

“Weaponized sexuality” to the normalization of sexual violence: Rape culture and the non-consensual distribution of intimate imagery (NCDII)

by

Samantha Hanson

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Criminal Justice degree.

Department of Criminal Justice
Master of Arts in Criminal Justice
The University of Winnipeg
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
August 2022

Copyright © 2022 Samantha Hanson

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank each and every participant who took the time to participate in this research. This project would not have been possible without the honest, personal accounts of your experiences. Words fail to articulate how thankful I am for your involvement.

To my remarkable Co-Supervisors: Dr. Michelle Bertrand and Dr. Kelly Gorkoff. I could not have even begun this research without your guidance and support. This has been a long project in the making, and your patience, kindness, and expertise made this research attainable. Thank you, from beginning to end. You were always there to support me in more ways than you know. To Dr. Alexa Dodge, my external examiner, thank you for your offered expertise and support.

To the rest of the Criminal Justice Department Faculty: I knew there was a reason I returned to complete my M.A. I am forever grateful, and proud, to have been a student of this department. To the fellow M.A. students who persevered by my side: thanks for the memories, and the friendships I will always cherish.

Finally, to my friends, family, and colleagues. You dealt with me, supported me, made me laugh, and ensured I kept it together when I questioned my own abilities. I am eternally grateful to have you in my life. Thank you, always.

I cannot say, to my knowledge, I hold the same experience with NCDII as others do. In saying this, I have been privy to the range of experiences of others known to me, and this large in part inspired my passion for the subject and associated content contained within my research. I identify as a white cis-female, so want to acknowledge the privileged perspective this research unavoidably comes from.

This research was conducted on ancestral lands, on Treaty One Territory.

Abstract

This thesis research explores the non-consensual distribution of intimate imagery (NCDII), a form of technology-facilitated sexual violence. NCDII is the digital sharing of sexualized visual content of another person, without the consent of the individual depicted. This research responds to four research driven questions: 1) What is the prevalence of NCDII?; 2) What are the contextual circumstances where sexual content is captured and distributed without someone's consent?; 3) What are the outcomes and consequences experienced by those who have been directly subject to NCDII? and; 4) What are individuals' general perspectives and understanding about NCDII? The current research argues NCDII is best explained and understood through the existence, and persistence, of rape culture. The findings demonstrate NCDII is a common act that has become normalized, and expected, among young people. Motivations to share non-consensual content of others range from amusement to retribution, while victims/survivors are blamed for their involvement, and held responsible for not adequately mitigating the risks both prescribed, and encouraged, by misogynistic social structures. This research discusses both the existence, and persistence, of digital rape myths and ideal victimhood, though also finds basic forms of consent are recognized by young people. This research has potential for information to be used in intervention solutions which could include cultural and educational messaging.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	9
CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW, RESEARCH QUESTIONS, AND RESEARCH APPROACH	12
THE WHAT, AND WHO OF NCDII: THE DIFFICULTY WITH DEFINITIONS	12
<i>Non-Consensual Distribution of Intimate Imagery (NCDII)</i>	12
<i>Victim/Survivor, Sharer, Recipient</i>	14
<i>Youth, Young Adults, and Language on Gender</i>	14
PREVALENCE OF NCDII	15
DEMOGRAPHICS OF INDIVIDUALS IMPACTED BY NCDII.....	16
<i>Age</i>	16
<i>Gender</i>	16
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	17
FRAMING NCDII WITHIN TYPOLOGIES.....	17
<i>Relationship Retribution</i>	18
<i>Sextortion</i>	18
<i>Voyeurism</i>	19
<i>Sexploitation</i>	20
<i>Sexual Assault</i>	20
<i>Social Reward</i>	20
HARMS OF NCDII	21
<i>Social Rupture</i>	21
<i>Constancy</i>	21
<i>Existential Threat</i>	22
<i>Isolation</i>	22
<i>Constrained Liberty</i>	22
LEGAL REMEDIES AND RESPONSES TO NCDII	23
<i>NCDII and the Criminal Law</i>	23
<i>Limitations to the Criminal Law</i>	24
The Law Does Not Deter and is Not Viewed as a Viable Response.	24
Minimizing Damage and Peer Level Responses Prioritized.	25
Minimal/Unknown Outcomes when Reports are Made.	25
<i>Non-Criminal Legal Responses to NCDII</i>	26
<i>Platform, Institutional, and Non-Government Organization Responses to NCDII</i>	26
Platform Responses.	26
Institutional Responses.	27
Non-Government Organizational Responses.	27
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	28
<i>Framing NCDII as a Form of Sexual Violence within Rape Culture</i>	28
<i>Rape Culture and NCDII Victim/Survivor Demographics</i>	29
Rape Culture and Gendered Surveillance.	31
Rape Culture and Sexual Subjectivity.....	33
<i>Rape Culture and Acceptance/Normalization of Sexual Violence</i>	34
<i>Victim/(Survivor) Blame and Slut-Shame</i>	36
Rape Myths and Responsibilization.	37
Isolation and Non-Disclosure.	38
<i>Rape Culture and the Criminal Justice System</i>	39
<i>Rape Culture and NCDII Prevention</i>	40
RESEARCH PROBLEM AND QUESTIONS	41
RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	41
1. <i>What is the Prevalence of NCDII?</i>	42
Prevalence of NCDII Experiences: Victim/Survivor, Sharer, Recipient.	42

Populations Who Experience NCDII.....	43
2. <i>What are the Contextual Circumstances where Sexual Content is Captured and Distributed Without Someone’s Consent?</i>	44
Sharer Motivations.....	44
Relationship Dynamics.....	45
Self-Created/Shared Imagery.....	45
3. <i>What are the Outcomes/Consequences Experienced by Those Who have been Directly Subject to NCDII?..</i>	45
Victim/Survivor Non-Disclosure, and Responses to Disclosure.....	46
Reasons for Sharing and Sharer Consequences.....	46
Victim/Survivor Harms.....	47
Recipient Feelings about Receiving NCDII Material.....	47
4. <i>What are Individuals’ General Perspectives and Understanding about NCDII?</i>	47
Perceptions of NCDII, and Views of Harms.....	47
Intimate Imagery Sharing.....	48
Responsibilization.....	48
METHODOLOGY: RESEARCH APPROACH.....	48
CHAPTER 2: METHODS.....	51
SURVEY PARTICIPANT SELECTION AND RECRUITMENT.....	51
SURVEY DESIGN AND DESCRIPTION.....	52
<i>Welcome Screen, Letter or Information, and Consent</i>	53
<i>Questions Regarding Demographics</i>	53
<i>Language and Direction</i>	54
<i>Screening Questions.....</i>	55
<i>Perspectives.....</i>	56
<i>Conclusion</i>	56
PROGRAMMING CONSIDERATIONS: SURVEY FUNCTIONALITY	57
ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	57
SURVEY TESTING.....	57
SURVEY DISTRIBUTION TIMELINE AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH PARTICIPANTS	58
<i>ID Error</i>	58
<i>Prize Draw</i>	59
CHAPTER 3: DATA ANALYSIS	60
ANALYTICAL SOFTWARE	60
INITIAL DATA CLEANING	60
DATA ANALYSIS.....	61
<i>Participant-Directed Data Correction.....</i>	62
<i>Analytical Notes</i>	62
THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES	63
UNUSABLE DATA	64
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	65
SECTION ONE	66
ALL PARTICIPANTS.....	66
PERCEPTIONS ON GENERAL INTIMATE IMAGERY SHARING	67
<i>Sexual Imagery Sharing of the Self.....</i>	67
<i>Sexual Imagery Sharing of Others.....</i>	71
SECTION TWO	73
WHAT IS THE PREVALENCE OF NCDII?.....	73
<i>Multiple Capacity Experiences</i>	75
POPULATIONS WHO EXPERIENCE NCDII/IMAGERY SHARING	76

<i>Gender and NCDII/Imagery Sharing</i>	76
<i>Race/Ethnicity and NCDII/Imagery Sharing</i>	78
<i>Age and NCDII Victimization</i>	80
SECTION THREE	80
CONTEXTUAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF CREATION/SHARING, AND RELATIONSHIP CONSIDERATIONS	80
<i>How Sexual Imagery was Originally Recorded: Reports from Victims/Survivors</i>	81
Responses to: 'Someone else took the imagery of me'	81
Responses to: 'I took the imagery myself'	82
Responses to: 'Someone took a screen shot'	84
<i>How Sexual Imagery was Obtained: Reports from Sharers</i>	84
<i>How Sexual Imagery was Shared: Reports from Victims/Survivors</i>	85
<i>How Sexual Imagery was Shared: Reports from Sharers</i>	85
<i>How Sexual Imagery was Shared: Reports from Recipients</i>	86
<i>Who Shared the Sexual Imagery: Reports from Victims/Survivors</i>	86
<i>Who is Depicted in the Shared Sexual Imagery: Reports from Sharers</i>	88
<i>Who was Depicted in the Sexual Imagery: Reports from Recipients</i>	89
<i>Who Sexual Imagery is Shared With: Reports from Sharers</i>	90
<i>Who Shared the NCDII Material: Reports from Recipients</i>	91
SECTION FOUR	92
MOTIVES FOR SHARING	92
<i>Reasons for Sharing Sexual Imagery: Reports from Sharers</i>	92
<i>Perceived Levels of Consent: Reports from Sharers</i>	94
<i>Perceived, Known, and/or Suspected Sharer Motives: Reports from Victims/Survivors</i>	96
SECTION FIVE	99
VICTIM/SURVIVOR DISCLOSURE OF EXPERIENCE, AND RESPONSES TO DISCLOSURE	99
<i>Disclosure of NCDII Experience: Reports from Victims/Survivors</i>	99
Victims/Survivors Who Told Someone About NCDII.	99
<i>Non-Disclosure of NCDII Experience: Reports from Victims/Survivors</i>	107
<i>Digital Platform Requests: Reports from Victims/Survivors</i>	108
SECTION SIX	109
OUTCOMES/CONSEQUENCES EXPERIENCED BY THOSE DIRECTLY SUBJECT TO NCDII	109
<i>Life Areas Impacted: Reports from Victims/Survivors</i>	109
Areas of Wellness	109
Social Relationships	111
Removal of the Imagery	112
<i>Life Areas Impacted: Reports from Sharers</i>	113
Areas of Wellness	113
Social Relationships	114
<i>Feelings about Having Received Sexual Imagery: Reports from Recipients</i>	114
I Did Not Like Seeing It.	115
Mixed Feelings.	115
Feelings of Indifference	117
I Liked Seeing It.	117
<i>Knowledge of Consequences Experienced by the Sharer: Reports from Victims/Survivors</i>	118
<i>Consequences Experienced by Sharers: Reports from Sharers</i>	120
SECTION SEVEN	121
CRIMINALIZATION AND PERCEIVED HARMS OF NCDII	121
AGREEMENT WITH NCDII CRIMINALIZATION	122
<i>Perspectives from Participants who Agree NCDII Should be Criminal</i>	122

The Wrongs of NCDII.....	122
'NCDII violates consent'.....	122
'It's not yours to share'.....	123
The Harms of NCDII.....	123
NCDII Alongside Other Crimes.....	124
Sexual Objectification/Display.....	125
Sexual Assault.....	125
<i>Reports from Participants Who Did Not Fully Agree with the Law</i>	126
'Intimate Imagery Should Not be Taken in the First Place'.....	126
'Depends on how the imagery was created/made available'.....	127
NCDII as Normal, Commonplace, and/or Excusable.....	128
SECTION EIGHT	128
PREVALENCE OF RESPONSIBILIZATION THEMES.....	129
NCDII RESPONSIBILIZATION THEMES.....	130
<i>Responses to: 'please describe why you think the person who shared the imagery is entirely responsible for their actions'</i>	131
'It's not yours to share!'.....	131
Trust Violations.....	132
Privacy and Reputation.....	133
NCDII is a Sex Crime.....	134
<i>Responses to: 'please describe why you think the sharer is more responsible, but the person in the imagery is partly responsible'</i>	135
Risk Management.....	135
Victim/Survivor Need to Consider Who They Trust with Intimate Imagery.....	136
Foreseeable Circumstances.....	136
Abstinence.....	137
Responsibility Depends on Factors.....	137
How the Imagery was Originally Captured.....	137
How the Imagery was Shared.....	138
Victim/Survivor-Sharer Relationship Dynamics.....	138
Under Abusive Circumstances.....	139
When Hacked/Stolen.....	139
Relationship Status.....	139
<i>Responses to: 'both the sharer and person in the imagery are equally responsible'</i>	140
<i>Responses to: 'the person in the imagery is more responsible, but the sharer is partly responsible'</i>	141
<i>Responses to: 'the person who was in the imagery is entirely responsible for putting themselves in the situation where imagery of them could be shared without their consent'</i>	142
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	143
PREVALENCE OF NCDII/IMAGERY SHARING.....	143
<i>NCDII is Common and Constituent of Rape Culture</i>	143
<i>NCDII and Victim/Survivor, Sharer, and Recipient Demographics</i>	144
Gender and Victims/Survivors.....	144
Gender and Sharers.....	145
Age, Race/Ethnicity and Victims/Survivors.....	146
CONTEXTUAL CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE SEXUAL CONTENT IS CAPTURED, AND DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT VICTIM/SURVIVOR CONSENT.....	147
<i>Sharer Motivations</i>	148
<i>Relationship Dynamics</i>	149
<i>Self-Created/Shared Imagery</i>	151
OUTCOMES/CONSEQUENCES EXPERIENCED BY THOSE DIRECTLY SUBJECT TO NCDII.....	152
<i>Victim/Survivor Non-Disclosure and Responses to Disclosure</i>	152
<i>Sharer Consequences</i>	155
<i>Victim/Survivor Harms</i>	156
<i>Recipient Feelings/Thoughts about Receiving NCDII Material</i>	156

GENERAL PERSPECTIVES AND UNDERSTANDING ABOUT NCDII AMONG THE SAMPLE	157
<i>Perceptions of NCDII, and Views of Harms</i>	157
<i>Intimate Imagery Sharing</i>	158
<i>Victim/Survivor Responsibilization</i>	159
OVERARCHING THEMES.....	162
<i>Participant Recognition of Consent</i>	162
<i>Digital Rape Myths and Ideal Victimhood</i>	164
LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	165
<i>Representativeness of the Sample</i>	165
Gender	165
Race/Ethnicity	166
Education	166
Increased Inclusivity.....	167
<i>Sharers and Language Limitations</i>	167
Recruitment	167
Sharer Data Correction	168
Sexual Imagery	168
Pornography	169
Relationship Wording	169
CONCLUSION	171
APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONS	173
PART 1: (DEMOGRAPHICS)	173
PART 2: (VALUES).....	175
PART 3: (PREVALENCE, CIRCUMSTANCES AND CONSEQUENCES: VICTIM/SURVIVOR).....	177
PART 4: (PREVALENCE, CIRCUMSTANCES AND CONSEQUENCES: SHARER)	188
PART 5: (PREVALENCE, CIRCUMSTANCES AND CONSEQUENCES: RECIPIENT)	195
PART 6: OTHER INVOLVEMENT SCREENING	198
PART 7: CRIMINALIZATION.....	200
PART 8: RESPONSIBILIZATION.....	201
APPENDIX B: E-MAIL INVITATION	203
APPENDIX C: SURVEY LETTER OF INFORMATION AND CONSENT	204
APPENDIX D: CONCLUSION FOR ONLINE SURVEY	206
APPENDIX E: ADDITIONAL SURVEY RESULTS.....	207
APPENDIX F: ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANT ACCOUNTS OF NCDII EXPERIENCE(S)	212
REFERENCES.....	215

Introduction

Sexual imagery is a form of personal property. Under patriarchy women's bodies (who tend to be the biggest victims of photo-sharing) have been weaponized through their sexuality...humans deserve agency as photos they take of themselves are an extension of their bodies. (Female-Identifying Research Participant, age 19: Victim/Survivor)

Obtained from this thesis research, this comment was a personal account offered by a female-identifying victim/survivor to the non-consensual distribution of intimate imagery (NCDII), a form of technology-facilitated sexual violence. NCDII is the digital sharing of sexualized visual content of another person, without the consent of the individual depicted (Powell & Henry, 2017). I argue, and is demonstrated by this victim/survivor's account, NCDII is the revocation of sexual rights and agency, a violation most significantly impacting female-identifying persons due to the stigmatizing stereotypes regarding feminine sexuality; however, this is an act of violence committed across demographics (Bailey, 2015; Marques, 2021; Powell & Henry, 2019; Dodge, 2021).

Powell and Henry (2017) argue sexual violence has taken a modern form through NCDII. This thesis is driven by questions about how often, and how it occurs, why it is viewed as a viable option to do to another, what range of outcomes result from it, and to conceptualize how NCDII is understood by members of the population. I use literature which argues rape culture permeates technology, the space where NCDII occurs (Powell & Henry, 2017; Cama, 2021).

My research is framed by four primary research questions: 1) What is the prevalence of NCDII?; 2) What are the contextual circumstances where sexual content is captured and distributed without someone's consent?; 3) What are the outcomes and consequences

experienced by those who have been directly subject to NCDII? and; 4) What are individuals' general perspectives and understanding about NCDII?

Overall, the current research finds NCDII is a common form of sexual violence experienced by a vast range of individuals in many capacities: 18.02% victim/survivors, (approximately) 8.67% sharers, and 29% recipients. NCDII has become a normalized, and expected, aspect of youth and young adult culture. My research demonstrates the contextual circumstances through which NCDII occurs are vast, ranging from weaponizing sexuality to the pursuit of social rewards, acts reinforced and tolerated due to the social conditions which permit sexual violence (Dodge, 2021; Morteux et al., 2019; Henry & Flynn, 2019). Harms and consequences for victims/survivors are often serious, while those who engage in the distribution of non-consensual materials are generally unaffected (Bailey & Burkell, 2020; Dodge & Spencer, 2018; Morteux et al, 2019). The current research shows victims/survivors are often blamed for their involvement in NCDII while being held responsible for not adequately mitigating the risks both prescribed, and encouraged, by misogynistic social structure (Pacheco, Mulhuish & Fiske, 2019; Shariff & DeMartini, 2015; Karaian, 2015; 2014; Bailey & Steeves, 2013). My research demonstrates both the existence, and persistence, of digital rape myths and ideal victimhood, and calls for acts of non-consent to be denounced. These findings offer potential for information to be used in intervention solutions to address NCDII, which could include cultural and educational messaging.

To situate NCDII and present the inspiration behind this research, Chapter One reviews the literature on NCDII, from what it is, who it impacts, how it occurs, why it is engaged in, how it is harmful, and associated responses to target this form of sexual violence. This information is located through the contention NCDII is a form of sexual violence, and is both a product, and

symptom, of rape culture (Shariff & DeMartini, 2015; Aikenhead, 2021; Dodge, 2021), and the elements introduced are unpacked through this theoretical lens.

I distributed an online survey to university of Winnipeg students. Chapter Two presents the method used, detailing the questions asked and why, and Chapter Three presents the data analysis strategy employed. Chapter Four presents the results obtained from the survey. This together led to Chapter Five, which presents a discussion to situate NCDII within rape culture and offers suggestions for future research and intervention.

Chapter 1: Literature Review, Research Questions, and Research Approach

The What, and Who of NCDII: The Difficulty with Definitions

To situate my research and associated language utilized in this thesis, commonly used terms are defined under their respective headings.

Non-Consensual Distribution of Intimate Imagery (NCDII)

In this thesis I adopt the definition non-consensual distribution of intimate images (NCDII) and ground this research in the contention NCDII is a form of sexual violence. Intimate imagery is defined as: a visual recording of a person made by any means, including photographic, film or video recording, whereby a person is portrayed as nude, exposing genital organs, genital region, anal region, breasts, or whereby a person is engaged in explicit sexual activity. NCDII has been referenced many ways in the literature, international legislation, and public service campaigns¹, though after reviewing the legal, conceptual, and theoretical definitions, I chose NCDII to limit the scope to instances where intimate imagery is distributed without the consent of the subject depicted. For this research, synonyms with intimate imagery, sexual imagery is used to describe NCDII content, particularly as this was the language utilized in the survey.

The act of distribution and associated consequences of doing so are prioritized as I sought to examine the power relations motivating intimate imagery distribution, and the associated cultural framings around this behaviour. NCDII as a term can include situations where imagery

¹ Sexualized cyberbullying (Dodge & Spencer, 2018); cyberbullying, electronic bullying, online bullying, online harassment (Jaffer & Brazeau, 2012), non-consensual distribution of intimate images (Department of Justice Canada, 2017; Aikenhead, 2018; Dodge & Spencer, 2018), cyber misogyny (West Coast Leaf, 2014; Dodge & Spencer, 2018), non-consensual sexting, coercive sexting (Henry, Flynn & Powell, 2019), revenge pornography (Walker & Sleath, 2017), non-consensual pornography (Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Dodge, 2021), technology-facilitated sexual violence (Dodge & Spencer, 2018), self/peer exploitation (The Canadian Centre for Child Protection, 2018;2017), sexting (Henry & Powell, 2015); involuntary porn, non-consensual sexting, unauthorized sexual images, image-based sexual exploitation, and image-based sexual abuse (Powell & Henry, 2017).

may have been recorded consensually, or originally shared consensually by the individual depicted, then later distributed, (Lenhart, Ybarra & Price-Feeney, 2016), in addition to instances where intimate imagery is captured without the subject’s consent, or created through abusive means (Powell & Henry, 2017). NCDII allows for a directed, yet inclusive means to consider the varied rationales for engaging in this act, and overcomes prospective concerns or stigmas interpreted with alternative terms². Synonymous with distribute, the term ‘share’ is also utilized frequently within this work, and for this purpose, means sending, texting, posting, forwarding, or any other form of digital distribution to a single person, to a group of people, or for numerous others to see in an online space.

Fairbairn (2015) argues NCDII is a form of interpersonal, sexual violence. Sexual violence “is about exerting power and aggression (not sexual desire) over someone else in order to undermine an individual’s sexual or gender integrity” (p. 232). A form of sexual violence, NCDII as a term allows for a range of relationship dynamics to be included. Like other forms of interpersonal sexual violence, most individuals involved in NCDII know one another in some capacity, (Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017; Dodge et al., 2019) though not in all instances (Powell & Henry, 2017; Henry, Flynn & Powell, 2018; Dodge et al., 2019; Pacheco, Melhuish & Fiske, 2019). While this work focuses on the interpersonal relational context of NCDII, these acts are a manifestation of broader socially structured inequalities such as misogyny, racism, and homophobia (Fairbairn, 2015; Coombs, 2021).

² Cyberbullying, which conflates multiple complex issues, often associated with “relatively benign schoolyard teasing” (Dodge, 2016, p. 67), failing to depict the nature of online sexual violence and digital sexual assault (Aikenhead, 2018; Dodge, 2016; Department of Justice Canada, 2017); Revenge pornography, which suggests sharers are motivated solely by revenge and images serve a pornographic purpose (Powell & Henry, 2017; Aikenhead, 2018; Department of Justice Canada, 2017).

Victim/Survivor, Sharer, Recipient

For the interpersonal relational terms in this thesis, ‘victim/survivor’ describes individuals who have had intimate imagery of themselves shared without their consent. While the term has been criticized by associating the former with weakness and the latter with strength (Boyle & Rogers, 2020; Jane, 2021), I maintain it is appropriate as the term aligns with the language in literature (Rackley et al, 2021), and acknowledges NCDII as sexual violence. While I am using victim/survivor to recognize NCDII as sexual violence, this does not mean experiences cannot be sex positive or promote subjective senses of power. To describe individuals who share intimate imagery of others, rather than the term ‘perpetrator’ (Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Starr & Lavis, 2018), I chose ‘sharer’ as it is neutral enough to account for varied motivations. Individuals in receipt of non-consensual intimate imagery, who do not engage in sharing, are referred to as recipients (Johnson, et al., 2018). Of note, individuals can experience NCDII in single, both, or all capacities (Walker et al., 2021). When these instances are known, associated describing terms are included.

Youth, Young Adults, and Language on Gender

The term young adults is used to describe individuals under the age of 30, and youths for those under the age of 18 (Rubalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Lenhart, Ybarra & Price-Feeney, 2016; Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017; Pacheco, Melhuish & Fiske, 2019; Hango, 2016). The NCDII literature primarily focuses on cisgender experiences with NCDII. As such, gender binaries dominate the literature, so in the literature review out of recognition for the non-cisgender experience, when possible, the term ‘identifying’ is used alongside described identities when they cannot be ascertained.

Prevalence of NCDII

Canadian, international statistics, and literature reveal NCDII is both a regularly occurring issue and is on the rise. For instance, according to Statistics Canada, police reported rates of NCDII have increased from 97 in 2015, to 555 in 2018 (Statistics Canada, 2018), while the Canadian Centre for Child Protection (2022) identified their agency received a 38% increase in NCDII reports post pandemic. It is unclear if this is attributed to an increase in reporting, or an increase in NCDII prevalence, though the data is of concern. Of the numbers reported in the literature, Johnson et al. (2018) found approximately 16% of Canadian young people ages 16-20 experienced NCDII as a victim/survivor, and 24% engaged in sharing.

International rates offer a more comprehensive overview of how frequently NCDII occurs; however, estimates vary across studies³, and generally, Canadian data is in line with international findings. To date the Canadian and international literature suggests ranges from 1.1%-16% victim/survivor rates, 1.4% to 35.2% sharer rates, and while limited, recipient rates at 43% (Johnson, et al., 2018). While numbers are informative, the reported rates are likely underestimates. Individuals may be unaware their images have been shared, so are unable to report (Dardis & Richards, 2022), in addition to the reality sexual abuse is the most underreported form of violence (Spencer, et al., 2018; The Canadian Centre for Child Protection, 2017; Powell & Henry, 2017). It is thus reasonable to suggest NCDII prevalence exceeds these known numbers.

³ Ranges of international prevalence rates: **Australia** (adults): 10% victim/survivor (Powell & Henry, 2017), 11% victim/survivor, 6.7% sharer (Henry, Flynn & Powell, 2019); **U.S.** (adults): 8% victim/survivor, 5% sharer (Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020), 4-6% victim/survivor (Henry & Flynn, 2019), 2% victim/survivor (Lenhart, Ybarra & Price-Feeney, 2016); **U.K.** (university students): 13% (via pictures), 4% (via videos) victim/survivor, 16% (via pictures), 4% (via videos) sharer (Walker et al., 2021). **Literature reviews:** Walker et al.'s (2021) cited victim/survivor rates across studies: 3-5.1%, and sharer rates: 1.1-35.2%. Walker and Sleath (2017) cited victim/survivor rates across studies: 1.1-6.3%, and sharer rates: 1.4-16.3%.

Demographics of Individuals Impacted by NCDII

To situate NCDII within the literature, victim/survivor and sharer age, gender, and race/ethnicity demographics are presented within this section, as these demographics intersect within social dynamics (Kessell, 2021).

Age

The literature suggests NCDII is primarily experienced by youths and adults under 30 (Rubalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Lenhart, Ybarra & Price-Feeney, 2016; Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017; Pacheco, Melhuish & Fiske, 2019; Hango, 2016; Ferreira, 2021).

Gender

Much of the global literature suggest individuals identifying as women/girls are overrepresented as victims/survivors, and males as sharers (Vitis, 2020; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Dardis & Richards, 2022; Rackley et al., 2021; Henry & Flynn, 2019; McGlynn et al., 2021; Aikenhead, 2018); however, there is literature inconsistent that suggests there is no association between gender and who is a sharer, and victim/survivor (Walker et al., 2021; Lenhart, Ybarra and Price-Feeney, 2016; Steeves, 2014; Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017; Dodge, 2021). More research is needed to better understand both frequency and experiences of non-cisgender and male-identifying victims/survivors (Dodge, 2021.) Of what is available regarding the non-heterosexual/non-cis community, members of the LGBTQ+ population are disproportionately at risk of NCDII as victim/survivors (Vitis, 2020; Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017; Lenhart, Ybarra & Price-Feeney, 2016; Dietzel, 2021), with males from this community also experiencing disproportionate rates of sharing (Dietzel, 2021).

Race/Ethnicity

In terms of race/ethnic demographics and NCDII, while limited, the literature suggests Indigenous populations are disproportionately represented as victims/survivors, particularly by male sharers (Vitis, 2020; Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017). Lenhart, Ybarra and Price-Feeney (2016) note 5% of Black individuals, as compared to 2% of white, and 2% of Hispanic individuals, have been victim/survivor to NCDII.

Framing NCDII within Typologies

There are various contextual circumstances around, and motivations guiding NCDII. In the book, *Sexual Violence in a Digital Age*, Powell and Henry (2017) present an overarching framework to consider the ways intimate imagery is created, shared without the consent of victims/survivors, and varied motivations of sharers. The authors presented five typologies which I chose to frame the distribution element of NCDII for my research, supplemented by additional literature: 1) relationship retribution, 2) sextortion, 3) sexual voyeurism, 4) exploitation, and 5) sexual assault. For my research, I added a sixth typology, 6) 'social reward,' to describe NCDII incidents outside the five typologies. While the typologies are presented separately in the sections which follow, they can overlap depending on the circumstances leading up to, and during NCDII. These typologies do not only apply to NCDII, as insinuated by the terminology whereby other harms/offences result, though the context within each typology can apply to some NCDII scenarios. The interpersonal dynamics between sharers and victim/survivors are not isolated within any typology, so all can include strangers, friends, romantic partnerships, among others.

Relationship Retribution

The first typology is relationship retribution, colloquially referred to as ‘revenge pornography,’ with the goal being, “shame punishment” (Powell & Henry, 2017, p. 122).

Relationship retribution includes situations where sharers distribute intimate imagery as a tool for harassment, humiliation, retribution, power/control, coercion, shame, feelings of entitlement, and abuse (Powell & Henry, 2017; Morteux et al, 2019). The imagery may have been obtained during a relationship (Crofts & Kirchengast, 2019; Morteux et al., 2019), or purposefully altered to appear nude or sexual (McGlynn et al., 2021; Thomassen & Dunn, 2021). Personal identifying information may be released alongside intimate imagery (Cheung, 2021).

This typology does not necessitate that a sharer have a romantic relation to a victim/survivor, just that sharer’s motivation is to instill shame within the confines of an interpersonal relationship (Powell & Henry, 2017). To demonstrate, it is useful to consider the less frequently reported peer-level incidents where both victims/survivors and sharers identify as female. Motives for sharing can also include jealousy, anger, to get back at a friend, or out of dislike for the victim/survivor (Johnson, 2015; Dodge, 2021). Dodge (2021) noted there is a lack of literature on female sharing, despite the notion females have contributed to the ‘slut-shame’ of other girls. This demonstrates how gender and sexual norms can be enforced and used as tools of abuse, “reaffirming the sex negative belief that female sexuality is shameful and can be weaponized to ruin one’s reputation” (Dodge, 2021, p. 457).

Sextortion

The second typology is sextortion, a form of blackmail and entrapment. Sextortion can include covert, coercive creation/obtainment of intimate imagery, and the distribution/threat of distribution. Sharers may threaten victims/survivors to distribute the imagery in their possession

to demand more content, extort money, or coerce victims/survivors into sexual relationships (Powell & Henry, 2017; O'Malley & Holt, 2022; Nicol & Valiquet, 2014; Bailey, 2014; Johnson, 2017; Vitis, 2020). Often sharers distribute these images to sexual predators, with motivations ranging from sexual perversion, fantasy, or power and control (Morteux et al, 2019). Included in this typology for this research are instances, regardless of whether distribution is threatened, where victims/survivors feel pressured to provide imagery to appease others, fit into social situations (Quayle & Cariola, 2019; Morteux et al, 2019) or under coercive relational circumstances (Drouin, Ross & Tobin, 2015; Thompson & Morrison, 2013), due to the feelings of obligation rather than willful/consensual sharing.

Voyeurism

The third typology is voyeurism, which is both the non-consensual capturing of intimate imagery, then distribution, in the context of NCDII (Powell & Henry, 2017; Thomasen & Dunn, 2021). Sexual gratification, deviance, and feelings of power are reported motivations for engaging in voyeuristic NCDII practices, and remorse is reportedly limited as sharers feel victims/survivors were unharmed as they were unaware their content was captured (Morteux et al, 2019). Voyeuristic motives can extend beyond individual sexual gratification (Eaton & McGlynn, 2020) and can include creation and/or distribution for the purpose of 'humour,' to prove something to one's peers, (Powell & Henry, 2017), or bias intimidating offences (Slane, 2015). Financial gain is another motive for distributing voyeuristic NCDII material, as many sites on the dark web offer incentive (Powell & Henry, 2017), and there is a significant demand for such content (Henry & Flynn, 2019).

Sexploitation

The fourth typology is sexploitation, which is the commercial trade of non-consensual intimate imagery. On both the dark and accessible web, individuals can financially capitalize on the distribution of non-consensual images and videos (Powell & Henry, 2017; Henry & Flynn, 2019; Marques, 2021; Slane & Langlois, 2018).

Sexual Assault

The fifth proposed typology for NCDII is sexual assault, being the creating, distributing and/or threatening to distribute imagery of sexual assaults/rape (Bailey, 2014; Segal, 2015; Broll & Huey, 2014). Non-consensual image sharing of this nature demonstrates the acceptance, toleration, and trivialisation of sexual violence, and exemplifies the problem of “rape culture,” (Powell & Henry, 2017, p. 130).

Social Reward

Inspired by the literature (Dodge, 2021; Morteux et al., 2019; Ringrose & Harvey, 2015), I added a sixth typology to include instances where individuals engage in NCDII for social reward. The literature suggests sharers engage in NCDII for perceived interpersonal social benefits, rather than perversion or vindictive purposes. Engaging in NCDII has allowed individuals to increase their social standing by showing off and/or bragging about sexual pursuits, and/or responding to peer pressures to fit in. Sharer motives under this typology can include: For fun/as a joke; to ask for advice, seek an opinion/discuss; because they always share things like this with friends; to show off; to get attention; to prove that they had received them; because they were asked to do so; as a response to boredom; and to feel sexy (Walker et al., 2021; Pacheco, Melhuish & Fiske, 2019; Johnson, 2015; Morteux et al., 2019; Dodge, 2021)

Harms of NCDII

While harms have been both implicitly and explicitly presented within the NCDII typologies, it is useful to wholly acknowledge NCDII can result in extensive subjective individual harms for victims/survivors, as well as collective social consequences (McGlynn & Rackley, 2017; Bates, 2017; DeKeseredy, Stonebert & Lory, 2021). To present the range of individual and social harms, the frames proposed by McGlynn et al (2021) are utilized: 1) social rupture, 2) constancy, 3) existential threat, 4) isolation, and 5) constrained liberty. While the frames are not all encompassing, typology dependent, or applicable to all NCDII situations, they offer a means to consider the range of reported NCDII harms experienced by victims/survivors.

Social Rupture

Social rupture has been described as utter devastation for victims/survivors, where NCDII has distinctly separated their realities between before and after the abuse. Social rupture permeates personal, professional, and digital reality. Social rupture harms are heightened by social and political contexts victims/survivors navigate, and feelings include degradation, mortification, shame, and disgust (McGlynn et al., 2021).

Constancy

Constancy is feeling NCDII is ongoing, where victims/survivors never know if or when the imagery may resurface or be discovered by others, making NCDII incidents seem endless (McGlynn et al., 2021; Sumrall, 2016). Simplistic solutions like turning off the device, or refraining from social media use, are not realistic as “online interactions are embedded in offline social contexts” (Gosse, 2021, p.52). Many victims/survivors experience repercussions related to their education or employment roles as their primary identity has been sexually objectified (McGlynn & Rackley, 2017).

Existential Threat

Existential threat is where individuals experience unnerving fear, worry and uncertainty about the imagery re-emerging. The need to be perpetually vigilant results in many victims/survivors hyper-analysing their social interactions (McGlynn et al., 2021; Jaffer & Brazeau, 2012). Victims/survivors have experienced supplemental harassment from outside persons when the sexual content includes identifying personal information (McGlynn & Rackley, 2017; Anderson & Wood, 2021; Cheung, 2021).

Isolation

The literature indicates victims/survivors have experienced feeling isolated from their family, friends, the online world, and society post NCDII. Trust violations experienced by many who had their intimate imagery distributed by someone known to them contributes to feeling alone. Feeling unsafe online can result in victims/survivors retreating from the online communities (McGlynn et al, 2021; Barker & Jurasz, 2021; Fairbairn, 2015), a theme particularly troubling for those who rely on technology to socialize (Cama, 2021).

Constrained Liberty

Constrained liberty as a frame explains victim/survivors' who feel overall unsafe in all life areas, impacting their freedoms and capacity to fully experience life (McGlynn et al., 2021). NCDII can and often occurs after intimate imagery is consensually produced/shared by the person depicted, serving to violate and deny the individual the right to display their body as they chose (Steeves, 2010). Individuals who are violated online may retreat from digital spaces, denying them, "equal digital citizenship," (Powell & Henry, 2017p.252) to access and participate in a space so integral to modern living (Yar, 2012; Bailey & Steeves, 2013; Regan & Sweet; Steeves, 2012). Perceptions of feeling unsafe in a culture already fueled by racism, sexism, and

misogyny can shatter the fundamental sense of security which allows for free choice, opportunity, connection, dignity, experience, and agency (McGlynn et al., 2021).

Legal Remedies and Responses to NCDII

To respond to the range of NCDII harms and associated damage which can result, the criminal law employed, associated limitations, and non-criminal legal responses are discussed in the sections to follow. Platform, institutional, and non-government organizational responses to NCDII are also presented.

NCDII and the Criminal Law

Influenced in part by the repercussions of NCDII reported in media, Government officials were tasked with identifying potential gaps in the Criminal Code to respond to this form of technology facilitated violence, and found existing legislation failed to acknowledge the intent, characteristics, and harms of NCDII (CCSO Cybercrime Working Group, 2013; West Coast LEAF, 2014)⁴. As a result, *The Protecting Canadians from Online Crimes Act* criminalized NCDII, and came into effect in 2015 (Dodge & Spencer, 2018; Coburn, Connolly & Roesch, 2015; Statistics Canada, 2018). The offence⁵ covers the distribution element applicable to the typologies, though does not encompass the range of additional offences, covered by other

⁴ As it relates to young people, officials submitted the use of child pornography charges would be “too blunt an instrument to address the core behavior at issue, especially in situations where the perpetrator is also under the age of 18” (CCSO Cybercrime Working Group, 2013, p.16). Alternative potential offences, such as voyeurism, obscene publication, criminal harassment, extortion, and defamatory libel were said to fail to consider the unique characteristics differentiating NCDII from alternate crimes (CCSO Cybercrime Working Group, 2013).

⁵ 162.1 (1) Everyone who knowingly publishes, distributes, transmits, sells, makes available or advertises an intimate image of a person knowing that the person depicted in the image did not give their consent to that conduct, or being reckless as to whether or not that person gave their consent to that conduct, is guilty (a) of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than five years; or (b) of an offence punishable on summary conviction.(2) In this section, “intimate image” means a visual recording of a person made by any means including a photographic, film or video recording,(a) in which the person is nude, is exposing his or her genital organs or anal region or her breasts or is engaged in explicit sexual activity;(b) in respect of which, at the time of the recording, there were circumstances that gave rise to a reasonable expectation of privacy; and (c) in respect of which the person depicted retains a reasonable expectation of privacy at the time the offence is committed (SC 2014).

Criminal Code sections, often occurring simultaneously (sexual assault, rape, voyeurism, extortion, etc.).

Limitations to the Criminal Law

As NCDII is experienced at high rates by young people, it is imperative to recognize their perceptions, and practical barriers to accessing justice, in addition to the realities faced when reports are made to police. Overall, the literature identifies limitations, suggesting the law does not serve as a deterrent, is not viewed as viable, is not prioritized, and offers limited outcomes when reports are made (Dodge & Lockhart, 2021; Johnson et al., 2018; Bailey & Burkell, 2020; Dodge & Spencer, 2018).

The Law Does Not Deter and is Not Viewed as a Viable Response. Johnson et al. (2018) suggests awareness of the criminal law does not deter young people from engaging in NCDII as sharers. For victims/survivors, Bailey and Burkell (2020) identify young people subject to online violence generally do not consider formal legal actions effective, or even viable solutions, to respond⁶. Their research suggests young people have limited faith in the justice system, perceive it as expensive, invasive, time consuming, unfair, inaccessible, intimidating, and inefficient. Youths are less likely than adults to seek legal remedies, as many are unaware of their legal rights, particularly those in marginalized circumstances (Bailey & Burkell, 2020) or from racialized communities, who do not perceive the legal system as one which protects them (Novich & Zduniak, 2021). Since the criminalization of NCDII, knowledge the sharer may be at risk to be criminally charged can deter both formal and informal disclosure (Coburn, Connolly & Roesch, 2015; Dodge & Spencer, 2018).

⁶ This is inclusive of potential civil remedies due large in part to the notion money will not address the core of the problem (Bailey & Burkell, 2020).

Minimizing Damage and Peer Level Responses Prioritized. Bailey and Burkell (2020) note requesting the support of justice actors can draw attention to a matter young people just want to disappear. The main goal of victims/survivors is minimizing the damage of harms experienced, and degree of distribution of content. Young people, generally, also do not want to get their peers, who may be the sharers, in trouble. Similarly, Dodge and Lockhart (2021) found young people are not interested in legal responses to NCDII, and if they tell anyone it is their peers. Young people do not want to disclose their experiences to adults in general, let alone criminal justice representatives, as they worry adults will overreact, use the criminal law in an unhelpful manner, or blame/shame the young people for their involvement in the incident (Dodge & Lockhart, 2021).

Minimal/Unknown Outcomes when Reports are Made. When NCDII matters are reported, the literature suggests minimal legal interventions come from victim/survivor disclosures to police. In review of the law in practice in the youth context, Dodge and Spencer (2018) interviewed police officers and note, “the majority of officers indicated their preference for using informal, non-criminal responses” (p. 645) to NCDII. A major identified reason for this is due to the reported commonplace nature of NCDII. Many interviewed officers spoke of the complexity of investigating online crimes, and suggested it is not feasible to charge young individuals accused of less serious, commonplace incidents which have become generally accepted behaviours (Dodge & Spencer, 2018). In addition, many victims/survivors are unaware their imagery is even being circulated, so are unable to report to police (Dardis & Richards, 2022).

As it relates to formal responses directed towards sharers, Morteux et al. (2019) suggests most sharers are not being identified through the law due to insufficient evidence, or

victim/survivors refraining from disclosing their experience to police. As such, sharers are often not being referred to appropriate programming geared to address the behaviour, so there is very limited research on appropriate interventions to reduce recidivism.

Non-Criminal Legal Responses to NCDII

Along with the criminal law, Provincial law is available for victims/survivors should they opt to bring a civil action forward⁷. Provincial Governments in Manitoba and Nova Scotia⁸ have created legislative mandates for designated agencies to address NCDII so individuals do not solely have to rely on criminal systems (Hrick, 2021). In Manitoba, the Canadian Centre for Child Protection (C3P) (2022) was designated the authorized agency to provide services and supports to victims/survivors of NCDII (Hrick, 2021). In addition to forwarding materials to police when appropriate, C3P offers educational resources, helps with removal of sexual imagery for people under the age of 18, provides telephone support, among others (Cybertip!ca; NeedHelpNow.ca). Non-criminal responses can address harms of social rupture, constancy, existential threat, isolation, and constrained liberty by offering communities of support, removal of imagery, among other needs the criminal law does not (McGlynn et al., 2021).

Platform, Institutional, and Non-Government Organization Responses to NCDII

In addition to legislative responses to NCDII, there are platform, institutional, and non-government initiated responses to mitigate the harms and respond to NCDII, some of which are presented in the sections to follow.

Platform Responses. Apps, sites, and social media platforms have their own policies to govern and regulate the content users post, inclusive of NCDII materials. Canada has imposed

⁷ Locally, on June 9, 2015, the Manitoba Provincial Government introduced the *Intimate Images Protection Act* (Hrick, 2021). Under this act, persons can bring a civil action forward in response to NCDII (Cybertip!ca, 2022; Intimate Images Protection Act, 2015).

⁸ In Nova Scotia, CyberScan offers victims/survivors criminal, civil, and educational supports, among others.

the *Digital Charter Implementation Act* (Government of Canada, 2021) to ensure ethical collection, use, and disclosure of data stored; however, platforms exercise extraordinary power on standards for removing content, and reserve discretionary rights to impose NCDII sharer consequences (Henry & Witt, 2021). Additional platform and general online responses include artificial intelligence tools to both recognize and remove sexual abuse imagery⁹, provide non-judgemental, anonymous counselling interventions, educational information, and requests for support (Henry & Witt, 2021; Ferreira, 2021; Louie, 2021; Canadian Centre for Child Protection, 2022). While these options may be useful when content is posted through a platform, if the content is distributed privately, such as via text message, police-initiated warrants would be required to request cell provider assistance to address the incident (Dodge et al, 2019).

Institutional Responses. School systems often respond to NCDII, to both address persons involved, while educating to prevent the abuse; however, districts/institutions have varied responses, largely dependent on priorities and school culture (Shariff & Demartini, 2015; Define the Line, 2022; Angrove, 2015). Additionally, as noted by Marques (2021), other responses to NCDII are largely social service-centered, where social services and medical providers respond to disclosures when they occur.

Non-Government Organizational Responses. There are also victim/survivor centered movements to respond to NCDII, which include social groups¹⁰, pages, and online influencers who use technology to express disdain for online violence (Marganski & Melander, 2021; Broadbent & Thompson, 2021).

⁹ An example being Project Arachnid, a tool which searches the clear and dark web for child sexual abuse material (Canadian Centre for Child Protection, 2022).

¹⁰ The need for victim/survivor centered responses to NCDII has prompted the creation of non-profit, volunteer operated organizations, an example being The Shameless Circle in Winnipeg. The organization's aim is educate and end the shaming stigma for women, offering resources, discussions and community-empowerment through groups and activities (The Shameless Circle, 2020).

Theoretical Framework

The current research has thus far located NCDII, from what it is, how it occurs, who is impacted, and associated legal and extra-legal responses. This thesis transitions to the theoretical framework which guided my research aim.

Framing NCDII as a Form of Sexual Violence within Rape Culture

Within my research, I locate NCDII as a product and symptom of rape culture (Shariff & DeMartini, 2015; Aikenhead, 2021). In rape cultures, all forms of sexual abuse and violence are legitimized by the value placed on hypermasculinity and heteronormativity which long precedes, and is replicated in, technology. These terms are defined as follows:

Hypermasculinity is the expression of an exaggerated gender performance, where value is placed on male dominance over women, sexual conquest, predatory sexuality, sexual promiscuity, impersonal sex, and compulsory heterosexuality. Heteronormativity refers to the regulation of both sexuality and gender within normatively prescribed boundaries of heterosexuality so that those within its boundaries and those outside them are regulated, marginalized, and sanctioned (Henry & Flynn, 2019, p. 1946).

Such values which support the masculine imperative (Smart, 1989) create what is referred to as rape culture, being a society which “implicitly and explicitly condones, excuses, tolerates, normalises and fetishizes sexual violence” (Powell & Henry, 2017, p. 102). The theoretical components of rape culture include the prioritization of traditional gender roles; sexism; adversarial sexual beliefs; hostility towards women and gender minorities; and acceptance of violence (Johnson & Johnson, 2021). While much of the literature describing rape culture presents as cis-based, rape culture is not limited to binary genders and extends to those who identify outside of cisgender identities, or present outside heteronormative gender roles (Dodge,

2021). Sexual abuse and rape culture persist as the systems of power are primarily comprised of white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, and capitalist exploitation (Kessel, 2021; Slane & Langlois, 2018), which are reinforced and justified by recipients who participate in holding interest in the consumption of abusive material (Aikenhead, 2021).

The concept of rape culture is a useful lens to examine NCDII, as “the ways in which victim/survivors understand and respond to their personal experiences of sexual harms are largely contingent upon the social, cultural, political, and temporal context within which these experiences occur” (Cama, 2021, p. 336). Framing NCDII as an act constituent of heteronormativity, and demographic inequality, is useful to conceptualize the actions of sharers, responses of recipients, and understand how victims/survivors experience this form of violence (Henry, Flynn & Powell, 2018). By proposing rape culture as a theoretical construct allows for an analysis of victim/survivor experience, and offers a useful framework to consider sharer motivations for engaging in NCDII. While I posit rape culture is a useful lens through which to examine NCDII, I do not suggest all incidents can be placed within this paradigm as singular constructs cannot represent all interpersonal situations, or account for all sexual subjectivities; however, it is a useful lens to consider the ways NCDII is understood and accepted in society.

In the sections that follow, I examine rape culture alongside: NCDII victim/survivor demographics, the acceptance/normalization of sexual violence, and victim/survivor blame and slut-shame. In addition, rape culture within the criminal justice system and NCDII prevention are reviewed.

Rape Culture and NCDII Victim/Survivor Demographics

Rape culture impacts different demographics in unequal ways, and this is apparent by examining who is primarily, and most significantly, impacted by NCDII. To date, there is limited

literature available on how NCDII specifically impacts gender minorities and racial groups. Through the lens of rape culture and heteronormativity, it is reasonable to posit intersectional oppression persists through this form of sexual violence as well (Henry & Flynn, 2019). To demonstrate, Dodge (2021, p. 452) proposed NCDII may be used as a “tool to ‘out’ sexual minorities or trans folks,” and related to racial sexual oppression, likely presents through “the ways racialized women have experienced non-consensual pornography as a tool of misogyny and racism concurrently.” Within a colonized nation, NCDII as a form of violence demonstrates technology is one of the many tools to wield racial and gendered oppression (Bailey & Shayan, 2021; Carlson & Frazer, 2021). Above all, the literature available indicates NCDII as a form of sexual violence is experienced unequally across, often intersecting, groups.

The bulk of literature asserts youth and young adult female identifying persons are primarily, and more seriously, impacted by NCDII as victims/survivors, though to reiterate, this is not representative of all cases. While NCDII cannot, and should not, be simplified along the lines of gender binaries, accounting for gender dynamics is crucial to understanding the relational context of NCDII within rape culture. What is clear within the literature is when NCDII occurs, identifying women/girls experience increased fear for their safety (Henry, Powell & Flynn 2017), diverse forms of harm (McGlynn, et al., 2021), and are subject to social scrutiny for being depicted as sexual subjects (Bailey & Steeves, 2013; Ringrose & Harvey, 2015). Bailey (2015) argues these experiences align with the misogynistic social conditions/structures which permit this form of gender-based violence (Bailey, 2015). Given that women and girls are primarily impacted by sexual violence, scholars suggest this is correlated with the stigmatizing stereotypes regarding feminine sexuality (Bailey, 2015; Marques, 2021; Powell & Henry, 2019).

Rape Culture and Gendered Surveillance. As young females are those primarily, and most significantly, known to experience NCDII (Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020), it is imperative to address the ways in which society, and individuals, frame female sexuality. Rape culture helps explain the sexual surveillance of primarily women and girls online by both peers, the state, and society at large (Regan & Sweet, 2015). The heteronormative components of rape culture frame female sexuality as that which is both fetishized and shamed (Karaian, 2014; Ringrose & Harvey, 2015), with sexist narratives creating opposing dichotomies where girls are “either ‘innocent’ and vulnerable to sexual predators; or precocious ‘vixens’ whose overt sexuality is condemned” (Kanai, 2015, p.86).

Female sexuality is framed through a gendered gaze as, “typically, the male is the one who looks, while the female is the one who is looked at” (Steeves & Bailey, 2016, p. 71). Capitalist structures flourish on the corporate trade of, and stereotypes female sexuality, with stereotypes amplified on social media. Women and girls are bombarded with advertisements, posts, and pressures to live up to societal expectations of ideal femininity, which values sexuality, and to meet the need to garner more followers, girls have been socialized to know sexuality is the way to meet this end (Bailey, 2015; Steeves, 2015). The very design of social networking encourages mass distribution of content, and engaging in self-creation/sharing fulfills constructed values of acceptance and worth; however, when females act on these ideals and experiment with sexual agency by creating intimate imagery themselves, their behaviours are met with regulation and judgement and are disproportionately subject to surveillance (Bailey & Steeves, 2013; Ringrose & Harvey, 2015).

Women and girls navigate the conflicting messages and expectations imposed upon them by a paternalistic, capitalist, heteronormative culture. Social norms and marketing practices

encourage maximum disclosure in online environments (Bailey, 2015), though conversely, social structures, including but not limited to educational systems, media, and state policies constantly remind individuals of the risks involved with online disclosure. Girls feel the expectation to be careful yet social, have an online presence though not look desperate, sexy but not slutty, and private but not prudish (Milford, 2015; Steeves, 2015). The heteronormative standard of how a proper, respectful, and safe girl should act and present herself online is significant, intensified by the further internalized burden placed upon females to care for and manage other's expectations of them (Steeves & Bailey, 2016). Social judgements and surveillance of female sexuality denies women and girls the equal right to see themselves, and be seen, as sexual subjects who can make choices which are both sexual and safe (Karaian, 2015), limiting their ability to experiment (Steeves, 2015).

For instance, gendered surveillance is uniquely demonstrated by relationship retribution NCDII, where content is shared by girls, of other girls. Surveilling girls online establishes norms of what is, and what is not, appropriate within youth culture (Regan & Sweet, 2015), where girls can achieve a sense of social belonging by excluding others, serving to define the criteria for how to represent themselves by comparison (Vaahensalo, 2021). Those who receive abusive content, and accept it accordingly, reinforce the harms experienced by victims/survivors by framing it as something with entertainment value (Regan & Sweet, 2015). By offering motives related to female-initiated acts of NCDII, the intention is not to detract from the recognition that harms perpetrated against women/girls by males are extensive, but rather: "to recognize the complexity of power relations and to understand women as both individuals being acted on by power and as wielders of power, it is necessary to recognize and address those cases that lay outside of the typical imagined gender dynamics of this issue and the paradigmatic cases of the

vengeful man” (Dodge, 2021, p. 458). Females slut shame other females as internalized heteronormative ideals place boundaries on female sexual agency, serving to produce and reproduce rape culture (Shariff & DeMartini, 2015), so addressing this reality recognizes the large-scale heteronormative structures which allow NCDII to be committed, and be conceived of as damaging, in the first place.

Rape Culture and Sexual Subjectivity. When individuals self-share/post sexual imagery of themselves, they choose how the content is presented, and who is privy to it (Steeves, 2012; Karaian, 2016; Koskela, 2004). Contrary to common themes depicted by state-authored public service NCDII prevention campaigns, (Karaian, 2014; Powell & Henry, 2017; Dodge & Spencer, 2018), it is not that individuals who share intimate imagery of themselves have no interest in privacy or how their content is seen, but rather, sharing fosters power and control to define the boundaries over who does and does not see the content, and how (Heath, 2015; Steeves, 2010). By making the invisible visible, individuals depicting themselves as sexual subjects hold the power over their chosen viewers by normalizing human bodies, deconstructing the shame of being a sexual person, and rebelling against the demand for modesty (Koskela, 2004; Karaian, 2012; Bailey, 2015). Contrary to heteronormative rape culture ideals, exploring sexuality digitally permits relatively safe, non-physical forums to learn about and define oneself as a sexual agent (Steeves, 2010; Bailey & Steeves, 2013), while maintaining control of what, when, and how the self is presented through active agency (Koskela, 2004).

As explored by Milford (2015), the dichotomies of liberation and constraint should not be seen as an either-or when considering the ways individuals engage in self-creation/sharing, as there are important elements to both considered by those engaging in this practice. Most individuals acknowledge and recognize the risks associated with intimate imagery creation and

sharing, similarly to how risk is recognized as a potential in any in-person interaction, regardless of sexual identity (Heath, 2015; Waldman, 2021), but pleasure can be experienced alongside danger (Karaian, 2012). “Headless selfies” (Karaian, 2016) which can serve to anonymize the person from the body depicted, engaging in rapport building and trust formation prior to sharing, reciprocal sharing to promote mutual surveillance and risk, and establishing recipients are in fact who they say they are prior to sending imagery are some of the few ways people alleviate risks to non-consensual distribution of their imagery, while still reaping the sought benefits (Waldman, 2021).

The harm occurs when the control over who sees the content, and how, is removed from the sexual subject, not through the initial self-creation/sharing of the imagery. Regardless of whether individuals post intimate imagery publicly, privately, or share with individuals they choose, the blatant bodily violation of removing control over how it is viewed and who is privy to the content is what makes NCDII a form of sexual violence (Bloom, 2016; Bates, 2017). As presented in the typologies of NCDII (relationship retribution, sextortion, voyeurism, exploitation, sexual assault, and social reward) the sexist rationales and toleration of violence normalized through rape culture permit the occurrences and continuance of NCDII, across all contexts regardless of how intimate imagery was originally created.

Rape Culture and Acceptance/Normalization of Sexual Violence

As demonstrated through the presented NCDII typologies, this a broad form of sexual violence engaged in for various rationales and purposes, though the acceptance of this act is reflective of rape culture. Research on sharer motivations/rationales indicates, “there was a strong sense among those interviewed that on sharing intimate images, while not a kind thing to do, was fairly commonplace. These comments from perpetrators combined with stakeholder

observations of IBA [image-based abuse] prevalence suggests that IBA is becoming somewhat normalized” (Mortoux et al., 2019, p. 5).

This notion is uniquely demonstrated through NCDII cases which fit within the social reward typology. The literature suggests proving access to (primarily) girls’ bodies through intimate imagery sharing is “normalized into a humorous aspect of ‘lad culture’” (Ringrose & Harvey, 2015, p. 216). This expression of normative masculinity by proving one’s “access to girls’ bodies” (Dodge, 2021, p. 455) demonstrates female victimization is a consequence of males’ attempts at gaining social rewards and status. Paraphrasing Ringrose et al (2012), Dodge notes, “because boys are often bullied for a lack of sexual experience or for not meeting normative standards of heterosexual masculinity, boys might sometimes share images to avoid harassment/bullying...attempts by boys to avoid being labeled as ‘fags’, can result in girls being constructed as ‘sluts’” (2021, pp. 455-456). Motivations for engaging in NCDII for self-serving reasons are troubling, particularly considering the literature suggests individuals sharing for social reward do not necessarily identify their acts as being problematic (Walker et al., 2021; Mortoux et al., 2019).

Rape culture normalizes this attempt at garnering social reward, as Johnson et al. (2018), noted young people tend to have a “blind spot” (p.3) which prevents them from recognizing the harms of NCDII. Young people who engage in NCDII for social reward tend to excuse and justify their behaviour through distortion of consequences, displacement of responsibility, and victim-blaming (Johnson et al., 2018). Reinforcing this notion, across the typologies, Mortoux et al.’s (2019) findings suggest sharers demonstrated minimal remorse for their actions, expressed minimalization of harms, and presented victim/survivor blaming comments such as “I only shared it with a few friends...they shouldn’t have sent the image to me in the first place” (p.5).

Rationalizations such as this demonstrate ideals held that individuals who express their sexuality are not respecting themselves, so are less worthy of respect from others (Ringrose & Harvey, 2015).

Harms of NCDII being overtly minimized by those sharing intimate imagery in this regard, viewing it as something comical and normalized, speaks towards the societal minimization and acceptance of sexualized violence. How males and females experience gender and sexual norms need recognition to challenge the homophobic/gender-norm enforcing social structures (Dodge, 2021). This is imperative as Johnson et al's (2018) study suggests youth, especially boys, who subscribe to gendered stereotypes are significantly more likely to share intimate imagery of others, particularly if they believe doing so is common and accepted/expected behaviours. Understanding why "such acts of abuse are so often excused, minimised and normalised" (McGlynn et al., 2021, p. 557) can be usefully unpacked by recognizing the existence of rape culture and everyday sexism (Dodge, 2016; 2019; 2021; Bates, 2012), which results in both subtle and overt forms of victim blaming and slut-shaming (Shariff & DeMartini, 2015). This is important considering the literature suggests NCDII is common.

Victim/(Survivor) Blame and Slut-Shame

The ways non-consensual intimate imagery is viewed and interpreted by spectators is influenced by histories, biases, and pre-existing stereotypical framings (Dodge, 2016). Depictions of non-consensually shared intimate imagery is a product of, and contributes to the production, and reproduction, of rape culture (Powell & Henry, 2017). The sexism inherent to rape culture influences the ways individuals interpret what it is they are seeing, which could serve to reproduce traditional sexed stereotypes, while acting as a forum for "victim blaming"

and “slut-shaming” (Dodge, 2016, p.76). As noted in the harms section, many victims/survivors experience constancy, and it is rape culture which permits the past to control the future for victims/survivors (Marques, 2021). When NCDII occurs, the heteronormative expectations which both encourage and punish sexualization result in, primarily, women and girls and those outside of stereotypical heteronormative identities being critiqued for not exercising caution by protecting their sexual privacy, producing, and reproducing rape myths.

Rape Myths and Responsibilization. Much of the available literature suggests victims/survivors are blamed, at least in part, for their involvement when NCDII occurs (Henry, Flynn & Powell, 2019; Gavin & Scott, 2019). Responsibilization themes and suggestions of risk management are particularly prevalent with victim/survivor self-captured/shared imagery, as it is viewed as something which should be expected as normal, most reportedly so when the individual depicted is female (Pacheco, Melhuish and Fiske; 2019; Shariff & DeMartini, 2015; Zvi & Bitton, 2021; Zvi, 2021). The notion individuals should anticipate distribution as an expected result of engaging in initial consensual imagery capturing/sharing is a disturbing finding, though one constituent of rape culture. The social importance placed upon managing risk, coupled with values on feminine modesty, serve to responsabilize individuals for their own involvement in being sexually captured digitally in the first place (Karaian & Van Meyl, 2015). It is reportedly common for agencies responding to, as well as family, and friends of victims/survivors to insinuate, or directly blame individuals for their involvement in the imagery, and/or for sharing imagery in the first place (Pacheco, Melhuish & Fiske, 2019). Such victim-blaming themes demonstrate the ways harms permeate the lived experience of victims/survivors, (social rupture, isolation, constrained liberty, among others) (McGlynn et al., 2021), and also speak to the collective social understanding of sexual violence (Crofts & Kirchengast, 2019).

Rape culture frames the idea that individuals who engage in acts which could put them at risk do not meet the threshold of the ideal victim, and subsequently, their individual and collective experiences are dismissed (Cama, 2021). Like other forms of violence which at one point were considered inevitable, including marital rape and domestic violence, the notion NCDII is being conceptualized as a form of abuse one should expect when engaging in digital sexual expression speaks to the work in dire need to counter this accepted rationalization (Fairbairn, 2015).

Isolation and Non-Disclosure. The literature suggests many victims/survivors internalize the blame placed on them by social stigmas on sexuality, and rape myths, (Eaton & McGlynn, 2020) resulting in isolation and non-disclosure (McGlynn et al., 2021). In addition to non-disclosure for reasons including perceived limited utility of the criminal law presented previously, victims/survivors are also reportedly known to refrain from disclosing to support systems generally, due large in part to the victim blame and social stigma rape culture produces. Concerns for judgemental shame/blame from others were noted as “top of mind” (p. 6) for many youth participants in Dodge and Lockhart’s (2021) study on NCDII non-disclosure: “the possibility of judgemental adult responses is often understood as a worse fate than having other teens see one’s nude image” (p. 6). Considering the ways youth sexuality is framed, fears of parental anger, disappointment and shame justify young people’s silence (Dodge & Lockhart, 2021).

Bailey and Burkell (2020) note young people often refrain from even sharing their stories with peers, as doing so is conceived of as “making a scene or adding to the drama” (p. 122). Additional reasons are due to the belief they will not be taken seriously (Yang & Grinshteyn, 2016). The issue of non-disclosure is exacerbated considering the multitude of harm many

victim/survivors experience, as the absence of social support can serve to intensify the feelings of isolation (Vitis, 2020).

Rape Culture and the Criminal Justice System

Rape culture permeates all levels of society, at a societal, institutional/organizational, and individual level, from the structural barriers to accessing social services for victims/survivors, the organizations which do not take reports of sexual abuse seriously, the outright denial or ignoring the needs of those who seek justice, to the peer support groups who hold explicit sexist and racist values (Powell & Henry, 2017). To preface, the following sections include legal responses to NCDII and associated critiques. In doing so I do not suggest there is no utility to the criminal law, but the reactionary tactics of the state fail to address the underlying systems of oppression and can serve to intensify the already extensive harms victims/survivors to NCDII face, while contributing to rape culture. The law and legal actors operate within the confines of racist, classist, and sexist stereotypes inherent within rape culture, and as such, perpetuate ideals which often serve to responsabilize victims/survivors (i.e. rape myths). Like all sex crimes, the criminal law has not been, and is often not, a remedy for sexual violence, inclusive of NCDII (Smart, 1989; Dodge, 2018 Aikenhead, 2018; Bailey, 2015; Aikenhead, 2021).

In terms of police responses, demonstrated masculine values and victim-blaming attitudes have resulted in victim/survivor apprehensions to report sexual violence (Henry, Flynn & Powell, 2018). To this point, Dodge and Spencer (2018) suggest the NCDII law may result in victim-blaming by officers responding should they become frustrated the imagery was captured in the first place. A further barrier preventing victims/survivors from reporting is the reluctance to show police the imagery to prove NCDII occurred (Morteux et al., 2019). Males may have increased reluctance due to stereotype inspired fears they will not be taken seriously (Zvi, 2021).

When matters do proceed through formal legal systems, rape culture, and associated rape myths, persist in Court. The Courts determine whether the offence occurred beyond a reasonable doubt (Manitoba Justice, n.d.), and reasons to doubt victims/survivors are framed by stereotypes on ideal victimhood. The system is not structured to meet the needs of victims/survivors, and more focus tends to be on them than the person charged (Spencer et al., 2018; Dodge, 2018). Of the NCDII cases which have proceeded to Canadian Court, Aikenhead (2018; 2021) suggests to date Canadian Courts are taking NCDII cases seriously; however, “some troubling trends are emerging that echo concerns previously raised by feminist legal scholars in the context of sexual assault case law” (Aikenhead, 2021, p. 534), as in a small sample of cases, the sentencing judges expressed the requisite for victims/survivors to use caution around taking sexual images in the first place (Aikenhead, 2021).

Rape Culture and NCDII Prevention

Apart from social media movements which challenge the underlying systems of discrimination presented, similar to the criminal justice response, it is apparent much of the non-criminal responses to NCDII are reactive, and contain elements of rape culture. While the range of response options victims/survivors have is an important step towards fostering healing, reactive means will not prevent future cases, nor do they address sharers. The notion those who are engaged in sharing often view NCDII as a normalized, non-abusive or criminal act, reinforces the need for increased awareness of the wrongs and harms (Mortoux et al., 2019). In saying this, it is imperative to stress equating legality with wrongs alone is insufficient, as risks of legal reprimand fail to dissuade those who presume they will not be charged for their actions (Strassberg et al, 2012; Mortoux et al, 2019). As such, experts in NCDII have called for the

increased need for community public awareness, campaigns, and educational initiatives (Morteux et al, 2019).

Globally, institutional actors have employed various prevention tactics to dissuade the public from engaging in NCDII, including but not limited to public service campaigns, creation of educational materials, school-based initiatives, and social media awareness (Coburn, Connolly & Roesch, 2015; Bailey, 2017; Hrick, 2021; Angrove, 2015; Ferreira, 2021; Dodge & Lockhart, 2021; Canadian Centre for Child Protection, 2022). While preventative, educational responses may often be the best means to address NCDII, caution must be utilized as to what the messaging is (Dodge & Lockhart, 2021), and feminist scholars have challenged much of the state's attempts at prevention as much is centered on victim/survivor responsibility (Karaian, 2015).

Victim/survivor-centered campaigns convey gendered themes which reproduce moral judgements of females and their sexuality, which could discourage victims/survivors from seeking support (Powell & Henry, 2017; Karaian, 2014; Dodge & Spencer, 2018).

This literature review has demonstrated NCDII is both a product, and symptom, of rape culture, and how responses framed by rape culture can serve to worsen NCDII incidents (Shariff & DeMartini, 2015; Aikenhead, 2021; Dodge, 2021; Powell & Henry, 2017). Having presented this form of sexual violence comprehensively, this thesis transitions to the questions which guided my research.

Research Problem and Questions

Research Questions

The literature review frames NCDII, from what it is, who it impacts, how it occurs, harms and outcomes experienced, in addition to varied legal and extra-legal responses. Several questions emerge from this literature review. I questioned how this harmful sexual violence has

come to be an accepted, and expected element of primarily youth culture, despite the state attempts to criminalize and raise awareness about NCDII (McGlynn et al., 2021; Johnson et al., 2018; Morteux et al., 2019; Dodge, 2021; Dodge & Spencer, 2018). Using the theoretical framework of rape culture, I conceptualize NCDII as a form of violence which occurs within a broad social and cultural context.

To contribute to this literature, this research asks:

- 1) What is the prevalence of NCDII?;
- 2) What are the contextual circumstances where sexual content is captured and distributed without someone's consent?;
- 3) What are the outcomes and consequences experienced by those who have been directly subject to NCDII?;
- 4) What are individuals' general perspectives and understanding about NCDII?

The sub-sections which follow present an in-depth discussion of each question.

1. What is the Prevalence of NCDII?

My question around prevalence is concerned with the number of people who represent themselves as victims/survivors, sharers, and/or recipients; and the demographics of those with NCDII experience.

Prevalence of NCDII Experiences: Victim/Survivor, Sharer, Recipient. As demonstrated in the literature, there is limited Canadian-based academic research on NCDII which considers how frequently this form of violence occurs (Johnson et al., 2018), and the information available from state agencies suggests reported victim/survivor numbers are alarming (Canadian Centre for Child Protection, February 7, 2022; Statistics Canada, 2018). Sexual violence, inclusive of NCDII, is an underreported form of violence, as rape culture has

made victim blame and shame a reality for many victims/survivors, justifying their silence, so the known prevalence numbers are likely underestimates (Dodge & Lockhart, 2021; Eaton & McGlynn, 2020). Prevalence rates are important given the harms experienced by victims/survivors of NCDII are vast (McGlynn et al., 2021), so it is necessary to understand how frequently this occurs.

I also wanted to know how many individuals engage in NCDII as sharers, as the literature suggests NCDII is normalized, commonplace, and accepted, particularly within youth cultures, with few sharers viewing their actions as damaging (Walker et al., 2021; Morteux et al., 2019; Ringrose & Harvey, 2015). In addition, I also wanted to understand how frequently NCDII material is received by recipients to gain an increased understanding on prospective prevalence, as was done in Johnson et al.'s (2018) research, as including this population does not rely on the self-reports of victims/survivors or sharers.

The likely high occurrences, and social acceptance of NCDII, through the lens of rape culture, prompted me to want to understand prevalence rates of victims/survivors, sharers, and recipients, to better understand the true extent of both occurrences and acceptance of acts of non-consent. Additionally, while limited, there is literature which suggests individuals can experience NCDII in multiple capacities (Walker et al., 2021), so this is another area I wanted to explore.

Populations Who Experience NCDII. Further to prevalence, the (primarily cis-based) literature suggests inconsistent information related to the gendered dynamics of victims/survivors and sharers (Walker et al., 2021; Lenhart, Ybarra and Price-Feeney, 2016; Steeves, 2014; Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017; Vitis, 2020; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Dardis & Richards, 2022; Rackley et al., 2021; Henry & Flynn, 2019; McGlynn et al., 2021; Aikenhead, 2018; Dodge, 2021). It is important to understand the gendered dynamics of those who have experienced

NCDII in varied capacities, as accounting for gendered dynamics is essential to framing NCDII as an act constituent of rape culture. I also wanted to contribute to the need for more research which examines experiences of non-cisgender groups (Dodge, 2021).

As there is very limited research which examines Indigenous experiences with NCDII (Vitis, 2020; Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017), this is another area I wanted to address, particularly as this research took place on stolen land (Bailey & Shayan, 2021; Carlson & Frazer, 2021). I wanted to add to the limited research which examines race alongside NCDII (Lenhart, Ybarra & Price-Feeney, 2016; Henry & Flynn, 2019).

2. What are the Contextual Circumstances where Sexual Content is Captured and Distributed Without Someone's Consent?

This question examines several aspects of NCDII including sharer motivations, relationship dynamics, and the circumstances associated with how self-created imagery is non-consensually shared.

Sharer Motivations. The literature argues that NCDII is a broad form of sexual violence, engaged in for varied motivations, precipitated under a range of circumstances, and occurs among diverse interpersonal relations. I examined how these six typologies are represented in my sample: 1) relationship retribution, 2) sextortion, 3) sexual voyeurism, 4) sexploitation, 5) sexual assault, and 6) social reward (Powell & Henry, 2017; Dodge, 2021; Morteux et al., 2019). This is important because the literature suggests NCDII is conceived of as something both normalized and rewarding (Ringrose & Harvey, 2015; Johnson et al., 2018; Morteux et al, 2019). Using rape culture as a framework of inquiry, I wanted increased understanding of how something experienced as so harmful by victims/survivors is minimized and accepted by sharers (McGlynn

et al., 2021). Knowing motivating information and sharer perspectives could be of eventual benefit to those working to prevent or reduce this form of violence (Morteux et al., 2019).

Relationship Dynamics. Further to sharer motivations, using the six typologies as a framework, I also wanted to understand the common relations between sharers and victims/survivors. This supplements information about sharer motivations. As the range of relations between the typologies are vast (e.g. peers, partners, strangers, etc.) (Powell & Henry, 2017), increased information on the subject will add to the literature and may be of benefit to eventual prevention and intervention initiatives (Morteux et al., 2019).

Self-Created/Shared Imagery. Individuals engage in self-captured/initiated imagery sharing to fulfill both individual and social purposes (Steeves, 2012; Karaian, 2016, 2012; Koskela, 2004; Bailey, 2015), and NCDII occurs when others remove the control of who sees, and how the sexual subject is presented. Contextualizing this within rape culture, scholars argue that victims/survivors are often blamed (Pacheco, Melhuish & Fiske, 2019). Therefore, it is important to understand the contextual circumstances leading up to NCDII, inclusive of self-creation, to understand how many victims/survivors experienced the revocation of their sexual agency, and/or may have been subject to victim-blame. By understanding this, reflections can be made about the extent of rape culture and acceptance of acts of non-consent.

3. What are the Outcomes/Consequences Experienced by Those Who have been Directly Subject to NCDII?

The elements of this question capture reasons for not disclosing NCDII, reasons for disclosure and responses to disclosure; reasons for non-consensual sharing and consequences experienced by sharers; harms experienced by victims/survivors; and what recipients (neither victims/survivors or sharers) think about receiving non-consensually shared content.

Victim/Survivor Non-Disclosure, and Responses to Disclosure. The literature indicates that victim/survivor isolation and non-disclosure of NCDII incidents are significant (McGlynn et al., 2021; Dodge & Lockhart, 2021; Bailey & Burkell, 2020; Eaton & McGlynn, 2020). I wanted to add to the literature about lack of disclosure, and to better understand the range of reasons why silence is so common and if/how this can be explained using the concept of rape culture. To contribute to the literature, I also wanted to understand the experiences of those victims/survivors who do opt to tell individuals of varied relations, from peers, adults, justice organizations, among others. The literature suggests when individuals do tell others, they often experience direct or indirect blame (Pacheco, Melhuish & Fiske, 2019), so I wanted to see how common this is by asking about responses to NCDII disclosures. By gathering this information, conceptual and theoretical contributions which explore NCDII rape myths can be added to the literature. In addition, by learning about social responses to NCDII, this research could supplement prevention and educational initiatives.

Reasons for Sharing and Sharer Consequences. Further to the theme of victim/survivor non-disclosure, rendering most sharers unidentified, the literature indicates the NCDII law does not deter, is not viewed as a viable response for victims/survivors, and little occurs when formal reports are made (Johnson et al., 2018; Bailey & Burkell, 2020; Dodge & Spencer, 2018). The literature suggests that sharers engage in NCDII for reasons of social reward and benefit (Dodge, 2021; Morteux et al., 2019). Inspired by this knowledge, I questioned what, if any, consequences sharers do experience following NCDII, both formally and socially, reward and/or punishment-based. This information can contribute to several areas of the literature including scholars that recognize the limitations of the criminal law to mitigate harms

experienced by victims/survivors (Dodge, 2018), while offering increased arguments towards the continued existence and persistence of rape culture.

Victim/Survivor Harms. The literature presents the harms of NCDII are vast, so I wanted to better understand the individual and social victim/survivor harms. I also wanted to know how longstanding impacts are to supplement the existing literature and localize the subject in Canada (McGlynn & Rackley, 2017; Bates, 2017; McGlynn et al., 2021).

Recipient Feelings about Receiving NCDII Material. I wanted to know how those in receipt of NCDII material feel about being privy to sexual content, particularly as the research suggests most young people do not see this form of violence as harmful (Johnson et al., 2018). By gaining a better understanding of how recipients feel about receiving NCDII content, the extent of rape culture can be better understood and challenged accordingly.

4. What are Individuals' General Perspectives and Understanding about NCDII?

These questions coalesce around the general population's understanding of harms of NCDII, sharing intimate imagery, and who is to blame when NCDII occurs.

Perceptions of NCDII, and Views of Harms. As presented in the literature, the harms of NCDII are vast, both individually and collectively (DeKeseredy, Stonebert & Lory, 2021; McGlynn et al., 2021), a notion acknowledged by legislators, in part prompting the criminalization of NCDII in Canada (CCSO Cybercrime Working Group, 2013; Dodge & Spencer, 2018). Given NCDII is reported as a common form of sexual violence (Johnson et al., 2018; Dodge & Spencer, 2018), and increasing prevention/educational materials have responded accordingly (Canadian Centre for Child Protection, 2022; NeedHelpNow.ca; Shariff & Demartini, 2015) I wanted to know if the harms are becoming better recognized by members of the population. I was in part inspired by Johnson et al.'s (2018) survey research, as nearly two-

thirds of young participants were aware of the NCDII law, though most did not truly recognize the harms. By understanding whether NCDII is conceived of as harmful, I wanted to examine whether the wrongs are recognized.

Intimate Imagery Sharing. To supplement the overall aim which seeks to questions how NCDII is conceptualized, I also wanted to know how intimate imagery sharing in general is conceived by members of the population, to offer insight on the potential judgements inspired by rape culture around the act of sexual subjectivity (Steeves, 2012; Karaian, 2016; Koskela, 2004). This information will be used to supplement the pursuit of considering the existence of NCDII rape myths and victim-blame.

Responsibilization. The literature suggests rape culture results in victims/survivors being held responsible for their own experience when NCDII occurs (Powell & Henry, 2017; Henry, Flynn & Powell, 2019; Zvi, 2021). I wanted to know the extent of victim-blaming by examining who is deemed primarily, or wholly responsible when NCDII occurs. By exploring whether there are boundaries or judgements placed on NCDII precipitating circumstances (i.e. whether the imagery was originally consensually self-captured/shared, or taken without the victim/survivor's knowledge), information will be used to supplement NCDII rape myths while framing who is considered the ideal victim/survivor (Dodge, 2018).

Methodology: Research Approach

To respond to my research questions, I chose a large scale, online survey comprised of both closed and open-ended questions. This survey generated quantitative information (numerical prevalence rates), and qualitative information (contextual circumstances, consequences, and social perspectives of NCDII) (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). As some of my research questions required assessing relationships (e.g. gender and rates of NCDII

victimization), a survey allowed me to generate data to be able to test relationships between variables. As noted by Field (2018), the appropriate test to determine relations between two categorical variables is the Pearson chi-square test, as only frequencies can determine relationships between two variables, and the use of online software with my survey allowed this to occur.

A survey allowed me to rapidly gather more data than I could have secured with other methods such as in-person interviews, and it allowed me to sample many people. Generating prevalence rates requires large numbers of respondents. To respond to the questions which required information from those with direct NCDII experience (victim/survivor, sharer, and/or recipient), a large and diverse sample size was necessary to gather enough responses from individuals who have experienced NCDII in some capacity. As presented, NCDII prevalence rates among the population vary (1.1%-16% victim/survivor rates, 1.4% to 35.2% sharer rates, and 43% recipient rates), and as not all individuals who would opt to take part in a survey would have direct experience, a large participant pool increased the likelihood of diversity and provided greater input to draw conclusions. To respond to the questions which required information about generalized perspectives and values, a large sample permitted the collection of ample information to formulate conclusions about the existence of rape culture, common rape myths, and conceptualizations of ideal victimhood from those both with and without direct NCDII experience.

Additionally, a survey was an optimal method as it ensured participant confidentiality. Considering victim/survivor non-disclosure is significant, due in part to the internalized feelings of self-blame (McGlynn et al., 2021; Eaton & McGlynn, 2020), a survey allowed for a relatively safe forum to share experiences without the requisite to self-identify. It also welcomed the

inclusion of more sharers, who may opt against speaking about their experience through methods such as in-depth interviews, due to the notion they would be admitting to having committed a criminal offence (SC 2014).

Having presented my research aim with justification for choosing a survey as my research method, the Chapter which follows presents the method utilized to conduct this research.

Chapter 2: Methods

Survey Participant Selection and Recruitment

The literature has found most people impacted by NCDII, and those at the highest risk, are under 30 (Ferreira, 2021; Rubalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Lenhart, Ybarra & Price-Feeney, 2016; Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017; Pacheco, Melhuish & Fiske, 2019; Hango, 2016). As such I chose to sample university students for my participant sample. According to the University of Winnipeg Enrolment Snapshot report, the average age of undergraduate students is 23 (2018). In addition, 62% of students are women, 10% Indigenous, and 9% International (2018); therefore, recruiting from the entire student body allowed me to access individuals from a range of gender and racial demographics. This method replicates literature and research that used survey-based research on university students to gather data on NCDII, making it an established and appropriate method (Dardis & Richards, 2022; Walker et al., 2021).

To recruit prospective participants from the University of Winnipeg student population, I e-mailed the Senior Analyst of the Office of Institutional Analysis at the University of Winnipeg, in compliance with the Survey Policy (University of Winnipeg, 2019). I requested to have my survey sent via e-mail to all presently enrolled undergraduate and graduate students. To offer incentive to participate in my study, I included the opportunity to enter a draw for one of two \$100 Amazon gift cards. The Office of Institutional Analysis agreed to distribute my survey invitation in February of 2021, and include a secondary reminder e-mail in the hopes of recruiting additional participants. Following ethics approval, I sent my survey questions (Appendix A), a write-up of the wording I wanted to utilize within the invitation e-mail (Appendix B), and a link to the survey, to the Office of Institutional Analysis for their review and distribution.

Survey Design and Description

My survey, programmed using Qualtrics Survey Software, was sent to all University of Winnipeg students, and was structured to gather information to respond to my four overarching research questions: 1) What is the prevalence of NCDII?; 2) What are the contextual circumstances where sexual content is captured and distributed without someone's consent?; 3) What are the outcomes and consequences experienced by those who have been directly subject to NCDII? and; 4) What are individuals' general perspectives and understanding about NCDII? Applicable survey questions were posed to different individuals pending their disclosed experience(s) with NCDII. A range of questions were posed to participants, though questions not directly related to my thesis pursuit are not discussed through text, though are available in the appendix for reader reference.

I designed the survey to be primarily comprised of closed-ended questions with established response options. The primarily closed-ended question approach was selected to reduce the need for excess participant effort and ensure reasonable completion times, though open-ended options were made available in most questions to allow participants the option to include their own responses (Krosnick, 1999).

The survey was broken into the following substantive sections: questions regarding demographics; general values questions; screening for NCDII involvement questions: victimization/survivor, sharer, recipient, and other known relations; and perspectives. For reader reference, Table 1 presents the substantive survey sections and their associations to the overarching research questions. Language use, consent and conclusions also formed sections of the survey. Readers are encouraged to review Appendix A for the full survey questions and associated response options, though the sections are briefly reviewed in this Chapter.

Table 1
*Research Questions and Applicable Survey Parts**

Research Question (RQ)	Demographics		General Values		Screening Questions		Perspectives	
	RQ	Survey Part #	RQ	Survey Part #	RQ	Survey Part #	RQ	Survey Part #
1) Prevalence of NCDII								
By involvement	✓	3, 4, 5, 6			✓	3, 4, 5		
By population	✓	1			✓	1		
2) Contextual circumstances								
Sharer motivations					✓	3, 4		
Relationship dynamics					✓	3, 4, 5		
Self-created/shared					✓	3, 4		
3) Outcomes and consequences								
Non-disclosure/ responses					✓	3		
Sharer consequences					✓	3, 4		
Victim/Survivor harms					✓	3		
Recipient feelings					✓	5		
4) Perspectives and understanding								
Perceptions and harms							✓	7
Intimate imagery sharing			✓	2			✓	2
Responsibilization			✓	8			✓	8

Note. See Appendix A, Survey Questions

Part 1 - All Participant Demographics

Part 2 - All participant Values

Part 3 - Victim/Survivor Screening

Part 4 - Sharer Screening

Part 5 - Recipient Screening

Part 6 - Other involvement

Part 7 - Criminalization

Part 8 - Responsibilization

Welcome Screen, Letter or Information, and Consent

As noted, participants were recruited through mass distributed e-mails sent by the University Office of Institutional Analysis which contained a link to access the survey. The link brought participants to the *Letter of Information and Consent* page (see Appendix C).

Questions Regarding Demographics

Participants were asked to provide their age, identified gender, and race, information obtained to formulate conclusions on populations primarily impacted by NCDII.

Language and Direction

Within the survey, I chose the terms ‘sexual imagery’¹¹ and ‘share’¹² to describe the key concepts. Sexual imagery was selected as it is an understandable enough term and allows for the inclusion of both still images and videos. This definition allowed for various production, content, and consent scenarios to be included, and it aligns with the criminal code definition of ‘intimate image’ (SC 2014), something important given information about the law was provided to participants. While ‘intimate imagery’ is used in this research, for the survey, given synonyms to intimate include ‘dear’ and ‘cherished,’ I chose to amend the language to ensure my survey was trauma informed (language without judgement and negative assumptions, is strength-based, and conveys information in a manner cognizant of what may re-traumatize someone) (Klinic Community Health Centre, 2013). Pornography was explicitly excluded so participants would know the questions pertain to individuals not consensually financially benefiting from their imagery and associated viewings. While the term ‘distribute’ is contained within the acronym NCDII utilized in this research, I chose ‘share’ to use in the survey as it is easier to understand in a digital context. The term share and the associated definition provided was purposefully articulated to be free of judgement and distribution motivations to ensure inclusion of various case scenarios (Powell & Henry, 2018; Coburn, Connolly & Roesch, 2015). These definitions were available to participants for ongoing reference throughout the survey to ensure participants would have a clear and consistent understanding to reduce the likelihood they may wrongly interpret the questions.

¹¹ Sexual imagery is defined as a visual recording of a person made by any means, including photographic, film or video recording, whereby a person is portrayed as nude, exposing genital organs, genital region, anal region, breasts, or whereby a person is engaged in explicit sexual activity. For this purpose, consensually produced imagery available through a recognized pornography source (e.g. pornography website) is excluded from this definition.

¹² Share means sending, texting, posting, forwarding, or any other form of digital distribution to a single person, to a group of people, or for numerous others to see in an online space.

Prior to each substantive section of the survey, where any opportunity for written information was made available, participants were continually reminded to refrain from disclosing any personal identifiable information of themselves or others¹³.

Screening Questions

I identified three primary groups of individuals to gather data from: victims/survivors to NCDII, sharers of visual sexual content, and recipients to NCDII. To screen for involvement, all participants were asked if they experienced the applicable situation; however, the terms used within this thesis were not included in the survey, so participants were not explicitly labelled. If participants answered 'yes,' they answered the rest of the questions within that section, and if they answered 'no,' the survey skipped to the next substantive section. Within each section, questions were asked about their full experience to ascertain prevalence among each group, contextual circumstances, and consequences. Out of recognition participants may have more than one experience, I used the same method described in Drouin, Ross, and Tobin (2015), where participants were asked to reflect on their most recent experience when answering the survey questions. I chose this practice as asking participants to consider their most recent experience would likely result in more reliable reflections. Drouin, Ross, and Tobin's (2015) research also inspired the Likert-scale questions and responses presented in the survey.

It is imperative to note as it relates to the sharer screening question, the non-consensual element of sharing was purposefully not included. The literature suggests NCDII is conceived of as normalized, and often unproblematic action (Mortoux et al., 2019; Ringrose & Harvey, 2015; Walker et al., 2021), so I did not want to deter individuals from taking the survey by presenting

¹³ This was done for ethical purposes, to ensure participant/prospective perpetrator confidentiality, and to limit any participant's ability to admit to the commission of an offence.

language which could make them feel judged. Levels of perceived consent were ascertained later in the survey.

For participants who denied personal involvement in all three categories (victim/survivor, sharer and/or recipient), they were asked if they know anyone who has experienced NCDII as a victim/survivor and/or sharer. This section was included to keep survey completion timing generally equivalent regardless of identified involvement between participants, and to gain an increased understanding about prospective rates of NCDII.

Perspectives

All participants were asked how NCDII is conceptualized as a criminal offence¹⁴ and whether they agree with criminalization. This question was posed to inspire open-ended responses on whether participants view NCDII as harmful and wrong. To obtain responses served to answer the responsabilization sub-theme contained in my fourth research question, participants were asked who they deem most responsible when NCDII occurs, and why. This question was asked to every participant except those who responded ‘yes’ to the victimization/survivor screening question, as I did not want to trigger or upset participants unnecessarily when the question could instead be posed to those without experience(s).

Conclusion

Upon completion of the survey, participants were asked to reaffirm consent. All participants were directed to the Conclusion page (appendix D), which provided links to crisis and counselling services, NCDII educational material, and peer reviewed articles. Participants were then re-directed to a new webpage for prize draw entry to ensure their responses were disassociated from their names.

¹⁴ The crime question was also posed for ethical purposes to provide an educational component for participants.

Programming Considerations: Survey Functionality

The survey security options ensured participant protection. The ‘anonymize responses’ function was turned on in Qualtrics, so no IP addresses, location data, or contact information were retained. I enabled functions to prevent participants from re-taking the survey, and to permit survey exit and re-entry within the open survey time frame. I designed the survey to allow participants to refuse a response to any question posed. Survey responses were not automatically withdrawn if the participant did not finish the survey, as given the ambiguity of what not completing the survey means, the decision was made to collect incomplete data for analysis purposes. This was deemed in compliance with ethical standards as participants were advised of how they could withdraw from the survey (using a randomized ID).

Ethical Considerations

I was aware my survey pertained to a form of sexual violence, and exposure to the content contained within may trigger an emotional response, so to mitigate risks, the survey was worded using simple, trauma-informed language. Trauma-informed language is that which communicates without judgement and negative assumptions, is strength-based, and conveys information in a manner cognizant of what may re-traumatize someone (Klinic Community Health Centre, 2013). I also included local counselling/crisis resources¹⁵ for participant reference in the conclusion form (appendix D). Participants answered questions about their general involvement in NCDII, and no question requested explicit detail or identifiable information.

Survey Testing

The survey was subjected to pre-tests to ensure each function was set correctly and operated as intended. I took the survey on both a computer and cell phone to ensure it worked on

¹⁵ Klinic Community Health and the University Wellness Centre

multiple mediums. I requested some friends and family test my survey to ensure it was user friendly, and to gauge approximate completion times to include for recruitment purposes (as noted in appendices B and C). Prior to my survey being distributed via e-mail, I deleted all test responses so the testing data would not be confused with the real data.

Survey Distribution Timeline and Correspondence with Participants

As noted, the Office of Institutional Analysis at the University of Winnipeg approved my survey to run in February of 2021. On February 2, 2021, the mass e-mail was distributed to all undergraduate and graduate students, and on February 27, 2021, I formally closed my survey¹⁶. As outlined in the consent form (appendix C), participants could contact me to modify/withdraw their responses at any point up to and including March 31, 2021, a deadline after which I began analyzing the data.

I received some general emails from students/prospective participants in the days immediately following the distributed e-mail. No one conveyed any information compromising their or other's direct identity related to NCDII. One student e-mailed me to advise they misread one question, and responded with a yes instead of no, prompting inapplicable questions, so provided their randomized ID so I could remove their invalid responses.

ID Error

It is important to identify an issue related to the randomized ID numbers provided to each participant. I used a code to prompt Qualtrics to generate a number for each participant, though I failed to set the function to retain the number and link it to the applicable responses. I became aware of this when I tried to remove the set of responses from the participant who provided me their ID number. When trying to locate the number, it became apparent the randomized ID

¹⁶ For those who had accessed the link prior to survey closure, they were allotted 48 hours through the Qualtrics settings to complete the survey.

numbers were not recorded as variables. I contacted Qualtrics support staff to inquire how to rectify this issue, though was informed I could not. I consulted with one of my thesis supervisors, and we agreed in the future embedding this code is required to fulfill the provided assurance on data removal. I recognize this programming error could have posed ethical problems in the event additional participants wanted their responses removed, though thankfully, this did not occur. In the view of my thesis team and I, this error did not compromise the ethical integrity of my study, as only one response set was unable to be removed, and it was due to an admitted error, something the participant was given the opportunity to amend by allowing them to re-take the survey by temporarily amending the go-back function.

Prize Draw

In total, 1269 participants provided their names and e-mails for the prize draw entry, and using www.randomizer.org, I selected two random numbers between 1-1269, located the associated e-mails, and the participants were e-mailed their \$100 Amazon Gift Cards. Once the prize draw was completed participant contact information was deleted.

The next chapter presents the data analysis conducted after participants took part in the survey.

Chapter 3: Data Analysis

This section describes the data analysis strategies employed for this research. Analytical software used, and how the data was cleaned is presented. Data analysis, both quantitative and qualitative, are described. Data deemed unusable in the analysis phase is noted.

Analytical Software

I used SPSS software to analyze quantitative data (Field, 2018). For the qualitative, open-ended written response options, I conducted directed and conventional content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005), both manually and with QSR NVivo software, in addition to a thematic analysis to conceptualize the large data sets (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Initial Data Cleaning

Qualtrics records any instance where someone clicked on the survey link, along with their progress in the survey. In total, 2,018 students who received the recruitment email clicked on the survey link. After data cleaning, the final number of participants included in analyses was 1532. The data was cleaned as follows: Three hundred and ten participants were removed because they did not proceed past the consent form (i.e., they clicked neither 'continue' nor 'exit'); Three participants declined consent to participate after reading the letter of information; Fifteen participants completed the survey but responded 'no' to the question about re-affirming consent, so their responses were deleted.

Some partial responses were retained. I determined so long as participants responded to the initial victimization/survivor screening question (either yes or no), their responses would be retained. If a participant did not make it far enough in the survey to respond to the first screening question their data was deleted (one hundred fifty-eight total). After data cleaning, I was left with a total of 1532 usable responses. For reference, and as will be outlined in the results sections, of

this number, 33 did not respond to the second screening question, and 94 did not answer the third screening question.

Data Analysis

Due to the way the survey was structured, not all questions were applicable to all participants, and participants were able to bypass questions they did not want to answer. I calculated percentages for quantitative data by dividing the number of participants who selected each response by the total number of individuals who answered the question. For this reason, the *ns* presented in the results are not the same between questions.

Many of the survey questions contained an *other* option for text input alongside pre-established responses. For questions where there were approximately twenty-five or less written responses, I conducted the content analyses manually. Using a directed approach (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005), I reviewed written responses and identified those which could fit into the pre-established responses and added them accordingly. I reviewed the remaining open-ended responses to examine whether new categories could be developed using a conventional content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). As outlined by Hsieh and Shannon (2005), a “conventional content analysis is generally used with a study design whose aim is to describe a phenomenon” (p. 1279) and enable categories to be drawn from the data itself. To gain a sense of the new categories/themes, I reviewed the open-ended responses repeatedly, and highlighted words/phrases which captured key concepts, which became my initial codes. I continued to take notes of my impressions/thoughts derived from the codes and added short labels. Through reflection, I was able to re-frame my labels into single defined categories, using terms to encapsulate my original reflections (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Once I established the new category, I created a new variable within SPSS to quantify.

Participant-Directed Data Correction

Some participants used the open-ended text option to indicate they had mistakenly selected ‘yes’ rather than ‘no’ to one of the initial screening questions. Through consultation with my supervisory committee, we determined if at any point a participant reported to mis-answering the screening question, or denied having the associated experience, all their subsequent responses within the section should be removed and their response to the screening question changed to ‘no’.

Of the 1532 responses to the victim/survivor question, 278 participants responded yes to the screening question. Two participants indicated in subsequent questions they mis-selected the screening question and had not experienced NCDII in this capacity. Therefore, the total number of individuals who were analyzed for this section were 276. Of the 1499 responses to the sharer screening question, 171 participants responded yes, though 41 were removed as the participant indicated in subsequent questions they had not shared sexual imagery of someone else; therefore, the total number of individuals analyzed for this section were 130. Of the 1438 individuals who responded to the recipient screening question, 418 responded yes. One participant indicated they had never experienced NCDII as a recipient, so 417 was the total number of responses analyzed.

Analytical Notes

Regarding the participant gender and racial/ethnic information, due to the various response alternatives presented, I collapsed across variables to have large enough sums to run meaningful statistical tests. For gender, female, male, and non-cisgender¹⁷ were the final collapsed groups. I collapsed the race/ethnicity variable into three categories: White (‘European’)

¹⁷ The non-cis gender category includes those who identified as ‘non-binary,’ ‘transgender,’ ‘two-spirit,’ in addition to those who selected ‘prefer not to identify,’ or selected multiple gender identities.

Indigenous¹⁸, and Black/Person of Color¹⁹. The individuals who selected ‘Prefer not to identify’ were not included in statistical tests. For age, the sample was very homogenous; therefore, age would not vary enough to do meaningful analyses in areas of interest.

Thematic Analysis of Open-Ended Responses

There were three substantive sections of the survey which requested written responses from participants rather than presenting response alternatives. To sort the data, I read every response and took manual notes of my initial thoughts and impressions, common themes/responses, and conducted a conventional content analysis (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). I reviewed the data again in NVivo, created codes from my reflections, and organized each response into the applicable codes. Many of the responses were categorized into multiple codes given the amount of detail participants offered.

As diverse terminology was used by participants, during the final analysis I determined the codes may be better understood as themes. As noted by Attride-Stirling (2001), themes should be specific enough to encompass one idea, but broad enough to allow for various iterations of texts; therefore, conducting a thematic analysis allowed for increased reflexivity (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The use of themes was an optimal way to conceptualize the data, as “a theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the dataset” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.82). Many participant comments applied across themes as many provided comprehensive input.

¹⁸ Some participants selected both ‘European’ and ‘Indigenous.’ As the ‘Indigenous’ category did contain ‘Metis’ within the list of included examples, this was the only group of individuals where ‘Indigenous’ was retained, and ‘European’ removed, rather than being categorized as holding ‘mixed’ ancestry.

¹⁹ The ‘black/person of color’ variable contains ‘African,’ ‘Caribbean,’ ‘East Asian,’ ‘Middle Eastern,’ ‘South Asian,’ ‘Southeast Asian,’ ‘Mixed(which contains individuals who selected multiple options),’ ‘Hispanic,’ ‘Pacific Islander,’ and ‘Cannot be classified.’

Unusable Data

This research unanticipatedly took place during the global COVID-19 pandemic, and I considered that the associated increased use of digital communication may have impacted reported NCDII prevalence rates. A pandemic question was posed to those who identified as having experienced NCDII in some capacity, with the goal being to compare general rates of reported experiences to those reported after the pandemic to determine if the pandemic was a significant variable. During the data analysis phase, I noticed due to a programming error, I failed to include '0' as a response option to the pandemic questions; therefore, participants were unable to indicate they did not experience NCDII post-pandemic, unless they opted to skip the full question. Through consultation with my thesis supervisors, it was determined the data gathered from these questions was unusable as assumptions cannot be made about how participants may have navigated their responses. As this question was only included due to an unanticipated global experience, it was not central or imperative to the overall study.

In the Chapters which follow, the results of my survey research are presented in order of how the questions were posed in the survey.

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter presents the results of my survey. Within this chapter, many participant quotations are used. Given the number of quotations, I refrained from identifying spelling or grammatical errors, and opted to leave the comments intact as provided by participants. The results sections contained within this chapter are presented in the general order of how questions were posed within the survey.

Section one presents demographic information of the full sample, as well as responses to the general perspectives question. Section two reviews the prevalence of NCDII for victims/survivors, (potential) sharers, and/or recipients, and those without direct experience, in addition to associated demographics. Section three reviews contextual circumstances of NCDII, inclusive of how intimate imagery is created, obtained, and comes to be shared. Relationship dynamics and modes of distribution are presented as well. Section four reviews motivations for engaging in intimate imagery sharing from varied perspectives, and sharer perceived levels of consent to engage in distribution. Section five presents victim/survivor isolation, non-disclosure, victim-blame/shame experienced, and support received by victims/survivors who opted to tell another about their experience. Primary relations victims/survivors tell their NCDII experience to also included. Section six examines post-NCDII outcomes, inclusive of sharer consequences, victim/survivor harms, and recipient feelings about having received NCDII material. Section seven presents general perspectives and knowledge of NCDII harms among the sample. Section eight reviews the results of how intimate imagery sharing is conceived, and associated degrees of victim/survivor responsabilization.

Section One

This section presents the demographic information (age, gender, race/ethnicity) of the total sample, and responses to general perspective questions posed to all participants.

All Participants

My total sample comprised of 1532 University of Winnipeg students. The most frequent reported age was 19, and the average was 22.45²⁰. Most of the sample (84.26%, or $n=1290$) was aged 25 and under. This age range is ideal given the literature suggests most individuals with NCDII involvement are under 30 (Ferreira, 2021; Rubalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Lenhart, Ybarra & Price-Feeney, 2016; Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017; Pacheco, Melhuish & Fiske, 2019; Hango, 2016). Most of the participants identified as female, at 72.6% ($n=1110$), followed by male, at 24% ($n=367$) and ‘non-cis gender’ at 3.4% ($n=52$).

Table 2 outlines the full participant racial/ethnic demographics to show the diversity of the sample²¹. As noted, this was collapsed to examine relationships between race/ethnicity and NCDII into the following groups, which will be referenced hereon out: White ($n=888$, or 58.65%), Indigenous ($n=146$, or 9.64%), and Black/Person of Color ($n=480$, or 31.70%).

Most of the sample ($n=1443$, or 94.19%) indicated they used multiple forms of electronic communication at least once per week. *Appendix E* presents the data on reported digital communication use as this was applicable, but not directly related, to my research pursuit.

²⁰ Of note, due to the notion 45 was the maximum age provided to participants, with a + used to include those above this age, this average is not exact.

²¹ Participants were explicitly asked if they identify as a person of colour, and 24.87% ($n=381$) said yes, 71.48% ($n=1095$) said no, and 3.66% ($n=56$) selected ‘prefer not to disclose.’

Table 2
Racial/Ethnic Demographics of the Total Sample

Option	<i>n</i>	% of 1532
African (e.g. Black)	69	4.5
East Asian (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean)	36	2.35
European (e.g. White, Caucasian)	888	57.96
Hispanic (e.g. Latino)	17	1.11
Indigenous (e.g., First Nations, Metis, Inuit)	146	9.53
Middle Eastern (e.g., Arab)	18	1.17
Pacific Islander	27	1.76
South Asian (e.g., Indian, Pakistani)	120	7.83
Southeast Asian (e.g., Thai, Indonesian)	112	7.31
Prefer not to identify	18	1.17
Mixed Ancestry ^a	75	4.9
Caribbean*	3	0.2
Cannot be classified*	3	0.2
Total	1532	100

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

^aParticipants who selected multiple options

Perceptions on General Intimate Imagery Sharing

Questions were posed to all participants to gauge how individuals conceive of intimate imagery sharing in general, both self and others, to respond to my fourth overarching research question (‘What are individuals’ general perspectives and understanding about NCDII?’). This section was not confined to examining non-consensually shared depictions as I wanted to understand potential judgement and limitations around the acts of sexual subjectivity (Steeves, 2012; Karaian, 2016; Koskela, 2004), and potential harms or boundaries related to sharing intimate imagery of others.

Sexual Imagery Sharing of the Self

All participants were asked, “Do you think there are any circumstances where it is okay for someone to share sexual imagery of themselves?”, with responses as follows: ‘Yes’ ($n=1183$,

or 77.22%), ‘No’ ($n=237$, or 15.47%) and ‘I don’t know’ ($n=112$, or 7.31%). Participants who responded yes were asked about circumstances to ascertain boundaries, information presented in Tables 3 and 4. Similarly, responses for those who selected ‘no’ are presented in Table 5, and ‘I don’t know’ in Table 6.

Table 3

Participant Responses to: “You said you do think there are circumstances where it is okay for someone to share sexual imagery of themselves”

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 1183
When one consensually shares images with certain people they choose ^b	1096	92.65
When the person receiving the imagery has consented prior to receiving it	1035	87.49
When the person receiving the imagery has not consented prior to receiving it	7	0.59
When one agrees to share their imagery, even if they are pressured to do it	15	1.27
All of the above, as the circumstances do not matter, it is always okay	4	0.34
When both sharer and recipient consent*	961	81.23
When risks/boundaries are clearly established*	21	1.78
When one is of the age of consent and/or 18+*	41	3.47
If people are in a trusting relationship*	9	0.76

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

^a Additional variables noted, though not added to the table due to the small number are as follows: Long term marriage, for professional film/art, breast cancer awareness, in a healthy and respectful relationship, and depending on what is shown in the imagery.

^b Participants who selected this response were directed to Table 4.

Table 4

Participant Responses to: “You said you think it is okay for someone to share sexual imagery of themselves when they consensually share images with certain people they choose. Please select the following individuals you think it is okay to consensually share sexual imagery with:”

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 1068
Long-term romantic partner	907	84.93
Short-term romantic partner	651	60.96
Sexual partner	695	65.07
Friend	384	35.96
Acquaintance	134	12.55
Family member	44	4.12
Someone they just met	129	12.08
Someone they are trying to get to like them	126	11.8
Someone who pays the person for their imagery, through money or other material ways	449	42.04
A group of people the person knows (e.g. a post for followers to see)	235	22
A group of people the person doesn't know (e.g. a post on an open website)	184	17.23
Who the recipient is does not matter, so long as the sender consented to sharing	320	29.96
Doctor*	8	0.75

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

Table 5

Participant Responses to: “You said you do not think there are any circumstances where it is okay for someone to share sexual imagery of themselves. Please select all of the following reasons why you think this:”

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 237
I do not think it is appropriate	147	62.03
I think sending sexual imagery is offensive	53	22.36
I think it is irresponsible to have sexual imagery traced to your digital footprint	132	55.7
It makes it easy for the image to spread to others	181	76.37
Comments/feelings about people who share sexual content*	38	16.03
Child welfare concerns*	5	2.11
Concerns related to inability to trust others*	11	4.64
Concerns for potential non-consenting recipients*	9	3.8
Encourages offenders or those with harmful motives*	19	8.02
Loss of control over personal content*	22	9.28
Gives other people power over the person in the image*	13	5.49
Privacy concerns*	6	2.53
Values on modesty*	32	13.5
Potential for negative impacts on various life areas*	10	4.22
Potential for impacted reputation/shame*	4	1.69
Online safety and risk management*	21	8.86
Concerns regarding hackers/trolls*	5	2.11

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

Table 6

Participant Responses to: “Please explain why you are unsure if there are any circumstances where it is okay for someone to share sexual imagery of themselves:”

Themes Created	<i>n</i>	% of 101
Comments considering the balance between personal choice and risk*	43	42.57
Consideration given to those who profit from sexual imagery*	4	3.96
It is up to the person in the image (‘To each their own’)*	9	8.91
Depends on the consent of individual(s) involved*	19	18.81
Dependent on relationship to the recipient*	33	32.67
Only if depicting a mother breastfeeding a baby*	1	0.99
If the person is an adult*	6	5.94
Personal feelings that it is unnecessary*	2	1.98
Unsure due to no personal experience*	4	3.96

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

Sexual Imagery Sharing of Others

All participants were asked, “Do you think there are any circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of someone else?”, with responses as follows: ‘No’ ($n=1253$, or 81.90%), ‘Yes’ ($n=199$, or 13.01%) and ‘I don’t know’ ($n=78$, or 5.10%). Responses to ‘no’ are presented in Table 7, ‘yes’ in Table 8, and ‘I don’t know’ in Table 9.

Table 7

Participant Responses to: “You said you do not think there are any circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of someone else. Please indicate which of the following are the reasons why you think this”

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 1250
I do not think it is appropriate	891	71.28
I think sending sexual imagery is offensive	256	20.48
It makes it easy for sexual imagery to spread to many people	864	69.12
It could negatively impact someone's reputation	1027	82.16
It is hard to know if someone else consented to having their imagery shared	1041	83.28
It is illegal to share sexual imagery of others	913	73.04
The person in the imagery loses power/control over the content*	7	0.56
Long term repercussions, personal harms*	14	1.12
It is not your to share* ^a	15	1.2
Breach of trust*	2	0.16

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

Table 8

Participant Responses to: “You said you do think there are circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of someone else. Please indicate which of the following are reasons why you think this”

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 195
It is okay if the sharer personally knows the person in the sexual imagery	15	7.69
It is okay if the sharer doesn't personally know the person in the sexual imagery	1	0.51
It is okay if the sharer knows the people with whom they are sharing the sexual imagery with	9	4.62
It is okay if the sharer doesn't know the people with whom they are sharing the sexual imagery with	2	1.03
It is okay to share if the sexual imagery is already available for others on public social media to see (e.g. unprotected, open account)	82	42.05
It is okay to share if the sexual imagery is already available for others on private social media to see (e.g. protected account only friends/followers can access)	6	3.08
It is okay to share if the person in the sexual imagery took it themselves	4	2.05
It is okay to share if the person in the sexual imagery originally shared it themselves	23	11.79
It is always okay to share sexual imagery of others	2	1.03
It is only okay to share with someone in a position of legal authority so they can help the person in the imagery with removal	47	24.1
If it is pornography*	3	1.54
To promote someone's sex work*	10	5.13
When the person in the imagery consents to it being shared by someone else*	101	51.79

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

Table 9

Participant Response to: “Please explain why are unsure if there are any circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of someone else”

Themes Created	<i>n</i>	% of 67
Personal preference against sharing of others*	7	10.45
It is okay if it is pornography*	6	8.96
If it is someone's job/for financial reasons*	5	7.46
It can put others at risk*	5	7.46
It is up to the person sharing ('to each their own')*	5	7.46
It is okay to share with certain individuals*	2	2.99
Unsure of legalities*	1	1.49
When it is consensual*	33	49.25
When the person in the image posted it themselves*	4	5.97

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

Many participants took part in this survey, and as presented, the sample comprised of a range of demographics. For general perceptions of imagery sharing of the self, most participants were in agreement there are circumstances where this is appropriate, with boundaries and limits. Most of the sample disagreed with the appropriateness of sharing sexual imagery of someone else, and of those who did agree, requisites for consent were stipulated among most participants. Section two now transitions to NCDII prevalence and associated demographics.

Section Two

This section presents the results served to respond to my first research question- the prevalence of NCDII. Experiences reported by victims/survivors, sharers, and recipients (inclusive of those with experience in multiple capacities, where two or more screened identities were confirmed), are presented, in addition to reports from individuals without direct experience, though who reported to knowing victim(s)/survivor(s) and/or sharer(s). Prevalence rates and associated population demographics are included, in addition to relationships between demographics and NCDII experiences. As a reminder, sharer rates should be interpreted with caution, and NCDII not assumed as individuals referred to as sharers for this purpose are those who responded affirmatively to: ‘Have you ever shared sexual imagery of another person?’ Perceived levels of consent to share are ascertained in later sections of the survey.

What is the Prevalence of NCDII?

Overall, NCDII was experienced by a sizable portion of participants: 18.02% were classified as victims/survivors, (approximately) 8.67% as sharers, and 29% recipients. The full responses to all three screening questions are as follows:

-Victim/survivor: (N=1532) responded to: *Have you ever found out, or had a reasonable degree of certainty, that sexual imagery of you was shared by someone else without your consent?* ‘Yes’ was selected by 18.02% ($n=276$), and ‘no’ by 81.98% ($n=1256$) of participants.

-Sharer: 1499 participants responded to: *Have you ever shared sexual imagery of another person? (e.g. Have you ever texted a nude image of someone you knew to a friend? Have you ever posted a sexual video of someone else on social media? etc.).* ‘Yes’ was selected by 8.67% ($n=130$), and ‘no’ by 91.33% ($n=1369$).

-Recipient: 1438 participants who responded to: *Have you ever electronically received shared sexual imagery of someone else knowing they likely did not consent to you seeing it? The imagery could have been sent to you through a link to a webpage, social media post, through text, e-mail, DM, etc.* ‘Yes’ was selected by 29% ($n=417$) and ‘no’ by 71% ($n=1021$) of participants.

All participants who confirmed involvement as a victim/survivor, sharer, and/or recipients were asked to quantify how many times they experienced sharing within this capacity, with responses presented in Table 10. As demonstrated, most reported 1-2 incidents among the presented range of 1-25+, and a notable finding is the notion a sizeable sample across all three groups indicated they were unsure of the number of times they experienced imagery sharing.

Participants who selected ‘no’ to all three of the screening questions ($n=816$), were asked about individuals they know who have experienced NCDII: 44% ($n=359$) said ‘yes’ that they knew a victim/survivor and 27.33% ($n=193$) selected ‘yes’ to knowing someone considered a sharer.

Table 10
Reported NCDII Incidents

Option	Victim/Survivor		Sharer		Recipient	
	<i>n</i>	% of 273	<i>n</i>	% of 93	<i>n</i>	% of 407
1	104	38.1	42	45.16	134	32.92
2	64	23.44	18	19.35	89	21.87
3	26	9.52	6	6.45	68	16.71
4	9	3.3	1	1.08	16	3.93
5	19	6.96	2	2.15	34	8.35
6	4	1.47	2	2.15	3	0.74
7	2	0.73			4	0.98
8	4	1.47			1	0.25
9	1	0.37			1	0.25
10	9	3.3	4	4.3	16	3.93
11	1	0.37				
12			1	1.08		
14					1	0.25
15	1	0.37			2	0.49
17			1	1.08		
20			3	3.23	1	0.25
25+	6	2.2			8	1.97
Unsure	23	8.42	13	13.98	29	7.13

*Note. Only options selected by participants have been included in this table.

Multiple Capacity Experiences

There were participants who experienced imagery sharing in multiple ways, meaning they were classified in more than one of the three groups: victim/survivor, sharer, recipient.

Prevalence of those with multiple involvements are as follows:

-Victim/survivor AND sharer: 1.80% ($n=27$)²²

²² This means 10.93% of the victim/survivors were also sharers, and 20.77% of the sharers were also victims/survivors.

-Sharer AND recipient: 2.99% ($n=43$)²³

-Victim/survivor AND recipient: 6.33% ($n=91$)²⁴

-Victim/survivor, sharer, AND recipient: 0.09% ($n=13$)

Populations Who Experience NCDII/Imagery Sharing

Having presented how frequently NCDII/imagery sharing occurs, this section transitions to the populations who primarily experience imagery distribution in varied capacities, through gender, race/ethnicity, and age.

Gender and NCDII/Imagery Sharing

As noted by Field (2018), the appropriate test to determine relations between two categorical variables is the Pearson chi-square test, as only frequencies can determine relationships between two variables. Using the 2 X 2 Pearson's chi-square analysis, I examined whether gender identity was associated with experiencing NCDII in various capacities. I analyzed my findings using three primary gender identities: female, male, and non-cisgender. As a reminder, females made up 72.60% ($n=1110$) of the sample, males 24% ($n=367$), and non-cisgender persons 3.40% ($n=52$).

This research found an association between gender and rates of victimization, whereby females and non-cisgender people are more likely to report being victims/survivors than males, $\chi^2(2, N = 1529) = 45.505, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .173$, suggesting a small effect size; see Table 11 for standardized residuals. Of the 275 participants who experienced NCDII as a victim/survivor, 83.27% identified as female. This means 20.63% of all females who took part in the survey were classified as victims/survivors. As noted, most of the sample identified as female

²³ This means 10.31% of recipients were also sharers, and 49.43% of the sharers were also recipients.

²⁴ This means 21.82% of recipients were also victims/survivors, and 36.99% of victim/survivors were also recipients.

($n=1110$, or 72.60%); however, the rates of victimization are higher proportionally. This notion is particularly true for the non-cisgender demographic, as this group made up of 3.40% of the total sample, yet 36.54% ($n=19$) had been victimized by NCDII.

Table 11

Gender and NCDII Victimization

Gender	Victim / Survivor					
	Yes			No		
	%	<i>n</i>	Std. Residual	%	<i>n</i>	Std. Residual
Female	20.63	229	2.1	79.37	881	-1
Male	7.36	27	-4.8	92.64	340	2.2
Non-Cisgender	36.54	19	3.2	63.46	33	-1.5

This research also found an association between gender and rates of sharing, whereby males are proportionately more likely to report sharing than female and non-cisgender groups, $\chi^2(2, N=1496) = 14.828$, $p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .1$, suggesting a small effect size; see Table 12 for standardized residuals. This means that 13.57% ($n=49$) of all males who took part in the survey identified as sharers. Of the sharers, 37.98% ($n=49$) identified as male, and while 58.91% ($n=76$) identified as female, 7.02% of all females in the survey identified as sharers, a lower percentage considering proportions.

Table 12

Gender and Sharing

Gender	Sharer					
	Yes			No		
	%	<i>n</i>	Std. Residual	%	<i>n</i>	Std. Residual
Female	7.02	76	-1.8	92.98	1007	0.6
Male	13.57	49	3.2	86.43	312	-1
Non-Cisgender	7.69	4	-0.2	92.31	48	0.1

While there appears to be strong gendered components to rates of both sharing and victimization, my findings present no statistical significance related to gender and rates of being exposed to non-consensual intimate imagery as a recipient: $\chi^2(2, N=1435) = 1.294, p < .524$. Females comprised 28.10% ($n=293$), males 31% ($n=106$), and non-cisgender 32% ($n=16$) of recipients. These findings suggest all genders are equally likely to be a recipient to non-consensual sexualized imagery.

Race/Ethnicity and NCDII/Imagery Sharing

To conduct the meaningful statistical tests with respect to whether there is an association between race/ethnicity and being a victim/survivor, sharer, or recipient, I collapsed across some of the categories so each had large enough *ns* to provide meaningful statistical analysis. Of the 1514 participants who offered an identity, I collapsed variables into three categories: White ($n=888, 58.65\%$), Indigenous ($n=146, 9.64\%$), and Black/Person of Colour ($n=480, 31.70\%$)²⁵.

This research found an association between race/ethnicity and rates of NCDII victimization, particularly among Indigenous identifying victims/survivors, $\chi^2(2, N=1514) = 15.044, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = 0.1$, suggesting a small effect size; see Table 13 for standardized residuals. Of all White individuals in the survey ($n=888$), 18.92% reported NCDII victimization, while comprising 58.65% of the total participants. For those in the Black/Person of Color category ($n=480$), 13.75% were categorized as victims/survivors, and comprised 31.70% of the total sample. Of all Indigenous identifying participants ($n=146$), 27.40% identified having

²⁵ Grouping in this manner is not suggesting these individuals have a unified experience, in general, or as it relates to NCDII.

experienced NCDII victimization, a number which is highly overrepresented considering this group comprised of 9.46% of the total survey.

Table 13
Race/Ethnicity and Victimization

Race/Ethnicity	Victim / Survivor					
	Yes			No		
	%	<i>n</i>	Std. Residual	%	<i>n</i>	Std. Residual
White	18.92	168	0.6	81.08	720	-0.3
Black/Person of Color	13.75	66	-2.2	86.25	414	1.1
Indigenous	27.40	40	2.6	72.60	106	-1.2

Conversely, race/ethnicity and rates of intimate imagery sharing did not reveal any significant findings, suggesting there is no relation between sharing sexual imagery of others and race/ethnicity: $\chi^2(2, N=1481) = 2.270, p < .321$. White individuals comprised of 8.09% ($n=71$), Black/Person of Colour 10.30% ($n=48$), and Indigenous individuals 7.25% ($n=10$) of all sharers.

As it relates to race/ethnicity relationships to receiving NCDII material, there are findings of statistical significance, whereby Black/Persons of Colour are slightly more likely to receive NCDII material: $\chi^2(2, N=1420) = 6.135, p < .047$, Cramer's $V = 0.066$, suggesting a very small effect size; see Table 14 for standardized residuals.

Table 14
Race/Ethnicity and Recipients

Race/Ethnicity	Recipient					
	Yes			No		
	%	<i>n</i>	Std. Residual	%	<i>n</i>	Std. Residual
White	26.82	225	-1.2	73.18	614	0.8
Black/Person of Color	33.41	149	1.7	66.60	297	-1.1
Indigenous	28.89	39	0	71.11	96	0

Age and NCDII Victimization

Sample participants who experienced NCDII as a victim/survivor²⁶ were asked how old they were when this occurred, with an offered range of ‘10 and under’ to ‘50 plus,’ and overall, the sample was relatively young ($M=17.31$, $SD=3.02$, $Mdn=17$)²⁷. Of the 261 participants who provided their age of victimization, 67.05% ($n=175$) identified NCDII occurred prior to them reaching the age of 18. The oldest reported age in the sample was 33.

Having established how often NCDII occurs and who is most effected, the results transition to the third section, which examines contextual circumstances of NCDII.

Section Three

This section presents information served to respond to the components of the second research question, being: ‘what are the contextual circumstances where sexual content is captured and distributed without someone’s consent?’

Contextual Circumstances of Creation/Sharing, and Relationship Considerations

This section offers insight on how intimate imagery is recorded/created, obtained, and comes to be shared based on the responses provided by participants who experienced NCDII as a victim/survivor, and/or recipient, and those who reported to sharing sexual imagery. Relevant relationship dynamics are explored, and modes of distribution are presented. Results reported by sharers must be interpreted with caution provided the non-consensual element of imagery sharing was not explicitly asked.

²⁶ As this survey posed questions about a criminal offence, specific details with the potential to offer a general time frame were purposefully omitted from the questions posed to sharers, so the age of those experiencing NCDII is limited to the victim/survivor demographic. The survey did not ask about the age when recipients received the content as I assessed it may not have been significant enough of an experience for them to recall an accurate age.

²⁷ This numbers should be viewed as approximations provided the lowest response option was not a ratio level of measurement.

How Sexual Imagery was Originally Recorded: Reports from Victims/Survivors

Participants who reported having experienced NCDII as a victim/survivor were asked how the sexual imagery which was later distributed non-consensually was originally recorded. Of the 269 victims/survivors who responded to this question: 19.33% ($n=52$) indicated ‘*someone else took the imagery of me*’; 57.62% ($n=155$) indicated ‘*I took the imagery myself*’; 49.07% ($n=132$) indicated ‘*someone took a screen shot of the imagery not intended for saving*’; and 4.09% ($n=11$) selected, ‘*I don’t know*’. Of note, 26.77% ($n=72$) of participants who responded to this question selected multiple response options. The following sub-sections present the follow up responses applicable to each recording circumstance.

Responses to: ‘Someone else took the imagery of me’. Of the 52 victims/survivors who reported ‘*someone else took the imagery of me*,’ they were asked if they consented to this: 44.23% ($n=23$) responded ‘yes,’ (see Table 15) while 55.77% ($n=29$) responded ‘no’ (see Table 16).

Table 15

<i>Circumstances Where Victims/Survivors Consented to the Person Taking the Imagery</i>		
Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 23
It was only supposed to be for me	4	17.39
It was only supposed to be for the person taking it	23	100
It was only supposed to be for people I chose to access it	3	13.04
I agreed, but I felt pressured	6	26.09
I was drunk and/or high	8	34.78
They told me they would give me money/something material if I let them record my sexual imagery	2	8.7
They told me they would go out with me if I let them record my sexual imagery	0	0

Table 16

<i>Circumstances Where Victims/Survivors Did Not Consent to the Person Taking the Imagery</i>		
Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 29
I was asleep	3	10.34
I did not know they were taking a picture/video at the time	23	79.31
I was unconscious/passed out from intoxication	4	13.79
I told them no, but they took the picture/video anyways	9	31.03
I thought they were joking around	7	24.14
I agreed, but I felt pressured	5	17.24

Responses to: ‘I took the imagery myself’. Victims/survivors who reported to having originally taken the (later non-consensually shared) imagery themselves were asked about their reason around the self-capturing: 89.54% ($n=137$) reported they took the imagery to consensually share with one other person; 28.10% ($n=43$) reported to feeling pressured by someone else to take the imagery; and 7.19% ($n=11$) reported to having taken the imagery to consensually share with more than one person. Table 17 presents the relation descriptors of the individuals the victim/survivor consensually took the sexual imagery to share with, as well as the individual who imposed pressures to self-capture imagery. Table 18 presents the forums where the self-captured sexual imagery was shared with more than one person on.

Table 17*Person the Sexual Imagery was Self-Captured For*

Option ^a	Consensual intended recipient of sexual imagery		Individual who pressured the victim/survivor to take the imagery	
	<i>n</i>	% of 137	<i>n</i>	% of 43
A past long-term romantic partner	28	20.44	9	20.93
A past short-term romantic partner	26	18.98	9	20.93
A person I used to date casually	14	10.22	7	16.28
A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)	21	15.33	6	13.95
A current long-term romantic partner	9	6.57	1	2.33
A current short-term romantic partner	1	0.73	0	0
A person I am dating casually	1	0.73	0	0
A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)	2	1.46	1	2.33
A past friend	15	10.95	4	9.3
A current friend	4	2.92	1	2.33
An acquaintance	3	2.19	2	4.65
A friend of a friend	1	0.73	2	4.65
Someone I just met online	8	5.84	7	16.28
A co-worker/colleague	1	0.73	2	4.65
A student from school	3	2.19	2	4.65

Note. The following relationships options were removed from this table as no participants selected them as options: a family member, someone I just met in person, someone who originally offered financial/material gain, an employer, a teacher, a working professional in my life.

^a The following direction was given to participants: Note-if one person holds multiple identities in this list, please choose their primary relation to you

Table 18*Forums Self-Captured Sexual Imagery was Shared On*

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 11
On a private social media account	6	54.55
On a public social media account	0	0
On an open website	2	18.18
On a group chat with people I know	1	9.09
To multiple recipient separately*	2	18.18

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

Responses to: ‘Someone took a screen shot’. Table 19 presents the responses to the circumstances of a screen shot taken of imagery the victim/survivor did not want saved, and the majority occurred through Snapchat²⁸.

Table 19

How a Screenshot was Taken Pre-NCDII

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 132
During a video chat	15	11.36
Of a snap chat I sent, only meant to be seen momentarily	111	84.09
Using a third device*	2	1.52
Hacked account*	1	0.76
Using another application*	7	5.3

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

These results indicate most victims/survivors originally self-captured/shared the intimate imagery in some capacity prior to NCDII occurring.

How Sexual Imagery was Obtained: Reports from Sharers

All sharers were asked how they originally obtained the sexual imagery they shared, and Table 20 presents the responses to this question, with response options relatively equal.

Table 20

How the Imagery was Obtained by Sharers

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 97
I took/recorded it	23	23.71
The person in the imagery shared it with me in a private message	28	28.87
The person in the imagery shared it on a social media post on a private account (e.g. protected, only friends can see) I had access to	7	7.22
The person in the imagery shared it on a social media post on a public account (e.g. not protected, anyone can see) I had access to	22	22.68
Someone not in the imagery shared it with me	21	21.65
I found it going through the person in the imagery's phone	0	0
I found it online/on social media after someone else posted it	22	22.68

²⁸ Snapchat is an application where the sender can specify how many seconds the recipient can be privy to the image, which disappears once the set time has elapsed, and notifies the sender in the event of a ‘screen shot’.

How Sexual Imagery was Shared: Reports from Victims/Survivors

To consider the forums of how intimate imagery was shared, victims/survivors were asked how NCDII occurred, and in most cases it was through a text/private message (see Table 21). A follow-up question was asked to those who selected social media, and of the 49 victims/survivors who responded, the top selected forums were as follows: Snapchat ($n=34$, 69.39%); Instagram ($n=13$, 26.53%); Facebook ($n=7$, 14.29%); Twitter ($n=6$, 12.24%).

Table 21

How sexual imagery was shared without consent.

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 265
Shared on a website	19	7.17
Shared on social media	52	19.62
Shared through a text or private message	182	68.68
Shared through an e-mail	2	0.75
Participants who selected multiple forums*	52	19.62
Unclear response*	1	0.38
Unsure how/where*	8	3.02
Using a stolen phone*	5	1.89
Showed others in person*	59	22.26

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

How Sexual Imagery was Shared: Reports from Sharers

Sharers were also asked how they shared sexual imagery, and my research finds sharers primarily distribute through text/private messages, and to multiple recipients. Sharers were asked how they originally shared the sexual imagery being reflected upon, with responses outlined in Table 22. Of the sharers who reported they shared the sexual imagery on social media, Snapchat was selected by 53.33% ($n=8$), and Instagram by 26.67% ($n=4$).

To gauge the degree of potential distribution sharers were then asked, ‘Do you know whether the person(s) who saw/received the sexual imagery shared it with others?’, and 90

participants responded to this question: 30% ($n=27$) indicated ‘yes,’ 43.44% ($n=39$) reported ‘no,’ and 26.67% ($n=24$) responded with ‘unsure.’

Table 22

Sharer accounts of how imagery was distributed

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 92
Shared on social media	17	18.48
Text/private message	74	80.43
E-mail	3	3.26
Posted on a website	1	1.09
Accidentally*	1	1.09
In person*	3	3.26

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

How Sexual Imagery was Shared: Reports from Recipients

Recipients were asked how sexual imagery was shared with them, and similar to sharer reports, the most common means is via text/private message. Table 23 presents the responses.

Table 23

How Sexual Imagery was Shared with Recipients

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 410
Text/private message	257	62.68
Mass text/mass message	71	17.32
Social media post	89	21.71
Website	22	5.37
In person	36	8.78
Airdrop, icloud, etc.*	2	0.49
Unclear response*	7	1.71

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

These findings suggest text messages are the primary mode of imagery distribution. The next sections discuss the relational dynamics between screened groups.

Who Shared the Sexual Imagery: Reports from Victims/Survivors

For relational dynamics between individuals when NCDII occurs, my research finds overall past romantic/dating relations are the primary sharers of NCDII content, followed by friends. Victims/survivors were asked if they knew who originally shared their sexual imagery

without their consent. Of the total 267 victims/survivors who responded to this question, 25.74% ($n=68$) noted they had suspicions, 64.42% ($n=172$) indicated they knew who shared their imagery, 5.62% ($n=15$) did not know, and 4.49% ($n=12$) selected ‘prefer not to say.’ Of those victims/survivors who identified having suspicions of, or who knew who shared their sexual imagery, they were asked to describe who this person was, with responses presented in Table 24.

Table 24

Sharer relations to victims/survivors

Option ^a	Sharer Relation to Victim/Survivor		Suspected Sharer Relation to Victim/Survivor	
	<i>n</i>	% of 172	<i>n</i>	% of 68
A past long-term romantic partner	50	29.07	17	25
A past short-term romantic partner	36	20.93	12	17.65
A person I used to date casually	21	12.21	11	16.18
A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)	27	15.7	9	13.24
A current long-term romantic partner	4	2.33	0	0
A past friend	30	17.44	14	20.59
A current friend	5	2.91	2	2.94
An acquaintance	11	6.4	2	2.94
A friend of a friend	9	5.23	4	5.88
Someone I just met online	4	2.33	11	16.18
Someone I just met in person	1	0.58	1	1.47
Someone who originally offered financial / material gain in exchange for the imagery	1	0.58	1	1.47
A co-worker/colleague	3	1.74	1	1.47
An employer	1	0.58	1	1.47
A student from school	11	6.4	5	7.35
A family member	1	0.58	1	1.47
Unclear* ^b	1	0.58	0	0
Someone who pressured me to share*	1	0.58	0	0
A customer of a workplace*	1	0.58	0	0
A hacker*	0	0	1	1.47

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

^a The following direction was given to participants: ‘If you are describing a single person, please select one option which best describes their primary relation to you.’

^b The ‘unclear’ variable comes from the following response provided by a participant: “an asshole who I wish never existed” (Female, age 22, Southeast Asian). While the relationship dynamics are unclear, the information the participant shared demonstrates the prospective emotional dimensions of NCDII by the unwillingness to classify her perpetrator as anything other than the words she opted to select.

In addition, victims/survivors who confirmed knowledge of, or suspicions of who shared were asked if they knew if more than one person did so, and 13.75% ($n=33$) confirmed they did, 33.75% ($n=81$) did not, and 52.50% ($n=126$) were unsure.

Who is Depicted in the Shared Sexual Imagery: Reports from Sharers

Sharers were asked about the nature of their relationship with the person depicted in the shared sexual imagery, and this research suggests most reported relations were *an acquaintance* (20.21%, or $n=19$), *a past long-term romantic partner* (12.77%, or $n=12$) and *a past friend* (12.77%, or $n=12$), though readers are encouraged to examine Table 25 as the findings present a vast array of relationship dynamics.

Table 25

Subject in Imagery's Relation to the Sharer

Option ^a	<i>n</i>	% of 94
A past long-term romantic partner	12	12.77
A past short-term romantic partner	7	7.45
A person I used to date casually	5	5.32
A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)	9	9.57
A current long-term romantic partner	10	10.64
A current short-term romantic partner	2	2.13
A person I am dating casually	2	2.13
A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)	3	3.19
A past friend	12	12.77
A current friend	6	6.38
An acquaintance	19	20.21
A friend of a friend	10	10.64
Someone I just met online	8	8.51
Someone I just met in person	1	1.06
A student from school	8	8.51
A family member	1	1.06
Stranger*	5	5.32
Pornstar, celebrity, famous person, etc.* ^b	8	8.51
Multiple responses selected*	20	21.28

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

^a Participants were provided the following direction: If describing a single individual, please select their primary relation to you when answering this question.

^b While consensually produced pornography was explicitly excluded in the definition of 'sexual imagery,' a notion made regularly apparent to participants through an operational definition text box, I opted not to remove those individuals who reported the shared imagery was pornography, based on the unknown whether the pornography being described was consensually produced and/or knowingly made available.

^c The following relationship options were removed from this table for presentation purposes as no participants selected them as options: a co-worker/colleague, an employer, a teacher, and a working professional in my life.

Who was Depicted in the Sexual Imagery: Reports from Recipients

Recipients were asked if they personally knew the victim/survivor in the sexual imagery ($n=406$): 49.26% ($n=200$) said yes, 43.60% ($n=177$) said no, and 7.14% ($n=29$) were unsure. For the recipients who said they did know the victim/survivor depicted, they were asked who their relation was to this person, with responses presented in Table 26.

Table 26

Victim/Survivor Relation to Recipients of NCDII

Option(s) ^a	<i>n</i>	% of 195
A past long-term romantic partner	6	3.08
A past short-term romantic partner	3	1.54
A person I used to date casually	3	1.54
A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)	1	0.51
A current long-term romantic partner	1	0.51
A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)	1	0.51
A past friend	42	21.54
A current friend	28	14.36
An acquaintance	61	31.28
A friend of a friend	34	17.44
Someone I just met online	3	1.54
Someone I just met in person	3	1.54
A co-worker/colleague	4	2.05
A student from school	45	23.08
A family member	1	0.51
Multiple responses selected*	35	17.95
Famous person*	1	0.51
Partner of an ex*	2	1.03
A friend's partner/ex*	5	2.56

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

^a Participants were provided with the following direction: 'If referring to one individual, please select one response which best describes their relation to you.'

^b The following relationship response options were removed from this table for presentation purposes as no participants selected them as options: a current short-term romantic partner, a person I am casually dating, an employer, a teacher, and a working professional in my life.

Who Sexual Imagery is Shared With: Reports from Sharers

This research also suggests sharers of sexual imagery primarily share to their friends and own relations, though imagery is also sent to relations to the person in the imagery. Sharers who indicated they shared via text/private message were asked who the directed recipient was, with responses presented in Table 27.

Table 27

Person(s) Sharers Distributed Sexual Imagery to Via Text/Private Message

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 69
Long-term current romantic partner of mine	22	31.88
Short-term current romantic partner of mine	3	4.35
Someone I am casually seeing	7	10.14
A current sexual partner of mine (no committed relationship)	5	7.25
Someone I was casually seeing	3	4.35
Current romantic partner of the person in the imagery	13	18.84
Someone the person in the imagery was casually seeing	5	7.25
A current sexual partner of the person in the imagery	3	4.35
An ex-romantic partner of the person in the imagery	2	2.9
A past sexual partner of the person in the imagery	2	2.9
A friend of mine	49	71.01
A friend of the person in the imagery	7	10.14
A group of friends	10	14.49
An acquaintance	1	1.45
A group of acquaintances	2	2.9
A family member of mine	3	4.35
A family member of the person in the imagery	1	1.45
Someone I just met online	3	4.35
Someone I just met in person	2	2.9

Note. The following relationship options were removed from this table as no participants selected them as options: a long-term ex-romantic partner of mine, a short-term ex-romantic partner of mine, a past sexual partner of mine, an employer of mine, a teacher of mine, a working professional of mine, an employer of the person in the imagery, a teacher of the person in the imagery, a working professional of the person in the imagery, and someone offering financial/material gain in exchange for the imagery.

Who Shared the NCDII Material: Reports from Recipients

Recipients were asked who shared the sexual imagery with them, and friends of varied capacities were the most selected responses (see Table 28 for additional selected relations).

Table 28
Sharer Relation to Recipient of NCDII

Option(s) ^a	<i>n</i>	% of 408
A past long-term romantic partner	19	4.66
A past short-term romantic partner	14	3.43
A person I used to date casually	12	2.94
A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)	13	3.19
A current long-term romantic partner	4	0.98
A current short-term romantic partner	1	0.25
A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)	6	1.47
A past friend	125	30.64
A current friend	115	28.19
An acquaintance	44	10.78
A friend of a friend	41	10.05
Someone I just met online	43	10.54
Someone I just met in person	3	0.74
A co-worker/colleague	6	1.47
An employer	0	0
A student from school	51	12.5
A family member	3	0.74
Multiple responses selected*	85	20.83
Stranger/random account*	32	7.84
Someone offering financial gain*	1	0.25
Unclear response*	3	0.74

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

^a Participants were provided with the following direction: ‘If referring to one individual, please select one response which best describes their relation to you.’

^b The following relationship options were removed from this table for presentation purposes as no participants selected them as responses: a person I am dating casually, someone who I provided financial/material gain in exchange for the image, a teacher, and a working professional in my life.

This research demonstrates NCDII/imagery sharing occurs through primarily known relational groups, with (likely) chains of distribution, findings unpacked further in the discussion.

The next section transitions to motivations to share intimate imagery.

Section Four

This section responds to part of my second research question, which seeks to understand the contextual circumstances of NCDII/imagery sharing through motivations. Presented in this section are the motivations for sharing intimate imagery from the perspective of the sharer, and the perceived motives from the viewpoint of the victim/survivor. The section presents information to provide an overview of how common NCDII is within the varied forms it takes (i.e. relationship retribution; sextortion; sexual voyeurism; sexploitation; sexual assault; and social reward) to better understand why individuals engage in intimate imagery distribution.

To preface this section, by presenting motivation-related information from various perspectives is not telling both sides of a single story. Rather, it is to provide nuance to the range of potential reasons why individuals engage in intimate imagery sharing of others.

Motives for Sharing

Sharers who responded to the questions in this section were originally asked if they have shared sexual imagery of another person, though as a reminder, the non-consensual nature was purposefully omitted. Sharer perceived levels of consent to distribute are presented in this section to determine how many incidents are likely NCDII; however, exact rates should be interpreted cautiously out of recognition participants did not explicitly self-identify as having engaged in NCDII.

Reasons for Sharing Sexual Imagery: Reports from Sharers

Sharers were asked what their reason was for sharing sexual imagery of someone else, and the primary reasons were related to those which are best categorized within the ‘social reward’ typology, as the two top selected responses were, ‘I thought it was amusing’ and ‘I

thought others would want to see it' (both 36.36%, $n=32$). Table 29 contains the selections and response options provided in the survey.

Table 29

Reason Sharers Distributed Imagery

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 88
I was also in the imagery	11	12.5
I thought others would want to see it	32	36.36
I was mad at the person in the imagery	1	1.14
I wanted to make the person in the imagery look/feel bad	2	2.27
I wanted to make the person in the imagery look/feel good	10	11.36
I wanted revenge on the person in the imagery	1	1.14
I wanted to make someone else jealous	1	1.14
My friends encouraged me to share it	18	20.45
Someone made me do it	2	2.27
I wanted to make myself look good	9	10.23
For money for the person in the imagery	1	1.14
I thought it was amusing	32	36.36
Assumed thoughts of the individual in the imagery/it was already available*	4	4.55
To inform parents as person in imagery was underage*	1	1.14
Unclear reason*	3	3.41

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

As these findings depict, other typologies are less common. For instance, related to 'relationship retribution,' motivations to inflict harm on victim/survivors were only identified by 5 participants (5.68%). While these questions did not explicitly request information from participants to encourage admission of other crimes (as would be required to ascertain prevalence of NCDII through sexual assault, voyeurism, sexexploitation, and sextortion) (Powell & Henry, 2017), from the responses presented, social reward/individual benefits were the primary motivators for engaging in imagery sharing.

There were sharers who provided context through text in addition to having selected a response, some of which are included to provide nuance to the varying rationales for sharing.

Related to the *I thought others would want to see it* response, additional quotes are:

-I share everything with my best friend (Male, age 23, Black)

-The image was shared on Instagram publicly, and was only shared with people that knew the individual personally. THE private areas were covered and difficult to see, if not impossible to see. (Female, age 23, White)

The new variable, being *assumed thoughts of the individual in the imagery/it was already available* was created from some of the below quotes:

-It was a public porn star. I don't know them, they don't know me. (Male, age 31, South Asian)

-It was posted on her public nude page (Female, age 22, Southeast Asian)

-The person wanted it to be shared... The person already shared it on her accounts both Instagram and twitter and it was a public account. (Female, age 19, Black)

A response provided, "just flexin" (Male, age 20, White), was placed within the *I wanted to make myself look good* category, as the term 'flex' is modern slang for showing off (Urban Dictionary, 2021).

As the responses in Table 29 and additional comments depict, the reasons for sharing intimate imagery of another person can be vast, information which is supplemented by sharer perceptions of consent.

Perceived Levels of Consent: Reports from Sharers

All sharers were asked whether the person in the sexual imagery agreed to it being shared to determine which instances could be classified as NCDII, and this research indicates most sharers within my research engaged in intimate imagery sharing without the affirmative, willing, and clear consent of the individual depicted. Only 22 sharing participants (25.29%) selected the response option which suggests the sharing was for reasons potentially outside of NCDII: *They*

told me I could share it the first time I asked,' so most participants likely comprised of NCDII sharers. Table 30 presents the responses to sharer's perceived levels of victim/survivor consent.

Table 30

Sharer perceived levels of person in imagery's consent

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 87
They told me I could share it the first time I asked	22	25.29
They told me I could share it, but I had to ask multiple times	2	2.3
They didn't tell me I wasn't supposed to share it	23	26.44
We recorded the imagery together and I was okay with sharing it so I think they were too	3	3.45
I thought they wanted me to share it, and I was right	2	2.3
I know they did not want the imagery shared with others	6	6.9
I do not think they would have wanted the imagery shared with others	29	33.33
Unclear consent circumstances*	6	6.9
Consent assumed based on where originally posted(e.g. porn, public figure, public post, famous person, etc.)*	9	10.34

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

^a The following response options were removed from this table for presentation purposes as no participants selected them as options: They seemed upset after I shared it, but they did not say or do anything about it, I thought they wanted me to share it, but I was wrong, and they did not say no, but they stopped talking to me after I shared it making me think they did not agree to it being shared.

The created variable *consent assumed based on where the imagery was originally posted* includes some of the following quotes, where it is apparent the sharers presumed as the imagery was self-captured and/or self-shared, it was appropriate to be distributed further:

-They shared it on their facebook. So I screen shot and gossiped about it with others. (Female, age 34, Indigenous)

-It was posted publicly on Tiktok by the individual. I am making the assumption that the individual posted it as it was on her page and was not removed and she was the one in the other videos on that particular page.(Female, 28, Indigenous)

The *unclear consent circumstances* variable was created by some of the following quotations, where sharers indicated information which could not be placed into existing categories, though demonstrated potential NCDII was occurring:

-They do not know I shared it. (Female, age 24, White)

-It was already being shared by everyone in the school. (Female, age 18, Middle Eastern)

Related to the response option, *I don't think they would have wanted it shared*, one participant offered the following comment in addition to their selection: "But it didn't have their face in it. The nude shared of me had my face in it." (Female, age 21, Black).

To gather further data on sharer motivations, victims/survivors were asked to consider why they think their imagery was shared without their consent.

Perceived, Known, and/or Suspected Sharer Motives: Reports from Victims/Survivors

Victims/survivors (236 total) were asked if they knew, or suspect, why someone shared their sexual imagery without their consent, and as presented in Table 31, most responses were sharer self-serving, and would be best placed within the social reward typology, followed by those applicable to relationship retribution.

To provide voice to those victims/survivors who offered open-ended responses, some will be presented to offer nuance to the reported frequencies in Table 31. To add to the *as a threat/after a threat* response option, two participants specified their experiences:

-Blackmail into continuing to talk to this man. (Female, age 19, White).

-They wanted me to send additional naked photos or else they would create an Instagram with it and add all my friends and family. I of course declined so they did. (Female, age 23, White).

Having selected the *to show me off* option, additional comments included:

-for approval from their friends. (Non-binary, age 31, White)

-To show me off to others so others would think i was "easy". (Female, age 24, White)

Table 31*Victim/Survivor Perspectives of Sharer Motives*

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 263
After an argument	22	8.37
After a break-up	49	18.63
To show themselves off to their friends	165	62.74
For money/material gain for themselves	8	3.04
To hurt me	53	20.15
As a threat / after a threat	34	12.93
To make me do something for them	25	9.51
To make others think less of me	64	24.33
To show me off	84	31.94
To help me build my confidence	6	2.28
To help me make money	2	0.76
Unsure*	6	2.28
Pressure from others to share*	1	0.38
For personal sexual pleasure*	2	0.76
Explicit sexual offender motives*	4	1.52
Unclear response*	2	0.76
To hurt someone else*	1	0.38
For humour*	2	0.76

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

Another participant selected *to show me off*, in addition to, *to show themselves off to their friends* and added: “I think they just wanted wank material and were proud that they had received a nude” (Non-binary, age 21, White). In addition to having selected *To show themselves off to their friends*, some additional comments include:

- To flaunt having a folder of sexual images. (Non-binary, age 19, Indigenous)
- To look/seem cool because they stole a girls phone and sent her and her friends nudes to themselves and then all their buddies. (Female, age 23, White)
- They all thought it was funny. (Female, age 27, White)

Alongside the *to make others think less of me* response option, two participants provided the following for additional context:

-Guy I used to sext with a couple years ago decided to randomly share a picture of me with my current long-term boyfriend, telling him that the picture was recent and that I had cheated on him with this guy.

(Female, age 21, White)

-He showed it to my current boyfriends friend to make them both think less of me. (Non-binary, age 22, White).

The unfortunately created new variable, *explicit sexual offender motives* was derived from the following comments offered by participants:

-I was a victim of child pornography. They shared for their own gain. (Female, age 19, White)

-They were an abuser. (Female, age 31, Mixed ancestry)

-They wished to prove I was gay, even though the encounter had not been consensual. Past friend assumed I was "in the closet." (Female, age 22, Hispanic)

-To provide to other sex offenders most likely. (Female, age 29, White)

Placed in the *unclear response* category were the following comments, both of which are important despite the unknown motivations the described sharers may have had, as they offer insight on prospective themes to consider in the context of NCDII, one being feelings of self-blame, and the next being feeling this form of abuse is to be expected and/or commonplace:

-It was a funny mistake I made, I've learned to be okay with it as long as it stayed within my close friend group. (Male, age 20, Southeast Asian)

-Just because they had the image. (Female, age 20, Indigenous)

One participant selected a number of potential sharer motives, and also added, "To mentally degrade me," (Female, age 22, Southeast Asian) a comment which offers descriptive insight on the degree of harm NCDII can create.

As these findings demonstrate, motivations to share sexual content are vast, though primarily self-serving for social reward. My research findings transition section five, which presents the outcomes experienced by those with NCDII/imagery sharing experience.

Section Five

This section reviews responses to my third research question, which seeks, in part, to understand levels of victim/survivor isolation, non-disclosure of the NCDII incidents, and any levels of victim-blame/shame, or positive support, experienced by those who chose to tell others about their experience. In addition, this section also presents information on which primary relations are told when victims/survivors do tell others.

Victim/Survivor Disclosure of Experience, and Responses to Disclosure

Disclosure of NCDII Experience: Reports from Victims/Survivors

All victims/survivors were asked if they told anyone about having experienced NCDII, and of the 261 responses, this research found just over half did not (50.19%, or $n=131$), while 49.81% ($n=130$) did.

Victims/Survivors Who Told Someone About NCDII. Of the victims/survivors who chose to tell someone else about their experience, they were asked who they told, and this research finds most confided in a friend ($n=116$, or 89.92%). Table 32 presents the relationship options selected by victims/survivors in response to this question.

For the victims/survivors who told someone else about NCDII, they were asked to identify how they felt, and what they experienced, after telling this individual (i.e. the relation identified within this survey). For presentation purposes, only relations where over ten participants selected, and identified associated outcomes, are included in this thesis.²⁹ The reported outcomes experienced are presented in the following tables: Friend: Table 33, Sibling: Table 34, Parent/Guardian/Caregiver: Table 35, Mental Health Professional: Table 36, and Police: Table 37; however, findings are briefly summarized in the paragraphs to follow.

²⁹ Responses for other selected relations can be made available upon request.

Table 32*Who Victims/Survivors Disclosed their NCDII Experience To*

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 129
Friend	116	89.92
Sibling	19	14.73
Parent/guardian/caregiver	15	11.63
Other family member (state) * <i>cousin</i>	1	0.78
Other trusted adult (state) * <i>friend's mom and dad</i>	1	0.78
Acquaintance	1	0.78
Stranger	1	0.78
Support group	3	2.33
Teacher/Instructor/Professor	7	5.43
School counsellor	8	6.2
Mental health professional (eg psychologist, psychiatrist, counsellor, etc)	15	11.63
Employer	2	1.55
Police	12	9.3
Lawyer	3	2.33
Romantic partner*	9	6.98

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

Of the victims/survivors who disclosed their experiences to a friend, and responded accordingly ($n=115$), most outcomes present as overall positive and supportive. For instance, 70.43% ($n=81$) felt listened to, and 64.35% ($n=74$) were reassured the NCDII was not their fault. Similar trends were observed for those who reported their experience to a sibling ($n=19$). Of the victims/survivors who shared outcomes ($n=14$) after telling a parent/guardian/caregiver, there was more variance in reported experiences. For instance, while 10 of 14 participants reported to having felt listened to, 7 of the 14 reported disclosing their story made them feel worse, and 5 of the 14 participants (35.71%) reported they were blamed for the imagery being shared.

For the victims/survivors who reported having told a mental health professional ($n=15$), most reported to having felt listened to and taken seriously (both 80%, $n=12$); however, a problematic observation is the notion 4 of 15 participants (26.67%) felt blamed, with some even

regretting disclosing after doing so (13.33%, or $n=2$). One comment provided within this section supplements these troubling numbers: “I went directly to a guidance counsellor (male) who told me “You shouldn’t have sent that, it’s your fault” and didn’t help me press charges” (Female, age 24, White). Experiences such as this depict the ways in which victims/survivors can be repeatedly abused by sharers and their communities when NCDII occurs.

Of the small number of victims/survivors who told police about NCDII ($n=12$, or 9.3%), overall the findings are not particularly positive: 6 participants (50%) reported to feeling they were not taken seriously, and the same number reported disclosing made them feel worse than they did prior to disclosing; 7 participants (58.33%) were not offered counselling resources following their disclosure, and 4 participants (33.33%) reported they were threatened by someone for having disclosed their experience. Only 5 participants (41.67%) reported disclosing to police improved their overall situation, though 6 participants (50%) indicated they received help with the removal of the imagery.

Table 33*Outcomes after Victims/Survivors Told a Friend about their NCDII Experience*

Option(s)	Friend	
	<i>n</i>	% of 115
I felt listened to	81	70.43
I did not feel listened to	5	4.35
I felt like I was taken seriously	59	51.3
I did not feel taken seriously	15	13.04
I was reassured having my imagery shared was not my fault	74	64.35
I was blamed for my sexual imagery being shared	11	9.57
Disclosing my story made me feel better than I did before I told	75	65.22
Disclosing my story made me feel worse than I did before I told	16	13.91
I was thankful I told after I did	59	51.3
I regretted telling after I did	9	7.83
I was offered counselling, which I accepted	6	5.22
I was offered counselling, which I declined	3	2.61
I was not offered counselling	40	34.78
I was threatened by someone for having told my story	4	3.48
I was able to get financial compensation after I told my story	1	0.87
I received help in the removal of the sexual imagery	28	24.35
I did not receive help in the removal of the sexual imagery	45	39.13
The person told someone else who was able to help	13	11.3
The person told someone else and it did not help	10	8.7
The person told someone else and it made my situation worse	7	6.09
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery better	5	4.35
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery worse	29	25.22
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told better	32	27.83
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told worse	7	6.09
Disclosing my story made no difference to my relationship with the person I told	66	57.39
Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation better	54	46.96
Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation worse	4	3.48
Looking back, disclosing my story made no difference to my situation	65	56.52

Table 34*Outcomes after Victims/Survivors Told a Sibling about their NCDII Experience*

Option(s)	Sibling	
	<i>n</i>	% of 19
I felt listened to	16	84.21
I did not feel listened to	0	0
I felt like I was taken seriously	9	47.37
I did not feel taken seriously	3	15.79
I was reassured having my imagery shared was not my fault	10	52.63
I was blamed for my sexual imagery being shared	1	5.26
Disclosing my story made me feel better than I did before I told	12	63.16
Disclosing my story made me feel worse than I did before I told	1	5.26
I was thankful I told after I did	10	52.63
I regretted telling after I did	2	10.53
I was offered counselling, which I accepted	2	10.53
I was offered counselling, which I declined	0	0
I was not offered counselling	5	26.32
I was threatened by someone for having told my story	0	0
I was able to get financial compensation after I told my story	0	0
I received help in the removal of the sexual imagery	5	26.32
I did not receive help in the removal of the sexual imagery	6	31.58
The person told someone else who was able to help	1	5.26
The person told someone else and it did not help	1	5.26
The person told someone else and it made my situation worse	2	10.53
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery better	1	5.26
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery worse	2	10.53
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told better	6	31.58
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told worse	1	5.26
Disclosing my story made no difference to my relationship with the person I told	12	63.16
Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation better	11	57.89
Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation worse	1	5.26
Looking back, disclosing my story made no difference to my situation	8	42.11

Table 35

Outcomes after Victims/Survivors Told a Parent/Guardian/Caregiver about their NCDII Experience

Option(s)	Parent/Guardian/Caregiver	
	<i>n</i>	% of 14
I felt listened to	10	71.43
I did not feel listened to	4	28.57
I felt like I was taken seriously	6	42.86
I did not feel taken seriously	2	14.29
I was reassured having my imagery shared was not my fault	6	42.86
I was blamed for my sexual imagery being shared	5	35.71
Disclosing my story made me feel better than I did before I told	5	35.71
Disclosing my story made me feel worse than I did before I told	7	50
I was thankful I told after I did	5	35.71
I regretted telling after I did	5	35.71
I was offered counselling, which I accepted	3	21.43
I was offered counselling, which I declined	1	7.14
I was not offered counselling	4	28.57
I was threatened by someone for having told my story	1	7.14
I was able to get financial compensation after I told my story	0	0
I received help in the removal of the sexual imagery	8	57.14
I did not receive help in the removal of the sexual imagery	4	28.57
The person told someone else who was able to help	2	14.29
The person told someone else and it did not help	0	0
The person told someone else and it made my situation worse	1	7.14
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery better	0	0
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery worse	4	28.57
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told better	2	14.29
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told worse	3	21.43
Disclosing my story made no difference to my relationship with the person I told	8	57.14
Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation better	8	57.14
Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation worse	2	14.29
Looking back, disclosing my story made no difference to my situation	5	35.71

Table 36

Outcomes after Victims/Survivors Told a Mental Health Professional about their NCDII Experience

Option(s)	Mental Health Professional	
	<i>n</i>	% of 15
I felt listened to	12	80
I did not feel listened to	2	13.33
I felt like I was taken seriously	12	80
I did not feel taken seriously	1	6.67
I was reassured having my imagery shared was not my fault	10	66.67
I was blamed for my sexual imagery being shared	4	26.67
Disclosing my story made me feel better than I did before I told	9	60
Disclosing my story made me feel worse than I did before I told	3	20
I was thankful I told after I did	9	60
I regretted telling after I did	2	13.33
I was offered counselling, which I accepted	9	60
I was offered counselling, which I declined	1	6.67
I was not offered counselling	1	6.67
I was threatened by someone for having told my story	0	0
I was able to get financial compensation after I told my story	0	0
I received help in the removal of the sexual imagery	6	40
I did not receive help in the removal of the sexual imagery	7	46.67
The person told someone else who was able to help	2	13.33
The person told someone else and it did not help	1	6.67
The person told someone else and it made my situation worse	1	6.67
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery better	1	6.67
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery worse	5	33.33
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told better	6	40
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told worse	1	6.67
Disclosing my story made no difference to my relationship with the person I told	8	53.33
Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation better	7	46.67
Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation worse	2	13.33
Looking back, disclosing my story made no difference to my situation	7	46.67

Table 37
Outcomes after Victims/Survivors Told the Police about their NCDII Experience

Option(s)	Police	
	<i>n</i>	% of 12
I felt listened to	6	50
I did not feel listened to	3	25
I felt like I was taken seriously	6	50
I did not feel taken seriously	6	50
I was reassured having my imagery shared was not my fault	3	25
I was blamed for my sexual imagery being shared	3	25
Disclosing my story made me feel better than I did before I told	3	25
Disclosing my story made me feel worse than I did before I told	6	50
I was thankful I told after I did	6	50
I regretted telling after I did	2	16.67
I was offered counselling, which I accepted	2	16.67
I was offered counselling, which I declined	2	16.67
I was not offered counselling	7	58.33
I was threatened by someone for having told my story	4	33.33
I was able to get financial compensation after I told my story	0	0
I received help in the removal of the sexual imagery	6	50
I did not receive help in the removal of the sexual imagery	5	41.67
The person told someone else who was able to help	0	0
The person told someone else and it did not help	2	16.67
The person told someone else and it made my situation worse	0	0
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery better	0	0
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery worse	6	50
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told better	0	0
Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told worse	2	16.67
Disclosing my story made no difference to my relationship with the person I told	8	66.67
Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation better	5	41.67
Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation worse	3	25
Looking back, disclosing my story made no difference to my situation	4	33.33

Non-Disclosure of NCDII Experience: Reports from Victims/Survivors

Of the victims/survivors who did not tell anyone about NCDII, they were asked why they chose not to tell, and this research suggests perceived feelings of judgement were prominent. Reasons for not telling are presented in Table 38. It is important to note, I purposefully opted against including a shame-based response in the survey as I did not want participants to potentially question if they should feel ashamed, so this theme was added after reviewing the data as it was offered/mentioned by participants themselves.

Table 38

Why Victims/Survivors Chose Not to Tell Anyone about the NCDII Experience

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 129
I did not want more people to know	87	67.44
I did not want to feel judged	78	60.47
I did not want to make the sharer look bad	18	13.95
I do not like talking about my personal matters	44	34.11
I did not think it would make any difference	74	57.36
I thought I would get in trouble	35	27.13
I did not want to get anyone else in trouble	14	10.85
I do not like authority figures	19	14.73
The person who shared my sexual imagery does not live in the same city/town as me	16	12.4
I was not bothered enough by the sharing to tell anyone about it	31	24.03
I would rather not say	5	3.88
Embarrassment/shame*	3	2.33
Faith based reasons*	2	1.55
The matter had already been resolved*	2	1.55

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

Some participants offered written information in addition to pre-identified reasons for not disclosing, so I interpreted their extra input as purposeful and I opted to include their verbatim responses. The following quotations came directly from participants who added extra input:

-I didn't know this was a crime to share someone else photo at 14 years old. (Female, age 25, Indigenous)

-I didn't want to cause drama.(Female, age 20, White)

-I just wanted to put this chapter behind me, and knew that my parents will judge me for taking the photos in the first place, so no point talking to them, just told them we broke up because my ex was cheating on me (which by the way he was too). (Female, age 31, White)

-I was always told never to share photos. Even though I was pressured into sending these photos, I thought I would get into more trouble than he would if I asked my parents for help. (Non-Binary, age 21, White)

-I wasn't really sure why I would nobody cares if it's a dude they would just say man up or something. but they do everything they can if it's a girl. (Male, age 18, Mixed ancestry)

-My parents always told me not to share pictures like that. They would shame me for sharing those pictures. (Non-Binary, age 21, White)

-People don't take sharing seriously especially if you aren't under 18 anymore. According to the cops. (Female, age 21, Mixed ancestry)

Overall, these comments depict the somber realities victims/survivors of NCDII must navigate, both individually and socially.

Digital Platform Requests: Reports from Victims/Survivors

Victims/survivors were also asked if they requested support from a digital platform to try to get the imagery removed ($n=261$), and most participants (91.34%, or $n=241$) indicated they did not. Some comments were provided in response to this question, and while they were able to be categorized into the 'no' response, they indicated the victim/survivors had no one to contact based on the forum it was shared on (i.e. through text or saved to a phone's camera).

Of the victims/survivors who did opt to contact providers ($n=19$, or 7.28%), 11 (57.89%) had the imagery removed by the provider, 4 (21.05%) reported they were unsure if the imagery was removed, 3 (15.79%) reported partly, and 1 (5.26%) indicated no. Few participants ($n=2$, or 0.77%) contacted Cybertips and/or another similar external resource, though both who did indicated the forum was helpful in partly removing the imagery from where it was shared.

This thesis transitions to section six, which presents consequences/outcomes of NCDII.

Section Six

This section responds to the remainder of my third research question, which asked about sharer consequences, victim/survivor harms, and recipient feelings about receiving NCDII material.

Outcomes/Consequences Experienced by those Directly Subject to NCDII

This section begins by exploring the various life areas impacted by victims/survivors after having intimate imagery shared without their consent, followed by reports from sharers, and the reported feelings from recipients. This section ends by exploring the consequences experienced by individuals who share intimate imagery of others, from both perspectives of the sharers and victims/survivors. As sharers were not explicitly asked if the imagery sharing was non-consensual, NCDII cannot be assumed when sections report sharer-derived results.

Life Areas Impacted: Reports from Victims/Survivors

Victims/survivors were asked how areas of individual wellness, and social relationships were impacted post NCDII.

Areas of Wellness. All victims/survivors were asked how areas of their wellness (physical, sexual, emotional, spiritual, mental health, intellectual wellness, employment, financial and education, areas inspired in part by McGlynn & Rackley, 2017) were impacted

after having sexual imagery shared without their consent. They were asked to rate their experience on a scale of 1-5 (1 being very negative, 5 being very positive), and to describe how said longstanding impacts lasted. The main points are summarized within this section, and the full results are presented in Table 39.

Very few victims/survivors identified positive outcomes following NCDII. Many participants indicated 'no impact' resulting from their imagery being shared, and the following life areas had over half of victims/survivors select this: 52.55% ($n=134$) had no impact on their physical health, 62.85% ($n=159$) on their spiritual wellness, 67.19% ($n=170$) on their intellectual wellness, 92.46% ($n=233$) on employment, and 96.02% ($n=241$) on financial. Of the victims/survivors who identified experiencing negative impacts (both very and some negative impacts), the most frequently selected areas of wellness were: mental health 77.07% ($n=195$); emotional wellness 84.59% ($n=214$); and 58.27% ($n=148$) sexual wellness. Of the victims/survivors who identified having very negative impacts in any of the life areas, all 9 areas of wellness were frequently reported as being impacted in the long term (over six months).

Table 39
Victim/Survivor Impacted Areas of Wellness and Length of Experience^a

Option(s)	Physical Health		Sexual wellness		Emotional Wellness		Spiritual Wellness		Mental Health		Intellectual Wellness		Employment		Financial		Education	
	<i>n</i>	% of 255	<i>n</i>	% of 254	<i>n</i>	% of 253	<i>n</i>	% of 253	<i>n</i>	% of 253	<i>n</i>	% of 253	<i>n</i>	% of 252	<i>n</i>	% of 251	<i>n</i>	% of 252
Very negative impact	22	8.63	51	20.08	97	38.34	33	13.04	90	35.57	16	6.32	4	1.59	3	1.2	14	5.56
	<i>n</i>	% of 22	<i>n</i>	% of 51	<i>n</i>	% of 97	<i>n</i>	% of 33	<i>n</i>	% of 90	<i>n</i>	% of 16	<i>n</i>	% of 4	<i>n</i>	% of 3	<i>n</i>	% of 14
Immediate	2	9.09	4	7.84	11	11.34	3	9.09	9	10	2	12.5	2	50	0	0	3	21.43
Short Term	5	22.73	2	3.92	9	9.28	1	3.03	6	6.67	3	18.75	2	50	1	33.33	0	0
Intermediate	5	22.73	10	19.61	23	23.71	4	12.12	18	20	2	12.5	0	0	1	33.33	2	14.29
Long Term	10	45.45	35	68.63	54	55.67	24	72.73	57	63.33	9	56.25	0	0	1	33.33	9	64.29
Some negative impact	101	39.61	97	38.19	117	46.25	60	23.72	105	41.5	59	23.32	16	6.35	7	2.79	62	24.6
	<i>n</i>	% of 100	<i>n</i>	% of 97	<i>n</i>	% of 117	<i>n</i>	% of 60	<i>n</i>	% of 104	<i>n</i>	% of 59	<i>n</i>	% of 15	<i>n</i>	% of 7	<i>n</i>	% of 62
Immediate	27	27	16	16.49	37	31.62	11	18.33	19	18.27	10	16.95	2	13.33	1	14.29	7	11.29
Short Term	35	35	31	31.96	31	26.5	19	31.67	39	37.5	32	54.24	4	26.67	2	28.57	27	43.55
Intermediate	15	15	16	16.49	23	19.66	13	21.67	23	22.12	12	20.34	7	46.67	3	42.86	21	33.87
Long Term	23	23	34	35.05	26	22.22	17	28.33	23	22.12	5	8.47	2	13.33	1	14.29	7	11.29
No impact	134	52.55	102	40.16	37	14.62	159	62.85	59	23.32	170	67.19	233	92.46	241	96.02	117	46.43
Some positive impact	8	3.14	7	2.76	6	2.37	3	1.19	8	3.16	11	4.35	1	0.4	0	0	2	0.79
	<i>n</i>	% of 8	<i>n</i>	% of 7	<i>n</i>	% of 5	<i>n</i>	% of 3	<i>n</i>	% of 8	<i>n</i>	% of 11	<i>n</i>	% of 1	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 2
Immediate	2	25	1	14.29	2	40	0	0	0	0	2	18.18	0	0	0	0	1	50
Short Term	3	37.5	3	42.86	2	40	1	33.33	2	25	3	27.27	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate	1	12.5	1	14.29	0	0	0	0	3	37.5	2	18.18	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long Term	2	25	2	28.57	1	20	2	66.67	3	37.5	4	36.36	1	100	0	0	1	50
Very positive impact	0	0	1	0.39	2	0.79	2	0.79	1	0.4	4	1.58	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 1	<i>n</i>	% of 2	<i>n</i>	% of 2	<i>n</i>	% of 1	<i>n</i>	% of 4	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 0
Immediate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Short Term	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long Term	0	0	1	100	0	0	2	100	0	0	3	75	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note. Multiple response options for degree of impact, single response option for length of impact

^a Immediate (within the first week); Short Term (within the first month); Intermediate (within six months); Long term (over six months).

^b Original *n*=256.

Social Relationships. Victims/survivors were also asked how their social relationships were impacted following NCDII, and overall this research finds if any social relations were negatively impacted, they were with sexual (*n*=109, or 43.78%) and romantic partners (*n*=117, or 47.37%), though overall, no social impacts were reported by the majority of victim/survivors. To demonstrate, well over half of the victim/survivor sample reported no impacts with friends, family, acquaintances, work contacts, school contacts, and paid professionals. Varying levels of negative impacts on friendships are noteworthy (*n*=70, or 27.34%), as well as those with acquaintances (*n*=63, or 25.30%), and school contacts (*n*=73, or 29.67%). While not suggesting there are benefits to NCDII, a warming finding is the notion that 33 participants indicated

some/very positive impacts on their friend groups (12.89%), suggesting these individuals have kind people in their lives who helped them overcome their experience. Results are presented in Table 40 for additional reference.

Removal of the Imagery. Victims/survivors were asked if to their knowledge, the imagery was removed from where it was shared, and of the 256 responses, results are as follows: 55.86% ($n=143$) of victims/survivors were not sure; 29.69% ($n=76$) reported it was removed; 8.59% ($n=22$) indicated it was not removed; and 5.86% ($n=15$) reported some was removed.

Table 40
Victim/Survivor Social Relationship Impacts Post NCDII

Option(s)	Friends		Family		Acquaintances	
	<i>n</i>	% of 256	<i>n</i>	% of 245	<i>n</i>	% of 249
Very negative impact	18	7.03	10	4.08	10	4.02
Some negative impact	52	20.31	27	11.02	53	21.29
No impact	153	59.77	205	83.67	179	71.89
Some positive impact	28	10.94	2	0.82	4	1.61
Very positive impact	5	1.95	1	0.41	3	1.2
	Work Contacts		School contacts		Sexual Partner(s)	
	<i>n</i>	% of 242	<i>n</i>	% of 246	<i>n</i>	% of 249
Very negative impact	2	0.83	16	6.5	31	12.45
Some negative impact	11	4.55	57	23.17	78	31.33
No impact	226	93.39	165	67.07	122	49
Some positive impact	1	0.41	5	2.03	13	5.22
Very positive impact	2	0.83	3	1.22	5	2.01
	Romantic Partner(s)		Paid Professional(s)		Other *	
	<i>n</i>	% of 247	<i>n</i>	% of 241	<i>n</i>	% of 148
Very negative impact	32	12.96	3	1.24	5	3.38
Some negative impact	85	34.41	10	4.15	2	1.35
No impact	113	45.75	220	91.29	138	93.24
Some positive impact	14	5.67	7	2.9	2	1.35
Very positive impact	3	1.21	1	0.41	1	0.68

Note. 9 participants offered open-ended detail, information which can be made available upon request.

Life Areas Impacted: Reports from Sharers

Sharers were also asked how areas of their individual wellness, and social relationships, were impacted after sharing someone else's sexual imagery.

Areas of Wellness. Sharers were asked to reflect upon the various areas of wellness impacted after sharing to determine what, if any, positive or negatives consequences are experienced, and overall, this research finds there are very minimal personal consequences in all areas of wellness, reward or punishment based. Of those life areas where over 10 sharers indicated experiencing anything other than 'no impact,' the areas of wellness negatively impacted were: 20% ($n=17$) for both emotional and spiritual wellness, and 17.65% ($n=15$) mental health. These findings, fully presented in Table 41, also demonstrate the very limited social rewards which result from intimate imagery sharing.

Table 41

Sharer Impacted Areas of Wellness Post Sharing, and Length of Experience^a

Option(s)	Physical Health		Sexual wellness		Emotional Wellness		Spiritual Wellness		Mental Health		Intellectual Wellness		Employment		Financial		Education	
	<i>n</i>	% of 86	<i>n</i>	% of 85	<i>n</i>	% of 85	<i>n</i>	% of 85	<i>n</i>	% of 85	<i>n</i>	% of 85	<i>n</i>	% of 85	<i>n</i>	% of 85	<i>n</i>	% of 85
Very negative impact	4	4.65	0	0	4	4.71	2	2.35	2	2.35	2	2.35	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>n</i>	% of 4	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 4	<i>n</i>	% of 2	<i>n</i>	% of 2	<i>n</i>	% of 2	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 0
Immediate	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Short Term	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate	0	0	0	0	2	50	2	100	1	50	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long Term	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Some negative impact	5	5.81	4	4.71	13	15.29	15	17.65	13	15.29	3	3.53	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>n</i>	% of 5	<i>n</i>	% of 4	<i>n</i>	% of 13	<i>n</i>	% of 15	<i>n</i>	% of 13	<i>n</i>	% of 3	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 0
Immediate	2	40	2	50	7	53.85	6	40	5	38.46	1	33.33	0	0	0	0	0	0
Short Term	3	60	2	50	4	30.77	5	33.33	6	46.15	2	66.67	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate	0	0	0	0	1	7.69	4	26.67	1	7.69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long Term	0	0	0	0	1	7.69	0	0	1	7.69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No impact	78	90.7	74	87.06	65	76.47	68	80	67	78.82	76	89.41	85	100	83	97.65	85	100
Some positive impact	0	0	6	7.06	3	3.53	1	1.18	3	3.53	5	5.88	0	0	2	2.35	0	0
	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 6	<i>n</i>	% of 3	<i>n</i>	% of 1	<i>n</i>	% of 3	<i>n</i>	% of 5	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 2	<i>n</i>	% of 0
Immediate	0	0	1	16.67	2	66.67	0	0	1	33.33	1	20	0	0	1	50	0	0
Short Term	0	0	2	33.33	0	0	0	0	1	33.33	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate	0	0	2	33.33	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	40	0	0	1	50	0	0
Long Term	0	0	1	16.67	1	33.33	1	100	1	33.33	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very positive impact	0	0	2	2.35	1	1.18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 2	<i>n</i>	% of 1	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 0	<i>n</i>	% of 0
Immediate	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Short Term	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long Term	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note. Multiple response options for degree of impact, single response option for length of impact

^a Immediate (within the first week); Short Term (within the first month); Intermediate (within six months); Long term (over six months).

^b Original $n=130$.

Social Relationships. Sharers were asked if any social relationships were directly impacted because of sharing sexual imagery, and overall, my research reveals most social relationships were not impacted, demonstrating both the limited social rewards, as well as repercussions resulting from engaging in intimate imagery distribution. Of the notable relations which were reported, 15.29% ($n=13$) of sharers indicated sharing sexual imagery of someone else had some positive impacts on their friendships. One participant explicitly stated sharing had some positive impact on their “ability to acquire sexual partners” (No gender specified, age 22, no ethnicity specified), while another noted positive impacts on “subscribers” (Female, age 23, White). Table 42 presents the full results.

Table 42
Sharer Social Relationship Impacts Post Sharing Sexual Imagery

Options(s) ^a	Very negative	% of n	Some negative	% of n	No impact	% of n	Some positive	% of n	Very positive	% of n	Total n
Friend(s)	0	0	7	8.24	68	80	13	15.29	0	0	85
Family	0	0	3	3.66	80	97.56	0	0	0	0	82
Acquaintances	0	0	2	2.41	79	95.18	3	3.61	0	0	83
Work contacts	0	0	0	0	83	100	0	0	0	0	83
School contacts	0	0	2	2.44	80	97.56	0	0	0	0	82
Sexual partner(s)	0	0	4	4.94	69	85.19	6	7.41	4	4.94	81
Romantic partner(s)	0	0	4	5	68	85	7	8.75	3	3.75	80
Paid professional(s) in my life	1	1.23	0	0	80	98.77	0	0	0	0	81
Other	0	0	0	0	55	96.49	2	3.51	0	0	57

Note. 6 participants provided open-ended responses, information which can be made available upon request.

^a Participants could select multiple impacts and relations.

Recipients were then asked about their feelings post-NCDII to examine outcomes.

Feelings about Having Received Sexual Imagery: Reports from Recipients

Recipients of NCDII were asked to reflect on how being exposed to the NCDII content made them feel ($n=403$), and overall, this current research reveals the following: most recipients did not like seeing the NCDII content (65.51%, or $n=264$); 18.11% ($n=73$) reported having mixed feelings; 13.15% ($n=53$) reported feeling indifferent towards the content; and 3.23% ($n=13$) liked seeing it. These responses are presented further in the below sections.

I Did Not Like Seeing It. My research found of the recipients who did not like being exposed to NCDII material, feeling bad for the victim/survivor, and feeling wrong about seeing the content, were the prominent explanations offered. Table 43 presents the full set of responses.

In regards to the newly created theme, ‘It made me question trusting others,’ my research demonstrates being a recipient can create harms as well, depicted through the following comment: “It made me scared that a mass message of this girl was sent, so bad that even as an adult I felt awkward taking a picture (and have done maybe twice) because seeing how that situation played out genuinely scared me as a child and into my adulthood” (Female, age 23, Middle Eastern).

Table 43

Recipient Reasons for Not Liking Viewing NCDII Content

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 260
It made me feel bad for the person in the sexual imagery	199	76.54
It made me feel bad for the person sharing the sexual imagery	21	8.08
The imagery was gross/disturbing	73	28.08
Receiving the imagery was gross/disturbing	113	43.46
I was annoyed I received the imagery	115	44.23
It made me angry	99	38.08
It made me think back to my experience	38	14.62
I felt like I was doing something wrong by seeing it	165	63.46
I did not consent to receiving/seeing the imagery*	6	2.31
I told someone who could do something to help as a result*	2	0.77
It made me question trusting others*	4	1.54
I was concerned about minors being privy to the content*	2	0.77

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

Mixed Feelings. Recipients who identified having mixed feelings about their exposure to NCDII content were asked for more detail, and the current research suggests mixed feelings were

experienced primarily due to liking seeing the imagery but feeling bad for the victim/survivor depicted. Table 44 displays the full set of response options.

Of the written responses provided by recipients, a noteworthy new category created is *The person in the imagery put themselves in that situation despite how it made me feel*, where varying degrees of victim/survivor responsibility were conveyed ($n=5$, or 7.14%). This option had purposefully been omitted when creating the survey so not to reinforce or inspire responsabilization themes among participants; however, as this is a primary theme for this research, some of the responses which encouraged this variable are included as follows:

Table 44

Reasons for Mixed Feelings Experienced by Recipients

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 70
I liked seeing the image, but at the same time I felt kind of bad for the person in the image	41	58.57
I liked seeing the image, but at the same time I felt negative feelings towards the person who shared the image	20	28.57
I did not like seeing the image, but I was glad the image was shared	5	7.14
I had consented to seeing it initially but I felt bad after*	7	10
The person in the imagery put themselves in that situation despite how it made me feel*	5	7.14
Unclear response*	4	5.71
Indifferent towards seeing the imagery, but I felt bad for the person in the imagery*	2	2.86
Confused about the situation and why I was seeing the imagery*	1	1.43

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

-The sex tape was made with their consent and I feel like they should have been responsible for their actions. (Female, age 19, South Asian)

-The video was a form of hazing through a hockey team— the video was taken with enthusiastic consent (it's like a "rite of passage" for all hockey captains to run naked throughout the arena) however I could not be certain if he consented to it being shared with everyone. (Female, 19, White)

-I was in high school at the time and... I remember placing blame on the girl for allowing this to spread, but also felt bad that so many people at our school had seen the photos. Today, I place no blame on the person who consented to share their own photos. (Female, age 25, White)

Feelings of Indifference. Recipients who reported to feeling indifferent about being exposed to NCDII material were asked to elaborate, and the following responses were provided ($n=52$): 78.85% ($n=41$) said ‘It made no difference to me,’ 38.46% ($n=20$) selected ‘I just deleted it,’ and one participant (1.92%) indicated they just blocked the sender. Some recipients offered text which offered additional insight into some of the feelings of generalized nonchalance about being exposed to non-consensual sexual imagery:

-I was not on good terms with the person in the photos at the time, so I didn’t care (Non-Binary, age 18, Southeast Asian)

-It was a random post on social media and as I did not know who it was about, I scrolled past it (Female, age 20, Black)

-Just a picture of a half naked girl, didn’t feel any way about it (Male, age 20, White).

I Liked Seeing It. The responses provided why some recipients reported to liking seeing the NCDII content are presented in Table 45.

Table 45
Reasons Why Recipients Liked Exposure to NCDII Content

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 13
It was funny	3	23.08
It turned me on	8	61.54
The person in the imagery deserved having their imagery shared	1	7.69
It was interesting	6	46.15
It gave me something to tell my friends about	2	15.38

Having presented the individual and social outcomes to NCDII, this section transitions to consequences known to have been experienced by, or experienced by sharers. Victim/survivor knowledge is first presented, followed by sharer reports of consequences.

Knowledge of Consequences Experienced by the Sharer: Reports from Victims/Survivors

Victims/survivors were asked if, to their knowledge, the sharer(s) of the described NCDII incident received any form of negative consequences ($n=247$), and overall, my research demonstrates most victims/survivors did not know of any sharer repercussions (see Table 46). Of the victims/survivors who were able to report some form of sharer outcome, 14.57% ($n=36$) reported the sharer had to apologize, though it is unknown who directed the sharer to do so. Some victims/survivors (8.91%, $n=22$) expressed knowledge the sharer lost friends, demonstrating some form of social consequence. My research also demonstrates the significant minority of NCDII incidents are brought to the attention of justice actors, as only 3.24% ($n=8$) of participants reported the sharer was warned by police, 1.21% ($n=3$) noted criminal charges, and 0.81% ($n=2$) indicated criminal conviction.

There were several victims/survivors who had selected pre-established response options, and added additional input, so some comments are included below to demonstrate the overall limited consequences to engaging in NCDII as a sharer:

-Hope that guy dies. (Female, age 22, Southeast Asian)

-I heard a rumor that they were almost fired a year later when someone said something about them sharing the photos with others. They weren't fired and lied saying they would never do that. (Female, age 19, White)

-It was only within my close friend group so there wasn't any serious problems that he deserved serious consequences for it, however if it was someone else who didn't feel the same as I did, I think there should definitely be some consequences if it's not consensual. (Male, age 20, Southeast Asian)

-The sharer is known to have had (? or still has) a secret nudes Dropbox which is creepy... that being said they are still mostly unaffected by this. (Female, age 20, White)

-The sharer was an adult while I was in high school and they couldn't go onto my school's property anymore. (Female, age 18, White)

Table 46

Victim/Survivor Knowledge of Sharer Consequences

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 247
The sharer lost their job	3	1.21
The sharer was warned by police	8	3.24
The sharer was criminally charged	3	1.21
The sharer was criminally convicted	2	0.81
The sharer was suspended/expelled from school	5	2.02
The sharer was punished by their parent/caregiver	10	4.05
The sharer had to pay me (i.e. restitution)	0	0
The sharer had to take a program	0	0
The sharer had to apologise to me	36	14.57
The sharer lost friends	22	8.91
The sharer did not experience any consequences that I know about	171	69.23
I am not sure	46	18.62
Banned from the online platform*	1	0.4

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

Consequences Experienced by Sharers: Reports from Sharers

My research finds there are very limited personal repercussions or consequences experienced by sharers of intimate imagery. Sharers were asked if they received any consequences for sharing sexual imagery of another, and nearly all sharers who responded ($n=81$) indicated they did not receive any form of consequence (95.06%, or $n=77$). Two sharers (2.47%) indicated they settled the conflict through conversation with the victim/survivor. One sharer (1.23%) selected ‘my friends thought less of me,’ and one (1.23%) selected ‘people I cared about were mad at me.’ The remaining potential consequences presented were not selected.

In terms of sharer-given directions for imagery removal, of the 85 sharers who responded, 88.24% ($n=75$) indicated they were never asked or directed to remove or stop the spread of imagery they shared, and 11.76% ($n=10$) said they were. Table 47 provides the relations of individuals who made the removal request to the sharers.

Table 47

Person Who Asked/Directed the Sharers to Remove Sexual Imagery

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 10
The person in the imagery	3	30
A friend of mine	4	40
A partner of mine	1	10
My parent/caregiver/guardian	1	10
Myself*	1	10

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

^aFor presentation purposes the following response options were removed from this table as no participants selected them as options: A friend of the person in the imagery, a partner of the person in the imagery, the person in the imagery’s parent/caregiver/guardian, teacher, employer, police, and lawyer.

Sharers were also asked if, to their knowledge, the sexual imagery was ever removed from where it was shared, and of the responses ($n=85$): 29.41% ($n=25$) reported it was not; 35.29% ($n=30$) reported they did not know (35.29%), 4.71% ($n=4$) said it was partly removed; and 30.59% ($n=26$) indicated it was. For the sharers who expressed knowledge the imagery was

either partly or fully removed ($n=30$), 66.67% ($n=20$) indicated they removed it, and 43.44% ($n=13$) said it was removed by someone else³¹.

This chapter transitions to the seventh section, which demonstrates how NCDII and associated harms are conceptualized by participants.

Section Seven

This section reviews participant responses which informed the first part of my final research question: ‘What are individuals’ general perspectives and understanding of NCDII.’ The ways the act in general, and associated harms, are perceived by participants are presented in the sections which follow.

Criminalization and Perceived Harms of NCDII

To preface this section, all participants within the survey were posed the following question: “In 2015, it became a criminal offence in Canada to share sexual imagery of someone else without their consent using technology. Do you agree that this should be a crime?” When originally crafting the survey, this question was included to serve as an educational component, and to supplement how NCDII is conceptualized. While unanticipated, what became quickly apparent was the value this question had in showing the knowledge the participants had about NCDII harms. I first present the responses to the criminalization question, then transition to the major themes created from participant responses.

As presented in this current research, of the total sample, a sizeable number of participants have experienced NCDII in varied capacities, directly, or have known others who have; therefore, it is reasonable to suggest the sample’s assessment of harms and wrongs are

³¹ Of note, the percentages do not equal 100% as participants were able to select multiple options, so it is apparent some participants both removed the imagery while also receiving support from others in doing so.

valuable. For this reason, their level(s) of experience are presented alongside the demographics when quotations are used. As a reminder, ‘sharer’ as an identifier does not equate to an affirmative NCDII distributor provided the non-consensual element of imagery sharing was not affirmatively ascertained.

Agreement with NCDII Criminalization

All participants were asked if they agree NCDII should be a crime, and responses are as follows: 93.31% ($n=1324$) said yes; 5.21% ($n=74$) said it depends on the circumstances; 0.92% ($n=13$) were not sure; and 0.56% ($n=8$) said no. Participants were all asked to elaborate on why they selected the response they did. The themes derived from this question are presented in the sections below, organized by responses to the crime question.

Perspectives from Participants who Agree NCDII Should be Criminal

From the comments provided by participants who indicated they agree NCDII should be criminal, the following themes were created, and are presented in the sub-sections which follow: recognition of NCDII wrongs; awareness of victim/survivor harms; discussing NCDII alongside other crimes; NCDII sexually objectifies individuals; and NCDII is sexual assault.

The Wrongs of NCDII. The most frequently found comments were those which expressed recognition NCDII violates consent, and imagery is not the sharer’s content to distribute. The comments which created these themes were expressed by a range of individuals within the sample, across gender, race, and imagery distribution experiences. This demonstrates there is common social understanding of the importance of consent and individual rights within the sample. Examples of comments contained within these two themes are as follows:

‘NCDII violates consent’.

-Without consent, it’s wrong to share sexual imagery. Period. (Female, age 21, Mixed ancestry, Survivor)

-You can never know if the person who is in the sexual imagery is okay with it without consent, or if that person will be affected by unconsented sharing of the imagery. (Non-Binary, age 19, White, unsure of knowledge of other's experiences)

-It should be a crime because the person didn't give consent for you to share pictures/videos of them. (Female, age 18, Indigenous, no personal involvement or knowledge of those with)

'It's not yours to share'

-Consent, plain and simple. If they trusted you enough in the first place to allow themselves to be seen by you, and only you, it is then your obligation to keep it private. If consent is given to share the pictures/videos, then they can do it, that's not your job. (Female, age 21, White, Victim/Survivor)

-If a person trusted you with a property of theirs, you do not just go ahead and claim it as yours. Fuck those asshats. (Female, age 22, Southeast Asian, Victim/Survivor and Recipient)

-It's violating, it's non consensual, it has the power to impact someone's entire life negatively, you shouldn't be allowed to distribute material that does not belong to you. (Female, age 20, Mixed Ancestry, Knows both victims/survivor(s) and sharer(s))

The Harms of NCDII. In addition to recognition of wrongs, another primary theme was perceptions of harms experienced by victims/survivors. Participants largely identified harms as the reason they agreed NCDII should be criminal. Participants reflected on an array of individual harms which can result from NCDII, including but not limited to: career implications, loneliness, privacy infringements, reputational harm, relationship damage, risk of suicide, shame, trust violations, impacted wellness, bullying, and removal of income. The most cited harm was that of privacy; however, most participants acknowledged an array of harms across multiple life areas, as demonstrated by the following quotations:

-because doing something like that can put someone in danger as well as being put on blast and they will get the repercussions being called a slut, a whore etc, which could lead to depression and eventually suicide while you are the one who never faced the consequences when you ruined that person life. (Female, age 19, White, Knows someone who shared imagery)

-Because it can harm people if they think that they are alone (Male, age 18, Mixed Ancestry, Knows victim/survivor(s))

-Sexual imagery shared widespread of an individual has the likely possibility of leading to ridicule, mental health issues, loss of respect and/or reputation, and in extreme cases can lead to suicide. (Male, age 20, White, Unsure if know anyone with experience)

-People are entitled to privacy... It should be a crime because people nowadays are disgusting and would ruin people's reputation (Female, age 19, Indigenous, No knowledge of other's experiences)

NCDII Alongside Other Crimes. In addition to recognition of harms, another theme derived from participants is the recognition imagery distribution is often part of the commission of other crimes, such as interpersonal and/or sexual abuse, harassment, exploitation, blackmail, trafficking, defamation, extortion, slander, and obtaining illegal funds, as demonstrated by the following comments:

-You don't know the person's age, you don't know if the image was produced during a rape, or an assault, or exploitation, human trafficking. You just don't know. (Female, age 25, White, Victim/Survivor)

-Because it could provoke sexual exploitation of the person in the picture by making her life embarrassing. Also, by circulating it among other people, few individuals can use it as a tool for sexual harassment at the workplace and the school. It also has a huge negative impact on the mental health of the person, who is in the image, as well as other's who receive it because it can trigger past trauma associated with their life.(Female, age 38, South Asian, Recipient)

-It should absolutely be a crime because these sexual images/recordings could be used against the victim, such as manipulation, abuse and harassment. Furthermore, not all images/recordings are taken with consent. Some perpetrators secretly film their victims without consent and share it on the internet. (Female, age 21, Southeast Asian, Knows victim/survivor(s) and sharer(s))

Some participants even identified the reality NCDII can place victims/survivors at risk of future offences beyond the acts leading up to and the actual distribution, as demonstrated by the following comments:

-you provide that person an increased risk of, blackmailing, sexual harassment, rape, being stalked, and just creepy/uncomfortable comments in general. digital content spreads like wildfire and if it ends up in the wrong persons hands you could really be putting that non-consenting person in a dangerous situation.

(Male, age 19, Indigenous, Not specified if others known)

-it should not be shared without consent so it is not received by individuals or groups that could use the imagery for exploitation or other malicious purposes (Male, age 18, South Asian, Unsure if others known)

-it exposes someone in a way that can make them targets for abuse, it (probably) will cause extreme distress to that person, etc (Transgender, age 29, Mixed Ancestry, Knows sharer(s))

Sexual Objectification/Display. Some participants spoke towards how being victim/survivor to NCDII sexually objectifies persons impacted by putting them on display for others:

-As much as I'd like to think it not to be true, there are people in this world who feel they are owed something from someone just because they saw sexual images of them on the internet. (Female, age 18, White, Does not know anyone with experience)

-It would be like being forced to walk out in public with no clothes on or put your private self on display in a busy shopping centre. (Female, age 37, White, Unsure if knows anyone with experience)

Sexual Assault. Another frequently found theme was that many participants described NCDII as sexual assault/sexual violence, an act comparable or equivalent to physical forms of sexual violence:

-It's a sex crime. It's in the same vein as taking a photo of someone changing or tearing their clothes off. It's violating. (Male, age 19, White, Sharer and Recipient)

-It is the most extreme version of breaking someone's privacy and trust. It emotionally, mentally, and in many more ways harms people. It does on the same scale as sexual assault and should be taken as such.

(Male, age 21, White, Victim/Survivor)

-Leaking someone's nude or sexual pics/videos can seriously damage a person's emotional well-being as well as cause real life problems. These people (almost always women) are then often branded as "sluts", for something that really isn't their fault. In my mind it's simply a form of impersonal sexual assault. It's the

same thing. You are using someone's body without their consent. It's effed up man. (Male, age 25, White, Knows victim/survivor(s))

-It is really not that different than any other sexual harassment or sexual assault just a different viewing/accessing. (Female, age 27, Indigenous, No knowledge of others with experience)

Reports from Participants Who Did Not Fully Agree with the Law

During the analysis phase, it became apparent there were similar themes between many of the responses provided by those participants who did not select 'yes' when asked if they agreed with the NCDII law. As such, the 'it depends,' 'unsure,' and 'no' comments are presented together. Of the responses provided, themes and topics included: explanations why participants did not believe in NCDII criminalization; criminalization should depend on situational factors and not be applicable to all NCDII incidents; sharer levels of intent; the potential for accidental sending; disagreement with criminalizing acts in general; the potential for hackers; presented circumstances where it may be appropriate to share sexual imagery (example being for the welfare of the individual depicted so they can access required supports), etc. While interesting, these topics lie beyond the scope of this research so are not discussed further.

There were comments reflective of rape culture contained within many of the justifications provided by participants within this section. The following themes were created from participant responses, and are presented in the sections which follow: views intimate imagery should not be taken in the first place; criminalization should be dependent on how the content came to be created/made available; and themes NCDII is normal, commonplace, and/or excusable.

'Intimate Imagery Should Not be Taken in the First Place'. Some participants expressed unease with criminalizing NCDII as they held the view imagery should not be

recorded/shared by the victim/survivor in the first place if the individual does not want it distributed. Several of the comments which framed this theme are as follows:

-I believe that once an image goes on the internet its practically impossible to take down so if I person doesn't want their image to be shared then they shouldn't be taking images in the first place (Male, age 18, Southeast Asian, Recipient)

-Phones, social media, messaging apps are not private. Once something is on a phone you are knowingly putting something into the public eye. (Male, age 30, White, Recipient)

-Because if they don't want naked pics of themselves floating around then they should have never shared it (Male, age 36, Indigenous, No knowledge of other's experience)

'Depends on how the imagery was created/made available'. Another theme was created from comments that NCDII criminalization should depend on how the intimate imagery came to be created and/or made available in the first place. As demonstrated by the provided quotations, participants whose comments created this theme did not deem there to be criminal wrongdoings if the imagery was posted publicly:

-I feel that if someone posts sexual imagery on their public unprotected social media account, the sharing of said imagery should not be a criminal offence. (Male, age 34, White, Recipient)

-I think it depends on who took the photo originally. If someone is taking sexual images of themselves and sending them to people then it is their problem. However if someone is taking photos of another person and sharing them then it is a crime. (Female, age 35, White, Knows sharer(s))

-In circumstances where someone has posted their sexual imagery publicly (or to a very wide audience), they are doing so with the understanding that this imagery will be shared without their explicit consent. Sharing becomes permissible in this situation, where consent is implied (but not explicitly given). (Female, age 24, White, Victim/Survivor, Sharer)

Some participants also specified the view that imagery made available for the purpose of sex work or financial benefit should not be criminalized if re-distributed:

-There are people who post images on platforms such as “only fans” that are extremely sexual in nature for profit. So if someone screenshots that and sends it to a friend it should be fine because the person posting it did it purposefully (Female, age 21, White, Sharer)

-depending on if the said person is a sex worker and the picture is in public domain with no copyright, i would consider it okay to be shared because i assume they put it online themselves (Non-Binary, age 18, Southeast Asian, Recipient)

-if they posted it themselves like on only fans and then it got around, it’s not a crime because they wanted people to see it (Female, age 29, Pacific Islander, Sharer)

NCDII as Normal, Commonplace, and/or Excusable. Participant comments also inspired the theme whereby NCDII is deemed as a normal occurrence, and/or excusable in certain circumstances. This theme was created from some of the following comments:

-I think it may depend on the context of the situation. If there is hate or a negative implication behind the sharing of naked photos it absolutely should be illegal as this is about as close to defamation as it could get. Groups of friends (male and female) will sometimes show sexual photos of their new partner. Although there is not consent on one end, this is more of a positive context. "Look at my new partner, they're so attractive right?" (Male, age 22, White, Knows victim/survivor(s) and sharer(s))

-If there is no way to identify the person in the photo it should not be a crime. maybe a fine can be handed out as a warning. (Male, age 21, White, Sharer, Recipient)

These themes derived from some participants who did not affirmatively agree with the NCDII law reflect those described in the final substantive section of the survey results, being NCDII responsabilization.

Section Eight

This section informs the latter components of my final research question, being: ‘what are individuals’ general perspectives and understanding about NCDII,’ to inform how intimate imagery sharing is conceived, and degrees of victim/survivor responsabilization. Within this section, participant-provided responses to the question ‘*If someone knowingly shares a sexual*

imagery or video of someone else without their consent, who do you think is most responsible for the imagery being shared?’ are explored.

Prevalence of Responsibilization Themes

The survey posed the above question with the multiple-choice options presented in Table 48 to initially organize participants responses. Once the initial response was selected, participants were directed to a text box where they were asked to describe why they selected the response they did. First, the statistical findings are presented, followed by the themes which came from the participant’s written responses.

As four of the five response options contained some element of victim/survivor responsibilization, I collapsed all responses except ‘The person who shared the imagery is entirely responsible for their actions’ together. To simplify, 37.88% ($n=436$) participants responded indicating some degree of responsibility should be placed upon the victim/survivor to NCDII, while 62.12% ($n=715$) indicated the responsibility rests with the sharer alone.

Table 48

Participant Responses to Who they Deem Most Responsible when NCDII Occurs^a

Option	<i>n</i>	% of 1151	Number of open-ended follow up responses
The person who shared the imagery is entirely responsible for their actions	715	62.12	655
The person who was in the imagery is entirely responsible for putting themselves in the situation where imagery of them could be shared without their consent	20	1.74	16
Both the sharer and person in the imagery are equally responsible	89	7.73	73
The sharer is more responsible, but the person in the imagery is partly responsible	313	27.19	288
The person in the imagery is more responsible, but the sharer is partly responsible	14	1.22	14

Note. Three participant responses were unable to be categorized

^aThis question was posed to all participants except those who identified as victim/survivor, so not to instill any feelings of shame.

I wanted to know if participant demographics impacted the responses, so Pearson chi-square tests were conducted using the condensed gender (female, male, non-cisgender) and ethnicity/race (White, Indigenous, Black/Person of Color) groups. This research reveals there is no association between gender and perspectives of victim/survivor responsibility: $\chi^2(2, N = 1149) = 5.225, p < .073$. Of the genders who expressed some degree of responsibility should be placed on the victim/survivor, 36.76% ($n=300$) identified as female, 41.91% ($n=127$) identified as male, and 23.33% ($n=7$) identified as non-cisgender.

Similarly, there is no association between race/ethnicity and perspectives of victim/survivor responsibility: $\chi^2(2, N = 1135) = 3.385, p < .148$. Of the groups who expressed some degree of responsibility should be placed on the victim/survivor, 35.60% ($n=236$) were classified as White, 40.53% ($n=152$) were within the Black/Person of Colour category, and 42.27% ($n=41$) were Indigenous.

This information is noteworthy as regardless of gender and ethnicity, the themes presented are consistent across the participant sample. When quotations are used, age, gender, and race/ethnicity are all identified to demonstrate the diversity apparent within each thematic category.

NCDII Responsibilization Themes

Within this section, the open-ended responses and themes derived from the responsabilization question are presented. The results are organized according to the option participants selected in response to the overarching responsabilization question.

When I analyzed the participant comments, it became quickly apparent many individuals provided explanations using (presumably) hypothetical situations which either assumed, suggested, or explicitly stated that the person depicted in the imagery had either created the

imagery themselves, or originally shared said imagery themselves. I quantified how common this assumption was, and these findings are presented in the associated sections. Another notable, though less common, theme was the notion some participants offered explicit gendered language, and when this occurred, only female pronouns were utilized when describing hypothetical victims/survivors.

Responses to: ‘please describe why you think the person who shared the imagery is entirely responsible for their actions’

Most participants in this research ($n=715$, or 61.96%) indicated they believed the individual who shared the imagery is entirely responsible for their actions. Of those who offered responses to this question ($n=655$), 49.45% ($n=324$) utilized wording which implied the person depicted either self-captured, and/or shared the content.

The following subsections present the main themes derived from participant responses to why they think the sharer is wholly responsible when NCDII occurs, which include: it’s not yours to share; trust violations; privacy and reputation; and NCDII is a crime.

‘It’s not yours to share!’. One of the most frequently reported reasons why participants viewed the sharer as responsible is because it is not their imagery to share, nor their right to do so. Many participants suggested sharing imagery of others removes personal choice of who becomes privy to the content. Some of the comments which created this theme are as follows:

- Just because a personal image has been shared with you does not make it yours to share. The image belongs to the person in the image. They should have control over who sees it. I believe the person sharing the image of someone else knows it's not theirs to share. (Female, age 32, White)
- If there is no consent, then the person who shared it is responsible. They made a choice on behalf of someone else. (Female, age 20, Southeast Asian)
- Because they don't have the right to choose what to do with other peoples bodies. (Female, age 19, White)

Along this theme, many participants expressed individuals have the right to sexual agency:

-It's not illegal to take sexual photos of yourself, nor it should be. It's also not illegal to send them to someone who wants to receive them. Therefore the blame should be on the sharer of the photo, it was not theirs to share. (Female, age 33, Indigenous)

-A person is allowed to express themselves however they like and the person in the picture should not be punished for trusting someone. (Female, age 23, South Asian)

As it relates to sexual rights, one participant suggested NCDII can also remove financial capital:

-In the case of services which provide that content based on a subscriber base / monetary situation, I still think that the people receiving the content should not be sharing it with others, but that is more because those people are using such a service as a job and if it is shared they are losing out on money. It is a service that must be paid for to receive. (Female, age 21, White)

Many participants cited the requisite for consent as a requirement to engage in any imagery sharing of other people, and any knowledge of lack of consent, or the choice to share regardless of consent, places the sharer fully responsible.

Trust Violations. Trust violations were a commonly reported reason why many participants explained they deemed the sharer most responsible. Many suggested the person depicted in the imagery likely trusted the original recipient, and this consent did not apply to recipients beyond the, presumably, original sharer, as demonstrated by some of the comments which created this theme:

-I think just like how physically, it isn't the victims fault (EVER) for trusting or giving consent to one person, the same applies to sexual images! If you trusted someone, it doesn't mean you trust everyone else (Female, age 20, Black)

-The person in the photo shared it to them, they gave the person trust and by sharing it further they have broken that trust and violate their privacy. It's not their image to share if it isn't their body. (Non-Binary, age 18, Indigenous)

Some participants cited NCDII is a betrayal of a privacy agreement, where trust is implicit in the context of receiving intimate imagery, as demonstrated through the following quotes:

-This is something you would know right away that such thing was only sent you by the person because they put their trust in you and thereby you shouldn't violate that trust by sharing it to others (Male, age 19, Black)

-If consent has not been given to share an image, than it should automatically be assumed that the image should not be shared, a person should not have to state that they do not want their image shared. Also, it should also be assumed that the individual in the image likely only intended it for whoever originally received the image, and their privacy should be respected. (Male, age 26, White)

Privacy and Reputation. Generalized concerns for the subject in the imagery's privacy were noted by many participants:

-I just believe that once someone shares a private photo with you you're now responsible for keeping it private. It's really more about having respect for another human beings privacy and acknowledging that if they wanted to share the photo with other people they would do it. It's not anybody's place to send a nude photo to anyone unless they are the consenting adult in the photo themselves and its going to another consenting adult. (Female, age 21, White)

-if someone takes a sexual photo of themselves then it doesn't matter, they can do what they like with that as it is their body, but if someone were to take that photo and send it to people without the person in the image being aware, then that is a violation of their privacy and dignity and completely unacceptable for the sharer to do (Female, age 18, White)

Some participants cited prospective concerns for the person in the imagery's reputation, among other life areas which could be negatively impacted resulting from the sharer's actions:

-I imagine a person in the sexual image trusted the sharer NOT to spread the image, so their trust was violated. Additionally, a person's career (or career plans) can be crushed if sexual images of them are found online. I would also imagine it would be deeply uncomfortable to imagine strangers looking at you in a sexual manner if you didn't consent to it. (Non-Cisgender, age 22, White)

-A person is allowed to express themselves however they like and the person in the picture should not be punished for trusting someone but the person who knowingly shares a picture is purposefully trying to negatively effect a person life for example by ruining their reputation. (Female, age 23, South Asian)

NCDII is a Sex Crime. Some participants explicitly equated/compared NCDII to sexual assault, as demonstrated by the following:

-Sex is only sex when it is consensual, otherwise it is sexual assault or rape. The same rules apply to sexting or sharing of sexual images. If it is not consensual then it is sexual assault. (Female, age 26, White)

-Sharing sexual images or videos consensually is totally moral and good in my opinion, just as consensual sex is moral and good. The illegality emerges in both cases when the victim does not consent to having their image shared or having sex in the case of sexual assault. (Female, age 23, White)

Other participants offered metaphors to describe sharer responsibility using other general crimes to demonstrate their point:

-just because there is a sexual image of someone does not mean that they are at fault if it gets leaked or shared without their consent. That's like saying if someone gets robbed, its their fault for having money in the first place. (Female, age 23, White)

-You are control of your actions, 100%. If someone sends you a photo and you misuse it, that is your fault and no one else is to blame. If you take a knife out of a drawer and stab someone, it is not someone else's fault for consensually putting the knife in the drawer. It is your fault for misusing the knife. (Female, age 20, White)

Other less common themes were those related 'don't blame the victim,' and concerns related to non-consenting or unwilling recipients to non-consensually produced/shared imagery. In addition, some participants considered hypothetical scenarios where sharers may be excused for their actions. Overall, most of the participants who identified the sharer as solely responsible presented comments which wholistically respected the person depicted in the imagery.

A telling finding was the notion that even when explicitly asked why they deemed the sharer as *entirely* responsible for their actions, 7.02% ($n=46$ of 655) of participants offered

comments suggesting some responsibility falls on the person depicted in the imagery for not adequately managing their risk³². The sections which follow address this, among other responsabilization themes.

Responses to: ‘please describe why you think the sharer is more responsible, but the person in the imagery is partly responsible’

Varying degrees of joint responsibility, held more by the sharer, were identified as the second most selected response ($n=313$, or 27.19%). Of the 288 written responses, 82.29% ($n=237$) made comments which implied the victim/survivor either created and/or originally distributed the content. Most participants explicitly mentioned both parties within their responses; however, the bulk of the emphasis remained on the victim/survivor, as will be demonstrated by the quotations which informed these findings. While there was some overlap within this section and the themes already described, I have opted to focus on the ways the sample conceived NCDII responsibility within this section, and those going forward.

The primary themes derived within this section are as follows: 1) risk management, which includes i) who is trusted, ii) foreseeable circumstances, and iii) abstinence; and, 2) responsibility depends on factors: i) how the imagery was captured, ii) how the imagery was shared, and iii) relationship dynamics. These themes taken together frame who participants seem to view as an ‘ideal victim’.

Risk Management. Comments which created the risk-management theme were the most common explanations why many deemed the sharer more responsible, but victim/survivor

³² These comments included: those which suggested the person should have acknowledged the risks of being depicted in sexual imagery and/or sharing sexual imagery; caution around who to trust with said imagery; knowledge anything captured digitally can be distributed; comments related to managing safety in online settings; conditional responsibility/circumstances.

partially responsible. To deconstruct risk-management, three prominent sub-themes were created: victim/survivor need to consider who is trusted with imagery prior to sending; victim/survivor need to foresee potential consequences; and suggestions for abstinence to prevent NCDII incidents.

Victim/Survivor Need to Consider Who They Trust with Intimate Imagery. Participants made comments suggesting victims/survivors need to be cautious about who they trust their imagery with, with examples as follows:

-The person who shared betrayed the senders trust. The sender should have evaluated if the receiver was worthy of this trust to begin with before sending intimate images. (Male, age 36, White)

-The sharer is more responsible because the imagery would not be let out if they didn't share it. But the sender should take partial blame and needs to be smart about who they trust and if they know the person well enough. (Female, age 19, White)

-I believe that the person in the imagery is partly responsible for that as well because we should learn not to trust people with our private images especially in our generation, on the other hand the person who actually took advantage of the other person's trust and shared that with other is completely someone who has no respect and empathy towards others. (Female, age 20, Middle Eastern)

Foreseeable Circumstances. As many of the quotations demonstrate, another prominent theme was that of 'foreseeable circumstances,' whereby suggestions were made related to the need to anticipate harm as inevitable when engaging in intimate imagery sharing:

-i feel like people know the risk of sending sexual photos is common sense. there is always a risk photos will get leaked and it is the senders responsibility to understand that. but i believe the most blame should be the recipient who sends it without consent. (Female, age 19, Southeast Asian)

-I think the sharer is ultimately on the hook if the images get shared as they had full control of the image at the time it was shared. That said I think its pretty easy to understand that if you send someone anything they now have full control of it. If you do not want there to be any chance of pictures of you getting out

then do not send them. Once you send them you're relying on the morals of someone else. (Male, age 23, White)

-The sharer did wrong by violating trust of the person in the image, but the person in the image has to know by 2021 that the internet is not a safe place. However, I really don't want to blame the victim so they can only be partly responsible. (Female, age 26, White)

Abstinence. As implied in some of the above quotations, another common theme was suggesting abstinence from engaging in any intimate imagery capturing/sharing in the first place:

-The damage is being done by sharing the image. However if the image was never created in the first place it could never have been shared. (Male, age 20, White)

-The person in the imagery shared it with someone, what happens once they do that is out of their control. If they did not want their imagery to be shared, they should never have sent it to anyone in the first place. However, the sharer is more responsible because they are distributing pornography without the consent or knowledge of the person who shared it with them. (Female, age 29, White)

Responsibility Depends on Factors. Some participants explicitly stated responsibility is dependent on factors surrounding the incident. 'How the imagery was captured,' 'how the imagery was shared,' and 'relationship dynamics' were the sub-themes created.

How the Imagery was Originally Captured. Participants within this sub-section conveyed boundaries of assessed responsibility dependent on the context the imagery was created through. For instance, imagery captured voyeuristically seemed to be viewed as the responsibility of the sharer alone, while imagery captured by the victim/survivor is more blameworthy, as demonstrated by the following:

-I believe that in most circumstances the sharer is most responsible for the imagery. Like if a sharer takes a picture without the other knowing about it, FULL responsibility. But if the person takes a picture and sends it, you literally do not know who you are sending pics to. ever. idc what anyone says. never ever. The person who took the pic and sends it needs to take SOME responsibility, because even if consent is given on both sides, people fucking lie (Non-Binary, age 27, White)

-Did the person in the image know their pic was being taken, were they aware they were going to be in these pictures before hand? If so then maybe they are partially to blame, for putting themselves in that position but they also didn't consent to being sent that is fully on the one who sent it out. But if they were totally unaware of everything then they absolutely have nothing to be blamed for. Doesn't matter if they were drunk, naked, if they didn't consent to those pictures being taken then they weren't at fault in any way. (Female, age 21, Indigenous)

How the Imagery was Shared. Similar to imagery capturing, depending on the factors surrounding the imagery distribution, participants wavered in their views on who was more responsible. My research finds in victim/survivor-initiated sharing (inclusive of content posted through social media), participants viewed the victim/survivor as more responsible, as demonstrated:

-The sharer of the imagery is violating the expectation of discretion of the person in the imagery, especially if it was a private text. This violation is the greater offence, and as such, the sharer bears the majority of the responsibility. That being said, it seems the person in the imagery accepts a certain amount of risk anytime they transmit sexual imagery through electronic means, and as such, should assume a part of the responsibility for the incident. However, if the sexual imagery was shared through a public, unprotected, social media account or blog, I feel the sharer bears no responsibility, since, a post like this comes with no reasonable expectation of privacy. (Male, age 34, White)

-It kind of depends on context, but typically, I believe the person who shared is at fault. If the imagery is coming from a public domain (because the person in the image posted it there), then I feel a small portion of responsibility falls on the person in the image as well. (Female, age 26, White)

Victim/Survivor-Sharer Relationship Dynamics. Participants whose responses were categorized into this theme presented information which suggests victims/survivors' level of responsibility was dependent on their relation to the sharer. Three relational dynamics were created from participant responses: when the sharer is an abuser; when the sharer is a hacker/steals the content; and responsibility is dependent on interpersonal relationship status.

Under Abusive Circumstances. Some participants specified they did not deem the victim/survivor responsible if the circumstances preceding NCDII were abusive in nature, as demonstrated by the following:

-I paused on this response because I really think it depends on a variety of factors. Was there coercion or other pressures on the person in the image to share it? (Female, age 23, White)

-It depends, because the person who was in the image may have been threatened to give the photo or was pressured into sending one (Female, age 20, East Asian)

When Hacked/Stolen. Similarly, other participants indicated the victim/survivor is not at fault if their imagery was hacked, or their phone stolen, as demonstrated by the following:

-The sharer commits the act of sharing the content without consent of the owner which is illegal. They made the choice of sharing and had full control whether or not to share the content. The person that the content belongs too is partly to blame for creating the content and not securing it. BUT if the content was secure then hacked then the creator would have little to no blame. (Male, age 24, White)

-The sharer should be held mostly responsible since they are the ones who violated the trust between the 2 parties but I also believe that anything we document on our phones is also our responsibility. If you don't want someone to have access to that information, it should not be shared; and if someone goes through our phone and illegally shares it the sharer should be held completely accountable (Female, age 23, White)

Relationship Status. Limits and values were identified on who is and is not an appropriate recipient to sexual content. Overall, if victimized by a long-term partner/spouse, the victim/survivor was not held responsible as they were if sharing content with anyone else, with some comments as follows:

-It all depends on context, and who you shared with. If you're sharing with a boyfriend/girlfriend and they betray the trust you set when entering the relationship, it's the senders fault. However if you send images to someone random who you haven't set those boundaries, you should take at least some responsibility in how that happened. (Male, age 19, White)

-it is the sharer's fault for sharing the images, however, the person who sent the photos needs to ensure that they are being sent to a trustworthy person. short term relationships or casual partners i don't think can be trusted. so i think it is partly the person who sent the images fault depending on who they sent it to.

(Female, age 24, White)

Responses to: 'both the sharer and person in the imagery are equally responsible'

Of the 73 participants who provided their reason for selecting 'both sharer and person depicted are equally responsible,' the themes raised were very similar to those discussed in the aforementioned section. While I cannot be certain, I considered the notion many individuals opted to select the response option which presented as more favourable towards victims/survivors of NCDII. Most participants ($n=64$, or 87.67%) included comments implying the person depicted either originally captured and/or shared the imagery, and almost all participants mentioned both parties in their comments.

The following quotations primarily reflect the risk management theme presented earlier. There were some small deviations related to participant comments being more overtly blunt and opinionated within this subsection, but overall, the differences were minimal, as demonstrated:

-I believe that both parties are responsible because if the imagery person did not send the image from the beginning, the image would've not been spread. On the other hand, the one who shared the image is also guilty of spreading others' privacy to the public. There could be a chance that the person of the imagery trusted the other. But the other person was not worth trusting. (Female, age 18, Black)

-If you're stupid enough to take a nude photo then you she be able to deal with the consequences. So they should get in trouble as well as the moron that shared the photo. (Female, age 19, White)

-Because both should have some sense as not to share these types of images digitally. They should learn from other people's mistakes. If the person sharing the image can't keep it in their pants, they should not expect others to. (Male, age 22, South Asian)

Responses to: ‘the person in the imagery is more responsible, but the sharer is partly responsible’

Of the participants who provided comments on why they selected the above response, 10 of 14 (71.43%) made comments suggesting the victim/survivor originally created/shared the imagery. The themes derived from this subset of responses overlap with the primary theme of risk management on the part of the victim/survivor, inclusive of who is trusted, abstinence and foreseeable circumstances:

-Sending sexual imagery should not be sent to people that the person does not know well. If you barely know them then why send such a personal image of yourself. You never know who you’re talking to.

(Female, age 20, White)

-A person taking and sharing a sexual image should always know the consequences that may come along with it. But the sharer is supposed to be responsible for not spreading the image around without consent.

(Female, age 18, White)

Additionally, the dependent circumstances theme surfaced related to how the imagery was originally captured, shared, and associated relationship dynamics between parties:

-It depends on the situation. Does the person in the imaginary know they are being recorded? Are they being forced in some way to participate? If not, then it’s mostly their fault (Female, age 25, White)

-I believe if the person in the imagery shared this publicly, then it is partly their responsibility and fault if people share the imagery. (Male, age 18, White)

-I feel that the person in the imagery has the most responsibility of the photo being shared because they have to declare if who they are sharing too is trust worthy enough to not expose said person in photo. It depends on the relationship between the two parties. If they are attempting to date or are already committed to one another, then some of the responsibility lands on the potential "sharer" to not do so in respect of their partner. But if it's just a fling and the photographed person shared irresponsibly that's on them. (Female, age 24, White)

Responses to: ‘the person who was in the imagery is entirely responsible for putting themselves in the situation where imagery of them could be shared without their consent’

All of the comments within this section implied the imagery was originally created/shared by the person depicted. While the comments within this section were more overt and focussed entirely on the person depicted, it is noteworthy they did not differ thematically from the aforementioned themes of risk management inspired by those who held sharers responsible as well. Some of the comments from this section are as follows:

-The imagery would never have been able to be shared if it did not exist. It existed, and therefore was shared. You can never trust anybody with anything really, people are not dependable and will let you down. To put your trust in someone and send them this imagery is asking for disaster. You need to own responsibility for taking those pics/images/videos and sharing them, but it is also awful for people to share them. They have no right to, but I still believe the person who shared the pics in the first place needs to be fully accountable to their actions. (Female, age 18, Prefer not to disclose ethnicity)

-Because if they don't want naked pics of themselves floating around then they should have never shared it (Male, age 36, Indigenous)

-The person taking the video or picture is entirely responsible because why would they share it in the first place and they should have thought about the consequences before taking those picture or videos. (Male, age 18, Southeast Asian)

The themes from this section, which demonstrate both subtle and overt signs of rape culture, are unpacked in the final discussion section of this research.

Chapter 5: Discussion

My overarching research pursuit was informed by the following four primary research questions: 1) What is the prevalence of NCDII?; 2) What are the contextual circumstances where sexual content is captured and distributed without someone's consent?; 3) What are the outcomes and consequences experienced by those who have been directly subject to NCDII? and; 4) What are individuals' general perspectives and understanding about NCDII? This chapter is framed by each research question and associated component, with key areas and findings discussed. In this section, findings are examined through the lens of rape culture, so it is noteworthy my submissions are not representative of every NCDII experience and/or perspectives of subjective circumstance. Primary wholistic findings and takeaways are unpacked. This discussion concludes with limitations to my research and suggestions for future research.

Prevalence of NCDII/Imagery Sharing

My first research question sought to learn about imagery sharing prevalence by experience (victim/survivor, sharer, and/or recipient) and demographics of populations impacted (age, race/ethnicity, and gender). My findings reveal rape culture can explain prevalence, discussed in the sections which follow.

NCDII is Common and Constituent of Rape Culture

My research reveals that NCDII is common: 18.02% of the sample were victims/survivors to NCDII, and 29% recipients to NCDII content. Further, 44% of participants without personal experiences indicated they knew a victim/survivor of NCDII, and 23.77% reported to knowing a sharer to NCDII. While I reiterate caution must be utilized when interpreting sharer prevalence (8.67% were sharers), the notion a sizeable number of these participants engaged in intimate imagery sharing without clear, affirmative consent suggests

NCDII may have been the circumstances reflected on. These findings localize the cited international literature which present a broad range of rates³³, and confirm the Canadian findings which suggest NCDII is a common experience for youth and young adults (Dodge & Spencer, 2018; Johnson et al., 2018). Overall, this research reveals a haunting reality that many young individuals are, or have been, involved with NCDII in various capacities, demonstrating the social importance of these findings.

The notion NCDII is common demonstrates the extent and power of rape culture, which is a society which “implicitly and explicitly condones, excuses, tolerates, normalises and fetishizes sexual violence” (Powell & Henry, 2017, p. 102). The disturbing rates presented in this current research speak towards the acceptance of sexualized violence, both by those perpetuating it, and those reinforcing its legitimacy. The theoretical components of rape culture, which include the prioritization of heteronormative gender roles, sexist belief systems, hostility towards females and gender minorities are all reflected in this current research, reinforcing the stark persistence these components have (Powell & Henry, 2017; Johnson & Johnson, 2021). This is particularly apparent when considering those populations who are primarily impacted by NCDII as victims/survivors.

NCDII and Victim/Survivor, Sharer, and Recipient Demographics

Gender and Victims/Survivors. As presented in results section two, female identifying, and non-cisgender participants, were overrepresented as victims/survivors in this research. For females, the notion they comprised the majority of victims/survivors (83.27%) could be because they were overrepresented in this current research’s survey sample (72.6% of all participants

³³ For instance, from 1.1%-16% of the population experiencing NCDII as a victim/survivor, and 1.4% to 35.2% engaging in sharing (Henry & Flynn, 2019; Henry, Flynn & Powell, 2019; Lenhart, Ybarra & Price-Feeney, 2016; Powell & Henry, 2017; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Walker & Sleath, 2017; Walker et al., 2021).

identified as female); however, my proportionately higher findings replicate the literature which suggests females are likely to be victimized by NCDII (Aikenhead, 2018; Henry & Flynn, 2019; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Vitis, 2020). For males, their underrepresentation of victims/survivors in this research may be due to the notion males are less likely to disclose NCDII experiences (Walker et al., 2021; Dodge, 2021). For the non-cisgender population, my findings are troubling high among this group. This group comprised 3.4% ($n=52$) of all survey participants, and 36.54% ($n=19$) were victim/survivor to NCDII. This data adds to the literature which suggests non-cisgender populations/gender minorities are overrepresented as victims/survivors (Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Vitis, 2020).

Rape culture is both a symptom, and a cause, for the overrepresentation of non-cisgender and female identifying victims/survivors. The misogynistic, heteronormative conditions and structures, legitimize NCDII as a viable means to weaponize, objectify, and trivialize feminine and non-confirming genders and sexualities (Bailey, 2015; Powell & Henry, 2019; Dodge, 2021). Through this lens, the findings of my research are regrettably not surprising.

Gender and Sharers. Exploring gender and sharers also offered insight to the extent of rape culture. My research suggests male identifying persons are overrepresented as sharers proportionately (they comprised 37.98% of sharers, but only 24% of the total survey sample), consistent with existing research (Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Dardis & Richards, 2022; Rackley et al., 2021; Henry & Flynn, 2019). Using rape culture as a theoretical framework, the overrepresentation of male imagery sharers is explained through hypermasculine, heteronormative social values (Henry & Flynn, 2019).

In saying this, there were also a number of female-identifying sharers within my research (58.91%, $n=76$). While females were overrepresented as survey participants, a potential

explanation for this, my findings echo the gendered dynamics discussed by Dodge (2021), among others (Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017; Steeves, 2014; Walker et al., 2021) who suggest there are many cases which challenge the traditional, male/female framings of NCDII sharer/victim-survivor roles. My research demonstrates the influence internalized heteronormative ideals on female agency can have to utilize sexuality as both a weapon, and to normalize sexual violence (Shariff & DeMartini, 2015), in addition to frames of thought on sex-negativity (Dodge, 2021). The ways feminine sexuality is subject to heightened surveillance and judgement encourages sharers to localize their own identities, gain social benefit, and establish norms by chastising and seeking entertainment through others (Karaian, 2015; Regan & Sweet, 2015; Vaahensalo, 2021). This was demonstrated through female-sharer provided comments presented in results sections four, such as, “I screen shot and gossiped about it with others” (Indigenous participant, age 34), and justifications such as “But it didn’t have their face in it. The nude shared of me had my face in it” (Black participant, age 21). These comments demonstrate both social rewards attempted to be gained and means to localize individual identity within a heteronormative culture which excuses, and encourages, such acts. Therefore, within the lens of rape culture, the ways sexuality is weaponized must be conceived to acknowledge that internalized heteronormativity can permeate all genders (Shariff & DeMartini, 2015; Dodge, 2021).

Age, Race/Ethnicity and Victims/Survivors. This research found most of the victims/survivors (67.05%) identified they experienced NCDII as a youth. These findings are consistent with other available studies which examine age of victimization (Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017; Lenhart, Ybarra & Price-Feeny, 2016; Rubalcaba & Eaton, 2020), though it is

important to recognize there could be limits to this finding provided the overall young age of the total sample.

This research also suggests there is a strong racialized component to NCDII victimization, particularly for Indigenous peoples, findings which reflect those derived from other colonized nations (Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017). Indigenous participants comprised 9.64% ($n=146$) of the total survey sample, yet made up 27.40% of all victims/survivors. Through the lens of rape culture, taking the above noted gender-dynamics into consideration, my research demonstrates NCDII is overutilized against Indigenous people as a tool of racism and sexual violence concurrently (Dodge, 2021). Demographics combined, my research demonstrates those who most commonly experience NCDII are female-identifying/gender-minority persons, Indigenous people, and youth. For local context in Winnipeg, for an Indigenous girl/non-cis individual, the findings of this research are especially concerning and demonstrate how technology is used and another means to facilitate sexual violence against Indigenous youths (Bailey & Shayan, 2021). The combination of findings is troubling, yet explained as rape culture encourages violence against age, race, and gender concurrently (Dodge, 2021; Steeves, 2015).

Contextual Circumstances Where Sexual Content is Captured, and Distributed without Victim/Survivor Consent

My second research question asked about NCDII contextual circumstances, and motivations to engage in intimate imagery sharing, relationship dynamics, and the ways sexual subjectivity is framed proved telling through the lens of rape culture, with discussions unpacked in the sections which follow.

Sharer Motivations

My research suggests the motivations for engaging in intimate imagery sharing of others are primarily for individual and/or social benefits, thus fitting into the ‘social reward’ typology presented (Dodge, 2021; Ringrose & Harvey, 2015; Morteux et al., 2019; Walker et al., 2021). The most frequently selected reasons for sharing were to appease to the perceived interest of others (36.36%, $n=32$), for amusement (36.36%, $n=32$), or due to peer influence to share (20.45%, $n=18$). While these findings should be cautiously interpreted to not presume NCDII, these findings align with the similar perceived rationales offered by victims/survivors to NCDII, where the majority believed the sharer distributed their intimate content to show off for friends (62.74%, $n=165$). Of the additional sharer comments quoted within results section four, some justified their actions by stating they shared the imagery simply because it was already posted/publicly available.

The current findings demonstrate how rape culture encourages the acceptance, and normalization, of sexual violence. The very notion individuals perceive any form of benefit to engaging in (potential) NCDII is troubling, though understandable provided the cultural framings around (primarily) feminine sexuality as that which is commonly objectified (Steeves & Bailey, 2016). Sharer attempts to prove oneself, be it sexually or socially, are at the expense of victims/survivors, and rape culture excuses the continuance of sexual violence (Dodge, 2021). For instance, comments such as “I share everything with my best friend” (Male sharer, age 23, Black), and “just flexin” (Male sharer, age 20, White), depict the normalized acceptance of using sexual imagery of another for personal/social purpose.

In terms of the other typologies found in the literature (relationship retribution, sextortion, sexexploitation, sexual assault, and voyeurism), responses provided by

victims/survivors about their views on why the sharer distributed their intimate content revealed how common NCDII is within these typologies (see Table 31, results section four). This information is supplemented by the imagery capturing circumstances presented in results section three. For instance, 29 victims/survivors did not consent to the capturing of the imagery taken of them by someone else. As presented in Table 16 (results section three), circumstances of this lack of consent ranged from being unaware the imagery was being taken, being captured regardless of saying no, or being unconscious/passed out, suggestive of voyeurism, sextortion, and/or sexual assault (Powell & Henry, 2017). This research confirms sharer motives are vast pending the situation and individual, though regardless of rationale, victim/survivors agency, dignity, and privacy among others, are blatantly ignored.

NCDII is thus used for reasons of weaponizing sexuality, to the commission of everyday sexism, all rationales based around heteronormative values (Dodge, 2016; Bates, 2012; Henry & Flynn, 2019). Having framed NCDII as an act of heteronormativity and demographic inequality helps explain the actions of sharers from those which are overt attempts to harm, to (seemingly) inconsequential, accepted aspects of peer culture. This is demonstrated from the vast range of participant responses presented in the results section, from both sharers, victims/survivors, and recipients. The range of reasons to engage in NCDII, a form of violence so commonly occurring, demonstrates the problematic components of rape culture and demographic inequality which clearly persist (Henry, Flynn & Powell, 2018; Morteux et al., 2019; Walker et al., 2021; Kessel, 2021).

Relationship Dynamics

This research demonstrates how NCDII is a highly interpersonal form of sexual violence. My results show that most victims/survivors knew who distributed their imagery, and most

victims/survivors who self-captured/sent the content, or permitted another to take the imagery of them, did so for a single individual, primarily partners (romantic, dating/sexual) (see section three of results). In saying this, a fair number of victims/survivors who knew who the sharer was ($n=172$) identified individuals who were not classified as close contacts (for example: Acquaintance – 11; Friend of a friend – 9; Someone I just met online – 4; Someone I just met in person – 1; A student from school – 11; Customer of a workplace – 1, equating to $n=37$, or 21.51%). Therefore, while the majority of NCDII circumstances may be interpersonal, my research demonstrates NCDII extends beyond directly known relations. The concept of rape culture can help contextualize these findings by suggesting that rape culture encourages the normalization and acceptance of sexual violence across relations, known or not (Powell & Henry, 2017).

This research also suggests there is likely a distribution chain when it comes to NCDII, arguably far beyond what has been reported in the results. In most reported situations, victims/survivors identified past (romantic/dating/sexual) partners as sharers. Most sharers reported to sharing intimate imagery with their friends (a theme confirmed by recipients who primarily received NCDII content from their friends). It is reasonable to assume friends of sharers would know the victim/survivor depicted if it was a past partner of the sharer; therefore, the notion 43.60% of recipients indicated that they did not know the victim/survivor strongly implies that the friends of sharers (i.e. original recipients) are sharing intimate content further. This point is strengthened by the notion 21.65% of sharers indicated the imagery they shared had been originally shared with them by someone not depicted in the imagery. This chain of distribution concept demonstrates the normalization of NCDII (Mortoux et al., 2019; Johnson et al., 2018). The notion NCDII is a common aspect of “lad culture” (Ringrose & Harvey, 2015, p.

216) explains the nonchalance of exchanging sexual imagery to various recipients who hold no real connections to the victim/survivor.

Self-Created/Shared Imagery

As reported by victims/survivors and sharers, in many cases (approximately 57.62%-75.46%)³⁴ when NCDII occurs, it originated through victim/survivor self-created/shared content. The imagery is then primarily provided to those known to the victim/survivor, as demonstrated above. This finding deeply problematizes both interpersonal and societal understandings and values of both bodily and imagery ownership. To demonstrate, the notion that 49.07% of victims/survivors had a screen shot taken of imagery they had sent to someone not intended for saving demonstrates how common it is for individuals to have their consent immediately revoked. The prevalence of this revocation of sexual agency is best explained through rape culture, which encourages sexuality to be viewed as something objectifiable and transmissible (Shariff & DeMartini, 2015; Powell & Henry, 2017; Aikenhead, 2021).

As presented in the literature, originally self-created/shared intimate imagery that is later distributed non-consensually results in many victims/survivors being blamed (Pacheco, Melhuish & Fiske, 2019), particularly if they are female (Zvi, 2021). Given most victims/survivors in this research engaged in self-capturing/sharing of intimate content, and identify as female, degrees of victim-blame experienced by the sample are probable, particularly considering my findings which suggest (at least) 37.88% ($n=436$) of the sample held varying ideals of victim/survivor responsabilization. In saying this, while not directly the same theme, this research does suggest well over half of victims/survivors reported no impacts on most of their social relationships (see

³⁴ Of the 269 victims/survivors, 52 indicated someone else took the imagery, and 11 were unsure of the capturing circumstances; therefore it is reasonable to assume the remaining participants ($n=203$) responded with a combination of 'I took the imagery myself' ($n=155$) and 'someone took a screen shot of the imagery not intended for saving' ($n=132$), the latter being an act often conducted by someone taking imagery themselves.

results section six, Table 40). This may be due to a combination of reasons, one potential being the notion just over half of victims/survivors (50.19%, $n=131$) refrained from telling anyone about their experiences, so perhaps social relations were unaware. Another consideration could be due to the demonstrated nonchalant rape culture encourages victims/survivors to internalize, as demonstrated by the following victim/survivor comment: “It was a funny mistake I made, I’ve learned to be okay with it as long as it stayed within my close friend group. (Male, age 20, Southeast Asian).” To the point of social relational impacts, if social relationships were impacted, my findings identify they were primarily negative.

Outcomes/Consequences Experienced by those Directly Subject to NCDII

This portion discusses the overarching findings derived from my third research question, which asked about outcomes and consequences experienced by those directly subject to NCDII/imagery sharing in various capacities. Key takeaway discussed in the sections to follow are victim/survivor non-disclosure, responses to disclosure, sharer consequences, victim/survivor harms, and recipient feelings/thoughts about receiving NCDII content.

Victim/Survivor Non-Disclosure and Responses to Disclosure

My research confirms many victims/survivors do not disclose NCDII. In the sample, just over half of victims/survivors refrained from telling anyone. The primary reasons victims/survivors did not tell people was because they did not want more people to know (67.44%, $n=87$) and did not want to feel judged (60.47%, $n=78$). These rationales are likely due to the ways society judges victims/survivors for their own involvement, and shames sexuality (Dodge & Lockhart, 2021; Powell & Henry, McGlynn et al., 2021; Zvi & Bitton, 2021), and/or due to individuals not wanting to encourage focus on their experience (Bailey & Burkell, 2020). These findings are supported by the following victim/survivor offered comments:

-I didn't want to cause drama. (Female, age 20, White)

-I just wanted to put this chapter behind me, and knew that my parents will judge me for taking the photos in the first place, so no point talking to them (Female, age 31, White)

-My parents always told me not to share pictures like that. They would shame me for sharing those pictures.
(Non-Binary, age 21, White)

My findings reflect those presented by Dodge and Lockhart (2021), where fear of judgement is experienced by many victims/survivors, fears encouraged by the ways sexuality is framed, and shamed, within rape culture, and those of Bailey and Burkell (2020) where young people primarily want the experience to stop.

A notable finding is that over half of victims/survivors said they did not tell anyone as they did not think it would make a difference (57.36%, $n=74$). While victims/survivors were not asked to elaborate on this response, this finding could be explained by the literature which suggests young people do not have faith in formal systems (Bailey & Burkell, 2020; Dodge & Lockhart, 2021), or out of the belief they will not be taken seriously (Yang & Grinshteyn, 2016). This speculation is strengthened by the following comments offered by victims/survivors who refrained from disclosure:

-I wasn't really sure why I would nobody cares if it's a dude they would just say man up or something.
(Male, age 18, Mixed ancestry)

-People don't take sharing seriously especially if you aren't under 18 anymore. (Female, age 21, Mixed ancestry)

The societal minimization of sexual violence described by these participants reflects some of many theoretical components of rape culture, where non-consensual acts are both normalized, and tolerated (Powell & Henry, 2017). Particularly for the male-identified victim/survivor's

experience, the downplay of their own experience could be due to the ways hypermasculine stereotypes fail to acknowledge male sexual victimization as valid (Dodge, 2021).

For the less than half of victims/survivors who did tell others about their experience (49.81%, $n=130$), this research is consistent with the available literature. In particular, disclosure occurs among friends/peers (Dodge & Lockhart, 2021). Overall, of the victims/survivors who told a friend, the outcomes of telling were primarily positive. There were, however, participants who said friend responses made matters worse for the victim/survivor. Few participants (11.63%, $n= 15$) disclosed to mental health professionals, though a small subset of this group reported experiencing victim-blame, a finding consistent with that reported by Pacheco, Melhuish and Fiske (2019).

Consistent with the findings in the literature (Bailey & Burkell, 2020; Dodge & Lockhart, 2021) very few participants told individuals in positions of authority: 11.63% ($n=15$) parent/guardian/caregiver; 5.43% ($n=7$) Teacher/Instructor/Professor; 9.30% ($n=12$) Police. For those who reported to police, only 50% felt listened to and taken seriously, and 25% were blamed for their own involvement. These findings coincide with the apprehensions young people have reported regarding involving justice system officials in NCDII incidents, and confirm what has been identified in literature related to limited justice system utility (Bailey & Burkell, 2020). This is particularly important given none of the sharers reported any form of criminal justice system involvement after sharing, and minimal victims/survivors confirmed the sharers were criminally sanctioned, and none were directed to diversionary measures. This research reiterates feminist claims which maintain the criminal law has not been, and is most often not, a remedy for sexual violence (Smart, 1989; Dodge, 2018). These findings are important, as they reinforce

the limited utility of prevention initiatives which prioritize risks of legal reprimand, as it is apparent there is limited follow-through in this regard (Dodge & Lockhart, 2021).

Sharer Consequences

My research reveals there are minimal personal and social consequences when sharers engage in NCDII/imagery sharing. In term of punishment-based consequences, the overwhelming majority of sharers (95.06%, $n=77$) did not receive any form of consequence after sharing sexual imagery. While this could be due to the notion the content may not have been non-consensually distributed as per NCDII criteria, this finding is corroborated by victims/survivors to NCDII in this current research, as 69.23% ($n=171$) reported the sharer did not experience any consequences, and 18.62% ($n=46$) were unsure.

In addition to formal consequences, my research indicates there are limited individual wellness-based repercussions to intimate imagery sharing, as demonstrated by the results presented in section six. The limited hardships experienced by sharers demonstrates the persistence of rape culture and acceptance of (potential) non-consensual sexual actions, as victims/survivors are shamed and abused (Dodge, 2016; Walker et al., 2021), while sharers remain relatively unaffected, both personally and socially (Mortoux et al., 2019; Johnson et al., 2018).

In saying this, my research also suggests there are very limited social rewards obtained from engaging in intimate imagery sharing, despite this being a primary motivating factor for sharing in the first place. As mentioned, amusement and the perceived interests of others (both 36.36%, $n=32$) were the most selected reasons for sharing intimate imagery of someone else; however, only 15.29% ($n=13$) of sharers reported positive friendship outcomes post-sharing.

This finding would benefit from future research to determine more information on positive outcomes given obtaining social rewards were found to be top motivating factors.

Victim/Survivor Harms

My research confirms many of the victim/survivor reported harms recognized by the literature (McGlynn & Rackley, 2017; Bates, 2017; McGlynn et al., 2021). The following participant provided quote depicts the range of harms described both in this current research, and those reflected in the literature, particularly in the ways rape culture permits the past to control the present/future for many victims/survivors (Marques, 2021):

It is sexual abuse. It has similar effects. It may not be physical but the other aspects are there. It can be very harmful to the person in the imagery, I have known multiple people who have experienced the sharing. The people who've experienced it have been alienated and are always the ones judged for it. The blame is more often than not on the victim, and they are ridiculed into scary situations including repeated abuse or bad mental states that can be difficult to recover from especially with limited resources. In addition, the person who is sharing deserves to be punished for the harm and long-term effects they cause. They deserve to feel the repercussions of a damaged reputation, a criminal record and the long term effects that these carry. It is unfair that the victim suffers while nothing happens to the offender. (Female, age 21, Mixed ethnicity, Victim/Survivor)

There were few victims/survivors (29.69%) who were able to confidently assert their imagery was removed, so many victims/survivors may experience constancy harms proposed by McGlynn et al. (2021). While not all victim/survivor comments were included in this thesis, readers are encouraged to reference Appendix F, which presents varied participant descriptions of their experiences with NCDII, which highlight the range of harms experienced.

Recipient Feelings/Thoughts about Receiving NCDII Material

In terms of recipient feelings towards receiving non-consensual imagery, my research found the majority indicated they did not like being exposed to the content (65.51%, $n=264$).

While this number comprises most recipients, the notion a sizable portion of participants selected alternate options and justified their selections accordingly demonstrate the interest in, and generalized acceptance towards, non-consensual intimate content (Aikenhead, 2021; Regan & Sweet, 2015).

General Perspectives and Understanding about NCDII Among the Sample

This section discusses the findings derived from my fourth and final research question: What are individuals' general perspectives and understanding about NCDII? Perceptions of NCDII, view of harms, judgements on intimate imagery sharing, and victim/survivor responsabilization are discussed in the sections to follow.

Perceptions of NCDII, and Views of Harms

My research suggests most participants hold levels of awareness of both the harms and wrongs of NCDII. While it is possible their responses may have been influenced by the inclusion of the NCDII legislation and vocabulary explicitly stating the act being referred to was non-consensual, overall, as presented in results section seven, the sample demonstrated apparent disdain for acts of non-consent. When asked directly about NCDII, participant responses reflected an overall understanding the act is wrong and harmful, findings similar to Morteux et al (2019) where it was recognized NCDII is not a kind thing to do. In saying this, as demonstrated by various sections of this current research, some participants placed boundaries on what constitutes as truly harmful related to NCDII. There were themes of generalized acceptance and normalizing sharing for the purposes of engaging with peers. This finding adds to the literature which discusses the importance of interventions which reinforce the unacceptability of NCDII and acts of non-consent in all contexts/spaces (Marganski & Melander, 2021; Marques, 2021).

The notion most participants were able to recognize NCDII as harmful is, on the surface, contrary when considering my findings which reveal how common this form of sexual violence is. This dissonance is best explained by the demonstrated strong influence of rape culture, which permits the minimization and acceptance of sexualized violence, despite knowledge of wrongs (McGlynn et al., 2021). The sections which follow supplement explanations why NCDII is excused and minimized.

Intimate Imagery Sharing

The results of my research demonstrate the sample holds judgement regarding sexual subjectivity, a problematic notion considering many NCDII incidents followed originally self-captured/shared content. For instance, as demonstrated in results section one, when asked about boundaries regarding intimate imagery sharing of the self, most participants (84.93%, $n=907$) deemed a long-term romantic partner as an appropriate recipient, with the remaining relations receiving far fewer responses (see Table 4), indicative of values held on who should be privy to sexual content. This theme was supplemented in section eight, where the theme of ‘victim/survivor-sharer relationship dynamics’ demonstrated clear perceived limits. Many participants expressed values and limits around how much blame they should place on victims/survivors, limits dependent on the context of the NCDII situation and the levels of original victim/survivor involvement.

My research demonstrates many victims/survivors who engage in (originally) consensual self-expression are chastised and shamed for ever having done so, consistent with the literature (Zvi & Bitton, 2021). In terms of the primarily reported female experience obtained through this work, this is best explained by the notion feminine sexuality is both fetishized and shamed, where women and girls are encouraged to be sexual, though judged when they do so. My

research demonstrates when NCDII occurs, the heteronormative and stereotypical gendered expectations, that both encourage and punish (primarily) female sexuality result in victims/survivors being judged and critiqued for not exercising adequate caution for their own privacy interests. The gendered surveillance of females and gender non-conforming individuals ensures they simply cannot win within rape culture (Karaian, 2014; Ringrose & Harvey, 2015; Regan & Sweet, 2015; Bailey & Steeves, 2013).

The social norms which encourage sexual disclosure are contradictory to the equally persistent reminders and expectations of risk management (Bailey, 2015; Milford, 2015; Steeves, 2015). Risk management was a primary finding in this current research, which arose in both sections one and eight of the results, best presented through responses to the of victim/survivor responsabilization question.

Victim/Survivor Responsibilization

This current research found it is very apparent there are pronounced themes of victim-blame, responsabilization, and conceptions on what an ideal victim to NCDII is. In presenting these findings, I am speaking on how victims/survivors are generally perceived per my findings, not on subjective ways individuals can constitute their own identifies. As presented in section eight of the results, a sizable portion of the sample (37.88%, $n=436$) explicitly indicated some degree of responsibility rests with victims/survivors when NCDII occurs. Even among the remaining participants who originally identified responsibility fully rests on the sharer, 7.02% ($n=46$) suggested victim/survivor responsibility through their comments. These victim-blame/responsibilization findings are consistent with existing research, reinforcing their legitimacy (Pacheco, Mulhuish & Fiske, 2019; Gavin & Scott, 2019; Shariff & DeMartini, 2015; Henry, Flynn & Powell, 2019).

Victim-blame was best depicted through the risk-management theme derived from the survey responses, where it became quickly apparent expectations of risk management were understood and communicated as common-sensical knowledge. For instance, participant comments such as, “the person in the image has to know by 2021 that the internet is not a safe place” (Female, age 26, White) and “I feel like people know the risk of sending sexual photos is common sense” (Female, age 19, Southeast Asian) demonstrate perceptions risk-management is an obvious element of digital interaction. Such ideals can be explained by the literature which has identified social structures, including educational systems, media, state policies, and prevention tactics, which constantly remind and reinforce the risks of online sexual disclosure (Milford, 2015; Steeves, 2015; Karaian, 2014; Powell & Henry, 2017). As demonstrated, participants conveyed the requisite victim/survivors foresee the potential for NCDII, and manage risks by better assessing those they entrust, or simply abstain from sexual expression.

As presented in the literature review, most individuals do recognize the risks of digital expression, and put forth efforts to mitigate them (Heath, 2015; Waldman, 2021; Karaian, 2016), so the unrealistic social expectations which continue to persist demonstrate the power rape culture holds on members of the population, and how this results in a ‘no win’ situation for victims/survivors. The notion NCDII is conceptualized as a form of abuse one should expect when engaging in digital sexual expression speaks to the work in dire need to counter this accepted rationalization (Fairbairn, 2015).

My research has spoken towards, and demonstrated the existence of digital rape myths. The risk management sub-themes of establishing trustworthy recipients, abstinence, and foreseeing abuse reflect many of the traditional, in-person rape myths (i.e. “she was walking at night by herself, she is promiscuous, and she was asking to be raped in that outfit”, etc.)

(Edwards et al., 2011, p.773). This finding is particularly troubling for groups who have been discriminated against when violence is deemed inevitable, such as Indigenous women and girls (Fairbairn, 2015), who are at an increased risk of victimization as per my findings.

My research has further demonstrated and supports to frame who is considered an ideal victim to NCDII. Discussed in results section eight, a prominent theme which derived from the NCDII responsabilization question was that victim/survivor levels of responsibility were highly dependent on the factors surrounding the incident. How the imagery was originally captured, shared, and the relationship with the sharer dictated whether or not victims/survivors should be held responsible for NCDII. Those who engaged in intimate imagery capturing/distribution were blamed, findings consistent with the literature (Zvi & Bitton, 2021; Zvi, 2021; Karaian & Van Meyl, 2015), and victims/survivors who expressed themselves sexually to anyone but a long term partner/spouse were judged by heteronormative standards of appropriate sexual relations (Henry & Flynn, 2019). Victims/survivors who posted their imagery to be seen beyond a single recipient were discussed as having forgone any interest in said imagery, despite the notion those engaged in sexual subjectivity choose how they are seen, how the content is presented, and who is privy to their content (Steeves, 2012; Karaian, 2016; Koskela, 2004).

My research has demonstrated an ideal victim to NCDII is viewed to be one without any control or involvement in the situation. Images captured voyeuristically (Powell & Henry, 2017) were specified by many participants as being not the fault of the victim/survivor, and individuals in abusive relationships tended to be viewed favourably in this context, as well as those hacked, depicting heteronormative ideals of innocence and vulnerability (Johnson & Johnson, 2021) and/or sex negativity for non-female identifying persons (Dodge, 2021). As the literature

demonstrates, individuals who do not meet the ideal, often misogynistic threshold of the ideal victim have their NCDII experiences dismissed (Cama, 2021).

Overarching Themes

This final section highlights key points found within this research: participant recognition of general consent, digital rape myths, and NCDII ideal victimhood. These overarching findings can be used by those who intervene, or create NCDII interventions, whether they be criminal justice, cultural messaging, and/or educational solutions.

Participant Recognition of Consent.

As my research demonstrates, the concept of general consent is clearly considered an important factor. To demonstrate, when asked about appropriateness of sharing sexual imagery in general in results section one, most participants indicated it is appropriate when the recipient consents to receiving it, and the sharer consents to sending it. On sharing sexual imagery of others, most participants felt it is not okay, with the top selected reason for this being uncertain consent circumstance. Even of the 13.01% of participants ($n=199$) who said there are circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of someone else, the theme ‘when the person in the imagery consents to it being shared by someone else,’ was created by participant comments ($n=101$, or 51.79%). This response option was not even presented, so had it been, it is likely agreement with this notion would have been more frequent. Further, the primary theme created in section seven was that NCDII violates consent and is wrong and/or should be criminal for this reason. While it is very possible participants may have considered the language used throughout the survey related to topics of consent and responded with this theme in mind, given the magnitude of responses which reiterated the importance of consent, I suggest there is a real understanding among the sample in terms of basic consent.

This current research which demonstrates basic consent is valued reflects the literature which suggests traditional, in-person forms of consent are understood concepts (Marques, 2021). In saying this, my research also found NCDII is common, often excused, and framed as something one should simply expect when engaged in forms of digital sexual expression. This is especially apparent from the bulk of comments which suggested digital intimate content made available equates to the subject depicted having forgone consent and ownership. To demonstrate, of the participants who indicated it is okay to share sexual imagery of someone else in section one, a frequently selected response explaining this was: ‘it is okay to share if the sexual imagery is already available for others on public social media to see (i.e. unprotected, open account)’ ($n=82$, or 42.05%). While participants could have been envisioning consensually posted scenarios when responding to this question, this presumption demonstrates how accepted it is to transmit content regardless of affirmative knowledge of context around the original post/share. This notion was apparent throughout the results, particularly in section four where sharer motivations were ascertained, and in section eight where ideal victimhood was demonstrated.

It is apparent from my findings there is a general rationalization that if imagery is openly, or already available, that it is appropriate to distribute, regardless of original context related to why it is available, or what the intention the person had in making it available, and if they themselves did so on their own volition. Consent applies to the digital memory of imagery (Marques, 2021), though my research demonstrates this recognition may be limited. Presumptions that people who distribute or post intimate imagery hold no regard for who views their content demonstrates the need for additional focus on what consent and individual sexual ownership means in online spaces. Continued activism from a rights-based framework is

encouraged to challenge feelings of rape culture created entitlements to digital intimate imagery (Shariff & DeMartini, 2015).

Digital Rape Myths and Ideal Victimhood

My research has demonstrated the existence of both digital rape myths and stereotypes on ideal NCDII victims/survivors. When NCDII occurs, primarily females, who do not adequately anticipate sexual violence and to have their agency revoked, are chastised and blamed for their failure to meet the misogynistic standards of the ideal victim (Dodge, 2016; Cama, 2021). This finding speaks to the dire need for accessible and improved information about individual sexual rights and imagery ownership.

My research has demonstrated the power of rape culture, and its associated components of prioritization of traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards females and gender-minorities, and the acceptance of sexual violence. These components permeate individuals, cultures, and institutions (Powell & Henry, 2017; Johnson & Johnson, 2021), and to demonstrate, my findings reveal heteronormative risk-management, abstinence-based preventative, educational, and formal responses to NCDII hold powerful influence on how NCDII is conceptualized. Information which reinforces risk-management messaging (Coburn, Connolly & Roesch, 2015; Karaian, 2015) is being consumed to reinforce victim-blaming themes, thus presenting detrimental effects to both individual victims/survivors, and social framings of sexuality at large (Dodge & Lockhart, 2021). Further, emphasis on abstinence messaging prohibits people from learning how to navigate their sexual selves in safe ways online (Johnson, 2015). As such, blame/shame, and abstinence-based messaging which scrutinizes failed attempts at risk management must end to challenge rape culture. Self-captured/shared

sexual imagery is in no way the problem: the revocation of agency is, and my research demands this claim be reiterated.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

This discussion concludes by presenting limitations of this research, which include sample representativeness, and language utilized in the survey. Suggestions for future research are presented.

Representativeness of the Sample

As the results demonstrate, there were many University of Winnipeg students who offered their input to contribute to these research findings. While the sample was large and diverse, it cannot be considered random nor representative. It is possible that participants who opened the e-mail and participated in my research may have felt strongly about the topic, so it is imperative to recognize there is likely some response bias to the findings. In saying this, there was both a large and diverse sample, so reasonable conclusions are still able to be drawn. Additional representativeness considerations, by way of gender, race/ethnicity, and educational status are presented in the subsections, along with suggestions to increase inclusivity.

Gender. Most of the participant sample identified as female (72.60%), so the findings reflect an overrepresentation of input from this gender. While this does create limitations to the overall representativeness, this is unsurprising given the literature on NCDII suggests there is a strong gendered component to the experience (Vitis, 2020; Ruvalcaba & Eaton, 2020; Dardis & Richards, 2022; Rackley et al., 2021; Henry & Flynn, 2019; McGlynn et al., 2021; Aikenhead, 2018; Dodge, 2021), so it is possible more female identifying persons saw value in participating in the survey. This may also be due to the notion males are less likely to disclose NCDII experiences, due in part by stereotype inspired fears they will not be taken seriously, and/or sex

negative views of male experiences (Walker et al., 2021; Dodge, 2021; Zvi, 2021). Future research would benefit from purposefully including a more representative sample to include more identified males, as they comprised only 24% of the total sample. Conversely, the gendered data is beneficial regarding the non-cisgender population, who comprised 3.4% of the total sample³⁵, so the data from this group is of benefit to enhance the gender diversity of the literature on NCDII. It is suggested future research prioritize this group considering the non-cisgender population was found to experience NCDII victimization at a highly troubling prevalence.

Race/Ethnicity. Most of the sample was categorized as ‘White’ (57.96%), though there were also a relatively proportionate number of Indigenous participants (9.53%)³⁶, an important contribution to the literature. Limitations to representation relate to the ways the remaining participants were categorized. The Black/Person of Colour group contained individuals who had identified across ten different racial/ethnic categories (comprising 31.70% of the total sample); therefore, NCDII experiences were generalized among those identifying outside of White and Indigenous. Future research would benefit from improved separation of the experiences of diverse races/ethnicities, and/or increased attempts to actively recruit more individuals of diverse backgrounds.

Education. An obvious limitation is individuals without access to post-secondary education were excluded from my research, so the findings do not equate to being representative

³⁵ While a low number, this population does represent the minority of Canadians, as according to Statistics Canada (2021), those who identify as transgender or non-binary represent 0.24% of the Canadian population aged 15 and older.

³⁶ Winnipeg has the largest population of Indigenous peoples in all major Canadian cities, representing 12.2% of the City of Winnipeg population (City of Winnipeg Economic Research, 2018). While the inclusion rates in the survey were lower than the city average, for Canadian-based literature, considering Indigenous peoples represent approximately 4.9% of the total population (City of Winnipeg Economic Research, 2018), the rates obtained in this research are considerably inclusive.

of the entire youth/young adult population. Much of the participant-derived data to date on NCDII comes from student populations (Walker et al., 2021; Gavin & Scott, 2019; Zvi & Bitton, 2021). To gain increased data to represent individuals outside of educational systems, it would be useful to sample young individuals who frequent local social services, such as community drop-in centres, resource centres to seek support, or recreational facilities, to access those who may be experiencing NCDII at unknown rates. Alternatively, future research could seek information from community-based stakeholders or those who directly work with populations likely impacted by NCDII (Marques, 2021) to support in increasing diversity to better understand the experiences of those typically silenced.

Increased Inclusivity. The literature suggests NCDII disproportionately victimizes individuals of non-heterosexual orientations, and those with disabilities (Vitis, 2020; Henry, Powell & Flynn, 2017; Lenhart, Ybarra & Price-Feeney, 2016; Dietzel, 2021), and my research did not request specific information of this nature. Future research would benefit from gathering information from these groups to increase the data to represent these demographics.

Sharers and Language Limitations

Further limitations of this research relate to wording/language utilized in the survey, particularly by way of sharer recruitment. Additional limitations addressed were the observed potential confusions around the language of sexual imagery, pornography, and tense on relationship dynamics.

Recruitment. It is imperative to note, the ‘sharer’ screening question did not explicitly state ‘without consent.’ As the literature suggests NCDII is conceived of as normalized, and often not problematic (Morteux et al., 2019; Ringrose & Harvey, 2015; Walker et al., 2021), I did not want to deter individuals who may be NCDII sharers from taking the survey by

presenting language which could make them feel judged. Therefore, it cannot be assumed all sharers of this research engaged in NCDII. The sharer rates from this current research should be considered approximations; however, they offer a useful range to understand the phenomenon. As is presented in section four of the results, approximately 75% of the sharers likely engaged in NCDII. Future research would benefit from posing questions of a similar nature to sharers who have confirmed involvement with the non-consensual element of imagery sharing.

Sharer Data Correction. The sharer screening question (results section two) had many participants report to misunderstanding the question. Should research of a similar nature be conducted in the future, it is apparent there may be a need to increase clarity. Alternatively, it may also be possible that upon reading the follow-up questions, participants did not want to discuss their involvement in sharing once a more nuanced understanding of what they were being asked about was established. It is likely the latter explanation may be the case given the number of participants who continued to answer questions leading up to eventually indicating they were mistaken. Therefore, while only the responses deemed valid were discussed in the results, it is possible the prevalence rates may have been higher had 41 responses not been discarded.

Sexual Imagery. For the language used within the survey, the use of the term ‘sexual imagery’ to describe NCDII content may have resulted in some less-specific results. While an operational definition was provided to promote consistent understanding, it is possible this was not referenced ongoing when participants navigated their responses. Therefore, some of the findings should be cautiously interpreted as they may be in reference to sexualized content, though not necessarily intimate imagery as intended for the NCDII context. This point is demonstrated by the following sharer provided comment: “The image was shared on Instagram publicly, and was only shared with people that knew the individual personally. THE private areas

were covered and difficult to see, if not impossible to see” (Female, age 23, White). Therefore, future research would benefit from additional attempts to ensure the topics being asked about are fully understood and consistent across samples.

Pornography. As some of the comments and added variables in tables throughout the results indicate, consensually produced pornography may have been what some of the participants were referencing as shared/received content. This is despite the notion consensually produced/available pornography was explicitly excluded from the definition of ‘sexual imagery,’ a notion made regularly apparent to participants; however, it is possible participants opted against fully reading the provided operational definitions. Provided this definition was made clear, I did not remove those individuals who reported the imagery being referenced was pornography. This is because it is unknown if the ‘pornography’ being described was consensually produced and/or knowingly made available, or if it was a way to refer to NCDII material. As such, caution should be utilized when interpreting the results when the word pornography is utilized.

Relationship Wording. As outlined in section three, a number of questions asked participants about their relations to person(s) involved with NCDII, as victim/survivor, sharer, and recipient. There were several response options for relations, many of which were prefaced with ‘ex’, ‘past’, and ‘current’. What did not occur to me when crafting the survey was that I should have stipulated how to respond to this question. Participants may have answered differently depending on whether they were describing the relation to the individual at the time of the NCDII incident, or at the time the survey questions were being answered. To demonstrate, a victim/survivor may have been in a relationship with the sharer at the time the imagery was captured, though since broken up, so when posed the question, they may have referred to their

sharer as an 'ex-partner,' when really, when the NCDII occurred, they may have been a 'current partner.' As such, the rates distinguishing current from past relations should be interpreted cautiously.

Having established the limitations and suggested directions for future research, this thesis concludes with the final following section.

Conclusion

This research has responded to four research driven questions: 1) What is the prevalence of NCDII?; 2) What are the contextual circumstances where sexual content is captured and distributed without someone's consent?; 3) What are the outcomes and consequences experienced by those who have been directly subject to NCDII? and; 4) What are individuals' general perspectives and understanding about NCDII? The findings of my research all hinge around the central components of rape culture, which include the prioritization of traditional gender roles, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility towards females and gender-minorities, and the acceptance of sexual violence (Powell & Henry, 2017).

My research has demonstrated NCDII is a common form of sexual violence experienced by a range of individuals. The contextual circumstances through which NCDII occurs are vast, ranging from weaponizing sexuality to the pursuit of social rewards, acts reinforced and tolerated due to the social conditions which permit sexual violence (Dodge, 2021; Morteux et al., 2019; Henry & Flynn, 2019). Harms and consequences for victims/survivors are often significant, while those who engage in the distribution of non-consensual materials are generally not negatively affected, formally, personally, or socially (Bailey & Burkell, 2020; Dodge & Spencer, 2018; Morteux et al, 2019). It is safe to assert NCDII has become a normalized, and expected, aspect of youth and young adult culture. Victims/survivors are often blamed for their involvement in NCDII and are held responsible for not adequately mitigating the risks both prescribed, and encouraged, by misogynistic social structures (Pacheco, Mulhuish & Fiske, 2019; Shariff & DeMartini, 2015; Karaian, 2015; 2014; Bailey & Steeves, 2013).

This current research has spoken towards both the existence, and persistence, of digital rape myths and presented findings on ideal victimhood; however, it has also shed insight to the

social awareness of basic forms of consent, demonstrating the optimistic potential for acts of non-consent to be deplored. It is for this reason my research demands increased emphasis go towards messaging that prioritizes sex-positivity, and what consent and sexual ownership truly mean in digital space. Young people deserve better. Rape culture, from its symptoms to its overwhelming influence, must be challenged and denounced to effectively prevent, reduce, and respond to NCDII.

Appendix A: Survey Questions

*****AFTER CONSENT FORM IS PROVIDED ON QUALTRICS AND CONSENT IS CONFIRMED:**

Page 1: “You will be given a randomized ID number on the following page to maintain your confidentiality. Please write this number down and ensure you retain it. Note that if you do not keep your randomized ID number, I may have difficulty identifying, or be able to identify, your data in the event you wish to modify or withdraw it.”

Page 2: Your randomized ID number is below

(*****)

Remember, please save this ID number in the event you wish to later modify or withdraw your survey responses.

Part 1: (Demographics)

1. Age:

-Insert (drop down)

2. Identified Gender:

-Female

-Intersex

-Male

-Non-Binary

-Transgender

-Two-Spirit

-Other (please state)

-Prefer not to identify

3. Race: Please insert how you choose to identify, or select one/multiple options:

-African (e.g., Black)

-East Asian (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean)

-European (e.g., White, Caucasian)

-Hispanic (e.g., Latino)

-Indigenous (e.g., First Nations, Metis, Inuit)

-Middle Eastern (e.g., Arab)

-Pacific Islander

-South Asian (e.g., Indian, Pakistani)

-Southeast Asian (e.g., Thai, Indonesian)

-Other (please describe)

-Prefer not to disclose

4. Do you identify as a person of colour?

-Yes

- No
- Prefer not to disclose

5. What forms of electronic communication do you use at least once per week?

- Please check all that apply
 - Text message
 - Instant message (e.g. Facebook messenger, WhatsApp, etc.) (please state)
 - E-mail
 - Social media (*if yes, direct to 6*)
 - Games (please state)
 - Video chat (Facetime, Zoom, Skype, etc.) (please state)
 - Blog (please state)
 - Other (please state)

6. What forms of social media do you use at least once per week?

- (Please check all that apply)
 - Facebook
 - Instagram
 - Kuaishou
 - LinkedIn
 - Line
 - Pinterest
 - QQ
 - Qzone
 - Reddit
 - Renren
 - Sina Weibo
 - Snapchat
 - Taringa
 - Telegram
 - TikTok
 - Tumblr
 - Twitter
 - Viber
 - VK
 - WeChat/Weixin
 - WhatsApp
 - YouTube
 - YY
 - Other (please state)

7. On March 20, 2020, the Manitoba government declared a province-wide state of emergency in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 whether your general use of electronic communication increased, decreased, or remained

about the same as a result of the lockdowns the province has gone through during the pandemic:

- 1-Significant decrease in electronic communication use
- 2-Some decrease in electronic communication use
- 3-No changes to electronic communication use
- 4-Some increase in electronic communication use
- 5-Significant increase in electronic communication use

Part 2: (Values)

*****Many of the questions which follow contain the terms ‘sexual imagery’ and ‘share.’ For the purposes of this survey:***

- ***Sexual imagery*** is defined as a visual recording of a person made by any means, including photographic, film or video recording, whereby a person is portrayed as nude, exposing genital organs, genital region, anal region, breasts, or whereby a person is engaged in explicit sexual activity.

For this purpose, consensually produced imagery available through a recognized pornography source (e.g. pornography website) is excluded from this definition.

- ***Share*** means sending, texting, posting, forwarding, or any other form of digital distribution to a single person, to a group of people, or for numerous others to see in an online space.

If you need to see these definitions again, they will be available throughout the survey by clicking on the highlighted word. A pop-up will appear with the definition.

1. Do you think there are any circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of oneself?

REMEMBER: To ensure your confidentiality, please do not include any personal identifying information, including your name or the names or other people in any of your provided responses.

-No

You said you do not think there are any circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of oneself. Please select all of the following reasons why you think this:

- I do not think it is appropriate
 - Please state why you think sharing sexually imagery of oneself is inappropriate: (text box)
- I think sending sexual imagery is offensive
- I think it is irresponsible to have sexual imagery traced to your digital footprint
- It makes it easy for the image to spread to others

-Other (please state)

-Yes

You said you do think there are circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of oneself. Please select the following reasons why you think this:

-When one consensually shares sexual imagery with:

-Long-term romantic partner

-Short-term romantic partner

-Sexual partner

-Friend

-Acquaintance

-Family member

-Someone they just met

-Someone they are trying to get to like them

-Someone who pays the person for their imagery, through money or other material ways

-A group of people the person knows (e.g. a post for followers to see)

-A group of people the person doesn't know (e.g. a post on an open website)

-Who the recipient is does not matter, so long as the sender consented to sharing

-Other (please state)

-When the person receiving the imagery has consented prior to receiving it

-When the person receiving the imagery has not consented prior to receiving it

-When one agrees to share their imagery, even if they are pressured to do it

-All of the above, as the circumstances do not matter, it is always okay

-Other (please state)

-I don't know

Please explain why you are unsure if there are any circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of oneself (please state)

2. Do you think there are any circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of someone else?

-No

You said you do not think there are any circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of someone else. Please indicate which of the following are reasons why you think this (select all that apply):

-I do not think it is appropriate

-I think sending sexual imagery is offensive

-It makes it easy for sexual imagery to spread to many people

-It could negatively impact someone's reputation

-It is hard to know if someone else consented to having their imagery shared

-It is illegal to share sexual imagery of others

-Other (please state)

-Yes

You said you do think there are circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of someone else. Please indicate which of the following are reasons why you think this (select all that apply):

- It is okay if the sharer personally knows the person in the sexual imagery
- It is okay if the sharer doesn't personally know the person in the sexual imagery
- It is okay if the sharer knows the people with whom they are sharing the sexual imagery with
- It is okay if the sharer doesn't know the people with whom they are sharing the sexual imagery with
- It is okay to share if the sexual imagery is already available for others on public social media to see (e.g. unprotected, open account)
- It is okay to share if the sexual imagery is already available for others on private social media to see (e.g. protected account only friends/followers can access)
- It is okay to share if the person in the sexual imagery took it themselves
- It is okay to share if the person in the sexual imagery originally shared it themselves
- It is always okay to share sexual imagery of others
- It is only okay to share with someone in a position of legal authority so they can help the person in the imagery with removal
- Other (please state)

-I don't know

Please explain why are unsure if there are any circumstances where it is okay to share sexual imagery of someone else (please state)

Part 3: (Prevalence, Circumstances and Consequences: Victim/Survivor)

1. Have you ever found out, or had a reasonable degree of certainty, that sexual imagery of you was shared by someone else without your consent?

- No (if no, direct straight to question 2)
- Yes (if yes, direct to all sub-questions, then question 2)

1.a. To the best of your knowledge, approximately how many times has sexual imagery of you been shared without your consent? For the purpose of estimating how many times this has happened to you, please consider someone sharing imagery of you in a 24-hour period one incident (e.g. 2 videos being shared on Facebook within the same day by an ex-partner would be one incident. If this same partner shared photos one month later, this would be a second incident.)

(insert #, drop down w/options)

1.b. Approximately how many times has sexual imagery been shared without your consent after March 20, 2020 when the province went into a lockdown as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic? For the purpose of estimating how many times this has happened to you, please consider someone sharing imagery of you in a 24-hour period one incident (e.g. 2 videos being shared on Facebook

within the same day by an ex-partner would be one incident. If this same partner shared photos one month later, this would be a second incident.)

(insert #, drop down w/options)

REMEMBER: To ensure your confidentiality, please do not include any personal identifying information, including your name or the names of other people in any of your provided responses.

For the purposes of the questions which follow, please consider the most recent incident where sexual imagery of you was shared by someone else without your consent. If you have multiple experiences, it may help to write down brief details of the most recent incident on a piece of paper for your own private reference to help keep your experiences separate. For the questions which follow, please answer them with your most recent incident in mind.

1.a. How was the sexual imagery, which was shared without your consent, originally recorded?

- Someone else took the imagery of me
 - At the time, did you consent to them taking the sexual imagery?
 - No (*Please select all which apply to your circumstances where you did not consent to the person taking the imagery*)
 - I was asleep
 - I did not know they were taking a picture/video at the time
 - I was unconscious/passed out from intoxication
 - I told them no, but they took the picture/video anyway
 - I thought they were joking around
 - I agreed, but I felt pressured
 - Other (please state)
 - Yes (*Please select all which apply to your circumstances where you did consent to the person taking the imagery*)
 - It was only supposed to be for me
 - It was only supposed to be for the person taking it
 - It was only supposed to be for people I chose to access it
 - I agreed, but I felt pressured
 - I was drunk and/or high
 - They told me they would give me money/something material if I let them record my sexual imagery
 - They told me they would go out with me if I let them record my sexual imagery
 - Other (please state)
- I took the imagery myself
 - To consensually share with one other person:
 - Who was the imagery you took meant for?*
 - A past long-term romantic partner
 - A past short-term romantic partner

- A person I used to date casually
- A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A current long-term romantic partner
- A current short-term romantic partner
- A person I am dating casually
- A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A past friend
- A current friend
- An acquaintance
- Someone I just met online
- Someone I just met in person
- Someone who originally offered financial / material gain
- A co-worker/colleague
- An employer
- A student from school
- A teacher
- A friend of a friend
- A working professional in my life (e.g. social worker, mentor, counsellor, etc.)
- A family member
- Other (please state)

-To consensually share with more than one person

How did you originally share the imagery with more than one person?

- On a private social media account
- On a public social media account
- On an open website
- On a group chat with people I know
- Other (please state)

-I felt pressured by someone else to take the imagery

Who pressured you to take the imagery?

- A past long-term romantic partner
- A past short-term romantic partner
- A person I used to date casually
- A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A current long-term romantic partner
- A current short-term romantic partner
- A person I am dating casually
- A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A past friend
- A current friend
- An acquaintance
- Someone I just met online
- Someone I just met in person
- Someone who originally offered financial / material gain
- A co-worker/colleague
- An employer

- A student from school
 - A teacher
 - A friend of a friend
 - A working professional in my life (e.g. social worker, mentor, counsellor, etc.)
 - A family member
 - Other (please state)
 - Someone took a screen shot of imagery not intended for saving
- How did someone take a screen shot?*
- During a video chat
 - Of a snap chat I sent, only meant to be seen momentarily
 - Other (please state)
 - I don't know
 - If you are willing to, please share the circumstances which describe how you are unsure.

1. b. To the best of your knowledge, how was your sexual imagery shared by someone else without your consent? (please select all that apply)

- Shared on a website
 - Do you know/remember the website(s) on which your sexual imagery was shared?
 - Yes
 - If so, please state which website (___)
 - No
- Shared on social media (Please select all that apply)
 - Facebook
 - Instagram
 - Kuaishou
 - LinkedIn
 - Line
 - Pinterest
 - QQ
 - Qzone
 - Reddit
 - Renren
 - Sina Weibo
 - Snapchat
 - Taringa
 - Telegram
 - TikTok
 - Tumblr
 - Twitter
 - Viber
 - VK
 - WeChat/Weixin

- WhatsApp
- YouTube
- YY
- Other (please state)
- Shared through text or private message
- Shared through an e-mail
- Other (please state)

1.c. Do you know who originally shared the sexual imagery without your consent?

- No
- I suspect, but I am not certain (prompt 1.f.i. later if selected)
- Who do you suspect shared the sexual imagery without your consent?(select multiple if applicable)*
 - A past long-term romantic partner
 - A past short-term romantic partner
 - A person I used to date casually
 - A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)
 - A current long-term romantic partner
 - A current short-term romantic partner
 - A person I am dating casually
 - A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)
 - A past friend
 - A current friend
 - An acquaintance
 - Someone I just met online
 - Someone I just met in person
 - Someone who originally offered financial / material gain
 - A co-worker/colleague
 - An employer
 - A student from school
 - A teacher
 - A friend of a friend
 - A working professional in my life (e.g. social worker, mentor, counsellor, etc.)
 - A family member
 - Other (please state)
- Yes (if yes is selected, prompt 1.f.i. later)
- Who shared the sexual imagery without your consent? (select multiple if applicable)*
 - A past long-term romantic partner
 - A past short-term romantic partner
 - A person I used to date casually
 - A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)
 - A current long-term romantic partner
 - A current short-term romantic partner

- A person I am dating casually
- A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A past friend
- A current friend
- An acquaintance
- Someone I just met online
- Someone I just met in person
- Someone who originally offered financial / material gain
- A co-worker/colleague
- An employer
- A student from school
- A teacher
- A friend of a friend
- A working professional in my life (e.g. social worker, mentor, counsellor, etc.)
- A family member
- Other (please state)

1.c.i. To the best of your knowledge, do you know if anyone else shared your sexual imagery without your consent after the imagery was originally shared?

- Yes, my imagery was shared by another person after it was originally shared (if selected, prompt 1.f.ii)
- No, my imagery was shared by the original sharer alone
- I am not sure if anyone else shared my imagery after it was originally shared

1.d. Do you know, or suspect, why someone else shared your sexual imagery without your consent?

Please select all which apply:

- After an argument
- After a break-up
- To show themselves off to their friends
- For money / material gain for themselves
- To hurt me
- As a threat
- To make me do something for them
- To make others think less of me
- To show me off
- To help me build my confidence
- To help me make money
- Other (please state)

1. e. Approximately how old were you when you had your sexual imagery shared without your consent?

(drop down age options)

1. f. How did you find out your sexual imagery was shared without your consent? (please select all which apply)

- The person who shared it told me
- I saw it myself
- Someone else who saw it told me
- I heard rumours about it
- It was shown to me by someone else who saw it
- Other (please state)

1.f.i. Did you contact the original person who shared your sexual imagery without your consent about their actions?

-Yes

Why did you choose to contact the person who shared your sexual imagery without your consent about their actions? (please select all which apply):

- I asked them to take the imagery down from where it was posted
 - Did the sharer remove the imagery?
 - Yes, when I first requested it
 - Yes, but it took multiple requests
 - Yes, but only after I threatened legal action/to tell a person in authority
 - Yes, but only after I took legal action/told a person in authority
 - No
 - No, but the website/social media provider/organization did when I contacted them
 - Unsure
 - Other (please state)
 - I asked them to try to stop the imagery from spreading any further (e.g. asking people who it was shared with to delete the content)
 - Did the sharer stop further spread of the imagery?
 - Yes, when I first requested it
 - Yes, but it took multiple requests
 - Yes, but only after I threatened legal action/to tell a person in authority
 - Yes, but only after I took legal action/told a person in authority
 - No
 - Unsure
 - Other (please state)
- I wanted to know why they shared my imagery without my consent
- I wanted them to know how them sharing my imagery negatively impacted me
- I wanted them to know how them sharing my imagery positively impacted me
- I wanted to make them feel bad for their actions
- Other (please state)

-No

Why did you choose not to contact the person who shared your sexual imagery without your consent about their actions? (please select all which apply):

- I did not know for sure who shared the imagery
- I was afraid the sharer may harm me
- I was too upset to speak to the sharer
- I did not think confronting the sharer would make things better for me
- I wanted to forget the sharing ever happened
- I had no way to contact the sharer
- I barely even knew the sharer
- I do not know anything about the sharer, including where they live
- I did not want the sharer to know how their actions made me feel
- I was not really bothered by the sharer's actions
- Other (please state)

***1.f.ii. Did you contact the person(s) who shared your sexual imagery, after it was originally shared by someone else, about their actions?**

-Yes

Why did you choose to contact the person(s) who shared your sexual imagery after it was originally shared by someone else? (please select all that apply):

- I asked them to take the imagery down from where it was posted
 - Did the sharer remove the imagery?
 - Yes, when I first requested it
 - Yes, but it took multiple requests
 - Yes, but only after I threatened legal action/to tell a person in authority
 - Yes, but only after I took legal action/told a person in authority
 - No
 - No, but the website/social media provider/organization did when I contacted them
 - Unsure
 - Other (please state)
- I asked them to try to stop the imagery from spreading any further
 - Did the sharer stop further spread of the imagery?
 - Yes, when I first requested it
 - Yes, but it took multiple requests
 - Yes, but only after I threatened legal action/to tell a person in authority
 - Yes, but only after I took legal action/told a person in authority
 - No
 - Unsure
 - Other (please state)

- I wanted to know why they shared my imagery without my consent
- I wanted them to know how them sharing my imagery negatively impacted me
- I wanted them to know how them sharing my imagery positively impacted me
- I wanted to make them feel bad for their actions

-Other (please state)

-No

Why did you choose not to contact the person(s) who shared your sexual imagery after it was originally shared by someone else? (please select all that apply):

-I did not know for sure who shared the imagery

-I was afraid the sharer may harm me further

-I was too upset to speak to the sharer

-I did not think confronting the sharer would make things better for me

-I wanted to forget the sharing ever happened

-I had no way to contact the sharer

-I barely even knew the sharer

-I don't know anything about the sharer, including where they live

-I did not want the sharer to know how their actions made me feel

-I was not really bothered by the sharer's actions

-Other (please state)

1.g. Did you request support from a digital platform to try to get the sexual imagery removed? (Please select all which apply):

-Yes, I contacted the website/social media provider/application to request assistance with removal

-Did the website/social media provider/application get the imagery removed?

-Yes

-No

-Partly

-Unsure

-Yes, I contacted Cybertips/another similar external resource to request assistance with removal

-Did Cybertips/other similar external resource help get the imagery removed?

-Yes

-No

-Partly

-Unsure

-Other (please state)

-No, none of the above

1. h. Did you tell anyone your sexual imagery was shared without your consent?

-Yes (if yes, prompt 1.h.i.)

Who did you tell your sexual imagery was shared without your consent? (select all which apply)

-Friend

-Sibling

-Parent/guardian/caregiver

-Other family member (please state relation)

-Other trusted adult (please state relation)

-Acquaintance

- Stranger
- Support group
- Teacher/Instructor/Professor
- School counsellor
- Mental health professional (e.g. psychologist, psychiatrist, counsellor, etc.).
- Medical Doctor
- Employer
- Police
- Lawyer
- Other legal professional (please state)
- Other (please state)

1.h.i. After you told (*whomever selected, and prompt all follow up questions for each selection made in 1.h.*), **please select all outcomes applicable to your circumstances:**

- I felt listened to
- I did not feel listened to
- I felt like I was taken seriously
- I did not feel taken seriously
- I was reassured having my imagery shared was not my fault
- I was blamed for my sexual imagery being shared
- Disclosing my story made me feel better than I did before I told
- Disclosing my story made me feel worse than I did before I told
- I was thankful I told after I did
- I regretted telling after I did
- I was offered counselling, which I accepted
- I was offered counselling, which I declined
- I was not offered counselling
- I was threatened by someone for having told my story
- I was able to get financial compensation after I told my story
- I received help in the removal of the sexual imagery
- I did not receive help in the removal of the sexual imagery
- The person told someone else who was able to help
- The person told someone else and it did not help
- The person told someone else and it made my situation worse
- Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery better
- Disclosing my story made my relationship with the sharer of the sexual imagery worse
- Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told better
- Disclosing my story made my relationship with the person I told worse
- Disclosing my story made no different to my relationship with the person I told
- Other (please state)
- Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation better
- Looking back, disclosing my story made my situation worse

- Looking back, disclosing my story made no difference to my situation
- Option to add anything not covered by this list *(open space)

-No

Select all which apply to your reason for not telling anyone your sexual imagery was shared without your consent:

- I did not want more people to know
- I did not want to feel judged
- I did not want to make the sharer look bad
- I do not like talking about my personal matters
- I did not think it would make any difference
- I thought I would get in trouble
- I did not want to get anyone else in trouble
- I do not like authority figures
- The person who shared my sexual imagery does not live in the same city/town as me
- I was not bothered enough by the sharing to tell anyone about it
- I would rather not say
- Other (please state)

1.i. To your knowledge, was the sexual imagery of you eventually removed from where it was shared?

- No
- Some was, but not entirely
- Yes
- I do not know

1.j. How were the following areas of your life impacted after your sexual imagery was shared? Please select how you were impacted on a scale of 1-5 (1-Very negative impact; 2-Some negative impact; 3-No impact; 4-Some positive impact; 5-Very positive impact) and if applicable, identify how longstanding the impacts were (Immediate; Short-term; Intermediate; Long-term) For each response, there is a blank space available for you to elaborate on how areas of your life were specifically impacted, should you choose to share.

*Under each option, include the following selections, as well as a blank space labelled 'option to share details about your specific experience':

1-Very negative impact; 2-Some negative impact; 3-Neither positive nor negative impact; 4-Some positive impact; 5-Very positive impact AND if 1,2,4 or 5 are selected, include**How longstanding were the identified impacts? (select all that apply) (Immediate; Short-term; Long-term; Ongoing; Intermittent; Other)

- Physical wellness
- Sexual wellness
- Emotional wellness
- Spiritual wellness

- Mental health
- Intellectual wellness
- Financial circumstances
- Employment
- Education
- Social relationships:
 - *only prompt scale for selected relations*
 - Friend(s)
 - Family
 - Acquaintances
 - Work colleagues
 - School peers
 - Sexual partner(s)
 - Romantic partner(s)
 - Paid professional(s) in my life (e.g. counsellor, mentor, etc.)
 - Other (please state)
- Other (please state)

1.k. To your knowledge, did the sharer of your sexual imagery experience any negative consequences for having shared your sexual imagery? (Select all which apply regardless if there were multiple consequences for a single sharer, or multiple sharers with various consequences):

- The sharer lost their job
- The sharer was warned by police
- The sharer was criminally charged
- The sharer was criminally convicted
- The sharer was suspended/expelled from school
- The sharer was punished by their parent/caregiver
- The sharer had to pay me (i.e. restitution)
- The sharer had to take a program
- The sharer had to apologise to me
- The sharer lost friends
- Other (please state)
- The sharer did not experience any consequences that I know about
- I am not sure
- Option to add anything further you would like to share about consequences (if any) the sharer(s) experienced *(blank space)

Part 4: (Prevalence, Circumstances and Consequences: Sharer)

*****Many of the questions which follow contain the terms ‘sexual imagery’ and ‘share.’ For the purposes of this survey:***

- ***Sexual imagery is defined as a visual recording of a person made by any means, including photographic, film or video recording, whereby a person is portrayed***

as nude, exposing genital organs, genital region, anal region, breasts, or whereby a person is engaged in explicit sexual activity.

For this purpose, consensually produced imagery available through a recognized pornography source (e.g. pornography website) is excluded from this definition.

- *Share means sending, texting, posting, forwarding, or any other form of digital distribution to a single person, to a group of people, or for numerous others to see in an online space.*

If you need to see these definitions again, they will be available throughout the survey by clicking on the highlighted word. A pop-up will appear with the definition.

2. Have you ever shared sexual imagery of another person? (e.g. Have you ever texted a nude image of someone you knew to a friend? Have you ever posted a sexual video of someone else on social media? Etc.)

-No (if no, skip to question 3)

-Yes (if yes, prompt sub questions)

2.i. Approximately how many times have you shared sexual imagery of another person? (For the purpose of this question, consider an incident any form of sharing which took place in a 24-hour period. For example, sharing three photos of an ex-partner on Facebook in one post would be considered a single incident. Posting a video on Instagram the next week would be considered a second incident.)

-Insert drop down #

2.ii. Approximately how many times have you shared sexual imagery of another person after March 20, 2020 when the province went into a lockdown as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic? (For the purpose of this question, consider an incident any form of sharing which took place in a 24-hour period. For example, sharing three photos of an ex-partner on Facebook in one post would be considered a single incident. Posting a video on Instagram the next week would be considered a second incident.)

-insert #, drop down w/options

REMEMBER: To ensure your confidentiality, please do not include any personal identifying information, including your name or the names of other people in any of your provided responses.

For the purposes of the questions which follow, please consider the most recent incident where you shared sexual imagery of another person(s). If you have multiple experiences, it may help to write down brief details of the most recent incident on a piece of paper for your own private reference to help keep your experiences separate. For the questions which follow, please answer them with your most recent incident in mind.

2.a. How did you originally obtain the sexual imagery which you shared? (please select all that apply)

- I took/recorded it
- The person in the imagery shared it with me
 - By private message
 - By a social media post from a private account (e.g. protected, only friends can see)
 - By a social media post from a public account (e.g. not protected, anyone can see)
 - Other (please state)
- Someone not in the imagery shared it with me
- I found it going through the person in the imagery's phone
- I found it online / on social media
- Other (please state)

2.b. What was the nature of your relationship with the person who was in the shared sexual imagery? (select all that apply)

- A past long-term romantic partner
- A past short-term romantic partner
- A person I used to date casually
- A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A current long-term romantic partner
- A current short-term romantic partner
- A person I am dating casually
- A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A past friend
- A current friend
- An acquaintance
- Someone I just met online
- Someone I just met in person
- Someone who originally offered financial / material gain
- A co-worker/colleague
- An employer
- A student from school
- A teacher
- A friend of a friend
- A working professional in my life (e.g. social worker, mentor, counsellor, etc.)
- A family member
- Other (please state)

2.c. How did you originally share the sexual imagery? (please select all that apply)

- Posted on a website
 - Please state which website(s) you shared the sexual imagery on(____).

-Shared on social media

-Please select which social media forum(s) you shared the imagery on:

- Facebook
- Instagram
- Kuaishou
- LinkedIn
- Line
- Pinterest
- QQ
- Qzone
- Reddit
- Renren
- Sina Weibo
- Snapchat
- Taringa
- Telegram
- TikTok
- Tumblr
- Twitter
- Viber
- VK
- WeChat/Weixin
- WhatsApp
- YouTube
- YY
- Other (please state)

-Text / private message:

*-Who did you send the imagery in a text/private message to? (select all which apply) **This list will also apply should 'e-mail' be selected.*

- Long-term current romantic partner of mine
- Short-term current romantic partner of mine
- Someone I am casually seeing
- A current sexual partner of mine (no committed relationship)
- A long-term ex-romantic partner of mine
- A short-term ex-romantic partner of mine
- A past sexual partner of mine (no committed relationship)
- Someone I was casually seeing
- Current romantic partner of the person in the imagery
- Someone the person in the imagery was casually seeing
- A current sexual partner of the person in the imagery
- An ex-romantic partner of the person in the imagery
- A past sexual partner of the person in the imagery
- A friend of mine
- A friend of the person in the imagery
- A group of friends
- An acquaintance

- A group of acquaintances
- An employer of mine
- A teacher of mine
- A working professional of mine (e.g. social worker, mentor, counsellor, etc.)
- An employer of the person in the imagery
- A teacher of the person in the imagery
- A working professional of the person in the imagery (e.g. social worker, mentor, counsellor, etc.)
- A family member of mine
- A family member of the person in the imagery
- Someone I just met online
- Someone I just met in person
- Someone offering financial / material gain
- Other (please state)
- E-mail (*see above list*)
- Other (please state).

2.d. What phrase best describes your answer to the following questions: Did the person in the sexual imagery agree to it being shared? (please select all that apply):

- They told me I could share it the first time I asked
- They told me I could share it, but I had to ask multiple times
- They didn't tell me I wasn't supposed to share it
- They seemed upset after I shared it, but they did not say or do anything about it
- We recorded the imagery together and I was okay with sharing it so I think they were too
- I thought they wanted me to share it, and I was right
- I thought they wanted me to share it, but I was wrong
- They did not say no, but they stopped talking to me after I shared it making me think they did not agree to it being shared
- I know they did not want the imagery shared with others
- I do not think they would have wanted the imagery shared with others
- Other (please state)

2.e Do you know whether the person(s) who saw/received the sexual imagery shared it with others?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

2.f. At the time, what was the reason you shared the sexual imagery of someone else? (select all that apply)

- I was also in the imagery
- I thought others would want to see it
- I was mad at the person in the imagery
- I wanted to make the person in the imagery look/feel bad

- I wanted to make the person in the imagery look/feel good
- I wanted revenge on the person in the imagery
- I wanted to make someone else jealous
- My friends encouraged me to share it
- Someone made me do it
- I wanted to make myself look good
- I wanted to make myself look bad
- For money for myself
- For money for the person in the imagery
- For money for someone else
- I thought it was amusing
- Other(please state)

2.g. Did you experience any of the following consequences resulting from sharing sexual imagery of someone else? (select all that apply)

- School suspension
- School expulsion
- Fired from work
- Formal warning at work
- Grounded by parent/caregiver/guardian
- Damaged reputation
- Kicked out of a group activity
- My friends thought less of me
- People I cared about were mad at me
- Threat(s) from someone
- Assaulted by someone
- Harassed by someone
- Criminal charge
- Legal warning
- Criminal conviction
- I had to take a court ordered program/go to counselling
- Ordered community service work
- I had to pay the person in the imagery money (i.e. restitution)
- Other (please state)
- I did not receive any consequences

2.h. Please identify how the below areas of your life were impacted as a direct result of you sharing sexual imagery of someone else. Please select how you were impacted on a scale of 1-5 (1-Very negative impact; 2-Some negative impact; 3-No impact; 4-Some positive impact; 5-Very positive impact) and if applicable, identify how longstanding the impacts were (Immediate; Short-term; Intermediate; Long-term). For each response, there is a blank space available for you to elaborate on how areas of your life were specifically impacted, should you choose to share.

*Under each option, include the following selections, as well as a blank space labelled 'option to share details about your specific experience':

1-Very negative impact; 2-Some negative impact; 3-Neither positive nor negative impact; 4-Some positive impact; 5-Very positive impact AND if 1,2,4 or 5 are selected, include**How longstanding were the identified impacts? (select all that apply) (Immediate; Short-term; Long-term; Ongoing; Intermittent; Other)

- Physical wellness
- Sexual wellness
- Emotional wellness
- Spiritual wellness
- Mental health
- Intellectual wellness
- Financial circumstances
- Employment
- Education
- Social relationships:
 - *only prompt scale for selected relations*
 - Friend(s)
 - Family
 - Acquaintances
 - Work colleagues
 - School peers
 - Sexual partner(s)
 - Romantic partner(s)
 - Paid professional(s) in my life (e.g. counsellor, mentor, etc.)
 - Other (please state)
- Other (please state)

2.i. Were you ever asked, or directed, to remove or stop further transmission of the sexual imagery of someone else you had shared?

- No
- Yes (who asked, or directed, you to remove the imagery/try to stop further transmission?)
 - The person in the imagery
 - A friend of mine
 - A partner of mine
 - A friend of the person in the imagery
 - A partner of the person in the imagery
 - My parent/caregiver/guardian
 - The person in the imagery's parent/caregiver/guardian
 - Teacher
 - Employer
 - Police
 - Lawyer
 - Other (please state)

2.h. To your knowledge, was the sexual imagery you shared eventually removed from the digital platform it was shared on? (e.g. was it removed from social media? Did the person(s) who received the imagery in an instant message delete it? Etc.)

- No
 - Some, but not entirely
 - Removed by me
 - Removed by someone else
 - I don't know
 - Yes
 - Removed by me
 - Removed by someone else
-

Part 5: (Prevalence, Circumstances and Consequences: Recipient)

*****Many of the questions which follow contain the terms 'sexual imagery' and 'share.' For the purposes of this survey:***

- ***Sexual imagery is defined as a visual recording of a person made by any means, including photographic, film or video recording, whereby a person is portrayed as nude, exposing genital organs, genital region, anal region, breasts, or whereby a person is engaged in explicit sexual activity.***

For this purpose, consensually produced imagery available through a recognized pornography source (e.g. pornography website) is excluded from this definition.

- ***Share means sending, texting, posting, forwarding, or any other form of digital distribution to a single person, to a group of people, or for numerous others to see in an online space.***

If you need to see these definitions again, they will be available throughout the survey by clicking on the highlighted word. A pop-up will appear with the definition.

3. Have you ever electronically received shared sexual imagery of someone else knowing they **likely did not consent** to you seeing it? The imagery could have been sent to you through a link to a webpage, social media post, through text, e-mail, DM, etc.

- No (skip to next end of survey)
- Yes

3.i. Approximately how many times have you electronically received sexual imagery of someone else knowing they **likely did not consent** to you seeing it? (For the purpose of this question, consider an incident any form of receiving which took place in a 24-hour period. For example, receiving three photos of a peer in one day through text

would be considered a single incident. Receiving a video on Instagram the next week would be considered a second incident.)

-Insert drop down #

3.ii. **Approximately how many times have you electronically received sexual imagery of someone else knowing they likely did not consent to you seeing it after March 20, 2020 when the province went into a lockdown as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?** *(For the purpose of this question, consider an incident any form of receiving which took place in a 24-hour period. For example, receiving three photos of a peer in one day through text would be considered a single incident. Receiving a video on Instagram the next week would be considered a second incident.)*

-Insert drop down #

REMEMBER: To ensure your confidentiality, please do not include any personal identifying information, including your name or the names or other people in any of your provided responses.

For the purposes of the questions which follow, please consider the most recent incident where you were exposed to sexual imagery of someone else knowing they likely did not consent to you seeing it. If you have multiple experiences, it may help to write down brief details of the most recent incident on a piece of paper for your own private reference to help keep your experiences separate. For the questions which follow, please answer them with your most recent incident in mind.

3. a. How was the sexual imagery shared with you?

- Text/private message
- Mass text/mass message
- Social media post
- Website
- Other (please state)

3. a. i. Who shared the sexual imagery with you?

- A past long-term romantic partner
- A past short-term romantic partner
- A person I used to date casually
- A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A current long-term romantic partner
- A current short-term romantic partner
- A person I am dating casually
- A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A past friend

- A current friend
- An acquaintance
- Someone I just met online
- Someone I just met in person
- Someone looking for financial / material gain
- A co-worker/colleague
- An employer
- A student from school
- A teacher
- A friend of a friend
- A working professional in my life (e.g. social worker, mentor, counsellor, etc.)
- A family member
- Other (please state)

3.b. Did you personally know the individual who was in the sexual imagery which was shared with you? For this purpose, if there were multiple people in the imagery, consider this question to be about the person who likely did not consent to you seeing the imagery.

- No
- Yes

-You said you personally knew the individual who was in the sexual imagery which was shared with you. What was this person's relation to you?

- A past long-term romantic partner
- A past short-term romantic partner
- A person I used to date casually
- A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A current long-term romantic partner
- A current short-term romantic partner
- A person I am dating casually
- A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A past friend
- A current friend
- An acquaintance
- Someone I just met online
- Someone I just met in person
- Someone looking for financial / material gain
- A co-worker/colleague
- An employer
- A student from school
- A teacher
- A friend of a friend
- A working professional in my life (e.g. social worker, mentor, counsellor, etc.)
- A family member

-Other (please state)

-I was not able to determine whether or not I knew the person from the imagery

3.c. How did being exposed to the sexual imagery make you feel?

-Indifferent

-It made no difference to me

-I just deleted it

-I did not open the message

-Other (please state)

-I had mixed feelings

-I liked seeing the image, but at the same time I felt kind of bad for the person in the image

-I liked seeing the image, but at the same time I felt negative feelings towards the person who shared the image

-I did not like seeing the image, but I was glad the image was shared

-Other (please state)

-I liked seeing it

-It was funny

-It turned me on

-The person in the imagery deserved having their imagery shared

-It was interesting

-It gave me something to tell my friends about

-Other (please state)

-I did not like seeing it

-It made me feel bad for the person in the sexual imagery

-It made me feel bad for the person sharing the sexual imagery

-The imagery was gross/disturbing

-Receiving the imagery was gross/disturbing

-I was annoyed I received the imagery

-It made me angry

-It made me think back to my experience

-I felt like I was doing something wrong by seeing it

-Other (please state)

Part 6: Other Involvement Screening

*** Questions 4.a. and 4.b. are for those who answer NO to Screening questions 1, 2 and 3.

4.a. Do you personally know anyone who has had their sexual imagery shared without their consent?

-Yes

-You said you personally know someone who has had their sexual imagery shared without their consent. Who was this person to you? Select all which apply:

REMEMBER: To ensure your confidentiality, please do not include any personal identifying information, including your name or the names or other people in any of your provided responses.

- A past long-term romantic partner
- A past short-term romantic partner
- A person I used to date casually
- A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A current long-term romantic partner
- A current short-term romantic partner
- A person I am dating casually
- A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A past friend
- A current friend
- An acquaintance
- Someone I just met online
- Someone I just met in person
- A co-worker/colleague
- An employer
- A student from school
- A teacher
- A friend of a friend
- A working professional in my life (e.g. social worker, mentor, counsellor, etc.)
- A family member
- Other (please state)

-No

-I'm not sure

4.b. Do you personally know anyone who has shared sexual imagery of someone else without their consent?

-Yes

-You said you personally know someone who has shared sexual imagery of someone else without their consent. Who was this person to you? Select all which apply:

REMEMBER: To ensure your confidentiality, please do not include any personal identifying information, including your name or the names or other people in any of your provided responses.

- A past long-term romantic partner
- A past short-term romantic partner
- A person I used to date casually

- A past sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A current long-term romantic partner
- A current short-term romantic partner
- A person I am dating casually
- A current sexual partner (no committed relationship)
- A past friend
- A current friend
- An acquaintance
- Someone I just met online
- Someone I just met in person
- A co-worker/colleague
- An employer
- A student from school
- A teacher
- A friend of a friend
- A working professional in my life (e.g. social worker, mentor, counsellor, etc.)
- A family member
- Other (please state)

- No
- I'm not sure

Part 7: Criminalization

4. c. In 2015, it became a criminal offence in Canada to share sexual imagery of someone else without their consent. Do you agree that this should be a crime?

*** REMEMBER: To ensure your confidentiality, please do not include any personal identifying information, including your name or the names or other people in any of your provided responses.

- Yes
 - You said you agree the act of sharing sexual imagery of someone else without their consent should be a crime. Why do you agree it should be a crime? (please state)**
- No
 - You said you do not agree the act of sharing sexual imagery of someone else without their consent should be a crime. Why do you think this act should not be a crime? (please state)**
- It depends on the circumstances
 - You said you think it depends on the circumstances when the act of sharing sexual imagery of someone else without their consent should be a crime. What circumstances do you think it depends on? (please state)**

-I am not sure

-You said you are not sure if the act of sharing of sexual imagery of someone else without their consent should be a crime. Why are you unsure? (please state):

Part 8: Responsibilization

Question 4.d. is NOT prompted for those who answer YES to question 1 in Part 3 (victim/survivor screening question).

4.d. If someone knowingly shares a sexual image or video of someone else without their consent, who do you think is most responsible for the imagery being shared?

- The person who shared the imagery is entirely responsible for their actions
- The person who was in the imagery is entirely responsible for putting themselves in the situation where imagery of them could be shared without their consent
- Both the sharer and person in the imagery are equally responsible
- The sharer is more responsible, but the person in the imagery is partly responsible
- The person in the imagery is more responsible, but the sharer is partly responsible
- Other (please state)

**For selected responses, prompt an open-ended question: “Why do you think ___” which includes: REMEMBER: To ensure your confidentiality, please do not include any personal identifying information, including your name or the names or other people in any of your provided responses.

Thank you! You have reached the end of the survey.

Do you still consent to me using your provided responses for the purpose of my research? (yes, no)

Remember, even if you say yes now, you can change your mind and modify or withdraw any of your provided responses up to and including March 31, 2021.

Thank you for completing the survey.

Please click next to review the concluding information which offers educational resources, researcher contact information, and directions should you choose to modify or withdraw any of your responses. After you have reviewed the concluding information, click next to be directed to the separate webpage where you will provide your name and contact information for entry to the prize draw.

Remember: Personal contact information required for entry to the prize draw is collected completely separate from your provided responses, so your identity will not be associated with your responses in any way.

***Prompt conclusion form (appendix D)

Next page:

Please click on the following link to exit to a new webpage to enter your name and e-mail for entry to the prize draw:

(On web page separate from survey, prompted once participant completes the survey)

Please provide your name and e-mail address for entry into the prize draw for a chance to win one of two \$100 Amazon gift cards!

Thank you again for taking the time to complete the survey, and I wish you all the best in your academic endeavours.

Appendix B: E-mail Invitation

Hello,

My name is Samantha Hanson and I am a graduate student in the Criminal Justice Master's Program at the University of Winnipeg.

I am researching non-consensual distribution of intimate images (NCDII), which is the sharing of sexual visual content of another person, without their consent, distributed using online technology and cyber media forums. I am recruiting post-secondary students registered at the University of Winnipeg to take part in an online survey regarding students' opinions on and experiences with NCDII.

I respect your time is very important, so I am offering all participants an entry into a prize draw for one of two \$100 Amazon Gift Cards.

The survey should take you approximately 30 minutes to complete. Your responses will be strictly confidential, and you will not be personally identified in any way through your participation in this research. This survey will be available up to and including February 19, 2021.

To learn more about this research project and participate in this study, please follow the link provided below.

Thank you for your time, and I wish you all the best in your academic year.

Samantha Hanson

Appendix C: Survey Letter of Information and Consent



Thank you for taking the time to consider being a participant in this survey. My name is Samantha Hanson, and I am a student in the Criminal Justice M.A. program at the University of Winnipeg, working under the supervision of Dr. Michelle Bertrand and Dr. Kelly Gorkoff.

The purpose of this survey is to gather information about the digital sharing of sexual imagery, whether you have been a recipient, sharer, person in the imagery, or as an individual with thoughts on the subject. There are several benefits to participation, including having your experiences and opinions about non-consensual distribution of intimate images (NCDII) heard. Your input will assist researchers in gaining an increased understanding of an understudied area in the social sciences, and your feedback may have the potential to influence how workers in the social services and criminal justice field respond to the sharing of sexual images. Your participation will allow you to learn of resources presently available to assist in the management of shared sexual imagery.

This survey should take you between 10-30 minutes to complete.

Your responses will be strictly confidential and you will not be personally identified in any way through your participation in this research. To ensure your confidentiality, please do not include any personal identifying information, including your name or names of other people, in any of your provided responses.

You do not have to answer any question if you do not want to and you can quit the survey at any time. When you are finished with the survey, you will be asked to confirm whether you consent to me using the answers you provided to my questions. Even if you say ‘no’, you will still be compensated for your time.

You will be compensated by being entered into a prize draw for one of two \$100 Amazon gift cards. To ensure you are able to receive compensation while still keeping your contact information separate from your answers, a new webpage will open up at the end of the survey. You will be asked to provide your name and e-mail so I am able to reach you should you be a prize winner.

Your contact information will be permanently deleted once compensation has been provided. You will not be contacted for any other purpose other than related to compensation.

The information from this survey will be used in my Master’s thesis, and may also be used at conference presentations, academic articles, as well as in teaching and further research. However, no matter how the information is presented, you will not be personally identified in any way. Data will be provided in aggregate format, and if any participants are quoted, any potentially identifying information will be removed. This research has been approved by the University of Winnipeg Ethics Board.

After you are finished with the survey, you may modify or withdraw your responses any time prior to March 31, 2021.

You will be given a randomized ID number on the following page to maintain your confidentiality. Please write this number down and ensure you retain it. Note that if you do not keep your randomized ID number, I may have difficulty identifying, or be able to identify, your data in the event you wish to modify or withdraw it. Please note, not fully completing the survey does not automatically withdraw your provided answers from the study.

This number can be used if you choose to modify or withdraw your data without having to provide your name. To remain disassociated from your responses I suggest that you use/create a non-identifying email account or call me at **431-277-0182** from a non-identifying phone number, to make your request.

Data will be stored on a secure Canadian server hosted by Qualtrics and only the researcher and supervising Professors will have access to the data by using a password-protected account. Any data used in the analyses will be stored on a password protected computer on a secure database which only the researcher and supervisors will have access to. As per university policy, data will be kept for a minimum of five years after the survey's completion.

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey or the way it is being conducted, please contact me at hanson-s4914@webmail.uwinnipeg.ca or [431-277-0182](tel:431-277-0182), or my primary supervisor Dr. Michelle Bertrand at m.bertrand@uwinnipeg.ca or 204-988-7503. If you have any remaining concerns about the conduct of this study that we are not been able to address, you may contact the University Human Research Ethics Board at 204-786-9058 or by email at ethics@uwinnipeg.ca.

Please be aware some of the sections in this survey ask questions of a sensitive nature, some of which relate to sexual abuse, so some questions may be considered stressful to some participants. You are able to skip any questions you do not want to answer, or stop your participation at any time, and you do not need to explain your reasoning for skipping questions or ending your involvement.

If answering any of these questions causes you distress, please contact counselling services at the University of Winnipeg by emailing studentwellness@uwinnipeg.ca or call 204-988-7611 and a representative will respond to you as soon as possible. More information about University counselling services can be found online at: <https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/student-wellness/contact-us.html>. Student counselling offers services via phone or Zoom video, and they operate Monday to Friday from 8:30am to 4:30pm. You may also call Klinik's 24-hour crisis phone line at 204-786-8686 or toll free 1-888-322-3019. More information on Klinik's crisis services, as well as general counselling services can be found online at <http://klinik.mb.ca>.

If you wish to receive a summary of the study's results please contact me at the above e-mail address or phone number.

It is recommended you retain a copy of this letter of information and consent so you may refer back to the information contained, as well as retain access to contact numbers/e-mails and support resources.

Please **[click here](#)** to retain a copy of this letter.

By clicking on "Continue" below to continue to the survey, it is understood that you consent to participate. By consenting, you do not waive any legal rights.

- Continue
- Exit survey

Appendix D: Conclusion for Online Survey



Thank you for taking part in this survey and helping me with my research! Your input will assist me and future researchers in gaining an increased understanding of an understudied area of the Canadian social sciences, and your feedback may have the potential to influence how workers in the social services and criminal justice field respond to the sharing of sexual imagery.

If answering any of these questions causes you distress, please contact counselling services at the University of Winnipeg by emailing studentwellness@uwinnipeg.ca or call 204-988-7611 and a representative will respond to you as soon as possible. More information about University counselling services can be found online at: <https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/student-wellness/contact-us.html>. Student counselling offers services via phone or Zoom video, and they operate Monday to Friday from 8:30am to 4:30pm. You may also call Klinik's 24-hour crisis phone line at 204-786-8686 or toll free 1-888-322-3019. More information on Klinik's crisis services, as well as general counselling services can be found online at <http://klinik.mb.ca>.

If you or someone you know wants information about how to remove sexual imagery from the internet, please visit <https://needhelpnow.ca/app/en/#>, and to learn about the law's response to non-consensual sexual imagery sharing, please visit https://www.cybertip.ca/pdfs/Ctip_SharingSexualPictures_en.pdf for more information. If you are interested in learning more about the non-consensual sharing of sexual imagery, I encourage you to review the following academic sources:

- Aikenhead, M. (2018). Non-consensual disclosure of intimate images as a crime of gender-based violence. *Canadian Journal of Women & the Law*, 30(1), 117–143
- Dodge, A., & Spencer, D. C. (2018). Online sexual violence, child pornography or something else entirely? Police responses to non-consensual intimate image sharing among youth. *Social & Legal Studies*, 27(5), 636–657
- Henry, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2019). Image-based sexual abuse: victims and perpetrators. *Trends & issues in crime & criminal justice*, (572), 1–19

Remember, you may modify or withdraw your responses any time prior to March 31, 2021. I encourage you call from a blocked phone number, or use/create a non-identifying email account to provide your random ID number if you wish to modify or withdraw any responses.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study or the way it is being conducted, please contact me directly at hanson-s4914@webmail.uwinnipeg.ca, or 431-277-0182 or my primary supervisor Dr. Michelle Bertrand at m.bertrand@uwinnipeg.ca or 204-988-7503. You may also contact us if you would like a summary of the research results. If you have any remaining concerns about the conduct of this study that we have not been able to address, you may contact the University Human Research Ethics Board at 204-786-9058 or by email at ethics@uwinnipeg.ca.

I encourage you to retain a copy of this conclusion letter so you are able to access the information contained at any time. If you would like to retain a copy of this letter, please [click here](#).

Thank you again for your time and participation, and I wish you all the best in your academic endeavors.
Samantha Hanson

Appendix E: Additional Survey Results

The results presented within this appendix include the questions posed within the survey which were not directly applicable to the overarching aim of this thesis, though applicable to themes of non-consensual distribution of intimate imagery (NCDII) in varied capacities. These questions were posed to allow the opportunity for future research, for interest purposes in the event my primary research questions were not fully answered, in the event of lower than expected recruitment, while also ensuring participant survey response times were generally consistent regardless of NCDII experience.

Technology Use

Table A

Forms of Electronic Communication Used at Least Once Per Week by the Total Sample

Option(s)	n	% of 1532
Text message through phone	1406	91.78
Instant messaging platform	1244	81.2
E-mail	1280	83.55
Social Media	1299	84.79
Games	425	27.74
Video Chat	1140	74.41
Blog	25	1.63
Multiple Options Selected	1443	94.19

Table B

Reported Electronic Communication Rates of Use Post Pandemic (March 20, 2020)

Option	n	% of 1530
Significant decrease in electronic communication use	22	1.44
Some decrease in electronic communication use	31	2.03
No changes to electronic communication use	139	9.08
Some increase in electronic communication use	621	40.59
Significant increase in electronic communication use	717	46.86

Table C*Forms of Social Media Used at Least Once Per Week by the Total Participant Sample*

Option(s)	n	% of 1297
Discord*	20	1.54
Facebook	758	58.44
Instagram	1212	93.45
Kuaishou	2	0.15
LinkedIn	107	8.25
Line	10	0.77
Pinterest	419	32.31
QQ	2	0.15
Qzone	2	0.15
Reddit	331	25.52
Renren	2	0.15
Signal*	4	0.31
Sina Weibo	2	0.15
Slack*	2	0.15
Snapchat	959	73.94
Taringa	2	0.15
Telegram	478	36.85
TikTok	671	51.73
Tumblr	93	7.17
Twitch*	2	0.15
Twitter	559	43.1
Viber	16	1.23
VK	4	0.31
Vsco*	5	0.39
WeChat/Weixin	8	0.62
WhatsApp	767	59.14
YouTube	973	75.02
YY	2	0.15
Non-Applicable* ^a	5	0.39
Multiple Forms Selected	1288	99.31

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

^aForums deemed 'non-applicable' for this purpose at the analysis stage were video/audio entertainment applications (Netflix, Spotify) and dating sites (Tinder, Grinder and Taimi).

^bOther applications reported by a single participant include: Clubhouse, Kakaotalk, Peach, Weverse, 4Chan

Discovery of the Shared Sexual Imagery: Reports from Victims/Survivors

Victims/survivors were asked how they found out sexual imagery was shared without their consent, with responses presented in Table D.

Table D

How sexual imagery was discovered by the victim/survivor

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 261
The person who shared it told me	82	31.42
I saw it myself	54	20.69
Someone else who saw it told me	124	47.51
I heard rumours about it	101	38.7
It was shown to me by someone else who saw it	43	16.48
Police*	3	1.15
A reasonable suspicion*	5	1.92
Unclear response*	1	0.38

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

Contact Made with the Sharer (or not): Reports from Victims/Survivors

Of the victims/survivors who confirmed they either suspected or knew who shared their sexual imagery, they were asked if they contacted the sharer about their actions, to which 50.84% ($n=121$) said yes, and 49.16% ($n=117$) advised they did not. Of the participants who did contact the sharer, Table E presents their provided reasons for doing so. Of the victims/survivors who asked the sharer to remove and/or stop the further spread of the imagery, Table F presents responses to the question which asked whether their request was successful.

Table E*Reasons why victim/survivor contacted sharers post NCDII*

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 120
I asked them to take the imagery down from where it was posted	32	26.67
I asked them to try to stop the imagery from spreading any further (e.g. asking people who it was shared with to delete the content)	71	59.17
I wanted to know why they shared my imagery without my consent	80	66.67
I wanted them to know how them sharing my imagery negatively impacted me	59	49.17
I wanted them to know how them sharing my imagery positively impacted me	3	2.5
I wanted to make them feel bad for their actions	45	37.5
To advise of intention to press, or charges pressed*	2	1.67
To get ride of original copies to prevent future distribution*	4	3.33
We were still in a relationship*	3	2.5
Uncategorized*	3	2.5

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses.

Table F*Victim/survivor accounts of whether sharers removed and/or stopped the further spread of the imagery after being asked*

Option(s)	Removal of Imagery		Stop Further Spread of Imagery	
	<i>n</i>	% of 32	<i>n</i>	% of 71
Yes, when I first requested it	3	9.38	25	35.21
Yes, but it took multiple requests	7	21.88	15	21.13
Yes, but only after I threatened legal action/to tell a person in authority	6	18.75	7	9.86
Yes, but only after I took legal action/told a person in authority	4	12.5	1	1.41
No	4	12.5	1	1.41
No, but the website/social media provider/organization did when I contacted them	5	15.63	0	0
Unsure	13	40.63	28	39.44
Unclear response* ^a	1	3.13	1	1.41

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

^a One participant advised, “they lied and said it never happened,” (Female, age 18, White) serving to deny the individual’s experience.

Of the victims/survivors who opted against the sharer(s), they were asked why they made this decision, with responses presented in Table G.

Table G

Reasons Victims/Survivors Chose Not to Contact Sharer(s)

Option(s)	<i>n</i>	% of 116
I did not know for sure who shared the imagery	19	16.38
I was afraid the sharer may harm me	17	14.66
I was too upset to speak to the sharer	33	28.45
I did not think confronting the sharer would make things better for me	79	68.1
I wanted to forget the sharing ever happened	59	50.86
I had no way to contact the sharer	4	3.45
I barely even knew the sharer	11	9.48
I did not know anything about the sharer, including where they live	5	4.31
I did not want the sharer to know how their actions made me feel	30	25.86
I was not really bothered by the sharer's actions	12	10.34
Length of time elapsed*	4	3.45
Shame*	2	1.72
I disclosed or was helped by someone else*	2	1.72
Degree of personal risk associated with doing so*	1	0.86

Note. An asterisk(*) indicates options were created by participant responses

Victims/survivors were also asked if they were aware if anyone else shared their sexual imagery after it was originally shared by the primary sharer to consider the degree of potential distribution. The majority of victims/survivors were unsure if secondary sharers distributed the content further 64.91% ($n=172$) were unsure, 22.64% ($n=60$) reported no, and 12.45% ($n=33$) said yes.

Appendix F: Additional Participant Accounts of NCDII Experience(s)

From the amount of data participants provided for this research, it is apparent NCDII is conceived as a serious harm with the real potential to cause significant damage. In response to the question asking about criminalization, there were participants who provided personal accounts of their direct/indirect NCDII experience. To give voice to these participants, they have been included.

-I am not often in favour of the government controlling our personal lives, but I believe this is one of the few times where the government should step in. The argument can be made that the sharer should not share if they do not want it to be seen, however, the situations in certain relationships can be very confusing and often, things are not so black and white. Many people I know have likely shared imagery, and I believe this bill has stopped these images from being spread, which would have in turn negatively impacted their personal and work lives. (Male, age 21, White, Victim/Survivor Recipient)

-Because I have had it happen to me and it effected my life in a very negative way. (Female, age 20, White, Victim/Survivor)

-because it is nonconsensual and therefore the person who shares it should face a consequence for doing so. also to deter others from doing it. (Female, age 20, Black, Victim/Survivor, Sharer)

-From my experience, I know how bad and horrible it feels to not have any control of a sexual image you sent to someone you thought would keep it to themselves (Non-Binary, age 18, Middle Eastern, Victim/Survivor, Recipient)

-I agree that it should be a crime, for when a photo is sent, (in my experiences, and of people that I know personally), they conceded to ONE person, the recipient of the photo. NOT to whoever else that person sent it further to. I used to be friends with this girl, she had a wilder past, and sent nudes, however she does not anymore. some people STILL have them, and bring them up from 5 years ago. they make fun, but don't have the common decency to delete them after five years. and have sent them further. That is not right at all. (Female, age 23, Mixed Ethnicity, Knows victim/survivor(s) and sharer(s))

-I know many people who have had their intimate images shared without their permission. Although I have personally not been in that situation, I have witnessed the damage that it has caused others. It should be a crime, and the people who share the images should be held accountable. (Female, age 21, White, Recipient)

-If there is no consent from the person in the imagery, there is a very likely chance they do not want images of themselves in such a vulnerable place being shared. There should be legal consequences for sharing this because it is wrong and it can have lasting negative effects on a person. I know it has negative effects on me and will for the rest of my life and no one should go unpunished for causing someone trauma and pain. (Female, age 18, White, Victim/Survivor)

-It can seriously ruin someone's reputation and mental health. I've known people who were tempted to commit suicide because people saw their nudes. Also, it is just very humiliating to people and that's a good enough reason to make it illegal. People have the rights to their own body and if they choose to send it to someone that's one thing, but if someone else shares their images to others who were not intended to see it, that shouldn't be allowed. (Female, age 20, White, Recipient)

-It is sexual abuse. It has similar effects. It may not be physical but the other aspects are there. It can be very harmful to the person in the imagery, I have known multiple people who have experienced the sharing. The people who've experienced it have been alienated and are always the ones judged for it. The blame is more often than not on the victim, and they are ridiculed into scary situations including repeated abuse or bad mental states that can be difficult to recover from especially with limited resources. In addition, the person who is sharing deserves to be punished for the harm and long-term effects they cause. They deserve to feel the repercussions of a damaged reputation, a criminal record and the long term effects that these carry. It is unfair that the victim suffers while nothing happens to the offender. (Female, age 21, Mixed ethnicity, Victim/Survivor)

-It isn't your fault for being manipulated by someone when they say they won't share it. As well as lots of high schools like mine did had secret group chats where they would share girls nudes and sexy videos without their knowledge and they should be held accountable for their actions (Female, age 19, Mixed ethnicity, Victim/Survivor)

-No matter what the circumstances are, sending/sharing sexual imagery of someone else without their consent should be a crime because 'consent' was not given by the person who's in the picture. The fact that

the consent was not given, should be an enough reason for it to be a crime. Everybody has rights. and one of the rights are 'right to privacy', no matter who the person is, and violating the trust or privacy of a person, is violation of their rights. Moreover, the topic of sharing sexual imagery in itself is a very sensitive topic and situation, especially for the person who's image is at stake. The world is not liberal enough to turn a blind eye when it comes to someone's nude pictures (especially of women or people from the LGBTQ+ community). The country I am from, the girls whose nudes were shared, were criticized, were labelled, and were scrutinized. They still have to bare with taunts from their family members because they apparently brought 'shame to the family'. However, the ones who shared those images by violating their trust, were never held accountable. And it is high time that things start to change. Keeping aside what the society thinks and what they have to deal with, the fact that they did not give consent should be an enough reason for the act of sharing sexual images such as nudes to be criminalized. Because most of the time, the person whose image is being shared are the victims.(Female, age 20, South Asian, Knows victim/survivor(s))

-Public image and reputation hold a strong position in society. We own our body. If someone received the gift of trust from another individual and used that to their advantage at some point with malicious intent they should be held accountable. We present ourselves differently to different people. I act around my family and friends in a way I never would in a job because they are different environments with different expectations. If it's illegal for people to walk around in public that way, it should be illegal to spread an image of people that way. Also, wtf is wrong with human beings and understanding consent. It needs to be freely given, or not done. (Female, age 26, White, Recipient)

-Though I had some slip ups, I do believe it is wrong to send someone else's sexual imagery without their consent as it can ruin the lives or hurt those people. Think of Amanda Todd. I know it isn't always the case that it can get that bad, but it is still unethical and disgusting. (Female, age 19, White, Victim/Survivor, Sharer, Recipient)

References

- Aikenhead, M. (2018). Non-consensual disclosure of intimate images as a crime of gender-based violence. *Canadian Journal of Women & the Law*, 30(1), 117–143.
- Aikenhead, M. (2021). Revenge pornography and rape culture in Canada's nonconsensual distribution case law. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 533-553.
- Anderson, B., & Wood, M. A. (2021). Doxxing: A scoping review and typology. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 205-226.
- Angrove, G. (2015). "She's such a slut!": The sexualized cyberbullying of teen girls and the education law response. In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic networks: An analytic tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3), 385-405.
- Bailey, J. (2015). A perfect storm: How the online environment, social norms, and law shape girls' lives. In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Bailey, J. (2017). From "zero tolerance" to "safe and accepting": Surveillance & equality in the evolution of Ontario's education & policy. *Education Law Journal*, 26(2), 147-180.
- Bailey, J. (2014). Time to unpack the juggernaut?: Reflections on the Canadian federal parliamentary debates on "cyberbullying". *Dalhousie Law Journal*, 37(2), 661-707.
- Bailey, J., & Burkell, J. (2020). Legal remedies for online attacks: Young people's perspectives. *The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research*, 9, 110-140.

- Bailey, J., & Shayan, S. (2021). The missing and murdered Indigenous women crisis: Technological dimensions. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 125-144.
- Bailey, J. & Steeves, V. (2013). Will the real digital girl please stand up? In H. Koskela & M. Wise (Eds.), *New Visualities, New Technologies: The New Ecstasy of Communication*. London: Ashgate Publishing.
- Barker, K., & Jurasz, O. (2021). Text-based (sexual) abuse and online violence against women: Toward law reform? *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 247-264.
- Bates, L. (2012). *The Everyday Sexism Project*. Retrieved from <https://everydaysexism.com>.
- Bates, S. (2017). Revenge porn and mental health: A qualitative analysis of the mental health effects of revenge porn on female survivors. *Feminist Criminology*, 12 (1), 22-42.
- Bloom, S. (2016). No vengeance for ‘revenge porn’ victims: Unraveling why this latest female-centric intimate-partner offence is still legal, and why we should criminalize it. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 42 (2), 233-289.
- Boyle, K. M., & Rogers, K.B. (2020). Beyond the rape “victim”-“survivor” binary: How race, gender, and identity processes interact to shape distress. *Sociological Forum*, 35(2), 323-345.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Broadbent, E., & Thompson, C. (2021). Justice on the digitized field: Analyzing online responses to technology-facilitated informal justice through social network analysis. *The*

Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse.

Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 689-709.

- Broll, R., & Huey, L. (2015). “Just being mean to somebody isn’t a police matter”: Police perspectives on policing cyberbullying. *Journal of School Violence, 14* (2), 155-176.
- Cama, E. (2021). Understanding experiences of sexual harms facilitated through dating and hook up apps among women and girls. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 333-350.
- Canadian Centre for Child Protection. (2022). *Press & Media: Public Awareness*. Retrieved from <https://www.protectchildren.ca/en/press-and-media/public-awareness/>
- Canadian Centre for Child Protection. (2022). *Programs and Initiatives*. Retrieved from <https://protectchildren.ca/en/programs-and-initiatives/>
- Canadian Centre for Child Protection. (2022). *Project Arachnid*. Retrieved from <https://protectchildren.ca/en/programs-and-initiatives/project-arachnid/>
- Canadian Centre for Child Protection. (2018). Self/peer exploitation: it’s not ok. A resource guide for families addressing self/peer exploitation. https://protectchildren.ca/pdfs/SPEX_FamilyGuide_Web_single_en.pdf
- Canadian Centre for Child Protection. (2017). Tweens/teens and apps. *Cybertip!ca Apps Safety Sheet*. Retrieved from https://www.cybertip.ca/pdfs/C3P_SafetySheet_Apps-short_en.pdf
- Carlson, B., & Frazer, R. (2021). Attending to difference in Indigenous people’s experience of cyberbullying: Toward a research agenda. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 145-163.
- CCSO Cybercrime Working Group. (2013). Report to the Federal/Provincial/Territorial ministers responsible for justice and public safety: Cyberbullying and the non-consensual

- distribution of intimate images. Department of Justice Canada. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/other-autre/cndii-cdncii/pdf/cndii-cdncii-eng.pdf>
- Cheung, A. (2021). Doxing and the challenge to legal regulation: When personal data become a weapon. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 577-594.
- City of Winnipeg Economic Research. (2018). City of Winnipeg indigenous peoples highlights. *Infrastructure Planning Office, Economic Research: 2016 Canadian Census*. Retrieved from <https://winnipeg.ca/cao/pdfs/IndigenousPeople-WinnipegStatistics.pdf>
- Coburn, P. I., Connolly, D.A., & Roesch, R. (2015). Cyberbullying: Is federal criminal legislation the solution? *Canadian Journal of Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 57(4), 566–579
- Coombs, E. (2021). Human rights, privacy rights, and technology-facilitated violence. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 475-491.
- Creswell, J.W., & Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Crofts, T., & Kirchengast, T. (2019). A ladder approach to criminalising revenge pornography. *Journal of Criminal Law*, 83(1), 87–103.
- CyberScan. (n.d.). Intimate images and cyber-protection: support for victims. *Nova Scotia*. Retrieved from <https://novascotia.ca/cyberscan/>.
- Cybertip!ca. (n.d.). *Don't get sextorted, send a naked mole rat*. Retrieved from <https://dontgetsextorted.ca/#home>

Cybertip!ca. (2022). Is there a sexual image of you online and you don't know what to do?

Online Harms: Intimate Images. Retrieved from <https://cybertip.ca/en/online-harms/intimate-images/#mb>.

Cybertip!ca. (n.d.) *Non-Consensual Distribution of an Intimate Image*. Retrieved from

https://www.cybertip.ca/pdfs/Ctip_SharingSexualPictures_en.pdf.

Dardis, C. M., & Richards, E. C. (2022). Nonconsensual distribution of sexually explicit images

within a context of coercive control: Frequency, characteristics and associations with other forms of victimization. *Violence Against Women*, 0 (0), 1-22.

Define The Line. (2022). Define the line. *McGill University*. Retrieved from

<https://www.mcgill.ca/definetheline/>

DeKeseredy, W. S., Stoneberg, D.M., & Lory, G.L. (2021). Polyvictimization in the lives of

north American female university/college students: The contribution of technology-facilitated abuse. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp.6-81.

Department of Justice Canada. (2017). Cyberbullying and the non-consensual distribution of

intimate images. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/other-autre/cndii-cdncii/p6.html>

Dietzel, C. (2021). "That's straight-up rape culture": Manifestations of rape culture on Grindr.

The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 351-368.

Dodge, A. (2016). Digitizing rape culture: Online sexual violence and the power of the digital

photograph. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 12(1), 65–82.

- Dodge, A. (2019). Nudes are forever: Judicial interpretations of digital technology's impact on "revenge porn." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 34(1), 121-143.
- Dodge, A. (2018). The digital witness: The role of digital evidence in criminal justice responses to sexual violence. *Feminist Theory*, 19(3), 303-321.
- Dodge, A. (2021). Trading nudes like hockey cards: Exploring the diversity of 'revenge porn' cases responded to in law. *Social & Legal Studies*, 30(3), 448-468.
- Dodge, A., & Lockhart, E. (2021). 'Young people just resolve it in their own group': Young people's perspectives on responses to non-consensual intimate image distribution. *Youth Justice*, 00(0), 1-16.
- Dodge, A., & Spencer, D. C. (2018). Online sexual violence, child pornography or something else entirely? Police responses to non-consensual intimate image sharing among youth. *Social & Legal Studies*, 27(5), 636-657.
- Dodge, A., Spencer, D., Ricciardelli, R., & Ballucci, D. (2019). "This isn't your father's police force": Digital evidence in sexual assault investigations. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 52 (4), 499-515.
- Drouin, M., Ross, J., & Tobin, E. (2015) Sexting: A new digital vehicle for intimate partner aggression? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 50, 197-204.
- Eaton, A. A., & McGlynn, C. (2020). The psychology of nonconsensual porn: Understanding and addressing a growing form of sexual violence. *Policy Insights from the Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 7 (2), 190-197.
- Edwards, K. M. , Turchik, J. A., Dardis, C. M., Reynolds, N., & Gidycz, C. A. (2011). Rape myths: History, individual and institutional-level presence, and implications for change. *Sex Roles*, 65, 761-733.

- Fairbairn, J. (2015). Rape threats and revenge porn: Defining sexual violence in the digital age. In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Ferreira, G.L.G.P. (2021). Technology as both a facilitator of response to youth intimate partner violence: Perspectives from advocates in the global-south. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 427-446.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.)*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Gavin, J., & Scott, A. J. (2019). Attributions of victim responsibility in revenge pornography. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict & Peace Research, 11*(4), 263–272.
- Gosse, C. (2021). “Not the real world”: Exploring experiences of online abuse, digital dualism, and ontological labor. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp 47-64.
- Government of Canada. (2021). Canada’s digital charter: Trust in a digital world. *Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada*. Retrieved from https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/062.nsf/eng/h_00108.html.
- Hango, D. (2016). Cyberbullying and cyberstalking among internet users aged 15-29 in Canada. *Insights on Canadian Society: Statistics Canada*. Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/75-006-x/2016001/article/14693-eng.pdf?st=3hnhWkx_
- Heath, S. (2015). Security and insecurity online: Perspectives from girls and young women. In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

- Henry, N., & Flynn, A. (2019). Image-based sexual abuse: Online distribution channels and illicit communities of support. *Violence Against Women*, 25(16), 1932-1955.
- Henry, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2019). Image-based sexual abuse: victims and perpetrators. *Trends & issues in crime & criminal justice*, (572), 1–19.
- Henry, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2018). Policing image-based sexual abuse: Stakeholder perspectives. *Police Practice and Research*, 19(6), 565-581.
- Henry, N., & Powell, A. (2015). Beyond the ‘sext’: Technology-facilitated sexual violence and harassment against adult women. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 48(1), 104-118.
- Henry, N., Powell, A., & Flynn, A. (2017). Not just ‘revenge pornography’: Australians’ experiences of image-based abuse: A summary report. *Gendered Violence and Abuse Research Alliance (GeVARA) Centre for Global Research Centre for Applied Social Research*. Retrieved from www.rmit.edu.au/schools/revenge_porn_report_2017
- Henry, N., & Witt, A. (2021). Governing image-based sexual abuse: Digital platform policies, tools, and practices. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 749-768.
- Hrick, P. (2021). The potential of centralized and statutorily empowered bodies to advance a survivor-centered approach to technology-facilitated violence against women. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 595-615.
- Hsieh, H-F., & Shannon, S. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Jaffer, M. S. B. & Brazeau, P. (2012). Cyberbullying hurts: respect for rights in the digital age.

- Standing senate committee on human rights. Retrieved from <https://sencanada.ca/content/SEN/committee/411/ridr/rep/rep09dec12-e.Pdf>
- Jane, E. A. (2021). "Feminism is eating itself": Women's experiences and perceptions of lateral violence online. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 171-188.
- Johnson, N. L., & Johnson, D. M. (2021). An empirical exploration into the measurement of rape culture. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(1-2), 70-95.
- Johnson, M. (2015). Digital literacy and digital citizenship: Approaches to girls' online experiences. In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Johnson, M., Mishna, F., Okumu, M., & Daciuk, J. (2018). *Non-Consensual Sharing of Sexes: Behaviours and Attitudes of Canadian Youth*. Ottawa: MediaSmarts. Retrieved from <https://mediasmarts.ca/sites/mediasmarts/files/publication-report/full/sharing-of-sexes.pdf>
- Kanai, A. (2015). Thinking beyond the internet as a tool: Girls' online spaces as postfeminist structures of surveillance. In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Karaian, L. (2016). Data doubles and pure virtu(e)ality: Headless selfies, scopophilia, and surveillance porn. In E. van der Meulen & R. Heynen (Eds.), *Expanding the Gaze: Gender and the Politics of Surveillance* (pp.35-55). University of Toronto Press.
- Karaian, L. (2012). Lolita speaks: 'Sexting,' teenage girls and the law. *Crime Media Culture*, 8 (1), 57-73.

- Karaian, L. (2014). Policing 'sexting': Responsibilization, respectability and sexual subjectivity in child protection/crime prevention responses to teenagers' digital sexual expression. *Theoretical Criminology*, 18(3), 282-299.
- Karaian, L. (2015). What is self-exploitation? Rethinking the relationship between sexualization and 'sexting' in law and order times. In E. Renold, J. Ringrose, & R. D. Egan (Eds.), *Children, Sexuality and Sexualization* (pp.337-351). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Karaian, L., & Van Meyl, K. (2015). Reframing risqué/risky: Queer temporalities, teenage sexting, and freedom of expression. *Laws*, 4, 18-36.
- Kessel, A. (2021). Rethinking rape culture: Revelations of intersectional analysis. *American Political Science Review*, 1-13.
- Klinic Community Health. (2021). *Crisis Support*. Retrieved from <https://klinik.mb.ca/crisis-support/>.
- Klinic Community Health Centre. (2013). *Trauma-informed*. The Trauma Toolkit Second Edition. Retrieved from https://trauma-informed.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Trauma-informed_Toolkit.pdf
- Koskela, H. (2004). Webcams, TV shows and mobile phones: Empowering exhibitionism. *Surveillance & Society*, 2 (2/3), 199-215.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Survey research. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 537-567.
- Lenhart, A., Ybarra, M., & Price-Feeney, M. (2016). Nonconsensual image sharing: One in 25 Americans has been a victim of "revenge porn." *Data & Society Research Institute and Centre for Innovative Public Health Research*. Retrieved from https://datasociety.net/pubs/oh/Nonconsensual_Image_Sharing_2016.pdf

- Louie, Y. M. (2021). Technology-facilitated domestic abuse and culturally and linguistically diverse women in Victoria, Australia. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 447-467.
- Lytle, R.D., Bratton, T.M., & Hudson, H.K. (2021). Bystander apathy and intervention in the era of social media. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 711-728.
- Manitoba Justice. (n.d.) *Role of the Manitoba Prosecution Service*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.mb.ca/justice/crown/prosecutions/print,role.html#:~:text=The%20Crown%20attorney's%20job&text=In%20order%20to%20convict%2C%20there,just%20determination%20of%20the%20case>
- Marganski, A. J., & Melander, L.A. (2021). Technology-facilitated violence against women and girls in public and private spheres: Moving from enemy to ally. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 623-641.
- Marques, O. (2021). Intimate image dissemination and consent in a digital age: Perspectives from the front line. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 309-328.
- McGlynn, C., Johnson, K., Rackley, E., Henry, N., Gavey, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2021). 'It's torture for the soul': The harms of image-based sexual abuse. *Social & Legal Studies*, 30(4), 541-562.
- McGlynn, C., & Rackley, E. (2017). Image-based sexual abuse. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 37(3), 534-561.

- Milford, T. S. (2015). Revisiting cyberfeminism: Theory as a tool for understanding young women's experiences. In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Morteux, C., Kellard, K., Henry, N., & Flynn, A. (2019). Understanding the attitudes and motivations of adults who engage in image-based abuse. *The Social Research Centre: eSafety Commissioner*. Retrieved from <https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2019-09/apo-nid258171.pdf>
- NeedHelpNow.ca. (n.d.). *How can we help you today?* Retrieved from <https://www.needhelpnow.ca/app/en/>.
- Nicol, J., & Valiquet, D. (2014). Legislative summary of Bill C-13. Library of Parliament. Retrieved from <https://lop.parl.ca/staticfiles/PublicWebsite/Home/ResearchPublications/LegislativeSummaries/PDF/41-2/c13-e.pdf>
- Novich, M., & Zduniak, A. (2021). Violence trending: How socially transmitted content of police misconduct impacts reactions towards police among American youth. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 271-288.
- O'Malley, R.L., & Holt, K.M. (2022). Cyber sextortion: An exploratory analysis of different perpetrators engaging in a similar crime. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(1-2), 258-283.
- Pacheco, E., Melhuish, N., & Fiske, J. (2019). *Image-based sexual abuse: A snapshot of new Zealand adults' experiences*. Wellington, NZ: Netsafe.

- Powell, A., & Henry, N. (2017). *Sexual violence in a digital age*. Palgrave Macmillan Studies in Cybercrime and Cybersecurity.
- Powell, A., & Henry, N. (2019). Technology-facilitated sexual violence victimization: Results from an online survey of Australian adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 34*(17), 3637-3665.
- Quayle, E., & Cariola, L. (2019). Management of non-consensually shared youth-produced sexual images: A Delphi study with adolescents as experts. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 95*, 104064.
- Qualtrics XM. (2022). Retrieved from <https://www.qualtrics.com>
- QSR International, (2022). *NVivo*. Retrieved from: <https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/about/nvivo/who-its-for/academia>
- Rackley, E., McGlynn, C., Johnson, K., Henry, N., Gavey, N., Flynn, A., & Powell, A. (2021). Seeking justice and redress for victim-survivors of image-based sexual abuse. *Feminist Legal Studies, 29*, 293-322.
- Regan, P. M., & Sweet, D.L. (2015). Girls and online drama: Aggression, surveillance, or entertainment? In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Ringrose, J., Gill, R., Livingstone, S., & Harvey, L. (2012). A qualitative study of children, young people and 'sexting:' a report prepared for the NSPCC. *NSPCC*, 1-75.
- Ringrose, J., & Harvey, L. (2015). BBM is like match.com: Social networking and the digital mediation of teens' sexual cultures. In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

- Ruvalcaba, Y., & Eaton, A. A. (2020). Nonconsensual pornography among U.S. adults: A sexual scripts framework on victimization, perpetration, and health correlates for women and men. *Psychology of Violence, 10*(1), 68–78.
- Segal, M. D. (2015). *Independent Review of the Police and Prosecution Response to the Rehteah Parsons Case*. Retrieved from <https://novascotia.ca/segalreport/Parsons-Independent-Review.pdf>
- Shariff, S., & DeMartini, A. (2015). Defining the legal lines: eGirls and intimate images. In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Slane, A., & Langlois, G. (2018). Debunking the myth of “not my bad”: Sexual images, consent, and online host responsibilities in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Women & the Law, 30*(1), 42–81.
- Slane, A. (2015). Motion to dismiss: Bias crime, online communication, and the sex lives of others in NJ v. Ravi. In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Smart, C. (1989). Rape: Law and the disqualification of women’s sexuality. In M. Cain & C. Smart (Eds.), *Feminism and the Power of Law* (pp.26-49). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Spencer, D., Dodge, A., Ricciardelli, R., & Ballucci, D. (2018). “I think it’s re-victimizing victims almost every time”: Police perceptions of criminal justice responses to sexual violence. *Critical Criminology, 26*, 189-209.
- Starr, T.S., & Lavis, T. (2018). Perceptions of revenge pornography and victim blame. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology, 12*(2), 427-438.

- Statistics Canada. (2021). A statistical portrait of Canada's diverse LGBTQ2+ communities. *Statistics Canada*. Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/daily-quotidien/210615/dq210615a-eng.pdf?st=cJhXQnLN>
- Statistics Canada. (2018). Police-reported cybercrime, by cyber-related violation. *Statistics Canada*. Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tb11/en/tv.action?pid=3510000101>
- Steeves, V., & Bailey, J. (2016). Living in the mirror: Understanding young women's experiences with online sexual networking. In E. van der Meulen & R. Heynen (Eds.), *Expanding the Gaze: Gender and the Politics of Surveillance* (pp.56-83). University of Toronto Press.
- Steeves, V. (2012). Hide and seek: Surveillance of young people on the internet. In K. Bal, K.D. Haggerty & D. Lyon (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. Routledge Handbooks Online.
- Steeves, V. (2015). "Pretty and just a little bit sexy, I guess": Publicity, privacy, and the pressure to perform "appropriate" femininity on social media. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Steeves, V. (2010). Privacy in a networked environment. In L. R. Shade (Eds.), *Mediascapes: New Patterns in Canadian Communication* (pp. 304-320). Toronto: Nelson.
- Strassberg, D.S., McKinnon, R.K., Sustaita, M.A., & Rullo, J. (2012). Sexting by high school students: An exploratory and descriptive study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42(1), 15-21.
- Sumrall, T. (2016). Lethal words: The harmful impact of cyberbullying and the need for federal criminalization. *Houston Law Review*, 53(5), 1475–1501.

- The Shameless Circle. (2020). <https://theshamelesscircle.org>
- The University of Winnipeg. (2018). *Enrolment Snapshot*. Retrieved from https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/institutionalanalysis/docs/reports/2018_enrolment_snapshot.pdf
- The University of Winnipeg. (2021). *Student Wellness*. Retrieved from <https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/student-wellness/>.
- The University of Winnipeg. (2019, May 28). *Survey policy*. <https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/institutional-analysis/docs/university-survey-policy.pdf>
- Thomassen, K., & Dunn, S. (2021). Reasonable expectations of privacy in an era of drones and deepfakes: Expanding the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *R v Jarvis*. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 555-576.
- Thompson, M.P., & Morrison, D.J. (2013). Prospective predictors of technology-based sexual coercion by college males. *Psychology of Violence*, 3(3), 233-246.
- Urban Dictionary. (2021). *Flex*. Retrieved from <https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Flex>
- Vaahensalo, E. (2021). Creating the other in online interaction: Othering online discourse theory. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 227-246.
- Vitis, L. (2020). Private, hidden and obscured: Image-based sexual abuse in Singapore. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 15(1), 25–43.

- Waldman, A. E. (2021). Navigating privacy on gay-oriented mobile dating applications. *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 369-381.
- Walker, K., & Sleath, E. (2017). A systematic review of the current knowledge regarding revenge pornography and non-consensual sharing of sexually explicit media. *Aggression & violent behavior*, 36, 9–24.
- Walker, K., Sleath, E., Hatcher, R. M., Hine, B., & Crookes, R. L. (2021). Nonconsensual sharing of private sexually explicit media among university students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36 (17-18), 9079-9108.
- West Coast LEAF. (2014). #Cybermisogyny: using and strengthening canadian legal responses to gendered hate and harassment online. Vancouver: west coast LEAF.
- Yang, Y. T., & Grinshteyn, E. (2016). Safer cyberspace through legal intervention: A comparative review of cyberbullying legislation. *World Medical & Health Policy*, 8(4), 458–477.
- Yar, M. (2012). Crime, media and the will-to-representation: Reconsidering relationships in the new media age. *Crime Media Culture*, 8(3), pp.245-260.
- Zvi, L., & Bitton, M.S. (2021). Perceptions of victim and offender culpability in non-consensual distribution of intimate images. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 27(5), 427-442.
- Zvi, L. (2021). The double standard toward female and male victims of non-consensual dissemination of intimate images. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0(0), 1-22.

Legislation Cited

Criminal Code (R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46)

Protecting Canadians from Online Crime Act, SC 2014, c 31

The Intimate Images Protection Act. (2015). C.C.S.M. c. 187



PROTOCOL APPROVAL

TO: **Samantha Hanson (Graduate Student)**
Principal Investigator

Supervisor
Michelle Bertrand

FROM: **Jeannie Kerr, Chair**
University Human Ethics Research Board (UHREB)

Re: **Protocol #HE15198**
Non-Consensual Distribution of Intimate Images (NCDII): An Analysis of Image-Based Sexual Abuse

Effective: 24-Jan-2021

Approval Type: 1 Year

Expiry: 24-Jan-2022

University Human Research Ethics Board (UHREB) has reviewed and approved the above research. UHREB is constituted and operates in accordance with the current *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. This approval is subject to the following conditions.

1. Approval is granted only for the research and purposes described in the application.
2. Any modification to the research must be submitted to UHREB through WebGrants for approval before implementation.
3. Any deviations to the research or adverse events must be submitted to UHREB as soon as possible.
4. This approval is valid for one year only (two years in the case of 2-2-1 approval) and, if required, a Renewal Request ("Post Approval Activity") must be submitted through WebGrants and approved by the above expiry date.
5. Any unanticipated issues or events during this project that may increase the level of risk to participants, or has other ethical implications that may affect participants' welfare, must be reported to UHREB without delay.
6. A Status Report must be submitted through WebGrants to UHREB when the research is complete or terminated.
7. The University of Winnipeg may request to review research documentation from this project to demonstrate compliance with this approved protocol and the University of Winnipeg UHREB *Policies and Procedures*.

Signed: Jeannie Kerr

Chair, UHREB

January 24, 2021

Date

*Email a copy of this Approval to Research Accounting to release project funds.