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Abstract

Since the Internet was first established in the late 1960s it has become significantly easier to gain access to. Email, bulletin board systems, and Internet gaming came to be in the 1970s. Internet pornography soon followed and access has continued to increase.

A new trend in pornography includes interactive pornographic websites, which offers users the ability to upload and share pornographic materials. This ability allows individuals to not only post their own photos or videos, but also the photos and videos of others who may, or may not, have consented to such distribution. Nonconsensual pornography also referred to as “revenge porn,” “cyber rape,” or “involuntary porn,” concerns the creation, acquisition and/or distribution of sexually graphic images or movies of individuals without their consent to the distribution. Simply, it is the nonconsensual distribution of consensually or nonconsensually created pornography. This exploratory research hopes to better understand the prevalence and effects of revenge porn amongst college students through a convenience sample of 167 criminal justice students at Bridgewater State University. Specifically this study asks, how prevalent is revenge porn among university students? What is the relationship between social media presence and revenge porn victimization? And what are the demographic characteristics of criminal justice students who post revenge porn online?
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Since the Internet was first established in the late 1960s it has become significantly easier to gain access to (Budde, 2014). Email, bulletin board systems, and Internet gaming came to be in the 1970s. Internet pornography soon followed and access has continued to increase.

In 1991, there were less than 90 published pornographic magazines (Budde, 2014). According to McMillan, as of 2011, forty-two thousand three hundred and thirty-seven of the one million most-trafficked sites on the Internet were offering sex-related content (McMillan, 2011). The Internet provides a fast and anonymous way to access pornography, making it appealing to men and women alike. One of the newer trends in pornography are interactive pornographic websites, which according to Budde, offers users the ability to upload and share pornographic materials (Budde, 2014).

This ability to upload and share pornographic materials allows people to not only post their own photos or videos, but also the photos and videos of others who may, or may not, have consented to such distribution (Budde, 2014). Revenge pornography, also sometimes referred to as “nonconsensual pornography,” “cyber rape,” or “involuntary porn,” is the practice of distributing nude or sexually graphic images of an adult individual without the consent of the person or persons present in the photograph or video (Budde, 2014; Franklin, 2014).

Revenge porn includes images or movies taken of the victim as well as images or movies taken by the victim, (commonly referred to as a “selfie”), uploaded without their consent (Larkin, 2014). Revenge porn can take many different forms. The distribution of sexually explicit photos or videos through text messages, e-mails, and in hard copy qualifies as revenge porn. However, cyber distribution is cheap and accessible making it most frequent form (Franklin, 2014).
A vengeful once-partner, hacker, or anyone else can upload a sexually graphic image to a website where millions of people can view it and share it (Franks, 2015). The Internet provides a “staggering means of amplifications, extending the reach of content in unimaginable ways,” (Citron & Franks, 2014, p. 350). Although private sharing of nude and sexual images via text message or in hard copy would likely qualify as revenge porn, the most common domain today is the Internet. It is important to note that the term ‘revenge porn’ is problematic due to the fact that first, not all individuals who distribute these videos or images to websites do so out of revenge or malice. Second, it arguably misrecognizes the harm or violation that has occurred (Henry & Powell, 2015).

Some websites that require consent from all parties in the photo many include provisions in their Terms of Consent that release them from liability, making the consent mandate basically ineffective (Budde, 2014). In addition, Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996 offers civil immunity to users and providers of interactive computer services (Franklin, 2014). There are a number of websites entirely dedicated to this type of pornography.

Such sites, including IsAnyoneUp.com, MyEx.com, MyAmateurGirlfriend.com, Texxxan.com, Pinkmeth.com and ExGirlfriendPics.com, encourage people to submit photos of former romantic partners, without the partner’s consent, in order to “get revenge.” Larkin compares the Internet to an elephant stating, “Like an elephant, the Internet never forgets,” (2014, p. 1). Information potentially lives in the cloud, a cache owned by a large search engine, or even the server of a firm that collects and sells personal information to other companies (Larkin, 2014).

This exploratory research hopes to better understand the prevalence and effects of revenge porn amongst college students through a convenience sample of criminal justice students.
at a Northeastern public university. The research questions for this study include: one, how prevalent is revenge porn among university students? Two, what is the relationship between social media presence and revenge porn? Three, what are the demographic characteristics of criminal justice students who post revenge porn online?

As this study is exploratory, it’s difficult to hypothesize about the results. However, we do expect to see a relationship between an individual’s social media presence and revenge porn victimization. We also expect to see a relationship between gender and likelihood to offend as well as victimization. As many public “revenge porn” cases involve female victims and male perpetrators.
CHAPTER TWO: Literature Review

Literature on revenge porn is limited. No national data exists, nor has there been an academically published study on the prevalence or cause of revenge porn. The nascent literature that does exist, demonstrates there is a need to understand the prevalence of, motivations behind, and consequences of these actions.

In 2014, an individual who went by the screen name, “Original Guy” released intimate photographs of celebrities he had collected on an anonymous online forum called AnonIB. AnonIB not only plays host to a vast amount of pornography but also a group of skilled hackers who have learned to penetrate the Cloud and obtain naked photographs of women (Cook, 2014). The International Business Times reported at least 26 celebrities were affected by the scandal back in 2014 (Remling, 2014).

According to Remling, sixty explicit images of twenty-five year-old Jennifer Lawrence were stolen off of her cloud account and posted on AnonIB before being distributed to other websites such as 4chan.org (Remling, 2014). Intimate photos of twenty-three year-old Sports Illustrated model Kate Upton and her boyfriend, Major League Baseball pitcher Justin Verlander, were also released. Nude and sexual photos of Gabrielle Union and her husband Dwyane Wade were also hacked (Remling, 2014). Although some celebrities affected by this have filed lawsuits to force the websites to remove the content, there have been no arrests in the case due to an inability to identify the original parties involved (Remling, 2014).

Each interactive pornography website provides its own guidelines for submissions. Many require everyone appearing in the picture or video to be over the age of eighteen and a guarantee that the images belong to the person submitting them (Franklin, 2014). These websites often encourage individuals to include the victim’s personal information in their posts such as their
name, location, age, place of employment, telephone number, and links to social media pages. In a 2013 study of 1,244 individuals, more than 50% of victims reported their full name and social networking profile appeared next to their nude photo and more than 20% reported the presence of their e-mail address and telephone number (Citron & Franks, 2014).

Evidence suggests the number of revenge porn victims may be high. According to Franklin, one study suggests that one in ten people have had an ex threaten to expose them online (2014). The same study claims that 60% of those who threatened this followed through with the threat (Franklin, 2014).

Another survey taken by the Cyber Civil Rights Initiative reported of the 361 respondents who reported this victimization, nearly 60% reported that their full name was posted with the material; 49% reported their social networking information was posted with the material; 26% had their email address included; 16% their home address; and 20% reported their phone number was included (Franks, 2015). Most of these sites allow visitors to search for individuals by name and browse images by geographic regions (Franklin, 2014).

Due to the permanence of the Internet, the ramifications of revenge porn can be everlasting, “making an original sin into an eternal one,” says Larkin (2014, p. 3). Wells agrees and demonstrates this point in a quote featured on an activist website Women Against Revenge Porn:

“As a victim of Revenge Porn, I am not victimized one time. I am victimized every time someone types my name into the computer. The crime scene is right before everyone’s eyes, played out again and again, and, ironically, I am treated as if I am the one who has committed the crime. I am victimized every time someone tells me that it’s my fault because I consented to the taking of the photos. But when someone shifts the blame to me, do you know what I say? I say, “Congratulations, because that’s exactly what the perpetrator wants you to think. He wants you to think I am the dumb whore who makes poor decisions,”” (Romano, 2013).
A major myth concerning revenge pornography is that the harm it inflicts is trivial (Citron & Franks, 2014). Some victims of revenge pornography have been threatened, stalked, harassed, fired by employers, and forced to change schools (Franks, 2015; Citron & Franks, 2014). Additionally, victims can suffer from a loss sense of security, anxiety, panic attacks, anorexia nervosa, depression, emotional distress, and some are even suicidal after their victimization (Franks, 2015; Citron & Franks, 2014; Franklin, 2014). The effects of revenge porn were obvious in the Cyber Civil Rights Initiative Survey.

Victims reported negative outcomes including: emotional distress (93%); teasing by others (37%); harassment or being stalked online (49%); harassment or being stalked outside of the Internet (30%); and suicidal thoughts due to being a victim (51%) amongst others (Franks, 2015). In September 2012, 15-year-old Audrie Pott committed suicide by hanging after three teenage boys sexually assaulted her and posted photos of the assault online (Kurhi, 2013).

Revenge photography also plays a role in intimate partner violence, with abusers using the threat of disclosure as a means of controlling their partner (Citron & Franks, 2014; Franks, 2015). In some cases the intimate images are themselves a result of an abuser’s coercion of a partner (Franks, 2015).

The professional consequences of revenge porn must also be considered. When an individual’s name is printed next to a naked image or video, their naked photos may appear during an Internet search for their name. Many victims have lost their jobs because of this, including teachers and government employees (Citron & Franks, 2014). For example, Adam Kuhn, chief of staff to Representative Steve Stivers of Ohio, resigned from office in June 2014 after his ex-girlfriend, Jennifer Roubenes Allbaugh tweeted an intimate picture of Kuhn to
Representative Stiver’s Twitter account. Allbaugh told a reporter she “just wanted to teach the pompous asshole a lesson,” (Franks, 2015, p. 12).

The presence of these photos might affect a person’s ability to find work at all. Employers often rely on online representations of individuals as a screening tool while hiring. According to a 2009 study by Microsoft, nearly 80% of employers use search engines to collect information on job candidates. Additionally, nearly 70% of the time, they reject applicants based on their findings (Citron & Franks, 2014).

Supporters of revenge porn outlets, such as the creator of IsAnyOneUp.com, Hunter Moore, often place the blame on the individual who consented to his or her photo to be taken (Budde, 2014). Hunter Moore, commonly referred to as the “Revenge Porn King” or the “Most Hated Man on the Internet” has publically stated, “I don’t know how you can point your finger at me; you took the picture […] somebody was gonna monetize this, and I was the person to do it,” (Morris, 2012).

During an interview with Dr. Drew Pinsky, which aired on CNN on April 23, 2012, a caller asked Moore if he was ashamed of himself knowing that women have killed themselves after their images were posted on his website. Moore, who started the site to hurt the girls that hurt him, responded, “I can’t take accountability for what other people have done,” (Moore, 2012).

Moore was first arrested in January 2014 and charged with fifteen counts related to computer hacking, identity theft, and conspiracy. He pled guilty the following month to aggravated identity theft and aiding and abetting in the unauthorized access of a computer to obtain information for purposes of private financial gain. Moore reportedly paid Charles “Gary”
Evans to infiltrate victims’ emails unknowingly to steal photos that were later posted on his website (Kreps, 2015).

U.S. District Judge Dolly Gee sentenced Moore to two and a half years in federal prison on December 2, 2015. Evans was sentenced the month before by Gee to two years in federal prison followed by three years of supervised release and a $2,000 fine for his involvement (Ohlheiser, 2015). While his victims may find relief in his imprisonment, Kreps notes that Moore wasn’t charged with any counts of invasion of privacy or revenge-porn (2015).

The first revenge porn website, “Is Anyone Up?,” was estimated to have grossed up to $20,000 a month before closing in 2012 (Franklin, 2014). However, the likelihood of sustained profitability is low and therefore, many website operators are likely to have alternative motives for creating these sites such as a sexual interest in revenge porn or the belief that exposing these victims is just (Franklin, 2014). These motives are based on the humiliation of the individuals (typically women) for engaging in lewd behavior. While some sites do feature images and videos of men, the majority of those depicted are female. The harm from having an image or video shared on a website disproportionately affects women (Franklin, 2014).

Jeong argues that under the First Amendment the government cannot hold someone accountable for the publication of true information regardless of the nature or strength of the privacy interest (Larkin, 2014; Jeong, 2013). Budde argues that the victim should not be punished for “exercising their right to sexual autonomy,” (2014). She promotes the punishment of offenders through existing legislation, such as harassment, extortion, and cyberstalking, in hopes of deterring others from posting in these forums (Budde, 2014).

Legislators and scholars alike are undecided on how to best handle the revenge porn problem. Some, like Bambauer, have advocated for civil action to compensate victims. Others,
like Franks and Citron, believe in drafting new criminal laws to punish offenders (Budde, 2014). Still others like Nussbaum contend that no civil or criminal action is required. Instead, Nussbaum believes that because revenge pornography stems from cultural norms, it would be best fought by reexamining the culture of masculinity (Budde, 2014).

The question that exists is whether the solutions for revenge porn belong in our civil or criminal courts? If neither, what does a better alternative look like? It is important to note that while legislatures and advocates are currently working to criminalize revenge porn, our current laws typically do not provide protection to victims of revenge porn (Franklin, 2014).

**Sexual Autonomy**

Sexual autonomy is referred to as freedom from illegitimate pressures to exercise one’s sexuality. It permits individuals to act freely on their conception of what their bodies and sexual capacities are for (Budde, 2014). Simply, it is the right or capacity of each individual to decide who, when, where, and how they choose to be sexual (Budde, 2014; Danaher, 2013). According to Budde, sexual autonomy occurs in revenge porn cases when a woman chooses to express her sexuality through the act of taking a sexually explicit image or video, or allowing another to do so. When these photos are distributed without the consent of the woman, it violates her sexual autonomy and demands a response from the law (Budde, 2014).

Citron states, “This disregard for harms undermining women’s autonomy is closely tied to idiosyncratic, dangerous views about consent with regard to sex,” (Citron & Franks, 2014). Budde argues that by allowing our legal system to remain indifferent on the issue of revenge porn, we are endorsing the behavior of the offender and allowing the blame for and the consequences of his behavior to be placed with the victim (Budde, 2014). According to Budde,
prosecution of revenge porn would protect individuals from limitations on their freedom of sexual autonomy (2014).

According to Citron and Franks, some states are deciding revenge pornography should be considered a form of violence that violates legal and social commitments to equality, like rape, domestic violence and sexual harassment. Like each of these, it can inflict serious injury on victims. It is also a form of gender discrimination and limits a woman’s control over her own bodies (Citron & Franks, 2014).

**Young People, Technology, and Social Media**

Socially interactive technologies act as agents of social change for young people because they facilitate the rapid dissemination of information, the creation of social networks, and the acceleration of the process of autonomy from parents (Mesch, 2012; Blumberg & Luke, 2009). The availability of this technology has transformed our everyday lives. A study by the National Center for Health Statistics indicates that one of every four U.S. households have one or more mobile phones and no landline; while only one of every seven U.S. households have a landline without a mobile phone (Blumberg & Luke, 2009).

Smith suggests that the vast majority of Americans who own mobile phones send and receive text messages. Additionally, text messaging has been identified as a preferred means of communication compared to phone calls, specifically among young adults (Smith, 2011).

Kohut et al., estimated that nearly half of all Americans use social networking websites such as Facebook. Additionally, Smith notes that individuals with college degrees have been noted to use social networking sites at a higher rate than those without (2011). A Pew study showed that 79% of twelve to seventeen year olds had sent messages to friends in the previous
week using a social networking site, 69% had sent a text message, 56% had sent instant messages, and 44% had sent e-mails. (Pew and American Life Project, 2009).

In 2015, Wang et al., used a mix methods study of computer and phone logging with daily surveys and interviews to track college students’ use of social media for seven days. They found that participants were on average spending over an hour and a half on social media sites daily. Further, this research found participants were visiting the sites many times (mean = 118) for short periods of time instead of spending long amounts of time online (Wang, et al., 2015).

While social media has been in widespread use for over a decade, there is still little understanding of college student’s patterns of social media use across sites. Wang et al.’s study revealed that students who constantly checked social media did not report a higher need or motivation to use social media sites to maintain social relationships, maintain a presence, or keep current with information, compared to infrequent users. Rather, continuous checkers reported feeling a lack of control. Wang et al. maintained that the establishment of social media routines is driven by a lack of self-discipline rather than social media needs (2015).

Technology and social media has drastically changed relationships and the way in which people communicate. Marganski and Fauth illustrate this by explaining that Facebook was first launched in 2004 to connect college students, but now appeals to all age groups. It now allows families and friends to connect and also has initiated other more intimate relationships (Marganski & Fauth, 2013).

Mesch refers to the widespread diffusion of online communication as the “network effect,” which implies that the extensive use of e-mail, instant messaging, and social networking sites by teens is the result of its diffusion through social networks. Further, Mesch questions the
extent to which networks used by teens have changed given that networks reflect social similarity (2012).

Kirkpatrick claims that Facebook has always had a strong sexual undertone (2010). On the site Facebook prompts members to indicate their relationship status and offers users an easy way to flirt through a small application where one member can “poke” another (Kirkpatrick, 2010). Social networking sites have begun to influence the way we approach intimacy and develop relationships. Marganski and Fauth argue that the quick and convenient method of contacting someone via technology may in part contribute to decrease in personal interactions and an increase in “risky” behavior (2013).

Social interactive technology has emerged as a forum for sexual relating and enabled a culture of “hooking up” or casually engaging in sexual behavior outside of a relationship. According to Marganski and Fauth hook ups have become “a staple of the American dating culture” and are now frequently occurring on our college campuses (2013, p. 360).

Accompanying the increased use of the Internet is an increase in reporting of cyber-harassment and cyber-bullying. Mesch argues that although the prevalence of cyber-harassment and cyber-bullying is not high, it is a type of aggression with amplified consequences due to the constant online communication (2012). Given the research and their increased affordability smartphones are the primary manner in which young people access social network sites. Another evolving problem resulting from the increased use, access, and availability of smartphones is sexting.

Sexting

The term ‘sexting’ first appeared in 2005 after allegations surfaced that Australian cricketer, Shane Warne, sent sexually explicit texts to three women, each in different continents
Sexting has been thoroughly discussed in the United States since December 2008, when the National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy reported that approximately 20% of teens participated in sexting (2008). Sexting may be defined as the practice of sending sexually explicit images or text through mobile phones or other mobile devices (McCabe & Johnson, 2014; Hasinoff, 2012).

Discussions of sexting often do not distinguish between the use of mobile media for sexual harassment and consensual intimate sexual use. An individual who chooses to send sexually explicit images of themselves to a peer is engaging in a different activity than someone who distributes a private image of someone else with malicious intent or coerces another to produce an explicit image (Hasinoff, 2012). Legislation has failed to recognize the harm that is experienced by victims of the non-consensual distribution of sexual images and arguably over-regulated consensual sexual communications (Henry & Powell, 2015).

There has been much attention focused on the extent at which minors are involved in sexting. Internet safety projects have fixated on sexting in an attempt to educate young people about the permanence of their ‘digital footprint’ and the impact these behaviors can have on their reputation. Additionally, these projects warn young people about the legal ramifications of sending or distributing sexually explicit images, such as child pornography charges (Henry & Powell, 2015).

Section 2256 of the U.S. Title 18 Code, defines child pornography as any visual depiction of sexually explicit conduct involving a minor (someone under 18 years of age) (United State Code). Visual depictions include photographs, videos, digital or computer generated images indistinguishable from an actual minor, and images created, adapted or modified, but appear to depict an identifiable, actual minor.
Sexting involves minors who without the grooming or coercion of adult offenders, are voluntarily creating and distributing self-produced child pornography. However, because this activity is considered the production of child pornography, children who are involved in this activity may face significant criminal penalties. According to Leary, juveniles account for a significant portion of child pornography offenders (2008). Further, the number of minors engaged in destructive behavior, including self-exploitation is expected to increase for a number of reasons including Internet growth, chat rooms, mobile apps such as Snapchat, cellular camera phones, and online payment services (Leary, 2008).

Additionally, scholars, lawyers, and others have argued that this approach is reflective of a heightened public anxiety around youth and sexuality. Henry and Powell argue that some scholars have focused on the minimization of risky behaviors while denying sexual agency and promoting victim blaming (Henry & Powell, 2015).

The non-consensual creation and distribution of sexual images, or more specifically, revenge porn, has been framed as a problem of user naiveté, in place of gender-based violence. There has been a failure to respond to the harms caused by revenge porn and little attention has been given to the ways in which technology is used to facilitate sexual violence or harassment against adult women (Henry & Powell, 2015).

Policy

Criminal Statutes. Policymakers are divided on how to approach the issue of revenge porn. According to Franks, the presence and prevalence of this crime is due in part to the “fact that malicious individuals do not fear the consequences of their actions,” (2015, p. 3). This is beginning to change. Budde argues, punishment beyond the scope of civil penalty is justified through both retributivist and utilitarian theories (Budde, 2014).
Franks argues existing sexual assault statutes could, and should, be amended to include revenge porn. She claims even though the non-consensual distribution of pornography does not involve physical contact, it should still be considered a form of sexual assault and therefore, should be legally addressed on both the federal and state level (Budde, 2014; Franks, 2015).

Existing laws in the penal code, including voyeurism, stalking, harassment, and child pornography, establish that physical contact is not necessary to induce harm (Budde, 2014; Franks, 2015). However, if revenge pornography were to be considered a form of sexual violence, it would require a change in sexual assault statutes. Budde asserts that although the Supreme Court acknowledged the relationship between the crime of production and distribution of child pornography in *New York v. Feber* (1982), it did not imply that the two were the same or should be considered as such (Budde, 2014).

According to Budde, the Supreme Court would then have to draw a line at contact for sexual offenses and would not support this inclusion of revenge porn in sexual assault statutes, given the harsh punishment for sex offenders. Felons convicted of sexual assault have numerous post-incarceration sanctions including sex offender registration and residency restrictions (Wright, 2015). These post-prison punishments may not be appropriate for revenge pornography offenders (Budde, 2014; Wright, 2015).

Defendants in revenge porn cases have argued that although this behavior is offensive in character, it is constitutionally protected under the government’s inability to hold an individual liable for the publication of true information (Humbach, 2014). While the specific provisions of revenge porn laws vary, they typically share two key provisions. They forbid images that show sexual exposure or contact and dissemination without consent of persons depicted (Humbach, 2014).
Humbach argues that these two prohibitions are unconstitutional, specifically regarding content distribution, viewpoint discrimination, and speaker discrimination as well as prior restraint. Content discrimination is a restriction on speech limited to particular content such as sexual exposure. Viewpoint discrimination is designed to suppress a particular point of view, in this case negative or personal information. Speaker discrimination and prior restraint are only applicable to individuals who have not received consent (Humbach, 2014).

According to Larkin, “The fundamental mission of the First Amendment is to prevent the government from censoring the free communication and the exchange of ideas because it finds their content objectionable,” (2014, p. 44). This amendment was originally drafted to protect the democratic process and matters of public interest, although it extends much further. “It embraces speech done for the purpose of artistic expression, public or private entertainment, or personal self-fulfillment however ‘trivial, despicable, crass, and repulsive’ that speech may be,” (Larkin, 2014, p. 45).

Some forms of speech have been recognized as unprotected by the Supreme Court, including child pornography, obscenity, defamation, and threats (Larkin, 2014; Humbach, 2014). In *New York v. Ferber* 1982, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that the First Amendment right to free speech did not forbid states from banning the sale of material depicting children engaged in sexual activity. The Court has also held that some types of speech, such as commercial speech, are entitled to First Amendment protection, but not to the same degree as other forms of speech (Larkin, 2014).

According to Larkin, the issue of revenge pornography suggests two questions to be considered similarly: “Is revenge porn a type of ‘speech’ that the First Amendment protects? If revenge porn is protected speech, what protection should it receive?” (Larkin, 2014, p. 45).
Larkin argues revenge porn exists to humiliate and shame the victim, rather than serve as a form of artistic self-expression. He describes revenge porn as, “malicious conduct that injures the welfare of someone who mistakenly trusted an intimate partner,” (2014, p. 49). It would be ridiculous to claim that censoring revenge porn would deter individuals from engaging in legitimate expression, as revenge pornography could not be considered a form of legitimate expression without justifying the intentional infliction of injury on someone else. Lastly, considering revenge porn protected under the First Amendment would “belittle” the fundamental establishment amendment (Larkin, 2014).

Targeted legislation, such as the ones previously discussed, may have its benefits. It allows for the punishment of offenders and provides an awareness of revenge porn as a crime. However, Budde and Jeonge argue that legislation may create other problems, specifically over criminalization (Budde, 2014; Jeong, 2013).

In 2012, Australian courts sentenced a man to prison for posting nude photographs of his ex-girlfriend on Facebook. He was charged with publishing an indecent article and sentenced to six months. According to Budde, there are a number of statutes in which revenge porn could be includes in the United States. This includes harassment and cyber-stalking (2014).

In 2009, the Philippines became the first country to criminalize revenge photography. In 2014, Israel became the first country to classify revenge pornography as a sexual assault. That same year, Canada also criminalized the behavior and a court in Germany ruled that an ex-partner must delete intimate images of a former partner upon request (Franks, 2015).

Before 2013, only three states in the United States had criminal laws directly applicable revenge pornography: New Jersey, Alaska, and Texas. Between 2013 and 2014, 13 states passed criminal legislation to address revenge porn: Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware,
Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin (Franks, 2015). Six of these states carry felony penalties and it is considered a misdemeanor in the other ten.

Unfortunately, many of the laws that have been passed suffer from overly burdensome requirements, narrow applicability, and susceptibility to constitutional challenges. A “clear, specific, and narrowly drawn law” which protects the right to privacy as well as the right to freedom of expression is necessary (Franks, 2015). The elements of an effective law will be discussed in further detail later.

New Jersey’s invasion of privacy statute, which is targeted at cyber-bullying and not specifically revenge porn, was enacted in 2004 (Budde, 2014). The relevant part of the statute is as follows:

"An actor commits a crime of the third degree if, knowing that he is not licensed or privileged to do so, he discloses any photograph, film, videotape, recording or any other reproduction of the image of another person whose intimate parts are exposed or who is engaging in an act of sexual penetration or sexual contact, unless that person has consented to such disclosure," (Budde, 2014).

This statute criminalizes the non-consensual observation, recording, or disclosure of pornographic images or videos. Each individual action may be charged as a third or fourth degree crime. Third degree crimes, according to the New Jersey Code of Criminal Justice, are punishable by up to a $30,000 fine and three to five years imprisonment. Fourth degree crimes, according to the New Jersey Code of Criminal Justice, are punishable by up to a $10,000 fine and 18 months in prison (Budde, 2014).

The statute does not limit prosecution only to those who have themselves, taken and distributed the photos or videos of the victim. It also prosecutes those who have distributed photos or videos sent by the victim to the offender in confidence (Budde, 2014). The statute has
never been subjected to a constitutional challenge. Budde claims that it may be vulnerable because there are no provisions within the law that would allow for photos of interest to the public to be released without penalty (2014).

Unlike New Jersey, California drafted new legislation targeted at revenge pornography in 2013 (Budde, 2014). The relevant part of the statute is as follows:

“Every person who commits any of the following acts is guilty of disorderly conduct, a misdemeanor:

(j)(4)(A) Any person who photographs or records by any means the image of the intimate body part or parts of another identifiable person, under circumstances where the parties agree or understand that the image shall remain private, and the person subsequently distributes the image taken, with the intent to cause serious emotional distress, and the depicted person suffers serious emotional distress,” (Budde, 2014).

The law prosecutes individuals who take photos of others, and then distributes them without permission, with disorderly conduct. Disorderly conduct, according to California Penal Code is punishable up to a $1000 fine and six months in jail (Budde, 2014).

California has received a great deal of criticism for the limited scope of this law. Although the law criminalizes revenge pornography, it can only be applied in cases where the image is taken by the offender, not the victim or a third party (Romano, 2013; Budde, 2014). This is problematic because the Cyber Civil Rights Initiative survey found that 83% of victims took the images themselves (Franks, 2015). Additionally, there is no distinction made between self-shots ("selfies") and pictures taken by someone else within the California legislation. The relevant action in these cases is not the taking of the photos, but the distribution of the photos without consent (Budde, 2014).

Budde claims that by choosing to protect only the set of individuals who did not take their own photo challenges sexual autonomy. By limiting prosecution to victims who were photographed, and refusing to protect self-shots, California is essentially victim blaming. It
implies to victims that “their suffering is their fault and they deserve it for exercising their sexual autonomy in such a manner,” (Budde, 2014).

While some other existing laws prohibit the nonconsensual recording of individuals in state of undress or sexual activity, for the most part, the nonconsensual disclosure of images and movies has been largely unregulated (Franks, 2015). Jeong argues that distributors of revenge pornography and the websites that host the pictures are subject to a number of legal liabilities, both civil and criminal, and therefore, a new criminal law is unnecessary (2013).

According to Jeong, a victim can go after the discloser under a tort theory of public disclosure or private information and the intentional infliction of emotional distress. A victim who photographed or videoed themselves can copyright the photo or video and have them removed through the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. Pornographic websites could be sought after by the FBI for not keeping records on the subjects of their photos. Lastly, websites that offer to take down photos in return for payment can be brought up on extortion charges (Jeong, 2013).

As evidenced by Table 1 on the following page, there is significant variation in state criminal revenge porn laws. An “*” demonstrates that the indicated state also offers victims civil remedies, in addition to criminal, to use in order to sue offenders. In addition to the states which currently have criminal or civil laws, a number of states currently with legislation pending including: Arizona, Connecticut, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Tennessee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Language of the Law</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Statute or Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Harassment in the second degree</td>
<td>Class B misdemeanor</td>
<td>11.61.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Unlawful distribution of sexual images or recordings</td>
<td>Class A misdemeanor</td>
<td>5-26-314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California*</td>
<td>Disorderly conduct</td>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>647(j)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Posting a private image for harassment or posting a private image for pecuniary gain</td>
<td>Class I misdemeanor</td>
<td>18-7-107, 18-7-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Violation of privacy</td>
<td>Class B misdemeanor; class G felony if aggravating factors are present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Criminalization of Non-Consensual Pornography Act of 2014</td>
<td>Felony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida*</td>
<td>Sexual cyberharassment</td>
<td>Misdemeanor first degree</td>
<td>784.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Invasion of privacy prohibition on nude or sexually explicit electronic transmission</td>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>16-11-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Violation of privacy in the first degree</td>
<td>Class C felony</td>
<td>711.1110.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Video voyeurism</td>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>18-6609(2)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Non-consensual dissemination of private sexual images</td>
<td>Class 4 felony</td>
<td>11-23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Nonconsensual disclosure of a private image</td>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>14:283.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Unauthorized dissemination of certain private images</td>
<td>Class D crime</td>
<td>1.17-A MRSA 511-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Stalking and harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Invasion of privacy in the third degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>2C.14-9(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Unauthorized distribution of sensitive images</td>
<td>Misdemeanor; fourth degree felony if recidivist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Unlawful dissemination of an intimate image</td>
<td>Category C felony</td>
<td>Chapter 200, Section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina*</td>
<td>Disclosure of private images</td>
<td></td>
<td>14-190.5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota*</td>
<td>Distribution of intimate images without or against consent</td>
<td>Class A misdemeanor</td>
<td>12.1-17-07.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Unlawful dissemination of an intimate image</td>
<td>Class A misdemeanor; class C felony for recidivists</td>
<td>ORS 161.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania*</td>
<td>Unlawful dissemination of intimate image</td>
<td>Second degree misdemeanor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas*</td>
<td>Unlawful disclosure or promotion of intimate visual material</td>
<td>Class A misdemeanor</td>
<td>21.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Distribution of intimate images</td>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>76-5b-203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont*</td>
<td>Disclosure of sexually explicit images without consent</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Unlawful dissemination or sale of images of another person</td>
<td>Class I misdemeanor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington*</td>
<td>Wrongful distribution of intimate images</td>
<td></td>
<td>9A RCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin*</td>
<td>Representations depicting nudity</td>
<td></td>
<td>942.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civil Courts and Revenge Porn. Congress made an attempt to regulate Internet pornography through the Communications Decency Act (CDA) of 1996. Section 230 of the CDA protects users and providers of interactive civil services from civil conflict caused by third parties. The courts consider three elements when deciding whether a defendant should be covered under Section 230: “(1) whether the Defendant is a provider of an interactive computer service; (2) if the postings at issue are information provided by another information content provider; and (3) whether Plaintiffs [sic] claims seek to treat Defendant as a publisher or speaker of third party content,” (Nemet Chevrolet, Ltd. v. Consumeraffairs.com, Inc., 2008).

Since its enactment, part of the act has been struck down (Nemet Chevrolet, Ltd. v. Consumeraffairs.com, Inc., 2008). However, Section 230 still stands. Section 230 was a reaction to Stratton Oakmont, Inc. v. Prodigy Services Co. 1995, in which Prodigy, an Internet service provider was held liable for defamatory statements others posted on its online bulletin boards (Franklin, 2014). The New York Supreme Court found Prodigy liable because the company monitored its bulletin boards but had not removed the offensive content. Because the company monitored its bulletin boards it was considered a publisher and therefore liable for the site’s contents. Had the company not monitored the content, it likely would not have been held liable (Franklin, 2014).

Congress was concerned with the impact this case would have on the control of material appropriate for minors. The case essentially provided website operators with an incentive to avoid regulating material posted on their sites by a third party. Instead, Congress hoped to encourage website operators to regulate material that appeared on their site. Section 230, titled Protection for ‘Good Samaritan’ Blocking and Screening of Offensive Material, was Congress’
attempt to promote free exchange over the Internet and encourage hosts to voluntarily monitor their sites for offensive and obscene material (Franklin, 2014).

Victims of revenge porn have sued many different types of defendants for defamation, disseminating false information, copyright violations, sexually explicit content including minors, and threats. However, the individual liability for site operators falls between the liability of the individual submitter and the limited liability of service providers. Many site operators add their own content in the form of comments, identifying information, or tags (Franklin, 2014).

Tags make it easier for users to search for what type of pictures they want to view. These tags may include the gender, age, and race of the victims, or even more spiteful words such as “disgusting,” “slut,” or “herps confirmed,” (Franklin, 2014).

Franklin argues while individuals who post images or videos to revenge porn site are not immune under Section 320, suing them is unlikely to provide closure or satisfaction to victims for two reasons. First, the plaintiff may not be identifiable. The image may have been taken without the victim’s consent, stolen from the plaintiff or another party, or shared with the submitter by someone who the defendant shared the image with.

Intending to protect their customers, providers are unlikely to volunteer the identifying information of their submitters (Franklin, 2014). Second, suits against submitters are “unattractive for revenge porn plaintiffs because the submitters might be judgment-proof,” (Franklin, 2014, p. 1314). There is a lack of data on the wealth of individuals who submit images to revenge porn sites, however Franklin assumes they do not have “deep pockets” (Franklin, 2014).
Jeong argues that many of the “most egregious” websites that host such images or movies have been shut down and civil cases have been taken against those involved (Jeong, 2013). However, MyEx.com and ExGirlfriendPics.com were all still running as of December 18, 2015.

Civil litigation emphasizes compensation for victims. It attempts to repair damage and provide the victim with monetary compensation. Under privacy torts, an invasion of privacy claim is defined as a claim where an individual who publicizes the private life of another is subject to liability if the matter would be highly offensive to a reasonable person and is not of legitimate concern to the public (Budde, 2014).

Many states have an invasion of privacy statute that can be applied to revenge porn. However, this action may place strain on the victim in the form of time, money, and legal resources. Further, if the defendant does not have the financial ability to pay compensation, a favorable judgment is worthless (Budde, 2014).

Given that the videos and pictures in these cases are created and published by website users, and not the website providers, it is nearly impossible for an individual to file suit against website providers. The Communication Decency Act of 1996 protects Internet providers who allow third-party content on their sites in an effort to encourage free and open communication on the Internet (Budde, 2014).

Intellectual property law, including copyright law, has also been considered as an option in the revenge porn problem. This law allows victims who have taken their own photos or videos to recover the photo through copyright. Intellectual property is explicitly exempted from Section 230 thus, websites would not be able to claim immunity in copyright infringement suits.

Dazed Digital, an online magazine, published an article discussing one woman’s fight against revenge pornography. “Hilary” (a pseudonym for privacy reasons) took nude photos and
videos of herself throughout a long-distance relationship she was in. Once the relationship was over her exboyfriend posted all of them on various sites. After learning the photos and videos had been posted, “Hilary” sought legal advice to take them down. Because revenge porn is not illegal where “Hilary” lived, she was only able to fight these images through copyright laws (Turco-Williams, 2015).

“Hilary” hesitantly sent the photos to the US Copyright Office for approval. She eventually managed to get all of the images copyrighted and removed, with the exception of the videos. The Copyright Office would not accept stills of the videos. Therefore, the only way to copyright the videos was to submit the full video in the application for copyright. An embarrassed “Hilary” opted out, leaving the videos online (Turco-Williams, 2015).

Some scholars criticize the use of copyright laws in this way. Critics worry about maintaining the law’s integrity and proper place. Copyright expert Rebecca Tushnet wrote, “Concern for the victims of these reprehensible [revenge porn] sites is understandable, but distorting copyright law is not the right solution,” (Budde, 2014). In addition, copyrights can only protect the creator of the image, meaning, it would only be useful in cases where the victim was subject of the photo as well as the photographer (Budde, 2014).

Current law, policies, and public debate arguably view the unauthorized dissemination of sexual images as a distinct form of sexual violence. This act is viewed as a distasteful violation of privacy (Calvert & Brown, 2000; Coleman, 2005), while sexual violence is viewed as a criminal violation of “bodily integrity” (Powell, 2010, p. 80). This distinction is particularly false when the image or recording is depicting a sexual assault. This distinction fails to recognize the impact of these behaviors in addition to the physical assault (Powell, 2010).
In 2006, 12 young men sexually assaulted a 17-year-old girl in Australia. The men recorded the assault and distributed images of the assault. The DVD was initially sold in schools for $5. Later, copies were sold on the Internet and clips were made available on YouTube. Since then, similar situations have occurred globally. According to Powell, there are claims that emerging technologies are driving increases in violent offenses committed by youth in an attempt to emulate what they see on the Internet (2010). Further, technology offers new ways for committing traditional crime (Powell, 2010).

In 2013, blogger Alexandria Goddard and a hacking group, Anonymous, released incriminating video, text, and social media posts documenting the sexual assault of a 16-year-old girl by at least two classmates. The sexual assault occurred in Steubenville, Ohio in August 2012. Video and photos were taken of the victim, incapacitated by alcohol, as she was transported, undressed, sodomized, peed on, and sexually assaulted (Goodman, 2013).

Evidence presented in court included hundreds of text messages, pictures, tweets, and videos describing the events and the individuals involved. Two football players, Ma’lik Richmond and Trent Mays, were eventually tried as juveniles and adjudicated as “delinquent beyond reasonable doubt.” They both served time in a juvenile penitentiary, Richmond was released in January 2014 and Mays was released a year later (Goodman, 2013).

On October 23, 2015, twenty-one year old Jayvon Woolfork was sentenced to thirty years in prison for sexually assaulting a 19-year-old girl. Woolfork had two friends and their girlfriends to his house on the night of November 1, 2013. The two girls beat a third girl who was there alone and dragged her about the house demanding she undress and have sex with Woolfork. The victim fought back and begged to be left alone but was eventually brought into a room and raped by Woolfork. He was charged with kidnapping and sexual battery while the two
women and their boyfriends all accepted plea deals for their participation (Olmeda, 2015). The events leading up to the rape were filmed and posted onto the Internet. The video served as a major piece of evidence in the trial.

Sexual violence continues to be intertwined with gender inequality and societal attitudes that condone the sexual abuse of women and gendered sexual harassment targeting women. New offenses and appropriate criminal penalties may be required to reflect the harm to victims and the seriousness of these offenses (Powell, 2010). The following section discusses ways to deal with revenge porn in the United States. Civil action is used to compensate victims, while criminal law is used to punish offenders.

**Elements of an Effective Law.** There are many laws that have been passed or are pending in regards to revenge pornography. However, many of these laws have overly burdensome requirements, narrow applicability, and/or constitutional deficiencies. According to Franks, in order for a law to be strong and effective it must be clear, specific, and narrow to protect the victim’s right to privacy and the offender’s right to freedom of expression (Franks, 2015). Franks gives a list of features that she believes an effective law should have, as well as feature that should be avoided.

First, the law should clearly state the elements of the offense. It should include, the knowing disclosure of sexually explicit images or movies of an identifiable person whom has not consented to the disclosure (Franks, 2015). This is necessary to protect individuals who unintentionally disclose images or movies.

For example, an individual who received sexually explicit images through email or text message and was subsequently hacked. Hunter Moore, “Revenge Porn King,” hired Charles
Evans to hack into hundreds of email accounts in order to obtain material to be posted onto his website (Morris, 2012).

Secondly, the law should allow exceptions for sexually explicit material voluntarily exposed in public or commercial settings (Franks, 2015). This would include behaviors such as streaking, flashing, or commercial pornography.

Third, the law should not confuse intent with motive. A person’s motive is irrelevant, criminal law does not require proof of motive. The question that needs to be addressed is whether the individual intentionally took part in nonconsensual conduct (Franks, 2015). The term “revenge porn” may be somewhat to blame for this misguided requirement. Some perpetrators are motivated by vengeance, however, this is not always the case. Some do it out of greed for money, notoriety, or entertainment.

Fourth, the law should not be broadly drafted to include drawings, paintings, or unusually expansive definitions of nudity. While not being so narrowly drafted as to apply to only nude images, as an image can be sexually explicit without nudity (Franks, 2015). This is important to allow for artistic expression.

Fifth, the law should not be limited to disclosures made online (Franks, 2015). Revenge pornography can take other forms as well such as printed photographs or even billboards. Sixth, the law should not be limited to conduct by a current or former intimate partner. The Cyber Civil Rights Initiative survey found that of the victims surveyed, 23% had their photos posted by an ex-friend, 7% by a friend, and 7% by a family member (Franks, 2015).

Lastly, the law should not broaden immunities for online entities beyond what Section 230 of the Communication Decency Act provides (Franks, 2015). Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996 was designed to “promote the free exchange of
information and ideas over the Internet and to encourage voluntary monitoring for offensive or obscene material,” (Franklin, 2014, p. 1311). The section protects users and providers of interactive computer services from liability of content posted by third parties (Franklin, 2014; Franks, 2015).

Humbach proposed a possible approach to drafting new revenge porn legislation while attempting to avoid a direct conflict with the First Amendment. According to Humbach, when a statute is meant to regulate non-speech conduct, it may have “incidental” impacts on free expression. Statutes that impose incidental burdens on speech are subject to a lesser level of scrutiny known as “intermediate scrutiny,” (Humbach, 2014).

Intermediate scrutiny requires that the law be otherwise within legislature’s constitutional power, further a governmental interest that is an important or substantial interest and unrelated to suppression of free expression, and imposes no greater burden on speech than what is necessary to further the governmental interest (Humbach, 2014). Humbach argues for a law that defines its prohibition in a way that its burden on speech is incidental to a valid non-speech-related purpose, therefore qualifying for review under the intermediate-scrutiny standard established by United States v. O’Brian 1969 (2014). By criminalizing any act intended to cause or attempt to cause the non-speech harm of extreme emotional distress (Humbach, 2014).

The Federal Video Voyeurism Prevention Act of 2004 prohibits the intentional recording or broadcasting of an image of another in the state of undress without that persons consent, under circumstances which the individual enjoys a reasonable expectation of privacy (Citron & Franks, 2014). Considering this legislation while simultaneously understanding that a person enjoys a reasonable expectation of privacy in a relationship, Citron and Franks argue for legislation addressing revenge pornography (Citron & Franks, 2014).
Although there is no form of physical contact with revenge porn, there is still harm. The effects of revenge pornography may be repeatedly experienced for as long as the images or videos are present. If as a society our goal is to encourage freedom, including sexual freedom, Budde argues that, “we must protect people from others’ abuse of that freedom,” (Budde, 2014, p. 1).

As our use of technology increases, the legal avenues to prosecute cyber crimes need to adapt and expand. Regardless of the avenue in which revenge porn is dealt with, the issue needs to be attended to. Budde argues that revenge porn is “too harmful to its victims, to the principles of sexual autonomy, and to society to go unchecked,” (Budde, 2014, p. 50). To encourage gender equality it is important to recognize and protect female sexual autonomy and expression. Budde establishes revenge pornography as a “threat to sexual freedom,” one which needs to be addressed (2014, p. 49).

The question to be addressed is whether revenge pornography cases belong in our civil or criminal courtrooms. While civil options exist and victims have experienced some success, civil court is not the best forum for these cases. First, Section 230 of the CDA provides immunity for web providers that host this material. Second, victims might not have the financial or legal means to bring suit, or similarly, defendants might not have the finances for a suit to be worth litigation. Finally, it might be in the public’s best interest to focus on prevention rather than compensation (Budde, 2014).

Criminal law may be the appropriate system for revenge pornography cases. Yet for any criminal (felony or misdemeanor) statute to be effective, it should be enacted based on an empirical understanding of the problem. Given the paucity of research on revenge porn it is imperative to collect data such as this study.
CHAPTER THREE: Theoretical Framework

Numerous criminologists agree that delinquent behavior is learned through social interaction. This is found in Sutherland’s theory of differential association, which declares that criminal or delinquent behavior involves the learning of techniques of committing crimes and motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes favorable to the violation of law (Sykes & Matza, 1957). According to Sykes and Matza, the specific content of what is learned has received little attention in theory or research compared to the process by which it is learned (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

Cohen argues the process of developing a delinquent subculture is a system of values that represent an inversion of the values held by respectable, law-abiding society. However, Sykes and Matza argue that Cohen’s image of juvenile delinquency as a form of behavior based on competing or countervailing values and norms suffered from a number of empirical and theoretical defects (1955).

Sykes and Matza argued that much of delinquency is based on what might be considered an unrecognized extension of defenses to crimes, in the form of justifications for deviance which are seen as valid by the delinquent but not by the legal system or society (1957). Sykes and Matza described these justifications as rationalizations. They viewed these rationalizations as following deviant behavior and protecting the individual from self-blame and the blame of others after the act. According to the pair, there was also reason to believe that these rationalizations precede deviant behavior and make this behavior possible (1957).

Sykes and Matza maintained that the disapproval following from internalized norms and conforming others in the social environment is “neutralized, turned back, or deflected in advance,” (1957, p. 667). Further, social controls that served to check or prevent deviant
motivational patterns are rendered inoperative, and the individual was available to engage in deviant behavior without consequences to his self-image. These justifications of deviant behavior are referred to as techniques of neutralization.

Further, Sykes and Matza believed that these five techniques make up a crucial component of Sutherland’s “definitions favorable to the violation of the law,” (1957, p. 667). The five techniques include the denial of responsibility, the denial of injury, the denial of the victim, the condemnation of the condemners, and the appeal to higher loyalties. The pair maintained that by learning these techniques a juvenile became delinquent, rather than by learning moral imperatives, values, or attitudes conflicting with those of dominant society (Sykes & Matza, 1957). In short, techniques of neutralization contradict dominant societal values but do not represent a “radical opposition to law abiding society” (Sykes & Matza, 1957, p. 667).

Sykes and Matza’s techniques of neutralization have been analyzed by a number of researchers. Spraitz and Bowen (2015) used Sykes and Matza’s theory to examine the techniques used by accused priests in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. The case study considered 42 priests accused of sexual abuse.

Using personnel files, Spraitz and Bowen conducted a retrospective content analysis of all direct correspondence and statements made by the accused priests. They focused on 18 of the priests whose files contained letters, journal entries, interview answers, or written statements. They found that the 18 priests used techniques of neutralization to justify their behaviors 106 times. The condemnation of condemners was used most frequently ($n = 42$) followed by the denial of responsibility ($n = 33$). Denial of the victim ($n = 16$), denial of injury ($n = 11$), and appeal to higher loyalties ($n = 4$) were all present (Spraitz & Bowen, 2015).
Etter and Birzer also found support for Sykes and Matza’s techniques of neutralization as applied to intimate partner violence. The pair collected data from protection from abuse filings over a one-year period in Sedgwick County, Kansas. Etter and Birzer argue that the significant rate of past arrests of accused abusers in their sample may be explained by techniques of neutralization, specifically denial of victim. Further, they argue that the group of abusers may reoffend because of what Sykes and Matza refer to as “guiltless” and might justify their behaviors as a result of extenuating circumstances (Etter Sr. & Birzer, 2007).

Malsh, Keijser, and Debets used this theory to understand whether and which neutralization techniques were used by convicted stalkers who reoffended. The researchers studied twenty case files that contained reports of interviews by law enforcement with both offenders and victims, as well as reports from mental health professionals. These documents demonstrated rationalizations used by stalkers to justify their behaviors and the continuation of those behaviors (Malsch, de Keijser, & Debets, 2011).

**The Denial of Responsibility**

A delinquent may define himself as lacking responsibility for his deviant actions. The denial of responsibility reduces the effectiveness of the disapproval of self or others as a restraint. The denial of responsibility extends past the claim that deviant acts are an accident or a similar negation of personal accountability. Further, the delinquent may claim his actions are due to being helplessly propelled into situations because of forces beyond his control such as unloving parents, bad companions, or a slum neighborhood (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

Sykes and Matza maintain that from a psychodynamic viewpoint, this orientation may represent an alienation from oneself, but stress the fact that interpretations of responsibility are cultural constructs and not merely idiosyncratic beliefs. Further, the pair notes that they are
more concerned with the function of deflecting blame attached to violations of social constructs and the relative independence of a specific personality structure than the validity of the orientation. An individual learning to view himself as acted upon rather than acting allows deviance from the dominant normative system without the frontal assault on the norms themselves (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

Individuals may blame their behaviors on a number of things including: alcoholism, mental health problems, parents or guardians, sexuality, bad companions, or a slum neighborhood. One might argue that the Internet serves a forum for bad companionship within this context. Websites such as IsAnyoneUp.com provide individuals with an encouraging environment to post explicit images or videos along with personal information on their victims. Individuals may blame their actions on parental dysfunction. Further, given that this specific type of pornography is not against the law in many states, perpetrators may even deny the wrongfulness of their action.

**The Denial of Injury**

The second technique of neutralization focuses on the injury or harm caused by the delinquent act. Criminal law has historically made the distinction between acts that are wrong in themselves (*mala in se*) and acts that are illegal but not immoral (*mala prohibita*). An individual can make that distinction when considering the wrongfulness of his behavior. For the delinquent, wrongfulness may be considered based on whether or not anyone has been clearly hurt by the individual’s deviance, which is clearly open to interpretation (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

Specifically, Sykes and Matza argue a delinquent frequently may feel that his behavior does not cause great harm despite that it runs counter to the law. The link between acts and their
consequences may be broken by the denial of injury, similar to how the link between the individual and his acts may be broken (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

Although revenge porn should be considered immoral, it is not always illegal. Most states are not currently recognizing revenge porn as a crime and an individual can make this distinction when considering the wrongfulness of his behavior. Further, the consequences of revenge porn are often misrecognized and because perpetrators are not causing direct physical harm through the distribution of images or videos, they may deny injury completely.

The Denial of the Victim

An individual may accept responsibility for his deviant actions and may be willing to admit that those actions caused injury or hurt, however the “moral indignation” of self and of others may be neutralized by an insistence that the injury is not wrong given the circumstances of the situation. An individual may argue that an injury is not really an injury, rather a form of rightful retaliation or punishment. In which case, the victim is transformed into a wrong-doer (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

According to Sykes and Matza, the denial of the existence of the victim by transforming him into a person deserving of injury is an extreme form of the delinquent’s recognition of appropriate and inappropriate targets for his delinquent acts. Further, the delinquent may deny the victim because of the circumstances of the delinquent act itself. For example, if the victim is physically absent, unknown, or abstract such as the case in many property or virtual crimes (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

Perpetrators of revenge porn often (but not always) take action out of revenge. As Sykes and Matza describe, they may accept responsibility for their actions but claim they are justified out of retaliation or punishment. Additionally, they will often deny the existence of a victim
completely if the victim consented to the original filming. However, while that individual consented to the original filming in a specific context, that individual did not consent to further distribution of that image or video.

**The Condemnation of the Condemners**

The fourth technique of neutralization, the condemnation of the condemners, involves a shift of focus from an individual’s own deviant acts to the motives and behavior of those who disapprove of his actions. The delinquent may claim his condemners are hypocritical, deviant in disguise, or provoked by personal spite. In this case, the delinquent manages to change the subject of the dialogue from his own deviant behavior to the reactions of other. By attacking others, the deviant behavior of the individual is more easily repressed (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

Revenge porn has been argued as a form of expression and those contesting revenge porn have been accused of disregarding an individual’s First Amendment right to freedom of speech. Lee Rowland, senior staff attorney specializing in speech and online privacy for the American Civil Liberties Union in New York stated, “A bill that criminalizes sharing an image of nudity, infringes of free speech,” (Williams, 2015).

**The Appeal to Higher Loyalties**

The last technique of neutralization, involves the neutralization of internal and external social controls by sacrificing the demands of the larger society for the demands of the smaller groups to which the delinquent belongs. The delinquent may feel as if he is caught in a dilemma that which would only be solved through violating the law (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

Sykes and Matza stress that deviation from norms may occur not because they are rejected but because other norms, involving a higher loyalty, are accorded precedence. Further, the point that both norms are believed is what gives meaning to the concepts of dilemma and role
conflict that Sykes and Matza describe. The conflict between friendship and law has been recognized by social scientists as a common human problem. The extent to which the delinquent is able to see that he acts on behalf of the smaller social groups to which he belongs as a violation of society’s norms may vary, but it is a matter of degree rather than kind (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

Syles and Matza maintain that techniques of neutralization are used to lessen the effectiveness of social controls. Slogans such as, “I didn’t mean it,” “I didn’t really hurt anybody,” “Everybody’s picking on me,” prepare the juvenile for delinquent acts. The definitions of the situation represent cracks in the dominant normative system rather than the creation of an opposing ideology. These definitions are extensions of patterns of thought established in society (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

One might argue that the individuals who frequent revenge porn websites appeal to a higher authority than the physical community that the individual is a part of. Support and encouragement from individuals engaging in a similar behavior take precedence over other norms. As this exploratory study seeks to understand the prevalence of and response to revenge porn, this theoretical framework was thought to have potential applicability. As will be discussed in the results section, due to the limited sample size, this analytical framework could not be applied.

This study hopes to gain an understanding of the prevalence and effects of revenge porn among university students at a Northeastern public university. Additionally, it hopes to understand the relationship between social media presence and revenge porn as well as the demographic characteristics of criminal justice students at a Northeastern public university who post revenge porn online.
CHAPTER FOUR: Methods

In order to investigate the research questions listed previously, a quantitative exploratory study was created using an original survey and convenience sample of criminal justice students at a Northeastern public university.

Quantitative Studies

Quantitative studies emphasize measurements and the statistical analysis of data collected through polls, questionnaires, and surveys. It is also possible to manipulate pre-existing statistical data using computational techniques. This research generally focuses on gathering numerical data from a sample and generalizing it across a population, while the findings in qualitative research cannot automatically be used to make generalizations because they are often not conclusive (Qualitative and Quantitative Research, 2016).

Typically, the goal in conducting quantitative research is to determine the relationship between two things within a population. Quantitative research may be descriptive, where subjects are usually measured once and the study is able to establish associations between variables, or experimental where subjects are measured before and after treatment and establishes causality. This research focuses on numeric data and convergent reasoning (Babbie, 2012).

Qualitative research is typically very structured using flexible methodological techniques such as interviews or group discussions. Quantitative research uses highly structured techniques such as questionnaires. Research in quantitative data can usually be replicated or repeated because unlike qualitative research, which allows for open responses from respondents, quantitative research focuses on responses to pre-formulated questions (Babbie, 2012).
Exploratory Research

Exploratory research often examines a large number of variables in an attempt to discover which variables, if any, have a relationship to a specific problem. In addition to numerous variables, exploratory research often tests numerous hypotheses, as such is the case with this specific exploratory study (Lund Research Ltd, 2012; Trochim, 2001).

Again, revenge porn is a new phenomenon that had not been researched by academics. As of 2015, the Cyber Civil Rights Initiative distributed the only existing survey. Because this organization is interested in raising awareness, their survey brings bias concerns and for this reason, this exploratory study required an original survey instrument. While we were interested in understanding the prevalence of revenge porn amongst all criminal justice students at a Northeastern public university, due to time constrictions and budgeting restrictions we chose a convenience sample of undergraduate and graduate criminal justice students at Bridgewater State University.

Sampling

The study sample was obtained using a convenience sample of criminal justice students at a Northeastern public university. Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling technique. Non-probability sampling includes multiple techniques that help researchers select units from a population that they are interested in studying. A core characteristic of non-probability sampling is that the sample selected is based on the subjective judgment of the researcher. Unlike probability sampling, the goal in non-probability sampling is to understand the intricacies of the sample, rather than achieve objectivity in the selection of samples or to make generalizations from the sample to the population (Lund Research Ltd, 2012; Trochim, 2001).
Again, convenience sampling contradicts probability-sampling techniques, which uses probabilistic methods to select a sample population at random. In convenience sampling, the units selected are most often the easiest to gain access to. There are many advantages to convenience sampling.

There are few rules governing how a convenience sample should be collected. The relative costs and time required to carry out a convenience sample are minimal compared to probability sampling techniques. Data drawn from a convenience sample would often be impossible to obtain using probability sampling techniques, which require formal access to lists of populations (Lund Research Ltd, 2012; Trochim, 2001).

There are also disadvantages to convenience sampling. For instance, convenience samples often suffer from biases such as an under-representation or over-representation of a particular group within the sample. Additionally, since the sampling frame is not known, there is an inherent bias, which means the sample is not likely to be representative of the population. This leaves the researchers with an inability to form generalizations from the sample to the population (Lund Research Ltd, 2012; Trochim, 2001). In this case, we do not have knowledge as to why some individuals participated in the survey while others did not. The sample is also biased because all participants are currently enrolled in criminal justice, which may make them more aware of the criminal consequences.

An email was sent by the department chair to 1,100 students on February 10, 2016 inviting them to participate in an online survey. A link was included in the email, which directed them to the survey’s Qualtrics link. A reminder was sent out a week later on February 17, 2016. The last reminder was sent out on February 24, 2016 and the survey was closed two weeks later.
Unfortunately only 167 students responded, creating a 15.3% response rate. This response rate seems to be consistent of online surveys of college students.

A 2010 study at the University of Cincinnati concerning the extent and nature of cyber stalking surveyed full-time undergraduate students and had a response rate of 13.2% (Reyns, 2010). Another online survey of college students, this time researching patterns of use in time-limited instant messaging services had a 9.5% response rate (Piwek & Joinson, 2016).

As directed by the Institutional Review Board, students were made aware that the study involved risks and asked to provide the most honest and accurate answers. They understood that the survey was only to be taken by individuals over the age of 18 and that their answers were to be applied to images in which the individual photographed was above the age of 18. The age requirement of 18 was included to prevent the disclosure of child pornography victimization or offending. It was also made clear that the responses would remain anonymous and there was no fiscal or academic benefit to participating in the survey.

Survey

Revenge porn is a new phenomenon that has developed as the Internet has become more accessible. There is little literature surrounding this topic and no quantitative, academic research has been published to date. Dr. Holly Jacobs, started the *End Revenge Porn Campaign* in 2012, as a website that collected signatures in favor of ending nonconsensual pornography (End Revenge Porn, 2015). This campaign eventually grew into a space where victims and victim advocates could gather and share information about nonconsensual pornography and services available to help them.

A year after its creation the End Revenge Porn Campaign was incorporated into the Cyber Civil Right Initiative (CCRI). The CCRI is now a nonprofit organization that advocates
for technological, social, and legal measures to fight against online abuse, including revenge porn, globally (Cyber Civil Rights Initiative, 2016).

The CCRI has constructed a number of studies concerning the prevalence and effects of revenge porn. However, because this organization is determined to bring awareness to the prevalence and effects of revenge porn, there are concerns of biases. The studies the CCRI has produced concerning revenge porn served as the only existing studies to consider this phenomenon until now.

We created an original survey instrument to send to criminal justice students at Bridgewater State University. The survey instrument was developed in September 2015 and after receiving IRB approval it was pilot tested with a small group of graduate students in January 2016.

There are many advantages associated with the use of online surveys. Watt et al. note that “using web-based evaluation questionnaires can bypass many of the bottlenecks in the evaluation system (e.g. data entry and administration) and move to a more ‘just in time’ evaluation model (2002, p. 327). Compared to the traditional paper survey, web surveys also have a shorter transmitting time, lower deliver cost, and more design options (Weimiao & Zheng, 2010).

Low response rates have become a major concern in web surveys. The American Association for Public Opinion Research has defined response rate as the number of completed units divided by the number of eligible units in the sample. A 2008 meta-analysis of forty-five studies examining the differences in response rate between web surveys and other modes estimated that the response rate in web surveys is on average approximately 11% lower than other modes (Manfreda et al.).
Institutional Review Board

Bridgewater State University requires any investigator who is gathering data through intervention or interaction with a living individual or accessing identifiable private personal information at the university or under it auspices to consult the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The purpose of the IRB is to protect the rights, welfare, and privacy of the subjects by holding to the principles of the Belmont Report and the regulations of the Department of Health and Human Services. This includes advancing responsible conduct in research, the ethical treatment of research subjects, and ensuring every human subject is informed and voluntarily participating (Bridgewater State University, N.D.).

A research proposal was first sent to the IRB in September of 2015. The committee had some initial concerns. The IRB was concerned that the consent document was not written with the participant in mind. Further, the IRB wanted to make sure that individuals under the age of 18 were not solicited to participate in the survey. They also felt that the initial goal of 400 participants was “ambitious” and “concerning.” They wanted to ensure that students did not feel coerced to participate through solicitation in classrooms, advertisement in classes, or credit for participation.

The IRB had concerns regarding methods and materials as well. Specifically, they felt terminology was used interchangeably. The IRB was also concerned with anonymity. They were concerned about exposing participants to unnecessary risks and asked us as the researchers to take the appropriate steps to collect unidentifiable responses. They also suggested we interrupt respondents with reminders that the questions were only for participants and targets over the age of 18 to prevent disclosures about child pornography victimization or offending.
The IRB also vocalized concerns that the resource list was not well suited for the participant’s needs, specifically concerning the perpetrators.

After revising and resubmitting the IRB proposal there were additional concerns. In addition to concerns over the consent portion of the survey, they also advocated for an “other” response and reiterated their concern with soliciting responses from students under the age of 18. After addressing the concerns of the IRB we were allowed to move forward with distributing the survey.

The information this survey intended to understand is extremely sensitive. It is sexual in nature and asks respondents to respond truthfully about intimate relationships. It also asks students to divulge potentially criminal conduct. For these reasons, the IRB was justifiably concerned for the privacy of their students.

Chi-square

Given that the number of students who identified as having a nude or sexually explicit image or video posted of them was low, as well as the number of people who identified as having posted a nude or sexually explicit image or video of someone else online, the relationship between social media presence and participation in the sending or receiving of nude or sexually explicit images was focused on. To understand that relationship two chi-square analysis were run. Chi-square analyses were chosen because the variables are dichotomous, meaning the variables are nominal with only two categories or levels.

Students were asked to identify the number of social media accounts they use regularly, meaning more than once a week. They were given five possible responses, one being “I decline to answer,” but the categories were eventually collapsed into two, 0-2 and 3 or more. The first chi-square compared social media presence with taking or receiving a nude or sexually explicit
image or video or someone they know, not including themselves. The second chi-square analysis compared social media presence with taking a nude or sexually explicit image of themselves.
CHAPTER FIVE: Results

Sample Description

Bridgewater State University was founded in 1840 in Bridgewater, Massachusetts. In the 2016 spring semester there were 11,089 total students enrolled. A group of 1,100 criminal justice students were sent the survey and as previously stated, 167 students responded.

As noted in Table 2 on the following page, students in this sample were all above the age of 18 and averaged 22.35 years old. Of the 167 respondents, 60% \( (n=84) \) of them were female, 40% \( (n=59) \) were male, and 2% identified as transgender or gender non-conforming \( (n=2) \). The sample is comparable to the overall population at Bridgewater where in the fall of 2015 59% of students are female and 41% are male.

That same semester Bridgewater classified 19% of the undergraduate population as freshmen, 21% of the population as sophomores, 27% as juniors, 32% as seniors, and 1% as unclassified. Again, the percentages of the overall population are comparable to the sample population. The sample population is composed of 12% \( (n=18) \) freshmen, 14% \( (n=21) \) sophomores, 24% \( (n=35) \) juniors, and 39% \( (n=56) \) seniors. Graduate students identified as 9% \( (n=13) \) of the sample population. Sixty-seven students in the sample identified as transfers. For various reasons the university does not ask students to identify their sexual orientation, however 89% \( (n=129) \) of the sample identified as heterosexual (Office of Institutional Research, Bridgewater State University, 2015). A comparison of demographics between our sample and the Bridgewater State University population is illustrated in Table 2 on the following page.

We also asked the sample to identify if they were an active member of a fraternity, sorority, or University athletic team. We found that the majority of the sample was not.
Specifically, 6% of the population identified as a member of a fraternity or sorority and 10% identified as a member of a Bridgewater State University athletic team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>Bridgewater State University</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual/straight</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian/Gay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7,803</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Media Presence

To understand the social media presence of our sample we asked students how many social media accounts (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.) students used regularly (e.g., more than once a week). Four percent of the sample \((n = 7)\) identified as not using any social media regularly, 29% of respondents \((n = 48)\) said 1-2, 52% \((n = 86)\) said 3-5, and 2% \((n = 4)\) said six or more.

Behaviors

Students were then asked if they have ever taken or received a nude or sexually explicit image or video of someone they knew not including themselves. Again, these answers were only supposed to apply to images were the individual captured was above the age of 18. Fifty-eight percent \((n = 96)\) of the sample answered yes and 26% \((n = 44)\) said they had not taken or received a nude or sexually explicit image or video of someone they knew not including themselves.

We asked those respondents who said they had taken or received a sexually explicit image or video of someone else what they did with that photo (they were able to choose more than one response). The majority of the sample, 86% \((n = 83)\) said they kept it to themselves. Twenty-seven respondents said they sent it to someone they were sexually and/or romantically involved with (e.g., current or former boyfriend, girlfriend, hook-up). Other respondents \((n = 9)\) sent it to someone they had a sexual interest in but did not have a relationship with, others \((n = 6)\) sent it to someone they did not have a sexual interest in or a sexual relationship with, and others \((n = 6)\) contacted the person who was in the image/video. Four students declined to answer, 9 chose “other” but did not specify, and no one admitted to posting the photo on a social media or online site. Responses are demonstrated in Table 3 on the following page.
Table 3: Responses to “What did you do with the image(s) or video(s)? (Check all that apply)” (N = 95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kept it to myself</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent it to someone I did not have a sexual interest in or a sexual relationship with (e.g. friend, roommate, fellow athlete, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent it to someone I had a sexual interest in but did not have a relationship with (e.g. potential boyfriend, potential girlfriend, potential hook-up)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent it to someone I was sexually and/or romantically involved with (e.g. current or former boyfriend/girlfriend/hook-up)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted the person who was in the image(s)/video(s)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted it on a social media or online site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I decline to answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents were asked, “If you received a nude or sexual image or video tomorrow, which of the following would influence you NOT to post it online?” Most students (n = 106) said they would not post it online because of an awareness of how it might affect the person in the image/video. A large amount of students (n = 76) cited a fear of hurting a friend. Others identified a fear of punishment: 45% (n = 63) fear of being caught, arrested, or prosecuted, 41% (n = 58) fear of becoming a registered sex offender, and 35% (n = 50) fear of being dismissed from school. Eight students said money would influence them to not post the image or video. Twenty-one students said other reasons would prevent them from posting the image or video.
online including: “I’m not an asshole,” “maturity,” “it’s weird,” and “good morals.” Responses are demonstrated in Table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Responses to “If you received a nude or sexual image or video tomorrow, what of the following would influence you NOT to post it online? (Check all that apply)” N = 140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being caught, arrested, or prosecuted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of hurting a friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of having to become a registered sex offender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being dismissed from school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being more aware of how it might affect the person in the image/video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I decline to answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were then asked if they had ever taken a sexually explicit image or video of themselves. Forty-five percent (n = 75) answered yes while 27% (n = 62) answered no. They were then asked what they did with the image(s) or video(s). Of the seventy-five respondents, 78% (n = 59) sent it to someone they were sexually and/or romantically involved with such as a boyfriend or girlfriend, 37% (n = 28) kept the photo to themselves, and 28% (n = 21) sent it to someone they had a sexual interest in but didn’t have a relationship with such as a potential boyfriend or girlfriend. Responses concerning what respondents did with sexually explicit images or videos they had taken of themselves are demonstrated in Table 5 on the following page.
Table 3: Responses to “What did you do with the image(s) or video(s)?
(Check all that apply)” (N = 75)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kept it to myself</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent it to someone I did not have a sexual interest in or a sexual relationship with (e.g. friend, roommate, fellow athlete, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent it to someone I had a sexual interest in but did not have a relationship with (e.g. potential boyfriend, potential girlfriend, potential hook-up)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent it to someone I was sexually and/or romantically involved with (e.g. current or former boyfriend/girlfriend/hook-up)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted it on a social media or online site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I decline to answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five participants answered yes when asked if anyone has ever posted a sexually explicit image or video of them to an online or social media site without their approval. Three participants identified a stranger as the individual who posted their photo, two identified an acquaintance. One of the five individuals who had their photos posted online claimed to have harmed or consider harming themselves, others contacted the source of the post, the website it was posted on, and friends for help or support.

Although the number of participants who identified as a victim is extremely low in this survey, the effects of this type of victimization can be seen in their responses. Four of the five victims reported that the victimization impacted their sense of safety or trust; two identified social difficulties with friends and emotional or sexual problems with current/former romantic or sexual partners. One victim reported academic problems in school and another reported her sexuality being influenced in a positive way. This information is demonstrated in Table 4 below.
Table 4: Responses to, “How did this impact you when you first found out? (Check all that apply)” N = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Created academic problems in school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created social difficulties with friends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created emotional and/or sexual problems with current/former romantic or sexual partners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created financial problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacted my sense of safety or trust</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced my sexuality in a positive way</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I decline to answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To better understand the relationship between social media presence and participation in the distribution of nude or sexually explicit images or videos amongst our sample a crosstab analysis was run. Forty participants identified as having zero to two social media accounts and having taken or received a nude or sexually explicit image of someone they know. While fifty-six participants identified as having more than three social media accounts and having taken or received a nude or sexually explicit image or someone else. A chi-square analysis was run to consider the same relationship, no statistical relationship was found. Again, a chi-square analysis was chosen because the variables are dichotomous. This is demonstrated in Table 5 below.
Thirty-three participants identified as having zero to two social media accounts and having taken a nude or sexually explicit image of themselves. Forty-two participants identified as having more than three social media accounts and having taken a nude or sexually explicit image or video of themselves. Again, a chi-square analysis was run and there was no statistical significance. This is demonstrated in Table 5 below.

| Table 5: Crosstab considering the relationship between social media use and participation in the creation or receipt of nude or sexually explicit images or videos. |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| How many social media accounts do you have that you use regularly? | Have you ever taken or received a nude or sexually explicit image or video of someone you know (Not including yourself)? | Yes | No | Yes | No |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 0-2                             | 40              | 15              | 33              | 20              |
| 3+                             | 56              | 29              | 42              | 42              |

As stated, a chi-square analysis was chosen because the variables were all dichotomous. Variables that were considered included individuals who identified as having taken or received nude or sexually explicit images or someone they knew, not including themselves, individuals who have taken a nude or sexually explicit image or video of themselves, and social media presence. Social media presence was defined as a social media site that is used regularly. Regularly was defined as more than once a week. Responses for social media presence were divided into two groups, 0-2 social media accounts and three or more social media accounts. As
demonstrated below in Table 6, we did not find anything statistically significant in our chi-square analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Chi-square analysis considering the relationship between social media presence and participation in sending or receiving nude or sexually explicit photos or videos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever taken or received a nude or sexually explicit image or video of…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data was also examined considering gender. As noted in the literature, gender should have been a risk factor for victimization. Results from this survey suggest that women may have been more likely to take nude pictures of themselves than men. Due to sample size and time constraints, gender was not considered in a chi-square analysis. It was however considered through crosstabs. This study found a higher percentage of males (75%, \(n = 43\)) received a nude or sexually explicit image or video of someone they knew, not including themselves than women (62%, \(n = 52\)). More women (55%, \(n = 46\)) had taken a nude or sexually explicit image or video of themselves than men (50%, \(n = 28\)). This information is demonstrated on the following page in Table 7.
Table 7: Considering gender and responses to “Have you ever taken or received a nude or sexually explicit image or video of someone you know NOT including yourself,” and “Have you ever taken a nude or sexually explicit image or video of yourself?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Have you ever taken or received a nude or sexually explicit image or video of someone you know (NOT including yourself)?</th>
<th>Have you ever taken a nude or sexually explicit image or video of yourself?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals who identified as having had a nude or sexual image posted to any online or social media site were asked, “What, if anything, do you think should happen to the person(s) who posted the image(s)/ and/or videos?” Two people felt jail or prison, a fine, and expulsion was appropriate. Two individuals felt that the offender should be forced to pay financial compensation and three respondents felt that the offender should be forced to undergo counseling. Regarding the website or social media site that allowed the image or video to be posted, one person felt the people responsible should be prosecuted and sent to prison and the website should be forced to shut down. Three respondents felt the website should be given a fine and two respondents felt that nothing should happen to the website.
CHAPTER SIX: Discussion and Conclusion

This survey was ultimately interested in understanding the prevalence of revenge porn among university students, the relationship between social media presence and revenge porn victimization, demographic characteristics of criminal justice students involved in revenge porn. However, because the number of individuals who identified as a perpetrator was so low, we were unable to draw any conclusions regarding offer behavior or characteristics. Because no one identified as a perpetrator we were also unable apply Sykes and Matza’s techniques of neutralization theory.

We did learn that criminal justice students at Bridgewater State University are participating in the dissemination and receipt of nude or explicit images. We also learned that these photos are sometimes being further distributed. Students surveyed are unclear on how to deal with individuals who post images of others without their consent as well as the websites that allow and sometimes encourage this behavior. This is consistent with the confusion on the part of legislatures as to what the best remedy is to combat the problem of revenge porn.

This survey, like most exploratory studies, faced many limitations. First, there was no established survey instrument to recreate. Instead we were forced to create our own survey instrument. We were prohibited from providing any sort of incentive, such as extra credit or financial compensation, for participation in the survey. While our response rate was consistent with similar online surveys at 15.27%, the ability to provide participants with an incentive may have increased our participation. Although the survey has served as a baseline in understanding the prevalence of revenge porn amongst a sample of students at Bridgewater State University, this low response rate prevents us from running strong statistical analyses.
Further, since this was a convenience sample of criminal justice students, we are unable to apply any conclusions to the entire student body. Additionally, because the sample is made up of criminal justice students, they may be biased in their responses. For instance, in response to a question about deterrence, numerous students demonstrated an awareness of the criminal consequences. It is likely that this sample has a higher awareness of legal issues and victimization than their peer group.

While this survey was distributed to understand the prevalence of revenge porn and its effects and consequences, there was also a strong interest in understanding the motivations of offenders to post such material to the Internet. However, no respondents identified as having posted a nude or sexually explicit image online so no conclusions regarding an individual’s motivations for posting the image or video or the consequences for such actions we made.

Additionally, the number of individuals who identified as having a sexually explicit image or video posted online without their consent (n = 5) was also low. Again, this made it extremely difficult to draw any conclusions concerning offender characteristics or the impact that it had on the victim. However we did gain some insight into the effects of this victimization and the resources victims used after finding out.

In the future more research is needed to better understand the prevalence of revenge porn, the offender’s motivations for posting materials, and the impact on victims. A larger, more diverse population would be extremely beneficial. I would be especially interested to see the prevalence of revenge porn across different age ranges. Also further information is needed regarding the relationship between sexting and revenge porn.
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</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is this a continuation of an approved IRB project?</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☒ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, provide previous IRB case number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a class project?</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☒ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a thesis?</td>
<td>☒ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
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2. Study Timeline

a. Anticipated starting date:
Study, including recruitment, cannot begin prior to IRB approval.

b. Duration of Study in months: (maximum approval period is 12 months)
Periodic Review/Renewal required after approved period.

3. Funding Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the researcher receiving support or applying for funding?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If YES, you must submit one complete copy of the proposal with this application.

Describe any consulting or other relationships with this sponsor.

Funding will be used for:

- [ ] Paying Participants (Provide further details in compensation section)
- [ ] Researcher Expenses (Postage, Equipment, Travel, etc.)
- [ ] Other:

Please describe: [ ]
4. Recruitment/Selection of Subjects

a. Maximum number of participants to be enrolled.  

If screening will occur, report number that will be screened.

b. Characteristics of subjects (check as many boxes as appropriate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Minors</th>
<th>□ Disabled (Physically or Mentally)</th>
<th>□ Elementary School Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗ Adults</td>
<td>□ Legally Incompetent</td>
<td>□ Middle School Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Prisoners</td>
<td>□ Cognitively Impaired</td>
<td>□ High School Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Pregnant</td>
<td>□ Non-English Speaking</td>
<td>✗ BSU Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sample for this study will be a convenience sample of undergraduate and graduate university students. Current students (over the age of 18 at the time of the survey) who are criminal justice majors will comprise the subject pool. Any criminal justice major not age 18 or over, or any student not majoring in criminal justice will be excluded from the pool. The explanatory/introductory email is included in the attachments.

After providing informed consent, a series of demographic questions are asked. Question 12 asks about if they have ever created self-produced pornography. Question 13 is the primary screening question about being a victim of "revenge porn." If the respondent answers "yes" the survey continues. If the respondent answers "no" they are directed to Question 14.

Question 14 is the primary screening question for the perpetration of "revenge porn." If a respondent answers "yes" the survey continues. If the respondent answers "no" the survey closes.

At the completion of the survey (or at any point that the respondent discontinues) the list of resources is provided.

An Outlook email distribution list of all criminal justice majors will be provided to the P.I. by the department's administrative assistant. All CJ majors will receive the initial introductory email. They will also receive two follow-up emails, each seven days apart. These three emails will be the ONLY method of recruitment for participants. No individual classes will be used to recruit respondents. There will be no extra credit incentives nor will this be linked to any specific assignment or instructor other than the Principal Investigator.

d. Please describe how you will identify and recruit prospective participants.

e. Records

Are you accessing private records? (i.e. medical, educational, employment)  

| □ Yes | ✗ No |
If YES, describe process for obtaining approval for the use of the records or for securing consent from the subjects. Attach a letter of support from the holder or custodian of the records i.e. primary physician, therapist, public school official.

f. Please describe your relationship to the potential participants (i.e. instructor of class, co-worker, etc.). If no relationship, state no relationship.

5. Performance Sites/Location of Research

☐ Bridgewater State University Facility
☐ Public Location
☒ Other

Please describe and provide letters of cooperation and/or support.

A small portion of the respondents will be students of the P.I. Given that the P.I. is also the department chair, all respondents will be repeatedly told that their refusal or participation will have no effect on their advising, academic progress or standing. These disclosures and precautions should ameliorate conflicts of interest.

There are no letters of cooperation provided nor needed. Survey materials will be sent from a BSU computer and office. Respondents will complete the survey from numerous locations including on and off campus.
6. Project Abstract

a. Provide a brief summary of the project, using non-technical terms that would be understood by a non-scientific reader. Please limit this description to no more than one page, and provide details in the method section.

With the technological advent of high-definition cameras available in nearly every smart-phone, a new problem has developed. Once consensual adult couples are filming themselves in a variety of sexual situations. In some cases, one party videotapes another without their awareness or knowledge. Once the relationship ends, a question evolves as to who owns these images or movies. Several cases have reached the courts on the concept of “revenge porn.” In these cases a former romantic partner released nude and sexual videos or images of their ex to various social media sites, without the former partner’s permission or consent. Several states (not Massachusetts) have enacted statutes criminalizing “revenge porn.” Revenge porn is new manifestation of a slightly older problem known as sexting.

Sexting is the taking and distribution of nude and/or sexual images of one’s self or one’s romantic partner. Federal and state law has focused on the sexting practices of minors which legally constitute child pornography. Yet there is very little research on the sexting practices of adults. There is a need for academic research into the sexting practices of adults, for a simple reason. Sexting in these once consensual adult relationships is not illegal. The problem arises in that many of these relationships will not last, while the digital images will. This can create a problem as to who "owns" these images not to mention the possibility that unauthorized distribution of these images may be done to inflict pain on a former romantic partner.

This study examines if and how college students are involved in or impacted by revenge porn and sexting. In other words, the research seeks to demonstrate if and how they are using social media in their sexual behaviors. By assessing if, how and why students are either victimized by or perpetrators of self-produced pornography, we can gain into this new phenomena. This study adds to the literature by assessing how prevalent this practice is amongst our most technologically sophisticated population, young people.

b. Describe the scientific objectives (aims) of this research, including (brief) discussion of previous relevant research.

The specific scientific aims of the study are as follows:
1) To develop a baseline prevalence dataset on how often college students are creators of self-produced digital nudity and/or pornography.
2) To develop a baseline prevalence dataset on how often college students receive pornography involving someone they know (e.g., Sexting recipient).
3) To develop a baseline prevalence dataset on how often college students distribute pornography involving someone they know (e.g., Sexting distributor and/or Revenge Porn Perpetrator).
4) To understand the emotional effects for victims of Revenge Porn and Sexting.
5) To understand the motivations for the Perpetration of Revenge Porn.
6) To learn respondents' thoughts about punishment and deterrence of Revenge Porn.

c. Method: Provide a sequential description of all procedures, researcher participant interaction, and intervention. Include the measures you plan to use, the time period(s) involved, and any deception that may be used.

At the bottom of the introductory email will be a link to the web-based survey. Should students choose to click on the link (demonstrating an interest in the survey), a description of the study is placed at the top of the web page. Students must read the informed consent form and initial and date the form.

Once informed consent is obtained, the first question of the study asks if the respondent is 18 years of age or over. If a respondent is not at least 18, the survey will shut down.

If over the age of 18 the respondent will be allowed to complete the survey. The entire survey consists of 33 questions which should be completed in 30-45 minutes. At the end of the survey is a list of local, state and regional resources which can aid in reducing and eliminating the effects of sexting and revenge porn.

After the first ten days of the survey being opened a reminder will be sent with the same information. The one change will be noting to a respondent if they have completed the survey to please disregard the email. A second and final email reminder will be sent one week after that.

We are seeking a response rate of 30%. Of the approximately 1000 potential respondents we are targeting a final sample of 300. Once the goal of 300 respondents has been reached the study will close. The research team will then enter the data into SPSS for analysis. The final study will be written up by Dr. Richard Wright. Ms. McCue will use
of Eric Garner (NYC) and Walter Scott (NC), resulted in numerous protests and calls for reform. These public cases involving police violence have gained notoriety due to the everyday use of camera-phones.

There is another form of violence which occurs privately but also results in emotional and physical harm. High profile anecdotes suggest that young people are using this technology in their sexual encounters. Photographing and videotaping their nude and/or sexual acts, some young people are uploading these images onto social media sites, perhaps unaware of the long-lasting nature and rapid dissemination of digital photography. This behavior has become better publicly understood with adolescents by the term "sexting." Although this new trend (e.g., Adult Sexting and Revenge Porn) involves consenting adults, unauthorized dissemination of one's nude or sexual imagery, can be quite harmful. By documenting, if and how, young people use social media in their sexuality, we will be able to inform BSU and the public debate about the use of camera phones and its' impact on students' sexual and emotional well-being.
7. Data Collection and Management (Check all that apply)

☒ a. Nature of data makes it potentially identifiable (e.g. video or audio recordings, photographs, IP address, material with DNA, etc.)

☐ b. Data will be recorded with identifying information (e.g. name, SSN, Banner ID, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will data be de-identified?</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☒ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If yes, please provide a timeframe and details (for example describe the destruction of identifying information or the process of assigning a code to replace identifiers)

The survey will be administered via the world-wide web through the use of Qualtrics software. The primary identifying information would be the name, and email address to which the survey was sent and completed. Secondarily an IP address could be recorded when participants complete the survey. There are settings within Qualtrics which will reduce the risk of disclosure. Security settings within the software will be enabled prior to survey distribution.

Although every reasonable effort will be taken, confidentiality during Internet communication procedures cannot be guaranteed. Research data may exist on backups or server logs beyond the time frame of this research project. Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used. Participation in this online survey involves risks similar to a person's everyday use of the Internet.

All survey data will be kept on the BSU server and a Dropbox account. All data will be password protected with only the research team having access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will there be a master list connecting the code?</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☒ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you checked a or b, please provide details of how data will be stored securely (i.e. locked cabinet, password protected, etc.).

If master code list is used, please provide detail, such as how/where code list is securely stored, when it will be destroyed, etc.

The Excel file containing individuals' responses will be password protected residing on both the BSU server and a Dropbox account.

☐ c. Data will be recorded without possibility of identification (Check this box only if any identifying information will be destroyed or eliminated and cannot be restored)

☐ d. Data is collected anonymously (Check this box only if it is not possible to connect respondents to data. Do not check this box if data will be collected electronically.)

e. Data sharing

| Will identifiable data be shared with anyone outside the immediate research team? (Check yes only if the respondents will be identified or identifiable in reports, presentations, etc.) | ☐ Yes | ☒ No |

f. Recording (Note that recordings and photographs are identifiable, so data is not anonymous.)
| Will participants be audio recorded? | □ Yes | ☒ No |
| Will participants be video recorded? | □ Yes | ☒ No |
| Will participants be photographed? | □ Yes | ☒ No |

If YES, please describe how/where recordings will be stored, who will have access to them, and an estimate of the date (month/year) that they will be destroyed.

g. Additional Details (if needed).
8. Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Will participants receive a gift or token of appreciation?</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☑ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If YES, list the item and its approximate value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Will participants receive services, treatment or supplies that have a monetary value?</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, please describe and provide the approximate value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Will participants receive course credit?</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, please describe non-research alternatives to earn the credit, the number of points awarded and what percentage of total points for the course it represents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Will participants receive monetary compensation (including gift cards)?</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, please detail the amount per session and total compensation possible. Additionally, describe what compensation amount is paid to participants who discontinue participation prior to completion. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If University funds are used to compensate participants, the name and address of participants will need to be provided to the Finance Office. If participants will be paid $100 or more in a calendar year, participant social security numbers must be provided to Finance. The consent form must reflect this.

** If you plan to use university funds to compensate participants, IRB approval may not be sufficient. In all cases, University Trust Fund Guidelines apply, please contact Accounting Office with questions. In some cases BSU may require further paperwork or documentation from you and/or your participants.
9. Consent Process (Select One of the Following Options)

☑️ I am obtaining signed consent for this study. Attach copies of all consent/assent documents, using the BSU templates as a guide to ensure all required elements are present.

☐ I am requesting a waiver or alteration of Informed Consent.

Provide details below and attach information that will be provided to participants regarding the study (email, opening page of online study, cover/consent letter, other consent text, etc.).

Additional information or rationale for request for waiver:

At the end of an introductory email, students are encouraged to click on the weblink to initiate the survey. Once in the survey, several paragraphs must be read explaining the study and seeking their informed consent. Students must scroll to the end of the informed consent, provide their initials and date the form. Once they have done, they have then provided informed consent and the survey will begin.

Once a respondent clicks on the survey the first question will ask if they are 18 years of age or older. If they respond “no,” they will be told they cannot participate and the survey will be closed. If participants have questions, they will be told to contact Dr. Wright directly. In both the original email, the follow-up emails and the informed consent, participants will be told that their refusal or participation in this study will have no impact on their academic records, progress or any services provided by the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Will the investigator(s) be obtaining all of the informed consents?</th>
<th>☑️ Yes</th>
<th>☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If NO, identify by name and training who will be describing the research to subjects/representatives and inviting their participation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Will any participants be minors?</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☑️ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, include procedures/form for parental consent and for the assent from the minor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To be considered, you must include all listed documentation on this checklist when submitting your application

☑️ A copy of all instruments (questionnaires, surveys, tests recruitment tools, interview questions, etc.), recruitment materials (advertisements, postings, etc.), debriefing materials
☑️ Informed consent, parental consent/permission, and/or minor assent document(s)
☐ Letters of assent or approval from cooperating institutions (if appropriate)
☑️ All required signatures
Investigator Assurance:

The principal investigator may not initiate any research involving human subjects until written notification of IRB approval or compliance with any and all contingencies made in connection with said approval has been received. Failure to provide all required information will result in return of your IRB application for correction prior to IRB review.

I understand that as Principal Investigator, I have ultimate responsibility for the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects, conduct of the study and the ethical performance of the project.

I agree to comply with the letter and spirit of the Bridgewater State University policies on research and investigation involving human subjects, as well as with all applicable federal, state and local laws regarding the protection of human subjects in research, including, but not limited to the following:

• No changes will be made in the protocol or consent form until approved by the BSU IRB.
• Legally effective informed consent will be obtained from human subjects if applicable, and documentation of informed consent will be retained, in a secure environment, for three years after termination of the project.
• Adverse/unexpected events will be reported to the BSU IRB promptly.
• All protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. Research must stop at the end of that approval period unless the protocol is re-approved for another term.

SIGNATURES: I certify to the best of my knowledge the information presented is an accurate reflection of the proposed research project and that I intend to comply with the letter and spirit of the Bridgewater State University Policy on the Protection of Human Subjects in Research.

[Signature]
Principal Investigator Signature

[Signature]
Co-Investigator Signature

[Signature]
Co-Investigator Signature

[Signature]
Co-Investigator Signature
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Date

(Date)

(Date)

(Date)
Good day.

As you know Bridgewater State is committed to ensuring that you have the best possible educational experience. Consistent with those goals I am conducting a survey with a series of questions about the sexual experiences of criminal justice majors and their use of social media. Of particular interest in the survey are sexual or nude situations which you were aware of or involved in which were photographed, videotaped and distributed with or without your consent or knowledge.

As required and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), we have placed our most earnest efforts in reducing the risk to survey respondents. Students are under no obligation to complete the survey and may refuse without any penalties.

**Participating or Not Participating In This Survey Will Have NO Impact on Your Academic Record, Progress or University Services!**

If you have any questions or concerns, please email or call me. Findings from this research will assist BSU in continuing to provide a safe, quality education for our students. The final study will be widely disseminated both on and off campus. I would greatly appreciate your efforts in completing this survey and providing us with this important information. Thank you very much.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me. I can be reached at Richard.Wright@bridgew.edu or 508-531-2678. Thank you.

To participate in this survey, YOU MUST BE 18 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER. If you are 18 and over and interested in participating in the survey please click on the following link.....

(HYPERLINK TO SURVEY WILL BE HERE)
Informed Consent Form - Social Media & Sexual Experiences Survey

This survey is being administered as a part of an academic study supervised by Prof. Richard Wright of the Criminal Justice department. If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Wright. He can be contacted either at 508-531-2678 or Richard.Wright@bridgew.edu.

**Purpose**

Although you may not personally benefit, the information you provide may help the researchers gain insight into how often students are involved in the creation, acquisition and dissemination of nude or sexual images and movies of adults they know.

This research will include questions about your background (e.g., age, race, sexual orientation, etc.), nude or sexual images or movies which you may have either taken yourself, received, taken of another adult, acquired electronically and/or were posted online.

The content of this study does involve risks. Specifically, answering questions about sexual experiences and the use of social media may cause you to feel uncomfortable, embarrassed or upset.

Please provide the most honest and accurate answers you can. This survey may take as little as 30-45 minutes and could take up to an hour. In the event that time becomes an issue please take a break and complete the survey later.

**IF YOU ARE NOT SURE THE IMAGES YOU RECEIVED, CREATED OR SENT INVOLVED ADULTS AGE 18 AND OVER, DO NOT ANSWER THE QUESTIONS.**

**Nude and/or sexual images of individuals under the age of 18 constitute child pornography under state and federal law.**

**For numerous reasons we are NOT interested in the experiences of anyone under the age of 18. Your answers to this survey should ONLY APPLY to adult images and situations.**

**This survey is completely voluntary. Your decision to participate, not to participate or partial participation involves no penalties and will have no bearing on your academic advising, standing or progress or services provided by the University.**

**There are no questions in this survey that you have to answer and you may withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty. If you wish to leave the study, your data may also be withdrawn.**

Security settings within the survey software (Qualtrics) have been enabled to reduce your risk. Although every reasonable effort will be taken, confidentiality during Internet communication procedures cannot be guaranteed. Absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, but will be upheld to the extent permitted by law. Research data may exist on backups or server logs beyond the timeframe of this research project.

**On the following screens you will be asked several questions seeking your informed consent. After reading the description, if you would like to participate in the survey you must check the box “YES” for each question.**
Are you over the age of 18? □ Yes □ No

Do you understand that your responses should ONLY apply to images or movies of adults 18 and over? □ Yes □ No

Have you read and do you understand the various risks and benefits of this research? □ Yes □ No

Please feel free to print a copy of this informed consent form for your records.

ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF THE PROJECT OR QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO YOUR RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT OR RESEARCH RELATED INJURY SHOULD BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE IRB ADMINISTRATOR AT PHONE NUMBER (508) 531-1242.
Resources:

The following are a list of resources trained in assisting people who have may have been victims and or Perpetrators of Revenge Porn and/or Adult Sexting. Please feel free to utilize any of these local, regional or national resources. You will not be blamed, judged or criticized for seeking help. Thank you again.

Bridgewater State University's Title IX Sexual and Domestic Violence Policy.  
http://bsutiltitlex.weebly.com  
Contact: Erin P. DeBoses, Esq.  
Director  
Office of Equal Opportunity, Boyden 206  
(508) 531-2744  
titleix@bridgew.edu  

www.EndRevengePorn.org

Emerge – Counseling and Education to Stop Domestic Violence. 2464 Massachusetts Avenue, Suite 101 · Cambridge, MA 02140 main office: 617-547-9879 · fax: 617-547-0904 · info@emergedv.com

The National Sexual Assault Hotline is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week at 1-800-656-HOPE (4673)

The Counseling Center at Bridgewater State University is located in Tillinghast Hall, Room 013. Their telephone number is 508-531-1331. Their office hours are Monday-Friday 8:30-4:30.

Rape Crisis Centers in Southeastern MA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hotline</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Safe Place</td>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>508-228-2111</td>
<td>508-228-0561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>508-228-7095 TTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECT</td>
<td>Vineyard Haven</td>
<td>508-696-7233</td>
<td>508-693-7900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>508-693-3843 TTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence House</td>
<td>Hyannis</td>
<td>800-439-6507</td>
<td>508-771-6507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope, Inc</td>
<td>Attleboro</td>
<td>800-323-4673</td>
<td>508-226-4015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Women's Center</td>
<td>New Bedford and</td>
<td>888-839-6636</td>
<td>508-996-3343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>508-996-1177 TTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womansplace Crisis Center</td>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>508-588-8255</td>
<td>508-588-2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>508-894-2869 TTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gay Men's Domestic Violence Project - http://www.gmdvp.org/
For counseling services, support groups, and advocacy services, please call SafeLink at 1-877-785-2020. SafeLink is a 24-hour, free and multi-lingual hotline for programs in Massachusetts. An advocate can talk with you about your needs and help you identify shelters, programs and other resources. They can connect you to services for both domestic violence and sexual assault.
Richard,
The committee reviewed your revised IRB application and has a few of minor requests before it can be approved:

Regarding the consent and solicitation:

- In the solicitation e-mail, would you change the second sentence to indicate that you are surveying CJ majors, not BSU students?
- Would you add sentences about risks? Perhaps that there will be questions that may make them feel uncomfortable, embarrassed, or upset.
- Would you add the phrase “to the extent permitted by law” to the consent document? For example: “Absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, but will be upheld to the extent permitted by law.”
- Would you assure participants in the consent document that no questions are mandatory and that they may withdraw without penalty at any time? You do say in the solicitation that participation is not obligatory, but the consent document does not remind them that they may skip questions or leave the study.
- The consent materials and application do not mention what will happen to data should they choose to withdraw. Those who wish to leave the study should be able to withdraw their data.
- Would you revise the first two sentences of the second paragraph of the consent document (under “purpose”) to read: Although you may not personally benefit, the information you provide may help the researchers gain insight into . . .
- Instead of requesting initials and date, would you have participants check boxes to indicate “yes” they are 18 or over, that “yes” they understand that their responses should only apply to adult images and situations, and that “yes” they have read and understand the risks and benefits of participating (feel free to add any other specific statements you think are important).

Regarding the survey:

- Please remove the request to specify the sport on question 8.
- Would you assure us that no responses are mandatory, including open ended requests to “please explain” or “please specify” for the “other” response.
- There are questions in which “other” is not an option (13k, 13l, 14b, 14g?).
- Would you make sure that “I decline to answer” is a possible response at the highest level of each question? There are some where that option is embedded and available only after a participant chooses the “yes” response.

Lastly, is it possible to send the link only to CJ sophomores and above (to reduce the number of students who are under 18 who will be solicited)?

Elizabeth R. Spievak, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
Hart 336
Bridgewater State University
90 Burrill Avenue
Bridgewater, Massachusetts 02325
Office: 508-531-2154
Fax: 508-531-1761
Yes those adjustments are fine. Thank you.

Richard,

I checked in with Kate McLaren and IT can provide you with a distribution list of CJ majors with b-dates before say, 11/13/1997. That way you wouldn’t have to just solicit sophomores or above, but no one under 18 would receive the solicitation e-mail.

I also contacted Joanna Boeing to find out about the following, which are all do-able:

- Ensure that if a participant exits the survey, data will not be included (Joanna had to call Qualtrics to find out for me—it is easy to accomplish this, its just an option she didn’t know about).
- Offer the list of resources if a participant leaves the study (Currently they will only appear if a participant finishes a study, but the board members asked in that they be made available to everyone regardless of whether they finish.) Qualtrics cannot send participants who exit the study to this page. Instead, would you either reference an attachment (with the resources) to or a link (embedded) in the solicitation e-mail? That way the participant could return to them, or even go to look at them regardless of their participation choice.
- Ask participants at the end of the study to confirm that they want their data to be included in the study. If “no” then the data is deleted/not included.

Let me know what you think. If all this is acceptable, we can move forward.

Elizabeth R. Spievak, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
Hart 336
Bridgewater State University
90 Burrill Avenue
Bridgewater, Massachusetts 02325
Office: 508-531-2154
Fax: 508-531-1761
Appendix 2: Consent Form

This survey is being administered as a part of an academic study supervised by Professor Richard Wright of the Criminal Justice department. If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Wright. He can be contacted either at (508)531-2678 or Richard.Wright@bridgew.edu.

Although you may not personally benefit, the information you provide may help the researchers gain insight into how often students are involved in the creation, acquisition and dissemination of nude or sexual images and movies of adults they know.

This research will include questions about your background (e.g., age, race, sexual orientation, etc.), nude or sexual images or movies which you may have either taken yourself, received, taken of another adult, acquired electronically and/or were posted online.

The content of this study does involve risks. Specifically, answering questions about sexual experiences and the use of social media may cause you to feel uncomfortable, embarrassed or upset.

Please provide the most honest and accurate answers you can. This survey may take as little as 30 -45 minutes and could take up to an hour. In the event that time becomes an issue please take a break and complete the survey later.

IF YOU ARE NOT SURE THE IMAGES YOU RECEIVED, CREATED OR SENT INVOLVED ADULTS AGE 18 AND OVER, DO NOT ANSWER THE QUESTIONS.

NUDE AND/OR SEXUAL IMAGES OF INDIVIDUALS UNDER THE AGE OF 18 CONSTITUTE CHILD PORNOGRAPHY UNDER STATE AND FEDERAL LAW.

FOR NUMEROUS REASONS WE ARE NOT INTERESTED IN THE EXPERIENCES OF ANYONE UNDER THE AGE OF 18. YOUR ANSWERS TO THIS SURVEY SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO ADULT IMAGES AND SITUATIONS.
THIS SURVEY IS COMPLETELY VOLUNTARY. YOUR DECISION TO PARTICIPATE, NOT TO PARTICIPATE OR PARTIAL PARTICIPATION INVOLVES NO PENALTIES AND WILL HAVE NO BEARING ON YOUR ACADEMIC ADVISING, STANDING OR PROGRESS OR SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE UNIVERSITY.

THERE ARE NO QUESTIONS IN THIS SURVEY THAT YOU HAVE TO ANSWER AND YOU MAY WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY AT ANY TIME WITH NO PENALTY. IF YOU WISH TO LEAVE THE STUDY, YOUR DATA MAY ALSO BE WITHDRAWN.

Security settings within the survey software (Qualtrics) have been enabled to reduce your risk. Although every reasonable effort will be taken, confidentiality during Internet communication procedures cannot be guaranteed. Absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, but will be upheld to the extent permitted by law. Research data may exist on backups or server logs beyond the timeframe of this research project.

On the following screens you will be asked several questions seeking your informed consent. After reading the description, if you would like to participate in the survey you must check the box "YES" for each question.
Appendix 3: 1st Wave Email Invitation

February 10, 2016
Subject: Research Study on Social Media & Sexual Experiences of BSU Students

Good day.

As you know Bridgewater State is committed to ensuring that you have the best possible educational experience. Consistent with those goals I am conducting a survey with a series of questions about the sexual experiences of criminal justice majors and their use of social media. Of particular interest in the survey are sexual or nude situations which you were aware of or involved in which were photographed, videotaped and distributed with or without your consent or knowledge.

As required and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), we have placed our most earnest efforts in reducing the risk to survey respondents. Students are under no obligation to complete the survey and may refuse without any penalties.

Participating or Not Participating In This Survey Will Have NO Impact on Your Academic Record, Progress or University Services!

If you have any questions or concerns, please email or call me. Findings from this research will assist BSU in continuing to provide a safe, quality education for our students. The final study will be widely disseminated both on and off campus. I would greatly appreciate your efforts in completing this survey and providing us with this important information. Thank you very much.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me. I can be reached at Richard.Wright@bridgew.edu or 508-531-2678. Thank you.

To participate in this survey, YOU MUST BE 18 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER. If you are 18 and over and interested in participating in the survey please click on the following link...

https://bridgew.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_3kCQekv1bGt4LB3

Dr. Richard G. Wright
Professor & Chairperson
Department of Criminal Justice
Bridgewater State University
Maxwell Library Room 311A
10 Shaw Road
Bridgewater MA 02325
508-531-2678
Richard.Wright@bridgew.edu
Appendix 4: 2\textsuperscript{nd} Wave Email Invitation

February 17, 2016
Subject: Reminder Email - Research Study on Social Media & Sexual Experiences of BSU Students

Good day.

This is a REMINDER email requesting your participation in the study mentioned below. If you have already participated in this survey, thank you and please disregard this email. If you haven’t participated, please consider doing so.

As you know Bridgewater State is committed to ensuring that you have the best possible educational experience. Consistent with those goals I am conducting a survey with a series of questions about the sexual experiences of criminal justice majors and their use of social media. Of particular interest in the survey are sexual or nude situations which you were aware of or involved in which were photographed, videotaped and distributed with or without your consent or knowledge.

As required and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), we have placed our most earnest efforts in reducing the risk to survey respondents. Students are under no obligation to complete the survey and may refuse without any penalties.

Participating or Not Participating In This Survey Will Have NO Impact on Your Academic Record, Progress or University Services!

If you have any questions or concerns, please email or call me. Findings from this research will assist BSU in continuing to provide a safe, quality education for our students. The final study will be widely disseminated both on and off campus. I would greatly appreciate your efforts in completing this survey and providing us with this important information. Thank you very much.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me. I can be reached at Richard.Wright@bridgew.edu or 508-531-2678. Thank you.

To participate in this survey, YOU MUST BE 18 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER. If you are 18 and over and interested in participating in the survey please click on the following link...

https://bridgew.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_3kCQekv1bGt4LB3

Dr. Richard G. Wright
Professor & Chairperson
Department of Criminal Justice
Bridgewater State University
Maxwell Library Room 311A
10 Shaw Road
Bridgewater MA 02325
508-531-2678
Richard.Wright@bridgew.edu
Appendix 5: 3rd Wave Email Invitation

February 24, 2016
Subject: FINAL REMINDER - Research Study on Social Media & Sexual Experiences of BSU Students

Good day.

This is the FINAL REMINDER email requesting your participation in the study mentioned below. If you have already participated in this survey, thank you and please disregard this email. If you haven’t participated, please consider doing so.

As you know Bridgewater State is committed to ensuring that you have the best possible educational experience. Consistent with those goals I am conducting a survey with a series of questions about the sexual experiences of criminal justice majors and their use of social media. Of particular interest in the survey are sexual or nude situations which you were aware of or involved in which were photographed, videotaped and distributed with or without your consent or knowledge.

As required and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), we have placed our most earnest efforts in reducing the risk to survey respondents. Students are under no obligation to complete the survey and may refuse without any penalties.

**Participating or Not Participating In This Survey Will Have NO Impact on Your Academic Record, Progress or University Services!**

If you have any questions or concerns, please email or call me. Findings from this research will assist BSU in continuing to provide a safe, quality education for our students. The final study will be widely disseminated both on and off campus. I would greatly appreciate your efforts in completing this survey and providing us with this important information. Thank you very much.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me. I can be reached at Richard.Wright@bridgew.edu or 508-531-2678. Thank you.

**To participate in this survey, YOU MUST BE 18 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER.**
If you are 18 and over and interested in participating in the survey please click on the following link…

https://bridgew.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_3kCQekv1bGt4LB3

**Dr. Richard G. Wright**
Professor & Chairperson
Dept. of Criminal Justice
Maxwell Library 311A
10 Shaw Road
Bridgewater MA 02325
508-531-2678
Richard.Wright@bridgew.edu
**Appendix 6: Survey Instrument**

1. Are you over the age of 18?
   - Yes
   - No
   
   If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey.

2. Do you understand that your responses should only apply to images or videos of adults 18 and older?
   - Yes
   - No
   
   If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey.

3. Have you read and do you understand the various risks and benefits of this research?
   - Yes. Please confirm your consent by entering your initials here: ____________________
   - No
   
   If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey.

4. How old are you?

5. Choose gender
   - Male
   - Female
   - Transgender
   - Other (Please specify) ____________________
   - I decline to answer
6. Which of the following best describes your race or ethnicity? (Select all that apply)
   ○ White/Caucasian
   ○ Asian, Pacific Islander
   ○ Native American, Aleut Eskimo
   ○ African American/Black
   ○ Hispanic
   ○ Other (Please specify) ____________________
   ○ I decline to answer

7. Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?
   ○ Heterosexual/Straight
   ○ Lesbian/Gay
   ○ Bisexual
   ○ Other (Please specify) ____________________
   ○ I decline to answer

8. Does Bridgewater State University presently classify you as a:
   ○ Freshman
   ○ Sophomore
   ○ Junior
   ○ Senior
   ○ Graduate Student
   ○ Non-matriculated Student
   ○ Other (Please specify) ____________________
   ○ I decline to answer

9. Are you an active member or pledge to a social sorority or fraternity (NOT an honor society)?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ I decline to answer
10. Are you a member of a Bridgewater State University athletic team?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ I decline to answer

11. Did you transfer to BSU from another university or community college?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ I decline to answer

12. How many social media accounts (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, etc.) do you have that you use regularly (e.g., more than once a week)?
   ○ 0
   ○ 1-2
   ○ 3-5
   ○ 6+
   ○ I decline to answer

13. Are you a full-time student (12 credits or more) at BSU?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ I decline to answer

14. Have you ever taken or received a nude or sexually explicit image or video of someone you know (NOT including yourself)?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ I decline to answer

   If No Is Selected, Then Skip To If you receive a nude or sexual image... If I decline to answer Is Selected, Then Skip To If you receive a nude or sexual image...
15. What did you do with the image(s) or video(s)? (Check all that apply)
   - Kept it to myself
   - Sent it to someone I did not have a sexual interest in or a sexual relationship with (e.g. friend, roommate, fellow athlete, etc.)
   - Sent it to someone I had a sexual interest in but did not have a relationship with (e.g. potential boyfriend, potential girlfriend, potential hook-up)
   - Sent it to someone I was sexually and/or romantically involved with (e.g. current or former boyfriend/girlfriend/hook-up) (4)
   - Contacted the person who was in the image(s)/video(s)
   - Posted it on a social media or online site
   - Other (Please specify)
   - I decline to answer

If Posted it on a social media... Is Not Selected, Then Skip To If you receive a nude or sexual image...

16. What site(s) was it posted on? (Check all that apply)
   - SnapChat
   - Tinder
   - Instagram
   - Facebook
   - Twitter
   - WhatsApp
   - Myex
   - Myamatuergirlfriend
   - Exgirlfriendpics
   - TheChive
   - Other ___________________
   - I decline to answer
17. How long ago did you post it online?
   - Less than 7 days
   - More than 8 days and less than 30 days
   - One to three months
   - More than six months
   - I don't know
   - I decline to answer

18. To your knowledge, is the image(s), video(s) still online?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I don't know
   - I decline to answer

19. Why did you post it on social media? (Choose all that apply)
   - Wanted to get revenge on my ex
   - Wanted to promote my sexual conquests
   - I received money to do it
   - I was dared to do it
   - I thought it was funny or cool
   - Other (Please specify) ____________________
   - I decline to answer
20. How did (or does) this behavior impact you? (Check all that apply)
   - Makes me feel shameful, dirty, or embarrassed
   - Makes me feel powerful and/or in control
   - Makes me feel more sexual
   - Benefits me financially
   - Makes me struggle academically
   - Causes sexual problems
   - Causes me to feel out of control
   - No impact
   - Other (Please specify) ____________________
   - I decline to answer

21. If you received a nude or sexual image or video tomorrow, which of the following would influence you NOT to post it online? (Check all that apply)
   - Fear of being caught, arrested, or prosecuted
   - Fear of hurting a friend
   - Fear of having to become a registered sex offender
   - Money
   - Fear of being dismissed from school
   - Being more aware of how it might affect the person in the image/video
   - Other ____________________
   - I decline to answer

22. Have you ever taken a nude or sexually explicit image or video of yourself?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I decline to answer

   If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Has anyone ever posted a sexually exp...

   If I decline to answer Is Selected, Then Skip To Has anyone ever posted a sexually exp...
23. What did you do with the image(s) or video(s)? (Check all that apply)
   - Kept it to myself
   - Sent it to someone I did not have a sexual interest in or relationship with (e.g. friend, roommate, etc.)
   - Sent it to someone I had a sexual interest in but didn't have a relationship with (e.g. potential boyfriend, potential girlfriend, potential hook-up)
   - Sent it to someone I was sexually and/or romantically involved with (e.g. current or former sexual/romantic partner/hook-up)
   - Posted it on a social media website
   - I decline to answer

If Posted it on a social media... Is Not Selected, Then Skip To Has anyone ever posted a sexually exp...

24. What site(s) was it posted on? (Check all that apply)
   - SnapChat
   - Tinder
   - Instagram
   - Facebook
   - Twitter
   - WhatsApp
   - Myex
   - Myamateurgirlfriend
   - Exgirlfriendpics
   - TheChive
   - Other (Please specify) ____________________
   - I decline to answer

25. Has anyone ever posted a sexually explicit image or video of you, to any online or social media site without your approval?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I decline to answer

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey. If I decline to answer Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey.
26. Who posted it? (Check all that apply)
   - Current boyfriend or girlfriend
   - Former boyfriend or girlfriend
   - Current sexual partner
   - Former sexual partner
   - Stranger
   - Friend
   - Someone I wanted a sexual relationship with but did not have one
   - Someone who wanted a sexual relationship with me, but I was not attracted to
   - Acquaintance
   - I don't know
   - Other (Please specify) ____________________
   - I decline to answer

27. Where was it posted? (Check all that apply)
   - Facebook
   - Twitter
   - Instagram
   - SnapChat
   - Tinder
   - WhatsApp
   - Myex
   - Myamateurgirlfriend
   - Exgirlfriendpics
   - TheChive
   - Other (Please specify) ____________________
   - I decline to answer

28. How did you find out it was posted online? (Check all that apply)
   - A friend told me
   - I saw it online
   - The person who posted it told me
   - I had a feeling/intuition that it might happen and I went online to look
   - My current boyfriend/girlfriend told me
   - Someone in law enforcement notified me
   - Someone I didn't know contacted me
   - An acquaintance told me
   - Other (Please specify) ____________________
   - I decline to answer
29. To your knowledge how long was the image(s), video(s) online before you learned about it?
   o Less than 7 days
   o More than 8 days and less than 30 days
   o One to three months
   o Between three and six months
   o More than six months
   o I don't know
   o I decline to answer

30. To your knowledge, is the image(s), video(s) still online?
   o Yes
   o No
   o I don't know
   o I decline to answer

31. What did you do when you found it? (Check all that apply)
   o Got drunk
   o Took drugs
   o Considered harming or did harm yourself
   o Called or contacted probable source of leak (e.g. person who posted it)
   o Called police
   o Called or contacted friend for support
   o Called or went to mental health counselor for support
   o Told my parents
   o Contacted website and asked them to remove it
   o Nothing
   o Other (Please specify) ____________________
   o I decline to answer

32. Have you gone online to verify that the image(s) or video(s) was you?
   o Yes
   o No
   o I decline to answer
33. How did this impact you when you first found out? (Check all that apply)
- Created academic problems in school
- Created social difficulties with friends
- Created emotional and/or sexual problems with current/former romantic or sexual partners
- Created financial problems
- Impacted sense of safety or trust
- Influenced my sexuality in a positive way
- No impact
- Other (Please specify) ____________________
- I decline to answer

34. How does this impact you today? (Check all that apply)
- Created academic problems in school
- Created social difficulties with friends
- Created emotional and/or sexual problems with current/former romantic or sexual partners
- Created financial problems
- Impacted sense of safety or trust
- Influenced my sexuality in a positive way
- No impact
- Other (Please specify) ____________________
- I decline to answer

35. What, if anything, do you think should happen to the person(s) who posted the image(s)/and/or video(s)? (Check all that apply)
- They should be prosecuted and sent to jail or prison
- The should be given a fine
- The should become a registered sex offender
- The should be forced to undergo counseling
- The should be forced to pay financial compensation
- They should be expelled from school
- Nothing
- Other (Please specify) ____________________
- I decline to answer
36. What, if anything, do you think should happen to the web/social media site that allowed the image(s)/and/or video(s) to be posted? (Check all that apply)

- The people responsible should be prosecuted and sent to jail or prison
- The people responsible should be given a fine
- The people responsible should become registered sex offenders
- The people responsible should be forced to undergo counseling
- The people responsible should be forced to pay financial compensation to me
- The website should be forced to shut down
- Nothing
- Other (Please specify) ____________________
- I decline to answer