



YAŞAR UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

MASTER THESIS

**EXAMINING CYBER DATING ABUSE THROUGH
ADULT ATTACHMENT, EMOTION REGULATION
AND BIG FIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS
IN YOUNG ADULTS**

CEREN ÇAKIR

THESIS ADVISOR: ASSIST. PROF. DR. BERRİN ÖZYURT

PSYCHOLOGY

PRESENTATION DATE: 09.08.2022

BORNOVA / İZMİR
AUGUST 2022

We certify that, as the jury, we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Art.

Jury Members:

Signature:

Assist. Prof. (PhD) Berrin ÖZYURT

Yaşar University

.....

Prof. (PhD) Ayşe Ender ALTINTOPRAK

Yaşar University

.....

Prof. (PhD) Haluk ARKAR

Ege University

.....



Prof. (PhD) Yucel Ozturkoglu
Director of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

EXAMINING CYBER DATING ABUSE THROUGH ADULT ATTACHMENT, EMOTION REGULATION AND BIG FIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS IN YOUNG ADULTS

Çakır, Ceren

MA, Psychology

Advisor: Assist. Prof. (PhD) Berrin ÖZYURT

August 2022

As technology improves, new ways of engaging with abusive behavior emerge. The current study aims to explore cyber-dating abuse by adult attachment, emotion regulation, and the Big Five personality traits. The sample of the study consists of 356 participants who are between 18 and 40 years old and currently or previously have had a romantic relationship with an intimate partner in the last 1 year. Demographic Information Form, Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CDAQ), Experiences in Close Relationships-II (ECR-R), Interpersonal Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (IERQ), Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS-16), and Big Five Inventory (BFI-44) were used to obtain data. To analyze, Pearson Correlation Analysis, Independent Samples t-test, One-way ANOVA, and Multiple Regression were used. As a result, it was found that cyber dating abuse has a reciprocal relationship in terms of victimization and perpetration. Secondly, monitoring/control victimization was positively correlated with avoidant attachment, anxious attachment, non-acceptance, clarity, and social modeling. Also, monitoring /control perpetration was positively correlated with anxious attachment, clarity, goals, impulse, strategies, non-acceptance, perspective taking, soothing, social modeling, and neuroticism, while negatively correlated with agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. Thirdly, cyber-dating abuse did not differ in terms of gender and age, while it differed for relationship length. To add, there was a positive relationship between social media, messaging app use, and cyber dating abuse. Lastly, only anxious attachment had significantly predicted monitoring/control victimization and perpetration in terms of cyber dating abuse. Therefore, the thesis contributes to the cyber dating abuse literature

by providing a deeper understanding. The limitations of the research and suggestions for future studies are discussed.

keywords: cyber dating abuse, attachment, big five personality, emotion regulation, difficulties in emotion regulation, interpersonal emotion regulation, young adulthood



ÖZ

GENÇ YETİŞKİNLERDE SİBER FLÖRT İSTİSMARININ YETİŞKİN BAĞLANMASI, DUYGU DÜZENLEME, VE BÜYÜK BEŞLİ KİŞİLİK ÖZELLİKLERİ ÜZERİNDEN İNCELENMESİ

Çakır, Ceren

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Psikoloji

Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Berrin ÖZYURT

Ağustos 2022

Teknolojinin gelişmesi ile yeni istismar davranışları da ortaya çıkmaktadır. Çalışma yetişkin bağlanması, duygu düzenleme ve büyük beşli kişilik özellikleri ile siber flört istismarını incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Çalışma örneklemini 18-40 yaş arası son 1 yılda romantik ilişki içerisinde olan veya olmuş 356 kişiden oluşmaktadır. Demografik Bilgi Formu, Siber Flört İstismarı Ölçeği, Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri (YİYE-II), Kişilerarası Duygu Düzenleme Ölçeği (KDDÖ) ve Duygu Düzenlemede Güçlükler Ölçeği (DGGÖ-16), Beş Faktör Kişilik Envanteri veriyi elde etmek amacıyla kullanılmıştır. Data Pearson Korelasyon Analizi, Bağımsız Örneklem T Testi, Tek Yönlü ANOVA ve Çoklu Regresyon ile analiz edilmiştir. Sonuç olarak, siber flört istismarına maruz kalma ve maruz bırakma arasında çift taraflı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Ek olarak izleme ve kontrol maruz kalma ile kaçınan ve kaygılı bağlanma, kabul etmeme, açıklık, sosyal modelleme arasında pozitif ilişki bulunmuştur. Ayrıca, izleme ve kontrol maruz uygulama ile kaçınan bağlanma, açıklık, amaçlar, dürtü, stratejiler, kabul etmeme, bakış açısı edinme, yatıştırılma sosyal modelleme ve nörotisizm ile pozitif; uyumluluk, sorumluluk ve deneyime açıklıkla negatif ilişkili olduğu bulunmuştur. Üçüncü olarak, siber flört istismarı cinsiyet ve yaş bağlamında farklılık göstermezken ilişki uzunluğu açısından farklılık göstermiştir. Sosyal medya ve mesajlaşma uygulamalarını kullanım süreleri ile siber flört istismarı arasında pozitif ilişki bulunmuştur. Son olarak, sadece kaygılı bağlanmanın izleme ve kontrol uygulama ve maruz kalmayı yordadığı bulunmuştur. Dolayısıyla, tez daha derin bir anlayış sağlayarak siber flört istismarı literatürüne katkıda bulunmuştur. Araştırmanın sınırlılıkları ve gelecek çalışmalar için öneriler tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: siber flört istismarı, yetişkin bağlanması, büyük beşli kişilik özellikleri, duygu düzenleme, duygu düzenleme güçlüğü, kişilerarası duygu düzenleme, genç yetişkinlik



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As it takes a whole village to raise a child, it took a whole country to finish this thesis.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Berrin Özyurt for her support and guidance. Also, I would like to thank my jury members, Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ender Altıntoprak and Prof. Dr. Haluk Arkar for their precious feedback.

Also, I would like to thank Assist. Prof. Serkan Denizli, Prof. Dr. Emre Özgen and Assist. Prof. Evrim Güteryüz for their help for the data analysis process.

I also would like to thank every participant for their patience and honest answers as the questions were long and took their precious time.

Then, I would like to give massive thanks to my friends, Büşra Uzun, Seval Emin, Ayşe Sevinç, Aysel Akbulut, Ayşen Dülger, Doğa Doğan, Betül Gizem Güven, Melda Hansa Şahin, Naz Akgül, Rabia Sıla Aydın, Su Günseli Çiftçi, Seyda Özcan, Sümeyye Demirkıran, Tuğçe Polat, Tutku Kölbilge, and Elif Tacar who supported me throughout this whole process with their help, encouragement, and presence. I am so lucky and happy to have them as my friends.

Also, I would like to thank my family, my brother Cenker Çakır, my parents Yeşim and Deniz Çakır, my cousin Jasmine Yağmur Bektaş, my aunt Yelda Kağnıcı and Sibel Kutal, my grandparents Şule and Ali Kağnıcı and my late grandparents Nejla and Hayrettin Çakır for their infinite support when things are good and tough. I could grow and thrive this much thanks to them.

Ceren Çakır
İzmir, 2022

TEXT OF OATH

I declare and honestly confirm that my study, titled “EXAMINING CYBER DATING ABUSE THROUGH ADULT ATTACHMENT, EMOTION REGULATION AND BIG FIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS IN YOUNG ADULTS” and presented as a Master’s Thesis, has been written without applying to any assistance inconsistent with scientific ethics and traditions. I declare, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that all content and ideas drawn directly or indirectly from external sources are indicated in the text and listed in the list of references.

Ceren akır

09.08.2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	v
ÖZ	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xiii
TEXT OF OATH	xv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xvii
LIST OF TABLES	xxiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xxv
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1. Cyber Dating Abuse	3
2.1.1. Cyberbullying.....	4
2.1.2. Intimate Partner Violence.....	5
2.1.3. Cyber Dating Abuse.....	9
2.2. Adult Attachment	14
2.3. Emotion Regulation.....	17
2.3.1. Difficulties in Emotion Regulation	19
2.3.2. Interpersonal Emotion Regulation	20
2.4. Personality	21
2.5. Interactions Between Adult Attachment, Emotion Regulation, Big Five Personality, and Cyber Dating Abuse	26
2.5.1. Adult Attachment and Cyber Dating Abuse.....	26
2.5.2. Emotion Regulation and Cyber Dating Abuse	28
2.5.3. Big Five Personality and Cyber Dating Abuse	31
2.6. Significance of The Study	33
2.7. Aim of The Study	34
CHAPTER 3 METHOD	37

3.1. Participants	37
3.2. Instruments	40
3.2.1. Demographic Information Form	40
3.2.2. Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CADQ).....	40
3.2.3. Experiences in Close Relationships Scale-Revised (ECR-R)	41
3.2.4. Interpersonal Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (IERQ)	42
3.2.5. Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS-16)	43
3.2.6. Big Five Inventory (BFI-44)	44
3.3. Procedure.....	44
3.4. Statistical Analysis	45
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	47
4.1. Data Cleaning	47
4.2. Descriptive Statistics of The Study	47
4.3. Hypothesis Testing.....	51
4.3.1. Correlation Between Cyber Dating Abuse Victimization and Perpetration.....	51
4.3.2. Inter-Correlations Between Cyber Dating Abuse and Attachment, Emotion Regulation, and the Big Five.....	51
4.3.3. Gender Differences for Cyber Dating Abuse Victimization and Perpetration.	55
4.3.4. Age Periods Differences for Cyber Dating Abuse Victimization and Perpetration	56
4.3.5. Correlation Between Social Media and Messaging Apps Usage and Cyber Dating Abuse Victimization and Perpetration	57
4.3.6. Differences in Relationship Length for Cyber Dating Abuse Victimization and Perpetration	58
4.3.7. The Prediction of Cyber Dating Abuse by the Attachment, Emotion Regulation, and Personality	60
Monitoring/Control Victimization	60
Monitoring/Control Perpetration	62
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION.....	65
4.1. Investigating the Reciprocal Relationship.....	67
4.2. Investigating Intercorrelations.....	67

4.3. Investigating Gender Differences.....	73
4.4. Investigating Age Period Differences.....	74
4.5. Investigating Relationship Length Differences	76
4.6. Investigating Online Behavior Relationship.....	77
4.7. Investigating the Prediction of Cyber Dating Abuse.....	78
4.8. Contributions of the Study.....	80
4.9. Limitations and Future Suggestions	81
REFERENCES	83
APPENDIX 1 – APPROVAL OF THE RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE	107
APPENDIX 2 – INFORMED CONSENT FORM	109
APPENDIX 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM	111
APPENDIX 4 – CYBER DATING ABUSE QUESTIONNAIRE (CDAQ).....	115
APPENDIX 5 – EXPERIENCES IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS SCALE-II (ECR-R).....	119
APPENDIX 6 – INTERPERSONAL EMOTION REGULATION QUESTIONNAIRE (IERQ)	123
APPENDIX 7 – DIFFICULTIES IN EMOTION REGULATION SCALE (DERS-16)	125
APPENDIX 8 – BIG FIVE INVENTORY (BFI-44).....	127
APPENDIX 9 – THE SCALE PERMISSIONS	129
APPENDIX 10 – SAMPLE RECEIPT	131
APPENDIX 11 – DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR CYBER DATING ABUSE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS	133

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. Distribution of Demographic Variables among Participants.....	38
Table 4.1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables	48
Table 4.2. Normality Test Results of Scales	49
Table 4.3. Inter-Correlations between Variables.....	52
Table 4.4. Independent Samples t-test Results for Gender	55
Table 4.5. Independent Samples t-test Results for Age Groups.....	56
Table 4.6. One-way ANOVA Results for Relationship Length.....	59
Table 4.7. The Results of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Monitoring/Control Victimization.....	61
Table 4.8. The Results of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Monitoring/Control Perpetration	64

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

IPV	Intimate Partner Violence
CDA	Cyber Dating Abuse
DAV	Direct Aggression Victimization
MCV	Monitoring/Control Victimization
DAP	Direct Aggression Perpetration
MCP	Monitoring/Control Perpetration
ECR	Experiences in Close Relationships
IERQ	Interpersonal Emotion Regulation Questionnaire
DERS	Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale
BFI	Big Five Inventory

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Everybody wants to love someone and be loved by that particular person. Therefore, one reads and writes books, listens to and sings songs, watches films and series about love and serenades the loved one, and even sacrifices own life, like Romeo and Juliet, or any causal relationship that may happen around. Romantic relationships are so fundamental to our lives, and this led researchers to investigate from multiple perspectives from why and how, to its positive and negative aspects to humankind.

While intimate partner violence is an important part of relationships, new forms of abuse and violence emerge with technology and apps, leading to new terms to come to light such as cyber dating abuse. Cyber dating abuse is “the control, harassment, stalking, and abuse of one’s dating partner via technology and social media” (Zweig, Lachman, Yahner, & Dank, 2014, p. 1306). Literature shows that psychological, physical, and sexual intimate partner violence is related to cyber dating abuse (Brem et al., 2021; Villegas, 2017) and has a reciprocal relationship between victimization and perpetration (Linares et al. 2021; Reed et al., 2016; Villora et al., 2019a; Villora et al., 2019b). Since young adults mostly communicate through technology (Crosswhite, et al., 2014), cyber dating abuse and its reasons, risk factors, and impacts should be studied.

Attachment theory was presented by Bowlby (1980), which considers the infants’ emotional bonding with their caregivers and classify the differences in their reactions under stressful situations that remain crucial throughout the life span (Bowlby, 1982; Ainsworth, 1989). The classification of attachment can also be seen in adulthood relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). In terms of cyber dating abuse, the relationship between anxious attachment and cyber dating abuse has been underlined through various studies (Basting et al., 2022; Bookwala, 2002; Toplu-Demirtaş, 2022; Villora, Navarro, & Yubero, 2019; Yushan & Cihan, 2021). The relationship between avoidant attachment and cyber dating abuse rather needs further studies as there are inconsistent outcomes (Basting et al., 2022; Lancaster, 2020; Yushan & Cihan, 2021).

Emotion regulation can be explained as “the extrinsic and intrinsic processes responsible for monitoring, evaluating, and modifying emotional reactions, especially their intensive and temporal features, to accomplish one's goals” (Thompson, 1994, pp. 27-28). The inability and difficulty for regulate their own emotions could lead people to engage with cyber dating abuse (Brem et al., 2021; İnce, 2022; Lancaster, 2020; Mahoney et al., 2022; Wu, 2019).

Even though interpersonal emotion regulation is an important tool that people use in their social connections to regulate themselves, it is relatively a new concept compared to intrapersonal emotion regulation. Parallel to that, no study that investigates cyber dating abuse in terms of its relation to interpersonal emotion regulation was found.

The Big Five is a concept that is commonly studied across concepts and disciplines of psychology, which consists of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience dimensions to understand personality through traits (McCrae & Costa, 1985). Its relation to ways to aggression such as cyberbullying (Peluchette et al., 2015) and intimate partner violence has been studied (Ulloa et al., 2016) to see whether personality would be a factor for engaging such behaviors. However, the relationship between the Big Five and cyber dating was only studied by Biolcati et al. (2021), as far as it was found, which makes the concept understudied.

As the violence and the ways and methods to engage with violent and abusive behaviors increases, and new concepts emerges, studying the effects and risk factors is crucial to understand and create prevention measures to decrease the adversity comes with it. Even though the relationships between attachment, emotion regulation, the Big Five personality traits, and cyber dating abuse, have been studied separately in the earlier studies, it is important to investigate altogether with age, gender, technology use, relationship length, and the predictability of attachment, emotion regulation, the Big Five personality traits for cyber dating abuse, especially in a Turkish context.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. CYBER DATING ABUSE

We live in a time zone where we are living with our smartphones, televisions, laptops, and other technology devices that make everything easier. And this easiness leads to using them more and more as time passes. With the internet, people started to use apps like MSN Yahoo, etc. Everybody was able to reach out to their friends who are in a foreign country with emails. Then the technology got improved and people were able to see each other at the same time using webcams in a video call. Nowadays, WhatsApp, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Skype, Zoom, and other dating apps are being used to communicate with people and those apps make it reachable to others in seconds. Social Networking Sites (SNS) have been used for establishing and maintaining communication such as with instant messaging, microblogging, gaming, and online dating (Kuss & Griffiths, 2017).

According to the report of We Are Social (Kemp, 2020), there were 4.54 billion internet users globally and 62.07 million internet users in Turkey in January 2020. The active social media users were 3.8 billion worldwide and 54 million in Turkey. Globally, people spent 2 hours and 24 minutes using social media, mostly Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram, Twitter, and WeChat. Turkish people spent 2 hours and 51 minutes using social media, mostly Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram, and Twitter.

The same report has been updated in 2022 (Kemp, 2022). The amount of internet users globally has risen to 4.95 billion and 69.95 million in Turkey. The amount of active social media users has risen to 4.62 billion worldwide and 68.9 million in Turkey. People spent 2 hours and 27 minutes worldwide and 3 hours and 31 minutes in Turkey using social media the most used platforms haven't changed and social media is mostly used for keeping in touch with friends and family, reading news stories, and filling spare time globally and locally.

Even though having technology has its positive effects such as positive well-being

(Valkenburg & Peter, 2007), and reducing loneliness and social anxiety (Ando & Sakamoto, 2008); there are also negative effects such as facing cyber aggression, cyberbullying, cyberstalking, and cyber dating abuse.

2.1.1. Cyberbullying

Cyber aggression can be explained as “any type of harassment or bullying, including teasing, telling lies, making fun of, making rude or mean comments, spreading of rumors, or making threatening or aggressive comments, that occurs through e-mail, a chat room, instant messaging, a Web site, or text messaging” (David-Ferdon & Hertz, 2007, p. 3).

Cyberbullying is one of the most common and extensive forms of cyber aggression. Cyberbullying has been defined as “willful and repeated harm inflicted with computers, cell phones, and other electronic devices” (Hinduja & Patchin, 2015, p. 11) or “an aggressive, intentional act carried out by a group or individual, using electronic forms of contact, repeatedly and over time against a victim who cannot easily defend him or herself” (Smith et al., 2008, p. 376). Cyberbullying can be experienced through e-mails, online games, instant messaging, and lastly social media (Kota & Selkie, 2018). Inappropriate and abusive messages, photos, threads (Beran & Li, 2005), hacking and stealing personal information from another person’s account, unwanted sexual advances, harassment by text message, and degrading comments to posts (Selkie et al., 2015), sharing confidential and privileged information of a person without permission as “airing dirty laundry” (Kota et al., 2014), can be seen as cyberbullying behavior.

The danger of cyberbullying is the opportunity for bullies to reach anyone around the world. It means that bullies can negatively affect the victim’s life even when they are not physically around the victim (Ayas & Horzum, 2010). Since the internet and social media is their weapon, the act can be made regardless of place, time, or identity (David-Ferdon & Hertz, 2007).

In a study by Alrajeh et al. (2021), the prevalence rates were found 6.8% for cyberbullies, 29.2% for cybervictims, and 35.8% for cyberbully-victims, meaning that more than half of the population has engaged with some sort of cyberbullying.

As young adults mostly use technology for communication (Crosswhite, et al., 2014), it is important to investigate these online experiences and their effects on young adults.

Balakrishnan (2015) has investigated cyberbullying among young adults who are between 17 and 30 years, and the effects of gender, age, and internet use frequency in Malaysia. As a result, there were no gender and age differences, and those who use the internet for 2-5 hours have reported more victimization and bullying compared to those who use the internet for less than an hour. To add, internet use was predictive for both victims and bullies, and more internet use predicted more cyberbullying activities in both bullying and victimization. Lastly, there was a significant association between cyber-victims and cyberbullies, meaning that cyber-victims can become cyberbullies, and vice versa.

In the literature, gender differences are still in debate. In terms of cyberbullying, while some studies found that males engage in perpetration and being bully-victim and females engage in victimization (Alrajeh et al., 2021), other studies show male participants being more victimized (Cénat et al., 2019). Additionally, some studies do not find such a difference (Hood & Duffy, 2018).

Cyberbullying victimization can be linked with LBGTQ+ status (Mkhize et al., 2020), and risky social network behaviors such as posting indiscrete content (Peluchette et al., 2015). Cyberbullying perpetration can be linked with dark side personality traits such as sadism, Machiavellianism, and narcissism (Kircaburun et al., 2018), moral disengagement, and lower parental monitoring (Hood & Duffy, 2018). However, the attitude towards cyberbullying is one of the most powerful predictors of future cyberbullying (Heirman & Walrave, 2012).

Cyberbullying can be linked to depression (Alrajeh et al., 2021; Selkie et al., 2015; Varela et al., 2022), suicidal thoughts, and suicidal attempts (Cénat et al., 2019) for both victimization and perpetration. Victims experience loneliness (Varela et al., 2022) whereas bullies have problematic alcohol use (Selkie et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2019).

2.1.2. Intimate Partner Violence

As an act of socialization and connecting, people start talking to others. The conversation might start with the thought of dating, or the flow of the conversation could lead the people to consider dating. In the beginning of the getting to know each other and flirting stages, the partner may not be known very well. It could be someone from online dating sites or social media, from school or work, someone that was seen in only one meeting, or a friend, or an acquaintance of a friend or relatives, etc.

As Connolly et al. (2013) stated, aligned with the Life Course Theory (Elder, 1994), romantic affiliations during early adolescence turn into casual dating during middle adolescence, and then into dyadic romantic bonds during later adolescence. Even though the path to leading a romantic relationship may change throughout life, the importance of a romantic relationship stays the same. With a little change, it becomes a milestone during young adulthood. As in Erickson's (1982) intimacy versus isolation theory, people who are approximately between 18 and 30 years old want to establish good relationships with intimate partners and friends while identifying themselves with such connections in this particular term.

Levinson (1986) suggests that early adulthood should be extended to even the 40s, with the transition from early adulthood transition happening from 17 to 22, and the midlife transition happening between 40 to 45. Even though there are different opinions about the termination of this term, it could be summarized that the maximum age agreed mostly is 40 (Boyd & Bee, 2015). Then the differences between 18-year-old and 40-year-olds' have led to emerging another developmental stage, which is emerging adulthood. It is a newly coined term by Arnett (2007a) that states emerging adulthood is neither a part of adolescence nor adulthood. Therefore, it includes late adolescence until early adulthood, which is between 18 and 25 years old. According to Arnett (2007a), this stage is "the age of identity explorations, the age of instability, the self-focused age, the age of feeling in between, and the age of possibilities." (p. 152). Emerging adults might continue their education and postpone marriage (Arnett, 2007a). Now, even more, people are delaying marriage, and the marriage rates are decreasing (Cohen, 2013). Rather than marriage, more couples cohabitate (Gurrentz, 2018), and cohabitate longer than in the past (Copen et al., 2013).

A lot of time and energy goes to maintaining the relationship bilaterally. That is why partners affect each other with what they do and speak. Close relationships can awake intense positive emotions such as passion, concern, caring, and as well as negative ones such as rage, jealousy, and despair. Therefore, they are related to both the best parts such as well-being, happiness, health, and the worst parts of life such as abuse, deception, and rejection (Weiten et al., 2018, p.251).

Violence also exists in intimate partner relationships. It could start right from dating; it could be also seen later in the marriage. The intimidating and harmful acts toward an intimate partner, dating, cohabiting, engaged, married, or who were formerly

partners are called intimate partner violence (Boyd & Bee, 2015). Also, dating abuse, dating violence, and intimate partner abuse are being used interchangeably.

Intimate partner violence (IVP) has sub-terms such as physical, psychological, sexual, and economic violence. Physical violence includes slapping, punching, hitting, hair pulling, choking, scratching, choking, and threats to do such things (Foshee et al., 2007; Singh et al., 2015). Psychological violence includes restricting the freedom of a partner, isolating from others, and threatening with harming a partner or a loved one (Follingstad & Dehart, 2000; as cited in Bakır, 2019). Sexual violence includes all sexual actions from touching to forcing to having sex physically or psychologically without consent (Topçu, 2009). Economical violence is generally out of concern since dating partners are not linked economically (Mulford & Giordano, 2008). However, when it is included, it can be described as controlling income such as forcing to work or resigning from work, taking money, or being not responsible around the house (Alan Dikmen et al., 2018).

It is important to note that even though these problematic and irritating behaviors that professionals name as partner violence can be seen by individuals. They might choose to stay in the relationship because of the myths such as ““love is blind,” not knowing how to “let go,” “true love [means that] no matter what you stay together,” or “waiting for that change that might never come”” (Helm et al., 2017, p. 328).

In the study of Özdere and Kürtül (2018), %14.8 of the participants reported experiencing victimization, and %17.2 of the participants reported perpetration. Alan Dikmen et al. (2018) have investigated undergraduate female students and found that 88% of women have experienced emotional, 22.2% of women have experienced verbal, 21.4% of women have experienced economic, 16.4% of women have experienced physical, and 7.2% of women have experienced sexual violence. Mulawa et al. (2016) found that 34.8% of men and 35.8% of women have reported victimization in the last 12 months. Bott et al. (2019) have analyzed 24 studies published between 1998 and 2017 in the Americas and found that the prevalence rates for women ever experiencing physical and/or sexual intimate partner violence ranged from 14% to 17% in Brazil, Panama, and Uruguay to 58.5% in Bolivia. The prevalence for the past year of physical and/or sexual intimate partner violence ranged from 1.1% in Canada to 27.1% in Bolivia.

Schnurr et al. (2013) studied the moderation relationship of cyber aggression perpetration between dominance and physical and psychological intimate partner violence of emerging adults using couple data. As a result, they found that women's cyber aggression behaviors towards their boyfriends were strongly related to their IVP compared to men. Furthermore, boyfriends' cyber aggression towards their girlfriend had an even stronger relationship with IVP of women, compared to women's cyber aggression.

Slep et al. (2021) have found that couples with high intimate partner violence are influenced by their partners' anger displays, both men and women. Additionally, low relationship satisfaction was also important for women participants. When participants displayed higher intensity anger, their partners also reacted with increased angry feelings; however, they displayed less anger. This finding also shows the dyadic relationship in anger.

Adults who have witnessed parental abuse and violence in childhood have a higher possibility of being a victim (Madruga et al., 2017), or a perpetrator (Mulawa et al., 2016) in their adulthood. Also, witnessing such abuse in childhood is related to having a positive attitude and supporting intimate partner violence (Karlsson et al., 2016) and perpetration in adulthood for men (Roberts et al., 2010). Additionally, alcohol use increases the risk of perpetration and victimization for men (Mulawa et al., 2016).

Adults who have experienced physical or sexual intimate partner violence victimization also experienced psychological violence victimization (Mulawa et al., 2016). To add, the physical intimate partner violence that was experienced in adolescence also stays consistent for later in early adulthood (Jouriles et al., 2017).

Similar to cyberbullying, victimization and perpetration are related to each other. In the study of Mulawa et al. (2016), nearly 70% of male perpetrators and 80% of female perpetrators also reported experiencing intimate partner victimization in the past year. Meaning that those who are victims of intimate partner violence also engage in perpetration towards their partner, and vice versa.

Attitudes toward dating violence are also an important topic, like cyberbullying (Heirman, & Walrave, 2012). Because the studies show that supportive attitudes are related to perpetration (Foshee et al., 2016) and when people are the victims of intimate partner violence, they tend to have a higher acceptance level compared to non-victims

(Özdere, 2019). Bacıoğlu and Kocabıyık (2020) found that the supportive attitude towards dating violence decreases as college students' age.

In a study by Özdere and Kürtül (2018), they wanted to evaluate the effectiveness of a psychoeducation program for dating violence. They give participants the Attitudes towards Dating Violence Scale before and after the program. As a result, researchers found that (1) the acceptance level for dating violence has decreased, and (2) the participants who joined the psychoeducation reported more dating violence as perpetrators and victims. In another study, they tried to see whether a psychoeducation program for flirt violence could make people recognize those behaviors and whether after this program the participants show better communication skills. What they found was that there was no significant change in the communication but for both males and females as perpetrators, people had less acceptance level for dating violence. It means that they have gained awareness of dating violence (Üstünel, 2020).

Cafferky et al. (2018) have found in the meta-analysis that alcohol, drugs, and substance abuse were related to both intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration. To add male alcohol substance users were more related to intimate partner violence perpetration and female substance users were more related to intimate partner violence victimization in terms of gender differences.

As the outcomes of intimate partner violence, women experience injuries, fear, posttraumatic stress, and decrease in relationship satisfaction (Caldwell et al., 2012), hopelessness, and anxiety (Alan Dikmen et al., 2018). According to the review by Laskey et al. (2019) intimate partner violence victimization is related to PTSD, depression, anxiety, suicidal thoughts, eating disorders, social connectedness, loneliness, and lower relationship satisfaction.

It should be noted that people who are in a relationship in which partners are victims and perpetrators at the same time are the most prone to experience depression, suicidal thoughts, and lower life satisfaction compared to individuals that are not affected by any violence in their relationship (Ulloa & Hemmet, 2016).

2.1.3. Cyber Dating Abuse

Even though technology, especially smartphones, has some advantages such as being convenient, communicating more efficiently even the recipient is far away, providing a sense of security, and helping people in an emergency, there are pros and cons to

face-to-face and internet communication. While the internet removes the requirement of physical proximity and real-time communication, the need for social, facial, and non-verbal cues is still the downside of online communication (Weiten et al., 2018, p. 226), which is a potential risk for creating ambiguity and miscommunication (Runions, Shapka, Dooley, & Modecki, 2013). Couples primarily send text messages due to increased availability, autonomy, and directness and to enrich emotionally and relationally connectedness (Pettigrew, 2009).

People also share information about themselves willingly and consciously in their updates about what they eat, whom they are with, where they are, and what they are doing mostly with the photos or selfies they post (Hunt et al., 2014) by adding location, tagging places, or any tips of the location in the frame.

For example, if the user allows, some apps send the location information as a notification to the other “friends” of the user as a feature (Weiten et al., 2018, p. 251), such as “Büşra is at Şato Library.” like in Foursquare and Swarm. However, those notifications continue as you use the application and keep this feature on while updating your profile. If both parties use the tracking application and allow sharing their location, the parties can see each other's live locations through the application. For example, the current location of their parents, spouses, and children can be seen by using an app (Hasinoff, 2017).

While social media enables individuals to socialize and improve offline connections (Lampe, Ellison, & Steinfield, 2006), it also can be used as a tool to stalk, harass, and threaten partners (Southworth et al., 2007) as they enable to overcome the privacy barrier. In addition, in terms of monitoring, sharing passwords or letting the partner see the profile might be seen as a sign of trust and commitment at the beginning of a relationship. However, later these actions can be rationalized by jealousy, worry for safety, or uncovering hidden things (Baker & Carreño, 2015).

Zweig, Lachman, Yahner, and Dank (2014) have described cyber-dating abuse as “the control, harassment, stalking, and abuse of one’s dating partner via technology and social media” (p. 1306). There are 4 categories of tools of cyber dating abuse. *Online social network strategies* include instant messaging services, social media, blogs, and forums. *Email use* includes disruptive email sending, using the email identity without permission, and monitoring the emails, *Mobile use* includes repetitively sending

disruptive content containing threats or sexuality by phone calls or texts, and real-time tracking of the victims with geolocation functions without consent (Fernet et al., 2019). *Other devices* include stalking, password hacking, spying, key recording software, hidden cameras, or activating web cameras remotely (Fernet et al., 2019; Southworth et al., 2007).

Technology use might be a risk factor in terms of exposing themselves and becoming a potential target because of accessibility and visibility for present and former partners (Balakrishnan, 2015). Also, due to monitoring options being easily available, partners could use technology as a way of perpetration (Marganski & Melander, 2015). Cyberstalking could have detrimental effects on the individual and their relationships (Kuss & Griffiths, 2017). As a result, forms of violence such as bullying, cyberbullying and intimate partner violence are related to cyber dating abuse (Schnurr et al., 2013; Van Ouytsel et al., 2017).

Since dating abuse can continue or may even increase after the end of the relationship (Anderson & Saunders, 2003), including participants' latest relationships in the last year is important since cyber abusive behaviors can increase especially when the perpetrator is not around the victim and the only way to reach might be using online sources. For example, ex-partners could use Facebook to interact with, harass, or vent to ex-romantic partners (Lyndon et al., 2011). Also, the myths about love and justification of violence increase the likelihood cyber dating abuse in relationships (Borrajo, Gámez-Guadix, & Calvete, 2015b), as they choose to stay in the relationship (Helm et al., 2017).

Cyber dating abuse has been studied with different theories of aggression (Akers & Jennings, 2009), such as Strain Theory (Curry & Zavala, 2020), Social Structure and Social Learning Theory (Curry & Zavala, 2020; Van Ouytsel et al., 2020), Self-Control (Curry & Zavala, 2020) and Routine Activities Theory (Van Ouytsel et al., 2018).

Marganski and Melander (2015) have examined the co-occurrence of in-person intimate partner violence and cyber aggression victimization with college students between 18 and 25 years old, and who have reported being in a relationship in the past 12 months. They found that 73% of the participants have reported experiencing some form of intimate partner's cyber aggression violence, suggesting that this is the most experienced IPV. They also found that cyber aggression victimization was strongly

related to in-person victimization for all three (psychological, physical, and sexual) IPV. Nearly all participants who reported experiencing cyber aggression victimization also reported experiencing in-person (94.8%, 96%, and 92.6%, respectively). To add, those who do not report experiencing in-person psychological, physical, and sexual victimization have experienced cyber aggression from their partners (51.8%, 34%, and 31.2%, respectively).

In the study of Reed et al. (2016), the prevalence of experiencing one or more cyber dating abuse victimization behaviors was 74.1% and one or more cyber dating abuse perpetration behaviors was 69.5% in their lifetime. Parallel to lifetime experiences, past year victimization was 68.8% and perpetration was 62.6%. Therefore, cyber dating abuse victimization was positively related to perpetration. In terms of gender differences, even though male participants report more frequent victimization, there is no difference in overall victimization. Also, cyber dating abuse was found to be related to psychological, physical, and sexual intimate partner violence (Reed et al., 2016),

Additionally, Zweig et al. (2013) have found that the victims of sexual and non-sexual cyber dating abuse were also likely to be the victims of dating violence and abuse. Also, sexual cyber dating abuse victims were seven times more likely to be the victims of sexual coercion (55 vs. 8 %), compared to non-victims, and sexual cyber dating abuse perpetrators were 17 times more likely to have also engaged in sexual coercion perpetration (34 vs. 2 %).

Similar to cyberbullying and intimate partner violence, cyber dating abuse also shows a reciprocal relationship in terms of perpetration and victimization (Linares et al. 2021; Reed et al., 2016; Villora et al., 2019a; Villora et al., 2019b, Villora, Navarro, & Yubero, 2019; Zweig et al., 2013).

In the study of Borrajo, Gámez-Guadix, and Calvete (2015a, p.358) *direct aggression* was explained as “an aggressive act with a deliberate intention to hurt the partner/ex-partner, such as insults or threats” and *monitoring/control* was explained as “the use of electronic means to control the partner/ex-partner; for example, the use of personal passwords” (Borrajo, Gámez-Guadix, & Calvete, 2015a, p.358).

Reed et al. (2017) have found that digital monitoring/control was the most frequent type of digital dating abuse, and girls reported more frequent digital sexual coercion victimization. Gender differences were also found in the frequency of digital dating

abuse perpetration, such that girls reported more frequent digital monitoring/control and boys reported more frequent digital sexual coercion. In terms of the reactions of the participants, girls were more likely to report distress to digital sexual coercion and direct aggression and boys were more dismissive, however, they were more reactive to monitoring/control, compared to direct aggression. Participants responded by blocking the perpetrator, getting annoyed, being uncomfortable or afraid, or trying to prevent further hostility could be reasons for such response.

Linares et al. (2021) have investigated the relationship between sexist attitudes, violence justification, impulsiveness, and problematic smartphone use with control and direct aggression behaviors in cyber dating abuse. As a result, they found that male participants reported being more controlled in terms of status and location and insulting their partners as perpetrators. To add, control behaviors were more common compared to aggression. Men showed more sexist attitudes and violence justification compared to women. In addition, controlling behaviors were related to impulsivity traits, which is the tendency to lose control of both negative and positive emotions. Lastly, problematic smartphone usage was linked to controlling perpetration.

According to Bakır (2019), male participants experienced more direct aggression victimization, perpetration, and monitoring/control victimization whereas female participants engaged more in monitoring/control victimization. To add, there was no relationship length difference. The only difference between the times spent online was related to spending more than 5 hours and direct aggression victimization.

Even though literature is not in a consensus about the difference between victimization and perpetration (Aracı-İyiyaydın, 2022; Bakır, 2019; Bennett et al., 2011; Bianchi et al., 2021; Burke et al., 2011; Brown et al., 2022; Erdem et al., 2022; İnce, 2022; Maftai & Dănilă, 2021; Zweig et al., 2013), other studies show that there is no difference (Borrajo Gámez-Guadix, & Calvete, 2015a; Curry & Zavala, 2020; Hancock et al., 2017; Reed et al., 2016; Toplu-Demirtaş et al., 2022; Velotti et al., 2022). The gender norms are not related to female and male perpetration or victimization (Villora, 2019a; Villora, 2019b).

In the study of Van Ouytsel et al. (2018), it was found that more time spent using social network sites (SNS) was related to more likely to be a victim of cyber dating abuse. As Van Ouytsel et al. (2018) stated, spending more time, and engaging with other users

could create an opportunity for the partner to monitor these activities and engage with victims. Also, relationship length was related to digital controlling victimization (Van Ouytsel et al., 2018) and partner violence along with frequent contact with a romantic partner (Giordano et al., 2010)

Since most cyber dating abuse studies investigate women and university students (Fernet et al., 2019), it is important to see the differences between genders and university students and older adults.

Experiencing distress and alcohol use is linked to cyber dating abuse victimization (Bennett et al., 2011; Duerksen & Woodin, 2021). Poor physical health, substance abuse, sexual intercourse experience with/out, or using alcohol or drugs prior to it was linked with cyber dating abuse perpetration (Van Ouytsel et al., 2017). Lower self-esteem was related to both direct aggression and monitoring/control, in terms of both victimization and perpetration (Bakır, 2019; Hancock, 2017). Depression, stress, and anxiety were also related to both victimization and perpetration (Maftei & Dănilă, 2021).

2.2. ADULT ATTACHMENT

Bowlby (1980) has presented the attachment theory, which considers the infants' emotional bonding with their caregivers and how differently they react under stressful situations.

Attachment theory explains both healthy and detrimental forms of a relationship which is a product of the adaptations to social situations leading to unique styles that applies the same dynamics to all people (Hazan & Shaver, 1987), despite the differences in genetics, culture, and individual experiences (Ainsworth, 1989).

The theory has been linked with most of the sub disciplines of psychology, such as social, developmental, and clinical psychology, and has a profound effect on psychological science. Therefore, it can be considered a “Grand Theory” in psychology (Fraley & Shaver, 2008).

Attachment behavior is any form of seeking proximity and trying to engage with the attachment figure when a person is frightened, tired, ill, or in distress and in need of comfort and assurance (Bowlby, 1980).

At birth, infants are equipped with signaling behaviors such as crying that will result

in proximity to anyone who can assure the need. This behavior then becomes specified to a primary figure. Later, grasping and reaching out also are added and these proximity-keeping behaviors become more “goal-corrected”. At approximately 1 year, the infant establishes an attachment to a primary and a couple of secondary attachment figures (Ainsworth, 1989).

Attachment relationships remain crucial throughout the life span (Bowlby, 1982; Ainsworth, 1989). In the later stages of life, the role of being a primary attachment figure shifts from caregivers to partners.

Like affectional bonds, attachment also requires the desire to maintain proximity, emotional distress at separation, joy at reunion, and grief at loss. However, security, comfort, and the ability to explore the world from a secure base created by the attachment figure are the ones that result in the secure attachment. Therefore, not all relationships might have a secure attachment (Ainsworth, 1989).

The possibility of abandonment creates anxiety, which is called separation anxiety (Bowlby, 1980). The threats of abandonment can also create anger. In order to prevent the attachment figure from executing a threat, anger can become dysfunctional (Bowlby, 1980).

Hazan and Shaver (1987) have found that Bowlby's (1982) and Ainsworth's (1989) attachment theory in infancy and childhood can also be seen in adulthood relationships. Both infants and adults feel safer when their attachment figure is near, available and responsive, and insecure when these are unmet; both share their experiences; both engage in mutual eye contact and physical affection; both share a language specific to their attachment figure, “motherese” in the infant-parent and “babytalk” in romantic relationships (Shaver et al., 1988, as cited in Fraley & Shaver, 2008). Therefore, Hazan and Shaver (1987) have adopted Bowlby's (1982) and Ainsworth's (1989) attachment theory and proposed that there are three adult attachment styles. According to Hazan and Shaver (1987), people with avoidant attachment showed fear of intimacy, jealousy, and emotional inconsistency. They also reported being distant, but they did not report loneliness. People with anxious/ambivalent attachment also showed jealousy, and emotional inconsistency as people with avoidant attachment does. However, they also desire the assurance of the relationship and seek proximity, and the attachment includes obsession. Lastly, people

with secure attachment also showed jealousy, and emotional inconsistency, meaning that these two concepts are the fundamental experiences of romantic love.

They found that adult attachment styles have a similar distribution in the population compared to infant attachment styles, meaning that 56% of the population were secure, 24% of the population were avoidant, and 20% of the population had anxious/ambivalent attachment to their attachment figure (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) proposed a two-dimensional model based on adults' positive and negative views of self and others. According to their theory, securely attached adults who have a positive view of self and others are not scared of intimacy and independence. They view themselves as lovable and view others as accepting and responsive. Adults with preoccupied attachment have a positive view of others, but a negative view of self, meaning that these adults try to obtain self-acceptance through acceptance of others. Individuals with fearful attachment have a negative view of self and others, meaning that they feel lovable, and others are untrustworthy and rejecting. These individuals avoid rejection from others. Lastly, people with dismissive attachment have a positive self of view, meaning that they feel lovable. However, they also have a negative view of others. These individuals avoid intimacy and value independency. They are also resistant to showing invulnerability.

Later, Brennan et al. (1998) collected 323 items that were on the most used scales and run a factor analysis. As a result, they found two dimensions for adult attachment, namely "*attachment-related anxiety*" and "*attachment-related avoidance*" (as cited in Selçuk et al., 2005). Individuals who have higher scores on attachment-related anxiety worry about their partner's responsiveness, availability, and attentiveness; and individuals who have low scores on this dimension are secure about such concerns. Individuals who have higher scores on attachment-related avoidance avoid emotional intimacy and reliance on others, and individuals who have lower scores on this dimension comfortably rely on others, receive support, and engage intimately. Therefore, individuals who have securely attached score lower on both dimensions (as cited in Fraley & Shaver, 2008).

Shaver & Mikulincer (2002) concludes that individuals with anxious attachment try to minimize the distance from attachment figures to gain their support and love by clinging and controlling behaviors repetitively. In contrast, individuals with avoidant

attachment isolate themselves from attachment figures to suppress distressing thoughts and painful memories, avoid interdependence and strive for self-reliance.

The adult attachment has been studied on various topics from work environment (Martin et al., 2022), to psychotherapy outcome (Levy et al., 2018), and relationship quality (Sheng et al., 2022).

Hart et al., (2015) have found that people with anxious attachment engage with Facebook more, meaning that they frequently post a comment and like, with concerns about social feedback. Their efforts generate positive feedback and higher levels of attention from others.

Musetti et al. (2022) have summarized in their systematic review that problematic social networking sites use is negatively related to secure attachment and positively related to attachment anxiety, however, the relationship between avoidant attachment and problematic social networking site use was inconsistent.

2.3. EMOTION REGULATION

Emotions have a major role in physiologic, cognitive, and behavioral responses that are essential for situational adaptation. The conclusion of the examination of environmental stimuli leads to emotions (Gross & Thompson, 2007).

Since the 1960s, one of the most commonly researched subjects has been emotion regulation. People's attempts to regulate their own emotional experiences have been the main subject of research on emotion regulation. (Sarısoy-Aksüt & Gençöz, 2020).

Thompson (1994, pp. 27-28) has described emotion regulation as “the extrinsic and intrinsic processes responsible for monitoring, evaluating, and modifying emotional reactions, especially their intensive and temporal features, to accomplish one's goals”. Intrinsic emotion regulation means regulating the emotions of self while extrinsic emotion regulation means emotion regulated by others. Emotion regulation can be considered an ambiguous term since it might refer to emotions regulating how people think and react physiologically and behaviorally. It could also be considered as the regulation of emotions (Gross & Thompson, 2007).

According to Process Model of Emotion Regulation by Gross (2002), different emotion regulation strategies can be used in the different stages in the process of emotion generation. The stages include selection of the situation, modification of the

situation, deployment of attention, modification of cognitive appraisal, and modulation of responses. Also, these five emotion regulation processes can be categorized as response-focused and antecedent-focused, which depends on the timing during the emotion-generation process. Antecedent-focused emotion regulation processes such as situation selection, situation modification, attention deployment, and cognitive change of a situation occur before the emotional response has been fully activated. On the other hand, suppression is that becomes activated after the emotional experience or the response to that emotion. Antecedent-focused emotion regulation processes create reappraisal strategies while response-focused emotion regulation processes create suppression strategies.

Emotion regulation processes could be conscious and unconscious, automated or controlled, these processes can be effective for one or more stages of producing emotions (Gross & Thompson, 2007). As they can vary from person to person, which then can become individual characteristics of personality (Cole et al., 1994). Patterns of emotion regulation might hinder functioning under specific circumstances, and these patterns might lead to support or develop into psychopathology symptoms (Cole et al., 1994).

Emotion regulation has been studied with internet addiction (Evren et al., 2018), diabetes (Fisher et al., 2018), substance dependence and eating disorders (Pierrehumbert et al., 2002), resilience (Mouatsou & Koutra, 2021), suicide ideation (Swee et al., 2020), and gaming (Müller & Bonnaire, 2021).

Aldao et al. (2010) have analyzed the relationships between six emotion-regulation strategies (namely acceptance, suppression, problem solving, avoidance, reappraisal, and rumination) and symptoms of depression, anxiety, eating, and substance-related disorders in their meta-analysis with 241 effect sizes from 114 studies. As a result, researchers found that maladaptive strategies (rumination, avoidance, suppression) were related to more psychopathologies to be seen. Parallel to that, adaptive strategies were related to less pathology. It should be also noted that the presence of maladaptive strategies was more strongly associated with psychopathology than adaptive ones.

When people face with external or internal changes that would create undesirable emotions, securely attached individuals can use problem-solving strategies and utilize from available sources of social support to assist problem solving to help the troubled

individual. However, individuals with avoidant attachment could block or inhibit emotional reactions to potential or actual threats to attachment-figure availability with downregulation. Additionally, individuals with anxious attachment could ruminate on the threatening aspects of the emotional experience. As a result, both lead to dysfunction from opposite patterns (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2007).

2.3.1. Difficulties In Emotion Regulation

Gratz and Roemer (2004) have explained emotion regulation as a concept that includes

- (a) awareness and understanding of emotions, (b) acceptance of emotions, (c) ability to control impulsive behaviors and behave in accordance with desired goals when experiencing negative emotions, and (d) ability to use situationally appropriate emotion regulation strategies flexibly to modulate emotional responses as desired in order to meet individual goals and situational demands. (pp. 42-43)

Furthermore, not having any or all of these is called difficulties in emotion regulation, or emotion dysregulation.

According to Gratz and Roemer (2004), difficulties in emotion regulation includes dimensions such as

- (a) lack of awareness of emotional responses, (b) lack of clarity of emotional responses, (c) nonacceptance of emotional responses, (d) limited access to emotion regulation strategies perceived as effective, (e) difficulties controlling impulses when experiencing negative emotions, and (f) difficulties engaging in goal-directed behaviors when experiencing negative emotions. (p. 52)

Awareness includes not paying attention and not acknowledging the emotions. *Clarity* includes being unclear about the feelings that is being experienced. *Non-acceptance* includes denial and feeling embarrassed or angry for having such emotional responses. *Strategies* means the lack of ways to cope with the emotion. *Impulse* means having lack of controlling behaviors related to the emotion. Lastly, *Goals* means having difficulty to shift towards that feeling and continue to do other things (Yiğit & Guzey

Yiğit, 2017).

Difficulties in emotion regulation have been studied with drunkorexia (Azzi et al., 2021), depression (Villalobos et al., 2021), parental mindfulness (Yan et al., 2021), binge watching (Starosta et al., 2021), child abuse (Walker et al., 2021).

Velotti et al. (2015) have investigated the moderating role of gender in the relationship between attachment and emotion regulation difficulties. As a result, both attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance were related to difficulties in acceptance, clarity, and overall emotion dysregulation. However, only attachment anxiety predicted impulse and strategies. Additionally, attachment avoidance was related to lack of awareness. Lastly, gender was found to moderate the relationship between attachment insecurity and goals. Specifically, anxious attachment in women and avoidant attachment in men was related to greater difficulties in engaging in goal-directed behaviors. Conversely, the association between attachment avoidance and difficulties in being goal was negative for women.

2.3.2. Interpersonal Emotion Regulation

People like to share positive and negative life experiences such as achievements and struggles with others. This need for sharing can become even stronger when people want to enhance their positive feelings or are in need of emotional support.

Knowing that there are people beside them, and they also share similar life experiences can be soothing. Learning others' coping strategies can also be helpful in dealing with individual problems and emotions. Sharing with others also includes listening to other people, which makes interpersonal emotional regulation bidirectional.

Zaki and Williams (2013) have proposed that interpersonal emotion regulation also should cover both "extrinsic vs intrinsic" and "response-dependent vs response-independent" regulation. In the intrinsic interpersonal regulation, the individual reaches out to a social contact to regulate his own emotion, and in the extrinsic interpersonal regulation, the individual enterprise to regulate another person's emotion. Response-dependent processes requires other persons' feedback while response-independent does not require to regulation of emotion.

Hoffman et al. (2016) are one of the earliest researchers that study interpersonal emotion regulation. According to them, interpersonal emotion regulation has four

components. *Enhancing positive affect* refers to the tendency to be with other people when having an emotional intensity and increasing positive emotions such as joy and happiness. *Perspective taking* refers to being reminded by another person that things could have been worse, others have it worse and not to worry about the current situation that the person is facing. *Soothing* refers to the need for other people around when feeling negative such as sad or depressed for comfort and sympathy. *Social modeling* refers to observing other people see how they cope with a situation that they are handling.

However, even though interpersonal emotion regulation is important, there is not an adequate amount of research in this field, especially in intimate partner violence and cyber dating abuse. Interpersonal emotion regulation has been studied in the workplace (Troth et al., 2018), sports team dynamics (Tamminen & Crocker, 2013), environments, mood and anxiety disorders (Hofmann, 2014), and empathy (Zaki, 2021).

Regardless of whether the relationship is abusive or not, it requires work from both parties. When attachment needs are not met, partners might want to use emotion regulation strategies, which include interpersonal interaction such as the want to be assured by a partner (Velotti et al., 2018). Individuals who are in a dissatisfying and abusive relationship can become estranged, anxious and angry (Robins et al. 2002). Especially when insecurely attached couples are in conflict, they can have hardship regulating their emotions and this could lead to mutual aggression with lower adaptive relationship functioning (Burk & Seiffge-Krenke, 2015).

2.4. PERSONALITY

Personality has been viewed from numerous theoretical perspectives, such as Psychoanalysis, Biological Theory, Humanistic Theory, Cognitive Theory, Behavioral Theory, and Trait Theory (Schultz & Schultz, 2017).

After Allport and Odbert (1936), Cattell (1943), and Norman's (1967) attempts to classify personality through a lexical approach, five factors were found, and these factors eventually became known as the "Big Five" (Goldberg, 1990). The model consists of 5 dimensions, namely extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience (McCrae & Costa, 1985).

Extraversion can be described as the “tendency to prefer companionship and social stimulation” (McCrae, & Costa, 2008, p.164). Extraverts can be defined as “sociable, fun-loving, affectionate, friendly, and talkative” (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Extraverts can talk to a stranger first, and introduce themselves; therefore, they can form new relationships easily (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). People with higher extraversion scores have great social skills and participate in group activities (McCrae, & Costa, 2008). People with lower extraversion scores like being alone compared to being in a group, they also might have a poorer relationship with their parents and receive rejection from their peers (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008).

Agreeableness can be described as the tendency to cooperativeness and compassion towards others (McCrae, & Costa, 2008). As Digman (1990) states, agreeableness has traits such as “altruism, nurturance, caring, and emotional support at the one end of the dimension, and hostility, indifference to others, self-centeredness, spitefulness, and jealousy at the other” (pp. 422-424). People who have higher agreeableness scores aim to maintain social harmony and believe in cooperation (McCrae, & Costa, 2008), and perform better in group settings (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). People who have lower agreeableness scores might be merciless, doubtful, uncooperative, and have interpersonal problems (McCrae, & Costa, 2008).

Conscientiousness can be described as the tendency to strive for achievement and impulse control. People with high conscientiousness plan and prepare ahead, think before acting, and can delay their gratification easily (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008), also they are self-disciplined, well organized, and careful (McCrae & Costa, 1987). They have leadership skills, higher academic achievements, better job performance, and they live longer (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008).

Neuroticism can be described as “individual difference in the tendency to experience distress” (McCrae & John, 1992, p. 195), and is also called emotional instability with feeling sad, nervous, and anxious (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). It is important to highlight that neuroticism includes negative affect and disturbing thoughts and behaviors that come with emotional distress. People who have higher scores on neuroticism may use inappropriate coping mechanisms such as hostile reactions and wishful thinking more frequently and adopt irrational beliefs such as self-blame (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Those who have higher neuroticism might have poorer coping with illnesses, experience burnout, and change their jobs (John, Naumann, &

Soto, 2008). However, having low scores on neuroticism does not mean having positive mental health. It can be described as being calm and relaxed (McCrae & John, 1992). Those who have lower neuroticism might have more commitment to their work and more satisfaction in their relationships (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008).

Openness to experience can be described as the tendency to a need for change, novelty, the depth, diversity, and uniqueness of a person's life (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). Openness to experience can also be viewed as "openness to feelings and new ideas, the flexibility of thought, and readiness to indulgence in fantasy" (Digman, 1990, p. 424). People who are open to experience like to experience different cultures, and have multiple hobbies, are interested in traveling, (McCrae, & Costa, 2008). They also have a sensitivity and success for art (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008; McCrae & Costa, 1987). People who have lower scores of openness to experience might have conservative attitudes, values, beliefs, and political preferences (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008).

The replicability of BFI with 56 nations studied by Schmitt et al. (2007) has allowed researchers to compare and generalize findings more confidently. Considering the impact of personality in research, the Big Five has been studied with various concepts from all disciplines of psychology such as academic performance (Mammadov, 2021), life satisfaction (Heidemeier & Göritz, 2016), marital satisfaction (O'Meara, & South, 2019), resilience (Iimura & Taku, 2018), depression (Allen et al., 2017), and recent impactful life experiences such as COVID-19 pandemic (Zacher & Rudolph, 2021).

Huang (2019) analyzed sixty-one articles with 22.899 participants to examine the relationship between social network site use and the Big Five in a meta-analysis. As a result, neuroticism and extraversion were positively, conscientiousness negatively correlated with social network site use, and all the relationships were small. However, openness and agreeableness were not significantly correlated with social network site use.

Choi et al. (2017) studied the behaviors related to selfies, and their relations to personality using an online panel survey with 299 selfie posters who were between 19 and 29 years old. They assessed the behaviors by asking about the importance of others' engagement with their posts, and the degree of observing, commenting, and liking others' selfies. As a result, they found that extroverts and agreeable people

tended to like and comment on others' selfies. People who have high agreeableness and low openness tended to observe others' selfies. Lastly, people who have high agreeableness and neuroticism, but low conscientiousness have engaged with other users' feedback for their posts.

Wang et al. (2012) analyzed the association between the Big Five, narcissism, self-esteem, and sensation seeking and the use of SNS (social networking sites). 265 SNS users from a university in China have participated with their self-reports. The frequency of specific features of SNS was asked alongside The Big Five Personality Inventory (BFPI), The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, Narcissism Personality Inventory (NPI)-16, and The Sensation Seeking Scale. Five standard multiple regression analyses were used to evaluate the hypotheses. As a result, extravert individuals used more communicative functions such as including status updates, adding more friends, and commenting. Agreeable and high in self-esteem users were more likely to make comments. Users who are open to experience and seeking sensation were more likely to play online games. In terms of gender, male users had more SNS friends and tended to play online games more than female users, who were more likely to post selfies and update their status. Also, users with more narcissism scores tended to post photos and update their status.

Noftle and Shaver (2006) have investigated the predictive relationship between attachment and Big Five on relationship quality. 8318 university students have completed Big Five Inventory (BFI) and Experiences in Close Relationships scale (ECR). As a result, neuroticism was positively, and others were negatively related to both attachment anxiety and avoidance.

In the study by Shaver and Brennan (1992), they examined the relationship between attachment styles and Big Five. As a result, securely attached participants had higher extraversion scores and lower neuroticism scores compared to the insecurely attached participants. They were also more agreeable compared to people with avoidant attachment. There were no differences in Openness. However, people who have avoidant attachment had lower scores for openness to feelings, and people who have anxious-ambivalent attachment had lower scores on openness to values.

Purnamaningsih (2017) investigated the relationship between the Big Five and emotion regulation strategies. 339 students from Universitas Gadjah Mada

participated, and The Big Five Personality Factors and Emotion Regulation Questionnaire were used. The data were analyzed with multiple regression analysis. As a result, selection situation was predicted by neuroticism, situation modification was predicted by openness, extraversion, and agreeableness, attentional deployment was predicted by extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism, cognitive change was predicted by conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness, and suppression was predicted by agreeableness, neuroticism, and extraversion.

Horwood and Anglim (2021) have studied the relationship between problematic smartphone use, emotion regulation difficulties, and the Big Five. As a result, problematic smartphone use was positively related to all emotion regulation difficulties, except for awareness, and lower conscientiousness. Additionally, emotion regulation difficulties were related to higher neuroticism, lower conscientiousness, and lower scores on extraversion, except for the relationship between impulse and extraversion. Awareness was negatively related to openness and agreeableness, and same pattern was seen for impulse. The biggest correlations for problematic smartphone use were overall emotion regulation difficulties ($r = 0.40$), impulse control difficulties ($r = 0.42$), neuroticism ($r = 0.43$), and conscientiousness ($r = -0.38$). In the regression analysis, even though emotion regulation difficulties were predictive for problematic smartphone use, when personality entered, its power has decreased.

Artan (2019) examined the relationship between Big Five personality and emotion regulation difficulties in 359 college students aged between 18 and 25. The Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale-Brief Form (DERS-SF) and Big Five personality trait test -50 Turkish version (OCEAN model) was used to analyze the data using Mann-Whitney U Test, Kruskal-Wallis Test, Independent Samples, T-Test, and ANOVA. It was found that DERS-SF and its subscales were not different in terms of gender. There was no difference for Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness, and BFPTT subscales in terms of gender. However, Conscientiousness was higher in women, whereas neuroticism was higher in men. When age was considered, there was no difference in BFPTT subscales and as a whole, except for Agreeableness. In addition to that, there was no age difference in DERS-SF and its subscales. In terms of the relationship between DERS-SF and BFPTT, there was a negative correlation between total scores. There was a negative correlation between BFPTT total scores and all DERS-SF subscales. Even though there was not a significant relationship between extraversion

and impulse, agreeableness and strategies, conscientiousness and strategies, openness, and impulse, all the other relationships between BFPTT and DERS-SF subscales and DERS-SF itself were negatively correlated.

2.5. INTERACTIONS BETWEEN ADULT ATTACHMENT, EMOTION REGULATION, BIG FIVE PERSONALITY, AND CYBER DATING ABUSE

2.5.1. Adult Attachment and Cyber Dating Abuse

Turan and Duy (2020) investigated the relationship between self-esteem, attachment, gender roles, and social approval as predictors of attitudes towards intimate partner violence among college students. As a result, there were no gender differences in the aggression dimension. However, male participants had higher total aggression scores, as well as abuse and control dimensions. The regression analysis showed that gender role attitudes predicted all three dimensions, whereas avoidant attachment predicted violence, anxious attachment predicted abuse and self-esteem predicted control dimensions of intimate partner violence.

In their meta-analysis, Velotti et al. (2022) investigated the relationship between attachment and intimate partner violence perpetration and found that both anxious and avoidant attachment were related to intimate partner violence perpetration. Additionally, anxious attachment was positively related to generic ($r = .28$), physical ($r = .19$), psychological ($r = .30$), and sexual ($r = .35$) violence. In terms of avoidant attachment was not significant for generic ($r = .07$), but positively related to physical ($r = .12$), psychological ($r = .14$), and sexual violence ($r = .20$) perpetration.

Villegas (2017) studied the relationship between adult attachment style and psychological and physical intimate partner violence and sexual coercion. The data was collected from 50 adults using Experiences in Close Relationships – Revised (ECR-R) Questionnaire and Conflict Tactics Scales-2 (CTS-2). The Data analyzed with Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis, Pearson's chi-square test, Logistic and Hierarchical Multiple Regression. As a result, participants who had higher anxious attachment scores were predicted to be engaged in psychological and physical intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization, however, this link was not found for avoidant attachment. There was no positive relationship between the perpetration of sexual coercion and avoidant attachment. Parallel with the literature,

intimate partner violence perpetration was correlated with intimate partner violence victimization.

Maftai and Dănilă (2021) have found that individuals with secure attachment reported more cyber dating abuse perpetration than dismissively attached participants, while participants with dismissing attachment reported less cyber dating abuse perpetration and victimization, compared to individuals with fearful attachment.

Lancaster et al. (2019) investigated the relationships among cyber dating abuse victimization, insecure attachment (anxious and avoidant), and relationship quality. Participants of the study were 230 undergraduate students at a large South Eastern University, USA. The Data of the study was collected by The Partner Cyber Abuse Questionnaire, The PN-RQ Scale, and the Experiences in Close Relationship Scale–Short Form. Four hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used in the study. As a result, cyber dating abuse victims who had higher attachment avoidance perceived lower positive relationship quality compared to non-victims of cyber dating abuse but there was no relation in terms of negative relationship quality. Similarly, the relationship between cyber dating abuse and relationship quality was not moderated by attachment anxiety in both negative and positive aspects. Specifically, the anxious attachment was related to cyber dating abuse victimization; however, the avoidant attachment was not related to cyber dating abuse victimization.

Basting et al. (2022) have investigated the relationship between attachment, cyber dating abuse, and family of origin violence. Also, the anxious attachment was positively related to the family of origin violence and all three forms of cyber dating abuse (direct aggression, monitoring/controlling, and sexual) for both victimization and perpetration. There was no relationship between family of origin violence and attachment avoidance, however, monitoring/controlling perpetration was not correlated, and direct aggression victimization and sexual victimization were positively correlated to the avoidant attachment. Because of path analysis, it was found that parent-to-child aggression was indirectly related to cyber dating abuse perpetration and victimization through attachment anxiety. Furthermore, the anxious attachment was related to an increase in all three forms of cyber dating abuse (direct aggression, monitoring/controlling, and sexual) for both victimization and perpetration. Additionally, the avoidant attachment was found to be related to increased direct cyber aggression victimization, increased cyber sexual direct

aggression victimization, and decreased cyber monitoring/controlling perpetration.

Toplu-Demirtaş et al. (2022) studied the mediative role of trust, anticipated partner infidelity, and jealousy between anxious attachment and cyber dating abuse perpetration. As a result, anxiously attached individuals anxiously were more likely to be jealous and suspicious of infidelity. Therefore, there was a significant indirect effect of dyadic trust, risk of infidelity, and jealousy between anxious attachment and cyber dating abuse perpetration.

Erdem et al. (2022) have investigated the relationship between cyber dating violence and attachment and found that anxious attachment was related to all except relational violence perpetration and avoidant attachment was not related to all except psychological violence victimization. The regression analyses show that anxious and avoidant attachment predicted psychological violence perpetration, and only anxious attachment predicted relational violence perpetration. In terms of victimization, both relational and psychological violence was predicted by only anxious attachment. Additionally, female participants had higher relational violence perpetration scores compared to males.

Yushan and Cihan (2021) have studied the effects of gender and attachment styles on cyber dating abuse victimization in emerging adulthood, with 211 participants. According to their analyses, men were faced with more direct aggression victimization compared to women; however, there was no significant difference in terms of monitoring/control victimization. Additionally, the secure attachment was negatively, and anxious-ambivalent and avoidant attachment were positively correlated to direct aggression victimization. Besides, the secure attachment was negatively, and anxious-ambivalent attachment was positively correlated to monitoring/control victimization. The correlation between avoidant attachment and monitoring/control victimization was not significant. Lastly, the multiple linear regression analyses showed that secure attachment negatively and avoidant attachment positively predicted direct aggression victimization whereas only anxious-ambivalent positively predicted monitoring/control victimization.

2.5.2. Emotion Regulation and Cyber Dating Abuse

Bacıoğlu & Kocabıyık (2020) found that social, intellectual, and freedom values positively, more human dignity, spirituality, futuwwa, and romantic values negatively

predicted attitude towards dating violence. In terms of cognitive emotion regulation strategies, rumination, refocus on planning, and positive appraisal was positively, and catastrophizing and other-blame was negatively predicted attitude toward dating violence.

Birlik (2019) examined the relationship between cognitive emotion regulation, self-compassion, and dating violence in undergraduate students. The data of the study were collected from 623 students through the Cognitive Emotion Regulation Scale, Self-Compassion Scale, and Dating Violence Scale. The Data analyzed by Pearson correlation analysis, simple linear regression, t-test, and one-way analysis of variance. The results showed that there was no difference between perpetration and victimization in terms of gender and no relationship between dating violence and cognitive emotion regulation. Lastly, acceptance, rumination, and refocus on planning and being a woman increase the attitudes toward dating violence while positive refocusing, putting into perspective, and catastrophizing decrease the attitudes toward dating violence.

In the study of Bliton et al. (2016), where they studied the relationship between gender, emotion regulation difficulties and intimate partner violence perpetration in college students, it was found that men's physical violence perpetration was not related to emotion regulation difficulties, whereas women's perpetration was related to all except goals and non-acceptance. In terms of psychological violence, men's perpetration was related to impulse and clarity, whereas women's perpetration was related to awareness and non-acceptance. In terms of regression analyses, none of the subscales of emotion regulation strategies was predictive for physical and psychological violence perpetration. Only being female was predictive for psychological violence perpetration.

Lancaster (2020) evaluated models of cyber dating abuse perpetration and victimization by examining partner attachment, family environment, and emotion regulation. 320 undergraduate students who reported being in a serious romantic relationship participated in the study. The data was collected using Partner Cyber Abuse Questionnaire, Experiences in Close Relationship Scale – Short Form, Self-Report Family Inventory, and Emotion Regulations Checklist Short Form. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used to analyze the study. Results showed that there was a significant direct positive effect from anxious attachment to cyber dating abuse

perpetration. However, there was no direct effect from avoidant attachment to cyber dating abuse perpetration. In addition, emotion regulation was a significant mediator for both avoidant and anxious attachment to cyber dating abuse perpetration. To add, there was a negative association between emotion regulation and cyber dating abuse perpetration and victimization. In terms of attachment, a significant direct effect of anxious attachment on victimization was seen. However, the direct effect was not present from the avoidant attachment on cyber dating abuse victimization. To be exact, higher anxious attachment scores were related to more cyber dating abuse victimization. Emotion regulation was not a significant mediator for anxious or avoidant attachment on cyber dating abuse victimization. At last, more emotion regulation skills were associated with less cyber dating abuse victimization.

Aracı-İyiaydın et al. (2022) have investigated the relationship between anxious attachment and psychological and cyber dating abuse, with the mediation of cognitive jealousy and rumination. As a result, from their path analysis, they found that individuals with anxious attachment were more likely to ruminate about their romantic partners, and the rumination triggers jealousy. Therefore, cyber and psychological dating abuse perpetration increases.

Brem et al. (2021) investigated the longitudinal relationship between alcohol problems and cyber dating abuse with emotion regulation being the moderator between the two variables. Five hundred seventy eight (578) college students participated in the study two times with 3 months in between participation. Path analyses were conducted using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales, the Psychological Aggression Using Technology Scale, the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test, and the 36-item Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. Results showed that alcohol problems predicted psychological and physical dating abuse for high and average emotion dysregulation. However, alcohol problems did not predict cyber-dating abuse independently or in relation to emotion dysregulation. Importantly, cyber-dating abuse predicted psychological and physical dating abuse.

Wu (2019) studied the relationship between binge drinking, emotion dysregulation, and cyber-dating abuse with 740 college students who were surveyed three times (baseline, 4- and 12-month follow-up). The data was collected by the Internet Perpetration and Victim Subscale of The Growing up with Media Survey, the alcohol assessment items based on the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism

(NIAAA) recommended questions, and The Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale-Short Form (DERS-SF) and analyzed with Linear Mixed Models and Ancillary Analyses. As a result, cyber-dating abuse did not predict emotion dysregulation. However, lifetime experience of sexual violence and physical intimate partner violence predicted emotion dysregulation.

İnce (2022) investigated the mediating role of positive and negative emotion regulation difficulties in the relationship between early maladaptive schemas (namely impaired autonomy, disconnection, unrelenting standards, other-directedness, and impaired limits) and cyber dating abuse. As a result, all variables were positively correlated to each other, except for the relationship between impaired limits of early maladaptive schemas and cyber dating abuse. For the mediation analyses, while positive emotion regulation difficulties had partial mediating role between cyber dating abuse with all five-schema domains, negative emotion regulation difficulties had partial mediator role between cyber dating abuse victimization and disconnection and others-directedness schema domains.

Mahoney et al. (2022) have investigated cyber psychological abuse and its prevalence and risk factors with 243 adults. As a result, cyber psychological abuse victimization and perpetration was positively related to child maltreatment, problematic alcohol and drug use, difficulties in emotion regulation, jealousy, avoidant attachment, and anxious attachment. They were also negatively related to age, communication skills, and relationship satisfaction. Hierarchical regression analysis showed that daily cell phone use and behavioral jealousy were positively, and relationship satisfaction were negatively predictive for perpetration and victimization of cyber psychological abuse.

Even though the relationship between adult attachment and interpersonal emotion regulation is conceptually related (Burk & Seiffge-Krenke, 2015; Velotti et al., 2018), a study that covers the relationship between interpersonal emotion regulation and cyber dating abuse or intimate partner violence could not be found. Therefore, it is important to study interpersonal emotion regulation together with attachment.

2.5.3. Big Five Personality and Cyber Dating Abuse

Peluchette et al. (2015) conducted a study that included more than 500 participants and looked for the effect of risky social network site practices (SNS) and self-disclosure and personality on the likelihood of cyberbullying victimization among young adult

Facebook users. For the first part of the study, they examined all possible correlations between these variables including gender, age, and citizenship. The Big Five was conducted with its five subcomponents and cyberbullying victimization was conducted as mild and harsh. As a result, they found a small positive significant correlation between extraversion and openness to experience both mild and harsh victimization. Also, they found a small negative significant correlation between conscientiousness and mild and harsh victimization. To add, they found a small negative correlation between neuroticism, agreeableness, and victimization. However, these correlations were only significant for neuroticism and harsh victimization and agreeableness and mild victimization.

Ulloa et al. (2016) have investigated the Big Five with intimate partner violence with Wave 4 of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, which includes 2,876 men and 4,311 women participants who are between 25 and 34 years old. The data were analyzed with linear multiple regression, separately for male and female participants. As a result, extraversion and neuroticism were positively correlated with perpetration. Additionally, conscientiousness, and agreeableness negatively, neuroticism was positively correlated with victimization for the whole sample. As a result of regression analyses, openness and neuroticism positively predicted intimate partner violence perpetration, and neuroticism positively predicted intimate partner violence victimization. In addition to these, extraversion positively predicted perpetration and victimization for female participants.

In the study of Biolcati et al. (2021), cyber-dating abuse was investigated with ghosting behaviors and the Big Five. As a result, it was found that extraversion and conscientiousness were not correlated, and emotional stability was negatively correlated to cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration. Agreeableness was negatively correlated with cyber dating abuse; however, the relationship was not significant except for the monitoring/control victimization. Openness to experience was positively correlated with direct aggression but not monitoring/control. All forms of ghosting behaviors, namely stopping messaging abruptly, punitive silence, and ending a relationship by disappearing were positively correlated with cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration. However, the relationships between stopping messaging abruptly and direct aggression victimization and ending a relationship by disappearing and monitoring/control perpetration were not significantly correlated.

Lastly, being male, increased extraversion and decreased emotional stability and agreeableness predicted direct aggression perpetration. Only decreased neuroticism and increased openness to experience predicted direct aggression victimization. Being female, decreased neuroticism and agreeableness predicted monitoring/control perpetration, while gender and the Big Five were not predictive for monitoring/control victimization.

2.6. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to investigate cyber-dating abuse through attachment, emotion regulation, and personality in young adulthood.

The theoretical approach of the study, which is considering romantic relationships with cyber dating abuse through attachment, emotion regulation, and personality, shows the uniqueness of the research. Several studies have been conducted to understand cyber dating abuse through attachment (Bakır, 2019; Basting et al., 2022; Erdem et al., 2022; Lancaster, 2020; Lancaster et al., 2019; Maftai & Dănilă, 2021; Toplu-Demirtaş et al., 2022;) emotion regulation (Brem et al., 2021; İnce, 2022; Lancaster et al., 2019; Wu, 2019), and personality Biolcati et al. (2021).

It should also be noted that with improving technologies, people have started to use more of these to connect and communicate (Kemp, 2020; Kemp, 2022). The negative aspects of it came along with positive ones. Cyber aggression, cyberbullying and such online abusive behaviors started to pervade, and new versions of those behaviors started to occur and draw researchers' attention to study their effects. The added effect of COVID-19 and the difficulties to connect offline have increased the possibility of these behaviors being seen.

Furthermore, cyber-dating abuse is a relatively new concept. The cyber world is a new field for these violence and abusive behaviors to occur. To add, the impacts of those behaviors have newly started to gain attraction in terms of dating. Some studies show that intimate partner violence can coexist (Reed et al., 2016) and be even weaker than cyber dating abuse (Marganski & Melander, 2015), and cyber dating abuse could be a predictive risk factor for intimate partner violence (Lu et al., 2021). Also, cyber dating abuse is a new concept, and the literature has yet to be filled in Turkey. Understanding cyber dating abuse will help researchers understand violence from a much more enhanced perspective. Therefore, the prevention of cyber dating abuse, and

consequently violence will be much more achievable, both globally and locally.

Considering these interactions, the present study combines these relationships of cyber dating abuse while examining the effects of attachment, emotion regulation, and personality together on predicting cyber dating abuse.

2.7. AIM OF THE STUDY

The study aims to examine the ways that cyber dating abuse perpetration and victimization behavior can be seen in Turkish young adults. For this aim, the relationships between cyber dating abuse, attachment, emotion regulation, and personality after obtaining the relationships of demographic and relational variables with cyber dating abuse such as gender, mean social media and messaging apps usage, age group, and relationship length was analyzed. The hypotheses are:

1. There would be a significant positive correlation between monitoring/control victimization and perpetration in terms of cyber dating abuse.
2. There would be significant correlations between attachment, emotion regulation, and personality with monitoring/control victimization and perpetration.
 - a. Agreeableness would have a significant negative correlation with monitoring/control perpetration.
 - b. Neuroticism would have a significant positive correlation with monitoring/control perpetration.
3. There would not be a gender difference in cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration.
 - a. There would not be a gender difference in cyber dating abuse monitoring/control victimization.
 - b. There would not be a gender difference in cyber dating abuse monitoring/control perpetration.
4. There would not be a difference between 18-25 and 26-40 years old in cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration.
 - a. There would not be an age period difference between 18-25 and 26-40 years old in cyber dating abuse monitoring/control victimization.

- b. There would not be an age period difference between 18-25 and 26-40 years old in cyber dating abuse monitoring/control perpetration.
5. There would be a relationship length difference between cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration.
 - a. There would be a relationship length difference in monitoring/control victimization.
 - b. There would be a relationship length difference in monitoring/control perpetration.
6. There would be a positive correlation between both average social media and messaging apps usage in a day with cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration, respectively.
 - a. There would be a positive correlation between average social media usage in a day and cyber dating abuse victimization.
 - b. There would be a positive correlation between average messaging apps usage in a day and cyber dating abuse victimization.
 - c. There would be a positive correlation between average social media usage in a day and cyber dating abuse perpetration.
 - d. There would be a positive correlation between average messaging app usage in a day and cyber dating abuse perpetration.
7. Attachment, emotion regulation, and the Big Five would significantly predict cyber-dating abuse.
 - a. Attachment, emotion regulation, and the Big Five would significantly predict monitoring/control victimization.
 - b. Attachment, emotion regulation, and the Big Five would significantly predict monitoring/control perpetration.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

3.1. PARTICIPANTS

The data has been collected from 356 Turkish participants who are between 18 and 40 years old and currently have a romantic relationship with an intimate partner (dating and engaged, except being married) or had an intimate partner in the last 1 year, living in Turkey. The Research Ethics Committee of Yaşar University (Appendix IX) approved the study on 21 November 2020. An online Google Forms document was distributed using personal social networks with snowball sampling. (<https://forms.gle/UgnjEQgRiHPbrvfs5>). To increase participation, a draw was held and 3 people who provided an email that is currently in use received 50 Turkish liras (Appendix 1). The email information of the participants was used for sharing a video of the drawing and to contact the winners.

The participants ranged in age from 18 to 40 with a mean of 22.83 ($SD = 2.722$). 88.2 % were between 18-25 years old ($n = 316$) while 11.2% were between 26 and 40 years old ($n = 40$). Of the total sample, 23.6% were male ($n = 84$) and 76.4 % were female ($n = 272$). The demographic information such as education levels of participants and their parents, the region they live, income level, and employment status can be seen in Table 3.1.

In addition to the above, a couple of questions about their romantic relationships and the time spent using social media and messaging apps were asked.

In terms of relationship status, 31.7% of the participants were single but had a relationship in the last one year ($n = 112$). 64.3% of the participants had a romantic partner ($n = 229$). 4.2% of the participants were engaged ($n = 15$). Regarding the length of their romantic relationships, 27,0% of the participants answered as having a relationship for 0-6 months ($n = 96$), while 17.7% of them stated as from 6 months to 1 year ($n = 63$), 19.1% as from 1 year to 2 years ($n = 68$), 13.5% as from 2 years to 3 years ($n = 48$), 11.5% as from 3 years to 4 years ($n = 41$); 11.2% as 4 or more years (n

= 40). 37.9% of the participants were living in different cities ($n = 135$) while 62.1% of them were not living in the different cities with their current or latest romantic partners ($n = 221$). In addition, 14.6% of the participants were living in the same house ($n = 52$) while 85.4% of them were not living in the same house with their current or latest romantic partners ($n = 304$) (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1. Distribution of Demographic Variables among Participants

Characteristics	N	(%)
Gender		
Female	272	76.4
Male	84	23.6
Age periods		
18-25	316	88.8
26-40	40	11.2
Education level		
Secondary school graduate	3	0.8
High school graduate	14	3.9
Associate degree student or graduate	19	5.3
Undergraduate or bachelor's degree	274	77.0
Graduate student or master's degree	42	11.8
Postgraduate student or doctor's degree	4	1.1
Mother education level		
Literate	16	4.5
Primary/secondary school	152	42.7
High school	102	28.7
Bachelor's degree	81	22.8
Master's or doctor's degree	5	1.4
Father education level		
Literate	8	2.2
Primary/secondary school	120	33.7
High school	106	29.8
Bachelor's degree	110	30.9
Master's or doctor's degree	12	3.4

Region		
Aegean	159	44.7
Marmara	81	22.8
Central Anatolia	44	12.4
Mediterranean	33	9.3
Black Sea	20	5.6
Southeastern Anatolia	7	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	12	3.4
Where they spend most of their lives		
Metropolis	197	55.3
Province	76	21.3
District	70	19.7
Village/Town	13	3.7
Income level		
Low	89	25.0
Medium	248	69.7
High	19	5.3
Employment		
Employed	78	21.9
Non-employed	278	78.1
Relationship status		
Single (was in one last 1 year)	112	31.5
In a relationship	229	64.3
Engaged	15	4.2
Length of relationship		
0 - 6 months	96	27.0
6 months -1 year	63	17.7
1-2 years	68	19.1
2 - 3 years	48	13.5
3 - 4 years	41	11.5
4 and more years	40	11.2
Living in different cities with partner		
Yes	135	37.9

No	221	62.1
Cohabitation		
Yes	52	14.6
No	304	85.4
<hr/>		
N= 356		
<hr/>		

3.2. INSTRUMENTS

In the present study, seven instruments were used: Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire, Experiences in Close Relationships-II, Interpersonal Emotion Regulation Questionnaire, and Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale, Big Five Inventory, and Demographic Information Form to obtain demographic information.

3.2.1. Demographic Information Form

Demographic Information Form collects data about gender, age, the region they live, the place where most of their lives were spent, education level of themselves and their parents, income level, employment status, relationship status, and whether they were in the same city with their current or latest partners or not and whether they were cohabiting with their current or latest partners, the length of the current or latest relationship, time spent a day in social media and messaging apps. (Appendix 3).

3.2.2. Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (Cadq)

Borrajo, Gámez-Guadix, Pereda, and Calvete (2015) assessed cyber-dating abuse in terms of both perpetration and victimization developed the scale. The scale consists of 2 subscales and 20 items each for both a perpetrator and a victim. The subscales have two sub-dimensions as direct aggression and monitoring/control. Direct aggression has 11 items while monitoring/control has nine items. The 6-point Likert scale is used to assess the frequency of cyber dating violence that had happened last 1 year for both a victim and a perpetrator. The rating is as follows ‘1 = never happened; 2 = it did not happen in the last year but happened before; 3 = Orarely: happened once or twice; 4 = sometimes: it happened between 3 and 10 times; 5 = frequently: it happened between 10 and 20 times; 6 = always: it happened more than 20 times. Higher scores point out the higher cyber dating perpetration and victimization.

Bakır and Kalkan (2019) made the Turkish adaptation of the scale. As for the reliability of the scale, Chronbach's alpha internal consistency for the monitoring/control sub-dimension was found .84 for perpetration and .85 for victimization. The Chronbach's alpha internal consistency for direct aggression sub-dimension was found .79 for perpetration, and .78 for victimization. The test-retest reliability was found .77 for perpetration and .80 for victimization (Bakır & Kalkan, 2019).

Confirmatory Factor Analyses obtained the validity of the scale. %44.4 of the total variance was explained by victimization and %44.7 of the total variance was explained by perpetration. It was found that for victimization $\chi^2=582,868$, $SD=169$, $\chi^2/SD=3,449$, $p=.000$. Also, the indicators were $GFI=.90$, $AGFI=.88$, $CFI=.75$, and $RMSEA=.05$. For perpetration, it was found that $\chi^2=595,459$, $SD=169$, $\chi^2/SD=3,523$, $p=.000$. In addition, the indicators were $GFI=.94$, $AGFI=.92$, $CFI=.79$, and $RMSEA=.05$.

The permission for using the scale has been obtained (Appendix 9). In the current study, Cronbach's Alpha was found .85 for both direct aggression and monitoring/control subscales of victimization while being .76 for direct aggression and .80 for monitoring/control subscales of perpetration.

3.2.3. Experiences In Close Relationships Scale-Revised (ECR-R)

Experiences in Close Relationships Scale-Revised (ECR-R) (Fraley et al., 2000, as cited in Selçuk et al., 2005) is a scale for assessing adult attachment styles. The scale has 36 items and two factors - 18 items each: anxious attachment and avoidant attachment. ECRS-II is a 7-point Likert-type scale self-reported measurement (1= totally disagree; 7= totally agree).

Turkish adaptation of the scale (Selçuk et al., 2005) was done by using the translation-back-translation method. 4th, 8th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 24th, 26th, 30th, 32nd, 34th, and 36th items were reversed. The score for the anxious attachment was acquired with the mean of the items with odd numbers and the avoidant attachment score was acquired with the mean of the items with even numbers (even-numbered items). Higher points mean higher anxious attachment and avoidant attachment while lower scores mean secure attachment.

Turkish version's The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficients were .90 for avoidant attachment and .86 for anxious attachment. The test-retest reliability was .82

for anxious attachment and .81 for avoidant attachment (Selçuk et al., 2005).

In order to obtain its validity, the relationships with other related variables were studied. The anxious attachment was negatively related to self-esteem and relationship satisfaction while positively related to concern about separation, pleasing others, and concern about disapproval. As expected, there was no relation Preference for solidity. Avoidant attachment is negatively related to self-esteem and relationship satisfaction while positively related to concern about disapproval and preference for solidity. As expected, no relationship was found between concern about separation and pleasing others.

Nebi Sümer, one of the authors of the scale, permits the scale to be used in scientific research by everyone on his official website (http://www.nebisumer.com/?page_id=337, accessed in September 2020). Therefore, permission was not asked for through e-mail. In the current study, Cronbach's Alpha was .90 for both Anxious and Avoidant Attachment.

3.2.4. Interpersonal Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (IERQ)

Hofmann et al. (2016) created the Interpersonal Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (IERQ) to evaluate interpersonal emotion regulation. The IERQ consists of four subscales soothing, enhancing positive affect, perspective-taking, and social modeling. The questionnaire includes 20 items, 5 items for each subscale and it is a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (not appropriate for me) to 5 (extremely appropriate for me). There are no reverse items in the questionnaire. Lower scores mean lower dependency on interpersonal emotion regulation strategies.

Turkish adaptation of the scale was done by Sarisoy-Aksüt and Gençöz (2020) with the translation-back-translation method. The internal consistency reliability of the questionnaire was .90. The Cronbach alpha coefficients of the subscales were .82 for enhancing positive affect, .79 for perspective-taking, .88 for soothing, and .89 for social modeling. Lastly, the Guttman split-half reliability of the scale was found as .89 (Sarisoy-Aksüt & Gençöz, 2020).

For its validity, Exploratory Factor Analysis confirmed the four-factor structure of the original scale. Also, IERQ showed moderate correlations with interpersonal problems and emotion regulation difficulties. Lastly, in order to obtain criterion validity, two groups were created based on their low and high interpersonal problems. T-test

analysis showed that participants who have low interpersonal problems had lower IERQ scores compared to the participants who had high interpersonal problems.

The permission for using the scale has been obtained (Appendix 9). Cronbach's Alpha was .85 for Enhancing Positive Affect, .78 for Perspective Taking, .88 for Soothing, and .87 for Social Modelling in the current study.

3.2.5. Difficulties In Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS-16)

Bjureberg et al. (2016) developed the DERS-16 to assess emotion dysregulation with a shorter scale than the original DERS (Gratz & Roemer, 2008). The scale consists of 16 items with a 5-point Likert for rating the frequency of difficulties in emotion regulation. The rating is as it follows "1 = Almost Never (0-10%); 2 = Sometimes (11-35%); 3 = Approximately Half-Half (36-65%); 4 = Most of the Time (66-90%); 5 = Almost Always (91-100%)". The scale includes 5 subscales namely clarity, goals impulse, strategies, and non-acceptance and the subscales have 2, 3, 3, 5, and 3 items respectively. There are no reverse items in the questionnaire. Higher scores indicate greater emotion dysregulation.

The DERS-16 was adapted into Turkish by Yiğit and Guzey Yiğit (2017). The translation was completed with the review from the original scale's author, Johan Bjureberg. The internal consistency coefficients were found to be .92 for overall DERS-16, .84 for Clarity, .84 for Goals, .87 for Impulse, .87 for Strategies, and .78 for Non-Acceptance. The Guttman split-half coefficient was .88 and Cronbach's alpha coefficients were found to be .86 and .88 for the two randomly divided parts of the scale.

To examine the construct validity of DERS-16, the overall DERS-16 score, and its subscales were all significantly correlated with emotional avoidance. In addition, the overall DERS-16 score, and Clarity, Strategies, and Non-acceptance subscales were negatively correlated while Goals and Impulse were slightly correlated with emotional expressivity. Also, there were positive correlations between all the subscales of BSI (psychological distress) and all DERS-16 scores.

The permission for using the scale has been obtained (Appendix 9). In the current study, Cronbach's Alpha was .85 for Clarity, .88 for Goals, .87 for Impulse and Strategies, and Non-Acceptance.

3.2.6. Big Five Inventory (BFI-44)

The BFI is an inventory to assess five personality factors namely extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). The scale consists of 44 items and 5 subscales for each personality dimension with a 5-point Likert for rating from 1 (Totally disagree) to 5 (Totally Agree). While extraversion and neuroticism subscales have 8 items, agreeableness and conscientiousness subscales have 9 items, and the openness to experience subscale has 10 items. Items 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, 18, 21, 23, 24, 27, 31, 34, 35, 37, 41, and 43 are reverse coded. The total score for the subscales is obtained by adding all items scored on a scale and dividing by the number of items on the scale.

The BFI was adapted into Turkish by H. Canan Sümer and Nebi Sümer as a part of an international project for the translation of the scale into 29 different languages in 56 nations by Schmitt et al. (2007). In the Middle east sample where Turkey was placed the Chronbach 's Alpha values were .74 for Extraversion, .76 for Neuroticism, .75 for Openness to Experience, .77 for Conscientiousness, and .67 for Agreeableness.

For validity, the scale correlates higher with both Costa and McCrae's (1992) and Goldberg's (1992) BFI scales (mean $r = .75$ and $.80$, respectively) compared to their correlation with each other (mean $r = .65$).

The permission for using the scale has been obtained (Appendix 9). In the current study, Cronbach's Alpha was .82 for Extraversion, .78 for Neuroticism, .81 for Openness to Experience, .75 for Conscientiousness, and .66 for Agreeableness.

3.3. PROCEDURE

The data was collected between December 2020 and April 2021. Due to COVID-19, online participation was the only healthy and risk-free option for everyone involved. The link for the study was distributed through online platforms such as WhatsApp, LinkedIn, Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, Telegram, etc. and it was asked to spread to people they know. The participants who have seen the form and decided to join the study filled out the consent form (Appendix 2).

Later the participants filled out the Demographic Information Form and Turkish versions of the Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CDAQ), Experiences in Close Relationships – II (ECR-R), Interpersonal Emotion Regulation Scale (IERQ),

Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS-16), and Big Five Inventory (BFI-44), respectively. 25-30 minutes were needed to complete all the scales and the Demographic Information Form. After finishing the questionnaires, the participants provided a currently used email address to join the draw. This information was not compulsory to finish the form, but it was used for determining the winner of the draw that includes 50 Turkish liras for three winners. The sample receipt can be seen in Appendix XI. After completing the data collection, the draw was held, and the video of this process has been sent to all participants who joined the draw. Only the first and last two characters in the email addresses were shown.

3.4. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Data were analyzed by using IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 22.0 for Windows, and Pearson Correlation Analysis, Independent Samples t-test, One-way ANOVA, and Multiple Regression were used.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1. DATA CLEANING

After completing the data collecting process, the participants who are married or had no relationship in the last one year were excluded from the data. Additionally, there were duplications of the same participants due to Google Forms. Therefore, the total number of participants dropped from 484 to 356.

For the time spent on social media and messaging apps questions, participants filled an open answer area. Their answers were then converted into minutes. One participant with an ID of 161 responded to the open question of “How much time do you spend on social media/messaging apps daily on average?” with the apps he/she used. Since there was only one participant, the means of these variables were used. In addition, the answers such as “I do not use social media.” were converted to 0 minutes.

Before conducting the main analyses, in order to check the data for any possible entering mistakes, the frequencies, and minimum and maximum values of variables were analyzed. Later, items that were stated to be reversed in the Instruments section were re-coded.

4.2. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE STUDY

The mean, standard deviation, range, skewness, and kurtosis of the subscales are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max.</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis
Cyber Dating Abuse						
Questionnaire (CDAQ)						
Direct Aggression Victimization	12.57	4.25	11	52	5.636	40.529
Monitoring/Control Victimization	17.75	8.56	9	54	1.500	2.358
Direct Aggression Perpetration	12.16	2.98	11	47	7.167	70.909
Monitoring/Control Perpetration	18.00	7.27	9	45	1.027	.601
Experiences in Close						
Relationships-Revised (ECR-R)						
Avoidant Attachment	2.62	1.00	1.00	5.50	.577	-.267
Anxious Attachment	3.58	1.11	1.11	6.72	.314	-.380
Interpersonal Emotion Regulation						
Questionnaire (IERQ)						
Enhancing Positive Affect	21.51	3.64	7	25	-1.286	1.541
Perspective Taking	12.16	4.51	5	25	.454	-.210
Soothing	15.16	5.48	5	25	-.017	-.883
Social Modeling	16.30	5.06	5	25	-.201	-.622
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation						
(DERS-16)						
Clarity	4.96	2.091	2	10	.688	-.251
Goals	10.16	3.26	3	15	-.259	-.979
Impulses	6.71	3.20	3	15	.716	-.260
Strategies	12.80	5.28	5	25	.510	-.715
Non-Acceptance	6.79	3.50	3	15	.824	-.366
Big Five Inventory (BFI-44)						
Extraversion	27.08	6.86	8	40	-.224	-.680
Agreeableness	34.23	5.31	21	45	-.184	-.551
Conscientiousness	31.79	6.20	17	44	.026	-.743
Neuroticism	24.33	6.77	8	39	-.127	-.700
Openness to Experience	38.11	6.88	14	50	-.694	.355
Daily social media use (m)	133.78	90.55	0	540	1.284	2.152
Daily messaging apps use (m)	134.03	105.10	0	600	1.592	3.069

N = 356.

Table 4.2. Normality Test Results of Scales

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		Shapiro-Wilk	
	<i>D</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>
Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CDAQ)				
Direct Aggression Victimization	.356	.000	.399	.000
Monitoring/Control Victimization	.153	.000	.855	.000
Direct Aggression Perpetration	.349	.000	.396	.000
Monitoring/Control Perpetration	.117	.000	.912	.000
Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R)				
Avoidant Attachment	.083	.000	.964	.000
Anxious Attachment	.054	.013	.987	.002
Interpersonal Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (IERQ)				
Enhancing Positive Affect	.169	.000	.857	.000
Perspective Taking	.085	.000	.969	.000
Soothing	.066	.001	.972	.000
Social Modeling	.069	.000	.977	.000
Difficulties in Emotion Regulation (DERS-16)				
Clarity	.222	.000	.916	.000
Goals	.138	.000	.950	.000
Impulses	.138	.000	.914	.000
Strategies	.125	.000	.947	.000
Non-Acceptance	.174	.000	.885	.000
Big Five Inventory (BFI-44)				
Extraversion	.084	.000	.980	.000
Agreeableness	.059	.005	.985	.001
Conscientiousness	.064	.001	.983	.000
Neuroticism	.072	.000	.985	.001
Openness to Experience	.111	.000	.962	.000
Daily social media use (m)	.207	.000	.890	.000
Daily messaging apps use (m)	.213	.000	.848	.000

N = 356.

In order to test the normality assumption of the variables, skewness, kurtosis, and Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk Analyses were conducted. The values for skewness and kurtosis between ± 1.0 are considered excellent; however, a value between ± 2.0 is also acceptable for normal univariate distribution (George & Mallery, 2020). Kline (2016) also concludes that skewness of 3 can be seen as severe, and even though there is no consensus, a kurtosis of between 8 and 20 can be concluded as severe. As can be seen in Table 4.1., all variables except two were normally distributed. Direct Aggression Victimization and Direct Aggression Perpetration variables were positively skewed (5.636 and 7.167 respectively) and leptokurtic (40.539 and 70.909 respectively). After using appropriate data transformation procedures such as Mahalanobis, logarithmic and square root (Field, 2009), the problems remained. Therefore, these variables were removed from the further analyses. The potential reasons will be discussed in the Discussion section.

Finally, according to Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk Analyses, all variables were not normally distributed, and the significance values were smaller than .05. The normality test results were presented in Table 4.2.

According to Norman (2010, p. 631) "Parametric statistics can be used with Likert data, with small sample sizes, with unequal variances, and with non-normal distributions, with no fear of "coming to the wrong conclusion"". Considering the sample sizes and the variables being obtained as Likert, using parametric analyses was decided.

Lastly, the descriptive statistics (mean, range, and SD) of the Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire items were presented (see Appendix 11). It should be noted that the rating of the scale starts from 1 being the victimization or perpetration never happened and 6 being always/it happened more than 20 times in a year. Also, most of the means of the items were close to 1 and the standard deviation was close to 1. In addition, 8 items have not been rated as 6 and 1 item has not been rated as 5. The implications will be mentioned in the Discussion.

4.3. HYPOTHESIS TESTING

4.3.1. Correlation Between Cyber Dating Abuse Victimization and Perpetration

Hypothesis 1 states that there would be a positive correlation between monitoring/control victimization and perpetration. To evaluate this hypothesis, Pearson Correlation Analysis was conducted.

In this study, a significant correlation between cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration in terms of monitoring/control, $r(354) = .648, p < .001$ was found. It can be seen that high victimization scores tended to be associated with high perpetration scores in terms of monitoring/control. Meaning that participants who had experienced cyber-dating abuse also engaged in abusive behaviors, and vice versa.

To conclude, hypothesis 1 was supported.

4.3.2. Inter-Correlations Between Cyber Dating Abuse and Attachment, Emotion Regulation, and the Big Five

Hypothesis 2 states that there will be significant correlations between attachment, emotion regulation, Big Five, and cyber dating abuse, respectively.

To analyze the relationship between variables, Pearson Correlations Coefficients were examined (see Table 4.3). Then, they were discussed according to Cohen's (1988) standards which suggest that correlations with .10 are weak, .30 are moderate, and .50 are strong associations.

The only moderate association was between monitoring/control perpetration with anxious attachment ($r = .408, p < .001$). The rest of the correlations showed weak associations.

The first correlation set consists of adult attachment and cyber dating abuse. In terms of avoidant attachment and cyber dating abuse, there was a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and avoidant attachment, $r(354) = .115, p = .030$. However, there was not a significant correlation between monitoring/control perpetration and avoidant attachment, $r(354) = .026, p = .620$.

Table 4.3. Inter-Correlations between Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Monitoring/Control Victimization	1																			
Monitoring/Control Perpetration	.648**	1																		
Avoidant Attachment	.115*	.026	1																	
Anxious Attachment	.291**	.408**	.375**	1																
EPA	-.038	.020	-.255**	-.044	1															
Perspective Taking	.04	.157**	-.043	.121*	.235**	1														
Soothing	.09	.253**	-.049	.386**	.352**	.495**	1													
Social Modeling	.108*	.155**	-.065	.187**	.391**	.628**	.576**	1												
Clarity	.121*	.161**	.239**	.331**	-.120*	.020	.121*	.093	1											
Goals	.066	.240**	.013	.448**	.066	-.011	.290*	.132*	.364**	1										
Impulses	.056	.165**	.165**	.413**	-.140**	.001	.229**	.137**	.416**	.561**	1									
Strategies	.095	.188**	.139**	.481**	-.102	-.041	.234**	.114*	.491**	.651**	.724**	1								
Non-Acceptance	.125*	.135*	.238**	.392**	-.123*	-.033	.128*	.058	.373**	.397**	.546**	.640**	1							
Extraversion	.029	-.044	-.197**	-.231**	.195**	.073	-.077	.058	-.153**	-.301**	-.153**	-.273**	-.301**	1						
Agreeableness	-.041	-.111*	-.364**	-.196**	.344**	.178**	.094	.200**	-.165**	-.110*	-.286**	-.273**	-.280**	.308**	1					
Conscientiousness	-.057	-.149**	-.183**	-.280**	.144**	.061	-.042	.054	-.278**	-.273**	-.172**	-.230**	-.169**	.223**	.255**	1				
Neuroticism	.049	.169**	.147*	.366**	-.079	-.132*	.173**	-.002	.413**	.525**	.551**	.650**	.415**	-.270**	-.365**	-.249**	1			
Openness to Experience	-.044	-.111*	-.155**	-.152**	.050	-.045	-.161**	-.062	-.010	-.069	.003	-.020	-.092	.363**	.229**	.273**	-.092	1		
Social media (m)	.133*	.104	.019	.075	.056	.039	.097	.057	.136**	.037	.086	.069	.046	.026	.092	-.108*	.057	-.041	1	
Messaging apps (m)	.128*	.137**	-.105*	.125*	.056	.007	.092	.001	.031	.111*	.084	.123*	.029	.006	.045	.025	.044	.033	.189**	1

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$; EPA= Enhancing Positive Affect

For anxious attachment and cyber dating abuse, there was a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and anxious attachment, $r(354) = .291, p < .001$. The same result was seen for the correlation between monitoring/control perpetration and anxious attachment, $r(354) = .408, p < .001$.

The second correlation set consists of interpersonal emotion regulation and cyber dating abuse. When it comes to enhancing positive affect and cyber dating abuse, there was not a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and enhancing positive affect, $r(354) = -.038, p = .474$. Also, there was not a significant correlation between monitoring/control perpetration and enhancing positive affect, $r(354) = -.020, p = .706$.

For perspective taking and cyber dating abuse, there was not a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and perspective taking, $r(354) = .040, p = .452$. However, there was a significant correlation between monitoring/control perpetration and perspective taking, $r(354) = .157, p = .003$.

In terms of soothing and cyber dating abuse, there was not a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and soothing ($r(354) = .090, p = .089$). However, monitoring/control perpetration and soothing were found to be significantly correlated, $r(354) = .253, p < .001$.

Lastly, for the relationship between social modeling and cyber dating abuse, there was a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and social modeling, $r(354) = .108, p = .041$. Just like monitoring/control victimization, there was a significant correlation between monitoring/control perpetration and social modeling, $r(354) = .155, p = .003$.

The third correlation set consists of emotion regulation difficulties and cyber dating abuse. For the relationship between clarity and cyber dating abuse, there was a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and clarity, $r(354) = .121, p = .022$. In addition, like monitoring/control victimization, there was a significant correlation between monitoring/control perpetration and clarity, $r(354) = .161, p = .002$.

In terms of goals and cyber dating abuse, there was not a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and goals ($r(354) = .066, p = .211$). However, the relationship between monitoring/control perpetration and goals was found to be

significantly correlated, $r(354) = .240, p < .001$.

When it comes to impulses and cyber dating abuse, there was not a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and impulses ($r(354) = .056; p = .292$). In contrast, the relationship between monitoring/control perpetration and impulses was found to be significantly correlated, $r(354) = .165, p = .002$.

For strategies and cyber dating abuse, there was not a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and strategies ($r(354) = .095, p = .075$). In contrast, the relationship between monitoring/control perpetration and strategies was found to be significantly correlated, $r(354) = .188, p < .001$.

Last of all, in the relationship between non-acceptance and cyber dating abuse, there was a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and clarity, $r(354) = .125, p = .018$. Parallel with monitoring/control victimization, there was a significant correlation between monitoring/control perpetration and clarity, $r(354) = .135, p = .011$.

The fourth correlation set consists of the Big five personality traits and cyber dating abuse. Hypothesis 2a states that agreeableness would have a significant negative correlation with monitoring/control perpetration while hypothesis 2b states that neuroticism would have a significant positive correlation with monitoring/control perpetration.

When personality traits were taken into consideration, extraversion was not correlated with neither monitoring/control victimization nor monitoring/control perpetration ($r(354) = .029, -.044; p = .580, .412$ respectively).

In terms of agreeableness and cyber dating abuse, there was a significant negative correlation between monitoring/control perpetration and agreeableness respectively ($r(354) = -.111; p = .036$). However, monitoring/control victimization and agreeableness were found to be not significantly correlated, $r(354) = -.041, p = .439$. Therefore, hypothesis 2a is supported.

In terms of conscientiousness and cyber dating abuse, there was not a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and conscientiousness, $r(354) = -.057, p = .285$. However, monitoring/control perpetration and conscientiousness were found to be significantly negatively correlated, $r(354) = -.149, p = .005$.

When it comes to neuroticism and cyber dating abuse, there was not a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and neuroticism respectively ($r(354) = .049, p = .353$). In contrast, the relationship between monitoring/control perpetration and neuroticism was found to be significantly correlated, $r(354) = .169, p = .001$. Therefore, hypothesis 2b is supported.

For openness to experience and cyber dating abuse, there was not a significant correlation between monitoring/control victimization and openness to experience, $r(354) = -.044, p = .412$. However, the relationship between monitoring/control perpetration and openness to experience was found to be significantly negatively correlated, $r(354) = -.111, p = .036$.

To conclude, in this study, avoidant attachment, anxious attachment, non-acceptance, clarity, and social modeling positively correlated with monitoring/control victimization. Therefore, hypothesis 2a was partially supported.

Also, anxious attachment, clarity, goals, impulse, strategies, non-acceptance, perspective taking, soothing, social modeling positively, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience were negatively correlated with monitoring/control perpetration. Therefore, hypothesis 2b was partially supported.

4.3.3. Gender Differences for Cyber Dating Abuse Victimization and Perpetration

The third hypothesis was that there would not be a gender difference in cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration. To analyze, Independent Samples t-test was conducted (see Table 4.4.).

Table 4.4. Independent Samples t-test Results for Gender

	Female		Male		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
M/C Victimization	17.41	8.805	18.86	7.641	-1.358	354	.175
M/C Perpetration	18.29	7.560	17.07	6.191	1.341	354	.181

Firstly, Hypothesis 3a states that there would not be a gender difference in monitoring/control victimization.

In terms of victimization, on average, male participants experienced more monitoring/control victimization ($M = 18.86, SE = .834$) compared to female participants ($M = 17.41, SE = .534$). However, the difference was not significant $t(354) = -1.358, p = .175$. This hypothesis was supported.

Secondly, Hypothesis 3b states that there would not be a gender difference in monitoring/control perpetration.

In terms of perpetration, on average, female participants engaged with more V perpetration ($M = 18.29, SE = .458$) compared to male participants ($M = 17.07, SE = .676$). Parallel with monitoring/control victimization, the difference was not significant $t(354) = 1.341, p = .181$. As a result, this hypothesis was supported.

In conclusion, gender did not differ for monitoring/control, for both cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration. Therefore, the third hypothesis was fully supported.

4.3.4. Age Periods Differences for Cyber Dating Abuse Victimization and Perpetration

The fourth hypothesis was that there would not be an age period difference in cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration for 18-25- and 26-40-years old adults. To analyze, Independent Samples t-test was conducted (see Table 4.5.)

Table 4.5. Independent Samples t-test Results for Age Groups

	18-25		26-40		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
M/C Victimization	17.80	8.498	17.35	9.105	.313	354	.754
M/C Perpetration	18.15	7.308	16.80	6.936	1.108	354	.268

Firstly, Hypothesis 4a states that there would not be an age period difference between 18-25 and 26-40 years old in monitoring/control victimization.

In terms of victimization, younger participants experienced more monitoring/control victimization ($M = 17.80, SE = .478$) compared to older participants ($M = 17.35, SE =$

.1.440). This difference was not significant $t(354) = .313, p = .754$. This hypothesis was supported.

Secondly, Hypothesis 4b states that there would not be an age period difference between 18-25 and 26-40 years old in monitoring/control perpetration.

In terms of perpetration, parallel with the monitoring/control victimization, on average, younger participants engaged with more monitoring/control perpetration ($M = 18.15, SE = .411$) compared to older participants ($M = 16.80, SE = .1097$). This difference was not significant $t(354) = 1.108, p = .268$. This hypothesis was supported.

In conclusion, there was no age difference for monitoring/control, for both cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was fully supported.

4.3.5. Correlation Between Social Media and Messaging Apps Usage and Cyber Dating Abuse Victimization and Perpetration

The sixth hypothesis was there would be a positive correlation between both social media and messaging app usage with cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration respectively. To evaluate this hypothesis, Pearson Correlation Analysis was conducted (see Table 4.3).

Hypothesis 6a states that there would be a positive correlation between average social media usage in a day with cyber dating abuse victimization.

As a result, there was a statistically significant correlation between social media usage per day and monitoring/control victimization, $r(354) = .133, p = .012$. It can be seen that high victimization scores tended to be associated with longer times using social media. Therefore, Hypothesis 6a was supported.

Hypothesis 6b states that there would be a positive correlation between average social media usage in a day with cyber dating abuse perpetration.

However, there was not a statistically significant correlation between social media usage per day and monitoring/control perpetration, $r(354) = .104, p = .051$. Therefore, Hypothesis 6b was not supported.

Hypothesis 6c states that there would be a positive correlation between average messaging app usage in a day and cyber dating abuse victimization.

For messaging app usage, there was a statistically significant correlation between messaging app usage per day and monitoring/control victimization, $r(354) = .128, p = .016$. It can be seen that high monitoring/control scores tended to be associated with longer times using social media apps. Therefore, Hypothesis 6c was supported.

Hypothesis 6d states that there would be a positive correlation between average messaging app usage in a day and cyber dating abuse perpetration.

As a result, there was a statistically significant correlation between messaging app usage per day and monitoring/control perpetration, $r(354) = .137, p = .01$. It can be seen that high monitoring/control scores tended to be associated with longer times using messaging apps. Therefore, Hypothesis 6d was supported.

Overall, hypothesis 6 was supported except for hypothesis 6b, which states the relationship between social media usage per day and monitoring/control perpetration.

4.3.6. Differences in Relationship Length for Cyber Dating Abuse Victimization and Perpetration

The fifth hypothesis was that there would be a relationship length difference between cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration. To analyze, One-way ANOVA was conducted (see Table 4.6.)

Firstly, Hypothesis 5a states that there would be a relationship length difference in cyber dating abuse monitoring/control victimization.

One-way analysis of variance with a between-subjects factor of *relationship length* (6 levels: 0-6 months, 6 months-1 year, 1-2 years, 2-3 years, 3-4 years, and 4 and more years) was conducted. The relationship between relationship length and monitoring/control victimization scores was statistically significant, $F(5,350) = 2.493, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .034$. A post hoc test using Tukey's HSD showed that the difference between 0-6 months and 1-2 years was significant ($p = .046$). However, other differences were not significant. It means that participants experienced less cyber dating abuse when they are in a relationship for less than 6 months, compared to those who have been in one for 1-2 years. Therefore, Hypothesis 5a was supported.

Table 4.6. One-way ANOVA Results for Relationship Length

Variables	Relationship Length	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	ANOVA		
					Type III SS	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
MCV	0-6 months	96	15.50	7.242	893.78	2.493	.000
	6 months-1 year	63	18.30	7.365			
	1-2 years	68	19.38	8.961			
	2-3 years	48	18.90	10.300			
	3-4 years	41	19.24	10.312			
	4+ years	40	16.60	7.393			
MCP	0-6 months	96	15.48	5.666	1096.82	4.345	.001
	6 months -1 year	63	17.70	7.244			
	1-2 years	68	19.76	7.470			
	2-3 years	48	18.17	8.014			
	3-4 years	41	20.41	7.852			
	4+ years	40	18.85	7.413			

Secondly, Hypothesis 5b states that there would be a relationship length difference in cyber dating abuse monitoring/control perpetration.

One-way analysis of variance with a between-subjects factor of *relationship length* (6 levels: *0-6 months*, *6 months-1 year*, *1-2 years*, *2-3 years*, *3-4 years*, and *4 and more years*) was conducted. The relationship between relationship length and monitoring/control perpetration scores was statistically significant, $F(5,350) = 4.345$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .058$. A post hoc test using Tukey's HSD showed that the difference between 0-6 months and 1-2 years was significant ($p = .002$). Also, the difference between 0-6 and 3-4 was significant ($p = .003$). However, other differences were not significant. It means that participants experienced less cyber dating abuse when they are in a relationship for less than 6 months, compared to those who have been in one for 1-2 years, and lesser than those who have been in one for 3-4 years. Therefore, Hypothesis 5b was supported.

4.3.7. The Prediction of Cyber Dating Abuse by the Attachment, Emotion Regulation, and Personality

The seventh hypothesis state that attachment, emotion regulation, and personality would significantly predict cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration. To analyze this hypothesis, Multiple Regression was conducted separately for victimization and perpetration respectively (see Table 4.7. and 4.8.).

Monitoring/Control Victimization

In the line with the purpose of the study, it was checked whether attachment, emotion regulation, and the Big Five would significantly predict monitoring/control victimization as stated in hypothesis 7a. Therefore, to check the relationship, simultaneous multiple regression analysis with the Forward entry method was used. Multiple regression analysis allows analyzing the effect of two or more variables on a given dependent variable (George & Mallery, 2020). The forward entry method is used when there is no specification of entry order of variables (Field, 2009).

Before the analysis, Participants 284, 316, 320, and 333 were excluded while detecting univariate outliers. Later, Participant 2 was excluded while detecting multivariate outliers using the SPSS command to create a significance level variable which is $1 - \text{CDF.CHISQ}(\text{MAH}_1, \text{df})$.

Later, multiple regression analysis' assumptions were checked. The variables that had significant correlations with monitoring/control victimization were entered into the model. Five predictor and criterion variables, namely, avoidant attachment, anxious attachment, non-acceptance, clarity, social modeling, and monitoring/control victimization were quantitative and continuous. Therefore, they met the criteria for the assumption of the variable type, which should be either quantitative and continuous or categorical with only two categories (Field, 2009).

The histogram of standardized residuals looks somewhat bell-shaped, which showed that the data met the assumption (Allison, 1999). The Durbin Watson value was 1.897, which is appropriate, considering the fact that the value needs to be between 1.5 and 2.5 to meet the assumption (Field, 2009).

For the multicollinearity assumption, correlations between independent variables were checked. The correlation values were not greater than .7, with the highest correlation being .39. Meaning that multicollinearity was not seen. In order to ensure that the

multicollinearity assumption was met, Tolerance and VIF values were obtained. A tolerance value below 0.1 and a singular VIF value above 10 indicate a serious problem (Cohen et al., 2003). Moreover, Allison (1999) states that the Tolerance value above .40 and VIF value below 2.5 indicate low multicollinearity. As a result, all the values for Tolerance and VIF were met the criteria for multicollinearity (Avoidant Attachment, Tolerance = .82, VIF = 1.22; Anxious Attachment, Tolerance = .71, VIF = 1.41; Social Modeling, Tolerance = .94, VIF = 1.07; Clarity, Tolerance = .81, VIF = 1.24; Non-Acceptance, Tolerance = .78, VIF = 1.29).

The homoscedasticity assumption was checked by using scatter plots of the regression analysis. Moreover, Mahalanobis and Cook's distances were 4.99 and .003, respectively. Therefore, there was no violation of the assumption.

Table 4.7. The Results of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Monitoring/Control Victimization

Variable	B	SE	β	t	Correlations			R^2	<i>Adjusted</i> R^2
					Zero-order	Partial	Part		
Model 1 (Constant)	7.480	1.937		3.861**				.101	.088
Avoidant Attachment	.183	.444	.023	.411	.119	.022	.021		
Anxious Attachment	1.915	.429	.270	4.465**	.301	.233	.228		
Social Modeling	.157	.082	.102	1.932	.151	.103	.098		
Clarity	-.065	.213	-.017	-.307	.096	-.016	-.016		
Non-Acceptance	.048	.129	.022	.372	.132	.020	.019		

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Multiple regression analysis using the forced entry method revealed that only anxious attachment predicted the criterion variable, which is monitoring/control victimization (see Table 4.7.). The results of the regression analysis showed that avoidant attachment, anxious attachment, non-acceptance, clarity, and social modeling explained 8.8% of the variance in victimization, $F(5,346) = 7.743, p < .001$. The f^2 of the model is 0.096, which is a small effect size according to Cohen (1988). Furthermore, the standardized coefficient value indicated that anxious attachment contributed significantly to the model ($\beta = .27, p < .001$). Therefore, only anxious attachment has significantly predicted monitoring/control victimization while avoidant

attachment non-acceptance, clarity, and social modeling did not. Meaning that the more a partner's anxious attachment score increases, the more cyber dating abuse victimization occurs in terms of monitoring/control. As a result, hypothesis 7a was supported.

Monitoring/Control Perpetration

In the line with the purpose of the study, it was checked whether attachment, emotion regulation, and the Big Five would significantly predict monitoring/control perpetration as stated in hypothesis 7b. Therefore, to check the relationship, simultaneous multiple regression analysis with the Forward entry method was used.

Later, multiple regression analysis' assumptions were checked. The variables that had significant correlations with monitoring/control victimization were entered into the model. 13 predictor and criterion variables, namely, anxious attachment, clarity, goals, impulse, strategies, non-acceptance, perspective taking, soothing, social modeling, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, openness to experience, and monitoring/control perpetration were quantitative and continuous. Therefore, they met the criteria for the assumption of the variable type which should be either quantitative and continuous or categorical with only two categories (Field, 2009).

During the multicollinearity assumption check, it was found that the correlation between Impulse and Strategies was .72, meaning that, multicollinearity was seen. Also, the VIF value of Strategies was found 3.60, which is far greater than the accepted value of 2.5 (Allison, 1999). Therefore, the Strategies variable was removed from the analysis, and the process was repeated with 12 predictor variables.

Before the analysis, Participants 140, 239, and 269 were excluded while detecting univariate outliers. Later, Participants 2, 104, 307, and 327 were excluded while detecting multivariate outliers using the SPSS command to create a significance level variable, which is 1-CDF.CHISQ (MAH_1, df).

The histogram of standardized residuals looks somewhat bell-shaped, which showed that the data met the assumption (Allison, 1999). The Durbin Watson value was 1,949 which is appropriate, considering the fact that the value needs to be between 1.5 and 2.5 to meet the assumption (Field, 2009)

For the multicollinearity assumption, correlations between independent variables were checked. The correlation values were not greater than .7, with the highest correlation

being .62. Meaning that multicollinearity was not seen. In order to ensure that the multicollinearity assumption was met, Tolerance and VIF values were obtained. Tolerance value below 0.1 and singular VIF values above 10 indicates a serious problem (Cohen et al., 2003). Moreover, Allison (1999) states that Tolerance value above .40 and VIF value below 2.5 indicates low multicollinearity. As a result, all the values for Tolerance and VIF were met the criteria for multicollinearity (Anxious Attachment, Tolerance = .63, VIF = 1.59; Perspective Taking, Tolerance = .38, VIF = 1.86; Soothing, Tolerance = .53, VIF = 1.90; Social Modeling, Tolerance = .50, VIF = 2.02; Clarity, Tolerance = .69, VIF = 1.45; Goals, Tolerance = .55, VIF = 1.82; Impulse, Tolerance = .48, VIF = 2.10; Non-Acceptance, Tolerance = .59, VIF = 1.69; Agreeableness, Tolerance = .72, VIF = 1.39; Conscientiousness, Tolerance = .78, VIF = 1.28; Neuroticism, Tolerance = .53, VIF = 1.88; Openness to Experience, Tolerance = .86, VIF = 1.17).

The homoscedasticity assumption was checked by using scatter plots of the regression analysis. Moreover, Mahalanobis and Cook's distances were 11.97 and .003, respectively. Therefore, there was no violation of the assumption.

Multiple regression analysis using the forced entry method showed that only anxious attachment predicted the criterion variable, which is monitoring/control perpetration (see Table 4.8.). The results of the regression analysis showed that anxious attachment, clarity, goals, impulse, non-acceptance, perspective taking, soothing, social modeling, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience explained 17.2% of the variance in monitoring/control perpetration, $F(12,336) = 7.026, p < .001$. The f^2 of the model is 0.207, which is a medium effect size according to Cohen (1988). Furthermore, the standardized coefficient value indicated that anxious attachment contributed significantly to the model ($\beta = .35, p < .001$). Therefore, only anxious attachment has significantly predicted monitoring/control perpetration while clarity, goals, impulse, non-acceptance, perspective taking, soothing, social modeling, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience did not. Meaning that the more a partner's anxious attachment score increases, the more cyber dating abuse perpetration occurs in terms of monitoring/control. As a result, hypothesis 7b was supported.

Table 4.8. The Results of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Monitoring/Control Perpetration

Variables	B	SE	β	t	Correlations			<i>Adjusted R²</i>	
					Zero-order	Partial	Part		
Model 1 (Constant)	8.9224	2.289		2.080*				.201	.172
Anxious Attachment	2.250	.397	.348	5.663**	.417	.295	.276		
Perspective Taking	.158	.106	.099	1.492	.160	.081	.073		
Soothing	.083	.089	.063	.941	.250	.051	.046		
Social Modeling	-.006	.099	-.004	-.063	.150	-.003	-.003		
Clarity	.095	.203	.027	.467	.168	.025	.023		
Goals	.222	.146	.100	1.517	.245	.082	.074		
Impulse	-.106	.161	-.047	-.662	.171	-.036	-.032		
Non-Acceptance	-.110	.131	-.053	-.839	.146	-.046	-.041		
Agreeableness	-.099	.078	-.073	-1.263	-.119	-.069	-.062		
Conscientiousness	-.008	.064	-.007	-.126	-.142	-.007	-.006		
Neuroticism	.010	.071	.010	.143	.175	.008	.007		
Openness to Experience	.000	.057	.000	.003	-.099	.000	.000		

Note. *p<.05. **p<.01.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Cyber Dating Abuse is a growing phenomenon that is gaining acknowledgment recently. The current study contributes to the literature on cyber dating abuse, particularly in the Turkish context.

The study aimed to explore the factors that have an effect on cyber dating abuse, both as a victim and a perpetrator. In more detail, the relationship between cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration and the effects of gender, age, social media usage, and relationship length on these variables was examined. Additionally, it was aimed to answer the question that whether cyber dating abuse would be predicted by attachment, emotion regulation, and the Big Five in terms of monitoring/control.

As mentioned in the Results section, the direct aggression victimization and direct aggression perpetration subscales of CDAQ could not be used due to the extreme skewness that could not be reduced by the known data transforming techniques. The participants rated most of the Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire scale items as never happened in a year. The reason for such a skewed distribution is that participants did not report any kinds of abusive behavior in their relationship. Items such as controlling friends on social networks, controlling status updates on social networks and checking the last connection in mobile applications were rated higher than others, specifically above 2, meaning that more people have experienced given item at least once in their relationship. The reason for that can be that these behaviors are linked with both positive and negative sides of a relationship, normalized in society, or necessary for maintaining the relationship and not adversely effective. That is why these behaviors may not be seen as abusive behaviors, which could lead to not fully understanding the concept and prevalence rates in society (Duerksen & Woodin, 2021). However, the extremeness of these behaviors could also lead to unhealthy stalking behaviors. Therefore, these behaviors must be carefully studied. On the other hand, the means of the items for monitoring/control are generally lower in the present study, compared to Borrajo, Gámez-Guadix, Pereda, and Calvete (2015). The difference could be

explained by the COVID-19 and the lockdowns that follows as people were more concerned about health issues during that period or the uniqueness of the study population. That is why, future studies should elaborate these means and see if this situation is unique to the current study.

Also, one reason for having extreme skewness for dating aggression subscales could be that couples genuinely did not experience abuse in a year, as Linares et al. (2021) have found that individuals have experienced less direct aggression compared to monitoring/control. Secondly, they might not know that they were abused; therefore, they do not have an awareness of what is happening in the relationship. Like Özdere and Kürtül's (2018) study on intimate partner violence, after learning what cyber dating abuse is, people might gain knowledge and report experiencing such behaviors. Also, having social support might increase reporting victimization (Mulawa et al., 2016). In order to raise awareness, future research should include a psychoeducation program about cyber dating abuse and study this possibility. Another possibility might be due to social acceptance they chose to answer differently than what happened. It is acceptable since the data was collected with snowball sampling and passed to everyone through their acquaintances.

Martínez Soto & Ibabe (2022) have examined all the scales of cyber dating abuse and especially recommended the Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire to be used for young people since more studies were proving the strength of the scale and have been adapted to four cultural contexts (Spain, Portugal, Chile, and Mexico) successfully. Moreover, it has been successfully adapted to Turkish (Bakır & Kalkan, 2019). The possible reason for such an outcome could be the fact that Bakır and Kalkan (2019) have only used factor analysis and did not use other cyber dating abuse-related scales to examine the adaptability of the original scale. However, the skewness problem was not seen in the other studies that used the original (Linares et al., 2021) or the Turkish version of the scale as the current study (İnce, 2022; Yushan & Cihan, 2021). Therefore, the only possibility left is that the population of the current study might cover only a specific part of the population, such as high education and SES levels.

To add, the scale does not include sexual behaviors as a whole. Even though there is an item for distributing sexual content to others, it does not include forcing the partner to send sexual content or sending one without a request or consent, which should be investigated, as Reed et al. (2017).

4.1. INVESTIGATING THE RECIPROCAL RELATIONSHIP

The first hypothesis investigated the co-occurrence of cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration. Parallel with the literature on cyber dating abuse (Bakır, 2019; Biolcati et al., 2021; Maftai & Dănilă, 2021; Lancaster, 2020; Linares et al. 2021; Reed et al., 2016; Villora et al., 2019a; Villora et al., 2019b; Villora, Navarro, & Yubero, 2019), intimate partner violence (Mulawa et al., 2016; Villegas, 2017), and cyberbullying Balakrishnan (2015), it was found that monitoring/control behaviors are related to each other, meaning that people who engage in such behaviors are both perpetrators and victims in the relationship, and this creates the reciprocal dynamic. Due to the nature of the study, only a correlation could be seen. However, it should be studied whether these abusive perpetration behaviors are happening as a response to victimization (Foshee et al., 2007) or previous victims turning into perpetrators (Del Rey et al., 2012; Patchin & Hinduja, 2006).

In conclusion, first hypothesis was fully supported as monitoring/control victimization and perpetration were related to each other.

4.2. INVESTIGATING INTERCORRELATIONS

The second hypothesis aimed to investigate the correlational relationship between cyber dating abuse and independent variables, namely adult attachment, emotion regulation, and Big Five personality traits.

As a result, avoidant and anxious attachment, non-acceptance and clarity in emotion regulation difficulties, and social modeling in interpersonal emotion regulation were positively correlated with monitoring/control victimization. Therefore, goals, impulse, and strategies in emotion regulation difficulties, enhancing positive affect, perspective taking, soothing, social modeling in interpersonal emotion regulation, and all personality traits were unrelated to monitoring/control victimization.

Also, anxious attachment, clarity, goals, impulse, strategies, non-acceptance in emotion regulation difficulties, perspective taking, soothing, and social modeling in interpersonal emotion regulation were positive, Big Five personality traits such as agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience were negatively, and neuroticism was positively correlated with monitoring/control perpetration. Therefore, avoidant attachment, extraversion, and enhancing positive affect were unrelated to

monitoring/control perpetration.

In terms of attachment, cyber dating abuse has been studied with attachment, and studies have shown that anxious attachment is related to cyber dating abuse victimization (Basting et al., 2022; Villora, Navarro, & Yubero, 2019), which is in line with the findings of the current study. Couples with insecure attachment styles can have hardship regulating their emotions in conflict, and this could lead to mutual aggression (Burk & Seiffge-Krenke, 2015), which could create a risk for victimization and perpetration. Furthermore, individuals with anxious attachment might choose to be with someone with anxious attachment, or due to the reciprocal relationship, victimization might be seen (Basting et al., 2022; Bookwala, 2002; Yushan & Cihan, 2021). Additionally, studies have shown that avoidant attachment is not related to cyber dating abuse victimization (Lancaster et al., 2019; Yushan & Cihan, 2021), and other studies showed the unrelatedness specifically for monitoring/control, but the avoidant attachment was positively related to other forms (Basting et al., 2022). Also, in another study, Lancaster (2020) found that avoidant attachment was positively correlated with cyber dating abuse victimization, which is in line with the findings of the current study.. As individuals with avoidant attachment try to create distance with their partners, they might experience cyber dating abuse victimization as a way to attempt intimacy coming from their partners (Allison et al., 2008).

Other studies show anxious attachment is related to cyber dating abuse perpetration (Basting et al., 2022; Toplu-Demirtaş, 2022), parallel with intimate partner violence (Velotti et al., 2022), which is in line with the findings of the current study. Individuals with anxious attachment might engage in cyber dating abuse perpetration in order to build and maintain intimacy and proximity or gain attention from their partners or perpetrate since they do not feel that they receive closeness and confirmation and confidence for their relationship (Allison et al., 2008; Shaver & Mikulincer 2002). Additionally, as the dyadic trust falls, infidelity suspicion and jealousy start, and anxiously attached partners might engage in cyber dating abuse perpetration. Also, some studies found that avoidant attachment was positively correlated with cyber dating abuse (Lancaster, 2020), parallel to the current findings. Other studies found a positive relationship between cyber and direct aggression but not for monitoring/control perpetration and avoidant attachment (Basting et al., 2022). Avoidantly attached individuals might not even try to engage with such behaviors

because they are already emotionally distant from their partners especially when the relationship gets serious, therefore they choose to stay away from the relationship and any form of intimacy which could be interpreted as showing concern or intimacy (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2002).

In terms of emotion regulation difficulties, non-acceptance and clarity were positively related to cyber dating abuse victimization while goals, impulse, and strategies were unrelated.

All emotion regulation difficulties, namely clarity, goals, impulse, strategies, and non-acceptance were positively correlated with cyber dating perpetration and victimization, which is consistent with literature of cyber dating abuse (İnce, 2022; Lancaster, 2020; Mahoney et al., 2022), and intimate partner violence (Bliton et al., 2016; Brem et al., 2021). This finding supports the idea that when an individual has difficulty regulating their emotions, they will show anger or start to interfere and engage with cyber dating abuse perpetration.

As emotion regulation difficulties are generally used as a total score for the cyber dating abuse literature (Brem et al., 2021; İnce, 2022; Lancaster, 2020; Mahoney et al., 2022; Wu, 2019), the separate effects are relatively understudied. However, as most of the subscales are positively related, we can conclude that the current study is in line with the literature.

As it was explained earlier, insecure attachments could block the ability to think of and reflect on one's own emotions, which in turn would lead to difficulties in emotion regulation (Velotti et al., 2015).

Therefore, it could be concluded that the people who have the lack of clarity of emotional responses, nonacceptance of emotional responses, access to subjectively effective emotion regulation strategies, and difficulties controlling impulses and engaging in goal-directed behaviors when experiencing negative emotions (Yiğit & Guzey Yiğit, 2017), are more likely to engage with cyber dating abuse perpetration.

However, it should be noted that goals, impulse, and strategies were unrelated to monitoring/control victimization. A possible explanation could be that when experiencing these monitoring/control behaviors from their partners, as this could happen more frequently and perceived as the normal of a relationship (Duerksen & Woodin, 2021), they might not necessarily feel as trapped or triggered, which would

not awake these responses. As the dimensions of emotion regulation difficulties has not been studied with cyber dating perpetration and victimization, especially for monitoring control, more studies should look for the relationship between and provide data to conclude.

In terms of interpersonal emotion regulation, there is no previous research that investigates the relationship between interpersonal emotion regulation and cyber dating abuse or intimate partner violence to knowledge. By definition, interpersonal emotion regulation should be related to less abuse and violence perpetration, since it provides an understanding that other people have similar experiences and deals with those problems with different approaches (Hoffman et al., 2016).

Also, enhancing positive affect was unrelated to cyber dating abuse, which could be explained by the nature of the subscale, which is increasing and improving positive affect that is already existing. During perpetration, individuals might not be able to focus on positive emotions while they ruminate on negative emotions and thoughts of separation and threat (Aracı-İyiyaydın et al., 2022). Nevertheless, new studies will show the reasons of unrelatedness.

In terms of social modeling, the positive link between victimization and perpetration in the present study can be explained with Social Structure and Social Learning Theory as individuals learn behaviors from others with a positive view of the behavior and imitation (Akers & Jennings, 2009), which is supported by the literature (Van Ouytsel et al., 2020), and this could be a risk for victimization and perpetration.

In terms of soothing, this positive relationship might be well-reasoned when an individual generally is in need of her/his partner and when this need is unmet, the individual might show aggression, and this might create a threat of separation (Bowlby, 1980). However, soothing was not related to victimization in the current study. A possibility for such an outcome can be when individuals are in need of others' presence, they might turn to other people apart from their partners, such as family members and friends. Social support might have a role in not having a relationship between soothing and cyber dating abuse victimization. Also, the link between anxious attachment, soothing, social support, and psychological distress (Gökdağ, 2021) can also explain cyber dating abuse.

Lastly, perspective taking having a negative relationship with monitoring/control

perpetration and not having a relationship with victimization should be further studied since theoretically includes regulation by others showing that the situation is not that bad compared to other people or not to worry (Hoffman et al., 2016). This process can also be eliminated if a person has already started to ruminate about the relationship (Aracı-İyiyaydın, 2022). Also, since these abusive behaviors of monitoring/control are normalized (Duerksen & Woodin, 2021), the person could learn from others through social learning (Akers & Jennings, 2009), and sharing their experiences when they interact with others. Therefore, the person would engage in perpetration and face with victimization. Even though knowing that others have similar experience is beneficial for learning (Lauckner et al., 2012), such interaction could have a supportive role on continuing these unwanted, maladaptive, and normalized behaviors. As this is an emerging field of study, further studies should reveal what underlies these relations.

In terms of personality, none of the subscales were related to monitoring/control victimization. Agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience were negatively, and neuroticism was positively correlated while extraversion was not significantly related to monitoring/control perpetration.

The literature shows that extraversion is not related to direct aggression and monitoring/control victimization and perpetration (Biolcati et al., 2021), which supports the current findings. As individuals with higher extraversion scores are outgoing and social (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008; McCrae, & Costa, 2008), they might choose to look for others rather than monitor their partners. Also, as extraversion and self-esteem are positively related (Li et al., 2015), individuals who have lower self-esteem are more likely to perpetrate and be a victim (Bakır, 2019; Hancock, 2017). On the other hand, intimate partner violence literature says otherwise in terms of perpetration by having a positive relationship (Ulloa et al., 2016). The difference in results could be due to concepts and how intimate partner violence was measured. Also, having limited sources might make it harder to reach a conclusion.

The literature shows that agreeableness is negatively related to direct aggression victimization/perpetration and monitoring/control perpetration (Biolcati et al., 2021), which is parallel to aggressive behaviors (Bettencourt et al., 2006), marital violence (Hellmuth & McNulty, 2008), and intimate partner violence (Ulloa et al., 2016). In the current study, the relationship between monitoring/control perpetration and agreeableness was significant, and the relationship between monitoring/control

victimization and agreeableness was not significant in the current study which is in line with (Biolcati et al., 2021), but in contrast to intimate partner violence victimization which found negative relationship (Ulloa et al., 2016). As Digman (1990) and McCrae and Costa (2008) state, individuals with low agreeableness can be jealous, doubtful, uncooperative, and deal with problems in their relationships, as they are not cooperative and do not care for harmony. Then, this could lead the individuals to engage in perpetration, especially because of their jealousy and doubt (Toplu-Demirtaş et al., 2022). The difference in victimization could be due to concepts or how intimate partner violence was measured. Also, having limited data can be harder to reach a conclusion. Therefore, future studies should reexamine the relationship between agreeableness and monitoring/control victimization and provide data to the literature.

According to the literature, openness to experience was positively related to direct aggression, but not related to monitoring/control perpetration and victimization (Biolcati et al., 2021). In the present study, openness to experience was negatively correlated to monitoring/control, however, the relationship was significant for perpetration only which is in contrast to the literature. As individuals with low openness to experience might have conservative attitudes, values, and beliefs (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008) and are not interested in novelty, they might show monitoring/control cyber dating abuse to their partners for being more open to the world and differences, which could turn as victimization for individuals with high openness to experience. However, such relationship for victimization was not seen in the current study.

According to the literature, conscientiousness was not related to cyber dating abuse, in any way (Biolcati et al., 2021). In the present study, conscientiousness was negatively correlated to monitoring/control perpetration, in contrast to the cyber dating abuse literature. This result was in contrast to Ulloa et al. (2016) who did not find a relationship in perpetration and found a negative relationship with conscientiousness in terms of intimate partner violence. As people with high conscientiousness can plan and prepare ahead, think before acting, and can delay their gratification easily (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008), be self-disciplined, and be careful (McCrae & Costa, 1987) they might not engage in such perpetration. Same wise, people with low conscientiousness would not be able to defeat their curiosity and would monitor their

partners' doings.

The literature shows that neuroticism is positively related to cyber dating abuse perpetration and victimization for both direct aggression and monitoring/control (Biolcati et al., 2021), which is parallel to aggressive behaviors (Bettencourt et al., 2006), intimate partner violence perpetration, and victimization (Ulloa et al., 2016), and cyberbullying victimization (Peluchette et al., 2015). In the current study, neuroticism was positively correlated to perpetration, however, not significantly related to victimization, which is half in line with literature. Individuals with higher neuroticism are more likely to experience emotional distress, and disturbing thoughts, and using inappropriate coping mechanisms such as hostile reactions more frequently and adopting irrational beliefs (McCrae & Costa, 1987), which could lead to monitoring/control perpetration. As they perpetrate, they also could be victimized. It is important to underline that victimization is not supported by the current study parallel to the rest of the personality traits, which could be due to the unique nature of cyber dating abuse. Therefore, more studies are needed to conclude.

In conclusion, second hypothesis was mostly supported as attachment, emotion regulation, and personality was correlated with monitoring/control victimization and perpetration, except for the relationship between personality and victimization.

4.3. INVESTIGATING GENDER DIFFERENCES

The third hypothesis was established to see the gender differences in cyber dating abuse in terms of monitoring/control. Some studies suggest male victimization (Bennett et al., 2011; İnce, 2022; Maftai & Dănilă, 2021), and female perpetration (Aracı-İyiyaydın, 2022; Bakır, 2019; Bianchi et al., 2021; Burke et al., 2011; Erdem et al., 2022; Reed et al., 2017; Zweig et al., 2013), female victimization (Bakır, 2019; Burke et al., 2011), and male perpetration in terms of sexual cyber dating abuse (Brown et al., 2022; Reed et al., 2017; Zweig et al., 2013). In conclusion, the literature seems to support the idea of male perpetration of direct aggression and female control/monitoring perpetration (Biolcati et al., 2021). However, the literature also supports gender indifferences as shown below. Therefore, it can be seen that the literature is not in a consensus about gender differences.

Even though male participants experienced more monitoring/control victimization compared to female participants, the difference was not significant. Conversely,

female participants engaged in more monitoring/control perpetration compared to male participants. However, the differences between genders were not significant for both perpetration and victimization.

A possible explanation for that is as people use more technology, they might also easily learn how to use and add it to their toolbox. Additionally, since online communication creates power equality due to taking a picture, sending it to others directly, or posting online, creating a fake social media account does not require advanced skills for perpetration, which also becomes a risk for victimization (Dooley et al., 2009). Therefore, gender differences in victimization and perpetration might become nonexistent.

Nevertheless, there were no gender differences in both monitoring/control victimization and perpetration, parallel with the literature on cyber dating abuse (Biolcati et al., 2021; Borrajo Gámez-Guadix, & Calvete, 2015a; Curry & Zavala, 2020; Mosley & Lancaster, 2019; Reed et al., 2016; Toplu-Demirtaş et al., 2022; Velotti et al., 2022; Yushan & Cihan, 2021), intimate partner violence (Jouriles et al., 2017), and cyberbullying (Balakrishnan (2015).

In conclusion, third hypothesis was fully supported as monitoring/control victimization and perpetration were not different for males and females.

This finding should be interpreted as the abuse is not specifically towards females, perpetrated by males and the preventive applications should also include the male population.

4.4. INVESTIGATING AGE PERIOD DIFFERENCES

In the fourth hypothesis, the difference between age groups was examined in terms of monitoring/control victimization and perpetration. In order to study the developmental stage differences between young adulthood and emerging adulthood, the participants were separated by their age, according to the theoretical background that states emerging adulthood is different than adolescence and young adulthood and needs to be seen as a different stage of life (Arnett, 2007a). As Arnett (2007b) states, young adulthood includes a wide range of ages, and emerging adulthood covers the young adults that are no longer adolescents but also not full adults as they receive longer education such as post-secondary education and consider marriage and parenting at

later ages. Older young adults mostly have stable work and relationships and take responsibility for a family and raising children by 30. Another reason for such separation is that most of the studies in terms of adulthood are being conducted in the university setting, where most of the participants are between 18-25 years old. Therefore, it was important to see the difference or indifference between conceptual and practical concerns since most of the research focuses on university students (Fernet et al., 2019).

As a result, younger participants experienced more monitoring/control victimization and perpetration compared to older participants, which is parallel to the literature (Bianchi et al., 2021; İnce, 2022; Linares et al., 2021; Maftai & Dănilă, 2021). However, these differences were not significant in the current study. Meaning that individuals who are between 18 and 25 years old have experienced as much cyber dating abuse as those who are between 26 and 40 years old in terms of both victimization and perpetration, which is consistent with previous studies on cyber dating abuse (Burke et al., 2011; Curry & Zavala, 2020; Mosley & Lancaster, 2019), intimate partner violence (Velotti et al., 2022) and cyberbullying (Balakrishnan, 2015; Varela et al., 2022).

One possible reason for this could be the stability of personality and abusive behaviors (Robins et al. 2002) as they found that individuals who were in a happy and non-abusive relationship when they were 21 years old were also in a happy and non-abusive relationship when they were 26 years old, regardless of a partner change. Another possibility is that participants have similar life experiences due to COVID-19 restrictions and lockdowns where people had to stay at home and physically apart from their partners before and during the data collection process. Additionally, younger and older adults might use similar platforms, which might lead participants to experience similar abusive experiences regardless of their age.

In conclusion, fourth hypothesis was fully supported as monitoring/control victimization and perpetration were not different for 18-25- and 26-40-years old adults.

This finding also gives a warning to professionals to not only focus on the adolescents or university students as them being more available to reach, but also on adults who have been in or might enter an abusive relationship to educate and help their way out of such relationships.

4.5. INVESTIGATING RELATIONSHIP LENGTH DIFFERENCES

The fifth hypothesis aimed to examine whether the relationship length would make a difference in terms of cyber dating abuse.

As a result, there was a significant difference in terms of relationship length for monitoring/control victimization. Participants experienced less cyber dating abuse when they are in a relationship for less than 6 months, compared to those who have been in one for 1-2 years. However, other differences were not significant.

Also, there was a significant difference in terms of relationship length for monitoring/control perpetration. Participants experienced less cyber dating abuse when they are in a relationship for less than 6 months, compared to those who have been in one for 1-2 years, and lesser than those who have been in one for 3-4 years. However, other differences were not significant.

In the literature, some studies suggest that cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration does not differ in terms of relationship length (Bakır, 20129, İnce, 2022). However, consistent with the current study, Van Ouytsel et al. (2018) have found that relationship length was related to digital controlling victimization and Giordano et al. (2010) have found the relationship between partner violence and longer duration and contact that is more frequent with the romantic partner. Bianchi et al. (2021) have found that there is no difference in terms of monitoring/control and direct aggression victimization or perpetration when the relationships were shorter and longer than 6 months, and longer relationship duration was correlated with and predictive of cyber dating abuse in terms of both victimization and perpetration.

At the beginning of a relationship, partners might not want to interfere with each other, as this period is a chance to get to know each other and their boundaries and perceive as such behaviors come with love (Helm et al., 2017). As the relationship progresses, they might not be able to see only the negative sides of a relationship since there are also positive sides that make partners stay in the relationship (Giordano et al., 2010), or leaving a relationship might be even harder than staying in one, especially if the individual has an anxious attachment (Velotti et al., 2018). Another possibility is those behaviors start to get viewed as normal in a relationship (Helm et al., 2017), therefore reporting might decrease.

In conclusion, fifth hypothesis was fully supported as monitoring/control victimization

and perpetration were different for the relationship length of the participants.

4.6. INVESTIGATING ONLINE BEHAVIOR RELATIONSHIP

The sixth hypothesis has aimed to link social media and online communication tools with cyber dating abuse. As a result, time spent using messaging apps per day was positively correlated with monitoring/control victimization and perpetration, meaning that the more time spent using messaging apps such as WhatsApp and Telegram, the more risk for one to be abused through monitoring/control behaviors by his/her romantic partner on an online platform.

The time spent using social media was positively correlated with victimization, however, this link was not parallel to perpetration. Meaning that the more time spent with apps such as Instagram, Snapchat, Twitter, etc., the more risk to be abused with monitoring/control behaviors by the partner. Even though the correlation between perpetration and social media was close to significance level ($p = .051$), it did not make the cut. Therefore, social media was not related to cyber dating abuse perpetration.

Müller et al. (2018) found that social media use frequency was not predictive of cyberbullying behaviors, but cyberbullying behaviors were predictive of future social media use frequency. Such a relationship might become correlational in the current study. Also, some studies support this link (Balakrishnan, 2015). Furthermore, Mosley and Lancaster (2019) have found that the time spent on the computer and cell phones is related to cyber dating abuse victimization. Additionally, Linares et al. (2021) found that people who use their smartphone more were more engaged in all four forms of cyber dating abuse. Also, Mahoney et al. (2022) found that daily cellphone use was related to and predictive for cyber psychological abuse victimization and perpetration. In contrast, while İnce (2022) did not find any difference in terms of the time spent on the internet, Bakır (2019) found such difference in only direct aggression perpetration for users who spends more than five hours on the internet, which does not specify the use of it. In conclusion, current findings are in line with literature, except for the relationship between monitoring/control perpetration and social media.

Due to the nature of cyber dating abuse which happens online, that creates the lack of need for proximity and disclosing personal information to anyone (Balakrishnan, 2015), partners experience cyber dating abuse easily as a victim or a perpetrator. The frequency of communication tools use such as WhatsApp, Telegram, and SMS was

not specifically asked in the literature on cyber dating abuse, however same logic could be applied.

In the literature, the use of social networking sites was related to controlling victimization (Van Ouytsel et al., 2018), which could be explained by Lifestyle-Routine Activities Theory as people spend more time on these social networking sites, perpetrators' chances to reach their victims' increases and perpetrators might become interested in victims' online activity with their partners or others as victims post more frequently, without such intentions of victims (Van Ouytsel et al., 2018).

In contrast to Linares et al. (2021), one possibility of not founding a link between monitoring/control perpetration and social media could be that perpetrators prefer messaging apps since direct communication would give them information that is more accurate and control to partners. Also, perpetrators might use other channels such as tracking apps, which are not specified in the scale that was used but included in other scales (Brown & Hegarty, 2021; Burke et al., 2011; Jaen-Cortés et al., 2017). These possibilities could explain both monitoring/control victimization and perpetration through messaging apps.

In conclusion, sixth hypothesis was mostly supported as the daily time spent on social media and online communication tools was correlated with monitoring/control victimization and perpetration, except for the relationship between perpetration and social media.

4.7. INVESTIGATING THE PREDICTION OF CYBER DATING ABUSE

The seventh hypothesis aimed to see the predictability of attachment, emotion regulation, and Big Five personality traits on cyber dating abuse in terms of victimization and perpetration.

As a result, avoidant attachment, anxious attachment, non-acceptance, clarity, and social modeling explained 8.8% of the variance with a small effect size in monitoring/control victimization. However, only anxious attachment contributed significantly to the model ($\beta = .27, p < .001$). Meaning that the more a partner's anxious attachment score increases the risk of being abused in terms of monitoring/control increases.

Anxious attachment, clarity, goals, impulse, non-acceptance, perspective taking,

soothing, social modeling, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience explained 17.2% of the variance with a medium effect size in monitoring/control perpetration. Parallel with victimization, only anxious attachment contributed significantly to the model ($\beta = .35, p < .001$). Meaning that the more a partner's anxious attachment score increases the probability of occurrence of abuse in terms of monitoring/control increases.

In terms of attachment, findings were parallel to the literature on intimate partner violence (Villegas, 2017), as the anxious attachment was predictive of perpetration and victimization. The findings were also supported by the cyber dating abuse literature (Basting et al., 2022; Erdem et al., 2022; Lancaster, 2020; Villora, Navarro, & Yubero, 2019; Yushan & Cihan, 2021). As discussed in hypothesis 2, insecurely attached individuals might be at risk of cyber dating abuse, however, the avoidant attachment was not strong enough to be predictive of cyber dating abuse victimization, which contrasts with Basting et al. (2022) who found prediction and not correlation of avoidant attachment. Further studies should investigate the predictability of cyber dating abuse through avoidant attachment.

In terms of emotion regulation difficulties, the findings were supported by the cyber dating abuse literature (Lancaster, 2020), as emotion regulation does not have a direct effect on cyber dating abuse. Also, emotion regulation difficulties not having a predictability over intimate partner perpetration was also seen (Bliton et al., 2016). Even though the relationship was seen as correlation in the second hypothesis, the variables did not have a predictive effect. A possible reason could be examining emotion regulation difficulties as separate dimensions, rather than a total score, which is used as in a couple of previous studies (Brem et al., 2021; İnce, 2022; Lancaster, 2020; Wu, 2019). Future studies should include both total scores and separate dimensions in their analyses for a comparison.

As mentioned earlier, there is no study found in terms of interpersonal emotion regulation and cyber dating abuse. Therefore, the reason why it was not predictive for cyber dating abuse should be further studied. Theoretically, as people regulate their emotions, they do not engage in such behaviors (Lancaster, 2020). Since romantic relationships include interpersonal interactions, it should also be an important factor for cyber dating abuse.

In terms of personality, none of the traits were predictive of monitoring/control victimization, which is parallel to literature (Biolcati et al., 2021). However, in contrast to Biolcati et al. (2021) who found neuroticism and agreeableness to be predictive, the Big Five was not predictive for monitoring/control perpetration in the current study. As neuroticism and agreeableness are related to aggression (Bettencourt et al., 2006), this finding is in contrast. A possibility for such should be further studied, however, the distribution being acceptable but not desired could play a factor in the results. Also, other personality characteristics which were not included in the Big Five could play a role in cyber dating abuse. Even though marital (Hellmuth & McNulty, 2008) and intimate partner violence was predicted by the Big Five (Ulloa et al., 2016), different dynamics between the concepts might result in the insignificance of prediction for cyber dating abuse.

It should be noted that, due to the limited research, the findings should not be concluded as supportive or not.

In conclusion, seventh hypothesis was supported as the models for monitoring/control victimization and perpetration was significant.

Even though the models have weakly and moderately explained monitoring/control victimization and perpetration, it should be noted that only one variable, namely anxious attachment had a significant effect on both outcome variables and one variable has such an effect on cyber dating abuse. To add, the variables that were correlated but not predictive of cyber dating abuse might be weakly correlated that this relationship could be in different relationships such as moderation and mediation, etc. Therefore, these variables should be analyzed with more complex methods to see any indirect effect on cyber dating abuse, such as path analyses or the moderation of emotion regulation in the relationship between attachment and cyber dating abuse, like teen dating violence in the study of Théorêt (2022). In addition, other factors that were not included in the present study which are likely to play an important role in cyber dating abuse, such as depression, alcohol use, and social support, need to be investigated in future studies.

4.8. CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY

With the advancements in technology, new and more severe and detrimental ways of aggressive and abusive behaviors are being seen; and they will keep evolving.

Therefore, it is important to see who we are, how we perceive and process emotions, how we attach to other people, and how these affect the abusive behaviors to be seen in a romantic relationship. Those behaviors can only be prevented if such dimensions and broader perspectives are known and acted upon. Even though cyber dating abuse is a topic that is newly being highlighted and studied, especially in Turkey, thanks to the knowledge from intimate partner violence and cyberbullying studies, we can act faster and reach out to more people.

4.9. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE SUGGESTIONS

The data was collected between the 7th of December 2020 and the 1st of April 2021, a very specific period in which COVID-19 has shown its effects all around the world. Therefore, the findings might be special for this period, or this period might have been a driving force for such abuse to increase. McNeil et al. (2022) have reviewed 19 studies and found that the prevalence of intimate partner violence has increased along with mental health issues, low SES, unemployment, and COVID-19 diagnosis for the individual and/or family members. Parallel to intimate partner violence, cyber dating abuse also increased during COVID-19 (Maftai & Dănilă, 2021). Since the restrictions have been removed and the world and Turkey have entered the normalization process (Cumhuriyet, 2021), cyber dating abuse should be studied without the primal effect of COVID-19.

The nature of the topic could have impacted the willingness of the participants to complete it. Also, individuals who are currently experiencing cyber dating abuse as victims or perpetrators might have been reluctant to give the real answers.

When it comes to the limitations regarding the participant pool, 11.2% were between 26 and 40 years old, and the engaged participants were only 4.2% of the population. Therefore, a study with more engaged and older people would help researchers understand the concept from this perspective since dating covers the whole period before marriage, and young adulthood covers a much more general age range compared to emerging adulthood and typical university students' age.

Also, there was a gender difference in participation. Even though reaching out to more male participants in order to have similar sample sizes was attempted, only 23.6% of the population was male in the study. Specifically, some male participants have reported that the length of the study was tiring so, they dropped out. Therefore, it

creates a possible representativeness issue in which any potential difference between men who participate in such research and those who do not cannot be known. Additionally, more studies should include sexual minorities and take into consideration their struggles and the effects of such abusive behaviors on them as male and LGBTQ+ victims are understudied (Laskey et al., 2019).

By virtue of participants responding to the behaviors that they experienced in a year, recall bias should be taken into consideration. Also, participants were assumed to be in a monogamous relationship. Additionally, the study did not differentiate between engaging in cyber dating abuse with the same or a different romantic partner.

In the current study, technology use was only obtained with social media platforms and messaging apps in general. Further studies can elaborate more specifically on the devices and apps (such as tracking apps, cameras, etc.) and their use in the context of cyber dating abuse.

Also, monitoring/control behaviors such as checking partner's updates, the "last seen"s, current location, and who they are with could happen more often and as they are normalized (Duerksen & Woodin, 2021). The frequencies that are being collected might not close to the reality, compared to direct aggression such as creating fake profiles and spreading rumor and private information (Linares et al., 2021).

Therefore, a study with a mixed design is necessary for our understanding of cyber dating abuse since the way the Turkish population perceives abuse can be different from the countries in that the scale was created and translated. That is why future studies should be done as cross cultural to elaborate these. Also, different dynamics and examples of abuse can be seen in the light of a study of mixed design.

In order to inquire and increase the awareness of cyber dating abuse, future studies should include a psychoeducation program and analyze the difference between reporting abusive behaviors before and after.

Also, future studies should aim for a couple data and study both sides of the relationship, and counter-explore the self-reports of each partner for cyber dating abuse bilaterally to see how the partners view the relationship more objectively and broader perspective.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44(4), 709–716. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.44.4.709>
- Akers, R. L., & Jennings, W. (2009). Social learning theory. In J. Miller (Ed.), *21st century criminology: A reference handbook* (pp. 323-332). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alan Dikmen, H., Özaydın, T., & Dereli Yılmaz, S. (2018). Üniversitedeki kadın öğrencilerde yaşanan flört şiddeti ile anksiyete ve umutsuzluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Acıbadem Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(2), 170–176. <https://doi.org/10.31067/0.2018.9>
- Aldao, A., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Schweizer, S. (2010). Emotion-regulation strategies across psychopathology: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30, 217-237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.11.004>
- Allen, T. A., Carey, B. E., McBride, C., Bagby, R. M., DeYoung, C. G., & Quilty, L. C. (2017). Big five aspects of personality interact to predict depression. *Journal of Personality*, 86(4), 714–725. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12352>
- Allison, P. D. (1999). *Multiple regression: A primer*. Pine Forge Press
- Allison, C. J., Bartholomew, K., Mayseless, O., & Dutton, D. G. (2008). Love as a Battlefield: Attachment and Relationship Dynamics in Couples Identified for Male Partner Violence. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29(1), 125–150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X07306980>
- Allport, G. W., & Odbert, H. S. (1936). Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, 47(1), i–171. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093360>
- Alrajeh, S. M., Hassan, H. M., Al-Ahmed, A. S., & Alsayed Hassan, D. (2021). An investigation of the relationship between cyberbullying, cybervictimization and depression symptoms: A cross sectional study among university students in

- Qatar. *PLOS ONE*, 16(12). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0260263>
- Anderson, D. K., & Saunders, D. G. (2003). Leaving an abusive partner: An empirical review of predictors, the process of leaving, and psychological well-being. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 4(2), 163–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838002250769>
- Ando, R., & Sakamoto, A. (2008). The effect of cyber-friends on loneliness and social anxiety: Differences between high and low self-evaluated physical attractiveness groups. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(3), 993–1009. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2007.03.003>
- Aracı-İyiaydın, A., Toplu-Demirtaş, E., Akçabozan-Kayabol, N. B., & Fincham, F. D. (2022). I ruminate therefore I violate: The tainted love of anxiously attached and jealous partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(9-10), NP7129–NP7155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520967743>
- Arnett, J. J. (2007a). Afterword: Aging out of care—toward realizing the possibilities of emerging adulthood. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 113, 151–161. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.207>
- Arnett, J. J. (2007b). Emerging adulthood: What is it, and what is it good for? *Child Development Perspectives*, 1(2), 68–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2007.00016.x>
- Artan, B. (2019). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde duygu düzenleme güçlüğü ile kişilik özellikleri ilişkisinin incelenmesi* [Master's thesis, Nişantaşı University] Ulusal Tez Merkezi
- Ayas, T., & Horzum, M. B. (2010). Sanal zorba/kurban ölçek geliştirme çalışması [Cyber bully/victim scale development study]. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi: Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E-Dergisi* [Academic Sight International Refereed Online Journal], 19, 1-17
- Azzi, V., Hallit, S., Malaeb, D., Obeid, S., & Brytek-Matera, A. (2021). *Drunkorexia and Emotion Regulation and Emotion Regulation Difficulties: The Mediating Effect of Disordered Eating Attitudes*. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(5), 2690. doi:10.3390/ijerph18052690
- Bacıoğlu, S. D., & Kocabıyık, O. O. (2020). The roles of value preferences and

- cognitive emotion regulation strategies on prediction of dating violence. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 7(1), 96-107. <https://doi.org/10.17220/ijpes.2020.01.009>
- Bakır, A. (2019). *Romantik ilişkilerde siber flört istismarının beden imgesi ve benlik saygısıyla ilişkisi* (Document No. 555972) [Master's thesis, Ondokuz Mayıs University] Ulusal Tez Merkezi
- Bakır, A., & Kalkan, M. (2019). Siber flört istismarı ölçeği'nin türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14(20), 75-95. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.546811>
- Baker, C. K., & Carreño, P. K. (2015). Understanding the role of technology in adolescent dating and dating violence. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(1), 308–320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-015-0196-5>
- Balakrishnan, V. (2015). Cyberbullying among young adults in Malaysia: The roles of gender, age and internet frequency. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 46, 149–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.021>
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 226–244.
- Basting, E. J., Romero, G. J., Garner, A. R., Medenblik, A. M., Cornelius, T. L., & Stuart, G. L. (2022). Applying attachment theory to link family of origin violence history to cyber dating abuse among college students. *Journal of Family Violence*, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-022-00418-1>
- Benet-Martínez, V., & John, O. P. (1998). Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait–multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 729–750.
- Bennett, D. C., Guran, E. L., Ramos, M. C., & Margolin, G. (2011). College students' electronic victimization in friendships and dating relationships: Anticipated distress and associations with risky behaviors. *Violence and Victims*, 26(4), 410–429. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.26.4.410>
- Beran, T., & Li, Q. (2005). Cyber-harassment: A study of a new method for an old behavior. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 32(3), 265-277.

<https://doi.org/10.2190/8YQM-B04H-PG4D-BLLH>

- Bettencourt, B. A., Talley, A., Benjamin, A. J., & Valentine, J. (2006). Personality and aggressive behavior under provoking and neutral conditions: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*(5), 751–777. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.5.751>
- Bianchi, D., Morelli, M., Nappa, M. R., Baiocco, R., & Chirumbolo, A. (2021). A bad romance: Sexting motivations and teen dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *36*(13-14), 6029–6049. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518817037>
- Biolcati, R., Pupi, V., & Mancini, G. (2021). Cyber dating abuse and ghosting behaviours: Personality and gender roles in romantic relationships. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.5114/cipp.2021.108289>
- Birlik, T. (2019). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde bilişsel duygu düzenleme, öz şefkat ve flört şiddeti arasındaki ilişki* (Document No. 626938) [Master's thesis, Düzce University] Ulusal Tez Merkezi
- Bjureberg, J., Ljótsson, B., Tull, M. T., Hedman, E., Sahlin, H., Lundh, L., Bjärehed, J., DiLillo, D., Messman-Moore, T., Gumpert, C. H., & Gratz, K. L. (2016). Development and validation of a brief version of the difficulties in emotion regulation scale: The DERS-16. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *38*(2), 284–296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-015-9514-x>
- Bliton, C. F., Wolford-Clevenger, C., Zapor, H., Elmquist, J., Brem, M. J., Shorey, R. C., & Stuart, G. L. (2016). Emotion dysregulation, gender, and intimate partner violence perpetration: An exploratory study in college students. *Journal of Family Violence*, *31*(3), 371–377. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-015-9772-0>
- Bookwala, J. (2002). The role of own and perceived partner attachment in relationship aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *17*(1), 84–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260502017001006>
- Borrajo, E., Gámez-Guadix, M., & Calvete, E. (2015a). Cyber dating abuse: Prevalence, context, and relationship with offline dating aggression. *Psychology Reports*, *116*(2), 565-585. <https://doi.org/10.2466/21.16.PR0.116k22w4>
- Borrajo, E., Gámez-Guadix, M., & Calvete, E. (2015b). Justification beliefs of violence, myths about love and cyber dating abuse. *Psicothema*, *27*(4), 327-333.

<https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2015.59>

- Borrajo, E., Gámez-Guadix, M., Pereda, N., & Calvete, E. (2015). The development and validation of the Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire among young couples. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48, 358–365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.063>
- Bott, S., Guedes, A., Ruiz-Celis, A. P., & Mendoza, J. A. (2019). Intimate partner violence in the Americas: a systematic review and reanalysis of national prevalence estimates. *Revista Panamericana De Salud Publica = Pan American Journal of Public Health*, 43, e26. <https://doi.org/10.26633/RPSP.2019.26>
- Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Volume III: Loss, sadness and depression*. London: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Retrospect and prospect. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 52(4), 664–678. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1982.tb01456.x>
- Boyd, D., & Bee, H. (2015). *Lifespan development* (Global Edition) (7th ed.). Pearson Education Limited
- Brem, M. J., Romero, G., Garner, A. R., Grigorian, H., & Stuart, G. L. (2021). Alcohol problems, jealousy, and cyber dating abuse perpetration among men and women: Toward a conceptual model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(19-20), NP10205–NP10228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519873333>
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships*, 46–76. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Brown, C., Flood, M., & Hegarty, K. (2022). Digital dating abuse perpetration and impact: The importance of gender, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 25(2), 193-208, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2020.1858041>
- Brown, C., & Hegarty, K. (2021). Development and validation of the TAR Scale: A measure of technology-facilitated abuse in relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 3, 100059. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2021.100059>
- Burk, W. J., & Seiffge-Krenke, I. (2015). One-sided and mutually aggressive couples:

- Differences in attachment, conflict prevalence, and coping. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 50, 254–266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2015.08.011>
- Burke, S. C., Wallen, M., Vail-Smith, K., & Knox, D. (2011). Using technology to control intimate partners: An exploratory study of college undergraduates. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(3), 1162–1167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.12.010>
- Cafferky, B. M., Mendez, M., Anderson, J. R., & Stith, S. M. (2018). Substance use and intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology of Violence*, 8(1), 110–131. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000074>
- Caldwell, J. E., Swan, S. C., & Woodbrown, V. D. (2012). Gender differences in intimate partner violence outcomes. *Psychology of Violence*, 2(1), 42–57. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026296>
- Cattell, R. B. (1943). The description of personality: basic traits resolved into clusters. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 38(4), 476–506. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054116>
- Cénat, J. M., Smith, K., Hébert, M., & Derivois, D. (2019). Cybervictimization and suicidality among French undergraduate students: A mediation model. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 249, 90–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2019.02.026>
- Choi, T. R., Sung, Y., Lee, J.-A., & Choi, S. M. (2017). Get behind my selfies: The big five traits and social networking behaviors through selfies. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 109, 98–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.12.057>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, P. (2013). Marriage is declining globally. Can you say that? Retrieved from <https://familyinequality.wordpress.com/2013/06/12/marriage-is-declining/>
- Cole, P. M., Michel, M. K., & Teti, L. O. (1994). The development of emotion regulation and dysregulation: A clinical perspective. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59(2/3), 73–100.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/1166139>

- Connolly, J., Nguyen, H. N. T., Pepler, D., Craig, W., & Jiang, D. (2013). Developmental trajectories of romantic stages and associations with problem behaviors during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, *36*(6), 1013–1024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2013.08.006>
- Copen, C. E., Daniels, K., & Mosher, W. D. (2013). First premarital cohabitation in the United States: 2006-2010 National Survey of Family Growth. *National Health Statistics Reports*, (64), 1–15.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). NEO PI-R. The Revised NEO Personality Inventory. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Crosswhite, J. M., Rice, D., & Asay, S. M. (2014). Texting among United States young adults: An exploratory study on texting and its use within families, *The Social Science Journal*, *51*(1), 70-78, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2013.10.002>
- Cumhuriyet (2021, June 27) *İçişleri Bakanlığı'ndan, 1 Temmuz'da başlayacak kademeli normalleşmeye ilişkin genelge.* <https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/icisleri-bakanligindan-yeni-genelge-1847821>.
- Curry, T. R., & Zavala, E. (2020). A multi-theoretical perspective on cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration within intimate relationships: A test of general strain, social learning, and self-control theories, *Victims & Offenders*, *15*(4), 499-519, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2020.1734996>
- David-Ferdon, C., & Hertz, M. F. (2007). Electronic media, violence, and adolescents: An emerging public health problem. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *41*(6), S1–S5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.020>
- Del Rey, R., Elipe, P., & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2012). Bullying and cyberbullying: Overlapping and predictive value of the co-occurrence. *Psicothema*, *24*(4), 608-613.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *41*, 417-440.
- Dooley, J. J., Pyżalski, J., & Cross, D. (2009). Cyberbullying versus face-to-face bullying. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie / Journal of Psychology*, *217*(4), 182–188.

<https://doi.org/10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.182>

- Duerksen, K. N., & Woodin, E. M. (2021). Cyber dating abuse victimization: Links with psychosocial functioning. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(19–20), NP10077–NP10105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519872982>
- Elder, G. H. (1994). Time, human agency, and social change: Perspectives on the life course. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 57*(1), 4–15.
- Erdem, A., Tunç, E., & Erdem, Ş. (2022). Investigation of the relationship between cyber dating violence and attachment styles in university students. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal, 12*(64), 171-188. <https://doi.org/10.17066/tpdrd.1096231>
- Erikson, E. H. (1982). *Life cycle completed*. Norton.
- Evren, B., Evren, C., Dalbudak, E., Topcu, M., & Kutlu, N. (2018). Relationship of Internet addiction severity with probable ADHD and difficulties in emotion regulation among young adults. *Psychiatry Research, 269*, 494-500. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2018.08.112>
- Fernet, M., Lapierre, A., Hébert, M., & Cousineau, M.-M. (2019). A systematic review of literature on cyber intimate partner victimization in adolescent girls and women. *Computers in Human Behavior, 100*, 11–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.06.005>
- Field, A. P. (2009). *Discovering statistics using Spss: (and sex, drugs and rock 'n' roll)* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fisher, L., Hessler, D., Polonsky, W., Strycker, L., Guzman, S., Bowyer, V., Blumer, I., & Masharani, U. (2018). Emotion regulation contributes to the development of diabetes distress among adults with type 1 diabetes. *Patient Education and Counseling, 101*(1), 124–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2017.06.036>
- Follingstad, D. R., & Dehart, D. D. (2000). Defining psychological abuse of husbands toward wives: Contexts, behaviors, and typologies. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(9), 891-920.
- Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Linder, F., Rice, J., & Wilcher, R. (2007). *Typologies of Adolescent Dating Violence*. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(5), 498–519. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506298829>

- Foshee, V. A., McNaughton Reyes, H. L., Chen, M. S., Ennett, S. T., Basile, K. C., DeGue, S., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Moracco, K. E., & Bowling, J. M. (2016). Shared risk factors for the perpetration of physical dating violence, bullying, and sexual harassment among adolescents exposed to domestic violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *45*, 672–686. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0404-z>
- Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2008). Attachment theory and its place in contemporary personality theory and research. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality. Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 518-541). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 350-365.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2020). *Ibm spss statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference* (16th ed.). Routledge.
- Giordano, P. C., Soto, D. A., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2010). The characteristics of romantic relationships associated with teen dating violence. *Social Science Research*, *39*(6), 863–874. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.03.009>
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*(6), 1216–1229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216>
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, *4*(1), 26–42. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.26>
- Gökdağ, C. (2021). How does interpersonal emotion regulation explain psychological distress? the roles of attachment style and social support. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *176*, 110763. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110763>
- Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the difficulties in emotion regulation scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *26*(1), 41–54.

<https://doi.org/10.1023/b:joba.0000007455.08539.94>

- Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2008). The relationship between emotion dysregulation and deliberate self-harm among female undergraduate students at an urban commuter university. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, 37(1), 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16506070701819524>
- Gross, J. J. (2002). Emotion regulation: Affective, cognitive, and social consequences. *Psychophysiology*, 39(3), 281–291. <https://doi.org/10.1017.S0048577201393198>
- Gross, J. J., & Thompson, R. A. (2007). Emotion regulation: Conceptual foundations. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 3–24). New York: Guilford Press.
- Gurrentz, B. (2018). For young adults, cohabitation is up, and marriage is down. US Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2018/11/cohabitation-is-up-marriage-is-down-for-young-adults.html>
- Hancock, K., Keast, H., & Ellis, W. (2017). The impact of cyber dating abuse on self-esteem: The mediating role of emotional distress. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 11(2), <https://doi.org/10.5817/CP2017-2-2>
- Hart, J., Nailling, E., Bizer, G. Y., & Collins, C. K. (2015). Attachment theory as a framework for explaining engagement with Facebook. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 77, 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.12.016>
- Hasinoff, A. A. (2017). Where are you? Location Tracking and the promise of child safety. *Television & New Media*, 18(6), 496–512. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476416680450>
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.511>
- Helm, S., Baker, C. K., Berlin, J., & Kimura, S. (2017). Getting in, being in, staying in, and getting out: Adolescents' descriptions of dating and dating violence. *Youth and Society*, 49(3), 318–340.
- Heidemeier, H., & Göritz, A. S. (2016). The instrumental role of personality traits: Using mixture structural equation modeling to investigate individual differences in the relationships between the big five traits and life satisfaction. *Journal of*

- Happiness Studies*, 17(6), 2595–2612. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-015-9708-7>
- Heirman, W., & Walrave, M. (2012). Predicting adolescent perpetration in cyberbullying: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Psicothema*, 24(4), 614-620.
- Hellmuth, J. C., & McNulty, J. K. (2008). Neuroticism, marital violence, and the moderating role of stress and behavioral skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(1), 166–180. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.166
- Hofmann, S. G. (2014). Interpersonal emotion regulation model of mood and anxiety disorders. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 38, 483–492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-014-9620-1>
- Hofmann, S. G., Carpenter, J. K., & Curtiss, J. (2016). Interpersonal emotion regulation questionnaire (IERQ): Scale development and psychometric characteristics. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 40(3), 341–356. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-016-9756-2>.
- Hood, M., & Duffy, A. L. (2018). Understanding the relationship between cyber-victimisation and cyber-bullying on social network sites: The role of moderating factors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 133, 103–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.04.004>
- Horwood, S., & Anglim, J. (2020). Emotion regulation difficulties, personality, and problematic smartphone use. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 24(4), 275-281. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2020.0328>
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2015). *Bullying beyond the schoolyard: Preventing and responding to cyberbullying*. (2nd ed.) Sage Publications (Corwin Press).
- Huang, C. (2019). Social Network Site use and big five personality traits: A meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 97, 280–290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.03.009>
- Imura, S., & Taku, K. (2018). Gender differences in relationship between resilience and big five personality traits in Japanese adolescents. *Psychological Reports*, 121(5), 920–931. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294117741654>
- İnce, E. H. (2022). *Erken dönem uyum bozucu şemalar ve dijital flört şiddeti arasındaki ilişkide olumlu duygu düzenleme güçlüğü ve olumsuz duygu düzenleme güçlüğünün aracı rolü* (Document No. 724974) [Master's thesis, Işık

- Jaen-Cortés, C. I., Rivera-Aragón, S., Reidl-Martínez, L. M., & García-Méndez, M. (2017). Violencia de pareja a través de medios electrónicos en adolescentes mexicanos [Intimate partner violence through electronic media in Mexican adolescents]. *Acta de Investigación Psicológica*, *7*, 2593–2605. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.aiprr.2017.01.001>
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. R. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality. Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 114–158). New York, NY: Guilford Press
- Jouriles, E. N., Choi, H. J., Rancher, C., & Temple, J. R. (2017). Teen dating violence victimization, trauma symptoms, and revictimization in early adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *61*(1), 115–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2017.01.020>
- Karlsson, M. E., Temple, J. R., Weston, R., & Le, V. D. (2016). Witnessing interparental violence and acceptance of dating violence as predictors for teen dating violence victimization. *Violence Against Women*, *22*(5), 625–646. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215605920>
- Kemp, S. (2020, February 18). *Digital 2020: Turkey - DataReportal – global digital insights*. DataReportal. Retrieved April 15, 2022, from <https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2020-turkey?rq=digital+2020+turkey>
- Kemp, S. (2022, February 15). *Digital 2022: Turkey - DataReportal – global digital insights*. DataReportal. Retrieved April 15, 2022, from <https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2022-turkey>
- Kircaburun, K., Jonason, P. K., & Griffiths, M. D. (2018). The dark tetrad traits and problematic social media use: The mediating role of cyberbullying and Cyberstalking. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *135*, 264–269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.07.034>
- Kline, R. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). The Guildford Press.
- Kota, R., Schoohs, S., Benson, M., & Moreno, M. (2014). Characterizing cyberbullying among college students: Hacking, Dirty Laundry, and mocking.

- Societies*, 4(4), 549–560. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc4040549>
- Kota, R., & Selkie, E. (2018). Cyberbullying and mental health. In M. A. Moreno, & A. Radovic (Eds.). *Technology and Adolescent Mental Health* (p. 89-99). Springer Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69638-6>
- Kuss, D., & Griffiths, M. (2017). Social Networking sites and addiction: Ten lessons learned. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 14(3), 311. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14030311>
- Lampe, C., Ellison, N., & Steinfield, C. (2006). *A face(book) in the crowd: Social searching vs. social browsing. Proceedings of the 2006 20th Anniversary Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work - CSCW '06.* pp. 167-70, <https://doi.org/10.1145/1180875.1180901>
- Lancaster, M. L. (2020). *Influential factors on young adult cyber dating abuse.* (Document No. 27740224) [Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University] ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global
- Lancaster, M., Seibert, G. S., Cooper, A. N., May, R. W., & Fincham, F. (2019). Relationship quality in the context of cyber dating abuse: The role of attachment. *Journal of Family Issues*, 41(6), 739-758. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X19881674>
- Lauckner, H., Doucet, S., & Wells, S. (2012). *Patients as educators: the challenges and benefits of sharing experiences with students. Medical Education*, 46(10), 992–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2012.04356.x>
- Laskey, P., Bates, E. A., & Taylor, J. C. (2019). A systematic literature review of intimate partner violence victimisation: An inclusive review across gender and sexuality. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 47, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2019.02.014>
- Levinson, D. J. (1986). A conception of adult development. *American Psychologist*, 41(1), 3.
- Levy, K. N., Kivity, Y., Johnson, B. N., & Gooch, C. V. (2018). Adult attachment as a predictor and moderator of psychotherapy outcome: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 74(11), 1996-2013. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22685>
- Li, Y., Lan, J., & Ju, C. (2015). Self-esteem, gender, and the relationship between

- extraversion and subjective well-being. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 43(8), 1243-1254.
- Linares, R., Aranda, M., García-Domingo, M., Amezcua, T., Fuentes, V., & Moreno-Padilla, M. (2021). Cyber-dating abuse in young adult couples: Relations with sexist attitudes and violence justification, smartphone usage and impulsivity. *PLoS ONE*, 16(6): e0253180. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253180>
- Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., Côté, S., & Beers, M. (2005). Emotion regulation abilities and the quality of social interaction. *Emotion*, 5(1), 113–118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.5.1.113>
- Lu, Y., Van Ouytsel, J., & Temple, J. R. (2021). In-person and cyber dating abuse: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 38(12), 3713–3731. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075211065202>
- Lyndon, A., Bonds-Raacke, J., & Cratty, A. D. (2011). College students' facebook stalking of ex-partners. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 14(12), 711–716. doi:10.1089/cyber.2010.0588
- Madruga, C. S., Viana, M. C., Abdalla, R. R., Caetano, R., & Laranjeira, R. (2017). Pathways from witnessing parental violence during childhood to involvement in intimate partner violence in adult life: The roles of depression and substance use. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 36(1), 107–114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dar.12514>
- Maftai, A., & Dănilă, O. (2021). Give me your password! what are you hiding? associated factors of intimate partner violence through technological abuse. *Current Psychology*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02197-2>
- Mahoney, J. C., Farrell, D. M., & Murphy, C. M. (2022). prevalence and predictors of cyber psychological abuse among adults. *Journal of Family Violence*, 37, 151–163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-021-00317-x>
- Mammadov, S. (2021). Big five personality traits and academic performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 90(2), 222–255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12663>
- Marganski, A., & Melander, L. (2015). Intimate partner violence victimization in the cyber and real world: Examining the extent of cyber aggression experiences and its association with in-person dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*,

33(7), 1071-1095. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515614283>

- Martin, S., Charvát, M., Střelec, J., Seitlová, K., & Kafetsios, K. (2022). Experiences in work relationships: A measure of attachment strategies at work. *Psychological Reports*, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941221075249>
- Martínez Soto, A., & Ibabe, I. (2022). Recommended Instruments for Analyzing Cyber Dating Violence: A Systematic Review. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 25, E4. <https://doi.org/10.1017/SJP.2021.50>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1985). Updating Norman's "adequacy taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and in questionnaires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(3), 710–721. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.49.3.710.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2008). The five-factor theory of personality. In O. P. John, R. R. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality. Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 159–181). New York: Guilford Press
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 175–215.
- McNeil, A., Hicks, L., Yalcinoz-Ucan, B., & Browne, D. T. (2022). Prevalence & correlates of intimate partner violence during covid-19: A rapid review. *Journal of Family Violence*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-022-00386-6>
- Mkhize, S., Nunlall, R., & Gopal, N. (2020). An examination of social media as a platform for cyber-violence against the LGBT+ population. *Agenda*, 34(1), 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2019.1704485>
- Mosley, M. A., & Lancaster, M. (2019). Affection and abuse: Technology use in adolescent romantic relationships. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 47(1), 52–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2019.1586592>
- Mouatsou, C., & Koutra, K. (2021). Emotion regulation in relation with resilience in emerging adults: The mediating role of self-esteem. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01427-x>

- Mulawa, M., Kajula, L. J., Yamanis, T. J., Balvanz, P., Kilonzo, M. N., & Maman, S. (2016). Perpetration and victimization of intimate partner violence among young men and women in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(16), 2486–2511. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515625910>
- Mulford, C., & Giordano, P. C. (2008). Teen dating violence: A closer look at adolescent romantic relationships. *National Institute of Justice Journal, 261*(1), 31-40.
- Müller, C. R., Pfetsch, J., Schultze-Krumbholz, A., & Ittel, A. (2018). Does media use lead to cyberbullying or vice versa? Testing longitudinal associations using a latent cross-lagged panel design. *Computers in Human Behavior, 81*, 93–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.12.007>
- Müller, T., & Bonnaire, C. (2021). Intrapersonal and interpersonal emotion regulation and identity: A preliminary study of avatar identification and gaming in adolescents and young adults. *Psychiatry Research, 295*, 113627. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113627>
- Musetti, A., Manari, T., Billieux, J., Starcevic, V., & Schimmenti, A. (2022) A problematic social networking sites use and attachment: A systematic review, *Computers in Human Behavior, 131*, 107199, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107199>.
- Noftle, E. E., & Shaver, P. R. (2006). Attachment dimensions and the big five personality traits: Associations and comparative ability to predict relationship quality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*(2), 179–208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2004.11.003>
- Norman, W. T. (1967). 2,800 personality trait descriptors: Normative operating characteristics for a university population. Unpublished paper, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan.
- Norman, G. (2010). Likert scales, levels of measurement and the “laws” of statistics. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 15*(5), 625–632. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-010-9222-y>
- O’Meara, M. S., & South, S. C. (2019). Big five personality domains and relationship satisfaction: Direct effects and correlated change over time. *Journal of*

Personality, 87(6), 1206–1220. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12468>

Özdere, M. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine ilişkin tutumları. *The Journal of Academic Social Sciences*, 95, 314–331. <https://doi.org/10.16992/asos.15167>

Özdere, M., & Kürtül, N. (2018). Flört şiddeti eğitiminin, üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine ilişkin tutumlarına etkisi. *Social Science Development Journal*, 3(9), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.31567/ssd.46>

Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4(2), 148–169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204006286288>

Peluchette, J. V., Karl, K., Wood, C., & Williams, J. (2015). Cyberbullying victimization: Do victims' personality and risky social network behaviors contribute to the problem?. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 52, 424–435. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.028>

Pettigrew, J. (2009). Text messaging and connectedness within close interpersonal relationships. *Marriage & Family Review*, 45(6-8), 697–716. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494920903224269>

Pierrehumbert, B., Bader, M., Miljkovitch, R., Mazet, P., Amar, M., & Halfon, O. (2002). Strategies of emotion regulation in adolescents and young adults with substance dependence or eating disorders. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 9(6), 384–394. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.339>

Purnamaningsih, E. H. (2017). Personality and Emotion Regulation Strategies. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 10(1), 53. <https://doi.org/10.21500/20112084.2040>

Reed, L. A., Tolman, R. M., & Ward, L. M. (2016). Snooping and sexting: Digital media as a context for dating aggression and abuse among college students. *Violence Against Women*, 22(13), 1556–1576. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801216630143>

Reed, L. A., Tolman, R. M., & Ward, L. M. (2017). Gender matters: Experiences and consequences of digital dating abuse victimization in adolescent dating relationships. *Journal of Adolescence*, 59, 79–

89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.05>

- Roberts, A. L., Gilman, S. E., Fitzmaurice, G., Decker, M. R., & Koenen, K. C. (2010). Witness of intimate partner violence in childhood and perpetration of intimate partner violence in adulthood. *Epidemiology*, *21*(6), 809–818. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ede.0b013e3181f39f03>
- Robins, R. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2002). It's not just who you're with, it's who you are: Personality and relationship experiences across multiple relationships. *Journal of personality*, *70*(6), 925-964.
- Runions, K., Shapka, J. D., Dooley, J., & Modecki, K. (2013). Cyber-aggression and victimization and social information processing: Integrating the medium and the message. *Psychology of Violence*, *3*(1), 9–26. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030511>
- Sarisoy-Aksüt, G., & Gençöz, T. (2020). Psychometric properties of the Interpersonal Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (IERQ) in Turkish samples. *Current Psychology*, *41*(2), 563–572. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00578-2>
- Schmitt, D. P., Allik, J., McCrae, R. R., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2007). The geographic distribution of big five personality traits: Patterns and profiles of human self-description across 56 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *38*(2), 173-212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022106297299>
- Schnurr, M. P., Mahatmya, D., & Basche, R. A. (2013). The role of dominance, cyber aggression perpetration, and gender on emerging adults' perpetration of intimate partner violence. *Psychology of Violence*, *3*(1), 70–83. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030601>
- Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (2017). *Theories of personality* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Selçuk, E., Günaydin, G., Sümer, N., & Uysal, A. (2005). Yetişkin bağlanma boyutları için yeni bir ölçüm: Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri-II'nin Türk örnekleminde psikometrik açıdan değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, *8*, 1-11.
- Selkie, E. M., Kota, R., Chan, Y.-F., & Moreno, M. (2015). Cyberbullying, depression, and problem alcohol use in female college students: A multisite study. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *18*(2), 79–86.

<https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2014.0371>

- Shaver, P. R., & Brennan, K. A. (1992). Attachment styles and the "Big Five" personality traits: Their connections with each other and with romantic relationship outcomes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *18*(5), 536–545. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167292185003>
- Shaver, P. R., Hazan, C., & Bradshaw, D. (1988). Love as attachment: The integration of three behavioral systems. In R. J. Sternberg, & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 68–99). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2002). Attachment-related psychodynamics. *Attachment & Human Development*, *4*(2), 133–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616730210154171>
- Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2014). Adult Attachment Strategies and the Regulation of Emotion. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 446–465). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Sheng, R., Hu, J., & Liu, X. (2022). Longitudinal relationships between insecure attachment and romantic relationship quality and stability in emerging adults: the mediating role of perceived conflict in daily life. *Current Psychology*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02668-6>
- Singh, V., Epstein-Ngo, Q., Cunningham, R. M., Stoddard, S. A., Chermack, S. T., & Walton, M. A. (2015). *Physical dating violence among adolescents and young adults with alcohol misuse. Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *153*, 364–368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.05.003>
- Slep, A. M., Heyman, R. E., Lorber, M. F., Tiberio, S. S., & Casillas, K. L. (2021). Couples' anger dynamics during conflict: Interpersonal Anger Regulation, relationship satisfaction, and intimate partner violence. *Family Process*, *60*(4), 1280–1294. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12634>
- Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *49*(4), 376–385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01846.x>
- Southworth, C., Finn, J., Dawson, S., Fraser, C., & Tucker, S. (2007). Intimate partner

- violence, technology, and stalking. *Violence Against Women*, 13(8), 842–856. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801207302045>
- Starosta, J., Izydorczyk, B., Sitnik-Warchulska, K., & Lizińczyk, S. (2021). Impulsivity and difficulties in emotional regulation as predictors of binge-watching behaviours. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12, 743870. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.743870>
- Swee, G., Shochet, I., Cockshaw, W., & Hides, L. (2020). Emotion regulation as a risk factor for suicide ideation among adolescents and young adults: the mediating role of belongingness. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 49, 2265–2274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01301-2>
- Tamminen, K. A., & Crocker, P. R. E. (2013). “I control my own emotions for the sake of the team”: Emotional self-regulation and interpersonal emotion regulation among female high-performance curlers. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 14(5), 737–747. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.05.002>
- Théorêt, V., Lapierre, A., Blais, M., & Hébert, M. (2022). Can emotion dysregulation explain the association between attachment insecurities and teen dating violence perpetration? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(1–2), 743–763. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520915547>
- Thompson, R. A. (1994). Emotion regulation: A theme in search of definition. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59(2/3), 25–52. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1166137>
- Topçu, S. (2009). *Cinsel istismar*. Ankara: Phoenix.
- Toplu-Demirtaş, E., Akcabozan-Kayabol, N. B., Araci-Iyiaydin, 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520927505>
- Troth, A. C., Lawrence, S. A., Jordan, P. J., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2018). Interpersonal emotion regulation in the workplace: A conceptual and Operational Review and future research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(2), 523–543. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12144>

- Turan, R., & Duy, B. (2020). Self-esteem, attachment, gender roles and social approval as predictors of the attitudes toward dating violence. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 10(56), 1-36. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tpdrd/issue/53508/712366>
- Ulloa, E. C., & Hammett, J. F. (2016). The effect of gender and perpetrator-victim role on mental health outcomes and risk behaviors associated with intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31, 1184–1207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514564163>
- Ulloa, E. C., Hammett, J. F., O’Neal, D. N., Lydston, E. E., & Leon Aramburo, L. F. (2016). The big five personality traits and intimate partner violence: Findings from a large, nationally representative sample. *Violence and Victims*, 31(6), 1100–1115. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.vv-d-15-00055>
- Üstünel, A. Ö. (2020). Eşit, güvenli, özgür ilişki: Üniversite öğrencilerine yönelik bir flört şiddeti önleme programının etki değerlendirmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 23(45), 19-38. <https://doi.org/10.31828/tpy1301996120191008m000016>
- Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2007). Online communication and adolescent well-being: Testing the stimulation versus the displacement hypothesis. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4), 1169–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00368.x>
- Van Ouytsel, J., Ponnet, K., & Walrave, M. (2018). Cyber dating abuse victimization among secondary school students from a lifestyle-routine activities theory perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(17), 2767–2776. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516629390>
- Van Ouytsel, J., Ponnet, K., & Walrave, M. (2020). Cyber dating abuse: Investigating digital monitoring behaviors among adolescents from a social learning perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(23-24), 5157–5178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517719538>
- Van Ouytsel, J., Torres, E., Choi, H. J., Ponnet, K., Walrave, M., & Temple, J. R. (2017). The associations between substance use, sexual behaviors, bullying, deviant behaviors, health, and cyber dating abuse perpetration. *The Journal of School Nursing*, 33(2), 116–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059840516683229>

- Varela, J. J., Hernández, C., Miranda, R., Barlett, C. P., & Rodríguez-Rivas, M. E. (2022). Victims of cyberbullying: Feeling loneliness and depression among youth and adult Chileans during the pandemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(10), 5886. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19105886>
- Velotti, P., Beomonte Zobel, S., Rogier, G., & Tambelli, R. (2018). Exploring relationships: A systematic review on intimate partner violence and attachment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1166. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01166>
- Velotti, P., D'Aguanno, M., de Campora, G., Di Francescantonio, S., Garofalo, C., Giromini, L., Petrocchi, C., Terrasi, M., & Zavattini, G. C. (2015). Gender moderates the relationship between attachment insecurities and emotion dysregulation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 46(2), 191–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0081246315604582>
- Velotti, P., Rogier, G., Beomonte Zobel, S., Chirumbolo, A., & Zavattini, G. C. (2022). The relation of anxiety and avoidance dimensions of attachment to intimate partner violence: A meta-analysis about perpetrators. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 23(1), 196–212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838020933864>
- Villalobos, D., Pacios, J., & Vázquez, C. (2021). Cognitive control, cognitive biases and emotion regulation in depression: A new proposal for an integrative Interplay Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 628416. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.628416>
- Villegas, R. L. (2017). *Adult attachment and intimate partner violence: a study on interpersonal styles developed early in life as precursors for psychological, physical, and sexual violence perpetrated by intimate partners* (Document No. 10288232). [Doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University] ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Víllora, B., Navarro, R., & Yubero, S. (2019). The role of social-interpersonal and cognitive-individual factors in cyber dating victimization and perpetration: Comparing the direct, control, and combined forms of abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(17-18), 8559–8584. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519851172>
- Víllora, B., Yubero, S., & Navarro, R. (2019a, March 28). Cyber dating abuse and

- masculine gender norms in a sample of male adults. *Future Internet*, 11(4), 84. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi11040084>
- Villora, B., Yubero, S., & Navarro, R. (2019b, March 29). Associations between feminine gender norms and cyber dating abuse in female adults. *Behavioral Sciences*, 9(4), 35. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs9040035>
- Yan, J. J., Schoppe-Sullivan, S., Wu, Q., & Han, Z. R. (2021). Associations from parental mindfulness and emotion regulation to child emotion regulation through parenting: The moderating role of coparenting in Chinese families. *Mindfulness*, 12, 1513–1523. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-021-01619-3>
- Yiğit, İ., & Guzey Yiğit, M. (2017). Psychometric properties of Turkish version of difficulties in emotion regulation scale-brief form (Ders-16). *Current Psychology*, 38, 1503–1511. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9712-7>
- Yushan, Z., & Cihan, H. (2021). The effect of attachment styles on cyber dating abuse in emerging adulthood. *Turkish Studies - Social*, 16(6), 2143-2156. <https://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.51452>
- Zacher, H., & Rudolph, C. W. (2021). Big Five traits as predictors of perceived stressfulness of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 175, 110694. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110694>
- Zaki, J. (2021). Integrating empathy and interpersonal emotion regulation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 71(1), 517-540. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010419-050830>
- Zaki, J., & Williams, W. C. (2013). Interpersonal emotion regulation. *Emotion*, 13(5), 803-810. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033839>
- Zweig, J. M., Dank, M., Yahner, J., & Lachman, P. (2013). The rate of cyber dating abuse among teens and how it relates to other forms of teen dating violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42(7), 1063–1077. doi:10.1007/s10964-013-9922-8
- Zweig, J. M., Lachman, P., Yahner, J., & Dank, M. (2014). Correlates of cyber dating abuse among teens. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43, 1306-1321. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0047-x>
- Wang, J.-L., Jackson, L. A., Zhang, D.-J., & Su, Z.-Q. (2012). The relationships among

- the Big Five Personality factors, self-esteem, narcissism, and sensation-seeking to Chinese University students' uses of social networking sites (SNSs). *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(6), 2313–2319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.07.001>
- Wang, C. W., Musumari, P. M., Techasrivichien, T., Suguimoto, S. P., Tateyama, Y., Chan, C. C., Ono-Kihara, M., Kihara, M., & Nakayama, T. (2019). Overlap of traditional bullying and cyberbullying and correlates of bullying among Taiwanese adolescents: a cross-sectional study. *BMC public health*, 19(1), 1756. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-8116-z>
- Weiten, W., Dunn, D. S., & Hammer, E. Y. (2018). *Psychology applied to modern life: Adjustment in the 21st century* (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- White, R., & Mason, R. (2013). Bullying and gangs. In J. C. Srabstein, & J. Merr (Eds.), *Bullying a Public Health Concern*, pp. 119-128. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Wu, L. (2019). *Relationships among cyber dating abuse, binge drinking, and emotion dysregulation in college students* (Document No. 27736257) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

APPENDIX 1 – APPROVAL OF THE RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE



T.C.
YAŞAR ÜNİVERSİTESİ
ETİK KOMİSYONU

Toplantı Tarihi: 25.11.2020

2020-2021 Akademik Yılı Toplantı Sayısı: 02

GÜNDEM 3:

Yaşar Üniversitesi İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi Dekanlığı'nın 11/11/2020 tarih ve 8703 sayılı yazısı ile sunulan; Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı 19300024003 numaralı öğrencisi Ceren ÇAKIR' ın; "Examining Cyber Dating Abuse Through Adult Attachment, Emotion Regulation, and Big Five Personality in Young Adult" başlıklı yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında; 18-40 yaş arası genç yetişkinlere çevrimiçi uygulamayı planladığı anket çalışmasına ilişkin Etik Komisyonu onay talebinin görüşülmesi.

GÖRÜŞME ve KARAR:

Yaşar Üniversitesi Etik Komisyonu yaşanan olağanüstü durum sebebiyle 25.11.2020 Çarşamba günü, Başkan Prof. Dr. Levent KANDİLLER ve tüm üyeler; gündem maddesini dijital ortamda değerlendirmiş, aşağıdaki karar alınmıştır.

KARAR 3:

Yaşar Üniversitesi İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi Dekanlığı'nın 11/11/2020 tarih ve 8703 sayılı yazısı ile sunulan; Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı 19300024003 numaralı öğrencisi Ceren ÇAKIR' ın; "Examining Cyber Dating Abuse Through Adult Attachment, Emotion Regulation, and Big Five Personality in Young Adult" başlıklı yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında; 18-40 yaş arası genç yetişkinlere çevrimiçi uygulanması planlanan anket sorularının uygunluğuna oy birliği ile karar verildi.

ASLI GİBİDİR



Ata TÜRKFİDANI
Yazı İşleri Müdürü

f A D A A B

APPENDIX 2 – INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Sayın gönüllü,

Bu çalışma Yaşar Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Berrin Özyurt danışmanlığında, Genel Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Ceren Çakır tarafından yürütülmektedir. Çalışmadaki amaç 18-40 yaş arası kişilerin flört deneyimlerini incelemektir. Katılımcılardan hali hazırda bir romantik ilişkide olmaları (flört veya nişanlılık) veya son bir yıl içerisinde bu tür bir ilişkide bulunmuş olmaları beklenmektedir. Katılım gönüllü olmalıdır. Çalışmada hiçbir kişisel kimlik bilgisi gerekmemektedir. Cevaplarınız kesinlikle gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir. Elde edilen bilgiler bilimsel amaçlar için kullanılacaktır. Çalışmada katılımcıları rahatsız eden sorular bulunmamaktadır. Bununla birlikte katılım esnasında herhangi bir sebeple rahatsız hissederseniz, istediğiniz zaman bırakabilirsiniz.

Çalışmamız 20-25 dakika arası sürmektedir. Sorulara vereceğiniz samimi ve dürüst cevaplar araştırmanın bilimsel niteliği açısından son derece önemlidir. Bilimsel katkı ve yardımlarınız için şimdiden sonsuz teşekkürler. Verilerin analizinden sonra, araştırma ile ilgili bir rapor yayınlanabilir. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi için Yaşar Üniversitesi Genel Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Bölümü Öğrencisi Ceren Çakır ile iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Not: Katılımcılar arasından yapılacak çekilişle rastgele 3 katılımcımıza 50şer Türk Lirası değerinde hediye çeki verilecektir. Çekiliş sonuçları video olarak katılımcılarımızla paylaşılacaktır. Çekilişe katılabilmek için lütfen geçerli e-mail adreslerinizi anketimizde belirtilen yere giriniz. Çekilişe katılmak istemiyorsanız e-mail adresinizi yazmayabilirsiniz. Çekilişe yalnızca çalışmayı sonuna kadar tamamlayanlar ve geçerli bir e-mail adresi sağlayanlar katılabilecektir.

Gönüllü katılımınızı belirtmek için, lütfen aşağıda bulunan bilgilendirilmiş onam formunu işaretleyiniz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen kendi isteğim ile katılıyorum ve her an katılımdan

ıkabileceđimin farkındayım. ()

Bilgileri okuyup anladığımı ve soru sorma fırsatımın olduđunu onaylıyorum. ()

Bu arařtırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum. ()



APPENDIX 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Cinsiyetiniz:

- (a) Kadın
- (b) Erkek

Yaşınız:

Eğitim Durumunuz

- (a) Ortaokul mezunu
- (b) Lise mezunu
- (c) Ön lisans öğrencisi/mezunu
- (d) Lisans öğrencisi/mezunu
- (e) Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi/mezunu
- (f) Doktora öğrencisi/mezunu

Gelir Durumunuz

- (a) Düşük
- (b) Orta
- (c) Yüksek

Çalışma Durumunuz:

- (a) Çalışıyorum
- (b) Çalışmıyorum

Annenizin eğitim durumu

- (a) Okuryazar
- (b) İlkokul/Ortaokul mezunu
- (c) Lise mezunu

- (d) Üniversite mezunu
- (e) Yüksek Lisans veya Doktora

Babanızın eğitim durumu

- (a) Okuryazar
- (b) İlkokul/Ortaokul mezunu
- (c) Lise mezunu
- (d) Üniversite mezunu
- (e) Yüksek Lisans veya Doktora

Yaşamınızın büyük çoğunluğunu geçirdiğiniz yer:

- (a) Büyükşehir
- (b) İl
- (c) İlçe
- (d) Köy/Kasaba

Yaşadığınız bölge

- (a) Ege Bölgesi
- (b) Marmara Bölgesi
- (c) İç Anadolu Bölgesi
- (d) Akdeniz Bölgesi
- (e) Güneydoğu Anadolu Bölgesi
- (f) Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi

İlişki durumunuz:

- (a) Son 1 senedir ilişkim yok
- (b) Şu anda ilişkim yok ama son 1 sene içinde ilişkim oldu
- (c) Sevgilim var
- (d) Nişanlıyım
- (e) Evliyim

İlişkinizin uzunluğu (Bitmiş ise eski partnerinizle olan ilişkinizin uzunluğu)

- (a) 6 aydan az
- (b) 6 ay- 1 yıl arası
- (c) 1 – 2 yıl arası
- (d) 2 – 3 yıl arası
- (e) 3 – 4 yıl arası
- (f) 4 ve daha fazla

Partneriniz / eski partneriniz bulunduğunuz ilden farklı bir ilde mi yaşamaktadır / yaşamaktaydı?

- (a) Evet
- (b) Hayır

Partnerle / eski partnerinizle beraber yaşama durumunuz:

- (a) Evet, beraber yaşıyoruz / yaşıyorduk
- (b) Hayır, beraber yaşamıyoruz / yaşamıyorduk

Günlük sosyal medya uygulamalarında (İnstagram, Facebook, Twitter vs.) geçirdiğiniz ORTALAMA süre (Aralık şeklinde değil, net bir sayı giriniz.)

Günlük mesajlaşma uygulamalarında (WhatsApp, Telegram, SMS vs.) geçirdiğiniz ORTALAMA süre (Aralık şeklinde değil, net bir sayı giriniz.)

APPENDIX 4 – CYBER DATING ABUSE QUESTIONNAIRE (CDAQ)

Aşağıda siz, partneriniz veya eski partneriniz tarafından, **yeni teknoloji kullanımına ilişkin (İnternet, sosyal ağlar, e-posta, WhatsApp, kısa mesaj, arama gibi mobil uygulamalar)** sergilenebilecek davranışların bir listesi sunulmuştur. Lütfen sizin, partnerinizin ya da eski partnerinizin son 1 yılda bunlardan herhangi birini kaç kez yaptığını işaretleyiniz.

1 = **Hiç:** Bu bizim ilişkimizde hiç olmadı.

2 = **Geçen yıl değil,** ama daha önce bir kere oldu.

3 = **Nadiren:** Bir ya da iki kere oldu.

4 = **Bazen:** 3 ile 10 kere arasında oldu.

5 = **Sık sık:** 11 ile 20 kere arasında oldu.

6= **Genellikle:** 20 kereden fazla oldu.

1. Birlikte olduğum kişi, sosyal medya durum güncellemelerimi kontrol etti.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin sosyal medya durum güncellemelerini kontrol ettim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Birlikte olduğum kişi, bana fiziksel olarak zarar vereceğine dair beni tehdit etmek için yeni teknolojileri kullandı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişiyi, ona fiziksel olarak zarar vereceğime dair tehdit etmek için yeni teknolojileri kullandım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Birlikte olduğum kişi, bana sorun yaratmak için sosyal medyada benim sahte bir profilimi oluşturdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişiye sorun yaratmak için, sosyal medyada onun sahte profilini oluşturdum.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Birlikte olduğum kişi, beni rezil etmek ya da küçük düşürmek için sosyal medyada profilime yorum yazdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Birlikte olduğum kişiyi rezil etmek veya küçük düşürmek için, sosyal medyada profilime yorum yazdım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Birlikte olduğum kişi, mesajlarıma ve/veya kişilerime göz atmak için iznim dışında şifrelerimi (telefon, sosyal medya, e-mail) kullandı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin mesajlarına ve/veya kişilerine göz atmak için izni dışında şifrelerini (telefon, sosyal medya, e-mail) kullandım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Birlikte olduğum kişi, yeni teknolojileri kullanarak, benimle ilgili sırları veya sakıncalı bilgileri yaydı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin sırlarını veya sakıncalı bilgilerini, yeni teknolojileri kullanarak yaydım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Birlikte olduğum kişi, mobil uygulamalara son bağlanma zamanımı kontrol etti.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin, mobil uygulamalara son bağlanma zamanını kontrol ettim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Birlikte olduğum kişi yeni teknolojileri kullanarak, beni, hakkımdaki sırları veya sakıncalı bilgileri yaymakla tehdit etti.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Yeni teknolojileri kullanarak, birlikte olduğum kişiyi, onun sırlarını veya sakıncalı bilgilerini yaymakla tehdit ettim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Birlikte olduğum kişi “ben” gibi davranarak sorun yaratmak için yeni teknolojileri kullandı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi gibi davranarak sorun yaratmak için yeni teknolojileri kullandım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Birlikte olduğum kişi yeni teknolojileri kullanarak, beni aşağılayıcı ve küçük düşürücü mesajlar gönderdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Yeni teknolojileri kullanarak, birlikte olduğum kişiyi aşağılayıcı ve küçük düşürücü mesajlar gönderdim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Birlikte olduğum kişi iznim olmadan, sosyal medya hesaplarımı, WhatsApp’ımı veya e-postamı inceledi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin izni olmadan, onun sosyal medya hesaplarını, WhatsApp’ını veya e-postasını inceledim.	1	2	3	4	5	6

12. Birlikte olduğum kişi bana ait fotoğraf, görüntü, video veya cinsel içeriği iznim olmadan başkalarına gönderdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişiye ait fotoğraf, görüntü, video veya cinsel içeriği onun izni olmadan başkalarına gönderdim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Birlikte olduğum kişi nerede ve kimle olduğumu kontrol etmek için yeni teknolojileri kullandı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin nerede ve kimle olduğunu kontrol etmek için yeni teknolojileri kullandım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Birlikte olduğum kişi onun çağrı ve mesajlarını hemen yanıtlamam için yeni teknolojileri kullanarak beni tehdit etti.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişiyi çağrı ve mesajlarını hemen yanıtlaması için yeni teknolojileri kullanarak tehdit ettim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Birlikte olduğum kişi beni sınamak için, yeni teknolojileri kullanarak başka biriymiş gibi davrandı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişiyi sınamak için yeni teknolojileri kullanarak başka biriymişim gibi davrandım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Birlikte olduğum kişi beni incitmek veya küçük düşürmek amacı ile sosyal medya durum güncellemelerinde bana gönderme yapan müzik, şiir, söz paylaştı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişiyi incitmek veya küçük düşürmek için sosyal medya durum güncellemelerimde ona gönderme yapan müzik, şiir, söz paylaştım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Birlikte olduğum kişi telefonumu iznim dışında kontrol etti.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin telefonunu izni dışında kontrol ettim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Birlikte olduğum kişi alay etmek amacıyla yeni teknolojileri kullanarak hakkımda söylentiler, dedikodu ve şakalar yaydı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi ile alay etmek amacıyla, yeni teknolojileri kullanarak hakkında söylenti, dedikodu ve şakalar yaydım.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Birlikte olduğum kişi nerede ve kiminle olduğumu kontrol etmek için beni telefonla çok fazla aradı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin nerede ve kiminle olduğunu kontrol etmek için onu telefonla çok fazla aradım.	1	2	3	4	5	6

20. Birlikte olduđum kiři sosyal medya hesabımda sahip olduđum arkadař listemi kontrol etti.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduđum kiřinin sosyal medya hesabında sahip olduđu arkadař listesini kontrol ettim.	1	2	3	4	5	6



APPENDIX 5 – EXPERIENCES IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS
SCALE-II (ECR-R)

Aşağıdaki maddeler romantik ilişkilerinizde hissettiğiniz duygularla ilgilidir. Bu araştırmada sizin ilişkinizde yalnızca şu anda değil, genel olarak neler olduğuyla ya da neler yaşadığınızla ilgilenmekteyiz. Maddelerde sözü geçen "birlikte olduğum kişi" ifadesi ile romantik ilişkide bulunduğunuz kişi kastedilmektedir. Eğer hali hazırda bir romantik ilişki içerisinde değilseniz, aşağıdaki maddeleri bir ilişki içinde olduğunuzu varsayarak cevaplandırınız. Her bir maddenin ilişkilerinizdeki duygu ve düşüncelerinizi ne oranda yansıttığını karşılardaki 7 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde, ilgili rakamı işaretleyiniz.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

Hiç

Kararsızım/

Tamamen

Katılmıyorum

Fikrim yok

Katılıyorum

1. Birlikte olduğum kişinin sevgisini kaybetmekten korkarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Gerçekte ne hissettiğimi birlikte olduğum kişiye göstermemeyi tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Sıklıkla, birlikte olduğum kişinin artık benimle olmak istemeyeceği korkusuna kapılırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Özel duygu ve düşüncelerimi birlikte olduğum kişiyle paylaşmak konusunda kendimi rahat hissedirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Sıklıkla, birlikte olduğum kişinin beni gerçekten sevmediği kaygısına kapılırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere güvenip inanmak konusunda kendimi rahat bırakmakta zorlanırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilerin beni, benim onları önemsemediğim kadar önemsemeyeceklerinden endişe duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere yakın olma konusunda çok rahatımdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Sıklıkla, birlikte olduğum kişinin bana duyduğu hislerin benim ona duyduğum hisler kadar güçlü olmasını isterim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere açılma konusunda kendimi rahat hissetmem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. İlişkilerimi kafama çok takarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere fazla yakın olmamayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Benden uzakta olduğunda, birlikte olduğum kişinin başka birine ilgi duyabileceği korkusuna kapılırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişi benimle çok yakın olmak istediğinde rahatsızlık duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere duygularımı gösterdiğimde, onların benim için aynı şeyleri hissetmeyeceğinden korkarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Birlikte olduğum kişiyle kolayca yakınlaşabilirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Birlikte olduğum kişinin beni terk edeceğinden pek endişe duymam.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Birlikte olduğum kişiyle yakınlaşmak bana zor gelmez.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişi kendimden şüphe etmeme neden olur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Genellikle, birlikte olduğum kişiyle sorunlarımı ve kaygılarımı tartışırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Terk edilmekten pek korkmam.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Zor zamanlarımda, romantik ilişkide olduğum kişiden yardım istemek bana iyi gelir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Birlikte olduğum kişinin, bana benim istediğim kadar yakınlaşmak istemediğini düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Birlikte olduğum kişiye hemen hemen her şeyi anlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişiler bazen bana olan duygularını sebepsiz yere değiştirirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Başımdan geçenleri birlikte olduğum kişiyle konuşurum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

27.Çok yakın olma arzumu bazen insanları korkutup uzaklaştırır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Birlikte olduğum kişiler benimle çok yakınlaştığında gergin hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Romantik ilişkide olduğum bir kişi beni yakından tanıdıkça, “gerçek ben” den hoşlanmayacağından korkarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişilere güvenip inanma konusunda rahatımdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. Birlikte olduğum kişiden ihtiyaç duyduğum şefkat ve desteği görememek beni öfkelenendirir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. Romantik ilişkide olduğum kişiye güvenip inanmak benim için kolaydır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. Başka insanlara denk olamamaktan endişe duyarım	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. Birlikte olduğum kişiye şefkat göstermek benim için kolaydır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. Birlikte olduğum kişi beni sadece kızgın olduğumda önemser.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. Birlikte olduğum kişi beni ve ihtiyaçlarımı gerçekten anlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**APPENDIX 6 – INTERPERSONAL EMOTION REGULATION
QUESTIONNAIRE (IERQ)**

Aşağıda bireylerin duygularını düzenlemek için diğer kişilerden nasıl faydalandıklarını belirten ifadeler listesi yer almaktadır. Lütfen her ifadeyi okuyunuz ve sizin için ne kadar uygun olduğunu ölçekteki 1’den (benim için hiç uygun değil) 5’e (benim için tamamen uygun) kadar olan sayılardan birini işaretleyerek belirtiniz. Lütfen bunu her bir ifade için yapınız. Doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

Benim için hiç uygun değil **Biraz uygun** **Orta derecede uygun** **Oldukça uygun** **Son derece uygun**

1. Başkalarının duygularıyla nasıl başa çıktığını öğrenmek daha iyi hissetmemi sağlar.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Başkalarının olayların görüldüğü kadar kötü olmadığını ifade etmesi, depresif duygu durumumla başa çıkmama yardım eder.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Neşemi paylaşmak için hevesli olduğumda diğer insanlarla birlikte olmak hoşuma gider.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Üzgün olduğumda etrafımda bana şefkat sunacak insanlar olsun isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Endişeli olduğumda başka bir kişinin durumun nasıl idare edileceğine dair düşüncelerini duymak bana yardımcı olur.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Sevinçli olduğumda belirli kişilerle birlikte olmak bana iyi hissettirir.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Üzgün olduğumda etrafımdakilerin başka kişilerin daha kötü durumlarda olduğunu hatırlatması bana yardımcı olur.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Olumlu duygular hissettiğimde başka insanlarla birlikte olmayı	1	2	3	4	5

severim çünkü bu olumlu hisleri artırır.					
9. Üzgün hissetmek genellikle bana sempati gösterebilecek kişileri etrafımda aramama sebep olur.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Üzgün olduğumda, başkalarının bana durumun çok daha kötü olabileceğini fark ettirmesi daha iyi hissettirir.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Hayal kırıklığına uğradığımda aynı durumu başkalarının nasıl idare ettiğini görmek bana yardımcı olur.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Üzgün hissettiğimde rahatlamak için çevremde başkalarına ihtiyaç duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Mutluluk bulaşıcı olduğu için, mutlu olduğumda etrafımda başkalarını ararım.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Sinirim bozulduğunda etrafımdakiler endişelenmememi söyleyerek beni sakinleştirebilirler.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Üzgün olduğumda, başkalarının benzer duygularla nasıl başa çıktığını duymak bana yardımcı olur.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Depresif hissettiğimde, sadece sevildiğimi görebilmek için etrafımda diğer insanlara ihtiyaç duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Kaygılı olduğumda, başkalarının bana endişelenmememi söylemesi beni sakinleştirir.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Sevinçli hissettiğimde, başkalarını da mutlu etmek için onlara yönelirim.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Üzgün hissettiğimde, başkalarından teselli beklerim.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Üzgünken, başkaları benim durumumda olsa ne yapardı bilmek isterim.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 7 – DIFFICULTIES IN EMOTION REGULATION SCALE

(DERS-16)

Aşağıdaki ifadelerin size ne sıklıkla uyduğunu, her ifadenin yanında yer alan 5 dereceli ölçek üzerinden değerlendiriniz. Her bir ifadenin altındaki 5 noktalı ölçekten, size uygunluk yüzdesini de dikkate alarak, yalnızca bir tek seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

	Hemen hemen hiç (% 0-%10)	Bazen (%11-%35)	Yaklaşık Yarı yarıya (% 6-% 65)	Çoğu zaman (%66-%90)	Hemen hemen her zaman (%91-%100)
1. Duygularıma bir anlam vermekte zorlanırım.					
2. Ne hissettiğim konusunda karmaşa yaşarım.					
3. Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde işlerimi bitirmekte zorlanırım.					
4. Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde kontrolden çıkarım.					
5. Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde uzun süre böyle kalacağına inanırım.					
6. Kendimi kötü hissetmenin yoğun depresif duyguyla sonuçlanacağına inanırım.					
7. Kendimi kötü hissederken başka şeylere odaklanmakta zorlanırım.					

8. Kendimi kötü hissederken kontrolden çıktığım korkusu yaşarım.					
9. Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde bu duygumdan dolayı kendimden utanırım.					
10. Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde zayıf biri olduğum duygusuna kapılırım.					
11. Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde davranışlarımı kontrol etmekte zorlanırım.					
12. Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde daha iyi hissetmem için yapabileceğim hiçbir şey olmadığına inanırım.					
13. Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde böyle hissettiğim için kendimden rahatsız olurum.					
14. Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde kendimle ilgili olarak çok fazla endişelenmeye başlarım.					
15. Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde başka bir şey düşünmekte zorlanırım.					
16. Kendimi kötü hissettiğimde duygularım dayanılmaz olur.					

APPENDIX 8 – BIG FIVE INVENTORY (BFI-44)

Aşağıda size kısmen tanımlayan (ya da pek tanımlayamayan) birtakım özellikler sunulmaktadır. Örneğin, başkaları ile zaman geçirmekten hoşlanan birisi olduğunuzu düşünüyor musunuz? Lütfen aşağıda verilen özelliklerin sizi ne oranda yansıttığını ya da yansıtmadığını belirtmek için size en iyi tanımlayan seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

1 = Hiç katılmıyorum

2 = Biraz katılmıyorum

3 = Ne katılıyorum ne de katılmıyorum (kararsızım)

4 = Biraz katılıyorum

5 = Tamamen katılıyorum

Kendimibiri olarak görüyorum

- | | |
|--|--|
| ___ 1. Konuşkan | ___ 23. Tembel olma eğiliminde olan |
| ___ 2. Başkalarında hata arayan | ___ 24. Duygusal olarak dengeli,
kolayca keyfi kaçmayan |
| ___ 3. İşini tam yapan | ___ 25. Keşfeden, icat eden |
| ___ 4. Bunalımlı, melankolik | ___ 26. Atılgan bir kişiliğe sahip |
| ___ 5. Orijinal, yeni görüşler ortaya
koyan | ___ 27. Soğuk ve mesafeli olabilen |
| ___ 6. Ketum/vakur | ___ 28. Görevi tamamlanıncaya kadar
sebat edebilen |
| ___ 7. Yardımsever ve çıkarıcı
olmayan | ___ 29. Dakikası dakikasına uymayan |

- ___ 8. Biraz umursamaz
- ___ 9. Rahat, stresle kolay baş eden
- ___ 10. Çok değişik konuları merak eden
- ___ 11. Enerji dolu
- ___ 12. Başkalarıyla sürekli didişen
- ___ 13. Güvenilir bir çalışan
- ___ 14. Gergin olabilen
- ___ 15. Maharetli, derin düşünen
- ___ 16. Heyecan yaratabilen
- ___ 17. Affedici bir yapıya sahip
- ___ 18. Dağınık olma eğiliminde
- ___ 19. Çok endişelenen
- ___ 20. Hayal gücü yüksek
- ___ 21. Sessiz bir yapıda
- ___ 22. Genellikle başkalarına güvenen
- ___ 30. Sanata ve estetik değerlere önem veren
- ___ 31. Bazen utangaç, çekingen olan
- ___ 32. Hemen hemen herkese karşı saygılı ve nazik olan
- ___ 33. İşleri verimli yapan
- ___ 34. Gergin ortamlarda sakin kalabilen
- ___ 35. Rutin işleri yapmayı tercih eden
- ___ 36. Sosyal, girişken
- ___ 37. Bazen başkalarına kaba davranabilen
- ___ 38. Planlar yapan ve bunları takip eden
- ___ 39. Kolayca sinirlenen
- ___ 40. Düşünmeyi seven, fikirler geliştirebilen
- ___ 41. Sanata ilgisi çok az olan
- ___ 42. Başkalarıyla iş birliği yapmayı seven
- ___ 43. Kolaylıkla dikkati dağılan
- ___ 44. Sanat, müzik ve edebiyatta çok bilgili

APPENDIX 9 – THE SCALE PERMISSIONS



Ayşegül Bakır

Alıcı: ben, Melek, Melek

6 Eki 2020 Sal 11:15



Merhaba Sevgili Ceren,

Ölçeği tez çalışmanızda kullanabilirsiniz, kendisi ektedir. Ölçekte bir kesme puanı bulunmamakta olup, her alt boyutta ortalama skorların yükselmesi siber flört istismarı davranışı sergilemenin veya maruz kalmanın arttığına işaret etmektedir. Ölçekteki sorular, hem uygulayan hem de uygulanan için paralel formlar şeklindedir. 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16 ve 18. maddeler Doğrudan Saldırganlık faktörüne ilişkin, 1, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19 ve 20. maddeler İzleme/Kontrol faktörüne ilişkindir. Tez çalışmanızda başarılar.

Saygılarımla,



Gizem Sarısoy

Alıcı: ben

19 Eki 2020 09:21

Merhabalar,

Tabii ki ölçeği kullanabilirsiniz. Ekte ölçeğin makalesini ve ölçeği gönderiyorum. İyi çalışmalar.

Sevgiler



Melike Guzey

Alıcı: ben

5 Eki 2020 Pzt 13:03



Merhaba,

Ölçeği kullanmanızdan memnuniyet duyarız. Ölçek bilgilerine ekteki dosyadan ulaşabilirsiniz. Çalışmanızda kolaylıklar dilerim.

Saygılarımla,

...

Dr. Melike Guzey

Ankara Üniversitesi | Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi | Psikoloji Bölümü



Nebi Sumer

Alıcı: ben

19 Eki 2020 Pzt 14:58

Memnuniyetle kullanabilirsiniz.

Ölçek ve ilgili yayınlar ekte..

İyi çalışmalar

NEBİ SÜMER

ÖĞRETİM ÜYESİ

FACULTY MEMBER

Sabancı Üniversitesi

Üniversite Caddesi No:27

34956 Orta Mahalle, Tuzla – İstanbul

T 0 216 483 93 20

F 0 216 483 92 50

www.sabanciuniv.edu



APPENDIX 10 – SAMPLE RECEIPT

TÜRKİYE İŞ BANKASI A.Ş.				DEKONT	
Büyük Mükellefler V.D.Başkanlığı Vergi Kimlik No 481 005 8590 Ticaret Sicil No:431112 Şirket Merkezi: İstanbul					
Sayın CEREN ÇAKIR					
Hesaba Para Aktarma İşlemi					
İnternet Şubesi İşlem Dekontu					
İşlem Tarihi	İşlem Zamanı	Sıra No	Fiş Sıra No		
05/04/2021	13:38:16	000161	3613 3816		
Gönderen			Alıcı		
İsim CEREN ÇAKIR			GC [REDACTED] ER		
Hesap [REDACTED]			[REDACTED]		
Aktarılan Tutar(TL)	Havale Ücreti(TL) + Vergi		Açıklama		
50.00	0.60		CEREN ÇAKIR - ÇALIŞMA ÇEKİLİŞ KAZANANI (GO**ER WINDOWSLIVE.COM)		
<small>İşbu dekont Bankamız kayıtları çerçevesinde Bankamızca iletildiği halli ile geçerli olup, dekont üzerindeki bilgiler ile Bankamız kayıtlarının uyuşmaması veya Bankamızca gönderilen halli ile farklılık arz etmesi halinde, Bankamız kayıtları esas alınacaktır. Dekontta konu işleme dair iddiaların ispatında banka kayıtları asıldır. Vergi Türkiye'de BSMV, K.K.T.C'de BSV olarak tahsil edilmektedir.</small>					
www.isbank.com.tr - 0 850 724 0 724					

**APPENDIX 11 – DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR CYBER DATING
ABUSE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS**

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max.</i>
Birlikte olduğum kişi, sosyal medya durum güncellemelerimi kontrol etti.	3.16	1.835	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin sosyal medya durum güncellemelerini kontrol ettim.	3.38	1.818	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi, bana fiziksel olarak zarar vereceğine dair beni tehdit etmek için yeni teknolojileri kullandı.	1.10	.467	1	5
Birlikte olduğum kişiyi, ona fiziksel olarak zarar vereceğime dair tehdit etmek için yeni teknolojileri kullandım.	1.04	.321	1	5
Birlikte olduğum kişi, bana sorun yaratmak için sosyal medyada benim sahte bir profilimi oluşturdu.	1.06	.414	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişiye sorun yaratmak için, sosyal medyada onun sahte profilini oluşturdum.	1.02	.231	1	5
Birlikte olduğum kişi, beni rezil etmek ya da küçük düşürmek için sosyal medyada profilime yorum yazdı.	1.04	.315	1	4
Birlikte olduğum kişiyi rezil etmek veya küçük düşürmek için, sosyal medyada profiline yorum yazdım.	1.04	.298	1	5
Birlikte olduğum kişi, mesajlarıma ve/veya kişilerime göz atmak için iznim dışında şifrelerimi (telefon, sosyal medya, e-mail) kullandı.	1.39	.965	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin mesajlarına ve/veya kişilerine göz atmak için izni dışında şifrelerini (telefon, sosyal medya, e-mail) kullandım.	1.44	.913	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi, yeni teknolojileri kullanarak, benimle ilgili sırları veya sakıncalı bilgileri yaydı.	1.06	.414	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin sırlarını veya sakıncalı bilgilerini, yeni teknolojileri kullanarak yaydım.	1.03	.303	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi, mobil uygulamalara son bağlanma zamanımı kontrol etti.	2.44	1.639	1	6

Birlikte olduğum kişinin, mobil uygulamalara son bağlanma zamanını kontrol ettim.	2.59	1.679	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi yeni teknolojileri kullanarak, beni, hakkımdaki sırları veya sakıncalı bilgileri yaymakla tehdit etti.	1.10	.545	1	6
Yeni teknolojileri kullanarak, birlikte olduğum kişiyi, onun sırlarını veya sakıncalı bilgilerini yaymakla tehdit ettim.	1.03	.317	1	5
Birlikte olduğum kişi “ben” gibi davranarak sorun yaratmak için yeni teknolojileri kullandı.	1.07	.418	1	5
Birlikte olduğum kişi gibi davranarak sorun yaratmak için yeni teknolojileri kullandım.	1.05	.383	1	5
Birlikte olduğum kişi yeni teknolojileri kullanarak, beni aşağılayıcı ve küçük düşürücü mesajlar gönderdi.	1.35	1,003	1	6
Yeni teknolojileri kullanarak, birlikte olduğum kişiyi aşağılayıcı ve küçük düşürücü mesajlar gönderdim.	1.24	.750	1	5
Birlikte olduğum kişi iznim olmadan, sosyal medya hesaplarımı, WhatsApp’ımı veya e-postamı inceledi.	1.54	1,129	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin izni olmadan, onun sosyal medya hesaplarımı, WhatsApp’ını veya e-postasını inceledim.	1.62	1,128	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi bana ait fotoğraf, görüntü, video veya cinsel içeriği iznim olmadan başkalarına gönderdi.	1.08	.450	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişiye ait fotoğraf, görüntü, video veya cinsel içeriği onun izni olmadan başkalarına gönderdim.	1.10	.505	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi nerede ve kimle olduğumu kontrol etmek için yeni teknolojileri kullandı.	1.81	1.401	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin nerede ve kimle olduğunu kontrol etmek için yeni teknolojileri kullandım.	1.76	1.278	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi onun çağrı ve mesajlarını hemen yanıtlamam için yeni teknolojileri kullanarak beni tehdit etti.	1.34	1.020	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişiyi çağrı ve mesajlarımı hemen yanıtlaması için yeni teknolojileri kullanarak tehdit ettim.	1.17	.658	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi beni sınamak için, yeni teknolojileri kullanarak başka biriymiş gibi davrandı.	1.16	.640	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişiyi sınamak için yeni teknolojileri kullanarak başka biriymişim gibi davrandım.	1.11	.496	1	6

Birlikte olduğum kişi beni incitmek veya küçük düşürmek amacı ile sosyal medya durum güncellemelerinde bana gönderme yapan müzik, şiir, söz paylaştı.	1.44	1.004	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişiyi incitmek veya küçük düşürmek için sosyal medya durum güncellemelerimde ona gönderme yapan müzik, şiir, söz paylaştım.	1.45	.996	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi telefonumu iznim dışında kontrol etti.	1.62	1.235	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin telefonunu izni dışında kontrol ettim.	1.67	1.154	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi alay etmek amacıyla yeni teknolojileri kullanarak hakkımda söylentiler, dedikodu ve şakalar yaydı.	1,12	.646	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi ile alay etmek amacıyla, yeni teknolojileri kullanarak hakkında söylenti, dedikodu ve şakalar yaydım.	1.05	.361	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi nerede ve kiminle olduğumu kontrol etmek için beni telefonla çok fazla aradı.	1.86	1.415	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin nerede ve kiminle olduğunu kontrol etmek için onu telefonla çok fazla aradım.	1.73	1.176	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişi sosyal medya hesabımda sahip olduğum arkadaş listemi kontrol etti.	2.60	1.680	1	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin sosyal medya hesabında sahip olduğu arkadaş listesini kontrol ettim.	2.65	1.573	1	6