

Invisible Chains: Unveiling the Universal and Unconscious Negative Attitude Towards Sex and Its Societal Implications

Bryce Petofi Towne
brycepstofitowne@gmail.com

Academic Abstract

The prevailing theory of an unconscious, universal negative attitude towards sex is deeply entrenched in societal norms and behaviors, transcending cultural and religious boundaries. This paper titled "Invisible Chains: Unveiling the Universal and Unconscious Negative Attitude Towards Sex and Its Societal Implications" examines this omnipresent phenomenon, dissecting its origins, manifestations, and societal repercussions. Using an interdisciplinary approach that combines a thorough literature review, a detailed language analysis, and a close examination of societal norms and popular culture, this study uncovers the subtle ways this negativity towards sex permeates our language, behavior, and institutional responses. This research offers significant insights into the experiences of sexual assault survivors, the effectiveness of children's sex education, persistent gender inequalities, and our collective understanding of human sexuality. Our investigation calls for a radical shift in societal attitudes towards sex, thereby fostering an environment conducive to open discussions about sex, promoting sex positivity, and prompting societal transformation.

Key words: Sex-related insulting language; Universal negative attitude towards sex; Sex education, Gender equality, Sexual assault survivors

Introduction

In our journey to understand human society and the complex, powerful dynamics that sculpt it, we consistently come across unseen forces subtly woven into our shared cultural matrix. This research paper endeavors to unravel one such force: the pervasive, albeit often unconscious, negative attitudes towards sex, a phenomenon observed universally despite numerous cultural, religious, and social differences. This idea, the backbone of our exploration, emanates from theories that hypothesize about this wide-spread negativity towards sex, arguing that it goes beyond mere societal norms and influences our perspectives, actions, and institutions in often subtle ways (D'Emilio & Freedman, 1997; Diamond, 2008).

These attitudes are not restricted to outwardly aggressive or explicit behaviors. They subtly appear in our linguistic choices, behavioral patterns, societal constructs, and institutional responses, significantly impacting several spheres of human society (Tiefer, 2004). Consequences include the experiences of sexual assault survivors, the quality and adequacy of sex education provided to children, the persistent presence of gender inequalities, and our comprehensive understanding of human sexuality (Tolman, 2002; Martin, 1996).

In this paper, the author embarks on an intricate exploration of this negative attitude towards sex, focusing on its origins, manifestations, and societal implications. This process amalgamates a thorough review of existing literature, an in-depth analysis of language use, and an examination of societal norms and popular culture, intending to offer a comprehensive understanding of this universal, yet often unnoticed, phenomenon (Cameron & Kulick, 2003).

The author intends to question these universally negative attitudes towards sex, which are contributing to a myriad of societal issues. It is the author's hope that this investigation will lay the groundwork for more open, candid, and non-judgmental dialogues about sex, thereby fostering a societal shift towards sex positivity, a more nuanced understanding of human nature, and the empowerment of all individuals (Barker et al., 2018). By illuminating these 'invisible chains,' the author aspires to foster meaningful conversations about sexual diversity and gender equality, and drive societal change (Connell, 2009; Rubin, 2002).

Through a systematic review of these areas, this paper puts forth the theory: There exists a universal and, oftentimes, unconscious negative attitude towards sex, which transcends cultural, religious, and social norms.

Through a comprehensive review of these areas, this paper proposes the theory:

There is a universal and often unconscious negative attitude towards sex, which transcends cultural, religious, and social norms.

Defining Insulting Expression

2.1 Definitions of Insulting and Cuss Words

Insulting language and curse words, also known as profanity, are linguistic expressions that convey strong emotions or offensive ideas (Jay, 2009; Bergen, 2016). These expressions, which can be directed at a person, a group, or an object, are frequently considered socially and culturally inappropriate in a variety of contexts (Stapleton, 2003; Ljung, 2010). Insulting language specifically aims to degrade, humiliate, or demean a person or group by employing

offensive terms regarding their identity, characteristics, or behaviour (Hughes, 1998; Montagu, 2001). In contrast, swearing is a subset of insulting language that typically involves taboo topics such as sexual acts, body parts, and bodily functions (Allan & Burrige, 2006; Pinker, 2007).

2.2 Symbolic Significance: The Transmission of Messages and the Effects of Insulting Language and Swear Words in Language and Culture

Insulting language and swear words carry significant symbolic significance in a language and culture, reflecting the social norms, values, and beliefs of a group (Allan & Burrige, 2006; Vingerhoets & Bylsma & Vlam, 2013). Speakers use these expressions to assert power, express strong emotions, and establish social boundaries (Jay, 2009; Dewaele, 2004). Particularly, the use of sexually insulting language can reveal societal attitudes towards gender roles, sexual behaviour, and moral codes (Stapleton, 2003; Sutton, 1995). The prevalence of sexual swear words in numerous languages highlights the deeply rooted taboos surrounding sexuality and the cultural norms that govern the expression of sexual desire (Hughes, 1998; Wajnryb, 2005).

In addition, the use of insulting language and profanity can have significant psychological and social repercussions for both the speaker and the target (Jay, 2009). According to Bowers and Pleydell-Pearce (2011), exposure to such language can elicit strong emotional responses, increase aggressive behaviour, and negatively impact interpersonal relationships. In addition, the use of sexually offensive language can perpetuate harmful

stereotypes, reinforce power dynamics, and contribute to the stigmatisation of particular individuals or groups based on their sexual behaviour or identity (Stapleton, 2003).

Sex-Related Insults

3.1 Expressions of Sexually-Related Insulting Words in Various Languages and Cultures

According to Jay and Ljung, in a wide variety of languages and cultures, sex-related insults are prevalent (Jay, 2009; Ljung, 2010). These expressions frequently include derogatory terms for genitalia or sexual acts (Hughes, 1998; Bergen, 2016). They target primarily sexual behaviour, sexual orientation, and gender identity. For example, in English, the terms "slut" and "whore" are used to insult women who are perceived to engage in "inappropriate" sexual behaviour, whereas the terms "fag" and "queer" are used to insult individuals based on their sexual orientation (Stapleton, 2003). Similar patterns can be observed in many other languages, such as the use of "puta" in Spanish, "schlampe" in German, and "yinjian" in Chinese, which all have negative connotations associated with sexual behaviour (Wierzbicka, 2013).

3.2 Reflections of Human Cognition and Sexual Attitudes in Sex-Related Insulting Words

The prevalence of sex-related insults in diverse languages and cultures suggests that these expressions reveal deeply ingrained human cognitions and attitudes regarding sex (Jay,

2009; Pinker, 2010). The social and moral taboos surrounding sexual behaviour, which lead to the stigmatisation and marginalisation of individuals who deviate from cultural norms, may account for the prevalence of sex-related insults (Allan & Burrige, 2006). In addition, by targeting the sexuality of marginalised groups, the use of sex-related insults can perpetuate and reinforce existing power structures, such as gender hierarchies (Stapleton, 2003; Thompson & Pleck, 1986).

Mehl and Pennebaker (2003) found that sex-related insults can have significant effects on an individual's self-perception, mental health, and interpersonal relationships. Exposure to such language can lead to feelings of shame, guilt, and low self-esteem, and may even contribute to the development of mental health conditions such as depression and anxiety (Bowers & Pleydell-Pearce, 2011). In addition, the use of sex-related insults can foster a hostile social environment, leading to an increase in discrimination, harassment, and violence (Stapleton, 2003; Pascoe, 2011). Fasoli et al. (2017) discovered that exposure to homophobic epithets leads to dehumanisation and physical distancing from gay men, highlighting the negative effects of such language.

Sex-related insults are widespread throughout languages and cultures, reflecting deeply ingrained attitudes towards sex and perpetuating social power structures. As sex-related insulting words are found in most languages and cultures, there is more to human nature than culture and social norms for researchers to investigate.

A Paradigm Shift

The academic landscape acknowledges a multitude of influences shaping attitudes towards sex, ranging from cultural norms, religious beliefs, societal dynamics, and individual factors. Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory (1983) offers a comprehensive understanding of the role culture plays in shaping individuals' behaviors and attitudes, including their views on sex. Further, the conceptual framework developed by Guiso, Sapienza, and Zingales (2003), exploring the impact of religious beliefs on economic attitudes, could be adapted to further probe the influence of religious tenets on sexual attitudes.

This paper, however, posits a novel theory suggesting a universal negative attitude towards sex, regardless of cultural, religious, and social influences. This proposition counters Krumpal's (2013) assertion about the role of social desirability bias in survey responses regarding sensitive issues such as sexual attitudes. This bias may potentially veil true attitudes towards sex, thereby leading to a skewed understanding of the subject.

Moreover, this paper's theory diverges from the insights provided by Sturgis and Allum (2004), who underscored the crucial role of knowledge and comprehension in molding attitudes towards science, a principle applicable to attitudes towards sex. If accurate, their proposition contradicts the theory of a universal negative attitude towards sex.

Lastly, the impact of social networks and support structures on shaping attitudes, as studied by Maulik, Eaton, and Bradshaw (2009), deserves consideration. Their

research implies that social factors substantially influence attitudes, opposing the theory of a universal negative attitude towards sex.

In conclusion, while the existing literature endorses the multi-faceted nature of attitudes towards sex, this paper propounds a contrasting theory advocating a universal negative attitude towards sex, irrespective of cultural, religious, personal, and social factors.

The Theory

The theory forwarded in this paper suggests a universal and often unconscious negative attitude towards sex, which transcends cultural, religious, and social norms. The theory is primarily based on the globally ubiquitous use of sexually offensive language, again, transcending cultural, religious, and societal boundaries. This theory is principally rooted in the author's personal observations, noting the recurrent use of derogatory or taboo language in routine interactions to convey strong emotions, assert disagreement, or socialize in casual settings. Although society largely acknowledges the inappropriateness of such language, especially around minors, its prevalence is widespread and persistent.

A vital observation underscored by the author is the global existence of sex-related offensive language in virtually all languages, even those no longer in use, defying cultural, geographical, religious, and societal barriers. This observation aligns with the results of several academic investigations. Janschewitz's (2008) research into taboo words, encompassing sexual slurs, demonstrated that such words often

command heightened attention and superior recall compared to emotionally neutral words. Similarly, Van Lancker and Cummings (1999) explored the neurolinguistic and neurobehavioral implications of swearing, noting an increase in the use of curse words in some neurological conditions. Further, Eilola and Havelka (2010) provided affective ratings for English and Finnish nouns, inclusive of taboo words, showcasing the emotional potency associated with such language.

Parvaresh and Tayebi's (2018) research into the association between rudeness and 'moral order' highlighted how aggressive language can act as a response to behaviors or social actions deemed objectionable, potentially explaining the recurring usage of sexually offensive language as a form of social regulation or emotional expression.

While no study expressly states that sex-related offensive language is universally present across all languages, a number of investigations offer indirect support to this argument. For instance, Jay's (2009) work discusses the pervasiveness and utility of taboo words, inclusive of sexual slurs, in human interaction. Furthermore, Craig et al.'s (2009) cross-national study on bullying and victimization among adolescents across 40 countries indirectly implies the widespread use of derogatory language, potentially inclusive of sexual slurs, across various languages and cultures.

The author's observation gains additional support from ChatGPT, a state-of-the-art language processing model, which confirms the presence of sexually offensive language in most of the languages it has been trained on. Even as an AI tool, its assertion that "based on the data available up to my training cutoff in September 2021,

most languages globally do contain sex-related offensive language" is noteworthy, considering its expansive training data from numerous languages.

The author's discovery of sexually offensive language in a broad array of current and extinct languages further emphasizes this phenomenon's universality, irrespective of cultural, religious, social norms, or personal disparities.

The author found that the following existing language has sex-related insulting language through Google search:

- | | | |
|---------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1. English | 15. Bengali | 29. Indonesian |
| 2. Spanish | 16. Punjabi | 30. Tagalog (Filipino) |
| 3. French | 17. Telugu | 31. Javanese |
| 4. German | 18. Marathi | 32. Sundanese |
| 5. Italian | 19. Tamil | 33. Hausa |
| 6. Portuguese | 20. Urdu | 34. Yoruba |
| 7. Russian | 21. Malayalam | 35. Igbo |
| 8. Polish | 22. Kannada | 36. Swahili |
| 9. Dutch | 23. Gujarati | 37. Zulu |
| 10. Greek | 24. Mandarin Chinese | 38. Amharic |
| 11. Turkish | 25. Japanese | 39. Oromo |
| 12. Arabic | 26. Korean | 40. Somali |
| 13. Persian | 27. Vietnamese | 41. Tigrinya |
| 14. Hindi | 28. Thai | 42. Afrikaans |

The extinct languages which the author found through Google search had sex-related insulting language:

- | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Latin | 10. Old Saxon | 19. Biblical Hebrew |
| 2. Ancient Greek | 11. Old Irish | 20. Old Church Slavonic |
| 3. Sanskrit | 12. Old Persian | 21. Old Prussian |
| 4. Old English | 13. Akkadian | 22. Gothic |
| 5. Old Norse | 14. Sumerian | 23. Old Welsh |
| 6. Classical Arabic | 15. Hittite | 24. Old Breton |
| 7. Middle English | 16. Ugaritic | 25. Old Cornish |
| 8. Old French | 17. Phoenician | 26. Etruscan |
| 9. Old High German | 18. Coptic | |

27. Mycenaean Greek (Linear B)	deciphered	32. Classical Nahuatl
28. Minoan (Linear A) -partially	29. Luwian	33. Classical May
	30. Hurrian	
	31. Old Turkic	

This theory, therefore, provides a fresh lens to understand the universally negative attitude towards sex, contesting the prevalent scholarly consensus that attitudes towards sex are shaped by cultural, religious, personal, and social factors. Yet, comprehensive research is warranted to conclusively affirm the universality of sex-related offensive language across all languages.

Sex-related Insulting Language

The usage of sex-related Insulting language reflects societal viewpoints towards sex, an aspect thoroughly scrutinized in the domain of sociolinguistics. This language usage signifies a universal negative attitude towards sex permeating diverse cultures and societies (Cameron, 1998). Although some scholars argue that derogatory language can serve positive functions such as establishing solidarity or facilitating jocular exchanges (Jay, 1992), its principal role remains to convey negative sentiments, intensify confrontations, and at times, incite verbal and physical aggression (Foucault, 1978).

The fact that sex is often used as a tool for insult underscores the predominantly negative, inappropriate, or offensive implications associated with sex (Cameron, 1998). This aligns with the general practice of utilizing terms with perceived negative connotations in insulting language. For example, 'stupid' and 'idiot' are more

frequently employed as insults than 'smart' and 'intelligent' (Wajnryb, 2005), echoing societal judgements about the positivity of intelligence and the negativity of its lack.

The implications of derogatory language are substantial, and this stands true for sex-related slurs as well (Jay, 1992). These slurs would lose their potency if society didn't possess negative viewpoints towards sex and specific sexual conducts. For instance, the term 'slut' is used to denigrate women who engage in sexual relationships with multiple individuals, implying societal judgement on promiscuity (Ringrose et al., 2013), while expressions such as 'screw you' serve as declarations of disgust or hatred, reinforcing the idea that sex can be utilized to offend or assail others (Foucault, 1978).

Despite the considerable amount of existing literature emphasizing the detrimental effects of sex-related derogatory language, research into its root causes and why sex is often considered a negative or even offensive subject of discourse is relatively sparse (Cameron, 1998; Jay, 1992). Foucault (1978), in his seminal work "The History of Sexuality," delves into society's often intricate attitudes towards sexuality, but a thorough exploration of why sex itself is utilized as an insult remains conspicuously missing. Similarly, Ringrose et al. (2013) discuss the effects of societal sexual double standards, especially on young women, but do not investigate the origins of these negative viewpoints.

This study does not aim to dispute existing literature; rather, it aspires to contribute a fresh angle to the conversation. The objective is to delve into the underlying reasons for the negative attitudes towards sex, thereby augmenting our

comprehension of this crucial facet of society (Wajnryb, 2005). It is vital to unearth and address the roots of these damaging perceptions and attitudes, not merely to shed light on the cultural context that perpetuates sex-related derogatory language, but also to inform strategies for promoting healthier societal attitudes towards sex.

There exists an abundance of research probing individuals' attitudes towards sex from diverse standpoints, including religious, moral, societal norms, and personal convictions. It is broadly accepted that these elements significantly shape attitudes towards sex, adding to the complexity of the issue (Foucault, 1978; Mahalik et al., 2005). For example, in Islamic cultures, male homosexuality and perceived sexual misconduct in women can be viewed as sinful and possibly criminal activities (Ali, 2016). Chinese culture also maintains a relatively conservative approach towards sex (Widman, 2006), reinforcing the understanding that attitudes towards sex are varied and influenced by religious, moral, societal norms, and personal variables.

Nonetheless, the pervasive and universal use of sex-related derogatory language poses a challenge to this consensus. From ancient to contemporary languages, from extinct to presently dominant tongues, from small to culturally dominant languages, sex-related derogatory language is invariably present (Jay, 1992; Wajnryb, 2005). The pervasiveness of such language provides persuasive evidence of a pervasive human inclination to view sex negatively. It invites further inquiry into the underlying universality of such attitudes, irrespective of cultural, religious, or social contexts.

Notwithstanding, while the universal existence of sex-related derogatory language suggests a potentially universal negative attitude towards sex, it is essential

to note that language and attitudes are not always inextricably linked (Lakoff, 1975). It is possible for individuals and societies to use such language without necessarily endorsing the negative attitudes they imply. This suggests that the connection between the presence of sex-related derogatory language and negative attitudes towards sex may not be as straightforward as it appears. Instead, it may reflect societal norms and expectations regarding appropriate behavior and expression, particularly in contexts where power dynamics and gender inequalities are at play (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2013).

In conclusion, while a plethora of research suggests that attitudes towards sex are complex and influenced by various cultural, religious, and personal factors, the ubiquity of sex-related derogatory language points towards a potentially universal negative attitude towards sex. More research is required to understand the complex interplay between language and attitudes, as well as to develop effective interventions to challenge and change negative attitudes towards sex.

Negative Attitudes towards Sex: A Universally Shared Bias

The ubiquity of sex-related insulting language across diverse societies and cultures indicates an underlying universal negative bias towards sex. Despite cultural, societal, or individual variations, this deep-seated bias appears to be fundamentally negative (Jay, 1992; Wajnryb, 2005). This prevailing negative bias may also be mirrored in societal discomfort around discussing sex in formal settings, the stigma

surrounding conversations about sex with children, and the societal condemnation of certain sexual behaviors as immoral or even criminal (Ali, 2006; Foucault, 1978).

Prominent figures such as musicians Nicki Minaj and Cardi B, who prominently feature sex and sexual lifestyles in their work, paradoxically resort to sex-related derogatory language such as 'bitch' and 'whore' to insult women deemed promiscuous (Durham, 2009). This highlights the ambivalence of societies where the explicit display of sexuality coexists with negative perceptions and stigmas surrounding it.

The pervasiveness of sex-related insults suggests a largely unconscious, rather than deliberate, universal negative bias towards sex (Jay, 1992). For instance, the deployment of phrases like "you're so gay" as an insult implies an underlying belief that homosexuality is derogatory, without an intentional reflection on why sexual references might be offensive (Herek, 2007). Such unconscious biases can be unveiled in the heat of the moment, such as during conflict situations, revealing deeply ingrained negative attitudes towards sex.

Societal apprehension and sensitivity towards sex-related topics is reflected in how discussions about sex, even between parents and their children, are often avoided or filled with discomfort (DiIorio, Kelley, & Hockenberry-Eaton, 1999). This unease extends to formal settings, where etiquette dictates the avoidance of sex-related topics, especially with individuals who aren't closely acquainted (Lees, 1993). The persistent avoidance of discussions about sex reinforces societal discomfort and the negative bias towards it.

The cultural dichotomy that celebrates birth but shies away from discussing conception and pregnancy is a striking example of this unconscious negative bias towards sex (Gabb, 2004). This discrepancy warrants further exploration to understand why the process leading to birth, i.e., sex, is stigmatized, while the outcome, birth itself, is celebrated.

Similarly, restrictions placed on sexually explicit content in academic discourse, news media, and the film industry attest to the perception of sex as a sensitive, even contentious subject (Greenberg et al., 2010; McNair, 2002). Such restrictions further cement the notion of sex as a universally uncomfortable and negative topic.

This study thus proposes that the ubiquity of sex-related derogatory language reveals an often unconscious, universal negative bias towards sex, transcending cultural, societal, and individual differences. While not challenging existing literature that emphasizes the negative consequences of sex-related insulting language (Cameron, 1998; Ringrose et al., 2013), this study invites a new direction of inquiry: to investigate the roots of such language and the underlying cause of the universally negative attitudes towards sex.

Language as a Reflection of Societal Attitudes

The author's assertion about the widespread use of sex-related insulting language as an indicator of universal negative attitudes towards sex aligns with linguistic and psychological theories, which suggest that our use of language is often a

manifestation of our underlying beliefs and attitudes (Bargh & Chartrand, 1999). This echoes the principles of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which postulates that the structure of a language not only influences but also determines the ways of thinking and behavior characteristic of the culture where it is spoken (Whorf, 1956). In essence, our language can both reflect and shape our thoughts.

Research in the field of psychology corroborates this notion, indicating that our choice of words can unintentionally reveal our subconscious beliefs and attitudes (Bargh & Chartrand, 1999). The implications of this for the present study are significant. If an individual harbors a negative attitude towards sex, it is likely to be reflected in their use of sexually insulting language. For instance, a person who identifies as gay and is comfortable with their sexual orientation is unlikely to use 'gay' as an insult, thus indicating a positive or neutral attitude towards homosexuality.

This is not to discount the influence of individual differences, societal norms, and religious beliefs on the use of sex-related insulting language. These factors certainly play a significant role. However, the observed ubiquity of sexually insulting language, transcending cultural, linguistic, and societal boundaries, hints at a deeper, more pervasive negative attitude towards sex. Boroditsky's (2001) research on language use as a reflection of societal attitudes and beliefs reinforces this argument.

The author's observation that nearly all aspects of sex—excluding pregnancy and childbirth—are portrayed negatively in insulting language is striking, especially when compared to other physiological behaviors such as eating, sleeping, or excreting, which are seldom used as insults. Jay's (2009) research in the field of linguistics

supports this notion, suggesting that insults related to sexual behavior are perceived as more offensive than those associated with other physiological behaviors. This disparity provides further evidence of the unique negative bias associated with sex in our language and, by extension, our societal attitudes.

Societal Biases and the Stigmatization of Sex

Sex, as a natural and pivotal aspect of human existence, is crucial for the survival and propagation of our species (Diamond, 2004). Yet, societal attitudes towards this essential physiological behavior differ starkly from other fundamental human activities such as eating, sleeping, and excretion. This difference is particularly evident in the use of derogatory language. While language related to eating, sleeping, and excretion can occasionally form the basis of insults, these instances are considerably less common and less offensive than sex-related insults (Allan & Burrige, 2006; Jay, 2000).

The reason for this stark contrast may lie in the complex intersection of societal, cultural, moral, and religious factors that surround sexual behavior (Foucault, 1978). Power dynamics, often intertwined with sexual activity, could also play a role in this disparity (Leaper & Ayres, 2007). The ubiquity of sex-related insults, transcending cultural and linguistic barriers, indicates a broader, perhaps global, deviation in attitudes towards sex compared to other physiological behaviors (Jay, 1992).

Despite the intrinsic nature of sex, the unique position it occupies within the domain of derogatory language provides an intriguing insight into societal perceptions of sex and the complexity of human cognition and values (Cameron, 1998).

Moreover, a noticeable trend in the use of sex-related insulting language is its disproportionate application towards women and sexual minorities. Multiple studies have highlighted that women are more likely than men to become targets of sexual harassment, which frequently incorporates sex-related insults (Fitzgerald, Swan, & Magley, 1997). Likewise, sexual minorities including individuals identifying as gay, lesbian, and transgender are common targets of derogatory language and discriminatory actions (Herek, 2009).

In certain societies, the negative attitudes towards sex reach extremes, where perceived 'inappropriate' sexual behaviors can lead to severe punitive measures, including criminal prosecutions or even capital punishment (Human Rights Watch, 2019). This severe stigmatization underscores the universal prevalence of negative attitudes towards sex across many cultures.

As we delve further into the complexities of sex and gender within society, we must acknowledge the embedded biases and disparities. The literature reveals a disproportionate focus of sex-related insulting language towards women and sexual minorities (Fitzgerald, Swan, & Magley, 1997; Herek, 2009). This uneven distribution of derogatory language is emblematic of the pervasive societal inequalities and ingrained prejudices that persist even in contemporary societies.

The situation worsens in societies with stringent views on sexuality, where deviations from the prescribed norms are met with severe punitive actions, extending to criminal penalties and, in extreme cases, death sentences (Human Rights Watch, 2014). Such severe responses underscore the widespread negative attitudes towards sex and expose a prevalent, yet often overlooked, human rights issue.

In conclusion, by examining the use of sex-related insulting language across various societies and cultures, we gain insight into the universal negative attitudes towards sex. The socio-cultural and moral complexities surrounding sexual behavior, coupled with ingrained biases, account for the distinct position sex occupies within the realm of derogatory language. However, further research is needed to fully understand the reasons behind this phenomenon and explore ways to foster more positive and respectful attitudes towards sex.

The Negative Implications of Sex-related Insulting Language

10.1 Sexual Insulting Language as a Catalyst for Violence, Abuse, and Bullying

Sexual insulting language, increasingly recognized as an instigator for violence, abuse, and bullying, is deeply embedded in power dynamics, gender stereotypes, and workplace structures, creating profound repercussions for individuals and communities (McDonald, 2012; Murnen, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002). It is a form of verbal abuse contributing to hostile

environments, leading to psychological distress and sometimes escalating to physical violence (Barak, 2005; Gruber & Fineran, 2008).

Language is central to bullying, with sexual insults magnifying its destructive impact. Studies have shown that this type of language extends beyond traditional workplaces into digital realms, exacerbating challenges in identification and mitigation (Barak, 2005; Kowalski, Giumetti, Schroeder, & Lattanner, 2014; Willard, 2007). Moreover, exposure to sexist language, as manifested in various forms of media, can foster a higher tolerance for sexual violence, indicating a potential causative relationship between sexual insulting language and violence (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Dill, Brown, & Collins, 2008).

Interestingly, benevolent sexism, typified by seemingly positive yet subtly derogatory language, also affects women's self-perception and may contribute to the perpetuation of gender stereotypes and power dynamics (Barreto, Ellemers, Piebinga, & Moya, 2010). The research underscores the pervasiveness of sexual insulting language, not only as overt abuse but also in more hidden, insidious forms.

The cyber realm, too, has emerged as a significant venue for sexual insulting language, further normalizing such behaviors and complicating intervention (Barak, 2005; Kowalski et al., 2014). The detrimental impacts of cyberbullying on victims' self-esteem and mental health are well-documented (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010). Disturbingly, peer-rejected adolescents are particularly vulnerable to this vicious cycle of victimization and aggression (Luthar & McMahon, 1996).

The connection between sexual insulting language and violence, abuse, and bullying is multifaceted, influenced by cultural and social norms, individual attitudes, and situational variables (Barker, 2005; Pascoe, 2005). This complexity underscores the need for comprehensive research to understand this phenomenon better and develop effective prevention and intervention strategies.

Collectively, empirical evidence reaffirms the triggering role of sexual insulting language in violence, abuse, and bullying, emphasizing the need to address this issue in promoting respectful and non-violent communication (Tanenbaum, 2015; Paludi & Barickman, 1991; Foubert, Newberry, & Tatum, 2008). Further research, policy-making, and education are imperative to challenge and change the societal structures that allow such language and behavior to persist.

10.2 Sexual Insulting Language: A Nexus of Sexism and Discrimination

Sexual insulting language represents a profound manifestation of sexism, acting as a conduit to establish and maintain gender biases and power hierarchies (Glick & Fiske, 1996). This language, far more than simple verbal interchange, propagates a complex web of actions such as explicit harassment, offensive jests, and subtly constructed remarks perpetuating gender stereotypes (Gumperz, Drew & Goodwin, 1982).

Inspired by 'Everyday Sexism' (Swim, Hyers, Cohen, & Ferguson, 2001), the pervasiveness and normalisation of sexual insulting language fuel a sexist culture, exacerbating gender discrimination across various social spheres, from workplaces and educational institutions to personal relationships. This language can even stimulate self-

objectification and disordered eating behaviours in women (Calogero, Tantleff-Dunn, & Thompson, 2011), underscoring the multifarious risks of self-objectification.

Victims of sexual insulting language suffer considerable psychological harm. Empirical research shows that such language intensifies feelings of exclusion and inferiority and augments stress and anxiety, thereby inducing various mental health issues (Schneider, Swan, & Fitzgerald, 1997). Furthermore, reactions to counter-stereotypical behaviours often result in cultural stereotype maintenance (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004), another potential harm resulting from sexual insulting language.

Within the context of masculinity, Pascoe (2011) identified a certain normalisation of sexual insulting language as 'locker room talk', frequently dismissed as harmless camaraderie despite its ability to reinforce patriarchal power structures. This normalisation can, in effect, silence victims, fostering a cycle of social inequality and discrimination. Additionally, the use of derogatory slurs demonstrates varying acceptance levels depending on the context, illustrating the subtle mechanisms through which sexist language can gain legitimacy (Jost & Kay, 2005).

Sexual insulting language, therefore, plays an indispensable role in promoting sexism and discrimination. It serves as a tool for reinforcing gender norms, perpetuating stereotypes, and sustaining patriarchal power structures (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Vescio, Gervais, Snyder, & Hoover, 2005). Addressing this problem necessitates a comprehensive understanding of its societal roots, its role in perpetuating discriminatory practices, and the development of effective strategies to challenge and neutralise these harmful behaviours. Initiatives promoting

gender-fair language, for instance, could potentially reduce gender stereotyping and discrimination (Sczesny, Formanowicz, & Moser, 2016).

10.3 Sexual Insulting Language and Sexual Victims

The profound and often underestimated impact of sexual insulting language on victims forms a pivotal part of discussions on sexism and discrimination (Weatherall, 2002). Specifically, within the sphere of sexual victimization, this offensive language induces a wide range of repercussions, extending beyond immediate emotional and psychological suffering to compromise long-term wellbeing and recovery (Campbell, Dworkin, & Cabral, 2009).

Sexual insulting language exacerbates the trauma experienced by victims of sexual assault (Brownmiller, 1975). This form of communication introduces an additional layer of maltreatment that makes the path to recovery even more challenging. It trivializes or minimizes victims' experiences, fortifying harmful norms and stereotypes feeding into the broader culture of sexual violence and victim-blaming (Burt, 1980).

Moreover, sexual insulting language perpetuates the culture of silence surrounding sexual victimization (Ullman, 2010). Empirical evidence underpins the role of fear of derogatory language and stigma in discouraging victims from reporting incidents of sexual violence or seeking help (Sable, Danis, Mauzy, & Gallagher, 2006). This culture of silence not only isolates victims but also inhibits the effective addressing of the root causes of sexual violence, thereby perpetuating these harmful behaviors (Renee & Pingree, 1997).

Sexual insulting language amplifies the power dynamics inherent in sexual assault cases (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). This language serves to assert dominance and control,

dehumanizing victims and reducing them to objects of derision and scorn (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Misra, Selwyn, & Rohling, 2012). Such objectification heightens feelings of powerlessness and worthlessness among victims, obstructing their recovery and reintegration into society (Livingston, Testa, & VanZile-Tamsen, 2007).

Notably, some victims may resort to alcohol as a coping mechanism, which can worsen their psychological distress and self-blame, amplifying the impact of posttraumatic stress disorder (Peter-Hagene & Ullman, 2018). Moreover, societal reactions to the disclosure of sexual victimization can impact the adjustment of survivors, with negative responses potentially worsening outcomes (Orchowski, Untied, & Gidycz, 2013).

Addressing sexual insulting language, therefore, requires a multifaceted approach, encompassing the development of rape prevention programs (Foubert, Newberry, & Tatum, 2008), challenging cultural myths that support rape (Burt, 1980), and deconstructing rape myths that perpetuate victim-blaming (Grubb & Turner, 2012). A deeper understanding of victims' lived experiences can facilitate a more compassionate and effective response, which is integral to changing the current narrative (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

Sexual insulting language profoundly affects sexual assault victims, contributing to a culture of silence, perpetuating harmful norms, and fostering a broader culture of sexism and discrimination. By reinforcing power imbalances, it leaves victims feeling objectified and devalued. Effectively tackling this issue requires a paradigm shift in societal attitudes and responses, informed by an evidence-based understanding of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women (Tjaden, 2000).

10.4 Sexual Insulting Language and Its Impact on the LGBT+ Community

Sexual insulting language directed towards the LGBT+ community operates as a powerful instrument of harassment, discrimination, and stigmatization (Herek, 2009), reinforcing harmful stereotypes and further marginalizing these individuals within society (Meyer, 1995; 2003). This linguistic behavior exemplifies societal biases against non-heteronormative sexual orientations and gender identities, contributing to systemic discrimination.

The impact of such language extends beyond immediate emotional harm, correlating with the psychological well-being of LGBT+ individuals. Bockting et al. (2013) underscore this concern, with their research suggesting a link between exposure to such language and increased rates of mental health issues, including depression, anxiety, suicidal ideation, and internalized homophobia or transphobia. Other studies have further illuminated these mental health challenges, indicating an alarming prevalence of mental health disorders, psychological distress, and suicidality among the LGBT+ youth (Mustanski, Garofalo, & Emerson, 2010; Russell & Fish, 2016).

In educational environments, these challenges intensify. LGBT+ students often grapple with derogatory language, magnifying their psychosocial and educational concerns (Bontempo & d'Augelli, 2002; Kosciw, Greytak, Bartkiewicz, Boesen, & Palmer, 2012). Homophobic teasing has been noted as a particular stressor among high school students (Espelage, Aragon, Birkett, & Koenig, 2008), while various forms of bullying hold different implications for LGBT+ adolescents (Swearer, Turner, Givens, & Pollack, 2008). D'Augelli,

Grossman, and Starks (2006) further point to the traumatic impact of childhood victimization on LGBT+ youth, highlighting the risk for post-traumatic stress disorder.

The systemic nature of this issue necessitates systemic responses. There is evidence that supportive environments, such as protective school climates, can reduce the risk for suicide ideation in sexual minority youths (Hatzenbuehler, Birkett, Van Wagenen, & Meyer, 2014). In addition, perceived discrimination's impact on school performance can be mitigated with adequate social support (Craig & Smith, 2014). Furthermore, the presence and participation in high school gay-straight alliances have been associated with improved young adult well-being (Toomey, Ryan, Diaz, & Russell, 2011).

Research also shows that openness about sexual orientation and/or gender identity can correlate positively with the well-being and educational outcomes of LGBT+ students (Kosciw, Palmer, & Kull, 2015). Simultaneously, the significance of intersecting identities and parent support in shaping adolescents' psychosocial and educational experiences is increasingly recognized (Poteat, Mereish, DiGiovanni, & Koenig, 2011).

10.5 Sexual Insulting Language and Sexual Shaming

The pervasive use of sexual insulting language underscores and perpetuates sexual shaming, a multifaceted social problem that stigmatizes individuals based on their real or perceived sexual behaviors (Ringrose & Renold, 2012; Tanenbaum, 2015). Such language functions to marginalize and control people based on their sexual choices, engendering a culture of guilt, silence, and repression (Phipps & Young, 2015). This control further fuels a

gendered issue that disproportionately affects women and those identifying as female (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012; Fine & McClelland, 2006).

The detrimental effects of sexual shaming on mental health, body image, and self-esteem are palpable. Women often find themselves the subject of "slut-shaming," a derogatory language practice intended to devalue or police women's sexuality (Ringrose & Renold, 2012; Tanenbaum, 2015). It contributes to a prevailing environment where sexism and gender-based violence are normalized (Jewkes, Flood, & Lang, 2015).

However, it's essential to acknowledge that sexual shaming also negatively impacts men and those identifying as male (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Anderson, 2010). Men's sexual behavior, often subjected to hegemonic masculinity, presents a different form of sexual shaming, promoting hypersexual behavior while concurrently demonizing non-conformity (Seidler, 2006; Pascoe, 2011).

Sexual insulting language leads to negative emotional, social, and psychological outcomes. It cultivates an environment where individuals internalize societal sexual norms, culminating in feelings of guilt, shame, and a diminished willingness to participate in healthy, consensual sexual activity (Fasula, Carry, & Miller, 2014). These effects emphasize the power dynamics inherent in sexual insulting language, acting as an instrument of social control and stigma (Jackson & Cram, 2003).

Recognizing the agency of women in their sexual decision-making processes is paramount to disrupting the cycle of sexual shaming (Armstrong, England, & Fogarty, 2012). Simultaneously, it's crucial to understand and challenge harmful societal norms surrounding

male sexuality (Anderson, 2010). Efforts to reject harmful societal norms surrounding sexuality, supplemented by comprehensive sexual education, are pivotal to addressing this issue (Fine & McClelland, 2006).

In addition, educating all genders to dispel rape myths and promote respectful attitudes towards sexuality serves as a formidable strategy for reducing sexual harassment and violence (Jewkes, Flood, & Lang, 2015; Carmody & Washington, 2001; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). Peer education programs have shown potential in changing attitudes and behaviors, particularly in high-risk groups such as fraternity men (McEwen, 1998).

In conclusion, sexual insulting language plays a critical role in perpetuating sexual shaming, a harmful practice with wide-reaching implications on individuals and society (Powell, 2010; Heldman & Wade, 2011). Addressing this complex issue demands a multi-dimensional approach, incorporating shifts in societal attitudes, comprehensive sexual education reforms, and enforcing laws against such behaviors.

The Negative Implications of Universal Negative Attitude towards Sex

11.1 Negative Attitudes Towards Sex and Its Influence on Sexual Assault Survivors

The widespread negative attitudes towards sex in various societies have ramifications that extend far beyond the use of language and societal norms, as they can notably influence the experiences of sexual assault survivors. Predominant

psychological literature suggests that these universally negative perceptions of sex often amplify the trauma endured by survivors of sexual assault, exacerbating feelings of shame, guilt, and social isolation (Campbell, Dworkin, & Cabral, 2009; Ullman, Townsend, Filipas, & Starzynski, 2007).

Sexual violence is undeniably a traumatic event, leaving survivors with physical, emotional, and psychological scars. The path towards recovery can be complex and lengthy (Resick, 1993). A society imbued with negativity towards sex can complicate this healing process. Survivors often grapple with self-blame and guilt in their aftermath, with societal attitudes towards sex often reinforcing these feelings, making the recuperation journey more challenging (Frazier, 2003).

Additionally, societal stigma related to sex can lead to victim-blaming, where survivors of sexual assault face undue blame for their own victimization. Empirical studies have revealed this victim-blaming to be more prevalent when victims were intoxicated during the assault or were perceived as engaging in behavior deemed "risky," such as wearing provocative attire or engaging in casual sexual encounters (Grubb & Turner, 2012). This damaging attitude further enforces silence around sexual violence, often discouraging survivors from reporting their experiences and seeking necessary help.

Moreover, this negative attitude towards sex affects sexual minorities, as societal views can fuel homophobia and discrimination. These individuals face unique struggles, bearing the double burden of traumatic experience and societal

discrimination. The use of derogatory language often serves to heighten the distress experienced by these individuals (Herek, Gillis, & Cogan, 2009).

Furthermore, societies criminalizing certain sexual behaviors such as homosexuality and sex work tend to display a higher degree of negativity towards sex (Human Rights Watch, 2018). In such societies, survivors of sexual assault who identify as sexual minorities or are sex workers may face additional barriers when seeking justice and support due to fear of criminal repercussions.

Lastly, negative attitudes towards sex can profoundly affect how professionals, including law enforcement, medical personnel, and therapists, respond to sexual assault survivors, potentially resulting in secondary victimization (Campbell et al., 2001). These attitudes can result in insensitive questioning, disbelief, or blame, further traumatizing the survivor (Campbell et al., 2001).

In conclusion, universally negative attitudes towards sex not only contribute to derogatory language use and sex-related stigma, but they also pose severe implications for survivors of sexual assault. This underlines the urgency for societal attitudes towards sex to evolve, and for promoting open, non-judgmental conversations about sex, as these changes can significantly aid in supporting the healing and recovery of sexual assault survivors.

11.2 Negative Attitudes Towards Sex and Their Impact on Children's Sex Education

The universal negative attitude towards sex critically affects sex education for children, impacting their academic, personal, and social development (UNESCO, 2018). As noted by Ballard and Gross (2009), sex education is essential for equipping children with knowledge about their bodies and relationships, preparing them for adulthood. However, prevailing sex-negative societal attitudes often lead to inadequate and misleading sex education.

In societies where sex is viewed negatively, conversations around sexual behaviors, body functions, and relationships become fraught, leading to circumvention, euphemistic language, or misinformation (UNESCO, 2018). Consequently, children may receive confusing or inaccurate information about sex, leaving them unprepared for puberty, sexual relationships, and their associated responsibilities (Ballard & Gross, 2009).

This negativity often cultivates an environment of shame and secrecy surrounding sex, as emphasized by Bay-Cheng (2003). Such a culture can significantly impact children's self-perception and self-esteem, especially as they traverse the challenges of adolescence (Allen, 2007). It can also stifle open, honest dialogue between children and parents or educators, presenting a significant hurdle to effective sex education (Martino, Elliott, Corona, Kanouse, & Schuster, 2008).

In educational settings, negative attitudes towards sex can shape the curriculum, leading to the implementation of abstinence-only education, which promotes the postponement of sex until marriage, at the expense of comprehensive sex education (Santelli et al., 2017). These programs often neglect important topics such as

contraception, safe sex practices, consent, and sexual diversity (Kohler, Manhart, & Lafferty, 2008). Additionally, the potential stigmatization of sex within these programs may cause students to feel guilt or shame about their sexual feelings or behaviors, which can be detrimental to their emotional and psychological well-being (Bay-Cheng, 2003).

Moreover, societal sex negativity often perpetuates discrimination against sexual minorities, leading to the omission of LGBTQ+ related topics from sex education programs (Fields, 2008). This exclusion can leave LGBTQ+ children without essential knowledge to engage in safe, consensual, and satisfying sexual relationships. It can also amplify feelings of isolation and stigma among these children, exacerbating the mental health disparities within the LGBTQ+ community (Russell & Fish, 2016).

In conclusion, widespread negative attitudes towards sex can significantly undermine comprehensive, inclusive sex education, potentially leaving children uninformed, unprepared, and emotionally burdened. Therefore, it is essential to challenge and transform these societal attitudes to cultivate a culture of openness, respect, and understanding around sex, significantly improving the quality of sex education for children (UNESCO, 2018).

Addressing Unconscious Biases and Promoting Equality

An understanding of the ingrained negative attitudes towards sex can provide significant insights into societal norms and behaviors. Notably, it has the potential to pave the way for improved gender equality, resonating with the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals, which underscore the importance of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls (United Nations, 2015).

Several cultures, including America, have witnessed substantial societal changes in attitudes towards sex. For example, there has been the legalization of same-sex marriages and civil partnerships (Taylor, 2013), and the decriminalization of sex work (Brents & Hausbeck, 2005). However, the persistence of sex-related insulting language suggests a complex dynamic where progress in certain aspects is coupled with a resistance to fundamental shifts in attitudes towards sex (Jay, 2009).

Even as popular media shows a liberalization of sexual attitudes with increased explicit sexual content (Frith & McRobbie, 2006), the presence of sex-related insulting language emphasizes the deep-rooted negative perceptions of sex within societies (Jay, 2009).

Scholars, media, and government have played a significant role in encouraging positive societal changes (Herek, 2007; Mahalik et al., 2005). Individuals, too, can make a difference by discouraging derogatory language that objectifies and stigmatizes, such as "slut" or "whore" for women, and "fag" for sexual minorities (Ringrose et al., 2013; Herek, 2007).

Further exploration into the distinct treatment of sex compared to other physiological behaviors is warranted. Why is sex universally (and often unconsciously) perceived negatively, and why is sex-related derogatory language so pervasive? These inquiries can greatly enhance our understanding of human nature and societal constructs surrounding sex (Jay, 2009; Wierzbicka, 2013).

Examining how this universally negative attitude influences religious, moral, and societal interpretations of sex can ultimately revolutionize our understanding of sex and, by extension, human nature (Foucault, 1978; Diamond, 2004).

It is the author's hope that such exploration might shift societal perceptions of sex, leading to real-world changes, including enhanced gender equality (Mahalik et al., 2005).

Method

To examine the universally negative attitudes towards sex and its implications, this study employed a multi-pronged approach, encompassing a review of literature, an analysis of languages, and an exploration of popular culture and societal norms. Data collection and analysis primarily involved online resources, including Google Search, Google Scholar, and ChatGPT.

Literature Review: A comprehensive literature review was conducted through Google Scholar to gain insights into the prevailing attitudes towards sex and their societal implications. Peer-reviewed articles, academic journals, books, reports from notable organizations like UNESCO, and other scholarly resources were perused. The

search terms included "negative attitudes towards sex," "sexual assault survivors," "sex education," "gender equality," "sex-related derogatory language," among others. The literature review was not restricted to a specific time frame, ensuring that the most relevant and significant works were included.

Language Analysis: A linguistic analysis of various languages was undertaken using Google Search to identify the presence of sex-related insulting language. This involved exploring languages from different parts of the world, focusing on their colloquial and formal usage. The objective was to identify common sex-related derogatory words, their frequency of use, and cultural contexts.

ChatGPT Exploration: OpenAI's ChatGPT, an advanced language model, was employed to generate coherent, information-based responses on a variety of topics related to the negative attitudes towards sex. This allowed for the extraction of relevant information from a broad array of topics related to sex and sexuality, drawing from the model's extensive training data, which includes a wide range of internet text up until September 2021. The model's ability to generate factual, nuanced information was leveraged to complement the data derived from the literature review and language analysis.

The information gathered from these methods was then integrated and synthesized to provide a multifaceted understanding of the universally negative attitudes towards sex. The results were analyzed and interpreted in the context of their implications for sexual assault survivors, children's sex education, and gender equality.

This mixed-method approach enabled a comprehensive exploration of the topic, ensuring that the paper draws upon a diverse range of sources to present a balanced and in-depth examination of the negative attitudes towards sex and their ramifications on different societal aspects.

Conclusion

In the discourse of "Invisible Chains: Unveiling the Universal and Unconscious Negative Attitude Towards Sex and Its Societal Implications," it has become evident that deep-seated, often unconscious negative attitudes towards sex transcend diverse societies, religious beliefs, and cultural norms. This universal negativity towards sex manifests in myriad forms - in our language, in the way sexual assault survivors are treated, in the way children are educated about sex, and in the persistent gender inequalities.

Our exploration underlined that these attitudes inflict additional trauma on sexual assault survivors, amplifying their feelings of guilt, shame, and isolation. Furthermore, it has become apparent that these negative attitudes obstruct effective, comprehensive sex education for children, fostering a culture of misinformation, secrecy, and shame. Equally concerning is the reinforcement of gender inequalities through sex-related insulting language and societal norms that disparage sexual behavior.

While progress has been observed in some aspects, such as the recognition of same-sex relationships and the decriminalization of sex work in some societies, the

ubiquitous sex-related insulting language and persistently negative attitudes signal a complex dynamic. A societal shift in attitudes towards sex is required, one that encourages open, non-judgmental conversations about sex, provides effective support to sexual assault survivors, and prioritizes comprehensive sex education.

This paper has elucidated the hidden and often unconscious negative perceptions of sex, hoping to instigate change in societal norms, and foster an environment that respects sexual diversity and promotes gender equality. However, this journey is not one to be taken lightly. We need to encourage continuous research and open dialogue about sex and its associated behaviors, challenging the negative attitudes deeply ingrained in our societies. By doing so, we not only make strides towards a more equitable society, but we also unlock a better understanding of human nature and sexuality - breaking the invisible chains that bind us.

Statement

During the preparation of this work the author used ChatGPT in order to cite some literature, confirm some statements, proofread and improve the language clarity and structure of this report. After using this tool/service, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication.

References

1. Ali, K. (2016). *Sexual ethics and Islam: feminist reflections on Qur'an, hadith, and jurisprudence*. Simon and Schuster.

2. Allan, K., & Burrige, K. (2006). *Forbidden words: Taboo and the censoring of language*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Allen, L. (2007). Denying the sexual subject: schools' regulation of student sexuality. *British educational research journal*, 33(2), 221-234.
4. Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). The effects of media violence on society. *Science*, 295(5564), 2377-2379.
5. Anderson, E. (2010). *In the game: Gay athletes and the cult of masculinity*. State University of New York Press.
6. Angelone, D. J., Mitchell, D., & Pilafova, A. (2007). Club drug use and intentionality in perceptions of rape victims. *Sex Roles*, 57, 283-29
7. Armstrong, E. A., England, P., & Fogarty, A. C. (2012). Accounting for women's orgasm and sexual enjoyment in college hookups and relationships. *American Sociological Review*, 77(3), 435-462.
8. Ballard, Sharon & PhD, CFLE. (2009). Exploring Parental Perspectives on Parent-Child Sexual Communication. *American Journal of Sexuality Education*. 4. 40-57. 10.1080/15546120902733141.
9. Barak, A. (2005). Sexual harassment on the Internet. *Social Science Computer Review*, 23(1), 77-92.
10. Bargh, J. A., & Chartrand, T. L. (1999). The unbearable automaticity of being. *American psychologist*, 54(7), 462.

11. Barker, G. T. (2005). *Dying to be men: Youth, masculinity and social exclusion* (Vol. 3). Psychology Press.
12. Barker, M. J., Gill, R., & Harvey, L. (2018). Mediated intimacy: Sex advice in media culture. *Sexualities*, 21(8), 1337-1345.
13. Barreto, M., Ellemers, N., Piebinga, L., & Moya, M. (2010). How nice of us and how dumb of me: The effect of exposure to benevolent sexism on women's task and relational self-descriptions. *Sex Roles*, 62, 532-544.
14. Bay-Cheng, L. Y. (2003). The trouble of teen sex: The construction of adolescent sexuality through school-based sexuality education. *Sex Education: sexuality, society and learning*, 3(1), 61-74.
15. Bergen, B. K. (2016). *What the F: What swearing reveals about our language, our brains, and ourselves*. Hachette UK.
16. Bockting, W. O., Miner, M. H., Swinburne Romine, R. E., Hamilton, A., & Coleman, E. (2013). Stigma, mental health, and resilience in an online sample of the US transgender population. *American journal of public health*, 103(5), 943-951.
17. Bontempo, D. E., & d'Augelli, A. R. (2002). Effects of at-school victimization and sexual orientation on lesbian, gay, or bisexual youths' health risk behavior. *Journal of Adolescent health*, 30(5), 364-374.
18. Boroditsky, L. (2001). Does language shape thought?: Mandarin and English speakers' conceptions of time. *Cognitive psychology*, 43(1), 1-22.

19. Bowers, J. S., & Pleydell-Pearce, C. W. (2011). Swearing, euphemisms, and linguistic relativity. *PloS one*, 6(7), e22341.
20. Brents, B. G., & Hausbeck, K. (2005). Violence and legalized brothel prostitution in Nevada: Examining safety, risk, and prostitution policy. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 20(3), 270-295.
21. Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men. Women and Rape*, 15, 105.
22. Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 38(2), 217.
23. Calogero, R. M., Tantleff-Dunn, S., & Thompson, J. K. (Eds.). (2011). *Self-objectification in women: Causes, consequences, and counteractions* (Vol. 12). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
24. Cameron, D. (Ed.). (1998). *The feminist critique of language: A reader*. Psychology Press.
25. Cameron, D., & Kulick, D. (2003). *Language and sexuality*. Cambridge University Press.
26. Campbell, R., Dworkin, E., & Cabral, G. (2009). An ecological model of the impact of sexual assault on women's mental health. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 10(3), 225-246.
27. Campbell, R., Wasco, S. M., Ahrens, C. E., Sefl, T., & Barnes, H. E. (2001). Preventing the "Second rape" rape survivors' experiences with community service providers. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 16(12), 1239-1259.

28. Carmody, D. C., & Washington, L. M. (2001). Rape myth acceptance among college women: The impact of race and prior victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(5), 424-436.
29. Connell, R. (2009). *Gender* (Vol. 14). Polity.
30. Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & society*, 19(6), 829-859.
31. Craig, S. L., & Smith, M. S. (2014). The impact of perceived discrimination and social support on the school performance of multiethnic sexual minority youth. *Youth & Society*, 46(1), 30-50.
32. Craig, W., Harel-Fisch, Y., Fogel-Grinvald, H., Dostaler, S., Hetland, J., Simons-Morton, B., ... & HBSC Bullying Writing Group. (2009). A cross-national profile of bullying and victimization among adolescents in 40 countries. *International journal of public health*, 54, 216-224.
33. D'emilio, J., & Freedman, E. B. (1997). *Intimate matters: A history of sexuality in America*. University of Chicago Press.
34. Dewaele, J. M. (2004). The emotional force of swearwords and taboo words in the speech of multilinguals. *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development*, 25(2-3), 204-222.
35. Diamond, L. M. (2004). Emerging perspectives on distinctions between romantic love and sexual desire. *Current directions in psychological science*, 13(3), 116-119.

36. Diamond, L. M. (2008). *Sexual fluidity: Understanding women's love and desire*. Harvard University Press.
37. Diamond, M. (2004). Sexual behavior in pre contact Hawai'i: a sexological ethnography. *Revista española del Pacífico*, (16), 37-58.
38. DiIorio, C., Kelley, M., & Hockenberry-Eaton, M. (1999). Communication about sexual issues: Mothers, fathers, and friends. *Journal of adolescent health*, 24(3), 181-189.
39. Dill, K. E., Brown, B. P., & Collins, M. A. (2008). Effects of exposure to sex-stereotyped video game characters on tolerance of sexual harassment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(5), 1402-1408.
40. Durham, M. G. (2009). *The Lolita effect: The media sexualization of young girls and what we can do about it*. Abrams.
41. Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological review*, 109(3), 573.
42. Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2013). *Language and gender*. Cambridge University Press.
43. Eilola, T. M., & Havelka, J. (2010). Affective norms for 210 British English and Finnish nouns. *Behavior Research Methods*, 42, 134-140.
44. Espelage, D. L., Aragon, S. R., Birkett, M., & Koenig, B. W. (2008). Homophobic teasing, psychological outcomes, and sexual orientation among high

- school students: What influence do parents and schools have?. *School psychology review*, 37(2), 202-216.
45. Fasoli, F., Maass, A., Paladino, M. P., & Sulpizio, S. (2017). Gay-and lesbian-sounding auditory cues elicit stereotyping and discrimination. *Archives of sexual behavior*, 46, 1261-1277.
 46. Fasula, A. M., Carry, M., & Miller, K. S. (2014). A multidimensional framework for the meanings of the sexual double standard and its application for the sexual health of young black women in the US. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 51(2), 170-183.
 47. Fields, J. (2008). *Risky lessons: Sex education and social inequality*. Rutgers University Press.
 48. Fine, M., & McClelland, S. (2006). Sexuality education and desire: Still missing after all these years. *Harvard educational review*, 76(3), 297-338.
 49. Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S., & Magley, V. J. (1997). But was it really sexual harassment?: Legal, behavioral, and psychological definitions of the workplace victimization of women.
 50. Foubert, J. D., Newberry, J. T., & Tatum, J. (2008). Behavior differences seven months later: Effects of a rape prevention program.
 51. Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality* (1st American ed.).

52. Frazier, P. A. (2003). Perceived control and distress following sexual assault: a longitudinal test of a new model. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 84(6), 1257.
53. Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T. A. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of women quarterly*, 21(2), 173-206.
54. Frith, S., & Goodwin, A. (2006). *On record: rock, pop and the written word*. Routledge.
55. Gabb, J. (2004). Critical differentials: Querying the incongruities within research on lesbian parent families. *Sexualities*, 7(2), 167-182.
56. Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 70(3), 491.
57. Greenberg, B. S., Sherry, J., Lachlan, K., Lucas, K., & Holmstrom, A. (2010). Orientations to video games among gender and age groups. *Simulation & Gaming*, 41(2), 238-259.
58. Grubb, A., & Turner, E. (2012). Attribution of blame in rape cases: A review of the impact of rape myth acceptance, gender role conformity and substance use on victim blaming. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 17(5), 443-452.

59. Gruber, J. E., & Fineran, S. (2008). Comparing the impact of bullying and sexual harassment victimization on the mental and physical health of adolescents. *Sex roles*, 59, 1-13.
60. Guiso, L., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2003). People's opium? Religion and economic attitudes. *Journal of monetary economics*, 50(1), 225-282.
61. Gumperz, J. J., Drew, P., & Goodwin, M. H. (Eds.). (1982). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge University Press.
62. Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Birkett, M., Van Wagenen, A., & Meyer, I. H. (2014). Protective school climates and reduced risk for suicide ideation in sexual minority youths. *American journal of public health*, 104(2), 279-286.
63. Heldman, C., & Wade, L. (2011). Sexualizing Sarah Palin: The social and political context of the sexual objectification of female candidates. *Sex Roles*, 65, 156-164.
64. Herek, G. M. (2007). Confronting sexual stigma and prejudice: Theory and practice. *Journal of social issues*, 63(4), 905-925.
65. Herek, G. M. (2009). Hate crimes and stigma-related experiences among sexual minority adults in the United States: Prevalence estimates from a national probability sample. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 24(1), 54-74.
66. Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., & Cogan, J. C. (2009). Internalized stigma among sexual minority adults: Insights from a social psychological perspective. *Journal of Counseling psychology*, 56(1), 32.

67. Hofstede, G. (1983). National cultures in four dimensions: A research-based theory of cultural differences among nations. *International studies of management & organization*, 13(1-2), 46-74.
68. Huddy, L., Mason, L., & Aarøe, L. (2015). Expressive partisanship: Campaign involvement, political emotion, and partisan identity. *American Political Science Review*, 109(1), 1-17.
69. Hughes, G. (1998). *Swearing: A social history of foul language, oaths and profanity in English*. Penguin UK.
70. Human Rights Watch. (2014). "I'm Afraid to Be a Woman": Human Rights Abuses Against Transgender People in the US. Human Rights Watch.
<https://www.hrw.org/report/2014/09/25/im-scared-be-woman/human-rights-abuses-against-transgender-people-malaysia>
71. Human Rights Watch. (2018). "I Have to Leave to Be Me": Discriminatory Laws against LGBT People in the Eastern Caribbean.
<https://www.hrw.org/report/2019/03/21/i-have-leave-be-me/discriminatory-laws-against-lgbt-people-eastern-caribbean>.
72. Jackson, S. M., & Cram, F. (2003). Disrupting the sexual double standard: Young women's talk about heterosexuality. *British journal of social psychology*, 42(1), 113-127
73. Janschewitz, K. (2008). Taboo, emotionally valenced, and emotionally neutral word norms. *Behavior research methods*, 40(4), 1065-1074.

74. Jay, T. (2009). The utility and ubiquity of taboo words. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 4(2), 153-161.
75. Jay, T., & Curse, W. W. (2000). *A neuro-psycho-social theory of speech*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
76. Jewkes, R., Flood, M., & Lang, J. (2015). From work with men and boys to changes of social norms and reduction of inequities in gender relations: a conceptual shift in prevention of violence against women and girls. *The Lancet*, 385(9977), 1580-1589.
77. Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 88(3), 498.
78. Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2013). College students and sexual consent: Unique insights. *Journal of sex research*, 50(6), 517-523.
79. Kohler, P. K., Manhart, L. E., & Lafferty, W. E. (2008). Abstinence-only and comprehensive sex education and the initiation of sexual activity and teen pregnancy. *Journal of adolescent Health*, 42(4), 344-351.
80. Kosciw, J. G., Palmer, N. A., & Kull, R. M. (2015). Reflecting resiliency: Openness about sexual orientation and/or gender identity and its relationship to well-being and educational outcomes for LGBT students. *American journal of community psychology*, 55(1-2), 167-178.

81. Kowalski, R. M., Giumetti, G. W., Schroeder, A. N., & Lattanner, M. R. (2014). Bullying in the digital age: a critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth. *Psychological bulletin*, 140(4), 1073.
82. Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: a literature review. *Quality & quantity*, 47(4), 2025-2047.
83. Lakoff, R. T. (2004). *Language and woman's place: Text and commentaries* (Vol. 3). Oxford University Press, USA.
84. Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Misra, T. A., Selwyn, C., & Rohling, M. L. (2012). Rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional intimate partner violence across samples, sexual orientations, and race/ethnicities: A comprehensive review. *Partner Abuse*, 3(2), 199-230.
85. Leaper, C., & Ayres, M. M. (2007). A meta-analytic review of gender variations in adults' language use: Talkativeness, affiliative speech, and assertive speech. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11(4), 328-363.
86. Lees, S. (1993). Sugar and spice. *Sexuality and adolescent girls*.
87. Livingston, J. A., Testa, M., & VanZile-Tamsen, C. (2007). The reciprocal relationship between sexual victimization and sexual assertiveness. *Violence Against Women*, 13(3), 298-313.
88. Ljung, M. (2010). *Swearing: A cross-cultural linguistic study*. Springer.

89. Luthar, S. S., & McMahon, T. J. (1996). Peer reputation among inner-city adolescents: Structure and correlates. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 6(4), 581-603.
90. Mahalik, J. R., Morray, E. B., Coonerty-Femiano, A., Ludlow, L. H., Slattery, S. M., & Smiler, A. (2005). Development of the conformity to feminine norms inventory. *Sex Roles*, 52, 417-435.
91. Malone, M. J. (1993). Cursing in America: A Psycholinguistic Study of Dirty Language in the Courts, in the Movies, in the Schoolyards and on the Streets.
92. Martin, K. A., & Puberty, S. (1996). *the Self: Girls and boys at Adolescence*.
93. Martino, S. C., Elliott, M. N., Corona, R., Kanouse, D. E., & Schuster, M. A. (2008). Beyond the "big talk": The roles of breadth and repetition in parent-adolescent communication about sexual topics. *Pediatrics*, 121(3), e612-e618.
94. Maulik, P. K., Eaton, W. W., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2009). The role of social network and support in mental health service use: findings from the Baltimore ECA study. *Psychiatric Services*, 60(9), 1222-1229.
95. McDonald, P. (2012). Workplace sexual harassment 30 years on: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(1), 1-17.
96. McEwen, J. D. F. M. K. (1998). An all-male rape prevention peer education program: Decreasing fraternity men's behavioral intent to rape.
97. McNair, B. (2002). *Striptease culture: Sex, media and the democratisation of desire*. Routledge.

98. Mehl, M. R., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2003). The sounds of social life: a psychometric analysis of students' daily social environments and natural conversations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 84(4), 857.
99. Meyer, I. H. (1995). Minority stress and mental health in gay men. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 38-56.
100. Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological bulletin*, 129(5), 674.
101. Montagu, A. (2001). *The anatomy of swearing*. University of Pennsylvania press.
102. Murnen, S. K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If "boys will be boys," then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex roles*, 46, 359-375.
103. Mustanski, B. S., Garofalo, R., & Emerson, E. M. (2010). Mental health disorders, psychological distress, and suicidality in a diverse sample of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youths. *American journal of public health*, 100(12), 2426-2432.
104. Orchowski, L. M., Untied, A. S., & Gidycz, C. A. (2013). Social reactions to disclosure of sexual victimization and adjustment among survivors of sexual assault. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 28(10), 2005-2023.
105. Paludi, M. A., & Barickman, R. B. (1991). *Academic and workplace sexual harassment: A resource manual*. State University of New York Press.

106. Parvaresh, V., & Tayebi, T. (2018). Impoliteness, aggression and the moral order. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 132, 91-107.
107. Pascoe, C. J. (2005). 'Dude, you're a fag': Adolescent masculinity and the fag discourse. *Sexualities*, 8(3), 329-346.
108. Pascoe, C. J. (2011). *Dude, you're a fag: Masculinity and sexuality in high school*. Univ of California Press.
109. Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2010). Cyberbullying and self-esteem. *Journal of school health*, 80(12), 614-621.
110. Peter-Hagene, L. C., & Ullman, S. E. (2018). Longitudinal effects of sexual assault victims' drinking and self-blame on posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 33(1), 83-93.
111. Phipps, A., & Young, I. (2015). 'Lad culture' in higher education: Agency in the sexualization debates. *Sexualities*, 18(4), 459-479.
112. Pinker, S. (2007). *The stuff of thought: Language as a window into human nature*. Penguin.
113. Poteat, V. P., Mereish, E. H., DiGiovanni, C. D., & Koenig, B. W. (2011). The effects of general and homophobic victimization on adolescents' psychosocial and educational concerns: the importance of intersecting identities and parent support. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 58(4), 597.

- 114.Powell, A. (2010). Configuring consent: Emerging technologies, unauthorized sexual images and sexual assault. *Australian & New Zealand journal of criminology*, 43(1), 76-90.
- 115.Renee, A., & PINGREE, B. S. (1997). Interpersonal communication and rape: Women acknowledge their assaults. *Journal of health communication*, 2(3), 197-212.
- 116.Resick, P. A. (1993). The psychological impact of rape. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 8(2), 223-255.
- 117.Ringrose, J., & Renold, E. (2012). Slut-shaming, girl power and 'sexualisation': Thinking through the politics of the international SlutWalks with teen girls. *Gender and Education*, 24(3), 333-343.
- 118.Ringrose, J., Harvey, L., Gill, R., & Livingstone, S. (2013). Teen girls, sexual double standards and 'sexting': Gendered value in digital image exchange. *Feminist theory*, 14(3), 305-323.
- 119.Rubin, G. S. (2002). Thinking sex: Notes for a radical theory of the politics of sexuality. In *Culture, Society and Sexuality A Reader* (pp. 143-178). Routledge.
- 120.Russell, S. T., & Fish, J. N. (2016). Mental health in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) youth. *Annual review of clinical psychology*, 12, 465-487.
- 121.Sable, M. R., Danis, F., Mauzy, D. L., & Gallagher, S. K. (2006). Barriers to reporting sexual assault for women and men: Perspectives of college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 55(3), 157-162.

- 122.Santelli, J. S., Kantor, L. M., Grilo, S. A., Speizer, I. S., Lindberg, L. D., Heitel, J., ... & Ott, M. A. (2017). Abstinence-only-until-marriage: An updated review of US policies and programs and their impact. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 61*(3), 273-280.
- 123.Schneider, K. T., Swan, S., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1997). Job-related and psychological effects of sexual harassment in the workplace: empirical evidence from two organizations. *Journal of applied Psychology, 82*(3), 401.
- 124.Sczesny, S., Formanowicz, M., & Moser, F. (2016). Can gender-fair language reduce gender stereotyping and discrimination?. *Frontiers in psychology, 25*.
- 125.Seidler, V. J. (2006). *Transforming masculinities: Men, cultures, bodies, power, sex and love*. Taylor & Francis.
- 126.Stapleton, K. (2003). Gender and swearing: A community practice. *Women and Language, 26*(2), 22.
- 127.Sturgis, P., & Allum, N. (2004). Science in society: re-evaluating the deficit model of public attitudes. *Public understanding of science, 13*(1), 55-74.
- 128.Sutton, L. A. (1995). Bitches and skanky hobags. *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self, 279-296*.
- 129.Swearer, S. M., Turner, R. K., Givens, J. E., & Pollack, W. S. (2008). "You're so gay!": Do different forms of bullying matter for adolescent males?. *School psychology review, 37*(2), 160-173.

130. Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday sexism: Evidence for its incidence, nature, and psychological impact from three daily diary studies. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(1), 31-53.
131. Tanenbaum, L. (2015). *I am not a slut: Slut-shaming in the age of the Internet*. Harper Perennial.
132. Taylor, P. (2013). *A survey of LGBT Americans: Attitudes, experiences and values in changing times*. Pew Research Center.
133. Thompson Jr, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist, 29*(5), 531-543.
134. Tiefer, L. (2004). *Sex is not a natural act & other essays*. Westview Press.
135. Tjaden, P. G. (2000). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
136. Tolman, D. L. (2002). *Dilemmas of desire: Teenage girls talk about sexuality*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA.
137. Toomey, R. B., Ryan, C., Diaz, R. M., & Russell, S. T. (2011). High school gay-straight alliances (GSAs) and young adult well-being: An examination of GSA presence, participation, and perceived effectiveness. *Applied developmental science, 15*(4), 175-185.

138. Ullman, S. E. (2010). Talking about sexual assault: Society's response to survivors. American Psychological Association.
139. Ullman, S. E., Townsend, S. M., Filipas, H. H., & Starzynski, L. L. (2007). Structural models of the relations of assault severity, social support, avoidance coping, self-blame, and PTSD among sexual assault survivors. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(1), 23-37.
140. UNESCO. (2018). International technical guidance on sexuality education: An evidence-informed approach. Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000260770.locale=zh>
141. United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. New York: United Nations.
<https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/803352?ln=en>
142. Van Lancker, D., & Cummings, J. L. (1999). Expletives: Neurolinguistic and neurobehavioral perspectives on swearing. *Brain research reviews*, 31(1), 83-104.
143. Vescio, T. K., Gervais, S. J., Snyder, M., & Hoover, A. (2005). Power and the creation of patronizing environments: the stereotype-based behaviors of the powerful and their effects on female performance in masculine domains. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 88(4), 658.
144. Vingerhoets, Ad & Bylsma, Lauren & Vlam, Cornelis. (2013). Swearing: A Biopsychosocial Perspective. *Psychological Topics*. 22. 287-304.

145. Wajnryb, R. (2005). *Expletive deleted: A good look at bad language*. Simon and Schuster.
146. Weatherall, A. (2002). *Gender, language and discourse*. Psychology Press.
147. Whorf, B. L. (2012). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. MIT press.
148. Widman, L., Welsh, D. P., McNulty, J. K., & Little, K. C. (2006). Sexual communication and contraceptive use in adolescent dating couples. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 39*(6), 893-899.
149. Wierzbicka, A. (2013). *Imprisoned in English: The hazards of English as a default language*. Oxford University Press.
150. Willard, N. E. (2007). *Cyberbullying and cyberthreats: Responding to the challenge of online social aggression, threats, and distress*. Research press.