

Review

Not peer-reviewed version

---

# Patterns of Control: A Narrative Review Exploring Nature and Scope of Technologically Mediated Intimate Partner Violence Among Generation Z Individuals

---

[Emily Melvin](#) and [Satarupa Dasgupta](#) \*

Posted Date: 27 May 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202505.2105.v1

Keywords: technologically mediated violence patterns; Generation Z individuals; association between online and offline violence



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Review

# Patterns of Control: A Narrative Review Exploring Nature and Scope of Technologically Mediated Intimate Partner Violence Among Generation Z Individuals

Emily Melvin and Satarupa Dasgupta \*

Independent Researchers; emilycmelvin01@gmail.com

\* Correspondence: sdasgupt@ramapo.edu

**Abstract:** With most individuals in the U.S. having regular access to internet connection and/or owning smartphones, digital communication has become an inevitable part of daily life for adults and adolescents. Consequently, forming, maintaining and ending relationships via digital media is a widespread phenomenon, however, there also is an ongoing risk of technology facilitated intimate partner violence (IPV) perpetration and victimization. The current paper conducts a traditional narrative review to synthesize extant research on the nature and scope of technology facilitated IPV among Generation Z individuals. The study endeavors to find key patterns in technology facilitated IPV and examine any reciprocal association between online and offline violence victimization and perpetration. In view of the international recognition of intimate partner violence (IPV) as an important public health concern, and the further complexity presented by the rapid digitalization of communication and interaction, the paper investigates any existing association between offline and online dating violence perpetration and victimization to improve violence mitigation programs and support services for younger victims.

**Keywords:** technologically mediated violence patterns; Generation Z individuals; association between online and offline violence

---

## 1. Introduction

Pew Research Center reported in 2024 that 96% of U.S. adults use the internet, 91% own smartphones, and 98% own cellphones. With most individuals in the U.S. having regular access to internet connection and/or owning smartphones, digital communication has become an inevitable part of daily life for adults and adolescents. Consequently, forming, maintaining and ending relationships via digital media is a widespread phenomenon, however there also is an ongoing risk of technology facilitated intimate partner violence (IPV) perpetration and victimization. Generation Z, who are one of the primary users of digital technology and social media, are at a unique risk for technology facilitated violence and abuse (Dimock, 2023). Among Generation Z individuals, IPV and sexual assault (SA) are often perpetrated through mobile and web-based technology, social media and other forms of information communication technology (Perrin & Anderson, 2019).

The current paper conducts a traditional narrative review to synthesize extant research on the nature and scope of technology facilitated IPV among Generation Z individuals. The study endeavors to find key patterns in technology facilitated IPV and examine any reciprocal association between online and offline violence victimization and perpetration.

### 1.1. Generation Z: The Digitally Engaged Generation

Generation Z, often referred to as the digital generation, are individuals born roughly between 1997 and 2012, according to the Pew Research Center Report (Dimock, 2019). Generation Z individuals have vastly different exposure and access to media and technology in comparison with their older counterparts, including the Baby Boomer Generation (born 1946- 1964), Generation X (born 1965-1980), and Generation Y (born 1981-1996) (Hecht, 2022). Having one of the highest usages of the

Internet, members of Generation Z incorporate the globalization of technology in their daily lived experiences. A survey produced by McKinsey Institute shows that more than 50% of Generation Z respondents were more comfortable in expressing themselves on online platforms and communicating through technology—including text, email, chat room, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, TikTok and other messaging platforms—instead of face-to face communication (Coe et al., 2023). Coe et al. (2023) also note that Generation Z respondents express greater faith and dependence on social media and technology to connect, communicate and navigate life. Additionally, the global lockdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic established and reinforced virtual modes of education and work. Consequently, Generation Z individuals have grown accustomed to relying on technology which had become an integral part of their lives (Dasgupta & Melvin, 2024).

### 1.2. *A Brief Description of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)*

IPV is violence that can occur within the context of dating, intimate, and romantic relationships. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines IPV in the following way: “Intimate partner violence is one of the most common forms of violence against women and includes physical, sexual, and emotional abuse and controlling behaviors by an intimate partner. IPV occurs in all settings and among all socioeconomic, religious and cultural groups. The overwhelming global burden of IPV is borne by women. Although women can be violent in relationships with men, often in self-defense, and violence sometimes occurs in same-sex partnerships, the most common perpetrators of violence against women are male intimate partners or ex-partners” (WHO, 2020).

IPV can comprise physical violence like punching, kicking and hitting; sexual violence including rape, non-consensual sexual contact, coercive reproduction and verbal sexual abuse; psychological violence like emotional and verbal abuse; economic violence including financial control and abuse; and online violence like cyberstalking, cyberbullying and sextortion (Breiding, 2014; Campbell 2002; Dicola & Spaar, 2016). IPV has negative physical and psychological health consequences. Prior research indicates that victims of IPV suffer from chronic pain, gastrointestinal disorders and gynecological ailments, have significantly increased rates of physical injury, depression, posttraumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, suicide ideations and attempts, and a higher incidence of sexually transmitted infections (Decker et al., 2014; Potter et al., 2021).

### 1.3. *The Impact of Social Media Engagement on Relationship Navigation*

The utilization of mediated communication has restructured the dynamics of interpersonal relationships among young adults affecting how they initiate, navigate and dissolve relationships. McKinsey Institute found that members of Generation Z considered their social media engagement as a positive experience that benefited their mental health (Coe et al., 2023). They also utilized social media to find support services and resources especially during times of a crisis (Coe et al., 2023). Importantly, the survey found that almost half of Generation Z respondents check their social media accounts multiple times a day, averaging at one hour of daily social media use (Coe et al., 2023). Instances of IPV, dating violence and abuse, harassment and sexual misconduct can be precipitated by and be reinforced through online interaction and virtual platforms for many members of Generation Z (Coe et al., 2023).

Individuals belonging to the Generation Z category comprises the age group where IPV and SA are most commonly experienced (NCADV statistics). Women aged between 18 to 24 years are most likely to be abused by an intimate partner and females aged between 16 and 19 years are four times more susceptible to rape and sexual assault compared to any other age group (NCADV statistics, 2020). Additionally, among members of Generation Z under the age of 18, two out of three victims are ages 12-17, with 82% of those victims under 18 being female (NCADV statistics 2020).

## 2. Methodology

A traditional narrative review was conducted on a) extant research on patterns and scope of technology facilitated IPV among Generation Z individuals b) extant research on the co-occurrence of online and offline violence and abuse among this population. Manuscripts that were reviewed were published between 2000 and February 2025. The manuscripts were identified in the following databases: (1) Academic Search Premier, (2) Gender Watch, (3) ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, (4) ProQuest Sociology, (5) Google Scholar, (6) JSTOR, (7) Science Direct, (8) Springer Link (9) Wiley Online Library and (10) World Cat.

Also, any publicly available reports and data published by domestic violence organizations, non-profits, advocacy organizations and state-based coalitions were also considered. Inclusion criteria for the review included a) studies conducted among populations in the Generation Z age range b) studies looking at patterns, scope and incidence of online IPV among dating and intimate partners who are Generation Z individuals c) studies examining any existing co-occurrence of online and offline dating violence and abuse among this population. A total of sixty-five studies—which fitted the inclusion criteria—were selected. The findings of the narrative review are discussed below.

### 3. Findings

#### 3.1. *Types of Technologically Facilitated Violence and Abuse*

Technologically facilitated violence and abuse often mirror traditional IPV patterns but the incorporation of digital tools and leveraging digital spaces can mean the extension of the perpetrator's reach and control. Common patterns of technologically facilitated violence and abuse can include harassment and threats, surveillance and monitoring, sexual abuse and exploitation, financial abuse and digital abuse post relationship dissolution (Rogers et al., 2022, Grmani et al., 2020; Henry & Flynn 2019).

A common example of technologically facilitated violence among young adults is digital dating violence (DDV). DDV is a variant of IPV, which comprise multiple and intersecting forms of violence, such as physical, sexual, psychological, economic and online occurring within context of a relationship. Vale et al. (2020, p. 89) noted that DDV encompasses many forms of abuse—ranging from online harassment, hate speech, doxing, cyber stalking, and image-based abuse, to gendered disinformation. Primarily DDV constitutes harmful behavior carried out by one partner towards the other remotely by utilizing technology (such as a smartphone, social media, a tracking app or another form of technology) to “blackmail, control, coerce, harass, humiliate, objectify or violate” (Henry & Powell, 2015, p. 398) the other person. Online and offline dating violence and abuse are often interrelated, as they share characteristics such as control, humiliation, isolating the other person from their close environment, and threats (Caridade et al. 2019; Gámez-Guadix et al. 2018; Hebert et al. 2019). However, they have their own distinguishing characteristics and occasionally there is scope of co-occurrence of both types of violence and abuse, both concurrently and over time.

Another common instance of technologically facilitated violence occurs when a perpetrator threatens to or actually spreads intimate information (such as photos, videos, misconstrued stories, etc.) about a victim to others via digital mediums or on social media (Said & McNealey, 2022). This is often referred to as the non-consensual distribution of intimate images (NCDII), commonly known as “revenge porn” or “leaking nudes”. The incidence of NCDII remains significantly high among young adults (Said & McNealey, 2022). A 2022 survey among college students in the Midwestern United States found that around 45% of undergraduates have been victims and perpetrators of NCDII (Hanson 2022; Mooney & Batko, 2025; Said & McNealey, 2022). Another survey on revenge porn among college students found that approximately 10% of the latter—mostly female and freshman—have shared an intimate photo of themselves through the Internet (Branch et al., 2017). There is still limited research to understand the impact of NCDII on young adults, strategies for its prevention and mitigation services for the victims.

DDV is also perpetrated through the phenomenon of sexting, which is “the use of mobile devices or computers to send or receive sexually explicit messages, photographs, or images” (Klettke et al., 2014). Parti et al. (2023) found that around 50% of teenagers begin sexting at age 16, and around 20% begin sexting before age 15, with a significant number starting as early as age 11 and while they are in middle school. According to the study, cisgender females were more likely to start sexting earlier compared to cisgender males and non-binary people (Parti et al., 2023). The study also found that incidence of adolescent sexting has continued to increase steadily over the years, meaning that a large portion of Generation Z has or will engage in sexting. Adolescent sexting is linked to greater chances and consequences of abuse and harassment online and offline (Klettke et al., 2014; Parti et al., 2023). Sexting is not inherently an indicator of violence—for it can be an outlet of sexual expression and exploration with oneself or one's partners at any age (Klettke et al., 2014; Parti et al., 2023). However, in view of the fact that many members of Generation Z have experienced DDV while sexting, it still remains an issue that needs support and remedial services for its victims.

As technology continues to advance and be a pivotal part of daily life—especially for adolescents and young adults—new forms of harassment and violence perpetrated through technologically

mediated avenues have increased as well and exhibit complex nature, scope and patterns. Jaureguizar et al. (2024, p. 2) states that “in recent years, other forms of harassment, control, and abuse have been added, derived from new forms of interaction through mobile phones and social networks.” The most common forms of abuse are found amongst younger victims and instances included “direct aggression (threats, insults, and public humiliation through online comments or images) and control (control of partner using the mobile phone or social networks)” (Jaureguizar, 2024, p.2). These are perpetrated through several media, such as via phone call, video chatting (or “Facetiming”), texting, messaging, dating apps, social media apps, and email (Havard & Lefevre, 2020). Perpetrators can comprise a variety of individuals—they can be someone the victim is romantically involved with, casually seeing but not romantically pursuing, a friend, a family member, a stranger, or a user behind an anonymous account (Jaureguizar et al., 2024). Understanding the dynamics between the perpetrators and victims might contribute towards predicting the scope and incidence of online violence which in turn can help to effectively design violence prevention and mitigation services.

### 3.2. Patterns of Violence Victimization and Perpetration

Extant research indicates that digital abuse is widespread among Generation Z individuals and often normalized within relationships. Reed et al. (2016) found that over 50% of surveyed college students experienced at least one form of technologically mediated IPV in their relationships. Afrouz and Vassos (2024) observe that “tech has become a tool for abuse” and “digital technology and online platforms [provide] more opportunities for abuse because it is often hidden, while at the same time harder to address or prevent” (p. 2818). Adolescent victims remain at a higher risk of DDV due to their exposure to online engagement. The latter render the prospect of DDV more feasible than offline violence, since the latter needs physical accessibility and proximity. With technology, abuse perpetration and victimization managed to transcend geographical barriers. Afrouz and Vassos (2024) note that “cyber-dating abuse is prevalent and insidious,” and perpetrators “abuse their victims from a distance and beyond physical location” (p. 2819).

Stonard (2020) observe that by having access to one’s public persona and information—whether that be through social media profiles or through other apps or services—a perpetrator can insert themselves in another person’s life without initiating direct contact or exposing their own identity. Additionally, perpetrators can discover personal details of the victim and utilize that against the latter in myriad ways such as cyberbullying and blackmail (Stonard, 2020). The multiple methods of messaging and communication across several apps and services (phone calls, text messages, emails, direct messaging on several social media accounts), offer newer ways for a predator to harass and access their victim (Caridade et al. 2019; Gámez-Guadix et al. 2018; Hebert et al. 2019). A perpetrator can create multiple fake profiles, email accounts, generate new phone number in order to contact the victim—this negates preemptive safety strategies such as blocking a known perpetrator. A telling commentary by a thirteen-year-old female participant in a 2017 Stonard study was “they’ll always find a way to get to you” —this perhaps demonstrates the insidiousness and ubiquity of technologically mediated harassment and abuse. A perpetrator of technologically mediated violence can be someone who the victim knows personally, or it can be a complete stranger that the victim met anonymously online (Caridade et al. 2019; Gámez-Guadix et al. 2018; Hebert et al. 2019).

### 3.3. Generation Z’s Vulnerability Towards Technologically Mediated IPV

Technologically facilitated IPV present unique challenges for Generation Z due to their high utilization of and dependence on digitally mediated communication, and navigation of relationships online. A common form of DDV involves the perpetrator controlling and monitoring the social media of the victim, thus normalizing surveillance and control (Quiroz et al., 2024). Quiroz et al. (2024) states that “Social media often fuels uncertainty and romantic jealousy, a complex emotion activated by a real or perceived threat to the relationship, as it presents people with unlimited, ambiguous, and easily accessible information about their partner’s digital behaviors that is continuously updated.” Features like Snapchat’s “Snap Map” and “Find My Friends” can be misused for stalking and controlling the victim’s movements (Dragiewicz et al., 2018; O’Brien & Maras 2024).

Additionally, as discussed previously, Generation Z members navigate intimate relationships via online dating apps, a phenomenon that has become much more prevalent through the use of smartphones and apps that were introduced in the early 2010s. Tinder, for example, is the most downloaded dating app in the world, according to Statista.com. According to a report released by Tinder,

Generation Z makes up more than 50% of the app's users (Tinderpressroom.com). While online dating is accessible and can facilitate the process of meeting prospective partners, it can also unlock the possibility for abuse and violence. A scoping review by Filice et al., (2022) references several studies that reveal percentages of Tinder and dating app users who have experienced unwanted and non-consensual forms of dating violence (online and then offline when the pair meets up in person) while using the app. The prevalence of dating apps in the lives of Generation Z and future generations has also resulted in exacerbating the incidence of DDV.

Additionally, a widespread access to pornography and sexually explicit media in the digital realm can affect interactions in intimate partner relationships among the Generation Z members. Research shows that adolescents and young adults who regularly access sexually explicit media via the Internet are more likely to engage in dangerous and non-consensual sexual actions (Adarsh & Sahoo, 2023). Similar to sexting, interaction with pornography and sexually explicit content can be a healthy outlet for sexuality, but among adolescents and younger adults, an association between consumption of such content and perpetration of non-consensual acts and online and offline violence can occur (Ballester-Arnal et al., 2022). Doring et al., 2022 found that 68% of all digital media users have been involved in sexual interaction in digital contexts in some sort of way. This means that over half of all digital media users have been exposed to or participate consensually or non-consensually in online sexual interactions. While further research is warranted, it is reasonable to predict that these numbers will increase over the years, especially for the younger generations.

### 3.4. *Impact of Generative Artificial Intelligence on Technologically Mediated IPV*

With the rapid advancement of generative artificial intelligence (AI), there is more opportunity for digitally mediated harm and harassment. IBM defines generative AI as “a technology that can create original text, images, video and other content” and it can be done almost instantaneously (<https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/artificial-intelligence>). Generative AI can create images through a series of prompts or by uploading other photos, videos or imagery, and most methods of AI technology are free or easily accessible (<https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/artificial-intelligence>). Generative AI has unlimited potential to exacerbate phenomena like revenge porn and NCDII. No More, an international nonprofit organization dedicated to ending domestic and sexual violence, reported in 2025, that AI is a tool for harm in gender-based violence and can render the latter more complex and multifaceted (<https://www.nomore.org/bias-in-the-bot-ais-relationship-to-gender-based-violence>). Generative AI is often used as a tool for image-based abuse as it can make it easier and quicker for predators to create and distribute violent, explicit, non-consensual, damaging media with little effort (Del Becaro, 2024; de Silva de Alwis 2024). No More found that in 2023, 98% of non-consensual “deepfake” content—which comprises digitally fabricated, hyper-realistic form of digital media, including images, videos and audio (<https://uit.stanford.edu/news/dangers-deepfake-what-watch>)—was sexual in nature, and 99% of those deepfakes were of women (<https://www.nomore.org/bias-in-the-bot-ais-relationship-to-gender-based-violence>). Additionally, generative AI and the use of deepfakes can compromise privacy and security, for victims and their family members (<https://uit.stanford.edu/news/dangers-deepfake-what-watch>). Deepfake content can be used as a blackmailing tool or an extortion tactic, compelling victims to give up personal information or performing an act against their will. As de Silva de Alwis (2024, p. 62) summarizes “The proliferation of deepfakes, AI-generated images, videos, and other media content, against women is another emerging category of violence that must be named in new and revised gender-based violence laws... Pornographic deepfakes reinforces a culture that commodifies and objectifies women's bodies.”

### 3.5. *Co-Occurrence of Online and Offline Violence*

“Technology-driven violence has a shape-shifting quality. It has the effect of blurring the lines between the real and the virtual worlds of violence... Online harassment and abuse spill into the real world, thereby causing both physical and psychological violence” (de Silva de Alwis, 2024, p. 57). Online and offline violence often interact with each other, for digital abuse often coexists with violence in offline spaces thus forming a continuum of harm. Despite the prevalence of DDV, the incidence of offline violence remains more frequent than the former (Jaureguizar et al. 2021). Prior research has found that cases of offline violence stemmed from online communication, and often the violence does not occur until in-person interaction begin (Jaureguizar et al. 2021). In one study among college students, it was found that about half (55.4%) of the students admitted to perpetrating

violence against a partner online, with most common actions of violence being control, while offline violence was much more common for perpetrators (80.4%), especially verbal violence. Of the self-reported victims, about half of the students (51.6%) experienced online violence while more (73.7%) had experienced offline violence, with the most common form of violence being verbal (Jaureguizar et al. 2021).

Digital abuse can also be an extension of offline violence with perpetrators of real life IPV using digital tools to extend their coercive control on their victims beyond physical proximity (Donato et al., 2022). A study from Sweden—which was published in 2022 but data collected in 2011—measured the co-occurrence of online and offline dating violence among adolescents (Dahlqvist et al., 2022). Of the surveyed youth, 57.3% shared they had been victimized in some capacity during their life and it was more common “to be victimized by a cooccurrence of online and offline sexual harassment and bullying, compared to one single form of victimization” (Dahlqvist et al., 2022). The primary forms of digital communication amongst the participants were cellphones and early editions of smartphones; less advanced social media platforms, including Myspace, Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram; and email. The study, though dated, shows the long-lasting impact of online and offline violence on adolescents.

Several studies have reported co-occurrence of online and offline dating violence (Cutbush et al. 2012; Marganski & Melander, 2018; Jaureguizar et al. 2024). Marganski and Melander (2018) note that victims of dating violence in real life noted incidence of online violence by the same perpetrators. Also noted was “online violence victimization was the strongest predictor of offline violence victimization (i.e., psychological, physical, and sexual). Specifically, in the case of psychological offline violence victimization, the only significant predictor was online violence victimization” (Jaureguizar et al. 2024, p. 16). Social media and online interaction have been noted to be a vehicle for perpetration of psychological abuse (Temple et al., 2016; Zweig et al., 2013). Studies that have examined the co-occurrence of online and offline violence have also reported “co-occurrence of perpetration and victimization, known as dual violence, reciprocal abuse or bidirectionality of violence” (Jaureguizar et al. 2024, p. 16). Fernández-González et al. (2020) observed that in dating violence victimization was itself a risk factor perpetration and online platforms often provided the vehicles for reciprocal violence. The theory of reciprocal online dating violence perpetration was also observed by Cutbush et al. (2010), Picard (2007), Temple et al. (2016) and Zweig et al. (2013). However, as Jaureguizar et al. (2024, p. 16) observe, “the mutual or reciprocal dating violence may also be the result of the presence of common characteristics that increase the odds to be a perpetrator and the victim...Therefore, this only reinforces the need to deepen the knowledge of the individual characteristics of victims and perpetrators.”

Mental health among Generation Z adolescents and adults is an ongoing concern, and the victimization in dating violence or IPV can exacerbate their mental health struggles. Online harassment solely, online harassment combined with offline harassment, and online sexual harassment correlate significantly with increased anxiety and depressive symptoms. For instance, Ståhl & Dennhag (2020) found that girls between the ages 12 and 20, on average, reported higher levels of anxiety and depressive symptoms and experienced more online and offline violence than boys. Hence the mental health issues and experiences of victimization of girls could intersect and worsen their wellbeing. Further, the study found that “although offline harassment is more commonly targeted towards girls, the connection to mental health, when it occurs, is similar for both girls and boys,” (Ståhl & Dennhag, 2020, p. 334).). Boys and girls in the study who reported instances of victimization of either online or offline violence expressed their need of peer-relationships for support especially if experiencing violence. This suggests that outreach or mitigation services young adults and adolescents undergoing victimization through offline and online violence can include fostering friendships and bonds with peers.

In a study by Jaureguizar et al. (2024) half of the participants reported experiencing both online and offline violence perpetration and victimization, with a slightly higher victimization data found by Gracia-Leiva et al. (2020). It is important to note here that the reviewed research observed a co-occurrence between online and offline violence, however an observable correlation was not demonstrated in any of the studies. As Jaureguizar et al. (2024, p.13) observe “online dating violence (perpetrated and suffered) also entails offline violence, but not all offline violence is associated with online violence...online and offline violence are two different entities and should be treated as such. Future longitudinal studies should further explore the longitudinal nature of online dating violence,

which would be of great interest to the design of dating violence prevention programs". In spite of the wider prevalence of offline violence, it is important to explore the implications of online violence, take prevention measures, and create safer and more accessible support seeking services for the victims. Additionally, in view of the international recognition of IPV as an important public health concern, and the further complexity presented by the rapid digitalization of communication and interaction, it is important to investigate any existing association between offline and online violence perpetration and victimization to improve mitigation programs and support services for younger victims.

#### 4. Future Directions: Technologically Based Violence Mitigation Services

According to the Lancet Commission on Adolescent Health and Wellbeing, adolescent and young adults' health promotion needs to incorporate multiple health and developmental needs, and lived experiences in order to understand preferences in service uptake and address disparities in access (Hegarty et al., 2019). Technology based violence mitigation services can offer cost-effective and longer-term sustainable solutions to address gaps in support-seeking and service uptake among young adult populations. The World Health Organization (WHO) in 2020 proposed a youth-centered digital health intervention framework for planning, development, and implementing solutions to improve healthcare seeking among young individuals. The WHO health framework notes that young adults globally have a higher ownership of digital devices, and tend to seek health information from the Internet. Hence the potential of systematically studying the use of digital technologies for IPV support provision among young adults cannot be understated.

As Huang et al. (2022, p. 4) note, "The combination use of digital health and implementation strategies/methodologies offers new opportunities to create novel approaches of integrated interventions to disrupt the traditional model of SRH (sexual and reproductive health) access and care to allow for user-friendly solutions." Generation Z individuals also use digital mental health programs approximately 50 percent more than Generation X members, and 64 percent of Generation Z digital health app users said they would continue using the digital resources in the future (Coe et al., 2023). Hence digitizing IPV mitigation services and incorporating service provision in an online format can render it more user-friendly for Generation Z victims.

Prioritizing technology in support services catering to Generation Z can lead to better access and better rates of violence mitigation service uptake. While a systematic review of digital technologies for IPV support provision among young adults is still lacking, prior research shows that text messaging is one of the most frequently used communication strategies for responding to IPV and seeking out help (Hegarty et al., 2019; Huang et al., 2022). Recent studies point to more social media-based strategies including utilization of Facebook, WhatsApp, Twitter, Snapchat and Instagram for disseminating awareness about online and offline IPV. Even blogs, virtual reality and online gaming can be utilized successfully for IPV response services among Generation Z victims (Gabbaron & Wynn, 2016). The utilization of "interactive technology (e.g., accepting input from the users, interactive video games) or technology with tailored functions" (Huang et al., p.4) are more effective among younger adults in promoting attitude and norm change surrounding IPV, and increase help-seeking and service uptake.

Additionally, another possible outlet for support seeking can be the platforms on which technologically facilitated IPV occurs frequently. While many dating apps can serve as the catalyst for violence—both online and offline—or remain the place where a victim first meets abuser, they have the potential to be a place of help, too. Bumble, the second most-downloaded dating app worldwide in 2024, according to Statista, launched its own "complimentary online trauma support program" back in 2021 (Ceci, 2024). The service, called Bloom, is free for its users, and it is specifically designed for individuals who met their perpetrators through the app, or for anyone who is interested in learning more about healthy relationships. While other dating apps like Tinder and Hinge have options to report suspicious activity or harassment, Bumble currently is the only mainstream app that offers online support services to its users (Ceci, 2024). Bloom was created with Chayn, a UK-based "global nonprofit, run by survivors and allies from around the world, creating resources to support the healing of survivors of gender-based violence," (<https://www.chayn.co/about>). Through Bumble and Chayn's joint service, users are granted access to resources, guides, courses, and one-on-one chat messaging services to discuss and learn about trauma and abuse (Ceci, 2024).

While services through dating apps may not be as useful as a crisis hotline or chat function during an in-the-moment emergency, they can be accessible for a wide range of users and can be also be an approachable way of learning about patterns of technologically mediated IPV, including DDV. However, it is also essential to note that young individuals from lower socioeconomic backgrounds may lack the financial means to have adequate access to digital IPV services. For instance, Generation Z minors might not have financial means or personal freedom to have access to devices or technological services (Dasgupta & Melvin, 2024). They also might not have their own funds or freedom to access online payment-required services, especially if the perpetrator is a family member (Dasgupta & Melvin, 2024). For victims with low English proficiency, virtual platforms of service provision can present multiple difficulties (Dasgupta & Melvin, 2024; Gámez-Guadix et al., 2018). Linguistic barriers can get magnified with technological advances. Also, victims may lack familiarity with and understanding of latest digital tools, and also, they might prefer to engage in face-to-face interactions (Dasgupta & Melvin, 2024; Gámez-Guadix et al., 2018). There is scope for further research to better understand whether different technology strategies are associated with different levels of engagement and response towards harm and safety issues among young adults.

## 5. Conclusions

“Traditional measures and assessment of IPV do not specify whether victimization occurs in person or online, and this contextual information could be significant for intervention and prevention...Practitioners could be missing some essential pieces of their clients’ experiences by neglecting to inquire and address technology-based abuse. Because certain behaviors may be more readily observed online, education about technology-based abuse may also enhance and expand the opportunity for interventions” (Brown et al., 2018, p. 223). Future studies need to synthesize relevant research to further examine the prevalence, scope and patterns of technologically facilitated IPV. Further steps include incorporating prevention and mitigation services for this form of violence within ICT devices and platforms, promulgating legislations and policies regarding technology-based abuse, and facilitating collaboration between researchers, lawmakers and advocates (Brown et al., 2018). Finally, the preference for social media and technologically mediated communication over traditional forms of interaction by the Generation Z members renders it essential to rethink and restructure violence mitigation programs and support services for younger victims. Online platforms, especially those provided by social media, can be utilized to encourage disclosure, help-seeking and service uptake among Generation Z victims of violence. It is particularly important to build digital practice and infrastructure to reach generations to come as our reliance on virtual and web-based technology increases.

## References

1. Adarsh, H., & Sahoo, S. (2023). Pornography and its impact on adolescent/teenage sexuality. *Journal of psychosexual health*, 5(1), 35-39.
2. Afrouz, R., & Vassos, S. (2024). Adolescents’ Experiences of Cyber-Dating Abuse and the Pattern of Abuse Through Technology, A Scoping Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 25(4), 2814-2828.
3. Ballester-Arnal, R., Garcia-Barba, M., Castro-Calvo, J., Gimenez-Garcia, C., & Gil-Llario, M. D. (2023). Pornography consumption in people of different age groups: An analysis based on gender, contents, and consequences. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 20(2), 766-779.
4. Borrajo, E. (2020). Cyber dating abuse and relational variables. In S. M. M. Caridade & M. A. P. Dinis (Eds.), *Adolescent dating violence: Outcomes, challenges and digital tools*. Nova Science Publishers.
5. Branch, K., Hilinski-Rosick, C. M., Johnson, E., & Solano, G. (2017). Revenge porn victimization of college students in the United States: An exploratory analysis. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, 11(1), 128-142.
6. Breiding, M. J., Chen, J., & Black, M. C. (2014). Intimate partner violence in the United States--2010.
7. Brown, M. L., Reed, L. A., & Messing, J. T. (2018). Technology-based abuse: Intimate partner violence and the use of information communication technologies. *Mediating misogyny: Gender, technology, and harassment*, 209-227.
8. Campbell, J. C. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *The lancet*, 359(9314), 1331-1336.

9. Caridade, S., Braga, T., & Borrajo, E. (2019). Cyber dating abuse (CDA): Evidence from a systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 48, 152–168.
10. Ceci, L. (2024). Most popular dating apps worldwide 2024, by numbers of downloads. Statista. Available online: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1200234/most-popular-dating-apps-worldwide-by-number-of-downloads/#:~:text=Most%20popular%20dating%20apps%20worldwide%202024%2C%20by%20number%20of%20downloads&text=With%20over%206.1%20million%20monthly,2.8%20million%20monthly%20downloads%2C%20respectively> (accessed on 5 October 2024).
11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). Youth Risk Behavior Survey Data Summary & Trends Report: 2013–2023. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
12. Chayn.com. About Us. Chayn. <https://www.chayn.co/about>
13. Coe, E., Doy, A., Enomoto, K., & Healy, C (2023). A new McKinsey Health Institute survey finds that Gen Z's social media engagement can feel negative but can also help with finding mental health support and connectivity. McKinsey Health Institute. <https://www.mckinsey.com/mhi/our-insights/generation-Z-mental-health-the-impact-of-tech-and-social-media>.
14. Cutbush, S., Williams, J., Miller, S., Gibbs, D., & Clinton-Sherrod, M. (2012). Electronic dating aggression among middle school students: Demographic correlates and associations with other types of violence. In Poster presented at the American Public Health Association, annual meeting (pp. 27–31).
15. Dahlqvist, H., Svensson, Å., & Gillander Gådin, K. (2022). Co-occurrence of online and offline bullying and sexual harassment among youth in Sweden: Implications for studies on victimization and health a short communication. *International Journal of Circumpolar Health*, 81(1).
16. Dasgupta, S., & Melvin, E. (2024). Technology-Based Intimate Partner Violence Intervention Services for Generation Z Victims of Violence. *Social Sciences*, 13(3), 169. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13030169>
17. Decker, M. R., Peitzmeier, S., Olumide, A., Acharya, R., Ojengbede, O., Covarrubias, L., ... & Brahmabhatt, H. (2014). Prevalence and health impact of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence among female adolescents aged 15–19 years in vulnerable urban environments: a multi-country study. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 55(6), S58–S67.
18. Del Becaro, T. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence and gender biases: Between new tools and human rights. *Student's Social Science Journal*, 17(17), 136–142.
19. de Silva de Alwis, R. (2024). A rapidly shifting landscape: why digitized violence is the newest category of gender-based violence. *La Revue des Juristes de Sciences Po*, (25), 62.
20. Dicola, D., & Spaar, E. (2016). Intimate partner violence. *American family physician*, 94(8), 646–651.
21. Dimock, M. (2019). Defining generations: Where Millennials end and Generation Z begins. *Pew Research Center*, 17(1), 1–7.
22. Donato, S., Eslen-Ziya, H., & Mangone, E. (2022). From offline to online violence: new challenges for the contemporary society. *International Review of Sociology*, 32(3), 400–412.
23. Döring, N., Krämer, N., Mikhailova, V., Brand, M., Krüger, T. H., & Vowe, G. (2021). Sexual interaction in digital contexts and its implications for sexual health: a conceptual analysis. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 769732.
24. Dragiewicz, M., Woodlock, D., Harris, B., & Reid, C. (2018). Technology-facilitated coercive control. In *The Routledge international handbook of violence studies* (pp. 244–253). Routledge.
25. Emezue, C. (2020). Digital or digitally delivered responses to domestic and intimate partner violence during COVID-19. *JMIR public health and surveillance*, 6(3), e19831.
26. Fernández-González, L., Calvete, E., & Orue, I. (2018). The role of acceptance of violence beliefs and social information processing on dating violence perpetration. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 29(3), 763–776. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12414>
27. Filice, E., Abeywickrama, K. D., Parry, D. C., & Johnson, C. W. (2022). Sexual violence and abuse in online dating: A scoping review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 67(2), 101781.
28. Gabarron, E., & Wynn, R. (2016). Use of social media for sexual health promotion: a scoping review. *Global health action*, 9(1), 32193.
29. Gámez-Guadix, M., Borrajo, E., & Calvete, E. (2018). Partner abuse, control and violence through internet and smartphones: Characteristics, evaluation and prevention. *Papeles Del Psicólogo*, 39(5), 218–230.

30. Gracia-Leiva, M., Puente-Martínez, A., Ubillos-Landa, S., González-Castro, J. L., & Páez-Rovira, D. (2020). Off-and online heterosexual dating violence, perceived attachment to parents and peers and suicide risk in young women. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(9), 3174.
31. Grimani, A., Gavine, A., & Moncur, W. (2022). An evidence synthesis of covert online strategies regarding intimate partner violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 23(2), 581-593.
32. Hanson, S. (2022). "Weaponized sexuality" to the normalization of sexual violence: Rape culture and the non-consensual distribution of intimate imagery (NCDII) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Winnipeg).
- Hebert, M., Daspe, M. È., Lapierre, A., Godbout, N., Blais, M., Fernet, M., & Lavoie, F. (2019). A meta-analysis of risk and protective factors for dating violence victimization: The role of family and peer interpersonal context. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 20(4), 574-590.
33. Hébert, M., Daspe, M. È., Lapierre, A., Godbout, N., Blais, M., Fernet, M., & Lavoie, F. (2019). A meta-analysis of risk and protective factors for dating violence victimization: The role of family and peer interpersonal context. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 20(4), 574-590.
34. Hecht, E (2022). What years are Gen X? A detailed breakdown of generation age ranges. *USA Today*. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2022/09/02/what-years-gen-x-millennials-baby-boomers-generation-Z/10303085002/>
35. Hegarty, K., Tarzia, L., Valpied, J., Murray, E., Humphreys, C., Taft, A., ... & Glass, N. (2019). An online healthy relationship tool and safety decision aid for women experiencing intimate partner violence (I-DECIDE): a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Public Health*, 4(6), e301-e310.
36. Henry, N., & Flynn, A. (2019). Image-based sexual abuse: Online distribution channels and illicit communities of support. *Violence against women*, 25(16), 1932-1955.
37. Henry, N., & Powell, A. (2015). Embodied harms: Gender, shame, and technology-facilitated sexual violence. *Violence Against Women*, 21(6), 758-779. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215576581>
38. Hinge.com. Safe dating advice. Hinge. <https://help.hinge.co/hc/en-us/articles/360007194774-Safe-Dating-Advice>
39. Huang, K. Y., Kumar, M., Cheng, S., Urcuyo, A. E., & Macharia, P. (2022). Applying technology to promote sexual and reproductive health and prevent gender based violence for adolescents in low and middle-income countries: digital health strategies synthesis from an umbrella review. *BMC health services research*, 22(1), 1373.
40. IBM. (2025). *What is Artificial Intelligence (AI)?*. IBM. <https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/artificial-intelligence>
41. Jaureguizar, J., Dosil-Santamaria, M., Redondo, I., Wachs, S., & Machimbarrena, J. M. (2024). Online and offline dating violence: same same, but different?. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 37, 13.
42. Klettke, B., Hallford, D. J., & Mellor, D. J. (2014). Sexting prevalence and correlates: a systematic literature review. *Clinical psychology review*, 34(1), 44-53.
43. 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(7), 1071-1095.
44. Mooney, R., & Batko, W. (2025). Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Empathy, and Judgements of Non-Consensual Distribution of Intimate Image (NCDII) Victims.
45. National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. National Statistics Domestic Violence Fact Sheet (2020). <https://ncadv.org/STATISTICS>.
46. O'Brien, W., & Maras, M. H. (2024). Technology-facilitated coercive control: response, redress, risk, and reform. *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology*, 38(2), 174-194.
47. Parti, Katalin, Cheryl E. Sanders and Elizabeth K. Englander. 2023. Sexting at an Early Age: Patterns and Poor Health-Related Consequences of Pressured Sexting in Middle and High School. *The Journal of School Health* 93: 73-81.
48. Perrin, A. & Anderson, M. (2019). Share of U.S. adults using social media, including Facebook, is mostly unchanged since 2018. Pew Research Center.
49. Pew Research Center. (2024). *Internet, broadband fact sheet*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/fact-sheet/internet-broadband/>

50. Picard, P. (2007). Tech abuse in teen relationships. Chicago, IL: Teen Research Unlimited. <http://www.loveisrespect.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/liz-claiborne-2007-tech-relationship-abuse.pdf>.
51. Potter, L. C., Morris, R., Hegarty, K., García-Moreno, C., & Feder, G. (2021). Categories and health impacts of intimate partner violence in the World Health Organization multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *International journal of epidemiology*, 50(2), 652-662.
52. Quiroz, S. I., Ha, T., & Anderson, S. F. (2024). "You liked that Instagram post?!" Adolescents' jealousy and digital dating abuse behaviors in reaction to digital romantic relations.
53. 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(13), 1556-1576. Rogers MM, Fisher C, Ali P, Allmark P, Fontes L. Technology-Facilitated Abuse in Intimate Relationships: A Scoping Review. *Trauma Violence Abuse*. 2023 Oct;24(4):2210-2226. doi: 10.1177/15248380221090218. Epub 2022 May 10. PMID: 35537445; PMCID: PMC10486147.
54. Said, I., & McNealey, R. L. (2023). Nonconsensual distribution of intimate images: Exploring the role of legal attitudes in victimization and perpetration. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 38(7-8), 5430-5451.
55. Ståhl, S., & Dennhag, I. (2020). Online and offline sexual harassment associations of anxiety and depression in an adolescent sample. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, 75(5), 330-335.
56. Stanford University. (2024) *Dangers of Deepfake: What to watch for*. University IT. <https://uit.stanford.edu/news/dangers-deepfake-what-watch>
57. Stonard, K. E. (2020). "Technology was designed for this": Adolescents' perceptions of the role and impact of the use of technology in cyber dating violence. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 105, 106211.
58. 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(14), 2083-2117.
59. Swan, T. (2025). *Bias in the bot: Ai's relationship to gender-based violence*. NO MORE. <https://www.no-more.org/bias-in-the-bot-ais-relationship-to-gender-based-violence/#:~:text=AI%20as%20a%20Tool%20for%20Harm&text=Generative%20AI%20has%20made%20it,of%20misinformation%20and%20online%20harassment>.
60. temple, J. R., Choi, H. J., Brem, M., Wolford-Clevenger, C., Stuart, G. L., Peskin, M. F., & Elmquist, J. (2016). The temporal association between traditional and cyber dating abuse among adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(2), 340-349. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0380-3>
61. Tinder.com. Reporting profiles and content. Tinder. <https://www.help.tinder.com/hc/en-us/articles/115003822043-Reporting-profiles-and-content>
62. Tinder Pressroom (2024). The Future of Dating is Fluid. Available online: <https://www.tinderpressroom.com/futureofdating#:~:text=This%20shift%20toward%20honesty,of%20Tinder%20is%20Gen%20Z> (accessed on 6 October 2024).
63. Vale, A. M., Pereira, F., & Matos, M. (2020). Adolescents' digital dating abuse and cyberbullying. In S. M. M. Caridade & M. A. P. Dinis (Eds.), *Adolescent dating violence: Outcomes, challenges and digital tools*. Nova Science Publishers.
64. World Health Organization (WHO). 2020. Youth-Centered Digital Health Interventions: A Framework for Planning, Developing and Implementing Solutions with and for Young People. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240011717>
65. 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(7), 1063-1077. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9922-8>

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.