



Government  
of Canada

Gouvernement  
du Canada

# Concept Testing of the “Online Child Sexual Exploitation” Ad Campaign

## *Focus Group Report*

**Prepared for Public Safety Canada**

**Supplier: EKOS RESEARCH ASSOCIATES INC.**

**Contract Number: 0D160-212095/001/CY**

**Contract Value: \$68,829.71**

**Award Date: September 16, 2020**

**Delivery Date: December 21, 2020**

**Registration Number: POR 034-20**

For more information on this report, please contact to:

[ps.communications-communications.sp@canada.ca](mailto:ps.communications-communications.sp@canada.ca)

*Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français*

Canada The wordmark for Canada, with a small red maple leaf icon above the letter 'a'.

## **Concept Testing of the “Online Child Sexual Exploitation” Ad Campaign**

**Prepared for Public Safety Canada**

Supplier name: **EKOS RESEARCH ASSOCIATES INC.**

Date: December 21, 2020

This public opinion research report presents the results of online focus groups testing three proposed concepts for the Online Child Sexual Exploitation ad campaign. The research was conducted by EKOS Research Associates Inc. on behalf of Public Safety Canada.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français sous le titre: Mise à l’essai des concepts de la campagne publicitaire « Cyberexploitation sexuelle des enfants.

This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes only. Prior written permission must be obtained from Public Services and Procurement Canada. For more information on this report, please contact Public Services and Procurement Canada at: [tpsgc.questions-questions.pwgsc@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:tpsgc.questions-questions.pwgsc@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca) or at:

Communications Branch  
Public Services and Procurement Canada  
Portage III Tower A  
16A1-11 Laurier Street  
Gatineau QC K1A 0S5

**Catalogue Number:**

POR-034-20E

PDF: PS4-275/1-2021E-PDF

**International Standard Book Number (ISBN):** 978-0-660-37231-0

**Related publications (registration number: POR 034-20):**

**Catalogue Number:** PS4-275/1-2021F-PDF (Final Report, French)

**ISBN:** 978-0-660-37233-4

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2021

For information regarding reproduction rights: [ps.communications-communications.sp@canada.ca](mailto:ps.communications-communications.sp@canada.ca)

# Table of Contents

<b>Summary</b>	5
A. Campaign Background	5
B. Methodology	5
C. Key Findings	7
D. Note to Readers	9
E. Contract Value	9
F. Political Neutrality Certification	9
<b>Concept Testing – Detailed Findings</b>	10
A. General Views of Parents about Children’s Online Activity	10
B. Concept Testing	12
C. Concept Ratings	25
D. Overall	26
<b>Appendix A:</b> Recruitment Screener	
<b>Appendix B:</b> Discussion Guide	
<b>Appendix C:</b> Ratings	
<b>Appendix D:</b> Concepts Tested	

# SUMMARY

## A. Campaign Background

The Government of Canada's National Strategy for the Protection of Children from Sexual Exploitation was launched in 2004 and expanded in 2009. In 2020, the Online Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse: Voluntary Principles was released to provide a framework to combat online sexual crimes against children and coordinate action between governments and industry partners. Canada's Criminal Code serves to protect children from all forms of child pornography, the use of the internet to lure children, from sexual contact or touching, and the procurement of children for illicit sexual activity. Public Safety (PS) Canada has been leading the National Strategy. PS is preparing to launch a multi-year public education and awareness campaign on Online Child Sexual Exploitation. The campaign is a component of Budget 2019 that included \$4.9 million over three years to support efforts to suppress Child Sexual Exploitation online.

The purpose of the research is to test the creative concepts developed for the multi-year public awareness campaign. The creative testing research will help to identify messaging and creative concepts (images, taglines, etc.) that are more successful at conveying the components of the awareness campaign.

## B. Methodology

A total of 16 focus groups were conducted online. Separate groups were conducted among parents of children 12 and younger, parents of children 13 to 17, in the Atlantic, Ontario, Quebec, the Prairies and BC. One group was conducted in each age range in these regions, with the exception of Quebec where two groups were held with parents of teens (i.e., 11 regional groups in total). Five additional groups were conducted with Indigenous parents (1), parents with lower levels of education and income (1), those more recently immigrated to Canada (i.e., last 10 years) (2; 1 in French and 1 in English), and in lone-parent households (1).

Each focus group was an hour and a half in duration. Groups with Quebec participants were conducted in French. All others were conducted in English. Because of lower turn out in a few groups, additional interviews were held (6). Participants logged onto a Zoom video meeting to generally discuss their children's online activity, their comfort as parents in staying up to date on their children's online activity, and to see and hear draft mock-ups of three proposed concepts for 30 second videos. They were asked to react to each one in terms of overall

impressions, clarity of message and appropriateness of the approach in getting parents to visit the Online Child Sexual Exploitation (OCSE) website. They were also asked to provide a series of ratings of each concept along similar dimensions.

Between six and seven participants were recruited to attend each discussion, using the Probit online panel, targeting Canadian parents of children between the ages of 5 and 17, keeping in mind a mix of participants in terms of gender, and socioeconomic status (recruitment screener can be found in Appendix A). In total, 78 individuals participated in the concept testing discussions, (see details in following table). Discussions occurred between November 23 and December 1, 2020.

**Table 1: Number of Participants per Region –  
Concept Testing Discussions**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Attended</b>
Atlantic under 13	4
Atlantic 13-17	4
Ontario under 13	4
Ontario 13-17	5
Quebec under 13	7
Quebec 13-17	5
Quebec 13-17	5
Prairies under 13	5
Prairies 13-17	5
BC under 13	5
BC 13-17	6
Immigrant parents (English)	5
Immigrant parents (French)	5
Indigenous parents	4
Low income/education parents	4
Single parents	4

The focus group guide (provided in Appendix B) was developed by EKOS in consultation with Public Safety Canada, along with a rating sheet used to rate each concept and provide an overall rating and ranking of the top concepts to quantify the results and obtain an initial reaction from each participant prior to discussion. Participants received an incentive of \$100 for their participation. Video recordings, researchers’ notes and observations from the focus groups formed the basis for analysis and reporting of results.

## C. Key Findings

Overall, there were a few overarching themes expressed by participants in discussing the three concepts:

- Statistics are useful in intriguing parents to pay attention and find out more. More likely to send parents to the website than actual scenarios presented.
- Parents expressed a desire to see diversity in age and gender of child, type of predator, and online activity (risk).
- Specific examples are useful for some to see “how” the risk occurs. Real is important for believability, including specific examples of how risk occurs, what the predator or victim “look” like.

The following table highlights positive and negative reactions to each of the three concepts.

**Summary of Reactions to Concepts**

Concepts	Positive Reactions	Negative Reactions
<p><b><u>People Like Me</u></b>            Girl texting with “boy” (Online friends may not be who they think they are)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› Concrete example of what and how it can happen</li> <li>› Recognizable situation (child on bed in room, or under blankets, texting)</li> <li>› Has shock value, appreciated the twist at the end</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› Showing only a girl victim. Less generalizable for some (e.g., parents of boys)</li> <li>› Predator too specific, difficult to present one predator (could be older/younger/good looking/innocuous looking)</li> <li>› Fear does not work well for some</li> <li>› Less solution-oriented for some</li> <li>› OCSE more than just sharing naked pictures</li> <li>› Narration confusing if that is the predators disguised voice. Was it the girls voice? Mentions “us”</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Never Alone Online</u></b>            Children are never alone online (Learn the signs of OCSE)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› Powerful, even ominous, imagery “attention grabbing”</li> <li>› More opportunity to show diversity of victims – both ages and gender</li> <li>› Predator was illusionary, non-specific image</li> <li>› Shows different types of online activity, mention of gaming notable and eye opening for some</li> <li>› Children could have been in common and private household spaces</li> <li>› Generalizable to more parents, more ‘saw themselves’ in the concept. Flopping on the couch received good mention.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› Fear-based imagery does not work as well for some.</li> <li>› Generic – does not show specific examples of what/how OCSE can occur (what the actual risk is)</li> <li>› Could show female shadow as well</li> <li>› Call to action (learn the signs) not as strong for some as ‘learn how to protect your kids’</li> </ul>

Concepts	Positive Reactions	Negative Reactions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› Can understand the ad, even without sound.</li> <li>› “Learn the signs” call to action was noticed as motivating to look for (more) information</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>The Talk</u></b> Something you should know (1 in 5 targeted are under 12)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› Child’s point of view is powerful for many (young person’s lived experience). Gut wrenching for some</li> <li>› Parents motivated to action by duty to guide/protect</li> <li>› Unknown terms known by child may compel some to investigate</li> <li>› Statistic is also a good hook, well noticed (facts, not blind fear)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› Seen as bland for some, low key</li> <li>› Less believable for some (that child would come to parent with this)</li> <li>› Experience of girl only</li> <li>› Text is somewhat weak (making babies in French version. Confusion - is she a victim? If so, her tone is very neutral)</li> <li>› The statistic was misunderstood in French (inflated impression of numbers)</li> </ul>

## ***Ratings***

Results of ratings provided by participants show the Never Alone concept to be more positively rated on tone & approach, clarity of message and garnering attention. It is tied with The Talk in terms of relevance. There is no clear “winner” in terms of the impact of going to the website: all three concepts are essentially tied on this dimension. In overall ratings of each concept there is also no clear winner, although People Like Me was ranked less often as the most preferred concept, and more often as the least preferred. This suggests that while the Never Alone concept is received more positively as the concepts are shown, one by one, when they are all presented, each of the three are seen to have merit in reaching parents and Never Alone and The Talk are viewed equally as positively.

## ***Overall***

As reflected in both the discussion and ratings, each of the three concepts has strengths that make it powerful, and attractive to parents. Results suggest that each of these concepts “will work” and each can benefit from the addition of some of the strengths of the other two approaches. This may be in part because parents have a strong appreciation and see value in a campaign of this nature. They believe the issue is urgent and that all types of parents can



benefit from increased awareness as well as information to better inform them. It may be for this reason that they appear to be particularly receptive to all viable approaches and that they see merit in other respondents' points of view.

## **D. Note to Readers**

It should be kept in mind when reading this report that findings from the focus groups are qualitative in nature, designed to provide a richer context rather than to measure percentages of the target population. These results are not intended to be used to estimate the numeric proportion or number of individuals in the population who hold a particular opinion as they are not statistically projectable.

## **E. Contract Value**

The contract value for the POR project is \$68,829.71 (including HST).

Supplier Name: EKOS Research Associates

PWGSC Contract Number: OD160-212095/001/CY

Contract Award Date: September 16, 2020

To obtain more information on this study, please e-mail to [ps.communications-communications.sp@canada.ca](mailto:ps.communications-communications.sp@canada.ca)

## **F. Political Neutrality Certification**

I hereby certify as Senior Officer of EKOS Research Associates Inc. that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Communications Policy of the Government of Canada and Procedures for Planning and Contracting Public Opinion Research.

Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate, or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.

Signed by:



Susan Galley (Vice President)

# CONCEPT TESTING – DETAILED FINDINGS

## A. General Views of Parents about Children’s Online Activity

Many participants felt they had a good idea of what they are doing online and who their children are communicating with. This varies notably, however, depending on the age of children. Parents of younger children (from age 12 to as young as five) who participated in the focus groups mostly described that they manage their children’s online activities, from the device they use, the applications they use, and the overall parental controls. Additionally, parents of younger children more often said they directly supervise their children while online.

“We have precise rules, the children are still young, we need to know when they are online and accompanied by an adult given their age. Certainly, we have to know who their friends are. Especially with online games. It is important for us to control them at such a young age so that they get used to the teenage years. Transmit to them the values of responsibility and trust.” (Quebec, under 13)

“With my 12-year-old daughter, I am losing confidence a bit: there is Snapchat, Facebook, Instagram, there is also tiktok, but her subscribers are really her cousins, etc.” (Quebec, under 13)

“Most of the communication she does online is with family members, thankfully no social media yet.” (Prairies, under 13)

“My 7 year old has the Kids Messenger. We got that once everything shut down so he could be in touch with his friends. But it is great because everything has to go through either myself or my husband to be able to connect to him.” (Atlantic, under 13)

Some parents of older children (13-17) said they are aware of what their children are doing online and who they are communicating with. Some said they felt that their children could come and talk with them about anything and they would know if anything untoward was happening online. A few admitted they had no idea what their children were doing some of the time and that it is an impossible task to keep up, with a few citing the need to allow for their teenager to have privacy. A few told stories of their children receiving naked photos of other children, or stories of other family or acquaintances who were lured or had been the target of attempted luring of children by predators online.

“I couldn't pretend that I know which people my 4 daughters are going to talk to.” (Quebec, 13+)

“My best way of doing that is dad jokes, trying to understand what's going on because I really don't.” (Ontario, 13+)

“I am a bad techno. I can use a computer, but my kids are really 3 steps ahead of me... So, I really focused on communication.” (Quebec, 13+)

“You don't want to go in there and check on them all the time and you do what to give them their privacy.” (Low income parents)

“I do have my concerns about just how much technology is on all the time, you need to strike a balance. I try to force them outside sometimes and let them know nature is out there.” (Ontario 13+)

### **Availability of Information**

Many participants said that they feel informed of what types of online child sexual exploitation are taking place; with most citing information presented in the news or by talking to other parents. Some emphasized that they rely on teaching their children good values and hope that they choose to do the right things. Few have looked for information online on the steps they can take to keep their kids safe or could name sources they would go to for information. A few described seminars available through the school on online child sexual exploitation.

“I follow all news stations to be up to date with what is going on. We would have a discussion with our kids to say not everyone outside of this household is good. We always have their computers open when doing their schoolwork and we look at their e-mail. We talk to them about not engaging in conversations with people they don't know.” (Low income parent)

“The [local school system] has done a really good job at communicating, especially after some of the issues that have come up in the past in the school system.” (Atlantic, 13+)

“I have friends who have had problems with their children on social media, so I would really go talk to those friends.” (Quebec, 13+)

“We have been free with their online interactions, who he is talking to, but we try to balance that with making sure he is informed, open and honest about what groups he is in, where he chats and what information we shares about himself.” (Indigenous parent)

“I don't know if there's anywhere specific I would go per say. I would start offline just my wife and I discussing various things, brainstorming. Other than that, we would probably do a general search online.” (Ontario, 13+)

“Information, not knowing where to go, I might go to a CLSC or a police service to find out more to help us with this.” (Quebec, 13+)

## B. Concept Testing

Following are details expressed by parents about each of the three proposed concepts presented individually.

### ***People Like Me***

People Like Me suggested that offenders often disguise themselves as children to build trust with their victims. A boy’s voice is used to narrate that kids spend a lot of time online, and they can be vulnerable to those who pretend they are someone they are not and may be asked for such things as naked pictures. The concept then reveals that the narrator is in fact a grown man, posing as a child’s peer online. The tagline is “Your child’s online friends might not be who they say they are”, and the call to action is to “Learn how to protect your kids from online child sexual exploitation” at the website [Canada.ca/ChildExploitation](http://Canada.ca/ChildExploitation).

People like me was generally rated lower overall than the other two concepts and chosen as the first preference less often than the other two concepts. Specifically, the tone and approach of the concept was rated lower. In the discussions, a few felt that the twist at the end was a strong element of the approach, delivering a shock that grabbed their attention. Many participants, however, said that, despite the reveal at the end, the concept did not do a very good job of grabbing their attention or delivering a gut-punch. The concept felt like a reminder to protect their children, but without any push to search for information. In this way, some parents found this concept less solution-oriented than the other two.

“I honestly did like the juxtaposition of the kids voice to the adult. I think that might be effective if we’re looking to reach people who haven’t seen all of this before I think it would be an effective shock.” (Atlantic, under 13)

“Does a great job of opening eyes or highlighting a very real possibility.” (Indigenous parent)

“I like the directness of the video, in that it’s being told from the perspective of the predator.” (Ontario, 13+)

“It did grab my attention a little bit. It was just like another advertisement, and then the word ‘naked’ came up and I said, ‘woah, what’s happening’.” (Ontario, under 13)

“The commercials that are like after school special, staged ones – and that’s what that one felt like to me – it’s just I didn’t believe that was actually happening.” (Atlantic, under 13)

“I didn’t like it. I found it really boring at the beginning. The first 20 seconds seemed very long.” (Atlantic, under 13)

“How many parents are out there that don’t already know the risks associated with kids being online and people posing as people that they aren’t?” (Ontario, under 13)

“Wouldn’t specifically make me want to go look for information or learn something, it is just a general ‘be careful’ out there.” (Single parent)

“Seeing ads like that is a reminder to be careful.” (Quebec, 13+)

“It does make you feel a bit helpless because you just can’t know and you’re kind of dependent on trying to get that message across to the kids: you just can’t chat with people you don’t know.” (Ontario, 13+)

Most participants felt that the message is clearly and simply conveyed; that you can not trust that the people you meet online are who they say they are. In ratings, the clarity of message was rated as strongly as the two other concepts.

“It really shows how easily someone can be duped into thinking they are someone they are not.” (Prairies, under 13)

“I will keep this in mind and if I see that something is wrong with my children, I will know that there are some tools to help me.” (Quebec, 13+)

“Knowing that there’s a resource that I could go and look for stats on predator behavior or to get caught up on what kids on the early teenage years are getting into, I think would be very compelling as a parent of kids that age.” (Ontario, under 13)

The girl portrayed in the concept was interpreted by most participants as being “very real” or typical of girls of that age. Lying on her bed, on her phone, even “hiding” under the covers is something that most participants could relate to or perceive as being a normal activity. The actions of the girl gave many participants the impression that the activity was secretive and unsupervised. The concrete example of how the exploitation can occur was clearly described, according to some participants.

“I could see my daughter at some point where she’ll want to have those private chats under the blankets as it were, the first romance type thing.” (Atlantic, under 13)

“The visuals of it with the girl in the bed... quite often I’ve seen my kids, they’ll make a fort, very innocent thing to be doing. Someone preying on the most vulnerable, most innocent comes across.” (Ontario, 13+)

“When I saw the little kid hiding the cell phone under the blanket – that’s exactly what most kids are doing. It’s a key moment in the video which immediately makes an emotional reply from whoever sees it.” (Immigrant parent)

“I think the beginning of the commercial, I really recognized my daughter, so it really caught my attention, it takes a pretty dark turn, and it works really well, the script is clear and believable.” (Quebec, 13+)

Some parents, however, particularly those with only boys, or those with older teenagers, felt that showing only a girl in the ad makes the concept less relatable to them, and does not motivate them to take action to look up information or to talk to their kids about ways to stay safe online. Some parents said the scope of the predators aim could be widened beyond naked photos to show additional examples/risks of OCSE.

“Tricking kids into sharing naked pictures and then using those pictures against them is definitely not the only bad thing that can happen with this type of crime, and so to make the narrative like that is the only potential thing that could happen doesn’t really make sense”. (Single parent)

In terms of how the concept was implemented, the transition of the voice from a child narrator to a man in the mock-up was not clear to some parents since it did not sound clearly like a man’s voice (at the end). This did not influence respondents’ overall like or dislike of the ad; however, many clarified that it would need to be clear in the final video that the voice at the end was that of an adult predator. Only a few felt there would be a benefit to remaining in a boy’s voice, in a continuation of the deception. Further, some participants said they were confused during the ad and by the reveal, as the narration was perceived to be that of the girl pictured in the concept and that the wording “... but it can also leave *us* vulnerable”. If the predator is saying “us”, these respondents felt that the voice was truly one of the children, making the transition to predator more confusing.

“I was a bit confused at first, but perhaps just because of the storyboarding. I didn’t get the transition that it was supposed to be an adult at the end.” (BC, under 13)

“It would need to be done very well to not almost become a mockery of itself, depending on the live action version” (Ontario, under 13)

“I like the idea of the older man mouthing the words in the teenage boys voice, that’s excellent, I love that.” (Low income, low education)

“I found that the "like me" was not strong enough. I wondered too many questions at the end ... I needed two plays.” (Quebec, 13+)

Some participants described the mock-up of the male predator in the concept as too stereotypical. The beard, while perhaps intended to make it clear it is an adult, made the man appear to be scruffy or creepy. These participants pointed out that predators can be from all walks of life and it is important to convey that they can look unassuming. These participants felt it important to convey that people must protect themselves from those who look innocent just as much as they do from those who look strange or deviant.

“Would it be more valuable to punch you in the face with someone who seems really normal, as opposed to someone who looks sleezy or someone you think of as a predator?” (BC, under 13)

“It’s not like you can identify a sexual predator visually. By showing the monster, it makes people think this is what the monster looks like, and this is not the case” (Ontario, under 13)

Although some parents said that they liked the shock value of the reveal at the end, a few participants said they were not overly keen on this concept because they do not react well to fear-based advertisements. While a portion of these few participants found the approach frightening, they also said they do not generally like fear being used as a motivator.

“It’s every parent’s worst nightmare. You’re watching that going ‘no! this is unbearable’ and maybe that’s the intended effect, to scare you enough to do something, however I don’t know if that works or if your brain automatically goes into a mode of ‘I don’t want to think about that so I’m going to erase what I just saw’.” (Immigrant parent)

“My first instinct would be to look away or to turn it off rather than going to the end.” (Atlantic, 13+)

## ***Never Alone***

The Never Alone concept presented the message that “When children are online, they’re never alone”. This approach shows three scenarios where children are online, using different devices (phone, laptop, and gaming system), and different ages (appearing in the sketch as potentially age 10 to 16), and genders (two girls and one boy). While the children are active on the devices, a shadowy male outline appears in the background.

Most participants felt that the Never Alone concept is successful in presenting a diversity of children, in terms of both ages and gender. This approach was viewed as relatable to more parents because they can see their own children in the ad, including boys as well as girls, and for a wider age range of children. Parents of older teenagers said they were more apt to relate to this concept, relative to the other two, as they felt the ages depicted skewed much higher. Some participants specifically noted that the image of the child “flopping” on the couch is relatable and a gesture that their own children would do.

“The best part was that they show a boy as well as they are equally in danger.” (Single parent)

“More relevant to me because there was a boy in the image.” (Atlantic, under 13)

“The kid flopping on the sofa with the cell phone, like you see that. That’s a very familiar image.”  
(Low income parent)

“I like the girl leaving the table to use her phone, as teenagers often do, they isolate themselves.” (Atlantic, under 13)

“It really cast a wider net and was much more likely to reach more situations and parents.”  
(Quebec, 13+)

Many participants, particularly parents of younger children, said they supervise their children when they are online, but appreciated that the children depicted in this concept are shown in areas of the home that could be both public or private. Therefore, for these participants, the perception from this concept is that predators could be communicating with your children, even if a parent is nearby.

“Most parents they look at their kids sitting on the couch, playing games and they assume they are talking to other kids.” (Atlantic, 13+)

“The commercial is real. It was really real to see the girl leave the table where it is public and then go into the room to have conversations. Even narrating that it’s in children’s apps. Children



are not safe at all when it comes to being on computers or anything to do with technology. This one painted more of a picture to me.” (Low income parent)

“It’s interesting that he is in the living room, there is always someone there. The image really struck me more.” (Quebec, under 13)

Many participants noted that in this concept, children are shown using a variety of mediums. Most participants said they typically think of social media applications as their concern when their children are online, but they do not usually think of gaming as a source of online child sexual exploitation. This concept helped them consider more potential avenues for predators to approach their children.

“It spoke to me the most. It just drove home that piece that it doesn’t matter what platform you’re on – when you’re online and you’re talking to strangers you are vulnerable.” (Prairies, under 13)

“Grabbed my attention. The scenario of the boy playing the video games... something so innocent but people can find a way to get in.” (Low income parent)

“The stereotype is that this happens only on social media but in reality, there are more ways to get children than by using their phone.” (Single parent)

“If I see that ad for the first time before knowing about Roblox, that would definitely catch my attention and got me to seek more information.” (Ontario, under 13)

“I like that it showed the kid at the end on a console or playing a video game. I think that’s something parents wouldn’t necessarily think of as an avenue where child exploitation can happen.” (Atlantic, under 13)

“Online gaming is a good source where predators can approach kids and it’s not obvious as social media, that definitely caught my eye.” (Ontario, under 13)

Many participants noted the shadowy imagery of the predators as creating an ominous feel to the ad. For the most part, this ominous tone was seen as effective at garnering attention and conveying the message that their kids are never alone when they are online, and predators can potentially be lurking everywhere. A few said that, in fact, the images in the concept can tell the story without the audio.

“I really liked this. I liked how striking it was. It delivered the message really clearly without having to be shocking or vulgar. It made me want to get the resources. The idea of someone

lurking in the shadows. I recognize I can't keep my kids offline but makes me think now I need the resources. A good visual representation of the threat." (BC, under 13)

"This is adequately shocking, someone hiding in the shadows and understanding the metaphor there is enough to have parents go look for information" (Indigenous parent)

"The messaging was very straight forward and ominous." (Low income parent)

"Personally, didn't find that it was too much. It's almost that I already know that, but it's a striking way to send the message. Even if someone doesn't speak English, they could see what is happening." (BC, under 13)

"[The message is that] We don't know who our children are talking to when they are behind their screens." (Quebec, 13+)

Some participants appreciated that the predator was shadowy and non-descript, as an effective way of reducing the risk of presenting specific or narrow images of what a predator may look like. Nonetheless, many noted that all predators in the concept are male missing the opportunity to depict a woman predator.

"It seemed like all the shadowy figures were male. It's always the stereotypical male going after a young girl, so I did like to see that there's a boy in the commercial, but it was still a male standing behind him. I think there should be some representation that it's not just men who can be predators online." (Atlantic, under 13)

"But include a shadow of a female predictor also." (Indigenous parent)

As with People Like Me, a few participants did not like this concept because it plays on fears, which is not their preferred approach.

"I didn't like it much. It makes me uncomfortable. I'm not a fear-based decision maker. This was overwhelming. It's clear, but it makes me feel like my kids should never be online. It would drive me to keep them off and shut everything down." (BC, under 13)

"It was too fear based and repulsed me by watching it. It makes me aware and remind me that it exists but doesn't make me want to find more information". (Prairies, 13+)

"It was trying to be scary, but I know there are bad people on the internet. I don't think there's anybody in the world right now who doesn't think there are people who misrepresent themselves online." (Atlantic, under 13)

“It just seemed to me that the shadow is in each image as if threats are everywhere and that kind of puts me off, and I’m like ‘okay sorry, there aren’t threats everywhere,’ and I get a little defensive.” (Ontario, 13+)

Some parents said that the generalized approach to showing the shadowing figures did not do as well as the other two concepts at painting a precise picture of how the exploitation can occur. For some parents, there needs to be a clearer illustration of how this can occur. Similarly, for a few parents the call to action at the end to “learn the signs of online child sexual exploitation” is not as compelling as “protect your children from online child sexual exploitation”.

“You don’t see the focal point, the sexual exploitation. You see some harm could come but it doesn’t really point to exploitation, it could be a robbery or mugging - it was more a ‘be physically safe’.” (Ontario, 13+)

### ***The Talk***

The Talk focuses on only a girl, sitting on a chair, in a room, facing the camera. She is turning the table on parents by initiating a discussion, similar to “the talk” parents have with children about the “birds and the bees”. Instead, however, she is informing parents about the new reality of what happens when children are online.

Many participants found the approach of The Talk to be very powerful; depicting a young person’s lived experience, and how different it likely is from her parents’ experiences when they were growing up. This vantage point of the child’s point of view worked well for many, who found this gut-wrenching. Some parents said this concept instilled in them the desire to protect the girl in the concept (and their own children), emphasizing how well this approach worked for them on an emotional level. Some parents said that the power of this approach comes from the way it compels parents to step up to their role in protecting and guiding their children. A few also commented on the simplicity of the concept, with one actor talking to the camera. A few said that this concept made them feel uncomfortable in a way that grabbed their attention. Some even described it as more shocking than the other two concepts, but in a different way, urging parents to pay attention to the new reality of their children.

“The fact that it’s coming from the child’s perspective and saying it’s not all about birds and bees and things being simple; there are new categories that you aren’t familiar with and there’s stuff going on here you can’t understand as a parent and couldn’t have known growing up. It lets the parents recognize there is a generational knowledge gap there.” (Ontario, 13+)

“Shock you into thinking that you could have that type of conversation with your kids.” (BC, 13+)

“The way the message was conveyed – this is a child. Its someone who should never have to have this conversation and they are the one presenting it to their parents. It’s that juxtaposition that made it more impactful. It’s a shock but it’s a shock to action that I think the other two didn’t have for me.” (Atlantic, under 13)

“There is something ominous about a child who’s speaking about being lured, just on a chair in an empty room. It makes it look like she’s in danger. That caught my attention.” (Low income parent)

“It was really shocking for me. The picture of the child and these big words like sex and making videos and pictures coming out of their mouth was very shocking for me - It would catch my attention, yes, when I see a kid that young saying these kinds of words.” (Immigrant parent)

“I think it was a wonderful ad. It hit home. Like, you taught me about the birds and the bees, but this is way beyond that. This is what’s on there on the Internet now”. (Indigenous parent)

“There was a little bit more of a call to action. You have a job to do as a parent”. (Atlantic, 13+)

“It was unsettling. Anything about children being hurt gets me upset. I feel like it should come from a young person, because it needs to really hit home for parents. Parents aren’t home all the time and don’t know what their kids are doing.” (Low income parent)

“(I found it) approachable as a parent; in a conversation that you could see yourself having with your kids” (Ontario, under 13)

“It also hooked me, it gave me chills, I liked the tone, that is clear that it is for parents.” (Quebec, 13+)

Some parents said that this concept felt bland and boring to them. It did not grab their attention or seem compelling, particularly in the first 10 seconds. A few parents felt that the approach was not believable; that the girl would initiate a discussion and look so calm about it. A few were concerned that the final version of the concept may involve an actor that does not appear believable in the role, or have a distracting outfit. In the French version, the “birds and the bees” phrase was translated to be “making babies”, which made some participants in Quebec perceive the girl as juvenile.

“It delivers the message but didn’t really grab my attention.” (Ontario, under 13)

“She was going on and on, reading off a script, rather than really coming from her. Didn’t seem to be real or effective.” (BC, 13+)

“The overalls might be a little young depending on the age they are going for. If it was an appropriate aged and dressed child talking about this stuff I think it would be more powerful than the others, at least for me.” (Atlantic, under 13)

“The script she is reading sounds very mature for someone young (if she’s meant to be under 12 as the statistics were saying), it doesn’t really fit.” (Low income parent)

“The girl is very calm and unconcerned. Usually children are not very calm if they encounter something that is not normal; and they know when something is unusual.” (Single parent)

“I wonder how many kids would sit and talk to their parents that straightforward. It would be so out of the blue for so many parents, that they wouldn’t even have a context for understanding what was going on.” (Atlantic, 13+)

“I don’t know how to feel when she is talking about her own experience... if she is an actress and she doesn’t nail it, it might feel fake. That would alienate me right away.” (Low income parent)

“The phrase ‘I know how to make babies’ is really not good.” (Quebec, 13+)

“It was really lacking in punch, we do not really understand who it is for ...” (Quebec, 13+)

The approach used the phrase “I’ve been told about the birds and the bees, but you should know about the cappers and the creeps”. Almost all participants said they were not familiar with the term capper. At the same time, most said this helped to drive home the notion that things have changed since they were young and there are elements of their child’s experience that they are out of touch with. Some said the unfamiliar term serves as a motivation to look up information. Also, some said that it may serve as an opening to start a conversation with their kids about this topic. A few suggested replacing the term capper with another word that may be more familiar, or add in some description of it so that parents are still given the novelty of the term, but not left feeling confused about its meaning.

“Adding those two slang terms at the end makes it more real and something you talk to your kids about.” (Atlantic, under 13)

“I thought it was very clever. I mean everyone knows what a creep is so that gave some context and it was clever to do that way because it shows that yeah you as a parent don’t know what they’re going through, they’ve got all these terms you don’t know anything about.” (Immigrant parent)

“I think the first way [cappers and creeps] is rhythmic and catchy. I would keep me listening for more.” (Low income parent)

“You are a parent trying to teach your kids about this and you don’t even know what that is.”  
(Ontario, under 13)

An alternate phrase to the “cappers and creeps” phrase, “it’s uncomfortable, but that’s my reality, it’s our reality,” was read to participants in some of the discussions. Most found that the original “cappers and creeps” phrase was more noticeable, catchy, and lyrical. The replacement term was deemed by most to be bland and a less desirable alternative. A few, however, did like that the alternative phrase was emphasizing the new “reality” of young people.

“When it comes to sex, the world has changed in terms of what we need to be teaching our kids.” (Prairies, 13+)

“The second phrase [my reality] is more like processed cheese, it does nothing. The first statement [cappers and creeps] meant more than the second one”. (Prairies, 13+)

Some participants felt the concept had a narrow focus, presenting only the single situation of a young girl, with the risk focused solely on naked pictures. Some participants sense that online exploitation happens primarily to girls, and even parents of boys emphasized that it is important to address the experience of girls. However, the current approach to this concept misses the opportunity to highlight the variety of ways in which children can be exploited. For example, the girl mentions “taking off my clothes on camera” which is perhaps a common method of sexual exploitation, but it does not teach parents to look for other areas of vulnerability. A number of participants argued that, as presented, this concept may also be of less appeal to parents of boys or older children.

“It always seems to focus on girls and males are the predators whereas that isn’t always reality and I think half of the kids are boys and are equally targeted and it’s not always a certain type/stereotype of man who does this. I didn’t think that was very helpful.” (Immigrant parent)

“Not only girls are sexually exploited, little boys too.” (Single parent)

“In both ads so far its young girls who are the victim and I kind of feel like are boys being targeted the same way? I have no idea right? I need to know how to protect my boys as well as my girls. Is it the same approach that a predator would take with a boy? So, I feel its missing information.” (Prairies, under 13)

A strong element of the concept, according to most parents, was the statistic provided that “1 in 5 children targeted online are 12 or younger”. Many participants found this statistic to be a powerful part of the concept, and that use of such a factual piece of information would be effective at garnering attention in any of the three concepts. This was an eye opener to many

participants, particularly among those with younger children who initially felt it was too early to talk to their children on this issue, or that their children are generally safe online because of their supervision or limits on activities at such a young age. Many participants, however, misinterpreted the statistic as 1 in 5 of all children 12 or younger being targeted, suggesting the need for clarity in what and how any factual information is conveyed. A few parents, for example, suggested that the statistic would be more clear or impactful if it was provided in text on the screen so that parents may read along with the narrator.

“I like the statistic they used for ages 12 and under, that was attention grabbing!” (Low income parent)

“The stat, the one in five, that did kind of catch my eye - it was new information.” (Ontario, under 13)

“The facts at the end are powerful because you might think this is only true for teenagers perhaps or tweens but they say one in every five are under the age of twelve. That strikes home. They are targeting younger and younger people.” (Prairies, under 13)

“The ‘1 in 5 under 10’ got my attention. I was saying earlier that I felt my kids were too young [to be vulnerable to sexual exploitation].” (Low income parent)

“The statistic at the end is super important: it really helps” (Quebec, under 13)

“For me, statistics are the part that tells me that this is a very common problem and that it can affect my children.” (Quebec 13+)

### ***Overall Impressions of Campaign***

Participants uniformly believe it is a good idea to provide resources to Canadian parents to mitigate online child sexual exploitation. Participants also feel that it is entirely appropriate for the federal government to be involved in these activities and that they see Public Safety as a reliable and trustworthy source of information. Most participants emphasized that greater awareness is needed among parents about the threats that are out there for children. In addition, they would like to see steps they can and should be taking to mitigate the risk and protect their children from online sexual predators. Further, most participants felt the timing of a campaign is right, if not overdue, as children are spending more time online due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

“The more exposure and the more knowledge that everyone has, the better.” (Prairies, under 13)

“I think this is really important. I don’t think there’s enough information out there and there’s a lot of ‘this isn’t going to happen to me and my child’.” (Atlantic, under 13)

“There is not a well-known resource for how to get information for parents.” (Ontario, under 13)

“Even if we know it exists, we quickly forget it, we become too comfortable. An important reminder” (Quebec, 13+)

“This is so long overdue. It’s been ongoing and it’s only getting worse. It’s very frightening as a parent, and parents need the resources. They are on the right track to do this, and it’s so important because the world is changing and a lot of times there’s a generational gap between parents and kids and you have to educate parents to keep up with the kids.” (Ontario, 13+)

Most participants feel that the campaign strikes the right balance in grabbing attention, without overly shocking or offending anyone. Some participants feel that the campaign could go even further and be more striking to motivate parents to pay attention and take action. A few expressed concerns that, with the rapidly changing nature of technology and increasing and varied potential threats of child predators, the information referred to in the campaign and on the website would need to be continuously updated to stay relevant.

“This makes me feel really good about caring for the country’s children. It showed sophistication. Invites participation. Doesn’t feel like a throwaway PSA. It feels real.” (BC, under 13)

Thinks the level of shock is good/strikes the right balance “it would be eye catching without being triggering – well maybe it would be triggering for some people but it’s not scary just ominous.” (Low income parents)

“Because the tone is very similar to the PSAs we would have seen as kids I think it’s going to catch our attention more. I think that’s a really good tactic – I don’t know if that’s a deliberate thing or just the Canadian aesthetic - but I think that’s going to catch parents of my generation.” (Low income parents)

“The website will have to be revisited a lot to keep current. Things are changing constantly so I would think this is a place that could get stale very quickly.” (Atlantic, under 13)



## C. Concept Ratings

As already described at a high level in previous sections, following are the results of the ratings provided by focus group participants for each of the tested concepts. In each table below, results are collapsed according to ratings indicating the specific concept to be weak to moderate (rating it a 1, 2 or 3 out of 5), or strong (rating it a 4 or a 5). Results show the Never Alone concept to be more positively rated on tone & approach, clarity of message and garnering attention. It is ties with The Talk in terms of relevance. There is no clear “winner” in terms of the impact of going to the website: all three concepts are essentially tied on this dimension.

### Tone & Approach (n=77)

Rating	People Like Me	Never Alone	The Talk
Weak - Moderate (1-3)	41 (54%)	25 (33%)	38 (49%)
Strong (4-5)	35 (46%)	<b>51 (67%)</b>	39 (51%)

### Clarity of Message (n=77)

Rating	People Like Me	Never Alone	The Talk
Weak - Moderate (1-3)	18 (24%)	10 (13%)	<b>26 (34%)</b>
Strong (4-5)	58 (76%)	<b>65 (87%)</b>	50 (66%)

### Grabs Attention (n=77)

Rating	People Like Me	Never Alone	The Talk
Weak - Moderate (1-3)	25 (33%)	16 (21%)	<b>33 (43%)</b>
Strong (4-5)	51 (67%)	<b>60 (79%)</b>	44 (57%)

### Is relevant/Works (n=77)

Rating	People Like Me	Never Alone	The Talk
Weak - Moderate (1-3)	27 (36%)	22 (29%)	<b>22 (29%)</b>
Strong (4-5)	49 (64%)	<b>54 (71%)</b>	<b>54 (71%)</b>

### Impact – Sends you to website (n=77)

Rating	People Like Me	Never Alone	The Talk
Weak - Moderate (1-3)	36 (47%)	32 (42%)	36 (47%)
Strong (4-5)	40 (53%)	44 (58%)	41 (53%)

Overall, there is no clear winner among the three concepts in terms of strength of rating, although the People Like Me concept was ranked less often as the most preferred concept, and more often as the least preferred. This suggests that while the Never Alone concept is received more positively as the concepts are shown, one by one, when they are all presented, each of the three are seen to have merit in reaching parents and Never Alone and The Talk are viewed equally as positively.

#### Overall (n=77)

Rating	People Like Me	Never Alone	The Talk
Weak - Moderate (1-3)	29 (38%)	25 (32%)	24 (31%)
Strong (4-5)	48 (62%)	52 (68%)	53 (69%)

#### Preference Ranking (n=77)

Rating	People Like Me	Never Alone	The Talk
First	13 (17%)	31 (41%)	31 (41%)
Second	30 (40%)	23 (31%)	23 (31%)
Last	32 (43%)	21 (28%)	22 (29%)

## D. Overall

As reflected in both the discussion and ratings, each of the three concepts has strengths that make it powerful, and attractive to parents. Results suggest that each of these concepts “will work”, and each can benefit from addition of some of the strengths of the other two approaches. This may be in part because parents have a strong appreciation and see value in a campaign of this nature. They believe the issue is urgent and that all types of parents can benefit from increased awareness, as well as information to better inform them. It may be for this reason that they appear to be particularly receptive to all viable approaches and that they see merit in other participants’ points of view.

As identified in many of the groups, each concept does better at achieving certain objectives:

- shocking and connecting with parents through a specific and concrete example (People Like Me);
  - appealing broadly by illustrating various scenarios and sources of risk (Never Alone);
- or,

- indicating that children live in a reality today that is different from that of parents and it is parents' duty to talk to their children in order to protect their children (The Talk).

In the end, since parents see merit in any of these approaches, selection of a concept may rest less with the level of receptivity of parents to a particular approach, and more with the main objective, target group to be reached or message to be conveyed by the campaign. For example:

- Parents of younger children, particularly girls, may find People Like Me most informative and compelling.
- Those who have boys or older children, or are already thinking about and planning for more obvious risk exposures (e.g., sexting, sharing pictures), may find Never Alone more relatable or compelling. Therefore, this may have a wider impact (i.e., be more generalizable to more parents).
- The Talk, may serve as a better motivator or foundation for parents to have conversations with their children on these issues.



# APPENDIX A

## RECRUITMENT SCREENER



## APPENDIX B: Recruitment Screener

**ENG**

Government of Canada Online Group Discussions With Parents for \$100 Incentive

Dear \_\_\_\_\_ ,

We are holding a series of small, online discussions with Canadian parents of children between the ages of 5 and 17, to gather feedback about several proposed approaches to an upcoming public awareness campaign related to children's safety. **All participants will receive a \$100 incentive for their participation.** If you are interested, please click on the following link to choose a time applicable to your region and to get a few more details:

**CLICK HERE**

If the link does not work for you, please copy the following one into your browser:

**Details:**

We are holding these small, online discussions for Public Safety Canada to gather feedback about several proposed approaches to an upcoming awareness campaign on children's safety while online. It's important that Public Safety is able to get this kind of feedback so that they can design the best possible awareness campaign to reach parents with information to help them keep children safe from online child sexual exploitation; a dangerous and serious online threat that is on the rise in Canada and around the world.

Participation is easy, and of course, voluntary! You will be asked to log into a video conference website, using a password protected link, to discuss and review several proposed approaches to the campaign. The discussion will last about 90 minutes and will be attended by only 5 or 6 participants. The discussion will be led by an experienced moderator and observed by officials responsible for planning the awareness campaign.

This online discussion will take place in a secure and confidential environment. All personal identities will be protected. You will only log in, and referred to by, your first name. No one else in the discussion will know your identity. Anonymous excerpts or quotes from the discussion may be included in the final aggregate report to illustrate the findings, but they will not be linked to any participant.

Once you register, you will receive a confirmation email right away and a short confirmation call within a few days. We can answer any questions you may have at that time. You will also be sent an email reminder the day before the discussion which will include the video conference link, meeting ID and password to gain access to the discussion.

If you have any questions, contact Sarah McKay at EKOS Research: 1-800-388-2873 or [smckay@ekos.com](mailto:smckay@ekos.com). This research is also registered with the Research Verification Service maintained by the Canadian Research Insights Council and can be verified at <https://canadianresearchinsightscouncil.ca/rvs/home/> by entering project code .

Thank you in advance for your interest. We hope you are able to join us!

Susan Galley  
Project Manager  
EKOS Research Associates, Inc.  
[www.ekos.com](http://www.ekos.com)

## INTRO

Thank you for visiting the registration site for the online focus groups with Canadian parents for Public Safety Canada. As explained in the email invitation, EKOS Research Associates is leading a series of discussions with parents of children between the ages of five and 17 to get feedback on several proposed approaches to an awareness campaign to be launched early in 2021, aimed at increasing safety of children while engaging in online activities, specifically informing parents about the threat of online child sexual exploitation; a dangerous and serious online threat that is on the rise in Canada and around the world.

The 90-minute discussions will take place online between November 16 and 30 in the evening. In each session, a small group of 5 or 6 parents will be asked to provide constructive feedback to help Public Safety Canada by reviewing and discussing several proposed approaches to the upcoming campaign. The sessions will be observed by representatives responsible for planning the campaign so that they can hear first-hand what Canadians think. Confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained throughout the research process. Participants will receive a \$100 incentive for their participation.

Once you have registered, you will receive an email confirmation right away. We will randomly select 5 or 6 parents to participate in each session, among those who register. If you are selected, you will receive a telephone confirmation within a few days. You will also receive an email reminder with the link to the secure video conference meeting a day or two before the session.

## DM\_Q02B

Are you financially responsible for any children between the ages of five and 17 living in your household or currently living somewhere else? If so, how many?

Yes (please enter number of children) :	1
No	2
Prefer not to say	9

## QCHILD [1,5]

In what age range do your children fall?

Select all that apply	
Under 5	1
5-9	2
10-12	3
13-17	4
Over 17	5

## CALCQCHILD

*If no children between 5 and 17 – end*

Under 13 only	1
13-17 only	2
Under 13 and 13-17	3
Over 17 only TERMINATE	4



**Q2**

Are you or is any member of your household or immediate family employed in:

**Q2A**

Government of Canada	
Yes	1
No	2

**Q2B**

An advertising agency	
Yes	1
No	2

**Q2C**

A market research company	
Yes	1
No	2

**Q2D**

The media (Print, Radio, TV, Internet)	
Yes	1
No	2

**CALCQ2**

*If yes, screen out*

THNK2	1
Continue	2

**QGENDR**

Are you...

Male	1
Female	2
Prefer to self-describe:	3
Prefer not to say	4

**QINCOME**

Which of the following categories best describes your total household income? That is, the total income of all persons in your household, before taxes?

Under \$20,000	1
\$20,000 to just under \$40,000	2
\$40,000 to just under \$60,000	3
\$60,000 to just under \$80,000	4
\$80,000 to just under \$100,000	5
\$100,000 to just under \$120,000	6
\$120,000 to just under \$150,000	7
\$150,000 and above	8
Don't know / No answer	99

## QEDUC

What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed to date?

Grade 8 or less	1
Some high school	2
High school diploma or equivalent	3
Registered Apprenticeship or other trades certificate or diploma	4
College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma	5
University certificate or diploma below bachelors level	6
Bachelor's degree	7
Post graduate degree above bachelor's level	8
Don't know / No answer	99

## CALCSES

### *Calculation*

HS and <40, Low SES	1
Other	2

## DM\_Q02

What is your current marital status?

Married	1
Living with partner (common-law)	2
Separated	3
Divorced	4
Widowed	5
Single (never married)	6
Don't know	98
Prefer not to say	99

## MINOR [1,3]

Do you consider yourself to be :

Select all that apply	
An Indigenous person	1
Recent immigrant to Canada (last 15 years)	2
A person with a disability	3
None of these	8
Don't know/No response	9

## QPROV

In which province or territory do you live?

British Columbia	1
Alberta	2
Saskatchewan	3
Manitoba	4
Ontario	5
Quebec	6
New Brunswick	7
Nova Scotia	8
Prince Edward Island	9
Newfoundland & Labrador	10
Yukon	11

Northwest Territories	12
Nunavut	13
Prefer not to answer	99

## QAGEX

May we have your year of birth, please?

Enter year :	77
Prefer not to say	99

## QAGEY

### *Hesitant*

Would you be willing to tell us in which of the following age categories you belong?

Under 18 years	1
18 – 24 years	2
25 – 34 years	3
35 – 44 years	4
45 – 54 years	5
55 – 64 years	6
65 – 69 years	7
70+ years	8
Prefer not to say	9

## CFILSKIP

### *if appropriate groups full, skip out*

Continue	1
Full skip to QFIL	2

## Q3

Participants in these discussions will be asked to voice their opinions and thoughts in the discussion. How comfortable are you in voicing your opinions in front of others, in <[If QC]French[ELSE]English> ? Are you...

Very Comfortable	1
Comfortable	2
Fairly Comfortable	3
Not Very Comfortable	4
Very Uncomfortable	5

## Q3B

If you are selected to participate in one of the discussions, you will be asked to log onto a video conference website and if you use separate audio, also dial into a teleconference number, with a Canadian number provided. You will participate through a general discussion, as well as by viewing some materials shown to you online throughout the discussion. Sessions will be recorded for research purposes only, but confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained.

Would you be comfortable clicking on a link that we provide in an email to log onto the website to participate and see these materials?

Yes	1
No	2

No response 9

### Q3C

Participants may also be asked to read a few paragraphs of materials and review video clips provided during the discussion. Do you have a disability or limitation that requires some level of accommodation in order to participate?

Yes, please describe the nature of this disability or limitation : 77  
No 2

### Q4

Have you ever attended a focus group or one on one discussion for which you have received a sum of money?

Yes 1  
No 2

### Q5

#### *Yes, Q4*

When did you last attend one of these discussions that was sponsored by the Government of Canada?

Please specify : 77  
Months 1  
Years 2  
Never 999

### CALCQ5

#### *Calculation*

Within last 6 months, thank and terminate 1  
Continue 99

### Q5B

#### *Yes, Q4 AND not never, Q5*

Have you attended 5 or more of these discussions that were sponsored by the Government of Canada?

Yes 1  
No 2

### QINFO

Would you be interested in participating in one of these online discussions?

Yes 1  
No 2  
It depends on the date and time 3

## QFOCUS12

### *Recent imm en*

Replacements are not permitted. If you usually use reading glasses you should make sure to have them with you as there will be some viewing of images and reading of materials throughout the discussion.

Are you able to participate in the one and a half hour discussion on ...?

NOTE that times are listed as eastern standard time and may not necessarily be in your own time zone.

Tuesday, November 24 at 7:30 p.m. eastern time, in English	12
Not available	999

## QFOCUS13

### *Recent imm fr*

<Replacements are not permitted. If you usually use reading glasses you should make sure to have them with you as there will be some viewing of images and reading of materials throughout the discussion.

> Are you able to participate in the one and a half hour discussion on ...?

NOTE that times are listed as eastern standard time and may not necessarily be in your own time zone.

Wednesday, November 25 at 6:30 p.m. eastern time, in French	13
Not available	999

## QFOCUS14

### *Indig en*

<Replacements are not permitted. If you usually use reading glasses you should make sure to have them with you as there will be some viewing of images and reading of materials throughout the discussion.

> Are you able to participate in the one and a half hour discussion on ...?

NOTE that times are listed as eastern standard time and may not necessarily be in your own time zone.

Wednesday, November 25 at 7:30 p.m. eastern time, in English	14
Not available	999

## QFOCUS15

### *single en*

<Replacements are not permitted. If you usually use reading glasses you should make sure to have them with you as there will be some viewing of images and reading of materials throughout the discussion.

> Are you able to participate in the one and a half hour discussion on ...?

NOTE that times are listed as eastern standard time and may not necessarily be in your own time zone.

Tuesday, November 24 at 7:30 p.m. eastern time, in English	15	Not available	999
--	----	---------------	-----

## QFOCUS16

### *low ses en*

<Replacements are not permitted. If you usually use reading glasses you should make sure to have them with you as there will be some viewing of images and reading of materials throughout the discussion.

> Are you able to participate in the one and a half hour discussion on ...?

NOTE that times are listed as eastern standard time and may not necessarily be in your own time zone.

Monday, November 23 at 7:30 p.m. eastern time, in English	16
Not available	999

## QFOCUS2

### *13-17*

<Replacements are not permitted. If you usually use reading glasses you should make sure to have them with you as there will be some viewing of images and reading of materials throughout the discussion.

> Are you able to participate in the one and a half hour discussion on ...?

NOTE that times are listed as eastern standard time and may not necessarily be in your own time zone.

QPROV = 7,8,9,10 and CALCQCHILD = 2,3	
Wednesday, November 18 at 5:30 p.m. eastern time, in English	2
QPROV = 5 and CALCQCHILD = 2,3	
Wednesday, November 18 at 7:30 p.m. eastern time, in English	4
QPROV = 2,3,4 and CALCQCHILD = 2,3	
Thursday, November 19 at 8:00 p.m. eastern time, in English	6
QPROV = 1 and CALCQCHILD = 2,3	
Thursday, November 19 at 10:00 p.m. eastern time, in English	8
QPROV = 6 and CALCQCHILD = 2,3	
Monday, November 23 at 6:00 p.m. eastern time, in French	10
QPROV = 6 and CALCQCHILD = 2,3	
Monday, November 23 at 8:00 p.m. eastern time, in French	11
Not available	999

## QFOCUS1

### *<13*

<Replacements are not permitted. If you usually use reading glasses you should make sure to have them with you as there will be some viewing of images and reading of materials throughout the discussion.

> Are you able to participate in the one and a half hour discussion on ...?

NOTE that times are listed as eastern standard time and may not necessarily be in your own time zone.

QPROV = 7,8,9,10 and CALCQCHILD = 1,2	
Monday, November 16 at 5:30 p.m. eastern time, in English	1
QPROV = 5 and CALCQCHILD = 1,2	
Monday, November 16 at 7:30 p.m. eastern time, in English	3
QPROV = 2,3,4 and CALCQCHILD = 1,2	
Tuesday, November 17 at 8:00 p.m. eastern time, in English	5
QPROV = 1 and CALCQCHILD = 1,2	
Tuesday, November 17 at 10:00 p.m. eastern time, in English	7
QPROV = 6 and CALCQCHILD = 1,2	
Thursday, November 19 at 6:30 p.m. eastern time, in French	9
Not available	999

## CALCGROUPSKIP

### *Skips RF to THINK2*

Continue	1
THNK2	99

## QFOCUSB

We are asking that all participants log in 5 minutes prior to the start time of the session. Late arrivals may not be admitted to the discussion, nor would an incentive be received. Would this be ok with you, if selected?

Yes	1
No	98

## QTELE

### *Text/phone*

If you are selected to participate in one of the discussions, we will be giving you a reminder telephone call and sending an email a day or two prior to your group discussion. Sessions will be observed and recorded, although anonymity will be safeguarded. Personal identities will not be revealed.

Is <telephone> the best telephone number at which to reach you?

Yes	1
No, please provide alternate phone number :	2

## QEMAIL

### *Email*

<[EMAIL is not empty]Is EMAIL the best email address at which to send you an invitation to the discussion, with the secure link and 1-800 number?[ELSE]What is the best email address at which to send you an invitation to the discussion, with the secure link and 1-800 number?>

EMAIL is not empty

Yes	1
<[EMAIL is not empty]No, please provide alternate email :[ELSE]Email address :>	77

## PFNAME

Please provide your first and last names. Only your first name will be used in the discussion.

### **FNAME**

First name:

1	1
---	---

### **LNAME**

Last name:

1	1
---	---

## CONFIRMATION EMAIL

Confirmation of online registration for group discussion

Dear \_\_\_\_\_ ,

This is to confirm that you are registered to attend an online discussion taking place on GROUPQUOTAS . The discussion will be in ENGRPLN .

Thank you for expressing your interest. If you are selected to participate in one of the discussions we will call you to confirm by telephone and provide a few more details about the discussion, as well as answer any questions you may have. We will then send you an email reminder the day before the discussions, including the login instructions as well as the password protected link for the discussion. We MUST first have the confirmation telephone call completed or we will not be able to send you these details for you to participate in the discussion.

If you want to contact us about this group, please call Sarah McKay, EKOS Research, at 1-800-388-2873 or email her at <a href="mailto:smckay@ekos.com">smckay@ekos.com. You may also verify this research with the Research Verification Service operated by the Canadian Research Insights Council (CRIC) at <https://canadianresearchinsightscouncil.ca/rvs/home/> by entering project code .

Sessions will be recorded for research purposes only. EKOS Research Associates Inc. is committed to maintaining the security and privacy of the information we collect from the public, and we protect your personal information through appropriate physical, organizational and technological measures. For more information about our privacy practices, please read our Privacy Policy. For questions regarding access to personal information held by EKOS, the accuracy of this personal information, or complaints related to EKOS' privacy practices, please contact our Privacy Officer at pobox@ekos.com.

Thank you for your registration.

Susan Galley  
Project Manager  
EKOS Research Associates, Inc.  
[www.ekos.com](http://www.ekos.com)

## THNK

We will give you a call in the next few days to confirm your participation by phone. We MUST first have the confirmation telephone call completed or we will not be able to send you these details for you to participate in the discussion. If you have any questions, please let us know by calling us toll-free at 1-800-388-2873 or by sending an e-mail to smckay@ekos.com. Thank you for your cooperation and time.

<Visit [ekos.com](http://ekos.com)>

## QFIL2

### *Quota filled*

Thank you for your cooperation! <We will contact you should space become available in the group.>

## THNK2

### *Screened out*

<[CALCGROUPSKIP = 99]If you are able to select one of the other available focus groups, please use the **Back** button to return to the previous screen and change your selection. Otherwise, thank you for your time.[ELSE]Thank you for your cooperation! Based on the information you have provided, unfortunately you are not eligible to participate in this survey.>



# **APPENDIX B**

## **DISCUSSION GUIDE**



## APPENDIX B: Discussion Guide

### 1. Introduction (3 minutes)

- I represent EKOS Research (reminder to only use first name of moderator and participants). These groups are being conducted for Public Safety Canada to explore reactions to some possible approaches used to tell Canadian parents about information resources available from the Government of Canada to help them keep children safe from the potential danger of online child sexual exploitation.
- This research will help the Government of Canada plan communications activities designed to increase the awareness of Canadian parents about online child sexual exploitation.
- The focus of our discussion today is on the approach to the advertising campaign that will be used to reach parents. We want to explore how the message from this advertising will be received and understood by parents and other caregivers.
- This group is part of a series of focus groups taking place online with Canadian parents across the country. This session will last about 90 minutes, and we'll just quickly go over the format and "ground rules":
  - Discussion is being recorded so I can listen to what everyone is saying and not worry too much about taking notes.
  - There are observers who have logged in from the Government of Canada and the ad agency developing the campaign so they can hear your opinions first-hand.
  - All comments are confidential.
  - Please do not take screen shots or make copies of the concepts shared today. They are for discussion purposes only, in draft form as you will see, and they are confidential.
  - There are no right or wrong answers here and no need for any expertise. We're looking for reactions and opinions.
  - Please try to speak one at a time and be respectful of one another's opinions.
  - It's okay to disagree. Please speak up even if you think you're the only one who feels a certain way. Everyone may have different experiences and different points of view.
- I'm going to raise some points for discussion, watch for time and make sure everyone has a chance to participate. We do not work for the Government of Canada.
- Please make sure that you are in a quiet place, free from distractions. We ask for your full attention for this time.

## **2. Introductions (5 minutes)**

1. Let's start by going around the group. Please introduce yourself and tell us something about yourself (# and age of children, part of the country you live in, whether you are working outside the home, or at home, etc.).

## **3. Warm Up (10 - 15 minutes)**

2. Do you generally feel you have a pretty good handle on what your children are doing online and who they are engaging with, or does it feel like a difficult task to try and keep up with what they are doing and who they are in contact with?
  - a. With the pandemic, does it feel easier or harder to know what is happening with your children online, apart from school?
3. Do you feel you have the information you need to be able to look out for the potential dangers your children may encounter online, or do you feel like you are a bit in the dark?
  - a. Did you feel you needed more information or guidance about what to look out for?
  - b. Did you look for or get any information or advice?
  - c. Did you feel that you know where to turn to get information or that it was difficult to know where to get reliable information from a source you could trust on these issues?
4. Are you familiar with terms such as online grooming or luring, sextortion, inappropriate content?
  - a. What do they mean to you and where did you hear about them?

## **4. Concept Testing (60 minutes, 15 / concept, 15 overall)**

Online child sexual exploitation (OCSE) is one of the most pressing and serious public safety issues in Canada, and internationally. This crime is on the rise and continues to increase significantly because of new technological advances. These technological advances—combined with low cost and anonymity—are contributing factors to this growing problem, allowing child sex offenders to easily recruit (luring and grooming) and coerce (sextortion) children.

The Online Child Sexual Exploitation awareness campaign aims to increase awareness among Canadians about the scale of OCSE, as well as engage them to think about, discuss and plan concrete actions they can take to help.

We are going to look at three different concepts or approaches that the Government of Canada is considering and get everyone's reaction to them. Your feedback is important and will feed into developing some new communication material to help inform parents about online child sexual exploitation, to assist them in keeping children safe.

Again, remember that there are no right or wrong answers here. Everybody has an equally valid opinion.

Each of these concepts or approaches is currently at the development stage, so what we will look at is rough mock-up of a 30 second video. So, it's not really what the video of the ad would look like, but it's meant to give us an idea of what they are thinking about. We will also go to a ratings page for the set so open your chat now and that is where you will find the links after each concept.

As we described to you on the telephone, and before we start, I want to caution you again that, because of the serious nature of this issue, these proposed videos have shocking content, and while it may be unpleasant, Public Safety considers it essential that the message to parents is clear and impactful. If anyone feels that this will be too difficult for them, please do let me know now and we can excuse you from the discussion.

***Moderator: show first 30 second video animatic of sample concept. Rotate order***

Before we start our discussion, take a minute to fill in a few ratings on the sheet and write down a few words on your initial reaction on the comments line on the ratings sheet.

5. What do you think of it? What is your first impression?
  - a. What do you like/not like about it?
  - b. Is the message or main point clear (e.g., the importance of parents knowing about the potential dangers of online activity for their children and knowing what to look out for, understanding that Public Safety is a reliable and trustworthy source of information to assist parents)?
  - c. Is it too shocking or does it strike the right tone? Is the tone of the material appropriate? Likes/dislikes and why?
  - d. What do you think of the images or characterization used? Does it work? Is there anything that you don't like?
  - e. Would it have you looking for information or going to the website?

#### **AFTER PRESENTING ALL CONCEPTS:**

6. Thinking about these three different approaches, which one do you think is the best and why?
  - a. Which approach and tone works best?
  - b. Which one more clearly tells the story of the objectives: emphasizing the importance of knowing the dangers of online child sexual exploitation and what to look for, telling parents that Public Safety offers a reliable and trustworthy source of information?
  - c. Which approach would you be more likely to pay attention to or is generally more engaging?
  - d. Which one would be more likely to have you go to the website or generally look for more information?

7. Which one do you think will do the best job of getting parent thinking, discussing and planning about what they need to do to keep their children safe?
8. Is there anything that you would change about the one you prefer the best that we have not already discussed that would make it better or clearer or more impactful as far as you are concerned?

## **5. Overall Impression of Campaign (10 minutes)**

9. What do you think generally about this campaign and its objectives?
  - a. Does it seem to make sense to you to inform Canadian parents about online child sexual exploitation, and what to look for to keep their children safe?
  - b. About Public Safety as a reliable and trustworthy source for information to help parents in monitoring children's online activity, to keep them safe?
10. What do you think of the feel of the campaign? Is this a sensitive topic area for parents? Do you think that Public Safety is taking the right approach in how they are choosing to inform and assist parents?
  - a. Is too it shocking? Shocking enough?

## **6. Wrap Up (2 minutes)**

11. Is there anything that we haven't talked about or that you would like to add before we go?

**THANK YOU**

# APPENDIX C

## RATINGS





## APPENDIX C: Ratings

### People Like Me, Online Time Isn't Alone Time, Having the Talk

	WEAK	NEITHER WEAK NOR STRONG	WEAK STRONG	STRONG	
a. Tone & approach.....	1	2	3	4	5
b. Clarity of the message – tells a clear story.....	1	2	3	4	5
c. Grabs my attention.....	1	2	3	4	5
d. Speaks to me (relevance) .....	1	2	3	4	5
e. Would have me visit the website .....	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

---

### Overall Impression

	WEAK	NEITHER WEAK NOR STRONG	WEAK STRONG	STRONG	
f. People Like Me (Boy's voice) .....	1	2	3	4	5
g. Online Time Isn't Alone Time (Others in background).....	1	2	3	4	5
h. Having the Talk (Teen telling parents) .....	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

---

Now, please rank the top three messages in the order of your preference: First, Second and Third.

# APPENDIX D

## CONCEPTS TESTED

## APPENDIX D: Concepts Tested

<https://vimeopro.com/banfieldagency/5696-ocse-ads-animatics-en>