The moderating effect of a same-sex preference on the amount of online harassment received by women on dating apps

P. Kok (6293727)

Supervisor: L. Mandemakers

Second examiner: J. Slabbekoorn

Sociology Department – Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences

Utrecht University, Netherlands

Abstract: The aim of this research is to examine the reason for online aggressive behaviour from men to women on dating apps. This is done by analysing the moderating effect of a same-sex preference for women on the amount of harassment received. By using theories on misogyny and the specific characteristics of online communication a framework was created that explains the online harassment of heterosexual women on dating apps. Making use of data from the American Trends Panel wave 56 provided by the Pew Research Center, logistic and linear regressions were used to compare the amount of harassment received between heterosexual and lesbian women. It was found that inter-sex aggression was indeed prevalent on online dating sites and misogyny and male sexual scripts are suggested as main causes.

Introduction

Since the beginning of time courting rituals have performed by humans in order find a suitable mate and one-day have children (Finkel, Eastwick, Karney & et alia, 2012). In the past, this courting ritual included men and women 'getting out there' to find a suitable mate, nowadays, using the internet 'love is just one swipe away'. This new form of courting ritual starts out with a search on the online meat market and if found desirable by both sides, a witty one-liner is used to break the ice. This is followed by an online conversation that eventually leads to a date on which people fall in love and live happily ever after. Anyway, this is how developers of dating apps such as Tinder, Grinder, okcupid and happn intended their platforms to be used (Tinder, 2021) (Grinder, 2021) (Okcupid, 2021) (Happn, 2021). These apps are intended to give a new dimension to dating, a new way of meeting people for all kinds of romantic relationships.

Research by the PEW research centre indicates that roughly 3 out of 10 Americans are using dating apps of which 39% have formed a meaningful connection with someone they met online, meaning they have married or have been in a committed relationship. Majorities of these online daters say that e-dating has been a positive solution for them to find people they find physically attractive, share the same interests with and who seem like they want to meet in person. Couch & Liamputtong (2008) found out that online dating sites are indeed used to meet new people and assess these people and their potential for romantic or sexual outcomes. Hergovich and Ortéga (2017) even argue that dating complete strangers increases social integration and makes it more likely that people will form committed romantic relationships with people that are unlike themselves. An example of this is that due to the increased use of dating apps more interracial marriages happen. According to the PEW research data the general experience of these e-daters has been positive and they emphasized that their dating pool has expanded significantly thanks to online dating (Anderson, Vogels & Turner, 2020). This could suggest that e-dating really does have a positive influence on the dating lives of these people.

All these apparent positive implications are counterbalanced by a slew of negative consequences. Kee and Yazdanifard (2015) found out that dating apps are full of deception, thus people pretending they are something they are not and that dating apps are ripe with racial prejudice. On top of that they considered e-dating to be promoting short lived relationships and to be a threat to marriage. They also state that e-dating increases the risk of sexually transmitted diseases, romantic scam and privacy breach.

As Tetiktok, Ozer, Cakir and others state ' *In all countries worldwide violence is a problem for women of all ages*' (p. 156) (2016). Women of all age groups experience sexual, physical and emotional violence. In some parts of the world more than others, but women are still the victim of many forms of domestic abuse. The problem of violence towards women is not just restricted to the household however. In all aspects of life women face sexual, physical and emotional violence more than men, even on the dating market (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001 ; Sheskin & Barak, 1997). Incidences of date rape and other forms of dating violence are prevalent among young women (Bergman, 1992). This harassment of women seems to extend to online contexts as well. The study by Anderson, Vogel and Turner (2020) found out that 6 out of 10 young women experienced some form of harassment while on dating apps. In all researched categories of harassment on dating apps, women seem to experience significant amount of harassment, especially in the age category of 18-34 (Anderson, Vogels & Turner, 2020). Instances of these forms of harassment are usually of a sexual nature. I won't be giving any examples here, but one just has to give a quick glance on the Instagram account of @tindernightmares to get an indication of the general abhorrent behaviour that is displayed towards women on dating apps. These comments range from mildly suggestive messages to outright rape threats. It is not just cringey one-liners however. Some Tinder users resort to sending dick-pics, an unsolicited photo of the male reproductive organ sent to a female love interest (Paasonen, Light, Jarret, 2019).

The addition of the internet to the dating world has opened up more possibilities to harass women while dating. This is due the specific characteristics of the main form of communication on dating apps; Computer Mediated Communication (CMC for short) (Herring, 2004 ; Wright & Webb, 2011, David & Cambre, 2016 ; Ritter, 2014). The specific characteristics of CMC open up avenues for all kinds of pleasant online interactions as well as negative online interactions such as harassment (Ritter, 2014 ; Thompson, 2018). Characteristic to CMC is that it enables users to synchronously talk to others while not being face to face with the other person and so communicate somewhat anonymously (Barak, 2005 ; Herring, 2004). More typical characteristics of CMC are invisibility, lack of eye contact and an option of an easy escape (Barak, 2005 ; Suler, 2004). All these factors are characteristic to CMC and powerful factors in changing ones online behaviour compared to ones offline behaviour (Herring, 2004 ; Suler, 2004). Since CMC can have an enormous influence on one's online behaviour and is the main form of communication while online dating and as such it could be key in explaining harassment of women while online dating.

Research has been done on the harassment of women in the offline world and research has been done the effects of online communication on the behaviour in the online world. There has been no research yet on the relationship between the effects of communication in an online context on inter-sex aggression. The online harassment of women could be the continuation of the offline aggression towards women, but in a new, online manifestation. This thesis aims to discern the root of the online harassment of women and see if there is case of aggression from men to women. Assessing if there is indeed case of inter-sex aggression can be done by analysing the differences in harassment received between women with an other-sex and women with same-sex preference. This thesis aims to analyse the extent to which sexual preference plays a part in the amount of harassment received for women. Lesbian women are attracted to other women and as such, inter-sex aggression cannot be the reason for harassment among lesbian women. This is conceptualised in this way: If women with same-sex preference receive less harassment than women with an other-sex preference, than I can conclude that inter-sex aggression is indeed the root cause of these aggressive behaviour. However, if women with a same-sex preference receive more harassment than people with other-sex preference, the problem could be somewhere else. While answering the main research question, this thesis also analyses the reasons behind intra-sex aggression on dating apps. This is especially interesting since almost half of the LGBTQ+ community is using dating apps (Anderson, Vogel & Turner, 2020). When compared to the extensive research that has been done on the topic of online harassment between heterosexual people on dating apps, much less has been done on the topic of the online harassment of non-heterosexual people on dating apps. At least 3,4% of the people in the United States identify as some form of LGBTQ+ and it seems to be a gap in current research to not analyse the rate of online harassment on dating apps for these people. The main focus of this paper is the possible moderating effect of a same-sex preference on the harassment received by women on dating apps and while doing this, it also analyses the harassment among people with a same-sex preference. This brings us to the research question:

"To what extent do women receive more online harrasment than men? And to what extent is this weaker for same sex preference?"

Theory

Misogyny

The first step in this thesis' hypothesis is examing the effect of sex on the amount of online harassment received and this is done by explaining an important aspect of inter-sex aggression, misogyny. An explanation for the rude behaviour of men directed towards women is what Banet-Weiser calls 'Popular misogyny' (2018). Popular Misogyny as she describes is a reaction to the success of feminist movements in the public discourse. She calls this Popular Feminism and it is the feminist struggle for equality and emancipation in popular culture (Banet-Weiser, 2018). Popular Misogyny is a reaction to success of Popular Feminism and these two are battling it out in popular discourse. The logic of Popular misogyny understands the feminist struggle for equality between men and women to be a zero-sum game. According to this logic, every gain made by women in their feminist struggle for equality is a loss to men. Since Popular Feminism is gaining ground in the popular discourse, the feeling of having 'lost' to women increases the feeling of victimhood amongst men. This feeling of victimhood makes men hostile towards women that have supposedly taken something from them. So the feeling of Popular Misogyny can best be described as men's anger towards women who have supposedly taken something from men (Banet-Weiser, 2018 ; Marwick & Caplan, 2018 ; Thompson, 2018 ; Towers, 2020).

Women are responding to this aggression towards them in a number of ways, but there is no man-hate in this same way as misogyny is woman-hate (Anderson, Kanner & Elsayegh, 2009). It is a clear part of misogyny to frame women with feminist ideals as man-haters however. This is a part of the narrative of Popular Misogyny but as explained by Anderson, Kanner and Elsayegh (2009) there is no more hate towards men between women with feminist ideals and women that do not have these ideals.

The nature of online dating

'Social and mobile media have reshaped the communication landscape' (2017) (p.1233) as Vitak et alia found out in their study on online harassment of women, the introduction of social and mobile media have had a prfound impact on the way we communicate with each other. In the workplace, at school as well as for romantic pursuits '*Our experiences using technology to connect and interact with others are being significantly shaped by the sociotechnical affordances of these platforms*' (p.1233) (Vitak, Chadha, Steiner, Ashktorab, 2017). One of the affordances of these new platforms is anonymity and this is a key contributor to the rude behaviour on dating apps. This anonymity is enforcing the so-

called *online disinhibition effect* (Suler, 2004). Suler found out that due to the anonymous nature of online communication people act less inhibited than the way they would in real life. This is because people disassociate their online actions from their offline persona and as such feel less responsible for the harm they are causing others while behaving rudely online. People can even go as far as stating that those online behaviours 'Aren't me at all'. To make matters worse, anyone can make an account on any dating app and use whichever name and photos they like. Most people will be using their own pictures and present them as themselves. People with malicious intent however could be using someone else's pictures and presenting them as someone they are not. On the net '*Others only know what a person tells them*' (p.322) (Suler, 2004), a clear sign of anonymity. The direct messaging feature dating apps use enables users to contact other users without meeting them in real life, which makes the perpetrator not having to worry about the real life consequences of his or her actions (Irby, 2018 ; David & Cambre, 2016). In this way, dating apps are providing a technological shield that enables the perpetrator to harass their victims almost uncontested (Zweig, Dank, Yahner, Lachman, 2013 ; Wolak, Mithell, Finkelhor, 2007). Furthermore, the text-based communication on dating apps, makes the person in conversation invisible to each other. This 'physical invisibility' amplifies the disinhibition effect, since they cannot see the dis- or approval of their conversation partner and as such makes them act less inhibited (Suler, 2004). In the case of dating apps this can go from proclaiming love at first swipe, or calling a woman a whore after she rejects a man's advances. On top of that, the invisible nature of the text-based contact on dating apps allows for an easy escape (Suler, 2004). One could put their disinhibited views, opinions 'out there' and then close the app, not having to deal with real life consequences let alone the online consequences (Lapidot-Lefer & Barak, 2012).

Whereas online communication provides a technological shield for men to harass women without consequence, the same online communication gives women the option to counter this harassment. It is not that women are purely victims of misogyny, they are acting against it but not in the same hateful way men are. As explained by the study of Hess and Flores (2016) women are responding to online hate not with hate, but more in a calm and counter-disciplining way. They do this by exposing rude behaviour of men on dating apps on interpersonal, physical and networked spaces and by making the perpetrators object of shame on different types of media. Instead of promoting hate towards men, women are using sarcasm and humour to ridicule these rude men (Ringrose & Lawrence, 2018).

Dating apps as equalizing tool

As seen by many feminist scholars, dating apps are places with toxic masculinity and act as a breeding ground for misogynistic practices (Sales, 2015 ; Shield, 2017 ; Kupers, 2005 ; Hess & Flores, 2017 ; Thompson, 2018). Human sexual behaviour is formed through sexual scripts as described by Gagnon and Simon (2017). These scripts can be seen as an operating syntax for social life and can be compared to a speech needing language. These scripts create discourses around the 'right' behaviour around sexuality in a society. Discourses influence our thought and feelings about subjects such as sexuality, feminity and masculinity. All men and women adhere to these socially constructed scripts and discourses and as such these shape our beliefs around sexuality. Since there are obvious biological differences between men and women, there are different sexual scripts for men and women. Men and women do not adhere to these scripts out of just biological differences, these scripts are socially enforced as well. Most of these gendered discourses are male dominated which leads to ambivalence about women's sexuality and this can quickly evolve into toxic masculinity (APA, 2018).

An instance of different sexual scripts that are imbued with toxic masculinity is the issue of 'Coolness'. This Coolness is a gendered code of conduct that defines what is cool and acceptable for men and women in regards to sexual acts (Lee, 2019). In the contemporary hookup discourse, it is considered cool for men to have had many sexual partners. Poignant in this discourse is that what is cool for men, is not cool for women. On the one hand men are pressuring women to have sex with them and be considered cool along the rule of coolness, while on the other hand having contempt for women that do engage in sexual acts the way men are doing and then consider them uncool (Lee, 2019). This coolness is a double standard in today's society and due to gendered nature of coolness, hookup culture is more accessible for men than for women.

However dating apps are enabling women to partake in this hookup culture the same way men are doing and attack this double standard. Dating apps can be seen as a tool for women to establish their own rules of coolness and partake in this hookup culture on their own terms (Brander, n.d ; Chan, 2018). This 'female attack' on the status-quo is perceived by men as an attack on themselves and their hegemonic masculine discourse. In this discourse men are the ones that should be 'chasing' women not the other way around (Hanson, 2021 ; Lee, 2019). This change in the status-quo, according to the zero-sum game logic of popular misogyny, gives men the feeling that they have lost something to women and this makes them aggressive towards women that are using dating apps.

On top of that the 'loss of agency' by men, dating apps are making it easier for women to pick and choose the men they are interested in and disregard the ones they don't like. By doing this women are accumulating agency for themselves and according to the logic of Popular Misogyny, are taking it away from men as well. This can be in favour of some men but this will also be disadvantageous to others. Women picking one man over the other can lead to feelings of missing out for the other man and this can eventually lead to feelings of hatred towards women as well (Conley, 2020 ; Hoffman, Ware & Shapiro, 2020).

Since dating apps can be seen as such an effective way for women to make their own rules and choices and gain access to hookup culture, women on dating apps are making men feel as if they lost their monopoly on access to hookup culture and thus increase the feeling of Popular Misogyny.

Dating apps and intersex aggression
The combination of misogyny aggravated by women's use of dating apps exacerbating the already existing feelings of loss amongst men amplified by disinhibition effect of online communication leads to harassment of women on dating apps by men leads me to formulate the following hypothesis:

Women receive more online harassment than men

Male sexual scripts
An important cause of comparatively more harassment of women on dating apps are the contents of the male sexual scripts. According to Gagnon & Simon (2017) both men and women adhere to gendered sexual scripts that define their views regarding sexual behaviour. These scripts are internalized at a young age and continue to be internalized throughout the lifecycle (Simon & Gagnon, 2017). These internalized sexual scripts are putting enormous pressure on men to adhere to their masculine sexual stereotypes, men feel obliged to conform to these gender roles and perform these sexual scripts. Examples of these sexual scripts are found by Mankayi (2008) who found that an important part of the masculine sexual image is that men have to be sexually dominant and assertive. Nimbi et alia (2020) found out that around the world a considerable part in the construction of male sexuality is the reporting of a high libido. For men in order to conform to their internalized masculine stereotype, they have to be assertive and dominant while pursuing their sexual desires and always be on the lookout for their next sexual partner. The internalized masculine sexual scripts and the pressure that is

felt to conform to these leads men to be more active in pursuing their sexual desires. This could lead to them sending unsolicited pictures, keeping in contact with the woman after her declination and frustration and anger after her declination.

Male sexual scripts are not the only reason for the comparatively higher amount of harassment of women. A significant body of research dedicated to the rate of sexual desire in males and the difference between male and female sexual desire (Nimbi, Tripodi, Rossi, a.o 2020). In the National Health and Social Life Survey it is cited that men are more interested in sex, want a higher frequency of sexual exchange and are more likely to have casual sex than women (Lauman, 2000). Testosterone is thought to be one of the main factors of this difference (van Anders, 2012). By saying this, men can be seen as the ones who are more interested in sex when compared to women. The content of their sexual scripts make it more socially acceptable for men to pursue their carnal desires born out of their high amount of testosterone.

The internalized male sexual scripts are resulting in harassment of women and are a key factor in explaining the online harassment of women. Misogyny, the disinhibition effect and male sexual scripts and are key factors in explaining online harassment of women. However, people with a same-sex preference are on a dating site looking for people of the same sex. As such, inter-sex aggression with a base of misogyny does not apply to them. So for people that have a same-sex preference and are making use of dating apps, the following hypothesis applies:

People with a same sex preference receive less online harassment than people with other-sex preference

Online harassment among lesbian women

For the next step in our hypothesis this thesis looks at the t amounts of online harassment of lesbian women. In the final step of our hypothesis we will analyse the how's and why's of aggression amongst lesbian women. Lesbian women, ofcourse, are attracted to other women. This means that there are two women that are having contact on a dating app. This means there are two persons that are comparatively less interested in sex than men due to comparatively lower levels of testosterone. This means that the chance for either one on the app to express their sexual desires is lower than for men. Furthermore, women are just as prone to sexual scripts as men are, albeit in a different, more passive way. Where male sexual script pushes to be dominant and assertive in pursuit of their gender scripts, the female sexual

script is more of a sexually passive and reluctant one (Denov, 2003). Female sexual script includes not initiating sex and not indicating sexual interest, whereas male sexual script includes the opposite (Byers & O'Sullivan, 1998).

Lesbian women, not being victim of misogyny or male sexual scripts and having female sexual scripts which centre on sexual passivity and lower levels of testosterone leads me to the final hypothesis:

Women with same-sex preference receive less online harassment than women with an other-sex preference

Methods

This analysis is a quantitative research of data gathered on behalf of the PEW Research Centre. This centre has been organising the American Trends Panel survey in different waves, starting in 2014. The ATP is a series of probability based, self-administered online questionnaires, distributed to a nationally representative sample in the United States. The language of the surveys is in English and Spanish. The members of the panel were invited by means of a nationwide cellphone and landline random-digit-dial survey in three recruitment waves and one national address-based sample survey. Panellists that accepted the invitation were asked to complete an initial demographic survey for sampling and weighting purposes. For those members of the panel that do not have an internet connection or are participating via mail are provided with a tablet with internet connection.

This analysis will be using data of wave 56 of the ATP which was conducted from October 16, 2019 to October 28, 2019. Prior to wave 56, the panel consisted of 9,942 members, of which eventually 4,860 completed the survey, 48,8%. The survey was launched by mail, email and SMS message and up to three reminders were sent if the survey had not yet been completed. All members were above the age of 18 and are subdivided into 6 age groups (18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65+). Post-paid incentives of $20 were offered to panellists who completed the survey in Spanish and to those who were using a ATP provided tablet. Panellists who were between the ages of 18 and 29, of African-American or Hispanic heritage were offered a $10 post-paid incentive in the form of a gift card. The differences in incentives were designed to increase participation of groups that have a traditionally low response rate.

The data collected in Wave 56 contains all necessary information to answer the research question. Wave 56 of the ATP asked the participants' opinions and experiences

while online dating, the participants' sexual preference and gender and relationship status of the respondent, making the data of this survey suitable for this analysis.

Participants

Of all the participants in the survey (N=4,860), 2,704 were in some kind of romantic committed relationships, it was necessary to only use people that are in some kind of romantic relationship, because out of their sex and that of their partner I was able to deduce their sexual preference. Out of all the respondents that are in some kind of romantic relationship, 998 of them have used a dating app in the past. After filtering the 4,860 respondents of ATP wave 56 on having some kind of romantic relationship and having used a dating app in the past, I arrived at the sample size of 998 respondents. The control variables used were AGECAT, GHOSTED and GENEXP. Some of these had missing values that reduced the sample size even further. So, after computing a NOMISS variable to filter out the respondents that had a missing value on any variable to be included into the analysis, the final sample size was 985 respondents.

Partner

In the analysis I only included the respondents that are in any sort of committed relationship with a partner. I chose to only use these respondents because in order to deduce the sexual preference of the respondents I have to know their own sex and that of their partner. In order to only include those people, I recoded the variables MARITAL_W56, MARITAL2_W56 and CASUAL_W56 into the new variables PARTNER and PARTNER2 and PARTNER3. The variable MARITAL_W56 asked about the marital status of the respondent. If the answer was a 1 or a 2 the respondents would get a 1 on the new variable PARTNER (indicating they are married or living together) and the other answers were recoded as 0. MARITAL2_W56 asked the status of commitment of the respondent, so if they are in a committed romantic relationship or not. If the answer was positive, score 1, they gained the score of 1 on the new variable PARTNER2 otherwise they gained the score 0 on the same variable. The variable CASUAL asked about the status of casual relationships of the respondent. If the answer was positive, they gained the score 1 on the new variable PARTNER3. If the answer was negative, they gained a 0 on the new variable. Afterwards, to only include those who have a relationship, the SELECT IF command was used. If the scores for PARTNER, PARTNER2 or PARTNER3 were 1, the respondents were included in the analysis.

Sex & sexual preference

There is no question asking the gender of the respondent, but we can construct this variable out of the question about the partner's sex and their sexual orientation. These are represented by the variables in the original data as PARTNERSEX_W56 and ORIENTATIONMOD_W56. First, ORIENTATIONMOD_W56 was recoded into the new variabel SEXPREF, which has 2 values, 0 indicating an other-sex preference and 1 indicating a same-sex preference. In order to discern the orientation as well as the sex of the respondent, this information was combined with the variable PARTNERSEX_W56 in the new variable ORIENTATION. The variable PARTNERSEX defines the sex of the partner of the respondent and this information was used to define the sex of the respondent. The new variable ORIENTATION had 4 values, 0 indicating that the respondent was a heterosexual woman, 1 indicating a heterosexual man, 2 indicating a homosexual man and 3 indicating a lesbian woman.

If a respondent scored a 0 on the variable SEXPREF (indicating other-sex preference) and a 1 on the variable PARTNERSEX_W56 (indicating a male partner), we can deduce that the respondent is a heterosexual women, gaining the score of 1 on the new variable ORIENTATION.

If a respondent scored a 0 on the variable SEXPREF (indicating other-sex preference) and a 2 on the variable PARTNERSEX_W56 (indicating a female partner), we can deduce that the respondent is a heterosexual man, gaining the score of 1 on the new variable ORIENTATION.

If a respondent scored a 1 on the variable SEXPREF (indicating same-sex preference) and a 1 on the variable PARTNERSEX_W56 (indicating a male partner), we can deduce that the respondent is a homosexual man, gaining the score of 2 on the new variable ORIENTATION.

If a respondent scored a 1 on the variable SEXPREF (indicating other-sex preference) and a 2 on the variable PARTNERSEX_W56 (indicating a male partner), we can deduce that the respondent is a lesbian woman, gaining the score of 3 on the new variable ORIENTATION.

This information was then finally recoded in the sex of the respondent in the new variable SEX. If a respondent scored a 0 or a 3 on the new variable ORIENTATION, they gained the score of 1 on the variable SEX, indicating they are women. But if they scored either a 1 or a 2, this indicates that they are men and then they gained the score 0 on the variable SEX.

Online harassment

In order to get an indication of the amount of online harassment experienced by the respondents I constructed the new variable EHARASS out of the variable ONHARASS_W56. This question asks the respondent if they have ever received any of four forms of online harassment. This includes getting called an offensive name via the chat function on the app, getting threatened to be physically harmed, receiving sexually explicit messages or texts that were not asked for and continued to be contacted by the perpetrator after stating that the victim was not interested anymore. The question was split up into 4 different variables; ONHARASS.A_W56, ONHARASS.B_W56, ONHARASS.C_W56 and ONHARASS.D_W56, all these variables had 3 different scores, 1 indicating the type of harassment has happened to the respondent, 2 indicating it has not happened to the respondent and 99, indicating a refusal to answer.

The old variables were recoded into new ones: ONHARASSA, indicating if the respondent has been called an offensive name through the chat function of the app or not. ONHARASSB, indicating if the respondent has received threats of physical harm or not. ONHARASSC, indicating if the person has received unsolicited pictures of a sexual nature and ONHARASSD, indicating if the person has received messages from the perpetrator after the victim has stated that they were not interested. These variables were dichotomous and the same as the previous variables but in these new ones the refusing respondents were left out. A score of 0 on the new variables indicated never having experienced this type of harassment and a 1 indicated the respondent did experience this form of harassment.

To measure the amount of types of online harassment received, the new variable EHARASS is constructed as a continuous variable out of the variables ONHARASSA, ONHARASSB, ONHARASSC and ONHARASSD. The COUNT command was used to count the times the variables were answered positively by the respondents. As such, the variable EHARASS has 5 values. 0 indicating none of the different forms of harassment have been experienced, 1 indicating any 1 form of harassment has been experienced, 2 indicating any 2 type of online harassment and so on. This is done so I can count the instances of any form of online aggressive behaviour, without making distinctions which type the online harassment was.

To measure if the respondents have ever received any of the types of harassment, the slightly modified variable EHARASS1 was computed. This was a dichotomized variable of

the previous variable EHARASS, with a 0 indicating none of the types of harassment received and 1 indicating any one or more of the types of harassment received.

Control variables

To test whether the initial effect of sexual preference on e-harassment holds up if more variables are added, the variables ONEXPGEN_W56 and ONGHOST_W56 were used. ONEXPGEN_W56 describes the general experience of the respondent on dating apps and the variable ONGHOST_W56, which indicates whether the person has been ghosted on a dating app. Ghosting is the act of at first having a digital conversation with someone and then eventually the other person stops responding, dissolving their potential relationship (Timmermans, Herman & Opree, 2020). The variable ONEXPGEN_W56, which has 4 values, 1 being a very good general experience, 2 being a somewhat good general experience, 3 a somewhat bad general experience and 4 a very bad general experience was recoded into the new variable GENEXP with 2 values, indicating either a good (0) or bad (1) general experience on dating apps. The variable ONGHOST_W56 was also recoded into a dichotomous variable, GHOSTED, leaving out the missings and indicating if the person has ever been ghosted (1) or not (0). These two new variables indicate an eventual bothersome experience of the respondent on dating apps. The bothersome experiences that a person has had on dating apps can lead a person to be rude to the people he or she will meet in the future on dating apps. A negative experience, through ghosting or any other form of negative experience on dating apps and the anger felt after the fact is not linked to any sex or sexuality. Whether one is gay, straight, a man or a women, having a nasty experience on a dating app can lead to being rude to other dating app users (Stoiescu, 2019 ; LeFebvre, Allen, Rasner & others, 2019 ; Weinstock & Wissman, 2004).

Furthermore, the control variable of AGECAT was used. On the one hand, one could conclude that the amount of e-harassment would go down with a higher age, simply because people of an older age are less tech savvy than the youth, and thus are less inclined to using dating apps, leading to less harassment among older age groups (Jaeger, 2004). So in this way I expected the amount of e-harassment to go down if the age goes up. Gutman, in his 2012 study, described the various forms of inter-elderly mistreatment based on the loss of agency and functional capacity such as loss of financial capacity, a loss of mobility, loss of driving and a greater dependence on others. In instances where this loss of functional capacity is especially observable, he explained that the harassment amongst elders that have different levels of functional capacity was especially bad (Gutman, 2012). This variable indicates the

age of the respondents divided into 5 categories, of which one (99) was recoded into missing since it mentioned the respondent not knowing their age. The other age groups were 18-29, 30-49, 50-64 and 65+. On dating apps, these differences between elders, or maybe between elderly and the younger if that is their preference, can become more prevalent leading to more harassment. The sex and sexual preference of the elders does not matter, since sex and sexual preference does not have an influence on the rate of bodily deterioration.

Analytical strategy

After creating the required variables the actual data analysis was performed. To test hypothesis 1 and see what kind of relationship being a women would have with ever having received harassment I performed a logistic regression with the dichotomized variable on online harassment as independent variable. Sex and sexual preference were used as independent variables and age, being ghosted or not and the general experience on dating apps as controlling variables. Furthermore, this regression also tested hypothesis 2 to see whether a same-sex preference would be have a negative relation to ever having received harassment. To test hypothesis 3, I created a moderating variable that interacted being a women and having a same-sex preference. This variable was included in model 3 of the regression. This was done to see if this interaction between sex and a same-sex preference would weaken the otherwise positive effect of being a women on ever having received harassment.

To further test the hypotheses and elaborate on the effect of sex and sexual preference on the amount of different types of harassment received, I performed a multiple linear regression, but this time with variable that described the sum of the different types of harassment received per respondent as dependent variable. The other variables in the regression were the same as above. To further expand on hypothesis 3, the interaction variable was added into model 3 of this regression as well. This was done to test the moderating effect of a same-sex preference for women on the amount of different types of harassment received.

To even further test hypothesis 1 and 2, a logistic regression per each specific type of harassment were performed. This was done to see if the sex and sexual preference of the person would have an effect on the type of harassment received and see if there were differences between men and women of different sexual preferences on specific types of harassment received. To further elaborate on hypothesis 3, and see of the moderating effect of same-sex preference for women would have a weakening effect on any specific type of

harassment received, the interaction variable was included in the final model of each logistic regression.

Results

Descriptive statistics

In table 1 below the descriptive statistics of all variables are displayed. Here is shown that the mean of the sex and sexual preference of the respondent is below less than half of the sample, which indicates that the majority of the people that participated in the survey are male and have an other-sex preference. Furthermore, the mean age of the respondents seemed to be in category 2, indicating that the mean age of the respondents was somewhere between 25 and 34. The mean amount of harassment received is 1,13, indicating that the mean amount of harassment received is any one of the types of harassment. This seems in line with the general experience one has had while online dating, since the mean of that variable is less than half as well, indicating the average experience while online dating is rather positive than negative. Interesting is the mean of being ghosted or not, since the variable shows that the average person has been ghosted while online dating. Since the average experience on dating apps seems to be rather positive, it seems that being ghosted does not have an influence on the general experience while online dating.

Tabel 1. Descriptive statistics of the respondents in analysis

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D
Independent					
Sex of respondent	985	0,00	1,00	,405	
Sexual preference	985	0,00	1,00	,243	
Interaction of sex and sexual preferece	985	0,00	1,00	,160	,367
Dependent					
Types of online harassments received	985	0,00	4,00	1,13	1,246
Age group of the respondent	985	1,00	4,00	2,24	,861
General experience on dating apps	985	0,00	1,00	,279	
Having been ghosted	985	0,00	1,00	,545	

Sex and sexual preference on online harassment

The results of the logistic regression used to see if there are differences in the OR between men, women with different sex preferences are in the table below. Model 1 shows that the OR for being a women was positive and significant ($OR=$ 2,10 , CI= 1,61 – 2,75 , $p<0,001$) and the same goes for having a same-sex preference $OR=$ 2,25 , CI=1,64 – 3,08 , $p<0,001$). After the introduction of the controlling variables age, being ghosted and general experience, the same remained true, although the OR decreased for being a women (OR=2,09 , CI= 1,59 – 2,76 , p<0,001) and increased for same-sex preference ($OR=$ 2,42 , CI= 1,73 – 3,34 , $p<0,001$). This indicates that women indeed have a higher chance of ever having received

harassment, but it also shows that people with a same-sex preference are more likely to receive harassment. In model 3, the interacting variable between having a women and same-sex preference was below 1 and significant as well (*OR*= ,24 , CI= ,12 - ,46 , *p*<0,001). This shows that women with a same-sex preference, are less likely than women with an other-sex preference to receive any form of harassment.

Table 2. Logistic regression results on sex, sexual preference, the interaction between the two and controlling variables

	Sex and ever having received online harassment		
	OR (CI)		
Constant	,976**	,938	,808
Predictor			
Female	2,10 (1,61 - 2,75)***	2,09 (1,59 – 2,76)***	2,82 (2,07 – 3,86)***
Sexual preference	2,25 (1,64-3,08)***	2,42 (1,74 – 3,34)***	3,94 (2,62 – 5,93)***
Control variables			
Age		,74 (,63 - ,87)***	,75 (,64 - ,88)***
Ghosted		2,11 (1,61 – 2,77)***	2,13 (1,62 – 2,80)***
General experience		1,22 (,90 – 1,65)	1,24 (9,23 – 1,68)
Moderator			
Woman*same-sex preference			,24 (,12 - ,46)***
N	985	985	985
-2 Log likelihood	1298,092	1245,411	1228,044
Nagelkerke R²	,070	,136	,157
Model χ²	52,996***	105,677	123,044

Sex and sexual preference on amount of types of online harassment

To elaborate on the effects of sex, sexual preference and the interaction between the two on the different types of harassment received, a multiple linear regression was used of which the result are described in the table below. Model 1 incorporated the direct effects of sex and sexual preference and seemed significant with an (adjusted) R^2=.146 and F=(2, 984)=35,691 $p<0,001$. The sex and sexual preference of the respondents were both positively and significantly related to the total amount of harassment received. This shows that being a woman (B=,505, t=6,432 $p<0,001$) and a same-sex preference (B=,533, t=5,945 $p<0,001$) are positively related to the amount of online harassment received.

The second model included the controlling variables of age, being ghosted or not and the general experience on dating apps to the regression. With the addition of the control variables the R^2 increased dramatically and significantly (R^2Change=,076, FChange=30,632, $p<0,001$) to a total of (adjusted)R^2=,107. This indicated that the control variables do have an effect on the amount of online harassment received. The second model , including the controlling variables, are outlined in model 2 in table below (Adjusted R^2= ,107, F(1,980)= 30,362, $p<0,001$). The effects of being a woman (B=,435, t=5,654 $p<0,001$) and the effect of having a same-sex preference (B= ,566 t= ,6440 $p<0,001$) remained positively related although a bit less strong than without the controlling variables.

The controlling variable of being ghosted or not, had a positive and significant effect (B=,507, t=6,612 $p<0,001$) which means that if someone has been ghosted on a dating app that the same person would receive more online harassment. The general experience someone has had on an online dating app seems to not be of significant effect on the amount of harassment received on dating apps since the variable is not significant (B=,073, t=,868 $p=.386$). The age of the respondent however seems to have a negative effect on the amount of online harassment received, indicating the older a person becomes, the less online harassment he or she will receive (B=-.225, t=-5,043 $p<0,001$). The positive relation between being a woman and the amount of harassment received confirms hypothesis 1: "*Women receive more harassment than men*". The positive relation between a same-sex preference and the amount of harassment received rejects hypothesis 2 "*People with a same-sex preference receive less harassment than those with an other-sex preference*".

Model 3 is the final model in this analysis and it includes the final variable on the interaction effect between being a woman and having a same-sex preference. With the addition of the interaction variable the adjusted R^2 of the model increased even further by ,026 to a total of R^2= ,167 (R^2Change= ,026, FChange 30,863 $p<0,001$) and the whole model

remained significant (Adjusted R²= .167, F(1,978)= 33,988, $p<0,001$). In the table below it becomes clear that the interaction between being a women and having a same-sex preference is negatively related to the amount of types of online harassment received and significant as well (B= -,979 t= -5,555 $p<0,001$). This shows the moderating effect of having a same-sex preference for women is indeed negatively related to the amount of harassment received, confirming hypothesis 3 "*Women with same-sex preference receive less online harassment than women with same-sex preference*" and with this answers the research question about intersex aggression while online dating.

Sex and sexua*l preference on the different types of harassment*

The logistic regressions performed to see if there is any difference in the different types of
harassments received per sex and sexuality, are in the tables below.

Table 4. Logistic regression results of sex, sexual preference and the interaction between the two on getting
called names and receiving threats of physical violence

	Getting called names			Threats of physical violence		
	OR (CI)			*OR (CI)*		
Constant	,278***	,387 ***	.322***	,043***	,06***	,48 ***
Predictor						
Sex	1,75 (1,32 – 2,33)***	1,71 (1,28 - 2,29)***	2,40 (1,70 - 3,38)***	2,23 (1,32- 3,76)**	2,10 (1,24 - 3,56)**	3,38 (1,73 - 6,59)***
Sexual preference	1.70 (1,24 - 2,33)**	1,85 (1.34 - 2.56)***	3,04 (2,00 - 4,61)***	1,34 (,757 - 2,37)	1,51 (,84 - 2,71)	3,24 (1,44 - 7,27)**
Control						
Age		.65 (,55 - ,79)***	,66 (,54 - ,79)***		,64 (,45 - ,899)*	,635 (,45 - ,89)**
Ghosted		2,393 (1,76 - 3,24)***	2,40 (1,77 - 3,26)***		,1,62 (,93 – 2,83)	1,61 (,92 - 2,81)
General experience		1,15 (,83 – 1,58)	1,16 (,84 - 1,61)		1,86 (1,08 – 3,19)*	1,93 (1,12 - 3,32)**
Moderator						
Woman*Same-sex preference			,277 (,14 - ,54)***			,01 (0,05 - ,69)*
N	985	985	985	985	985	985
-2 Log likelihood	1162,297	1096,853	1082,708	458,383	441,768	434,769
Nagelkerke R²	,035	,125	,143	,027	,070	,089
Model χ²	24,568***	90,012***	104,157***	9,936***	26,552***	33,551

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

Offensive name calling

The first model on offensive name calling only describes the direct effect of being a woman and having a same sex preference. The OR for these was above 1 and significant which means that women and people with a same-sex preference are more likely to receive harassment than men or people with an other-sex preference. The OR for being a female and for same-sex preference were respectively (*OR*= 1,75, CI=1,32 - 2,33 , *p*<0,001*)* and same-sex preference (*OR*= 1,70, CI=1,24 - 2,33 , *p*<0,001*)*. After the introduction of the controlling variables of age, being ghosted and general experience the effects of being a woman (*OR*=1.71 CI=1,28 - 2,29 , *p*<0,001) and having a same-sex preference (*OR*= 1,85, CI=1,34 - 2,56 , *p*<0,001*)* remained in the same direction although a bit less strong. The final model 3 introducing the interaction term between being a woman and having a same-sex preference yielded an omnibus model with a χ^2 (df = 1, N = 985) = 39,326, p <.001, Nagelkerke R^2 = .056. Since the interaction term is below 1 (*OR*= ,28, CI= ,14 - ,54 , *p*<0,001*)*, that indicates that women with a same-sex preference are less likely to have been called names on a dating apps. The negative relation of the interaction term shows that the positive relation between being a women and being called offensive names is weakened by having a same-sex preference.

Threats of physical violence

Model 1 describes the direct effects of being a woman for which the OR was above 1 and significant (*OR*= 2,23, CI=1,32 - 3,76 , *p*=0,002*)*. For having a same-sex preference however, the OR was above 1, but insignificant (*OR*=1,34, CI=,75 – 2,37, *p*=,315*)*. This shows that having a same-sex preference has no effect on receiving threats of physical violence and as such people with a same-sex and other-sex preference have the same chance of receiving these kinds of threats. After the introduction of the controlling variables age, being ghosted and the general experience on dating apps the effects of being a woman (*OR*= 2,10, CI=1,24 - 3,56 , *p*<0,006*)* remained significant and the effect of having a same-sex preference remained insignificant (*OR*= 1,51, CI=,84 - 2,71 , *p*=,166*.* The omnibus model of model 3 on receiving threats of physical harm was significant χ^2 (df = 1, N = 985) = 16,780, p <.001, Nagelkerke R^2 = .089. The introduction of the interaction between being a women and having a same-sex preference was significant and below 1 again (*OR*= ,202, CI=,05 - ,70 , *p*<0,001*)*, which shows that the positive effect of being a woman on the chance of receiving physical threats is weakened by the same-sex preference of the woman. As such, lesbian women are less likely to receive threats of physical harm on dating apps.

Table 5. Logistic regression results of sex, sexual preference and the interaction between the two on receiving sexually tinted images and being unwantedly contacted

	Receiving sexually tinted images			Being unwantedly contacted		
Constant	,29***	,55*	,43**	-,74 ***	,46 ***	,38 ***
Predictor						
Sex	2,19 (1,66 - 2,89)***	2,15 (1,62 - 2,86)***	3,309 (2,36 - 4,63)***	2,01 (1,55 – 2,62)***	2,01 (1,54 - 2,64)***	2,80 (2,05 - 3,83)***
Sexual preference	2,84 (2,091 - 1.77)***	3,14 (2,28 - 4,32)***	5,84 (3,87 - 8,82)***	1,99 (1,47 - 2,68)***	2,12 (1,56 - 2,90)***	3,52 (2,38 - 5,20)***
Control						
Age		,63 (,52– ,75)***	,631 (,528 - ,75)***		,79 (,67 - ,93)**	,80 (,68 - ,94)**
Ghosted		1,81 (1,36 - 2,41)***	1,82 (1,36 - 2,43)***		2,24 (1,71 - 2,94)***	2,26 (1,72 - 2,98)***
General experience		1,03 (,759 – 1,42)	1,05 (,771 - 1,45)		1,24 (,92 – 1,67)	1,26 (,94 - 1,71)
Moderator						
Woman*Same-sex preference			,19 (,10 - ,38)***			,25 (,13 - ,47)***
N	985	985	985	985	985	985
-2 Log likelihood	1207,825	1154,165	1130,073	1302,298	1250,42	1232,417
Nagelkerke R²	,095	,163	.192	,059	,125	,147
Model χ²	70,408***	124,068***	148,160***	44,641***	96,518***	114,522***

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

Receiving unsolicited sexually tinted photos

Model 1 describes the direct effect of being a woman and having a same sex preference and for these two the OR was above 1 and significant, respectively (*OR*= 2,19 , CI= 1,66 -2,89, *p*<0,001*)* and (*OR*= 2,84 , CI= 2,09 – 3,85, *p*<0,001*)* . After introduction of the controlling variables the effects of being a women (*OR*= 2,15, CI=1,62 - 2,86 , *p*<0,001*)* and having a

same-sex preference (*OR*= 3,14 , CI=2,28 - 4,32 , *p<0,001)* remained positive and significant. The OR and its confidence interval for these effects are much higher than for the other variables, which shows that people with a same-sex preference are way more likely than people with an other-sex preference to receive these kind of pictures. The final model 3 describing the chance of receiving unwanted messages or photos of a sexual nature yielded a significant model χ^2 (df = 1, N = 985) = 95,599, p <.001, Nagelkerke R^2 = .127. For this model, the Nagelkerke R^2 is almost twice as high as the previous two variables, which shows that this model explains much more of the variance in the amount of unwanted messages. The interacting variable between being a woman and having a same-sex preference was significant and below 1 (*OR*= ,19, CI=,10 - ,38 , *p<0,001)* again, which shows that being a lesbian woman has a negative effect on the amount of unwanted sexual messages received.

Being unwantedly contacted after declination of advances
Model 1 describes the direct effect of being a woman and having a same-sex preference. Like for the other types of online harassment the OR for these two was above 1 and significant again. The OR being respectively (*OR*= 2,01 , CI= 1,55 – 2,62 *p<0,001*) and (*OR*= 1,99, CI= 1,47 – 2,68 *p<0,001*). After introducing the controlling variables in model 2 the effect remained in the same direction although a bit less strong. The effect of being a woman was (*OR*= 2,01, CI=1,54 - 2,62 , *p<0,001)* and the effect of a same-sex preference was (*OR*= 2,12, CI=1,56 - 2,90 , *p<0,001).*
The last model 3 that shows the OR of being stalked after rejection of the potential love interest was significant χ^2 (df = 1, N = 985) = 62,889, p <.001, Nagelkerke R^2 = .083. The effect of being a woman and having a same-sex preference is below 1 and significant for the chance of being stalked as well (*OR*= ,25, CI=,13 - ,47 , *p<0,001)* which means that lesbian women are less likely to be stalked after declination of advances while online dating.

Conclusion

The results of all regressions showed that being a women was positively related with the amount of harassment received. The first regression on ever having received harassment, the second regression on the amount of different types of harassment and the final regression on the specific types of harassment all showed the positive relation between being a women and the amount of harassment received, confirming hypothesis 1. The confirmation of hypothesis 1 shows that women are more likely to receive online harassment than men, which implicates misogyny in online interactions between men and women. The already existing hate from men towards women in offline society as described by Banet-Weiser (2018) seems to have found its way into the online world as well. According to the logic of Popular Misogyny men are frustrated since they feel as if they lost something to women. The use of dating apps enables women to partake in hookup culture the same way men are doing, which feels as a loss to men and as such they are frustrated by women who are using dating apps (Banet-Weiser, 2018). The expression of these male frustrations is aided by the disinhibition effect as described by Suler (2004) which alleviates the barriers for men to harass women without consequences.

In all different regressions, the effect of a same-sex preference was positively related with the amount of harassment as well, reversing hypothesis 2. A same-sex preference was positively related with ever having received harassment and with the amount of types of harassment received. This remained true for all different types of harassment received, except for receiving threats of physical violence, for which the OR was insignificant, showing that there is no relation between having a same-sex preference and receiving threats of physical violence. The reversal of hypothesis 2 should be interpreted with the confirmation of hypothesis 3, which shows that for women a same-sex preference is negatively related with the receiving of harassment. For men, however a same-sex preference is positively related with the amount of harassment received. Out of the reversal of hypothesis 2 and the confirmation of hypothesis 3, I can conclude that a same-sex preference is a moderating effect for the amount of harassment received, but it is different per sex. A same-sex preference is a weakening effect for women and an strengthening effect for men on receiving online harassment.

For all performed regressions, the results showed that a same-sex preference for women is indeed negatively related with ever having received harassment, the amount of different types of harassment and for each specific type of harassment, confirming hypothesis 3. The confirmation of hypothesis 3 shows that lesbian women indeed receive less harassment than heterosexual women, and this is due to their sexual preference. Lesbian women are on dating apps looking for other women, which means that there is no man on the other end of the conversation, but a woman. As such, inter-sex aggression does not occur. The absence of aggression with the absence of the man, proves the existence of inter-sex aggression. While this is beneficial for lesbian women, this conclusion proves that there is men to women aggression on dating apps and heterosexual women are victim to this aggression from the other sex. The presence of this inter-sex aggression hints at misogyny.

An important implication to be drawn out of the reversal of hypothesis 2 and confirmation of hypothesis 3 is the impact of the male sexual scripts on the harassment behaviour of men. The fact that a same-sex preference for men is a strengthening effect could show that something inherent to men might be the cause of the online harassment of women and men alike. As explained by Gagnon and Simon (2017, the behaviour of men in the dating world is constructed out of sexual scripts. Since gay men are looking for other gay men, there are two men that have to adhere to their masculine sexual scripts. This means that both feel that they have to be assertive, dominant and display a high libido in order to conform to their masculine stereotype (Mankayi, 2008 ; Nimbi et alia, 2020). All men, gay or straight have these scripts internalized and this results in aggression towards women they are trying to date but seemingly also in aggression towards other men they are trying to date. The gender of the potential love interest does not matter, men will behave rude to their potential partner. As such I argue that men and their sexual scripts are another important reason for harassment of both men and women on dating apps, maybe even more so then misogyny.

Besides men and their behaviour, it could also be suggested that the disinhibition effect of the contact through dating apps is a cause of concern. The fact that the feelings of frustration are expressed online is an indication of another probable key factor in the prevalence of online inter-sex aggression, namely the disinhibition effect of online communication. As explained by Suler (2004), the anonymous nature of these apps alleviates the barriers for men to express their frustrations towards men and women alike. Concluding from all this, one could think that there is something inherently wrong with men, dating apps, or both. The fact that there is aggression on an app on which people are looking for love is in any matter a reason for concern.

Discussion

A strength of this thesis is that it combined previous research on online interaction and offline misogyny to form an explanation for the massive amounts of online harassment from men to women on dating apps. On top of analysing inter-sex aggression, it also analysed same-sex aggression of lesbian women. While analysing the same-sex aggression for women, this thesis found out that having a same-sex preference is a strengthening effect for men, as opposed to the hypothesized weakening effect it is to women. This offers an incentive for further research to investigate the extent of online harassment among gay men.

As I´ve taken notes on the strengths of this research there are some limitations to take into account when interpreting the results of this research. One such limitation is the number of respondents. Out of all 985 respondents, only 44 were lesbian women and only 159 were gay men. Percentage wise for the sample it was quite alright and the amount of gay men was fine, but the experiences of just 203 people with a same-sex preference is not enough to make claims about all people with a same-sex preference. Furthermore, in this sample there were only 44 lesbian women present. This could have influenced the outcome of the analysis, since the 44 lesbian women in the analysis could have received less harassment for other reasons than the absence of men. The amount of gay men in the analysis was almost thrice as high as the amount of lesbian women as well, which could be a different explanation for the much higher amount of harassment among gay men. As such, further research should include more lesbian women and an even distribution between gay men and lesbian women.

As stated in the introduction, people from the LGBTQ+ community are making most use of online dating apps (Anderson, Vogel, Turner, 2020). In this thesis it becomes apparent that of all the people with same-sex preference in the survey, 47% of them has received at least one form of harassment. This compared with just the 30% of people that have received any form of harassment in the hetero community, as such further research should be contributed to the online interactions of the LGBTQ+ community.

On top of that, it should be noted that the sample was taken in the United States. The amount of harassment received could change for better or worse in other cultures and continents and as such they would be good subjects for further research. According to Iqbal (2021) the US and UK are the world´s first and second countries with the highest number of Tinder users, with Brazil being third. The sexual scripts for men and women and the norms regarding same-sex preference differ from those in the United States and UK and as such could prove valuable insight into inter-sex aggression in online context (Parker, 1999 ; Parker, 2009 ; D´Abreu & Krahé, 2016). Furthermore, this thesis only includes men and women with

an other- and same-sex preference and excludes other genders and other sexual orientations. Especially introducing people with a bisexual sexual preference could prove valuable for further research, since they are the recipients of online harassment from men and women and as such can directly compare these two sexes and the amount of harassment they sent.

Although the limitations of this thesis should be taken into account, it shows that inter-sex aggression in its online manifestation is present in contemporary society. Further research should be dedicated to the underlying reasons of this aggression. This thesis suggested misogyny already, but further research is required to understand all aspects of inter-sex aggression and its online manifestations.

An example of online manifestations of misogyny are the Incel (Involuntary Celibates) and MGTOW (Men Going Their Own Way) communities. These are groups of men that gather on social networking sites such as Twitter, reddit and 4chan and preach hate towards women (Jones, Trott & Wright, 2020 ; Wright, Trott & Jones, 2020 ; Lin, 2017). These online groups are a good example to study, since they are the epitome of online misogyny. Besides the obvious implications of women-hating-men online, contemporary Incel attacks such as Alek Minassian's van attack in Toronto (2018) and Elliot Rodger's school shooting in Isla Vista (2014) are 2 examples of radicalised misogynists turning online words into offline actions which is a cause for concern (Baele, Brace & Coan, 2019 ; Tomkinson, Harper & Attwell, 2019).

Outside of the online manifestations of misogyny, this thesis offers incentive to further dedicate research to the sexual scripts of men. As suggested in the conclusion, male sexual scripts could be key to explaining the harassment of women and men alike and as such it is important to delve deeper into this subject due to its harmful consequences. As it is not only harmful for potential lovers, but also for men themselves (Sanders, 2008 ; McCormick, 2010 ; Murray, 2018). Existing research on male sexual scripts already examined the harmful effects of these sexual scripts and the current thesis further emphasizes the need to dedicate more research to this subject.

Literature

Anderson, K. J., Kanner, M., & Elsayegh, N. (2009). Are feminists man haters? Feminists' and nonfeminists' attitudes toward men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *33*(2), 216-224.

Anderson, M. , Vogels, E. A. , Turner, E. (06-02-2020) *The virtues and downsides of online dating.* Geraadpleegd van: https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2020/02/06/the-virtues-and-downsides-of-online-dating

APA, Boys and Men Guidelines Group. (2018). APA guidelines for psychological practice with boys and men. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://www.apa.org/about/policy/psychological-practice-boys-men-guidelines.pdf

Banet-Weiser, S. (2018). Empowered: Popular feminism and Popular misogyny. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Baele, S. J., Brace, L., & Coan, T. G. (2019). From "Incel" to "Saint": Analyzing the violent worldview behind the 2018 Toronto attack. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 1-25.

Barak, A. (2005). Sexual harassment on the Internet. *Social Science Computer Review*, *23*(1), 77-92.

Bergman, L. (1992). Dating violence among high school students. *Social Work*, *37*(1), 21-27.

Brander, C. Young Feminist—Dating Apps: Finger Swipes as a Silent Act of Feminism.

Chan, L. S. (2018). Liberating or disciplining? A technofeminist analysis of the use of dating apps among women in urban China. *Communication Culture & Critique*, *11*(2), 298-314.

Conley, J. (2020). *Efficacy, Nihilism, and Toxic Masculinity Online: Digital Misogyny in the Incel Subculture* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).

Couch, D., & Liamputtong, P. (2008). Online dating and mating: The use of the internet to meet sexual partners. *Qualitative Health Research*, *18*(2), 268-279.

D'Abreu, L. C. F., & Krahé, B. (2016). Vulnerability to sexual victimization in female and male college students in Brazil: Cross-sectional and prospective evidence. *Archives of sexual behavior*, *45*(5), 1101-1115.

David, G., & Cambre, C. (2016). Screened intimacies: Tinder and the swipe logic. *Social media+ society*, *2*(2), 2056305116641976.

Denov, M. S. (2003). The myth of innocence: Sexual scripts and the recognition of child sexual abuse by female perpetrators. *Journal of Sex Research*, *40*(3), 303-314.

Finkel, E. J., Eastwick, P. W., Karney, B. R., Reis, H. T., & Sprecher, S. (2012). Online dating: A critical analysis from the perspective of psychological science. *Psychological Science in the Public interest*, *13*(1), 3-66.

Frost, D. M., Meyer, I. H., & Schwartz, S. (2016). Social support networks among diverse sexual minority populations. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *86*(1), 91.

Gagnon, J. H., & Simon, W. (2017). *Sexual conduct: The social sources of human sexuality*. Routledge.

Ging, D., & Siapera, E. (2018). Special issue on online misogyny.

Grinder (2021) *About Grindr.* Geraadpleegd van: https://www.grindr.com/about/

Gutman, G. M., & Yon, Y. (2014). Elder abuse and neglect in disasters: Types, prevalence and research gaps. *International journal of disaster risk reduction*, *10*, 38-47.

Happn (2021) *About happn.* Geraadpleegd van: https://www.happn.com/nl/about/

Herring, S. C. (2004). Slouching toward the ordinary: Current trends in computer-mediated communication. *New media & society*, *6*(1), 26-36.

Hess, A., & Flores, C. (2018). Simply more than swiping left: A critical analysis of toxic masculine performances on Tinder Nightmares. New Media & Society, 20, 1085–1102.

Hoffman, B., Ware, J., & Shapiro, E. (2020). Assessing the threat of incel violence. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, *43*(7), 565-587.

Iqbal, M. (17-03-2021) *Tinder revenue and Usage statistics.* Business of apps. Consulted on: https://www.businessofapps.com/data/tinder-statistics/#2

Irby, S. E. (2018). Adding Fuel to the Fire: Sexual Harassment and Male Chauvinism on Tinder.

Jones, C., Trott, V., & Wright, S. (2020). Sluts and soyboys: MGTOW and the production of misogynistic online harassment. *new media & society*, *22*(10), 1903-1921

Jaeger, B. (2004). Trapped in the digital divide? Old people in the information society. *Science & Technology Studies*.

Kee, A. W. A., & Yazdanifard, R. (2015). The review of the ugly truth and negative aspects of online dating. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*.

Kupers, T. A. (2005). Toxic masculinity as a barrier to mental health treatment in prison. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61, 713–724

Lapidot-Lefler, N., & Barak, A. (2012). Effects of anonymity, invisibility, and lack of eye-contact on toxic online disinhibition. *Computers in human behavior*, *28*(2), 434-443.

Lee, J. (2019). Mediated Superficiality and Misogyny Through Cool on Tinder. *Social Media+ Society*, *5*(3), 2056305119872949.

LeFebvre, L. E., Allen, M., Rasner, R. D., Garstad, S., Wilms, A., & Parrish, C. (2019). Ghosting in emerging adults' romantic relationships: The digital dissolution disappearance strategy. Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 39(2), 125-150.

Lewis, S. F., & Fremouw, W. (2001). Dating violence: A critical review of the literature. *Clinical psychology review*, *21*(1), 105-127.

Lin, J. L. (2017). Antifeminism online. MGTOW (men going their own way).

Mankayi, N. (2008). Morality and sexual rights: Constructions of masculinity, femininity and sexuality among a group of South African soldiers. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *10*(6), 625-634.

Marwick, A. E., & Caplan, R. (2018). Drinking male tears: Language, the manosphere, and networked harassment. *Feminist Media Studies*, *18*(4), 543-559.

McCormick, N. B. (2010). Sexual scripts: Social and therapeutic implications. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, *25*(1), 96-120.

Murray, S. H. (2018). Heterosexual men's sexual desire: Supported by, or deviating from, traditional masculinity norms and sexual scripts?. *Sex Roles*, *78*(1), 130-141.

Nimbi, F. M., Tripodi, F., Rossi, R., Navarro-Cremades, F., & Simonelli, C. (2020). Male sexual desire: an overview of biological, psychological, sexual, relational, and cultural factors influencing desire. *Sexual medicine reviews*, *8*(1), 59-91.

Okcupid (2021) *okcupid homepage.* Geraadpleegd van: https://www.okcupid.com/

O'Sullivan, L. F., Byers, E. S., & Finkelman, L. (1998). A comparison of male and female college students' experiences of sexual coercion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *22*(2), 177-195.

Paasonen, S., Light, B., & Jarrett, K. (2019). The dick pic: Harassment, curation, and desire. *Social Media+ Society*, *5*(2), 2056305119826126.

Parker, R. G. (1999). *Beneath the equator: Cultures of desire, male homosexuality, and emerging gay communities in Brazil*. Psychology Press.

Parker, R. G. (2009). *Bodies, pleasures, and passions: Sexual culture in contemporary Brazil*. Vanderbilt University Press.

Postmes, T., Spears, R., & Lea, M. (1998). Breaching or building social boundaries? SIDE-effects of computer-mediated communication. *Communication research*, *25*(6), 689-715.

Ringrose, J., & Lawrence, E. (2018). Remixing misandry, manspreading, and dick pics: Networked feminist humour on Tumblr. *Feminist Media Studies*, *18*(4), 686-704.

Ritter, B. A. (2014). Deviant behavior in computer-mediated communication: Development and validation of a measure of cybersexual harassment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *19*(2), 197-214.

Sales, N. J. (2015, August 6). Tinder and the dawn of the "dating apocalypse." Vanity Fair. Retrieved from www .vanityfair.com/culture/2015/08/tinder-hook-up-culture-end -of-dating

Sanders, T. (2008). Male sexual scripts: Intimacy, sexuality and pleasure in the purchase of commercial sex. *Sociology*, *42*(3), 400-417.

Sheskin, R., & Barak, A. (1997, June). Sexual harassment proclivities and vocational preferences. Paper presented in the Annual Conference of the Canadian Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Shield, A. (2017). "Looking for north Europeans only": Identifying five racist patterns in an online subculture. Kult-Postkolonial Temaserie, 15, 87–106.

Stoicescu, M. (2019). The globalized online dating culture: Reframing the dating process through online dating. *Journal of Comparative Research in Anthropology and Sociology*, *10*(01), 21-32.

Suler, J. (2004). The online disinhibition effect. *Cyberpsychology & behavior*, *7*(3), 321-326.

Tetikcok, R., Ozer, E., Cakir, L., Enginyurt, O., İscanli, M. D., Cankaya, S., & Ozer, F. (2016). Violence towards women is a public health problem. *Journal of forensic and legal medicine*, *44*, 150-157.

Thompson, L. (2018). "I can be your Tinder nightmare": Harassment and misogyny in the online sexual marketplace. *Feminism & Psychology*, *28*(1), 69-89.

Timmermans, E., Hermans, A. M., & Opree, S. J. (2020). Gone with the wind: Exploring mobile daters' ghosting experiences. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 0265407520970287.

Tinder (2021) *tinder homepage.* Geraadpleegd van: https://tinder.com/nl

Towers, A. (2020). Empowered: Popular Feminism and Popular Misogyny.

Tomkinson, S., Harper, T., & Attwell, K. (2020). Confronting Incel: exploring possible policy responses to misogynistic violent extremism. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, *55*(2), 152-169.

van Anders, S. M. (2012). Testosterone and sexual desire in healthy women and men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *41*(6), 1471-1484.

Vitak, J., Chadha, K., Steiner, L., & Ashktorab, Z. (2017). Identifying women's experiences with and strategies for mitigating negative effects of online harassment. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing* (pp. 1231-1245).

Weinstock, L. M., & Whisman, M. A. (2004). The self-verification model of depression and interpersonal rejection in heterosexual dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *23*(2), 240-259.

Wiederman, M. W. (2005). The gendered nature of sexual scripts. *The Family Journal*, *13*(4), 496-502.

Wiederman, M. W. (2015). Sexual script theory: Past, present, and future. In *Handbook of the sociology of sexualities* (pp. 7-22). Springer, Cham.

Wolak, J., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2007). Does online harassment constitute bullying? An exploration of online harassment by known peers and online-only contacts. *Journal of adolescent health*, *41*(6), S51-S58.

Wright, K. B., & Webb, L. M. (Eds.). (2011). *Computer-mediated communication in personal relationships*. Peter Lang.

Wright, S., Trott, V., & Jones, C. (2020). 'The pussy ain't worth it, bro': assessing the discourse and structure of MGTOW. *Information, Communication & Society*, *23*(6), 908-925.

Zweig, J. M., Dank, M., Yahner, J., & Lachman, P. (2013). The rate of cyber dating abuse among teens and how it relates to other forms of teen dating violence. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, *42*(7), 1063-1077.