



YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

MASTER'S PROGRAM IN GUIDANCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL COUNSELING

PREDICTIVE ROLES OF ATTACHMENT STYLES AND GENDER ROLES

ATTITUDES ON CYBER DATING ABUSE OF INDIVIDUALS

İLSU PAŞAALİOĞLU

FEBRUARY, 2022

PREDICTIVE ROLES OF ATTACHMENT STYLES AND GENDER ROLES
ATTITUDES ON CYBER DATING ABUSE OF INDIVIDUALS

BY

İLSU PAŞAALIOĞLU

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER IN DEPARTMENT OF
GUIDANCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL COUNSELING

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY

FEBRUARY, 2022

TEZ TESLİM ve ONAY TUTANAĐI

TEZ BAŐLIĐI: PREDICTIVE ROLES OF ATTACHMENT STYLES AND
GENDER ROLES ATTITUDES ON CYBER DATING ABUSE OF INDIVIDUALS

ONAYLAR:

Prof. Dr. Nilüfer Şehriban ÖZABACI

(Tez Danışmanı)

Prof. Dr. Baki DUY

(Üye)

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi. Serdar KÖRÜK

(Üye)

TESLİM EDEN

: İLSU PAŐAALİOĐLU

TEZ SAVUNMA TARİHİ

: 20.01.2022

TEZİN ENSTİTÜYE TESLİM TARİHİ

: 21.02.2022

PLAGIARISM

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and rules that are not original to this work.

Date: 20.01.2022

Name/Surname: **İlsu PAŞAALİOĞLU**



ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to investigate the predictive roles of attachment styles and gender roles attitudes on cyber dating abuse of individuals. This research is a correlational design for finding causes of events or phenomena. The sample of the study was composed of 503 people (276 female, 227 male). The data was obtained from the participants via Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire Relationship Scales Questionnaire Gender Role Attitudes Scale. Independent samples t-test and one-way analysis of variance were used to assess the differences among individuals' cyber dating abuse exposure and tendency levels in terms of seven demographic variables: gender, age, education level, socio-economic level, duration of the romantic relationship, type of the romantic relationship and average time spent online. In the primary analyses of the study, Pearson correlation analysis was used to examine the correlations among the variables. Then, the multiple regression analysis was employed to determine the predictive roles of the main variables.

According to the findings of the research, it has been determined that individuals' cyber dating abuse exposure and tendency levels differ according to individuals' gender, education level, income level, type of romantic relationship initiation, duration of romantic relationship and average time spent online. There is a moderately significant negative relationship between gender roles attitudes and all sub-dimensions of cyber dating abuse. There is a significant relationship between all sub-dimensions of attachment styles and all sub-dimensions of cyber dating abuse. This relationship is positive for fearful and preoccupied attachment styles and negative for secure and dismissing attachment styles. In addition, Gender Roles Attitudes and *Secure Attachment Style* negatively predicts all cyber dating abuse

dimensions. *Preoccupied Attachment Style* positively predicts all cyber dating abuse dimensions. *Fearful Attachment Style* positively predicts Direct Aggression Exposure and Monitoring/Control Exposure dimensions.

Keywords: *dating violence, cyber dating abuse, gender roles attitudes, attachment styles*



ÖZET

Bu araştırma, bireylerin bağlanma tarzlarının ve toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri tutumlarının siber flört istismarı üzerindeki yordayıcı rollerinin araştırılması amacıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu araştırma, olayların ya da olguların nedenlerini bulmaya yönelik ilişkisel (correlational) modele dayalı bir çalışmadır. Araştırmanın katılımcıları 276 kadın ve 227 erkek olmak üzere 503 kişiden oluşmaktadır. Araştırma verileri Siber Flört İstismarı Ölçeği, İlişki Ölçekleri Anketi, Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerini Tutum Ölçeği ve araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan Demografik Bilgi Formu aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Bireylerin siber flört istismarına maruz kalma ve eğilim düzeylerinin cinsiyet, eğitim düzeyi, gelir düzeyi, ortalama ilişki süresi, romantik ilişkiye başlama türü ve internette geçirilen süre değişkenlerine göre anlamlı farklılık gösterip göstermediğinin belirlenmesinde ilişkisiz örneklem t-testi ve tek faktörlü varyans analizi (ANOVA) kullanılmıştır. Ayrıca, araştırma değişkenleri arasındaki korelasyonların belirlenmesi için Pearson korelasyon analizi; ana değişkenlerin yordayıcı rollerini belirlemek için çoklu regresyon analizi yapılmıştır.

Araştırma bulgularına göre bireylerin siber flört istismarına maruz kalma ve eğilim düzeylerinin bireylerin cinsiyetine, eğitim düzeyine, gelir düzeyine, romantik ilişkiye başlama türüne, romantik ilişki süresine ve internette geçirdikleri ortalama süreye göre farklılık gösterdiği belirlenmiştir. Toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri tutumları ve siber flört istismarının tüm alt boyutları arasında orta düzeyde negatif yönde anlamlı ilişkiler olduğu; bağlanma stillerinin tüm alt boyutları ve siber flört istismarının tüm alt boyutları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu; bu ilişkinin korkulu ve saplantılı bağlanma için pozitif, güvenli ve kayıtsız bağlanma için negatif olduğu bulunmuştur. Ayrıca, Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerini Tutumları ve Güvenli Bağlanma Tarzı, tüm siber flört istismarı alt boyutlarını negatif yönde yordamaktadır. Saplantılı Bağlanma Tarzı

tüm siber flört istismarı alt boyutlarını pozitif yönde yordamaktadır. Korkulu Bağlanma Tarzı Doğrudan Saldırganlığa Maruz Kalma ve İzleme/Kontrol alt boyutlarını pozitif yönde yordamaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler; *flört şiddeti, siber flört istismarı , toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri tutumları, bağlanma stilleri*



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to declare my most sincere thanks to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Nilüfer ÖZABACI. She was such a patient and an experienced guide in every sense, who always supported me during my thesis, guided me with her knowledge and experience. She is an excellent person with her academic career and polite attitudes.

I would like to thank my very valuable teacher Prof Dr. Baki Duy, who enlightened me with his endless knowledge in my thesis jury, and I am also grateful to my teacher Assoc. Prof. Serdar Körük, who supported me in every problem during thesis process and did not leave me alone with his communication.

In addition, I would like to thank my husband, Orhan PAŞAALIOĞLU. He always supports me when I feel down and exhausted. I sometimes thought of leaving my master's degree. If I came to complete this thesis today, it is because of my husband's continuous support.

My deepest and sincerest thanks go to my beloved family. Meral ŞEN and Yıldırım ŞEN always provide every condition for my success and happiness. They have always been by my side, materially and spiritually, and strived for me to live in the best conditions.

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACT	Error! Bookmark not defined.
ÖZET.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
TABLE OF CONTENT	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose of Study.....	7
1.3 Assumptions	7
1.4 Limitations	8
1.5 Definitions.....	8
1.6 Abbreviations	9
1.7 Importance of the Research.....	9
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	12
2.1 Violence Concept and Definition	13
2.2 Dating Violence.....	14
2.2.1 Types of Dating Violence	17
2.2.1.1 Physical Dating Violence	17
2.2.1.2 Psychological/Emotional Dating Violence	18
2.2.1.3 Sexual Dating Violence	20
2.2.1.4 Economic Dating Violence	21
2.2.1.5 Cyber Dating Abuse / Violence	22
2.2.2 Risk Factors of Dating Violence	26
2.2.3 Effects of Dating Violence	29
2.2.4.Theoretical Background of Dating Violence	30
2.3.4.1 Social Learning Theory.....	30
2.3.4.2 Feminist Theory.....	31
2.3.4.3 Power Theory	33
2.3.4.4 Attachment Theory	34
2.2.5 Attachment and Dating Violence	36
2.2.6 Gender Roles and Dating Violence	39
2.2.7 Foreign studies about cyber dating abuse.....	41
2.2.8 Domestic studies about cyber dating abuse	46
2.2.9 Foreign studies about gender roles attituted and dating violence	46

2.2.10 Domestic studies about gender roles attitudes and dating violence	49
2.2.11 Foreign studies about attachment styles and dating violence	52
2.2.12 Domestic studies about attachment styles and dating violence	55
3. METHOD	57
3.1 Model of Study	57
3.2 Participants	58
3.3 Instruments	59
3.4 Data Collection Process	62
3.5 Data Analyses	63
4. FINDINGS.....	63
4.1 Descriptive Statistics.....	63
4.2 Demographic Variables.....	65
4.2.1 Is there a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure level in terms of gender variables?.....	65
4.2.2 Is there a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure level in terms of education level variable?	66
4.2.3 Is there a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure level in terms of income level variable?	69
4.2.4 Is there a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure level regarding the type of romantic relationship initiation?	71
4.2.5 Is there a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure level in terms of duration of romantic relationship variable?.....	73
4.2.6 Is there a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure level in terms of average time spent online variable?	75
4.3 Correlations	77
4.4 Multiple Regression Analyses Results on the Predictors of Cyber Dating Abuse...	79
5. RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS	83
5.1 Results.....	84
5.2 Discussion	87
5.2.1 There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of gender variable	87
5.2.2 There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of education level variable	88
5.2.3 There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of income level variable.....	89

5.2.4 There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of the type of romantic relationship initiation variable	90
5.2.5 There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of duration of romantic relationship variable	92
5.2.6 There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of average time spent online variable	93
5.2.7 There is a meaningful relationship between attachment styles and cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels of individuals	94
5.2.8 There is a meaningful relationship between gender roles attitudes and cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure level of individuals	95
5.2.9 There is a meaningful relationship between gender roles attitudes and attachment styles of individuals	97
5.2.10 Gender roles attitudes predict on cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels of individuals	98
5.2.11 Attachment styles predict on cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels of individuals	99
5.3 SUGGESTIONS.....	99
5.3.1 Suggestions for researchers	99
5.3.2 Suggestions for mental health professionals.....	100
REFERENCES.....	101
APPENDICES.....	136
Appendix-1: Demographic Information Form	136
Appendix-2: Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CDAQ)	137
Appendix-3: Gender Roles Attitudes Scale (GRAS).....	138
Appendix-4: Relationship Scales Questionnaire (RSQ)	138
Appendix-5: Permissions	139

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. Characteristics of the Participants.....	58
Table 4.1. Descriptive Statistics	64
Table 4.2. T-Test Findings to Gender.....	65
Table 4.3. ANOVA Findings to Education Level.....	66
Table 4.4. Tukey Post Hoc Result of Education Level	67
Table 4.5. ANOVA Findings to Income Level	69
Table 4.6. Tukey Post Hoc Results of Education Level	70
Table 4.7. ANOVA Findings to Type of Relationship Initiation.....	71
Table 4.8. Tukey Post Hoc Results of Type of Relationship Initiation.....	72
Table 4.9. ANOVA Findings to Duration of Romantic Relationship	73
Table 4.10. Tukey Post Hoc Results of Duration of Romantic Relationship	74
Table 4.11. ANOVA Findings to Average Time Spent Online	75
Table 4.12. Tukey Post Hoc Results of Average Time Spent Online	76
Table 4.13. Pearson's Correlations Among Variables	77
Table 4.14 Multiple Regression Analysis For Direct Aggression Exposure.	79
Table 4.15. Multiple Regression Analysis For Monitoring/Control Exposure.....	80
Table 4.16. Multiple Regression Analysis For Direct Aggression Tendency	81
Table 4.17. Multiple Regression Analysis For Monitoring/Control Tendency	83

1. INTRODUCTION

Intimacy is a fundamental element of interpersonal relationships. Establishing intimacy is imperative for most individuals, and it is the basis of physical and mental health (Moss & Schweber, 1993). Sullivan (1953) claims that different interpersonal needs cause intimacy. People need other individuals and are intensely involved in close relationships, so intimacy is essential for human life. Regan (2011) noted that nearly all human behavior and development dimensions are part of relationships with other people, and relationships significantly affect human health. People have a romantic relationship to meet intimacy and coexist with others throughout their lives. Romantic relationships provide satisfaction and happiness to people. It differs from other social relationships, including love and passion, directing energy to a single attachment object, and seeking love and trust (Rotenberg et al., 2001). Additionally, it has many features like openness, honesty, warmth, protection, dedication, and loyalty (Rubenstein & Shaver, 1982).

Romantic relationships are common in the young adulthood period. The individual tends to establish closeness with other people as a task of the developmental period in young adulthood. At the same time, the individual's commitment to his family decreases, his loyalty to his friends and romantic partner increases (Seifert & Hoffnung, 1997). People spend time and do activities together until they get married to their partners, and they finalize their relationships as termination or formal continuation. Before marriage, this process is called dating (Straus, 2004). They make the right partner choice, have sexual experience, and meet specific emotional needs in the dating process. It starts in adolescence and continues until the later stages of life (Skipper & Nass, 1966). The formation and maintenance of romantic relationships are critical during this period, and young adults have

different experiences to discover the person they will marry (Fincham & Cui, 2011). So, the quality of the romantic relationship with an intimate partner has an important place in an individual's life. When a romantic relationship is healthy and functional, it contributes to physical and emotional well-being. People with satisfying relationships report that they are happier and healthier, who do not have a fulfilling relationship have a higher risk of developing emotional problems such as depression (Hendrick, 2009).

Couples may occasionally experience incompatibility and relational problems in their romantic relationships. These problems sometimes threaten the existence of individuals and affect their mental and physical health. According to Kernberg (1995), love includes both normality and pathology. A warm and romantic relationship experienced at the beginning by partners turns into a tiring process for couples that includes jealousy and complex crises. Unfortunately, these conflicts can sometimes end with violence and inevitable destructive consequences. While violence is characterized by psychological, physical, sexual, and economic harm or suffering, dating violence is a subtype of violence among unmarried people (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989). Violence is observed in married couples and can also be seen among couples dating. This concept has emerged since the 1980s as the most common type of violence, and it threatens the life safety of individuals. Every individual may be exposed to dating violence regardless of religion, language, race, and age (Polat, 2016). It also has many adverse effects, such as increasing mental illness, causing eating disorders, increasing substance use, and reducing success in business and social life (Baldan & Akış, 2017). New technologies have moved to a different context among young people worldwide.

Childhood attachment is directly related to mutual interactions and experiences with romantic partners, and there is a reciprocal interaction between attachment styles and dating violence (Slootmaeckers & Migerode, 2018). Bowlby was the first psychiatrist to explain the strong relationship between mother and baby, and he called a baby's relationship with its mother is "attachment." This bond is established with the primary caregiver (Bowlby, 1973). The bond between mother and baby serves the baby's survival, who cannot sustain his own life. When the baby moves away from the mother, he can face many dangers, so attachment is vital for the baby's emotional and physical safety (Ainsworth, 1989). The basis of the bonding between mother and baby is the mother's sensitivity to the baby's needs. Whether the attachment figure is psychologically and physiologically accessible is essential in determining the attachment style. Failure to meet the baby's need for love and care causes the baby's expectation to be unfulfilled and creates anxiety in similar situations (Bowlby, 1977). The infant's inability to survive and the need for caregiving from an adult are the basis of attachment theory. For this reason, the baby needs to increase the sense of security and maintain this safety in case of stress experiences. The attachment figure calms and soothes the baby in a stressful situation (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). In summary, if the attachment figure gives appropriate responses and is accessible and supported adequately, continue their healthy development and seek adult help when needed. However, if the caregiver does not meet the baby's needs, feelings of anxiety and anger restrict their contact with the environment (Ainsworth, 1989). Attachment plays an active role in the formation of individuals' basic beliefs about life and affects individuals' perceptions and future relationships. It starts with the mother, the first caregiver in the individual's life, and later develops romantic relationships (Levy & Johnson, 2018). Hazan and Shaver (1987) said that behavior patterns observed in

childhood are also observed in romantic relationships. Colin (1996) stated that attachment plays a vital role in partner relationships. It has been observed that individuals who develop secure attachment adapt to their peers and are more successful in their relationships with their partners. On the other hand, it was observed that individuals who could not develop secure attachment were dependent on their relationships and had negative behavioral patterns. Farr (2000) states that there is a significant relationship between dating violence and attachment styles because individuals with insecure attachment styles may find themselves in dysfunctional, violent behaviors. The dating violence that individuals have been exposed to or showed in their past relationships affects their future relationships and attachment styles; likewise, individuals' attachment styles also affect the quality of their dating relationships and may lead to dating violence. For this reason, which attachment style individuals have can be very important in dating violence.

One notable theory-based risk factor that has been associated with adolescent and adult partner violence is gender role attitudes. Gender role attitudes refer to an individual's beliefs about appropriate role-related behaviors for men and women (McHugh and Frieze, 1997). Social Role Theory (Eagly, 1987) argues that people adopt gender role attitudes based on their observations of the behavior of men and women. These attitudes are classified as traditional and egalitarian. Traditional attitudes include the beliefs that men have the final say in decision-making, and they are heads of households while women are responsible for home and children. While society assigns dominant, insensitive, and aggressive roles to men, women have been attributed to being elegant, calm, and dignified (Heimer & De Coster, 1999). People behave according to the roles their culture attributes to masculinity and femininity. So, gender roles differ with time and place (Bhasin, 2003). Stith, Smith, Penn & Ward

(2004) found that traditional gender role attitudes are associated with male partner violence perpetration. Lichter and McCloskey (2004) investigated the relationships between traditional gender role attitudes, acceptance of dating violence, and aggressive behavior in a dating relationship. More strict attitudes toward dating violence were related to the likelihood of both dating violence perpetration and victimization (Ali, Swahn, & Hamburger, 2011). Moreover, although there are essential debates remain regarding gender disparities in teen dating violence prevalence rates, many authors underline the necessity to study this issue through a gender because girls are more likely to report injuries, fear, and posttraumatic stress symptoms as a result of dating violence and to be victims of sexual dating violence (Hamby & Turner, 2013; Hebert, Blais, & Lavoie, 2017). Also, changing gender role attitudes are the target for several adolescent dating violence programs, and it shows that investigating gender roles is an essential factor in preventing dating violence (Foshee, 1996).

Dating violence is a multifaceted concept that is also affected by many factors. Gender is a concept that has been proven to be associated with dating violence. In the United States, a woman is beaten every 15 seconds, and a woman is raped or killed by her partner every 6 minutes. Women are more likely to be killed by their male partners than other violent deaths (Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999). Also, when the psychological violence is examined, women show more psychological aggression than men (Hines & Saudino, 2003). When dating violence is examined in terms of education level, university students are more exposed to and practice dating violence. This is because college students spend more time on romantic relationships. This situation creates the basis for dating violence (Foshee, Linder MacDougall & Bangdiwala, 2001). Furthermore, socioeconomic level is a factor that triggers dating

violence. Low socio-economic power was found to be associated with the perpetrator of violence, especially by men (Spriggs et al., 2009). The duration of romantic relationship is also one of the factors affecting dating violence. According to Samios and O'Leary (1987), men show more violent behavior as the duration of the romantic relationship lasts. Therefore, it is valuable and necessary to investigate the relationship between many demographic variables and dating violence.

Violence has been present throughout human history, but the rise of violence's technological and bureaucratic nature has made contemporary violence quite different from the past (Collins, 1975). Electronic technologies such as mobile phones and social networks, a new theme in the literature, have facilitated the abuse of such violent behavior, especially psychological violence. Today, reaching information and receiving news about partners becomes easier (Brown & Hegarty, 2018). Technology is frequently used to track, disturb and argue with partners (Southworth et al., 2007). The increase in the control needs of the couples and the availability cause different pathologies in the relationships. (Morahan-Martin & Schumacher, 2000). Baker and Carreno (2016) investigated how adolescents frequently use technology to abuse dating partners, and they found that adolescents use technology often to reach these purposes. The digital dimension of dating violence, called cyber dating abuse, is closely related to other forms of violence (Zweig, Dank, Yahner & Lachman, 2013). Control, threats, and humiliation are common points of dating violence and cyber dating abuse, but cyber dating abuse involves technologically harassing and threatening the partner compared to dating violence (Borrajó, Gámez-Guadix, & Calvete, 2015). Cheyne and Guggisberg (2018) define cyber dating violence as an online form of intimate partner violence. For this reason, this research related to cyber dating abuse will help to define violence more comprehensively and to understand its

causes better. Especially when looking at domestic studies, although there are some studies on dating violence, studies on cyber dating abuse are very limited. This research was conducted to examine the concept of cyber dating abuse more widely and shed light on future research due to the lack of research about this topic. On the other hand, the concepts of attachment and gender roles attitudes have been proven to affect people's feelings, thoughts, and behaviors. Also, these concepts are effective in predicting dating violence. For this reason, this research will contribute to the expansion of the literature.

1.1. Purpose of the Study

1. The primary purpose of this study was to examine the predictive role of attachment styles and gender role attitudes on cyber dating abuse of individuals. The research questions of the study: Is there a significant difference between cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure scores levels in terms of (a) gender, (b) education level, (c) income level, (d) type of relationship initiation (internet, face to face, etc.), (e) duration of the relationship, and (f) average time spent online?
2. Is there a significant relationship between cyber dating abuse tendency, exposure, attachment styles, and gender roles attitudes?
3. Do gender roles attitudes predict cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels significantly?
4. Do attachment styles predict cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels significantly?

1.2. Assumptions

1. The scales used in the study (Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire, Relationship Scales Questionnaire, Gender Role Attitudes Scale) are valid and reliable.

2. It is assumed that people participating in the research answered the questions sincerely and impartially.
3. It is assumed that the selected sample for the research is sufficient to represent the universe.

1.3. Limitations

1. Cyber dating abuse is newly researched subject so there are limited studies on this concept.
2. This research is limited to young adults whom the researcher reached.
3. This research is limited to the qualities measured by the Cyber Dating Abuse Scale, Gender Role Attitudes Scale, and Relationship Scales Questionnaire

1.4. Definitions

Dating violence: Words, gestures, and behaviors containing painful or hurtful physical or psychological forces and threats against the partner in the dating relationship (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989).

Cyberdating abuse: Cyberdating abuse which is the sub-dimension of dating abuse, is controlling, disturbing, and following of partners each other through social media or technology (Zweig, Dank, Yahner & Lachman, 2014).

Attachment: It is the bond that develops with caregivers in the first years of individuals and determines the quality of their interpersonal relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1994).

Gender roles: The concept of gender roles is society's roles and responsibilities to the individual as male and female (Lindsey, 1990).

1.5. Abbreviations

RSQ: Relationship Scales Questionnaire

GRAS: Gender Role Attitudes Scale

CDAQ: Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire

WHO: World Health Organization

TDK: Turkish Language Association

1.6. Importance of Research

Violence means the act of physical intention or perceived intention to hurt a person (Gelles & Straus, 1990). To threaten other people and physically harm them or try to harm is also called violence (Reiss & Roth, 1993). World Health Organization (WHO) defined “violence” as deliberate behaviors that aim to enforce power over oneself, others, or a community by threatening or enforcing, and harm, death, or maltreatment are some results of violence (as cited in Rutherford et al., 2007).

According to data obtained by World Health Organization (2002), 1.6 million people die each year because of violence.

Dating violence is the sub-dimension of violence that has been the subject of nearly 20 years of research, and it is often observed among young adults and adolescents (Makepeace, 1981). According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2008) data, approximately 25% of young people are exposed to physical, sexual, and psychological dating violence every year. Dating violence tends to peak in young adolescence, triggering the risk of revictimization in future romantic relationships. So, young adults are at risk for dating violence (Cui et al., 2013). Dating violence will likely violence will evolve into domestic violence in the later stages. It

is essential to investigate dating violence to examine better individuals' violence patterns (Akın & Subaşı, 2003).

Another channel through which dating violence manifests itself is technology. Dating violence is transferred to a new context via technology and social media. This context can increase the use of psychological violence because it is more comfortable to control and pressure. Using the internet, social media and technological tools have been prevalent among young people. If the partners are not together, they own and suppress each other thanks to technology. It provides an opportunity for couples to humiliate, intimidate and watch each other (Spitzberg & Hoobler, 2002). Zweig, Lachman, Yahner, and Dank (2014) defined cyber dating abuse as "control, harassment, stalking, and abuse of one's dating partner via technology and social media." As a result of dating violence, various psychological symptoms, mood swings, and suicide behaviors have been observed. Also, these people are more prone to substance use and risky sex behaviors (Dick et al., 2014). Although there are many sources in foreign studies, one thesis is written about cyber dating abuse in domestic research (Bakır, 2019). The researcher examined the relationship of cyber dating violence with body perception and self-esteem. The author of this thesis has also adopted the Cyber Dating Abuse Scale into Turkish in 2019. This thesis, my only source in domestic studies, shows a shortcoming in the literature on this subject.

Individuals' attachment styles affect people's behavior patterns in dating relationships and perceptions about their relationships. Individuals whose needs were not responded well enough by their mothers develop insecure attachment patterns leading to unhealthy relationships. So, individuals' romantic relationship experiences are affected by childhood attachment experiences (Fraley et al., 2000). According to Ménard and Pincus (2012), university female students with insecure attachment styles

follow their partners using electronic communication tools. In addition, the anxious attachment style predicts cyber abuse in partner relationships (Strawhun et al., 2013). In our country, Turan (2018) found that avoidant attachment style is a significant predictor of violence dimension of dating violence and anxious attachment style significantly predicted abuse and control dimensions. Ayhan (2020) investigated the relationship between secure attachment and attitudes toward dating violence. She found that participants' secure attachment scores to parents increased attitudes towards dating violence decreased. In addition, Öztürk (2021) found a significant relationship between dating violence and attachment styles. However, studies examining the relationship between attachment styles and dating violence on Internet are insufficient because cyber dating abuse is a relatively new concept in the literature.

While cyber dating abuse can be seen in almost every culture, gender roles are one of the most important reasons for this situation. Martínez-Pecino & Durán (2019) noted that men with high levels of traditional gender role attitudes used more cyber abuse in their romantic relationships. It has been observed that men who have conventional gender beliefs show more sexual oppression and aggression. Reed et al., (2018) also found that boys expressed more significant endorsement of stereotypical gender and dating beliefs. Stereotypical beliefs affect dating abuse victimization and perpetration.

There are also many demographic variables that affect cyber dating abuse. Menard and Pincus (2012) studied relationship between cyberstalking and gender. According to results, men' scores are significantly higher than women. Age is another variable that affects cyber dating violence. Borrajo et al. (2015) investigated prevalence of cyber dating violence on university students. Half of the participants are

victims of cyber dating abuse. Furthermore, Bakır (2019) found that application of cyber dating abuse and exposure to cyber dating abuse vary according to gender, romantic relationship status, and time spent on the internet. The relationship between relationship duration and cyber dating abuse was also examined. Schnurr, Mahatmya, and Basche (2013) determined a relationship between the increase in duration of romantic relationship and cyber-aggression tendency. When studies are examined, it has been determined that there are many demographic variables that affect cyber dating abuse. Examining the research in terms of demographic variables will enrich the study.

This study is essential in investigating the predictive effects of gender roles attitudes, and attachment styles in explaining the extent of dating violence applied and exposed over the Internet. Current studies do not examine the online dimension of dating violence. In addition, this research examines the online dimension of dating violence in terms of many demographic variables. This presents a wide range of research to researchers and practitioners. Finally, individuals can develop preventive attitudes to avoid exposure to cyber dating abuse in their romantic relationships thanks to this research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, the theoretical framework of the research is explained, and studies in the literature have been examined. Firstly violence, dating violence, cyber dating abuse, attachment, and gender role issues are presented, domestic and foreign research on the same problems are described.

2.1. Violence Concept and Definitions

Violence has been a popular research topic for the last few years. While violence has different types, causes, and definitions, it happens at the interpersonal, collective, and global levels. It is a problem for all human relations. For this reason, it should be thought of as a human rights problem because it increases the quality of life of all people regardless of religion, language, race (Eisler, 1995). Violence is the behavior that threatens people's bodily and existential integrity and damages their cultural and symbolic values in mutual relationships (Michaud, 1991). Violence is a part of human life experiences since humanity uses physical and psychological force against another person to harm (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi & Lozano, 2002). It is also discussed using force by people who disagree (TDK, 2018). The World Health Organization (2002) defines violence as "the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either result in or have a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation." WHO categorizes violence into three groups: self-violence, interpersonal violence, and collective violence. In addition, there are four groups when considering the nature of violence. These are physical, emotional, sexual violence, and neglect. Furthermore, Ünsal (1996) discussed violence in two categories as "private violence" and "collective violence." The suicidal behavior of an individual is an example of private violence. Collective violence includes social events such as terrorist acts, wars, dictatorial regimes. In summary, a definition of violence is a relative concept. There are subjective definitions of violence that include opinions of women who experience violence, men who perpetrate violence, and researchers who evaluate the information provided by concerned individuals (Dobash & Dobash,

1998). So, violence is a complex and multidimensional concept. Dating violence is also a newly used form of violence as a definition.

2.2. Dating Violence

Before explaining the concept of dating violence, it is necessary to understand the meaning of dating. Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) defined the dating process as a mutual communication in which two people make each other happy. This process increases or decreases the possibility of continuing the relationship with the same person in the future. It is also defined as a process of mutual sharing and doing social activities before severe stages of the relationship, such as getting engaged or married (Straus, 2004). It describes an emotional and behavioral developmental process that each individual experiences or hopes to live in a certain period of life. In its most general and current definition, dating is the whole of stages involving friendship, love, and sexuality. In this process, partners know each other and determine their harmony (Hortaçsu, 2003). Most definitions of dating relationships refer to heterosexual couples. In this study, the definition made by Harned (2002) is accepted because the relationship of homosexual individuals is accepted as dating, and it includes all the dating behaviors that occur mutually between two people. Dating occurs in an individual's life due to psychological and social needs. According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, dating corresponds to the person's need for love and belonging. The need for love is the most critical need for a person who successfully meets the physical and safety needs (Passer & Smith, 2011). It is known that the dating relationship is mainly experienced in the youth period. Relationship experiences in this period are essential for reaching adulthood and gaining emotional maturity. Dating has a supportive role in adolescents' physical and psychological development. It has been demonstrated that individuals with a passionate relationship are more

approved by their environment and have better social skills (Furma, Low & Ho, 2009). On the other hand, violence in dating relationships during adolescence is a significant health problem, and it causes negative psychological consequences for people exposed to violence (Baldan & Akış, 2017).

Conflict is an essential part of human relationships. However, individuals may resort to violence to solve their problems in romantic relationships. Dating violence is the psychological, physical, or sexual assault of an individual in romantic relationships, regardless of male or female. While pushing, slapping, hitting are evaluated physically, behaviors such as offended, jealousy, and following are reviewed in the psychological dimension (Yumuşak, 2013). According to Makepeace, who is the first user of the concept of dating violence (1981), interpersonal violence is not limited to domestic violence to which women are exposed often. Dating violence is another dimension of violence that individuals initiate or are exposed to before marriage. In an old study by Sugarman and Hotaling (1989), dating violence refers to using physical or psychological force to injure or inflict pain on another person. Violence and abuse in romantic relationships consist of negative behaviors that cause physical harm fear, and restricting the person's freedom. While physical and psychological violence are dimensions that require extreme attention, dating violence is not formed by just physical and psychological dimensions. Sexual, dating violence, which includes harassment attempts, involuntary forced sexual intercourse; abortion is another sub-dimension (APA, 2002). In addition, economic dating violence which means restricting freedom economically, and cyber violence, which means threatening behaviors with electronic devices, are considered within the scope of dating violence (Polat, 2016). In the context of psychological dating violence, the use of electronic technologies such as mobile phones and social networks facilitated abuse

(Draucker & Martsolf, 2010). Dating violence which has become an essential problem of daily life with the spread of media and communication tools is a serious risk factor for the health and well-being of the individual. According to the research, it is stated that 20-40% of women are exposed to physical and sexual dating violence, and up to 90% of women are exposed to psychological violence (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Furthermore, 1 in 4 men is exposed to dating violence during their lifetime (Black, Basile, Breiding, Smith, Walters & Merrick, 2011). For this reason, it is an important problem in the world, regardless of society, culture, and country (Ellsberg, Arango, Morton, Gennari, Kiplesund & Contreras, 2015). Individuals usually describe their partner's restrictive and jealous behaviors like love, so they do not realize that they experience dating violence. Attitudes and behaviors perceived as innocent evolve into harassment and violence in the later stages of the relationship. Therefore, dating violence is like insidious cancer. This type of violence is more common in women's lives than any other form of violence, and dating violence is the starting point of all other forms of violence. The violence experienced during the dating period can be a sign of possible future violence. The first step for preventing domestic violence is to detect dating violence because exposure to dating violence leads to domestic violence in the future (Heise, 2011).

When dating violence is evaluated in general, it is classified as physical, psychological, and sexual violence. Economic and cyber violence has been considered dating violence in recent years. (Shorey, Cornelius & Bell, 2008). Although dating violence is defined with different phrases, there is no clear distinction among types of dating violence, and they are all connected. Types of dating violence are described in detail below.

2.2.1. Types of Dating Violence

2.2.1.1. Physical Dating Violence

Physical violence is the most remarkable and overt form among other types of violence because studies about violence mainly focus on physically aggressive behaviors (Crick, 1996). Physical violence means the intentional use of physical force to hurt or kill by slapping, pushing, kicking, biting, strangling, threatening (Heise, Ellsberg & Gotte Moeller, 2002). The use of physical force against another person with an object (e.g., stick, rock, bullet) is also evaluated as physical violence (Tremblay & Nagin, 2005). In addition, the concept of physical violence includes the use of a wide range of coercive and abusive behaviors, mostly against women (WHO, 2015). Solakoğlu Uçar (2007) stated that the concept of violence for women mostly means physical violence.

Attala, Hudson & McSweeney (1994) studied 90 abused women aged 18-66, and 50 women aged 19-49 served as a control group; It was determined that 76 women were physically abused, but only 66 of these women reported physical abuse. In addition, it was determined that all of those who were physically abused were also subjected to some type of non-physical abuse. According to the WHO (2002) data, physical violence in close relationships often causes almost half of the cases of psychological abuse and sexual abuse. Also, 13-61% of 24.000 women reported physical violence, and 4-49% of these women reported severe physical violence from their partners in 10 countries According to the research conducted by Straus (2004), it was determined that female participants experienced more physical violence than men during the dating period. In a study investigating the prevalence of physical and sexual violence, ten countries and 15 settlements were examined. This study has been calculated that the prevalence of physical violence in a person's lifetime is between

13% and 61%. (Garcia-Moreno, Jansen, Ellsberg, Heise, Watts & WHO, 2006). In their research, Bell and Naugle (2007) found that 20-30% of university students faced physical violence, 15-25% sexual violence, and 80% psychological violence. Studies also show that physical violence leads to various negative emotions such as anger, hurt, and fear (Sears, Byers, Whelan & Saint-Pierre, 2006).

2.2.1.2. Psychological/Emotional Dating Violence

Psychological violence is defined as humiliating, controlling, embarrassing, making the partner feel worthless, separating the partner from friends or family (Saltzman, Fanslow, McMahon & Shelley, 1999). The type of violence, called emotional or psychological violence, includes attitudes and behaviors that cause psychological suffering and harm (Damka, 2009). Also, verbal expressions such as yelling, insulting, criticizing, and reprimanding are evaluated within the scope of psychological violence. Verbally aggressive behaviors are considered a destructive form of violence because these behaviors lead to psychological pain (Roberto & Finucane, 1997). Furthermore, the concept of technology has brought innovations to people's lives, such as mobile phones and social networks. People have begun to use technological devices as a tool of psychological violence, and this type of violence has taken a different dimension (Draucker, Martsolf, Stephenson, Heckman, Sheehan & Ferguson, 2010). Frieze (2000) defines psychological violence as the determinant of other types of violence. Psychological violence and physical violence cannot be distinguished from each other because when physical violence ends, psychological violence generally continues and manifests itself as a reminder of physical violence. Studies show that the most common violence type in romantic relationships is psychological violence and verbal violence is more common in men than women (Bookwala, Frieze, Ryan & Smith, 1992). Similarly, Maiuro (2000) said that

psychological violence does not always result in physical violence. Physical violence often occurs first, and psychological violence accompanies it.

There are lots of consequences of psychological dating abuse. Poor self-esteem, decreases in self-confidence, aggressive behaviors, poor communication skills, sexual problems, dysfunctional beliefs, deficits in attention and perception, distorted body perception, psychopathologies like depression, anxiety, eating disorders, post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, suicidal behaviors, and intentions are results of psychological violence (O'Leary & Maiuro, 2001).

When looking at the prevalence rate of emotional dating violence, the study conducted by Marshall (1996) found that 87% of the participants suffered from physical violence, and 97% experienced psychological violence. Anderson & Kobek Pezzarossi (2012) investigated the prevalence of psychological violence in the past year. They found the rate of exposure to psychological violence is 87,5 %. In our country, Toplu & Hatipoğlu-Sümer (2011) found that 77% of female and 70% of male participants were victims of psychological violence. Furthermore, 85% of female persons and 75% of male persons reported psychological violence. Öyekçin, Yetim, and Şahin (2012) studied this subject. They found that 54.6% of women were subjected to emotional violence.

In summary, psychological violence is the most common type of violence, but the consequences of psychological violence are not as visible as physical violence (Baldry, 2003). It continues from verbal abuse to physical abuse. However, it is not considered necessary in society due to the lack of factual findings. It has destructive consequences, and any type of violence should be underestimated (Follingstad et al., 1990).

2.2.1.3. Sexual Dating Violence

The concept of sexual violence is behavior that threatens body integrity through all kinds of sexual behavior unwanted by the person such as sexual contact, rape, and prostitution. It can be physical or verbal (Ellesberg, 2005). Sexual violence has been also defined as forced sexual intercourse by using power and mental pressure in DSM 5 (American Psychiatric Association, 2014). Sexual violence may or may not contain physical violence. Researchers say a complex relationship between sexual violence and physical violence (Marshall & Holtzworth-Munroe, 2002).

Relationships that have physical and emotional violence often include sexual violence. Since sexual violence includes other types of violence, it is crucial to recognize violence and different types of violence within concepts related to sexual violence (Atman, 2003). In addition, sexual violence is the least reported type of violence by victims for reasons such as humiliation of the victim, confidentiality in the family, and a sense of guilt (Büyükgök, 2007).

When looking at the prevalence of sexual dating violence, according to the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2010), approximately 1 in 5 women and 1 in 71 men in the United States have had forced sexual intercourse unwillingly. More than half of the female rape victims were raped by their spouses, and their acquaintances raped 40.8%; more than half of the male victims reported being raped by an acquaintance, and 15.1% reported being raped by a stranger. Garcia-Moreno et al. (2006) also found that while the lifetime frequency of sexual violence is between 13% and 61%, the number of individuals who are victims of physical and sexual violence is between 15% and 71%. These proportions are parallel to each other. In research by Yıldırım (2016), young women between the ages of 15 and 24 have been the most exposed to sexual violence

in the year. When looking at gender differences, the rate of exposure to sexual dating violence was 13.6% for girls and 8.3% for boys; The rate of perpetration of sexual dating violence was 1.6% for girls and 4.6% for boys (Ybarra et al., 2016).

2.2.1.4. Economic Dating Violence

Not giving money or giving limited money, controlling the money spent, confiscating the woman's assets, preventing the woman's work and confiscating her income, not meeting household expenses, not giving money to family members, not giving information about income and expenses of the house to other family members and making decisions without consulting the woman are forms of economic dating violence (Korkut-Owen & Owen, 2008). Fawole (2008) investigated the types of economic violence women experience in his study. The economic violence experienced by women includes limited access to money, receiving less money for equal work with men, discriminatory traditional laws regarding inheritance and property rights, meeting all the needs of the house, or limitation of their work. While most studies pay attention to physical and psychological violence, economic violence has remained in the background compared to other types of violence (as cited in Miškulin, 2020).

When looking at the prevalence of economic dating violence, Stylianou (2018) found that 93% of participants have experienced economic violence in their life. This rate is higher than the possibility of exposure to physical violence. This study shows that economic violence is as common as other types of violence (as cited in Doyle, 2020). Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies (2015) investigated whether women were subjected to economic violence/abuse by their partners in Turkey. The survey results revealed that 30 percent of women experienced economic violence in any period of their lives. Another study observed that the rate of women

being exposed to economic violence during their lifetime was 30%, and this rate was 12% in the last year (Yıldırım, 2016).

2.2.1.5. Cyber Dating Violence / Cyber Dating Abuse

The definition of dating violence includes behaviors such as control and monitoring and physical and sexual dimensions, and the main way to demonstrate control and monitoring behaviors is technology (Baker & Carreno, 2016). Cyberdating abuse, which is the sub-dimension of dating violence, is controlling, disturbing, and following of partners each other through social media or technology. It uses all kinds of psychological and sexual violence with digital tools by a partner whose relationship is ongoing or ended (Zweig et al., 2014). "Cyber harassment", "online violence", "cyber dating violence", "cyber dating abuse", "cyber victimization", "cyber aggression", "electronic dating violence" are other keywords in literature (Rodríguez-Domínguez, Pérez-Moreno & Durán, 2020). Cyberdating abuse has begun to show itself in various forms with the widespread use of technology. The use of social media is parallel and similar among youth, and they spend most of their time on social networks such as Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, although there are some differences between countries and cultures. Behaviors such as sharing another person's photos or writings, threatening to partner with sharing nude and sex videos, and frequently disturbing partner with phone calls or messages are examples of cyber dating abuse. Controlling partners' social media friends, restricting partners' behaviors in the digital environment, and wanting to be informed about everything related to partners generate cyber dating abuse. People pressure each other by controlling social media accounts and social media friends. They limit their partners' communication channels and external resources and try to make their partners depend on themselves in this way. They show jealous reactions and anger to their partners

and do not have proper conflict resolution strategies (Eshelman & Levendosky, 2012). Especially, youth use online platforms to establish dominance, create a perception of threat and humiliate the partner by sharing her private images or videos. For this reason, the environment of dating violence has expanded with the change of communication technologies, and digital tools have become a tool of threat and violence (Muniz, 2017). These tools eliminate distances and provide continuous interaction with the partner. Technology makes it easier to reach each other anytime and anywhere for people. This situation leads to cyber abuse and affects an individual's psychological well-being. It is a fact that social networks create negative emotions such as anxiety, stress, fear, and positive emotions such as belonging and sincerity (Mishna, Cook, Saini, Wu & MacFadden, 2011).

Picard (2007), in his study with adolescents aged 13-18, found that both preparator and victim use technology for abuse in their romantic relationships. 36% of participants stated that their partners control what they do and where they are via phone call ten or more times during a day, 35% of them said that they are disturbed about these daily routines via text message; 25% of participants heard disturbing words from their partners and criticized through e-mail, text message, phone call, blog, online chat; 19% of them said that their partners spread rumors about themselves using a web site such as mobile phone, e-mail, text message, blog, Facebook; 22% of participants were stated that they were enforced sexual activity when they do not want to via mobile phone or internet; 11% of participant's partners posted private or embarrassing pictures or videos; 17% of participants reported that they fear what their partner can do when they do not respond to their partner's cell phone call, e-mail, or text message; 10% of participants reported being physically threatened by their partners via e-mail or text message.

In another study, Weisz & Black (2001), harmful behaviors, which experts consider dating violence, establish strong bonds by young people. While sexual and physical violence behaviors are perceived as dating violence for them, it has been observed that they do not perceive cyber violence as violence and only find it disturbing. According to a study conducted with 540 young people in the USA, 3 in 4 young people were exposed to dating violence in the digital environment.

In the Technology and Young Friendship Abuse Study conducted in 2007, 1 in 3 young people stated that they receive 10, 20, or 30 messages per hour from their partners about what they do and where they are (Marganzki & Melender, 2015). Zweig et al. (2013) found in their studies that 84% of young people who report cyber dating abuse are also a victim of psychological dating violence. In addition, 73% of the young people who show cyber dating abuse stated that they show psychological dating violence. 52% of victims of cyber dating abuse were also exposed to physical dating violence, and 33% of these victims are exposed to sexual dating violence. Specifically, LGBT individuals reported a significantly higher rate than heterosexual individuals. In a study in Hacettepe University by Sünnetçi et al. (2016), 72% of women and 61% of men defined the request for social media passwords as violence. 55% of women and 50% of men inform the partner of what they do and where they are during a day as violence. As a result, women are more aware of cyber dating violence than men. In another study, it has been found that the technology is also widely used for abusive behaviors such as monitoring, password sharing, and accessing accounts among couples. Most participants described these behaviors as typical adolescent behavior (Lucero, Weisz & Smith-Darden (2014).

According to the research conducted by Draucker & Martsolf (2010), the last six of the eight ways in which electronic communication is used in dating are related

to violence, harassment, and control behaviors. These are: 1) initiating a romantic relationship, 2) non-aggressive communication, 3) arguing, 4) monitoring the partner's location or controlling their activities, 5) showing emotional aggression towards the partner, 6) seeking help during a violent period, (7) by not responding to calls, texts and other contacts through technology, removing the partner's access to him and (8) re-establishing contact after a violent period.

A study investigating the relationship between technology and the prevalence of dating violence was conducted in England. In the research, dating violence experiences in areas such as calling, messaging, social networks, photo, video calls, and e-mail were discussed. It was observed that 73% of adolescents between the ages of 12-18 were exposed to dating violence at least once in 12 months from technological fields. It has been observed that the prevalence of the technological type of dating violence ranges from 12% to 56%. These behaviors are manipulative behaviors such as keeping the partner out of the use of technology, controlling who the partner is with, humiliating with the message, comfortable sharing, sexual pressure (Stonard, 2019).

According to İpek (2020), classifying this type of violence is challenging because of constantly evolving and changing new technologies. Cyberdating abuse, which refers to pressuring and controlling partners within the relationship using digital tools, is examined in five sub-topics.

1. To intervene partner's social media friends and posts
2. To want partner's social media accounts passwords
3. To check partner's location thanks to applications and want her locations
4. To constantly call to partner and want a quick response to messages and calls from her

5. To check partner's phone and computer without her permission
6. To force a partner to send sexual messages and photos.

As seen in domestic and foreign studies, cyber dating abuse is as common as other forms of violence. It is an essential channel for transmitting violence regardless of gender and culture. Many young people have been exposed to this type of violence at least once in their lives. It is clearly observed that individuals exposed to cyber dating abuse are also vulnerable to other types of violence. kindsypes of violence trigger each other, and violence manifests itself in a dimension spread to other dimensions.

2.2.2. Risk Factors in Dating Violence

The risk factors of dating violence have many dimensions as individual, social, and familial (Baker & Stith, 2008). The risk factors in dating violence can be listed as follows (Kızmaz, 2006).

- Age
- Gender differences
- One or both partners using alcohol and drugs
- Adoption of gender roles and violence against women
- Witnessing or being exposed to violence during childhood
- Personality disorders
- Low income and low academic achievement

Romantic relationships are very important in adolescence in gaining self-knowledge and self-awareness. Romantic relationships during emerging adulthood are rehearsals for marriage, so this critical period plays a crucial role in one's life to establish and maintain a romantic relationship (Turan & Duy, 2020). In the National

Survey on Teen Relationships and Intimate Violence (2014), 68.7% of women aged between 12-18 who had romantic relationship in the past year reported some type of dating violence victimization, and 63.4% reported perpetration (Taylor & Mumford, 2016). In another study on high school students, up to 20% of participants were involved in dating violence as either perpetrator or victim, and also between 10% and 20% were engaged in sexual violence (Choi & Temple, 2016). In addition, Flake, Barros, Schraiber & Menezes (2013) found that dating violence is widely experienced among university students.

Gender is an essential factor in understanding the nature of violence and violent behavior. Researches indicate that both men and women abuse their partners physically and psychologically (Hickman, Jaycox & Aronoff, 2004). Eagly and Steffen (1986) found that 89% of the studies showed that males are more aggressive than girls in their meta-analysis review. It is known that dating violence is commonly demonstrated by men, although there are opposite situations, and it can be observed in all cultures and ethnicities (Martins et al., 2014).

Studies show that individuals who use alcohol and drugs are more likely to show violence against their partners. In a study conducted by Temple et al. (2013), 28 studies are analyzed, and alcohol use has been found to increase the risk of dating violence significantly. In addition, Foshee, Linder MacDougall & Bangdiwala (2001) found that alcohol use is a predictor after a year or one and half years for women who use violence.

Another risk factor is the adoption of gender roles in society and violence against women. Men are considered superior to women, and it is accepted that male violence is a normal and legitimate situation (Aslan et al., 2008). In the study by Gressard, Swahn, & Tharp (2015), female adolescent who have egalitarian perspectives on

gender inequality are exposed to more physical dating violence. In another study conducted with male students, it was stated that the possibility of physical and psychological dating violence is higher among young people who have a traditional perspective on gender equality and patriarchal cultural norms (Ozaki & Otis, 2017).

Dutton (1999) noted that experiencing violence in the family or witnessing the violence cause learning the anger. Exposure and witnessing violence during childhood increase the probability of being exposed to violence for women and increase the violent behaviors of men. It is assumed that strict and coercive parenting practices and aggressive methods are learned through social learning, and learning violence by observing forms the basis for dating violence. Young people who witness and experience violence in their peer relationships can show violence or are exposed to violence in dating relationships (Makin-Byrd & Bierman, 2013).

Psychological factors also explain why partners continue to remain in a violent relationships. Individuals show violence or are exposed to violence to satisfy their sadistic and masochistic needs (Kernberg, 2011). Also, aggressive behaviors towards the environment can be observed in manic type bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, and paranoid disorders (Cassidy, Murry, Forest & Carroll, 1998).

Parents' educational status and socioeconomic levels are other factors that affect dating violence. The rate of dating violence is higher in young people whose parents' education levels are low (Black et al., 2015). Psychosocial stressors such as economic troubles that cause family tension are reported to be at risk for dating violence. It has been observed that violence is experienced more frequently in families with low socioeconomic status than families with high socioeconomic status (Cascardi & Vivian, 1995).

2.2.3. Effects of Dating Violence

Dating violence is a significant health problem with long-term and short-term consequences. They are categorized as psychological symptoms (posttraumatic stress disorder etc., psychological disorders), cognitive changes (biases in attributions and attitudes), problems in communication skills (using abusive communication) (Dutton, 1993). In addition, Tuz (2015) described the results of dating violence as loss of self-esteem, mental problems, difficulty in controlling anger, post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, suicidal thoughts and behaviors, alcohol and substance use, starting sexual intercourse at an early age, sexually transmitted diseases. In addition to its psychological effects are associated with physical injury, unhealthy weight control, and risky sexual behaviors (Silverman, Raj, Mucci, & Hathaway, 2001). In a study conducted by Carlson, McNutt & Choi (2003), mental health symptoms such as anxiety and depression have been observed in women who have been victims of dating violence. When violence is experienced in a dating relationship, men and women are affected differently. Women feel fear and anxiety in the face of violent behavior. On the other hand, Men stated that they felt intense anger towards women's aggression (Wolfe, Scott & Crooks, 2005). In the study conducted by Bonomi et al. (2013), it was observed that women and men exposed to dating violence had symptoms such as eating disorders, depression symptoms, and increased substance use. Akin & Microcar (2015) said that violence in a dating relationship not only harms individuals physically, but also socially, financially, and psychologically. Individuals exposed to violence have a weak self-perception with a loss of self-confidence. This situation blocks having a healthy and robust identity for adolescents. In addition, dating violence experienced during adolescence affects a lifelong cycle of violence, and this violence is passed down from generation to generation (Drucker,

2012). As can be seen, victims of dating violence have lots of health problems, and minor physical ailments can progress to serious mental health problems (Khichadi & 2010).

2.2.4. Theoretical Background of Dating Violence

2.2.4.1. Social Learning Theory

According to Bandura (1969), who argues that people learn by observing the behaviors of others, emphasizes cognitive dimensions of learning. He says that information and learning through observation are stored in the brain for use. People learn behavior through observation and perform this behavior in similar situations, and it is the most persistent way to learn (as cited in Murdock, 2014). According to social learning theory, environmental factors, personal factors, and behaviors interact.

The person affects the environment and is also affected by the environment. Early interactions of the individual with their parentessential important role in forming and establishing many behaviors. Children imitate parents with observing. The imitated behaviors are reinforced and stored in the brain for use in the future. (Shorey et al., 2008). Cochran, Maskaly, Jones & Sellers (2015) observed that dating violence is directly related to each of four components of social learning theory which are attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation.

In theory, it is emphasized that violence is learned due to violent experiences within the family. Witnessing or being exposed to violence in early childhood causes individuals to embrace violence. Aggressive behaviors of individuals in dating relationship reflect their family life (Luthra & Gidycz, 2006). Also, it is stated that individuals who live in an environment where violence is reinforced positively will show violent behaviors and aggression tendencies in close relationships (Bell &

Naugle, 2008). In a study by Foshee et al. (2009), individuals exposed to violence in their childhood increase the probability of experiencing violence in romantic relationships. They use violence as a problem-solving tool. Moreover, individuals adopt the role of their same-sex parent in a violent relationship and model him more than the other parent (Jackson, 2000). Looking at the relationship between dating violence and social learning theory, individuals learn all kinds of violent behavior as a result of their interaction with the environment. If the individual's social environment supports violence, she may exhibit violent behavior or stay silent when is exposed to violence (Süzer, 2019). Furthermore, according to the new theory (background-situational model) developed by Riggs and O'Leary (1989) to better understand dating violence, it has shown that there is a significant relationship between childhood abuse and maltreatment, alcohol and substance use, and dating violence.

Although social learning theory explains many complex reasons for violence, it has shortcomings in dating violence and cannot fully define this concept. This is because there is an ever-changing cycle of violence (O'Keefe, 1997). Follette and Alexander (1992) stated that violent behaviors within the family are not sufficient to explain future violent behavior. Still, they noted that it was a predictor to detect violence in the future. Similarly, Shorey et al. (2008) reported that although findings are indicating that dating violence is associated with childhood abuse, experiencing violence within the family is insufficient to explain dating violence. This situation can be considered the need for a comprehensive model that includes early experiences explaining violence in romantic relationships.

2.2.4.2. Feminist Theory

Feminist theory is one of the first theories that come to mind in explaining dating violence (Hutchinson, 2012). The legal and social inequality of women has

started the feminist movement in the 1800s. Later in the 1960s, this movement has continued with women's desire for equality in education and work. In the third wave of feminism, it was realized that sexual pressure could not be eliminated as long as there was racial and economic pressure and focusing on political inequality (Gardner, 2009). The word feminism means a doctrine that affects norms in many cultures. In other words, gender roles and expectations placed on people by society and gender inequity put women in a more disadvantaged position than men (Murdock, 2014). The primary purpose of feminist theory is to analyze the discriminatory behaviors against women; in this context, the links between the events women experienced and coping strategies with these events are examined (Gardner, 2009).

Zimmer and Scott (2017) said that while feminism is a phenomenon in which men and women have equal potential, women are more exposed to dating violence than men. Violence results from patriarchal order, and men use violence to gain control and power over women. While the roles of men are determined by society as aggressive, dominant, and competitive, women are expected to be passive, submissive, and cooperative. The concept of power is directly linked with dating violence. The fact that one partner is more vulnerable and weaker than the other depends on physical differences, and this condition increases the likelihood of experiencing dating violence (Caldwell, Swan & Woodbrown, 2012). According to Fox, Russo & Dutton (2002), violence in romantic relationships occurs more frequently in cultures with dominant male roles. In addition, if women's economic power is higher than men's, this is a risk factor that increases violence. In a study conducted by Caldwell et al. (2012), women feel the adverse effects of dating violence more than men. Women have higher rates of depression, anxiety disorder, and post-traumatic stress disorder after they experience dating violence. There are

several contradictions in the theory of women's place in the cycle of violence. Feminist theory admits that women also show violence. Still, they lead to defend themselves violent behavior of, men they do not arouse fear in men, and their behaviors do not cause injury (Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999). Some feminist theorists say that women do not resort to violence only to defend themselves. These inconsistent discourses caused criticism about theory (Hettrich & O'Leary, 2007). In summary, the feminist theory argues that violence derives from the power imbalances associated with the roles which our society imposes on women and men. Therefore, raising awareness about the patriarchal social structure, the place of women and men in society, and gender roles will be preventive to block violence (Gündüz, 2019).

2.2.4.3. Power Theory

Power theory emphasizes the inequality of power distribution between men and women. This theory argues that the power imbalance in romantic relationships due to gender discrimination. This situation can lead to dating violence (Hutchinson, 2012). While the feminist approach emphasizes the gender-based power differences arising from the patriarchal system, the power theory emphasizes the power differences within the family system. All factors in Feminist Theory such as conflicts, beliefs about dating violence and gender inequality affect dating violence. Differently, power theory stated that family structure is an important factor that affects violence like culture, gender roles and patriarchal social structure. The power imbalance between men and women in the family increases tension and violence occurs. Power inequality triggers a sense of aggression in individuals. Also, to experience or witness violence increases individuals' likelihood of dating violence. When violence is supported by family members' beliefs and attitudes, this attitude becomes a risk factor for dating violence (Straus, 1977). According to a study conducted by Kapıcıoğlu

(2008), there is a linear relationship between "power" and "violence" and the concept of power has different effects on all types of violence. However, there are very limited works on power theory. For this reason, this theory is not sufficient to explain dating violence. New researches are needed on power theory to explain dating violence multidimensionally (Bell & Naugle, 2008).

2.2.4.4. Attachment Theory

Bowlby (1969) described attachment as a biological reflex that aims to survive. This theory focuses on emotional structures that allow children to attach to their parents (Bowlby, 1973). The tendency to form strong emotional bonds is part of human nature and this tendency is innate in a newborn. The formation of attachment is vital for the baby because attachment behaviour provides care and safety for the baby. This instinctive closeness between mother and baby establishes the attachment relationship. Bowlby stated that attachment takes place in four stages. The first stage is the first six weeks after birth, the second stage is from the sixth to the eighth month, the third stage is from the eighth to the twenty-fourth month and the fourth stage is from the twenty-fourth month to the end of childhood. However, attachment is not a behavior that ends at a certain age and time. It continues throughout life. Although attachment decreases with age, its effects may occur in some trigger and critical situations and events in human life. The mother usually is shown as the attachment figure but this person does not have to be a mother. The baby can establish the intimacy she needs with other people (Bowlby, 1969). Gander and Gardiner (1995) defined attachment as a mutual and mutually supportive interaction with the parents. It develops over time and strengthens as the caregiver meets the needs of the baby, so the first person who is attached by baby is very important and she is source of trust. The main phenomenon of attachment theory is that human needs care and attention.

People need a caregiver to receive care. Attachment meets the baby's need for closeness and creates a sense of security for the baby. The formation of the perception that "the world is a safe place" is developed. The formation of this perception in a healthy way brings quality relationships to individuals in the future.

According to Ainsworth (1978), figures of attachment consist of secure, avoidant and anxious/ ambivalent attachment and they are grouped based on the separation behavior of children from their mothers. Hazan & Shaver (1987) said that children's attachment styles will shape their relationships to other people. Individuals who have secure attachment define their relationships as safe, have more positive relationship patterns and communicate others more positively. Individuals with anxious and avoidant attachment style defined their relationships as more insecure than individuals who are securely attached. Bowlby (1969) stated that babies create representations in their minds as a result of their experiences with their first caregivers and maintain their relationships based on these representations. First examples or mental representations of children's relationships are created by caregivers during childhood. Children's future relationships are affected by their interactions with their families. In other words, people choose their dating partners according to relationships with their families (Waters, Posada, Crowell & Lay, 1993). Childhood experiences are emphasized in many researches on attachment. In a study conducted by Robertson (1973) on children who lost their mothers or who were separated from their mothers, it was found that these children suffered for a long time. Growing up without mom's love may cause some behavioral disorders in the child (as cited in Brandel & Ringel, 2007). Individuals' first romantic relationship experiences develop depend on their relationships with their parents (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). When a healthy attachment does not occur in infancy, many difficulties are experienced in lots

of area in life such as unhealthy peer relationships, tendency to crime and show violence, decreased empathic thinking and inability to establish close and secure relationships and having negative self-perception (Senemoğlu, 2007). Attachment styles are directly related to individuals' beliefs about relationships, love styles, romantic relationship process, self-esteem level, avoidance or intimacy attitudes and dependent behaviors to their partner. As a result, attachment theory not only include relationship with caregiver and infant's emotional reactions but also helps to understand nature of romantic relationships, love and loneliness in adulthood (Çelik, 2004). In this context, it is important to examine the phenomenon of violence in romantic relationships from the framework of attachment theory.

2.2.5. Attachment and Dating Violence

When people start a new relationship, they bring their past relationships with them. Attachment theory is a guide to examining how individuals in romantic relationships carry their past experiences to their relationships (Collins, 1996). According to Hazan & Shaver (1987), while unhealthy relationships arise from inconsistent and late care given from caregiver, healthy relationships derive from consistent and timely care in childhood. They stated that parents who have stable and sensitive attitude contact healthier relationship with their children and these children can establish a healthy relationship with their romantic partners in the future. While individuals with secure attachment style have lovely and long-term relationship, individuals with insecure attachment style are more jealous and emotionally unstable. It is stated that individuals who do not respond to their needs or respond to their needs inconsistently by their caregivers establish unhealthy relationships. Individuals match their romantic relationship experiences with their childhood attachment experiences and act accordingly. It has been observed that individuals with insecure attachment

style cannot control their emotions and they have a tendency to show violence in dating relationships regardless of gender (Fraley & Shaver, 2000). Insecure attachment of either or both individuals in romantic relationships poses a greater risk of experiencing dating violence (Yarkovsky, 2016). These individuals engage abusive and violent behavior in their romantic relationships. In addition, individuals who have insecure attachment show compulsive behaviors towards their partners and they insult and threaten their partners due to the lack of conflict and problem-solving skills. They try to be dominant and pressure their partners. These behaviors often cause aggression and violence (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). People with insecure attachment style have less belief to resolve the conflict during conflict and they are more affected from the conflicts with their partners (Creasey & Hesson-McInnis, 2001). Furthermore, men with insecure attachment style use more physical violence in dating relationship than women (Lawson, 2012)

Tussey et al (2018) noted that anxious attachment was associated with exposure to domestic violence and poor maternal care while avoidant attachment was associated with a weak relationship with the caregiver. Individuals who have these attachment styles are more likely to experience dating violence. (Weiss & Sampson, 1986) noted that individuals who have an anxious and avoidant attachment style may demonstrate harassing, offensive and unsatisfactory attitudes in order not to hurt their partners. This situation leads to some problems in romantic relationships. Individuals who develop anxious attachment in their childhood may not fully understand their partner's rejection symptoms. Therefore, they show excessive intimacy instead of getting away from the partner in the termination stage of their romantic relationship (Hocking, Simons, & Surette, 2016). In addition, in a study conducted by Follingstad, Bradley, Helff & Laughlin (2002) found that anxious attachment style triggers anger

in individuals. Continuing the relationship despite the fear of rejection and abandonment creates anxiety for person and this anxiety causes angry. They desire to control their partners with their anxiety and anger emotions, so psychological dating violence occurs. Furthermore, Strawhun et al. (2013) found that anxious attachment style predicts cyberstalking-related behaviors in romantic relationships among undergraduate students. On the other hand, people with the avoidant attachment style often try to avoid discussion in a conflict situation. These people show dominant behaviors to protect themselves and avoid deeper interaction with their partners. These dominant behaviors also cause dating violence (Shi, 2003).

To examine secure attachment, in a study conducted by Alyıldız & Elkin (2016) on a Turkish sample, the relationship between attachment styles and anger was examined. Students with a secure attachment style have low level anger and their level of controlling anger is high. According to the study of Babcock, Jacobson, Gottman & Yerington (2000) on married couples, men who show violent behaviour in marriage have insecure attachment style. It has been observed that spouses with a secure attachment style are less prone to violence than spouses with an insecure attachment. Shorey et al. (2008) emphasized the need for studies on whether securely attached individuals experience dating violence in terms of examining dating violence within the framework of attachment theory.

Individuals with obsessive attachment style are highly dependent on their partners and they do not like being alone. These individuals also have a high level of separation anxiety. The dislike of loneliness creates the desire to spend more time with the partners. Therefore, conflicts occur naturally. The degree of anxiety and strategies of coping with anxiety increase the likelihood of dating violence (Korkmaz, 2017).

2.2.6. Gender Roles and Dating Violence

According to Lindsey (1990), the concept of "gender roles" refers to personality traits, roles and responsibilities socially determined of women and men . For this reason, in the definition of the concept of gender, there are not biological differences. Gender roles include values, expectations, judgments and roles about how society sees people, how they perceive them, how they think and how they expect them to behave. These responsibilities and roles are based on social stereotypes and they affect people from birth to death. Historical, cultural, political and economic events play an important role in creation of these roles. Its simplest definition is expectations and norms about men and women. These norms differ according to different cultures, times and places. Therefore, it resistant to change (Pincha, 2009). According to Bem, gender is a lens through which people perceive the world (Ruble, Taylor, Cyphers, Greulich, Lurye & Shrout, 2007). Zastrow (2013) describes the formation of gender roles based on hunter-gatherer societies as follows: “Men were generally hunters, women were gatherers of nuts, herbs, and other food. Although women gathered more food than men, the man's hunting activities were seen as more prestigious. Women have spent most of their adult lives with pregnancy, caring for babies, raising children. The women's tasks were housework such as cooking, serving and cleaning. More behavioral patterns have been added to these gender role distinctions. Child-rearing models were developed in line with boys' valuing aggression and leadership, and girls' being passive and dependent on providing emotional support to boys ”. Although boys and girls are born and raised in the same house, they are raised according to two different stereotypes; masculinity and femininity. While men are trying to be raised as purposeful, successful and not showing their feelings; women are raised more emotionally and they should be far

from physical intimacy (Yüksel, 1995). So, men are traditionally raised to be dominant and aggressive, to act in masculine way and suppress their emotions compared to women (Feder, Levant & Dean, 2007).

Gender roles is a trigger factor for men to display violent behaviors (Meetoo & Mirza, 2007). According to Aslan et al. (2008), these stereotypes are the determinants of attitudes towards violence. An individual may be afraid of being evaluated negatively, so they may remain silent to dating violence in order to be accepted and approved by the society. This situation may lead to serious problems such as murder and domestic violence. In addition, power imbalances promoted by cultural judgments cause violence. Violence is triggered by the fact that men always consider themselves privileged and have the right to control women. Women constantly perceive themselves as wrong in discussions with men and think that they cannot live without a man for their own good (Nightangale & Morrisette, 1993). Próspero (2008) argued that masculine attitude is the predictor of all types of dating violence. In addition, according to some feminist theorists, the most important resources of male violence are the meanings that society attribute to gender and patriarchal social structure (Anderson et al., 2011). Similarly, Locke & Mahalik (2005) stated that gender roles are strong predictors of sexual aggression to women. In a qualitative study aiming to understand and evaluate the acceptance status of dating violence and to investigate its relationship with gender roles, a study was conducted with 36 female university students. It has been concluded that dating violence against women originates from inequality and is seen less important than other areas of violence, in some cases violence is more acceptable. However, it was revealed that violence against male seems more unacceptable for the participants. The fact that gender is an important factor when interpreting violent behavior is one of the findings of the study (Allen &

Lehrner, 2018). Furthermore, men have started to lose their sovereignty because women participate business life and they start to be active in production. This situation causes problems for men to adapt to this change and transformation. The sharing of responsibilities such as housework and child care, which are not related to masculine roles, within the family causes a tension and increases violent behaviors for men (Oktan, 2008).

Studies in this area have found that individuals' gender perceptions affect their tendency or exposure levels to dating violence. It is important to investigate how do perceptions about gender roles affect dating violence in the electronic environment in terms of understanding the scope of gender roles.

2.2.7. Foreign Studies About Cyber Dating Abuse

Bennett, Guran, Ramos & Margolin (2011) examined cyber victimization in the friendship and dating relationships of university students. They prepared 22 matters in four categories: hostility, humiliation, exclusion and interventionism. 92% of the participants stated that they have been exposed to electronic abuse in the last year. In addition, men are more victimized than women and women's cyber-violent behavior is associated with alcohol use.

In a study with middle school students in the United States, 30% of students were exposed to at least one of the types of cyber violence via receiving a disturbing email (18.3%) and an annoying instant message (16%) by their partners (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010).

In a study conducted by Flach and Deslandes (2017) , it was found that 20% to 50% of American teens were exposed to cyber violence during their close relationships. This result caused pay attention to cyber partner violence for scientist.

In a study conducted by Kamali (2015) with university students, it was observed that many students were exposed to harassment and insults on social networks by partners. 15.7% of students received disturbing e-mails every week, 14% of them received uncomfortable phone calls, 15.3% of them are harassed on Facebook or other social networks frequently.

Choja and Nelson (2016) examined the negative effects of psychological violence against women in their studies. Research results showed that most of the participants are aware of the cyber-abuse of women on Facebook. In addition, the majority of the participants stated that they witness cyber-abuse of women on Facebook.

Korchmaros, Ybarra, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Boyd & Lenhart (2013) investigated the relationship between psychological dating violence on technology and face-to-face dating violence. According to the findings, 46% of the people who are between age of 14-19 are psychological dating violence practitioners. In the last 12 months, 58% of the participants show psychological violence only by using classical communication methods such as face-to-face communication, while 17% of the participants show psychological violence by technological tools such as computers. 24% of the participants show psychological violence in both ways.

In the research conducted with 9000 German internet users, women are more likely than men to be victim of online sexual harassment and cyber stalking and the effects of cyber violence are more traumatic for women victims (Staude-Müller, Hansen & Voss, 2012).

In the study of Baker and Helm (2011), 48% of the 628 participants reported that their partners control their phones to check their messages and 39% of

participants checked their partners' personal pages to see people whom their partners are in contact. This study also observed a differentiation based on gender. According to findings, women show dating violence and were exposed to it more.

Zweig et al. (2013) investigated cyber dating abuse among youth through technology and social media and relationship among cyber dating abuse and other types of dating violence. More than 25% of the participants reported that they experienced cyber dating abuse victimization. Female victims more than male victims in the context of dating violence and sexual cyber dating abuse. Moreover, 1 in 10 young people stated that they show cyber dating abuse. While women have tendency to demonstrate non-sexual cyber dating violence behaviors, men have tendency to show sexual cyber dating violence behaviors.

Zweig et al. (2014) examined cyber dating abuse in terms of substance use, sexual activity, school connection, family relationships, partner relationships, and psychosocial adjustment with 3745 people. In the study, it was found that experiencing cyber dating abuse was mostly associated with being a woman, showing delinquent behaviors, have high levels of depressive symptoms, hostility and anger. In addition, depressive symptoms and anger are more common in people exposed to cyber dating violence than other types of violence. Furthermore, 26% of participants experience cyber violence, 11% of them experience sexual cyber violence and 22% of them experience non-sexual cyber violence.

Borrajó, Gámez-Guadix, Pereda & Calvete (2015) investigated prevalence of cyber dating violence, its context and the relationship between offline dating aggression and cyber abuse. 433 university students in young adulthood participated in the study. Half of the participants are victims of cyber dating abuse and this victimization are caused by partner's controlling behaviors in the last six months. In

addition, jealousy is a basic factor in cyber dating abuse and offline dating aggression is related to these abusive behaviors.

In a study by Borrajo, Gamez Guadix & Calvete (2015), 656 young people individuals who are between the ages of 18-30 participate study (79.5% women). According to data, 50% of participants were exposed to cyber partner violence via message applications, 40% of them are exposed to via social networks and 7% of them are exposed to via e-mail . Types of cyber violence are sending threatening messages (6.5%), sending insulting or humiliating messages (7.5%), sending pictures or videos that disturb the person (1%), spreading bad gossip or jokes about partner (3.4%), using partner's messages or password to question the people contacted (17%), publishing private information and images of partner (5.1%), using the internet or mobile phone to check partner (38.6%), sending a photo with another person to envy partner (14%) and connection with an ex-partner via internet or mobile phone to envy partner (15.5%). Men share private information and images of their partners in terms of gender.

In a study by Borrajo, Gámez Guadix & Calvete (2015b), the relationship among cyber dating abuse, myths about love and justification beliefs of violence. As a result, justification of violence is highly associated with direct aggression in online dating relationships. In addition, myths about love and cyber dating abuse are related to each other significantly.

Marganski and Melander (2018) investigated the extent of cyber-aggression victimization in partner relationships and whether psychological, physical and sexual partner violence experiences occur simultaneously with cyber-aggression. According to the findings, approximately %75 of the 540 participants who have a romantic

relationship have experienced cyber-aggression in the last year. This type of violence is associated with psychological, physical, and sexual partner violence.

Menard and Pincus (2012) examined relationship between cyberstalking and gender. 934 women and 807 men participated the research. These participants are undergraduate students. As a result of study, men' scores are significantly higher than women in the context of cyberstalking behaviour.

Cebecioğlu and Altıparmak (2017) investigated the ways of cyber violence experienced by university students. According to findings for male students, 61.4% of male students received unwanted advertising messages, 14.8% of them received sexual messages, 8% of them had applications that give location information, 6.8% of them were followed insistently and 6.8% of them were exposed to political content. For female students, 65.1% of female students received unwanted advertising messages, 11.9% of them were exposed to sexually messages, 8.3% of them were exposed to applications that require location information, 11.9% of them were experienced persistent tracking and 2.8% of them were shared private information by hackers.

In the “Domestic Violence Against Women Research” in 2014, it was stated that 27% of women exposed to partner violence. Disturbing phone calls, be followed on social media, going to work or home of partner, sending gifts, sharing contact information of partner with third persons, threatening with suicide are the ways of showing violence. The most common types of stalking are harassment by going to the place where the woman is working and / or living (6%), following on social media (6%), sending letters, text messages or e-mails (8%) and calling by phone (19%).

2.2.8. Domestic Studies About Cyber Dating Abuse

Bakır (2019) who is the only researcher who studies cyber dating abuse in our country conducted a study with 458 people to investigate individuals' body image and self-esteem due to cyber dating abuse. In the study, it was found that there is a relationship between the cyber abuse behavior in young adults and their self-esteem levels. When the self-esteem of individuals decreases, level of exposure to cyber dating abuse and show to cyber dating abuse are increasing. Also, it has been determined that the exposure and direct aggression levels of men are significantly higher than women. Furthermore, cyber abuse behaviors differ significantly in terms of romantic relationship status. People who defined their relationship status as "lover" received the highest scores. Secondly, there were people who define their relationship status as "meeting occasionally". Finally, couples who defined their relationship as "engaged" got the lowest scores. Furthermore, individuals who define their relationship status as "occasionally meeting" get highest scores in monitoring and control subdimension and cyber dating abuse differed significantly in terms of time people spent on the internet in direct aggression sub-dimension. She also adapted the "Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire" developed by Borrajo et al. (2015) to our country and used it in her research. In this context, she has brought a new questionnaire to our country and filled a gap in the literature.

2.2.9. Foreign Studies About Gender Roles Attitudes and Dating Violence

In the study conducted by Lichter and McCloskey (2004), they investigate the effect of exposure to domestic violence during childhood on gender roles beliefs and dating violence in adolescence are examined. 208 mother-child couples who were or were not exposed to domestic violence were studied twice. In these interviews,

information was collected by asking questions about adolescents' beliefs about gender roles, their acceptance of dating violence and their experiences with dating violence. As a result of the research, adolescents who were exposed to domestic violence during childhood are more likely to show dating violence and adolescents who have traditional gender roles attitudes justify dating violence.

McNaughton Reyes, Foshee, Niolon,& Reidy (2016) aimed to examine male adolescents' level of dating violence and their gender roles attitudes. For this purpose, 577 male high school students who are aged between 14-15 were participated in the study. As a result, it was found that men with traditional gender roles are more likely to show dating violence.

According to the results of the study conducted by Coleman and Stith (1997) with 155 female nursing students, one of the determinants of women's victimization in dating violence is that they have egalitarian views in gender roles.

In the study conducted by Haigler, Day & Marshall (1995), the relationship between parental attachment and gender role identities was examined. The sample of the study is 218 university students, 90% of whom are Caucasian. According to the findings of the study, the attachment levels of feminine and androgenic individuals to their parents are significantly higher than masculine individuals.

In the study conducted by Street, Kimmel & Kromrey (1996) with 2990 Caucasian, Spanish, African American and Asian undergraduate and graduate students' perceptions on gender role preferences are examined. It was found that the ideal female type for all students is androgynous gender oriented, while the ideal male type is masculine gender oriented. According to the findings of the study, women

significantly defined themselves as androgynous gender oriented, while men defined themselves as masculine gender oriented.

Smith and Reid (1986) examined role-sharing attitudes and behaviors in families. In the study, both men and women work in these families. Most of the participants argued that the earning money, childcare, housework and decision-making should be shared by both partners. However, couples often fail to share this role. It was found that the women are responsible for childcare and housework while men were perceived as a livelihood. In addition, it has been observed that couples have the same education level and income share tasks more.

Guzman (1996) studied with 30 married couples and investigated whether differences in gender attitudes affect marital satisfaction. If the husband has the traditional gender role and the woman has the egalitarian gender role, marital satisfaction is the lowest level. If the man has the egalitarian gender role and the woman has the traditional gender role, marital satisfaction is the highest level. Also, it was a significant positive relationship between education level and egalitarian gender role.

In a study conducted by Lye and Biblarz (1993) with 1437 married couples, the relationship between gender roles and marital satisfaction was examined. It has been found that couples have non-traditional roles have lower marital satisfaction than traditional ones. In addition, researchers note that conflicts decrease when men are less traditional and conflicts increase when women are less traditional.

In a study conducted with 30 Israeli couples participating in divorce mediation programs to examine whether the attitudes of the couples in the agreement process differ by gender. According to results, attitude differences of the spouses during the

divorce process was related to gender differences. Women were found to be more emotional and expressive, while men were found to be rigid and silent. This result was explained by the difference in gender roles. Men were generally described as insensitive and women were generally described as emotional (Pines, Gat & Tal, 2002).

2.2.10. Domestic Studies About Gender Roles Attitudes and Dating Violence

In a study conducted by Tok (2001), the aggression levels of 531 university students with different stereotypes about gender roles were examined. As a result, aggression levels of men were significantly higher than women. Male students with traditional stereotypes about gender roles were found to be significantly more aggressive than others.

In the study examining the violence tendencies and gender role attitudes of 300 university students by Kodan Çetinkaya (2013), female students have more egalitarian gender roles than male students and students who are exposed to domestic violence have more traditional gender roles. In addition, it was observed that when the traditional gender role scores increased, tendency to violence increased.

Sarıhan (2019) investigated that how gender characteristics and trauma experiences of childhood predict whether the attitudes towards the dating violence. The study group of this research consists of 1021 students studying at various program and classroom levels of two foundations and two public universities in Ankara in 2018-2019. As a result, there is a significant relationship between university students' attitudes towards dating violence and contradictory emotional sexism level.

In a study conducted by Doğan (2018), the relationship between the attitudes of university students towards dating violence and towards male role norms and threat to manhood was examined. The sample of this research consisted of 510 students who study at Gaziantep University during 2016-2017 academic year. It was determined that university students' attitudes towards dating violence correlated with their perception of masculinity roles positively, lowly and significantly.

Yumuşak (2013) investigated the relationship between the attitudes of university students towards dating violence and towards sexism and their narcissistic personality traits. The sample of this research is 1171 students who studied at a state university in Middle Black Sea Region during 2012-2013 academic year. In this research, it was determined that university students' attitudes towards dating violence associated with their ambivalence sexism levels positively and significantly. In addition, ambivalence toward men correlated with their attitudes towards dating violence positively and significantly

Baykal (1988) found that girls are more traditional in terms of stereotypes about gender roles than boys in his study that investigating the stereotypes of university students regarding gender roles. In addition, male students in the traditional group have a higher level of self-acceptance than male students in the non-traditional group. Moreover, gender stereotypes did not differ in terms of variables of class, age and education level of the mother.

Girginer (1994) found that traditional orientations were more dominant in his study to determine the evaluations of gender roles in Turkish society. 2.23% of the participants in the study were found to be androgens. It was found that 64.92% of them had traditional gender characteristics and 32.83% of them had undifferentiated gender roles. In addition, while childcare and housework are perceived mostly as roles

belonging to women, important decisions about the financial situation of the family or the sexual aspect of marriage are perceived as belonging to men..

In another study in Hacettepe University, university students' perspectives on gender roles were investigated. As a result, it has been determined that male students have a traditional perspective on working and marital life compared to female students and both women and men have an egalitarian perspective about social life and family life (Vefikuluçay Yılmaz, Zeyneloğlu, Kocaöz, Kısa, Taşkın & Eroğlu, 2009).

Çelikkaleli and Avcı (2016) examined whether university students' attachment styles differ according to their biological sex and gender roles. 445 university students (281 women, 164 men) participated in the study. Bem Gender Roles Inventory and Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory was used in the data collection process. As a result of the analysis, it was found that biological sex did not cause a difference in attachment styles alone. In addition, it was found that feminine individuals had fearful attachment style, masculine individuals had fearful and secure attachment style and androgynous individuals had secure attachment style.

Turan (2018) investigated the predictive role of university students' gender roles attitudes, attachment styles, self-esteem levels and social approval needs on their attitudes towards dating violence with 842 participants. As a result, all five sub-dimensions related to gender roles ("egalitarian gender role", "female gender role", "male gender role", "gender role in marriage", "traditional gender role") were found to be predictors of attitudes towards dating violence.

2.2.11. Foreign Studies About Attachment Styles and Dating Violence

Ooi, Ang, Fung, Wong & Cai (2006) examined the effects of parent-child attachment on self-esteem, social stress and aggression. 91 boys who have disruptive behavioral problems participated in the study and they are between the ages of 8 and 12. These children display antisocial behaviors such as fighting and lying. Parent-child attachment is effective on aggression, social stress and self-esteem. High quality parent-child attachment was found to be associated with low levels of social stress and high levels of self-esteem. Parent-child attachment also has been found to be effective on children's behavior and emotional status.

Finzi, Ram, Har-Even, Shnit & Weizman (2001) examined the relationship between attachment styles and aggression in children who are physically abused and neglected. The study included 41 children who were physically abused, 38 children who were neglected, and 35 children who were not neglected and abused. It was found that children who are exposed to physical abuse have avoidant attachment style and high aggression levels.

Mikulincer (1998) investigated the relationships among attachment styles, tendency to anger and expressing anger in his research. The research sample consists of 100 people (56 women and 44 men). As a result, anger scores of people who are securely attached were lower and they showed more harmonious reactions and positive emotions when they were angry.

In the study by Smagur, Bogat & Levendosky (2018), they found that insecure attachment increased the risk of dating violence and was directly related to depressive symptoms due to dating violence. Furthermore, dating violence experienced by individuals can also affect people's attachment style and it causes develop insecure

attachment style for people. In other words, there is a mutual interaction between attachment and dating violence.

Avgoustis (2000) discussed the issue of dating violence and emotional neglect as a mediator of attachment style in adolescents. When men and women who are emotionally neglected during childhood have an avoidant attachment and they are more likely to show violence in their romantic relationships. However, while women who were emotionally neglected and have avoidant attachment style suffer from dating violence. In addition, men adopt more aggressive attitudes physically, sexually and emotionally.

According to Katz (2014), there is an important relationship between individuals in a violent romantic relationship and a non-violent romantic relationship and having an anxious-avoidant attachment style. It is observed that individuals in a violent romantic relationship have anxious-avoidant attachment style. At the same time, the number of female participants who reported dating violence is higher than the number of male participants who reported dating violence.

Bartholomew and Allison (2006) found that individuals who have anxious attachment were more prone to dating violence. Also, the relationship between avoidant attachment style and dating violence was found to be low.

Wright (2015) examined the relationship of cyber-aggression with partner and parent attachment in romantic relationships with adolescents. The participants of the study are 600 people (376 women, 274 men). Insecure attachment to mother and insecure partner attachment were positively correlated. In addition, anxious and insecure partner attachment was found to be associated with cyber-aggression.

Lancaster, Seibert, Cooper, May & Fincham (2020) studied with 230 undergraduate students (89.2% female) in order to determine how insecure attachment styles may impact the relationship between cyber dating abuse and relationship quality. As a result of findings, there is a significant relationship between attachment avoidance and the relationship between cyber dating abuse and relationship quality. However, attachment anxiety does not affect the relationship between cyber dating abuse and relationship quality

Hazan and Shaver (1987) conducted a study with 620 people between the ages of 8-14. They found that the attachment pattern in later periods and childhood attachment patterns were similar. It was revealed that individuals who were securely attached to their parents in childhood developed more secure attachment in their romantic relationships in adulthood. In addition, it was observed that parents behave their children as their parents threatened them.

Main, Kaplan & Cassidy (1985) investigated the relationships of adult individuals with their parents and how these relationships affect their adult life. It has been observed that adults who are securely attached in adult romantic relationships experience more positive relationships with their parents, and adults who are not securely attached in romantic relationships experience more rejection in their childhood.

Gittleman, Klein, Smider & Essex (1998) studied with men and women between the ages of 21 and 52 and found that adults who were securely attached in their romantic relationships had higher scores in parental attachment. So, individuals who have a close and warm relationship with their parents experience secure attachment in adult romantic relationships. In this study, mother attachment is a significant predictor in predicting the romantic relationships of both women and men.

However, attachment to the father is a significant predictor of attachment in romantic relationships for only men

Simons and Surette (2016) aimed to investigate the effects of attachment styles of children who were abused by their parents on their adult relationships. This study was conducted with 601 university students. The results showed that child maltreatment is associated with betrayal in adulthood and anxious attachment partially mediates this relationship.

2.2.12. Domestic Studies About Attachment Styles and Dating Violence

Kahraman (2015) studied the relationships among adolescents' attachment styles and aggressive behaviors and depression levels. The sample group of the study consists of 119 adolescents (68 women, 51 men) live in Şırnak. It was found that the fearful attachment level was high in women and the level of obsessive attachment was high in men. In addition, female adolescents have high hostility tendencies and male adolescents have high physical aggression tendencies.

Kaplan (2012) analyzed the mediator role of empathy in the relationship between attachment and aggression in adolescents. 1424 adolescents, 709 girls and 715 boys, between age of 13 and 19, who live in Burdur participated in the study. The aggression scores of adolescents with insecure attachment are higher than adolescents with secure attachment. In addition, adolescents with secure attachment style have also aggressive behaviors.

In a study conducted by Karaboğa & Eken (2020), the effect of attachment style with parents on violent behavior in adolescence has been investigated. 145 volunteer adolescents who experienced disciplinary punishment participated in the

study. The findings obtained from the study emphasized that parental rejection has significant effect on violent behavior in adolescence.

In a study conducted by Gümüş (2016), the relationship between attachment styles and tendency to violence was examined with a sample of university students in Çanakkale. 375 volunteer students studying at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University participate in the research. As a result, a positive significant relationship was found between students' level of tendency to violence and their fearful and obsessive attachment scores.

Irmak and Altınbaş (2017) compared the resilience, attachment, coping styles and psychopathologies of the women who are exposed to domestic violence. There was no meaningful difference between the exposure to violence and attachment styles on 150 women participating in the study who were exposed to domestic violence.

Imamoğlu (2003) examined the relationship between teacher candidates' anger and anger expression styles and attachment styles. The research was conducted with a total of 465 senior students studying in different departments of Marmara University. As a result of the findings, there is a relationship between the attachment styles of the teacher candidates and their anger and anger expression styles. A linear and significant relationship was found between trait anger and insecure attachment styles (fearful, apathetic, and obsessive) while there is a significant negative relationship with secure attachment style.

In the study conducted by Damarlı (2006), the relationships among attachment styles, gender roles and self-concept in adolescents were examined. The sample of the study is 305 women and 276 men in different regions of Ankara. Findings showed that participants with a secure attachment style have more positive self-concepts than

participants who have obsessive and fearful attachment style. In addition, significant relationships were observed between gender role, attachment styles and self-concept in the study. In addition, it was observed that men have higher level of secure attachment than women.

Çetin (2015) studied the relationship between first-year university students' close attachment patterns and parent attachment patterns. He found that trusting the mother and being able to communicate with the father were significant predictors of secure attachment in a romantic relationship while alienation from the father was a significant predictor of obsessive attachment.

Çiftçi (2010) examined the relationship between parental relationship perception and adult attachment styles. 163 university students, 95 females and 68 males, participated in the study. It has been determined that the participants who are alienated from their parents and have a low level of communication with parents have anxious or avoidant attachment in their romantic and friendship relationships.

In a study conducted by Göçener (2010) with 255 university students between the ages of 17 and 40, it was stated that when individuals' secure attachment levels to their parents increase, they behave more positive in their interpersonal relationships such as romantic relationships.

3. METHOD

This section includes information on the model of the study, sample, data collection tools, and analysis of the data.

3.1. Model of the Study

The correlational model was used in this research. Correlational research is a kind of nonexperimental research and it is used in order to predict and explain of the

relationship among variables and investigate to what extent two or more variables are related without any manipulation of the variables. According to Grove et al. (2014), there are three types of correlational research designs: descriptive or explanatory, predictive, and model testing are three types of correlational research design. A descriptive design tries to explain of the relationships between and among variables. A predictive design tries to predict the level of a dependent variable from the measured values of the independent variable. The model testing design emphasizes testing theoretically proposed relationships (as cited in Seeram, 2019).

3.2. Participants

The participants of the study consists of individuals who in a dating relationship. The research consists of 503 participants, 276 women and 227 men. Participants average age is 25 ± 5 that varies between 16 and 59. The convenient sampling method was chosen as the sampling method (Büyüköztürk et al., 2015).

In the Table 3.1., distribution of the demographic variables regarding the participants was presented.

Table 3.1.
Characteristics of the Participants

		Frequency	%
Gender	Female	276	55
	Male	227	45
Education Level	Primary & Middle School	17	3
	High School	80	16
	Bachelor's	359	72
	Master's	47	9
Income Level	0-2500 TL	247	49
	2501-5000 TL	122	24
	5001-10000 TL	113	23
	10000 TL and Above	21	4
Duration of the Relationship	0-1 Year	206	41
	2-3 Years	109	22
	3-4 Years	49	10
	5 Years +	139	27

Type of Relationship	via Friends	82	16
Initiation	via Online	200	40
	via Face to Face	221	44
Average Time Spent Online	0-1 Hours	46	9
	2-3 Hours	162	32
	3-4 Hours	137	27
	5+ Hours	158	32
Total		503	100

3.3. Instruments

3.3.1. Demographic Information Form

A demographic information form was developed by the researcher as the first part of the questionnaire package. The form consisted of questions that were related to participants age, gender, profession, socio economic level and duration of relation.

3.3.2. Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CDAQ)

It was developed by Borrajo et al. (2015) to measure the existence of technology-based violence that individuals are exposed to and initiate in their romantic relationships. It was adapted to Turkish by Bakır (2019).

Cyber Dating Abuse Scale consists of 20 items. Each item consists of two parallel items as victimization and perpetration. The response scale used was a 6-point Likert scale that asked how many times the behaviors had occurred during the last year of the relationship: 1 (never), 2 (not in the last year, but it occurred before), 3 (rarely: 1 or 2 times), 4 (sometimes: between 3 and 10 times), 5 (often: between 10 and 20 times) and 6 (always: more than 20 times). While items 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16 and 18 were related to the Direct Aggression factor, items 1, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 were related to Monitoring / Control factor. (Borrajo, Gámez-Guadix Pereda & Calvete, 2015) for the scales of victimization and for perpetration.

In the reliability of the scale, the internal consistency coefficient was .73 for the Direct Aggression Perpetration Dimension, .84 for the Direct Aggression Victimization Dimension, .81 for the Control Perpetration Dimension, and .87 for the Control Victimization Dimension respectively. The results showed a structure composed of four factors, two for the scale of Victimization and two for the scale of Perpetration, with acceptable internal consistency coefficients (Borrajó, Gámez-Guadix Pereda & Calvete, 2015).

In Turkish adaptation of the CDAQ, three different techniques were used to examine the reliability of the Scale. These are Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient, test-retest reliability and split-half reliability. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient obtained for the scale was .84 for the Victimization Dimension, and .83 for the Perpetration Dimension. In split-half reliability analysis, reliability coefficient was .75 for the Victimization Dimension, and .77 for the Perpetration Dimension. Finally, in test-retest reliability, reliability coefficient was .80 for the Victimization Dimension, and .77 Perpetration Dimension. All three high coefficients (> 0.70) provide satisfactory evidence for the reliability of the scale (Bakır, 2019). The Cronbach alpha coefficient for this study was found .963 for Cyber Dating Abuse Tendency Dimension and .967 for Cyber Dating Abuse Exposure Dimension.

3.3.3. Relationship Scales Questionnaire (RSQ)

Relationship Scales Questionnaire was developed by Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) to measure the types of attachment styles. Items taken from Hazan and Shaver's (1987) Attachment Measure Paragraphs, Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) Relationship Questionnaire and Collins and Read's (1990) Adult Attachment Scale (cited in Sümer & Güngör, 1999) are used to create this scale. The scale consists of 30 items and 17 of them are used for attachment styles. The rest of the

items are used for determining attachment dimensions including 3 factors –close, depend and anxiety- (Collins & Read,1990). The scale measure four attachment styles which are called as secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing. Relationship Scales Questionnaire is a 7 Likert type scale in which item responses range from 1 “totally does not describe me” and 5 “totally describes me”. There are five items in secure and dismissing attachment subscales while there are four items in preoccupied and fearful attachment subscales. Normally there are 17 items for these attachment styles, but 1 item is used for 2 subscales by coding that item reversely. Each subscale’s score is obtained via dividing the total subscale score by the number of items in that subscale. As a result, each subscale has a score ranging from 1 to 7. In the reliability studies of RSQ, Cronbach alpha values of the subscales ranged between .41 and .71. Although the internal consistency reliability values were low, 82 acceptable level of test-retest reliability coefficients (.53 for females, and .49 for males) were found (Griffin and Bartholomew, 1994).

Turkish adaptation of Relationship Scales Questionnaire (RSQ) was conducted by Sümer and Güngör (1999) on a Turkish sample of 123 students. Internal consistency reliability coefficients for four subscales ranged between .27 and .61. Test-retest correlation coefficients is between .54 and .78. In this study, the use of this scale was preferred instead of the more up-to-date Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised scale because it was assumed that it would enrich the research more due to its more sub-dimensions. Cronbach alpha coefficient for this study was found .81 for secure attachment style, .85 for fearful attachment style, .74 for dismissing attachment Style and .71 for preoccupied attachment style.

3.3.4. Gender Roles Attitudes Scale (GRAS)

The Gender Role Attitudes Scale was developed by García-Cueto et al. (2015). The scale includes 20 items to determine the egalitarian attitude of individuals about gender roles. The scale is a 5 Likert type scale (1= I do not agree at all, 5 = I completely agree). The first six items in the scale are coded directly, but the last 14 items are reverse coded. The total score is obtained by adding the score from all items. Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as .99 within the scope of reliability of the scale. Item- total correlation values ranged from .39 to .92. So, it can be said that the scale is reliable quite (García-Cueto et al., 2015). Turkish adaptation of Gender Role Attitudes Scale was conducted by Bakioğlu & Türküm (2018). After EFA (Exploratory Factor Analysis) 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7 items were removed from the scale, and thus, 15 items were left. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as .88, and the test-retest reliability coefficient was calculated as .77. In the original study of the scale, the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as .99. Item-total correlations varied between .37- .68. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for this study was found .927.

3.4. Data Collection Process

First, necessary permissions were obtained from Yeditepe University Ethics Committee. Quantitative data was obtained through The Personal Information Form, Cyber Dating Abuse Scale, Gender Roles Attitudes Scale and Relationship Scales Questionnaire by the researcher. At the beginning of data collection, all participants were informed about the purpose of the research, and assured of the secrecy and anonymity of the study. Participation was completely voluntary. The completion of the survey packet took about 15 minutes.

3.5. Analysis of the Data

Firstly, internal consistency reliability was measured by Cronbach α before the main analyses. In the main analyses of the study, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to evaluate correlations between variables. Then, multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive roles of gender role attitudes, and attachment styles on cyber dating violence. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and independent samples t-test were used for the demographic variables. Since series of ANOVAS conducted, in order to avoid inflated Type 1 error rate a Bonferroni adjustment procedure was applied. Thus, the p-value was set at .01 instead of .05. IBM SPSS version 26 was conducted in all statistical analyses.

4. FINDINGS

This chapter of the research includes findings related to research questions. First of all, descriptive statistics of variables are explained. Then, the analysis results on whether the variables of cyber dating abuse, attachment styles and gender role attitudes differ according to demographic information, correlations among the cyber dating abuse, gender roles attitudes and attachment styles and whether individuals' attachment styles and gender roles attitudes predict cyber dating abuse are included.

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for cyber dating abuse, gender roles attitudes and attachment styles are presented in the Table 4.1.

Table 4.1.

Variable	Mean	Std. D.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Direct Aggression Exposure	17.65	12.46	1.68	1.85	10	60
Monitoring/Control Exposure	27.65	17.18	0.51	-1.39	9	54
Direct Aggression Tendency	19.19	13.61	1.75	2	11	66
Monitoring/Control Tendency	26.43	16.78	0.69	-1.15	9	54
CDAQ	50.05	16.33	-0.16	-1.29	19	75
Fearful Attachment Style	4.425	1.59	-0.21	-0.69	1	7
Dismissing Attachment Style	4.356	1.05	-0.64	-0.01	1	6.6
Secure Attachment Style	3.808	0.99	-0.04	0.17	1	7
Preoccupied Attachment Style	3.937	1.32	0.36	-0.27	1	7
<i>Descriptive Statistics</i>						

As seen in the Table 4.1., all of the research scales have skewness and kurtosis values between the -2 and +2, (George & Mallery, 2019) and it indicates that the research data have normal distribution. Therefore the parametric tests were used in the hypothesis testing of the research.

For the Cyber Dating Abuse Tendency and Exposure, the Direct Aggression Exposure has a mean score of 17,6±12,4 which below the average and minimum maximum scores ranged between 10 and 60. For the Monitoring/Control Exposure has a mean score of 27,6±17,1 which around the average and minimum maximum scores ranged between 9 and 54. For the Tendency side of the scale, Direct Aggression Tendency has a score of 19,1±13,6 which below the average and minimum maximum scores ranged between 11 and 66. For the Monitoring/Control Tendency has a score of 26,4±16,7 which around the average and minimum maximum scores ranged between 9 and 54.

Gender Roles Attitude Scale has a mean score of $50,1 \pm 16,3$ which is slightly above the average and this score indicates that the sample has an above-average attitude towards gender roles. Minimum maximum scores ranged between 19 and 75.

Finally, for the Attachment Styles, Fearful Attachment Style $4,4 \pm 1,5$ and minimum maximum scores ranged between 1 and 7, Dismissing Attachment Style $4,3 \pm 1,1$ and minimum maximum scores ranged between 1 and 6, Secure Attachment Style $3,8 \pm 0,9$ and minimum maximum scores ranged between 1 and 7 and lastly Preoccupied Attachment Style has a mean score of $3,9 \pm 1,3$ and minimum maximum scores ranged between 1 and 7. These scores indicates a slightly above average attachment style.

4.2. Demographic Variables

The seven sub-problem of the study is to investigate whether individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels differ according to their demographic information. Relevant findings are presented below.

4.2.1. Is There a Significant Difference Between Individuals' Cyber Dating Abuse Tendency, And Exposure Levels in Terms of Gender Variable?

In the Table 4.2 presented below shows the results of the independent t-test that conducted for the exploring the statistically significant mean differences between the Gender and Cyber Dating Abuse subscales.

Table 4.2.

Independent T test for Cyber Dating Abuse by Gender

Cyber Dating Abuse Sub-scales	Group	N	Mean	Median	SD	SE	t	df	p	d
Direct Agression Exposure	Female	276	15.514	10	11.102	0.668	-4.32	501	.001	-0.38
	Male	227	20.260	13	13.510	0.897				
Monitoring/Control Exposure	Female	276	24.428	16	16.315	0.982	-4.74	501	.001	-0.42
	Male	227	31.581	27	17.424	1.156				

Direct Aggression Tendency	Female	276	15.616	11	9.750	0.587	-6.79	501	.001	-0.60
	Male	227	23.551	14	16.164	1.073				
Monitoring/Control Tendency	Female	276	23.225	17	14.757	0.888	-4.84	501	.001	-0.43
	Male	227	30.348	23	18.245	1.211				

It can be seen in the Table 4.2., there are significant differences between gender and Cyber Dating Abuse subscales Direct Aggression Exposure [$t(501) = -4.32$, $p < .05$, $d = -0.38$], Monitoring/Control Exposure [$t(501) = -4.74$, $p < .05$, $d = -0.42$], Direct Aggression Tendency [$t(501) = -6.79$, $p < .05$, $d = -0.60$], Monitoring/Control Tendency [$t(501) = -4.84$, $p < .05$, $d = -0.43$]. When these significant relationships examined it could be stated that the in all subscales male participants have higher scores than the female participants (Direct Aggression Exposure ($\bar{X} = 20.26$, $SD = 13.51$), Monitoring/Control Exposure ($\bar{X} = 31.58$, $SD = 17.42$), Direct Aggression Tendency ($\bar{X} = 23.55$, $SD = 16.16$), Monitoring/Control Tendency ($\bar{X} = 30.35$, $SD = 18.25$)).

4.2.3. Is There a Significant Difference Between Individuals' Cyber Dating Abuse Tendency, And Exposure Levels in Terms of Education Level Variable?

In order to predict whether the cyber dating abuse subscales have a significant difference according to education level, one way ANOVA analysis was conducted. The results were presented in the table 4.3.

Table 4.3.
ANOVA for Cyber Dating Abuse by Education Level

Sub-scales	Education Level	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
Direct Aggression Exposure	Primary & Middle School	11,6	3,6						
	High School	14,9	11,4	1.570.75	3	523.58	3.42	.017	.020
	Bachelor's	18,6	12,6						
	Master's	16,9	13,3						
Monitoring/	Primary & Middle School	13,4	9,6						

Control Exposure	High School	20,5	13,9	10.417.1	3	3.472.34	12.57	.001	.070
	Bachelor's	30,3	17,5						
	Master's	24,5	14,8						
Direct Aggression Tendency	Primary & Middle School	11,7	1,5						
	High School	15,3	12,0	2.753.2	3	917.73	5.07	.002	.030
	Bachelor's	20,5	13,9						
	Master's	18,3	14,2						
Monitoring/Control Tendency	Primary & Middle School	11,1	2,83						
	High School	17,4	10,8	13.490.8	3	4.496.93	17.53	.001	.095
	Bachelor's	29,3	17,4						
	Master's	25,4	14,5						

It can be seen in the Table 4.3., there are significantly differences between the Education Level and Cyber Dating Abuse subscales ($\text{sig} < 0,05$). [$F(3,499) = 3,42$, $p < .05$] for Direct Aggression Exposure, [$F(3, 499) = 12,57$, $p < .05$] for Monitoring/Control Exposure, [$F(3,499) = 5,07$, $p < .05$] for Direct Aggression Tendency and [$F(3,499) = 12,53$, $p < .05$] for Monitoring/Control Tendency.

The results of the Tukey post hoc test performed to determine the source of Cyber Dating Abuse at Education Level are given in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4

Tukey Post Hoc Test Results of Education Level

Sub-scales	Education	Education	Mean Difference	SE	df	t	p _{Tukey}
Direct Aggression Exposure	Primary& Middle School	High School	-3.290	3.304	499.000	-0.996	0.752
	-	Bachelor's	-6.988	3.071	499.000	-2.276	0.105
	-	Master's	-5.332	3.501	499.000	-1.523	0.425
	High School	Bachelor's	-3.698	1.530	499.000	-2.417	0.075
	-	Master's	-2.041	2.274	499.000	-0.898	0.806
	Bachelor's	Master's	1.656	1.919	499.000	0.863	0.824
Monitoring/Control	Primary& Middle School	High School	-7.104	4.438	499.000	-1.601	0.379
	-	Bachelor's	-16.841	4.124	499.000	-4.083	< .001
	-	Master's	-11.083	4.703	499.000	-2.357	0.087
	High	Bachelor's	-9.737	2.054	499.000	-4.740	< .001

Exposure	School						
		Master's	-3.978	3.054	499.000	-1.303	0.562
	Bachelor's	Master's	5.759	2.577	499.000	2.234	0.115
	Primary& Middle School	High School	-3.623	3.592	499.000	-1.009	0.745
Direct	-	Bachelor's	-8.745	3.339	499.000	-2.619	0.045
Aggression	-	Master's	-6.576	3.807	499.000	-1.727	0.311
Tendency	High School	Bachelor's	-5.122	1.663	499.000	-3.080	0.012
	-	Master's	-2.953	2.472	499.000	-1.195	0.631
	Bachelor's	Master's	2.169	2.086	499.000	1.040	0.726
	Primary& Middle School	High School	-6.307	4.277	499.000	-1.475	0.453
	-	Bachelor's	-18.189	3.975	499.000	-4.576	<.001
	-	Master's	-14.308	4.532	499.000	-3.157	0.009
Monitoring/ Control	High School	Bachelor's	-11.881	1.980	499.000	-6.001	<.001
Tendency		Master's	-8.001	2.943	499.000	-2.719	0.034
	Bachelor's	Master's	3.881	2.484	499.000	1.562	0.401

For Direct Aggression Exposure there was no significance.

People who have Bachelor's degree were more likely to higher Monitoring/Control Exposure than people who have Primary&Middle School and High School degree

Similarly people who have Bachelor's degree were more likely to higher Direct Aggression Tendency than people who have Primary&Middle School and High School degree

Lastly people who have Bachelor's degree were more likely to higher Monitoring/Control Tendency than people who have Primary&Middle School and High School degree. Master's degree were more likely to higher Monitoring/Control Tendency than High School degree.

4.2.4. Is There A Significant Difference Between Individuals' Cyber Dating Abuse Tendency And Exposure Levels In Terms Of Income Level Variable?

In order to predict whether the cyber dating abuse subscales have a significant difference according to income level, one way ANOVA analysis was conducted. The results were presented in the table 4.5.

Table 4.5.
ANOVA for Cyber Dating Abuse by Income Level

	Income Level	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
Direct Aggression Exposure	0-2500	20,23	12,94	3.747.088	3	1.249.029	8.40	.001	0.048
	2501-5000	16,57	12,43						
	5001-10000	14,23	11,2						
	10000 +	12,14	3,75						
Monitoring/ Control Exposure	0-2500	32,37	18,36	11.004.77	3	3.668.257	13.34	.001	0.074
	2501-5000	24,08	15,93						
	5001-10000	22,12	13,42						
	10000 +	22,76	13,03						
Direct Aggression Tendency	0-2500	22,77	14,72	6.432.401	3	2.144.134	12.35	.001	0.069
	2501-5000	16,67	12,17						
	5001-10000	15,09	11,46						
	10000 +	13,9	5,82						
Monitoring/ Control Tendency	0-2500	31,98	18,15	15.650.42	3	5.216.807	20.69	.001	0.111
	2501-5000	22,78	14,67						
	5001-10000	19,2	11,63						
	10000 +	21,48	13,45						

It can be seen in the Table 4.5., there are significantly differences between the Income Level and Cyber Dating Abuse subscales (sig<0,05). [F(3,499)= 8,400, $p<.05$] for Direct Aggression Exposure, [F(3, 499)= 13,343, $p<.05$] for

Monitoring/Control Exposure, $[F(3,499)= 12,354, p<.05]$ for Direct Aggression Tendency and $[F(3,499)=20,694, p<.05]$ for Monitoring/Control Tendency.

The results of the Tukey post hoc test performed to determine the source of Cyber Dating Abuse at Income Level are given in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6.

Tukey Post Hoc Test Results of Income Level

Sub-scales	Income	Income	Mean Difference	SE	df	t	p _{Tukey}
Direct Aggression Exposure	0-2500	2501-5000	3.665	1.349	499.000	2.716	0.034
	-	5001-10000	6.001	1.385	499.000	4.333	<.001
	-	10000 and above	8.088	2.772	499.000	2.918	0.019
	2501-5000	5001-10000	2.335	1.592	499.000	1.467	0.458
	-	10000 and above	4.423	2.881	499.000	1.535	0.417
	5001-10000	10000 and above	2.087	2.898	499.000	0.720	0.889
Monitoring/Control Exposure	0-2500	2501-5000	8.286	1.835	499.000	4.516	<.001
	-	5001-10000	10.245	1.883	499.000	5.440	<.001
	-	10000 and above	9.607	3.769	499.000	2.549	0.054
	2501-5000	5001-10000	1.958	2.165	499.000	0.905	0.802
	--	10000 and above	1.320	3.917	499.000	0.337	0.987
	5001-10000	10000 and above	-0.638	3.940	499.000	-.162	0.998
Direct Aggression Tendency	0-2500	2501-5000	6.101	1.458	499.000	4.185	<.001
	-	5001-10000	7.685	1.496	499.000	5.136	<.001
	-	10000 and above	8.869	2.995	499.000	2.962	0.017
	2501-5000	5001-10000	1.584	1.720	499.000	0.921	0.794
	-	10000 and above	2.767	3.112	499.000	0.889	0.811
	5001-10000	10000 and above	1.184	3.131	499.000	0.378	0.982
Monitoring/Control Tendency	0-2500	2501-5000	9.201	1.757	499.000	5.237	<.001
	-	5001-10000	12.776	1.803	499.000	7.085	<.001
	-	10000 and above	10.504	3.609	499.000	2.910	0.020
	2501-5000	5001-10000	3.575	2.073	499.000	1.725	0.312
		10000 and above	1.302	3.751	499.000	0.347	0.986
	5001-10000	10000 and above	-2.273	3.773	499.000	-.602	0.931

It can be seen in the Table 4.7., there are significantly differences between the type of relationship initiation and Cyber Dating Abuse subscales ($\text{sig} < 0,05$) [$F(3,499) = 104,15$, $p < .05$] for Direct Aggression Exposure, [$F(2, 500) = 146,94$, $p < .05$] for Monitoring/Control Exposure, [$F(2,500) = 118,57$, $p < .05$] for Direct Aggression Tendency and [$F(2,500) = 119,81$, $p < .05$] for Monitoring/Control Tendency.

The results of the Tukey post hoc test performed to determine the source of Cyber Dating Abuse for Type of Relationship Initiation are given in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8

Tukey Post Hoc Test Results of Type of Relationship Initiation

Sub-scales	Relationship Initiation		Mean Difference	SE	df	t	P _{Tukey}
Direct Aggression Exposure	via Friends	via Online	-14.301	1.376	500.000	-10.397	.001
		via facetoface	-0.708	1.356	500.000	-0.522	.861
	via Online	via facetoface	13.593	1.024	500.000	13.277	.001
Monitoring Control Exposure	via Friends	via Online	-21.254	1.792	500.000	-11.864	.001
		via facetoface	0.116	1.767	500.000	0.066	.998
	via Online	via facetoface	21.370	1.333	500.000	16.027	.001
Direct Aggression Tendency	via Friends	via Online	-16.044	1.473	500.000	-10.891	.001
		via facetoface	-0.390	1.453	500.000	-0.268	.961
	via Online	via facetoface	15.654	1.096	500.000	14.277	.001
Monitoring/ Control Tendency	via Friends	via Online	-23.122	1.644	500.000	-14.062	.001
		via facetoface	-0.393	1.621	500.000	-0.242	.968
	via Online	via facetoface	22.729	1.224	500.000	18.573	.001

Multiple comparisons indicated that for direct aggression exposure the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via facetoface group.

For monitoring/control exposure the the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via facetoface group.

Post hoc test results revealed that for direct aggression tendency the the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via facetoface group.

Lastly for monitoring/control tendency the the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via facetoface group.

4.2.6. Is There a Significant Difference Between Individuals' Cyber Dating Abuse Tendency, and Exposure Levels in Terms of Duration of Romantic Relationship Variable?

In order to predict whether the cyber dating abuse subscales have a significant difference according to duration of romantic relationship, one way ANOVA analysis was conducted. The results were presented in the table 4.9.

Table 4.9.
ANOVA for Cyber Dating Abuse by Duration of Romantic Relationship

	Duration	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
Direct Aggression Exposure	0-1 Year	19,19	12,9	3.076.391	3	1.025.46	6.834	.001	.039
	2-3 Years	14,21	9,43						
	3-4 Years	22,37	15,84						
	5 Years +	16,42	11,77						
Monitoring/Control Exposure	0-1 Year	29,9	17,34	4.769.334	3	1.589.78	5.531	.001	.032
	2-3 Years	23,9	14,76						
	3-4 Years	33,1	17,67						
	5 Years +	25,35	17,71						
Direct Aggression Tendency	0-1 Year	21,05	14,3	3.439.275	3	1.146.42	6.385	.001	.037
	2-3 Years	15,86	10,86						
	3-4 Years	23,88	18,08						
	5 Years +	17,41	11,81						
Monitoring/Control Tendency	0-1 Year	28,69	17,04	5.089.712	3	1.696.57	6.209	.001	.036
	2-3 Years	22,94	14,28						
	3-4 Years	32,35	17,77						
	5 Years +	23,76	16,95						

It can be seen in the table 4.9., there are significantly differences between the Duration of Romantic Relationship and Cyber Dating Abuse subscales ($\text{sig} < 0,05$) [F(3,499)= 6,834, $p < .05$] for Direct Aggression Exposure, [F(3, 499)= 5,531, $p < .05$] for Monitoring/Control Exposure, [F(3,499)= 6,385, $p < .05$] for Direct Aggression Tendency and [F(3,499)=6,209, $p < .05$] for Monitoring/Control Tendency.

The results of the Tukey post hoc test performed to determine the source of Cyber Dating Abuse for Type of Relationship Initiation are given in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10

Tukey Post Hoc Test Results of Duration of Romantic Relationship

	Avg_Relationship		Mean Difference	SE	df	t	Ptukey
Direct Aggression Exposure	0-1 Year	2-3 Years	4.978	1.451	499.000	3.431	.004
		3-4 Years	-3.178	1.947	499.000	-1.632	.361
		5 Years +	2.765	1.345	499.000	2.056	.169
	2-3 Years	3-4 Years	-8.156	2.107	499.000	-3.871	.001
		5 Years +	-2.213	1.567	499.000	-1.412	.492
	3-4 Years	5 Years +	5.943	2.035	499.000	2.920	.019
Monitoring/Control Exposure	0-1 Year	2-3 Years	6.004	2.008	499.000	2.990	.015
		3-4 Years	-3.199	2.695	499.000	-1.187	.635
		5 Years +	4.550	1.861	499.000	2.445	.070
	2-3 Years	3-4 Years	-9.203	2.916	499.000	-3.156	.009
		5 Years +	-1.453	2.169	499.000	-0.670	.908
	3-4 Years	5 Years +	7.750	2.817	499.000	2.751	.031
Direct Aggression Tendency	0-1 Year	2-3 Years	5.191	1.587	499.000	3.271	.006
		3-4 Years	-2.824	2.130	499.000	-1.326	.547
		5 Years +	3.643	1.471	499.000	2.477	.065
	2-3 Years	3-4 Years	-8.015	2.305	499.000	-3.478	.003
		5 Years +	-1.548	1.714	499.000	-0.903	.803
	3-4 Years	5 Years +	6.467	2.226	499.000	2.905	.020
Monitoring/Control Tendency	0-1 Year	2-3 Years	5.749	1.958	499.000	2.936	.018
		3-4 Years	-3.653	2.627	499.000	-1.390	.506
		5 Years +	4.939	1.814	499.000	2.722	.034
	2-3 Years	3-4 Years	-9.402	2.843	499.000	-3.307	.006
		5 Years +	-0.810	2.115	499.000	-0.383	.981
	3-4 Years	5 Years +	8.592	2.746	499.000	3.128	.010

Multiple comparisons indicated that for direct aggression exposure 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years group and 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups.

For monitoring/control exposure the 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years group and 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups.

Post hoc test results revealed that for direct aggression tendency the 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years group and 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups.

Lastlty for monitoring/control tendency the 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 5 Years + group and 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups.

4.2.7. Is There A Significant Difference Between Individuals' Cyber Dating Abuse Tendency And Exposure Levels In Terms Of Average Time Spent Online Variable?

In order to predict whether the cyber dating abuse subscales have a significant difference according to average time spent online, one way ANOVA analysis was conducted. The results were presented in the table 4.11.

Table 4.11.
ANOVA for Cyber Dating Abuse by Average Time Spent Online

	Average Time	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
Direct Aggression Exposure	0-1 Hours	14,67	8,93	7.491.31	3	2.497.10	17.686	.001	0.096
	2-3 Hours	12,99	6,97						
	3-4 Hours	18,85	13,73						
	5+ Hours	22,27	14,59						
Monitoring/Control Exposure	0-1 Hours	21,85	15,28	22.094.1	3	7.364.67	29.145	.001	0.149
	2-3 Hours	19,68	12,63						
	3-4 Hours	30,15	17,71						
	5+ Hours	35,36	17,35						
Direct Aggression Tendency	0-1 Hours	16,52	10,8	12.442.3	3	4.147.43	25.679	.001	0.134
	2-3 Hours	13,54	6,46						
	3-4 Hours	19,15	13,67						
	5+ Hours	25,82	16,59						
Monitoring/Control Tendency	0-1 Hours	21,17	15,74	26.677.9	3	8.892.64	38.665	.001	0.189
	2-3 Hours	17,79	10,16						
	3-4 Hours	27,99	16,99						
	5+ Hours	35,49	17,44						

It can be seen in the Table 4.11., there are significantly differences between the Average Time Spent Online and Cyber Dating Abuse subscales ($\text{sig} < 0,05$) and when these differences were examined it could be stated that the participants who spent 5+ hours on internet daily have the highest scores. [$F(3,499) = 17,686$, $p < .05$]

for Direct Aggression Exposure, $[F(3, 499)= 29,145, p<.05]$ for Monitoring/Control Exposure, $[F(3,499)= 25,679,p<.05]$ for Direct Aggression Tendency and $[F(3,499)=38,665, p<.05]$ for Monitoring/Control Tendency.

The results of the Tukey post hoc test performed to determine the source of Cyber Dating Abuse for Type of Relationship Initiation are given in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12.

Tukey Post Hoc Test Results of Average Time Spent Online

Internet_Time			Mean Difference	SE	df	t	p _{Tukey}
Direct Aggression Exposure	0-1 hour	2-3 hours	1.680	1.985	499.000	0.846	0.832
		3-4 hours	-4.173	2.025	499.000	-2.061	0.168
		5 hours +	-7.598	1.991	499.000	-3.817	.001
	2-3 hours	3-4 hours	-5.853	1.379	499.000	-4.244	.001
		5 hours +	-9.278	1.329	499.000	-6.983	.001
	3-4 hours	5 hours +	-3.425	1.387	499.000	-2.469	0.066
Monitoring/Control Exposure	0-1 hour	2-3 hours	2.169	2.656	499.000	0.817	0.847
		3-4 hours	-8.305	2.709	499.000	-3.066	0.012
		5 hours +	-13.513	2.663	499.000	-5.074	.001
	2-3 hours	3-4 hours	-10.474	1.845	499.000	-5.677	.001
		5 hours +	-15.682	1.777	499.000	-8.823	.001
	3-4 hours	5 hours +	-5.207	1.856	499.000	-2.806	0.027
Direct Aggression Tendency	0-1 hour	2-3 hours	2.985	2.123	499.000	1.406	0.496
		3-4 hours	-2.632	2.166	499.000	-1.215	0.618
		5 hours +	-9.295	2.129	499.000	-4.365	.001
	2-3 hours	3-4 hours	-5.616	1.475	499.000	-3.807	.001
		5 hours +	-12.279	1.421	499.000	-8.642	.001
	3-4 hours	5 hours +	-6.663	1.484	499.000	-4.491	.001
Monitoring/Control Tendency	0-1 hour	2-3 hours	3.384	2.534	499.000	1.336	0.541
		3-4 hours	-6.819	2.584	499.000	-2.639	0.043
		5 hours +	-14.320	2.541	499.000	-5.636	.001
	2-3 hours	3-4 hours	-10.203	1.760	499.000	-5.796	.001
		5 hours +	-17.704	1.696	499.000	-10.440	.001
	3-4 hours	5 hours +	-7.501	1.770	499.000	-4.237	.001

Multiple comparisons indicated that for direct aggression exposure 5 hours + group significantly higher than 0-1 hour group and 3-4 hours and 5 hours groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours group.

For monitoring/control exposure the 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 0-1 hour group. 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours one. 5 hours + group significantly higher than 3-4 hours group.

Post hoc test results revealed that for direct aggression tendency 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 0-1 hour group. 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours one. 5 hours + group significantly higher than 3-4 hours group.

Lastly for monitoring/control tendency the 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 0-1 hour group. 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours one. 5 hours + group significantly higher than 3-4 hours group.

4.3. Correlations

In this section, the correlation analysis results and findings are presented.

Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the correlations of variables.

The results were presented in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13.

Pearson's Correlations among variables (N= 503)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.Direct Agression Exposure	—								
2.Monitoring/Control Exposure	.756***	—							
3. Direct Agression Tendency	.804***	.686***	—						
4.Monitoring/Control Tendency	.713***	.882***	.801***	—					
5. Gender Roles Attitudes	-.624***	-.619***	-.669***	-.660***	—				
6. Fearful Attachment Style	.381***	.316***	.276***	.295***	-.342***	—			
7. Dismissing Attachment Style	-.115**	-.103*	-.148***	-.147***	.180***	.197***	—		
8. Secure Attachment Style	-.411***	-.402***	-.448***	-.439***	.342***	-.433**	-.052	—	
9. Preoccupied Attachment Style	.170***	.237***	.258***	.240***	-.144**	-.186***	.011	-.015	—

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

It can be seen in the Table 4.13., there are statistically significant relationship ($p < 0.01$) between all Cyber Dating Abuse subscales and all Attachment Style subscales and all Cyber Dating Abuse subscales were positively correlated with

Fearful Attachment Style ($r = .381$ (Direct Aggression Exposure), $r = .316$ (Monitoring/Control Exposure), $r = .276$ (Direct Aggression Tendency), $r = .295$ (Monitoring/Control Tendency) and *Preoccupied Attachment Style* ($r = .170$ (Direct Aggression Exposure), $.237$ (Monitoring/Control Exposure), $.258$ (Direct Aggression Tendency), $.240$ (Monitoring/Control Tendency) while were negatively correlated with *Dismissive Attachment Style* ($r = -.115$ (Direct Aggression Exposure), $r = -.103$ (Monitoring/Control Exposure), $r = -.148$ (Direct Aggression Tendency), $r = -.147$ (Monitoring/Control Tendency) and *Secure Attachment Style* ($r = -.411$ (Direct Aggression Exposure), $r = -.402$ (Monitoring/Control Exposure), $r = -.448$ (Direct Aggression Tendency), $r = -.439$ (Monitoring/Control Tendency)).

There are statistically significant, negative and moderate relationship between the gender roles attitudes of the participants and cyber dating abuse subscales ($p < 0.01$, $r = -.624$ (Direct Aggression Exposure), $r = -.619$ (Monitoring/Control Exposure), $r = -.669$ (Direct Aggression Tendency), $r = -.660$ (Monitoring/Control Tendency). This relationship indicates that the when the participants' Gender Roles Attitudes increases their Direct Aggression Exposure, Monitoring/Control Exposure, Direct Aggression Tendency and Monitoring/Control Tendency decreases or vice versa.

When the relationship between gender role attitudes and attachment styles is examined, there are statistically significant relationship between the Gender Roles Attitudes and Attachment Styles of the participants. When these statistically significant relationships were examined it could be stated that the relationship is weak and negative the for *Fearful Attachment Style* ($r = -.273$) and *Preoccupied Attachment Style* ($r = -.144$), the relationship is weak and positive for the *Dismissing Attachment Style* ($r = .180$) and the relationship is moderate and positive for *Secure Attachment Style* ($r = .342$).

Multiple Regression Analysis Results on the Predictors of Cyber Dating Abuse

In this section, the regression analyses results and findings are presented. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was conducted to estimate predictors of Cyber Dating Abuse.

Multiple regression analysis conducted for Direct Agression Exposure. VIF and tolerance values were examined in order to avoid the multicollinearity problem. The tolerance ranged from .55 to .89, with VIF values between 1.21 and 1.85. Durbin-Watson value is 1.98, that is, there is no auto-correlation problem. Bonferroni protocol was applied to prevent type 1 error in all regression analyzes and the statistical significance value was determined as $p=.01$ instead of $p=.05$. The findings of the multiple regression analysis for Direct Agression Exposure are presented in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14.

Multiple Regression Analysis For Direct Agression Exposure

Predictor	B	SE	t	p	Beta (β)	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Intercept	36.229	3.620	10.009	.001			
Gender Roles Attitudes	-0.357	0.029	-12.248	.001	-0.468	-0.543	-0.393
Fearful Attachment Style	1.472	0.315	4.672	.001	0.188	0.109	0.267
Dismissing Attachment Style	-0.927	0.412	-2.248	.025	-0.079	-0.147	-0.010
Secure Attachment Style	-2.158	0.471	-4.579	.001	-0.171	-0.245	-0.098
Preoccupied Attachment Style	1.279	0.326	3.928	.001	0.136	0.068	0.203

As seen in Table 4.14, only the model for Direct Agression Exposure is significant [$F(4,97.5)= 86.746$, $p<.001$, $R^2=0.466$]. Considering the standardized coefficients (β) of the predictor variables, Gender Roles Attitudes ($\beta= -0.468$, $p<0.01$)

and Secure Attachment Style ($\beta = -0.171$, $p < 0.01$) negatively predicts individuals' Direct Aggression Exposure. Fearful Attachment Style ($\beta = 0.188$, $p < 0.01$) and Preoccupied Attachment Style ($\beta = 0.136$, $p < 0.01$) positively predicts individuals' Direct Aggression Exposure.

Gender Roles Attitudes, Secure Attachment Style, Fearful Attachment Style and Preoccupied Attachment Style explain 46 % of direct aggression exposure. When the confidence intervals for the meaningful results are examined, it will be seen that these intervals do not contain zero and the beta values are in this range.

Multiple regression analysis conducted for Monitoring/Control Exposure. VIF and tolerance values were examined in order to avoid the multicollinearity problem. The tolerance ranged from .59 to .81, with VIF values between 1.31 and 1.65. Durbin-Watson value is 1.58, that is, there is no auto-correlation problem. Bonferroni protocol was applied to prevent type 1 error in all regression analyzes and the statistical significance value was determined as $p = .01$ instead of $p = .05$. The findings of the multiple regression analysis for Monitoring/Control Exposure are presented in Table 4.15.

Tabla 4.15.

Multiple Regression Analysis For Monitoring/Control Exposure

Predictor	B	SE	t	p	Beta (β)	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Intercept	53.685	5.027	10.679	.001			
Gender Roles Attitudes	-0.503	0.040	-12.435	.001	-0.478	-0.554	-0.403
Fearful Attachment Style	1.259	0.438	2.878	.004	0.117	0.037	0.196
Dismissing Attachment Style	-0.837	0.573	-1.462	.144	-0.051	-0.121	0.018
Secure Attachment Style	-3.255	0.655	-4.973	.001	-0.187	-0.262	-0.113
Preoccupied Attachment Style	2.448	0.452	5.410	.001	0.188	0.120	0.256

As seen in Table 4.15., only the model for Monitoring/Control Exposure is significant [$F(497.5) = 84.036$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = 0.458$]. Considering the standardized coefficients (β) of the predictor variables, Gender Roles Attitudes ($\beta = -0.478$, $p < 0.01$) and Secure Attachment Style ($\beta = -0.187$, $p < 0.01$) negatively predicts individuals' Monitoring/Control Exposure. Fearful Attachment Style ($\beta = 0.117$, $p < 0.01$) and Preoccupied Attachment Style ($\beta = 0.188$, $p < 0.01$) positively predicts individuals' Monitoring/Control Exposure.

Gender Roles Attitudes, Secure Attachment Style, Fearful Attachment Style and Preoccupied Attachment Style explain 45 % of Monitoring/Control Exposure. When the confidence intervals for the meaningful results are examined, it will be seen that these intervals do not contain zero and the beta values are in this range.

Multiple regression analysis conducted for Direct Aggression Tendency. VIF and tolerance values were examined in order to avoid the multicollinearity problem. The tolerance ranged from .48 to .86, with VIF values between 1.45 and 1.95. Durbin-Watson value is 1.72, that is, there is no auto-correlation problem. Bonferroni protocol was applied to prevent type 1 error in all regression analyzes and the statistical significance value was determined as $p = .01$ instead of $p = .05$. The findings of the multiple regression analysis for Direct Aggression Tendency are presented in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16.

Multiple Regression Analysis For Direct Aggression Tendency

Predictor	B	SE	t	p	Beta (β)	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Intercept	49.949	3.684	13.557	< .001			
Gender Roles Attitudes	-0.442	0.030	-14.902	< .001	-0.530	-0.600	-0.460
Fearful Attachment Style	0.293	0.321	0.912	0.362	0.034	-0.039	0.108
Dismissing Attachment	-0.957	0.420	-2.280	0.023	-0.074	-0.138	-0.010

Style							
Secure Attachment Style	-3.486	0.480	-7.266	<.001	-0.253	-0.322	-0.185
Preoccupied Attachment Style	1.911	0.332	5.764	<.001	0.185	0.122	0.249

As seen in Table 4.16., only the model for Direct Aggression Tendency is significant [$F(497.5) = 115.031, p < .001, R^2 = 0.536$]. Considering the standardized coefficients (β) of the predictor variables, Gender Roles Attitudes ($\beta = -0.530, p < 0.01$) and Secure Attachment Style ($\beta = -0.253, p < 0.01$) negatively predicts individuals' Direct Aggression Tendency. Preoccupied Attachment Style ($\beta = 0.185, p < 0.01$) positively predicts individuals' Direct Aggression Tendency.

Gender Roles Attitudes, Secure Attachment Style and Preoccupied Attachment Style explain 53 % of Direct Aggression Tendency. When the confidence intervals for the meaningful results are examined, it will be seen that these intervals do not contain zero and the beta values are in this range.

Multiple regression analysis conducted for Monitoring/Control Tendency. VIF and tolerance values were examined in order to avoid the multicollinearity problem. The tolerance ranged from .59 to .81, with VIF values between 1.31 and 1.65. Durbin-Watson value is 1.58, that is, there is no auto-correlation problem. Bonferroni protocol was applied to prevent type 1 error in all regression analyzes and the statistical significance value was determined as $p = .01$ instead of $p = .05$. The findings of the multiple regression analysis for Monitoring/Control Tendency are presented in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17.***Multiple Regression Analysis For Monitoring/Control Tendency***

Predictor	B	SE	t	p	Beta (β)	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Intercept	62.102	4.632	13.407	<.001			
Gender Roles Attitudes	-0.531	0.037	-14.249	<.001	-0.517	-0.588	-0.446
Fearful Attachment Style	0.686	0.403	1.702	0.089	0.065	-0.010	0.140
Dismissing Attachment Style	-1.293	0.528	-2.450	0.015	-0.081	-0.147	-0.016
Secure Attachment Style	-4.002	0.603	-6.635	<.001	-0.236	-0.306	-0.166
Preoccupied Attachment Style	2.229	0.417	5.346	<.001	0.175	0.111	0.240

As seen in Table 4.17., only the model for Monitoring/Control Tendency is significant [$F(497.5) = 106.840$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = 0.518$]. Considering the standardized coefficients (β) of the predictor variables, Gender Roles Attitudes ($\beta = -0.517$, $p < 0.01$) and Secure Attachment Style ($\beta = -0.236$, $p < 0.01$) negatively predicts individuals' Monitoring/Control Tendency. Preoccupied Attachment Style ($\beta = 0.175$, $p < 0.01$) positively predicts individuals' Monitoring/Control Tendency.

Gender Roles Attitudes, Secure Attachment Style, and Preoccupied Attachment Style explain 51 % of Monitoring/Control Tendency. When the confidence intervals for the meaningful results are examined, it will be seen that these intervals do not contain zero and the beta values are in this range.

5. RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this section, the results, discussion and suggestions are listed. First of all, the results of the thesis were stated in the light of the findings. Then, the findings of the study were compared with other findings in the literature; the similarities and differences are discussed. Finally, suggestions made within the framework of the findings of the thesis and suggestions for future studies are listed.

5.1. RESULTS

1. According to research findings, individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels differ according to gender. Male participants have higher scores than the female participants in Cyber Dating Abuse subscales.
2. Individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels differ according to education level. For Direct Aggression Exposure, there was no significance. People who have Bachelor's degree were more likely to higher Monitoring/Control Exposure than people who have Primary&Middle School and High School degree. Similarly, people who have Bachelor's degree were more likely to higher Direct Aggression Tendency than people who have Primary&Middle School and High School degree. Lastly, people who have Bachelor's degree were more likely to higher Monitoring/Control Tendency than people who have Primary&Middle School and High School degree. Master's degree were more likely to higher Monitoring/Control Tendency than High School degree.
3. Individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels differ according to income level. Multiple comparisons indicated that for all sub-dimensions, the 0-2500 income group significantly higher than the o 2501-5000, 5001-10000 and 10000 and above income group. For monitoring/control exposure, the 0-2500 income group significantly higher than the 2501-5000, and 5001-10000 income group. For direct aggression tendency, the 0-2500 income group significantly higher than the 2501-5000, 5001-10000 and 10000 and above income group. Lastlty for monitoring/control tendency, the 0-2500 income group significantly higher than the 2501-5000, 5001-10000 and 10000 and above income group.

4. Individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels differ according to type of romantic relationship initiation. Multiple comparisons indicated that for Direct Aggression Exposure, the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via facetoface group. For Monitoring/Control Exposure, the the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via facetoface group. For Direct Aggression Tendency, the the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via facetoface group. Lastlty for Monitoring/Control Tendency, the the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via facetoface group.
5. Individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels differ according to duration of romantic relationship. Multiple comparisons indicated that for direct aggression exposure, 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years group and 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups. For monitoring/control exposure, the 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years group and 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups. For direct aggression tendency, the 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years group and 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups. Lastlty for monitoring/control tendency, the 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 5 Years + group and 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups.
6. Individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels differ according to average time spent online. Multiple comparisons indicated that for Direct Aggression Exposure, 5 hours + group significantly higher than 0-1 hour group and 3-4 hours and 5 hours groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours group. For

Monitoring/Control Exposure, the 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 0-1 hour group. 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours one. 5 hours + group significantly higher than 3-4 hours group. For Direct Aggression Tendency, the 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 0-1 hour group. 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours one. 5 hours + group significantly higher than 3-4 hours group. Lastly for Monitoring/Control Tendency, the 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 0-1 hour group. 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours one. 5 hours + group significantly higher than 3-4 hours group.

7. According to research findings, it was seen that there is a meaningful relationship between individuals' attachment styles and cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels. It was found that there is a positive relationship for Fearful and Preoccupied Attachment style. Individuals' Fearful and Preoccupied Attachment Style scores increase, their cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels increase. In addition, there is a negative relationship for Dismissive and Secure Attachment Style. Individuals' Dismissive and Secure Attachment Style scores increases, their cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels decrease.
8. There is a significant, moderate and negative relationship between individuals' gender role attitudes and cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels. Individuals' egalitarian perspective about gender roles increase, their cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels decrease.
9. There is a meaningful relationship between gender roles attitudes and attachment styles of the participants. Individuals' secure and dismissive attachment style scores increase, their gender roles attitudes scores increase; when their fearful and

preoccupied attachment style scores increase, their gender roles attitudes scores decrease.

10. Gender Roles Attitudes negatively predicts individuals' Direct Aggression

Exposure, Monitoring/Control Exposure, Direct Aggression Tendency and Monitoring/Control Tendency.

11. Secure Attachment Style negatively predicts individuals' Direct Aggression

Exposure, Monitoring/Control Exposure, Direct Aggression Tendency and

Monitoring/Control Tendency. *Fearful Attachment Style* positively predicts individuals' Direct Aggression Exposure and Monitoring/Control Exposure.

Preoccupied Attachment Style positively predicts individuals' Direct Aggression Exposure, Monitoring/Control Exposure, Direct Aggression Tendency and Monitoring/Control Tendency.

5.2. DISCUSSION

5.2.1. There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of gender variable

In this study, cyber dating abuse was studied in terms of gender variation from demographic variables. When the findings of the study were examined, it was seen that individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels show significant difference according to gender variable. In the study, it was determined that male's level of direct aggression exposure, monitoring/control exposure, direct aggression tendency and monitoring/control tendency in cyber dating abuse was significantly higher than female. According to results of the research, male scores increase among female scores on subscales of cyber dating abuse.

In the literature, Barter et al. (2009) claimed that males are more prone to perpetrate psychological violence than females. Similarly, Zweig et al. (2013) found

that cyber dating violence victimization is more common among female. Differently, Kinsfogel and Grych (2004) argued that females are more prone to perpetrate psychological violence than males. Furthermore, Burke et al. (2011) found in their study that females send more control emails to their romantic partners than males. There are also studies stating that there is no difference between the victimization levels of female and male (Kaura & Lohman, 2007).

According to the results of the research, it can be interpreted that dating violence does not differ by gender. In this context, acceptability of violence can be important factor. Because, individuals do not express that they use violence in their romantic relationships in order not to be socially rejected. On the other hand, if they are exposed to violence, they express it more easily because they are victims. So, it can be thought that control and monitoring behaviors are more acceptable for females and direct aggression behaviors are more acceptable for males in societies.

5.2.2. There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of education level variable

Education level of individuals is another variable whose relationship with dating violence is examined. In the study, for Direct Aggression Exposure, there was no significance. People who have Bachelor's degree were more likely to higher Monitoring/Control Exposure than people who have Primary&Middle School and High School degree. Similarly, people who have Bachelor's degree were more likely to higher Direct Aggression Tendency than people who have Primary&Middle School and High School degree. Lastly, people who have Bachelor's degree were more likely to higher Monitoring/Control Tendency than people who have Primary&Middle

School and High School degree. Master's degree were more likely to higher Monitoring/Control Tendency than High School degree.

According to Straus's research (2008), 31.6% of women and 24.4% of men among university students have been subjected to dating violence by their partners in the last year. In the study conducted by Bliton et al. (2016) with 598 university students, it was determined that 72% of the participants used psychological violence and 20% applied physical violence. In our country, Fidan & Yeşil (2018) reported that all young women were exposed to psychological and social dating violence, and that all young men practiced psychological and social dating violence in their study with 60 university students. Also, Aslan et al. (2008), determined that 18.0% of first-year students, 40.1% of fourth-year students and 28.6% of all students were exposed to violence in dating relationships in the study he carried out with the first- and fourth-year students of the nursing department.

According to results of the research, dating violence levels of university students were found to be higher. It can be interpreted that dating violence studies are generally conducted on university students. The concentration of studies on this sample may have led to the conclusion that dating violence is common among university students. For this reason, it may not be correct to make a comment that the increase in the level of education increases the dating violence.

5.2.3. There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of income level variable

Socio-economic status of individuals is another variable whose relationship with dating violence is examined. In the study, for direct aggression exposure, the 0-2500 income group significantly higher than the 2501-5000, 5001-10000 and 10000 and

above income group. For monitoring/control exposure, the 0-2500 income group significantly higher than the 2501-5000, and 5001-10000 income group. For direct aggression tendency, the 0-2500 income group significantly higher than the 2501-5000, 5001-10000 and 10000 and above income group. Lastly for monitoring/control tendency, the 0-2500 income group significantly higher than the 2501-5000, 5001-10000 and 10000 and above income group.

When the literature was examined, data support the research. Cascardi & Vivian (1995) observed that violence is experienced more frequently in families with low socioeconomic status than families with high socioeconomic status. Similarly, Black et al. (2015) found that the rate of dating violence is higher in young people whose parents' education level are low in their studies. Also, Lewis and Fremouw (2001) concluded that low socioeconomic status and living in the countryside are predisposing factors for dating violence. However, there are also studies that say that violence can be seen at all income levels (Erber & Erber, 2018).

Based on this information, it can be said that the socio-economic level factor is related to dating violence. When individuals cannot meet their basic needs due to economic difficulties, tension may arise in relationships and violent behaviors may be observed. On the other hand, it is observed that individuals with high socio-economic status also practice dating violence. So, it can be interpreted that dating violence manifests itself at every socio-economic level.

5.2.4. There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of type of romantic relationship initiation variable

When the findings of the study were examined, it was seen that individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels show significant difference according to

type of romantic relationship of individuals. Multiple comparisons indicated that for Direct Aggression Exposure, the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via faceto face group. For Monitoring/Control Exposure, the the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via faceto face group. For Direct Aggression Tendency, the the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via faceto face group. Lastlty for Monitoring/Control Tendency, the the via Online group significantly higher than the via Friends and via faceto face group.

When the relevant literature is examined, no similar studies were found. Research generally focuses on how the relationship status of individuals affects violence behaviour. For example, individuals who define their relationships as lovers are more likely to be exposed to sexual aggression in their relationships than individuals who define their relationships as married or engaged according to the research conducted by Marganski and Melander (2018) with 540 university students. Similarly, Bakır (2019) found that those who defined their relationship status as 'lover' got the highest scores in the direct aggression tendency and direct aggression exposure sub-dimensions of cyber dating abuse.

It can be interpreted that when individuals meet on the internet, they may not be able to provide the necessary environment of trust in the relationship and may not know each other deeply enough. Because the emotions reflected in real life and the emotions reflected in the internet environment will not be the same. For this reason, these individuals may be trying to provide a sense of trust that they do not have by exhibiting more monitoring and controlling behaviors over each other.

5.2.5. There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of duration of romantic relationship variable

When the findings of the study were examined, it was seen that individual's cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels show significant difference according to duration of romantic relationship. In the study, multiple comparisons indicated that for Direct Aggression Exposure, 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years group and 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups. For Monitoring/Control Exposure, the 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years group and 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups. For Direct Aggression Tendency, the 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years group and 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups. Lastly for Monitoring/Control Tendency, the 3-4 Years group significantly higher than 5 Years + group and 0-1 Year group significantly higher than 2-3 Years and 5 Years + groups. Multiple comparisons indicated that for Direct Aggression Exposure, 5 hours + group significantly higher than 0-1 hour group and 3-4 hours and 5+ hours groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours group.

It is seen that there are similar results in the studies examining the effect of the duration of the romantic relationship on the dating violence in the literature. Arias, Samios, & O'Leary (1987) found that duration of romantic relationship was associated with physical aggression in men in a dating in their study of 95 men and 175 women. In other words, as the duration of the relationship increases, the probability of men to show violence to their partner increases. In a study by Schnurr, Mahatmya, and Basche (2013), the increase in duration of romantic relationship and cyber-aggression tendency was revealed.

According to the results of the research, it can be interpreted that dating violence differs according to duration on romantic relationship. It can be said that individuals become more attached each other as time progresses in a romantic relationship and this situation increases the exposure and tendency to cyber dating abuse.

5.2.6. There is a significant difference between individuals' cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels in terms of average time spent online variable

When the findings of the study were examined, it was seen that individual's cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels show significant difference according to average time spent online. Multiple comparisons indicated that for Direct Aggression Exposure, 5 hours + group significantly higher than 0-1 hour group and 3-4 hours and 5 hours groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours group. For Monitoring/Control Exposure, the 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 0-1 hour group. 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours one. 5 hours + group significantly higher than 3-4 hours group. For Direct Aggression Tendency, the 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 0-1 hour Years group. 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours one. 5 hours + group significantly higher than 3-4 hours group. Lastly for Monitoring/Control Tendency, the 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 0-1 hour group. 3-4 hours and 5 hours + groups significantly higher than 2-3 hours one. 5 hours + group significantly higher than 3-4 hours group.

In the literature, Korchmaros et al. (2013) concluded that people who spend more than 3 hours in text messaging during the day use psychological violence three times more than those who spend between 0-1 hours. Similarly, Van Ouytsel, Ponnet & Walrave (2018) found a relationship between the time spent on social networking

sites and exposure to controlling behaviors in dating in their studies investigating the relationship between dating violence and internet use.

According to the results of the researches, it can be interpreted that the time individuals spend online increases dating violence. Constant internet using makes easier for individuals to reach and monitor their partners. Personal data, which are constantly updated in the online environment, meet the control needs of the partners. This situation can be interpreted as excessive internet using facilitates the use of psychological violence by partners.

5.2.7. There is a meaningful relationship between attachment styles and cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels of individuals

In this study, the relationship between attachment styles and cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels of individuals was examined and there is a statistically significant relationship between all cyber dating abuse subscales and all attachment styles subscales. Cyber Dating Abuse subscales is positively correlated with *Fearful Attachment Style* and *Preoccupied Attachment Style* while negatively correlated with *Dismissing Attachment Style* and *Secure Attachment Style*.

When the literature is examined, these findings are supported in studies conducted within the scope of dating violence and cyber dating abuse. Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan (2004) have found associations between insecure attachment styles and dating violence for male. Similarly, Marshall et al. (2013) said that individuals who have anxious attachment trusted their partners less and experienced greater jealousy. So, they checked the romantic partner's social media page. In university students, individuals with higher anxious and insecure attachment reported more perpetration of cyber dating abuse (Wright, 2015). Moreover, it was found that there was a positive relationship between anxious attachment style and perpetration of physically

aggressive behaviours in a dating relationship among male high-school students. (Grych & Kinsfogel, 2010). Female university students with an insecure attachment style also were more likely to follow their partners using electronic devices (Menard & Pincus, 2012). In another study, Lancaster et al. (2020) also examined the link between cyber dating abuse and attachment avoidance. The results of this research show that young adults who are exposed to cyber dating abuse and young adults who have high attachment avoidance reported significantly lower positive relationship quality.

According to the results obtained from previous research and current research, the relationship between attachment styles and cyber dating abuse was determined. It can be interpreted that individuals who have secure and dismissive attachment style experience cyber dating abuse less frequently in their romantic relationships. On the other hand, individuals who have fearful and preoccupied attachment style more likely to experience cyber dating abuse. It can be said that attachment styles are an effective factor in the cyber abuse that individuals experience in romantic relationships.

5.2.8. There is a meaningful relationship between gender roles attitudes and cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels of individuals

When the relationship between gender roles attitudes and cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels of individuals was examined, there is a statistically significant, negative and moderate relationship between all cyber dating abuse subscales and gender roles attitudes. An increase in the attitudes of individuals about gender roles means an increase in their egalitarian perspectives about gender roles according to the scale. The fact that individuals have an egalitarian perspective about

gender roles has decreased the possibility of being exposed to and perpetrated cyber dating violence.

These findings are supported in studies investigating dating violence in the context of gender roles. McNaughton Reyes et al. (2016) found that having a negative perception about gender roles is a risk factor for the physical violence which is a sub-dimension of dating violence. Similarly, Selçuk, Avcı and Mercan (2018) investigated the relationship between gender role attitudes and dating violence with a sample of 292 university students. They concluded that dating violence is a problem stemming from gender norms. Also, having traditional masculine gender role ideology for male is one of the risk factors in physical perpetration (Stith et al., 2004). Moreover, according to study conducted by Reed et al. (2018), men who have stereotypical gender beliefs were more likely to perpetrate sexual coercion and direct aggression in secondary education students. In cyber dating abuse, male with high hostile gender role attitude showed higher cyber abuse in romantic relationships compared to those with low hostile gender role attitude (Martínez-Pecino & Durán, 2019). Similarly, Linares et al. (2021) found that there is a moderate association between cyber dating abuse and sexist attitudes in young adult couples. Differently, Villora, Yubero and Navarro (2019) did not find statistically significant relationship between conformity to masculine gender norms and cyber dating abuse perpetration and victimization in their study with a sample of 614 male university students.

According to the previous and current research results, it can be interpreted that gender role attitudes shape people according to the beliefs of the society in which they were born and raised. These attitudes come into play unconsciously in individuals' relationships. People who believe in masculine roles try to have power and hold the

strings in their romantic relationships. Therefore, these people may be more prone to dating violence.

5.2.9. There is a meaningful relationship between attachment styles and gender roles attitudes of individuals

The relationship between gender roles attitudes and attachment styles of individuals was examined and there is a relationship between gender role attitudes and all attachment styles subscales. According to current study results, when individuals' secure and dismissive attachment style scores increases, their egalitarian perspectives about gender roles increase. When their fearful and preoccupied attachment style scores increase, their egalitarian perspectives about gender roles decrease.

When the relevant literature was examined, different results measured with Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Haigler et al. (1995) examined the relationship between parental attachment and gender role identities on a sample of university students. They concluded that androgynous and feminine individuals were more securely attached than ambiguous and masculine individuals. In the study where Forbes and Adams-Curtis (2000) repeated the same study, the level of closeness to their parents was found to be higher in the participants defined as androgens. In our country, Çelikkaleli and Avcı (2016) found that the attachment styles of university students differed significantly according to gender roles. Accordingly, those with feminine and masculine gender roles are more fearful; and androgens had secure attachment styles.

According to the results of the research, insecure attachment of individuals causes having masculine or feminine roles and discriminational attitudes about gender roles, while secure attachment enables them to have an androgynous identity and egalitarian perspective on gender roles. Families of individuals who have secure attachment

strive to raise their children in a just, egalitarian and respectful environment. This situation may have enabled the individual to have positive perspectives about gender roles. On the other hand, the dominant role of parents and chaotic family environment in families with insecure attachment may block having different perspectives about gender roles.

5.2.10. Gender roles attitudes predict on cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels of individuals

In this study, the predictive role of gender roles attitudes on cyber dating abuse was examined. According to research findings, Gender Roles Attitudes negatively predicts individuals' Direct Aggression Exposure, Monitoring/Control Exposure, Direct Aggression Tendency and Monitoring/Control Tendency.

When the relevant literature was examined, the predictive role of gender roles attitudes on cyber dating abuse has not been investigated. According to Próspero (2008), masculine attitude was found to be a significant predictor of all types of dating violence. Also, Locke & Mahalik (2005) found that gender roles are strong predictors of sexual aggression to women.

When current research and previous studies are examined, gender roles are an important predictor of dating violence. It is observed that feminine or masculine roles imposed by society may have created stereotypes about accepting and applying violence in individuals. Societies often attribute power and dominance to men, while they attribute tenderness and soft feelings to women. So, it can be interpreted that individual who adapts to these roles may perceive dating violence as an acceptable male role.

5.2.11. Attachment styles predict on cyber dating abuse tendency and exposure levels of individuals

In this study, the predictive role of attachment styles on cyber dating abuse was examined. According to research findings, attachment styles predict on cyber dating abuse.

In literature, the predictive role of attachment styles on cyber dating abuse has not been investigated. Similarly, Tussey et al. (2018) said that individuals who have anxious and avoidant attachment are more likely to exposure dating violence. In addition, Strawn et al. (2013) argued that anxious attachment style is a significant predictor of cyberstalking-related behaviors in romantic relationships.

When current research and previous studies are examined, attachment styles predict on dating violence. It can be interpreted that the cyber dating violence in romantic relationships of individuals with secure and dismissive attachment style is less than individuals with fearful and preoccupied attachment style. So, it can be seen that attachment styles of individuals shape how people behave in their romantic relationships and the quality of the relationships that individuals establish with their caregivers determine the nature of their romantic relationships future.

5.3. SUGGESTIONS

5.3.1 Suggestions for researchers

1. Qualitative or meta-analysis research methods may be used to deepen the research.
2. Social learning factors, peer influences, cultural influences and personal characteristics of individuals may be investigated in the context of dating violence.

3. Violence is an elusive cycle rooted in the past. For this reason, longitudinal studies will be effective in providing more detailed and long-term information about the problem.

5.3.2 Suggestions for mental health professionals

1. Education programs may be prepared to increase awareness of mental health professionals about dating violence.

2. Preventive and protective factors should be studied on dating violence by mental health professionals.

3. It can be ensured that there are classes on healthy romantic relationships for students in schools by mental health professionals because young adults and adolescents need to be aware of how they can cope with dating violence.

4. Studies of dating violence often focus on heterosexual individuals and young adults. For this reason, dating violence in homosexual and other age groups is also worth investigating.

5. Psychological counselors should inform individuals about dating violence and raise awareness in the institutions they work. They can also organize group counseling sessions for individuals who are exposed to dating violence.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Walls, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachment Beyond Infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44, 709-716.
- Ali, B., Swahn, M., & Hamburger, M. (2011). Attitudes affecting physical dating violence perpetration and victimization: Findings from adolescents in a high-risk urban community. *Violence and Victims*, 26(5), 669–683. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.26.5.669
- Allen, N. E., & Lehrner, A. (2018). A qualitative investigation of the role of gender in young women's dating violence in the United States. *Violence against women*, 24(14), 1697-1717. doi:10.1177/1077801218754408
- Anderson, M. L., & Kobek Pezzarossi, C. M. (2011). Is it abuse? Deaf female undergraduates' labeling of partner violence. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 17(2), 273-286.
- Arias, I., Samios, M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2(1), 82–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626087002001005>
- Aslan, D., Vefikuluçay, D., Zeyneloğlu, S., Erdost, T. ve Temel, F. (2008). *Ankara 'da iki Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu 'nun birinci ve dördüncü sınıflarında okuyan öğrencilerin flört şiddetine maruz kalma, flört ilişkilerinde şiddet uygulama durumlarının ve bu konudaki görüşlerinin saptanması araştırması*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Kadın Sorunları Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi.

Atman, Ü. C. (2003). Kadına Yönelik Sıddet, Cinsel Taciz, Irza Geçme. *Sted Dergisi*, 12(9), 333-340.

Attala, J. M., Hudson, W. W., & Mcsweeney, M. (1994). A partial validation of two shortform Partner Abuse Scales. *Women & Health*, 21, 2-3.

Avgoustis, E. (2000). The importance of childhood emotional neglect to adolescent dating violence: Is insecure attachment style a risk factor?. Doktora tezi, York Üniversitesi, Toronto.

Ayhan, Y. (2020). Flört şıddeti ve flört şıddetine yönelik tutumun güvenli bağlanma ve anne babaya benzerlik ilişkisinin incelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Üsküdar Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Ayyıldız, N., & Elkin, N. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin bağlanma stilleri ile sürekli öfke ve öfke ifade tarzları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3, 52 – 68.

Babcock, J. C., Jacobson, N. S., Gottman, J. M., & Yerington, T. M. (2000). Attachment, emotional regulation, and the function of marital violence: Differences between secure, preoccupied, and dismissing violent and nonviolent husbands. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15(4), 391- 409.

Baker, C. K., & Carreno, P. K. (2016). Understanding the role of technology in adolescent dating and dating violence. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(1), 308-320. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10826-015-0196-5>

Baker, C. K., & Helm, S. (2011). Prevalence of intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration among youth in Hawaii. *Hawaii Medical Journal*, 70(5), 92.

- Baker, C. R., & Stith, S. M. (2008). Factors predicting dating violence perpetration among male and female college students. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 17(2), 227–244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926770802344836>
- Bakır, A. (2019). Romantik ilişkilerde siber flört istismarının beden imgesi ve benlik saygısıyla ilişkisi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Samsun.
- Bakioğlu, F., & Türküm, A. S. (2019). Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerine Tutum Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye Uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Kastamonu eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 27(2), 717-725. <https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.2697>
- Baldan, G.A., & Akış, N. (2017). Flört Şiddeti. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi*. 43 (1), 41-44.
- Baldry, A. C. (2003). “Stick and Stones Hurt my Bones but His Glance and Words Hurt More”: The Impact of Psychological Abuse and Physical Violence by Current and Former Partners on Battered Women in Italy. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 2(1), 47-57.
- Bandura, A. (1969). Social learning of moral judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 11(3), 275–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0026998>
- Barter, C., McCarry, M., Berridge, D. & Evans, K. (2009). *Partner exploitation and violence in teenage intimate relationships*. London: NSPCC.
- Bartholomew, K., & Allison, C. J. (2006). *An Attachment Perspective on Abusive Dynamics in Intimate Relationships*. In M. Mikulincer & G. S. Goodman (Eds.), *Dynamics of romantic love: Attachment, caregiving, and sex* (pp. 102-127). Guilford Press.

Baykal, S. (1988). Üniversite öğrencilerinin cinsiyet rolleri ile ilgili kalıp yargılarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Bell, K. M., & Naugle, A. E. (2007). Effects of social desirability on students' selfreporting of partner abuse perpetration and victimization. *Violence and Victims*, 22(2), 243-256. doi: 10.1891/088667007780477348

Bell, K.M. & Naugle, A.E. (2008). Intimate partner violence theoretical considerations: Moving towards a contextual framework. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28, 1096-1107.

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.

Bhasin, K. (2003). Toplumsal Cinsiyet “Bize Yüklenen Roller”. (K.Ay, Ed.) Dayanışma Vakfı Yayınları. İstanbul: Kuşak Ofset Birinci Basım.

Black, B. M., Chido, L. M., Preble, K. M., Weisz, A. N., Yoon, J. S., Delaney-Black, V., Kernsmith, P., & Lewandowski, L. (2015). Violence exposure and teen dating violence among African American youth. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(12), 2174-2195. doi: 10.1177/0886260514552271.

Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner And Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Bliton, C. F., Wolford-Clevenger, C., Zapor, H., Elmquist, J., Brem, M. J., Shorey, R. C., Stuart, G. R. (2016). Emotion dysregulation, gender, and intimate partner violence perpetration: an exploratory study in college students. *Journal of Family Violence*, 31(3), 371-377.

Bonomi, A. E., Anderson, M. L., Nemeth, J., Rivara, F. P. & Buettner, C. (2013). History of Dating Violence and the Association with Late Adolescent Health. *BMC Public Health*, 13(1), 821.

Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., Ryan, K., & Smith, C. (1992). Predictors of Dating Violence: A Multivariate Analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 7(4), 297-311.

Borrajó, E., Gámez Guadix, M. & Calvete, E. (2015). Justification beliefs of violence, myths about love and cyber dating abuse. *Psicothema*, 27(4), 327- 333.

Borrajó E, Gámez-Guadix, M., & Calvete E. (2015). Cyber dating abuse: Prevalence, context, and relationship with offline dating aggression. *Psychological reports*, 116(2), 565-85.

Borrajó, 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.

Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and loss: Volume I, Attachment (2. Bask1). NY: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1973). Attachment and loss: Volume 2. Separation. New York: Penguin

Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds: I. Aetiology and psychopathology in the light of attachment theory. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 130, 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.130.3.201>

Brandell, J.R., & Ringel, S. (2007). *Attachment and dynamic practice: an integrative guide for social workers and other clinicians*. New York: Columbia University Press,

Brown., C., & Hegarty, K. (2018). Digital Dating Abuse Measures: A Critical Review. *Agression and Violent Behavior*, 40, 44-59.

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.

Büyükök, D. (2007). Eşler Arası Şiddet. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Aydın.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (17. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Caldwell, J. E., Swan, S. C. & Woodbrown, V. D. (2012). Gender differences in intimate partner violence outcomes. *Psychology of Violence*, 2(1), 42–57. doi: 10.1037/a0026296

Carlson, B. E., McNutt, L., & Choi, D. Y. (2003). Childhood and Adult Abuse among Women in primary Health Care: Effects on Mental Health. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(8), 924-941. doi: 10.1177/0886260503253882

Cascardi, M. & Vivian, D. (1995). Context for specific episodes of marital violence: Gender and severity of violence differences. *Journal of Family Violence*, 10(3), 265–293.

Cassidy, F., Murry, E., Forest, K., & Carroll, B. J. (1998). Signs and symptoms of mania in pure and mixed episodes. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 50(2-3), 187-201.

Cebecioğlu, G., & Altıparmak, İ. B. (2017). "Dijital Şiddet: Sosyal Paylaşım Ağları Üzerine Bir Araştırma". *Sakarya University Journal of Education* 7(2), 423-431.

Cheyne, N., & Guggisberg, M. (2018). *Stalking: An age old problem with new expressions in the digital age*. In M. Guggisberg, & J. Henricksen (Eds.), *Violence against women in the 21st century: Challenges and future directions* (pp. 161–190). Nova Science Publishers.

Choi, H. J., & Temple, J. R. (2016). Do gender and exposure to interparental violence moderate the stability of teen dating violence? Latent transition analysis. *Prevention Science*, 17(3), 367-376.

Choja, O., & Nelson, O. (2016). Psychological violence and the bane of cyberharassment against women: an experiential inquest on Facebook. *Gender and Behaviour*, 14(3), 7589-7608.

Cochran, J. K., Maskaly, J., Jones, S. & Sellers, C. S. (2015). Using Structural Equations to Model Akers's Social Learning Theory with Data on Intimate Partner Violence. *Crime & Delinquency*, 63(1). doi: 10.1177/0011128715597694

Coleman, J., & Stith, S. (1997). Nursing Students' Attitudes Toward Victims of Domestic Violence As Predicted By Selected Individual and Relationship Variables. *Journal of Family Violence*, 12 , 113-138.

Colin, V. L. (1996). *Human Attachment*. New York: Mcgraw-Hill.

Collins, N. L. (1996). Working models of attachment: Implications for explanation, emotion, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 810-832.

Collins, R. (1975). *Conflict Sociology*. New York.

Creasey, G. & Hesson-McInnis, M. (2001). Affective responses, cognitive appraisals, and conflict tactics in late adolescent romantic relationships: Associations with attachment orientations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48, 85-96. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.48.1.85

Crick, N. R. (1996). The role of overt aggression, relational aggression, and prosocial behavior in the prediction of children's future social adjustment. *Child Development*, 67, 2317-2327.

Cui, M., Ueno, K., Gordon, M., & Fincham, F. D. (2013). The continuation of intimate partner violence from adolescence to young adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(2), 300–313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12016>.

Cutbush, S., Williams, J., Miller, S., Gibbs, D., & Clinton-Sherrod, M. (2012). *Electronic dating aggression among middle school students: demographic correlates and associations with other types of violence*. Poster presented at the American Public Health Association , Annual Meeting , San Francisco (pp. 27 – 31).

Çelikkaleli, Ö., & Avcı, R. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin cinsiyete ve toplumsal cinsiyete özelliklerine göre bağlanma biçimlerinin incelenmesi. *Journal of Computer and Education Research*, 4(7), 103-125.

Çelik, Ş. (2004). The effects of an attachment-oriented-psychoeducational-group-training on improving the preoccupied attachment styles of university students. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Çetin, N. (2015). Üniversite 1. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Anne-Baba ve Arkadaşlarına Bağlanma Biçimleri ile Romantik İlişkilerinde Sorun Çözmeleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Damarlı, Ö. (2006). Ergenlerde toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri, bağlanma stilleri ve benlik kavramı arasındaki ilişkiler, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Damka, Z. (2009). Sığınma evinde kalan şiddet mağduru kadınlar: anksiyete duyarlılığı, travmaya bağlı suçluluk, travma sonrası stres bozukluğu ve psikolojik belirtiler. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara.

Dick, R. N., McCauley, H. L., Jones, K. A., Tancredi, D. J., Goldstein, S., Blackburn, S., Miller, E. (2014). Cyber dating abuse among teens using school-based health centers. *Pediatrics*, 134(6), 1560-1567. doi:10.1542/peds.2014-0537

Dobash, R.E. and Dobash, R.P. (1998). *Rethinking Violence Against Women*. London: Sage.

Doğan, S. (2018). Erkeklik rollerini kabullenmenin ve erkeklığe yönelik tehdit algısının üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine yönelik tutumları ile ilişkisi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.

Doyle, J. L. (2020). Experiences of intimate partner violence: The role of psychological, economic, physical and sexual violence. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2020.102370>

Draucker, C. B., & Martsof, D. S. (2010). The Role of Electronic Communication Technology in Adolescent Dating Violence. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing*, 23(3), 133-142.

Draucker, C. B., Martsof, D., Stephenson, P., J. R., Heckman, T., Sheehan, D., & Ferguson, C. (2010). Aggressive Events in Adolescent Dating Violence. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 31(9), 599–610.

Dutton, D. G. (1999). Traumatic origins of intimate rage. *Aggress. Viol. Behav.* 4, 431–447. doi: 10.1016/S1359-1789(98)00027-5

Dutton, M. A. (1993). Understanding women's responses to domestic violence: A redefinition of battered woman syndrome. *Hofstra Law Review*, 21(4), 2.

Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social-psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100, 283-308.

Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eisler, R. M. (1995). *The relationship between masculine gender role stress and men's health risk: The validation of a construct*. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 207–228). New York: Basic Books.

Ellsberg, M. (2005). "Sexual violence against women and girls: Recent findings from Latin America and the Caribbean". In: *Sex without consents: Young people in developing countries*. (Edited by Jejeebhoy, S. J., Shah, I., & Thapa, S.), London, UK: Zed Books.

Ellsberg, M., Arango, D. J., Morton, M., Gennari, F., Kiplesund S., Contreras, M. (2015). Prevention of violence against women and girls: what does the evidence say? *Lancet*. 385(9977), 1555-66.

- Erber, R., & Erber, M. W. (2018). *Intimate relationships: Issues, theories, and research* (3rd ed.). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Eshelman, L., & Levendosky, A. A. (2012). Dating violence: Mental health consequences based on type of abuse. *Violence and Victims*, 27, 215-228.
<https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.27.2.215>
- Farr, C. N. (2000). Female to male dating violence: Borderline personality characteristics, attachment style, psychopathology, and motivation (Doktora tezi, West Virginia Üniversitesi, Morgantown).
- Fawole, O. I. (2008). Economic violence to women and girls: Is it receiving the necessary attention?. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 9(3), 167-177.
- Feder, J., Levant, R. F., & Dean, J. (2007). Boys and violence: A gender-informed analysis. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 38(4), 385–391. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.38.4.385>
- Fidan, F., & Yeşil, Y. (2018). Flört Şiddeti. *Balkan ve Yakın Doğu Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4 (1), 16-24.
- Fincham, F. D., & Cui, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Romantic Relationships in Emerging Adulthood*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Finzi, R., Ram, A., Har-Even, D., Shnit, D., & Weizman, A. (2001). Attachment styles and aggression in physically abused and neglected children. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 6, 769-786. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1012237813771>
- Flach R. M. D., Deslandes, S. F. (2017). Cyber dating abuse in affective and sexual relationships: a literature review. *Cadernos de saude publica*, 33(7).

- Flake, T. A., Barros, C., Schraiber, L. B., & Menezes, P. R. (2013). Intimate partner violence among undergraduate students of two universities of the state of São Paulo, Brazil. *Revista Brasileira de Epidemiologia*, 16, 801-816.
- Follette, V., & Alexander, P. (1992). Dating Violence: Current and Historical Correlates. *Behavioral Assessment*, 14, 39-52.
- Follingstad, D., Bradley, B., Helff, C. M., & Laughlin, J. E. (2002). A model for predicting dating violence: anxious attachment, angry temperament, and need for relationship control. *Violence and Victims*, 17(1), 35-47.
- Follingstad, D., Rutledge, L. L., Berg, B. J., & Hause, E. S. (1990). The role of emotional abuse in physically abusive relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, 5(2), 107-120.
- Forbes, G. B., & Adams-Curtis, L. E. (2000). Gender role typing and attachment to parents and peers. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(2), 258–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540009600466>
- Foshee, V. A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse prevalence, types and injuries. *Health Education Research*, 11(3), 275-286.
- Foshee, V. A., Linder, F., MacDougall, J. E. & Bangdiwala, S. (2001). Gender differences in the longitudinal predictors of adolescent dating violence. *Preventive Medicine*, 32(2), 128-141.
- Foshee, V., Banefield, T., Suchindran, C., Ennet, S., Bauman, K., Karriker-Jaffe, K., McNaughton Reyes, H. L., Mathias, J. (2009). The Development of Four Types of Adolescent Dating Abuse and Selected Demographic Correlates. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 19(3), 380-400.

Fox, E., Russo, R., and Dutton, K. (2002). Attentional Bias for Threat: Evidence for Delayed Disengagement from Emotional Faces. *Cognition and Emotion*, 16(3), 355–379.

Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions. *Review of General Psychology*, 4, 132-154.

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.

Frieze, I. H. (2000). Violence in close relationships- development of a research area : Comment on Archer , *Psychological Bulletin*, 126 (5), 681-684.

Furman, W., Low, S., & Ho, M. (2009). Romantic Experience and Psychosocial Adjustment In Middle Adolescence. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 38, 1- 16.

Gander, J. M., Gardiner, W. H. (1995). Çocuk ve Ergen Gelişimi. (B. Onur, Çev.). Ankara: İmge.

García-Cueto, E., Rodríguez-Díaz, F. J., Bringas-Molleda, C., López-Cepero, J., Paíno Quesada, S., Rodríguez-Franco, L. (2015) Development of the Gender Role Attitudes Scale (GRAS) amongst young Spanish people. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 15, 61-68.

Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, H. , Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., Watts, C. H., & WHO (2006). Multi-country Study on Women’s Health and Domestic Violence against Women Study Team. Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence: Findings from the

WHO Multicountry Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence. *Lancet*, 368, 1260- 1269.

Gardner, C. V. (2009). *The a to z of feminist philosophy*. Toronto: The Scarecrow Press.

Gelles, R. C., Straus, M. A. (1990). Reviewed Work: Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 16(3), 326-328.

Girginer, H. U. (1994). Türk toplumunda cinsiyet rolleri algısı. Yüksek lisans tezi, Ege Üniversitesi, İzmir.

Gittleman, M. G., Klein, M. H., Smider, N. A., & Essex, M. J. (1998). Recollections of parental behaviour, adult attachment and mental health: mediating and moderating effects. *Psychological Medicine*, 28(6), 1443-1455. doi:10.1017/S0033291798007533

Göçener, D. (2010). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Güvenli Bağlanma Düzeyleri İle Kişilerarası İlişki Tarzları Arasındaki İlişkiler. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Gressard A., Swahn, M. H., & Tharp, A. T. (2015). A First Look at Gender Inequality as a Societal Risk Factor for Dating Violence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 49(3), 448-57.

Griffin, D. W., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). The Metaphysics of Measurement: The Case of Adult Attachment. In K. Bartholomew & D. P. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in Personal Relationships: Attachment Processes in Adult Relationships (Vol. 5)*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Grych, J. H., & Kinsfogel, K. M. (2010). Exploring the role of attachment style in the relation between family aggression and abuse in adolescent dating relationships.

Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 19(6), 624-640.

Guzman, R. C. (1996). Attitudes toward traditional versus egalitarian gender roles in dual- earner marriages and their effect on marital satisfaction, Master's Thesis, California State University, Long Beach.

Güleç Öyekçin, D., Melih Şahin, E., & Yetim, D. (2012). Kadına yönelik farklı eş şiddeti tiplerini etkileyen psikososyal faktörler. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 23(2), 75-81.

Gümüş, A. B., Keskin, G. (2016). Bir Üniversite Öğrenci Örnekleminde Bağlanma Stilleri ve Şiddet Eğiliminin İncelenmesi. *Sağlık ve Toplum*, 26(1), 33 - 42.

Gündüz, Ö. (2019). İlişkisel kültürel kurama dayalı programın üniversite öğrencisi kadınların flört şiddeti tutumlarına, çatışma çözmelerine, ilişkilerine etkisi. Doktora Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Haigler, V. F., Day, H. D., & Marshall, D. D. (1995). Parental attachment and gender-role identity. *Sex Roles*, 33(3), 203-220.

Hamby, S., & Turner, H. (2013). Measuring teen dating violence in males and females: insights from the national survey of children's exposure to violence.

Psychology of Violence, 3(4), 323–339. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029706>

Harned, M. S. (2002). A multivariate analysis of risk markers for dating violence victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, 1179–1197. doi:

10.1177/088626002237401

Hatipoğlu-Sümer, Z. & Toplu, E. (2011). Flört İlişkisinde Şiddete Maruz Kalma ve Şiddet Uygulama: Güç Algısı ve Güç Doyumunun Rolü (Dating Violence

- Victimization and Perpetration: The Role of Power Perception and Power Satisfaction). Paper presented at the meeting of the XI. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi (XI. National Congress of Counseling and Guidance, 2011, İzmir, Turkey.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.52.3.511
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5(1), 1-22.
- Hazan, C. ve Shaver, P. R. (1994). Deeper into attachment theory. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5(1), 68-79
- Hebert, M., Blais, M., & Lavoie, F. (2017). Prevalence of teen dating victimization among a representative sample of high school students in Quebec. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 17(3), 225–233.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2017.06.001>.
- Heimer, K., & De Coster, S. (2006). The Gendering of Violent Delinquency. *Criminology*, 37(2), 277-318.
- Heise, L., Ellsberg, M., & Gotte Moeller, M. (2002). A global overview of gender-based violence. *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics*, 78, 5-14.
- Heise, L. (2011). What works to prevent partner violence?. An evidence overview. London, England: Department for International Development.
- Hendrick, S. S. (2009). *Yakın İlişkiler Psikolojisi*. (A. Dönmez, Ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

- Hettrich, E. L. & O'Leary, D. K. (2007). Females' reasons for their physical aggression in dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(9), 1131–1143.
- Hickman, L. J., Jaycox, L. H. & Aronoff, J. (2004). Dating violence among adolescents: Prevalence, gender distribution, and prevention program effectiveness. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 5(2), 123-142.
- Hines, D.A. and Saudino, K.J. (2003). Gender differences in psychological, physical, and sexual aggression among college students using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales. *Violence and Victims*, 18(2), 197.
- Hocking, E. C., Simons, R. M. & Surette, R. J. (2016). Attachment style as a mediator between childhood maltreatment and the experience of betrayal trauma as an adult. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 52, 94-101. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2016.01.001
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Meehan, J. C. (2004). Typologies of men who are maritally violent: Scientific and clinical implications. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(12), 1369–1389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260504269693>
- Hortaçsu, N. (2003). İnsan İlişkileri. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Hutchinson, K. (2012). Predictors of College Students' Dating Violence Perceptions and Help-Seeking Recommendations. Doktora Tezi, The University of Akron.
- Irmak, Ç., & Altıntaş, M. (2017). Aile içi şiddet mağduru kadınlarda ruhsal dayanıklılık, bağlanma biçimleri, başa çıkma tutumları ve psikopatoloji. *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 18(6), 561-570.

İmamoğlu, S. (2003). Öğretmen adaylarının öfke ve öfke ifade tarzları ile bağlanma stilleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

İpek, S. (2020). Dijital flört şiddetinin suskunluk sarmalı bağlamında incelenmesi: Türkiye ve İspanya karşılaştırmalı tren testi uygulaması. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul.

Jackson, S., Cram, F.& Seymour, F. (2000). Violence and Sexual Coercion in High School Students Dating Relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15, 23-36.

Kahraman, S. (2015). Ergenlerde bağlanma stillerinin saldırganlık davranışları ve depresyon düzeyi ilişkisi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Beykent Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Kamali, A. (2015). Assessing cyber-bullying in higher education. *Information Systems Education Journal*, 13(6), 43.

Kapıcıoğlu, İ. (2008). Üniversite öğrencilerinin şiddet algısı. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

Kaplan, B. (2012). Ergenlerde bağlanma ve saldırganlık davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ege Üniversitesi, İzmir.

Karaboğa, F., & Eker, E. (2020). Adolescents' Parental Rejection Perceptions and The Attachment Styles as a Parameter of Tendency to Violence. *Journal of International Psychological Counseling and Guidance Researches*, 2(2), 143.

Katz, C. C. (2014). Investigating the cycle of violence: The role of attachment style in the relationship between child maltreatment and intimate partner violence. Doktora tezi, Chicago Üniversitesi, Chicago.

- Kaura, S. A., & Lohman, B. J. (2007). Dating violence victimization, relationship satisfaction, mental health problems, and acceptability of violence: A comparison of men and women. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22(6), 367-381.
- Kernberg, O. F. (1995). *Love relations: Normality and pathology*. Yale University Press.
- Kernberg, O. F. (2011). Limitations to the capacity to love. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 92(6), 1501-1515.
- Khubchandani, J. (2010). Adolescent Dating Violence : School Nurses' Perceptions And Practices. The University of Toledo, Submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment Of The Requirements For The Doctor Of Philosophy Degree in Health Education.
- Kızmaz, Z. (2006). Okullardaki Şiddet Davranışının Kaynakları Üzerine Kuramsal Bir Yaklaşım. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 30(1), 47-70.
- Kinsfogel, K. M. & Grych, J. H. (2004). Interparental conflict and adolescent dating relationships: integrating cognitive, emotional, and peer influences. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18(3), 505.
- Kodan Çetinkaya, S. (2013). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Şiddet Eğilimlerinin ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerine İlişkin Tutumlarının İncelenmesi. *Nesne Dergisi*, 1(2), 21-43.
- Korchmaros, J. D., Ybarra, M. L., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Boyd, D. & Lenhart, A. (2013). Perpetration of teen dating violence in a networked society. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 16(8), 561-567.

Korkmaz, T. (2017). Erişkin seperasyon anksiyetesi düzeyinin bağlanma biçimleri ile ilişkisinin incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Üsküdar Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Korkut-Owen F. & Owen D. (2008). *Kadına yönelik aile içi şiddet*. Kadının Sorunları Statüsü Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara.

Krug, E. G, Dahlberg, L. L, Mercy, J. A, Zwi, A. B, & Lozano R. (Ed.). World Report on Violence and Health. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2002.

Lancaster, M., Seibert, G. S., Cooper, A. N., May, R. M., & Fincham, F. (2020). Relationship quality in the context of cyber dating abuse: The role of attachment. *Journal of Family Issues*, 41(6), 739-758.

Lawson, J. (2012). Sociological Theories of Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 22(5), 572-590.

Levy, K. N., & Johnson, B. N. (2018). Attachment and psychotherapy: Implications from emprical research. *Canadian Psychology/ Psychologie Canadienne*. doi: 10.1037/cap0000162

Lewis, S. F., & Fremouw, W. (2001). Dating violence: A critical review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 21(1), 105- 127.

Lichter, E. L., & McCloskey, L. A. (2004). The effects of childhood exposure to marital violence on adolescent gender-role beliefs and dating violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28(4), 344–357. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00151.x

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). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253180>

Lindsey, L. (1990). *Gender Roles a Sociological Perspective*. United States of America: Prentice Hall International Limited.

Locke, B. D., & Mahalik, J. R. (2005). Examining masculinity norms, problem drinking, and athletic involvement as predictors of sexual aggression in college men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(3), 279-283.

Lucero, J. L., Weisz, A. N., Smith-Darden, J., & Lucero, S. M. (2014). Exploring Gender Differences: Socially Interactive Technology Use/Abuse Among Dating Teens. *Affilia*, 29(4), 478-491.

Luthra, R., & Gidycz, C. A. (2006). Dating violence among college men and women: Evaluation of a theoretical model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21, 717-731. doi: 10.1177/0886260506287312

Lye, D. N., & Biblarz, T. J. (1993). The effects of attitudes toward family life and gender roles on marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Issues*, 14 (2), 157-188.

Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Newman, D. L., Fagan, J., & Silva, P. A. (1997). Gender differences in partner violence in a birth cohort of 21-year-olds: Bridging the gap between clinical and epidemiological approaches. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65, 68 –78.

Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. *Monographs of the society for research in child development*. 50(1/2), 66-104. doi: 10.2307/3333827.

Maiuro, R., & Daniel, J. (2000). *Psychological abuse in violent domestic relations*.

Springer publishing company, New York.

Makepeace, J. (1981). Courtship Violence Among College Students. *Family Relations*, 30, 97–102.

Makin-Byrd, K. & Bierman, K. L. (2013). The Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. Individual and Family Predictors of The Perpetration of Dating Violence and Victimization in Late Adolescence. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 42(4), 536-550.

Marganski, A. & Melander, L. (2018). Intimate partner violence victimization in the cyber and real world: Examining the extent of cyber aggression experiences and its association with in-person dating violence. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 33(7), 1071-1095.

Marshall, A., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (2002). Varying forms of husband sexual aggression: Predictors and subgroup differences. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16, 286-296.

Marshall, L. L. (1996). Psychological abuse of women: Six distinct clusters. *Journal of Family Violence*, 11(4), 379-409.

Marshall, T. C., Bejanyan, K., Di Castro, G., & Lee, R. A. (2013). Attachment styles as predictors of Facebook-related jealousy and surveillance in romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 20(1), 1–22.

Martínez-Pecino, R., & Durán, M. (2019). I Love You but I Cyberbully You: The Role of Hostile Sexism, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34, 812–825.

- Martins, C., Gouveia, A., Chaves, M., Lourenço, R., Marques, S., & Santos, T. (2014). Dating violence and nursing student well-being. *Aten Primaria*, 46, 129-134.
- McHugh, M. C., & Frieze, I. H. (1997). The measurement of gender-role attitudes: A review and commentary. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00097.x>
- McNaughton Reyes, H. L., Foshee, V. A., Niolon, P., & Reidy, D. (2016). Gender Role Attitudes and Male Adolescent Dating Violence Perpetration: Normative Beliefs as Moderators. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(2). DOI:10.1007/s10964-015-0278-0
- Meetoo, V., & Mirza, H.S. (2007). There is nothing ‘honourable’ about honour killings: Gender, violence and the limits of multiculturalism. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 30(3), 187- 200.
- Menard, K. S., & Pincus, A. L. (2012). Predicting overt and cyber stalking perpetration by male and female college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27, 2183–2207. doi: 10.1177/0886260511432144.
- Mihçioğur, S., & Akın, A. (2015). Flört Şiddeti- 'Şiddet'li sevgi'. *Sağlık ve Toplum*, 25(2), 9-15.
- Michaud, İ. (1991). Şiddet. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mikulincer, M. (1998). Adult Attachment Style and Individual Differences in Functional Versus Dysfunctional Experiences of Anger. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 513-524.

Mikulincer, M. & Shaver, P. R. (2007). Attachment processes and couple functioning. Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change. New York: Guilford Press.

Mishna, F., Cook, C., Saini, M., Wu, M. J., & MacFadden, R. (2011). Interventions to prevent and reduce cyber abuse of youth: A systematic review. *Research on Social Work Practice, 21*, 5–14.

Miskulin, C. I. (2020). Economic Violence against Women in Croatia: A Comparative Study between Continental and Maritime County. *Collegium Antropologicum, 44*(3), 115-119.

Morahan-Martin, J., & Schumacher, P. (2000). Incidence and correlates of pathological Internet use among college students. *Computers in Human Behavior, 16*(1), 13–29

Moss, B. F., & Schwebel, A. I. (1993). Defining Intimacy in Romantic Relationships. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 42*(1), 31–37.

Muniz, M. (2017). Online Teen Dating Violence, Family and School Climate from a Gender Perspective. *Infancia y Aprendizaje, 40*(3), 572–598.

Murdock, N.L. (2014). *Psikolojik Danışma ve Psikoterapi kuramları*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Nightangale, H.& Morrisette, P. (1993). Dating Violence: Attitudes, Myths, and Preventive Programs. *Social Work in Education, 15*(4), 225-233.

O’Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of Dating Violence Among High School Students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 546-568.

Oktan, A. (2008). Türk Sinemasında Hegemonik Erkeklikten Erkeklik Krizine: Yazı-Tura ve Erkeklik Bunalımının Sınırları. *Selçuk İletişim*, 5(2), 152-166.

O'Leary, K. D., & Maiuro, R. D. (Eds.) (2001). *Psychological Abuse in Violent Domestic Relations*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.

Ooi, Y. P., Ang, R. P., Fung, D. S. S., Wong, G. & Cai, Y. C. (2006). The impact of parent-child attachment on aggression, social stress and self-esteem. *School Psychology International Copyright*, 27, 552-566. Doi: 10.1177/0143034306073402

Ozaki, R., & Otis, M. D. (2017). Gender equality, patriarchal cultural norms, and perpetration of intimate partner violence: Comparison of male university students in Asian and European cultural contexts. *Violence Against Women*, 23(9), 1076–1099. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801216654575>

Öztürk, I. İ (2021). Üniversite öğrencilerinde flört şiddetinin benlik saygısı ve bağlanma biçimleri ile arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Gelişim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Passer, M.W., & Smith, R.E. (2011). *Psychology*. New York.

Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2010). Cyberbullying and self- esteem. *Journal of school health*, 80(12), 614-21.

Picard, P. (2007). Tech abuse in teen relationships. Chicago, IL: Teen Research Unlimited.

Pincha, C. (2009). Toplumsal Cinsiyete Duyarlı Afet Yönetimi (Demirer, K. D., Çev.). Kocaeli Üniversitesi Yayınları.

- Pines, A. M., Gat, H., & Tal, Y. (2002). Gender differences in content and style of argument between couples during divorce mediation. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 20(1), 23-50. doi: 10.1002/crq.9
- Polat, O. (2016). Şiddet. *Marmara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Hukuk Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 22(1), 15-34.
- Próspero, M. (2008). Effects of masculinity, sex, and control on different types of intimate partner violence perpetration. *Journal of Family Violence*, 23(7), 639–645. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-008-9186-3>
- Reed, L. A., Ward, L. M., Tolman, R. M., Lippman, J. R., & Seabrook, R. C. (2018). The Association Between Stereotypical Gender and Dating Beliefs and Digital Dating Abuse Perpetration in Adolescent Dating Relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(9-19), 1-25.
- Regan, P. (2011). *Close Relationships* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Reiss, A. J., Jr., & Roth, J. A. (Eds.). (1993). *Understanding and preventing violence*. National Academy Press.
- Riggs, D., & O'Leary, D. (1989). *A Theoretical Model of Courtship Aggression. Violence in Dating Relationships: Emerging Social Issues*. New York: NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Roberto, A. J., & Finucane, M. (1997). The assessment of argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness in adolescent populations. *Communication Quarterly*, 45, 21-36.
- Rodríguez-Domínguez, C., Pérez-Moreno, P., & Durán, M. (2020). Cyber dating violence: A Review of Its Research Methodology. *Annals of Psychology*, 36, 200-209.

Rotenberg, K. J., Shewchuk, V. A., & Kimberley, T. (2001). Loneliness, sex, romantic jealousy, and powerlessness. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18(1), 55–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407501181003>

Rubenstein, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1982). *In Search of Intimacy*. New York; Delacorte Press.

Ruble, D. N., Taylor, L. J., Cyphers, L., Greulich, F. K., Lurye, L. E. & Shrout, P. E. (2007). The Role of Gender Constancy in Early Gender Development. *Child Development*, 78(4), 1121-1136.

Rutherford, A., Zwi, A. B., Grove, N. J., & Butchart, A. (2007) Violence: a glossary. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 61(8), 676–680.

Saltzman, L. E., Fanslow, J. L., McMahon, P. M., & Shelley, G. A. (1999). Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Sarıhan, B. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinde flört şiddetinin yordayıcıları olarak ve çocukluk çağı travma yaşantıları ve toplumsal cinsiyetçilik özellikleri. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ufuk Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Schnurr, M. P., Mahatmya, D. & Basche III, 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.

Sears, H. A., Byers, E. S., Whelan, J. J. & Saint-Pierre, M. (2006). “If it hurts you, then it is not a joke” adolescents’ ideas about girls’ and boys’ use and experience of

abusive behavior in dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(9), 1191-1207.

Seeram, E. (2019). An Overview of Correlational Research. *Radiologic Technology*, 91(2), 176-179.

Seifert, K., & Hoffnung, L. (1997). *Child and Adolescent Behavior*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Selçuk, K. T., Avcı, D., & Mercan, Y. (2018). Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Flört Şiddetine Maruziyet: Flört Şiddetine Yönelik Tutumların ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Algısının Şiddete Maruziyet ile İlişkisi. *Acıbadem Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(3), 302-308.

Senemoğlu, N. (2015). Gelişim, Öğrenme ve Öğretim: Kuramdan Uygulamaya (Development, learning and instruction: from theory to practice). Ankara: Yargı.

Sezer, G. (2019). Beliren Yetişkinlik Döneminde Flört Şiddetine Yönelik Tutum, Sosyal Onay İhtiyacı ve Olumsuz Değerlendirme Korkusunun İncelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Mersin Üniversitesi, Mersin.

Shi, L. (2003). The association between adult attachment styles and conflict resolution in romantic relationships. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 31, 143-157. doi: 10.1080/01926180301120

Shorey, R. C., Cornelius, T. L., Bell, K. M. (2008). A critical review of theoretical frameworks for dating violence: Comparing the dating and marital fields. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 13, 185–194.

Silverman, J. G., Raj, A., Mucci, L. A., & Hathaway, J. E. (2001). Dating violence against adolescent girls and associated substance use, unhealthy weight control,

sexual risk behavior, pregnancy, and suicidality. *Jama*, 286(5), 572-579.

doi:10.1001/jama.286.5.572

Skipper Jr, J. K., & Nass, G. (1966). Dating behavior: A Framework for Analysis and an Illustration. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 28(4), 412-420.

Slootmaeckers, J. ve Migerode, L. (2018). Fighting for connection: patterns of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 17(4), 294-312.

doi: 10.1080/15332691.2018.1433568

Smagur, K. E., Bogat, G. A. & Levendosky, A. A. (2018). Attachment insecurity mediates the effects of intimate partner violence and childhood maltreatment on depressive symptoms in adult women. *Psychology of Violence*, 8(4), 460 – 469.

Smith, A. D. and Reid, W. J. (1986). Role expectations and attitudes in dual-earner families. *Social Contemporary Social Work*, 67 (7), 394-402.

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

Spitzberg, B., Hoobler, G. (2002). Cyberstalking and the technologies of interpersonal terrorism. *New Media & Society*, 4(1), 71-92.

Spriggs, A.L., Halpern, C.T., Herring, A.H. and Schoenbach, V.J. (2009). Family and school socioeconomic disadvantage: Interactive influences on adolescent dating violence victimization. *Social Science & Medicine*, 68(11), 1956- 1965.

Staude-Müller, F., Hansen, B., & Voss, M. (2012). How stressful is online victimization? Effects of victim's personality and properties of the incident. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 9(2), 260-274.

- Stith, S. M., Smith, D., Penn, C.E., & Ward, D.B. (2004). Intimate Partner Physical Abuse Perpetration and Victimization Risk Factors: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 10*(1), 65-98.
- Stonard, K. E. (2019). Technology-assisted adolescent dating violence and abuse: A factor analysis of the nature of electronic communication technology used across twelve types of abusive and controlling behaviour. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 28*(1), 105-115. doi: 10.1007/s10826-018-1255-5
- Straus, M. (1977). Wife Beating: How Common and Why?. *Victimology, 2*, 443-458.
- Straus, M. (2004). Prevalence of Violence Against Dating Partners by Male and Female University Students Worldwide. *Violence Against Women, 10*(7), 790-811. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801204265552>
- Straus, M. (2008). Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. *Children and Youth Services Review, 30*, 252–275.
- Strawhun, J., Adams, N., & Huss, M. T. (2013). The assessment of cyberstalking: An expanded examination including social networking, attachment, jealousy, and anger in relation to violence and abuse. *Violence and Victims, 28*, 715–730. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.11-00145
- Street, S., Kimmel, E., & Kromrey, J. D. (1996). Gender role preferences and perceptions of university students, faculty, and administrators. *Research In Higher Education, 37* (5), 615-632.
- Stylianou, A. M. (2018). Economic Abuse Within Intimate Partner Violence: A Review of the Literature. *Violence and Victims, 33*(1), 3-22.

Subaşı, N., & Akın, A. (2003). Kadına yönelik şiddet; nedenleri ve sonuçları.

Toplumsal Cinsiyet, Sağlık ve Kadın (Akın A., Ed.), 231-249.

Sugarman, D. B., & Hotaling, G. T. (1989). Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk markers. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 3–32). Praeger Publishers.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. W W Norton & Co.

Sünetçi, B., Say, A., Gümüštepe, B., Enginkaya, B., Yıldızdoğan, Ç., & Yalçın, M. (2016). “Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Flört Şiddeti Algıları Üzerine Bir Araştırma”, *Ufku Ötesi Bilim Dergisi*, 16 (1), 56-83.

Sümer, N., & Güngör D. (1999). Yetişkin bağlanma stilleri ölçeklerinin Türk örneklemini üzerinde psikometrik değerlendirmesi ve kültürlerarası bir karşılaştırma. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14, 71-106.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc. Publishing.

Taylor, B. G., & Mumford, E. A. (2016). A national descriptive portrait of adolescent relationship abuse: results from the National Survey on Teen Relationships and Intimate Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(6), 963.

Temple J. R., Shorey, R., Fite, P., Stuart, G., & Le, V. D. (2013). Substance Use as a Longitudinal Predictor of the Perpetration of Teen Dating Violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42(4), 596-606.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the national violence against women survey. *Violence against Women*. 6(2):142- 61.

Tok, Y. (2001). Cinsiyet rolleri ile ilgili farklı kalıp yargılara sahip üniversite öğrencilerinin saldırganlık düzeyleri. Yüksek lisans tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Tremblay, R. E., Nagin, D. S. (2005). The developmental origins of physical aggression in humans. In R. E. Tremblay, W. W. Hartup, & J. Archer (Eds.), *Developmental Origins of Aggression* (pp. 83-106). New York: The Guildford Press.

Turan, R. (2018). Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Gönül İlişkisinde Şiddete Yönelik Tutumlar İle Toplumsal Cinsiyet Roller, Bağlanma Boyutları, Benlik Saygısı ve Sosyal Onay Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

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.

Tussey, B. R., Tyler, K. A., & Simons, L. G. (2018). Poor Parenting, Attachment Style, and Dating Violence Perpatration Among Collage Students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(5-6). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518760017>

Tuz, C. (2015). Bir Üniversitedeki Kız Öğrencilerin Cinsel Şiddet Öyküsü ve Şimdiki Depresyon ile İlişkisi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Ünsal, A. (1996). Genişletilmiş Bir Şiddet Tipolojisi. *Cogito*. 6, 29-36.

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.

Vefikuluçay Yılmaz, D., Zeyneloğlu, S., Kocaöz, S., Kısa, S., Taşkın, L., & Eroğlu, K. (2009). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerine İlişkin Görüşleri. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1), 775- 792.

Villora, B., Yubero, S., & Navarro, R. (2019). Cyber Dating Abuse and Masculine Gender Norms in a Sample of Male Adults. *Future Internet*, 11(4), 84.

DOI:[10.3390/fi11040084](https://doi.org/10.3390/fi11040084)

Waters, E., Posada, G., Crowell, J. and Lay, K.L. (1993). Is attachment theory ready to contribute to our understanding of disruptive behavior problems?. *Development and Psychopathology*, 5(1-2), 215-224.

Weiss, J., & Sampson, H. (1986). *The psychoanalytic process: theory, clinical observation: An Ampirical Research*. New York: Guilford press

Weisz, A. N., and Black, B. M. (2001). Evaluating a sexual assault and dating violence prevention program for urban youths. *Social Work Research*, 25, 89–100.

Wekerle, C. & Wolfe, D. A. (1999). Dating violence in mid-adolescence: Theory, significance, and emerging prevention initiatives. *Clinical psychology review*, 19(4), 435-456.

Wolfe, D. A., Scott, K. L., Crooks, C. V. (2005). Abuse and violence in adolescent girls' dating relationships. En D. J. Bell, S. L. Foster y E. J. Mash (Eds.), *Handbook of behavioral and emocional problems in girls: Issues in clinical childs psychology*. Nueva York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

World Health Organization (2002). World Report on Violence and Health.

Wright, M. F. (2015). Cyber aggression within adolescents' romantic relationships: Linkages to parental and partner attachment. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 44(1), 37-47.

Yarkovsky, N. (2016). Experiences of dating violence in emerging adult couples: The role of attachment style and emotion regulation. Doktora Tezi. Windsor Üniversitesi, Ontario.

Ybarra, M.L., Espelage, D.L., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Korchmaros, J.D., & Boyd, D. (2016). Lifetime prevalence rates and overlap of physical, psychological, and sexual dating abuse perpetration and victimization in a national sample of youth. *Archeological Sex Behaviour*, 45, 1083–1099.

Yıldırım, S. (2016). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Benlik Saygısı ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Tutumlarının Flört Şiddetine Yönelik Tutumlarına Etkisi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi. Ankara.

Yumuşak, A. (2013). Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine yönelik tutumları, toplumsal cinsiyetçilik ve narsisistik kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki.

Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Tokat.

Yüksel, Ş. (1992). Cinsellik İdeolojisi: Dün ve Bugün. N. Arat (Ed.). *Türkiye’de Kadın Olgusu*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları

Zastrow, C. (2013). Sosyal Hizmete Giriş: Cinsiyet rollerinin ve cinsiyetçiliğin tarihi. (Çiftçi, D.B., Ed.). Nika Yayınevi, Ankara. 596-633.

Zimmer, & Scott (2017). *Dating Violence and Victimization*. Salem Press Encyclopedia.

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.

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.

doi:10.1007/s10964-013-0047-x



APPENDICES

Appendix-1: Demographic Information Form

1. Cinsiyetiniz

- Kadın: ()
- Erkek: ()
- Diğer: ()
-

2. Eğitim Düzeyiniz

- İlkokul: ()
- Ortaokul: ()
- Lise: ()
- Üniversite: ()
- Yüksek Lisans: ()

3. Gelir Düzeyiniz

- 0-2500: ()
- 2500-5000: ()
- 5000-10000: ()
- 10000 ve üzeri: ()

4. Ortalama İlişki Süreniz (varken)

- 0-1 yıl: ()
- 2-3 yıl: ()
- 3-4 yıl: ()
- 5 yıl ve üzeri: ()

5. Romantik İlişkilerinize Genellikle Nasıl Başlarsınız?

- Yüz yüze: ()
- İnternet Üzerinden: ()
- Bir arkadaş ya da tanıdık vasıtasıyla: ()

6. Gün içerisinde internette ortalama ne kadar vakit geçirirsiniz?

- 0-1 saat: ()
- 2-3 saat: ()
- 3-4 saat: ()
- 5 saat ve fazlası: ()

Appendix-2: Cyber Dating Abuse Scale

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
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
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
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
20. Birlikte olduğum kişi sosyal medya hesabımda sahip olduğum arkadaş listemi kontrol etti.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Birlikte olduğum kişinin sosyal medya hesabında sahip olduğu arkadaş listesini kontrol ettim.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix-3: Gender Roles Attitude Scale (GRAS)

① Hiç katılmıyorum	②	③ Kararsızım	④ Katılıyorum	⑤ Tamamen Katılıyorum	anlamına gelmektedir.
1. Erkeklerin ev işlerine yardım etmede kızlarla aynı sorumlulukları vardır.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5. Bir kadından ziyade bir erkeği ağlarken görmek daha kötüdür.*	①	②	③	④	⑤
10. Bir babanın temel sorumluluğu maddi konularda çocuklarına yardım	①	②	③	④	⑤
15. Birçok önemli işte erkeklerle anlaşmak kadınlarla anlaşmaktan daha	①	②	③	④	⑤

Appendix-4: Relationship Scales Questionnaire (RSQ)

Ölçek maddeleri; Aşağıda yakın duygusal ilişkilerinizde kendinizi nasıl hissettiğinize ilişkin çeşitli ifadeler yer almaktadır. Yakın duygusal ilişkilerden kastedilen arkadaşlık, dostluk, romantik ilişkiler ve benzerleridir. Lütfen her bir ifadeyi bu tür ilişkilerinizi düşünerek okuyun ve her bir ifadenin sizi ne ölçüde tanımladığını aşağıdaki 7 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde değerlendiriniz.

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

**Beni Hiç
Tanımıyor**

Beni Kısmen

Tamamıyla Beni

Tanımlamıyor

Tanımlıyor

1. Başkalarına kolaylıkla güvenemem.

5. Başkalarıyla çok yakınlaşırsam incitileceğimden korkuyorum.

10. Başkalarının bana dayanıp bel bağlaması konusunda oldukça rahatımdır

20. Birlikte olduğum kişileri bazen daha fazla duygu ve bağlılık göstermeleri için zorladığımı hissedirim.

30. Başkalarıyla yakınlaşmayı nispeten kolay bulurum.