

Sexualising characteristics of adolescents on TikTok. Comparative study Great Britain-Spain

Journal:	<i>Convergence</i>
Manuscript ID	CON-21-0100.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Article
Keywords:	TikTok, adolescents, sexualisation, gender, age, social media, Great Britain, Spain, content analysis
Abstract:	<p>The research addresses whether adolescents are increasing their self-sexualisation on TikTok through content analysis. It has studied the type and number of sexualising features present in the videos that Spanish and British teenagers share on the social network TikTok, offering a comparative view. A total of 447 videos from 12 British and 12 Spanish tiktokers aged 11 to 17 have been analysed, considering their gender and age and comparing both nationalities. A high level of self-sexualisation has been found in the videos of adolescents of both genders and nationalities. The results show that age and gender determine the sexualising characteristics included in their videos and that British and Spanish minors do not use the same sexualising codes, although neither nationality is more sexualised than the other. It has been confirmed that boys and girls self-sexualise in similar proportions. Age determines sexualising characteristics they incorporate in their audio-visual productions, which indicate the blurring of traditional stereotyped roles and the unification of sexual codes that have traditionally been considered a female domain.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Sexualising characteristics of adolescent on TikTok. Comparative study Great Britain-Spain

Abstract:

The research addresses whether adolescents are increasing their self-sexualisation on TikTok through content analysis. It has studied the type and number of sexualising features present in the videos that Spanish and British teenagers share on the social network TikTok, offering a comparative view. A total of 447 videos from 12 British and 12 Spanish tiktokers aged 11 to 17 have been analysed, considering their gender and age and comparing both nationalities. A high level of self-sexualisation has been found in the videos of adolescents of both genders and nationalities. The results show that age and gender determine the sexualising characteristics included in their videos and that British and Spanish minors do not use the same sexualising codes, although neither nationality is more sexualised than the other. It has been confirmed that boys and girls self-sexualise in similar proportions. Age determines sexualising characteristics they incorporate in their audio-visual productions, which indicate the blurring of traditional stereotyped roles and the unification of sexual codes that have traditionally been considered a female domain.

Keywords:

TikTok, adolescents, sexualisation, age, gender

1. Introduction

Digital technologies are producing profound social transformations (Garber, 2019). The intense incorporation of such technology into households has been dynamically transferred to the adolescent population, who are noted for their massive use of ICT (National Statistics Institute, 2021; The Office of Communications, 2021), in all areas of their lives (Smahel et al, 2020).

Digital adolescent communication on social networks through the use of devices is not exempt from sexual and erotic content in which the focus is placed on the sexualised, eroticised body (Ramsey and Horan, 2018; van Oosten, 2018). Imbued in the current consumer society (Subawa et al, 2020) minors are growing up in a highly eroticised context (Choi and DeLong, 2019) where sexual behaviour and attitudes are adopted at an early age (Mori et al., 2019).

Based on the Objectification theory of Fredrickson and Roberts (1997), and taking into account the clarifications formulated by Fasoli et al., (2018) on the differences between objectification and self-sexualisation, this research analyses the characteristics of self-sexualisation of adolescents, both female and male, on the social network TikTok. Attention has been paid as to whether age and gender are significant variables when it comes to the sexualised self-representation of British and Spanish adolescents in the

1
2
3 audio-visual productions they upload to their channels on this social network. An
4 examination has also been carried out as to whether girls are repeating patterns of sexual
5 behaviour or whether boys are appropriating those behaviours by enhancing their value
6 in terms of sexual attractiveness.
7
8
9

10 11 **2. Theoretical framework**

12 **2.1. Objectification and self-sexualisation; two different constructs**

13
14
15 The Objectification theory of Fredrickson and Roberts (1997), which is based on the ideas
16 of Bartky (1990), provides a framework for the sociocultural understanding of the risks
17 to which women are exposed by having their bodies treated as objects for the pleasure of
18 others. However, although the concepts of sexualisation and objectification are
19 sometimes used synonymously, Ward (2016) and Fasoli et al., (2018) have pointed out
20 that they are two constructs that are linked, but not equivalent. These authors diverge
21 from the objectification theory argued by Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) in stating that
22 sexualisation is a broader phenomenon than sexual objectification, as it involves a focus
23 on the sexual attractiveness of people whose value is based on their sexuality (American
24 Psychological Association, APA, 2007). Fasoli et al. (2018) point out that there are
25 different levels of sexualisation, which can lead to different degrees of self-
26 objectification, and both genders can be perceived as sexual objects. They take a contrary
27 approach in pointing out that sexualisation is not balanced with regard to gender, as girls
28 who show their bodies are perceived as less intelligent, which is not the case for boys,
29 confirming that when girls are sexualised they have a higher risk of being perceived as
30 less resolute and competent than boys (Jongenelis, et al., 2016; Smith, 2018; Díaz-
31 Bustamante-Ventisca, et al., 2020).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **2.2. TikTok, the digital native social network**

41
42 One of the social networks on which minors are mostly using is TikTok (Datareportal,
43 2022), a digital application for mobile devices driven by artificial intelligence focused on
44 music, lip-sync, and dance. TikTok allows for the creation, editing and viralisation of
45 selfie videos that enhance creative freedom, social immersion, and entertainment for
46 teenagers (Anderson, 2020; Wang, 2020). It works by allowing adolescents to share short
47 videos or music clips that include performances and dances for up to 60 seconds by users,
48 who are known as tiktokers. TikTok allows users to create short videos that often include
49 background music, to which special effects and filters can be added. It also allows one to
50 use and create alternate versions of well-known songs, use mythical phrases from TV,
51 cinema, celebrity personalities, videos from YouTube and other tiktokers, as well as to
52 join challenges, make jokes, and perform duets. These features have allowed this social
53 network to become a stage for performing, telling stories, and expressing opinions or
54 identities through performances in categories ranging from comedy to video games
55 (Shutsko, 2020).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The app also allows streaming performative acts carry out by its celebrities which
4 establishes its own content creators' culture (Butler, 2020). The apps' algorithm adapts
5 to the user's exploration using parasocial strategies to increase the interactivity of
6 tiktokers' accounts and to achieve more successful audio-visual productions (Abidin,
7 2021). Similarly, Patel and Binjola (2020) investigated the celebrity phenomenon within
8 the application as a contribution of the app to young people's creativity. Suárez-Álvarez
9 and García-Jiménez (2021) concludes that the teenager celebrities' content goes viral
10 focus on entertainment performances, music videos that stress their self-expression. In
11 addition, Feng et al. (2019) stress that the videos created and disseminated are
12 characterized by low level of production, easy edition, and distribution, and the use of
13 fragmented time. Mackenzie and Nichols (2020), who have also taken a creative point of
14 view but with a focus on counterculture expression, have explored whether the creations
15 by youth on this social network can be understood within these parameters. All of these
16 studies have concluded that easy access to technology for the production, sharing and
17 distribution of user-created content is the factor that has promoted the widespread use of
18 the app.
19
20
21

22 The application not only integrates self-expression and self-exposure of social networks
23 (Jensen, 2008), but it increases the risk of sexual content dissemination (Ringrose et al., 2021),
24 and sexual harassment (Haslop, 2021). Tiktok also intensifies the datafication of its content
25 (Van Dijck and Poell, 2013), as it delivers content tailored to the user by analysing raw
26 data in real-time that is poorly manipulated and curated for it to be put online. This user
27 accessibility does not ensure a diversity of content, but instead provides evidence of its
28 standardisation, which is something that has not only affected this application (Xu et al.,
29 2019) but social networks as a whole due to the technology gap and its inequalities
30 (Dutton and Reisdorf, 2019; Fuchs, 2017; Van Dijk, 2020).¹
31
32
33

34 35 **2.3. Adolescent sexualisation in the digital environment**

36
37 From an early age, adolescents are exposed to hypersexualised images consisting of
38 sexualised expressions, postures or dress codes that are considered excessively
39 precocious (Baley, 2011). To identify the signs that indicate the occurrence of childhood
40 sexualisation, the APA report (2007) points to four indicators that can induce this
41 situation: reducing a person's value to their attractiveness or sexual behaviour; identifying
42 physical attractiveness with being sexy; representing the person as an object rather than
43 a free person; and inappropriately attributing sexuality to individuals. Despite the fact this
44 report continues to be one of the most consulted APA reports (Lamb and Koven, 2019),
45 and serves as the basis for identifying the indicators of child sexualization, has been
46 criticised for its lack of deepening the risks of minor's exposure and the lack of distinction
47 between studies focused on adults and adolescents. Scholars also has stressed that it
48 reinforce traditional stereotypes and it does not include other ethnic minorities, or
49 underrepresented groups such as LGTB and people with disabilities (Smith and Attwood,
50 2011; Renold and Ringrose, 2013; Lamb and Koven, 2019).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 ¹ The website Tiktok Cultures condentse a vast literature and research focused on the application, which
60 stress the variety of topcis from political communication to mental health.

1
2
3 This undervaluation of other types of girls is also criticised by Egan (2013), who points
4 out that literature and traditional media portray the sexualised girl as a white,
5 heterosexual, middle-class female, leaving out other types of women, as well as those
6 who are part of the problem, such as girls belonging to the lower classes. Egan (2013)
7 questions the traditional concept of sexualisation. She points out that the traditional
8 discourse of female sexualisation does not delve into the underlying cultural assumptions
9 and rhetoric that seek to protect the innocence of an “imaginary figure” (p.71), which
10 adults need in order to alleviate their sense of powerlessness and fear. She argues that in
11 conservative narratives of sexualisation, a sexualised girl represents a symbol of cultural
12 decline and a dangerous future, and girls who maintain their innocence promise a more
13 stable future through a respectable femininity that complies with heteronormativity and
14 hegemonic stereotypes (Caldeira, et al. 2020). Such innocence should be removed as a
15 criterion for assessing the sexuality of girls, as it disempowers them (Egan and Hawkes,
16 2008).

17
18
19
20
21
22 Egan (2013) does not deny the potential dangers faced by girls in today's society. Instead,
23 she questions the way in which gender, race, and sexuality are shaped within traditional
24 discourse. She argues that popular literature on sexualisation reflects an Anglo aversion
25 to sexualising girls that is more a reflection of the distress felt by adults than the girls'
26 own practices. Such discourse results in depicting girls as passive recipients and reduces
27 their sexuality to sexualisation (Egan and Hawkes, 2008).

28
29
30
31 Egan (2013) argues that girls have become metaphors for the cultural and economic
32 instability of our hyper-modern society that reflects concerns about social order and the
33 future. With regard to girls, Egan asserts that in the discourse of sexualisation, “she is
34 emblematic of a fractured and corrupted middle-class status as well as an expression of
35 nostalgia for times past when taste, status, age, difference, and control were believed to
36 be more transparent and manageable” (p.8), which represents “the erosion of middle-class
37 respectability and the transformation of good middle-class girls into their working-class
38 poor counterparts” (p. 104). She emphasises that sexualised girls are portrayed as
39 cognitively, morally and emotionally damaged, rather than focusing on sexism, racism,
40 homophobia, and classism. In this traditional discourse on child sexualisation,
41 Rúðólfssdóttir (2019) asserts that girls and young women are interpreted as “a group that
42 is particularly at risk for victimisation and objectification” (p.120), which renders young
43 sexuality pathological.

44
45
46
47
48
49 Most of the literature focuses on the study of female hypersexualisation, whereas in the
50 case of boys and adolescent males the situation is less prolific, although it has increased
51 in recent years (Vandenbosch and Eggermont, 2015; Visser et al, 2019; Sherman et al.,
52 2020; Skowronski et al., 2021). Hypersexuality and the excessive focus on girls' bodies
53 through stereotypes of sexual value in women is transmitted through the media (Ward,
54 2016; Grande-López, 2019). It also occurs in advertising, which aims to induce
55 consumption by linking purchase expectations to the satisfaction of sexual needs
56 (Méndiz, 2018). Child hypersexualisation has important emotional, cognitive, and
57 behavioural consequences on the psycho-affective development of children and
58
59
60

1
2
3 adolescents (Cary et al., 2021) and can even lead to dehumanisation (Bernard and
4 Wollast, 2019).
5

6 Adolescents need to show themselves on the web in the most original way possible with
7 seductive gestures and poses (Khattab, 2020) highlighting their physical attractiveness,
8 and intensifying the role of sexual attraction (Daniels and Zurbriggen, 2014; Trekels et
9 al., 2018a). As creators of content by which they are empowered (Eleá and Miklos, 2017)
10 from their mobile devices, a study by Trekels et al. (2018b) on self-sexualisation in
11 adolescents from Austria, Belgium, Spain and South Korea has concluded that despite
12 cultural differences, there is a growth in sexualisation and higher levels of self-
13 sexualisation on the new media compared to traditional media. The consequence of these
14 phenomena is the trivialisation of social attitudes and behaviours related to bodily display
15 (Llovet et al., 2019).
16
17
18
19

20 This trivialisation of sexual images exhibited by women through social media is
21 proliferating (Drenten et al, 2021), within an increasingly sexualised Western culture
22 (Blake et al, 2018). This increase in sexualisation may be perceived as the result of a
23 culture that reinforces gender inequality, female oppression, and patriarchy (Bartky,
24 2015; Jairath and Daima, 2021; Lu and Malik, 2022), yet this is occurring in societies that
25 have made more progress in achieving gender equality (Blake, et al, 2018). The findings
26 of Blake et al. (2018) confirm that sexualisation is manifested in response to economic
27 conditions, although it is not related to female subordination. This might suggest the
28 possibility that sexualisation may become an indicator of achieving a higher social status
29 and an increase in girls' competence.
30
31
32
33

34 Gil (2012) explores the 'sexualisation of culture' and proposes that worries regarding
35 sexualisation are carried out in moral rather than political terms, while Gil and Orgad
36 (2018) further explore the shift from moral panic to political engagement in the #Metoo
37 movement. While this movement has multi-class, ethnic, and racial features, it does not
38 cover all the real gender issues, and once again, it excludes LGBT and people with
39 disabilities. They point out that this movement continues to express a traditional view of
40 sexualisation by focusing on comprehension of the sexual violence between men and
41 women and male domination, while ignoring other realities such as "cis-women, trans*
42 men and women and gender non-conforming subjects and queer subjects of colour"
43 (p.1319). This indicates a sexualised culture circumscribed to neoliberal capitalism linked
44 to consumerism and discourses of choice and empowerment (Wood, 2017).
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **3. Research Objectives and Questions**

52

53 The study examines sexualised attributes such as body position, clothing, and attitude in
54 front of the camera with the aim of reducing the possible interpretations of the moving
55 image. Our research aims not only to document changes in the sexualisation of adolescent
56 boys and girls, but also to focus on the cultural representation of femininity and
57 masculinity in social networks. Therefore, the objectives of this research are (a) to
58
59
60

investigate amount of sexualising characteristics that boys and girls both nationalities incorporate in the videos they upload to this social network; (b) to study whether girls self-sexualise more than boys in their videos they create and disseminate on TikTok and to determine whether age defines their audiovisual production; (c) to check whether British and Spanish tiktokers use similar sexualising characteristics according to their gender and

In an environment characterised by the massively use of the Internet by adolescents (Bozzola, 2021), it is necessary to study their behaviour in the digital context (Vannucci, et al., 2020). There is scant research on the sexualisation of young people both nationalities on social networks that simultaneously takes into account the variables of gender and age for the purpose of ascertaining the way in which boys and girls self-sexualise on their digital profiles on this social network. Based on the literature, the following questions are proposed:

RQ1. Are the ages and gender of the tiktokers variables in the number of self-sexualising features used in the videos that both British and Spanish adolescents share on this social network?

RQ2. Considering gender and age variables separately, is the self-sexualisation of girls (both British and Spanish) higher than that of boys (both British and Spanish)? and is age a variable (in both nationalities) that determines their audiovisual production?

RQ3. Do not British and Spanish tiktokers incorporate similar sexualising features in terms of type and amount according to their gender in their TikTok audio-visual productions?

4. Methodology

The research carried out has been exploratory-descriptive in nature, and has been developed using a content analysis as a method for measuring the content of digital messages uploaded to TikTok (Parry, 2019; Tam, 2022). The variables have been unified, categorised, and coded to analyse the data with the aim of identifying whether there are factors that relate or disaggregate these variables.

4.1. Coding the variables

A coding sheet was created and segmented into two sub-areas. The first includes the name of the channel, date of publication, title, and the author's gender and age. The second analyses the sexualising characteristics that appear in the content of the videos published on this social network.

4.1.1. Sexualising characteristics

As reported by Graff et al., (2013), there are three trends related to sexualisation. The first is from the works of Edwards (2020) and Vänskä (2020) which focuses on how clothing and accessories increasingly display sexualised female body parts. The second is a result

1
2
3 of the study by Goodin et al., (2011), which looks at sexualised interest in the female
4 breast by examining clothing worn by girls on the websites of 15 of the most popular
5 shops in the United States. Davis (2018) research objectification of university students on
6 Instagram where female breasts and buttocks are used as instruments for use and
7 enjoyment of men. Finally, the third focuses on the role of pornography in creating
8 standards of beauty and transmitting their features female roles, as proposed by Jeffreys
9 (2014) and Maheux et al (2021) among both genders.
11
12

13 From these lines of research, the sexualising features limited to female and male
14 appearance in relation to body position, body parts, clothing and accessories have been
15 identified. We have supplemented these with observations about sexualisation and gender
16 stereotyping from both the UK government's Baley report entitled, "Letting Children be
17 Children" (Barker and Duschinsky, 2012), the study by authors Graff et al., (2013), who
18 explore the sexualising, childlike features of the depictions of girls in the US magazines
19 *Seventeen* and *Girls' Life*, Gerding and Aubrey (2018) researches the sexualizing qualities
20 of girls in popular publications in which they present provocative clothing and sexy facial
21 expressions. Prokop and Švancárová (2020) highlights the use of high heels by women
22 as a resource to increase your physical attractiveness to men. In the case of girls, coding
23 has been carried out on the body parts recognised as sexualised and emphasised, which
24 among others include the following: the breasts in low-cut, tight clothing; the exposed
25 abdomen and buttocks enhanced by excessively short, tight clothing; attention drawn to
26 the breasts and buttocks by using leather and animal print clothing; and high heels.
27
28
29
30
31

32 In order to address the indicators that define male sexualising features, we have reviewed
33 the works that study the idealised Western body image according to gender and social
34 marketing proposed by Murnen (2011), as well as the analysis of the sexualisation of men
35 on the covers of *Rolling Stone* magazine by Hatton and Trautnet (2011) and the reflections
36 on male sexualisation by the Baley report (Barker and Duschinsky, 2012). Moreover, a
37 review has been carried out of Krebbekx (2021) stresses the relevance of male abdominal
38 muscles in social media as a representation of masculinity (Drummond and Drummond,
39 2015). Ali and Qamar (2020) focus on body's full or partially appearance to strength its
40 objectivization as a result of audiences desires (Aorlotti, 2018). Based on these studies, and
41 in the case of male adolescents (among other factors), coding has been carried out
42 regarding the appearance of the torso and prominent musculature, comments that speak
43 of women from a physical point of view, military and sporty clothes, accessories, and the
44 appearance of cars and weapons as components of their masculinity.
45
46
47

48 The study of audio-visual content requires the understanding and coding of body language
49 to connect audiences and increase its confidence (Dhawan, 2021), which, as Turchet (2012)
50 points out, has such a high level of significance that more than 90% of men's and women's
51 communication is non-verbal. In order to enhance persuasive messages, males and
52 females use body positions with which they intend to influence recipients in order to
53 attract their interest (Pease and Pease, 2016).
54

55 Authors such as Greene (2018) and Van Natten (2021) have investigated the body
56 language that women use to communicate some kind of romantic interest. It consists of
57 the eroticised body posture in which women touch, brush or stroke their hair, cross their
58 legs, and tilt their heads. Bianciotti (2017) works along the same lines and has
59 investigated characteristic bodily actions and the aesthetic/erotic/corporal modes of
60

seduction and eroticism that girls use in constructing themselves. They also do this to attract attention in order to arrange encounters, and they add enticing or mischievous smiles as well, and sensual dances in which they move their waists and hips provocatively. Rosidah et al. (2021) concludes that sensual dances of women on TikTok enhances their sexual attractiveness by showing themselves as sexually active women. Owen and Harman (2022) do not confine the dances only to girls and incorporate sensual dancing into the sexualising codes of boys. Authors point out that new marketing strategies boost male sexual dance which promotes boys and girls share similar roles.

The above-mentioned research provides the epistemological and theoretical guide to confirm the proposed questions.

Thirty sexualising codes were recorded, of which 19 belonged to female adolescents and 11 to male adolescents (Table 1).

Table 1. Sexualisation characteristics by gender

Girls	Boys
Sensual or provocative dances	Sensual or provocative dances
Swimsuit, bikini, panties	Swimming trunks, underwear
Shirt or T-shirt that exposes the abdomen (tummy)	Cars (to enhance masculinity)
Low-cut shirts or dresses that emphasise cleavage or breasts	Neck chains or chest necklaces
Necklaces or pendants on the cleavage	Comments referring to the physical aspects of girls
Crossing the legs	Sexual messages on clothing
Tilting the head	Prominent abdominal muscles
Excessive make-up	Enhanced or exaggerated hairstyles
Sexual messages on clothing	Naval piercings
Enhanced or exaggerated hairstyles	Sporty clothes
Naval piercings	Enticing or mischievous smiles
Red or black leather clothing	
Wearing lingerie	
Animal print clothing	
Very short or buttocks-revealing clothes (dresses, trousers, skirts)	
Enticing or mischievous smiles	
Touching hair	
Tight dresses, shirts, or leggings	
High-heeled shoes	

4.2. Sample

The sample consists of 477 videos from 24 teenage profiles from Spain and Great Britain (UK), from 11 to 17 years of age. Twenty videos from 12 Spanish tiktokers (6 boys and 6 girls) and 12 UK tiktokers (6 boys and 6 girls) were analysed. One of the British girls contributed 17 videos.

The selection criteria for the sample are teenagers between 11 and 17 years of age with an active profile on this social network, and who are not famous or known for other professions. They also have more than half a million followers with videos that have more than 1,000 views each, in order to guarantee the interest of the audience of the content

published. This figure is considered relevant due to the fact that starting from 1,000 views per video the creators can start to generate advertising revenue by applying the rate known as RPM (Revenue per Thousand). The authorship of the videos has been confirmed by viewing all of the videos, and the age of the protagonists has been determined using the Google and Bing search engines, and by consulting websites such as <https://es.famousbirthdays.com>, which offers updated information on celebrities and famous people from different fields such as film, television, and social networks like YouTube, Instagram, Facebook and TikTok.

The time span under study began on 6 January 2020 and ended on 1 December 2020. The time span under study began on 6 January 2020 and ended on 1 December 2020. The research focused on the months in which the app became the most downloaded platform, surpassing other social networks such as Facebook, Messenger and Instagram (Sensor Tower, 2020; Nikke Asia, 2021). Male tiktokers who met the requirements of the sample were between 14 and 17 years of age. In the case of girls, the age range was wider, and they started participating on this social network from the age of 11 until the age of 17. We did not find any 13-year-old girls who met the requirements set out in the selection criteria.

A profile belonging to two British twin brothers who share a channel was selected, as they met the requirements of the sample, and both of them appear in all of their videos analysed. In order for the study to offer the maximum investigative uniformity, we worked with another account starring two Spanish brothers who share their audio-visual productions and who also met the selection criteria. In the case of the Spanish brothers' channel, one brother is 15 years old and the other is 17. Therefore, in order to ensure that both ages are statistically reflected in the analysis and that an accurate study is achieved, the videos have been doubled, giving the same number of videos to the 15-year-old age group (20 videos) and to the 17-year-old age group (20 videos) (Table 2).

Table 2. Sample selection

Profile	Age	Gender	Nationality	No. of followers
Subject 23	11	Girl	Spanish	685.6K
Subject 22	12	Girl	English	765.4K
Subject 24	12	Girl	English	558.3K
Subject 5	14	Girl	Spanish	6.4M
Subject 6	14	Girl	Spanish	3.7M
Subject 9	14	Girl	English	3.3M
Subject 18	14	Boy	Spanish	1.5M
Subject 7	15	Girl	Spanish	3.6M
Subject 1	16	Boy	English	17.7M
Subject 2	16	Boy	English	8.6M
Subject 3	16	Girl	Spanish	6M

Subject 4	16	Boy	English	6M
Subject 17	16	Boy	Spanish	1.5M
Subject 21	16	Boy	English	860.4K
Subject 8	17	Girl	English	3.5M
Subject 10	17	Boy	Spanish	2.9M
Subject 11	17	Girl	English	2.6M
Subject 13	17	Boy	Spanish	2M
Subject 14	17	Boy	Spanish	1.8M
Subject 15	17	Girl	English	1.8M
Subject 16	17	Girl	Spanish	1.6M
Subject 19	17	Boy	English	1.3M
Subject 20	17	Boy	English	985.8K
Subject 12	15/17	Boy	Spanish	2.3M

5. Results

The results show a high level of self-sexualisation in the videos of adolescents among both nationalities, and only 25% do not contain any sexualising features. The maximum number of features in the videos is eight, and what is striking is that 30% of the girls' videos and 20% of those of the boys do not include any of the eight features.

It has been observed that of the sexualisation criteria proposed for the projects reviewed, some of the sexualising characteristics are not used by the adolescents in their audio-visual productions. In the case of boys, in none of the videos do they use cars to enhance their masculinity, wear military clothing, or talk about the physical aspects of women. In the case of girls, they do not wear red or black leather clothing, animal print clothing, high heels, nor touch objects used for a sexual purpose. Sexual messages on clothing and navel piercings are also absent in both genders. This highlights the rapidly evolving codes of sexualisation that the adolescents themselves adhere to on social networks.

5.1. Number of sexualising characteristics according to the age and gender of the video authors

Male and female adolescents who are 17 years old show the most sexualising qualities (21% for girls and 20% for boys). In the case of girls, they begin to display more of these qualities at the age of 14 (18%), decreasing in the following year and increasing once again at the age of 16. The boys lag behind the girls. Moreover, boys increase the amount of content with sexual elements from the age of 16 onward (17%). Boys and girls who show this type of content are in their mid-teens (14-16 years) and late teens (17-19 years) (UNICEF, 2020).

Through the use of variance analysis, we have studied whether the sexualising features provided by the tiktokers of both nationalities are related to their gender and age. The ANOVA Factor 1 test enhanced with the Brown-Forsyth test ($F(9,62)=3.801, p < 0.01.$) confirms that the sexualising codes of the adolescents register statistically significant

relationships according to the age and gender of the authors, which shows that both variables are registered as factors when it comes to showing different sexualising features.

In order to confirm this association, Pearson's Chi-square test has been used with a confidence level of 95% ($\chi^2(144)=744.524, p<0.001, N=1083$) which, being higher than the theoretical value of 173.004, confirms the existence of a highly significant relationship between the observed sexualising features, gender and age. The strength of this relationship is evident from the analysis of Cramer's V, which is close to 0.3, (Cramer's V = 0.276).

5.2. Analysis of gender and age variables separately

Since age and gender are statistically related, it is researched which of the two variables is more related to the sexualizing characteristics that adolescent tiktokers incorporate in their videos. After considering a greater number of studies focusing on female hypersexualisation and self-objectification, it might seem that girls are the ones who display more sexualising characteristics. Thus, it is necessary to confirm the way in which adolescent girls and boys of both nationalities show themselves on this social network in relation to gender, and whether it is the girls who contribute the most self-sexualising qualities on their TikTok channels (Table 3).

Table 3. Distribution of observations according to sexualising characteristics and gender (both nationalities)

Sexualising characteristics	Gender		Totals	
	Girls	Boys		
Sensual or provocative dances	82	55	137	
Swimming trunks / underwear (boys)	0	11	11	
Shirt or T-shirt that exposes the abdomen (tummy)	59	0	59	
Low-cut shirts or dresses that emphasise cleavage or breasts	56	0	56	
Neck chains or necklaces on the chest or cleavage (boys and girls)	56	41	97	
Crossing the legs	1	0	1	
Tilting the head	18	0	18	
Excessive make-up	50	0	50	
Prominent abdominal muscles (boys)	0	13	13	
Enhanced or exaggerated hairstyle (boys and girls)	64	104	168	
Wearing lingerie	1	0	1	
Sporty clothes (boys)	0	135	135	
Very short or buttocks-revealing clothes	20	0	20	
Enticing or mischievous smiles	104	108	212	
Bras or bikinis	9	0	9	
Touching hair	25	0	25	
Tight dresses, shirts, or leggings	71	0	71	
	<i>Totals</i>	616	467	1083
	<i>Total number of videos analysed by gender</i>	237	240	
	<i>Number of sexualising characteristics per video</i>	2.60	1.95	

The results show that girls of both nationalities have 616 sexualising characteristics and boys of both nationalities have 467, which means an average of 2.60 sexualising characteristics per video for girls compared to 1.95 characteristics for boys. The ANOVA analysis of the ratio of group averages (Brown-Forsyth test $F(1,29)=0.410$, $p=0.526$) indicates that this difference is not statistically significant, which shows that girls do not self-sexualise in their productions more than boys.

Since girls do not self-sexualise more than boys, it could be interesting to investigate whether age is the variable that determines the amount of the sexualising characteristics that tiktokers incorporate in their viralised videos. The results show the age group with the most sexualising characteristics are 17-year-old tiktokers with 449 sexualising characteristics (41%), followed by 16-year-olds with 231 (21%) and 14-year-olds with 225 (21%). (Table 4).

Table 4. Distribution of observations according to sexualising characteristics and age (both nationalities)

Sexualising characteristics	Age						Totals
	11	12	14	15	16	17	
Sensual or provocative dances	1	4	47	16	25	44	137
Swimming trunks / underwear (boys)	0	0	1	0	4	6	11
Shirt or T-shirt that exposes the abdomen (tummy)	0	4	18	9	10	18	59
Low-cut shirts or dresses that emphasise cleavage or breasts	0	5	13	13	2	23	56
Neck chains or necklaces on the chest or cleavage (boys and girls)	1	2	17	17	9	51	97
Crossing the legs	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Tilting the head	0	0	1	3	1	13	18
Excessive make-up	0	1	9	6	0	34	50
Prominent abdominal muscles (boys)	0	0	1	0	4	8	13
Enhanced or exaggerated hairstyle (boys and girls)	0	13	22	3	65	65	168
Wearing lingerie	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Sporty clothes (boys)	0	0	9	15	50	61	135
Very short or buttocks-revealing clothes	1	3	3	5	0	8	20
Enticing or mischievous smiles	1	6	49	24	50	82	212
Bras or bikinis	0	0	4	0	0	5	9
Touching hair	0	0	10	7	0	8	25
Tight dresses, shirts, or leggings	2	3	21	13	11	21	71
<i>Totals</i>	6	41	225	131	231	449	1083
<i>Percentage</i>	1%	4%	21%	12%	21%	41%	

The ANOVA Factor 1 test enhanced with the Brown-Forsyth test of the age groups (Brown-Forsyth test $F(5,46)=6.629$, $p<0.001$) indicates that there are statistically significant differences between age groups and sexualising characteristics. So, age is the factor that statistically relates to sexualising characteristics above gender.

5.3. Comparison of sexualising characteristics of British and Spanish tiktokers

In their preference to include sexualising features, there are differences by gender and nationality as well. Spanish male tiktokers are more likely to show themselves in swimming trunks or underwear (as opposed to not a single video from the British), and 62% of the Spanish teenagers display their prominent musculature, as opposed to 38% of British teenagers. In the case of girls, Spanish girls are more likely to show excessive make-up (68% Spanish; 32% British), to wear tight shirts or leggings (63% Spanish; 37% British) and to wear shirts or T-shirts that expose the abdominal area (59% Spanish; 41% British). British girls are more likely to show themselves in a bra or bikini (67% British; 33% Spanish) or other forms of sexualisation such as touching the hair. Only two British girls cross their legs or wear lingerie compared to none of the Spanish teenage girls. More evenly matched from the point of view of nationality is the use of low-cut shirts or dresses by girls, emphasising cleavage (54% Spanish; 46% British), or tilting the head, which both nationalities use equally (50% Spanish and British).

Both genders are more likely to wear accessories such as necklaces or pendants that emphasise the cleavage or chest (74% Spanish; 26% British), to dance in a sensual and provocative way (64% Spanish; 36% British), and to smile in a mischievous or sensual way (57% Spanish, 48% British) (Table 5).

Table 5. Distribution of observations according to sexualising characteristics and nationalities.

Sexualising characteristics	Nationality				
	Spanish	British	Totals	% Spanish	% British
Sensual or provocative dances	88	49	137	64%	36%
Swimming trunks / underwear (boys)	11	0	11	100%	0%
Shirt or T-shirt that exposes the abdomen (tummy)	35	24	59	59%	41%
Low-cut shirts or dresses that emphasise the cleavage or breasts	30	26	56	54%	46%
Neck chains or necklaces on the chest or cleavage (boys and girls)	72	25	97	74%	26%
Crossing the legs	0	1	1	0%	100%
Tilting the head	9	9	18	50%	50%
Excessive make-up	34	16	50	68%	32%
Prominent abdominal muscles (boys)	8	5	13	62%	38%
Enhanced or exaggerated hairstyle (boys and girls)	72	96	168	43%	57%
Wearing lingerie	0	1	1	0%	100%
Sporty clothes	80	55	135	59%	41%
Very short or buttocks-revealing clothes	11	9	20	55%	45%
Enticing or mischievous smiles	111	101	212	52%	48%
Bras or bikinis	3	6	9	33%	67%
Touching hair	9	16	25	36%	64%
Tight dresses, shirts, or leggings	45	26	71	63%	37%
<i>Totals</i>	618	465	1083		

Percentage 57% 43%

Then British and Spanish adolescents do not self-sexualise using the same sexual codes. However, the Student's T-test probability distribution (T) with a confidence level of 95% ($T=0.787$, $p = 0.219$) confirms that there are no statistically significant differences between the distribution of sexualising characteristics used by Spanish and British adolescents, and that neither nationality is more sexualised than the other.

6. Conclusions and further research

Social networks have become a means of communication and a window through which adolescents share their lives, becoming showcases for the representation of their identities (Bossen and Kottasz, 2020). With the aim of being sexually attractive, these communications might include self-presentations with sexualising characteristics (Ramsey and Horan, 2018). There is scant literature that combines both genders in relation to their self-sexualisation on TikTok to assess the possible differences detected by gender and age and compare the self-sexualising characteristics shown by British and Spanish adolescents on their channels.

Our results show highly sexualised self-presentation in the videos that boys and girls share on this social network which is in line with the findings of Trekels et al. (2018a). They share audio-visual productions focused on exposing their bodies, clothes, and bodily poses with erotic content, displaying a type of exhibition-oriented adolescence in which the cult of the body and image acquires special significance (Edwards, 2020; Vänskä, 2020). In the case of girls, they begin to incorporate a greater number of sexualising characteristics earlier than boys (around 14 years), while boys postpone such features until the age of 16. This confirms the findings of Choi and DeLong (2019) and Mori et al., (2019), who point out that girls display sexualised behaviours and attitudes at younger ages. Age and gender (Rosidah, et al. 2021; Owen and Harman, 2022) have been seen as dependent variables for adolescents of both nationalities when it comes to including sexualising features in their publications. Teenagers in middle and late adolescence differ this behaviour in front of the camera of their mobile devices. The statistically significant relationship between sexualising characteristics, gender and age among the tiktokers of both nationalities leads to confirmation both variables determine the creation and dissemination of content on TikTok.

After reviewing the literature that emphasises female sexualisation (Gerding and Aubrey 2018; Mori et al., 2019; Prokop and Švancárová, 2020), one might believe *a priori* that girls self-sexualise more than boys, so we decided to study the variables of gender and age separately to check this. However, it is observed that this does not occur on TikTok. Even though girls include proportionally more sexualising features than boys, the statistical difference is not significant. We has been confirmed that age determines the number of sexualising characteristics that they show in both genders' videos. Consequently, girls do not self-sexualise more than boys, and in fact, the

1
2
3 behaviour is quite similar. These results support the research of van Oosten et al., (2017)
4 regarding male and female roles of adolescents from 13-17 years of age on social
5 networks, in which they report that while stereotypical gender role orientation predisposes
6 adolescents to represent and expose themselves to sexy content, they have found no
7 differences with regard to gender. The findings also reinforce the results of Suárez-
8 Álvarez and García-Jiménez (2021), who highlight a reduction in traditional gender roles
9 displayed by young people in their audio-visual productions on TikTok.
11

12
13 This comparison in the behaviour of boys and girls of both nationalities contradicts the
14 gender theory construct (Bem, 1981), which advocates that the self-concept of boys and
15 girls with which they develop their gender identities is performed through role schemes
16 that lead them to behave in gender stereotyped ways. Likewise, it refutes the social role
17 theory of Eagly and Wood (1991) since in this research boys and girls show similar
18 behaviours without distinguishing differences according to socially identified gender. The
19 evolution of gender roles and behaviours matches Butler's (2020) theory of gender
20 performativity, which states that gender expression is the result of social, historical, and
21 cultural construction and not only of roles biologically determined gender.
22

23
24 Similarly, the theory of gender intensification (Galambos, 2004), which points to the
25 divergence of gender roles in adolescence in their characteristics and behaviour, has not
26 been confirmed. Nor has this theory been confirmed by Korlat et al. (2021), who have
27 found greater gender similarities than differences in self-descriptions made by
28 adolescents. van Oosten et al., (2017) point to the possible social pressure on adolescents
29 to confine themselves to stereotyped gender roles. Still, this association of gender
30 characteristics between boys and girls demonstrates that new generations of adolescents
31 are more reluctant to assume stereotypical gender roles, traits and behaviour (Fedele et
32 al, 2021). This metamorphosis leads to new norms of gender relations and social roles
33 among the new generations and the disappearance of some of the sexualising
34 characteristics found in previous studies, which have not reappeared in this research. Such
35 results indicate that the evolution of sexualisation among minors is not monolithic, and
36 that the eroticism of minors is shaped by the culture in which they grow up (Egan, 2013).
37

38
39 Finally, we focus on the differences in sexualising characteristics according to the
40 selection and amount in the videos they share on this social network, taking into account
41 gender and age and comparison of both nationalities. Significant differences have been
42 detected in the sexualising characteristics used by both nationalities, as well as in the
43 number of these characteristics. It has also been verified that Spanish boys show
44 themselves in swimming trunks or underwear and show their muscles without any sense
45 of embarrassment compared to British boys, who prefer not to show themselves in this
46 way. Among females, British girls are more uninhibited than their male counterparts,
47 showing themselves in bras or bikinis twice as many times as Spanish girls. With regard
48 to commonalities, the sexual characteristics most often used include necklaces on the
49 chest or cleavage, head tilts, enhanced hairstyles, sensual dances, and enticing smiles.
50 This concurs with the findings of Khattab (2020), who indicates that young people display
51 themselves in seductive poses in front of their cameras. Although these differences are
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 significant in terms of the way in which adolescent boys and girls of both nationalities
4 represent themselves, the statistical analysis confirms that there are no discrepancies in
5 the distribution of sexualising characteristics, which confirms that neither nationality is
6 more sexualised than the other. This is in line with the findings of Trekels et al. (2018b),
7 who found no differences in the self-sexualization of young people in the countries they
8 studied, which include Austria, Belgium, Spain and South Korea.
9

10
11 Our results pose the question as to whether in the present consumer culture (Subawa et
12 al, 2020), children are growing up in an increasingly eroticised society (Choi and DeLong,
13 2019), or whether we as adults, with our fears, class differences, and cultural
14 backgrounds, are the ones disguising our socio-economic worries about today's capitalist
15 society in sexualised children (Egan, 2013). Perhaps, as argued by Blake et al. (2018),
16 female sexualisation is evolving into a symbol of social status rather than a problem that
17 victimises girls and young women for their way of dressing and their attitude.
18
19

20
21 This analysis focuses on the study of niños **fair-skinned** girls and boys, yet we cannot be
22 sure that they are heterosexual and middle class. Questioning traditional literature and
23 popular culture regarding the concept of girls' sexualisation and agency, as recommended
24 by Egan (2013), will allow us to broaden the context and delve deeper into the collective
25 imagination, interpretation, and subjugation of adults in our capitalist society (Egan,
26 2013; Egan and Hawkes, 2008; Wood, 2017), while leaving behind the moralistic point
27 of view (Gil, 2012).
28
29

30
31 For future research, the present study provides further opportunities to determine whether
32 the sexualisation of girls (and boys) is more a symptom of cultural instability and adult
33 concern rather than a description of the way they grow up (Egan, 2013). **Also, future
34 research could look if girls' sexualisation might be connected to girls' competence rather
35 than to be related to female subordination (Blake et al, 2018).** It would be useful to ask children
36 about their dress and attitude toward their mobile device cameras as channels for
37 promoting the agency of their sexual development (Egan and Hawkes, 2008). **Some of
38 the sexualising characteristics studied in this paper, such as stomach exposure, have been
39 selected because academic literature considers them sexualizing characteristics. This has
40 allowed us to determine them as evidence of sexualization. However, this paper proposes
41 to investigate whether these sexualizing characteristics and attitudes correspond to those
42 that minors consider sexualizing and with the understanding of a non-pathologized
43 sexualization (Rúðólfssdóttir, 2019).**
44
45

46
47 **Authors such as Egan (2013) focus** their reflections on the sexualisation of girls, while
48 the authors of the present study have addressed the self-sexualisation of boys on social
49 networks as well, in order to offer a more complete picture of the self-portrayal that
50 children display on their TikTok profiles. Looking at children from the analytical
51 perspective of child sexualisation will allow us to determine ~~whether the children
52 themselves represent the erosion of middle-class respectability (Egan 2013)~~, whether
53 their sexualisation represents an increase in their social status not subject to subordination
54 (Blake et al, 2018), or whether it poses a risk to their development (Cary et al., 2021;
55 Bernard and Wollast, 2019). **Furthermore, it will be necessary to delve into the**
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sexualizing characteristics of girls and boys with other appearances, ethnicities and
4 belonging to other groups such as LGBTBI girls and boys or with disabilities (Orgad,
5 2018).
6

7
8 When analysing the results of this study, one should bear in mind that the findings have
9 been derived from a specific, previously determined time frame. Moreover, they do not
10 consider the production conditions and restrictions that the app itself poses when
11 disseminating videos. Nor has consideration been given to the extent to which this social
12 network allows certain previously standardised content to be made visible, the limits of
13 interpretation when determining what constitutes a sexualising attitude, the real impact
14 of this type of content compared to the rest of the content published by this sector of the
15 population, nor the perception of this sector of the population of such content. **One of the**
16 **limitations of studying decontextualized images is not being able to confirm the possible**
17 **divergences between the followers' views and the content creators' purposes because these**
18 **images can be understood from different prisms. While “exposes the abdomen” or**
19 **“swimsuit, bikini, panties/swimming trunks, underwear” may be perceived by adults as**
20 **sexualizing, peers may not see them as the protagonist’s auto sexualization. Likewise,**
21 **content producers may not seek to auto-sexualize themselves on their social media**
22 **profiles. Therefore, it is not possible to equate bodily exposure with sexual display. These**
23 **limitations should be considered when future analyses and possible extrapolations of this**
24 **research.**
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 After observing the ease of sharing and accessing sexualised content on an open social
32 network, the need arises to investigate the risks to which users are exposed. Furthermore,
33 studies should be conducted on mediation strategies that parents can take on a social
34 network developed exclusively for mobile devices that hinders their control and
35 supervision capability. Likewise, it would also be beneficial to increase research on the
36 self-sexualisation of male adolescents on social networks to know the codes by which
37 they communicate, and whether they are appropriating such codes that have traditionally
38 been assigned to girls, which seems to be the case.
39
40
41
42
43

44 Bibliographic references

45 Abidin C (2021) Mapping Internet celebrity on TikTok: Exploring attention
46 economies and visibility labours. *Cultural Science Journal*, 12(1), 77-103.
47 <https://doi.org/10.5334/csci.140>
48
49

50 Ali S, Qamar, A. (2020). Male Sexualisation in Music Videos: A Critical Analysis under
51 Nussbaum’s Perspective of Objectification. *iJournals: International Journal of Social*
52 *Relevance & Concern*, 8(2):1-11. <https://doi.org/10.26821/IJSRC.8.2.2020.8208>
53
54

55 American Psychological Association (APA, 2007). *Task Force on the Sexualization of*
56 *Girls. Report of the APA task force on the sexualization of girls*. Washington, DC:
57 American Psychological Association. :
58 <http://www.apa.org/pi/women/programs/girls/report-full.pdf>
59
60

- 1
2
3 Anderson KE (2020). *Getting acquainted with social networks and apps: it is time to talk*
4 *about TikTok*. Library Hi Tech News.
5
6 Aorlotti (2018) Gaze and Gender in Music Videos Using Charli XCX's Boys – Studies
7 in Visual Cultures. Available at: [https://visualculture.blog.ryerson.ca/gazeand-gender-](https://visualculture.blog.ryerson.ca/gazeand-gender-in-music-videos/)
8 [in-music-videos/](https://visualculture.blog.ryerson.ca/gazeand-gender-in-music-videos/) (accessed 22 March 2022).
9
10
11 Bailey R (2011) *Letting Children Be Children*. Report of an Independent Review of the
12 Commercialization and Sexualization of Childhood. UK: The Stationery Office.
13
14 Barker M, Duschinsky R (2012). Sexualisation's four faces: sexualisation and gender
15 stereotyping in the Bailey Review. *Gender and Education* 24(3): 303-310.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2012.660136>
17
18 Bartky, SL (2015) *Femininity and domination: Studies in the phenomenology of*
19 *oppression*. London: Routledge.
20
21 Bem SL (1981) Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological*
22 *Review* 88: 354–364. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354>
23
24 Bernard P, Wollast R (2019) Why is sexualization dehumanizing? The effects of posture
25 suggestiveness and revealing clothing on dehumanization. *Sage Open*, 9(1),
26 <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440198282>
27
28 Bernard P, Gervais S, Allen J, Campomizzi S, Klein O (2015) Body parts reduction and
29 self-objectification in the objectification of sexualized bodies. *Revue internationale de*
30 *psychologie sociale* 28(1): 39-61. Available at: [https://www.cairn.info/revue-](https://www.cairn.info/revue-internationale-de-psychologiesociale-2015-1-page-15.htm)
31 [internationale-de-psychologiesociale-2015-1-page-15.htm](https://www.cairn.info/revue-internationale-de-psychologiesociale-2015-1-page-15.htm)
32
33 Bianciotti MCR (2017) Seduction and (hetero) eroticism in perspective: reiteration,
34 displacements and incorporations of sex/gender/desire performatively materialized.
35 *Pensamiento Americano* 10(18): 200-220.
36
37 Blake KR, Bastian B, Denson TF, Grosjean P, Brooks RC (2018) Income inequality not
38 gender inequality positively covaries with female sexualization on social media.
39 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(35), 8722-8727.
40 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1717959115>
41
42 Bossen CB, Kottasz R (2020) Uses and gratifications sought by pre-adolescent and
43 adolescent TikTok consumers. *Young consumers*, 21(4): 463-478.
44 <https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-07-2020-1186>
45
46 Bozzola,E (2021) Media Use during Childhood and Adolescence. *International*
47 *Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(3), 967.
48 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18030967>
49
50 Butler J (2020) *Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology*
51 *and feminist theory*. London: Routledge.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Caldeira S, De Ridder S, Van Bauwel S. (2020) Between the mundane and the political:
4 Women's self-representations on Instagram. *Social Media+ Society*, 6(3), 1-14.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051209408>
6
7
8 Cary KM, Maas MK, Nuttall AK (2021) Self-objectification, sexual subjectivity, and
9 identity exploration among emerging adult women. *Self and Identity*, 20(7), 845-853.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2020.1772358>
11
12
13 Choi D, DeLong M (2019) Defining female self sexualization for the twenty-first
14 century. *Sexuality & Culture*, 23(4): 1350-1371. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-019-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-019-09617-3)
15 [09617-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-019-09617-3)
16
17
18 Daniels EA, Zurbriggen EL (2014) The Price of Sexy: Viewers' Perceptions of a
19 Sexualized Versus Non-sexualized Facebook Profile Photograph. *Psychology of*
20 *Popular Media Culture* 5(1), 2-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000048>
21
22
23 Datareportal (2022) *Digital 2022: Global Overview Report*. Available at:
24 <https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2022-global-overview-report> (accessed 21
25 March 2022).
26
27
28 Davis SE (2018) Objectification, sexualization, and misrepresentation: Social media and
29 the college experience. *Social Media+ Society*, 4(3):1-9.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118786727>
31
32
33 Dhawan E (2021) *Digital Body Language: How to Build Trust and Connection, No*
34 *Matter the Distance*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
35
36
37 Díaz-Bustamante-Ventisca M, Llovet-Rodríguez C, Narros-González MJ (2020)
38 Perceived sexualization in girls' fashion stylings: A Spain-China cross-cultural
39 analysis. *Comunicar*, 28(65): 77-87. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C65-2020-07>
40
41
42 Drenten J, Gurrieri L, Tyler, M (2020) Sexualized labour in digital culture: Instagram
43 influencers, porn chic and the monetization of attention. *Gender, Work & Organization*,
44 27(1), 41-66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12354>
45
46
47 Drummond M, Drummond C (2015) Its All about the Six-pack: Boys Bodies in
48 Contemporary Western Culture. *Journal of Child Health Care*, 19(4): 423-431.
49 <https://doi.org/10.1177/136749351453812>
50
51
52 Dutton WH, Reisdorf BC (2019) Cultural divides and digital inequalities: attitudes
53 shaping Internet and social media divides'. *Information, Communication and*
54 *Society* 22(1): 18-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1353640>
55
56
57 Eagly AH, Wood, W (1991) Explaining sex differences in social behavior: A
58 metaanalytic perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17: 306-315.
59 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167291173011>
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

- 1
2
3 Egan RD (2013) *Becoming sexual: A critical appraisal of the sexualization of girls*. UK:
4 John Wiley & Sons.
5
6 Egan RD, Hawkes GL (2008) Endangered girls and incendiary objects: Unpacking the
7 discourse on sexualization. *Sexuality & culture*, 12(4), 291-311.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-008-9036-8>
9
10 Eleá I, Miklos L (2017) Introduction-Young and Creative. Creativity in Everyday
11 Practices. In: I. Eleá and L. Miklos (eds.) *Young and Creative. Digital Technologies*
12 *Empowering Children in Everyday Life*. Gothenburg: Nordicom, pp.9-13.
13
14 Fasoli F, Durante F, Mari S, Zogmaister C, Volpato C (2018) Shades of sexualization:
15 When sexualization becomes sexual objectification. *Sex Roles* 78(5-6), 338-351.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0808-1>
17
18 Fedele M, Aran-Ramspott S, Elexpuru I, Korres O (2021) *Construcción de las*
19 *identidades, valores y estereotipos juveniles en los social media: l@s influencers y las*
20 *audiencias Millennial y Centennial* [Construction of youth identities, values and
21 stereotypes in social media: influencers and Millennial and Centennial audiences].
22 Madrid: Editorial Dykinson.
23
24 Feng YL, Chen CC, Wu SM (2019). Evaluation of charm factors of short video user
25 experience using FAHP–A case study of Tik Tok App. In *IOP conference series:*
26 *Materials science and engineering* (Vol. 688, No. 5, p. 055068). IOP Publishing.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/688/5/055068>
28
29 Fredrickson BL, Roberts TA (1997) Objectification theory: Toward understanding
30 women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of women quarterly*,
31 21(2): 173-206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x>
32
33 Fuch C (2017) *Social media: A critical introduction*. London: Sage.
34
35 Galambos NL (2004) Gender and gender role development in adolescence. In: Lerner RM
36 and Steinberg L (eds) *Handbook of adolescent psychology*. New Jersey: John Wiley
37 and Sons Inc, pp. 233–262.
38
39 Garber I (2019) Schemas of the Transformation of Psychology in an Information Society.
40 *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology* 56(5-6): 296-313.
41 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10610405.2019.1659699>
42
43 Gerding Speno A, Aubrey JS (2018) Sexualization, youthification, and adultification: A
44 content analysis of images of girls and women in popular magazines. *Journalism &*
45 *Mass Communication Quarterly*, 95(3): 625-646.
46 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699017728918>
47
48 Gill R (2012) Media, Empowerment and the ‘Sexualization of Culture’ Debates. *Sex*
49 *Roles*, 66(11), 736–745. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0107-1>
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Gill, R., Orgad, S. (2018). The shifting terrain of sex and power: From the ‘sexualization
4 of culture’ to #MeToo. *Sexualities*, 21(8), 1313-1324.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460718794647>
6
7
8 Goodin S, Van Denburg A, Murnen SK, Smolak L (2011) “Putting on” sexiness: A
9 content analysis of the presence of sexualizing characteristics in girls’ clothing. *Sex*
10 *Roles* 65: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-9966-8>
11
12 Graff KA, Murnen SK, Krause AK (2013) Low-Cut Shirts and High-Heeled Shoes:
13 Increased Sexualization across Time in Magazine Depictions of Girls. *Sex Roles*
14 69(11): 571–582. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-013-0321-0>
15
16 Grande-López V (2019) Female hypersexualisation in media as a show case for beauty
17 and success. *Media Literacy and Gender Studies* 8(16): 21-32.
18
19
20 Greene F (2018) *The Secret Rules of Flirting: The Illustrated Guide to Reading Body*
21 *Language, Getting Noticed, and Attracting the Love You Deserve--Online and In*
22 *Person*. Beverly, Massachusetts: Fair Winds Press.
23
24
25 Haslop C, O’Rourke F, Southern, R (2021) #NoSnowflakes: The toleration of harassment
26 and an emergent gender-related digital divide, in a UK student online culture.
27 *Convergence*, 27(5), 1418-1438. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856521989270>
28
29
30 Hatton E, Trautner MN (2011) Equal opportunity objectification? The sexualization of
31 men and women on the cover of Rolling Stone. *Sexuality and culture* 15(3): 256-278.
32 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-011-9093-2>
33
34 Jairath J, Daima R (2021) Role of Pop Culture in Popularizing Gender-Bending
35 Fashion and Ideals of Beauty and Makeup. *International Journal of Policy Sciences and*
36 *Law*, 1(3), 1637-1649. <https://bit.ly/3e0shq7>
37
38
39 Jeffreys S (2014) *Beauty and misogyny: Harmful cultural practices in the West*. London:
40 Routledge.
41
42 Jongenelis MI, Pettigrew S, Byrne, SM, Biagioni N (2016) An investigation of young
43 girls’ responses to sexualized images. *Body Image*, 19: 150-158.
44 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2016.09.003>
45
46
47 Khattab M (2020) Synching and performing: body (re)-presentation in the short video
48 app TikTok. *WiderScreen* 21(1–2): 2-16. <https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe202002074858>
49
50
51 Korlat S, Forst N, Schultes M, Schober MT, Spiel B, Kollmayer M (2021) Gender role
52 identity and gender intensification: Agency and communion in adolescents’
53 spontaneous self-descriptions. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 19
54 (1): 64-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2020.1865143>
55
56
57 Krebbekx, W (2021) Watching six-packs, chilling together, spreading rumours: Enacting
58 heteronormativity through secondary school friendships and teaching practices.
59 *Gender and Education*, 33(1): 17-32.
60 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2018.1538496>

- 1
2
3 Lamb S, Koven J (2019) Sexualization of girls: Addressing criticism of the APA report,
4 presenting new evidence. *Sage open*, 9(4): 1-15.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1177/215824401988102>
6
7
8 Liu G, Malik MA (2022) Construction of Femininity and Consumer Culture in
9 American Women's Magazines: A Qualitative Study about Good Housekeeping. *Global*
10 *Sociological Review*, VII(II), 26-36. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2020\(VII-II\).04](https://doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2020(VII-II).04)
11
12 Llovet C, Díaz-Bustamante M, Méndiz A (2019) State of the issue of child sexualisation
13 in the digital environment and media literacy proposals. *Doxa Comunicación*, 28: 223-
14 240. <https://doi.org/10.31921/doxacom.n28a12>
15
16
17 Lumby C, Albury K (2010). Too much? Too young? The sexualisation of children debate
18 in Australia. *Media International Australia*, 135(1): 141-152.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X1013500116>
20
21 Mackenzie SA, Nichols (2020) Finding 'Places to Be Bad' in Social Media: The Case of
22 TikTok. In: Nichols D., Perillo S. (eds) *Urban Australia and Post-Punk*. Singapore:
23 Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 285-298. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9702-9_22
24
25
26 Maheux AJ, Roberts SR, Evans R., Widman L, Choukas-Bradley S (2021) Associations
27 between adolescents' pornography consumption and self-objectification, body
28 comparison, and body shame. *Body Image*, 37: 89-93.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2021.01.014>
30
31
32 Méndiz A (2018) The representation of the child in children's advertising. From
33 innocence to sexualization. *Methaodos. Revista De Ciencias Sociales*, 6(1): 125-137.
34 <http://dx.doi.org/10.17502/m.rcs.v6i1.231>
35
36
37 Mori C, Temple JR, Browne D, Madigan S (2019) Association of sexting with sexual
38 behaviors and mental health among adolescents: A systematic review and meta-
39 analysis. *JAMA pediatrics*, 173(8): 770-779.
40 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2019.1658>
41
42
43 Murnen SK (2011) Gender and body images. In: Cash TF and Smolak L (ed.) *Body*
44 *image: A handbook of science, practice, and prevention*. New York: The Guilford
45 Press, pp. 173–179.
46
47
48 National Statistics Institute (2021) Survey on Equipment and Use of Information and
49 Communication Technologies (ICT) in Households. Available at:
50 <https://bit.ly/3L4AuV9> (accessed 21 March 2022).
51
52
53 Nikkei Asia (2021). *TikTok overtakes Facebook as world's most downloaded app*.
54 Available at: <https://s.nikkei.com/35W8mEH> (accessed 21 March 2022).
55
56
57 Owen C, Harman V (2022) Marketing Dance to Boys and Men: New, Complex and
58 Dynamic Practices of Masculinities. In: Risner, D., Watson, B. (eds) *Masculinity,*
59 *Intersectionality and Identity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, pp. 185-206.
60

- 1
2
3 Parry, K. (2019). Quantitative Content Analysis of the Visual. In: Pauwels, L and Mannay
4 D (eds). *The SAGE Handbook of Visual Research Methods*. London: Sage, pp. 353-
5 367.
6
7
8 Patel K, Binjola H (2020) TikTok the New Alternative Media for Youngsters for Online
9 Sharing of Talent: An Analytical Study. *Journal of Advanced Research in Journalism*
10 *and Mass Communication*, 7(1): 16-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3600119>
11
12 Pease A, Pease B (2016) *The Definitive Book Of Body Language: How to read others'*
13 *attitudes by their gestures*. Houdson: Orion Group.
14
15 Prokop P, Švancárová J (2020) Wearing high heels as female mating strategy. *Personality*
16 *and Individual Differences*, 152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109558>
17
18 Ramsey LR, Horan AL (2018) Picture this: Women's self-sexualization in photos on
19 social media. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 133: 85-90.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.06.022>
21
22 Renold E, Ringrose J (2013) Feminisms re-figuring “sexualisation,” sexuality and “the
23 girl.” *Feminist Theory*, 14: 247-254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700113499531>
24
25 Ringrose J, Regehr K, Milne B (2021) *Understanding and Combatting Youth Experiences*
26 *of Image-Based Sexual Harassment and Abuse*. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3D4RiIN>
27
28 Rosidahn I, Komunikasi I, Afifah Afif N, Nadzir M, Masyhuri M, Nur Laila P, Ahwan
29 Z (2021) Woman Sensual Dance di Social Media Tiktok dalam Relasinya dengan
30 Stigmatisasi Perempuan dan Imitative Culture. *Journal Darussalam: Journal*
31 *Pendidikan, Komunikasi dan Pemikiran Hukum Islam*, 13(1): 49-64.
32 <https://doi.org/10.30739/darussalam.v13i1.1287>
33
34 RÚDÓLFSDÓTTIR AG (2019) Children, sexuality and sexualization Emma Renold, Jessica
35 Ringrose and R Danielle Egan. *Feminism & Psychology*, 29(1), 120–123.
36 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353517714595>
37
38 Sensor Tower (2020) *Sensor Tower Store Intelligence Data Digest Q4 2020*. Available
39 at: <https://sensortower.com/blog/q4-2020-data-digest> (accessed 21 March 2022).
40
41 Sherman AM, Allemann H, Prickett S (2020) Hypersexualization and Sexualization in
42 Advertisements for Halloween Costumes. *Sex Roles*, 83: 254–266.
43 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-019-01105-0>
44
45 Shutsko A (2020) User-Generated Short Video Content in Social Media. A Case Study
46 of TikTok. In: Meiselwitz G (eds) *Social Computing and Social Media. Participation,*
47 *User Experience, Consumer Experience, and Applications of Social Computing. HCI*
48 *2020*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 12195. Springer, Cham.
49 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49576-3_8
50
51 Skowronski M, Busching R, Krahe B (2021) Links between exposure to sexualized
52 Instagram images and body image concerns in girls and boys. *Journal of Media*
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications*, 34(1): 55-62.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000296>
5

6 Smahel D, MacHackova H, Mascheroni G, Dedkova L, Staksrud E, Olafsson K,
7 Hasebrink U (2020) *EU Kids Online 2020: Survey results from 19 countries*. Available
8 at: <https://bit.ly/36hAORO> (accessed 21 March 2022).
9

10
11 Smith C, Attwood F (2011). Lamenting sexualization: research, rhetoric and the story of
12 young people's 'sexualization' in the UK Home Office review. *Sex education*, 11(3):
13 327-337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2011.590314>
14

15
16 Smith JK, Liss M, Erchull MJ, Kelly CM, Adragna K, Baines K (2018) The relationship
17 between sexualized appearance and perceptions of women's competence and
18 electability. *Sex Roles*, 79(11), 671-682. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-018-0898-4>
19

20
21 Su Y, Baker, BJ, Doyle, JP, Yan M (2020) Fan Engagement in 15 Seconds: Athletes'
22 Relationship Marketing During a Pandemic via TikTok. *International Journal of Sport*
23 *Communication*, 13(3): 436-446. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsc.2020-0238>
24

25
26 Suárez-Álvarez R, García-Jiménez A (2021) Centennials on TikTok: type of video.
27 Analysis and comparative Spain-Great Britain by gender, age, and nationality.
28 *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, 79: 1-22.
29 <https://www.doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2021-1503>
30

31
32 Subawa NS, Widhiasthini NW, Pika P and Suryawati PI (2020) Hedonism on the behavior
33 of consumer society as a global cultural transformation. *International research journal*
34 *of management, IT and social sciences*, 7(2): 59-70.
35 <https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v7n2.878>
36

37
38 Tam MS (2022) Türk TikTokerların İçerik Paylaşım Pratikleri Üzerine Nicel Bir
39 Araştırma. *TRT Akademi*, 7(14): 182-211. <https://doi.org/10.37679/trta.1008427>

40
41 The Office of Communications (2021) *Online Nation 2021 report*. Available at:
42 <https://bit.ly/3L5SoqF> (accessed 22 March 2022).
43

44
45 Trekels J, Ward LM, Eggermont S (2018a) I "like" the way you look: How appearance-
46 focused and overall Facebook use contribute to adolescents' self-
47 sexualization. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 81: 198-208.
48 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.12.020>
49

50
51 Trekels J, Karsay K, Eggermont S, Vandenbosch, L (2018b) How social and mass media
52 relate to youth's self-sexualization: Taking a cross-national perspective on rewarded
53 appearance ideals. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47(7), 1440-1455.
54 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0844-3>
55

56
57 Turchet P (2012) *The secrets of body language: An illustrated guide to knowing what*
58 *people are really thinking and feeling*. New York: Skyhorse Publishing, Inc.

59
60 United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (2020). *Adolescencia y*
juventud. Available at: <https://uni.cf/3uCqjAT> (accessed 1 March 2021).

- 1
2
3 Van Dijck J, Poell T (2013) Understanding social media logic. *Media and*
4 *communication*, 1(1), 2-14. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2309065>
5
6 Van Dijk J (2020) *The network society. 4th Edition*. London: Sage.
7
8 Van Natten D (2021) *Body Language for Women: Learn to Read People Instantly and*
9 *Increase Your Influence*. New York: Skyhorse Publishing.
10
11
12 Van Oosten JM (2018) Sexy Selfies. The Role of Social Media in Adolescents' (Self)
13 Sexualization. In: Kühne R, Baumgartner SU, Koch T and Hofer M (eds.) *Youth and*
14 *Media Current Perspectives on Media Use and Effects*, pp. 187-202.
15 <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783845280455>
16
17
18 Van Oosten JM, Vandenbosch L, Peter J (2017) Gender roles on social networking sites:
19 investigating reciprocal relationships between Dutch adolescents' hypermasculinity
20 and hyperfemininity and sexy online self-presentations. *Journal of Children and*
21 *Media*, 11(2): 147-166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2017.1304970>
22
23
24 Vandenbosch L, Eggermont S (2015) Sexualization of adolescent boys: Media exposure
25 and boys' internalization of appearance ideals, self-objectification, and body
26 surveillance. *Men and Masculinities*, 16: 283-306.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X1347786>
28
29
30 Vannucci A, Simpson EG, Gagnon S, Ohannessian CM (2020) Social media use and risky
31 behaviors in adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Adolescence*, 79:258-274.
32 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2020.01.014>
33
34
35 Vänskä A (2020) Sexualising fashion? An introduction to the special theme issue.
36 *Sexualities*, 23(5-6): 692-701. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460720939401>
37
38
39 Visser BA, Stiner E, Sultani F, Choma B (2019) Male Enjoyment of Sexualization Scale.
40 In: Milhausen RR, Sakaluk JK, Fisher TD, Davis CM and Yarber WL (eds). (2019)
41 *Handbook of Sexuality-Related Measures*. New York: Routledge, pp. 163-164.
42
43 Wang Y (2020) Humor and camera view on mobile short-form video apps influence user
44 experience and technology-adoption intent, an example of TikTok (DouYin).
45 *Computers in Human Behavior*, 110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106373>
46
47
48 Ward LM (2016) Media and sexualization: State of empirical research, 1995-2015. *The*
49 *Journal of Sex Research*, 53: 560-577.
50 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2016.1142496>
51
52
53 Wood R (2017) *Consumer Sexualities: Women and Sex Shopping*. London: Routledge.
54 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315447520>
55
56 Xu L, Yan X, Zhang Z (2019) Research on the causes of the "Tik Tok" app becoming
57 popular and the existing problems. *Journal of Advanced Management Science* 7(2):
58 59-63. <https://doi.org/10.18178/joams.7.2.59-63>
59
60

Table 1. Sexualisation characteristics by gender

Girls	Boys
Sensual or provocative dances	Sensual or provocative dances
Swimsuit, bikini, panties	Swimming trunks, underwear
Shirt or T-shirt that exposes the abdomen (tummy)	Cars (to enhance masculinity)
Low-cut shirts or dresses that emphasise cleavage or breasts	Neck chains or chest necklaces
Necklaces or pendants on the cleavage	Comments referring to the physical aspects of girls
Crossing the legs	Sexual messages on clothing
Tilting the head	Prominent abdominal muscles
Excessive make-up	Enhanced or exaggerated hairstyles
Sexual messages on clothing	Naval piercings
Enhanced or exaggerated hairstyles	Sporty clothes
Naval piercings	Enticing or mischievous smiles
Red or black leather clothing	
Wearing lingerie	
Animal print clothing	
Very short or buttocks-revealing clothes (dresses, trousers, skirts)	
Enticing or mischievous smiles	
Touching hair	
Tight dresses, shirts, or leggings	
High-heeled shoes	

Table 2. Sample selection

Profile	Age	Gender	Nationality	No. of followers
Subject 23	11	Girl	Spanish	685.6K
Subject 22	12	Girl	English	765.4K
Subject 24	12	Girl	English	558.3K
Subject 5	14	Girl	Spanish	6.4M
Subject 6	14	Girl	Spanish	3.7M
Subject 9	14	Girl	English	3.3M
Subject 18	14	Boy	Spanish	1.5M
Subject 7	15	Girl	Spanish	3.6M
Subject 1	16	Boy	English	17.7M
Subject 2	16	Boy	English	8.6M
Subject 3	16	Girl	Spanish	6M
Subject 4	16	Boy	English	6M
Subject 17	16	Boy	Spanish	1.5M
Subject 21	16	Boy	English	860.4K
Subject 8	17	Girl	English	3.5M
Subject 10	17	Boy	Spanish	2.9M
Subject 11	17	Girl	English	2.6M
Subject 13	17	Boy	Spanish	2M
Subject 14	17	Boy	Spanish	1.8M
Subject 15	17	Girl	English	1.8M
Subject 16	17	Girl	Spanish	1.6M
Subject 19	17	Boy	English	1.3M
Subject 20	17	Boy	English	985.8K
Subject 12	15/17	Boy	Spanish	2.3M

Table 3. Distribution of observations according to sexualising characteristics and gender (both nationalities)

Sexualising characteristics	Gender		Totals
	Girls	Boys	
Sensual or provocative dances	82	55	137
Swimming trunks / underwear (boys)	0	11	11
Shirt or T-shirt that exposes the abdomen (tummy)	59	0	59
Low-cut shirts or dresses that emphasise cleavage or breasts	56	0	56
Neck chains or necklaces on the chest or cleavage (boys and girls)	56	41	97
Crossing the legs	1	0	1
Tilting the head	18	0	18
Excessive make-up	50	0	50
Prominent abdominal muscles (boys)	0	13	13
Enhanced or exaggerated hairstyle (boys and girls)	64	104	168
Wearing lingerie	1	0	1
Sporty clothes (boys)	0	135	135
Very short or buttocks-revealing clothes	20	0	20
Enticing or mischievous smiles	104	108	212
Bras or bikinis	9	0	9
Touching hair	25	0	25
Tight dresses, shirts, or leggings	71	0	71
<i>Totals</i>	616	467	1083
<i>Total number of videos analysed by gender</i>	237	240	
<i>Number of sexualising characteristics per video</i>	2.60	1.95	

Table 4. Distribution of observations according to sexualising characteristics and age (both nationalities)

Sexualising characteristics	Age						Totals
	11	12	14	15	16	17	
Sensual or provocative dances	1	4	47	16	25	44	137
Swimming trunks / underwear (boys)	0	0	1	0	4	6	11
Shirt or T-shirt that exposes the abdomen (tummy)	0	4	18	9	10	18	59
Low-cut shirts or dresses that emphasise cleavage or breasts	0	5	13	13	2	23	56
Neck chains or necklaces on the chest or cleavage (boys and girls)	1	2	17	17	9	51	97
Crossing the legs	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Tilting the head	0	0	1	3	1	13	18
Excessive make-up	0	1	9	6	0	34	50
Prominent abdominal muscles (boys)	0	0	1	0	4	8	13
Enhanced or exaggerated hairstyle (boys and girls)	0	13	22	3	65	65	168
Wearing lingerie	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Sporty clothes (boys)	0	0	9	15	50	61	135
Very short or buttocks-revealing clothes	1	3	3	5	0	8	20
Enticing or mischievous smiles	1	6	49	24	50	82	212
Bras or bikinis	0	0	4	0	0	5	9
Touching hair	0	0	10	7	0	8	25
Tight dresses, shirts, or leggings	2	3	21	13	11	21	71
<i>Totals</i>	6	41	225	131	231	449	1083
<i>Percentage</i>	1%	4%	21%	12%	21%	41%	

Table 5. Distribution of observations according to sexualising characteristics and nationalities.

Sexualising characteristics	Nationality				
	Spanish	British	Totals	% Spanish	% British
Sensual or provocative dances	88	49	137	64%	36%
Swimming trunks / underwear (boys)	11	0	11	100%	0%
Shirt or T-shirt that exposes the abdomen (tummy)	35	24	59	59%	41%
Low-cut shirts or dresses that emphasise the cleavage or breasts	30	26	56	54%	46%
Neck chains or necklaces on the chest or cleavage (boys and girls)	72	25	97	74%	26%
Crossing the legs	0	1	1	0%	100%
Tilting the head	9	9	18	50%	50%
Excessive make-up	34	16	50	68%	32%
Prominent abdominal muscles (boys)	8	5	13	62%	38%
Enhanced or exaggerated hairstyle (boys and girls)	72	96	168	43%	57%
Wearing lingerie	0	1	1	0%	100%
Sporty clothes	80	55	135	59%	41%
Very short or buttocks-revealing clothes	11	9	20	55%	45%
Enticing or mischievous smiles	111	101	212	52%	48%
Bras or bikinis	3	6	9	33%	67%
Touching hair	9	16	25	36%	64%
Tight dresses, shirts, or leggings	45	26	71	63%	37%
	<i>Totals</i>	618	465	1083	
	<i>Percentage</i>	57%	43%		