Details of questionnaire used in survey

The following items were included in the questionnaire:

Socio-demographic information. Items included were age, gender, ethnicity, place of residence, parents' marital status and parents' education level.

Use of social networking sites (SNS). Items included were the age of initiation of SNS use, motivation for use, most frequently used SNS, number of SNS profiles, frequency and duration of access to SNS, number of SNS contacts and motivations for use

Privacy settings and disclosure of personal information on SNS. Items included were the use of privacy settings on their SNS profiles and about specific behaviors pertaining to public display of personal information on user profiles as well as the sharing of personal information and interaction with "SNS contacts". The term SNS contacts denoted individuals encountered solely through a SNS without a prior face-to-face introduction.

Posting of personal information was measured by display of any of the following data on a publicly accessible profile: real name, photograph, residential address, name of school, telephone number

Disclosure of personal information was deemed to occur if any of the following data were sent to an SNS contact: real name, photograph, address, name of school, telephone number

Posting of revealing images was deemed to occur if an image (either a still photograph or video) of the respondent clad only in a swimsuit or undergarments was displayed on a publicly accessible SNS profile

Interaction with strangers was deemed to occur if respondents accepted "friend requests" from individuals unknown to them or communicated with such individuals through chat, replying of messages or posting comments on their wall

Victimization on SNS. The following items assessed victimization within the previous 12 months under categories of harassment and unwanted sexual solicitation. The frequency of these experiences was indicated on a 6-point scale which ranged from "daily or almost daily" to "never". To facilitate statistical analysis, the responses were grouped under three categories: (1) frequent (experiences occurred at least a few times a year) (2) infrequent (experiences occurred once in the past 12 months (3) never

Harassment was measured through 3 questions adapted from the Growing Up with Media Survey (whether someone made rude or mean comments, spread rumours whether they were true or not, made threatening or aggressive remarks [1]

Unwanted sexual solicitation was measured with 3 questions adapted from the Youth Internet Safety Survey (whether someone had forced sexual talk when they were unwilling, whether someone had asked for sexual information about themselves which they were unwilling to share or if someone had asked them to do something sexual against their will) [2].

.

Previous studies have shown high reliability for both instruments. The internal reliability estimated with Cronbach's Alpha was .93 for Internet sexual solicitation victimization and 0.79 for Internet harassment victimization [1 3 4].

Perpetration on SNS. The following items assessed self-reported online perpetration within the previous 12 months under categories of harassment and unwanted sexual solicitation. The frequency of these actions was indicated on a 6-point scale which ranged from "daily or almost daily" to "never". To facilitate statistical analysis, the responses were grouped under three categories: (1) frequent (respondents did this at least a few times a year) (2) infrequent (respondents did this once in the past 12 months (3) never.

Perpetration of harassment was measured with three questions from the Growing Up with Media Survey (making rude or mean comments, spreading rumours about someone whether they were true or not, directing threatening or aggressive comments towards others on SNS) [1].

Perpetration of unwanted sexual solicitation was measured with three questions adapted from the Youth Internet Safety Survey (forcing others to engage in sexual talk, asking for sexual information or asking another to do something sexual when they were unwilling) [1].

The internal reliability for the measures was estimated with Cronbach's Alpha: Perpetration of harassment (Cronbach .82); and Perpetration of unwanted sexual solicitation (Cronbach .93) [1].

Experiences of offline victimization. Lifetime experiences of offline victimization were assessed using the validated ISPCAN Child Abuse Screening tool for young adults Version ICAST-R with 5 stem questions each assessing three domains of offline victimization (sexual abuse, physical abuse or psychological abuse). For each stem question, the response options were: (1) yes; (2) no and (3) cannot remember. For each positive response, follow-up questions enquired about the frequency of maltreatment experiences and the category of the perpetrator. A positive response to at least one stem question denoted victimization in that particular domain. A summary index indicating the number of categories of victimization was created ranging from 0 (none) to 3 (all three types). Previous studies have shown moderate to high reliability [5].

Offline bullying. Lifetime perpetration of offline bullying was assessed using 4 stem questions to measure three domains (1) psychological (not allowing a peer to join in a group out of anger or hostility, spreading rumours about someone whether they were untrue or not) (2) physical (pushing, beating or slapping a peer) (3) sexual (kissing or touching a peer sexually when they did not consent). For each item, respondents were asked the frequency of these actions on a 6-point scale from "daily or almost daily" to "never" [1]. A summary index of the number of types of perpetration was created ranging from 0 (none) to 3 (all three types).

Parental conflict. A validated version of the Measure of Parenting Style (MOPS) was used to assess parental conflict levels with 15 core items assessing Parental Indifference (6 items), Parental Over-Control (4 items), and Parental Abuse (5 items). Responses were scored on a 4-point Likert type scale as follows: 0 = not true at all; 1 = slightly true; 2 = moderately true; 3 = extremely true. A total score was derived from summation of scores for all the items with higher scores indicating greater levels of parental conflict. The instrument has shown moderate to high reliability and validity. Previous studies with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .76 to .93 suggest

that the measures are within acceptable internal consistency while test-retest coefficients for

the subscale ranged from 0.74 to 0.94, indicating high to moderate consistency [6].

1. Ybarra ML, Espelage DL, Mitchell KJ. The Co-occurrence of Internet Harassment and Unwanted Sexual Solicitation Victimization and Perpetration: Associations with Psychosocial Indicators. Journal of Adolescent Health 2007;**41**(6, Supplement):S31-S41 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.09.010[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
2. Ybarra ML, Mitchell KJ, Finkelhor D, et al. Internet prevention messages: Targeting the right online behaviors. Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine 2007;**161**(2):138
3. Finkelhor D, Mitchell K, Wolak J. Online Victimization of Youth: Five Years Later. 2007
4. Wolak J, Mitchell K, Finkelhor D. Online Victimization of Youth: Five Years Later. Virginia: National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, 2006.
5. Dunne MP, Zolotor AJ, Runyan DK, et al. ISPCAN child abuse screening tools retrospective version (ICAST-R): Delphi study and field testing in seven countries. Child abuse & neglect 2009;**33**(11):815-25
6. Parker G, Roussos J, Hadzi-Pavlovic D, et al. The development of a refined measure of dysfunctional parenting and assessment of its relevance in patients with affective disorders. Psychological Medicine 1997;**27**(05):1193-203 doi: doi:10.1017/S003329179700545X[published Online First: Epub Date]|.