



Unveiling the Correlates and Associated Factors of Cyber-Intimate Partner Violence (C-IPV) among Men and Non-binary Individuals

Yuhaniz Ahmad^{1,2}, Salmi Razali^{1*}

¹Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, Hospital Al-Sultan Abdullah, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Selangor, Malaysia.

²School of Quantitative Sciences, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia.

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800324>

Received: 21 August 2026; Accepted: 26 August 2026; Published: 04 September 2026

ABSTRACT

Background: Cyber-intimate partner violence (C-IPV) among men and non-binary individuals is an under-investigated public health concern. **Objectives:** This study aimed to determine the prevalence of C-IPV and examine its demographic, behavioral, relational, and digital-associated factors in Malaysia. **Methods:** A secondary analysis of a cross-sectional online survey of Malaysian adults (N = 1,272) was conducted, comprising 1,224 males (96.2%) and 48 non-binary individuals (3.8%). Intimate partner violence (IPV) was screened using the Women Abuse Screening Tool (WAST), and cyber-abuse was assessed via the Cyber-abuse Victimization Scale (CVS). Backward binary logistic regression and chi-squared analyses were applied. **Results:** The overall prevalence of C-IPV was 49.7% (n = 632). In the regression model, weekly alcohol consumption (once to twice a week) was the strongest associated factor (AOR = 6.76, 95% CI [3.61, 12.65]). Participants aged 46 and older had significantly higher odds of C-IPV (AOR = 4.93, 95% CI [1.16, 21.12]) than those aged 21 or younger. Relationship configurations also elevated risk, specifically non-egalitarian partner age gaps (partner 1–5 years older, AOR = 2.10; over 5 years younger, AOR = 1.68) and multiple concurrent partners (2 partners, AOR = 1.69; 3 partners, AOR = 1.83). High digital engagement significantly increased C-IPV odds, including daily browsing for 11 hours or more (AOR = 1.93) and updating accounts daily (AOR = 2.29) or weekly/monthly (AOR = 2.30), while smoking was associated with lower risk. Although non-binary individuals experienced significantly higher rates of physical, emotional, and sexual IPV than males, cyber-abuse manifestations did not differ by gender. **Conclusion:** These findings challenge youth-centric digital abuse assumptions, illustrating how relational dynamics, alcohol use, and intense digital integration compound risk. Inclusive, gender-sensitive interventions are urgently required.

Keywords: Cyber intimate partner violence, Cyber abuse, Alcoholism, Non-binary gender, Social media

INTRODUCTION

While the World Health Organization (WHO)(2025) provides extensive global estimates regarding the prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV) against women there are limited equivalent global prevalence figures for male and non-binary victims of IPV. In the United States, current percentages of IPV among men range from 8% to 28% (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2025). In the UK, the National Centre for Domestic Violence (NCDV) (2026) estimated that 1 in 6-7 men experienced domestic violence. Among non-binary gender, a meta-analysis and systematic review of 49966 transgender individuals indicated a 1.7 times higher prevalence of IPV among them compared to cisgender (Peitzmeier et al., 2020).

Estimating the true prevalence of male victimization is hindered by significant data inconsistencies across regional studies and a pervasive tendency for men to underreport abuse due to societal stigma and masculine norms. Available data most likely represent only a fraction of the issue, as the "feminization" of IPV and differing



interpretations of abusive behaviours continue to obscure the true scope of men's experiences (Hong et al., 2025; Scott-Storey et al., 2023; Spencer et al., 2022).

Understanding men's experiences with intimate partner violence requires considering how evolving gender expectations and diverse masculinities shape their reality. Many societies expect men to act according to a strict, traditional idea of manhood (Farias et al., 2023). Societies that embrace patriarchal doctrine enforce the belief that men must hold absolute social, economic, and political power, which ultimately traps everyone in rigid, harmful gender roles (Farias et al., 2023). When men do not fit this principle, others often use insults, homophobia, or violence to punish them (Elipe et al., 2022). When men go against traditional ideas of manhood, they face a higher risk of partner violence, and gay men face extra dangers like being forced out of the closet. Because society wrongly views being a victim as a female trait, abused men often do not recognize the abuse, blame themselves, or try to act tough to prove they are still "real men" (Hong et al., 2025; Scott-Storey et al., 2023; Spencer et al., 2022). Due to societal pressure, abused men often hide or downplay violence from female partners out of shame and fear of being laughed at or wrongly blamed. When these men do try to get help, authorities and support services frequently dismiss them, while gay and trans victims face even worse isolation due to homophobia and transphobia (Hong et al., 2025; Scott-Storey et al., 2023; Spencer et al., 2022).

While it is often overlooked, research confirms that men experience a diverse and severe range of physical, psychological, and sexual violence within intimate partner relationships (Hong et al., 2025; Scott-Storey et al., 2023; Spencer et al., 2022). Men report experiencing a wide range of physical violence, from hitting and biting to the use of weapons, yet many do not perceive these acts as serious or threatening due to their ability to physically manage or restrain their partners (Vail et al., 2025). While these experiences are often downplayed or lack sufficient context regarding their impact, it is crucial to recognize that many men (particularly within LGBTQ+ relationships) do experience significant fear, terror, and distress, highlighting the need to look beyond the physical act itself to understand the unique, gendered realities of victimization (Lim et al., 2026).

Men also experience a wide range of sexual violence, yet limited definitions that focus strictly on physical force often lead to the underreporting of these incidents by heterosexual men who may not perceive themselves as victims due to differences in physical size and strength (Vail et al., 2025). When broader definitions (including coercion, manipulation, threats, and unwanted sexual activities) are applied, it becomes clear that sexual violence is a significant issue, particularly within LGBTQ+ communities, where incidents of forced sex and specific tactics like HIV-related abuse are reported at higher rates (Palich et al., 2024).

Psychological violence appears to be the most prevalent form of intimate partner violence (IPV) experienced by men, manifesting through coercive tactics such as insults, humiliation, social isolation, and threats (Hong et al., 2025; Scott-Storey et al., 2023; Spencer et al., 2022). This type of violence intended to undermine their self-worth, paternal competence, and sense of masculinity. Unlike the tactics often used against women, psychological abuse against men frequently utilizes "gender role harassment," including emasculating, homophobic, or disparaging comments about their status as a "man," which can lead to profound distress, loss of control, and even suicidal ideation (Lysova et al., 2022; Scott-Storey et al., 2023). Although this area of research is still developing, it is clear that these tactics are uniquely designed to exploit societal expectations of manhood, necessitating further investigation into how men define, experience, and internalize these often-hidden forms of abuse.

Coercive control is a critical framework for understanding intimate partner violence (IPV), as it highlights how perpetrators leverage power to inflict severe physical and mental harm. While men often report being subjected to coercive control by female partners, this abuse frequently manifests through non-physical tactics rather than direct aggression; common methods include the weaponization of children, social isolation, monitoring, manipulation, blackmail, and false accusations (Lysova et al., 2022; Scott-Storey et al., 2023). Furthermore, men may experience economic and financial abuse, such as restricted access to assets, as well as legal and administrative abuse, where systems are manipulated to create financial instability or jeopardize child custody (Berger et al., 2016; Lysova et al., 2022). Although these patterns of control are well-documented, further research is needed to fully understand the unique impacts and variations of these coercive tactics on male victims.



Cyber-violence against men is suggested to manifest as digital stalking, unauthorized device monitoring, image-based sexual abuse (revenge porn), and the manipulation of online social or financial accounts to isolate victims (Hocking et al., 2026). Men frequently underreport these experiences due to the stigma surrounding male victimization and the common, yet incorrect, belief that such abuse is a gendered experience limited to women; consequently, they often face dismissal when seeking help, which exacerbates the psychological distress, anxiety, and fear they endure (Lysova et al., 2022).

Cyber and traditional violence against men is a significant yet frequently marginalized public health and social issue. While research confirms that men experience a diverse range of physical, sexual, and psychological abuse, often mirroring the tactics identified in female victims, the prevailing societal narrative remains deeply coded as a gendered, female-centric experience (Hong et al., 2025; Scott-Storey et al., 2023; Spencer et al., 2022). This systemic stigmatization, reinforced by patriarchal ideals of masculinity and a lack of gender-inclusive research, leaves many male victims isolated, unable to identify their experiences as abuse, and discouraged from seeking support (Lim et al., 2026; Lysova et al., 2022). Consequently, when men do attempt to disclose victimization, they often face scepticism, dismissal, or gender-biased responses from authorities and support services, leaving their unique health and safety needs largely unaddressed (Lim et al., 2026; Lysova et al., 2022). The majority of data on men and non-binary experiences of traditional IPV came from Western countries, and little is known about this predicament in other parts of the world. Despite rapid advances in digital technology, very limited data on C-IPV focus on understanding its occurrence among men and non-binary gender. The progress on investigating this type of abuse has often centred on women's experiences. Hence, this study aimed to investigate the prevalence of C-IPV among men and those who perceived themselves as 'other gender' or non-binary gender. Rather than conducting a direct comparative analysis that might minimize the unique suffering of any specific group, it is essential to examine these experiences by considering the social and structural factors that create distinct variations in how men define, endure, and respond to such violence. This study also investigated C-IPV contributing factors, including demographic, behavioural, relationship, and social media engagement factors. The study would also examine the differences in the manifestation of IPV and cyber abuse between both genders.

METHODOLOGY

Study Setting

This study was carried out in Malaysia, a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural country in Southeast Asia. It is dominated by Malay (58.3%), Malaysian Chinese (22.2%), and Malaysian Indians (6.5%) (Department of Statistics Malaysia (DOSM), 2026). Malays are mostly Muslims, while other ethnic groups are free to embrace and practice any religion. In contemporary Southeast Asian countries such as Malaysia, patriarchal norms dictate a rigid gender binary where men are positioned as the definitive heads of households and primary decision-makers, while women are structurally relegated to domestic and reproductive expectations. This systemic imbalance is reinforced by state-backed messaging and the uneven enforcement of religious and family codes, which prioritize male authority and undermine female autonomy (Nilan & Maunati, 2025). Because the patriarchal framework aligns strictly with a cis-heteronormative ideology, individuals with non-binary gender identities or expressions face severe societal pushback and an increased tendency for mental health problems (Eng Hui et al., 2026).

Study Design

This cohort of participants is part of a larger cross-sectional online study on Malaysian adults examining the associated factors of C-IPV. This study is a secondary analysis focused on men and those perceived as having a gender other than male or female. Data on women have been published elsewhere. The study aimed to determine the prevalence of C-IPV and its relationship with socio-demographic factors, relationship factors, behavioural factors including smoking and alcohol consumption, as well as patterns of social media use. Given the nature of C-IPV, which often occurs in covert environments, an online survey was used to improve access to this target population.



Data Collection

A convenience sampling technique was used to gather the data. The survey disseminated Google Forms questionnaires through social media platforms including Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and WhatsApp. Participants aged 18 years or older, proficient in the national language, i.e., Malay language, in an intimate relationship, and having access to the internet were invited to complete the online questionnaires. After potential participants scanned the QR code on the study promotion banner, they were linked to the participation information page, which described the risks and benefits of the study. Those who fulfilled the selection criteria and agreed to participate were invited to go to the next page to complete the questionnaires. Implied consent was considered when participants proceeded to the subsequent page of the online survey.

Measurement Tools

These questionnaires were divided into 4 sections: i) the sociodemographic background of participants, ii) the questions related to abuse and violence; iii) the behavioural, psychological and relationship characteristics, and iv) pattern of social media use. In the parent online survey, the questions related to gender included the following items: male, female, and other gender. Our secondary analysis retrieved and analysed only data related to males and assumed other gender as non-binary. Other sociodemographic data included ethnicity, employment, marital status, and total household income [categorized into three groups: B40 (total household income less than RM4,849), M40 (total household income between RM4,850 and RM10,959), and T20 (total household income exceeding RM10,959)].

There were no validated and specific local questionnaires assessing all types of gender backgrounds for men and non-binary individuals. Hence, to assess the abuse and violence experiences, we utilized a structured questionnaire, the Malay Version of the Women Abuse Screening Tool (WAST) for screening IPV victims, and the Cyber-abuse Victimization Scale (CVS). The Malay Version of WAST has a cut-off score of 15 and an acceptable Cronbach's alpha of .873, sensitivity of .596, and specificity of .767. The Malay version of the CVS questions has a Cronbach's alpha of .92, indicating high internal consistency.

It measures the frequency of cyber-victimization experiences, from never or once experiencing any cyber-abuse (score= 0) to having twice the occurrence of cyber-abuse (score=1) or having three times or more cyber-abuse (score 2). C-IPV was considered present if the participants reported experiencing both IPV and having scores of any cyber-abuse items with a score of two or more.

For the behavioural, psychological, and relationship characteristics, we assessed the presence of behaviours related to smoking, alcohol consumption, depression, number of partners, and age gaps between participants and their partner. The final sections were related to social media use and information, including the number of social media accounts, duration of browsing social media, number of followers, and frequency of updating the social media account.

Data Analysis

The Chi-squared analysis (X²) was then applied to determine the associations between C-IPV and socio-demographic parameters and the behavioural, psychological and relationship characteristics as well as the pattern of social media use. We also compared the detailed descriptions for each item of WAST and CVS between males vs. non-binary gender. To estimate the odds of the factors that demonstrated significant associations with C-IPV, we included statistically significant and only dependent variables ($p < .05$) in the Chi-squared analyses were included in the backward binary logistic regression model.

Ethical Considerations

This study was approved by the Universiti Teknologi MARA research ethics committee in June 2023; REC/06/2023(PG/FB/12).

RESULTS

Demographic Profile of Participants

Table 1 shows the background of the participants. The total number of study participants (N = 1,272) was divided almost equally between those reporting no exposure to C-IPV (n = 640, 50.3%) and those reporting affirmative exposure (n = 632, 49.7%). There were obvious significant statistical differences in the background sociodemography between participants experience CIPV versus those who did not, except for marital status. The cohort was characterized by a highly distinct dominant profile: the vast majority of respondents were male (n = 1,224, 96.2%), married (n = 1,113, 87.5%), actively employed (n = 1,039, 81.7%), and aged between 22 and 45 years (n = 819, 64.4%). Culturally and socioeconomically, the predominant group identified as ethnically Malay (n = 805, 63.3%), practiced Islam (n = 808, 63.5%), belonged to the Middle 40% (M40) income tier (n = 731, 57.5%), and had attained tertiary-level education (n = 731, 57.5%) (Table 1).

C-IPV and Other Abuses

A total of 576 participants (45.3%) had experienced C-IPV with repeated (twice) cyber-abuse, and about 4.4%(n=56) had experienced C-IPV more than twice. A combined total of 49.7% (n=632) experienced some level of C-IPV involving frequent episodes or twice or more cyber-abuse. When asked about being abused by a partner, about 65% to 70% of male participants reported having 'sometimes' or 'often' experienced physical, emotional, or sexual abuse compared to only about 40% to 60% for those who claimed to be non-binary (Table 2).

Behavioural, Psychological, and Relationship Characteristics

There were obvious significant statistical differences in the background behavioural, psychological, and relationship characteristics between participants experience CIPV and those who did not. In terms of behavioural factors, the dominant group reported lifetime alcohol abstinence (n = 659, 51.8%). Within the C-IPV "Yes" subgroup (n = 632), older participants (46+ years) (n = 264, 41.8%), consumed alcohol once to twice per week (n = 182, 28.8%), and reported exactly three lifetime partners (n = 180, 28.5%) demonstrated a disproportionately higher concentration compared to the "No" subgroup.

Non-smokers represented the largest single smoking status category (n = 493, 38.8%). The majority of the participants were negative for clinical depression (n = 1,121, 88.1%). Regarding relationship factors, more than half of the cohort reported having only one lifetime partner (n = 692, 54.4%), with the most common age gap with a partner being those who had a partner more than 5 years younger (n = 488, 38.4%).

Social Media Use

The overall participants exhibited high digital engagement, with the predominant profile consisting of participants who manage two or more social media accounts (n = 658, 51.7%), browse intensively for 11 hours or more daily (n = 653, 51.3%), maintain a moderate network of 1 to 500 followers (n = 1,002, 78.8%), and update their accounts on weekly to monthly basis (n = 961, 75.5%).

When cross-examined by C-IPV status, the intensive browsing behaviour (11 hours and more) was almost equally split between groups, but distinct descriptive differences emerged elsewhere. Specifically, the C-IPV "No" group showed a higher concentration of participants who managed multiple accounts (n = 347, 54.2%), maintained larger networks of over 500 followers (n = 127, 69.8% of that tier), and updated their profiles daily (n = 108, 62.1% of that tier). In contrast, the C-IPV "Yes" group was more closely balanced between owning one account (n = 296, 46.8%) versus multiple accounts (n = 311, 49.2%) and leaned heavily toward moderate follower counts (n = 559, 88.5%).



Table 1 The Background Characteristics of Sociodemographic, Behavioural, Relationship, and Social Media Use of the Participants

		Cyber-Intimate Partner Violence (C-IPV)				
	Total	No	Yes	X ²	df	p-value
	N=1272	n= 640	n= 632			
Sociodemography						
Age						
21 years or less	17	14	3	36.15	2	<.001**
Between 22 and 45 years	819	454	365			
46 years or more	436	172	264			
Gender						
Male	1,224	603	621	14.3	1	<.001**
Other	48	37	11			
Marital Status						
Single	29	21	8	8.5	4	0.075
Married	1113	546	567			
Widower	77	44	33			
Separated	33	19	14			
Divorce	20	10	10			
Religion						
Islam	808	436	372	17.07	2	<.001**
Other religions	313	126	187			
No religion	151	78	73			
Ethnicity						
Malay	805	435	370	42.79	5	<.001**
Chinese	178	64	114			
Indians	206	82	124			
Sabah Bumiputra	21	14	7			
Sarawak Bumiputra	22	16	6			
Others	40	29	11			
Highest education						
Primary	48	31	17	44.31	3	<.001**
Secondary	462	275	187			
Tertiary	731	311	420			
No education	31	23	8			
Employment						
Working	1039	487	552	27.5	3	<.001**
Unemployed	87	56	31			
Retired	83	53	30			
Student	63	44	19			
Socioeconomic group						
Below 40%(B40)	435	252	183	17.38	2	<.001**
Middle 40% (M40)	731	332	399			
Top 20% (T20)	106	56	50			
Behavioural, Psychological, and Relationship Characteristics						



Smoking status						
Not smoking	493	244	249	52.09	2	<.001**
Not everyday smoking	446	177	269			
Everyday smoking	333	219	114			
Alcohol Use						
Never	659	374	285	133.738	5	<.001**
More than a year ago	122	74	48			
1 to 2 times a year	114	62	52			
1 to three times a month	107	68	39			
Once to twice a week	213	31	182			
Almost everyday	57	31	26			
Depression						
No	1121	548	573	7.719	1	.005*
Yes	151	92	59			
Number of Partners						
1	692	395	297	62.625	4	<.001**
2	251	140	111			
3	256	76	180			
4	59	24	35			
5 or more	14	5	9			
Age Gaps with Partner						
No difference	128	83	45	71.117	4	<.001**
Partner 1 to 5 years older	171	75	96			
Partner more than 5 years older	142	91	51			
Partner 1 to 5 years younger	343	208	135			
Partner more than 5 years younger	488	183	305			
Social Media use						
Number of social media						
One account	525	229	296	27.56	2	<.001**
Two or more accounts	658	347	311			
No account	89	64	25			
Duration of browsing social media						
11 hours or more	649	334	319	13.65	2	<.001**
6 to 10 hours	483	220	263			
5 hours or less	136	86	50			
Number of followers						
More than 500	182	127	55	72.59	2	<.001**
1-500	1002	443	559			
No follower	88	70	18			
Frequency of updating the social media account						
Everyday	174	108	66	68.93	2	<.001**
Weekly to Monthly	961	424	537			
Never	137	108	29			

Notes: X²=Chi-Squared test, df=degrees of freedom, p-value is significant when *p<.05 and **p<.001.



Difference in Abuse Experiences between Males and Non-Binary Groups

Table 2 shows the differences in the experiences of intimate partner abuse between two distinct groups: a large cohort of males (n=1224) and a smaller group categorized as non-binary (n=48). Regarding general relationship tension, a notable disparity emerged. The non-binary group reported a significantly higher rate of "No tension" (50%) compared to the male cohort (27%), indicating a higher prevalence of perceived harmony within this smaller group (p=.002). However, this initial sense of calm contrasts sharply with their reported methods of conflict resolution. When faced with disagreements, the non-binary group reported "Great difficulty" at a rate of 25.0%, more than triple the 7.4% reported by the male group (p<.001). This suggests that while these participants may perceive less constant tension, their approach to managing conflict is markedly more persistent.

Intimate Partner Violence and Cyber Abuse

The non-binary group consistently demonstrated a distinct response pattern, showing a higher frequency of severe indicators of intimate partner abuse, either physical (p=.002), emotional (p=.017), or sexual abuse (p=.036) and statistically significant variations across all items, including feelings of being put down (p=.017), argument ended with kicking and hitting (p=.002) and sensations of fear (p<.001) compared to the male group. However, no significant differences were found between both groups in terms of cyber-abuse.

Associated Factors for C-IPV among the Participants

Table 3 shows the multiple logistic regression analysis to identify the demographic, behavioural, relationship, and social media-associated factors of the target dependent variable. Statistical analysis indicated a strong model fit (Omnibus Coefficient: $X^2(44) = 345.46$, $p < .001$; Hosmer-Lemeshow Test: $X^2(8) = 10.83$, $p = .212$). The pseudo-R² values ranged from .238 (Cox & Snell) to .317 (Nagelkerke). Furthermore, the model successfully classified 68.7% of positive C-IPV cases and 71.4% of negative cases.

Demographic Factors

The multivariate analysis revealed that age was a significant associated factor of the outcome (p = .007). Specifically, participants aged 46 years or more exhibited a nearly fivefold increase in the odds of the outcome compared to those aged 21 years or less (p = .031, AOR=4.93, 95% CI [1.16, 21.12]). The cohort aged between 22 and 45 years did not differ significantly from the youngest baseline group (p = .108). Highest education level also emerged as a significant associated factor in the model (p = .026). However, while the overall variable significantly contributed to model fit, none of the individual education tiers (primary, secondary, or tertiary) achieved independent statistical significance when evaluated directly against the reference group of individuals with no formal education. Similarly, employment status was verified as a significant overall associated factor (p = .017), though its individual sub-categories did not deviate significantly from the baseline student population. Gender, religion, ethnicity, and family monthly income groups did not significantly predict the dependent variable (p > .05).

Table 2 Detailed Questions Assessing the Abuses among Male and Non-Binary Participants

		Gender				
Detailed Questions Assessing the Abuses		Male	Non-Binary (n%)	X ²	df	p-value
		(n%)	n= 48			
		n= 1224				
Items of WAST Questionnaires assessing Intimate Partner Violence						
1. In general, how would you describe your relationship?	No tension	332(27%)	24(50%)	12	2	.002*
	Some tension	712(58.2%)	19(39.6%)			



	A lot of tension	180(14.7%)	5(10.4%)			
2. Do you and your partner work out arguments with difficulty?	No difficulty	324(26.5%)	20(41.7%)	29.19	2	<.001**
	Some difficulty	809(66.1%)	16(33.3%)			
	Great difficulty	91(7.4%)	12(25.0%)			
3. Do arguments ever result in you feeling put down or bad about yourself?	Never	396(32.4%)	25(52.1%)	8.14	2	.017*
	Sometimes	798(65.2%)	22(45.8%)			
	Often	30(2.5%)	1(2.1%)			
4. Do arguments ever result in hitting, kicking, or pushing?	Never	416(34.0%)	28(58.3%)	12.38	2	.002*
	Sometimes	788(64.4%)	19(39.6%)			
	Often	20(1.6%)	1(2.1%)			
5. Do you ever feel frightened by what your partner says or does?	Never	355(29.0%)	24(50.0%)	14.72	2	<.001**
	Sometimes	810(66.2%)	19(39.6%)			
	Often	59(4.8%)	5(10.4%)			
6. Has your partner ever abused you physically?	Never	414(33.8%)	28(58.3%)	12.9	2	.002*
	Sometimes	795(65.0%)	19(39.6%)			
	Often	15(1.2%)	1(2.1%)			
7. Has your partner ever abused you emotionally?	Never	397(32.4%)	25(52.1%)	8.19	2	.017*
	Sometimes	804(65.7%)	22(45.8%)			
	Often	23(1.9%)	1(2.1%)			
8. Has your partner ever abused you sexually?	Never	352(28.8%)	19(39.6%)	6.62	2	.036*
	Sometimes	813(66.4%)	24(50.0%)			
	Often	59(4.8%)	5(10.4%)			

Items of CVS Questionnaires assessing Cyber Abuse Victimization

1. Have you ever been a victim of cyber-abuse/abuse?	Never or once	1066(87.1%)	40(83.3%)	1.16	2	.559
	Twice	122(10%)	7(14.6%)			
	Three times or more	36(2.9%)	1(2.1%)			
2. Someone posted mean or hurtful comments about you online.	Never or once	972(79.4%)	41(85.4%)	3.95	2	.153
	Twice	213(17.4%)	4(8.3%)			
	Three times or more	39(3.2%)	3(6.3%)			
3. Someone posted a mean or hurtful picture of you online.	Never or once	648(52.9%)	23(47.9%)	4.95	2	.084
	Twice	112(9.2%)	9(18.8%)			
	Three times or more	464(37.9%)	16(33.3%)			
4. Someone posted a mean or hurtful video of you online.	Never or once	954(77.9%)	40(83.3%)	0.82	2	.663



	Twice	193(15.8%)	6(12.5%)			
	Three times or more	77(6.3%)	2(4.2%)			
	Never or once	933(76.2%)	40(83.3%)	1.78	2	.41
5. Someone created a mean or hurtful web page about you.	Twice	219(17.9%)	5(10.4%)			
	Three times or more	72(5.9%)	3(6.3%)			
	Never or once	898(73.4%)	37(77.1%)	0.37	2	.832
6. Someone spread rumors about you online.	Twice	197(16.1%)	7(14.6%)			
	Three times or more	129(10.5%)	4(8.3%)			
	Never or once	603(49.3%)	25(52.1%)	0.71	2	.702
7. Someone threatened to hurt you through a cell phone message.	Twice	181(14.8%)	5(10.4%)			
	Three times or more	440(35.9%)	18(37.5%)			
	Never or once	906(74.0%)	39(81.3%)	1.36	2	.507
8. Someone ever threatened to hurt you online	Twice	230(18.8%)	7(14.6%)			
	Three times or more	88(7.2%)	2(4.2%)			
	Never or once	942(77.0%)	36(75.0%)	1.67	2	.434
9. Someone pretended to be you online and acted in a mean or hurtful way	Twice	162(13.20%)	9(18.8%)			
	Three times or more	120(9.8%)	3(6.3%)			
	Never or once	942(77.0%)	36(75.0%)	1.67	2	.434

Notes: X²=Chi-Squared test, df=degrees of freedom, p-value is significant when *p<.05 and **p<.001. WAST=Woman Abuse Screening Tool and CVS= Cyber Victimization Scale

Behavioural and Relationship Factors

Alcohol use was the strongest behavioural factor identified in the model ($p < .001$). This effect was primarily driven by individuals who consumed alcohol once to twice a week, who exhibited more than a six fold increase in odds compared to those who never drank ($p < .001$, AOR = 6.76, 95% CI [3.61, 12.65]). Other alcohol consumption frequencies did not yield statistically significant shifts from the baseline. Depression status did not significantly predict C-IPV ($p = .240$). Smoking status demonstrated a highly significant relationship with the outcome variable ($p < .001$). Interestingly, both smoking groups showed significantly lower odds of the outcome relative to non-smokers. Specifically, non-everyday smokers had lower odds ($p = .036$, AOR = .65, 95% CI [.44, .97]), and everyday smokers demonstrated an even more pronounced reduction in odds ($p < .001$, AOR = .45, 95% CI [.32, .65]) compared to their non-smoking counterparts.

Relationship characteristics heavily influenced the outcome. The age gap with a primary partner was an omnibus significant associated factor ($p = .001$). Participants with partners 1 to 5 years older had more than twice the odds of the outcome compared to those reporting no age difference ($p = .010$, AOR = 2.10, 95% CI [1.19, 3.69]).



Furthermore, having a partner more than 5 years younger was associated with significantly higher odds ($p = .03$, AOR = 1.68, 95% CI [1.04, 2.70]). The number of concurrent partners was also a significant associated factor ($p = .050$). Compared to individuals with only 1 partner, having 2 partners ($p = .012$, AOR = 1.69, 95% CI [1.12, 2.55]) or 3 partners ($p = .012$, AOR = 1.83, 95% CI [1.14, 2.92]) significantly escalated the odds of experiencing C-IPV.

Social Media Engagement Factors

All but one metric of social media interaction served as significant model contributors. The total duration of daily browsing was globally significant ($p = .042$). Individuals who browsed social media for 11 hours or more daily had nearly double the odds of experiencing C-IPV compared to those browsing 5 hours or less ($p = .01$, AOR = 1.93, 95% CI [1.16, 3.23]). The frequency of updating one's social media account was similarly significant ($p = .038$). Relative to users who never updated their accounts, significantly higher odds were observed both for those who updated every day ($p = .023$, AOR = 2.29, 95% CI [1.12, 4.67]) and those who updated on a weekly to monthly basis ($p = .011$, AOR = 2.30, 95% CI [1.21, 4.39]). Finally, the total number of followers presented a significant omnibus effect ($p = .020$). However, individual comparisons against the baseline group (no followers) did not reach independent statistical significance. The total number of social media accounts maintained was not a significant associated factor in this model ($p = .603$).

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide critical insights into the prevalence, demographic, behavioural, and relationship factors that are associated with cyber intimate partner violence (C-IPV) among men and non-binary individuals. By examining these factors through a multivariate lens, this research highlights complex dynamics that both align with and challenge existing literature on digital abuse.

This study found that about 49.7% of men and non-binary individuals have some level of C-IPV involving frequent episodes or two or more episodes of cyber-abuse. This study demonstrates a high prevalence of C-IPV, which supports the increasing number of cyber abuse in the form of cyberbullying (Samsudin et al., 2023) and IPV cases among men as recorded by the local police department in recent years (Radio Televisyen Malaysia (RTM), 2025). Perhaps the online survey created a safe platform for the participants to disclose their experience of becoming victims of cyber abuse and IPV. The percentage is comparable with C-IPV experienced by women (Ahmad & Razali, 2025). The percentage is almost equivalent to those reported in other parts of the world, such as certain districts in the US and European countries (Concordia University St. Paul, 2026; Eurostat, 2025).

Table 3 Multiple Regressions for the Significant Associated Factors for C-IPV among the Participants

Dependent Variables	Multiple Regression						95% C.I. for AOR	
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	P-value	AOR	Lower	Upper
Age			1.02	2	.007*			
Between 22 and 45 years	1.16	0.72	2.58	1	0.108	3.18	0.78	13.07
46 years or more	1.6	0.74	4.67	1	.031*	4.93	1.16	21.12
Gender	-0.62	0.44	1.94	1	0.164	0.54	0.23	1.29
Religions			5.05	4	0.282			
Islam	0.43	0.62	0.5	1	0.481	1.54	0.46	5.17
Buddha	0.42	0.41	1.04	1	0.309	1.52	0.68	3.4
Hindu	-0.25	0.34	0.56	1	0.453	0.78	0.4	1.5
Christian	0.73	0.62	1.38	1	0.24	2.07	0.62	6.98
Ethnics			8.73	5	0.12			
Malay	-0.22	0.74	0.09	1	0.768	0.81	0.19	3.41
Chinese	0.7	0.54	1.66	1	0.197	2.01	0.7	5.82



Indians	0.2	0.6	0.11	1	0.738	1.22	0.38	3.98
Sabah Bumiputra	-0.41	0.74	0.32	1	0.574	0.66	0.16	2.8
Sarawak Bumiputra	-0.87	0.72	1.47	1	0.226	0.42	0.1	1.72
Highest Education Level			9.22	3	.026*			
Primary	0.43	0.64	0.46	1	0.498	1.54	0.44	5.41
Secondary	0.55	0.56	0.96	1	0.326	1.73	0.58	5.15
Tertiary	1	0.56	3.19	1	0.074	2.73	0.91	8.2
Employment Status			1.24	3	.017*			
Working	0.54	0.35	2.37	1	0.124	1.71	0.86	3.38
Unemployed	-0.17	0.42	0.16	1	0.694	0.85	0.37	1.93
Retired	-0.13	0.44	0.09	1	0.763	0.88	0.37	2.06
Family monthly income			0.65	2	0.722			
M40	-0.13	0.16	0.65	1	0.419	0.88	0.64	1.2
T20	-0.09	0.26	0.12	1	0.734	0.92	0.55	1.52
Smoking Status			18.23	2	<.001**			
Not everyday	-0.43	0.2	4.41	1	0.036	0.65	0.44	0.97
Everyday	-0.79	0.19	18.2	1	<.001	0.45	0.32	0.65
Alcohol Use			41.41	5	<.001**			
More than a year ago	0.51	0.26	3.81	1	0.051	1.66	1	2.76
1 to 2 times a year	0.53	0.28	3.52	1	0.061	1.69	0.98	2.94
1 to three times a month	0.15	0.29	0.26	1	0.609	1.16	0.66	2.06
Once to twice a week	1.91	0.32	35.63	1	<.001**	6.76	3.61	12.65
Almost everyday	0.65	0.37	3.14	1	0.076	1.92	0.93	3.96
Depression	-0.26	0.22	1.38	1	0.24	0.78	0.51	1.19
Age Gaps with Partner			17.62	4	.001*			
1 to 5 years older	0.74	0.29	6.6	1	.010*	2.1	1.19	3.69
More than 5 years older	0.15	0.28	0.28	1	0.6	1.16	0.67	2.01
1 to 5 years younger	-0.03	0.25	0.01	1	0.905	0.97	0.6	1.58
More than 5 years younger	0.52	0.24	4.5	1	.034*	1.68	1.04	2.7
Number of partners at a time			9.5	4	.050*			
2	0.53	0.21	6.34	1	.012*	1.69	1.12	2.55
3	0.6	0.24	6.31	1	.012*	1.83	1.14	2.92
4	0.48	0.38	1.58	1	0.209	1.61	0.77	3.4
5 or more	0.97	0.69	1.97	1	0.161	2.63	0.68	10.2
Duration of browsing social media			6.34	2	.042*			
11 hours or more	0.66	0.26	6.33	1	.012*	1.93	1.16	3.23
6 to 10 hours	0.48	0.26	3.45	1	0.063	1.61	0.97	2.68
Frequency of updating the social media account			6.53	2	.038*			
Everyday	0.83	0.36	5.2	1	.023*	2.29	1.12	4.67
Weekly to Monthly	0.84	0.33	6.42	1	.011*	2.3	1.21	4.39
Number of followers			7.86	2	.020*			
More than 500	-0.01	0.49	0	1	0.982	0.99	0.38	2.59
1-500	0.55	0.46	1.45	1	0.229	1.74	0.71	4.29
Number of social media			1.01	2	0.603			



One account	-0.28	0.41	0.44	1	0.505	0.76	0.34	1.71
Two or more accounts	-0.39	0.42	0.85	1	0.356	0.68	0.3	1.55
Constant	-4.69	1.05	19.99	1	<.001	0.01		

Notes: The reference group include Age (21 years or less), Gender (Male), Religions (No religion), Ethnicity (Others), Highest education (No education), Employment (Student), Socioeconomic group (Below 40%:B40), Smoking status (Not smoking), Alcohol Use (Never), Depression (No), Number of Partners (1), Age Gaps with Partner (No difference), Number of social media (No account), Duration of browsing social media (5 hours or less), Number of followers (No follower), Frequency of updating the social media account (Never). X²=Chi-Squared test, df=degrees of freedom, p-value is significant when *p<.05 and **p<.001.

A key finding of this study is the significant role of age in predicting C-IPV. Specifically, individuals aged 46 years or older demonstrated a nearly fivefold increase in the odds of experiencing C-IPV compared to those aged 21 years or less. This outcome contradicts a large body of literature that typically characterizes C-IPV as predominantly affecting adolescents and young adults (Dekel et al., 2025; Gilbar et al., 2023). A plausible explanation for this divergence is that older adults may lack the digital literacy or coping mechanisms required to navigate relationship conflicts online (Khan et al., 2026; Vo et al., 2026), leading to escalations that manifest as cyber surveillance or harassment. Conversely, the cohort aged 22 to 45 did not differ significantly from the youngest baseline group, suggesting a stabilization of risk across emerging and established adulthood.

Age gap between participants and their primary partner also served as a highly significant associated factor of C-IPV. Participants whose partners were 1 to 5 years older exhibited more than twice the odds of experiencing C-IPV compared to those in age-egalitarian relationships. Concurrently, having a partner who was more than 5 years younger also significantly escalated C-IPV risk. These dual findings can be interpreted through the lens of power-control theory and relationship insecurity (Brooks et al., 2020). In relationships where a partner is older, traditional power imbalances, differences in life stages, or asymmetrical digital monitoring may foster control dynamics that manifest as C-IPV. As Malaysia progresses economically, more women enter the workforce and gain economic independence (Jalal et al., 2020). In a heterosexual relationship, older working women who are empowered with financial security may challenge the power dynamics within traditional families and disagree with patriarchal doctrine, instigating conflict that leads to abuse and controlling behaviour. On the other hand, when a primary partner is substantially younger, individuals may experience heightened relationship insecurity, jealousy, or a perceived loss of control and mental torture (Candel & Turliuc, 2019). Such control may happen in polygamous marriage, where the younger spouses may gain indirect control through emotional outbursts manifested as part of their mental health conditions (Salahudeen Raseena & Palaniswami, 2026). Furthermore, in the digital age, these anxieties frequently manifest in cyber abuses and lead to damaged trust, emotional distress, and conflict (Loor, 2026; Toplu-Demirtaş et al., 2022).

The findings of this study also demonstrate that polygamous relationships, compared to monogamous or single-partner arrangements, systematically escalated the odds of digital abuse. Specifically, individuals with 2 partners and those with 3 partners showed progressively higher risks. This escalation in odds strongly suggests that relationship complexity and non-monogamy (particularly if non-consensual or closeted) introduce volatile relational dynamics. Managing multiple romantic or sexual partnerships increases the structural opportunities for conflict, secrecy, and boundary violations (Salahudeen Raseena & Palaniswami, 2026). In such contexts, mobile devices and social media platforms often act as primary battlegrounds (Toplu-Demirtaş et al., 2022). Partners may weaponize digital tools to uncover infidelity, conduct unauthorized surveillance, or execute targeted harassment out of retaliatory jealousy (Loor, 2026). These results highlight that C-IPV risk is heavily compounded by relational configurations that deviate from singular, age-matched partnerships.

Among the behavioural factors examined, alcohol use was identified as the strongest associated factor in the model. This potent effect was primarily driven by individuals who consumed alcohol once to twice a week, who exhibited more than a sixfold increase in the odds of the outcome compared to the baseline group. This finding strongly resonates with established substance use frameworks and offline IPV literature, which position alcohol as a potent disinhibitor that impairs emotional regulation, cognitive processing, increases impulsivity, and misinterprets partner cues (Poole et al., 2026; Rowlands, 2026). In a digital context, alcohol consumption may



reduce a user's perceived threat of consequences, leading to impulsive acts of cyber aggression, aggressive messaging, or obsessive digital monitoring, in particular among non-binary couples (Şerban et al., 2026). In contrast, the results regarding smoking status revealed an unexpected, highly significant inverse relationship. This occurs perhaps because smoking habits may have been successfully used as part of a coping mechanism to handle conflict among men and non-binary individuals (Li et al., 2024).

There are a few limitations of this study that warrant further discussion. Classifying the "other gender" category as representative of non-binary individuals is a structural limitation of the parent survey that likely conflates distinct gender identities and limits statistical power due to the small subgroup size. The cross-sectional design of this secondary analysis precludes establishing temporal precedence or causal pathways between the dependent and independent variables. Furthermore, although an online survey may minimise stigma, shame, or fear related to disclosure of experiencing abuse, the findings should be cautiously interpreted because of the challenges and bias that may occur through online surveys, such as the presence of fraudulent responders, systematic preference to participants with internet coverage, and platform heterogeneity (Han & Anderson, 2026; Schuster et al., 2026). Furthermore, our study was not able to explain other factors such as the presence of power and control through tactics that exploit social stigmas, legal system biases, and traditional expectations of masculinity (Berger et al., 2016; Lysova et al., 2022). Perhaps, future studies should explore C-IPV and other related abuses among men and non-binary individuals using face-to-face interviews and in-depth analysis in a qualitative study without prejudice and bias against them. It is important to highlight the need for future research to employ probability sampling and longitudinal designs to fully unpack these power-control dynamics.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals an alarmingly high prevalence of cyber intimate partner violence (C-IPV) among men and non-binary individuals. These findings significantly challenge traditional beliefs regarding the demographics of cyber abuse. With nearly half of the participants reporting C-IPV experiences, the findings highlight that cyber abuse is heavily driven by complex relational and behavioural dynamics. Particularly, the risk is remarkably high among older adults (aged 46 and above), who may lack digital literacy and conflict-resolution skills, as well as individuals navigating age-disparate or polygamous relationships, where power imbalances and insecurities frequently manifest as digital surveillance or harassment. Furthermore, regular alcohol use serves as a crucial associated factor for cyber abuse, exacerbating impulsivity and relational tensions in the cyber environment. There is an urgent need for effective interventions addressing and mitigating the increasing rates of C-IPV; interventions and future research must pivot toward more inclusive, targeted approaches.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors express their gratitude to the participants who were willing to participate in the survey.

DECLARATION

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Use of AI Services: The authors declare they have used AI services, specifically for grammar correction and minor style refinements. They carefully reviewed all suggestions from these services to ensure the original meaning and factual accuracy were preserved.

Authors' Contribution: YA and SR were responsible for data collection, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, project administration, and writing the original draft. SR facilitated the grant acquisition, conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, supervision, writing, review, and editing. Both authors participated in writing, review, and editing.

Funding: This study is funded by the Ministry of Higher Education Fundamental Research Grant Scheme: FRGS/1/2021/SS0/UITM/02/17 through the Research Management Centre, Universiti Teknologi MARA; ID: 600-RMC/FRGS5/3(063/2021).



REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, Y., & Razali, S. (2025). Cyber-intimate partner violence (C-IPV) and its risk factors among women in Malaysia. *PLoS One*, 20(7), e0327978.
2. Berger, J. L., Douglas, E. M., & Hines, D. A. (2016). The mental health of male victims and their children affected by legal and administrative partner aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 42(4), 346-361.
3. Brooks, C., Martin, S., Broda, L., & Poudrier, J. (2020). How many silences are there? Men's experience of victimization in intimate partner relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(23-24), 5390-5413.
4. Candel, O.-S., & Turliuc, M. N. (2019). Insecure attachment and relationship satisfaction: A meta-analysis of actor and partner associations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 147, 190-199.
5. Concordia University St. Paul. (2026). Why Is Domestic Violence on the Rise? Understanding the Crisis and Criminal Justice Response. Retrieved 18 July 2026 from <https://online.csp.edu/resources/article/domestic-violence-statistics-trends/>.
6. Dekel, R., Nuttman-Shwartz, O., & Gilbar, O. (2025). Predicting distress among young adults: The role of exposure to traumatic events and face-to-face and cyber intimate partner aggression perpetration. *Journal of Family Violence*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-025-00875-4>
7. Department of Statistics Malaysia (DOSM). (2026). Demographic Statistics Malaysia, First Quarter 2026. Retrieved 23 May 2026 from <https://www.dosm.gov.my/portal-main/release-content/demographic-statistic-malaysia-q12026>
8. Elipe, P., Espelage, D. L., & Del Rey, R. (2022). Homophobic verbal and bullying victimization: Overlap and emotional impact. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 19(3), 1178-1189.
9. Eng Hui, E., Lee, L. G. L., & Berezina, E. B. (2026). The Trans-Cis Crossroad: Comparison of Discrimination, Family Rejection, Suicide Attitude, and Family Support between Transgender and LGBTQ+ Cisgender Individuals in Malaysia. *Sexual and Gender Diversity in Social Services*, 1-26.
10. Eurostat. (2025). Violence experienced by total population. Retrieved 18 July 2026 from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Violence_experienced_by_total_population.
11. Farias, M. G., Biermann, M. C., de Melo Maia, L. F., & de Oliveira Meneses, G. (2023). Structural patriarchy and male dominance hierarchies. In *Encyclopedia of Domestic Violence* (pp. 1-14). Springer.
12. Gilbar, O., Charak, R., Trujillo, O., Cantu, J. I., Cavazos, V., & Lavi, I. (2023). Meta-analysis of cyber intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization: Different types and their associations with face-to-face IPV among men and women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 24(3), 1948-1965. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221082087>
13. Han, S., & Anderson, C. K. (2026). The platform matters: Selection and measurement bias in online reviews. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 67(1), 42-53.
14. Hocking, V., Atkinson, S., Dang, H.-V., & Clarke, N. (2026). Everyday tracking and extraordinary harm: item finder misuse in digital coercive control. *Information & Computer Security*, 1-20.
15. Hong, C., Wang, Y., Wang, Y., Pushpanadh, S., Stephenson, R., Keum, B. T., Goldbach, J. T., Graham, S. M., & Holloway, I. W. (2025). The associations between intimate partner violence and mental health outcomes among sexual minority men: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 26(1), 58-72.
16. Jalal, N., Baskaran, R., Rajoo, N. T., Prathaban, S. N., & Ambalagan, P. (2020). Gender equality at the workplace: Malaysia's stance and prevailing challenges. *International Journal of Innovation and Business Strategy*, 14(2), 56-77.
17. Khan, S., Webster, S., Puxty, J., & Robertson, M. (2026). Key challenges and barriers to digital literacy for older adults: Scoping review. *JMIR Aging*, 9, e80647.
18. Li, M., Chau, K., Calabresi, K., Wang, Y., Wang, J., Fritz, J., & Tseng, T. S. (2024). The effect of minority stress processes on smoking for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer individuals: a systematic review. *LGBT Health*, 11(8), 583-605.



19. Lim, G., Lusby, S., Carman, M., & Bourne, A. (2026). Affective barriers to accessing professionalized intimate partner violence services among LGBTQ people in Australia. *Violence Against Women*, 32(5), 1181-1206.
20. Loor, L. M. (2026). *Infidelity in Romantic Relationships: A Scoping Systematic Review* Doctoral Dissertation, California Southern University].
21. Lysova, A., Hanson, K., Dixon, L., Douglas, E. M., Hines, D. A., & Celi, E. M. (2022). Internal and external barriers to help seeking: Voices of men who experienced abuse in the intimate relationships. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 66(5), 538-559.
22. National Centre for Domestic Violence (NCDV). (2026). CDC Domestic Abuse Statistics UK. Retrieved 8 July 2026 from <https://www.ncdv.org.uk/domestic-abuse-statistics-uk/>.
23. Nilan, P., & Maunati, Y. (2025). Gender: New Paradigms of Equity and Identity in Southeast Asia. In *Decolonising Social Science Research in Southeast Asia: New Ways of Knowing* (pp. 33-57). Springer.
24. Palich, R., Rodger, A. J., Nicholls, E. J., Wright, T., Samba, P., Chu, I. Y. H., Burns, F. M., Weatherburn, P., Trevelion, R., & McCabe, L. (2024). Experiences with health care services and HIV testing after sexual assault in cisgender gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men and transgender people. *HIV Medicine*, 25(6), 746-753.
25. Peitzmeier, S. M., Malik, M., Kattari, S. K., Marrow, E., Stephenson, R., Agénor, M., & Reisner, S. L. (2020). Intimate partner violence in transgender populations: Systematic review and meta-analysis of prevalence and correlates. *American Journal of Public Health*, 110(9), e1-e14.
26. Poole, E., Basting, E., Son, S., Jensen, M., Medenblik, A., & Stuart, G. (2026). Emotion Dysregulation, Aggressive Expectancies, and Alcohol: Predicting Intimate Partner Violence in College Students. *Journal of College Student Mental Health*, 1-24.
27. Radio Televisyen Malaysia (RTM). (2025). Berita; Kes keganasan rumah tangga libat mangsa lelaki meningkat; Retrieved 18 July 2026 from <https://berita.rtm.gov.my/nasional/senarai-berita-nasional/senarai-artikel/kes-keganasan-rumah-tangga-libat-mangsa-lelaki-meningkat/>.
28. Rowlands, E. (2026). The Alcohol–Jealousy–Anger Triad: Drivers of Intimate Partner Violence Against Men. *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 11(2), 119-133.
29. Salahudeen Raseena, R., & Palaniswami, U. (2026). Living in Polygyny: Exploring Family Dynamics, Power, and Patriarchy in Women’s Mental Health. *Marriage & Family Review*, 1-20.
30. Samsudin, E. Z., Yaacob, S. S., Wee, C. X., Ruzlin, A. N. M., Azzani, M., Jamil, A. T., Muzaini, K., Ibrahim, K., Suddin, L. S., & Selamat, M. I. (2023). Prevalence of cyberbullying victimisation and its association with family dysfunction, health behaviour and psychological distress among young adults in urban Selangor, Malaysia: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*, 13(11), e072801.
31. Schuster, A. M., Agrawal, S., Watson, G. P., & Cotten, S. R. (2026). Online survey researchers’ experience with fraudulent responders. *Sage Open*, 16(1), 21582440261424005.
32. Scott-Storey, K., O’Donnell, S., Ford-Gilboe, M., Varcoe, C., Wathen, N., Malcolm, J., & Vincent, C. (2023). What about the men? a critical review of men’s experiences of intimate partner violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 24(2), 858-872.
33. Şerban, I., Salvati, M., & Enea, V. (2026). Traditional intimate partner violence and cyber dating abuse among gay, lesbian, and heterosexual individuals. The role of minority stress, alcohol use and jealousy. *Current Psychology*, 45(3), 251.
34. Spencer, C. M., Stith, S. M., & Cafferky, B. (2022). What puts individuals at risk for physical intimate partner violence perpetration? A meta-analysis examining risk markers for men and women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 23(1), 36-51.
35. Toplu-Demirtaş, E., Akcabozan-Kayabol, N. B., Araci-Iyaydin, A., & Fincham, F. D. (2022). Unraveling the roles of distrust, suspicion of infidelity, and jealousy in cyber dating abuse perpetration: An attachment theory perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(3-4), NP1432-NP1462.
36. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2025). National Domestic Violence Hotline, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Violence Prevention and Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; National Domestic Violence Hotline. Available at <https://www.thehotline.org/stakeholders/domestic-violence-statistics/>.



-
37. Vail, S. L., Spencer, C. M., Moore, M., & Keilholtz, B. M. (2025). The role of identity and gender beliefs in self-identification of abuse for male victims of IPV. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 40(9-10), 2424-2444.
 38. Vo, D. V., Nguyen, P. N. T., Huynh, V. T., & Nguyen, G. M. T. (2026). Cyberbullying among high school students: digital literacy as a protective factor? *Social Psychology of Education*, 29(1), 7.
 39. World Health Organization. (2025). Violence against women prevalence estimates, 2023; Global, regional and national prevalence estimates for intimate partner violence against women and non-partner sexual violence against women <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240116962>