

Patel, U., & Roesch, R. (2020). The prevalence of technology-facilitated sexual violence: A

    meta-analysis and systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 23*(2), 428–443.

Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration

    of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois rape myth acceptance scale.

    Journal of Research in Personality, 33(1), 27–68.

Powell, A., Scott, A. J., Flynn, A., & McCook, S. (2022). Perpetration of image-based sexual

    abuse: extent, nature and correlates in a multi-country sample. *Journal of*

    Interpersonal Violence. Advanced online publication.

Powell, A., & Henry, N. (2017). *Sexual violence in a digital age*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Powell, A., & Henry, N. (2019). Technology-facilitated sexual violence victimisation:

    Results from an online survey of Australian adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*,

    34(17), 3637–3665.

Powell, A., Henry, N., & Flynn, A. (2018). Image-based sexual abuse. In W. S. DeKeseredy,

    & M. Dragiewicz (Eds.). *Routledge handbook of critical criminology* (pp. 305–315).

    Routledge.

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., & Webster, K. (2018). Cultures of gendered violence: An integrative review of

    measures of attitudinal support for violence against women. *Australian & New*

    Zealand Journal of Criminology, 51(1), 40–57.

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 and*

Adolescent Psychiatry, *21*(10), 569–582.

Rackley, E., McGlynn, C., Johnson, K., Henry, N., Gavey, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2021). Seeking justice and redress for victim-survivors of image-based sexual abuse. *Feminist Legal Studies, 29*, 293–322.

Reed, R. A., Pamlanye, J. T., Truex, H. R., Murphy-Neilson, M. C., Kunaniec, K. P., Newins, A. R., & Wilson, L. C. (2020). Higher rates of unacknowledged rape among men: The role of rape myth acceptance. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, *21*(1), 162–167.

Reed, L. A., Tolman, R. M., & Ward, L. M. (2016). Snooping and sexting: Digital media as a context for dating aggression and abuse among college students. *Violence Against Women*, *22*(13), 1556–1576.

Ruvalcaba, Y., & Eaton, A. A. (2020). Nonconsensual pornography among U.S. adults: A sexual scripts framework on victimisation, perpetration, and health correlates for women and men. *Psychology of Violence*, *10*(1), 68–78.

Snaychuk, L. A., & O'Neill, M. L. (2020). Technology-facilitated sexual violence: Prevalence, risk, and resiliency in undergraduate students. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, *29*(8), 984–999.

Song, W. (2021). Validation of the Korean version of the Sexual Image-Based Abuse Myth Acceptance Scale (K-SIAMA). *Korean Journal of Women's Psychology, 26*(3), 185–200.

Stanley, N., Barter, C., Wood, M., Aghtaie, N., Larkins, C., Lanau, A., & Överlien, C. (2018). Pornography, sexual coercion and abuse and sexting in young people's intimate relationships: A European study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *33*(19), 2919–2944.

Vera-Gray, F. (2018). *The right amount of panic: How women trade freedom for safety.* Policy Press.

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.

Walker, K., Sleath, E., Hatcher, R. M., Hine, B., & Crookes, R. L. (2019). Nonconsensual

    sharing of private sexually explicit media among university students. *Journal of*

    Interpersonal Violence,36(17–18), NP9078–NP9108.

Table 1

Lifetime Prevalence of IBSA Victimisation as a function of Respondent Country

	Respondent Country			
	UK	Australia	NZ	Total
	% (*n*)	% (*n*)	% (*n*)	% (*n*)
IBSA victimisation (taken)[*]	33.5 *(679)*	31.1 *(638)$_a$*	35.1 *(712)$_a$*	33.2 *(2029)*
IBSA victimisation (distributed)	21.7 *(440)*	19.4 *(399)*	21.7 *(439)*	20.9 *(1278)*
IBSA victimisation (threatened)	19.0 *(385)*	17.2 *(354)*	19.9 *(403)*	18.7 *(1142)*
IBSA victimisation (any)[*]	39.0 *(791)$_a$*	35.2 *(724)$_{a,b}$*	39.0 *(791)$_b$*	37.7 *(2306)*
IBSA victimisation (all)	13.9 *(282)*	12.9 *(265)*	15.5 *(315)*	14.1 *(862)*

Note. Column percentages sharing subscripts are significantly different. [*] $p < .05$.

Table 2

Lifetime Prevalence of IBSA Victimisation as a function of Respondent Gender

	Respondent gender		
	Female	Male	Total
	% (*n*)	% (*n*)	% (*n*)
IBSA victimisation (taken)	32.9 *(1047)*	33.5 *(982)*	33.2 *(2029)*
IBSA victimisation (distributed)***	18.0 *(571)*	24.1 *(707)*	20.9 *(1278)*
IBSA victimisation(threatened)***	16.9 *(539)*	20.6 *(603)*	18.7 *(1142)*
IBSA victimisation (any)	38.1 *(1211)*	37.4 *(1095)*	37.7 *(2306)*
IBSA victimisation (all)***	11.4 *(362)*	17.1 *(500)*	14.1 *(862)*

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 3

Most Significant IBSA Victimisation as a function of Respondent Gender by Co-occurring

Abuse Types and Resulting Concerns

	Respondent gender		
	Female	Male	Total
	% (*n*)	% (*n*)	% (*n*)
Co-occurring abuse			
Additional IBSA[*]	17.7 *(91)*	24.5 *(108)*	20.8 *(199)*
Unwanted communications	30.5 *(157)*	25.6 *(113)*	28.2 *(270)*
Threats of harm	18.4 *(95)*	13.8 *(61)*	16.3 *(156)*
Controlling behaviour[**]	22.1 *(114)*	15.0 *(66)*	18.8 *(180)*
Physical harm[*]	10.1 *(52)*	6.1 *(27)*	8.3 *(79)*
Fear for safety	11.7 *(60)*	4.8 *(21)*	8.5 *(81)*
Any co-occurring abuse	59.2 *(305)*	59.6 *(263)*	59.4 *(568)*
Resulting concerns			
Emotional concerns[***]	90.3 *(465)*	77.6 *(164)*	84.4 *(808)*
Reputational concerns[*]	72.8 *(375)*	63.5 *(280)*	68.5 *(655)*
Safety concerns[**]	80.4 *(414)*	74.1 *(327)*	77.5 *(741)*

Note. [*] p < .05. [**] p < .01. [***] p < .001.

Table 4

Frequencies and Descriptives for the 13 Respondent Characteristics by Lifetime Prevalence of IBSA Victimisation

	IBSA victimisation (any)			
	Yes		No	
	%	*n*	%	*n*
Demographic characteristics				
Respondent country[*]				
UK	39.0	791	61.0	1237
Australia	35.2	724	64.8	1330
NZ	39.0	791	61.0	1236
Respondent gender				
Female	38.1	1211	61.9	1970
Male	37.4	1095	62.6	1833
Respondent sexuality[***]				
Heterosexual	35.4	1923	64.6	3507
LGB	56.4	383	43.6	296
Respondent racial/ethnic identity[**]				
White/European/Pākehā	36.5	1644	63.5	2854
Indigenous & BAME	41.1	622	58.9	949
Respondent disability/assistance[***]				
No assistance required	31.6	1500	68.4	3250
Assistance required	59.3	806	40.7	553
Experiential characteristics				
Online dating behaviours[***]				
No, never	8.4	194	36.2	1378
Yes, one or more	91.6	2112	63.8	2425
Sexual self-image behaviours[***]				
No, never	14.1	337	85.9	2296

	Yes		No	
Yes, one or more	56.1	1929	43.9	1507
IBSA perpetration (taken)***				
No	29.4	1510	70.6	3632
Yes	82.3	796	17.7	171
IBSA perpetration (distributed)***				
No	31.5	1720	68.5	3741
Yes	90.4	586	9.6	62
IBSA perpetration (threatened)***				
No	32.3	1801	67.7	3772
Yes	94.2	505	5.8	31

	Yes		No	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Demographic characteristics				
Respondent age***	35.06	12.12	41.42	13.68
Attitudinal characteristics				
Minimise/excuse***	2.95	1.41	2.23	1.1
Blame***	3.86	1.52	3.74	1.64

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 5

Summary of the Initial and Final Logistic Regression Models Predicting Lifetime Prevalence of IBSA Victimisation

	Initial model					Final model				
	B	*SE*	*p*	*OR*	95% CI	*B*	*SE*	*p*	*OR*	95% CI
Demographic characteristics										
Respondent country			.696					-		
UK	0.11	.13	.394	1.12	[0.86, 1.45]	-	-	-	-	-
Australia	0.06	.13	.670	1.06	[0.82, 1.36]	-	-	-	-	-
Respondent sexuality	0.48	.14	< .001	1.62	[1.24, 2.12]	0.47	.14	.001	1.61	[1.23, 2.10]
Respondent age	-0.02	.01	< .001	0.98	[0.97, 0.99]	-0.02	.01	< .001	0.98	[0.97, 0.99]
Respondent racial/ethnic identity	0.05	.12	.688	1.05	[0.83, 1.33]	-	-	-	-	-
Respondent disability/assistance	0.97	.11	< .001	2.63	[2.11, 3.29]	0.97	.11	< .001	2.63	[2.11, 3.28]
Attitudinal characteristics										
Minimise/excuse	0.57	.06	< .001	1.77	[1.59, 1.97]	0.58	.06	< .001	1.78	[1.60, 1.98]
Blame	-0.11	.05	.019	0.89	[0.81-0.98]	-0.12	.05	.017	0.89	[0.81, 0.98]
Experiential characteristics										
Online dating behaviours	1.13	.29	< .001	3.09	[1.76, 5.43]	1.13	.29	< .001	3.10	[1.77, 5.45]
Sexual self-image behaviours	1.62	.19	< .001	5.04	[3.47, 7.33]	1.62	.19	< .001	5.03	[3.46, 7.30]

IBSA perpetration (taken)	1.09	.14	< .001	2.97	[2.26, 3.90]	1.08	.14	< .001	2.96	[2.25, 3.88]
IBSA perpetration (distributed)	0.71	.19	< .001	2.02	[1.39, 2.95]	0.70	.19	< .001	2.02	[1.39, 2.94]
IBSA perpetration (threatened)	1.02	.21	< .001	2.76	[1.84, 4.15]	1.02	.21	< .001	2.78	[1.85, 4.17]

Note. Reference categories: country = NZ, sexuality = heterosexual, racial/ethnic identity = White/European/Pākehā, disability/assistance = no assistance required, online

dating behaviours = no, sexual self-image behaviours = no, IBSA perpetration (taken) = no, IBSA perpetration (distributed) = no, IBSA perpetration (threatened) = no.