

Frotteurism and Exhibitionism: An Updated Examination of Their Prevalence, Impact on Victims, and Frequency of Reporting

Silvia Fraga Dominguez
Birmingham City University

Elizabeth L. Jeglic and Cynthia Calkins
John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Leah Kaylor
Saint Louis University

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Silvia Fraga Dominguez, College of Psychology, Faculty of Business, Law, and Social Sciences, Birmingham City University, Birmingham B4 7BD.

Telephone number: 0121 331 4051. Email: Silvia.FragaDominguez@bcu.ac.uk

Conflict of Interest

We have no conflict of interest to declare

Funding

No funding received

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from Prof Elizabeth L. Jeglic at ejeglic@jjay.cuny.edu, upon reasonable request.

IRB approval number

2019-1074-JohnJay

Abstract

Public awareness campaigns and the #MeToo movement aimed to change the incidence and reporting of sexual violence, although their impact on behaviors such as frotteurism and exhibitionism is unknown. Following up on the findings of Clark and colleagues (2016), this study used a self-report survey of college students ($N = 580$) in a major city to examine whether rates of frotteuristic and exhibitionistic acts had changed following these recent events. Results showed that the prevalence of these acts as reported by victims remains high—38% of the current sample reported at least one incident compared to 44% of the sample in the original study. Women continue to be victimized at higher rates than men and report more long-term negative consequences associated with victimization. Reporting to others, including the police, has not increased. These findings suggest that public awareness campaigns and survivor-led social movements may have had some impact on the incidence of sexual violence but may not have influenced the reporting of frotteuristic or exhibitionistic acts.

Key words: exhibitionism, voyeurism, prevalence, consequences, #MeToo, transportation, sexual assault

Practice impact statement

Findings from this study suggest that prevalence of frotteuristic and exhibitionistic behavior remains high and that these behaviors are impactful, particularly for female victims, but are under-reported to authorities. Increasing reporting is a priority; however, this needs to be paired with training for first respondents so that those who report behaviors receive appropriate support.

Frotteurism and Exhibitionism: An Updated examination of their prevalence, impact on victims, and frequency of reporting

In the fall of 2017, the hashtag #MeToo was used by millions of women to share their personal stories of sexual abuse and harassment. This cultural reckoning gave rise to the #MeToo movement, resulting in increased awareness (Jaffe et al., 2021), reporting, and prosecution of sexual abuse (Levy & Mattsson, 2023). Using the FBI's National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), Levy and Mattsson (2023) observed a 9% increase in the reporting of sexual assault and a 5% increase in the number of reports of leading to arrest in the six months following #MeToo, which persisted through the one year data collection period. Notably, however, the NIBRS defines sexual assault narrowly to include "any sexual act including Rape, Sodomy, Sexual Assault With An Object, or Fondling directed against another person, without the consent of the victim, including instances where the victim is incapable of giving consent; also unlawful sexual intercourse." It is unknown whether rates of reporting and arrest for what were historically considered "nuisance crimes," such as exhibitionism and frotteurism, have also increased. In addition to the #MeToo movement, in the mid-2010s public transit systems, such as New York City's Metro Transit Authority (MTA), where acts of exhibitionism and frotteurism often take place (Clark et al., 2016), launched public awareness campaigns about reporting unwanted sexual conduct and increased situational crime prevention tactics such as installing cameras on trains. However the effects of these strategies on the perpetration and victim reporting of unwanted sexual contact such as exhibitionism and frotteurism remain unknown. Research conducted prior to the #MeToo movement and public transit campaigns found that 44% of those sampled reported having been the victim of an exhibitionistic and/or frotteuristic act, though fewer than 10% reported the criminal acts to authorities (5% frotteurism, 9% exhibitionism; Clark et al., 2016). The goal of the present study was to compare the prevalence rates of

exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts since the #MeToo movement and transit-related public awareness campaigns to see if these events and approaches had an effect on the incidence and victim reporting of exhibitionism and frotteurism.

What is Known About Exhibitionism and Frotteurism

Exhibitionism and frotteurism are sexual paraphilias that when acted upon with nonconsenting individuals constitute sexual offenses. According to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual 5th Edition Text Revision* (DSM-5 TR; APA, 2022), exhibitionism is defined as fantasies, urges, or behaviors involving the “exposure of one’s genitals to an unsuspecting person” (p. 783) while frotteurism describes fantasies, urges or behaviors related to the “touching or rubbing against a nonconsenting person” (p.785). Changes made from the DSM-IV-TR (APA, 2000) to the fifth edition (DSM-5, 2013) and revised text edition (DSM-5TR; 2022) differentiate between paraphilic interests and paraphilic disorders (Balon, 2016). Specifically, an individual would meet diagnostic criteria for a paraphilic disorder if they: 1) acted on urges and fantasies with a non-consenting person; or 2) the urges and fantasies cause clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning (APA, 2013).

Prevalence rates

Despite the serious nature of these paraphilias, exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts were historically considered “nuisance behaviors” as opposed to sexual offenses and consequently have received relatively little empirical attention (e.g., Davis & Davis, 1976; Firestone et al., 2006). Most of what we know about exhibitionism and frotteurism is based upon self-report surveys of those who engage in these acts, particularly based on single case studies of clinical or justice involved samples (e.g., Fedoroff, 2010; Patra et al., 2013). Meanwhile, the reported population prevalence rates of both *disorders* is listed in the DSM-

5TR as “unknown”. However, there are some recent community-based studies which provide behavior rates in non-correctional samples. Joyal and Carpentier (2017) reported rates of 7.8% and 32.4% of men engaging in exhibitionistic and frotteuristic behavior, respectively, while the figures for women were 2.7% (exhibitionism) and 20.5% (frotteurism). Meanwhile, Bártoová et al. (2020) reported similar rates of people engaging in at least one exhibitionistic behavior (8.2% of men, 5.6% of women) and frotteuristic behavior (27.9% of men, 14% of women). Finally, Seto et al. (2021) reported rates of people engaging in exhibitionistic behaviors as 5.6% and frotteuristic behaviors as 8.2%. Although the rates of exhibitionism are similar across studies, there is more variability in relation to frotteurism rates. However, it is important to note that researchers’ use of different definitions may partly explain this variability. For example, Seto et al. (2021) used a criminal definition of “touching or rubbing against a nonconsenting person” (p. 2), while others, such as Joyal and Carpentier (2017), used a broader definition that may apply to more scenarios and more frequent behaviors: “sexually aroused by touching or by rubbing yourself against a stranger” (p. 165).

A challenge in estimating prevalence rates of exhibitionistic and frotteuristic behavior and the number of individuals that they may impact is that individual perpetrators may have multiple victims (Abel et al., 1987; Bader et al., 2008; Bhugra et al., 2010; Långström & Seto, 2005). For example, in a study of non-incarcerated individuals convicted of sex crimes, Abel and colleagues (1987) found that those who reported engaging in frotteuristic acts reported an average of 901 victims and those who reported engaging in exhibitionist acts reported an average of 513 victims.

Given the high number of victims per perpetrator and the low incidence of reporting, a more accurate way to assess the frequency of occurrence may be through the use of victim self-report. Victim self-report studies reveal that between 30 and 59% people report being a victim of exhibitionistic acts (Cox, 1988; Murphy & Page, 2006; Rhoads & Borjes, 1981;

Riordan, 1999; Szumski & Kasparek, 2020), although the samples of some of these studies only include women.

Understanding the Characteristics and Consequences of Exhibitionism and Frotteurism

Unlike other types of sexual assault where the acts are often perpetrated on a known individual (family, friend, acquaintance, current or former intimate partner; Jones et al., 2004), individuals who engage in exhibitionistic acts typically target young females with whom they have no prior relationship (Cox, 1988; Freund et al., 1988; Riordan, 1999) perhaps believing that younger victims are less likely to report the behavior to authorities (Clark et al., 2016) or perhaps stemming from sexual interest in younger females. Furthermore, prior studies have found that the nature of exhibitionistic acts may vary based upon geographic location. For example, in suburban and rural areas, individuals tend to expose themselves in parking lots, wooded areas, public streets, parks, and inside vehicles (Bader et al., 2008; Gittleson et al., 1978) while in major metropolitan cities exhibitionistic acts tend to take place in areas of public transportation (e.g., subway stations or buses; Clark et al., 2016).

Frotteuristic acts also usually involve an unsuspecting victim who is unknown to the perpetrator (Patra et al., 2013; Ranger & Fedoroff, 2015). As frotteuristic acts require physical contact, they typically take place in crowded areas such as shopping malls, public events, nightclubs, elevators, or on public transportation. These types of locations often involve close contact with others thereby reducing the chances of detection and apprehension (Clark et al., 2016; Lussier & Piche, 2008; Patra et al., 2013; Ranger & Fedoroff, 2015), as acts may easily be overlooked or even go unnoticed (Guterman et al., 2011; Patra et al., 2013). As well, perpetrators may be able to hide the behavior by stating that the contact was accidental or unintentional.

To better understand the prevalence and consequences of exhibitionism and frotteurism, Clark and colleagues (2016) surveyed 459 undergraduate students who lived in a major metropolitan city in 2009. Overall, they found high lifetime victimization rates, with 44% of the sample having experienced either an exhibitionistic or frotteuristic act at some point in their lives. Specifically, 40% of women and 12% of men reported experiencing an exhibitionistic act, while 24% of women and 7% of men reported experiencing an act of frotteurism. Those who reported victimization were generally young (mean age 16 for exhibitionism and 18 for frotteurism) and female, while perpetrators were typically reported to be male. Most incidents of exhibitionism took place on public transportation (56%) or on the street or in a public building (28%), while frotteuristic acts took place almost exclusively on public transportation (84%). Less than 9% of the reported cases of exhibitionism and 5% of the reported cases of frotteurism by female victims were reported to authorities, with no cases reported by male victims.

Despite the once common view that exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts are mere nuisance crimes, there is evidence to suggest that victims suffer consequences that may have long-term impact on their wellbeing (Cox, 1988; Krueger & Kaplan, 2000; Riordan, 1999). More recent publications have emphasized that this view is outdated and that behaviors like exhibitionism can be impactful and may not always occur in isolation (Hopkins et al., 2016). Those who experienced exhibitionistic and/or frotteuristic acts reported that they altered their social activities, movement, proximity to others, and became more cautious as a consequence of their victimization (Clark et al., 2016; Riordan, 1999). Clark and colleagues (2016) examined reactions to frotteuristic acts and found that disgust and a sense of violation were most commonly reported along with fear that the offender wanted to cause them additional harm.

Although limited literature on the topic has been published since the study by Clark et al. (2016), Choi et al. (2020) conducted a similar study in South Korea interviewing young adults in transport hubs and university campuses. In their sample of over 700 participants, researchers found that 20% had experienced exhibitionism and 11% had experienced frotteurism. Similar to Clark et al. (2016)'s findings, although most of those sampled told family or friends about the exhibitionistic (73%) or frotteuristic (49%) act, very few reported the exhibitionistic act (7 %) or frotteuristic act (2%) to the police. Twenty percent of those who experienced a frotteuristic act and 10% of those who experienced an exhibitionistic act described being distressed over a period of months (Choi et al., 2020). The authors acknowledged specific cultural characteristics in Korea which may have contributed to the lower prevalence rates of frotteuristic and exhibitionistic acts in their study.

Societal events that may impact prevalence and reporting

Not only is there little data on the prevalence and reporting of exhibitionism and frotteurism, particularly from the perspective of victims, but most of the studies – including Clark et al.'s (2016) study – were conducted more than a decade ago. In the last decade there have been two seminal societal events or changes that may have impacted the perpetration and victims' reporting and help-seeking experience following exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts. First, the implementation of transit surveillance and awareness campaigns which started in some major metropolitan centers like New York and Los Angeles in the mid-2010s (Huusko 2014; Metro, 2015) may have impacted the recognition of paraphilic acts and the reporting of these sex crimes. For example, in 2015, the New York City MTA posted posters within its train cars stating:

“Unwanted sexual contact shouldn't be a part of anyone's commute. A crowded train is no excuse for unwanted sexual contact or behavior. MTA riders have the right to

commute without someone harassing or touching them in a sexual manner. By reporting an incident, riders are letting violators know that their behavior is inappropriate. Report it to an MTA employee, police officer or on [mta.info](https://www.mta.info).”

As many frotteuristic and exhibitionistic incidents happen in or near public transport, the wording in these posters may have increased potential victims’ and bystanders’ awareness of these crimes, the importance of reporting, and how to report these crimes. In addition, these campaigns may have served to deter would be perpetrators from carrying out sex crimes, to the extent that public awareness may lead to increased recognition and reporting.

In addition, in the fall of 2017, allegations of years of sexual assault by movie producer Harvey Weinstein against female actresses in Hollywood surfaced. These allegations – often accompanied by the hashtag #MeToo on social media – went viral as millions of women began to share their personal stories of sexual abuse and harassment (Drewett et al., 2021). The #MeToo movement that followed led to increased awareness about the prevalence of abuse and harassment and a seemingly increased willingness to expose or disclose acts of abuse and harassment. As such, the #MeToo movement may have had an impact on the reporting of frotteuristic and exhibitionistic incidents, potentially through increased recognition of the seriousness of any sexual crime and through victims coming out of the shadows and reporting on incidents of abuse.

Current Study

Despite the increased societal focus on sexual violence prevention in the past decade, there remains a paucity of research examining exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts, particularly from victims’ perspectives. This paper seeks to replicate the Clark and colleagues (2016) study to understand whether the frequency, characteristics, victim responses, and disclosure and reporting rates of exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts have changed in

response to societal events (i.e., transit awareness campaigns and the #MeToo movement). It will also seek to describe both barriers and reasons for seeking help, in the context of literature which highlights that these crimes are often underreported. By continuing to develop our understanding of these sexual paraphilias and the factors associated with victimization, researchers can make prevention recommendations to reduce victimization. The current study will examine situational factors related to exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts and their association with victimization.

The goals of this study are three-fold. First, this study will examine the offense characteristics of exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts (i.e., frequency, offender behavior, situational characteristics, victim reaction). Second, this study will identify the correlates of victimization and lastly, as this is a replication study, we will compare our findings to those of Clark and colleagues (2016) to examine whether there has been a change in prevalence rates and reporting since their study was conducted.

Method

Participants

Five hundred and eighty undergraduate students at an urban university in New York City completed a self-report, online questionnaire assessing exposure to exhibitionistic and/or frotteuristic acts. Participants were recruited through the university's online research pool and participants received course credit for participation in the spring and fall of 2020. All undergraduate students enrolled in introductory psychology courses had access to the website. Participants ($N = 580$) ranged in age from 17 to 51 years, with an average age of 20.01 years ($SD = 3.68$). Seventy-four percent ($n = 429$) of participants were female, and 45.7% ($n = 265$) reported their socioeconomic status as "middle" class. The majority of participants identified as Latino ($n = 257$, 44.3%), White ($n = 103$, 17.8%), and Asian/Pacific

Islander ($n = 58$, 10%). In terms of the highest level of education, 296 (51.0%) had a high school degree.

Procedure

Study procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board at John Jay College of Criminal Justice and the online survey was posted on the university's research pool website. Undergraduate students from the research pool who were interested in participating followed a link to the survey where a full description of the study was provided. After obtaining informed consent, participants were asked to complete an 88-item self-report questionnaire developed for the Clark and colleagues (2016) study, with the addition of 25 questions. The questions examined demographic characteristics and items related to experiencing exhibitionistic and/or frotteuristic acts. Definitions for exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts were adapted from the DSM-5 (APA, 2013) and condensed into one-sentence descriptions for ease of understanding. Exhibitionistic acts were defined as "a stranger exposing their genitals in front of you in public without your permission," whereas frotteuristic acts were defined as "a stranger fondling you (touching your behind/breasts) or rubbing their genitals against you in public without your permission." Participant responses were identified only by a study ID number to ensure confidentiality.

Measures

As there are no standardized assessments of exhibitionistic or frotteuristic behavior, a self-report questionnaire consisting of both open-ended and forced-choice questions was designed for the Clark and colleagues (2016) study and utilized in the present study. Factors identified in previous studies as relevant to exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts were included in the measure. The content validity of the measure was assessed by three experts in the field prior to the Clark and colleagues (2016) study. Content analyses were used to identify themes

of open-ended responses, which were then transformed into categorical variables for subsequent analyses. The details of each question are provided in the following sections and are separated by type of content: participant demographics/characteristics, offense characteristics, victims' reactions, and non-victims' reactions. Several questions were added from the original, to examine victims' reactions and help-seeking in more detail, as well as non-victims' bystander intervention.

Participant demographics/characteristics. Eight items assessed participant demographic information including gender, age, race, socioeconomic status, SES, highest level of education, borough of residence, use of public transportation, and use of public parks.

Characteristics of exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts. Frequency of victimization was coded as having ever experienced either exhibitionistic and/or frotteuristic acts. If participants indicated they had been victimized, they were prompted to provide information on each separate incident. Thirty-four items assessed offender demographics, as well as the location and characteristics of the incident. Of these 34 items, 24 were closed-ended questions assessing the behaviors of the perpetrator and the contextual characteristics of the incident. In addition, 10 open-ended questions assessed incident location, the perpetrator's reaction, and the age of the victim and estimated age of the perpetrator at the time of the incident. It should be noted that items are based on victims' perceptions of events.

Victims' reactions to exhibitionistic and frotteuristic behavior. Forty-two items assessed victims' feelings and behaviors about the incident. Twenty-four of these questions were recorded as a dichotomous endorsement assessing victims' physical and emotional reactions at the time of the offense, whether the incidents were reported to authorities, and whether the incidents had any long-term impact on the victims' psychological well-being and future behaviors. The remaining eighteen items were open-ended and assessed the participants'

immediate reactions to the incidents as well as the participants' feelings about what had occurred. In addition, we assessed whether and if so, how the incidents changed the behaviors of the victims.

Non victims' reactions to exhibitionistic and frotteuristic behavior. If participants reported that they had not been victimized, they were asked a dichotomous question assessing whether they had witnessed these acts happening to someone else, and if the answer was "yes", an open-ended question was displayed to assess their reactions in this situation.

Results

The results are presented in three parts to address the three main aims of the study. First, we ran descriptive statistics for those who experienced frotteuristic acts and those who experienced exhibitionistic act to determine the (a) frequency of victimization, (b) incident characteristics, (c) victims' reactions to victimization, and (d) non-victims' experience of witnessing others being victimized (Aim 1).

Second, we examined differences in demographic variables based on type of victimization (Aim 2). Following the procedure in Clark and colleagues (2016), participants were separated by type of victimization into four mutually exclusive groups: those who reported only frotteurism victimization, those who reported only exhibitionism victimization, those who reported both types of victimization, and those who reported no victimization. Comparisons were made between these four groups to identify correlates of victimization. These comparisons were made using Kruskal Wallis H to test for differences among continuous variables—because parametric assumptions were violated—and chi-square tests for categorical variables.

Third, we examined differences between the current sample and the sample examined in Clark and colleagues (2016), using Mann-Whitney U tests for continuous variables and chi-

square tests for categorical variables (Aim 3). Although the original sample was used, the data were prepared for analysis in the same way as the current sample for the purpose of consistency. As a result, there are some minor differences in the frequencies and percentages with respect to the published data in Clark and colleagues (2016).

Aim 1: Descriptive Analyses

The descriptive statistics for frequency of victimization for all participants are presented in Table 1, followed by offense characteristics and victims' reactions, which are separated by gender (female and male). Cases where participants self-identified with a gender other than male or female were too few ($n = 7$, 1%) to present data for these cases separately.

[insert Table 1 here]

Frequency of victimization. Two-hundred-and-one participants (38.1%) experienced some type of victimization. Eighty-five (14.7%) experienced an incident of frotteurism only, 81 experienced an incident of exhibitionism only (13.9%) and 55 (9.5%) experienced both. There were 283 incidents of frotteurism reported by 140 (24.1%) participants in the sample. Eighty-seven percent of those who experienced an incident of frotteurism were women and 10% were men, with 3% identifying as non-binary. Over two-thirds of those who experienced a frotteuristic incident experienced more than one incident ($n = 94$, 67%). There were 221 incidents of exhibitionism reported by 136 (23.4%) participants in the sample. Eighty-five percent of the those who experienced an exhibitionistic incident were women and 13% were men, with 2% identifying as non-binary. The majority of those who experienced an exhibitionistic incident experienced one incident only ($n = 83$, 61.0%). Although some individuals provided details for multiple victimization incidents, the majority were missing

too much information to provide meaningful data. Thus, the remainder of the frequencies provided in this section include only one incident per victim (the first one reported).

Description of incident conditions reported by female victims. The characteristics of frotteuristic and exhibitionistic incidents as reported by female victims are presented in Table 1. The majority of frotteuristic and exhibitionistic acts were reported to have occurred in public transportation (53% of frotteuristic and 48% of exhibitionistic cases) and in crowded areas (78% of frotteuristic and 56% of exhibitionistic cases). Victims of frotteuristic acts were most commonly alone and on average 16.28 years old (ranging from 8 to 24 years old) at the time of the incident. The victims of exhibitionistic acts had an average age of 16.25 (ranging from 5 to 25) at the time of the incident, but they were more often (66%) with someone at the time of the incident. Perpetrators of exhibitionistic acts were estimated by victims to be, on average, 31.53 years old ($SD = 12.14$) at the time of the offense. Perpetrators of frotteuristic acts were estimated to be, on average, 38.42 years old ($SD = 9.34$) at the time of the act.

Regarding perpetrator behaviors that took place during the incident, more than half (56%) of all those who engaged in exhibitionistic acts were described as masturbating at the time of the incident (this question was not asked to frotteurism victims). Perpetrators of frotteurism were more often described as well-groomed (35%) than perpetrators of exhibitionism (14%). In 77% of exhibitionism cases and 55% of frotteurism cases, female victims reported that the perpetrators remained in the area after the incident. Reactions of perpetrators after the incident were mixed, although the most common reaction for

perpetrators of both frotteuristic and exhibitionistic acts was to do nothing or act like nothing happened (33% and 59% of cases, respectively).

Description of female victims' reactions. As seen in Table 2, almost all victims (88% of frotteurism and 95% of exhibitionism victims) reported having moved away from the perpetrator following the incident. Victims reported a variety of feelings resulting from the incident, primarily being scared (28% of frotteurism victims and 17% of exhibitionism victims), or feeling violated (26% of frotteurism victims and 42% of exhibitionism victims), angry (18% of frotteurism victims and 17% of exhibitionism victims), or uncomfortable (16% of frotteurism victims and 22% of exhibitionism victims). A little over half of frotteurism victims (52%) were fearful that the perpetrator wanted to cause harm, and this feeling was reported by 45% of exhibitionism victims. Almost half of victims of frotteuristic behavior (46%) reported long-term effects because of the incident, whereas only one fourth of exhibitionistic behavior reported long-term impact. Most commonly, the effect was that they felt fearful or anxious, followed by taking measures to protect themselves, or a feeling of distrust towards others or towards specific places, such as public transport. Consistent with the latter effect, more than half of frotteurism victims (65%) and almost a third of exhibitionism victims (32%) reported a change in behavior, such as being more cautious or alert. For frotteurism victims, the second most common behavior change was monitoring the proximity of others, while for exhibitionism victims, it involved taking measures such as avoiding public transport or carrying pepper spray.

[insert Table 2 here]

Description of female victims' reporting. As seen in Table 3, more than half (55%) of victims of frotteuristic and exhibitionistic behaviors told someone about the incident. Victims most commonly disclosed to friends or classmates, followed by family members. The

majority (81%) told someone shortly after the incident, with a minority (9% of frotteurism and 13% of exhibitionism victims) waiting months or years to disclose. The most common reasons for telling were because the behavior was inappropriate or they were scared, and because they needed to share it with someone. Disclosing because they wanted to warn others was also common. Victims indicated that the main reasons for non-disclosure were believing that the behavior was not serious enough (17% of frotteurism victims and 39% of exhibitionism victims) or feeling scared (21% of frotteurism victims). Despite many victims disclosing to informal sources, only 5% (for frotteuristic behavior) and 8% (for exhibitionistic behavior) reported the incident to the police or sought legal action. Within the minority of cases where victims did make a formal report, the most common result was for action to be taken, but the victim was not informed of the outcome. The most common reasons for not reporting to the police were the lack of information or evidence, as well as belief that the incident was not serious enough or worth reporting. Although many victims were aware of awareness campaigns, this influenced reporting in less than a quarter of cases, and #MeToo influenced reporting in less than 10% of cases. In 11% of both types of victimization someone else had helped, primarily by alerting the victim or separating them from the perpetrator.

Description of male victimization. Fourteen men (10% of the male sample) reported having been the victim of a frotteuristic act and 18 men (13% of the male sample) reported having been the victim of an exhibitionistic act. Men reported having been, on average, 17.79 years old (range = 13 to 25) when the frotteuristic incident occurred and 17.44 years (range = 8-23) when the exhibitionistic incident occurred. Consistent with female victimization cases, perpetrators were estimated to be older than victims on average, with victims describing an average age of 30.86 ($SD = 10.76$) for frotteuristic incidents and 34.00 ($SD = 11.92$) for exhibitionistic incidents. The majority of frotteuristic offenses reported by males in this

sample were perpetrated by a female (65%), while the majority of exhibitionistic offenses were reported to have been perpetrated by males (78%). Half of the frotteuristic occurred in a train/subway station (50%). Similarly, almost half of the incidents of exhibitionism also took place in public places such as a train/subway station (44%) or on the street (28%).

The majority of victims of frotteuristic and exhibitionistic acts described negative feelings towards the event such as feeling “disgusted,” “upset,” or “weird.” However, more than a third of male victims of exhibitionism (38%) reported no negative feelings. Only one victim of each type of incident reported being fearful that the perpetrator wanted to cause harm. Most victims of either of the types of incidents reported moving away from the perpetrator (72% of frotteurism victims and 89% of exhibitionism victims). In terms of long-term effects, these were reported by three out of 14 frotteurism victims (21%) and none of the exhibitionism victims. Similarly, only four out of 14 frotteurism victims (29%) and none of the victims of exhibitionism reported a change in their behavior.

None of the victims of frotteuristic acts and only one of the victims of exhibitionistic acts (6%) reported the incident to authorities. Many victims of frotteuristic (64%) and exhibitionistic (67%) acts told someone else about the incident, primarily friends or classmates, or family members. The most common reason for telling was because they thought it was inappropriate (frotteuristic act; 25%) or because they wanted to alert others (exhibitionistic act; 33%) (see Tables 1, 2, and 3 for a complete description of the sample).

Bystander behaviors. Among the participants who did not report frotteurism victimization ($n = 440$), 48 (10.9%) reported witnessing an incident. Of those who completed the follow-up questions ($n = 44$, 91.7%) the most commonly reported bystander reactions were to confront the perpetrator directly by telling them to stop ($n = 12$, 27.3%), to do nothing (e.g., because it

may not be safe; $n = 8$, 18.2%), and to alert the victim of the situation and help them escape from it ($n = 6$, 13.6%).

Among the participants who did not report being victimized by an exhibitionistic act ($n = 444$), 23 (5.2%) reported witnessing an incident. Of those who provided data ($n = 22$, 95.6%) the most common bystander reactions were to confront the perpetrator directly by telling them to stop ($n = 5$, 22.7%), to alert the victim of the situation and help them escape from it ($n = 3$, 13.6%), or to tell someone ($n = 3$, 13.6%).

Aim 2: Bivariate Associations with Victimization Type

To facilitate comparison of victimization type, four mutually exclusive victimization groups were created and compared concerning six victim demographic characteristics and public amenity use variables. Results are shown in Table 4. The victimization groups (frotteuristic victimization only, exhibitionistic victimization only, both frotteuristic and exhibitionistic victimization, and no victimization) differed significantly in gender, age, public transport use, and park use. Specifically, analyses indicated that victims of frotteurism only and victims of both frotteurism and exhibitionism were more likely to be female (86% and 96%, respectively) than non-victims (69%), and that those victimized by both frotteurism and exhibitionism were significantly older (21.26) than the other three groups. Those victimized by both frotteurism and exhibitionism were more likely to use public parks often (78%) than non-victims (59%), and victims of frotteuristic incidents were more likely to use public

transport often (44%) than non-victims (24%). There were no significant differences between groups for race/ethnicity or SES.

[insert Table 4 here]

Aim 3: Bivariate Associations with Respect to Clark et al. (2016)

The Clark et al. (2016) sample and current sample were compared concerning the same variables used for comparison in Aim 2, with the addition of type of victimization, age when they were victimized, and help-seeking variables to examine changes in disclosure and police reporting. Results are shown in Table 5. The two samples differed significantly in type of victimization, current age, age at time of frotteurism victimization, race/ethnicity, disclosure of exhibitionism, and public transport use. Specifically, analyses indicated that victims of exhibitionistic only victimization was less common in the current sample (14% versus 24% in the original study), and that victims in the current sample were more likely to be Asian/Pacific Islander (15% vs 5% in the original study), and less likely to use public transport more than once per day (39% vs 84% in the original study). Victims in the current sample were significantly younger (21.40) and they were also significantly younger at the time they experienced frotteurism (16.10 vs 17.25 in the original study). Finally, victims in the current sample were less likely to tell someone about their experience of an exhibitionistic act.

[insert Table 5 here]

Discussion

This study examined the prevalence, characteristics, and consequences of acts of exhibitionism and frotteurism in a large sample of young adults in a major urban city to assess if there has been a change in prevalence for exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts

following the #MeToo movement and transit-based awareness and surveillance campaigns. Overall, the results suggest that the prevalence of exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts as reported by victims remains high – 38% of the the current sample reported an incident of exhibitionistic or frotteuristic victimization compared to 44% of the sample in the Clark et al. (2016) study that we replicated. Women continue to be victimized at higher rates, experience more long-term negative consequences, and report more changes in behavior after being victimized than males who experienced victimization. Despite a small drop in the frequency of victimization compared to Clark et al. (2016), reporting to others, including the police, has not increased, suggesting that #MeToo or awareness campaigns have had little effect on formal or informal disclosure of exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts. In fact, victims in the current sample were significantly less likely to disclose exhibitionism incidents to others (56%) than in the original sample (where 71% made a disclosure). Although not a significant difference, only 55% disclosed their frotteurism victimization, compared to 67% in the original study. The rates of seeking police or legal action have remained stable across studies.

Although rates of exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts remain high, our data do suggest that incidence may be decreasing. Notably, the current current study was conducted during a period when public transport use was not as common (the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic), as evidenced in the sample, who were significantly less likely to use public transport than the sample in Clark et al. (2016). Given that incidents of victimization often occurred in public transport and crowded places, particularly for frotteuristic incidents, the lower prevalence may be partly explained by this decreased use of public transport. However, as the current study assessed lifetime prevalence and the reported incidents occurred on average years before the participants entered college, we think that the decreased incidence of paraphilic acts is real and not an artifact of decreased public transportation use.

Consistent with prior research (Cox, 1998; Riordan, 1999), participants who experienced victimization tended to be young – on average around age 16 – at the time of the incident. Victims were primarily female, with only a minority of men reporting victimization, which is also consistent with prior findings (Choi et al., 2020; Cox, 1998; Riordan, 1999). Although this could be due to the sample being predominantly female, similar findings in terms of prevalence have been found in samples with a more equal gender distribution (e.g., Choi et al., 2020). However, rates of victimization disclosed by male participants should be considered in the context of the research on males’ underreporting of victimization due to specific barriers to disclosure, such as stigma or gender norms (Easton et al., 2014).

In terms of the consequences of these incidents, frotteuristic and exhibitionistic incidents remain impactful, albeit with different patterns by gender and type of victimization. Long-term effects and reported changes in behavior appear to be more common for female victims than male victims, and more common for frotteuristic than exhibitionistic acts. Findings suggest that frotteuristic acts are more impactful and distressing, potentially due to the level of proximity and the physical contact between victim and perpetrator, and perhaps because it is more commonly perceived to be violating (Clark et al., 2016). The way in which frotteuristic acts are perpetrated is more targeted than exhibitionistic acts, particularly when the latter occurs in a public place where there are multiple victims. However, exhibitionistic incidents are also impactful, and close to half of female victims reported being fearful that the perpetrator wanted to cause harm. This fear was reported by more than half of female victims of frotteurism. These findings suggest that victims perceive these incidents with some degree of seriousness or threat, as opposed to mere nuisance behaviors.

Despite prevalence remaining high, and victims still reporting long-term impact, behavioral changes and being fearful of the perpetrator, only a minority of victims specified

that they had formally reported to police or sought legal action, consistent with Clark et al. (2016). This is consistent with a reporting rate of 7% exhibitionistic incidents in research by Szumki and Kasparek (2020). The current study provides further information about the barriers to reporting and reasons why the participants decided not to report, which can inform practice and policy. The most common reasons for not reporting were lack of evidence about the incident, thinking that they would not be taken seriously, or thinking that it was not serious enough to report. Some of the barriers reported may be common to other types of sexual victimization (Zinzow et al., 2022), although they may be exacerbated by these behaviors' historical framing as nuisance behaviors, as evidenced by some of the barriers reported (Davis & Davis, 1976; Firestone et al., 2006). Regardless of the reasons for underreporting, our findings suggest that many of these offenses may go undetected by authorities, perhaps allowing perpetrators to repeat these behaviors. While relatively little is known about escalation from exhibitionistic and frotteuristic acts to other contact sexual offenses, existing research suggests that while rare, in some cases perpetrators may escalate into contact sexual offenses (McNally & Fremouw, 2014).

Although reporting from victims is important, the frotteuristic and exhibitionistic behaviors reported in this study often occurred in public and crowded places, suggesting that there are many witnesses and bystanders who could intervene—even if some frotteuristic incidents may go unnoticed due to the nature of the behaviors (Guterman et al., 2011; Patra et al., 2013). The current study has provided some context about bystander intervention and how others react to witnessing these behaviors. Victims in the sample reported that someone had helped in percentages ranging from 0% (male frotteurism victims) to 12% (female frotteurism victims). In terms of non-victims in the sample, a minority (5%) reported witnessing these behaviors and in those cases, they sometimes reacted by confronting the perpetrator or telling them to stop. This suggests that some bystanders intervene when they

witness frotteuristic and exhibitionistic incidents, although they may feel more inclined to intervene when there is a female victim. Although we did not enquire about perpetrators' reactions to those interventions, related data in the study does not support that reactions from bystanders would significantly influence perpetrators' behaviors. When victims reported moving away after the incident, many perpetrators did not react, particularly in exhibitionistic incidents. Thus, if these behaviors are not brought to the attention of authorities, they may reoccur, given that a quarter of exhibitionism perpetrators are estimated to reoffend with another non-contact sexual offense (McNally & Fremouw, 2014).

Consistent with other types of sexual victimization and other types of victimization, informal disclosure (e.g., to family and friends) was more common (e.g., Sabina & Ho, 2014; Sylaska & Edwards, 2014). More than half of the victims of frotteuristic and exhibitionistic acts – both male and female – had disclosed their experience of victimization to someone, the majority doing so shortly after the incident. Disclosure was slightly more common among males than females, despite female victims being more impacted by the behaviors. One of the often-cited reasons for disclosing was to warn others, suggesting that although participants may not think that the behaviors are worth reporting to police, they do think these behaviors are worth warning others about. There are many barriers to making police reports and lack of reporting is common for victims of sexual violence or abuse (Zinzow et al., 2022). Relatedly, one of the themes of the tweets shared on the day that #MeToo went viral related to responses received after disclosure, including unhelpful responses from police and other professionals (Drewett et al., 2021). Hence, along with encouraging formal reporting, we need to ensure that responses to reporting and organizational policies support those who report exhibitionistic and frotteuristics acts and that they treat these incidents seriously.

Limitations

The current study has some limitations, many of which are similar to the original study and described in Clark and colleagues (2016). Specific to this sample is that the data were gathered during the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in decreased time spent in public transport and which could have had an impact on victimization rates. However, participants were asked to report on lifetime victimization (with most reporting that these behaviors had happened several years before their study participation), such that prevalence rates should be minimally impacted by the pandemic. Another limitation is that it was not possible to report on the experiences of individuals who did not identify as male or female due to small sample size. In future research, it will be important to provide information about the experiences of victimization experienced by gender-diverse people as there is research to suggest that they be particularly vulnerable to sexual abuse (Rimes et al., 2019). Finally, as in the original sample, findings are representative of a specific highly populated urban area in the United States and of a college sample. The sample primarily consisted of young female students, which may mean the experiences reported could be more relevant to this population and may also impact the victimization and reporting rates. On the other hand, the ethnicity breakdown is a strength and stands in contrast with samples that are less ethnically diverse. However, further research on victimization experiences by the general population, those living in rural areas and in other countries would be helpful in further understanding these offenses and their impact on the wider population.

Implications for Research, Practice, and Policy

The current study has some implications for future research. Along with expanding victimization surveys to other countries and geographical areas, it is also important to investigate how these behaviors are changing in the context of increased online use. Further research on image-based exhibitionism, how it manifests, and its impact on victims will be helpful, adding to recent literature on the topic (e.g., Kaylor et al., 2016; Oswald et al., 2020).

Although victimization surveys are helpful in understanding the scope and nature of these understudied sex offending behaviors, as well as their impact on victims, further research on professional perceptions is necessary. This would contribute to our understanding of the type of responses that victims face and whether professionals, particularly law enforcement, understand that these are impactful behaviors that lead to changes in behavior and cause fear.

The rates reported in the study suggest that incidents of frotteurism and exhibitionism remain common and are impactful, but are under-reported. Considering these findings within the context of rates of sexual recidivism and potential escalation (McNally & Fremouw, 2014), we need to continue increasing awareness and encourage reporting from victims and bystanders. Although more than half of victims across groups were aware of transit awareness campaigns, fewer victims said that their decision to report was influenced by awareness campaigns, suggesting that other reasons (such as the ones reported in the study) may be influencing the decision to report. A common reason for not reporting was the lack of evidence about the perpetrator, which stresses the importance of having cameras on public transport. Alongside encouraging reporting from these groups, we also need to increase professional awareness and ensure that disclosures are responded to appropriately. As part of this response, victims should be supported to access appropriate resources and help, as it is evident that at least some of them suffer long-term impact and see their behaviors changed as a result of the incidents.

Conclusion

Despite the frequency and impact of frotteuristic and exhibitionistic behaviors, attention to these types of behaviors has been limited, with only a handful of publications since Clark et al. (2016) examining the experiences of victims. However, our findings, alongside previous research, emphasize that these behaviors are impactful, particularly for

female victims. Future research on victimization experiences using a diversity of samples will contribute to our understanding of these experiences. Continued efforts to increase awareness and reporting, and ensure that responses to reporting are appropriate will help victims access appropriate support to deal with the long-term impact of these crimes and may help perpetrators receive intervention which can help prevent further incidents of these and other types of sexual crimes.

References

Abel, G. G., Becker, J., Mittelman, M., Cunningham-Rathner, J., Rouleau, J., & Murphy, W. (1987). Self-reported sex crimes of nonincarcerated paraphiliacs. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2, 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626087002001001>

Abel, G.G. & Rouleau, J.L. (1990). The nature and extent of sexual assault. In W.L. Marshall, D.R. Laws, & H.E. Barbaree (Eds.), *Handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender* (pp. 9-21). Plenum. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-0915-2_2

Ahrens, C. E., Stansell, J., & Jennings, A. (2010). To tell or not to tell: The impact of disclosure on sexual assault survivors' recovery. *Violence and Victims*, 25(5), 631-648. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.25.5.631>

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text rev.). <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890420249.dsm-iv-tr>

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596>

American Psychiatric Association. (2022). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed., text rev.). <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787>

Bader, S. M., Schoeneman-Morris, K. A., Scalora, M. J., & Casady, T. K. (2008). Exhibitionism: Findings from a Midwestern police contact sample. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 52(3), 270-279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X07307122>

Balon, R. (2016). Lack of clarity in the DSM-5 criteria of Voyeuristic Disorder. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 42(5), 391-392.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2016.1158760>

Bártová, K., Androvičová, R., Krejčová, L., Weiss, P., & Klapilová, K. (2021). The prevalence of paraphilic interests in the Czech population: Preference, arousal, the use of pornography, fantasy, and behavior. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 58(1), 86–96.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2019.1707468>

Bhugra, D., Popelyuk, D., & McMullen, I. (2010). Paraphilias across cultures: Contexts and controversies. *Journal of Sex Research*, 47, 242-256.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224491003699833>

Choi, B., Kim, I., Lee, G. Y., Kim, S., Kim, S. H., Lee, J. G., & Lim, M. H. (2020). Estimated prevalence and impact of the experience of becoming a victim of exhibitionism and frotteurism in Korea: A general population based study. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 30(2-3), 132-140. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2153>

Clark, S. K., Jeglic, E. L., Calkins, C., & Tatar, J. R. (2016). More than a nuisance: The prevalence and consequences of frotteurism and exhibitionism. *Sexual Abuse*, 28(1), 3-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214525643>

Cox, D. J. (1988). Incidence and nature of male genital exposure behavior as reported by college women. *Journal of Sex Research*, 24(1), 227-234.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224498809551417>

Davis, S. K., & Davis, P. W. (1976). Meanings and process in erotic offensiveness: An expose of exposees. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 5, 377-396.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/089124167600500307>

Drewett, C., Oxlad, M., & Augoustinos, M. (2021). Breaking the silence on sexual harassment and assault: An analysis of# MeToo tweets. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 123, 106896. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106896>

Easton, S. D., Saltzman, L. Y., & Willis, D. G. (2014). “Would you tell under circumstances like that?”: Barriers to disclosure of child sexual abuse for men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15(4), 460-469. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034223>

Fedoroff, J.P. (2010). Paraphilic worlds. In S.B. Levine (Ed.), *Handbook of clinical sexuality for mental health professionals* (pp. 401–424). Routledge.

Firestone, P., Kingston, D. A., Wexler, A., & Bradford, J. M. (2006). Long-term follow up of exhibitionists: Psychological, phallometric, and offense characteristics. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 34, 349-359.

Freund, K. (1990). Courtship disorder. In W. L. Marshall, D. R. Laws & H. E. Barbaree (Eds.), *Handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender* (pp. 195-207). Plenum. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-0915-2_12

Freund, K., & Watson, R. (1990). Mapping the boundaries of courtship disorder. *Journal of Sex Research*, 27, 589–606. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499009551581>

Freund, K., Watson, R., & Rienzo, D. (1988). The value of self-reports in the study of voyeurism and exhibitionism. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 1, 244-262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107906328800100205>

Gebhard, P. H., Gagnon, J. H., Pomeroy, W. B., & Christenson, C. V. (1965). *Sex offenders: An analysis of types*. Heinemann.

Gittleson, N. L., Eacott, S. E., & Mehta, B. M. (1978). Victims of indecent exposure. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 132, 61-66. <https://doi.org/10.1192/s0007125000282986>

Grant, J. E. (2005). Clinical characteristics and psychiatric comorbidity in males with exhibitionism. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 66(11), 1367-1371.

<https://doi.org/10.4088/jcp.v66n1104>

Guterman, J. T., Martin, C. V., & Rudes, J. (2011). A solution-focused approach to frotteurism. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, 30(1), 59-72.

<https://doi.org/10.1521/jsyt.2011.30.1.59>

Hopkins, T. A., Green, B. A., Carnes, P. J., & Campling, S. (2016). Varieties of intrusion: Exhibitionism and voyeurism. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 23(1), 4-33.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10720162.2015.1095138>

Huusko, J. (2014, October 6). *New York City launches campaign to end sexual harassment on the subway*. [http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/10/6/new-york-city-](http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/10/6/new-york-city-launchescampaigntoendsexualharassmentonthesubway.html)

[launchescampaigntoendsexualharassmentonthesubway.html](http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/10/6/new-york-city-launchescampaigntoendsexualharassmentonthesubway.html)

Jaffe, A. E., Cero, I., & DiLillo, D. (2021). The #MeToo movement and perceptions of sexual assault: College students' recognition of sexual assault experiences over

time. *Psychology of Violence*, 11(2), 209–218. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000363>

Johnson, R. S., Ostermeyer, B., Sikes, K. A., Nelsen, A. J., & Coverdale, J. H. (2014). Prevalence and treatment of frotteurism in the community: A systematic review. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, 42(4), 478-483.

Jones, J.S., Wynn, B.N., Kroeze, B., Dunnuck, C., & Rossman, L. (2004) Comparison of sexual assaults by strangers versus known assailants in a community-based population. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 22(6), 454-459.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2004.07.020>

Kafka, M. P., & Hennen, J. (1999). The paraphilia-related disorders: An empirical investigation of nonparaphilic hypersexuality disorders in 206 outpatient males. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 25, 305–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/009262399278760>

Kaylor, L., & Jeglic, E. (2019). Non-contact paraphilic disorders and offending. In Craig & Bartels (Ed.), *Sexual deviance: Understanding and managing deviant sexual interest and paraphilic disorders*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Kaylor, L., Jeglic, E. L., & Collins, C. (2016). Examining the impact of technology on exhibitionistic behavior. *Deviant Behavior*, 37(10), 1152-1162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2016.1169828>

Krueger, R. B., & Kaplan, M. S. (2000, October). Disorders of sexual impulse control in neuropsychiatric conditions. In *Seminars in Clinical Neuropsychiatry*, 5(4), 266-274. <https://doi.org/10.1053/scnp.2000.9555>

Långström, N., & Seto, M. (2006). Exhibitionism and voyeuristic behavior in a Swedish national population survey. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 35, 427-435. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-006-9042-6>

Levy, R. E., & Mattsson, M. (2023). The effects of social movements: Evidence from #MeToo. SSRN 3496903. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3496903>

Lussier, P., & Piché, L. (2008). Frotteurism: Psychopathology and theory. In D. R. Laws & W. T. O'Donohue (Eds.), *Sexual deviance: Theory, assessment, and treatment* (2nd ed., pp. 131–149). Guilford Press.

MacPherson, G. J. (2003). Predicting escalation in sexually violent recidivism: Use of the SVR-20 and PCL:SV to predict outcome with noncontact recidivists and contact

recidivists. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 14(3), 615–627.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14789940310001615470>

McAnulty, R. (2017). Frotteurism. In B. A. Sharpless (Ed.), *Unusual and Rare Psychological Disorders: A Handbook for Clinical Practice and Research*, pp. 136-148.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/med:psych/9780190245863.003.0010>

McNally, M. R., & Fremouw, W. J. (2014). Examining risk of escalation: A critical review of the exhibitionistic behavior literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 19(5), 474-485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.07.001>

Metro (2015, April 17). *L.A. Metro launches campaign to prevent sexual harassment*. <https://www.metro-magazine.com/10037075/l-a-metro-launches-campaign-to-prevent-sexual-harassment>

Murphy, W. D., & Page, I. J. (2006). Exhibitionism. In McAnulty, R. D. and Burnette, M. M. (Eds.), *Sex and sexuality: Sexual deviation and sexual offenses* (pp. 1–20). Praeger Publishers.

Oswald, F., Lopes, A., Skoda, K., Hesse, C. L., & Pedersen, C. L. (2020). I'll show you mine so you'll show me yours: Motivations and personality variables in photographic exhibitionism. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 57(5), 597-609.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2019.1639036>

Patra, A. P., Bharadwaj, B., Shaha, K. K., Das, S., Rayamane, A. P., & Tripathi, C. S. (2013). Impulsive frotteurism: A case report. *Medicine, Science and the Law*, 53(4), 235-238.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0025802412474813>

Ranger, R., & Fedoroff, P. (2015). Frotteurism. *The International Encyclopedia of Human Sexuality*, 369-426. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118896877.wbiehs165>

Rhoads, J., & Borjes, E. (1981). The incident of exhibitionism in Guatemala and the United States. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 139, 242-244.

<https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.139.3.242>

Rimes, K. A., Goodship, N., Ussher, G., Baker, D., & West, E. (2017). Non-binary and binary transgender youth: Comparison of mental health, self-harm, suicidality, substance use and victimization experiences. *The International Journal of Transgenderism*, 20(2-3), 230–240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15532739.2017.1370627>

Riordan, S. (1999). Indecent exposure: The impact upon the victim's fear of sexual crime. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 10, 309-316.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585189908403684>

Rooth, F. G. (1973). Exhibitionism, sexual violence, and paedophilia. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 122(6), 705–710. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.122.6.705>

Ryley, S., & Donohue, P. (2014, June 23). *Grand Central more like sex crime central: Nearly half of all subway sex crimes reported along Lexington Avenue line in Manhattan.* *New York Daily News*. <https://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/nyc-crime/daily-news-analysis-reveals-perverted-subway-stations-article-1.1836952>

Sabina, C., & Ho, L. Y. (2014). Campus and college victim responses to sexual assault and dating violence: Disclosure, service utilization, and service provision. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 15(3), 201-226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014521322>

Seto, M. C., Curry, S., Dawson, S. J., Bradford, J. M., & Chivers, M. L. (2021). Concordance of paraphilic interests and behaviors. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 58(4), 424–437. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2020.1830018>

Swindell, S., Stroebel, S. S., O’Keefe, S. L., Beard, K. W., Robinett, S. R., & Kommor, M. J. (2011). Correlates of exhibition-like experiences in childhood and adolescence: A model for development of exhibitionism in heterosexual males. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 18(3), 135-156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10720162.2011.593432>

Sylaska, K. M., & Edwards, K. M. (2014). Disclosure of intimate partner violence to informal social support network members: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 15(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838013496335>

Szumski, F., & Kasparek, K. (2020). Encountering an exhibitionist: The female victim’s perspective. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 57(5), 610-623.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2019.1669523>

Templeman, T. L., & Stinnett, R. D. (1991). Patterns of sexual arousal and history in a “normal” sample of young men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 20(2), 137-150.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01541940>

World Health Organization. (2016). *International statistical classification of diseases and related health problems* (10th ed.). <https://icd.who.int/browse10/2016/en>

World Health Organization. (2019). *International classification of diseases for mortality and morbidity statistics* (11th Revision). <https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en>

Zinzow, H. M., Littleton, H., Muscari, E., & Sall, K. (2022). Barriers to formal help-seeking following sexual violence: Review from within an ecological systems framework. *Victims & Offenders*, 17(6), 893-918.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2021.1978023>

Table 1

Percentage of Victims Endorsing Offense Characteristics

Offense characteristics <i>n</i> (%)	Type of Victimization			
	Frotteuristic Act (<i>n</i> = 136)		Exhibitionistic Act (<i>n</i> = 133)	
	Females (<i>n</i> = 122)	Males (<i>n</i> = 14)	Females (<i>n</i> = 115)	Males (<i>n</i> = 18)
Mean age at victimization (SD)	16.28 (2.71)	17.79 (3.31)	16.25 (3.48)	17.44 (3.20)
Incident location crowded ^a	95 (77.9%)	13 (92.9%)	63 (55.8%)	9 (52.9%)
Alone during incident ^a	67 (55.4%)	4 (28.6%)	50 (44.2%)	3 (16.7%)
Only victim ^{ad}	100 (84.0%)	12 (85.7%)		
Incident location ^b				
Public transportation	62 (53.4%)	7 (50.0%)	53 (48.2%)	8 (44.4%)
Street or public building	16 (13.8%)	0 (0%)	28 (25.5%)	5 (27.8%)
School/University	14 (12.1%)	3 (21.4%)	6 (5.5%)	1 (5.6%)
Party/club/restaurant/concert	10 (8.6%)	3 (21.4%)	1 (0.9%)	1 (5.6%)
Work	7 (6.0%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)
Park	2 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	14 (12.7%)	1 (5.6%)
Other	5 (4.3%)	0 (0%)	7 (6.4%)	2 (11.1%)
Perpetrator was male ^a	116 (95.1%)	5 (35.7%)	113 (98.3%)	14 (77.8%)
Perpetrator well-groomed				
Yes	43 (35.2%)	9 (69.2%)	16 (14.0%)	3 (16.7%)
No	36 (29.5%)	1 (7.7%)	85 (74.6%)	11 (61.1%)
Uncertain	43 (35.2%)	3 (23.1%)	13 (11.4%)	4 (22.2%)
Perpetrator's mean approximate age (SD)	31.80 (11.92)	30.86 (10.76)	38.42 (9.34)	34.00 (11.92)
Perpetrator masturbated ^c			64 (55.7%)	5 (27.8%)
Perpetrator said something prior ^c			16 (14.0%)	1 (5.9%)
Perpetrator did not leave ^a	87 (55.4%)	8 (57.1%)	85 (76.6%)	11 (61.1%)
Perpetrator's reaction to victim moving away ^b				
No reaction/looked indifferent/acted like nothing happened/continued	28 (32.6%)	2 (20.0%)	53 (58.2%)	7 (58.3%)
Smiled/laughed	13 (15.1%)	2 (20.0%)	9 (9.9%)	0 (0%)
Moved away	8 (9.3%)	5 (50.0%)	7 (7.7%)	0 (0%)
Denied responsibility/blamed victim	6 (7.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Scared/shocked/confused/upset	4 (4.7%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)

Angry/yelled	5 (5.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)
Moved closer/followed victim	3 (3.5%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.3%)	0 (0%)
Uncertain	9 (10.5%)	0 (0%)	6 (6.6%)	2 (16.7%)
Other	10 (11.6%)	0 (0%)	12 (13.2%)	2 (16.7%)
Perpetrator seen in area again	14 (11.7%)	1 (7.1%)	10 (9.0%)	3 (16.7%)

Note. Pairwise deletion used for missing data. Victimization groups are not mutually exclusive, each group includes all incidents of victimization.

^a Item was coded dichotomously yes/no.

^b Open-ended item recoded into categories.

^c Question not asked for frotteurism incidents.

^d Question not asked for exhibitionism incidents.

Table 2

Percentage of Reaction to Victimization

Reaction characteristics <i>n</i> (%)	Type of Victimization			
	Frotteuristic Act		Exhibitionistic Act	
	Females (<i>n</i> = 127)	Males (<i>n</i> = 14)	Females (<i>n</i> = 118)	Males (<i>n</i> = 18)
Moved away from perpetrator	107 (88.4%)	10 (71.4%)	107 (94.7%)	16 (88.9%)
Took picture/video of incident	1 (.08%)	0 (0%)	2 (1.8%)	2 (11.1%)
Someone else took picture/video	4 (3.3%)	0 (0%)	8 (7.1%)	6 (33.3%)
Feelings about the incident ^b				
Scared/shocked/surprised	30 (28.3%)	1 (7.1%)	16 (16.7%)	2 (12.5%)
Violated/disgusted/disrespected	28 (26.4%)	2 (14.3%)	40 (41.7%)	3 (18.8%)
Angry/upset/“annoyed”	19 (17.9%)	2 (14.3%)	16 (16.7%)	2 (12.5%)
Uncomfortable/“weird”	17 (15.6%)	4 (28.6%)	21 (21.9%)	5 (31.3%)
Ashamed/embarrassed/“dirty”	11 (10.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0%)
No negative feelings	2 (1.9%)	1 (7.1%)	8 (8.3%)	6 (37.5%)
Other	23 (21.7%)	6 (42.9%)	15 (15.6%)	2 (12.5%)
Fearful the perpetrator wanted to cause harm ^a	63 (51.6%)	1 (7.1%)	50 (44.6%)	1 (5.6%)
Long-term effects ^a	55 (45.5%)	3 (21.4%)	28 (24.8%)	0 (0%)
Type of long-term effect ^b				
Fearful/scared/anxious	19 (34.5%)	0 (0%)	6 (21.4%)	0 (0%)
Taking measures to protect themselves (e.g., change in behavior, including avoiding public transport)	16 (29.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (10.7%)	0 (0%)
Distrust of others/dislike of specific places (e.g., public transport, crowded)	15 (27.3%)	0 (0%)	8 (28.6%)	0 (0%)
Increased alertness/vigilance	4 (7.3%)	1 (33.3%)	6 (21.4%)	0 (0%)
Symptoms of trauma	4 (7.3%)	1 (33.3%)	1 (3.6%)	0 (0%)
Other	11 (20.0%)	1 (33.3%)	6 (21.4%)	0 (0%)
Reported change in behavior ^a	78 (64.5%)	4 (28.6%)	36 (31.9%)	0 (0%)
Type of behavior change ^b				
More cautious/alert/aware	49 (63.6%)	3 (75.0%)	18 (50.0%)	0 (0%)
Monitor proximity to others	9 (11.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (5.6%)	0 (0%)
Avoid crowds/public transport	7 (9.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.8%)	0 (0%)
Taking measures to protect themselves (e.g., avoiding certain people, carrying pepper spray, avoiding transport or walking at night)	7 (9.1%)		8 (22.2%)	0 (0%)

Changed way they dress	2 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Avoid being alone	2 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	3 (8.3%)	0 (0%)
Other	11 (14.3%)	1 (25.0%)		0 (0%)

Note. Pairwise deletion used for missing data. Victimization groups are not mutually exclusive, each group includes all incidents of victimization.

^a Item was coded dichotomously yes/no.

^b Open-ended item recoded into categories. Several participants indicated multiple responses; thus, percentages may exceed 100. Percentages are calculated with respect to the number of victims who answered the question.

Table 3

Characteristics of Help-Seeking Behaviors by Victim or Others

Help-seeking characteristics <i>n</i> (%)	Type of Victimization			
	Frotteuristic Act		Exhibitionistic Act	
	Females (<i>n</i> = 122)	Males (<i>n</i> = 14)	Females (<i>n</i> = 118)	Males (<i>n</i> = 18)
Told anyone ^a	66 (54.5%)	9 (64.3%)	61 (55.0%)	12 (66.7%)
Person they told ^b				
Friends or classmates	16 (48.5%)	2 (66.7%)	23 (42.6%)	8 (66.7%)
Family members	13 (39.4%)	0 (0%)	25 (46.3%)	3 (25.0%)
Partner	2 (6.1%)	0 (0%)	4 (7.4%)	0 (0%)
Professional (e.g., therapist, teacher, transport worker)	2 (6.1%)	0 (0%)	7 (13.0%)	3 (25.0%)
Colleague or boss	1 (3.0%)	1 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (16.7%)
How long after incident they told someone				
Shortly after (immediately after or within hours)	48 (81.4%)	6 (85.7%)	25 (80.6%)	5 (83.3%)
Day(s) later	3 (5.1%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.5%)	1 (16.7%)
Within weeks	3 (5.1%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Months later	2 (3.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.2%)	0 (0%)
Years later	3 (5.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.7%)	0 (0%)
Reasons for telling				
Because it was inappropriate, or they were scared	15 (27.3%)	2 (25.0%)	14 (25.5%)	1 (11.1%)
Because they needed to share what happened with others (e.g., because it was affecting the victim)	10 (18.2%)	1 (12.5%)	9 (16.4%)	0 (0%)
Because they wanted to warn others (e.g., friends)	8 (14.5%)	0 (0%)	7 (12.7%)	3 (33.3%)
To get help from others	7 (12.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
During normal conversation or a conversation about a specific topic (e.g., experiences in public transport)	2 (3.6%)	0 (0%)	5 (9.1%)	1 (11.1%)
Because they thought it was a funny or “silly” story	0 (0%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (1.8%)	2 (22.2%)
So that the perpetrator would face consequences	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (7.3%)	0 (0%)
Because it was shocking, out of the ordinary	3 (5.5%)	3 (37.5%)	5 (9.1%)	1 (11.1%)
Other	10 (18.2%)	0 (0%)	10 (18.2%)	1 (11.1%)
Reasons for not telling				
Not worth telling (not serious enough, incidents are commonplace, was not affected by it)	5 (17.2%)	2 (100%)	7 (38.9%)	0 (0%)

General or specific fear (e.g., they would not be believed/taken seriously, they would be blamed)	6 (20.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Shame, guilt, or embarrassment	5 (17.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Didn't want to "make a big deal out of it" or think about it	3 (10.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (11.1%)	0 (0%)
Didn't understand the situation or that it was wrong (e.g., too young)	3 (10.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.6%)	0 (0%)
Unsure	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.6%)	0 (0%)
Other	7 (24.1%)	0 (0%)	7 (38.9%)	0 (0%)
Reported to police/sought legal action ^a	6 (5.0%)	0 (0%)	9 (8.0%)	1 (5.6%)
Reasons for not reporting				
Did not have enough information or evidence about perpetrator	5 (21.7%)	1 (50%)	3 (15.8%)	0 (0%)
Did not think they would be taken seriously	5 (21.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (10.5%)	1 (25.0%)
Not serious enough or worth reporting; they were not affected	4 (17.4%)	1 (50%)	3 (15.8%)	1 (25.0%)
Did not want to tell others about it or face consequences from it	3 (13.0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10.5%)	0 (0%)
Other	6 (26.1%)	0 (0%)	9 (47.4%)	2 (50.0%)
Police/legal response				
Positive	1 (25.0%)		0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Action was taken, but no information on outcome	3 (75.0%)		4 (57.1%)	0 (0%)
Negative	0 (0%)		3 (42.9%)	0 (0%)
Awareness of campaigns	67 (54.9%)	9 (64.3%)	47 (42.0%)	12 (66.7%)
Awareness influenced reporting	7 (10.4%)	2 (22.2%)	11 (23.4%)	2 (16.7%)
#MeToo influenced reporting	7 (5.9%)	0 (0%)	8 (7.3%)	1 (5.6%)
Someone helped	14 (11.6%)	0 (0%)	13 (11.4%)	1 (5.6%)
Type of help provided				
Pulling victim away, separating victim from perpetrator, or alerting victim	5 (38.5%)	0 (0%)	8 (72.7%)	0 (0%)
Taking official measures (e.g., involving police) to remove the perpetrator	4 (30.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Confronting perpetrator	3 (23.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (27.3%)	0 (0%)
Asking if victim was okay	1 (7.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Note. Pairwise deletion used for missing data. Victimization groups are not mutually exclusive, each group includes all incidents of victimization.

^a Item was coded dichotomously yes/no.

^b Open-ended item recoded into categories. Several participants indicated multiple responses; thus, percentages may exceed 100. Percentages are calculated with respect to the number of victims who answered the question.

Table 4

Sample Characteristics and Bivariate Association With Type of Victimization (Frotteurism, Exhibitionism, or Both)

Characteristic	Type of Victimization				Test statistic (<i>df</i>)	Effect size	Total
	FO	EO	Both	None			
<i>n</i> (%)	85 (14.7%)	81 (14.0%)	55 (9.5%)	359 (61.9%)			
Gender ^a					26.730(3)	.217***	
Female	72 (85.7%) ^c	65 (80.2%)	50 (96.2%) ^c	242 (68.6%) ^c			429 (75.3%)
Male	12 (14.3%) ^c	16 (19.8%)	2 (3.8%) ^c	111 (31.4%) ^c			141 (24.7%)
Current age ^b <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	19.74 (2.88)	19.70 (3.98)	21.26 (4.23)	19.96 (3.67)	11.302 (3)	.015*	
Race/Ethnicity ^a					8.323 (12)		
Latino	38 (44.7%)	39 (48.1%)	24 (43.6%)	156 (43.5%)			257 (44.3%)
White	16 (18.8%)	14 (17.3%)	7 (12.7%)	66 (18.4%)			103 (17.8%)
Asian/Pacific Islander	12 (14.1%)	14 (17.3%)	6 (10.9%)	57 (15.9%)			89 (15.3%)
African American	7 (8.2%)	9 (11.1%)	7 (12.7%)	35 (9.7%)			58 (10.0%)
Other	12 (14.1%)	5 (6.2%)	11 (20.0%)	45 (12.5%)			73 (12.6%)
SES ^a					5.032 (3)		
Lower	48 (57.1%)	40 (49.4%)	35 (63.6%)	177 (49.4%)			300 (51.9%)
Middle/upper	36 (42.9%)	41 (50.6%)	20 (36.4%)	181 (50.6%)			278 (48.1%)
Public transport use ^a					16.038 (3)	.167**	
1 day or less	48 (56.5%) ^c	52 (64.2%)	35 (63.6%)	270 (76.1%) ^c			405 (70.3%)
>1 day	37 (43.5%) ^c	29 (35.8%)	20 (36.4%)	85 (23.9%) ^c			171 (29.7%)
Park use ^a					10.659 (3)	.136*	
Rarely	24 (28.2%)	32 (39.5%)	12 (21.8%) ^c	146 (40.8%) ^c			212 (37.0%)
Not rarely ^d	61 (71.8%)	49 (60.5%)	43 (78.2%) ^c	212 (59.2%) ^c			365 (63.0%)

Note. Pairwise deletion used for missing data. Victimization groups are exclusive. FO = frotteurism victimization only; EO = exhibitionism victimization only; Both = experienced both frotteurism and exhibitionism victimization; None = no victimization; SES = socioeconomic status.

^a χ^2 and Φ^2/V reported for chi-square analyses. V is presented for Race/Ethnicity

^bKruskal Wallis H and η^2 reported for age.

^cAdjusted standardised residuals show a significant result.

^dThis category means twice a month or more

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

Table 5

Sample Characteristics and Bivariate Association With Time of Survey (Time 1 vs Time 2)

Characteristic	Time of Survey		Test statistic (<i>df</i>)	Effect size	Total
	Time 1	Time 2			
<i>n</i> (%)	N (%)	N (%)			
Gender ^a			1.006 (1)		
Female	185 (89.4%)	187 (86.2%)			372 (87.7%)
Male	22 (10.6%)	30 (13.8%)			52 (12.3%)
Current age ^b <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	22.23 (5.95)	21.40 (4.37)	19325.5 (1)	.12*	
Age at time of frotteurism victimization ^b	17.25 (5.02)	16.10 (3.25)	4901.5 (1)	.18**	
Age at time of exhibitionism victimization ^b	16.77 (3.70)	16.08 (4.02)	10103.5 (1)		
Race/Ethnicity ^a			22.721 (4)	.231***	
Latino	94 (45.9%)	101 (45.7%)			195 (45.8%)
White	38 (18.5%)	37 (16.7%)			75 (17.6%)
African American	47 (22.9%) ^c	23 (10.4%) ^c			70 (16.4%)
Asian/Pacific Islander	10 (4.9%) ^c	32 (14.5%) ^c			42 (9.9%)
Other	16 (7.8%)	28 (12.7%)			44 (10.3%)
SES ^a			2.020 (1)		
Lower	101 (49.0%)	123 (55.9%)			224 (52.6%)
Middle/upper	105 (51.0%)	97 (44.1%)			202 (47.4%)
Public transport use ^a			90.738 (1)	.461***	
1 day or less	33 (16.0%)	135 (61.1%)			168 (39.3%)
>1 day	173 (84.0%)	86 (38.9%)			259 (60.7%)
Park use ^a			2.272 (1)		
Rarely	78 (37.7%)	68 (30.8%)			146 (34.1%)
Not rarely	129 (62.3%)	153 (69.2%)			282 (65.9%)
Type of Victimization			18.516 (3)	.132***	
FO	52 (10.9%)	85 (14.7%)			137 (13.0%)
EO	114 (24.0%) ^c	81 (14.0%) ^c			195 (18.5%)
Both	41 (8.6%)	55 (9.5%)			96 (9.1%)
None	268 (56.4%)	359 (61.9%)			627 (59.4%)
Victim told someone about frotteurism ^d			3.105 (1)		
Yes	62 (66.7%)	76 (55.1%)			138 (59.7%)
No	31 (33.3%)	62 (44.9%)			93 (40.3%)

Victim told someone about exhibitionism ^d			6.488 (1)	.152*	
Yes	106 (70.7%)	74 (56.1%)			180 (63.8%)
No	44 (29.3%)	58 (43.9%)			102 (36.2%)
Police or legal action about frotteurism ^d			.047 (1)		
Yes	4 (4.4%)	7 (5.1%)			11 (4.8%)
No	86 (95.6%)	131 (94.9%)			217 (95.2%)
Police or legal action about exhibitionism ^d			.018 (1)		
Yes	12 (8.0%)	10 (7.6%)			22 (7.8%)
No	138 (92.0%)	122 (92.4%)			260 (92.2%)

Note. Pairwise deletion used for missing data. Victimization groups are exclusive. FO = frotteurism victimization only; EO = exhibitionism victimization only; Both = experienced both frotteurism and exhibitionism victimization; None = no victimization; SES = socioeconomic status.

^a χ^2 and Φ^2 reported for chi-square analyses.

^bMann-Whitney U and Cohen's d reported for age.

^cAdjusted standardised residuals show a significant result.

^dVictim analyses only refer to those who were victimized in each sample for each type.

*p < .05. **p < .01.

