



**WOMEN AND GIRLS' USE OF PORNOGRAPHY:
MYTHS, FACTS, & CONTROVERSIES**



WOMEN AND GIRLS' USE OF PORNOGRAPHY: MYTHS, FACTS, & CONTROVERSIES

Walter S. DeKeseredy
Anna Deane Carlson Endowed Chair of Social Sciences,
Director of the Research Center on Violence, and
Professor of Sociology
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV
U.S.A. 26501

walter.dekeseredy@mail.wvu.edu

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
The Extent and Distribution of Female Porn Consumption	5
New Empirical Directions	6
Why Do Girls and Women Consume Pornography?	9
A Note on Female Pornographers	10
Conclusions	12
References	14

Introduction

“Pornography overwhelmingly caters to a heterosexual male audience. Women are often portrayed in one-dimensional hyper-sexualized images without any sexual agency (Corsianos, 2007; DeKeseredy & Corsianos, 2016) — that is, always orgasmic; willing to do anything; often reacting by doing what they are told or by being physically moved into positions to perform in particular ways; always accepting of what is being done to them regardless of the level of humiliation or level of violence; and always wanting more. That these images have become mainstream, with the audience wanting more, tells us much about how the fantasies of many straight males have been conditioned and constructed by the porn industry.

Though porn consumption is repeatedly framed in the scientific literature as a decidedly male enterprise, there is, as the National Center on Sexual Exploitation (2022) points out, an unsettling truth about women that warrants equal attention: “[W]omen – and even young girls – now make up a sizeable block of pornography consumers,” and there has been a major increase in women’s use of porn over the past five decades (p. 1). What do we know and what don’t we know about women’s and girls’ porn consumption? The main objective of this white paper is to answer these two important questions.”

The Extent and Distribution of Female Porn Consumption

Research on women's porn use is not plentiful, but we are beginning to see an increase in empirical attention devoted to this phenomenon, with most of this work based in the U.S. For example, among college students in this country, it is estimated that 60.4% of women have used porn for sexual gratification (*Herbenick et al., 2017*). Another large-scale U.S. study found that 60.2% of women reported consuming porn in the past month (*Solano et al., 2020*). These two surveys reveal a significant increase in women's porn use in light of the fact that fifty years ago, another U.S. study found that among college students aged 17 to 24, only 12% of women had watched a porn movie at least once in their lifetime and only 1% stated that they did so fairly often (*Berger et al., 1972*). Returning to this current era, a 2022 survey conducted by Pornhub (*2023*) found that 36% of visitors to this site were female, up 4% from the year before, and Wright et al. (*2013*) found that women between 18 and 30 years of age in the U.S. are twice as likely to use porn compared to older women. Nonetheless, there are studies showing that women's use of porn continues to be lower than men's. For instance, one widely-cited inquiry found that 13.4% of college age women in the U.S. stated that they watched porn videos in a previous month compared to 35.3% of college age men (*Herbenick et al., 2017*). Still, the fact that Johnson et al.'s (*2019*) survey of 706 heterosexual women between 18 to 29 years of age uncovered that 83% of them had seen porn and one third of them viewed it before the age of 13, is alarming and warrants the collective attention of policy makers.

What are women watching? Though hardly a reputable scientific agency, Pornhub (*2023*), the world's leading free porn site, provides some answers to this question in its 2022 Year in Review. According to Pornhub's data, women were +155% more likely than men to view the Scissoring genre, followed by Solo Male (+87%),, and videos with the tag 'vagina licking' (+78%) . Additionally, women are +40% more likely to watch Threesome videos, and +37% more likely to view reality-themed videos. Further, compared to male visitors, women are +34% more likely to view Hardcore videos, +30% more likely to view Bondage, and +29% more likely to watch Gangbang videos. And, compared to men, the porn performers that are most often viewed by women are often portrayed as gay or bisexual. For Pornhub's statisticians, this comes as no surprise" because 46.7% of gay male porn is viewed by female visitors.

Pornhub, in gathering statistics for their Year in Review (*2022*), used anonymous data collected by Google Analytics to discern where female users live and what they looked for, and prudence should be used when interpreting these data because: (1) many men could have been using women's computers to watch porn and (2) many men may have forced women to watch porn. Evidence supporting the first cautionary note is the fact that there is a major pornography gap between the amount of porn consumed by men and women in heterosexual relationships (*Johnson et al., 2019*). In fact, "there is a consistent pattern of many women being partnered with men who regularly use pornography while they report little or no use" (*Carroll et al., 2017, p.153*). Another thing we know is that, as remarked by

University of Paderborn scholar Madita Oeming, “Public discourse is normalizing the idea of female porn consumers bit by bit” (*quoted in Salihbegovic, 2020, p. 1*).

Some quantitative studies of women’s use of porn, not surprisingly, have also been conducted in other countries like Australia, Sweden, Denmark, and the Czech Republic, and they are covered in a systematic and thematic synthesis published by Litsou et al. (2021). One of the key limitations of the work they review, and of the aforementioned U.S. studies, is that most of the quantitative research done so far does not provide participants with a definition of porn and hence researchers are unable to accurately determine how respondents conceptualize porn. For instance, as Marshall and Miller (2023) remind us, in response to a question that simply asks whether someone views violent porn:

study participants may not define the pornography they view as violent, regardless of whether someone appears to be in pain in the pornography they are viewing. Thus, the questions asked about pornography use, and the perception of the questions asked, have both caused problems in understanding the true relationships between pornography use and sexual coercion. (*p. 3*)

What is more, documented by Litsou et al. (2021), is the possibility that social desirability¹ factors may encourage certain answers (*Fisher & Katz, 2000; Krumpal, 2013*). Women may report lower levels of porn consumption, and men higher levels, than is actually the case (*Carroll et al., 2017*). Further, many respondents may be reluctant to reveal that they watch violent porn.

New Empirical Directions

Quantitative research can be greatly improved by trying to differentiate between at least some classification of types of sexual imagery, to determine if consumption is more related to one type of pornography than another. Marshall and Miller (2023) have a new measure that helps achieve this goal. They constructed a porn use instrument consisting of these four domains: (1) type of pornography used, (2) sexual scripts, (3) habits, and (4) compulsivity. To measure the first domain, Marshall and Miller use 10 items assessing consumption of porn with physical aggression and humiliation, 10 items assessing the use of porn containing coercion and young people, and five items assessing the use of porn with extreme violence. Though promising, valid, and reliable, Marshall and Miller, and rightfully so, offer some words of caution about their measure: “[F]uture research is warranted to provide further evidence of the factors contained within it

¹ Social desirability is “the tendency for people to present themselves in a generally favorable fashion” (Holden & Passy, 2009, p. 441).

and the refining of the items that comprise it. Specifically, cross-validation studies and examinations of the efficacy of the instrument among more diverse populations are needed” (p. 17). Nonetheless, Marshall and Miller’s offering is an important step in the right direction because, in their words, “the need for a valid and comprehensive measure of pornography consumption is paramount” (p. 17).

Another point to ponder when examining the extant literature is that rates of disclosure might be higher if women in the studies cited here and elsewhere (e.g., *Johnson et al., 2019; Litsou et al., 2021*) were asked about their use more than once, in different ways, and at different points in the instrument (*DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1998*). DeKeseredy et al. (2021) and Smith (1987) empirically show that at the outset, some people may not reveal sensitive information but will do so if asked to complete supplementary open- or closed-ended questions.

If quantitative research on women’s and girls’ use of porn is in short supply, the same can be said about qualitative studies (*Litsou et al., 2021*). Hopefully, there will be a “new wave” of such inquiries that carefully examine the contexts, meanings, and motives of women’s use of porn. As well, there have been many studies on perceptions of, and reactions to, pornography among young women and men, but there are far fewer on how older women watch and experience porn (see *Litsou et al., 2021*), and this is another major research gap that needs to be addressed.

There is also a need for innovative alternatives to simply using cross-sectional survey research. A cross-sectional survey is a method that analyzes data across a sample population at a specific point in time and it is common in pornography research. What makes this method problematic is that while porn use typically paves the way to participation and interest in sexual relations (*Peter & Valkenburg, 2007; Ward et al., 2015; Wright, 2012*), the temporal order of variables cannot be determined (*Bridges et al., 2023*). In another publication, Marilyn Corsianos and I (see *DeKeseredy & Corsianos, 2016*) suggest moving beyond simply using this common approach to using one that employs ethnography, as well as other novel techniques like life course research,² which is described in greater detail in a previous white paper I wrote for Culture Reframed, [Understanding the Harms of Pornography: The Contributions of Social Scientific Knowledge](#) (*DeKeseredy, 2020*).

Ethnography is a field research method that many social scientists say they use but actually do not. Instead, they use observation and call it ethnography. All field researchers, however, do not use the same method of observation. Specifically, some adopt the role of non-participant observer and remain detached from the people, events, and

² Following Glen Elder (1994), the life course is defined here as “the interweave of age-graded trajectories, such as work careers and family pathways, that are subject to changing conditions and future options, and to short-term transitions ranging from leaving school to retirement” (p. 5).

processes they observe. Participant observers are researchers who actually participate, albeit in varying degrees, in the lives of the small community or group they are studying. Ethnography, on the other hand, involves being “concerned with the ‘discovery’ and description of the culture and structure of particular social groups” (*Davidson & Layder, 1994, p. 164*). Ethnographers do at least four things that observers are unlikely to do:

- They define as their goal the discovery of the values, norms, and meanings that members of a small community, village, or social group use to organize their relationships with other human beings and the environment. They also use this information to describe how different kinds of relationships (economic, political, familial, religious, legal) are interrelated to form a whole.
- Ethnographers rarely, if ever, impose their own meanings, perceptions, values, and norms on members of the communities and groups they are studying.
- They are far more likely than observers to be social cryptographers, who seek to discover the codes people use in organizing and explaining their behavior.”
- Ethnographers routinely use observation, especially participant observation, as a research tool to produce ethnographic research reports, but the opposite cannot be true because observation always precedes ethnography. (*Alvi et al., 2000, p. 26*)

There is some ethnographic work on men’s consumption of porn, such as that involving observations of men watching porn in groups (*e.g., Kimmel, 2008; Sanday, 1990*), but there are no comparable studies of women and girls. In fact, almost all the qualitative research on females’ use of porn done to date used interviews (*Litsou et al., 2021*). One salient exception is Cameron et al.’s (2005) focus group study of 14- to 17-year-old U.S. females. Most found porn sites to be repulsive and offensive to women. Most of them also said that they did not watch porn intentionally and, if they did, it did not affect their perceptions of their sexuality.

Regardless of what new empirical steps are taken in the future, it is important to embrace multiple ways of knowing and not be wedded to any particular method. Certainly, the techniques briefly suggested here constitute just the tip of the iceberg. There are many more, such as archival research, but irrespective of which piece of the pornography puzzle a researcher wants to study, they should strive for data triangulation (*Denzin, 1978*). As Denzin and Lincoln (2005) state, “The combination of multiple methodological practices, empirical materials, perspectives, and observers in a single study is best understood, then, as a strategy that adds rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth to any study. Like a civil engineer, using a variety of “sightings” for different angles makes it more likely that we will correctly understand why women consume pornography. We can also develop a better understanding of this phenomenon by crafting sound theoretical perspectives. It is to this issue that I turn to next.

Why Do Girls and Women Consume Pornography?

There are few detailed, nuanced social scientific answers to this question. Thus far, theoretical developments have not kept pace with the growing empirical literature on women's and girls' consumption of pornography. Instead, researchers have focused mainly on what Johnson et al. (2019) refer to as the associative outcomes of the relationship between porn use and women's sexual health and sexual behavior, such as the following identified in their literature review (*see pp. 1-2*):

- earlier and/or faster engagement in sexual relations;
- more permissive attitudes toward casual sex;
- an increased likelihood of engaging in risky sexual activities (e.g., using drugs or alcohol during sex) (*Brown & L'Engle., 2009; Tomaszewska & Krahe., 2018; Wright & Arroyo, 2013*);
- increased risk of sexual violence victimization (*Hald et al., 2010; Malamuth et al., 2000; Wright et al., 2016*); and
- stronger adherence to traditional gender attitudes toward heterosexual relationships. (*Wright & Bae, 2015*)

Other studies of women's pornography use reviewed by Johnson et al. (2019) and Litsou et al. (2021) generate contradictory findings. Some found that women reported positive effects, like an increased sense of sexual liberation, while others uncovered negative ones, like embarrassment and discomfort watching porn, feelings of inadequacy and lower self-esteem, and increased psychological distress.

As is often said, more research is necessary, but so is theory construction. In the words of Kurt Lewin (1951), the founder of modern social psychology, "There is nothing more practical than good theory" (p. 169). Even so, this widely-cited observation is not reflected in the women's and girls' use of porn literature. This is not to say that the field is entirely devoid of theory. There are instances, for example, of the application and testing of cognitive scripts theory, which, as Johnson et al. (2019) note, "argues that cultural scripts such as those found in the media can provide a heuristic model outlining how people should or should not think, feel, and act in response to what is happening around them" (p. 2). Still, much of the research on women's use of porn recently reviewed by Litsou et al. (2021) is stuck in the quagmire of what the late sociologist C. Wright Mills (1959) coined as abstracted empiricism (e.g., research devoid of theory). Stated differently, there is an overarching emphasis on simply gleaning quantitative data on the extent of, and factors associated with, females' use of porn.

It is now time to develop new speculative theoretical perspectives that not only explain the psychology and social psychology of women's use of porn, but that also situate this behavior "in terms of its wider structural origins" (*Taylor et al., 1973, p. 270*). In other words, researchers need to ask, "What is the broader social, political, and economic context in which women are viewing porn?" Certainly, we should turn to feminist sociological work for answers to this question and no useful ones can be provided without examining the analysis provided by Gail Dines (2010) in her path-breaking book *Pornland*. She answers the question of "Why do young women find value in porn?" She asserted that this is due, in large part, to their "internalizing porn ideology, an ideology that masquerades as advice on how to be hot, rebellious and cool in order to attract (and hopefully keep) a man." As well, the porn industry devotes much time and effort to encouraging young women today to accuse anti-porn activists of "denying them the free choice to embrace our hypersexualized porn culture" since "as rising members of the next generation's elite," they see "no limits or constraints on them as women" (*p. 100*). Swedberg (2021), one of the leading sociological advocates for speculation to be an integral part of social science research, would likely strongly concur with this observation, which draws from some of his thoughts: Like all other good speculative theories, Dines' offering is "stated clearly" and "constructed in a way that is testable in principle" (*p. 70*).

Hopefully, other researchers will follow in Dines' footsteps and test hypotheses derived from her empirically informed feminist explanation, one that is similar to some earlier feminist accounts of the gendered nature of socialization in contemporary society. Decades of sociological research show that people continuously "take in"/internalize what they see, hear, and read, and they make decisions about how they should act, think, and feel about different things. People are social creatures continuously shaped by external social forces, and given the undeniable presence and accessibility of misogynistic sexual media in our society today, we cannot ignore the ways in which these popularized, commodified images impact people's perceptions of "women," "men," sex, sexuality, violence, and relationships.

A Note on Female Pornographers

No paper on women's use of porn is complete without at least a brief examination of women who sexually objectify other women, some of whom claim to be feminist pornographers and who argue that their videos empower them and the women featured in their type of porn. These arguments about the power of porn to facilitate sexual empowerment and liberation are part of the porn industry's (female producers included) message used to groom teen girls to consume pornography. Marit Ostberg (2010) is one example of such a pornographer. Winner of the 2021 PorYes Feminist Porn Award, she insists that "feminist porn... wants to encourage people to feel sexy and to be sexual objects, but decide for themselves how, and why, and for who. Once you have that power

it is much easier to decide when you do not want to be sexual (p. 1). Similarly, Erica Lust and Naomi Salaman push hard for increased availability of pornography produced by women for women. Nonetheless, just because women make porn does not mean that it is not violent. Actually, there are more similarities than differences between porn directed by men and by women (*DeKeseredy et al., 2021*). Consider that some self-defined feminist pornographers depict women who are hog-tied while having sex that looks painful or are suspended from the ceiling while men penetrate them. They argue that many women are turned on by being submissive and therefore that needs to be respected. What also makes their work “feminist,” they claim, is that the actors perform in safe working environments and they are asked what kinds of sex they want to participate in, whereas in mainstream porn, performers are not given a choice. Also, they claim that “feminist” porn features actors who are more diverse in age, size, race, and sexual orientation than those in mainstream porn (*DeKeseredy & Corsianos, 2016*).

Gail Dines (2021), among others (e.g., *DeKeseredy et al., 2021*), does not see anything empowering in so-called feminist porn and recently made this explicit in her comparison of Netflix’s *Hot Girls Wanted: Turned On* (HGWTO) and Hulu’s *The Handmaid’s Tale*, which is based on Canadian novelist Margaret Atwood’s (1985) best-selling book. Dines’ commentary focuses on the first episode of HGWTO, which features self-defined feminist pornographer Erica Lust. Lust’s narrative mimics the above declarations about empowerment and desire, but in reality, as Dines describes:

Lust’s rather bizarre idea of a compelling “erotic” movie for women was to portray a woman pianist living out her fantasy of playing the piano naked while being “pleasured.” So Lust finds Monica, a woman who is both a pianist and willing to play out this fantasy, concocted by Lust. The problem is that Monica is new to porn and lacks any experience, while Lust hires a mainstream male porn performer, resulting in the usual degrading porn sex – pounding penetration and hair pulling included. Monica finishes the scene in obvious pain and traumatized, looking like a deer caught in the headlights of an oncoming truck. But remember, this is a “feminist” porn film, so Lust, acting all sisterly, gives Monica a big hug and a glass of water to make her feel better. And then asks her to fake an orgasm for the final scene. So much for authentic female sexuality! (p. 400)

Dines further stresses that “Lust’s duplicity would fit perfectly into the Republic of Gilead,” the fictional country featured in *The Handmaid’s Tale*, and she then refers to the Aunts who are prominent people in this series. Their job is to train the Handmaids to produce children, and they engage in a form of what the late Canadian sociologist Erving Goffman (1959) defines as impression management. This involves, in the words of Dines (2021), “manipulating and cajoling the Handmaids into believing they are on their side, by training them to fulfill their God-given roles of producing babies” (p. 401). The Handmaids get a hug if they give birth, but are physically punished with a cattle prod if they step out of line.

Gail Dines' commentary is heavily informed by Mary Daly. Daly (1978) developed the concept of token torturers, women who exonerate patriarchal men and who turn women against each other. Drawing upon this concept, Dines argues that feminist pornographers claim that they are producing erotic media for women, but are really only producing it for male pleasure. For Dines, similarly, the Aunts and their cattle prods are "front-line enforcers," but backing them up are male Guardians (security forces) who are ready to kill any woman who does not comply with Gilead's patriarchal norms and laws.

Conclusions

As male pornography consumption increases, female use increases as well (Behun & Owens, 2020). What is to be done? Some feminists such as Anna Gronau (1985) assert that porn, even its violent forms, should be freely available in private and public places because it functions to remind women of the patriarchal forces that victimize and exploit them. If it is banned, then it is much more difficult for women to struggle against hidden patriarchy than it is to fight against the blatant and extreme forms of sexism found in pornography. There are other feminists with different perspectives, like those who embrace the postmodernist³ view that pornography can be subversive and liberatory (Attwood, 2018; Williams, 1989). As well, some sex-positive feminists⁴ assert that pornography is just as important to women as it is to men, and that there is nothing inherently degrading to women about such media (McElroy, 1995; Strossen, 2000; Sullivan & McKee, 2015). The reality, however, is that porn is purposely designed to humiliate and debase women and it is thus essential to challenge these two troubling pro-porn narratives.

Within anti-porn circles, it is frequently stated that we need to educate boys and men about the harms of violent, degrading sexual imagery and literature. This line of reasoning is well-taken and many people are following suit. Still, healthy sex education is not just simply about teaching males, it also involves talking to girls and women. Drawing from therapist Donnie Van Curen, Foubert (2022) makes evident that we should begin by encouraging parents "to help their daughters build self-esteem. This entails teaching fourth- to sixth-grade girls what attachments look like and what being secure in themselves and their bodies looks like. Foubert also emphasizes the value of teaching

³ With origins mainly in France, postmodern thought has had a significant impact on many academics, especially those based in university English departments, more particularly those who specialize in literary criticism. Postmodernist thought adopts a deep skepticism about knowledge claims – statements about what is "true" and "real." Postmodernists reject claims of objectivity and challenge the modernist notion that we can harness science and logic, discover truth, and put truth to work to solve problems like violence against women (DeKeseredy, 2022).

⁴ Definitions of sex-positivity vary "but typically include positive notions of desire, demystifying sex as a taboo subject, affirmative "yes means yes" notions of consent, the acceptance of consensual sex practices different from one's own, and concern for the well-being of self and others" (Wodda & Panfill, 2021, p. 5).

young girls to be defined by their own talents, instead of by their friends. Then, as these girls progress through middle-school and into high school, parents and teachers should talk to them about the harms of consuming porn. Parents should also quickly turn to Culture Reframed for assistance. This organization offers three courses for parents and educators that can help young people build resilience and resistance to hypersexualized media and porn. More information on these free courses is available at www.culturereframed.org and I strongly encourage readers to not only examine them, but also to use them and recommend them to others. There is no time to waste. As Dines (2010) puts it, "If the culture is now one big collective perpetrator, then we can assume that an ever-increasing number of girls and women are going to develop emotional, cognitive, and sexual problems as they are socialized into seeing themselves as mere sex objects and not much else" (p. 118).

References

- Alvi, S., DeKeseredy, W. S., & Ellis, D. (2000). *Contemporary social problems in North American society*. Addison Wesley Longman.
- Attwood, F. (2018). *Sex media*. Polity.
- Atwood, M. (1985). *The handmaid's tale*. McClelland & Stewart.
- Behun, R. J., & Owens, E. W. (2020). *Youth and internet pornography: The impact and influence on adolescent development*. Routledge.
- Berger, A. S., Gagnon, J. H., & Simon, W. (1972). *Technical report of the commission on obscenity and pornography, volume IX*. U.S. Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.
- Bridges, A. J., Willis, M., Ezzell, M. B., Sun, C., Johnson, J. A., & Wright, P. J. (2023). Pornography use and sexual objectification of others. *Violence Against Women*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012231207041>
- Brown, J. D., L'Engle, K. L. (2009). X-rated: Sexual attitudes and behaviors associated with U.S. early adolescents' exposure to sexually explicit media. *Communication Research*, 36, 129-151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650208326465>
- Cameron, K., Salazar, L., Bernhardt, J., Burgess-Whitman, N., Wingood, G., & DiClemente, R. (2005). Adolescents' experience with sex on the web: Results from online focus groups. *Journal of Adolescence*, 28, 535-540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2004.10.006>
- Carroll, J. S., Busby, D. M., Willoughby, B. J., & Brown, C. C. (2017). The porn gap: Differences in men's and women's pornography patterns in couple relationships. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 16(2), 146-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332691.2016.1238796>
- Corsianos, M. (2007). Mainstream pornography and "women": *Questioning sexual agency*. *Critical Sociology*, 33(5-6), 863-885. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156916307x230359>
- Daly, M. (1978). *Gyn/ecology: The metaethics of radical feminism*. Beacon Press.
- Davidson, J. O., & Layder, D. (1994). *Ethnography and qualitative analysis*. Routledge.
- de Beauvoir, S. (1949). *The second sex*. Vintage.

- DeKeseredy, W. S. (2020). *Understanding the harms of pornography: The contributions of social scientific knowledge*. Culture Reframed. https://culturereframed.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/CR_Harms_of_Porn_Report_2020.pdf
- DeKeseredy, W. S. (2022). *Contemporary critical criminology* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Corsianos, M. (2016). *Violence against women in pornography*. Routledge.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., DeKeseredy, A., & DeKeseredy, P. (2021). Understanding *The Handmaid's Tale*: The contribution of radical feminism. In J. A. Grubb & C. Posick (Eds.), *Crime TV: Streaming criminology in popular culture* (pp. 82-95). New York University Press.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (1998). *Woman abuse on campus: Results from the Canadian national survey*. Sage.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., Stoneberg, D. M., Nolan, J., & Lory, G. L. (2021). Improving the quality of survey data on college campus woman abuse: The Contribution of a supplementary open-ended question. *Violence Against Women*, 27(12-13), 2477-2490. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801220975496>
- Denzin, N. (1978). *The research act*. McGraw-Hill.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., 1-32). Sage.
- Dines, G. (2010). *Pornland: How porn has hijacked our sexuality*. Beacon Press.
- Dines, G. (2021). *The Handmaid's Tale* offers a terrifying warning, but the hijacking of feminism is just as dangerous. In E. Miller (Ed.), *Spinning and weaving: Radical feminism for the 21st century* (pp. 399-403). Tidal Time Publishing, LLC.
- Elder, G. H. (1994). Time, human agency, and social change. Perspectives on the life course. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57, 4-15. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786971>
- Fisher, R. J., & Katz, J. E. (2000). Social desirability bias and the validity of self-reported values. *Psychology and Marketing*, 17(2), 105-120. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1520-6793\(200002\)17:2%3C105::aid-mar3%3E3.0.co;2-9](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1520-6793(200002)17:2%3C105::aid-mar3%3E3.0.co;2-9)
- Foubert, J. D. (2022). *Protecting your children from internet pornography: Understanding the risks, and ways to protect your kids*. Northfield Publishing.

- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Double-Day.
- Gronau, A. (1985). Women and images: Feminist analysis of pornography. In C. Vance & V. Burstyn (Eds.), *Women against censorship* (pp. 127-155). Douglas and McIntyre.
- Hald, G. M., Malamuth, N. M., & Yuen, C. (2010). Pornography and attitudes supporting violence against women: Revisiting the relationship in nonexperimental studies. *Aggressive Behavior*, 36(1), 14-20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20328>
- Herbenick, D., Bowling, J., Fu, T., Dodge, B., Guerra-Reyes, L., & Saunders, S. (2017). Sexual diversity in the United States: Results from a nationally representative probability sample of adult women and men. *PLoS ONE*, 12(7). <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0181198>
- Holden, R. R., & Passey, J. (2009). Social desirability. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 441-454). The Guilford Press.
- Johnson, J. A., Ezzell, M. B., Bridges, A. J., & Sun, C. (2019). Pornography and heterosexual women's intimate experiences with a partner. *Journal of Women's Health*, 28(9). <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2018.7006>
- Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland*. HarperCollins.
- Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability in sensitive surveys: A literature review. *Quality & Quantity*, 47(4), 2025-2047. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-011-9640-9>
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers*. Harper and Row.
- Litsou, K., Graham, C., & Ingham, R. (2021). Women in relationships and their pornography use: A systematic review and thematic synthesis. *Journal Sex and Marital Therapy*, 47(4), 381-413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623x.2021.1885532>
- Malamuth, N. M., Addison, T., & Koss, M. P. (2000). Pornography and sexual aggression: Are their reliable effects and can we understand them. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 11, 26-91.
- Marshall, E. A., & Miller, H. A. (2023). Psychometric evaluation of initial domains on the comprehensive assessment of pornography tool. *Violence Against Women*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012231205583>
- McElroy, W. (1995). *XXX: A woman's right to pornography*. St. Martin's Press.

Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. Oxford University Press.

National Center on Sexual Exploitation. (2022). What do we know about pornography use among women? <https://endsexualexploitation.org/articles/what-do-we-know-about-pornography-use-among-women/>

Ostberg, M. (August 27, 2010). Vi behover fler kata kvinnor i offentligheten. *Newsmill*. www.newsmill.se/artikel/2009/08/27/vi-behover-fler-kata-kvinnor-i-offenligheten?page=1

Peter, J., & Valkenberg, P. M. (2007). Adolescents' exposure to a sexualized media environment and their notions of women as sex objects. *Sex Roles*, 56(5-6), 381-395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9176-y>

Pornhub. (2023). The 2022 year in review. <https://www.pornhub.com/insights/2022-year-in-review#gender-demographics>

Salihbegovic, A. S. (2020). Women watch porn, too – but why? *DW.Com*. <https://www.dw.com/en/women-watch-porn-too-but-why/a-55710197>

Sanday, P. R. (1990). *Fraternity gang rape*. New York University Press.

Schwartz, M. D., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (1998). Pornography and the abuse of Canadian women in dating relationships. *Humanity & Society*, 22(2), 137-154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016059769802200202>

Smith, M. D. (1987). The incidence and prevalence of woman abuse in Toronto. *Violence and Victims*, 2(3), 173-187. PMID: 3154164.

Solano, I., Eaton, N. R., & O'Leary, K. D. (2020). Pornography consumption, modality and function in a large internet sample. *Journal of Sex Research*, 57(1), 92-103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2018.1532488>

Strossen, N. (2000). *Defending pornography: Free speech, sex and the fight for women's rights*. New York University Press.

Sullivan, R., & McKee, A. (2015). *Pornography: Structures, agency and performance*. Polity.

Swedberg, R. (2021). Does speculation belong in social science research? *Sociological Methods & Research*, 50(1), 45-74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124118769092>

- Taylor, I., Walton, P., & Young, J. (1973). *The new criminology: For a social theory of deviance*. Routledge.
- Tomaszewska, P., & Krahe, B. (2018). Predictors of sexual aggression victimization and perpetration among Polish university students: A longitudinal study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 47*, 493-505. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-016-0823-2>
- Ward, L. M., Vandenbosch, L., & Eggermont, S. (2015). The impact of men's magazines on adolescent boys' objectification and courtship beliefs. *Journal of Adolescence, 39*(1), 49-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.12.004>
- Williams, L. (1989). *Hard core: Power, pleasure and the "frenzy of the visible."* University of California Press.
- Wodda, A., & Panfil, V. R. (2021). *Sex-positive criminology*. Routledge.
- Wright, P. J. (2012). A longitudinal analysis of U.S. adults' pornography exposure: Sexual socialization, selective exposure, and the moderating role of unhappiness. *Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications, 24*(2), 67-76. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000063>
- Wright, P. J., & Arroyo, A. (2013). Internet pornography and U.S. women's sexual behavior: Results from a national sample. *Mass Communication and Society, 16*(5), 617-638. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2012.754045>
- Wright, P. J., & Bae, S. (2015). A national prospective study of pornography consumption and gendered attitudes toward women. *Sexuality & Culture, 19*, 444-463. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-014-9264-z>
- Wright, P. J., Tokunaga, R. S., & Kraus, A. (2016). A meta-analysis of pornography consumption and actual acts of sexual aggression in general population studies. *Journal of Communication, 66*(1), 183-205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12201>