JSPR

Article

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships
1–19

DOI: 10.1177/0265407520907159
journals.sagepub.com/home/spr
SAGE

Cyber dating abuse: Assessment, prevalence, and relationship with offline violence in young Chileans

Laura Lara
Universidad Autónoma de Chile, Chile

Abstract

The aims of the present study were to (1) adapt and validate the Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CDAQ) for young Chileans and (2) provide data on the prevalence of cyber dating abuse in young Chileans. As a sample, 1,538 Chilean high school and university students (14–24 years old) participated in the study (59.8% females). Results showed that the CDAQ had an adequate fit with the original correlated four-factor model as well as with a second-order factor model that considered the four scales as primary factors of two secondary factors: victimization (control and aggression from the victimization perspective) and perpetration (control and aggression from the perpetrator's perspective). Reliability analysis also showed that the questionnaire presented satisfactory values for internal consistency. Scores on the CDAQ were positively correlated with traditional forms of assessing dating violence, providing new evidences of validity. Prevalence data showed cyber dating behaviors are common practices among young Chileans, with around three quarters of that population reporting being victims or aggressors. Finally, prevalence of control (around 72% for both perspectives) was higher than direct aggression (34.4% for victimization and 27% for direct aggression).

Keywords

Adolescents, assessment, dating violence, electronic media, social media, youth adults

Corresponding author:
Laura Lara, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universidad Autónoma de Chile, 5 Poniente 1670, CP 3467987, Talca, Chile.
Email: llarav@uautonoma.cl

Communication through technology such as cell phones and social media, among young people, is rapidly increasing. The widespread use of technology for social engagement among young people has positive consequences, such as the opportunity to develop close and meaningful relationships (Valkenburg & Peter, 2011). In this way, for example, available research shows how young people use technology to establish and maintain relationships (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010) and explore their sexuality (Klettke et al., 2014). However, it also provides new opportunities for harassment and abusive behaviors (Baker & Carreño, 2016). Recently, a new form of dating violence has emerged: abuse that occurs via electronic media and social networking. There is no unanimous term to refer to this phenomenon, for example, Brown and Hegarty (2018) identify 17 different terms to describe the problem, such as digital dating abuse, electronic dating violence, cyber dating abuse, or cyber violence. However, *cyber dating abuse*, understood as "the control, harassment, stalking and abuse of one's dating partner via technology and social media" (Zweig et al., 2014, p. 1306), is one of the more accepted terms among researchers, being the most inclusive and frequently used (Borrajo et al., 2015).

Since the study of this form of dating violence is still in its infancy, and there is no consensus about either the terminology or the behaviors it covers, it is not surprising that its measurement presents a challenge (Exner-Cortens, 2018). Indeed, research that focuses on traditional dating violence among adolescents and young adults is limited (Jennings et al., 2017), and its assessment is not exempt from limitations and concerns (see reviews by Exner-Cortens et al., 2016a, 2016b). Measurements available for cyber dating abuse present even more severe limitations and concerns, especially regarding their evidence of validity. For example, Brown and Hegarty (2018) make a critical review of the available instruments for measuring digital dating abuse in young people's relationships (from 16 years to 24 years old), including 16 different tools. Their findings point to the lack of validity evidence, especially with respect to convergent and construct validity reported in the papers; with only two reporting convergent validity (Leisring & Giumetti, 2014; Preddy, 2015) and four construct validity (Borrajo et al., 2015; Burke et al., 2011; Leisring & Giumetti, 2014; Preddy, 2015). Moreover, with the exception of Borrajo et al. (2015), the rest used principal component analysis (PCA) to assess the dimensionality of scales. However, as Baglin (2014) explains "PCA does not attempt to explain the underlying population factor structure of the data and makes the often, unrealistic, assumption that each variable is measured without error" (p. 2).

Another problem derives from the fact that many measurements of the phenomenon (e.g., Morelli et al., 2018) are an extension of instruments originally created to assess traditional dating violence (also called offline dating violence, to differentiate it from cyber dating abuse). In such instances, the researchers merely added to the existing items to address the electronic aspect of the behaviors. Such measures do not capture the specific features of cyber dating violence. In fact, many studies that focus on this topic (e.g., Elphinston & Noller, 2011; Lu et al., 2018; Marganski & Melander, 2018; Peskin et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2018) have developed "ad hoc" assessment tools, with insufficient guaranties about their validity since they are constructed at the moment of the research for the specific study. This situation is highlighted in the review of adolescent dating violence by Stonard et al. (2014), who observe that all the measures to assess

cyber aggression used "ad hoc" instruments. They concluded there was a need for an established instrument that would allow future assessments to be more consistent and comparable.

This way of adding items to instruments designed to measure face-to-face abuse does not allow for the study of the intricacies of violence through new technologies. The absence of physical and temporal borders of new technologies makes possible and often facilitates opportunities for dating violence that would be impossible or extremely difficult in the context of traditional dating formats, allowing for faster public humiliation and easier control (Morelli et al., 2018; Zweig et al., 2014). For example, electronic communications provide the aggressor with very effective forms of surveillance with the protection of anonymity. With that, forms of abuse not only can increase exponentially, enabling constant contact with the victim—often enough, without him or her even knowing about it, as for example when they are being monitored (Doucette et al., 2018). Indeed, although researchers initially classified (or treated) cyber dating violence as a form (or extension) of traditional psychological/emotional dating violence (Morelli et al., 2018), there is currently a movement among investigators (e.g., Peskin et al., 2017; Stephenson et al., 2018) to conceptualize it as a behavior distinguishable from traditional dating violence because of its unique features. Unlike traditional dating abuse, cyber dating abuse can happen anytime and anywhere, easily and continuously (Peskin et al., 2017). As Lu et al. (2018) have pointed out, "[cyber dating violence] is qualitatively different from victimization by offline forms of adolescent relationship abuse, as the victims can be targeted 24/7, and might, therefore, feel unable to escape the abuse" (p. 1). It can potentially be publicly humiliating on a broad scale (e.g., when material with sexual content is shared without permission), and it is easier to revictimize the target because of the permanent nature of digital information (Korchmaros et al., 2013). Because of this, consequences of cyber dating abuse for young people may be worse than traditional dating violence, for example, girls reported cyber dating abuse could be more serious because it gives more opportunities for abuse and it is harder to avoid (Stonard et al., 2017).

Some research even points to new technologies creating abusers that would not exist without them (Stonard, 2018). For example, without a direct emotional response from the victim perpetrators cannot accurately assess the harm caused by their actions, lowering their inhibitions toward such behaviors (Heirman & Walrave, 2008).

Despite these differences, and although the study of the relationship between cyber dating abuse and traditional forms of dating violence is scant, results available (Marganski & Melander, 2018; Morelli et al., 2018; Temple et al., 2016; Zapor et al., 2017) show they are nonetheless correlated.

Another problem is that none of the available instruments have been validated with populations other than the one in which they were developed. There is thus not enough evidence for their validity when used within other contexts and populations. Indeed, some authors selected some items from other questionnaires and applied them in different contexts without a validation process as, for example, Van Ouytsel et al. (2018), who selected 4 items from the Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CDAQ) to apply to a sample of secondary students in Flanders. Stephenson et al. (2018) conclude their review of research on abuse in the context of social media, identifying the CDAQ as the most

inclusive of the available instruments; however, they precisely point out the need for retesting to ensure its accuracy in other contexts.

Moreover, almost all such research has been carried out in developed countries, primarily in the U.S. (Stonard, 2018). There is thus little knowledge about the topic in other cultural contexts, where the use of new technologies of communications is also widespread, such as Latin America. Need for such research is particularly the case in Chile, where the use of new technologies is common. In fact, Chile is the Latin American country with the highest rates of Internet access (IMS, 2016) and ranking in the top 10 in the world of Internet inclusion, considering availability, affordability, relevance, and readiness (Lepe, 2018). Based on the data provided by The Chilean National Youth Institute (Instituto Nacional de la Juventud, 2017), 94% of Chileans between 15 years and 29 years of age have a Facebook account, 85% connect to the Internet daily and spend an average of 5.81 hr connected, and the main activity on the Internet (73% of young people) is to chat. A National Survey (Centro UC, 2016) indicated that more than 90% of Chileans at the age of 15 have their own cell phone with an Internet connection. Despite this high usage, in Chile, little is known about how these new technologies are affecting dating violence, since there is a lack of scientific research about it. The only data about cyber dating abuse in Chile come from surveys from the National Young Institute, which include a few dichotomous (yes/no) questions on the subject. These showed that the phenomenon is a serious problem. For example, 39.4% of young people between the ages of 15 and 29 responded that their partner checks their cell phone and/or social networking venues without their permission (Instituto Nacional de la Juventud, 2018). Available data for general dating violence in Chile also show the severity of the phenomenon, although depending on the measurements used prevalence varies. Vizcarra and Poo (2011) reported that 26% of university students suffered physical violence and 56% psychological abuse, and Leal-Soto et al. (2010) estimated physical victimization prevalence of around 20% and psychological victimization of around 38% in a sample of high school students.

In conclusion, there is a pressing need for the establishment of a valid instrument to measure this form of dating violence (Brown & Hegarty, 2018; Exner-Cortens, 2018). We decided to adapt and validate the CDAQ (Borrajo et al., 2015) for the Chilean context, for two main reasons. First, the CDAQ conceptualizes control and direct aggression as different dimensions, factors that have been proved to be identifiable through factor analyses and have adequate psychometric proprieties. *Control* refers to behaviors that are intended to monitor or control, while *direct aggression* refers to behaviors that are intended to cause harm. Most of the instruments merely report an overall rate, while the behaviors they include point to different aspects. We believe this situation could be one of the reasons there are such varying results in the prevalence of online dating violence. In their review of the literature, for instance, Brown and Hegarty (2018) reported a range between 6% and 91%. Considering the data in this manner, items reflecting *control* behaviors present the highest prevalence, particularly as expressed by dating partners inspecting their victims' social networking account without permission (Peskin et al., 2017; Zweig et al., 2013). Items least endorsed are those related to direct aggression, that is, making threats to harm the partner over technological devices (Marganski & Melander, 2018). In any case, although data available clearly point to

cyber dating abuse as a frequent problem among young people, the differences in reported prevalence are broad-based and likely due to the wide range of measurements used, including different items and variant time frames (e.g., from 3 months to ever in life). This situation makes abundantly clear that one should be cautious in comparing or generalizing from results (Stonard et al., 2014).

The second reason is that the CDAQ evaluates both the victim's and the perpetrator's perspectives at the same time, allowing for the study of bidirectionality (or mutuality) of cyber dating abuse, understood as one being at the same time victim and perpetrator of cyber dating abuse. This is a situation that, in previous research, has been found to be common among young people (Stonard, 2018). For example, Borrajo et al. (2015) and Reed et al. (2016) reported cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration highly correlated with one another, suggesting the behaviors are bidirectional. In general, research results point that the power dynamic in relationships differs between young (dating violence) and adults (domestic violence), showing young dating relationships are usually characterized by mutual dating aggression.

However, the CDAQ only has been validated for young adults (from 18 years to 30 years old, Borrajo et al., 2015). As well, most of the instruments available focus on university students. There is, to begin with, scant knowledge about cyber dating abuse on adolescents. The lack of appropriate instruments for this population compounds the problem, making it difficult to study the issue and compare its manifestations to those in other age groups. Adding to this, studies that focus on adolescents (usually high school students) do not include young adults either.

Based on the above, the main objective of this study was to adapt and validate the CDAQ for young Chilean persons. As a secondary goal, we aimed to provide data on the prevalence of cyber dating abuse in young Chileans, both from a victimization and perpetration perspective.

Method

Participants

Participants were 1,538 Chilean students, 14–24 years old ($M = 18.27$, $SD = 2.96$) from high schools (49.5%) and universities (50.5%). Of the sample, 59.8% were females, 46.2% of the participants had a current romantic partner, and most of them were in heterosexual couples (95.6%). To be eligible for this study, participants had to have access to the Internet (though their own electronic device), be or have been in a romantic relationship during the last 12 months with a duration of at least 1 month, and not live with their partner.

Almost all participants had a cell phone (99.9%) and a computer (88.4%), with the cell phone being the principal device used to connect to the Internet (96.6%). Regarding social media, Facebook (92.8%), WhatsApp (92.2%), and Instagram (73.9%) were the most used, although 15.7% used Snapchat and 8.2% used Twitter. The most used platforms to communicate with their partners were WhatsApp (90%), followed by Facebook (64.4%) and Instagram (46.2%).

Instruments

Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire. The CDAQ (Borrajo et al., 2015), adapted and validated in this study for the Chilean population, is a 40-item, self-reported behavioral questionnaire with two parallel versions of 20 items: one for victimization and another for perpetration. The instrument measures cyber dating abuse in two dimensions, *control* (9 items) and *direct aggression* (11 items). The response scale used in this study was a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*continuously*), and measuring the frequency of the behaviors in the last 6 months—considering either one's current partner or the most recent if not presently in a relationship. The original version (Borrajo et al., 2015) was validated with young adults (from 18 years to 30 years old) in Spain, demonstrating the factorial structural of the scale using a four-factor model (*control victimization*, *control perpetration*, *aggression victimization*, and *aggression perpetration*), with adequate internal consistency of the four factors, measured with Cronbach's alphas ($\alpha = .73$ for direct aggression perpetration, $\alpha = .84$ for direct aggression victimization, $\alpha = .81$ for control perpetration, and $\alpha = .87$ for control victimization).

The CDAQ, as used in this study, was adapted from the original tool for use with young Chileans (from 14 years to 24 years of age), through expert review and focus groups. First, the initial items were reviewed by 10 Chilean psychologists, who independently corroborated their adequacy for the Chilean context and carried out proposals to improve the statements, especially focusing on improving their accuracy and ease of comprehension for adolescents. Once the proposals had been unified, the adequacy of items was verified through 10 focus groups, formed of five participants each ($N = 50$ total participants), of similar age and sex as the target population. The main modifications on the items were based on words that are uncommon, unfamiliar, or do not have the same meaning in Chile as in Spain. We paid special attention to making the sentences as clear as possible, trying to avoid sophisticated language that can lead to comprehension problems, as Brown and Hegarty (2018) advise in their critical review. The final version for the Chilean population is presented in the Appendix.

Dating Violence Questionnaire (DVQ). The Chilean version of the DVQ (Lara & Lopez-Cepero, 2018), adapted for Chilean youths (from 14 years to 24 years old), was used to measure traditional dating violence. In this study, we used the extended version that consists of 46 items grouped in eight scales (*detachment, humiliation, sexual, coercion, physical, gender-based, instrumental*, and *emotional punishment*). The present study includes a second set of parallel items modified to assess the frequency with which the participant perpetrated those actions. The DVQ+ items are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*continuously*), obtaining an adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = .96$ for victimization and .93 for aggression).

Procedure

The data were collected in five secondary schools and two Chilean universities in the regions of Maule and Bío-Bío, with prior authorization from the educational institutions. Signed consent was requested from minors in order to participate in the study, as well as

signed informed consent from their legal guardians. In the case of adults, informed consent from themselves was requested. Administration of the questionnaire was carried out collectively in paper format during school hours.

The initial sample consisted of 1,743 participants, of which 205 were excluded for the following reasons (alone or combined): not having the consent of their parents and/or legal guardians in the case of minors ($n = 80$), did not meet the inclusion criteria ($n = 79$), or the questionnaires were not completed in full ($n = 110$).

Data analysis

Analysis of the internal structure of the CDAQ was performed using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Given that the items of perpetration and victimization are parallel, we allowed measurement errors of parallel items to correlate. The CFA was carried out using the program Mplus 7.3, on the polychoric correlation matrix, using the weighted least squares mean and variance adjusted estimation method. There are controversies about cutoff values for assessing fit in CFA (Lance et al., 2006; Marsh et al., 2004); we considered the cutoff points established by Arbuckle (2011), including the root mean square error of approximation < .08, the comparative fit index > .90, and the Tucker–Lewis index > .90. Regarding loading factors, standardized factor loadings $\geq .50$ were considered acceptable (Hair et al., 2010). To determine whether the models tested differed significantly from one another, χ^2 analyses were conducted.

Internal consistency of the scales was analyzed by Cronbach's αs (conducted using the software SPSS 25) and ordinal coefficient αs (using the formula provided by Dominguez-Lara, 2017). Concurrent validity of CDAQ scales was assessed by the Pearson bivariate correlation between the CDAQ scales and the DVQ scales, matching perpetration and victimization perspectives, performed with SPSS 25 software.

For absolute prevalence, responses were dichotomized considering the existence of one or more experience in the last 6 months (0 = *no experiences*, 1 = *at least one or more experiences*). For frequency prevalence, responses were dichotomized considering the existence of frequent responses (0 = *never and sometimes*, 1 = *frequently, very often, and continuously*).

Results

Structural validity

The same four-factor model proposed by the original authors of the scale (Borrajo et al., 2015) was tested (Model 1), where the four factors that compose the questionnaire (control victimization, control perpetration, aggression victimization, and aggression perpetration) are correlated. Also, another plausible configuration was tested (Model 2), a second-order model, considering the four scales as primary factors that configure into two second-order factors: victimization (control and aggression victimization) and perpetration (control and aggression perpetration).

For Model 1, the correlation between perpetration and victimization was .742 for control and .715 for direct aggression. The correlation between victimization of control

Table 1. Fit indices of CFA.

Model	χ^2	*p*	*df*	RMSEA	CFI	TLI
1. Correlated four factors	3,265.59	<.001	714	.048	.938	.933
2. Two second-order factors	3,485.30	<.001	715	.050	.933	.927

Note. CFA = confirmatory factor analysis; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index.

Table 2. Internal consistency of cyber dating abuse scales.

Scales	Cronbach's α	Ordinal α
Control victimization	.891	.937
Control perpetration	.832	.911
Direct aggression victimization	.801	.860
Direct aggression perpetration	.795	.887
Victimization	.902	.947
Perpetration	.850	.946

and direct aggression was .704, and the correlation between perpetration of control and direct aggression was .502. For Model 2, the correlation between perpetration and victimization was .762.

The results showed that both models present an adequate fit to the data (Table 1), although fit was better for Model 1. Moreover, χ^2 comparison of the models showed that Model 1 was significantly better than Model 2 ($\chi^2 = 180.25, p < .01$). For Model 1, factor loadings ranged between .50 and .91 (see Online Supplementary Material).

Reliability

Reliability was estimated using two complementary indexes, including Cronbach's α and one estimation suitable for ordinal data: ordinal α. Results of analysis show that values were adequate for every scale with all the indexes considered, reaching values from .795 to .946 (Table 2).

Concurrent validity

To assess the concurrent validity of the CDAQ, we analyzed correlations between the scores on the four subscales of the CDAQ and the eight subscales of the DVQ as well as between the composite variables of both questionnaires matching the perspectives (victimization and perpetration). Results show that all the correlations were positive and statistically significant (Table 3), being them moderate (around .30) or high (above .50; Cohen, 1988).

Prevalence

Overall, 74.3% participants were victims of at least one of the behaviors (74.8% of males and 73.9% of females), and 34.3% frequently (36.9 of males and 32.5 of females), while

Table 3. Correlations between cyber dating abuse and traditional dating violence.

	Cyber dating abuse					
Offline dating violence	CV	DAV	CP	DAP	V	P
Coercion	.68**	.67**	.47**	.35**	.72**	.49**
Physical	.55**	.60**	.34**	.44**	.61**	.42**
Gender	.54**	.60**	.33**	.36**	.60**	.39**
Emotional Punishment	.59**	.65**	.40**	.46**	.65**	.48**
Instrumental	.54**	.70**	.33**	.42**	.63**	.41**
Detachment	.57**	.58**	.38**	.36**	.61**	.43**
Humiliation	.58**	.68**	.45**	.45**	.66**	.51**
Sexual	.50**	.55**	.26**	.32**	.55**	.32**
Violence	.67**	.73**	.47**	.48**	.74**	.55**

Note. CV = control victimization; CP = control perpetration; DAV = direct aggression victimization; DAP = direct aggression perpetration; V = victimization; P = perpetration.
**$p < .01$.

75.1% perpetrated at least one of the behaviors (72% of males and 77.2% of females), and 29.5% did so frequently (28.6% of males and 30.1% of females).

Regarding dimensions, both for perpetration and victimization perspectives, around 72% of the participants indicated they have been controlled by or control their partner, while the prevalence was lower in the aggression component: 34.4% for victimization and 27% for perpetration. When only participants who perform these behaviors frequently (excluding sometimes) are considered, 32.1% have been controlled by their partners frequently and 27.9% have controlled their partners; 12.4% have been victims of direct aggression and 6.5% have perpetrated it. As presented in Table 4, this prevalence rate was similar for males and females.

Regarding specific behaviors explored on the questionnaire, Table 4 presents their prevalence (in absolute terms and considering their frequency). The most frequent item was *Checking last connection in mobile applications* (around half of the participants indicated having been victim and perpetrator, 22% as victim and 18% as perpetrator frequently). Regarding the least prevalent behavior, *Sending and/or uploading photos, images and/or videos with intimate or sexual content without permission* was the last one in terms of absolute prevalence for both perspectives (around 2%), and the lest frequent from the perspective of the victim (.3%) while, from the perspective of the perpetrator, the items with the lowest prevalence were *Creating a fake profile on a social network to cause problems* and *Spreading rumors, gossip and/or jokes through new technologies with the intention of ridiculing* (both with a .3%). As presented in Table 4, prevalence rate was similar for males and females.

Discussion

The first aim of this study was to adapt and validate a questionnaire to measure cyber dating abuse among young Chileans from the perspectives of both the victim and the perpetrator at the same time and differentiating between control and aggression

Table 4. Prevalence of cyber dating abuse.

	Total				Males				Females			
	Ever		Frequent		Ever		Frequent		Ever		Frequent	
	V%	P%	V%	P%	V%	P%	V%	P%	V%	P%	V%	P%
Control	72.1	72	32.1	27.9	71.5	70.2	34.0	27.2	72.5	73.3	30.9	28.4
1. Controlling status updates on social networks	33.2	34.5	12.2	11.2	32.8	32.0	11.7	10.5	33.4	36.2	12.5	11.6
5. Using passwords (phone, social networking, email) to browse messages and/or contacts without permission	27.2	25.7	6.1	4.4	28.6	22.8	6.3	2.8	26.3	27.6	6.0	5.5
7. Checking the last connection in mobile applications	50.3	54.8	22.0	18.1	54.4	54.9	26.9	19.7	47.5	54.8	18.8	17.1
11. Checking social networks, WhatsApp, or email without permission	29.4	25.4	7.7	4.4	31.4	23.3	8.3	3.6	28.0	26.7	7.3	5.0
13. Using new technologies to control where you are/I am and with whom	23.9	18.1	7.2	4.2	23.1	16.7	7.1	3.6	24.5	19.0	7.3	4.7
14. Threatening to answer calls or messages immediately using new technologies	13.1	10.7	5.3	2.6	12.8	10.8	4.4	2.1	13.4	10.5	6.0	2.9
17. Checking a partner's mobile phone without permission	34.7	28.3	9.7	5.4	35.1	25.2	10.5	5.2	34.3	30.4	9.1	5.5
19. Excessive calls to control where you are/I am and with whom	18.6	12.2	6.0	2.3	15.0	9.2	3.9	2.1	21.0	14.2	7.4	2.5
20. Controlling friends on social networks	33.7	27.0	11.1	6.3	29.4	24.4	9.2	5.3	36.5	28.8	12.3	7.0
Direct aggression	34.4	27.0	12.4	6.5	36.7	23.1	12.5	4.4	33.8	29.7	12.4	7.9
2. Threats through new technologies to physically harm	4.7	1.6	1.7	1.0	4.0	1.8	2.1	0.3	5.1	5.1	1.4	1.4
3. Creating a fake profile on a social network to cause problems	3.3	0.9	1.5	0.3	3.9	0.3	2.1	0.3	2.8	1.3	1.1	0.4
4. Writing a comment on the wall of a social network to insult or humiliate	8.1	6.4	1.1	1.0	7.6	5.2	1.0	0.5	8.5	7.3	1.2	1.3
6. Spreading secrets and/or compromised information using new technologies	5.9	5.7	1.0	0.9	4.2	2.6	0.6	0.3	7.1	7.7	1.2	1.3
8. Threatening to spread secrets or embarrassing information using new technologies	5.3	2.5	1.8	0.8	3.1	1.9	0.3	0.2	6.8	2.9	2.4	1.2
9. Using new technologies to pretend to be me/my (ex) partner and create problems	4.7	2.5	2.1	1.2	5.2	2.4	2.8	1.1	4.3	2.5	1.7	1.2
10. Sending insulting and/or demeaning messages using new technologies	14.5	11.3	4.4	2.9	11.7	7.9	3.4	1.0	16.4	13.6	5.0	4.1
12. Sending and/or uploading photos, images, and/or videos with intimate or sexual content without permission	2.3	1.8	0.3	0.5	1.1	1.1	0.6	0.0	3.2	2.3	0.1	0.8

(continued)

Table 4. (continued)

	Total				Males				Females			
	Ever		Frequent		Ever		Frequent		Ever		Frequent	
	V%	P%	V%	P%	V%	P%	V%	P%	V%	P%	V%	P%
15. Pretending to be another person using new technologies to test a partner	10.1	3.6	2.9	0.8	10.4	3.7	3.7	0.5	10.0	3.6	2.4	1.0
16. Posting music, poems, phrases . . . on a social networking site with the intent to insult or humiliate	15.1	12.7	7.2	2.6	16.5	9.5	7.0	2.1	14.2	14.9	7.3	2.9
18. Spreading rumors, gossip, and/or jokes through new technologies with the intention of ridiculing	7.8	3.1	2.7	0.3	8.6	3.2	3.2	0.5	7.3	2.9	2.4	0.1

Note. V = victimization; P = perpetration. Items in English extracted from Borrajo et al. (2015).

dimensions. The adapted CDAQ shows adequate psychometric properties—through CFA and reliability analysis—and is associated with traditional forms of dating violence.

The CFA has corroborated the adequacy of the four-factor model proposed by Borrajo et al. (2015). Although the original model presents a better fit, results also supported the inclusion of two second-order factors in the model, considering the four scales as primary factors that configure into two second-order factors, victimization (control and aggression from the victimization perspective) and perpetration (control and aggression from the perpetrator perspective). This also allows the use of the composite scores of cyber dating abuse from the perspective of victimization and aggression. Also, reliability indexes showed the internal consistency of all the scales is appropriate.

As expected, cyber dating abuse correlated with traditional forms of dating violence, as previous research (Marganski & Melander, 2018; Morelli et al., 2018; Temple et al., 2016; Zapor et al., 2017) has found. Although there are not many studies that focus on the link between online and offline dating violence, the available results show they are associated. However, the relation is complex, and there is a need for more research that focuses on this link. For example, one key question to answer pertains to the continuum of dating violence in the offline and online contexts: Is digital technology providing another way to harass, control, and abuse (cf. Van Ouytsel et al., 2018; Zweig et al., 2013) or is it creating victims and perpetrators who would not exist without the medium? Because of the ease, anonymity, and acceptance of online dating abuse behaviors (Baker & Helm, 2010), it is conceivable that both possibilities are true. Moreover, young people are initiating their first romantic relationships in a context in which this digital technology has always been present, and they frequently use it to communicate, making it difficult to differentiate the medium as a separate realm of their developmental context. Indeed, some research (e.g., Marganski & Melander, 2018) has identified that cyber dating abuse occurs in the absence of other forms of dating violence. What is clear is that more research is needed to understand how both contexts are interacting.

Regarding the second aim of this study, the prevalence found in our study shows how cyber dating abuse is a common phenomenon among young people in Chile. Clearly, control behaviors are more frequent than direct aggression. These found patterns are similar to those reported by Borrajo et al. (2015) and, as well, differentiations made by others (e.g., López-Cepero et al., 2018) between control-centered and damage-centered abuse. The dimensionality of the CDAQ, which permits differentiating between control and direct aggression, could help us to understand the range of prevalence found in previous research. In fact, our overall prevalence rate is heavily influenced by online control behaviors and is similar to prevalence rates reported in research that looks at online abuse as a whole. For example, Melander and Hughes (2018) reported that 71% of respondents were perpetrators and 75% were victims of at least one aggressive cyber behavior during the prior 12 months. The prevalence of direct aggression is similar to the findings of studies that, while reporting lower prevalence overall, included behaviors reflecting direct aggression. In this vein, Smith et al. (2018) reported 33% of respondents perpetrated and 35.6% were victims of at least one cyber violent behavior in a romantic relationship context during the previous 12 months.

Moreover, consistent with previous research (Borrajo et al., 2015; Reed et al., 2016; Stonard, 2018), our results show that perpetration and victimization are correlated. This

supports the idea that cyber dating abuse is mutual in young relationships, with young people being perpetrators and victims at the same time. However, while victimization and perpetration prevalence show similar patterns and rates, when considering specific behaviors and their frequency, it is necessary to indicate that it seems young people identify more with victimization than aggression. Studies that consider both perspectives, for example, Stonard (2018), also report more victimization prevalence than perpetration, especially for behaviors similar to the ones included in the direct aggression dimension. Also, young people had difficulty seeing themselves as aggressors. This has important implications for intervention purposes, particularly when we consider that some behaviors can happen without the awareness of the victim as, for example, monitoring or snooping (Doucette et al., 2018).

Because of the Likert-type scale of response, the questionnaire allows not just identification of who are victims or perpetrators—as some researchers (e.g., Doucette et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2018) used in their studies—but also identification of those young people who are being abused or abusing frequently. However, it is necessary to take precautions when using frequency as an indicator. Besides the potential uses of this identification for intervention purposes, some of the behaviors included—because of their severity and potentially harmful consequences—only need to appear once to have a devastating impact. This is especially true of the ones included in the direct aggression dimension, for example, spreading images with intimate or sexual content or threatening physical harm through new technologies. As Reed et al. (2016) have observed, these behaviors can constitute abuse with only one occurrence. However, it is also important to highlight that a constant control over one's partner can have a negative impact over the romantic relationship, facilitating the development of an abusive and violent dynamic—while not being perceived as direct aggression by young people. There is also a need to further study how these behaviors are being normalized among young people, as we report a high prevalence of monitoring behaviors. For example, Stonard et al. (2017) highlight that checking a partner's phone and messages are perceived to be common behaviors, and literature results are indicating how young people are confusing cyber dating abuse behaviors with proof of love and caring. In this regard, Baker and Helm (2010), through the analysis of focus groups with adolescents, conclude that some of these behaviors (such as monitoring and controlling) are seem as "irritating" by adolescents but not as abusive or violent. This highlights the need to increase their awareness of cyber controlling as a form of abuse and thereby prevent this trajectory before it reaches increased levels of verbal and physical abuse, as this could well be the first exposure to dating violence.

Finally, it is necessary to mention some limitations of the present study. Firstly, most of the participants in this study declared themselves to be in heterosexual relationships. However, the questionnaire is not specific for heterosexual populations, and could be used for studying lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth, that is almost absent in dating violence literature (Dank et al., 2014). Secondly, although cyber dating abuse prevalence where quite similar between boys and girls, that does not mean that consequences are similar. Consequences of cyber dating abuse for boys and girls need to be studied further. Results available show that, in general, girls report more negative emotional consequences than boys (Reed et al., 2017; Zweig et al., 2013).

In sum, in this study, we present the first validation in a different context of an instrument to measure cyber dating abuse, showing adequate psychometric properties that allow the assessment of this phenomenon in Chilean youths. This is helpful, as there were no available instruments to do so. The research has important implications for practitioners and educators alike, providing them with a tool to measure cyber dating abuse specially developed for the characteristics of this population. Moreover, we present the first set of data documenting the prevalence of cyber dating violence in Chile, which is drawn from a validated measure appropriate for this population. Although it is difficult to compare prevalence across studies (due to different measurements, time periods, behaviors included, etc.), the prevalence reported in this study is very high. This, in and of itself, warrants attention. The prevalence is striking. Overall, three in four of the participants report involvement in cyber dating abuse behaviors, and around one in three do so frequently. These findings should be taken seriously: They highlight the need to address this form of dating violence in social policy and education programs, particularly given that it is usually not accounted for in the estimation of dating violence prevalence (Peskin et al., 2017).

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This work was supported by FONDECYT 11180663 of the National Commission for Scientific and Technological Research of Chile (CONICYT), Ministry of Education.

ORCID iD

Laura Lara https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6420-2398

Open research statement

As part of IARR's encouragement of open research practices, the authors have provided the following information: This research was not pre-registered. The data used in the research are available. The data can be obtained by emailing: llarav@uautonoma.cl. The materials used in the research are available. The materials can be obtained by emailing: llarav@uautonoma.cl.

Supplemental material

Supplemental material for this article is available online.

References

Arbuckle, J. L. (2011). *IBM SPSS Amos 20 user's guide*. Amos Development Corporation.

Baglin, J. (2014). Improving your exploratory FACTOR analysis for ordinal data: A demonstration using FACTOR. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, *19*. http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=19&n=5

Baker, C. K., & Carreño, P. K. (2016). Understanding the role of technology in adolescent dating and dating violence. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *25*, 308–320. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-015-0196-5

Baker, C. K., & Helm, S. (2010). Pacific youth and shifting thresholds: Understanding teen dating violence in Hawai'i. *Journal of School Violence*, *9*, 154–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220903585879

Borrajo, E., Gámez-Guadix, M., Pereda, N., & Calvete, E. (2015). The development and validation of the cyber dating abuse questionnaire among young couples. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *48*, 358–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.063

Brown, C., & Hegarty, K. (2018). Digital dating abuse measures: A critical review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *40*, 44–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.03.003

Burke, S. C., Wallen, M., Vail-Smith, K., & Knox, D. (2011). Using technology to control intimate partners: An exploratory study of college undergraduates. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *27*, 1162–1167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.12.010

Centro UC. (2016). Encuesta CASEN 2015: Cobertura y uso de teléfonos móviles. http://www.encuestas.uc.cl/img/datos/Casen%20Celulares.pdf

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dank, M., Lachman, P., Zweig, J. M., & Yahner, J. (2014). Dating violence experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *43*, 846–857. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9975-8

Dominguez-Lara, S. (2017). Fiabilidad y alfa ordinal [reliability and ordinal alpha]. *Actas Urológicas Españolas,* 42*, 140–141*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acuro.2017.07.002

Doucette, H., Collibee, C., Hood, E., Stone, D. I. G., DeJesus, B., & Rizzo, C. J. (2018). Perpetration of electronic intrusiveness among adolescent females: Associations with in-person dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518815725

Draucker, C. B., & Martsolf, D. S. (2010). The role of electronic communication technology in adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing*, *23*, 133–142. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6171.2010.00235.x

Elphinston, R. A., & Noller, P. (2011). Time to face it! Facebook intrusion and the implications for romantic jealousy and relationship satisfaction. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *14*, 631–635. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2010.0318

Exner-Cortens, D. (2018). Measuring adolescent dating violence. In D. A. Wolfe & J. R. Temple (Eds.), *Adolescent dating violence: Theory, research, and prevention* (pp. 315–340). https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-811797-2.00013-X

Exner-Cortens, D., Gill, L., & Eckenrode, J. (2016a). Measurement of adolescent dating violence: A comprehensive review (Part 1, behaviors). *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *27*, 64–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2016.02.007

Exner-Cortens, D., Gill, L., & Eckenrode, J. (2016b). Measurement of adolescent dating violence: A comprehensive review (Part 2, attitudes). *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *27*, 93–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2016.02.011

Hair, J. F., Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*. (7th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Heirman, W., & Walrave, M. (2008). Assessing concerns and issues about the mediation of technology in cyberbullying. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, *2*, 1–12.

IMS. (2016). *IMS mobile in Latam study*. https://www.imscorporate.com/news/Estudios-comScore/IMS-Mobile-Study-Septiembre2016.pdf

Instituto Nacional de la Juventud (2017). *Octava encuesta nacional de juventud 2015*. http://www.injuv.gob.cl/storage/docs/Libro_Octava_Encuesta_Nacional_de_Juventud.pdf

Instituto Nacional de la Juventud (agosto, 2018). Sondeo violencia en las relaciones de pareja: Visibilidad, denuncias y sanciones. *Revista RT-Instituto Nacional de la Juventud*, *27*. http://www.injuv.gob.cl/storage/docs/Revista_RT_INJUV_28_2018.pdf

Jennings, W. G., Okeem, C., Piquero, A. R., Sellers, C. S., Theobald, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2017). Dating and intimate partner violence among young persons ages 15–30: Evidence from a systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *33*, 107–125.

Klettke, B., Hallford, D. J., & Mellor, D. J. (2014). Sexting prevalence and correlates: A systematic literature review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *34*, 44–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2013.10.007

Korchmaros, J. D., Ybarra, M. L., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Boyd, D., & Lenhart, A. (2013). Perpetration of teen dating violence in a networked society. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, *16*, 561–567.

Lance, C. E., Butts, M. M, & Michels, L. C. (2006). The sources of four commonly reported cut off criteria: What did they really say? *Organizational Research Methods*, *9*, 202–220. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428105284919

Lara, L., & López-Cepero, J. (2018). Psychometric properties of the dating violence questionnaire: Reviewing the evidence in Chilean youths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518760612

Leal-Soto, F., Reinoso, L., Rojas, K., & Romero, R. (2010). Violencia en las relaciones de pareja en adolescentes escolares de Arica [Intimate partner violence among adolescent students of Arica, Chile]. *Revista Infancia y Educación*, *1*, 18–35.

Leisring, P. A., & Giumetti, G. W. (2014). Sticks and stones may break my bones, but abusive text messages also hurt: Development and validation of the cyber psychological abuse scale. *Partner Abuse*, *5*, 323–341. https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.5.3.323

Lepe, N. (2018). The Inclusive Internet Index: Chile sube 12 puestos y entra al top 10 en ranking que mide desarrollo de la conectividad digital. *Publimeto*. https://www.publimetro.cl/cl/estilo-vida/2018/02/27/the-inclusive-internet-index-chile-sube-12-puestos-entra-al-top-10-ranking-mide-desarrollo-la-conectividad-digital.html

López-Cepero, J., Vallejos-Saldarriaga, J., & Merino-García, M. (2018). Digital intimate partner violence among Peruvian youths: Validation of an instrument and a theoretical proposal. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518803610

Lu, Y., Ouytsel, J. V., Walrave, M., Ponnet, K., & Temple, J. R. (2018). Cross-sectional and temporal associations between cyber dating abuse victimization and mental health and substance use outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence*, *65*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2018.02.009

Marganski, A., & Melander, L. (2018). Intimate partner violence victimization in the cyber and real world: Examining the extent of cyber aggression experiences and its association with in-person dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *33*, 1071–1095. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515614283

Marsh, H. W., Hau, K., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *11*, 320–341.

Melander, L., & Hughes, V. (2018). College partner violence in the digital age: Explaining cyber aggression using routine activities theory. *Partner Abuse*, *9*, 158–180. https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.9.2.158

Morelli, M., Bianchi, D., Chirumbolo, A., & Baiocco, R. (2018). The cyber dating violence inventory. Validation of a new scale for online perpetration and victimization among dating partners. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *15*, 464–471. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2017.1305885

Peskin, M. F, Markham, C. M., Shegog, R., Temple, J. R., Baumler, E. R., Addy, R. C., Hernandez, B., Cuccaro, P., Gabay, E. K., Thiel, M., & Emery, S. T. (2017). Prevalence and correlates of the perpetration of cyber dating abuse among early adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *46*, 358–375. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0568-1

Preddy, T. M. (2015). *Assessment and investigation of electronic aggression in the romantic relationships of emerging adults* (Doctoral dissertation), University of Tennessee, Tennessee, Knoxville. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/a266/b4f88403f2614634ee8e7c9fef9db3d40bd4.pdf?_ga=2.70399448.971886013.1569081941-1906863038.1569081941

Reed, L. A., Tolman, R. M., & Ward, L. M. (2016). Snooping and sexting: Digital media as a context for dating aggression and abuse among college students. *Violence Against Women*, *22*, 1556–1576. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801216630143

Reed, L. A., Tolman, R. M., & Ward, L. M. (2017). Gender matters: Experiences and consequences of digital dating abuse victimization in adolescent dating relationships. *Journal of Adolescence*, *59*, 79–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.05.015

Smith, K. J., Cénat, J. M., Lapierre, A., Dion, J., Hébert, M., & Côté, K. (2018). Cyber dating violence: Prevalence and correlates among high school students from small urban areas in Quebec. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *234*, 220–223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.02.043

Stephenson, V. L., Wickham, B. M., & Capezza, N. M. (2018). Psychological abuse in the context of social media. *Violence and Gender*, *5*, 129–134. https://doi.org/10.1089/vio.2017.0061

Stonard, K. E. (2018). The prevalence and overlap of technology-assisted and offline adolescent dating violence. *Current Psychology*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-0023-4

Stonard, K. E., Bowen, E., Lawrence, T. R., & Price, S. A. (2014). The relevance of technology to the nature, prevalence and impact of adolescent dating violence and abuse: A research synthesis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *19*, 390–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.06.005

Stonard, K. E., Bowen, E., Walker, K., & Price, S. A. (2017). "They'll always find a way to get to you": Technology use in adolescent romantic relationships and its role in dating violence and abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *32*, 2083–2117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515590787

Temple, J., Choi, H. J., Brem, M., Wolford-Clevenger, C., Stuart, G. L., Peskin, M. F., & Elmquis, J. (2016). The temporal association between traditional and cyber dating abuse among adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *45*, 340–349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0380-3

Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2011). Online communication among adolescents: An integrated model of its attraction, opportunities, and risks. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *48*, 121–127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2010.08.020

Van Ouytsel, J., Ponnet, K., & Walrave, M. (2018). Cyber dating abuse victimization among secondary school students from a lifestyle-routine activities theory perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *33*, 2767–2776. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516629390

Vizcarra, M. B., & Poo, A. M. (2011). Violencia de pareja en estudiantes universitarios del sur de chile [intimate partner violence in south Chilean college students]. *Universitas Psychologica*, *10*, 89–98.

Zapor, H., Wolford-Clevenger, C., Elmquist, J. A., Febres, J., Shorey, R. C., Brasfield, H., Leisring, P. A., & Stuart, G. L. (2017). Psychological aggression committed through technology: A study with dating college students. *Partner Abuse*, *8*, 127–145. https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.8.2.127

Zweig, J. M., Dank, M., Yahner, J., & Lachman, P. (2013). The rate of cyber dating abuse among teens and how it relates to other forms of teen dating violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *42*, 1063–1077. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9922-8

Zweig, J. M., Lachman, P., Yahner, J., & Dank, M. (2014). Correlates of cyber dating abuse among teens. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *43*, 1306–1321. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0047-x

Appendix

Table A1. Chilean version of the CDAQ.

Item	Chilean version	Scale
1	Mi pareja o expareja ha controlado las publicaciones del perfil de mi red social (o redes).	CV
	He controlado las publicaciones del perfil de la red social (o redes) de mi pareja o expareja.	CP
2	Mi pareja o expareja me ha amenazado con hacerme daño físicamente a través de las nuevas tecnologías	DAV
	He amenazado a mi pareja o expareja con hacerle daño físicamente a través de las nuevas tecnologías.	DAP
3	Mi pareja o expareja ha creado un perfil falso sobre mí en una red social para causarme problemas.	DAV
	He creado un perfil falso sobre mi pareja o expareja en una red social para causarle problemas.	DAP
4	Mi pareja o expareja ha escrito un comentario en el muro de una red social para insultarme o humillarme.	DAV
	He escrito un comentario en el muro de una red social para insultar o humillar a mi pareja o expareja.	DAP
5	Mi pareja o expareja ha utilizado mis contraseñas (teléfono, redes sociales, correo) para curiosear mis mensajes y/o contactos sin mi permiso.	CV
	He utilizado las contraseñas (teléfono, redes sociales, correo) de mi pareja o expareja para curiosear sus mensajes y/o contactos sin su permiso.	CP
6	Mi pareja o expareja ha difundido secretos y/o informaciones comprometedoras sobre mí a través de las nuevas tecnologías.	DAV
	He difundido secretos y/o informaciones comprometedoras sobre mi pareja o expareja a través de las nuevas tecnologías.	DAP
7	Mi pareja o expareja está pendiente de la hora de mi última conexión en aplicaciones del móvil.	CV
	Estoy pendiente de la hora de la última conexión de mi pareja o expareja en aplicaciones del móvil.	CP
8	Mi pareja o expareja me ha amenazado a través de las nuevas tecnologías con difundir secretos o información comprometedora sobre mí.	DAV
	He amenazado a mi pareja o expareja a través de las nuevas tecnologías con difundir secretos o información comprometedora sobre él/ella.	DAP

(continued)

Table A1. (continued)

Item	Chilean version	Scale
9	Mi pareja o expareja ha utilizado las nuevas tecnologías para hacerse pasar por mí y crearme problemas.	DAV
	He utilizado las nuevas tecnologías para hacerme pasar por mi pareja o expareja y crearle problemas.	DAP
10	Mi pareja o expareja me ha enviado mensajes insultándome y/o humillándome a través de las nuevas tecnologías.	DAV
	He enviado mensajes insultando y/o humillando a mi pareja o expareja a través de las nuevas tecnologías.	DAP
11	Mi pareja o expareja ha revisado mis redes sociales, whatsapp o correo sin mi permiso.	CV
	He revisado las redes sociales, whatsapp o correo de mi pareja sin su permiso.	CP
12	Mi pareja o expareja ha enviado y/o subido fotos, imágenes y/o vídeos míos íntimos o de contenido sexual a otras personas sin mi permiso.	DAV
	He enviado y/o subido fotos, imágenes y/o vídeos de contenido sexual sobre mi pareja o expareja a otras personas sin su permiso.	DAP
13	Mi pareja o expareja ha utilizado las nuevas tecnologías para controlar donde he estado y con quién.	CV
	He utilizado las nuevas tecnologías para controlar a mi pareja o expareja donde ha estado y con quién.	CP
14	Mi pareja o expareja me ha amenazado a través de las nuevas tecnologías para que conteste a sus llamadas o mensajes de manera inmediata.	CV
	He amenazado a mi pareja o expareja a través de las nuevas tecnologías para que conteste a mis llamadas o mensajes de manera inmediata.	CP
15	Mi pareja o expareja se ha hecho pasar por otra persona a través de las nuevas tecnologías para ponerme a prueba.	DAV
	Me he hecho pasar por otra persona a través de las nuevas tecnologías para poner a prueba a mi pareja o expareja.	DAP
16	Mi pareja o expareja ha publicado música, poesías, frases . . . en los estados de su red social en referencia a mí con la intención de insultarme o humillarme.	DAV
	He publicado música, poesías, frases . . . en los estados de mi red social en referencia a mi pareja o expareja con la intención de insultarle o humillarle.	DAP
17	Mi pareja o expareja ha revisado mi teléfono móvil sin mi permiso.	CV
	He revisado el teléfono móvil de mi pareja o expareja sin su permiso.	CP
18	Mi pareja o expareja ha divulgado rumores, chismes y/o bromas sobre mí a través de las nuevas tecnologías con la intención de ridiculizarme.	DAV
	He divulgado rumores, chismes y/o bromas a través de las nuevas tecnologías sobre mi pareja o expareja con la intención de ridiculizarla.	DAP
19	Mi pareja o expareja me ha llamado de forma excesiva para controlar donde estaba y con quién.	CV
	He llamado a mi pareja o expareja de forma excesiva para controlar donde estaba y con quién	CP
20	Mi pareja o expareja ha controlado las amistades que tengo en las redes sociales.	CV
	He controlado las amistades que tiene mi pareja o expareja en las redes sociales.	CP

Note. CDAQ = Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire; CV = control victimization, CP = control perpetration; DAV = direct aggression victimization; DAP = direct aggression perpetration.