TECHNOLOGY, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ADVOCACY AND THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS
BRIDGET HARRIS, MOLLY DRAGIEWICZ, DELANIE WOODLOCK

Bridget Harris

Molly Dragiewicz

Delanie Woodlock

Author/s Biography/ies:

Bridget Harris is an early career researcher and Senior Lecturer in the Faculty of Law, Queensland University of Technology, Australia. She works in the areas of domestic, family and sexual violence; technology-facilitated harm, advocacy and justice in the context of gender-based violence; spatiality (space, place, spacelessness); access to justice.

Molly Dragiewicz is Associate Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Griffith University in Australia. Dragiewicz is an internationally award-winning criminologist whose research focuses on violence and gender. She is currently working on research about technology-facilitated coercive control, domestic violence and family law, and complex trauma.

Delanie Woodlock is a community researcher and Adjunct Lecturer at the University of New England, Armidale, Australia. Her research interests include: violence against women, domestic violence, and the medicalisation of women's health. Her work has examined violence against women with disabilities, technology-facilitated abuse, and the impact of trauma on women's mental health.

ABSTRACT:

Goal 5 of the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) prioritises gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls. Key to achieving this is addressing violence against women (VAW; see SDG target 5.2) and, we believe, understanding the role of technology in both enacting *and* combating VAW. In this chapter, we outline how technology-facilitated VAW threatens women's use of technology and discuss policies and practices of support workers and practitioners that aid safe use of digital media. We consider features of technology-facilitated VAW advocacy which differ from traditional VAW advocacy, using examples from the global north and south. Information communication technologies are used by VAW advocates in a range of ways; to provide information and education about domestic violence, safe use of technology and negotiating the legal and criminal justice systems; collect evidence about abuse; provide support; and pursue social change. As the capabilities and prevalence of ICT and devices increase and access costs decrease, these channels offer new and innovative opportunities capitalising on the spacelessness, cost-effectiveness and timelessness of media. Nonetheless, technological initiatives are not perfect or failsafe. Throughout the pages that follow, we acknowledge the limitations and challenges of technology-facilitated advocacy, which could hinder application of the SDG.

KEYWORDS:

(Please supply up to 6 keywords for your Chapter)

1. Domestic violence
2. Gender-based violence
3. Technology
4. Advocacy
5. Spatiality
6. Technology-facilitated violence

TECHNOLOGY, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ADVOCACY AND THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Introduction

Goal 5 of the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) prioritises gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls. Key to achieving this is addressing violence against women (VAW; see SDG target 5.2) and, we believe, understanding the role of technology in both enacting *and* combating VAW. Recognition of and responses to technology-facilitated VAW is growing. In fact, in her latest report, Dubravka Šimonović, the UN Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women emphasised that "[o]nline and ICT-facilitated forms of violence against women have become increasingly common, particularly with the use, every day and everywhere, of social media and other technical platforms" (2018, p. 4), and must be targeted. The UN has been proactive in identifying and seeking to combat what has been termed 'cyberviolence against women'. Indeed, in July 2017, 'Orange Day' – a day, each month, when the United Nations Women aims to raise awareness and prevent VAW – focused on cyberviolence. Interestingly, this particular Orange Day used technology; uniting experts and survivors in a UN 'Facebook live' session that discussed experiences and responses to the phenomenon. Like advocates across the globe, the UN has not only used technology to address 'online' but 'offline' VAW. Information, resources, guides and research are shared by the UN via the Internet and information communication technology (ICT). Initiatives that use technology to address VAW (such as those developed by advocates and agents of change) are also sponsored and shared by such channels. Thus far there has been little academic consideration of how technology is or could be used to eliminate VAW, protect women and advance their rights and freedoms. Without reflection and examination, the progress of SDG 5 is, consequently, limited. In the pages that follow we considered the impact of technology in relation to SDG 5 and how digital media may be harnessed to eliminate VAW (5.2). In pursuing goal 5, the UN recognises the importance of protecting and advancing women's use of technology (SDG 5.B). Indeed, technology can, we contend, help to "facilitate full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life" (SDG 5.5). Fulfilling the aspirations of 5.B and 5.5 means ensuring that women can safely use technology so cyberviolence specifically, and VAW more broadly, must be eliminated.

This chapter seeks to address a knowledge deficit and prompt further study of how technology can be used to secure SDGs. We begin by exploring pathways to the 5th UN SDG and current directions on VAW. We then outline how technology-facilitated VAW threatens women's use of technology and discuss policies and practices of support workers and practitioners that aid safe use of digital media. The third component of the chapter then outlines features of technology-facilitated VAW advocacy which differ from traditional VAW advocacy, followed by the fourth section, which features studies of praxis. ICTs are used by VAW advocates in a range of ways; to provide information and education about domestic violence, safe use of technology and negotiating the legal and criminal justice systems; collect evidence about abuse; provide support; and pursue social change. As the capabilities and prevalence of ICT and devices increase and access costs decrease, these channels offer new and innovative opportunities capitalising on the spacelessness, cost-effectiveness and timelessness of media (see also Bennett & Segerber 2012; Coombs 1998; Jensen, Jorba & Anduiza 2012). Nonetheless, technological initiatives are not perfect or failsafe.

Throughout the pages that follow, we acknowledge the limitations and challenges of technology-facilitated advocacy, which could hinder application of the SDG. We note that the scope of this chapter is international, documenting initiatives in the global north and south, though we appreciate that we focus more heavily on English speaking nations. This is both a consequence of language barriers and limited sources we can reach, though we have endeavoured to include a range of countries, cultures and dialects where possible.

Terminology

VAW is a broad category and is defined by the UN in the *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against* Women, 1993 as:

> any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life.

In this chapter we centre here on one form of VAW in examining technology-facilitated harm and advocacy: domestic violence. Different words have been described to discuss this phenomenon (such as intimate partner violence, domestic violence, family violence, gender-based violence), which we see as enacted in the family setting, primarily by intimate partners. We contend that domestic violence is gendered; disproportionately harming women, due to persistent and pervasive gender norms and structural inequality between women and men (on this framework and terminology discussions, see DeKeseredy, Dragiewicz & Schwartz 2017; Harris 2018). We draw on Kelly's (1987) and Stanko's (1985), work, in situating domestic violence (and technology related abuse and stalking practices by perpetrators) within a continuum of violence (Kelly) or unsafety (Stanko) to which women are consistently exposed. These harms can be emotional, physical, structural and symbolic and feature in all social domains. This continuum is underscored by and seeks to preserve male power and social control (see also Harris, forthcoming).

A second key term that must be defined is ICTs. ICTs include forms of communication technology like computers and the associated use of the Internet, mobile phones and other communication and information dissemination devices, including global positioning systems (GPS), and digital audio and video recording devices. Social media platforms, such as Facebook; "micro-blogs" like Twitter, Tumblr and Instagram, and video and podcast sharing services such as Vimeo, Snapchat, Vine and YouTube, can also be classified as ICTs (on studies examining domestic violence and technology see Dragiewicz et al 2019; Hand, Chung & Peters, 2009; Harris & Woodlock 2019; Woodlock 2017) .

The Sustainable Development Goals, Technology and Gender

Human rights frameworks provide a foundation to outline and advance basic rights and protections. Over time, these principles have evolved to emphasise that, to progress women's rights and equality, VAW must be addressed. Indeed, in 1993, the UN *Declaration*

on the Elimination of Violence against Women stated that "violence against women is an obstacle to the achievement of equality, development and peace" (UN, 1993). Twenty-three years on, the UN's blueprint for the future – the SDGs (5) – includes, as a stand-alone goal for the first time, an aim to "achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls". Development and human rights goals are increasingly converging, with the SDGs incorporating a much stronger focus on human rights as a means to promoting sustainable development than ever before. In line with these reforms, VAW has emerged as a key issue for recent efforts to promote sustainable development. Mirroring earlier manifestations, the UN asserts that, key in accomplishing these priorities is eliminating all forms of VAW "in the public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation" (VAW, UN 2015, SDG 5.2). This goal positions VAW as an important social problem with significant implications for development, health, and justice. SDG 5 also avows that women and girls should have full and effective civic participation and leadership opportunities in political, economic and public life (SDG 5.5). Recognising the role technology can play in pursuing gender equality and empowering women and girls, the SDGs also prioritise their access to technology (SDG 5.B).

Technology can provide channels for women to bolster their financial and social capital, via access to educational and employment pathways, and participation and autonomy in various community and State spheres (Harris & Woodlock 2019). It is therefore important to enhance access to technology (SDG 5.B) and address barriers to technology, including how perpetration of VAW, both offline and online, can restrict or reduce use of technology. The latter has received little attention until more recently. As uptake of digital media and devices increases, so too does technology-facilitated VAW, which threatens the ability of women to exercise their rights and freedoms, access opportunities and engage in community and civic life. The UN acknowledges that human rights discourses provide both obligations and resources for addressing human rights implications of VAW offline *and* online. On the latter, the most recent *Report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women, Its Causes and Consequences on Online Violence Against Women and Girls from a Human Rights Perspective*, notes:

> *Even though the core international human rights instruments, including those on women's rights, were drafted before the advent of ICT, they provide a global and dynamic set of rights and obligations with transformative potential, and have a key role to play in the promotion and protection of fundamental human rights, including a woman's rights to live a life free from violence, to freedom of expression, to privacy, to have access to information shared through ICT, and other rights* (Šimonović, 2018, p. 5).

There has been some scholarship in the aforementioned areas, but very little specifically exploring how technology can be used to tackle VAW (see SDG 5.2) and, how advocacy can protect and safeguard women's use of technology (see SDG 5.B). Both elements are ultimately integral to attaining gender equality and empowerment.

Technology as a Channel to Enact Domestic Violence

TECHNOLOGY, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ADVOCACY AND THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Cyberviolence is firmly on the VAW agenda, yet thus far, there has been little attention on technology in the enactment of domestic violence (see Dragiewicz et al 2018; Dragiewicz et al 2019; Harris 2018; Harris & Woodlock 2019; Woodlock 2014, 2017). Domestic violence perpetrators use a raft of spatially diffuse strategies to enact harm (Stark 2007) and increasingly, this involves using digital channels (Harris 2018). Given the features and uptake of technology and role it plays in our lives, it has, worryingly, as Woodlock (2017) explains, ensured domestic violence perpetrators have almost constant and immediate access to survivors. ICT has served to escalate and amplify harm in violent relationships (Dimond, Fiesler & Bruckman 2011). It is not a distinct form of abuse or stalking, but part of a pattern of behaviour in coercive and controlling relationships; an "extension of violence that is already being perpetrated in the relationship" (Lyndon et al 2011, 3178) and incorporates:

> such behaviours as harassment on social media, stalking using GPS data, clandestine and conspicuous audio and visual recordings, threats via SMS, monitoring email, accessing accounts without permission, impersonating a partner, and publishing private information (doxing) or sexualised content without consent (Dragiewicz et al 2018, 610).

We contend that these behaviours should be framed as 'technology-facilitated coercive control' or 'digital coercive control', as these terms highlight:

> the method (digital), intent (coercive behaviour) and impact (control of an ex/partner) and – because the concept of 'coercive control' is central – situates harm within a wider setting of sex-based inequality (Harris & Woodlock 2019, 533-4).

This framing is underscored by an assumption that there is intersectional structural inequality and men engage in coercive control to maintain and reinforce their power and status (Stark 2007). Thus digital coercive control (as an extension of traditional patriarchal structures) clearly infringes women's rights, freedom and equality (the focus of SDG 5).

Survivors report serious, pervasive and persistent outcomes of digital coercive control (Dragiewicz et al 2019). The "concept of 'feeling safe' from an abuser no longer has the same geographic and spatial boundaries it once did" (Hand et al 2009, part 3). Women are exposed to digital harms whenever and wherever devices or digital profiles are accessed (Harris 2018). The contact and surveillance afforded by ICT aids perpetrator omnipotence and omnipresence (Stark 2007) and serves to "microregulate women's everyday behaviour (in private and public places) and restrict their access to supports, via spaceless means" (Harris & Woodlock 2019, 538). Women have described the "invasions of privacy and curtailment of communications as forms of violation that were damaging in and of themselves, infringing upon their basic dignity" (Dragiewicz et al 2019, 29). This impacts on their wellbeing, sense of safety and security (Harris 2016), creating a "climate of fear" (Dragiewicz et al 2019, 29). Harms performed using technology can "pose not only a greater danger, but also provide a deterrent for women who are considering leaving" (Dimond et al 2011, 413-414). Coercive control generally and forms of digital coercive control specifically (high level messaging and digital monitoring and stalking) have been identified as an emerging trend across domestic homicide and filicide cases (Harris, forthcoming). Despite associated psychological, emotional and physical effects, digital coercive control has frequently been minimised and overlooked by criminal justice agents (Harris & Woodlock 2019). Women are commonly pressured (by their social networks, police, telecommunication providers and social media platforms) or may elect to change their use of technology, or disengage altogether. This is problematic and can lead to an escalation as opposed to

cessation of violence. Moreover, it reduces women's use of technology (SDG 5B), which is important in aiding civic participation, education and employment opportunities (SDG 5.5) and has been found to assist women in overcoming conservative gender roles and patriarchal structures in communities (Harris & Woodlock 2019; Hay & Pearce 2014)

Appreciating that technology can be a tool for perpetrators, in past decades organisations have used ICT to assist workers encountering and survivors experiencing digital coercive control. Perhaps the most well-known enterprise is Safety Net, founded by Cindy Southworth in the United States of America in 2002, under the auspices of the National Network to End Domestic Violence. Safety Net focuses on the intersection of technology and domestic violence and works to address the safety, privacy and civil rights of survivors (see also Southworth, Finn, Dawson, Fraser & Tucker, 2007). Representatives began training community agencies about perpetrators use of technology in domestic violence, as well as how survivors can use technology, safely (pursuing both SDG 5.2 and 5B). A key aspect of Safety Net activity is a 'train the trainer' model, resulting in the development of a network of technology safety trainers. Knowledge-sharing also occurs at annual international Technology Summits (often sponsored by corporations such as Uber, Facebook, and Google) which began in 2013. The Summit brings together VAW advocates, service providers, law enforcement, and technology companies to address the intersections of technology, safety, and privacy. Information is provided about existing and emerging strategies of perpetrators, advocates and ICT platforms and updates pertaining to justice system policies and practices. In 2017 the Safety Net Project expanded into Australia, with WESNET's (The Women's Services Network) Safety Net Australia launching in 2011 and in 2017 SafetyNed launched in the Netherlands. Like their predecessors, Safety Net Australia and SafetyNed provide information for advocates and survivors of digital coercive control. These bodies have made important strides towards educating women and workers, yet there are challenges with these operations, including the need for ongoing funding (and thus often State support), the evolution of technology which can pose new threats and the tension of educating women and workers, but not perpetrators.

Technology as a Channel for Advocacy

Domestic and sexual violence advocates workers have long endeavoured to reduce VAW, protect and empower women, with and without technology. However, the characteristics and dynamics of the Internet and ICT brings the prospect of extending 'traditional' (offline) work and counter barriers facing domestic violence workers. ICT provides cost-efficient "new channels and opportunities for legal advocacy, community engagement and empowerment" (Harris 2013, 270; Cukier & Middleton 2003; Greenberg & MacAulay 2009). Internationally, support workers are overburdened and under-resourced and importantly, digital initiatives can be offered with limited capital. Across the globe agencies (particularly NGOs) generally rely on tenuous and temporary State funding and/or contributions from the community or private sector. As a consequence, staff often struggle to assist all clients or potential clients in their area or to be assured of their ability to do so in the future. Organisations have recorded extensive unmet requests for services; a consequence of the sheer volume of survivors, help-seeking, and proportionately low economic and staff sources (see, for instance, NNEDV 2018). Workers may be restricted in their areas of operation - only servicing particular catchment areas - divisions which may be imposed by funders or organisational charters, for practical purposes (George & Harris 2014). Precarious financing can result in staff being laid off or positions unfilled (NNEDV 2018). Technology offers a free or cost and resource effective means for advocates to both build their profile, capacity and

extend their services, numerically, in terms of clients assisted; operationally, through roles performed; and geographically (Harris 2013, see also Castan 2010; Good Christopherson & Nemovicher 2012; Hart 2002).

ICT seems to further opportunities for heavily burdened organisations contending with penury, to not only deliver but amplify their services. Yet technology-facilitated advocacy does need resources and investment to establish (Partners for Prevention 2013) which can be difficult as workers and women may be affected by the digital divide. Essentially, citizens do not have equal connectivity, in terms of adequate access, or ability to engage with the internet and ICT. A breadth of literature has highlighted digital divides between persons with more and less capital and certainly VAW agencies have limited capital. This is concerning, as our research on VAW and technology has indicated that workers are anxious about their ICT knowledge and skills (Woodlock 2017). Digital media training and education can require both time and money, which has to be diverted to other facets of the organisation, including from face-to-face assistance for survivors (Dragiewicz et al 2019). Moreover, we contend domestic violence survivors may experience a digital divide, because of the dynamics of abusive relationships. We have found that, as part of the control and coercion enacted by perpetrators, survivor finances and ICT can be withheld or removed (Dragiewicz et al 2019). Discrepancies in technology uptake and ownership have also been observed based on disabilities, ethnic and cultural identity, gender, education level, age and geographic location (Curtin 2001; DiMaggio, Hargittai, Russell Neuman, & Robinson 2001; Dutta-Bergman 2005; Harris 2013; Mesch 2012; Rooksby, Weckert & Lucas 2007; Willis & Tranter 2006). Ultimately, "online inequalities often mirror offline ones", as Hacker, Mason and Morgan (2007) explain. Thus while technology might be used to overcome inequalities, if not confronted or considered, digital advocacy may serve to reinforce rather than redress marginalisation and hinder the effectiveness of initiatives. The digital divide can effect VAW agency development and delivery of and survivor engagement with digital advocacy. Organisations must be aware of and develop strategies to bypass these issues to ensure effective use of technology.

Despite the digital divide, the 'spacelessness' of technology-facilitated violence can be transformative for organisations. Traditional advocacy is generally restricted to particular places (fixed geographic areas), but technology-facilitated advocacy is not. ICT can be accessed through a fixed location within "macro access points" ("community or public access points, such as in a school or library") or "micro access points" ("privately owned access points, such as in a residence or Internet cafe") or, increasingly commonly, while in transit, using a portable device (Harris 2013: 274). Even when access points are fixed, they are not bound to a particular place and so can offer a spacelessness that transcends physical borders and boundaries (see also Blair & Harris 2012). We do emphasise that, globally, knowledge-sharing about digital advocacy in different locations can be beneficial, but there are contextual differences and so "informed understanding of the political, social and cultural *contexts* in which media and communications interventions" and "cultural norms and beliefs, and knowledge of target audiences" is imperative (Partners for Prevention 2013, 14). Nonetheless, spaceless advocacy has advantages. Jurisdictionally, real world practices can be constricted and this is perhaps most evident when regional, rural and remote locations are examined. The time, distance and cost required for non-urban workers or clients to travel to survivors and other agencies can be prohibitive. Public transport networks, where available, are often scant and fragmented at best, and private transport (taxis or ride-sharing) options are often absent (Harris 2016). ICT can allow for connection with clients and/or with other industry professionals, without travel. Certainly technology can bolster the parameters of service provision, but, regardless of mode of delivery, both workers and survivors may prefer in person to digital contact (Harris 2013).

Some domestic violence survivors may favour the privacy and anonymity afforded by ICT-facilitated advocacy. Those seeking assistance for what is often characterised as 'private' and 'hidden' violence have described difficulties in "going public" (George & Harris 2014, 84). This is especially true for those in small (regional, rural and remote) communities where they are more likely to be known by those they disclose violence to than in larger (urban) communities. With ICT and the Internet, women may be able to seek information and support from wherever they like, whenever they like, without necessarily feeling exposed. With some digital channels (like Skype) there may be restrictions as to when 'real world' workers can be reached, but there is otherwise a 'timeless' aspect of digital advocacy (Titifanue, Kant, Finau, & Tarai 2017). Internet pages and applications, for instance, can be engaged whenever a woman chooses to use such sources (at any time of the day or night and in any location, through mobile devices). While ICT is typically only accessed when workers are available, digital media may be available beyond the hours of a traditional domestic violence service. Even where practitioners are not on-hand for instant communications, there may be automatic references or links provided to women, courtesy of the platforms employed. Workers can, in fact, still be provided even in their absence, with the use of artificial intelligence programs to communicate with and provide information to women. In Thailand the 'Sis Bot' chat bot provides 24 hour information for survivors via Facebook Messenger (UN Women 2019). Such initiatives are relatively new and are rarely evaluated. While interesting, we caution that these should not function as replacements for 'real world' workers and anecdotally, we have heard of problematic responses when disclosures are made or assistance is sought. Essentially, technology may provide 'out-of-office' information and referrals at the convenience of the user, but we are skeptical that it can be used for user-specific queries, such as in regard to safety-planning.

Technology and the Provision of Information and Education

Information and education for workers and women can, we maintain, potentially advance elimination of VAW and foster safe engagement with technology and opportunities for social and civic participation. Legal agents - those at non-government services in particular - have proactively trialed the technological provision of knowledge as a means to extend numbers of those assisted. Free, community-based services are pioneers in this area; staff have sought to democratise and demystify legal knowledge, including pertaining to domestic violence (Blair & Harris 2012). Domestic violence advocacy organisations too, have explored how technology can provide information to survivors and practitioners since the 1990s (Roberts, 2002). Resources can include an overview to the dynamics of violence, help-seeking processes and links to supports. There has been relatively little evaluation of this educative role to date. Finn's (2000) content analysis of domestic violence related websites in June 1998 is an exception. He found 300 domestic violence agencies already had a web presence. A survey of the agencies (166 responded) indicated that the majority had been online for under two years and had created their websites primarily to provide community education. However, even at this early stage of technology-facilitated advocacy it was apparent that these channels could be weaponised. Several agencies in Finn's (2002) study reported receiving threats and staff subjected to online abuse. One agency website was hacked, with all the pronouns changed from "she" to "he" when referring to survivors of domestic violence. Confronted by these reports, Finn (2000, 95) cautioned that services needed to "…understand that the use of the Internet itself may create new forms of victimization for users" and could increase the risk "...of violence if an abusive partner discovers online activity related to domestic violence services". Crucial, Finn (2000) advised, was awareness of dangers exposed to staff and services in online advocacy provision. To

this end, he recommended that agencies sites instruct survivors about safe use of technology, such as password protection, encryption software and how to respond to online harassment. Older initiatives are to be commended for their innovation and intent, although more attention to risk facing workers and women was needed to pursue SDG 5.2.

There has been much development and agency knowledge-sharing in this arena, but, worryingly, Sorenson, Shi, Zhang, and Xue's (2014) analysis of 261 VAW agency websites found that most still did not provide the safeguards; only one third of the pages had an "escape" or "quick exit" option. Most did not explain why such an option might be needed or provide information about perpetrators' use of technology in domestic violence. Our review of online VAW resources indicates that this may be changing. This is especially true of jurisdictions where there has been wide-scale specialised training of practitioners on the topic of technology and domestic violence. Consequently, we maintain that, in order to effectively provide educative resources for women, education of workers must be foreground. A pressure though, for agencies, is temporality. While survivors can access the Internet and ICT at any time, information can become dated and so must be both regulated and updated.

One initiative using technology to extend both organisational and survivor knowledge was undertaken by one of the authors of this chapter (Woodlock; see Woodlock et al 2019), together with colleagues in Australia. The 2015 ReCharge: Women's Technology Safety project (hereafter referred to as the 'Recharge project' brought together three Australian community organisations (the Domestic Violence Resource Centre Victoria, WESNET and Women's Legal Services New South Wales - NSW) to examine how technology could be used to support frontline domestic violence professionals (and survivors), in particular, responses to digital coercive control. Online surveys of 546 practitioner participants provided insights into needs of staff and survivors, which informed development of referral information and online staff training programs. There are benefits to the creation of spaceless training, including that it can be accessed by those in any geographic location, such as regional, rural and remote zones. However, we have found that, when upskilling, some prefer in person education. In face-to-face sessions on digital coercive control, for example, trainers can 'walk through' apps, programs and devices; showing staff how to open and alter privacy settings (Dragiewicz et al 2019). We do note that agencies could engage with both online and offline training, if available. It is nonetheless important to consider how digital mode of delivery may impact on learning, for workers and survivors.

Legal guides were created for the Recharge project, which outlined the relevant legal options for those experiencing stalking and abuse, enacted through technology, in the context of domestic violence. In so doing, the resources serve to outline the 'tools' that women could apply in responding to and regulating violence, beyond legislation focused on domestic violence. This included information about protection orders, surveillance and recordings and relevant criminal offences, with scenarios explaining how laws could be applied in particular circumstances and jurisdictions around the country. Content also covered interrelated topics, including family law and property law. These resources distilled complex legal and justice system information, which could otherwise be expensive to access and challenging to understand, though it may still feel overwhelming for survivors. And even locating – let alone consuming – these resources may be beyond some survivors who struggle with help-seeking (Harris 2013; Partners for Prevention 2013). Moreover, like workers, survivors may find ICT off-putting and be more comfortable accessing information face-to-face (Blair & Harris 2012; Harris 2013). It can, however, be a crucial source of information for women and a starting point in help-seeking. We also note that, for survivors in areas with few VAW and legal agencies, digital advocacy may be the only channel of assistance they can easily

contact. This is true too, where abusers restrict travel and access to transport or when they intentionally cause conflict of interest by contacting all legal organisations in a location (George & Harris 2014).

Technology and Evidence Collection

Technology can function to assist in regulation and thus elimination of VAW (SDG 5.2). Building on previous projects on digital coercive control (see Woodlock 2013, 2017) Woodlock – one of the chapter authors – was involved in the formulation of a smartphone app called SmartSafe+ in 2015. Launched by the Domestic Violence Resource Centre Victoria (DVRCV), the app was designed to assist survivors to collect and store evidence to assist in the procurement of a protection order, or to prove a breach of an order. SmartSafe+ stored photographs, video and recordings off device, to ensure the evidence could be protected and presented in court. In our work survivors have previously identified "a lack of clarity and general confusion as to what evidence of technology-facilitated abuse and stalking is acknowledged by police", especially in regard to breaches of intervention orders "and is admissible in court" (George & Harris, 2014, 162; see also Harris, 2016, 2018). Thus the establishment of clear guidelines to collect and present evidence was paramount. During the development of the app, extensive consultations were held with court support workers, legal advocates, lawyers, police, court registrars and judicial officers so as to ensure app-collected evidence was admissible and the chain of evidence would not be impacted by electronic storage.

The SmartSafe+ app was distributed via frontline domestic violence professionals and many staff received training prior to client engagement. This process ensured app users were supported by practitioners and the app was part of the support process, not a standalone resource. Attention was also given to safety. In order to use the app, women had to first participate in a risk assessment (a series of questions) which asked them to reflect on how a perpetrator may use technology. Previous research conducted by the DVRCV has shown that many perpetrators demand passwords and full access to a victim's phone (Woodlock, 2013) and so, in such circumstances, women are advised not to use the app. The success of the app was apparent not only in its extensive uptake but in State honours issued. In 2016 SmartSafe+ won the inaugural Victorian Premier's iAward for Public Sector Innovation at the Australian Information Industry Association in 2016. The SmartSafe+ initiative represents, we believe, a successful example of technology-facilitated advocacy and vital in this success was the skillset of creators; their frontline experience, research-informed practice and awareness of the potentials and pitfalls of technology. Thus the possible weaknesses or flaws of digital responses, earlier noted by Finn (2000; limited worker knowledge and security concerns) were addressed in the distribution and design of the app (on criteria for successful digital VAW advocacy, see also Partners for Prevention 2013).

Technology and Service Provision

Bolstering advocacy is key in the pursuit of SDG 5.2, but many countries still have no national referral resource for domestic violence services via phone or online, and few countries that do, have governments that fully fund these initiatives. For this reasons, digital services are primarily referrals points or telephone 'crisis lines', with limited capacity to provide a full range of services. Despite inconsistent resourcing across locations, workers are increasingly attempting to use technology to perform other roles and effect change. Noteworthy and exciting are VAW related hackathons organised by advocates and

humanitarian groups in Armenia (Geeks Against GBV 2019), Bosnia and Herzegovina (UN Women 2017), India (The Bachchao Project 2016), Nepal (The World Bank 2013), and African regions (Shikeenga et al 2017; Resilient Africa 2018). These events encourage women to create new digital opportunities to respond to VAW and provide advocacy. Currently, ICT is most often used to extend or mimic traditional in person assistance and also to connect workers in different locations. The Bangladesh National Women's Lawyer's Association is one such enterprise. The organises uses Skype from within five rural community legal centres (in Gaibandha, Kurigram, Jamalpur, Dinajpur and Khulna districts) with legal services acting as an intermediary between clients, lawyers and prosecutors in Dhaka, at the national association. As well as aiding rural service provision, "not only saving time, but also saving money as well as energy of these particular rural communities who no longer need beyond their localities", capacity building occurs through provision of specialist legal information to local support workers, assisting women (Community Legal Services Bangladesh 2014a, b). While we had previously cautioned that women may not connect with digital workers, Community Legal Services Bangladesh (2014), maintains that the platform enables "lawyers/prosecutors to judge their clients' reactions and tailor their advice to the visual cues they receive" which is "like an actual face-to-face meeting with a client". The digital divide will still shape engagement with such services and certainly, not all survivors will be able to easily or safely reach the service. Regardless, it aids in more women accessing assistance than would otherwise be possible.

Using Technology to Campaign for Change

Since the advent of the Internet, advocates have used technology to mobilise anti-violence campaigns that challenge the underlying ideologies and structures that facilitate violence (advancing SDG 5.2). These efforts have flourished with the rise of ICT. Digital activism has created new spaces, audiences and reach. As Titifanue et al (2017, 134, 140) explain, technology provides "an online public sphere"; "a means through which individuals, groups and organisations can spread messages, gain the interest of the populace and organise movements and activities". Organisers and participants may be local or global; centralised or decentralised; planned and coordinated to different degrees or, more spontaneous and separated; and use one or a series of digital means. A connected digital movement does not require traditional structures or fixed locations. "Technology-enabled networks … are flexible organizations in themselves", Bennett and Segerber (2012, 753), explain, in facilitating "co-ordinated adjustments and rapid actions aimed at often shifting political targets" and can cross "geographic and temporal boundaries". In this vein, Jensen et al (2012, 3) highlight how technology has transformed civic engagement, noting "[t]he speed of digital communication reduces not only transmission time but also geographic distance", with "a global reach". The spaclessness of digital activism can perhaps contribute to the effectiveness and longevity of campaigns, which might otherwise dissipate in regional grassroots activities (Titifanue et al 2016; Tifanue et al 2017). Other features of digital media are attractive to activists seeking to prevent VAW. Being able to develop a succinct and identifiable image, catchphrase (or "hashtag") that can be easily and freely shared can, Zuckerman says (2012, n.p.), serve to "slowly win the hearts and minds of millions" and aid in the visibility, location and cohesion of campaigns (Titifanue et al, 2017). Personal and interactive communications and networks can be established using ICT, which can contribute to investment in social movements (Bennet & Segerberg, 2012).

On an international level, one of the most recognisable VAW campaigns - "Take Back The Tech!"- grew out of the Association for Progressive Communication (APC), which arose

between 1982 and 1987. The group was born out of independent, non-profit computer "networks"; "people with experience in communication and international collaboration" in the non-government sector "and a deep commitment to making new communication techniques available to movements working for social change" (APC, 2019, see also Noronha & Higgs, 2010). As the structure and information sharing of this network developed, the organisation received consultative UN (Category 1) status in 1995, allowing for access to the UN Economic and Social Council and subsidiary bodies. This heralded opportunities to lobby and have input into UN deliberations, including in regard to online VAW. The APC launched Take Back The Tech! in 2006 as "a call to everyone, especially women and girls, to take control of technology to end violence against women", highlighting technology-facilitated VAW as well as research and strategies to combat such harms. This agenda foregrounds SDG 5.2 and women's use of technology (5.B) as essential to achieving full and effective participation and leadership in political, economic and public life (5.5). It is premised on fostering and supporting women to use technology - encouraging 'claims' to digital spaces - and challenging ideologies which seek to exclude women from these spaces and, in so doing, restrict their civic participation and human rights. While associated resources are available year-round, the campaign takes place annually, during the '16 Days of Activism Against Gender-Based Violence'. It has a global reach, while encouraging campaigners to develop local actions in their jurisdiction. Organisations and individuals can become involved, including by tagging the associated Twitter account or hashtag for the campaign, or joining online discussions. In this way, though spaceless and international in operation, Take Back The Tech! seeks to effect change in fixed geographic locations. It also attempts to combat cyberviolence which, as we noted, can result in diminished use of technology. Finally, it fosters real world and spaceless systems of support and transformation. The flexibility of networks and connectivity of the movement is evident and, as indicated by the reach of the movement, globally (Bennett & Segerber, 2012; Zuckerman, 2012).

Technology can also provide channels to further SDG 5.2, by confronting myths surrounding VAW, including victim-blaming discourse which can foster violence. As Guo and Sax (2013) assert, in confronting entrenched perspectives and inequalities (that are commonly overlooked in mainstream media) digital channels are a vehicle to present alternative voices and ideas. Weathers, Sanderson, Neal & Gramlich (2016, 61) contend that women in the are a "subset of the population that is often forgotten, underrepresented or misrepresented in comparison with dominant social groups". ICT, then, are media where women can speak and be heard. Social media has been engaged by advocates and often survivors themselves (see Sitter & Curnew, 2016), to unpack the frequently asked question of "why didn't she leave?" (the abusive situation). This question overlooks the complexities and dangers of exiting violent relationships and puts expectations on victims, as opposed to placing the onus on perpetrators (Harris & Woodlock, 2018). In 2014 one such use of ICT emerged, in response to a heavy media criticism of a survivor in a high-profile case who stayed with her abusive partner. The commentary of the case prompted one woman to share her account of #WhyIStayed on Twitter. Other survivors followed - internationally - using that hashtag (and also #WhyILeft) to educate readers on the dynamics of violence, their experience of abusive relationships and confront widely-held perspectives which place the onus on survivors to change their behaviour, as opposed to perpetrators. Posters also emphasised love for partners, fear, risk, shared children and practical issues (like resources and a lack of support) that complicate responses to violence. The hashtag garnered attention. It also gave voices excluded from mainstream media and dominant discourse a space to speak (Clarke 2016; Cravens, Whiting, & Aamar, 2016; Weathers et al, 2016). While some posters appeared to use accounts with their real name (and sometime identifying features), in using ICT, women were also able to put forward their perspective, anonymously (Weathers et al,

2016), which attractive, given feelings of shame that many survivors describe experiencing (Harris & Woodlock, 2018). While the aforementioned example was spontaneous, in other instances advocates have used Twitter for sustained campaigns denouncing online VAW and promoting women's use of technology as key for attaining equality. Uganda WOUGNET (Women of Uganda Network) uses ICT to regularly disseminate messages denouncing and highlighting the impacts of VAW (and online VAW specifically) on women's use of technology and civic engagement. Workers frequently spark dialogue with advocates and academics, internationally – including the authors of this chapter – about these aims (5.2, 5.B. and 5.B) can be achieved.

There are a raft of potential benefits to using technology to effect change, but there are limitations. Some critics worry that "real world" activism weakens in digital spaces. The connected localised and spaceless aspect of campaigns could, some contend, disrupt real world activism. Another issue might be that digital campaigns can generate micro-activism or "slacktivism": "political activities that have no impact on real-life political outcomes, but only serve to increase the feel-good factor of the participants" (Christensen, 2011, n.p). ICT posts, and re-posts (retweets or reblogs) or 'likes' of posts about issues or joining online networks can signify support in a digital space, but this means little if not translated to daily-life or, if an individual is a bystander as opposed to agent for change. There are, however, ways to translate online support and engagement into action, such as through petitions and calls to contact State representatives, and building social capital and virtual communities of supporters, volunteers, clients, and community (Greenberg & MacAulay, 2009; Harris, 2013; Hart, 2002; Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012). This can be important for fundraising and exerting political pressure and ultimately, the introduction of new policies and practices. We recognise that those fighting against systems and ideologies that support and facilitate VAW may face a backlash (Finn, 2000). Yet digital activism can connect advocates and survivors; it is not only a means to seek change, but for those who seek it to feel heard and supported, by spaceless networks.

Conclusion

The SDGs identify the elimination of violence against women and enhancing use of technology as an important pathway to gender equality and empowerment. Accordingly, women's confidence and security in accessing technology must be fostered and this requires addressing digital coercive control and domestic violence more broadly. In this chapter, we highlighted key uses of technology to educate, assist, and empower women around in line with the human rights and development goals of the SDGs, which will also serve to foster civic participation. There are limitations and challenges with digital advocacy, but we remain hopeful and optimistic about progress to date and evolution in this arena. As we have explored here, advocates are using technology to combat and regulate violence, provide information, education and services, build organisational capacity and challenge ideologies and structures that can support violence. As more women and domestic violence practitioners move online, they will continue to exploit ICTs in innovative and unique ways to transform the experience of survivors and their digital lives.

References

APC. (2018). History of the APC. Retrieved from https://www.apc.org/en/about/history

The Bachchao Project. (2016) *Hackathon against gender based violence 16.* Retrieved from http://thebachchaoproject.org/events/hackathon-against-gender-based-violence/

Bennett, W.L. & Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society*, *15*, 739-768.

Blair, M. & Harris, B. (2012). Just spaces: Community Legal Centres as levelling places of law. *Alternative Law Journal*, *37*(1) 8-11.

Castan, M. (2010). Law, advocacy and the brave new world. *Alternative Law Journal*, *35*(4), 192-193.

Christensen, H.S. (2011). Political activities on the Internet: Slactivism or political participation by other means? *First Monday*, *16*(2), n.p.

Clarke, R. (2016). 'Hope in a hashtag': The discursive activism of #WhyIStayed. *Feminist Media Studies*, *16*(5), 788-804.

Community Legal Services Bangladesh. (2014a). Retrieved August 4, 2018, from http://communitylegalservice.org/legal-advice-through-teleconferencing-facilities/

Community Legal Services Bangladesh. (2014b). Retrieved August 4, 2018, from http://communitylegalservice.org/providing-legal-services-through-video-conferencing/?upm_export=print

Coombs, W.T. (1998). The Internet as a potential equalizer: New leverage for confronting social irresponsibility. *Public Relations Review*, *24*(3), 289-304.

Cravens, J., Whiting, J., & Aamar, R. (2015). Why I Stayed/Left: An analysis of voices of intimate partner violence on social media. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, *37*(4), 472-385.

Cukier, W. & Middleton, C. (2003). Evaluating the web presence of voluntary sector organizations: An assessment of Canadian web sites. *IT & Society, 1*(3), 102-130.

Curtin, J. (2001). A digital divide in rural and regional Australia. *Current Issues in Brief, Information and Research Services.* Canberra: Department of Parliamentary Library.

DeKeseredy, W.S., Dragiewicz, M. & Schwartz, M.D. (2017). *Abusive Endings: Separation and Divorce Violence Against Women.* Oakland: University of California Press.

DiMaggio, P., Hargittai, E., Russell Neuman, W., & Robinson, J.P. (2001) Social implications of the internet. *Annual Review of Sociology, 27*, 307-36.

Dimond, J.P., Fiesler, C., & Bruckman, A.S. (2011). Domestic violence and information technologies. *Interacting with Computers*, *29*(5), 413-421.

Dutta-Bergman, M.J. (2005). Access to the internet in the context of community participation and community satisfaction. *New Media Society, 7*(1), 89-109.

Dragiewicz, M., Burgess, J., Matamoros-Fernandez, A., Salter, M., Suzor, N.P., Woodlock, D., & Harris, B. (2018). Technology facilitated coercive control: Domestic violence and the competing roles of digital media platforms. *Feminist Media Studies*, *18*(4), pp. 609-625.

Dragiewicz, M., Harris, B., Woodlock, D., Salter, M., Easton, H., Lynch, A., Campbell, HH., Leach, J., & Milne, L. (2019). *Domestic violence and communication technology: Survivor experiences of intrusion, surveillance and identity crime*, Australian Communications Consumer Action Network.

Finn, J. (2000). A Survey of Domestic Violence Organizations on the World Wide Web, *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, 17:1, 83-102, DOI: 10.1300/ J017v17n01_06

Geeks Against GBV. (2018). Retrieved from https://geeksagainstgbv.am

George, A., & Harris, B. (2014). *Landscapes of Violence*. Deakin University, available online at https://www.deakin.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/287040/Landscapes-of-Violence-online-pdf-version.pdf

Good Christopherson, E., & Nemovicher, S. (2012). Tweeting for a better world. *The Non-Profit Times*, *3*, 11-15.

Greenberg, J. & MacAulay, M. (2009). NPO 2.0? Exploring the web presence of environmental nonprofit organisations in Canada. *Global Media Journal*, *2*(1), 63-88.

Guo, C., & Saxton, G.D. (2013). Tweeting social change: How social media are changing nonprofit advocacy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *43*, 57-79.

Hacker, K.L., Mason, S.M., Morgan, E.L. (2007). Digital Disempowerment. In E. Rooksby & J. Weckert (Eds.) *Information Technology and Social Justice* (112-47)*.* Hershey: Information Science Publishing.

Hand, T., Chung, D., & Peters, M. (2009). *The Use of Information and Communication Technologies to Coerce and Control in Domestic Violence and Following Separation*. Sydney, AU: Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse, UNSW.

Harris, B. (2013) *Just Spaces: Community Legal Centres as Levelling Places of Law* (PhD thesis). Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

Harris, B. (2016). Violent landscapes: A spatial study of family violence. In A. Harkness, B. Harris & D. Baker (Eds.), *Locating Crime in Context and Place: Perspectives on Regional, Rural and Remote Australia* (75-84). Sydney: The Federation Press.

Harris, B. (2018). Spacelessness, spatiality and intimate partner violence: Technology-facilitated abuse, stalking and justice. In K. Fitz-Gibbon, S. Walklate, J. McCulloch & J.M. Maher (Eds.), *Intimate Partner Violence, Risk and Security: Securing Women's Lives in a Global World* (52-70). London: Routledge.

Harris, B. (Forthcoming). Technology and Violence Against Women. In S. Walklate, K. Fitz-Gibbon, J. McCulloch & J.M. Maher (Eds.), *Emerald Handbook on Feminism, Criminology and Social Change.* Great Britain: Emerald.

Harris, B. A., & Woodlock, D. (2018). Digital coercive control: Insights from two landmark domestic violence studies. *British Journal of Criminology*, *Online first*, 1–21. https://doi.org/doi:10.1093/bjc/azy052

Hart, T. (2002). ePhilanthropy: Using the internet to build support. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 7*(4), 353-60.

Jensen, M.J., Jorba, L., & Anduiza, E. (2012) 'Introduction'. In E. Anduiza, M.J. Jenson & L. Jorba (Eds.), *Digital Media and Political Engagement Worldwide: A Comparative Study.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kelly, L. (1987). The continuum of sexual violence. In Women, Violence and Social Control: Essays in Social Theory, Eds J. Hanmer and M. Maynard, pp.46-60, Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.

Liou, C., for Partners for Prevention. (2013). *Using social media for the prevention of violence against women.* United Nations.

Lovejoy, K. & Saxton, G.D. (2012) Information, community, and action: How nonprofit organizations use social media. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *17*, 337-353.

Lyndon, A., Bonds-Raacke, J., & Cratty, A.D. (2011). College students' Facebook stalking of ex-partners. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking, 14*(12), 711-726.

Mesch, G.S. (2012). Minority status and the use of computer-mediated communication: A test of the social diversification hypothesis. *Communication Research, 39*(3), 317-37.

Noronha, F., & Higgs, K. (2010) The internet is a radically different place because of the APC. *APC News July 2010.*

NNEDV. (2018). *12th Annual Domestic Violence Counts Report*. Washington, DC.

Rentschler, C.A. (2015). #Safetytipsforladies: Feminist Twitter takedowns of victim blaming'. *Feminist Media Studies*, *15*(2), 353-356.

Rentschler, C. A. (2017). Bystander intervention, feminist hashtag activism, and the anti-carceral politics of care. *Feminist Media Studies*, *17*(4), 565–584. https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2017.1326556

Resiliant Africa Network. *Hackathon on ending violence against women and girls.* Retrieved from https://www.ranlab.org/evawghackathon

Roberts, A. R. (2002). *Handbook of domestic violence intervention strategies: Policies, programs, and legal remedies*. Oxford University Press.

Rooksby, E., Weckert, J., and Lucas, R. (2007). The Digital Divide in Australia: Is Rural Australia Losing Out? In E. Rooksby & J. Weckert (Eds.) *Information Technology and Social Justice* (240-61). Hershey: Information Science Publishing.

Shikeenga, E., Nashandi, N., Shipepe, A., Ndjibu, R., & Peters, A.N. (2017). Human computer interaction and gender-based violence hackathons in Namibia. *HCI Across Borders CHI*, Denver.

Šimonović, D. (2018). *Report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women, Its Causes and Consequences on Online Violence Against Women and Girls from a Human Rights Perspective* (No. A/HRC/38/47). United Nations General Assembly. Retrieved from https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G18/184/58/PDF/G1818458.pdf?OpenElement

Sitter, K.C. & Curnew, A.H. (2016). The application of social media in social work community practice. *Social Work Education*, *35*(3), 271-283.

Sorenson, S. B., Shi, R., Zhang, J., & Xue, J. (2014). Self-presentation on the web: Agencies serving abused and assaulted women. *American Journal of Public Health*, *104*(4), 702-707.

Southworth, C., Finn, J., Dawson, S., Fraser, C., & Tucker, S. (2007). Intimate partner violence, technology and stalking. *Violence Against Women*, *13*(8), 842-856.

Stanko, E. (1985). *Intimate Intrusions: Women's Fears of Male Violence*. London: Routledge & Keagan Paul.

Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: The entrapment of women in personal life.*

Titifanue, J., Tarai, J., Kant, R., & Finau, G. (2016). From social networking to activism: The role of social media in the free West Papua campaign. *Pacific Studies, 39*(3), 255-281.

Titifanue, J., Kant, R., Finau, G. & Tarai, J. (2017). Climate change advocacy in the Pacific; The role of information and communication technologies. *Pacific Journalism Review, 23*(1), 133-149.

United Nations. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, A/RES/70/1 § (21 October 2015). Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E

United Nations. (18 December 1979).Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. United Nations General Assembly resolution 34/180 (1979). Retrieved from https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cedaw.aspx

United Nations. (20 December 1993). Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women. United Nations General Assembly resolution 48/104. Retrieved from https://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/ViolenceAgainstWomen.aspx

United Nations Women. (2019). *Using AI in accessing justice for survivors of violence.* Retrieved from http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2019/5/feature-using-ai-in-accessing-justice-for-survivors-of-violence

United Nations Women. (2017). *In Bosnia and Herzegovina, youth harness the power of tech to combat violence against women and girls.* Retrieved from http://eca.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2017/12/in-bosnia-and-herzegovina-youth-harness-the-power-of-tech-to-combat-violence-against-women-and-girls

Weathers, M.R., Sanderson, J., Neal, A. & Gramlich, K. (2016). From silence to #WhyIStayed: Locating our stories and finding our voices. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, *17*(1), 60-67.

Willis, S. & Tranter, B. (2006). Beyond the 'digital divide': Internet diffusion and inequality in Australia. *Journal of Sociology, 42*(1), 43-59.

Woodlock, D. (2017). The abuse of technology in domestic violence and stalking. *Violence Against Women*, *23*(5), 584–602. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801216646277

Woodlock, D. (2013) *Technology-facilitated Stalking: Findings and Recommendations from the SmartSafe Project.* Domestic Violence Resource Centre Victoria, available at https://www.smartsafe.org.au/sites/default/files/SmartSafe-Findings-Booklet.pdf

Woodlock, D. McKenzie, M., Western, D. & Harris, B. (2019). Technology as a weapon in domestic violence: Responding to digital coercive control. *Australian Social Work,* in press (online first).

WOUGHNET. (2019). *Women of Uganda Network.* Retrieved from woughnet.org

The World Bank. (2013). *Hackathon to address violence against women.* Retrieved from http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2013/06/03/hackathon-address-violence-against-women-nepal

Zuckerman, E. (2012). My heart's in Accra: Understanding digital civics. Retrieved from http://www.ethanzuckerman.com/blog/2012/08/30/understanding-digital-civics/