

Understanding and Measuring Technology- Facilitated Gender-Based Violence (TF-GBV)

A Guide to Quantitative Assessment Tools

Understanding and Measuring Technology-Facilitated Gender- Based Violence (TF-GBV):

A Guide to Quantitative Assessment Tools

Authors:

Camilla Devereux (sistemaFutura); Alexandra De Filippo (sistemaFutura); Jackline Namubiru (Innovations for Poverty Action); Lucas Salamanca (sistemaFutura; Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú); Victoria Isika (Innovations for Poverty Action); Andrea Chávez-Lazo (sistemaFutura); Abigail M. Hatcher (sistemaFutura; University of North Carolina).

Contributors:

Editing and design support provided by the Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) Communications team, including Ana Tamayo and Michael Podesta.



Executive Summary

Technology-facilitated gender-based violence (TF-GBV) is an increasingly prevalent and complex form of violence that reflects, amplifies, and transforms offline gender inequalities and harms. As digital technologies become embedded in everyday social, economic, and intimate life, women and girls—particularly adolescents and young adults—face growing risks of harassment, abuse, coercion, and exploitation across online and technology-mediated spaces. Despite rising global attention to TF-GBV, the evidence base remains fragmented, with significant variation in how TF-GBV is defined, operationalized, and measured across contexts.

This document brings together existing validated quantitative instruments used to measure TF-GBV. This compendium is the result of a systematic desk review of peer-reviewed literature published primarily between 2009 and 2025. It is not intended to be exhaustive, nor does it propose a single universal tool for measuring TF-GBV. Rather, this review aims to lay the groundwork for the development of a contextualized yet adaptable TF-GBV measurement instrument—one that draws on existing evidence while remaining responsive to women’s lived realities across diverse sociocultural and technological contexts, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). By making it publicly available, we hope to support researchers, policymakers, and practitioners seeking to understand how TF-GBV has been measured to date. The document is conceived as a living resource, to be updated as new measures emerge and the field evolves.

The compendium catalogues 19 quantitative measures spanning a wide range of TF-GBV manifestations, including cyberbullying, technology-facilitated intimate partner violence, online sexual harassment, image-based sexual abuse, cyber dating abuse, sextortion, and related attitudes, risks, and protective factors. The measures cover diverse populations—adolescents, young adults, working adults, and forcibly displaced youth—and have been validated across multiple sociocultural contexts, predominantly in Europe, Latin America, Australia, and North America, with more limited representation from low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

Each measure is documented in detail, including its conceptual focus, target population, structure, psychometric properties, context of validation, and key strengths and limitations. Where available, information on validity, reliability, factor structure, and applicability is presented to support informed selection and adaptation. The compendium also highlights whether measures assess victimization, perpetration, or both, and the extent to which they capture frequency, severity, impact, and relational context.

In addition to cataloguing measures, the compendium synthesizes key methodological and ethical considerations for measuring TF-GBV, drawing on guidance from the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW). These considerations underscore the importance of contextual understanding, ethical data collection, inclusion of younger adolescents, attention to perpetration as well as victimization, and flexibility to account for rapidly evolving technologies and forms of abuse.

Ultimately, by consolidating existing quantitative approaches to measuring TF-GBV, this compendium seeks to support more rigorous research, improved monitoring, and the design of

Findings

Several cross-cutting gaps in the existing measurement landscape emerge from this review. These include the limited availability of validated measures developed or tested in LMIC settings; inconsistent inclusion of gender-specific and power-based dynamics; challenges in capturing emerging forms of TF-GBV; and tensions between the need for comparability across contexts and the need for locally meaningful measurement. While many existing instruments demonstrate strong psychometric properties, most are context-specific and were not designed for cross-cultural adaptation without further validation.

Issue	What the Compendium Shows	Why It Matters
TF-GBV measurement is fragmented	Existing tools vary widely in definitions, scope, and quality	Limits comparability and hinders coordinated policy responses
Strong tools exist—but are context-specific	18 validated measures cover multiple TF-GBV forms, but most were developed in high-income settings	Tools cannot be assumed to transfer across contexts without adaptation
Adolescents and young women are a central focus	Many measures target adolescents and young adults	Measurement must reflect age-specific risks and digital practices
Perpetration is under-measured	Most tools focus primarily on victimization	Understanding perpetration is critical for prevention strategies
Ethics and safety are essential	UNFPA and ICRW guidance emphasize safeguarding, confidentiality, and contextual sensitivity	Poor measurement can expose respondents to harm
One-size-fits-all tools are unrealistic	No single measure captures all forms of TF-GBV across contexts	Contextualized yet adaptable tools are needed



Introduction

This compendium outlines the existing measures used to determine TF-GBV. It provides an overview of validated instruments, scales, and methodologies currently employed by researchers, policymakers, and practitioners **to assess the prevalence, nature, and impact of gender-based violence perpetrated through digital means**. The measures included herein span various contexts and cultures, reflecting the global nature of this issue.

The document is organized into the following chapters;

Chapter 1: Background on TFGBV - This chapter introduces TF-GBV, examining how digital tools and online spaces are used to perpetrate or amplify gendered harm. It highlights the diverse forms of TF-GBV, the populations most affected, its intersections with offline violence, and its social, psychological, and civic impacts.

Chapter 2: How We Found These Measures - This section details the methodology used to identify and compile the measures presented in this document, including the databases searched, key terms used, and the criteria for inclusion. Placing this methodology upfront establishes the rigor and scope of the review early on.

Chapter 3: Guiding Principles for Robust Measurement - This section consolidates two foundational topics: the statistical concepts used to evaluate whether a measure is sound (validity and reliability), and the ethical and contextual guidance from UNFPA and ICRW on measuring TF-GBV responsibly.

Chapter 4-6 - The Measures: This section, organized thematically, presents the core measures included in the review:

- Chapter 4: Cyberbullying Measures (Measures 1-3)
- Chapter 5: Relationship Abuse Measures (Measures 4-11)
- Chapter 6: Sexual Violence Measures (Measures 12-18)

For each measure, it includes information such as the measure's name, authors, year of development, target population, number of items, subscales (if any), psychometric properties, contexts of validation, and any notable strengths or limitations.

Annex 1. Systematic Literature Search: This section details the methodology used to identify and compile the measures presented in this document. It outlines the databases searched, key terms used, and the criteria for inclusion, particularly focusing on peer-reviewed articles published within the last 15 years. This systematic approach ensures a comprehensive and up-to-date overview of existing TF-GBV measures.

Annex 2. Summary of Measures: This section provides a consolidated overview of the measures identified through the systematic literature search. It catalogs each measure by thematic area—including bullying, relationship abuse, and sexual violence—and presents the associated scale name(s), publication(s), and the geographic context in which each measure was validated. This summary serves as a quick-reference guide for identifying relevant, validated tools for measuring various dimensions of TF-GBV.

Annex 3. Measure Items: This section contains additional information to support the main content of the document. It includes full copies of the measures (where they can be identified) or any other supplementary material that enhances the utility of the document without cluttering the main sections.



Chapter 1: Background on TF-GBV

TF-GBV refers to acts of violence, abuse, harassment, and coercion that are perpetrated or amplified through digital technologies and online spaces and are rooted in gendered power inequalities. It's no surprise then that TF-GBV estimates range widely—from 16 percent to 58 percent—across different contexts and manifestations.¹ Many forms of TF-GBV mirror offline gender-based violence while introducing new dynamics related to scale, anonymity, permanence, and speed of harm.² TF-GBV can occur across a wide range of digital platforms, from basic SMS and call functions to social media, messaging applications, dating platforms, email, gaming environments, and other networked technologies.

TF-GBV encompasses diverse behaviors, such as online harassment and threats, cyberstalking, non-consensual sharing of intimate images, sextortion, technology-facilitated intimate partner violence, online sexual harassment, and gender- or sexuality-based hate speech.³ These behaviors often overlap and can occur alongside offline forms of violence. In this sense, “online and digital violence does not occur in a vacuum, but is part of a continuum of multiple, recurring, and interrelated forms of violence against women and girls (VCMN) that are often connected to offline violence.”⁴ This reinforces patterns of control, intimidation, and social exclusion.

Indeed, sophisticated technology isn't necessary for TF-GBV to occur: Threatening or recurring calls to a basic phone with the intent to control, digital job adverts aimed to groom women into dangerous situations, or exposing someone's phone number can be forms of TF-GBV. While anyone can experience online abuse, women and girls—particularly adolescents, young women, and those with public or marginalised identities—are disproportionately targeted. Women in public life, such as politicians, activists, or journalists, are also at higher risk. According to the UN Women Strategy report (2025), 75 percent of female journalists report experiencing online violence.

The impacts of TF-GBV extend beyond digital spaces. Evidence links exposure to adverse psychological outcomes, including anxiety, depression, fear, shame, and social withdrawal, as well as disruptions to

¹ UN Women (2025). *UN Women Strategy: Preventing and eliminating technology-facilitated violence against women and girls*. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2025/12/un-women-strategy-preventing-and-eliminating-technology-facilitated-violence-against-women-and-girls>

² UN Women (2025). Global trends to prevent and respond to technology-facilitated violence against women and girls: a compendium of emerging practices. https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2025-12/global-trends-to-prevent-and-respond-to-technology-facilitated-violence-against-women-and-girls-en_1.pdf

³ The Economist. (n.d.). *Measuring the prevalence of online violence against women*. <https://onlineviolencewomen.eiu.com/>

⁴ UN Women (2025). *UN Women Strategy: Preventing and eliminating technology-facilitated violence against women and girls*. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2025/12/un-women-strategy-preventing-and-eliminating-technology-facilitated-violence-against-women-and-girls>



education, employment, relationships, and civic participation.⁵ ⁶ In intimate relationships, digital tools can be used to extend patterns of surveillance, coercive control, and abuse beyond physical proximity.⁷

The impacts are also differentiated according to life stages, with distinct and overlapping forms of violence shaped by intersecting forms of oppression and discrimination.⁸ For adolescents and young people, TF-GBV may be closely intertwined with identity formation, peer relationships, and early dating experiences. Overall, TF-GBV leads to a chilling effect, silencing women from public digital spaces and limiting participation.⁹

Despite growing recognition of TF-GBV as a critical global issue, efforts to measure it remain inconsistent. Definitions vary across disciplines and institutions, and measurement tools differ in scope, populations covered, and methodological rigor. Rapid technological change further complicates measurement, as new platforms and behaviors emerge faster than research instruments can be updated. These challenges are particularly acute in LMICs, where digital access is expanding rapidly but context-specific evidence remains limited. According to a review of TF-GBV prevention and response interventions, only 2 of the 37 studies were conducted in an LMIC.¹⁰ The Delphi study¹¹ further underscores the lack of standardized indicators and the need for greater conceptual alignment to support comparable and actionable data across settings.

As proposed by the [Shared Research Agenda on TF-GBV](#), accurate, ethical, and contextually grounded measurement of TF-GBV is essential for understanding prevalence, identifying risk and protective factors, monitoring trends, and designing effective prevention and response strategies. Strengthening the evidence base—while ensuring that measurement approaches reflect women’s lived realities across diverse cultural and technological contexts—is a critical step toward addressing TF-GBV and its links to broader patterns of gender-based violence.

⁵ Brain Builders Youth Development Initiative (2025). Understanding Technology-Facilitated Gender-Based Violence in Central and West Africa.

⁶ Equity Now, HAART Kenya, KICTANet, Life Bloom Services International & Trace Kenya (2025). *Experiencing online sexual exploitation and abuse in Kenya: Survivor narratives and legal responses*. <https://www.kictanet.or.ke/download/experiencing-online-sexual-exploitation-and-abuse-in-kenya-survivor-narratives-and-legal-responses/>

⁷ Tanczer, L., Lopez-Neira, I., Parkin, S., Patel, T., & Danezis, G. (2018). Gender and IoT Research Report: The Rise of the Internet of Things and Implications for Technology-Facilitated Abuse. London: STEaPP, PETRAS IoT Hub. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/steapp/sites/steapp/files/giot-report.pdf>

⁸ United Nations Population Fund, Save the Children, & United Nations Children’s Fund. (2025). *Technology-facilitated gender-based violence: Considerations across the life course*. https://www.unicef.org/media/176181/file/TFGBV%20across%20the%20life%20course_FINAL.pdf.pdf

⁹ Amnesty International. (n.d.). Online violence. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/technology/online-violence/>

¹⁰ Evans, D. P., Hadd, A. R., Shervinskie, A., Cagney, J., Shakil, Z., Bergenfeld, I., ... & Clark, C. J. (2025). Building safer digital spaces: Prevention and response interventions for technology-facilitated gender-based violence.

¹¹ Nikolaos Koukopoulos, Madeleine Janickyj, and Leonie Maria Tanczer, “Defining and Conceptualizing Technology-Facilitated Abuse (‘Tech Abuse’): Findings of a Global Delphi Study,” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* (2025), <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605241310465>.



Chapter 2: How We Found These Measures

The measures presented in this document were identified through a systematic search of academic databases, including Google Scholar, PubMed, PsycINFO, and Web of Science. The purpose of the literature search was to identify **robust measures of TF-GBV**.

The primary aim was to find self-report measures where measurement is conducted at the level of the victim, rather than measurements conducted by or with the perpetrator or aggressor. Due to the preference for self-reported measures, papers about population-level indicators or observational statistics were not included in the compendium of measures. In addition, studies presenting reliable and valid scales were prioritized over descriptive analysis of survey instruments describing the prevalence and impact of abuse on specific populations.

To ensure the relevance and currency of the information, the search primarily focused on peer-reviewed articles published within the last 15 years (2009-2024). This approach allowed for the identification of the most recent and validated measures in the rapidly evolving field of technology-facilitated gender-based violence. Additional measures were included based on their significance in the field, or notable robustness, even if they fell outside the 15-year publication window.

When searching, terms from two or more of the lists below were combined, such as "Online harassment scale" or "Digital abuse assessment tool" or "Online depression risk assessment", to help identify relevant measures. For each measure, the relevant search term is included in the description in Annex 1.



Chapter 3: Guiding Principles for Robust Measurement

3.1 Validity and Reliability

Two broad concepts are used to assess the robustness of scales like these:

1. **Validity:** Does the scale actually measure the outcomes that it says it does? For example, if a scale is intended to measure the self-esteem of an individual, are we confident that it is measuring this as opposed to, say, their confidence? In other words, validity asks: *Are we measuring the right thing?*
2. **Reliability:** Does the scale consistently produce the same results for the same kind of individual? For example, for a relatively stable construct—such as an individual's perseverance—are the individual's scores on the scale similar if repeated measurements are taken a week apart? In other words, reliability asks: *Are we measuring it consistently?*

Validity and reliability are typically assessed using a small range of statistical methods. The most common of these, referenced throughout this compendium, include:

- Cronbach's alpha (α): A number between 0 and 1 that indicates how well a set of items "hang together" as a group—that is, whether they all appear to be measuring the same underlying concept. Values above 0.70 are generally considered acceptable; above 0.80 is good; above 0.90 is excellent.
- McDonald's omega (ω): Similar to Cronbach's alpha, this is an alternative measure of internal consistency that some researchers consider more accurate, particularly when items vary in how strongly they relate to the underlying concept.
- Composite reliability: Another indicator of internal consistency, often used alongside confirmatory factor analysis. Like alpha and omega, higher values (above 0.70) suggest the items reliably measure the same construct.
- Test-retest reliability: A measure of stability over time. If the same people take the scale twice (e.g., two weeks apart), do they get similar scores? High test-retest correlations suggest the measure is stable.
- Factor analysis: A statistical technique used to identify clusters of related items within a scale. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is used when researchers are discovering patterns for the first time; confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) tests whether a proposed structure fits new data. These analyses help confirm that a scale's subscales (groupings of items) genuinely reflect distinct underlying concepts.
- Convergent validity: Evidence that the scale correlates with other measures of related concepts, as expected. For example, a cyberbullying victimization scale that correlates with depression scores provides evidence of convergent validity.
- Content and face validity: Content validity refers to whether the items adequately cover the full range of the concept being measured. Face validity is a simpler judgment: do the items look like they measure what they are supposed to? Both are typically assessed through expert review.
- Model fit indices (CFI, RMSEA, SRMR, etc.): Numbers reported alongside factor analyses that indicate how well the proposed statistical model matches the actual data. For instance, a Comparative Fit Index (CFI) above 0.95 and a Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) below 0.06 are commonly considered indicators of good fit.



3.2 Ethical and contextual Considerations for Measuring TF-GBV

Both the UNFPA and ICRW emphasize the importance of understanding local contexts, capturing a wide range of TF-GBV behaviors, and considering ethical implications when developing measures. They also highlight the need for flexible approaches that can adapt to rapidly evolving forms of TF-GBV, given the constantly changing nature of the issue.

UNFPA has developed comprehensive guidance on measuring TF-GBV in their discussion paper.¹² This guidance emphasizes the need for a nuanced, context-specific approach to measurement, recognising the complex and rapidly evolving nature of TF-GBV. UNFPA stresses the importance of generating diverse forms of evidence, including prevalence data, qualitative insights, and policy analyses, to build a robust understanding of TF-GBV in different settings.

The paper also highlights key challenges in measurement and offers considerations for researchers and policymakers:

Contextual understanding:

- Prioritize in-depth qualitative research to understand local forms and dynamics of TF-GBV
- Consider how technologies may be weaponised differently across various contexts

Comprehensive measurement:

- Generate evidence on prevalence, specific forms of TF-GBV, service data, and policy analysis
- Include TF-GBV perpetrated both within and outside of intimate partner relationships

Age considerations:

- Develop methods to capture TF-GBV experiences among young adolescents (below 15 years)
- Recognize that current violence prevalence surveys often exclude this younger age group

Perpetration data:

- Increase focus on measuring perpetration of TF-GBV, not just victimization
- Include demographic questions about respondents' professions or public profiles

Ethical and safety considerations:

- Ensure safe and ethical use of technology in research processes
- Prioritize secure data storage, management, and disposal

Measurement challenges:

- Acknowledge difficulties in defining and quantifying discrete TF-GBV incidents
- Recognize challenges in cross-country comparisons due to contextual differences

Balancing trend analysis and emerging forms:

- Consider how to balance the need for consistent questions to track trends with the need to capture new and emerging forms of TF-GBV

Caution in prevalence estimation:

¹² University of Melbourne – United Nations Population Fund (2023). Measuring technology-facilitated gender-based violence. A discussion paper.



- Recognize that underestimating TF-GBV prevalence through partial measures may be more harmful than having no prevalence data

The ICRW¹³ has developed a comprehensive conceptual framework for understanding and measuring technology-facilitated gender-based violence (TF-GBV). Key elements of this framework include (1):

Motivation: Emotional, psychological, functional, or ideological drivers behind perpetrator behavior

Intent: The perpetrator's determination to cause harm

Behaviors: Specific actions like stalking, defamation, bullying, sexual harassment, exploitation, and hate speech

Mode: Technologies used to perpetrate violence (e.g., social networking sites, dating sites)

Cross-cutting tactics: Methods like doxing, hacking, and image-based abuse

Frequency: Number and timeframe of offenses

Impact: Physical, psychological, social, economic, and functional effects on victims/survivors

Help-seeking and coping: Strategies used by victims/survivors to manage and respond to TF-GBV

Measurement considerations:

- Capture the full spectrum of TF-GBV behaviors
- Include questions about perpetrator motivation and intent
- Measure frequency and severity of incidents
- Assess impacts across multiple domains
- Consider the relationship between perpetrator and victim/survivor

Context: The framework emphasizes the importance of considering social, gender, cultural, legal, political, religious, and technological contexts when measuring TF-GBV.

¹³ ICRW guidance: Hinson L, Mueller J, O'Brien-Milne L, Wandera N. (2018). Technology-facilitated gender-based violence: What is it, and how do we measure it? Washington D.C., International Center for Research on Women.



Chapter 4: Cyberbullying Measures

This chapter presents three validated scales designed to measure cyberbullying—repeated aggressive or harmful behavior carried out through digital means. These measures capture victimization, perpetration, and (in one case) bystander observation. While cyberbullying is not always gender-based, several of the behaviors assessed (e.g., sharing private photos without consent, sexual harassment online) overlap directly with TF-GBV and are relevant to its measurement.

Measure 1: The Cyberbullying Test

General Information

Description	A 45-item instrument assessing 15 cyberbullying behaviors from three perspectives: cybervictimization, cyberaggression, and cyberobservation. Provides four indices: level of cybervictimization, cyberaggression, cyberobservation, and aggressive cybervictimization.
Developer(s)	Maite Garaigordobil
Target audience	Adolescents, aged 12–18
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Cybervictimization · Cyberaggression · Cyberobservation
Sociocultural context(s)	Basque Country (Northern Spain)
Cost	Not specified
Further information	Not available
Source	Garaigordobil, M. (2015). Psychometric Properties of the Cyberbullying Test, a Screening Instrument to Measure Cybervictimisation, Cyberaggression, and Cyberobservation. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 32(23), 3556–3576.



Items and Administration

Number of items	45 (15 behaviors × 3 perspectives)
Perspectives assessed	Victim (suffered behaviors) · Aggressor (carried out behaviors) · Observer (witnessed behaviors among classmates)
Recall period	Past year
Response scale	4-point: never (0), sometimes (1), several times (2), always (3)
Scoring / interpretation	Cutoff points classify respondents as "no problems," "at risk," or "problem" across four cyberbullying indices

See Annex 1 for the full list of items.

Psychometric Properties

Table 1.1 · Internal Consistency

Scale	Cronbach's α
Full scale (45 items)	.91
Cybervictimization	.82
Cyberaggression	.91
Cyberobservation	.87

Item-total correlations were moderate to high across all subscales; inter-scale correlations were moderate.

Table 1.2 · Test–Retest Stability

Goodman–Kruskal γ ; 3-month interval; n = 83, aged 12–16

Index	γ
Cybervictimization	.63
Cyberaggression	.74
Cyberobservation	.80



Table 1.3 · Construct Validity — Factor Structure

Analysis	Finding
EFA	Three-factor structure (cybervictimization, cyberaggression, cyberobservation); 42.39% of variance explained
CFA	Confirmed three-factor structure; fit indices reported in Table 1.4

Table 1.4 · CFA Model Fit Indices

Index	Value	Conventional benchmark
χ^2/df	4.88	< 5.0 acceptable
CFI	.91	≥ .90 acceptable
NNFI	.90	≥ .90 acceptable
GFI	.92	≥ .90 acceptable
RMSEA [90% CI]	.056 [.056, .063]	< .06 good; < .08 acceptable
SRMR	.050	< .08 acceptable

All indices meet or exceed conventional thresholds for acceptable model fit.

Table 1.5 · Convergent Validity

Subscale	Positively associated with	Negatively associated with
Cybervictimization	Neuroticism, behavioral problems	Self-esteem
Cyberaggression	Antisocial behavior	Empathy

Table 1.6 · Additional Validity Evidence

Type	Finding
Cross-cultural	Scale structure replicated across two Spanish samples: Basque Country ($n = 3,026$) and Bizkaia ($n = 1,008$)



Content / face Not formally tested; items derived from prior empirical research and directly assess cyberbullying behaviors

Measure 2: The Cyberbullying Questionnaire (CBQ)

General Information

Description	Measures cyberbullying behaviors, assessing both perpetration and victimization. The adult version consists of 20 items; the adolescent version has 14 items for perpetration and 9 for victimization. A short 7-item adult version (CBQ-S) is also available.
Developer(s)	Adult version (USA, Sweden): Sandra Jönsson, Tuija Muhonen, Rebecka Cowen Forssell, Martin Bäckström Adolescent version (Spain, Mexico): Esther Calvete, Izaskun Orue, Ana Estévez, Lourdes Villardón, Patricia Padilla
Target audience	Adult version: Working adults Adolescent version: Adolescents, aged 12–18
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Adult version: One overall factor (cyberbullying behaviors) Adolescent version: Two factors — Perpetration · Victimization
Sociocultural context(s)	Adult version: Sweden and USA (working adults) Adolescent version: Developed in Spain; validated with Mexican adolescents
Cost	Not specified (likely free)
Further information	Adult version: scirp.org Adolescent version: Not provided
Sources	Adult version: Jönsson, S., Muhonen, T., Cowen Forssell, R., & Bäckström, M. (2017). Assessing Exposure to Bullying through Digital Devices in Working Life. <i>Psychology</i> , 8, 477–494. Adolescent version: Gámez-Guadix, M. et al. (2014). Psychometric Properties of the CBQ Among Mexican Adolescents. <i>Violence and Victims</i> , 29(2), 232–247.



Items and Administration

Feature	Adult version	Adolescent version
Number of items	20 (full) / 7 (CBQ-S short version)	14 (perpetration) + 9 (victimization)
Response scale	5-point: never (1) to daily (5)	Adult version: 5-point: never (1) to daily (5) Adolescent version: 4-point: never (0) to 5+ times (3)
Constructs	Cyberbullying behaviors (single factor)	Adult version: Cyberbullying behaviors (one factor) Adolescent version: Perpetration and victimization (two factors)

Psychometric Properties

Adult Version

Table 2.1 · Internal Consistency — Adult

Sample	Cronbach's α
Swedish sample	.96
US sample	.96

Table 2.2 · Validity — Adult

Type	Finding
Factor structure	One-factor model confirmed through ESEM
Criterion validity	Significant correlations with well-being, work engagement, and intention to quit (see Table 2.3)

Table 2.3 · Criterion Validity Correlations — Adult

External construct	r	Direction
Work engagement	-.10	Negative
Wellbeing	-.30	Negative
Intention to quit	.20	Positive



All correlations statistically significant.

Adolescent Version (Mexican Sample)

Table 2.4 · Internal Consistency — Adolescent

Subscale	Cronbach's α
Perpetration	.90
Victimization	.79

Table 2.5 · Validity — Adolescent

Type	Finding
Factor structure	Two-factor model (perpetration, victimization) confirmed through CFA
Convergent validity	Significant correlations with justification of cyberbullying, impulsivity, and depression (see Table 2.6)
Cross-cultural	Multiple-group covariance structure analysis confirmed factor structure equivalence across Mexican and Spanish samples

Table 2.6 · Convergent Validity Correlations — Adolescent

External construct	Perpetration	Victimization
Justification of cyberbullying	$r = .45$	$r = .31$
Impulsivity	$r = .26$	$r = .25$
Depression	$r = .16$	$r = .27$

All correlations statistically significant.



Measure 3: Cyber Victim and Bullying Scale (CVBS)

General Information

Description	A 22-item instrument measuring both cyber victimization and cyberbullying behaviors among high school students. Consists of two parallel scales: Scale of Cyber Victim (SCV) and Scale of Cyber Bullying (SCB). Assesses behaviors relevant to TF-GBV such as sharing private information, offensive language, and manipulating photos without consent.
Developer(s)	Bayram Çetin, Erkan Yaman, Adem Peker
Target audience	High school students, aged 14–19
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Both SCV and SCB have three factors: Cyber Verbal Bullying (7 items) · Hiding Identity (5 items) · Cyber Forgery (10 items)
Sociocultural context(s)	Turkey
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research use)
Source	Çetin, B., Yaman, E., & Peker, A. (2011). Cyber victim and bullying scale: A study of validity and reliability. <i>Computers & Education</i> , 57(4), 2261–2271.

Items and Administration

Number of items	22 (reduced from initial pool of 45 after expert review)
Response scale	5-point Likert: never (1), rarely (2), occasionally (3), frequently (4), always (5)
Item availability	Exact wording of final 22 items not provided in the paper



Psychometric Properties

Table 3.1 · Internal Consistency (Cronbach's α)

Scale	Overall α	Subscale range
Scale of Cyber Victim (SCV)	.89	.68–.86
Scale of Cyber Bullying (SCB)	.89	.69–.83

Table 3.2 · Split-Half Reliability

Scale	Overall	Subscale range
SCV	.79	.56–.82
SCB	.79	.55–.81

Table 3.3 · Test–Retest Reliability (30-day interval)

Scale	Overall	Subscale range
SCV	.85	.69–.87
SCB	.90	.72–.86

Table 3.4 · Validity Evidence

Type	Finding
Construct validity	Confirmed through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses
Criterion validity	Significant correlations with the Aggression Questionnaire: SCV $r = .27$; SCB $r = .35$



Chapter 5: Relationship Abuse Measures

This chapter presents eight validated scales that measure TF-GBV occurring within intimate or dating relationships. These measures cover a range of behaviors—monitoring, control, threats, humiliation, sexual coercion, and psychological abuse—carried out through digital tools. They span adolescent dating relationships and young adult partnerships, and capture both victimization and perpetration. Collectively, they reflect the growing recognition that digital technologies can extend and intensify patterns of coercive control in intimate relationships. Emerging efforts to build consensus—such as a recent Delphi study¹⁴—highlight both the breadth of behaviors encompassed by TF-GBV and the ongoing challenges in defining and measuring it consistently across contexts.

Measure 4: Technology-Facilitated Abuse in Relationships (TAR) Scale

General Information

Description	A 30-item instrument measuring technology-facilitated abuse in relationships. Assesses victimization, perpetration, and impact of TAR behaviors across all digital platforms. Notable for measuring impact alongside prevalence, and for its development process involving youth and expert consultation.
Developer(s)	Cynthia Brown, Kelsey Hegarty
Target audience	Young people aged 16–24 (who have been in a dating relationship in the last 12 months)
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Four factors: Humiliation · Monitoring and Control · Sexual Coercion · Threats
Sociocultural context(s)	Australia
Cost	Not specified (likely free; full item list not provided in paper)
Source	Brown, C., & Hegarty, K. (2021). Development and validation of the TAR Scale. <i>Computers in Human Behavior Reports</i> , 3, 100059.
External recognition	Recommended in Soto, A.M. & Ibabe, I. (2022). <i>The Spanish Journal of Psychology</i> , 25, e4.

¹⁴ Nikolaos Koukopoulos, Madeleine Janickyj, and Leonie Maria Tanczer, “Defining and Conceptualizing Technology-Facilitated Abuse (‘Tech Abuse’): Findings of a Global Delphi Study,” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* (2025), <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605241310465>.



Items and Administration

Number of items	30
Response scale — Victimization	6-point: not at all, once, a few times, monthly, weekly, daily/almost daily
Response scale — Impact	5-point for distress and fear: not at all, slightly, moderately, very, extremely
Response scale — Perpetration	6-point: no, once, a few times, monthly, weekly, daily/almost daily

Psychometric Properties

Initial validation study: n = 527, young people aged 16–24, Australia

Table 4.1 · Internal Consistency

Scale / Factor	Cronbach's α
Overall scale	.91
Factor 1: Humiliation	.879
Factor 2: Monitoring and Control	.828
Factor 3: Sexual Coercion	.847
Factor 4: Threats	.801

Table 4.2 · Validity Evidence

Type	Finding
Face validity	Consultation with 38 youth aged 16–24 via discussion groups and online surveys
Content validity	Consultation with 17 national and international academic, policy, and health experts via online survey
Construct validity	EFA (generalised least squares, promax rotation) revealed four-factor structure; see Table 4.3



Table 4.3 · EFA Variance Explained

Factor	Variance explained
Factor 1: Humiliation	31.606%
Factor 2: Monitoring and Control	8.894%
Factor 3: Sexual Coercion	7.979%
Factor 4: Threats	4.879%
Total	53.36%

Note: Test–retest reliability, convergent validity, and divergent validity have not yet been assessed. The authors recommend CFA with an independent sample.



Measure 5: Cyber-Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CDAQ)

General Information

Description	A 20-item instrument measuring various types of cyber dating abuse, including perpetration and victimization. Assesses behaviors such as threats, identity theft, control, and humiliation through digital technologies in dating relationships.
Developer(s)	Erika Borrajo, Manuel Gámez-Guadix, Noemí Pereda, Esther Calvete
Target audience	Young people in dating relationships, aged 18–30
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Direct Aggression (perpetration and victimization) · Control/Monitoring (perpetration and victimization)
Sociocultural context(s)	Spain
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research use)
Source	Borrajo, E., Gámez-Guadix, M., Pereda, N., & Calvete, E. (2015). The development and validation of the cyber dating abuse questionnaire among young couples. <i>Computers in Human Behavior, 48</i> , 358–365.
External recognition	Recommended in Soto, A.M. & Ibabe, I. (2022). <i>The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 25</i> , e4.

Items and Administration

Number of items	20 parallel items for perpetration and victimization
Response scale	6-point Likert: never (1), not in the last year but before (2), rarely: 1–2 times (3), sometimes: 3–10 times (4), often: 10–20 times (5), always: 20+ times (6)
Example item pair	Victimization: "My partner or former partner threatened to hurt me physically through new technologies" / Perpetration: "I threatened to hurt my partner or former partner physically through new technologies"



Psychometric Properties

Table 5.1 · Reliability and Validity Summary

Type	Finding
Internal consistency	Cronbach's α ranged from .73 to .87 across subscales
Construct validity	Confirmed through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses
Convergent validity	Demonstrated through correlations with offline dating violence and cyberbullying



Measure 6: Adolescent Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (CARPA)

General Information

Description	The CARPA (<i>Cuestionario de Abuso en Relaciones de Pareja de Adolescentes</i>) assesses offline and online abuse in dating relationships among adolescents. Evaluates both victimization and perpetration, as well as reasons for and reactions to abuse.
Developer(s)	Esther Calvete, Liria Fernández-González, Izaskun Orue, Manuel Machimbarrena, Joaquín González-Cabrera
Target audience	Adolescents, aged 11–18
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">· Victimization (5 subscales): verbal offline, offline control, physical and sexual aggression, direct online violence, online control· Perpetration (5 subscales): verbal offline, offline control, physical and sexual aggression, direct online violence, online control· Reasons for abuse and Reactions to abuse
Sociocultural context(s)	Spain
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research use)
Source	Calvete Zumalde, E., Fernández González, L., Orue Sola, I., Machimbarrena Garagorri, J. M., & González Cabrera, J. (2021). Validación de un cuestionario para evaluar el abuso en relaciones de pareja en adolescentes (CARPA), sus razones y las reacciones. <i>Revista de Psicología Clínica con Niños y Adolescentes</i> , 8(1), 60-69. https://doi.org/10.21134/RPCNA.2021.08.1.8

Items and Administration

Number of items	24 (victimization) + 24 (perpetration) + 24 (reasons and reactions)
Response scale	4-point: never (0) to almost always (3)
Administration note	Victimization and perpetration administered separately to reduce response bias; paper or online format



Psychometric Properties

Table 6.1 · Reliability

Metric	Values
Cronbach's α / ordinal α	.74–.97 across scales
Composite reliability	.76–.98

Table 6.2 · Validity Evidence

Type	Finding
Content validity	Expert review and agreement on item categorization
Construct validity	CFA supported hierarchical structure; RMSEA = .030, CFI = 1.00
Convergent validity	Positive correlations with related mental health symptoms
Known-groups validity	Ability to detect gender differences in abuse patterns

Note: Test–retest reliability and criterion-related validity not reported; recommended for future research.



Measure 7: Cyber Dating Abuse Scale in Adolescent Dating (Cib-VPA / ECVPA)

General Information

Description	Assesses cyber dating violence perpetration among adolescents. Includes two subscales: Cyber-control (excessive control behaviors) and Cyber-aggression (threats and insults through social media).
Developer(s)	María-Jesús Cava, Sofía Buelga
Target audience	Adolescents, aged 12–18
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Cyber-control · Cyber-aggression
Sociocultural context(s)	Spain
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research purposes)
Source	Cava, M.J., & Buelga, S. (2018). Propiedades psicométricas de la escala de ciber-violencia en parejas adolescentes (Cib-VPA). <i>Suma Psicológica</i> , 25(1), 51–61.

Items and Administration

Number of items	10
Response scale	4-point: never (1), seldom (2), sometimes (3), often (4)
Example items	Cyber-control: "I do not let my partner chat with some friends and if he/she does I get angry and I make him/her feel bad" Cyber-aggression: "I have spread malicious rumors or lies about my partner through social networks"



Psychometric Properties

Table 7.1 · Reliability and Validity Summary

Type	Finding
Internal consistency	Cyber-control: $\alpha = .75$; Cyber-aggression: $\alpha = .83$
Construct validity	Evidence through associations with offline dating violence, sexist attitudes, and romantic myths



Media Scale (EVIME)

General Information

Description	The EVIME (<i>Escala de Violencia de Pareja que se expresa a través de Medios Electrónicos</i>) assesses dating violence perpetrated through electronic media among Mexican adolescents. Covers five dimensions of electronic aggression and control in romantic relationships.
Developer(s)	Claudia Ivette Jaen-Cortés, Sofía Rivera-Aragón, Lucy María Reidl-Martínez, Mirna García-Méndez
Target audience	Adolescents, aged 12–19
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Control, intrusive monitoring, and cyber surveillance · Verbal aggression · Sexual aggression · Sexual coercion · Humiliation
Sociocultural context(s)	Mexico
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research purposes)
Source	Jaen-Cortés, C.I., Rivera-Aragón, S., Reidl-Martínez, L.M., & García-Méndez, M. (2017). Violencia de pareja a través de medios electrónicos en adolescentes mexicanos. <i>Acta de Investigación Psicológica</i> , 7(1), 2593–2605.

Items and Administration

Number of items	32 across five subscales
Response scale	4-point Likert: never (1) to always (4)
Item availability	Full item list not provided; factor loadings for each item included in the paper



Psychometric Properties

Table 8.1 · Internal Consistency

Scale	Cronbach's α
Overall scale	.94
Control, intrusive monitoring, and cyber surveillance	.92
Verbal aggression	.93
Sexual aggression	.86
Sexual coercion	.82
Humiliation	.78

Table 8.2 · Validity Evidence

Type	Finding
Construct validity	EFA revealed five-factor structure explaining 57.7% of total variance
Convergent validity	Positive and significant correlations between the five dimensions (moderate to high)



Measure 9: Digital Intimate Partner Violence Questionnaire (DIPVQ)

General Information

Description	Assesses digital intimate partner violence victimization among young adults. Includes two subscales: control-centered cyberabuse and damage-centered cyberabuse.
Developer(s)	Javier López-Cepero, José Vallejos-Saldarriaga, María Merino-García
Target audience	Young adults (university students)
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Control-centered cyberabuse (5 items) · Damage-centered cyberabuse (7 items)
Sociocultural context(s)	Peru
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research purposes)
Source	López-Cepero, J., Vallejos-Saldarriaga, J., & Merino-García, M. (2021). Digital Intimate Partner Violence Among Peruvian Youths. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 36(11–12), 5167–5185.

Items and Administration

Number of items	12 (5 control-centered + 7 damage-centered)
Response scale	5-point Likert, recoded to 3 levels: never (0), sometimes (1), frequently (2)

Psychometric Properties

Table 9.1 Reliability

Scale	Ordinal EAP α	McDonald's Ω
Control-centered cyberabuse	.963	—
Damage-centered cyberabuse	.969	—
Total scale	.96	.96



Table 9.2 · Validity Evidence

Type	Finding
Construct validity	EFA revealed two-factor structure explaining 78.7% of total variance
Concurrent validity	Positive correlations with traditional IPV measures; negative correlations with relationship satisfaction



Measure 10: Cyber Psychological Abuse Scale (CPAS)

General Information

Description	Assesses cyber psychological abuse in romantic relationships among young adults. Focuses on minor and severe forms of cyber abuse. Authors recommend use with caution pending further research.
Developer(s)	Leisring, P.A., Giumetti, G.W.
Target audience	Young adults (mean age = 19.03 years)
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Minor cyber abuse (6 items) · Severe cyber abuse (3 items)
Sociocultural context(s)	USA
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research purposes)
Source	Leisring, P.A., & Giumetti, G.W. (2014). Sticks and stones may break my bones, but abusive text messages also hurt. <i>Partner Abuse</i> , 5(3), 323–341.
External recognition	Also used in: Brem, M.J. et al. (2019). A longitudinal examination of alcohol problems and cyber, psychological, and physical dating abuse. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 36, NP10499–NP10519.

Items and Administration

Number of items	9 (6 minor + 3 severe)
Response scale	Not specified in the article
Item availability	Specific items not provided in the paper



Psychometric Properties

Table 10.1 · Reliability and Validity Summary

Type	Finding
Internal consistency	Minor cyber abuse: $\alpha = .81$; Severe cyber abuse: $\alpha = .82$
Content validity	Supported by development study; items carefully developed to reflect cyber psychological abuse
Structural validity	Very good: CFI = .97; two-factor structure (minor and severe) fits data well
Construct validity	Indeterminate—no specific hypotheses formulated or tested regarding relationships with other variables



Measure 11: Modern Adolescent Dating Violence Attitude Scale (MADVA)

General Information

Description	Measures attitudes towards different types of adolescent dating violence and abuse in both online and offline contexts. Statement-based measure scored on a five-point Likert scale across six subscales.
Developer(s)	Gill Kirkman, Dominic Willmott, Daniel Boduszek, Agata Debowska
Target audience	Adolescents, aged 10–25 (mean age = 15.72)
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Sexual abuse offline (8 items) · Sexual abuse online (8 items) · Psychological abuse offline (8 items) · Psychological abuse online (8 items) · Physical abuse offline (8 items) · Controlling behaviour offline (8 items)
Sociocultural context(s)	UK
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research purposes)
Source	Kirkman, G., Willmott, D., Boduszek, D., & Debowska, A. (2025). Introduction and validation of the MADVA scale. <i>International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice</i> , 80, 100705.

Items and Administration

Number of items	48 (8 per subscale × 6 subscales)
Response scale	5-point Likert: strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5)



Psychometric Properties

Table 11.1 · Composite Reliability

Subscale	Composite reliability
Sexual abuse offline	.94
Sexual abuse online	.95
Psychological abuse offline	.97
Psychological abuse online	.97
Physical abuse offline	.94
Controlling behaviour offline	.97
ARI	.92

Table 11.2 · Validity Evidence

Type	Finding
Construct / factorial validity	CFA confirmed six-factor structure; CFI = .97, TLI = .97, RMSEA = .034 [90% CI: .033, .036], WRMR = 1.209
Factor loadings	All items show strong loadings on their corresponding six latent factors



Chapter 6: Sexual Violence Measures

This chapter presents seven validated scales that measure technology-facilitated sexual violence and related phenomena. These include scales for online sexual harassment, image-based sexual abuse (such as non-consensual sharing of intimate images and sextortion), sexting behaviors (both consensual and non-consensual), protective and risk factors associated with digital sexual practices, and the use of technology for sexual health communication. Together, they reflect the diverse ways in which sexual violence manifests across digital platforms.

Measure 12: Online Sexual Harassment Scale (OSHS)

General Information

Description	Measures online sexual harassment victimisation in adults. Two subscales: gender harassment and unwanted sexual attention. Developed through literature review, content analysis of online posts, and factor analysis.
Developer(s)	Niall Buchanan, Adam Mahoney
Target audience	Adults (primarily validated with university students)
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Gender harassment (5 items) · Unwanted sexual attention (7 items)
Sociocultural context(s)	United Kingdom
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research purposes)
Source	Buchanan, N., & Mahoney, A. (2022). Development of a scale measuring online sexual harassment. <i>Legal and Criminological Psychology</i> , 27(1), 63–81.

Items and Administration

Number of items	12 (5 gender harassment + 7 unwanted sexual attention)
Response scale	5-point Likert: never (0), once or twice (1), sometimes (2), often (3), most of the time (4)
Item availability	Specific items not provided in the article



Psychometric Properties

Table 12.1 · Internal Consistency (McDonald's ω)

Scale	ω
Gender harassment	.86
Unwanted sexual attention	.95
Overall scale	.95

Table 12.2 · Validity Evidence

Type	Finding
Content validity	Established through systematic literature review and content analysis of online posts
Construct validity	Supported by EFA and CFA
Factorial validity	CFA fit indices: $\chi^2/df = 2.67$, SRMR = .032, NFI = .94, RMSEA = .085, CFI = .96



Scale (RBTSPS)

General Information

Description	A general measure of perceptions and experiences related to using technology for sexual and intimate practices. Not specifically designed for perpetrators or victims.
Developer(s)	Lily Moor, Joel Anderson, Jennifer Power, Alexandra James, Andrea Waling, Nicole Shackleton
Target audience	Adults (18 years and over)
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">· Benefits: Sexual gratification · Connection · Access to information and culture· Risks: Concerns (about sharing explicit content) · Worries (about privacy) · Knowledge of rights and ownership
Sociocultural context(s)	Australia
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research purposes)
Source	Moor, L., Anderson, J.R., Power, J., James, A., Waling, A., & Shackleton, N. (2024). The risks and benefits of technologised sexual practice scale. <i>Sexual Health</i> , 21, SH23034.

Items and Administration

Number of items	26 across six subscales
Response scale	5-point Likert: not applicable to me (0) to strongly agree (5)



Psychometric Properties

Table 13.1 · Reliability and Validity Summary

Type	Finding
Internal consistency	Study 1: $\alpha > .711$ for all subscales; Study 2: $\alpha > .898$ for all subscales
Construct validity	Supported by EFA and CFA; model fit: CFI = .939, TLI = .930, RMSEA = .077, SRMR = .037



Measure 14: Technology-Facilitated Sexual Violence (TFSV) Scales

General Information

Description	A set of measures assessing both perpetration and victimization of different forms of technology-facilitated sexual violence among adults. Notable for comprehensively covering multiple forms of TFSV with parallel perpetration and victimisation versions.
Developer(s)	Jone Martínez-Bacaicoa, Miguel A. Sorrel, Manuel Gámez-Guadix
Target audience	Adults aged 16 and older
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	· Online Gender-Based Violence Scale (12 items, 3 subscales) · Online Gender- and Sexuality-Based Violence Scale (8 items, 2 subscales) · Digital Sexual Harassment Scale (5 items) · Online Sexual Coercion Scale (4 items) · Nonconsensual Pornography Scale (4 items) Each scale has parallel perpetration and victimization versions.
Sociocultural context(s)	Spain
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research use)
Source	Martínez-Bacaicoa, J., Sorrel, M.A., & Gámez-Guadix, M. (2024). Development and Validation of TFSV Perpetration and Victimization Scales Among Adults. <i>Assessment</i> , 1–18.

Items and Administration

Number of items	33 (Full item list not provided; sample items given for each scale)
Response scale	4-point: never (0), 1–2 times (1), 3–4 times (2), 5+ times (3)
Validation sample	2,486 participants aged 16–79 ($M = 25.95$, $SD = 9.81$)



Psychometric Properties

Table 14.1 · Reliability and Validity Summary

Type	Finding
Internal consistency	Cronbach's α : .708–.916; Omega: .682–.918 across scales
Construct validity	Confirmed through EFA and CFA; generally unidimensional except Online Gender-Based Violence Scale
Concurrent validity	Demonstrated through correlations with sexist ideology



Measure 15: Peer Sexual Cybervictimisation Scale

General Information

Description	Measures peer sexual cybervictimization among adolescents. Adapted from the Sexual Harassment Survey for online contexts. Separates Ambiguous Sexual Cybervictimization (ASCV)—more general/indirect sexual content—from Personal Sexual Cybervictimization (PSCV)—direct, personal sexual content or solicitations. Also measures emotional impact.
Developer(s)	Virginia Sánchez, Noelia Muñoz-Fernández, Esther Vega-Gea
Target audience	Adolescents
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	· Ambiguous Sexual Cybervictimization (ASCV) · Personal Sexual Cybervictimization (PSCV)
Sociocultural context(s)	Spain
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research purposes)
Source	Sánchez, V., Muñoz-Fernández, N., & Vega-Gea, E. (2017). Peer sexual cybervictimization in adolescents. <i>International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology</i> , 17, 171–179.

Items and Administration

Number of items	9 across two subscales
Response scale	5-point Likert: never (0) to daily (4)



Psychometric Properties

Table 15.1 · Reliability and Validity Summary

Type	Finding
Internal consistency	ASCV: $\alpha = .78$; PSCV: $\alpha = .74$
Construct validity	Supported by EFA and CFA
Factorial invariance	Confirmed by gender—the scale measures the same concepts equally well for boys and girls



Measure 16: Adolescent Sexting Scale (A-SextS)

General Information

Description	A comprehensive measure of sexting behaviors among adolescents, covering types of actions, recipients, media formats, and degrees of sexual explicitness. Developed to address the lack of consensus in defining and measuring sexting.
Developer(s)	Cristian Molla Esparza, Pablo Nájera, Emelina López-González, Josep-Maria Losilla
Target audience	Adolescents, aged 11–18
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Nine subscales: · Sending sexts to boyfriend/girlfriend (SF) · to someone known in person (SK) · to someone known only online (SI) · Posting/live-streaming pictographic content (PS) · Asking for sexts from boyfriend/girlfriend (AF) · from someone known in person (AK) · from someone known only online (AI) · Receiving sexts (R) · Refusing to send sexts (RS)
Sociocultural context(s)	Spain
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research purposes)
Source	Molla Esparza, C., Nájera, P., López-González, E., & Losilla, J.M. (2020). Development and Validation of the A-SextS with a Spanish Sample. <i>International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health</i> , 17(21), 8042.

Items and Administration

Number of items	64 across nine subscales
Response scale	5-point Likert: never (0) to more than once a day (4)





Psychometric Properties

Table 16.1 · Reliability and Validity Summary

Type	Finding
Internal consistency	Cronbach's α : .62–.89; McDonald's ω : .81–.96 across subscales
Content validity	Established through literature review, discussion groups, and pilot testing
Concurrent validity	Prevalence rates consistent with previous studies
Criterion validity	Positive correlations with age, pornography consumption, and sexual activity

Measure 17: Image-Based Sexual Abuse Scale (IBSA)

General Information

Description	Measures both victimization and perpetration of two forms of image-based sexual abuse among adolescents: sextortion (threatening to distribute sexual images to pressure the victim) and nonconsensual sexting (distributing sexual images without consent).
Developer(s)	Manuel Gámez-Guadix, Estibaliz Mateos-Pérez, Sebastian Wachs, Michelle Wright, Jone Martínez, Daniel Íncera
Target audience	Adolescents, aged 12–17
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	· Sextortion victimization · Sextortion perpetration · Nonconsensual sexting victimization · Nonconsensual sexting perpetration
Sociocultural context(s)	Spain
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research purposes)



Source

Gámez-Guadix, M. et al. (2022). Assessing image-based sexual abuse: Measurement, prevalence, and temporal stability. *Journal of Adolescence*, 94, 789–799.

Items and Administration

Number of items

12 (3 per subscale)

Response scale

4-point Likert: never (0), 1–2 times (1), 3–4 times (2), 5+ times (3)

Psychometric Properties

Table 17.1 · Internal Consistency

Subscale	Cronbach's α
Sextortion victimization	.91
Sextortion perpetration	.93
Nonconsensual sexting victimization	.65
Nonconsensual sexting perpetration	.76

Table 17.2 · Validity Evidence

Type	Finding
Construct validity	Confirmed through CFA
Concurrent validity	Demonstrated through correlations with sexting, cyberbullying, depression, and anxiety



Measure 18: Condom Use Negotiated Experiences Through Technology (CuNET) Scale

General Information

Description	A unidimensional scale measuring support for using digital sexual communication (sexting) to negotiate condom use among forcibly displaced adolescents. Adapted from the embarrassment about negotiation and condom use subscale of the Multidimensional Condom Attitudes Scale (MCAS).
Developer(s)	Moses Okumu
Target audience	Forcibly displaced adolescents, aged 16–19
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	Single factor: support for text-based condom negotiation
Sociocultural context(s)	Uganda (urban forcibly displaced adolescents)
Cost	Not specified (likely free for research purposes)
Source	Okumu, M. (2020). The Role of Digital Sexual Communication in the Sexual Health of Forcibly Displaced Adolescents Living in Informal Urban Settlements of Kampala Uganda. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Items and Administration

Number of items	5
Response scale	7-point Likert: strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7)



Psychometric Properties

Table 18.1 · Reliability and Validity Summary

Type	Finding
Internal consistency	Cronbach's α = .98; Composite Reliability Index = .98
Construct validity	Confirmed through EFA and CFA
Convergent validity	Average Variance Extracted = .90
Criterion validity	Positively associated with recent condom use



Measure 19: Construction and Validation of Cyber Harassment Experience Scale (CHES)

General Information

Description	A multidimensional scale developed to assess experiences of cyber harassment in young women in Pakistan. Items were generated through focus group discussions, in-depth interviews with victims, and expert consultations with Cybercrime Wing-FIA, judges, lawyers, and NGO specialists.
Developer(s)	Sumaira Ayub & Farah Malik (University of the Punjab)
Target audience	Young women aged 18–30, active internet users with experience of cyber harassment
Data collection format	Self-report
Subscales / constructs	· Unauthorized use of identity information · Use of sexual content · Cyber terrorization · Intimidation
Sociocultural context(s)	Pakistan (urban university students, Lahore)
Cost	Open access (published in open-access journal)
Source	Ayub, S., & Malik, F. (2024). Construction and validation of Cyber Harassment Experience Scale (CHES). <i>Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research</i> , 39(4), 875–894. https://doi.org/10.33824/PJPR.2024.39.4.47

Items and Administration

Number of items	54 (reduced from an initial pool of 69)
Item generation	Items derived from focus groups (n = 8 MPhil/PhD scholars), in-depth interviews with victims, and expert panels (FIA Cybercrime Wing, High Court judges, NGO experts)
Response scale	5-point Likert: Never (1), One or Two Times (2), Sometimes (3), Often (4), Mostly (5)



Psychometric Properties

Table 19.1 · Reliability and Validity Summary

Type	Finding
Internal consistency	Cronbach's $\alpha = .98$ (overall); ranging from .86 to .98 across the four subscales
Construct validity	Established via Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation; 4 factors extracted accounting for 66.74% of total variance
Content validity	Ensured through focus group discussions and in-depth interviews with victims and experts (FIA Cybercrime Wing, judiciary, and NGO specialists). Then a pilot test with 20 university students (19-30 years old).
Sampling adequacy	KMO = .97 (superb); Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: $\chi^2(29171.36)$, $p < .001$



Annex

1. Systematic Literature Search

Search terms related to TF-GBV

1. Cyberbullying
2. Cyberstalking
3. Deepfake pornography
4. Digital economic abuse
5. Digital exposure
6. Digital intimate partner violence
7. Electronic dating violence
8. Gender-based violence
9. Image-based abuse
10. Impersonation
11. Intimate partner violence
12. Online behavior
13. Online grooming
14. Online gender-based violence
15. OGBV
16. Online harm
17. Online harassment
18. Online hate speech (gender-based)
19. Online mental health
20. Online sexual assault
21. Online sexual harassment
22. Online threat
23. Revenge pornography
24. Self-efficacy
25. Sextortion
26. Social media
27. Technology Facilitated Gender-Based Violence
28. TF-GBV
29. Trolling

5. Intimate partner
6. Power
7. Protection
8. Relationship
9. Sexual partner
10. Women

Search Terms related to Physical and Emotional State

1. Anxiety
2. Attitude
3. Construct
4. Control
5. Coping
6. Incidence
7. Injury
8. Protective
9. Self efficacy
10. Self-efficacy
11. Shame
12. Suicidality
13. Vulnerability
14. Humiliation

Search Terms related to Relationships:

1. Attitudes
2. Conflict
3. Consent
4. Gender Relations



Terms for Measurement Tools

1. Scale
2. Measure
3. Survey
4. Psychometric
5. Exposure
6. Identification
7. Self-report
8. Self report
9. Measurement
10. Instrument
11. Questionnaire
12. Index
13. Inventory
14. Assessment
15. Risk
16. Evaluation metric
17. Screening tool
18. Diagnostic measure
19. Rating
20. Checklist
21. Rubric
22. Indicator
23. Scoring system
24. Benchmark tool
25. Profiling instrument
26. Analytical framework



2. Summary of Measures

Theme	Measures of	Scale Name(s)	Paper(s)	Context of validation
Bullying	Cybervictimization; Cyberaggression; Cyberobservation	The Cyberbullying Test	Link here	Spain
Bullying	Cyberbullying behaviors (both perpetration and victimization)	The Cyberbullying Questionnaire (CBQ) The Cyberbullying Questionnaire-Short Form (SBQ-S)	Adolescent version Adult version	USA, Sweden, Spain, Mexico
Bullying	Cyberbullying behaviors (both perpetration and victimization)	Cyber Victim and Bullying Scale (CVBS)	Link here	Turkey
Relationship abuse	Technology-facilitated abuse in relationships	The Technology Abuse Relationships Scale (TAR)	Link here	Australia
Relationship abuse	Technology-facilitated abuse in dating relationships	Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CDAQ-A)	Link here	Spain
Relationship abuse	Technology-facilitated abuse in adolescent dating relationships	Adolescent Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (CARPA)	Link here (Spanish)	Spain
Relationship abuse	Technology-facilitated abuse in dating relationships	Cyber Dating Abuse Scale in Adolescent Dating (ECVPA)	Link here (English)	Spain
Relationship abuse	Technology-facilitated abuse in dating relationships	Intimate Partner Violence expressed through Digital Media Scale (EVIME)	Link here	Mexico
Relationship abuse	Technology-facilitated victimization (control and damage)	Digital Intimate Partner Violence Questionnaire (DIPVQ)	Link here	Peru



Relationship abuse	Technology-facilitated abuse in relationships (psychological effects)	Cyber Psychological Abuse Scale (CPAS)	Link here	USA
Relationship abuse	Technology-facilitated abuse in dating relationships	Modern Adolescent Dating Violence Attitude Scale (MAVDA)	Link here	UK
Sexual violence	Technology-facilitated sexual violence (both perpetration and victimization)	Online Sexual Harassment Scale (OSHS)	Link here	UK
Sexual violence	Protective factors and risk factors associated with technology-facilitated sexual behaviors	Risks and Benefits of Technologised Sexual Practice Scale (RBTSPS)	Link here	Australia
Sexual violence	Technology-facilitated sexual violence (both perpetration and victimization)	Technology-facilitated Sexual Violence Scales (TSVS)	Link here	Spain
Sexual violence	Technology-facilitated sexual violence (both perpetration and victimization)	Peer Sexual Cybervictimization (in Adolescence) Scale	Link here	Spain
Sexual violence (image based)	Sexting (consensual & non-consensual)	Adolescent Sexting Scale (A-SextS)	Link here	Spain
Sexual violence (image based)	Sextortion, non-consensual sexting, revenge pornography	Image-based Sexual Abuse Scale (IBSAS)	Link here	Spain
Sexual violence (condom use)	Technology-facilitated condom use	Condom use Negotiated Experiences through Technology (CuNET) scale	Link here	Uganda



3. Measure Items

Items for Measure 1: The Cyber Bullying Test

1. Have they ever sent you offensive and insulting messages by cellphone or Internet?
2. Have you ever received offensive and insulting calls on your cellphone or by Internet (Skype . . .)?
3. Have you ever been assaulted to tape the assault and hang it on the Internet?
4. Have they ever diffused your private or compromising pictures or videos by Internet or cellphone?
5. Have they ever taken pictures of you without your permission in places such as locker rooms, beaches, or toilets and hung them on the Internet or diffused them by cellphone?
6. Have you ever received anonymous calls to scare or frighten you?
7. Have they ever blackmailed or threatened you with calls or messages?
8. Have they ever harassed you sexually by cellphone or on the Internet?
9. Has anybody ever signed your blog, pretending to be you, making slandering comments, lying, or revealing your secrets?
10. Have they ever stolen your password to prevent your access to your blog or e-mail?
11. Have they ever touched up your photos or videos to diffuse them through social networks or YouTube to humiliate you or make fun of you?
12. Have they ever harassed you to isolate you from your social network contacts?
13. Have they ever blackmailed you, making you do things you did not want to do to prevent them from diffusing your intimate matters on the network?
14. Have they ever threatened to kill you or your family by cellphone, the social networks, or any other type of technology?
15. Have they ever slandered you through the Internet, telling lies about you to discredit you? Have they ever spread rumors about you to harm you?

Items for Measure 2: The Cyberbullying Questionnaire (CBQ)

Adult version (20 items):

1. Your supervisor/colleagues are not responding to your emails or text messages.
2. Your work performance has been commented upon in negative terms on the Internet.
3. Rude messages have been sent to you via digital media.
4. Persistent criticism of your work or performance has been made against you via digital media.
5. Necessary information has been withheld making your work more difficult (e.g. being excluded from email lists).
6. Aggressively worded messages have been sent to you via email, text messages or the like.
7. Threatening personal messages have been sent to you via digital media.
8. Allegations about you have been made on the Internet.
9. Threatening messages about your friends/your family have been sent to you via digital media.
10. Others have commented on the Internet that you should quit your work.



11. Attacks against you as a person, your values or your personal life have been made on digital media.
12. Your computer identity has been hijacked.
13. Gossip or rumors about you have been spread on the Internet.
14. Extracts from your messages have been copied so that the meaning of the original message is distorted.
15. Offensive photos/videos of you have been posted on the Internet.
16. Jokes about you have been spread on the Internet or via e-mail to several recipients.
17. Viruses have intentionally been sent to your e-mail address.
18. Your mistakes or errors at work are repeatedly commented about in emails, text messages, or the like.
19. False statements about you have been spread on the Internet.
20. Colleagues have excluded you from the social community online (e.g. Facebook, Twitter).

Adolescent version:

Perpetration (14 items):

1. Sending threatening or insulting messages
2. Posting or sending humiliating images of classmates
3. Posting links of humiliating images to other people for them to see
4. Writing embarrassing jokes, rumors, gossip, or comments about a classmate on the Internet
5. Posting or sending links with rumors, gossip, etc. about a classmate to other people so they can read them
6. Hacking to send messages by e-mail or social networks that could make trouble for the other person
7. Recording a video or taking pictures by cell phone while a group laughs and forces another person to do something humiliating or ridiculous
8. Posting or sending these images to be seen by other people
9. Recording a video or taking pictures by cell phone while someone hits or hurts another person
10. Posting or sending these images to be seen by other people
11. Broadcasting online other people's secrets, compromising information, or images
12. Deliberately excluding someone from an online group
13. Recording a video or taking cell phone pictures of classmates performing some type of behavior of a sexual nature
14. Hanging or sending these images to be seen by other people

Victimization (9 items):

1. Receiving threatening or insulting messages
2. Posting on the Internet or sending humiliating images of me
3. Writing embarrassing jokes, rumors, gossip, or comments about me on the Internet



4. Hacking me to send messages by e-mail or social networks that could be troublesome for me
5. Recording a video or taking pictures by cell phone while a group laughs and forces me to do something humiliating or ridiculous
6. Recording a video or taking pictures by cell phone while someone hits or hurts me
7. Broadcasting online secrets, compromising information or images about me
8. Deliberately excluding me from an online group
9. Recording a video or taking cell phone pictures of me performing some type of behavior of a sexual nature

Items for Measure 3: Cyber Victim and Bullying Scale (CVBS)

The full list of 22 items is not provided in the published paper. The paper mentions that the scale includes items related to cyber verbal bullying, hiding identity, and cyber forgery, but does not disclose the specific wording of all items.

Items for Measure 4: Technology-facilitated Abuse in Relationships (TAR)

The full list of 30 items is not provided in the paper. The authors only include a sample of items for each factor, listed below:

Humiliation (10 items):

1. Signed me onto a pornography site without my permission
2. Started a social networking page for posting negative information about me
3. Threatened to distribute nude image(s) of me
4. Told me on a digital device to harm myself
5. Edited a photo or video of me in an offensive manner and sent it to me
6. Threatened on a digital device to physically hurt me
7. Changed an aspect of my online profile without my permission
8. Posted something negative through my account without my permission
9. Threatened on a digital device to physically hurt my family or friends
10. Shared a hurtful meme about me on a digital device

Monitoring and Control (7 items):

1. Made me remove or add contact(s) on my digital device
2. Made me stop interacting with another person(s) on my digital device
3. Pressured me to share my password(s) with them
4. Made me disclose digital conversation(s) I've had with another person(s) to them
5. Checked to see who I was communicating with on my digital device in a way that made me feel uncomfortable
6. Logged onto my digital device without my permission
7. Monitored where I am via tracking software

Sexual Coercion (8 items):

1. Pressured me to send nude image(s) of myself
2. Pressured me on a digital device to send sexually explicit messages



3. Pressured me to engage in phone sex
4. Pressured me on a digital device to engage in sexual acts
5. Pressured me on a digital device to discuss sexual issues
6. Pressured me to engage in sexual activity via live video
7. Sent me unwelcome nude images
8. Shared a nude photo or video of me without my permission

Threats (5 items):

1. Sent me threatening messages on a digital device
2. Threatened on a digital device to emotionally hurt me
3. Threatened on a digital device to damage things that are important to me
4. Made me feel threatened if I ignored their calls or messages
5. Threatened on a digital device to physically hurt themselves if I didn't do what they wanted

Items for Measure 5: Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CDAQ-A)

1. Spreading rumors, gossip and/or jokes through new technologies with the intention of ridiculing
2. Threats through new technologies to physically harm
3. Creating a fake profile on a social network to cause problems
4. Spreading secrets and/or compromised information using new technologies
5. Threatening to spread secrets or embarrassing information using new technologies
6. Writing a comment on the wall of a social network to insult or humiliate
7. Using new technologies to pretend to be me/my (ex) partner and create problems
8. Sending and/or uploading photos, images and/or videos with intimate or sexual content without permission
9. Pretending to be another person using new technologies to test a partner
10. Posting music, poems, phrases... on a social networking site with the intent to insult or humiliate
11. Sending insulting and/or demeaning messages using new technologies
12. Controlling friends on social networks
13. Using new technologies to control where you are/I am and with whom
14. Checking a partner's mobile phone without permission
15. Checking social networks, Whatsapp, or email without permission
16. Excessive calls to control where you are/I am and with whom
17. Controlling status updates on social networks
18. Checking the last connection in mobile applications
19. Using passwords (phone, social networking, email) to browse messages and/or contacts without permission
20. Threatening to answer calls or messages immediately using new technologies

Each item consists of two parallel questions: one for victimization and one for perpetration. For example, an item might be phrased like this:



- Victimization: "My partner or former partner made a comment on a wall of a social network to insult or humiliate me"
- Perpetration: "I wrote a comment on the wall of a social network to insult or humiliate my partner or former partner"

Participants are meant to answer using a 6-point Likert scale: 1 (never) 2 (not in the last year, but it occurred before) 3 (rarely: 1 or 2 times) 4 (sometimes: between 3 and 10 times) 5 (often: between 10 and 20 times) 6 (always: more than 20 times).

Items for Measure 6: Adolescent Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (CARPA)

Direct Online

14. Threatening to cause physical harm through a mobile phone or the internet
15. Creating a fake social media profile of the partner to cause problems
16. Sharing secrets and/or sensitive information about the partner online
17. Threatening via mobile or internet to disclose secrets or sensitive information about the partner
18. Using a mobile phone or the internet to impersonate the partner and cause problems
19. Sending insulting and/or humiliating messages to the partner via mobile phone or internet
20. Sending and/or posting photos, images, and/or videos of sexual content about the partner to others without their consent
21. Spreading rumors, gossip, and/or jokes online about the partner with the intent to ridicule them

Offline Verbal

1. Insulting
2. Threatening face-to-face to cause harm
3. Criticizing in public or private
4. Blaming the partner for problems or during arguments
5. Belittling or criticizing something the partner liked

Offline Control

5. Controlling or trying to prevent the partner from doing something they wanted through comments
6. Trying to isolate the partner from their friends
7. Discouraging the partner from having hobbies that are not shared
8. Making it difficult for the partner to go somewhere or talk to someone

Online Control

16. Using the partner's passwords (phone, social media, email) to snoop on their messages and/or contacts without permission
17. Using a mobile phone or the internet to track where the partner has been and with whom
18. Calling excessively to check where the partner was and with whom



Physical/Sexual

3. Throwing an object to cause harm
4. Hitting or pulling hair
5. Pushing
6. Kissing or touching without the partner's consent

Items for Measure 7: Cyber-Violence Scale in Adolescent Couples (CIB-VPA or ECVPA)

Cyber-Victimization Sub-scale

1. My partner gets angry if he/she sees that I am online, and I don't answer him/her right away.
2. My partner is aware of whether I am online on my mobile or connected to social networks.
3. My partner doesn't let me chat with some friends and gets angry if I do.
4. He/she has made me delete or block friends from my social networks or from my mobile phone so that I have no contact with them.
5. My partner has made me delete comments, photos, or videos of me on social networks because they made him/her jealous.
6. He/she has told rumors or lies about me on social networks.
7. My partner has insulted or threatened me privately.
8. He/she has told me that if I break up with him/her, he/she will say or post personal things about me on social networks.
9. My partner has made public comments about me on the Internet or in WhatsApp groups that have made me feel bad.
10. My partner has sent or uploaded to social networks without my permission photos, videos, or messages of me that I did not want people to see.

Cyber-Perpetration Sub-scale

1. I get angry if I see that my boy/girlfriend is online and doesn't answer me right away.
2. I am aware of whether my boy/girlfriend is online, on the mobile phone, or connected to social networks.
3. I don't let him/her chat with some friends, and if he/she does, I get angry and make him/her feel bad.
4. I made him/her delete or block friends from his/her networks or mobile phone, so that he/she doesn't have contact with them.
5. I get jealous about his/her comments, photos, or videos in social networks, and I make him/her delete them.
6. I have spread rumors or lies about my girl/boyfriend in social networks.
7. I have insulted or threatened my girl/boyfriend privately.
8. I have told him/her that, if he/she breaks up with me, I will say or publish his/her personal things on social networks.
9. I have made public comments about my boy/girlfriend on the Internet and in WhatsApp groups that have made him/her feel bad.



10. I have sent or uploaded to social networks photos, videos or messages that he/she did not want people to see without his/her permission.

Both sub-scales include two factors:

- Cyber-control: items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5
- Cyber-aggression: items 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10

Items for Measure 8: Intimate Partner Violence expressed through Digital Media Scale (EVIME)

Initial 48 items:

1. Threatens me if I don't send a photo of myself by email in which I appear naked or in a suggestive pose
2. Sends me photos with sexual content through social media despite me not wanting to receive them
3. Sends me text messages pressuring me to have sex
4. Sends me photos electronically in which they appear naked, even though I don't want to receive them
5. Sends me emails pressuring me to have sex, despite me not wanting to
6. Sends me messages through electronic means requesting sexual acts, even though they know I don't want to
7. Posts photos or other images of me on social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo) that are private and embarrassing
8. Sends me threatening text messages
9. Takes private videos of me and sends them to their friends without my consent
10. Uses my social media accounts without my permission
11. Sends me text messages that make me feel scared
12. Writes unpleasant things about me on social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
13. Created a social media profile about me (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo) that bothers me
14. Posts information on social media that makes me feel insecure
15. Makes me feel afraid when I don't answer their phone calls
16. Sends me messages through my phone that make me feel insecure
17. Threatens me with physical harm via email
18. Spreads rumors about me using email
19. Sends me emails that make me feel insecure
20. Uses the information I post on my social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo) to make me feel bad
21. Makes me feel afraid when I don't respond to their posts on my social media profile (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
22. Threatens me if I don't send them a photo of myself naked or in a suggestive pose via my phone
23. Threatens me with physical harm via text messages



24. Manipulates me through social media
25. Pressures me to send them a photo of myself naked or in a suggestive pose.
26. Tries to isolate me from my friends on social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
27. Threatens me with physical harm through social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
28. Forces me to reject friend requests on social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
29. Checks my email without my permission
30. Monitors the activities I do on social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
31. Demands that I make a video call to prove where I am
32. Asks me to use a GPS tracker on my phone to know my whereabouts
33. Checks my phone without my permission
34. Pressures me via social media to have sex, even though I don't want to
35. Demands that I give them the passwords to my electronic accounts to know who I communicate with
36. Threatens me if I don't send them a photo of myself naked or in a suggestive pose via social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
37. Forces me to exchange erotic or sexual videos/photos as proof of love
38. Posts videos or photos of us engaging in erotic or sexual activities without my consent
39. Posts offensive nicknames about me
40. Prohibits me from contacting friends of the opposite sex through social media
41. Sends me sexual content via phone, even though I don't want to receive it
42. Manipulates me through social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
43. Threatens me with physical harm via phone calls
44. Spreads rumors about me via social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
45. Spreads rumors about me using my phone
46. Sends me sexist or feminist insults via electronic means
47. Offends me through social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
48. Checks my social media accounts without my permission (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)

32 items total for the factorial scale across the five subscales. Distribution of items across factors:

Control, Intrusive Monitoring, and Cyber Surveillance (Original items numbers: 28, 40, 30, 48, 26, 33, 35, 29, 42, 10)

1. Forces me to reject friend requests on social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
2. Prohibits me from contacting friends of the opposite sex through social media



3. Monitors the activities I do on social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
4. Checks my social media accounts without my permission (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
5. Tries to isolate me from my friends on social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
6. Checks my phone without my permission
7. Demands that I give them the passwords to my electronic accounts to know who I communicate with
8. Checks my email without my permission
9. Manipulates me through social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
10. Uses my social media accounts without my permission

Verbal Aggression (Original items numbers: 23, 17, 27, 8, 43, 39, 12, 13, 47, 14, 11)

11. Threatens me with physical harm via text messages
12. Threatens me with physical harm via email
13. Threatens me with physical harm through social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
14. Sends me threatening text messages
15. Threatens me with physical harm via phone calls
16. Posts offensive nicknames about me
17. Writes unpleasant things about me on social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
18. Created a social media profile about me (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo) that bothers me
19. Offends me through social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
20. Posts information on social media that makes me feel insecure
21. Sends me text messages that make me feel scared

Sexual Aggression (Original items numbers: 2, 4, 3, 38, 5)

22. Sends me photos with sexual content through social media despite me not wanting to receive them
23. Sends me photos electronically in which they appear naked, even though I don't want to receive them
24. Sends me text messages pressuring me to have sex
25. Posts videos or photos of us engaging in erotic or sexual activities without my consent
26. Sends me emails pressuring me to have sex, despite me not wanting to

Sexual Coercion (Original items numbers: 36, 25, 37)

27. Threatens me if I don't send them a photo of myself naked or in a suggestive pose via social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)



28. Pressures me to send them a photo of myself naked or in a suggestive pose
29. Forces me to exchange erotic or sexual videos/photos as proof of love

Humiliation (Original items: 44, 45, 46)

30. Spreads rumors about me via social media (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, or Badoo)
31. Spreads rumors about me using my phone
32. Sends me sexist or feminist insults via electronic means

Items for Measure 9: Digital Intimate Partner Violence Questionnaire (DIPVQ)

Control-Centered Cyberabuse (5 items):

1. He/she has used your email, phone, or social networks without permission pretending it was you (originally number 4).
2. He/she calls or texts you 10, 20, or 30 times in an afternoon to know your location (originally number 12).
3. He/she has forbidden you from using the Internet or your cell phone (originally number 15).
4. He/she has sent messages via the Internet to your friends or acquaintances to cause problems (originally number 17).
5. He/she tries to figure out your secret passwords, log in through the security questions, or access when you leave your session open (originally number 18).

Damage-Centered Cyberabuse (7 items):

1. He/she has threatened you with sharing your personal information (email, messages, and intimate photos) with other people (originally number 1).
2. He/she has sent you disturbing videos or photos of sexual content by cell phone or the Internet (originally number 3).
3. He/she threatens you with disclosing secrets if you do not agree to do what he or she asks for (originally number 6).
4. He/she has spread or published intimate photos or videos where you appeared without asking permission. (originally number 8).
5. He/she has used your email or social network accounts to buy things without your permission (originally number 9).
6. He/she has threatened or pressured you to obtain your photos or videos with sexual content (originally number 13).
7. He/she has sent you messages by cell phone or the Internet to ask for sex, even knowing you do not like when he or she does that (originally number 16).

Eliminated items (8 items):

1. He/she has accessed your email accounts, social networks, or registered your mobile without permission to control who you talk to.
2. He/she has used the social networks (Facebook, Tuenti, Twitter) to send you unpleasant messages.



3. He/she calls you with a hidden number to control what you do.
4. He/she has used social networks to gather information about your activities to harass or annoy you.
5. You feel afraid of not responding his or her calls or messages because he or she can harm you.
6. He/she has published rumors or false offensive information about you on the Internet.
7. He/she checks all your uploaded photos or videos to social networks to make sure you do not lie or cheat him or her.
8. He/she demands to know your access passwords of your email, cell phone, and/or social networks.

Items for Measure 10: Cyber Psychological Abuse Scale (CPAS)

- Minor cyber abuse (6 items: 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8)
- Severe cyber abuse (3 items: 4, 5 and 9)

1a. Have you used capital letters to “shout” at your partner in an email, instant message, text message, or on a social networking site?

1b. Has your partner used capital letters to “shout” at you in an email, instant message, text message, or on a social networking site?

2a. Have you insulted your partner in an email, instant message, text message, or on a social networking site?

2b. Has your partner insulted you in an email, instant message, text message, or on a social networking site?

3a. Have you abruptly stopped emailing, instant messaging, or text messaging your partner during a disagreement?

3b. Has your partner abruptly stopped emailing, instant messaging, or text messaging during a disagreement?

4a. Have you posted inappropriate pictures or embarrassing information online to humiliate your partner?

4b. Has your partner posted inappropriate pictures or embarrassing information online to humiliate you?

5a. Have you threatened to harm your partner in an email, instant message, text message, or on a social networking site?

5b. Has your partner threatened to harm you in an email, instant message, text message, or on a social networking site?

6a. Have you sworn at your partner in an email, instant message, text message, or on a social networking site?

6b. Has your partner sworn at you in an email, instant message, text message, or on a social networking site?

7a. Have you called your partner names in an email, instant message, text message, or on a social networking site?



7b. Has your partner called you names in an email, instant message, text message, or on a social networking site?

8a. Have you kept tabs on your partner by checking their email messages, messages on their cell phone, or inbox on a social networking site?

8b. Has your partner kept tabs on you by checking your email messages, messages on your cell phone, or inbox messages on a social networking site?

9a. Have you sent an email to others about your partner in order to hurt or embarrass your partner?

9b. Has your partner sent an email about you to others in order to hurt or embarrass you?

Items for Measure 11: Modern Adolescent Dating Violence Attitude Scale (MADVA)

Attitudes Towards Sexual Abuse (Offline)

1. If a girl agrees to go over to a guy's house, then she is showing him that she is willing to have sex.
2. In a relationship, a girl should give the guy what he wants sexually, even if she doesn't feel like it at the time.
3. It's okay for guys to pressure their girlfriends into doing sexual things, that's just how it works these days.
4. When a guy forces his girlfriend to have sex with him, it shouldn't be considered rape because they are in a relationship.
5. When a girl invites a guy she recently met over to her house, she's signaling to him that she wants to have sex.
6. It's okay for a guy to expect something sexual in return if he's been making an effort to be nice to a girl and giving her lots of attention.
7. It's okay for a guy to make a girl do certain sexual things, even if she's acting shy or like she might not want to.
8. There is nothing wrong with a girl giving a guy what he wants sexually so that he treats her better in the relationship.

Attitudes Towards Sexual Abuse (Online)

9. There is nothing wrong with a guy pretending to like a girl online so that he can convince her to send him nude pictures.
10. If a girl has been flirting with a guy online, it's okay for him to expect some sexual messages or images in return.
11. Girls nowadays overreact and complain for no real reason about guys sending them unwanted sexual pictures online.
12. Guys sending unwanted sexual pictures of themselves to girls online is just them trying their luck and it doesn't really harm anyone.
13. It's okay for a guy to force his girlfriend to do sexual things on camera if they are in a relationship.
14. Girls who complain about guys sharing their naked pictures online are partially to blame too for sending them in the first place.



15. Forcing girls to send naked pictures or videos online is just a normal part of dating these days—pretty much all guys do it.
16. When guys pressure girls for naked pictures and sex chat online, it's just their way of showing that they're interested in her.

Attitudes Towards Physical Abuse (Offline)

17. If a girl is talking to other guys online, her boyfriend is justified in pushing her around until he gets an explanation.
18. If a girl is openly flirting with other guys online, her boyfriend can't be blamed for being violent towards her.
19. Girls complain too much these days about guys being physically aggressive with them when it's usually just meant as a joke.
20. As long as it doesn't go beyond a push or shove, sometimes guys are justified in using force against their girlfriends.
21. Sometimes issues with anger mean that a young guy cannot stop himself from hitting his girlfriend, even if he wanted to.
22. Young guys don't hit their girlfriends unless they did something serious to deserve it.
23. There is nothing wrong with a guy who has been cheated on hitting his girlfriend.
24. There are some occasions when it's okay for a guy to hit a girl.

Attitudes Towards Psychological Abuse (Offline)

25. It's not a big deal if a guy threatens to end the relationship to get his girlfriend to do what he wants.
26. There is nothing wrong with a guy humiliating his girlfriend in front of her friends if he thinks she did something to deserve it.
27. Some guys threaten and shout at their girlfriends, but it shouldn't be made into a big deal unless it gets physical.
28. It's okay for guys to say hurtful things to make their girlfriends feel bad as it doesn't cause any real harm.
29. Guys often insult their girlfriends or use put-downs - it's just something that happens in relationships and shouldn't be made into a big deal.
30. There is nothing wrong with a guy making his girlfriend feel bad so that he can get her attention.
31. There is nothing wrong with a guy making his girlfriend feel worthless if he thinks she is bad-mouthing him to others.
32. A guy shouldn't be judged for bringing up something from his girlfriend's past to deliberately make her upset as long as he says sorry after.

Attitudes Towards Psychological Abuse (Online)

33. If a guy suspects his girlfriend is talking to other guys online, he's justified in making her feel worthless.
34. It's okay for a guy to bad-mouth and insult a girl he's dating, if she's commenting on other guys' pictures online.



35. Guys have a right to 'slut shame' their girlfriends for talking to other guys online, even if they are just friends.
36. It's okay for guys to flirt with other girls online in view of their girlfriends—it's harmless as long as they don't do it in person.
37. When guys insult their girlfriends online, it shouldn't be made into a big deal as it's only a bit of fun and doesn't cause any real harm.
38. It's okay for a guy to stop his girlfriend from talking to people he doesn't approve of on social media.
39. A guy is justified in calling his girlfriend a slut online if she's constantly liking other guys' pictures.
40. It's okay for a guy to insult or embarrass his girlfriend on social media as long as he doesn't do it to her in person.

Attitudes Towards Controlling Behaviour (Offline)

41. In a relationship, guys have a right to say who their girlfriends can and can't talk to.
42. If a guy suspects his girlfriend is cheating, then it's okay for him to stop her from using social media.
43. Girls should accept that their boyfriends have a right to say who they can and can't spend time with.
44. It's okay for a guy to stop his girlfriend from wearing something he doesn't approve of – they're in a relationship after all.
45. It's okay for a guy to have his girlfriend's social media passwords to check who she is talking to online.
46. In a relationship, it's okay for a guy to control how his girlfriend spends her money.
47. Girls complain too much these days about their boyfriends being too controlling when usually it's just them being protective.
48. In a relationship, a guy has the right to control some parts of his girlfriend's life.

Items for Measure 12: Online Sexual Harassment Scale (OSHS)

The scale has a total of 12 items, divided into two subscales that are measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (0=Never, 1=Once or Twice, 2=A few times, 3=Often, 4=All the time):

- Gender harassment (5 items)
 - Unwanted sexual attention (7 items)
1. Have you been sent an **unwanted** message propositioning you for sex?*
 2. Have you received an **unwanted** explicit sexual message or text?*
 3. Received an **unwanted** message with a sexual comment? (e.g "you make me aroused", "are you horny?")*
 4. Posted a picture on social media and then had someone leave a sexual comment about your body
 5. You were sent an offensive sexist message
 6. Felt pressure to share a naked picture of yourself with someone
 7. Been sent an unwanted sext from someone?



8. Had someone send you an **unwanted** explicit photo of an intimate part of their body (e.g. penis, breasts etc)*
9. Someone sent you a message with a negative comment about your gender or sexual orientation. (e.g "get back to the kitchen", "you are so gay")
10. Had someone leave a public sexist comment about your general appearance on social media? (e.g "you look so pretty", "you have such a hot body")
11. Been asked for any sexual favors?
12. Received a private message from someone commenting on the way you look which made you feel uncomfortable?

***Bold Items:** Survey feedback suggested that these items should have the word unwanted added for final scale clarity.

Items for Measure 13: Risks and Benefits of Technologised Sexual Practice Scale (RBTSPS)

Sexual gratification:

1. I find it sexually gratifying or exciting to share explicit text messages with someone I have met online.
2. I find it sexually gratifying or exciting to receive erotic or sexual images from someone I have met online.
3. I find it sexually gratifying or exciting to share erotic or sexual images of myself with someone I have met online.
4. I find it sexually gratifying or exciting to have sex online via a webcam with another person(s).

Connection:

1. I feel emotionally connected to my partner(s) because of our online communication.
2. Connecting with someone online helps me to develop a closer connection with them.
3. I feel as emotionally connected with someone when communicating online as I do in 'real life'.
4. I feel more sexually connected to my partner(s) because of our online communication.
5. I feel that I can be more honest with someone online than in person.

Access to information and culture:

1. Information I have found online has helped me feel more comfortable about sex.
2. The Internet has enabled me to explore sexual cultures I did not have access to previously.
3. Thanks to the Internet, I have tried new things in my sex life.
4. I have used the Internet to find information about sex that has improved my sexual experiences.

Risks:

Concerns (about sharing explicit content):



1. Sharing sexually explicit or naked images or videos with someone could cause me embarrassment.
2. Sharing sexually explicit or naked images or videos with someone could cause me problems in the workplace.
3. Sharing sexually explicit or naked images or videos with someone could cause me problems with friends or family.
4. Sharing sexually explicit or naked images or videos with someone could cause me legal problems.

Worries (about privacy):

1. I worry that if I search for pornography online my search history will be seen by others.
2. I worry that my friends or family will find out if I purchase sex toys online.
3. I worry about giving my personal contact details to companies if I purchase sex toys online.
4. I worry that my data will be hacked if I purchase sex products online.

Knowledge of rights and ownership:

1. Sharing explicit or naked images or videos of myself online or via text means I no longer have control over where that images or video appears.
2. Sharing explicit or naked images or videos of other people risks criminal prosecution.
3. Sharing explicit or naked images or videos could potentially lead me to lose my job.
4. Uploading sexually explicit or naked images or videos to a website means that website owns that image/video.
5. Sharing explicit or naked images or videos of myself to a website means I have no right to ask for that image/video to be removed.

Items for Measure 14: Technology-Facilitated Sexual Violence (TFSV) Scales

Technology-Facilitated Sexual Violence Perpetration

Online gender-based violence items

- Online gender role-based violence:
 1. You have insulted a woman for looking “too masculine” or doing “manly things.”
 2. You have made fun of a woman for looking “too masculine” or doing “manly things.”
 3. You have humiliated, belittled, or made a woman feel inferior for looking “too masculine” or doing “manly things.”
 4. You have discriminated against a woman or excluded a woman from an online group, forum, or chat for looking “too masculine” or doing “manly things.”
- Online physical appearance-based violence:
 1. You have insulted a woman because of her physical appearance.
 2. You have made fun of a woman because of her physical appearance.
 3. You have humiliated, belittled, or made a woman feel inferior because of her physical appearance.



4. You have discriminated against a woman or excluded a woman from an online group, forum, or chat because of her physical appearance.
- Online anti-feminism violence:
 1. You have insulted a woman for expressing or defending feminist issues.
 2. You have made fun of a woman for expressing or defending feminist issues.
 3. You have humiliated, belittled, or made a woman feel inferior for expressing or defending feminist issues.
 4. You have discriminated against a woman or excluded a woman from an online group, forum, or chat for expressing or defending feminist issues.

Online gender and sexuality-based violence items

- Online sexual orientation-based violence:
 1. You have insulted someone for being homosexual, bisexual, asexual, or non-heterosexual.
 2. You have made fun of someone for being homosexual, bisexual, asexual, or non-heterosexual.
 3. You have humiliated, belittled, or made someone feel inferior for being homosexual, bisexual, asexual, or non-heterosexual.
 4. You have discriminated against someone or excluded someone from an online group, forum, or chat for being homosexual, bisexual, asexual, or non-heterosexual.
- Online gender identity-based violence perpetration:
 1. You have insulted someone for being trans.
 2. You have made fun of someone for being trans.
 3. You have humiliated, belittled, or made someone feel inferior for being trans.
 4. You have discriminated against someone or excluded someone from an online group, forum, or chat for being trans.

Digital sexual harassment

1. You have made sexual comments to someone that you believe they did not want to receive.
2. You have asked someone sexual questions to someone that you believe they did not want to answer.
3. You have insisted that someone send you sexual content (photos or videos) that you believe they did not want to send.
4. You have insisted that someone answer sexual questions that you believe they did not want to answer.
5. You have sent someone sexual content (photos or videos) of yourself that you believe they did not want to receive.

Nonconsensual pornography items



1. You have shown someone sexual content (photos or videos) of another person without their consent.
2. You have posted sexual content (photos or videos) of another person without their consent.
3. You have forwarded sexual content (photos or videos) of another person without their consent.
4. You have taken photos/videos of a person without their consent.

Online sexual coercion items

1. You have threatened someone with showing their sexual content (photos or videos) to another person.
2. You have threatened someone with publishing their sexual content (photos or videos).
3. You have threatened someone with forwarding their sexual content (photos or videos).
4. You have threatened someone with telling others on the internet about his/her sexual intimacy.

Technology-Facilitated Sexual Violence Victimization

Online gender-based violence items

- Online gender role-based violence:
 1. Someone has insulted you for looking “too masculine” or doing “manly things.”
 2. Someone has made fun of you for looking “too masculine” or doing “manly things.”
 3. Someone has humiliated, belittled, or made you feel inferior for looking “too masculine” or doing “manly things.”
 4. Someone has discriminated against you or excluded you from an online group, forum, or chat for looking “too masculine” or doing “manly things.”
- Online physical appearance-based violence:
 1. Someone has insulted you because of your physical appearance.
 2. Someone has made fun of you because of your physical appearance.
 3. Someone has humiliated, belittled, or made you feel inferior because of your physical appearance.
 4. Someone has discriminated against you or excluded you from an online group, forum, or chat because of your physical appearance.
- Online anti-feminism violence:
 1. Someone has insulted you for expressing or defending feminist issues.
 2. Someone has made fun of you for expressing or defending issues feminist issues.
 3. Someone has humiliated, belittled, or made you feel inferior for expressing or defending feminist issues.
 4. Someone has discriminated against you or excluded you from an online group, forum, or chat for expressing or defending feminist issues.



Online gender and sexuality-based violence items

- Online sexual orientation-based violence:
 5. Someone has insulted you for being homosexual, bisexual, asexual, or non-heterosexual.
 6. Someone has made fun of you for being homosexual, bisexual, asexual, or non-heterosexual.
 7. Someone has humiliated, belittled, or made you feel inferior for being homosexual, bisexual, asexual, or non-heterosexual.
 8. Someone has discriminated against you or excluded you from an online group, forum, or chat for being homosexual, bisexual, asexual, or non-heterosexual.
- Online gender identity-based violence perpetration:
 1. Someone has insulted you for being trans.
 2. Someone has made fun of you for being trans.
 3. Someone has humiliated, belittled, or made you feel inferior for being trans.
 4. Someone has discriminated against you or excluded you from an online group, forum, or chat for being trans.

Digital sexual harassment

1. Someone has made sexual comments at you that you did not want to receive.
2. Someone has asked you sexual questions that you did not want to receive.
3. Someone has insisted that you send sexual content (photos or videos) that you did not want to send.
4. Someone has insisted that you answer sexual questions that you did not want to answer.
5. Someone has sent you sexual content (photos or videos) of them that you did not want to receive.

Nonconsensual pornography items

1. Someone has shown someone else sexual content of you (photos or videos) without your consent.
2. Someone has posted sexual content of you (photos or videos) on the internet without your consent.
3. Someone has forwarded sexual content of you (photos or videos) without your consent.
4. Someone has taken sexual photos/videos of you without your consent.

Online sexual coercion items

1. You have been threatened with showing sexual content of yours (photos or videos) to another person.
2. You have been threatened with publishing sexual content of yours (photos or videos).
3. You have been threatened with forwarding sexual content of yours (photos or videos).



4. You have been threatened with telling someone on the internet about your sexual intimacy.

Items for Measure 15: Peer Sexual Cybervictimization Scale (Adolescents)

Ambiguous Sexual Cybervictimization (ASCV):

1. Made sexual comments, jokes or gestures towards you on your social networking profile or via WhatsApp
2. Shown, given or left you sexual pictures, photographs or remarks
3. Written you sexual messages or shown sexual drawings
4. Talked about sex with you over the Internet

Personal Sexual Cybervictimization (PSCV):

1. Made jokes or spread false rumors about your sexual behaviors on your social networking profile or via WhatsApp
2. Called you a queer, lesbian, prostitute, homosexual, etc., on your social networking profile or via WhatsApp
3. Shown you their behind or other parts of the body via photos
4. Hinted or asked that you send photos of a naked part of your body
5. Sent or shown you a personal photo of a provocative nature or showing a part of the body

Items for Measure 16: Adolescent Sexting Scale (A-SextS)

1. Sent a sexy text to boyfriend/girlfriend
2. Sent a sexy text to someone known in person
3. Sent a sexy text to someone known only on the internet
4. Sent a sexy audio to boyfriend/girlfriend
5. Sent a sexy audio to someone known in person
6. Sent a sexy audio to someone known only on the internet
7. Sent naked image/video to boyfriend/girlfriend
8. Sent naked image/video to someone known in person
9. Sent naked image/video to someone known only on the internet
10. Sent underwear image/video to boyfriend/girlfriend
11. Sent underwear image/video to someone known in person
12. Sent underwear image/video to someone known only on the internet
13. Sent dressed image/video to boyfriend/girlfriend
14. Sent dressed image/video to someone known in person
15. Sent dressed image/video to someone known only on the internet
16. Sent a sexy image/video of other people to boyfriend/girlfriend
17. Sent a sexy image/video of other people to someone known in person
18. Sent a sexy image/video of other people to someone known only on the internet
19. Posted a sexy text
20. Posted naked image/video
21. Posted underwear image/video



22. Posted dressed image/video
23. Streamed naked video
24. Streamed underwear video
25. Streamed dressed video
26. Sexy voice calls with boyfriend/girlfriend
27. Sexy voice calls with someone known in person
28. Sexy voice calls with someone known only on the internet
29. Naked video call with boyfriend/girlfriend
30. Naked video call with someone known in person
31. Naked video call with someone known only on the internet
32. Underwear video call with boyfriend/girlfriend
33. Underwear video call with someone known in person
34. Underwear video call with someone known only on the internet
35. Dressed video call with boyfriend/girlfriend
36. Dressed video call with someone known in person
37. Dressed video call with someone known only on the internet
38. Asked for a sexy text to boyfriend/girlfriend
39. Asked for a sexy text to someone known in person
40. Asked for a sexy text to someone known only on the internet
41. Asked for a sexy audio to boyfriend/girlfriend
42. Asked for a sexy audio to someone known in person
43. Asked for a sexy audio to someone known only on the internet
44. Asked for naked image/video to boyfriend/girlfriend
45. Asked for naked image/video to someone known in person
46. Asked for naked image/video to someone known only on the internet
47. Asked for underwear image/video to boyfriend/girlfriend
48. Asked for underwear image/video to someone known in person
49. Asked for underwear image/video to someone known only on the internet
50. Asked for dressed image/video to boyfriend/girlfriend
51. Asked for dressed image/video to someone known in person
52. Asked for dressed image/video to someone known only on the internet
53. Asked for a sexy voice call to boyfriend/girlfriend
54. Asked for a sexy voice call to someone known in person
55. Asked for a sexy voice call to someone known only on the internet
56. Asked for a sexy video call to boyfriend/girlfriend
57. Asked for a sexy video call to someone known in person
58. Asked for a sexy video call to someone known only on the internet
59. Refused to send sexy contents to boyfriend/girlfriend
60. Refused to send sexy contents to someone known in person
61. Refused to send sexy contents to someone known only on the internet
62. Received a sexy content from boyfriend/girlfriend
63. Received a sexy content from someone known in person
64. Received a sexy content from someone known only on the internet



Items for Measure 17: Image-based Sexual Abuse Scale (IBSAS)

Sextortion Victimization:

1. You have been threatened to show a sexual image of yourself to another person.
2. You have been threatened to post a sexual image of you on the internet.
3. You have been threatened to resend a sexual image of you.

Sextortion Perpetration:

1. You have threatened someone by showing a sexual image of him/her to another person.
2. You have threatened someone by posting a sexual image of him/her on the internet.
3. You have threatened someone to forward a sexual image of him/her.

Nonconsensual Sexting Victimization:

1. Someone has shown another person a sexual image of you (photos or videos) without your consent.
2. Someone has posted a sexual image of you (photos or videos) on the internet without your consent.
3. Someone has forwarded a sexual image of you (photos or videos) without your consent.

Nonconsensual Sexting Perpetration:

1. You have shown someone a sexual image (photos or videos) of another person without his/her consent.
2. You have posted a sexual image (photos or videos) of another person on the internet without his/her consent.
3. You have forwarded a sexual image (photos or videos) of another person without his/her consent.

Items for Measure 18: Condom use Negotiated Experiences through Technology (CuNET) scale

Items:

1. While sexting, I am not embarrassed to suggest using condoms to my partner
2. While sexting, it is really easy to bring up issues of using condoms to my partner
3. While sexting, it is easy to suggest to my partner that we use a condom
4. While sexting, I am comfortable talking about condoms with my partner
5. While sexting, I know what to say to my partner when I want to talk about condoms or other protections

Suggested Presentation: The items should be presented with a 7-point Likert scale response format:

1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Somewhat disagree 4 = Neither agree nor disagree 5 = Somewhat agree 6 = Agree 7 = Strongly agree

