

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Full title:

A UK survey of young people’s views on condom removal during sex

Short title: Young people’s views on condom removal during sex

Authors: Farida Ezzat^{1*}, Graham Hart², Geraldine Barrett^{1*}

¹Elizabeth Garrett Anderson Institute of Women’s Health, University College London, London, United Kingdom

²Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, United Kingdom

*Corresponding authors: g.barrett@ucl.ac.uk (GB), farida.ezzat.22@ucl.ac.uk (FE)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 **Abstract**

24 **Introduction:** Non-consensual condom removal (NCCR) refers to the act of removing a condom
25 during sex without the other person's permission. It poses physical and psychological risks to
26 women's health. Views and attitudes regarding this sexual practice are not well understood in the
27 UK. This study aimed to explore young people's views on the morality and criminality of NCCR
28 and how their views are affected by negative health outcomes, relationship status, and socio-
29 demographic characteristics.

30 **Methods:** A quantitative online survey of people aged 18-25 living in the UK was conducted. The
31 survey consisted of two NCCR scenarios, varied by health outcome and relationship status,
32 followed by questions about the morality and criminality of NCCR and respondents' socio-
33 demographic characteristics. Statistical analysis included Chi-square testing and logistic
34 regression modelling.

35 **Results:** Most of the 1729 respondents considered NCCR to be a violation of consent to sex
36 (97.4%-98.1%), to be wrong (99.3%-99.5%), and to be sexual assault (86.3%-89.2%).
37 Respondents were more likely to support prison time for NCCR if the victim got pregnant (52.1%)
38 (rather than depressed (41.6%)) or was part of a casual hook-up (53.9%) (as opposed to a long-
39 term dating relationship (47.2%)). Respondents who were female or non-heterosexual were more
40 likely to view NCCR as sexual assault and support prison as a penalty for NCCR.

41 **Conclusion:** The majority of young UK adults in this survey considered condom removal during
42 sex without the other person's permission to be a violation of consent, morally wrong, and a form
43 of sexual assault. Support for prison as a penalty was lower. These findings can inform future
44 campaigns on consent in sexual relationships and legislation to provide support for women
45 affected by NCCR.

46 **Introduction**

47 Young people are the most common condom-using demographic [1] and, within that population,
48 the heterosexual male subset frequently engages in condom use resistance [2]. Condom use
49 resistance tactics are employed to avoid using a condom when a sexual partner wants to use one.
50 Davis et al. [3] identified a wide range of condom use resistance tactics including non-consensual
51 condom removal which has recently emerged in the public and legal spheres as a “sex trend” [4].

52 Non-consensual condom removal (NCCR), sometimes known as *stealth*, occurs when a person,
53 the *stealther* or NCCR perpetrator, removes the condom before or during sexual intercourse
54 without the permission of the other person, the *stealthed* or NCCR victim. NCCR can occur in
55 heterosexual and male same-sex encounters. Alexandra Brodsky’s seminal paper [5] was the first
56 of its kind to offer insight into NCCR through the eyes of stealthed women while contextualizing
57 this sexual practice as a novel form of sexual assault within the American legal system. Brodsky’s
58 paper ushered in a new era of research focused on conditional consent, or consent given based on
59 specific conditions such as condom use.

60 Surveys of female stealthed partners record NCCR rates ranging from 12% to 32% [3,6–8]. NCCR
61 is more common in casual or nonexclusive relationships and women who have five or more sexual
62 partners in a single year are more likely to experience NCCR [9,10].

63 NCCR poses physical and psychological risks to women’s health, and potentially that of their male
64 partners. It increases the risk of negative health outcomes for men and women such as sexually
65 transmitted infections (STIs) and, for women, unplanned pregnancy [6,11,12]. In terms of
66 psychological outcomes, stealthed women report low levels of control as sexual beings [9] and
67 feelings of sexual shame and violation [13,14].

68 Evidence from outside the UK shows that many people believe NCCR is wrong due to lack of
69 consent but other prevalent reasons include negative outcomes like STI transmission and

70 unplanned pregnancy [6]. While studies show that most people believe NCCR should be
71 considered sexual assault [15,16], such views are more common among women than men [16].

72 Czechowski et al. [6] found that the majority of Canadian undergraduate students thought there
73 should be consequences for stealthers; some mentioned that consequences should apply only if
74 there are negative outcomes like STIs or unplanned pregnancy or if the stealthed partner wants to
75 pursue action against the stealther. Such views display the public's ambivalence to a blanket rule
76 and inclination towards a flexible system to hold stealthers accountable.

77 The public's views reflect the way that legal systems approach NCCR. In the United States and
78 Canada, the law adopts a risk-based approach requiring bodily harm (e.g. STI transmission or
79 unplanned pregnancy) to consider NCCR an actual crime [5,6]. The state of California set
80 precedent by making NCCR illegal under civil law. A recently passed Australian legislation states
81 that intentional misrepresentation of condom use vitiates consent [17]. The UK Sexual Offences
82 Act addresses the use of deception during sexual intercourse but does not specify NCCR as a form
83 of sexual assault or rape [18].

84 Existing research on NCCR mainly covers prevalence rates and risk factors with few studies,
85 mostly qualitative and North America-specific, investigating views on NCCR and their
86 implications on legal reform. To address this gap and extend previous NCCR research, this study
87 explored how young people in the UK view NCCR.

88 **Methods**

89 **Aim and Objectives**

90 Aim: To explore young people's views in the UK on the morality and criminality of non-
91 consensual condom removal (NCCR).

92 Objectives:

- 93 1. To examine how different scenarios of NCCR affect young people’s views on its violation
94 of consent to sex.
- 95 2. To explore how NCCR scenarios, varied by negative health outcomes for women and
96 relationship status, affect young people’s views on the morality and criminality of NCCR.
- 97 3. To assess whether young people’s views on NCCR are associated with their socio-
98 demographic characteristics.

99 **Methodology**

100 A quantitative approach was adopted to determine the prevailing views on NCCR among young
101 people which can guide future awareness campaigns, support services, and legislation addressing
102 NCCR. A survey was designed and delivered online using Qualtrics. There were two eligibility
103 criteria for survey participation: age between 18-25 and residence in the UK.

104 **Sampling and Recruitment**

105 Convenience sampling was used as a time-efficient recruitment method. Participants were
106 recruited via printed flyers distributed on the UCL campus and through social media channels. A
107 post containing the survey link was shared on personal social media accounts. An Instagram
108 account was set up for the study where the survey link was easily accessible to the public. A paid
109 Instagram advertisement, funded by UCL, was launched to boost the survey reach.

110 **Survey Design**

111 This study explored young people’s views on several aspects of NCCR: violation of consent to
112 sex, morality, and criminality. Criminality was further subdivided into criminal status – whether
113 NCCR is a form of sexual assault or not – and penalty – whether NCCR perpetrators should face
114 prison time or not. Views were the dependent variables investigated through two independent
115 variables: post-NCCR negative health outcomes for women and relationship status. The survey
116 questionnaire was divided into two sections: NCCR scenarios and socio-demographic questions.

117 **NCCR Scenarios**

118 The first section included two fictional scenarios adapted from Nguyen et al. [19]. Scenario A, or
119 the Outcome scenario, focused on negative health outcomes for women. Scenario A1 described an
120 unplanned pregnancy whereas scenario A2 described depression. Scenario B, or the Relationship
121 status scenario, focused on the nature of the relationship between the male and female partners
122 involved in NCCR. Scenario B1 described a casual hook-up whereas scenario B2 described a long-
123 term dating relationship. Scenario variations were randomized and participants received one
124 variation of each scenario (Table 1).

125 **Table 1: NCCR scenarios and their variations**

Scenario A: Post-NCCR negative health outcomes for women

Scenario A1 – Unplanned pregnancy

John and Kate have been having sex with each other for a while. Neither of them have any other sexual partners. On all the occasions they have had sex so far, they have used condoms. One night while having sex, John removed the condom without asking Kate. After sex, Kate discovered the condom on the floor and realized that John had ejaculated inside her vagina. Now, a few weeks later, Kate has just found out that she is pregnant after taking a pregnancy test.

Scenario A2 – Depression

John and Kate have been having sex with each other for a while. Neither of them have any other sexual partners. On all the occasions they have had sex so far, they have used condoms. One night while having sex, John removed the condom without asking Kate. After sex, Kate discovered the condom on the floor and realized that John had ejaculated inside her vagina. Kate became very upset and anxious about John's actions. In the next few days, she kept revisiting what happened and became depressed.

Scenario B: Relationship status

Scenario B1 – Casual hook-up

Looking for a casual hookup, Sam and Alice matched on a dating app. They started texting each other for a few days before finally deciding to meet. Their first date goes well. At the end of the night, they went back to Sam's flat to have sex. Alice handed Sam a condom and he put it on. During sex, when Alice wasn't looking, Sam took off the condom without asking her. After Sam ejaculated inside her vagina, he pulled out and was naked and uncovered on the bed. Alice saw that he didn't have the condom on and realized that Sam had taken off the condom during sex.

Scenario B2 – Long-term dating

Sam and Alice met a few months ago and started dating. They have been having sex with each other every week. As a couple, they buy condoms regularly and agree to use them when they have sex. The most recent time that Sam and Alice had sex, she handed him a condom and he put it on. During sex, when Alice wasn't looking, Sam took off the condom without asking her. After Sam ejaculated inside her vagina, he pulled out and was naked and uncovered on the bed. Alice saw that he didn't have the condom on and realized that Sam had taken off the condom during sex.

126

127 Each scenario was followed by four multiple choice questions:

- 128 1. Did X have Y's agreement to sex after he removed the condom without asking her?
- 129 2. Did X do something wrong when he removed the condom without asking Y?
- 130 3. Did X sexually assault Y when he removed the condom without asking her?
- 131 4. Should X serve time in prison for removing the condom without asking Y?

132 Question 1 addressed violation of consent to sex. To avoid using language that could lead
133 respondents, the words 'consent' and 'consensual' were not included in any part of the survey.
134 Instead, the phrase 'without asking' was used in scenarios and questions as recommended by
135 Czechowski et al. [6]. Question 2 addressed the morality of NCCR while questions 3 and 4 focused
136 on the criminality of NCCR (Figure 1).

137 **Figure 1: Operationalization of study variables**

138 [insert figure 1 here]

139 Respondents could choose 'Yes', 'No', or 'Not sure' for all questions. Due to the sensitive, sexual
140 nature of the scenarios, all questions were voluntary and respondents could skip any questions they
141 did not wish to answer and still be able to continue the survey.

142 [Socio-demographic Questions](#)

143 The second section covered several socio-demographic questions which were taken directly from
144 the UK census [20]. The final question asked whether the respondent was born in the UK or not.
145 All socio-demographic questions were voluntary.

146 [Participant Consent and Support](#)

147 Before starting the survey, participants were required to check four consent tick boxes which were
148 used to obtain informed consent in an anonymous manner. The tick boxes ensured that participants
149 met the eligibility criteria, understood the sexual nature of the questions, and knew their responses
150 would be anonymous. Upon completing the survey, participants were shown a brief message

151 thanking them for participating and signposting them to the study's Further Help webpage which
152 was designed to support participants who may find the scenarios emotionally distressing. The
153 webpage included UK support services covering unplanned pregnancy, STIs, and sexual assault.

154 **Pre-testing**

155 Prior to the online launch of the survey, a pre-testing process was undertaken to optimize question
156 clarity and comprehension. Six pre-testing interviewees were recruited on the UCL campus on 24
157 and 25 May 2023. All interviewees found the survey easy to understand and straightforward.
158 Survey comprehension was satisfactory and no changes were made to the questions.

159 **Data Collection**

160 The survey was conducted from 30 May to 4 July 2023, over a five-week period. Collected data
161 was stored on a password-protected Qualtrics account accessible to the researchers only. After the
162 survey was closed, the data were exported for analysis.

163 **Data Analysis**

164 Survey responses with at least one answered question were included in the data analysis. Some
165 respondents typed ages outside the target range; these responses were classified as 'Age unclear'
166 but were not excluded as all respondents checked the consent tick box confirming they are aged
167 18-25, thus their responses were attributed to possible typing errors.

168 Chi-square tests were used to identify significant associations between scenario variations and
169 participant views. Where the Outcome scenario was found to significantly affect views, a stratified
170 Chi-square test was used to explore whether there was a framing effect of the Outcome scenario
171 on the corresponding view in the Relationship status scenario.

172 Using STATA, unadjusted odds ratios of the dependent variables by socio-demographic
173 characteristics were calculated and logistic regression modelling was performed to calculate
174 adjusted odds ratios. Adjusted proportions are also presented. Due to the overwhelming agreement

175 on questions 1 and 2, logistic regression modelling focused on questions 3 and 4 where meaningful
176 associations could be identified. The dependent variable was coded 1 (yes) and 0 (no and no sure).
177 As a potential framing effect of the Outcome scenario on the penalty question in the Relationship
178 status scenario had been identified, it was explored formally with an interaction term (S1 Table).
179 Informed by this, we used a composite variable of received scenario combinations, i.e. A1+B1,
180 A1+B2, etc in the final model (penalty views in the Relationship status scenario).

181 **Ethics Approval**

182 The study was approved by the UCL Research Ethics Committee, ethics project ID: 24257/002.
183 All participants in the study (pre-testing interviewees and survey participants) were fully informed
184 of the aims and conditions of the study via Participant Information Sheets. The pre-testing
185 interviewees completed and signed written consent forms in the presence of FE. Online survey
186 participants were anonymous. As approved by the research ethics committee, survey participants
187 were required to check four statements in order to continue to the survey questions. The four
188 statements were: “I am aged 18-25”, “I live in the UK”, “I understand there will be questions about
189 examples of sexual behaviour and condom use”, and “I understand that my answers will be
190 anonymous”. The answering of survey questions implied consent, as is usual practice in the UK
191 and as was approved by the research ethics committee.

192 **Results**

193 **Sample**

194 There were 1818 survey responses to the online survey. Of those, 89 respondents checked the
195 consent tick boxes without answering any survey questions; these responses were excluded from
196 data analysis. The remaining 1729 responses were included in data analysis as they contained at
197 least one answered question. The sample was predominantly female, cisgender, non-heterosexual,
198 White, non-religious, and born in the UK (Table 2).

199 **Table 2: Respondents' socio-demographic characteristics**

Socio-demographic characteristic	n	%
Age (n=1667)		
18	140	8.4
19	155	9.3
20	202	12.1
21	208	12.5
22	209	12.5
23	221	13.3
24	289	17.3
25	232	13.9
Unclear	11	0.8
Sex (n=1668)		
Male	402	24.1
Female	1266	75.9
Gender identity (n=1669)		
Cisgender	1497	89.7
Other gender identity	172	10.3
Sexual orientation (n=1669)		
Straight/heterosexual	755	45.2
Gay or lesbian	131	7.8
Bisexual	664	39.8
Other sexual orientation	119	7.1
Ethnicity (n=1667)		
White	1416	84.9
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	84	5.0
Asian or Asian British	87	5.2
Black, Black British, Caribbean or African	22	1.3
Other ethnic group	27	1.6
Prefer not to say	31	1.9
Belonging to a religion (n=1666)		
Yes	286	17.2
No	1380	82.8
Current student (n=1665)		
Yes	917	55.1
No	748	44.9
Current programme of study (n=912)		
GCSE/O level/National 5	2	0.2
College or further education qualification	37	4.1
A/AS/S levels/International Baccalaureate	64	7.0
Undergraduate degree or nursing or teaching qualification	621	68.1
Postgraduate degree	173	19.0
Other	15	1.6
Highest educational qualification (n=1656)		
GCSE/O level/National 5	95	5.7
College or further education qualification	159	9.6
A/AS/S levels/International Baccalaureate	615	37.2
Undergraduate degree or nursing or teaching qualification	549	33.2
Postgraduate degree	220	13.3
Other	18	1.1
Born in the UK (n=1656)		
Yes	1375	83.0
No	281	17.0

200

201

202 [Scenario completion](#)

203 The Outcome scenario was completed by 1729 respondents (S1 Figure), 50.3% answered the
204 Pregnancy variation (scenario A1) and 49.7% answered the Depression variation (scenario A2).
205 The Relationship status scenario was completed by 1693 respondents, 49.9% answered the Casual
206 hook-up variation (scenario B1) and 50.1% answered the Long-term dating variation (scenario
207 B2). No significant associations between scenario allocation and socio-demographic
208 characteristics (S2 Table) were found.

209 **Survey Findings**

210 [Outcome Scenario](#)

211 The majority of respondents agreed that NCCR is a violation of consent to sex, morally wrong,
212 and a form of sexual assault (Table 3). No significant difference in responses between scenario
213 variations were found in these three questions. Regarding prison as a penalty, there was a
214 significant difference by scenario: over half of the respondents answered ‘Yes’ in the Pregnancy
215 scenario whereas over half of the respondents answered ‘Not sure’ or ‘No’ in the Depression
216 scenario (Table 3).

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

Table 3: Respondents’ views in the Outcome scenario

	Yes		Not sure		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<i>Did John have Kate’s agreement to sex after he removed the condom without asking her?</i>						
Pregnancy (n=869)	8	0.9	10	1.2	851	97.9
Depression (n=860)	7	0.8	9	1.0	844	98.1
Chi = 0.101, df = 2, p-value = 0.95						
<i>Did John do something wrong when he removed the condom without asking Kate?</i>						
Pregnancy (n=869)	864	99.4	1	0.1	4	0.5
Depression (n=860)	854	99.3	3	0.3	3	0.3
Chi = 0.154, df = 2, p-value = 0.56						
<i>Did John sexually assault Kate when he removed the condom without asking her?</i>						
Pregnancy (n=869)	775	89.2	65	7.5	29	3.3
Depression (n=860)	742	86.3	92	10.7	26	3.0
Chi = 5.478, df = 2, p-value = 0.07						
<i>Should John serve time in prison for removing the condom without asking Kate?</i>						
Pregnancy (n=869)	453	52.1	317	36.5	99	11.4
Depression (n=860)	358	41.6	385	44.8	117	13.6
Chi = 19.169, df = 2, p-value <0.001						

225

226 Respondents who were female, non-heterosexual (i.e. gay, lesbian, bisexual, etc.), or born in the
227 UK were more likely to believe NCCR is sexual assault (Table 4).

228 Female respondents were more likely to support prison as a penalty for NCCR (Table 5). The
229 Outcome scenario had a statistically significant (p-value <0.001) effect on respondents’ views on
230 prison as a penalty; respondents were less likely to support prison time for NCCR in cases where
231 the outcome was depression as opposed to pregnancy (Table 5).

232

233

234

235 **Table 4: Factors associated with views on sexual assault in the Outcome scenario**

Variable	Unadjusted		Adjusted		Adjusted Proportion % (95% CI)
	OR (95% CI)	P-value	OR (95% CI)	P-value	
Outcome					
Pregnancy	1.0	0.07	1.0	0.241	90.6% (88.4-92.4%)
Depression	0.76 (0.57 – 1.02)		0.83 (0.61 – 1.13)		88.9% (86.5-90.9%)
Sex					
Male	1.0	<0.001	1.0	<0.001	83.0% (78.9-86.5%)
Female	2.53 (1.85 – 3.44)		2.18 (1.57 – 3.04)		91.4% (89.7-92.9%)
Gender identity					
Cisgender	1.0	0.02	1.0	0.26	89.7% (87.9-91.2%)
Other gender identity	2.06 (1.10 – 3.87)		1.51 (0.74 – 3.09)		91.2% (84.5-95.1%)
Sexual orientation					
Heterosexual	1.0	<0.001	1.0	<0.001	85.3% (82.3-87.8%)
Gay or lesbian	1.74 (0.97 – 3.12)		1.90 (1.03 – 3.50)		91.6% (86.0-95.2%)
Bisexual	3.52 (2.41 – 5.16)		2.84 (1.91 – 4.22)		94.3% (92.1-95.9%)
Other sexual orientation	1.44 (0.81 – 2.56)		1.00 (0.53 – 1.92)		85.3% (76.3-91.2%)
Ethnicity					
White	1.0	0.03	1.0	0.95	89.9% (88.1-91.4%)
Non-White	0.66 (0.45 – 0.96)		0.99 (0.65 – 1.51)		89.5% (85.2-92.7%)
Belonging to a religion					
Yes	1.0	0.20	-	-	-
No	1.28 (0.88 – 1.85)		-		-
Current student					
Yes	1.0	0.07	-	-	-
No	1.33 (0.98 – 1.81)		-		-
Born in the UK					
Yes	1.0	<0.001	1.0	<0.001	90.1% (89.2-92.4%)
No	0.48 (0.34 – 0.67)		0.48 (0.33 – 0.70)		82.8% (77.6-87.0%)

236

237

238 **Table 5: Factors associated with penalty views in the Outcome scenario**

Variable	Unadjusted		Adjusted		Adjusted Proportion
	OR (95% CI)	P-value	OR (95% CI)	P-value	% (95% CI)
Outcome					
Pregnancy	1.0	<0.001	1.0	<0.001	51.7% (48.3-55.1%)
Depression	0.65 (0.54 – 0.79)		0.70 (0.57 – 0.85)		42.8% (39.4-46.3%)
Sex					
Male	1.0	<0.001	1.0	<0.001	36.4% (31.8-41.4%)
Female	1.93 (1.53 – 2.43)		1.78 (1.40 – 2.26)		50.8% (48.1-53.6%)
Gender identity					
Cisgender	1.0	0.87	-	-	-
Other gender identity	1.15 (0.84 – 1.58)		-		-
Sexual orientation					
Heterosexual	1.0	0.001	1.0	0.07	44.1% (40.5-47.7%)
Gay or lesbian	0.92 (0.63 – 1.34)		1.00 (0.68 – 1.48)		44.2% (35.7-53.1%)
Bisexual	1.45 (1.18 – 1.79)		1.31 (1.06 – 1.62)		50.8% (46.9-54.7%)
Other sexual orientation	1.53 (1.04 – 2.26)		1.35 (0.91 – 2.01)		51.6% (42.6-60.6%)
Ethnicity					
White	1.0	0.99	-	-	-
Non-White	1.00 (0.76 – 1.31)		-		-
Belonging to a religion					
Yes	1.0	0.86	-	-	-
No	0.98 (0.76 – 1.26)		-		-
Current student					
Yes	1.0	0.22	-	-	-
No	0.89 (0.73 – 1.07)		-		-
Born in the UK					
Yes	1.0	0.17	-	-	-
No	0.84 (0.65 – 1.08)		-		-

239

240 **Relationship Status Scenario**

241 The majority of respondents agreed that NCCR is a violation of consent to sex, morally wrong,
 242 and a form of sexual assault (Table 6). No significant difference in responses between scenario
 243 variations were found in these three questions. Regarding prison as a penalty, there was a
 244 significant difference by scenario: over half of the respondents answered ‘Yes’ in the Casual hook-

245 up scenario, whereas over half of the respondents answered ‘Not sure’ or ‘No’ in the Long-term
 246 dating scenario (Table 6).

Table 6: Respondents’ views in the Relationship status scenario

	Yes		Not sure		No	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<i>Did Sam have Alice’s agreement to sex after he removed the condom without asking her?</i>						
Casual hook-up (n=844)	11	1.3	6	0.7	827	98.0
Long-term dating (n=849)	16	1.9	6	0.7	827	97.4
Chi = 0.911, df = 2, p-value = 0.63						
<i>Did Sam do something wrong when he removed the condom without asking Alice?</i>						
Casual hook-up (n=844)	840	99.5	1	0.1	3	0.4
Long-term dating (n=849)	845	99.5	0	0	4	0.5
Chi = 1.143, df = 2, p-value = 0.57						
<i>Did Sam sexually assault Alice when he removed the condom without asking her?</i>						
Casual hook-up (n=844)	753	89.2	70	8.3	21	2.5
Long-term dating (n=849)	736	86.7	80	9.4	33	3.9
Chi = 3.513, df = 2, p-value = 0.17						
<i>Should Sam serve time in prison for removing the condom without asking Alice?</i>						
Casual hook-up (n=844)	455	53.9	308	36.5	81	9.6
Long-term dating (n=849)	401	47.2	335	39.5	113	13.3
Chi = 9.804, df = 2, p-value = 0.007						

247

248 Respondents who were female, non-heterosexual, or born in the UK were more likely to believe
 249 NCCR is sexual assault (Table 7). Respondents who were female or non-heterosexual were more
 250 likely to support prison time for NCCR (Table 8).

251 When used to detect possible framing effects of the Outcome scenario, Chi-square test yielded a
 252 value of 0.005 indicating a significant association between the received Outcome scenario and
 253 penalty views in the subsequent Relationship status scenario. The composite variable, representing

254 the four possible scenario combinations, remained significant after adjustment (Table 8).
 255 Receiving the prior pregnancy scenario and the casual hook-up relationship scenario both
 256 increased the likelihood of supporting prison as a penalty; scenario combinations appeared to work
 257 in an additive fashion (Table 8).

258 **Table 7: Factors associated with criminality views in the Relationship status scenario**

Variable	Unadjusted		Adjusted		Adjusted Proportion % (95% CI)
	OR (95% CI)	P-value	OR (95% CI)	P-value	
Relationship status					
Casual hook-up	1.0	0.11	1.0	0.24	90.5% (88.3-92.4%)
Long-term dating	0.79 (0.59 – 1.06)		0.83 (0.61 – 1.13)		88.7% (86.3-90.7%)
Sex					
Male	1.0	<0.001	1.0	<0.001	82.4% (78.3-85.9%)
Female	2.56 (1.88 – 3.49)		2.25 (1.62 – 3.13)		91.3% (89.6-92.8%)
Gender identity					
Cisgender	1.0	0.02	1.0	0.23	89.5% (97.7-91.1%)
Other gender identity	2.08 (1.11 – 3.90)		1.54 (0.76 – 3.15)		91.2% (84.4-95.1%)
Sexual orientation					
Heterosexual	1.0	<0.001	1.0	<0.001	85.1% (82.1-87.6%)
Gay or lesbian	1.75 (0.98 – 3.15)		1.91 (1.04 – 3.52)		91.6% (85.9-95.1%)
Bisexual	3.66 (2.49 – 5.38)		2.93 (1.96 – 4.36)		94.3% (92.2-95.6%)
Other sexual orientation	1.35 (0.77 – 2.36)		0.93 (0.49 – 1.75)		84.1% (74.9-90.3%)
Ethnicity					
White	1.0	0.05	1.0	0.89	-
Non-White	0.69 (0.47 – 1.00)		0.97 (0.64 – 1.49)		-
Belonging to a religion					
Yes	1.0	0.81	-	-	-
No	1.05 (0.71 – 1.55)		-		-
Current student					
Yes	1.0	0.40	-	-	-
No	1.14 (0.84 – 1.54)		-		-
Born in the UK					
Yes	1.0	0.001	1.0	0.01	90.5% (88.8-92.0%)
No	0.56 (0.40 – 0.80)		0.58 (0.40 – 0.86)		84.5% (79.8-88.3%)

259

260 **Table 8: Factors associated with penalty views in the Relationship scenario**

Variable	Unadjusted		Adjusted		Adjusted Proportion % (95% CI)
	OR (95% CI)	P-value	OR (95% CI)	P-value	
Scenarios Received*					
A1-B1	1.0		1.0		57.9% (53.0-62.7%)
A1-B2	0.75 (0.58 – 0.99)	0.0001	0.76 (0.58 – 1.00)	0.0005	51.3% (46.5-56.0%)
A2-B1	0.69 (0.52 – 0.90)		0.72 (0.55 – 0.95)		50.0% (45.1-54.8%)
A2-B2	0.53 (0.40 – 0.69)		0.55 (0.41 – 0.73)		43.1% (38.4-48.0%)
Sex					
Male	1.0	<0.001	1.0	<0.001	41.1% (36.3-46.1%)
Female	1.78 (1.41 – 2.23)		1.62 (1.28 – 2.06)		53.6% (50.8-56.4%)
Gender identity					
Cisgender	1.0	0.34	-	-	-
Other gender identity	1.17 (0.85 – 1.60)		-		-
Sexual orientation					
Heterosexual	1.0	<0.001	1.0	0.005	46.1% (42.5-49.8%)
Gay or lesbian	1.00 (0.69 – 1.45)		1.05 (0.71 – 1.53)		47.2% (38.6-56.1%)
Bisexual	1.61 (1.31 – 1.99)		1.46 (1.17 – 1.81)		55.5% (51.6-59.3%)
Other sexual orientation	1.63 (1.10 – 2.40)		1.43 (0.96 – 2.13)		55.1% (45.9-64.0%)
Ethnicity					
White	1.0	0.87	-	-	-
Non-White	1.02 (0.78 – 1.34)		-		-
Belonging to a religion					
Yes	1.0	0.75	-	-	-
No	0.96 (0.74 – 1.24)		-		-
Current student					
Yes	1.0	0.08	-	-	-
No	0.84 (0.69 – 1.02)		-		-
Born in the UK					
Yes	1.0	0.11	-	-	-
No	0.81 (0.63 – 1.05)		-		-

*A1: Pregnancy; A2: Depression; B1: Casual hook-up; B2: Long-term dating

262 **Discussion**

263 The majority of respondents agreed that NCCR is a violation of consent to sex, morally wrong,
264 and criminal. Respondents who were female, non- heterosexual, or were born in the UK were more
265 likely to view NCCR as sexual assault. Outcome and relationship status significantly affected
266 penalty views; pregnancy and casual hook-up relationships increased the likelihood of supporting
267 prison as a penalty for NCCR. Respondents who were female or non-heterosexual were more
268 likely to support prison as a penalty for NCCR. A framing effect of the Outcome scenario was
269 established in relation to penalty views in the subsequent Relationship status scenario.

270 **Consent: It's Complicated**

271 Regardless of outcome or relationship status, the overwhelming majority of respondents believed
272 that NCCR is a violation of consent to sex and morally wrong. This finding is consistent with
273 Czechowski et al. [6] where almost all survey respondents believed NCCR is wrong, over half of
274 whom cited lack of consent as the reason for their view.

275 Aligning with previous research [15], most respondents in our study viewed NCCR as sexual
276 assault. Although almost all of our respondents confirmed that the male partner no longer had the
277 female partner's agreement to sex after NCCR, not as many viewed it as sexual assault. The gap
278 between identifying violation of consent to sex and viewing NCCR as sexual assault could reflect
279 a mismatch in young people's understanding of consent, which has been previously observed [15].

280 Several UK-based efforts, such as the #Consentiseverything campaign [21], focus on explicit
281 consent as the main criterion for sexual literacy. While obtaining verbal consent is deemed
282 important, UK university students often find it awkward to openly discuss consent, preferring to
283 negotiate it using non-verbal cues [22]. However, non-verbal consent can be unclear, and
284 ambiguous consent has been linked to higher odds of sexual assault victimization among
285 undergraduate students [23]. Therefore, current consent-centric campaigns are misaligned with the

286 reality of sexual dynamics among young people and better sexual health awareness focused on
287 context-specific and conditional consent is needed.

288 **Constructing Criminality**

289 In agreement with previous research [6,15], female respondents in our study were more likely to
290 view NCCR as sexual assault. One possible explanation for this finding may be that more women
291 experience NCCR compared to men and are in turn more negatively affected by it [6,7,16].
292 Similarly, respondents who identified as gay, lesbian, or bisexual were more likely to view NCCR
293 as sexual assault compared to their heterosexual counterparts. Such increased awareness could be
294 due to the fact that, not unlike women, sexual minorities are disproportionately affected by sexual
295 assault [24–26].

296 Despite this, experiencing NCCR does not always correspond to acknowledging sexual assault.
297 Research shows that, compared to those who have not experienced NCCR, victims are less likely
298 to view NCCR as sexual assault [16]. Aversion to acknowledge victimization [27], concerns about
299 the negative impact of the sexual assault label [28], and emotional attachment to sexual partners
300 [4,29] can act as barriers for victims to acknowledge sexual assault.

301 Respondents born in the UK were more likely to view NCCR as sexual assault which could be
302 attributed to the rise of UK sexual assault awareness campaigns targeting young people. For
303 example, the 2014 ‘I Heart Consent’ campaign [30] entailed the delivery of consent workshops in
304 20 UK universities where attendees were able to better discuss sexual consent.

305 **Consequences and Conundrums**

306 This study was the first of its kind to investigate views on prison as a penalty for NCCR. Previous
307 research on mandating consequences for NCCR show a supportive majority [6]. Ambivalent or
308 oppositional views were significantly higher in our study which could be attributed to the
309 specificity and severity of prison time as well as cultural differences between study populations.

310 Over half of the respondents supported prison time if the female partner got pregnant but that
311 support dropped by almost 10% if she became depressed. This difference shows that pregnancy is
312 perceived as a more serious consequence warranting legal penalty. Conditional support for
313 consequences based on outcome, usually pregnancy, has been previously noted [6]. In Britain,
314 unplanned pregnancy is most common among young people [31] and 40% of women who use
315 emergency contraception cite condom failure as their main reason to do so [32]. This further
316 emphasizes NCCR as a women's health issue. In cases where victims do not discover they have
317 been stealthed, their reproductive health is compromised as they are unable to procure emergency
318 contraception and are therefore at a higher risk of unplanned pregnancy.

319 Respondents were less likely to support prison if the partners were part of a long-term dating
320 relationship compared to a casual hook-up. This is echoed by some participants in Czechowski et
321 al. [6] whose views on legal consequences for NCCR were influenced by relationship status.
322 Current research shows that NCCR often occurs in casual or short-term relationships [9,10,14],
323 however the surreptitious nature of NCCR and existing trust between couples may lead to
324 underreporting in stable relationships. Sexual crime scenarios where victim and perpetrator know
325 each other are perceived as less severe, resulting in lower rates of crime reporting and punishment
326 severity [33,34], thus impeding sexual justice for women in long-term relationships. On the other
327 hand, women outside stable relationships are also at high risk. Women who have multiple sexual
328 partners and those in short-term relationships are more likely to experience both unplanned
329 pregnancy [31] and NCCR [9,10,14], consequently they are particularly vulnerable to reproductive
330 health problems and sexual assault victimization.

331 Female respondents were more likely than male respondents to support prison as a penalty. This
332 gendered effect is a novel finding as previous research had not shown differences in such views
333 [6], although female jurors are more likely to convict defendants in sexual assault and rape cases
334 [35,36]. Non-heterosexual respondents were also more likely to support prison time which aligns
335 with this population's higher tendency to recognize sexual assault as discussed earlier.

336 **Limitations**

337 This study had several limitations. The use of a non-random convenience sample, dominated by
338 university students and Instagram users, limits the generalizability of the results to the general
339 population of young people aged 18-25. Additionally, the majority of the study population was
340 White and cisgender, further reducing result generalizability to ethnic and gender minorities who
341 are understudied in NCCR research. Nevertheless, this was the first UK study to cover views on
342 NCCR. Its quantitative approach and large sample size offer valuable insight to begin to address
343 research gaps in this area.

344 **Conclusion**

345 NCCR has been identified as the most frequently reported form of condom nonuse [37], further
346 underlining the urgency of investigating this phenomenon. Since personal NCCR experiences can
347 influence views [16], future studies should focus on NCCR victims and perpetrators to better
348 understand their legal expectations and guide policy reform accordingly. Given the prevailing
349 awareness that NCCR is a violation of consent and a form of sexual assault, future sexual health
350 campaigns and legislation should tackle this phenomenon to provide the needed support for
351 women affected by NCCR.

352 **Supporting Information**

353 S1 Figure: Scenario allocation

354 S1 Table: Interaction term logistic regression model of the association between outcome scenario
355 and views on penalty in the relationship status scenario

356 S2 Table: Associations between sociodemographic factors and scenario allocation

357 Dataset

358 Acknowledgements

359 This research was conducted as part of the UCL EGA Institute for Women's Health MSc
360 Women's Health programme.

361 References

- 362 [1] Reece M, Herbenick D, Schick V, Sanders SA, Dodge B, Fortenberry JD. Condom Use
363 Rates in a National Probability Sample of Males and Females Ages 14 to 94 in the United
364 States. *J Sex Med* 2010;7:266–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1743-6109.2010.02017.X>.
- 365 [2] Davis KC, Stappenbeck CA, Norris J, George WH, Jacques-Tiura AJ, Schraufnagel TJ, et
366 al. Young Men's Condom Use Resistance Tactics: A Latent Profile Analysis
367 2014;51:454–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2013.776660>.
- 368 [3] Davis KC, Stappenbeck CA, Masters NT, George WH. Young Women's Experiences
369 with Coercive and Noncoercive Condom Use Resistance: Examination of an Understudied
370 Sexual Risk Behavior. *Women's Health Issues* 2019:231–7.
371 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2019.01.005>.
- 372 [4] Ebrahim S. I'm Not Sure This Is Rape, But: An Exposition of the Stealthing Trend. *Sage*
373 *Open* 2019;9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019842201>.
- 374 [5] Brodsky A. "Rape-Adjacent": Imagining Legal Responses to Nonconsensual Condom
375 Removal. *Columbia J Gend Law* 2017;183.
- 376 [6] Czechowski K, Courtice EL, Samosh J, Davies J, Shaughnessy K. "That's not what was
377 originally agreed to": Perceptions, outcomes, and legal contextualization of non-
378 consensual condom removal in a Canadian sample. *PLoS One* 2019;14:e0219297.
379 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0219297>.
- 380 [7] Costa GKF, da Silva MN, Arciprete APR, dos Santos Monteiro JC. Stealthing among
381 university students: associated factors. *Revista Da Escola de Enfermagem* 2022;56.
382 <https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-220X-REEUSP-2021-0573EN>.
- 383 [8] Bonar EE, Ngo QM, Philyaw-Kotov ML, Walton MA, Kusunoki Y. Stealthing
384 Perpetration and Victimization: Prevalence and Correlates Among Emerging Adults. *J*
385 *Interpers Violence* 2021;36:NP11577–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519888519>.
- 386 [9] Boadle A, Gierer C, Buzwell S. Young Women Subjected to Nonconsensual Condom
387 Removal: Prevalence, Risk Factors, and Sexual Self-Perceptions. *Violence Against*
388 *Women* 2021;27:1696–715.
389 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801220947165/FORMAT/EPUB>.
- 390 [10] Lévesque S, Rousseau C, Dumerchat M. Influence of the Relational Context on
391 Reproductive Coercion and the Associated Consequences. *Violence Against Women*
392 2021;27:828–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801220917454>.
- 393 [11] Davis KC, Logan-Greene P. Young Men's Aggressive Tactics to Avoid Condom Use: A
394 Test of a Theoretical Model. *Soc Work Res* 2012;36:223–31.
395 <https://doi.org/10.1093/SWR/SVS027>.

- 396 [12] UNFPA. Seeing the Unseen The case for action in the neglected crisis of unintended
397 pregnancy 2022;46–7. <https://www.unfpa.org/swp2022> (accessed December 14, 2023).
- 398 [13] Jones H, Bogen K, Lorenz T. Sexual Wellness Outcomes Associated with Experiences of
399 Stealthing. *J Sex Med* 2022;19:S9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JSXM.2022.05.022>.
- 400 [14] Tarzia L, Srinivasan S, Marino J, Hegarty K. Exploring the gray areas between
401 “stealthing” and reproductive coercion and abuse 2020.
402 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03630242.2020.1804517>.
- 403 [15] Ahmad M, Becerra B, Hernandez D, Okpala P, Olney A, Becerra M. “You Do It without
404 Their Knowledge.” Assessing Knowledge and Perception of Stealthing among College
405 Students. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17103527>.
- 406 [16] Latimer RL, Vodstrcil LA, Fairley CK, Cornelisse VJ, Chow EPF, Read TRH, et al. Non-
407 consensual condom removal, reported by patients at a sexual health clinic in Melbourne,
408 Australia. *PLoS One* 2018;13:e0209779.
409 <https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0209779>.
- 410 [17] Christian K. ACT criminalises stealthing, outlawing non-consensual removal of condom
411 during sex - ABC News. ABC News 2021. [https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-10-08/act-
412 criminalises-stealthing-in-australia-first/100522564](https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-10-08/act-criminalises-stealthing-in-australia-first/100522564) (accessed April 22, 2023).
- 413 [18] Sexual Offences Act 2003. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/42/contents>
414 (accessed April 22, 2023).
- 415 [19] Nguyen KK, Weeks C, Stenstrom D. Investigating the Effects of Stealthing Justifications
416 on Rape Perceptions. *Violence Against Women* 2021;27:790–805.
417 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801220930823/FORMAT/EPUB>.
- 418 [20] UK Data Service. Census forms 2021. [https://ukdataservice.ac.uk/learning-
419 hub/census/resources/census-forms/](https://ukdataservice.ac.uk/learning-hub/census/resources/census-forms/) (accessed August 22, 2023).
- 420 [21] Thames Valley Police. Consent is everything 2015. [http://www.consentiseverything.com/
421](http://www.consentiseverything.com/) (accessed August 15, 2023).
- 422 [22] Wignall L, Stirling J, Scoats R. UK university students’ perceptions and negotiations of
423 sexual consent. *Psychol Sex* 2022;13:474–86.
424 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2020.1859601>.
- 425 [23] Walsh K, Sarvet AL, Wall M, Gilbert L, Santelli J, Khan S, et al. Prevalence and
426 Correlates of Sexual Assault Perpetration and Ambiguous Consent in a Representative
427 Sample of College Students. *J Interpers Violence* 2021;36:NP7005–26.
428 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518823293>.
- 429 [24] Eisenberg ME, Lust K, Mathiason MA, Porta CM. Sexual Assault, Sexual Orientation,
430 and Reporting Among College Students. *J Interpers Violence* 2021;36:62–82.
431 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517726414>.
- 432 [25] De Schrijver L, Fomenko E, Krahe B, Roelens K, Vander Beken T, Keygnaert I. Minority
433 Identity, Othering-Based Stress, and Sexual Violence. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*
434 2022;19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19074221>.

- 435 [26] Katz-Wise SL, Hyde JS. Victimization experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual
436 individuals: A meta-analysis. *J Sex Res* 2012;49:142–67.
437 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2011.637247>.
- 438 [27] Weiss KG. “Boys will be boys” and other gendered accounts: An exploration of victims’
439 excuses and justifications for unwanted sexual contact and coercion. *Violence Against*
440 *Women* 2009;15:810–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801209333611>.
- 441 [28] Khan SR, Hirsch JS, Wamboldt A, Mellins CA. “I didn’t want to be ‘that girl’”: The social
442 risks of labeling, telling, and reporting sexual assault. *Sociol Sci* 2018;5:432–60.
443 <https://doi.org/10.15195/v5.a19>.
- 444 [29] Kahn AS, Jackson J, Kully C, Badger K, Halvorsen J, Kahn A. Calling it Rape:
445 Differences in Experiences of Women Who do or do not Label their Sexual Assault as
446 Rape. *Psychol Women Q* 2001;27:233–42. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.00103)
447 [6402.00103](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.00103).
- 448 [30] NUS. I Heart Consent Pilot Report. 2015. [https://www.nusconnect.org.uk/resources/i-](https://www.nusconnect.org.uk/resources/i-heart-consent-pilot-report)
449 [heart-consent-pilot-report](https://www.nusconnect.org.uk/resources/i-heart-consent-pilot-report) (accessed August 15, 2023)
- 450 [31] Wellings K, Jones KG, Mercer CH, Tanton C, Clifton S, Datta J, et al. The prevalence of
451 unplanned pregnancy and associated factors in Britain: Findings from the third National
452 Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (Natsal-3). *The Lancet* 2013;382:1807–16.
453 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)62071-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62071-1).
- 454 [32] Nappi RE, Lobo Abascal P, Mansour D, Rabe T, Shojai R. Use of and attitudes towards
455 emergency contraception: A survey of women in five European countries. *European*
456 *Journal of Contraception and Reproductive Health Care* 2014;19:93–101.
457 <https://doi.org/10.3109/13625187.2013.865164>.
- 458 [33] King LL, Roberts JJ. The Complexity of Public Attitudes Toward Sex Crimes. *Vict*
459 *Offender* 2017;12:71–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1005266>.
- 460 [34] Schwarz S, Baum MA, Cohen DK. (Sex) Crime and Punishment in the #MeToo Era: How
461 the Public Views Rape. *Polit Behav* 2022;44:75–104. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-020-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-020-09610-9)
462 [09610-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-020-09610-9).
- 463 [35] Schutte JW, Hosch HM. Gender Differences in Sexual Assault Verdicts: A Meta-
464 Analysis. *J Soc Behav Pers* 1997;12:759–72.
- 465 [36] Bottoms BL, Peter-Hagene LC, Stevenson MC, Wiley TRA, Mitchell TS, Goodman GS.
466 Explaining gender differences in jurors’ reactions to child sexual assault cases. *Behavioral*
467 *Sciences and the Law* 2014;32:789–812. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2147>.
- 468 [37] Davis KC, Hammett JF, Chen W, Stewart R, Kirwan M. A Scoping Review of
469 Nonconsensual Condom Removal (“Stealth”) Research. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 2023.
470 <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221146802>.

471

Four dependent variables: young people's views on NCCR in terms of

1. Violation of consent to sex
2. Morality
3. Criminality
4. Penalty

Question 1: Violation of consent to sex

Did X have Y's **agreement to sex** after he removed the condom without asking her?

Question 2: Morality

Did X do something **wrong** when he removed the condom without asking Y?

Question 3: Criminality

Did X **sexually assault** Y when he removed the condom without asking her?

Question 4: Penalty

Should X **serve time in prison** for removing the condom without asking Y?

Two independent variables:

Scenario A

Post-NCCR negative health outcomes for women

Scenario B

Relationship status

Scenario A: Outcome

- A1. Unplanned pregnancy - positive pregnancy test
- A2. Depression - "upset" "anxious" "depressed"

Scenario B: Relationship status

- B1. Casual hook-up - "casual hook-up" "dating app"
- B2. Long-term dating - months-long dating "couple"

Figure