Appendices for:

"Basically... porn is everywhere"
A Rapid Evidence Assessment on the Effects that Access and Exposure to Pornography has on Children and Young People

Final report 30 April 2013

By Miranda A. H. Horvath, Llian Alys, Kristina Massey, Afroditi Pina, Mia Scally and Joanna R. Adler

Contents

Appendix 1 - United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child

This report was commissioned as part of the Office of the Children's Commissioner's Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Gangs and Groups (CSEGG).

The Inquiry aims to promote children's right to protection from sexual exploitation, in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC). This states that every child shall be protected from all forms of exploitation, victimisation and abuse, and receive help accordingly, specifically with regard to:

- Article 19: Protection from all forms of violence.
- Article 34: Protection from sexual abuse and exploitation.
- Article 35: Protection from abduction.
- Article 37: Protection from torture.
- Article 39: Right to rehabilitation from abuse, exploitation and torture.

It is being conducted in the spirit of, and in compliance with, the following UNCRC articles:

- Article 3: The best interest of the child must be a primary consideration in all actions concerning children.
- Article 12: Every child has the right to have their views heard in all decisions affecting them, and to have those views taken seriously.

Appendix 2 – Attendees at the experts workshop

Staff from the Office of the Children's Commissioner
Sue Berelowitz
Gareth Edwards
Sandra Gulyurtlu
Shaila Sheikh

Practitioners
Holly Dustin   End Violence Against Women Coalition
Fiona Elvines   Rape Crisis South London
Marcus Erooga   Independent Consultant & Visiting Research Fellow Centre for Applied
                      Childhood Studies, University of Huddersfield
Heather Harvey   Lilith Research and Development Team, Eaves for women
Ben Lindsay   Consultant
Charlie Rumsby   Healthwatch Development Worker
Laura Price   Intern with Ben Lindsay
Jude Warnes   Intern with Ben Lindsay

Academics
Feona Attwood   Middlesex University
Helen Beckett   University of Bedfordshire
Despina Chronaki   Loughborough University

Those who were not able to attend the workshop but consulted with us individually:
Abi Billinghurst   ABIANDA
Maddy Coy   Child & Woman Abuse Studies Unit, London Metropolitan University
Marai Larasi   Imkaan & End Violence Against Women Coalition

Appendix 3 - Research objectives specified in the tender

1. Assess the existing literature on children and young people's use of pornography, and the potential impact this may have on their relationships and expectations.

2. Draw upon literature which has sought to assess the impact of viewing/witnessing violence on children and young people's attitudes and behaviours, and assess whether there is a relevance between this and pornography.

3. Document the range of opinions and arguments that have been offered in relation to children and young people's access to pornography.

4. Explore the evidence of any differences/similarities between pornography and other sexualised imagery and ideas presented to young people through film, music, advertising, mainstream and specialist media etc.

5. Identify any evidence as to whether viewing of sexual imagery or violence may have differing effects on children and young people dependent on other protective/risk factors in their lives.

6. To compare and distinguish between research available on children and young people viewing, sharing, and making, indecent images of themselves and their peers, and children and young people's viewing and sharing of pornography.

7. To offer some consideration of the implications of the above objectives for children and young people's vulnerability to victimisation or perpetration of sexual exploitation.

8. To offer recommendations to the CSEGG Inquiry in relation to children and young peoples' access to pornography and any further research that is required.

9. To produce a report for the CSEGG Inquiry that illustrates all of the above objectives and informs the final CSEGG Inquiry report.

Appendix 4 - Sub-questions for the research questions

Identify and assess the existing evidence base on children and young people's access and exposure to pornography.

Access
1. What evidence exists on the extent to which children and young people access pornography?

2. How do children and young people access pornography?
   a) With what frequency do they access pornography?
   b) Through what means do they access pornography (e.g. computers, mobile phones, magazines etc)?

3. How do children and young people explain and describe their access to pornography?

4. What opinions and arguments that have been offered in relation to children and young people's access to pornography?

5. What evidence exists about the different contexts (e.g. within the home, at school, amongst friends, alone etc) within which children and young people access pornography?

6. What evidence exists about children and young people sharing pornography they have accessed?
   a) Do differences exist in sharing behaviours in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, socioeconomic status etc?
   b) Through what means do they share pornography (e.g. forwarding emails or picture messages, sharing links to websites or youtube videos etc)?

Exposure
1. What evidence exists on the extent to which children and young people are exposed to pornography?

2. How are children and young people exposed to pornography?
   a) With what frequency are they exposed to pornography?
   b) Through what means are they exposed to pornography (e.g. computers, mobile phones, magazines etc)?

3. How do children and young people explain and describe their exposure to pornography?

4. What opinions and arguments that have been offered in relation to children and young people's exposure to pornography?

5. What evidence exists about the different contexts (e.g. within the home, at school, amongst friends, alone etc) within which children and young people are exposed to pornography?

6. What evidence exists about children and young people sharing pornography they have been exposed to?
   a) Do differences exist in sharing behaviours in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, socioeconomic status etc?
   b) Through what means do they share pornography (e.g. forwarding emails or picture messages, sharing links to websites or youtube videos etc)?

7. What evidence exists about children and young people viewing, sharing, and making, indecent images of themselves and their peers?
   a) What evidence exists about differences in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, socioeconomic status etc?
   b) What evidence exists about the contexts in which they view, share and make indecent images of themselves and their peers (e.g. by themselves, with others, in a relationship, as part of cyber bullying)?

Identify and assess the existing evidence base on the effects that access and exposure to pornography has on children and young people's sexual expectations, attitudes and behaviours.

1. What evidence exists on the potential effects (attitudinal and behavioural) of pornography on children and young people's relationships (e.g. romantic, sexual, friendship, family etc) and expectations (e.g. about sex, romance, relationships etc) both current and future?

2. Is evidence available on how children and young people perceive the content of pornography?
   a) Is there evidence that distinguishes between such perceptions in terms of fantasy and reality?
   b) Is there evidence that assesses children and young people's perceptions of the extent of access and or exposure to pornography experienced by their peers?

3. Is evidence available on how children and young people perceive the effects pornography may have on them?

4. Is there evidence that identifies any links between how children and young people describe relationships and their access or exposure to pornography?

5. Does the existing evidence base imply any links between children and young people's expectations and attitudes towards relationships and their exposure or access to pornography?

6. Is there any evidence as to whether viewing sexual imagery may have differing effects on children and young people dependent on other protective/predictive risk factors in their lives (e.g. age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status, experience of child abuse, parental controls, awareness and mediation, child's computer/safety training etc)?

7. Is there any evidence as to whether viewing violent imagery[1] (e.g. on television, in computer games, in films, on youtube etc) may have differing effects on children and young people dependent on other protective/predictive risk factors in their lives (e.g. age, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, socio-economic status, experience of child abuse, parental controls, awareness and mediation, child's computer/safety training etc)?

Draw upon existing literature reviews and meta-analyses on the associations between access and exposure to sexualised or violent visual imagery on children and young people, and consider whether this bears relevance to the issue in question.

1. Is there evidence which identifies any links between children and young people's descriptions of relationships and their access to sexualised/violent imagery?

2. Is literature which has sought to assess the impact of viewing/witnessing violence on children and young people's attitudes and behaviours relevant to discussions about the effects of access and exposure to pornography?

3. What is the evidence of any differences/similarities between pornography and other sexualised visual imagery and ideas presented to young people through film, music, advertising, mainstream and specialist media etc[2]?
    a) What evidence exists about how children and young people perceive sexualised imagery presented in pornography compared to other media content?
    b) Is there any evidence to suggest that the sexualised imagery in certain types of media (e.g. Manga or music videos) more closely resembles pornography than others (e.g. mainstream films or television programmes)?

4. Building on the work of the Bailey (2011) and Papadopoulos (2010) reviews but with a focus on whether the findings bear any relevance to the central question of the effects of access and exposure to pornography; what evidence exists on the potential impacts (attitudinal and behavioural) of sexualised media (that does not meet the agreed definition of pornography) on children and young people's relationships (e.g. romantic, sexual, friendship, family etc) and expectations (e.g. about sex, romance, relationships etc) both current and future?

---

[1] Please note that in keeping with the rest of the research questions we are focusing on exposure to violent imagery not directly witnessing violence.
[2] It may also be worth considering including clothing products and services for children as outlined in the Bailey Review (2011) or 'sexualised merchandise' as Papadopoulos (2010) described them.

Appendix 5 – Detailed methodology

Study design

The research commissioners imposed a strict timeline on this project and their guidance was to meet that timeline even if material was missed, therefore in order to meet this requirement, a systematic literature review or meta-analysis was impossible. A question-led adapted Rapid Evidence Assessment (REA) was used in order to present a critical overview of key findings and identify any omissions in the literature.

An REA is a tool for synthesizing the available research evidence on a policy issue, as comprehensively as possible, within the constraints of a given timetable. A toolkit for undertaking an REA has been widely implemented since its inception by Government Social Research (see http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/networks/gsr/resources-and-guidance and for examples Brown et al.,, 2010; Disley et al., 2011; Horvath et al., 2012; Itzin et al., 2007; Underwood et al., 2007). According to Davies (2003) the functions of an REA are to:

- search the electronic and print literature as comprehensively as possible within the constraints of a policy or practice timetable
- collate descriptive outlines of the available evidence on a topic
- critically appraise the evidence (including an economic appraisal)
- sift out studies of poor quality
- provide an overview of what the evidence is saying.

The REA comprised three stages (identifying the literature, screening the literature and synthesising the literature) which are outlined below.

Stage one: identifying the literature

Setting criteria for the literature to be included and excluded was the initial step in identifying the literature. The inclusion/exclusion criteria were agreed between the OCC and the project team and can be found in Appendix 4.

Search terms
Search terms were developed from the research questions in order to maintain scope and rigour. The initial search terms used to identify relevant literature were agreed in conjunction with the OCC and were broken down by research question (See Appendix 5). Guidelines for conducting the searches were also developed to ensure consistency (see Appendix 6), for example using the term 'child*' as opposed to 'children'. All the abstracts from each individual search were retained and placed in appendices (available from the authors upon request). Included and excluded data were separated into different documents and retained, a minimum of 10% of all searches were also moderated by the Principal Investigator.

Three approaches were taken for identifying literature – academic database searches, grey literature database searches and a direct call for papers. The details of these strategies are outlined below:

Academic literature searches
Academic literature searches were conducted on fifteen databases (see Appendix 7). After the first seven days of searching using the initial search terms, the search terms were reviewed. It was not possible to complete all the searches in the time frame, and it was apparent that even if it was, it would not necessarily be beneficial to do so. Many of the search terms were not finding relevant research or were simply returning data that had already been identified. Consequently the databases were prioritised in order to maximise searching time on the databases that held relevant material. As we progressed, search terms that were not returning relevant material were excluded[3]. In addition to excluding thirty of the original search terms, all the general search terms with child*, e.g. Pornography AND child*, were excluded as they were only returning results relevant to children within pornography, and the general search terms with young* AND people* added were placed on low priority as they were not identifying new material. Pornography* was already being used as a search term and was identifying anything relevant to young people and children. In the larger databases with over 2,000 results, the general search terms were conducted with adolescent* and young* AND people* added, as these were the most commonly used terms in the relevant material. The general search terms were not used on their own for over 2,000 results, therefore maximising the time spent searching through material relevant to the target groups.

The deadline for academic searches was set for four days after the review of the searches. Searches not completed within the available time were noted. Four search terms were returned to and are detailed in the section about additional searches below. See Table 1 for the figures for references found in the academic searches.

Grey literature
In order to access unpublished and/or non-peer reviewed research ('grey' literature), a two stage process was implemented; searching online resources and a 'call for papers' (this also included academic papers to ensure we had not missed anything).

Online resources
Searching online resources followed the academic literature searches and again adopted the reviewed search terms (see Appendix 5), this time within five additional databases (see Appendix 8). These continued for a further four days. On the first day of searching, the term 'meta-analyses' was excluded from research question 3 as these searches were not productive. In addition, only the first 50 items from each database were screened[4]. All searches were entered into a Microsoft Excel spread sheet with the search term used, total number of items found, number of included and excluded items, and the name of the

---

[3] All searches were entered into a Microsoft Excel spread sheet with the search term used, total number of items found, number of included and excluded items, and the name of the database. This meant it was easy to identify the search terms and databases that were not effective. Please see Appendix 5 for the revised and initial search terms, and Appendix 7 for a list of initially proposed databases and how they were revised.

[4] Because the time for this project was so limited we had to severely limit the searches. We decided to limit the grey literature more strictly than the peer-reviewed literature, in part as a preliminary Weight of Evidence decision.

database (available from the authors upon request). See Table 1 for the figures for references found in the grey searches.

<u>Call for papers</u>
Five approaches were taken:
- team members sent requests to their extended networks using email and social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, Linked-In Groups and Blogs (see Appendix 8 for the text used).
- native language speakers in the group sent out additional requests for materials in Italian, Greek and Welsh.
- current holdings of the project team were identified and a request for information was placed on the Police Online Knowledge Area (POLKA).
- the OCC, London Metropolitan University and University of Bedfordshire were sent requests to forward any information already collected from their work to date (see Appendix 10).
- the OCC also posted a request for relevant material on their webpage and sent this out to their advisory groups and extended networks (see Appendix 9).

In order to ensure the material received was processed effectively, a dedicated email account was set up. If a member of the team received an email with material, it was forwarded to the dedicated email account and flagged to ensure this could be identified as containing relevant grey and/or academic literature. Once the item had been processed, this email was then de-flagged and placed in an appropriate folder. In addition, all items were recorded in a Microsoft Excel spread sheet detailing the item and whether the item had been included or excluded. As before, a minimum of 10% of all decisions were reviewed by the Principal Investigator to ensure accuracy and consistency. See Table 1 for the figures for references received in the call for papers.

<u>Additional searches</u>
Four further additional searches were conducted once all the previous searches had been completed. The search terms 'sexualisation' and 'pornification' were used in Google and Google Scholar. The first 50 results for each search were screened. Table 1 shows the figures for references found in the additional Google searches in the grey literature figures and Google Scholar in the academic searches figures.

Table 1: Table summarising total number of items identified, included and excluded, at each stage of data processing.

	Total	Included	Excluded
Stage one: Identifying the literature	**N**	**N**	**N**
Academic Searches	38,165	1,910	36,225
Grey Literature Searches	2,656	303	2,353
Call for Papers	179	91	88
Total	**41,000**	**2,304**	**38,666**
Stage two: Screening the literature			
Weight of Evidence	2,304	276	2,028

Once material had been located, each reference was screened according to a two stage process. The titles and abstracts or executive summaries were reviewed against the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Where a database provided the option to limit searches using aspects of the exclusion criteria, this was conducted, for example searching for data between the given time frame of January 1983 and January 2013. Where possible, stage one screening took place simultaneously to the searches, for example, the search results for 'pornography*' in PsycInfo were screened straight away in order to ascertain which articles were included or excluded. Excluded articles were saved into a separate document for quality control and items matching the inclusion criteria were saved in an appendix in a file accessible to the whole team ready for the second stage of screening. The number of each appendix was detailed on a Microsoft Excel spread sheet alongside the date of the search, the name of the database, the search term used, the research question the search term applied to, the total number of items found, the total number of items included and the total number of items excluded.

Stage two: screening the literature

Full text articles were then obtained for all material that fit the inclusion criteria. This was achieved by searching for articles that had open access, using (online) subscription sources from each of the consortium universities, emailing the authors of selected papers (see Appendix 11) and finally, visiting the British Library. Any articles not obtained through these means were excluded due to the strict time frame for the data to be assessed. Full text files were stored in a mutually accessible file. References that met the inclusion criteria were read in full and compared against the inclusion and exclusion criteria once again. Any changes in materials from conference proceedings or research that was likely to have progressed since publication were identified and reviewed. If a particular source met the criteria, the key information was coded using a data extraction form (see Appendix 12).

Once full text articles were obtained, they were read in full and reviewed against the inclusion/exclusion criteria again. If they were judged not to meet the inclusion criteria, they were excluded at this stage (2,028 papers were excluded). Papers that met the inclusion criteria had their key information placed on the specially designed 'Data Extraction Form' (see Appendix 12). They were also assessed using a 'Weight of Evidence' (WoE) approach, in which the quality and relevance of the literature were assessed and given a strength rating; high, medium or low (see Appendix 13 for the WoE coding form). This approach was developed by the EPPI-Centre (Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Coordinating Centre) and can be used for both quantitative and qualitative studies. This method ensured consistency in approach and allowed us to assess research conducted using varied methodologies and diverse analytic strategies according to a common assessment structure. We modified the EPPI-Centre's approach for this study (the guidelines we used for conducting the WoE assessments are in Appendix 13).

Each study was weighted according to three dimensions (A, B and C) in conjunction with each other, these were:

A) Taking into account all of the quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering all of the study question(s)?
1. High
2. Medium
3. Low

B) Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this review.
1. High
2. Medium
3. Low

C) Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this review.
1. High
2. Medium
3. Low

These judgments were then combined into a final dimension (D) which signified the overall WoE judgment (High, Medium or Low). The findings of lower quality studies were given less weight in the synthesis. Table 2 shows the number of studies included and excluded at the second stage of screening.

Table 2. Summary of papers included for each research question and the number of papers falling into each WoE category (Low, Medium and High)

| | Number of papers included in the REA | Number of papers in WoE category | | |
		Low	Medium	High
Research question 1	155	67	60	28
Research question 2	159	68	63	28
Research question 3	116	56	37	23
Total	430*	191	160	79

See Appendix 14 for the full lists of papers included for each research question and the WoE category
* This figure is greater than the total of included papers in Table 1 because some papers were applicable to more than one research question.

Each included article was detailed in a spread sheet with the relevant research question and WoE strength detailed. This helped to provide an overview of the data relevant to each research question. Many of the papers contained data that were relevant to more than one research question this was also detailed in the spread sheet. A minimum of 10% of all decisions made were reviewed by the Principal Investigator to ensure consistency and accuracy.

Stage three: synthesising the data

In order to produce the final report, the data collected for each of the research questions were synthesised. The first step taken to ensure synthesis was to focus on the research questions. This was undertaken from the very beginning by identifying search terms for each research question individually and keeping a log of which data applied to which research question. The data collected were then organised by research question into separate files and entered into a spread sheet. The data were explored for patterns, integrated and revisited to check the synthesis for quality, sensitivity, coherence and relevance. There were formal and informal knowledge exchanges between the authors throughout this process. This was in the form of regular telephone and e-mail exchanges as well as a full day meeting during which key themes, difficulties, preliminary findings and understanding of the available literature was discussed. Patterns in the data were continually discussed and solutions to problems of missing or unavailable data were found. This information sharing enabled the researchers to ensure clear understanding and full information was held by all parties and avoid duplication. Initial findings were presented and discussed at a four hour workshop with practitioners, policy makers, academics and members of the OCC team with relevant expertise which took place on 5 March 2013. Participants for the workshop were recruited through general invitations which were part of the call for papers (see Appendix 9 for the exact wording) and targeted invitations to people who were known to have expertise in the area. Fifteen people participated in the workshop (see full list on page two of the report). Three participants who could not attend the workshop were consulted on a one to one basis (see page two of the report). No remuneration was provided for contributing to this process.

The workshop on 5 March 2013 and the draft report highlighted that little was known concerning children and young people's understanding of what is meant by pornography, therefore a workshop was conducted with seventeen 16-18 year olds on 25 April 2013, to provide some support and challenge to the REA findings. Information sheets and consent forms were sent to potential participants in advance of the workshop (please contact the authors for copies of all of the materials used in the workshop).

On the day of the workshop the workshop facilitators read the information sheet and consent forms to the young people and all questions and concerns were addressed. Young people who were happy to take part then signed the consent form. The workshop began with an icebreaker activity and agreement of the ground rules. For the first activity the young people were divided into two groups by gender, given A3 paper and pens and asked to write on post-it notes which were then stuck on the paper what words/terms they and other young people use when they are talking about images they see that could be described as 'sexy, naked, topless, sex, erotic, revealing' and to explain what kinds of images those words describe. All groups then came together and discussed which words and images they had been talking about they thought were pornography and why?

Finally, they were asked how they would define pornography. The second activity was a structured debate of the motion 'this house believes that seeing pornography has no effect on children and young people'. The young people were again divided into groups, however

this time the groups were mixed gender. Finally everyone was asked to write on two post-it notes answers to the following questions which they stuck up on the wall:

- One thing you think we need to know about young people and pornography.
- One thing that either adults, parents and carers, schools, the Children's Commissioner, the Government or everyone can do to address this issue.

The young people were fully debriefed at the end of the session and given debriefing sheets which contained details of where they could go for support before leaving. Middlesex University Department of Psychology Ethics Committee reviewed the proposal for the workshop and it was conducted in line with the Office of the Children's Commissioner's Participation Strategy and Safeguarding Policy. The OCC gave the young people a £10 gift card to thank them for taking part.

Appendix 6 – Inclusion and exclusion criteria

	Include	Exclude
1.	Studies published between January 1983 and 22 January 2013	Studies published before January 1983 and studies published after 22 January 2013
2.	Studies focused on children and/or young people (up to 18 years old)	Studies focused on adults (over 18 years old)
3.	English, Welsh, Italian and Greek language publications	Publications in languages other than English, Welsh, Italian and Greek
4.	All research methods	
5.	Studies focused on pornography	Studies focused on indecent images of children
6.	Publically available academic research, non-academic research, reports, policy documents, reviews, meta-analyses.	Media or other reports of specific cases. Confidential documents/information. Non-academic opinion pieces
7.	Violence as means to sexual arousal but only from meta-analysis and reviews	General material on the influence of violence on young people's behaviour
8.	The effects of violent imagery on children and young people but only from meta-analysis and reviews	

Exceptions

Exceptions will be made to the criteria in the following cases:
- Key events (to be determined once searches are complete)
- Areas where there is thin coverage (to be determined once searches are complete)
- Specifications made in the brief (e.g. self-videoing and sharing will be considered in the course of the search)
- Anything highly relevant published since January 2013 that is drawn to our attention.

Appendix 7 – Initial and revised search terms by research question

Initial list of search terms
General[5]
Pornography* (porn; porno)
Erotic* (Erotica)
Sexually* AND explicit*
Obscene* (obscenity)
Sexual* AND humiliation*
Public* AND disgrace*
'X-rated'
Girlie* AND magazine*
Dirty* AND movie*
Dirty* AND film*
Sexploitation*
'Hard-core'
'Soft-core'

Revised list of search terms
General[6]
Pornography* (porn; porno)
Erotic* (Erotica)
Sexually* AND explicit*

Initial list of search terms
Research question 1
'Access* pornography*' (Accessing, Porn, Porno)
'Use* pornography*' (Using, Porn, Porno)
'Exposure pornography*' (Porn, Porno)
'Coerce* pornography*' (Coercing, Porn, Porno)
'View* pornography*' (Viewing, Porn, Porno)
'Receive* pornography*' (Receiving, Porn, Porno)
'Share* pornography*'(Sharing, Porn, Porno)
'sexting'
'make* pornography*' (Making, Porn, Porno)
'Obtain* pornography*' (Obtaining, Porn, Porno)
'Buy* pornography*' (Buying, Porn, Porno)

Revised list of search terms
Research question 1
'Access* pornography*' (Accessing, Porn, Porno)
'Use* pornography*' (Using, Porn, Porno)
'Exposure pornography*' (Porn, Porno)
'View* pornography*' (Viewing, Porn, Porno)
'Receive* pornography*' (Receiving, Porn, Porno)
'sexting'
'make* pornography*' (Making, Porn, Porno)
'Obtain* pornography*' (Obtaining, Porn, Porno)

Initial list of search terms
Research question 2
'Pornography* impact*' (Porn, Porno,

Revised list of search terms
Research question 2
'Pornography* impact*' (Porn, Porno,

---

[5] Once initial searches have been conducted on the above words they will then be conducted again, firstly with the word child*, secondly with the words 'young* AND people*' added.
[6] On searches returning more than 2,000 results, the general search terms will be used with the words 'young* AND people*' and 'adolescent*' added. On searches returning less than 2,000 results, the general search terms will be used on their own.

impacts)
'Pornography* cause*' (Porn, Porno, causes)
'Pornography* outcome*' (Porn, Porno, outcomes)
'Pornography* association*' (Porn, Porno, associations)
'Pornography* correlation*' (Porn, Porno, correlations)
'Pornography* result*' (Porn, Porno, results)
'Pornography* consequence*' (Porn, Porno, consequences)
'Pornography* role*' (Porn, Porno, roles)
'Pornography* expectation*' (Porn, Porno, expectations)
'Pornography* Attitude*' (Porn, Porno, attitudes)
'Pornography* behaviour*' (Porn, Porno, behaviours)
'Pornography* effect*' (Porn, Porno, effects)
'Pornography* influence*' (Porn, Porno, influences)
'Pornography* relationship*' (Porn, Porno, relationships)
'Pornography* perception*' (Porn, Porno, perceptions)
'Pornography* fantasy*' (Porn, Porno, fantasies)
'Pornography* reality*' (Porn, Porno, realities)
'Pornography* aspiration*' (Porn, Porno, aspirations)
'Pornography* feeling*' (Porn, Porno, feelings)
'Pornography* affect*' (Porn, Porno, affects)

impacts)
'Pornography* outcome*' (Porn, Porno, outcomes)
'Pornography* association*' (Porn, Porno, associations)
'Pornography* result*' (Porn, Porno, results)
'Pornography* consequence*' (Porn, Porno, consequences)
'Pornography* role*' (Porn, Porno, roles)
'Pornography* Attitude*' (Porn, Porno, attitudes)
'Pornography* behaviour*' (Porn, Porno, behaviours)
'Pornography* effect*' (Porn, Porno, effects)
'Pornography* influence*' (Porn, Porno, influences)
'Pornography* relationship*' (Porn, Porno, relationships)
'Pornography* perception*' (Porn, Porno, perceptions 'Pornography* affect*' (Porn, Porno, affects)

Initial list of search terms
Research question 3[7]
 'Sexual* Image*' (Sexualised, Imagery, Images)
'Violent* Image*' (Violence, Imagery, Images)
'Sexual* material*' (Sexualised, Materials)
'Violent* material*' (Violence, Materials)

Revised list of search terms
Research question 3[8]
 'Sexual* Image*' (Sexualised, Imagery, Images)
'Violent* Image*' (Violence, Imagery, Images)
'Sexual* material*' (Sexualised, Materials)
'Violent* material*' (Violence, Materials)

---

[7] For each of these searches, the terms 'review' and 'meta-analyses*' will be added.
[8] For each of these searches, the terms 'review' and 'meta-analyses*' will be added.

'Sexual* media' (Sexualised)
'Violent* media' (Violence)
'Lads mags'
'Page 3'
'Sexual* video game*' (sexualised)
'Violent* video game*' (violence)
'Sexual* music video*' (sexualised)
'Violent* music video*' (violence)
Manga
Pornification
Sexualisation
'Slasher film*'
'Slasher movie*'
'Horror film*'
'Horror movie*'
'Snuff film*'
'Snuff movie*'
'Glamour model**' (Modelling)

'Sexual* media' (Sexualised)
'Violent* media' (Violence)
'Sexual* video game*' (sexualised)
'Violent* video game*' (violence)
'Sexual* music video*' (sexualised)
'Violent* music video*' (violence)
Manga

Appendix 8 – Guidance notes for conducting literature searches

1. Where search engines allow you to place an asterisk (or other symbol) after a word so that all variants of that word are searched please do so. Where they do not please search using all variants of that word (in the list below variants are shown in brackets where relevant).

2. When searching for strings of words e.g. use pornography, where search engines allow you to please insert 'AND' between the words so that the search will only return results where both/all words are included.

3. Words to be searched as phrases should be entered using inverted commas.

Appendix 9 – Databases used to identify academic material

Initial list of databases	Revised list of databases
PsycInfo/PsycARTICLES	*High priority*
Medline	PsycInfo/PsycARTICLES
Lexisnexis	Medline
ScienceDirect	Lexisnexis
ISI Web of knowledge/Web of Science[9]	ISI Web of knowledge/Web of Science[10]
J-Stor	Ingenta Connect
Ingenta Connect	Economic and Social Research Council
Home Office/RDS (Scottish, Welsh and NI)	RAND/Joseph Rowntree
Cambridge Scientific Abstracts (Illumina)	Foundation/Barnado's/NSPCC websites
RAND/Joseph Rowntree	Home Office/RDS (Scottish, Welsh and NI)
Foundation/Barnado's/NSPCC websites	Google Scholar
Economic and Social Research Council/EDS archives	J-Stor
Academic Search Premier	*Low priority*
Google Scholar	Cambridge Scientific Abstracts (Illumina)
	EDS archives
	Academic Search Premier
	ScienceDirect

---

[9] Including the Arts and Humanities Citation Index; Conference Proceedings Citation Index; Science Conference Proceedings Citation Index: Social Science and Humanities; Social Sciences Citation Index; Science Citation Index

[10] Same as footnote above

Appendix 10 – Databases used to identify grey literature

1. Google — Using the same terms as the database searches and the first 50 hits from each search term will be investigated.

2. Intute[11] — Using the same terms as the database searches and the first 50 hits from each search term will be investigated.

3. Social Care Online — Using the same terms as the database searches and the first 50 hits from each search term will be investigated.

4. http://www.greynet.org/ — Using the same terms as the database searches and the first 50 relevant hits from each search term will be investigated.

5. http://www.ciaonet.org/ — Using the same terms as the database searches and the first 50 relevant hits from each search term will be investigated.

---

[11] Although Intute no longer receives funding it has a database of publications and links to web resources up to 2011.

Appendix 11 – Text of requests sent to extended networks and posted on the OCC website

Hello,

Call for Papers and Workshop: Literature review on the Effects that Access and Exposure to Pornography has on Children and Young People

We are a consortium team led by Middlesex University. As part of their Inquiry into child sexual exploitation in gangs and groups, we have been commissioned by the Office of the Children's Commissioner to conduct a literature review on the Effects that Access and Exposure to Pornography has on Children and Young People.

We are writing to ask for you assistance obtaining any literature that may be relevant. As you would expect we are conducting searches of many academic databases but we suspect much of the work done on this topic may not have been published in academic journals and books. Therefore we would be extremely grateful if you could alert us to any unpublished material / material published in non-academic places / documents / reports / briefings (i.e. grey literature) that is in the public domain. Ideally if you could attach the documents that would be excellent otherwise if you could provide a full reference and its source that would be very helpful.

We have set up a dedicated non-confidential email address in order to receive large files for anything you are able to provide us with – please send any electronic materials to: occlitreview@gmail.com To protect your materials, we request that submissions are compressed (e.g. via Winzip or 7Zip) and password protect (please see attached instructions for how to do this)

If you only have hard copies please send them to:
Professor Miranda Horvath
Literature Review on Pornography
Department of Psychology
Middlesex University
London
NW4 4BT

We are working to a very short timescale so need to receive all materials as promptly as possible and by **4 February 2013 at the latest please.**

PLEASE NOTE that we are not requesting confidential or sensitive materials that could identify individuals, if you have any such materials that you think we should see, please send us an email and we will provide you with details of how to send in such materials.

We will be holding a workshop on Tuesday 5 March in central London to discuss the preliminary themes of the literature review with relevant parties to ensure that the final report produced will appropriately represent the evidence base. If you are interested in

attending this event and inputting into the work further, please send an email to m.horvath@mdx.ac.uk briefly stating why you would like to take part (places will be strictly limited). Thank you in advance for your help with this very important project. Please do not hesitate to contact any member of the team if you have and comments or questions.

Kind regards
Miranda Horvath (Principal Investigator, Middlesex University) m.horvath@mdx.ac.uk
Llian Alys (Investigator, University of Bedfordshire) Llian.Alys@beds.ac.uk
Kristina Massey (Investigator, Canterbury Christ Church University) kristina.massey@canterbury.ac.uk
Afroditi Pina (Investigator, University of Kent) a.pina@kent.ac.uk
Joanna Adler (Senior Advisor, Middlesex University) j.adler@mdx.ac.uk

HOW TO EMAIL PASSWORD PROTECTED DOCUMENTS USING WINZIP

1. Right-click the file you want to email
2. Select 'WinZip'
3. Select 'Zip and E-mail Plus'
4. Choose the name, select compression type "Zip:legacy compression" and tick the box "Encrypt Zip file"
5. Enter and confirm a password
6. Make a note of the password
7. Click 'OK'
8. Telephone password to recipient

Appendix 12 – Text of emails sent to the OCC, London Metropolitan University and the University of Bedfordshire

Dear (insert appropriate name),

We are a consortium team led by Middlesex University. As part of their Inquiry into child sexual exploitation in gangs and groups, we have been commissioned by the Office of the Children's Commissioner to conduct a literature review on the Effects that Access and Exposure to Pornography has on Children and Young People.

We are writing to ask for your assistance obtaining any literature that may be relevant. We are aware that you have been conducting research for the OCC inquiry into child sexual exploitation in gangs and groups and believe that you may have both academic and grey literature already that is relevant to our literature review. Therefore we would be extremely grateful if you would alert us to any material that you have come across in the course of your work that you think might be relevant. Ideally, if you could please attach the documents to an e-mail that would be much appreciated; otherwise if you could provide a full reference and its source, that would be very helpful. A member of the literature review team would be happy to come and meet with you to discuss your work and its relevance to our project at a mutually convenient time (emails will be personalised to make it clear that Llian to Bedfordshire Miranda to London Met). We have set up a dedicated email address we can receive large files for anything you are able to provide us with – please send any electronic materials to: occlitreview@gmail.com To protect your materials, we request that submissions are compressed and encrypted (please see attached instructions for how to do this)

If you only have hard copies, please send them to:
Professor Miranda Horvath
Literature Review on Pornography
Department of Psychology
Middlesex University
London
NW4 4BT

We are working to a very short timescale so need to receive all materials as promptly as possible and by **4 February 2013 at the latest please.**

PLEASE NOTE that we are not requesting confidential materials or sensitive materials that could identify individuals, if you have any such materials that you think we should see, please send us an email and we will provide you will details of how to send them to us.

We will be holding a workshop on Tuesday 5th March in central London to discuss the preliminary themes of the literature review with relevant parties to ensure that the final report produced will appropriately represent the evidence base. We would be delighted if members of your team could attend this event. To attend, please send an email to

m.horvath@mdx.ac.uk letting us know who will represent you. Thank you in advance for your help with this very important project. Please do not hesitate to contact any member of the team if you have any comments or questions.

Kind regards,

Miranda Horvath (Principal Investigator, Middlesex University) m.horvath@mdx.ac.uk

Llian Alys (Investigator, University of Bedfordshire) Llian.Alys@beds.ac.uk

Kristina Massey (Investigator, Canterbury Christ Church University) kristina.massey@canterbury.ac.uk

Afroditi Pina (Investigator, University of Kent) a.pina@kent.ac.uk

Joanna Adler (Senior Advisor, Middlesex University) j.adler@mdx.ac.uk

HOW TO EMAIL PASSWORD PROTECTED DOCUMENTS USING WINZIP

1. Right-click the file you want to email
2. Select 'WinZip'
3. Select 'Zip and E-mail Plus'
4. Choose the name, select compression type "Zip:legacy compression" and tick the box "Encrypt Zip file"
5. Enter and confirm a password
6. Make a note of the password
7. Click 'OK'
8. Telephone password to recipient

Appendix 13 – Text used to email authors directly

Hello,

We are getting in touch with you because we have seen some of your work that relates to children or young people's use/access to pornography or sexually explicit material. We are also taking into account literature reviews concerning violent material.

We are a consortium team led by Middlesex University. As part of their Inquiry into child sexual exploitation in gangs and groups, we have been commissioned by the Office of the Children's Commissioner to conduct a literature review on the Effects that Access and Exposure to Pornography has on Children and Young People.

Whilst conducting searches of academic databases we have come across your research (*Name of Paper*) and feel that this may be relevant to our research questions. We are writing to ask for assistance in obtaining a copy of the full text article as we do not have access to it via other means. We would greatly appreciate any help you can give us in this respect. If you have any other material that you feel is relevant to this literature review and would like to pass this on we would be very grateful.

We have set up a dedicated non-confidential email address in order to receive large files for anything you are able to provide us with – please send any electronic materials to: occlitreview@gmail.com.

 We are working to a very short timescale so need to receive all materials as promptly as possible and by **25 February 2013 at the latest please.**

Kind Regards,

Mia Scally (Research Assistant, Middlesex University)

Miranda Horvath (Principal Investigator, Middlesex University) m.horvath@mdx.ac.uk

Llian Alys (Investigator, University of Bedfordshire) Llian.Alys@beds.ac.uk

Kristina Massey (Investigator, Canterbury Christ Church University) kristina.massey@canterbury.ac.uk

Afroditi Pina (Investigator, University of Kent) a.pina@kent.ac.uk

Joanna Adler (Senior Advisor, Middlesex University) j.adler@mdx.ac.uk

Appendix 14 – Data extraction and Weight of Evidence coding form

1. Data extracted by	Llian Alys Miranda Horvath Kristina Massey Afroditi Pina				
2. Type of source	Peer-reviewed journal		Academic report		
	Book		Government report		
	Book chapter		Gov com report[1]		
	Opinion piece (website)		Charity[2] report		
	Opinion piece (non-website)		Charity[2] com report[1]		
	Newspaper article		Other report		
	Other, please specify				
3. Authors (e.g. Horvath, M., Pina, A. & Massey, K.)					
4. Year of publication					
5. Publication Title					
6. Journal title					
Journal volume (issue)					
Journal page numbers					
7. Publisher					
Place of publication					
8. Peer Reviewed	Yes		No		Not Known	
9. Abstract (if available)					
10. Where conducted/ location					
11. Sample a) Age Range					
b) Gender					
c) Ethnicity					
d) Source of Participants					
e) Number of participants					
12. Method	Quantitative		Qualitative		Mixed-Methods	
a) For quant specify if RCT, power/confidence/sensitivity analysis conducted	.				
b) For qual specify whether saturation reached, is analysis rigorous, how were quotes selected etc					
13. Key findings/main themes					

14. Strengths of paper (as author states)	
15. Limitations of paper (as author states)	

16. Lit review questions paper is relevant to	1		2		3	
17. Comments						

Notes to guide completion of 1-17

Where options are provided for answers – highlight the one that applies in yellow or where boxes are provided put an X in the box that applies.

[1] These are reports commissioned by the government or a charity but which were conducted independently. So a report published by Amnesty but the work for which was conducted and written up by an independent team of academics would be in this category whereas a report published by Amnesty where the work was conducted and written up by Amnesty employees should be categorised as 'charity report'.

[2] This includes voluntary/independant organisations (whether or not registered as a charity)

Weight of Evidence Coding

1. WoE coded by: Llian Alys   Miranda Horvath   Kristina Massey   Afroditi Pina

A) Taking into account all of the quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering all of the study question(s)*?

High	
Medium	
Low	

B) Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this literature review.

High	
Medium	
Low	

C) Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this literature review.

High	
Medium	
Low	

D) Overall weight of evidence

High	
Medium	
Low	

* This refers to the questions posed by that paper NOT those of the literature review which are addressed in B and C

Appendix 15 – Guidelines for making Weight of Evidence decisions

A) Taking into account all of the quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering all of the study question(s)?
1. High
2. Medium
3. Low

Factors to guide decisions
The focus here is on evaluating the paper independent of the literature review questions. So check to see if:
- There is a clear statement of aims of the research and is it related to the aims of the REA?
- There is a clear statement of findings?
- There is adequate discussion of the evidence for and against the researchers' arguments?
- The findings are discussed in relation to the original research questions?
- The study was subjected to some form of peer review? If not peer reviewed was it a significant piece that is nonetheless considered very influential (e.g. stimulated new policy/debate/research/law. We will take each piece on its merit and discuss amongst ourselves e.g. if in doubt about these specific articles, they will be forwarded to the rest of the team for agreement?)
- In some studies it is difficult to distinguish between the findings of the study and the conclusions. In those cases, code the trustworthiness of these combined results/conclusions.

B) Appropriateness of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this review.
1. High
2. Medium
3. Low

Factors to guide decisions
The focus here is on whether the study design and analysis are suitable for answering the questions we're trying to answer in the lit review. So check to see if:
- The reasons for the particular elements of the design have been discussed and justified? Especially choice of data collection methods (questionnaires, interviews, focus groups, diaries etc.)
- The methodology used (quantitative/qualitative/mixed methods) is appropriate?
- Ethical issues were considered? Were enough details provided so that the reader can assess whether ethical standards were maintained? Was approval from an ethics committee granted? Do the researchers discuss issues such as informed consent, confidentiality etc?
- A control group required/used? If so how were they matched/recruited?

- Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? Was a full description of the analysis process provided? Is it clear how data presented were selected from the sample? Were contradictory data presented/taken into account/discussed?
- In summary you should: assess the quality of data, the analysis and synthesis of data, the appropriateness of data and the interpretation of data

C) Relevance of particular focus of the study (including conceptual focus, context, sample and measures) for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this review.
1. High
2. Medium
3. Low

Factors to guide decisions
The focus here is on whether things like definitions/sample etc of the study are in line with the questions for our lit review. So check to see if:
- The definitions used for in line with those used for the literature review (e.g. of children and young people's, pornography, sexual expectations, attitudes and behaviours, sexualised or violent visual imagery)? If not are they similar enough that the study is relevant?
- Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research and for the questions posed for this literature review?
- Has the researcher explained how the participants were selected and recruited?
- Have the researchers explained why the participants included were most appropriate to provide information sought?
- Were there any issues with recruitment? E.g. response rate/ineligibility
- Were there any issues with the data collection methods? Is it clear how it was collected? Was the setting for collection justified? Were the methods justified?
- Do the study authors engage in reflexivity e.g. consider the possibility of researcher bias, considered the relationships between them and the participants?

D) Overall weight of evidence
1. High
2. Medium
3. Low

Factors to guide decisions
Taking into account quality of execution, appropriateness of design and relevance of focus, what is the overall weight of evidence this study provides to answer the question of this specific systematic review? Double check the following four areas:
- **Provenance:** What are the author's credentials? Are the author's arguments supported by evidence (e.g. primary historical material, case studies, narratives, statistics, recent scientific findings)?
- **Objectivity:** Is the author's perspective even-handed or prejudicial? Are contrary data considered or is certain pertinent information ignored to reinforce the author's point? Is there evidence of bias in the article? Do the statistics match those in other publications? [If not, is the argument (method, research design etc) on which they

are based convincing?] How do we know the data is reliable? What other supporting data is there?

- **Persuasiveness:** Which of the author's theses are most/least convincing?
- **Value:** Are the author's arguments and conclusions convincing? Does the work ultimately contribute in any significant way to an understanding of the subject?

Appendix 16 – Papers included for each research question and their Weight of Evidence category[12]

Research question 1		WoE
Alexy, Burgess & Prentky	2009	High
Attwood	2005	Low
Attwood	2011	Medium
Attwood & Hunter	2009	Low
Bailey	2011	Low
Bale	2011	Medium
Becker & Stein	1991	High
Bekele, van Aken & Dubas	2011	High
Billinghurst	2009	Low
Bleakley, Hennessey & Fishbein	2011	High
Bleakley, Hennessey, Fishbein & Jordan	2008	High
Bocij & Macfarlane	2003	Low
Boies, Knudson & Young	2004	Medium
Bonino, Ciairano, Rabaglietti & Cattelino	2006	High
Boyd & Marwick	2009	Low
Braun-Courville & Rojas	2009	High
Bross	2005	Low
Brewster & Wylie	2008	Low
Brown & L'Engle	2009	High
Brown	2011	Medium
Bryant	2009	Medium
Buckingham & Bragg	2003	High
Burton, Leibowitz & Howard	2010	High
Byron	2008	Medium
Cameron et al	2005	Medium
Cantor, Mares & Hyde	2009	High
Carr & Hilton	2009/10	Medium
Charles	2012	Low
Chetty & Basson	2006	High
Chronaki	2013	Medium
Cline	2001	Low
Cline, Cooper, Watson, Lefever & Paul	N.D.	Low
Collins, Martino & Shaw	2010	High
Corne, Briere & Esses	1992	Medium
Cowan & Campbell	1995	Medium
Cowell & Smith	2009	Medium
Crabbe & Corlett	2010	Low
Dake, Price, Maziarz & Ward	2012	Medium

---

[12] Nine articles were not specified to a research question and 7 articles were used for context. These papers are not included in the tables above, however have been referenced where used.

Daneback & Månsson	2013	Low
DCSF	2010	Low
Dombrowski, Gischlar & Durst	2007	Low
Doring	2009	Medium
Eberstadt & Layden	2010	Medium
Escobar-Chaves et al	2005	Medium
Ezzell	2009	Low
Felson	1996	High
Flander, Cosic & Profaca	2009	Low
Fleming, Greentree, Cocotti-Muller, Elias & Morrison	2006	Medium
Flood	2007	Medium
Flood	2009	Medium
Flood	2010	Medium
Freeman-Longo	2000	Low
Gagnon	2007	Low
Gerry	2010	Low
Greenfield	2004	Low
Griffiths	2002	Low
Häggström-Nordin, Sandberg, Hanson & Tydén	2006	Medium
Häggström-Nordin, Tydén , Hanson & Larsson	2009	Medium
Hasebrink, Livingstone, Haddon & Olafsson	2009	High
Hegna, Mossige, Wichstrøm	2004	Medium
Independent Parliamentary Inquiry into Online Child Protection	2012	Medium
Johansson & Hammaren	2007	Medium
Kendall	2004	Low
Kim	2001	Low
Kim	2011	Low
Kinsman, Nyanzi & Pool	2000	Low
Kopecký	2012	Low
Kraus & Russell	2008	Medium
Kubicek, Beyer, Weiss, Iverson & Kipke	2010	Low
Lauszus, Kloster, Nielsen, Boelskifte, Falk & Rasmussen	2011	Low
Lenhart	2009	Medium
Lin, Lo & Jacobs	2012	Low
Livingstone & Bober	2003	Medium
Livingstone & Bober	2004	Medium
Livingstone & Bober	2005	Medium
Livingstone, Bober & Helsper	2005	Medium
Livingstone & Görzig	2012	High
Livingstone, Haddon, Görzig & Olafsson	2011	High
Lo & Wei	2005	Low
Löfgren-Mårtenson & Månsson	2010	High
Mulley	2013	Low
Lowe	2012	Low

Luder et al	2011	High
Malamuth & Impett	2012	High
Mattebo, Larsson, Tydén , Olsson & Häggström-Nordin	2012	Medium
Mesch	2009	Low
Mitchell, Finkelhor & Wolak	2003a	Low
Mitchell, Finkelhor & Wolak	2003b	Low
Morgan	2011	Medium
Morrison, Harriman, Morrison, Bearden & Ellis	2004	Medium
Munro	2011	Low
National Coalition to Prevent Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation	2011	Low
Nitirat	2007	Medium
Njue, Voeten & Remes	2011	Low
Noonan	2006	Low
NSPCC	2011	Low
Owens, Behun, Manning & Reid	2012	High
Papadopoulos	2010	Medium
Perrin et al.,	2008	Low
Peter & Valkenburg	2010b	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2007	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2009	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2010a	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2011	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2006	Medium
Phippen	2012	Low
Poulter	2009	Low
PSHE ASSOCIATION	2012	Low
Powell	2010	Low
Reisman	2011	Low
Rice et al	2012	Medium
Rideout	2001	Medium
Ringrose, Gill, Livingstone & Harvey	2012	Medium
Roe	1987	Low
Romito & Beltramini	2011	Medium
Rosen, Cheever & Carrier	2008	Medium
Rovolis & Tsaliki	2012	High
Sabina, Wolak & Finkelhor	2008	High
Schrock & Boyd	2008	Low
Schrock & Boyd	2011	Low
Shek & Ma	2012	Medium
Silver	2012	Low
Sinković, Štulhofer & Božić	2012	Medium
Skau	2007	Medium
Skoog, Stattin & Kerr	2009	Medium
South West Grid for Learning	2012	Low
Staksrud & Livingstone	2009	High

Staksrud	2009	Low
Stone	2011	Low
Strasburger	2005	High
Svedin, Åkerman & Priebe	2011	High
ter Bogt, Engels, Bogers & Kloosterman	2010	Medium
Træen, Spitznogle & Beverfjord	2004	Low
Tsaliki	2011	Low
Tsitsika et al	2009	Medium
Tydén & Rogala	2004	Medium
Unni	2010	Low
van den Eijnden, Meerkerk, Vermulst, Spijkerman & Engeles	2008	Low
Vandoninck, D'Haenens & Donoso	2010	High
Vanwesenbeeck	2001	Low
Varnhagen	2006	Medium
Wallmyr & Welin	2006	Medium
Weiss	2012	Low
Weiss	2012b	Low
Williams	2001	Low
Wolak, Finkelhor & Mitchell	2011	Low
Wolak, Mitchell & Finkelhor	2006	High
Wolak, Mitchell & Finkelhor	2007	Medium
Wold, Aristodemou, Dunkels & Laouris	2009	Low
Wolf	2012	Low
Womack	2007	Low
Women's Forum Australia	2008	Low
Ybarra & Mitchell	2005	Medium
Ybarra, Mitchell, Hamburger, Diener-West & Leaf	2011	Medium
Ybarra, Finkelhor, Mitchell & Wolak	2009	Medium

Research question 2		WoE
Alexy, Burgess & Prentky	2009	High
Allen	2006	Low
Allen, D'Alessio, Emmers & Gebhardt	1996	Medium
Attwood	2005	Low
Attwood	2011	Medium
Bailey	2011	Low
Bale	2011	Medium
Bekele, van Aken & Dubas	2011	High
Benedek & Brown	1999	Medium
Billinghurst	2009	Low
Bleakley, Henessey & Fishbein	2012	High
Boies, Knudson & Young	2004	Medium
Bonino, Ciairano, Rabaglietti & Cattelino	2006	High
Borg	1998	Low
Braun-Courville & Rojas	2009	High
Bross	2005	Low
Brown & L'Engle	2009	High
Brown	2011	Medium
Bryant	2009	Medium
Buckingham & Bragg	2003	High
Bulkley	2008	Low
Bullen	2011	Low
Burton, Leibowitz & Howard	2010	High
Byron	2008	Medium
Cameron et al	2005	Medium
Cantor, Mares & Hyde	2009	High
Caron & Carter	1997	High
Charles	2012	Low
Chetty & Basson	2006	High
Chronaki	2013	Medium
Cowell & Smith	2009	Medium
Comartin, Kernsmith & Kernsmith	2013	Medium
Corne, Briere & Esses	1992	Medium
Cowan & Campbell	1995	Medium
Crabbe & Corlett	2010	Low
Daneback & Månsson	2013	Low
Ezzell	2009	Low
Farber, Shafron, Hamadani & Nitzburg	2012	Low
Felson	1996	High
Ferguson	2011	Low
Flood	2009	Medium
Flood	2010	Medium

Freeman-Longo	2000	Low
Ghule, Balaiah & Joshi	2007	Low
Gillispie	2006	Low
Greenfield	2004	Low
Häggström-Nordin	2005	Medium
Häggström-Nordin, Sandberg, Hanson & Tydén	2006	Medium
Häggström-Nordin, Tydén, Hanson & Larsson	2009	Medium
Hald, Malamuth & Yuen	2010	Medium
Hasebring, Livingstone, Haddon & Olafsson	2009	High
Hegna, Mossige, Wichstrøm	2004	Medium
Hilton	2007	Medium
Hunter, Figueredo & Malamuth	2010	Medium
Independent Parliamentary Inquiry into Online Child Protection	2012	Medium
Irala et al	2009	Low
Izugbara	2005	Low
Johansson & Hammaren	2007	Medium
Joinson	2006	Low
Katehakis	2011	Low
Kaufman	2003	Low
Kendall	2004	Low
Kim	2001	Low
Kim	2011	Low
King	2012	Low
Kinsman, Nyanzi & Pool	2000	Low
Kjellgren, Priebe, Svedin & Langstrom	2010	High
Kjellgren, Priebe, Svedin, Mossige & Langstrom	2011	High
Krauss & Russell	2008	Medium
Kubicek, Beyer, Weiss, Iverson & Kipke	2010	Low
Lauszus, Kloster, Nielsen, Boelskifte, Falk & Rasmussen	2011	Low
Laville	2012	Low
Lavoie, Robitaille & Hebert	2000	Low
Livingstone & Bober	2003	Medium
Livingstone & Bober	2004	Medium
Livingstone & Bober	2005	Medium
Livingstone, Bober & Helsper	2005	Medium
Livingstone, Haddon, Görzig & Olafsson	2011	High
Livingstone, Kirwil, Ponte & Staksrund	2013	High
Lo & Paddon	2000	Low
Lo & Wei	2005	Low
Löfgren-Mårtenson & Månsson	2010	High
Mulley	2013	Low
Lowe	2012	Low
Luder et al	2010	High
Malamuth & Impett	2012	High

Mancini, Reckdenwald & Beauregard	2012	Low
Mason	2013	Low
Mattebo, Larsson, Tydén, Olsson & Häggström-Nordin	2012	Medium
McKee	2013	Low
Medical Xpress	2011	Low
Mesch	2009	Low
Meszaros	Working paper	Low
Mitchell, Finkelhor & Wolak	2003	Low
Mitchell, Finkelhor & Wolak	2003	Low
Mitchell, Finkelhor & Becker-Blease	2007	Medium
Morgan	2011	Medium
Morrison, Morrison, Morrison, Bearden & Ellis	2004	Medium
Moyer	2011	Low
Mulholland	In Press	Medium
Munro	2011	Low
National Coalition to Prevent Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation	2011	Low
Nitirat	2007	Medium
Njue, Voeten & Remes	2011	Low
NSPCC	2011	Low
Ofcom	2011	Medium
Open University	2013	Low
Papadopoulos	2010	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2006	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2007	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2008	High
Peter & Valkenburg	2009	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2010	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2010b	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2011	Medium
Rice et al	2012	Medium
Rideout	2001	Medium
Ringrose, Gill, Livingstone & Harvey	2012	Medium
Rogala & Tydén	2003	Medium
Romito & Beltramini	2011	Medium
Sabina, Wolak & Finkelhor	2008	High
Seto & Lalumière	2010	Medium
Schrock & Boyd	2008	Low
Schrock & Boyd	2011	Low
Silver	2012	Low
Sinković, Štulhofer & Božić	2012	Medium
Skau	2007	Medium
Smith, Barker & Attwood	Work in Progress	Low
Staksrud & Livingstone	2009	High

Strasburger	2005	High
Steinberg & Monahan	2010	Low
Štulhofer, Busko & Landripet	2010	High
Štulhofer, Busko & Schmidt	2012	Low
Štulhofer, Jelovica & Ružić	2008	Low
Svedin, Åkerman & Priebe	2011	High
ter Bogt, Engels, Bogers & Kloosterman	2010	Medium
To, Ngai & Kan	2012	High
Træen, Spitznogle & Beverfjord	2004	Low
Tsitsika et al	2009	Medium
Tydén & Rogala	2004	Medium
van den Eijnden, Meerkerk, Vermulst, Spijkerman & Engeles	2008	Low
Vanwesenbeeck	2001	Low
Varnhagen	2006	Medium
Villani	2001	Medium
Wallmyr & Welin	2006	Medium
Williams	2001	Low
Wingood et al	2001	Low
Wolak, Mitchell & Finkelhor	2006	High
Wolak, Mitchell & Finkelhor	2007	Medium
Wolf	2012	Low
Womack	2007	Low
Women's Forum Australia	2008	Low
Wong et al	2009	Medium
Ybarra & Mitchell	2005	Medium
Ybarra, Mitchell, Hamburger, Diener-West & Leaf	2011	Medium
Yu	2012	Low
Zgourides, Monto & Harris	1997	Medium
Zhang, Miller & Harrison	2008	Low
Zillman	2000	Low

Research question 3		WoE
Adachi & Willoughby	2011	Low
Alexy, Burgess & Prentky	2009	High
Allen, D'Alessio, Emmers & Gebhardt	1996	Medium
Anderson & Bushman	2001	Low
Anderson	2004	High
Anderson, Ihori, et al	2010	High
Attwood	2011	Medium
Bailey	2011	Low
Bekele, van Aken & Dubas	2011	High
Benedek & Brown	1999	Medium
Bleakley, Henessey, Fishbein & Jordan	2008	High
Bleakley, Henessey, Fishbein & Jordan	2009	High
Bleakley, Henessey, Fishbein & Jordan	2011	Medium
Bonino, Ciairano, Rabaglietti & Cattelino	2006	High
Botta	2003	Medium
Boxer, Huesmann, Bushman, O'Brien & Moceri	2008	High
Boyle & Hibberd	2005	Medium
Browne & Hamilton-Giachritsis	2005	High
Buckingham & Bragg	2003	High
Bullen	2011	Low
Burton, Leibowitz & Howard	2010	High
Bushman & Huesmann	2006	Medium
Byron	2008	Medium
Chandra et al	2008	Medium
Cheung	1997	Low
Dill & Dill	1998	High
Ezzell	2009	Low
Felson	1996	High
Ferguson	2009	Low
Ferguson & Kilburn	2009	Medium
Funk, Baldacci, Pasold & Baumgardner	2004	Low
Gentile & Anderson	2003	Medium
Gentile & Stone	2005	High
Gillispie	2006	Low
Häggström-Nordin, Sandberg, Hanson & Tydén	2006	Medium
Huesmann & Taylor	2006	Medium
Hunter, Figueredo & Malamuth	2010	Medium
International Society for Research on Aggression	2012	Low
Izugbara	2005	Low
Johansson & Hammaren	2007	Medium
Kalof	1999	Medium
Kendall	2004	Low

King	2012	Low
Kraus & Russell	2008	Medium
Lemal & van den Bulck	2009	Low
L'Engle, Brown & Kenneavey	2006	Medium
Livingstone, Kirwil, Ponte & Staksrund	2013	High
Lo & Wei	2005	Low
Lomonaco, Kim & Ottaviano	2010	Low
Löfgren-Mårtenson & Månsson	2010	High
Mulley	2013	Low
Malamuth & Impett	2012	High
Mancini, Reckdenwald & Beauregard	2012	Low
Markey & Markey	2010	Medium
Martino, Collins, Kanouse, Elliott & berry	2005	Low
Marvin	2012	Medium
Mattebo, Larsson, Tydén, Olsson & Häggström-Nordin	2012	Medium
Mesch	2009	Low
Meszaros	Working paper	Low
Mitchell, Finkelhor & Wolak	2003	Low
Mitchell, Finkelhor & Wolak	2003	Low
Morgan	2011	Medium
Morrison, Morrison, Morrison, Bearden & Ellis	2004	Medium
Munro	2011	Low
Myers, Eggleston & Smoak	2003	Low
National Coalition to Prevent Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation	2011	Low
Nitirat	2007	Medium
Ofcom	2011	Medium
Papadopoulos	2010	Medium
Pardun, L'Engle & Brown	2005	Medium
Pediatrics	2009	Low
Pemberton	2011	Low
Peter & Valkenburg	2007	Medium
Peter & Valkenburg	2010	Medium
Pornification- pleasure vs profit	N.D.	Low
PHD Research Blog	2012	Low
Paik & Comstock	1994	High
Ponte, Bauwens & Mascheroni	2009	Low
Poulter	2009	Low
PSHE Association	2012	Low
Quinton	2012	Low
Ray & Jat	2010	Low
Reisman	2011	Low
Ringrose	2009	Low
Roe	1987	Low

Rule & Ferguson	1986	Medium
Sanson et al	2000	Low
Savage	2004	Medium
Schooler & Flora	1996	High
Schooler, Ward, Merriwether & Caruthers	2004	Low
Schrock & Boyd	2008	Low
Schrock & Boyd	2011	Low
Silver	2012	Low
Sinković, Štulhofer & Božić	2012	Medium
Steinberg & Monahan	2010	Low
Stermer & Burkley	2012	Medium
Strasburger	2005	High
Swedish Media Council	2012	Low
Thompson & Stice	2001	Low
Tolman, Kim, Schooler & Sorsoli	2007	Medium
Villani	2001	Medium
Ward	2002	High
Ward	2003	Low
Ward & Friedman	2006	High
Ward, Hansbrough & Walker	2005	Medium
Werner-Wilson, Fitzharris & Morrissey	2004	Low
Whitaker & Bushman	2010	Low
Williams	2001	Low
Willoughby, Adachi & Good	2011	High
Winnett	2009	Low
Wolf	2012	Low
Womack	2007	Low
Women's Forum Australia	2008	Low
Wright	2009	Low
Ybarra et al	2008	Medium
Zillman	2000	Low

Appendix 17: Extended list of future research recommendations

Research questions for which answers are needed, but for which the findings are likely change rapidly as societies and technologies change

- What do children and young people think pornography is?
  - Does their definition of what pornography is affect how they understand and experience it?
- What is the content of the pornography that children and young people are exposed to and access?
- In what contexts are children and young people exposed to pornography?
  - How do the contexts in which they are exposed to pornography affect (or not) how they experience it?
- In what contexts do children and young people access pornography?
  - How do the contexts in which they access pornography affect (or not) how they experience it?
- What are the different responses taken to children and young people's access and exposure to pornography? e.g. the ban in Iceland, different approaches to filtering, sex education etc)
  - What have the effects of those differing international responses been on children and young people?
- What are young people's motivations for 'sexting'? (sexual arousal, revenge, humiliation, a laugh etc)
  - Do young people's motivations differ depending on the context or with whom the sexting is occurring?
- What are young people's motivations for placing sexualised images of themselves on websites and social networking sites?
  - Do young people's motivations differ depending on individual or contextual factors?
- Do cultural norms/context affect children and young people's attitudes towards pornography?

Research questions for which findings are likely to have more longevity

- For which children and young people does exposure and access to pornography have negative effects on their attitudes, behaviours and sexual expectations?
- Why do some children and young people choose to access pornography?
- Why do some children and young people choose not to access pornography?
- Are there links between exposure and access to pornography and other activities children and young people engage in?
  - If links are found with negative/damaging behaviours what can be done to address these problems?
  - If links are found with positive/enhancing behaviours, how can these links developed and translated to other contexts?
- Do different forms of pornography have differing effects on children and young people, and if they do, why and how?

- Are individual characteristics of children and young people linked to how they experience pornography?
  - Are there individual characteristics which make some children and young people more resilient to any effects pornography may have? If so what are they and why do they have this influence?
  - Conversely are there characteristics which make some children and young people more vulnerable to any effects pornography may have? If so what are they and why do they have this influence?
- What are the associations between practices in sexual exploitation and pornography?
- Does exposure and access to pornography affect children and young people's sexual expectations for themselves and of/for others?
  - How and why does it have these effects?
  - Can any effects it has be changed/ameliorated? If so, how?
- Does exposure and access to pornography affect children and young people's behaviours (sexual and non-sexual)?
  - How and why does it have this effect?
  - Can any effects it has be changed? If so, how?
- Does exposure and access to pornography affect children and young people's attitudes (sexual and non-sexual)?
  - How and why does it have this effect?
  - Can any effects it has be changed? If so, how?
- Are some children and young people being exposed to pornography by older generations within and outside their families?
  - If they are, who is doing it? Why is this done? What effect does it have on those children and young people who are receiving pornography this way? Do those effects differ from those experienced by children and young people who are exposed to and access pornography through other means?
- What role does exposure and access to pornography play in children and young people's identities?
  - Assuming that children and young people hold multiple identities depending on who they are with, how does pornography influence these?
  - Are there gender differences in these effects?
- How effective can talking to adults and positive role models be in challenging the proliferation of sexual and sexualised images in children and young people's daily lives?
- Does pornography affect children and young people's understanding and experience of consent and objectification? Are there gender differences?
- What effects does pornography have on children and young people's sexual behaviours? Are these effects mediated by sex education?
- Are children and young people able to distinguish between reality and fantasy when exposed to and accessing pornography?
  - What do children and young people do with the information they have gleaned from pornography? How to they translate/apply it to their lives?