

Supplementary File (Moralized Misogyny and Political Visibility)

Table S1. Theoretical and analytical operationalization of core constructs.

Construct	Definition in this study	Analytic function	Key indicators / manifestations	Inclusion / exclusion criteria
<i>Moralized misogyny</i>	Gendered hostility framed through culturally specific moral evaluation that seeks to discipline women's political visibility.	Core analytic category identifying when harassment operates as patriarchal norm enforcement rather than generic abuse.	Moral accusations of indecency, shame, betrayal, impurity, immodesty, sexual deviance; religious or nationalist denunciation; respectability-based ridicule.	Included when at least two moralized gendered indicators are directed at a woman or group of women. Excludes generic insults or partisan critique without gendered moral evaluation.
<i>Morally motivated networked harassment</i>	The mobilization of the crowd around a perceived violation of shared norms, through which ordinary users participate because harassment is framed as righteous defense rather than abuse.	Explains why audiences join harassment and how participation becomes morally intelligible.	Pile-ons, moral outrage, ridicule framed as social defense, in-group affirmation, denunciation of "transgressive" women.	Used interpretively rather than as a standalone coding category. Not all hostile engagement qualifies unless norm violation is central.
<i>Digital vigilantism</i>	Collective extra-legal punishment through visibility, exposure, circulation, and audience participation.	Explains how harassment becomes punitive and disciplinary through coordinated public exposure.	Naming and shaming, exposure rhetoric, doxing, calls for punishment, reposting, comment-thread escalation, link-seeking behavior.	Included when punitive visibility involves audience participation beyond a single post or actor. Excludes isolated single-actor abuse without collective uptake.
<i>Weaponized visibility</i>	The strategic use of visibility to harm rather than empower, including the forced exposure of women's real or fabricated intimate identities.	Captures how visibility itself becomes a mechanism of reputational punishment.	Public exposure of private life, fabricated intimacy, circulation of humiliating visuals, searchable scandalization.	Used interpretively to track punitive exposure; not every visible attack qualifies unless visibility is central to the harm.
<i>Informal patriarchal governance</i>	The informal regulatory system through which audiences function as patriarchy's "law enforcement," disciplining	Names the broader governing logic linking individual attacks to systemic	Recurring sanction of women's speech, leadership, ambition, autonomy, and public presence through crowd participation.	Interpretive umbrella concept, not a direct coding variable.

Construct	Definition in this study	Analytic function	Key indicators / manifestations	Inclusion / exclusion criteria
	women who violate gendered expectations.	exclusion from political citizenship.		
<i>Credibility scaffolding</i>	The visual and discursive packaging that lends misogynistic claims provisional authority, shareability, and deniability.	Explains how attacks acquire plausibility and circulatory power.	News-mimic layouts, logos, tickers, headline syntax, screenshots, photocard aesthetics, authoritative visual cues, humor/disclaimer framing.	Included where packaging helps frame rumor or abuse as reportable, evidentiary, or easily shareable; excludes plain abuse without such cues.
<i>Moral evidence-making</i>	The transformation of manipulated visuals or insinuating artifacts into “proof” of pre-existing moral narratives about women’s deviance.	Explains how fake, ambiguous, or weakly evidenced content becomes actionable as moral confirmation.	AI-IBSA, edited images, intimate composites, decontextualized screenshots, deepfakes, cheapfakes, visual insinuation.	Included when artifacts function to confirm sexual or moral allegations regardless of factual reliability.
<i>Permissible infrastructure</i>	The socio-technical environment that lowers inhibition and enables harassment to be framed as acceptable, humorous, or unserious.	Explains how severe abuse becomes normalized and deniable.	Exposé pages, satire/humor disclaimers, meme formats, “just entertainment” framing, platform virality, monetization logics.	Used interpretively to identify enabling environments rather than as a strict inclusion variable.
<i>National (dis)loyalty</i>	Moral framing of women as traitors, foreign agents, or enemies of the nation.	Identifies nationalist moral coding as a specific mode of delegitimation.	“Western agent,” “traitor,” “anti-state,” civilizational shame, betrayal tropes.	Included when national betrayal is used to revoke women’s legitimacy. Excludes policy criticism without moralized national framing.
<i>Religious (dis)loyalty</i>	Moral framing of women as enemies of religion or violators of religious order.	Identifies religious moral coding as a specific mode of delegitimation.	“Anti-Islam,” “apostate,” “impure,” attacks on modesty, sacrilege claims.	Included when religious deviance is linked to political illegitimacy. Excludes policy criticism without moralized religious framing.
<i>Sexual impropriety, purity, and pornification</i>	Discursive or visual framing of women as sexually immoral, shameless, polluted, or culturally impure in order to revoke political standing.	Captures the dominant gendered mechanism through which women’s authority is converted into sexual scandal.	Slut-shaming, accusations of transactional sex, “night service” rhetoric, critiques of dress/mobility, porn-star comparisons, sexualized photocards, deepfakes, edited intimate visuals.	Includes textual character assassination and visual manipulation targeting sexual character or modesty. Excludes non-sexualized satire or neutral descriptions without moral judgment.

Table S2. Operational definitions of content types.

Content Type	Definition in this study
<i>Posts</i>	Standalone Facebook posts relying primarily on written language to convey moral judgment, political claims, or gendered attacks, without accompanying visuals.
<i>Images</i>	Static visual files (photographs, illustrations, or graphics) used alone or with minimal text to convey political or moral meaning.
<i>Memes</i>	Image–text composites using humor, sarcasm, or cultural references to moralize, ridicule, or delegitimize women’s political visibility; often optimized for virality.
<i>Photocards (News-mimic visuals)</i>	Designed graphics imitating journalistic formats (logos, headlines, captions) to lend credibility to moralized or misleading claims without adhering to journalistic standards.
<i>(Edited) Screenshots</i>	Screenshots of social media posts, comments, or news articles that are selectively cropped, annotated, or contextually reframed to support moral shaming or delegitimization.
<i>AI-generated or Heavily Manipulated Visuals</i>	Images created or substantially altered using AI tools or advanced editing to fabricate, exaggerate, or misrepresent events, identities, or actions.
<i>Short Videos / Reels</i>	Brief video clips (most often vertically formatted) circulated on Facebook that combine visuals, text overlays, audio, or narration to amplify moralized or gendered political attacks.
<i>Deepfakes</i>	Highly realistic AI-generated or manipulated audiovisual content depicting individuals saying or doing things they did not do, regardless of whether the content is sexualized.
<i>AI-IBSA (AI- enabled Image-Based Sexual Abuse)</i>	AI-generated or manipulated sexualized images or videos targeting women without consent, including pornographic composites or sexually degrading fabrications used for political or moral disciplining.

S1. Systematic Monitoring Protocol

We treated Facebook as an evolving field of public political communication and observed it through a structured, repeated, non-participant protocol. Monitoring was designed to identify recurring forms of moralized misogyny, visual manipulation, and crowd-based disciplinary discourse targeting politically visible women in post-uprising Bangladesh. This protocol functioned as a consistent screening mechanism rather than passive browsing.

To reduce, though not eliminate, algorithmic personalization, monitoring was conducted through a research account created specifically for observation and not used for prior engagement, networking, or interaction (see [Herrick et al., 2021](#)). This “clean-slate” approach cannot fully neutralize platform curation, but it helped reduce the likelihood that researchers’ preexisting browsing patterns shaped what became discoverable during field observation.

Monitoring period

Systematic monitoring was conducted between **September 2024 and December 2025** through repeated daily observation of selected public Facebook spaces. To maintain procedural consistency, monitoring was typically conducted during a fixed evening window—at around **9:00 PM Bangladesh Standard Time (GMT+6)**—when political posting, sharing, and comment activity were often highly visible. This regular temporal routine enabled longitudinal observation of recurring attacks, changing formats, and post-event surges in visibility.

What was monitored

Monitoring focused on publicly accessible Facebook pages, profiles, and groups that were repeatedly active in post-uprising political communication, especially those reframing nationally salient political events and actors through satire, parody, ridicule, exposé, activist commentary, and news-mimic content. These included:

- *Partisan political pages* regularly posting on political developments, party conflict, protest events, and public controversies;
- *Humor, satire, or meme pages* that circulated political ridicule, parody, and moralized mockery, often using entertainment or ‘satire’ framings to soften accountability;
- *Exposure/“exposé” accounts* presenting themselves revealing of hidden wrongdoing, often through screenshots, links, edited visuals, or insinuation-based claims;
- *Media-linked and news-mimic pages* that posted political updates or imitated journalistic aesthetics;
- *Public profiles and pages of politically visible women*, and prominent activist or influencer accounts commenting on nationally salient events, especially where attacks unfolded in posts/comment threads;
- *Anti-feminist and misogynist hubs*, where hostility toward women’s public participation appeared repeatedly and was often linked to wider political discourse.

Purposive selection ensured that spaces were included when they repeatedly produced or amplified content at the intersection of gender, morality, and political visibility. They were not treated as exhaustive of the Bangladeshi Facebook ecosystem. Rather, they constituted a purposively delimited empirical field in which moralized attacks on women’s political visibility were most likely to appear, circulate, and intensify. Accordingly, it does not represent everyday interpersonal use of Facebook or non-political harassment.

Observation combined **routine follow-up of recurrent pages/accounts** with **event-responsive tracking**. In practice, this meant that once a page, profile, or account repeatedly appeared in relation to political attacks, visual manipulation, or moral shaming, it was added to the monitoring field and revisited over time. This allowed us to observe not only isolated posts but also patterns of repetition, escalation, adaptation, and recirculation across different page types.

Monitoring was also responsive to major political moments, public controversies, and surges in harassment. When a politically visible woman became the object of intensified discussion, ridicule, or image-based attack, surrounding posts, derivative reposts, and associated comment threads were tracked to understand how the attack moved across the platform and how audiences participated in its amplification.

What was recorded during monitoring

During observation, we maintained structured field notes and analytic logs for each candidate item. At minimum, these notes documented:

- date of observation;
- page/account type;
- targeted individual or group;
- form of content (e.g., post, image, meme, edited screenshot, photocard, reel, short video, comment-thread pile-on);
- immediate political context or triggering event, where identifiable;
- dominant theme or accusation;
- moral code invoked, where present (e.g., sexual impropriety, shame, religious deviation, national betrayal, social indecency, bodily or appearance-based degradation);
- visible interactional pattern, including ridicule, pile-ons, exposure rhetoric, calls for punishment, link-seeking, or demands for “proof”;
- whether the item appeared original, reposted, re-edited, or part of a broader circulation chain.

These notes were used both to guide inclusion decisions and to trace recurring discursive and semiotic patterns across the corpus.

Keyword retrieval strategy (summary)

- **Languages:** Bangla and English
- **Categories:** women’s names; gendered slurs; moral terms related to indecency, “character,” modesty, betrayal; nationalist and religious denunciations
- Full keyword lists are withheld here to prevent retraumatization and misuse.

Systematic monitoring worked alongside keyword-based retrieval rather than replacing it. Repeated observation helped identify recurrent actors, pages, and attack templates, while keyword searches in Bangla and English helped surface additional posts involving women’s names, moral slurs, and culturally specific vocabularies of shame, impurity, betrayal, and impropriety. Together, these strategies allowed us to move iteratively between known political spaces and emergent cases. It did not mean collecting every politically hostile post encountered. Rather, it functioned as a structured screening process through which posts were retained only if they met the study’s inclusion criteria: public accessibility, political relevance, women as primary targets, and clear evidence of moralized misogyny as defined in the codebook. This included content in which moral sanctions—e.g., shame, impurity, sexual suspicion, betrayal, or disrespectability—were mobilized to delegitimize women’s public visibility.

The corpus was concentrated around recurrent political flashpoints, including electoral moments, public controversies, and high-visibility attacks on women activists, student leaders, and politicians, rather than evenly distributed across time. While content could originate from diverse locations, inclusion was based on whether it entered *nationally* visible debates, rather than local or regionally confined interactions. So, particular individuals and events are more visible within the dataset. This reflects both platform dynamics—where prominent figures attract disproportionate attention—and underlying structural inequalities in women’s political representation. The corpus therefore captures patterns of amplification rather than equal distribution across actors.

Although this study does not conduct a comparative quantitative analysis across genders, observational patterns indicated that male politicians were more often criticized in relation to ideology, performance, or political action, whereas women were disproportionately targeted through sexualized, moralized, and identity-based attacks.

This strategy supports analytic depth and pattern identification, not statistical representativeness. The resulting corpus should therefore be understood as a purposive, theoretically informed dataset of recurring forms of moralized misogyny within publicly visible Bangladeshi Facebook political discourse, rather than as a representative sample of all Facebook content or all online harassment in Bangladesh.

S2. Identification of Manipulated, Synthetic, and Recontextualized Visuals.

Our aim is not to forensically verify whether an image is “real” or AI-generated, but to analyze how visual content produces credibility and enables harassment. For this reason, we classified visual manipulation using a tiered approach based on the strength of available evidence.

First, we identified **externally corroborated synthetic or manipulated content**. This included items that had been flagged in credible fact-checking reports, publicly discussed by activists or targeted communities as known fabrications, or contained explicit indicators of generation tools (such as visible watermarks, embedded logos, or self-disclosing captions and hashtags).

Second, we classified **high-confidence visual manipulation** based on observable visual cues. These included compositing or generation artifacts such as unnatural edges around faces or hair, inconsistent lighting or shadows, distortions in hands or teeth, mismatched gaze, implausible body proportions, or the repeated use of identical visual templates across different targets. These assessments were further informed by contextual familiarity with recurring templates and manipulation styles within Bangladeshi political communication, alongside prior experience in fact-checking and information integrity analysis.

Third, we identified **deceptive recontextualization**, where authentic images or screenshots were repurposed through misleading captions, selective cropping, or “news-mimic” layouts. In these cases, the image itself was not fabricated, but its meaning was altered to frame women’s political actions as sexual or moral deviance.

When we could not confidently determine whether content was AI-generated, we did not treat it as evidence of synthetic media. Instead, such items were included only when they clearly functioned as recontextualized or manipulative content within our analytical framework.

To avoid false positives, ambiguous cases were classified conservatively as recontextualization or manipulation rather than AI-generated content unless corroborating evidence or strong visual indicators were present. This conservative classification strategy prioritizes analytical validity over exhaustive

labeling, ensuring that claims of synthetic or manipulated media are grounded in observable or corroborated evidence rather than speculative attribution.

S3. Methodological Operationalization.

To analyze the governance of women's political visibility on Facebook, we integrated **Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis (FCDA)** and **Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis (MCDA)**. The following protocols detail how we operationalized these theoretical frameworks.

Operationalizing FCDA

We adopted FCDA not merely as a descriptive tool, but as a form of “analytical activism” designed to critique discourses that sustain a *gendered social order*. Our analysis focused on how gender operates as an “ideological structure” that divides political actors hierarchically, specifically examining how this structure is enacted and renewed through digital vigilantism.

We operationalized FCDA by coding for **three** specific discursive mechanisms:

- **Interdiscursivity and Hybrid Identities:** Following Lazar's (2014) concept of “interdiscursivity”—the interaction *between* different discourses *within* texts—we analyzed how political discourse was threaded together with religious, nationalist, and sexual discourses to produce hybrid accusations. Specifically, we coded for instances where political terminology (e.g., “nomination,” “speech”) was co-opted into a “moral grammar” of sexual purity, thereby re-articulating political difference as moral deviance.
- **The Discursive Enactment of Power and Silence:** We analyzed power not just as overt coercion, but as “invisible power” that is misrecognized as natural or commonsensical. We coded for “silencing strategies” where patriarchal assumptions were presented as universal moral truths (e.g., “common sense” notions of modesty). This included analyzing how “hegemonic gender ideology” was maintained through the “winning of consent” in comment sections, where harassment was framed as a necessary defense of community values rather than an act of dominance.
- **Gender as a Structure of Relevance:** Acknowledging that gender exists within a matrix of other identities (race, religion, profession), we operationalized the “gendering” of these other categories. We examined *when* and *how* a target's gender was foregrounded to delegitimize her professional or political identity. We specifically analyzed the “co-constructed” nature of gender relations in comment threads, coding for how male *and* female users collectively performed “moral policing” to reinstate the boundaries of the public sphere.

Operationalizing MCDA

We employed MCDA to analyze how semiotic resources beyond language—specifically photography, layout, and typography—were “co-articulated” to legitimize harassment. We moved beyond a systemic description of modes to focus on their social “affordances”—what specific semiotic resources allowed perpetrators to *do* to women's reputations.

We operationalized MCDA by coding for three dimensions of visual manipulation:

- **The Re-contextualization of Social Practice:** Drawing on Ledin and Machin (2018), we analyzed how the social practice of politics was “re-contextualized” through visual means. We tracked how specific elements of political events (e.g., a speech or a rally) were subjected to “substitutions, additions, and deletions.” Specifically, we analyzed how the *political context* (a woman speaking at a

podium) was deleted and substituted with a *sexual context* (pornographic overlays or “bedroom” captions), effectively “productizing” women’s bodies as objects of consumption rather than agents of politics.

- **Iconic Signs and Credibility Scaffolding:** We analyzed photographs and deepfakes as “iconic signs” that claim to represent unmediated reality. We coded for how the “denotative” power of photography (the realistic image of the woman) was used to naturalize the “connotative” message of immorality. For deepfakes and AI-IBSA (Image-Based Sexual Abuse), we analyzed how the “affordance of the photograph”—its *claim to truth*—was weaponized to bypass critical scrutiny, creating an immediate visceral association between the politician and sexual deviance.
- **The Authority of Layout and Design:** We examined how “design” and “layout” functioned as distinct semiotic modes. For “news-mimic photocards,” we analyzed the deployment of “visual coordination”—the use of framing, boxing, and journalistic typography. We coded for how these “elaborated semiotic resources” (e.g., red “breaking news” banners, sans-serif fonts, logos) were used to borrow the institutional authority of journalism. We analyzed how these design choices created a “conceptual representation” that classified false sexual allegations as objective “news facts,” thereby lending “credibility scaffolding” to the harassment.

Assessment of Data Saturation

To ensure the corpus was robust enough to answer the research question without extending data collection indefinitely, we operationalized saturation across:

- **Thematic Saturation:** We considered the data saturated when new posts began to merely repeat existing moral accusations (e.g., “sexualized nomination” or “religious impurity”) without offering novel discursive variations or justifications. Furthermore, we ceased collection of visual artifacts when the “news-mimic” and “porn-equivalent” templates became predictable in their layout, typography, and aesthetic construction. This repetition indicated we had mapped the finite repertoire of visual harassment tools currently in circulation.

Once this redundancy was established across all major page types (e.g., partisan, meme, and media-linked), the corpus was finalized at **327 items**.

S4. Ethical Considerations and Researcher Positionality.

This study adheres to the ethical framework outlined in the Association of Internet Researchers (AoIR) Ethical Guidelines 3.0 (Franzke et al., 2020). Considering the volatile political context of post-uprising Bangladesh and the sensitive nature of gendered disinformation, we adopted a “process approach” to ethics, privileging ongoing reflection and “bottom-up” judgment over static checklists, recognizing that ethical challenges in digital governance often evolve *alongside* the research itself.

While the data collected for this study comprises **publicly accessible** Facebook posts, comments, and visuals, we reject the notion that “public availability” equates to “fair use” without restriction. Aligning with Franzke et al. (2020), we distinguish between information that is technically public and matters that are contextually sensitive. The subjects of this research—politically visible women—are targets of “anticipatory vulnerability” and “conditional citizenship.” Treating their harassment data as merely public content would violate the principle of **contextual integrity**, which emphasizes that privacy is defined by the relational contexts in which information is shared, rather than a binary public/private switch (Nissenbaum, 2004).

To mitigate “downstream harms,” we applied the principle of **data minimization**, collecting only the data strictly necessary to answer the research questions regarding moralized governance.

Due to the high risk of “doxing,” “mob censorship,” and “re-traumatization” inherent in digital vigilantism, seeking informed consent from individual perpetrators or targets was deemed unsafe and methodologically infeasible. Instead, we employed a rigorous **double anonymization** protocol:

- **Removal of PII:** All names, locations, and specific timestamps were removed.
- **Paraphrasing:** Extreme content, particularly sexualized threats and “moral evidence-making” visuals (e.g., deepfakes), was paraphrased or described rather than reproduced. This decision prevents the research from becoming a vehicle for further circulating the “visual violence” and algorithmic amplification of the harassment.

Table S3. Ethical risk mitigation matrix.

Category	Specific Research Threat	Mitigation Strategy Applied
<i>Harm to Subjects</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Re-identification and doxing risks from quoting or reproducing exposure content 2. Amplification of harm through reproducing misogynistic visuals 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Double anonymization and paraphrasing to remove names, locations, timestamps, and searchability 2. Textual description only; no reproduction of deepfakes, porn-equivalents, or news-mimic visuals
<i>Researcher Safety</i>	Researcher retaliation and surveillance	Operational security via VPN use and separate, non-identifiable research accounts
<i>Researcher Wellbeing</i>	Psychological harm from sustained exposure to violent and sexualized content	Exposure limits, structured work boundaries, and peer debriefing
<i>Data Management</i>	Accidental data leaks of sensitive raw material	Encrypted offline storage and strict data minimization
<i>Contextual Ethics</i>	Ethical misreading of “public” Facebook content	Contextual integrity approach, treating public data as sensitive and mechanism-focused

Our methodology is grounded in a *feminist ethics of care*, which prioritizes the well-being of the community and the reduction of harm over the unbridled pursuit of data. We acknowledge that digital data are not “raw” but are products of unequal power relations (Franzke et al., 2020).

In analyzing “deepfakes” and “news-mimic photocards,” we treated these artifacts not merely as “content” but as tools of **structural violence** designed to exclude women from public life. Our analysis was guided by the feminist principle that researchers must avoid “over-investment” in the outcome that ignores the autonomy of the subjects. We balanced the need to document these governance mechanisms with the imperative to avoid normalizing the “pornified” logic of the attacks.

Recognizing the risks of studying “abusive online attacks and language” and the potential for “trauma,” this study implemented specific researcher safety protocols. The two researchers established boundaries for reviewing high-toxicity content (e.g., rape threats, hanging bodies) to manage the psychological toll of curating extreme violence, acknowledging that researcher well-being is a primary ethical obligation.

Our approach to this study is informed by feminist research ethics, which emphasizes situated knowledge, reflexivity, and the ethics of care. As researchers, we occupy an insider positionality as Bangladeshi feminist scholars fluent in both the linguistic and cultural nuances of the digital discourse under analysis. This situatedness allows us to decode high-context moral vocabularies (e.g., specific slurs, religious euphemisms, and political dog-whistles) that automated tools or external researchers might miss. However, we also acknowledge that this proximity carries the risk of “over-investment” or normalization of the violence we observe. To mitigate bias, we engaged in continuous reflexive praxis, including:

- **Peer Debriefing:** Regular discussions to challenge our interpretations and ensure we were not projecting our own political biases onto the data.
- **Negative Case Analysis:** Actively seeking out counter-examples (e.g., instances of support or failed vigilante mobilization) to avoid constructing a monolithic narrative of victimhood.
- **Emotional Distance:** While we approach the harassment data with an “ethics of care” for the victims, we maintained analytic distance to document the *mechanisms* of governance rather than solely the *affect* of the abuse.

Our commitment to FCDA means we do not view the data as neutral “content” but as evidence of structural power relations. We explicitly align with the view that research should not merely extract data but should contribute to understanding and dismantling systems of oppression (Franzke et al., 2020). By documenting these harms, we aim to render visible the “conditional citizenship” imposed on women in digital political spaces.

Table S4. Moralized misogyny: Repertoires, justifications, and tropes.

Cluster	Core Practice	How Visibility Is Rendered Transgressive	Dominant Moral Justification	Typical Artifacts & Outputs	Discursive Function
<i>Sexual moralization</i>	Sexualization & promiscuity claims	Political visibility is re-coded as sexual availability and moral impurity	Moral correction (“she is shameless”); competence denial (“she advanced improperly”)	“Night meal” framing; bed/hotel euphemisms; “used then discarded” narratives; comments treating nomination as sexual transaction	Erases competence; converts politics into sexual exchange; legitimizes punishment
	AI sexual falsification	Synthetic visuals materialize alleged deviance as “proof”	Truth-telling exposure (“we are revealing reality”)	AI kissing videos; morphs; composites; pornified edits framed as entertainment but treated as evidence	Makes accusation visually incontestable; escalates harassment credibility
	Pornographic equivalence	Women equated with sexual commodities	Humor & entertainment (“just memes”)	Edited images; comparison memes	Converts political identity into sexual object
<i>Respectability governance</i>	Respectability policing	Public visibility framed as violation of modesty/shame norms	Moral discipline (“good women don’t do this”)	Clothing/body scrutiny; “dress properly” demands; hijab policing; indecency/shame rhetoric	Naturalizes exclusion; frames harassment as social hygiene
	Body-as-disqualification	Appearance used as proxy for legitimacy	Competence denial	Reaction threads; image-based ridicule (skin tone, weight, presentation)	Displaces political debate with bodily adjudication
<i>Religious–national boundary policing</i>	Religious–national delegitimation	Women framed as threats to religion, nation, or moral community	Religious defense; national defense	“Kafir/murtad” labels; moral panic captions; anti-national portrayals	Converts dissent into betrayal; escalates moral panic
	Religious–national polluter trope	Gender equality framed as contamination	Religious defense	Sermonic posts; nationalist moral captions	Recasts equality as existential threat
<i>Ownership & patriarchal control</i>	Ownership policing	Women’s visibility treated as requiring male permission	Moral order enforcement	“Where is her husband/father?” comments; assessment through male ties; insinuations of being “with other men”	Reasserts guardianship logic; revokes autonomy
	Moral veto on leadership	Women’s participation framed as	Veto	Gonovote / reform comment clusters	Pre-emptively blocks institutional inclusion

		unacceptable regardless of merit			
Credibility scaffolding	Fake credibility objects	Manufactured evidence makes transgression appear factual	Truth-telling exposure	Photocard-style fake news; edited screenshots; decontextualized clips; meme-news layouts	Launders harassment through journalistic aesthetics
	Merit / Quota contamination	Inclusion framed as unfair or corrupt exception	Competence denial	Policy threads; referendum comments	Delegitimizes structural equality measures
Humor & diffusion	Humor-as-authorization	Cruelty made socially safe and shareable	Humor & entertainment	“Just memes”; haha-dominant reactions; parody/troll pages	Lowers participation threshold; normalizes mass humiliation
	Victim-blaming / “attention seeking”	Women framed as exploiting harm narratives	Victim-blaming	Ridiculing awareness posts; accusations of staging harm	Silences critique without rebuttal

References

- Franzke, A. S., Bechmann, A., Zimmer, M., & Ess, C. M. (2020). *Internet Research: Ethical Guidelines 3.0*. AoIR (The International Association of Internet Researchers). <https://aoir.org/reports/ethics3.pdf>
- Herrick, S. S. C., Hallward, L., & Duncan, L. R. (2021). “This is just how I cope”: An inductive thematic analysis of eating disorder recovery content created and shared on TikTok using #EdRecovery. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 54(4), 516–526. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.23463>
- Lazar, M. M. (2014). Feminist critical discourse analysis: Relevance for current gender and language studies. In S. Ehrlich, M. Meyerhoff, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *The handbook of language, gender and sexuality* (2nd ed., pp. 180–200). Wiley Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584248.ch9>
- Ledin, P., & Machin, D. (2018). Multi-modal critical discourse analysis. In J. Flowerdew & J. Richardson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* (pp. 60–76). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315739342>
- Nissenbaum, H. (2004). Privacy as contextual integrity. *Washington Law Review*, 79(1), 119–158. <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol79/iss1/10>