

Cyber intimate partner aggression in adulthood: The role of insecure attachment and self-control

Journal:	<i>Journal of Criminal Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	JCP-03-2023-0015.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	adult attachment;, cyber aggression, Finkel's I3 model, partner violence, romantic relationships, self-control

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

MANUSCRIPT DETAILS

TITLE: Cyber intimate partner aggression in adulthood: The role of insecure attachment and self-control

ABSTRACT:

Purpose: This study builds on existing literature on face-to-face aggression in intimate relationships and adopts Finkel's I3 theory to investigate the relationship between adult attachment style, dispositional self-control, and cyber intimate partner aggression (IPA) perpetration and victimization.

Methods: Participants (N = 173) aged 20 to 52 (M = 32.75 years, SD = 7.73, mode = 29 years) completed a series of standardized online measures to assess anxious and avoidant attachment, dispositional self-control, and experience of cyber IPA (psychological, sexual, and stalking), as both a perpetrator and victim.

Findings: Avoidant attachment was associated with increased perpetration of stalking and psychological abuse. Those high on avoidant attachment were also more likely to report that they were victims of cyber IPA psychological abuse and stalking. Self-control did not predict experience of cyber IPA, as a perpetrator or victim. Interactions between self-control and attachment were also non-significant.

CUST_RESEARCH_LIMITATIONS/IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

CUST_PRACTICAL_IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

CUST_SOCIAL_IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

Originality: This study addressed the paucity of cyber IPA research conducted with adult populations, by examining processes and factors to improve understanding of the experiences of online perpetration and victimization. The study also found evidence for the importance of impellance factors but not inhibiting factors (Finkel, 2008).

Abstract

Purpose: This study builds on existing literature on face-to-face aggression in intimate relationships and adopts Finkel's I³ theory to investigate the relationship between adult attachment style, dispositional self-control, and cyber intimate partner aggression (IPA) perpetration and victimization.

Methods: Participants ($N = 173$) aged 20 to 52 ($M = 32.75$ years, $SD = 7.73$, mode = 29 years) completed a series of standardized online measures to assess anxious and avoidant attachment, dispositional self-control, and experience of cyber IPA (psychological, sexual, and stalking), as both a perpetrator and victim.

Findings: Avoidant attachment was associated with increased perpetration of stalking and psychological abuse. Those high on avoidant attachment were also more likely to report that they were victims of cyber IPA psychological abuse and stalking. Self-control did not predict experience of cyber IPA, as a perpetrator or victim. Interactions between self-control and attachment were also non-significant.

Originality: This study addressed the paucity of cyber IPA research conducted with adult populations, by examining processes and factors to improve understanding of the experiences of online perpetration and victimization. The study also found evidence for the importance of impellance factors but not inhibiting factors (Finkel, 2008).

Keywords: adult attachment; cyber aggression; Finkel's I³ model, partner violence; romantic relationships; self-control

Cyber intimate partner aggression in adulthood: The role of insecure attachment and self-control

Introduction

Cyber aggression research has evolved rapidly in the last decade, reflecting the exponential growth of electronic information and communication technologies (ICTs). The broad and novel range of ICTs that people use to interact in their social and intimate relationships has increased interest on how different types of interpersonal aggression, rife in real-life, might exist in a cyber-environment (Kowalski et al., 2019). Consequently, there is now a plethora of research on various elements of cyber aggression, including cyberbullying in children and adolescents (e.g., Tian et al., 2023), cyber dating aggression in college-aged students (e.g., Standlee, 2023) and cyber stalking of intimate partners (e.g., Wilson, Sheridan, & Garratt-Reed, 2022; Woodlock, 2017). It is now clear that ICTs are a mechanism by which different forms of interpersonal abuse can be perpetrated, separately or along with face-to-face victimization (Wright, 2015), and that they can be harmful (Kim et al., 2018).

By comparison, and with the exception of cyber-stalking, research into adults' use of cyber intimate partner aggression (IPA), have lagged behind (Watkins et al., 2018). This is surprising as face-to-face IPA is ubiquitous in adulthood, is widely accepted as a serious global concern, and is associated with poorer mental and physical health (Cirici Amell, et al., Soler et al., 2023; Garcia-Moreno Jansen et al., 2006; Stubbs & Szoeki, 2022). Also, adults are active users of the internet, mobile phones, and social media (Burnell & Kuther, 2016; Kuss et al., 2018). Kowalski et al. (2019) summarised that in 2017, only 5% of all American adults reported not having a mobile phone, and of those who did, three-quarters owned smartphones. Thus, while there is potential for ICTs to be used positively in intimate relationships (e.g., keeping in contact when apart), ICT may also be used negatively (e.g., invading privacy, covert monitoring) (Wright, 2015). Both offline and cyber IPA includes

1
2
3 behaviors such as threats, insults, humiliation, excessive monitoring, tracking, stalking and
4
5 omnipresence intended to control, distress, or isolate a partner (Borrajó et al., 2015; Creamer
6
7 & Hand, 2022; Sheridan, 2023; Wheatley, 2023; Woodlock, 2017). Yet cyber IPA and real-
8
9 life IPA are distinguishable by a number of features. For example, Watkins et al. (2018)
10
11 noted that cyber exchanges occur without interpersonal feedback unlike real-life interactions
12
13 (e.g., victim's reactions), thus fostering a disinhibiting environment in which words and
14
15 actions unlikely to be expressed face-to-face, are more likely to occur in a cyber context.
16
17 Portable ICT devices mean that victims can be targeted at any time, and harmful messages
18
19 can be permanent (e.g., texts, social media posts), so momentary actions may not be short-
20
21 lived and be witnessed and circulated by a large and public audience, all of which is beyond a
22
23 victim's control.
24
25
26
27

28 29 **Theoretical frameworks**

30
31 In this digital era, these differences indicate a need to identify psychological factors
32
33 that underpin experiences of cyber IPA perpetration and victimization in adulthood,
34
35 separately from face-to-face experiences. Notably, when established associations between
36
37 offline intimate relationships and attachment style (Wilson et al, 2022) are considered in line
38
39 with the growing research on partner directed aggression online (Marganski & Melander,
40
41 2018; Yahner et al., 2015), there is a strong rationale for applying robust theoretical models
42
43 developed for face-to-face IPA to cyber IPA.
44
45
46

47 Finkel's (2008) I³ model, in particular, has been a useful framework for examining the
48
49 process by which face-to-face IPA occurs. Finkel (2008) proposes that the likelihood of
50
51 aggressive behavior occurring depends on the strength of two forces (instigation and
52
53 impellance), as well as inhibiting forces that guard an individual from acting on their
54
55 impulses. Instigation refers to exposure to discrete partner behaviors that typically trigger an
56
57 urge to aggress, (e.g., jealousy, provocation, conflict). Impellance refers to dispositional or
58
59
60

1
2
3 situational factors that psychologically prepare an individual to aggress when encountering
4 instigation (e.g., insecure attachment styles, negative affect, anger). Inhibition refers to
5
6 dispositional or situational factors that increase the likelihood that an individual will override
7
8 their urge to aggress (e.g., self-control, relationship commitment). According to the I³ model,
9
10 the risk of partner-directed aggression increases in the context of an interaction between a
11
12 strong impelling drive and a weak inhibitory force, in the presence of a strong instigating
13
14 trigger, usually termed “perfect storm” theory (Finkel, 2014). Research has supported the
15
16 “perfect storm” interaction to predict interpersonal aggression and IPA (Finkel, 2015; Finkel
17
18 et al., 2012; Slotter et al., 2012). Application of Finkel’s (2008) I³ framework has enhanced
19
20 understanding of the underlying processes and factors associated with face-to-face IPA. This
21
22 has included the role of factors such as anger, provocation, relationship commitment,
23
24 insecure attachment styles and self-regulatory processes (e.g., self-control) for understanding
25
26 occurrences of IPA (e.g., Finkel & Slotter, 2007; Finkel et al., 2009; Finkel et al., 2012;
27
28 Slotter et al., 2012). The present study draws upon Finkel’s (2008) I³ framework of partner-
29
30 directed aggression to examine psychological factors (that is, partner attachment and self-
31
32 control) that may act as impelling and inhibitory forces in experiences of cyber IPA (both
33
34 perpetration and victimization) in adulthood.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Attachment theories also provide a useful framework upon which to better understand
43
44 cyber IPA, in terms of the dynamics underpinning the two dimensions of insecure
45
46 relationships in adulthood, characterized by anxiety and avoidance. The association between
47
48 insecure intimate partner attachment and offline IPA perpetration and victimization is well
49
50 established (Kuijpers et al., 2012; Miyagawa & Kanemasa, 2022). Associations between
51
52 insecure attachment and cyber stalking of intimate partners has also been highlighted
53
54 (Creamer & Hand, 2022). Thus, secure attachment has been identified as an inhibitory force
55
56
57
58
59
60

(Babcock et al., 2000), and insecure attachment is conceptualized as an impelling force that increases the likelihood of partner-directed aggression in intimate relationships.

According to Bowlby's (1973, 1980) theory of attachment, relationships with caregivers during early childhood influence the development of internal working models of the self (e.g., whether deserving of love), others (e.g., if others are responsive and supportive), and the relationship between the self and others. These internal working models influence relationship behavior and expectations of intimate partners during adulthood (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Attachment styles, which can be categorized as secure or insecure, influence sensitivity to perceived relationship threats (Besser & Priel, 2009), interactions with intimate partners (Gouin et al., 2013), and relationship conflict (Brewer & Forrest-Redfern, 2022). Those with secure attachments expect others to be available, responsive, and display confidence in their relationships (Simpson et al., 1996). In contrast, insecure attachments are characterized by anxiety (i.e., dependence, fear of rejection or abandonment) and/or avoidance (i.e., discomfort with emotional closeness, desire for independence) (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

Reflecting a fear of abandonment or rejection, anxious attachment is characterized by a motivation to preserve intimate relationships and sensitivity to relationship threats. Gormley (2005) posits that anxiously attached adults experience negative feelings of self, lack confidence in emotion management, and blame themselves for conflict. Those high on attachment anxiety underestimate their partner's commitment and overestimate relationship threats (Collins, 1996), seek reassurance and proximity to the partner (Eastwick & Finkel, 2008), and are more likely to perceive behavior as infidelity (Kruger et al., 2013). Finkel and Slotter (2007) describe how individuals with strong attachment anxiety can engage in 'hyper activating strategies' that involve monitoring partner's behavior, and if they perceive their relationship to be under threat, they are motivated to escalate security-seeking efforts

(Doumas et al., 2008). Thus, it is predicted that those high on anxious attachment will be more likely to engage in cyber IPA stalking, but not other overt forms of partner-directed cyber aggression (e.g., psychological or sexual abuse) that could damage the relationship.

Avoidant attachment is characterized by a desire to maintain independence and avoid closeness. Those high on avoidant attachment distance themselves from emotional situations (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), seek autonomy (Hazan & Shaver, 1994), and dislike intimacy (Brennan et al., 1998). With higher levels of self-control, but limited awareness of the emotional state of others, attachment avoidance is associated with affect escalation followed by anger, grudge bearing, and the externalization of blame to others (Gormley, 2005). Their use of intimate partner aggression may involve devaluing and controlling them, using psychological means, in order to maintain their own sense of self-control (Gormley, 2005). Thus, it is predicted that avoidant attachment will predict both greater perpetration of controlling and dismissive behavior (i.e., psychological cyber IPA) and the perception that they are victims of cyber IPA. Though previous research suggests that insecure attachment is related to the perpetration of offline IPA (e.g., Goldenson et al., 2007; Spencer et al., 2021; Trombetta & Rolle, 2022) and cyber IPA (Marshall et al., 2013; Toplu-Demirtas et al., 2022), partner violence research has, however, typically focused on anxious rather than avoidant attachment, child or adolescent rather than adult populations, and offline rather than cyber IPA.

Self-Control

Dispositional self-control, one feature of self-regulation, refers to an individual's ability to control and override impulses and urges, including aggressive thoughts and behavior. According to the strength model of self-regulation, self-regulation relies on a limited, depletable, and renewable resource (Baumeister et al., 2007; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). Refraining from aggression involves drawing from this resource. Therefore,

1
2
3 individuals with limited dispositional self-control may be at increased risk of engaging in
4 harmful behaviors, including partner violence (DeWall et al., 2007). In accordance with
5 Finkel's (2008) I³ model, dispositional self-control represents a potential inhibiting force.
6
7 Previous research indicates that self-regulatory failure, such as depleted self-control, predicts
8 greater frequencies of partner-directed aggression (Finkel et al., 2009) while greater levels of
9 dispositional self-control act as a protective factor, reducing the likelihood of this occurring
10 (Finkel et al., 2012). Further, dispositional self-control is associated with cyber aggression,
11 including the use of harassing or threatening posts (Donner et al., 2014) and cyberbullying
12 (Vazsonyi et al., 2012).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Applying Finkel's (2008) I³ model, lower levels of dispositional self-control
25 represents a weak inhibition factor that, in the presence of a strong impelling force, such as
26 insecure attachment, is theorized to increase the likelihood of aggressive behavior occurring
27 in intimate relationships. Watkins et al. (2015) reported that self-control depletion was a
28 significant predictor for partner violence only when taking into account its interaction with
29 emotional affect as an impelling force. This is consistent with other research that emphasizes
30 the moderating role of self-control, as opposed to direct effects on aggression (Cooper et al.,
31 2017). Similar to the attachment literature, research investigating dispositional self-control
32 and partner violence has focused on offline rather than cyber aggression and typically
33 recruited student samples. There is, therefore, a need to investigate dispositional self-control
34 as a direct predictor of cyber IPA and consider interactions between attachment and self-
35 control.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **The current study aims to investigate the processes and factors influencing cyber IPA**
52 **in adults, to improve knowledge of online perpetration and victimization.** The current study
53 builds upon previous offline partner violence research by examining the role of partner
54 attachment style and dispositional self-control on cyber IPA perpetration and victimization in
55
56
57
58
59
60

an adult sample. It is predicted that a) those high on anxious attachment will be more likely to engage in stalking, b) those high on avoidant attachment will be more likely to perpetrate psychological aggression and perceive themselves to be a victim of cyber IPA, and c) those with high dispositional self-control will be less likely to perpetrate psychological aggression, sexual aggression, and stalking. Further, d) it is predicted that interactions between attachment and self-control - that those high on anxious or avoidant attachment will be more likely to perpetrate cyber IPA when self-control is low.

Method

Ethics

The study materials and procedure received full approval from the University of Central Lancashire Psychology and Social Work Ethics Committee and complied with British Psychological Society (BPS) ethics guidelines.

Participants

Women ($N = 173$) aged 20 to 52 years ($M = 32.75$ years, mode = 29 years, $SD = 7.73$), were recruited online via social media platforms. All participants were required to be in a romantic relationship of at least six months duration at the time of the study. Mean relationship length was 98.55 months ($SD = 80.03$), with a large proportion of participants married or cohabiting (72.9%). The majority of participants were of white ethnic origin (92.5%), with more than half the sample (60.1%) reporting that they had dependents.

Measures

Participants completed initial demographic questions (e.g., age, sex, ethnicity, relationship length) followed by a series of standardized measures.

The Cyber Aggression in Relationships Scale (Watkins et al., 2018) is a 34 item self-report measure of cyber aggression between intimate partners. Participants report the frequency of their own, and their partner's, engagement in aggressive behavior (0 = this has never happened to 7 = more than 20 times in the past 6 months). Perpetration and

victimization are measured (17 items each) across three domains; psychological (5 items), sexual (4 items), and stalking (8 items). Example statements include “I intentionally ignored my partner’s phone calls or text messages to hurt my partner’s feelings” (psychological), “I pressured my partner to send sexual or naked photos of him or her to me” (sexual), and “I kept tabs on the whereabouts of my partner using social media” (stalking).

The Experiences in Close Relationships–Revised (Fraley et al., 2000) is a 36-item self-report measure examining romantic attachment orientation. The measure contains two subscales (18 items per subscale), assessing anxious attachment and avoidant attachment. Example items include “I’m afraid that I will lose this person’s love” (anxious attachment) and “I get uncomfortable when this person wants to be very close” (avoidant attachment). Participants respond to each item in relation to their current romantic partner (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree).

The Brief Self-Control Scale (Tangney et al., 2004) is a 13-item self-report dispositional self-control measure. Participants indicate how much each item reflects their typical behavior (1 = not at all to 5 = very much). Example statements include “I often act without thinking through all the alternatives”.

The Cronbach’s alpha’s in this study were: anxious attachment $\alpha = .95$; avoidant attachment: $\alpha = .95$; self-control: $\alpha = .85$; psychological perpetration: $\alpha = .59$; sexual perpetration: $\alpha = .43$; stalking perpetration: $\alpha = .77$; psychological victimization: $\alpha = .57$; sexual victimization: $\alpha = .46$; and stalking victimization: $\alpha = .70$. Low Cronbach’s alpha’s for the psychological (perpetration: $\alpha = .59$; victimization: $\alpha = .57$) and sexual (perpetration: $\alpha = .43$; victimization: $\alpha = .46$) aggression subscales reflect the relatively low number of items (5 and 4 respectively) contributing to each subscale.

Statistical Analysis

Initial inspection of the data revealed substantial experiences of both cyber IPA perpetration and victimization. The frequencies of those reporting any psychological, sexual, and stalking perpetration were 63.6%, 8.1%, and 67.6% respectively. The frequencies of those reporting any psychological, sexual, and stalking victimization were 50.9%, 17.3%, and 48.0% respectively. Total cyber IPA perpetration and victimization frequencies were 80.3% and 67.6%. Exploration of the data revealed univariate outliers for all variables with the exception of anxious attachment. Square root transformations were applied to all variables, which resulted in the removal of outliers and improved skewness. Correlations were then conducted to examine relationships between (anxious and avoidant) attachment, self-control, and cyber IPA (perpetration and victimization). These data are shown in Table 1.

To test our predictions that a) those high on anxious attachment will be more likely to engage in stalking, b) those high on avoidant attachment will be more likely to perpetrate psychological aggression and perceive themselves to be a victim of cyber IPA, c) those with high dispositional self-control will be less likely to perpetrate psychological aggression, sexual aggression, and stalking, and d) those high on anxious or avoidant attachment will be more likely to perpetrate cyber IPA when self-control is low, a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed. Psychological, sexual, and stalking aggression perpetration and victimization were the criterion variables. Anxious attachment, avoidant attachment, and self-control were entered into Block 1. Interactions between anxious attachment and self-control and avoidant attachment and self-control were entered into Block 2.

Results

For perpetration of psychological IPA, both the first model (anxious attachment, avoidant attachment, self-control), $F(3, 165) = 5.52, p = .001, R^2 = .09, \text{Adj } R^2 = .08$, and second model (with the addition of the attachment self-control interactions), $F(5, 163) = 3.45$,

$p = .005$, $R^2 = .10$, $Adj R^2 = .07$, were significant. Avoidant attachment was a significant independent predictor, such that those high on avoidant attachment were more likely to engage in psychological IPA. No other individual predictors or interactions were significant. For perpetration of sexual aggression, neither the first model, $F(3, 166) = 1.93$, $p = .126$, $R^2 = .03$, $Adj R^2 = .02$, nor the second model, $F(5, 164) = 1.55$, $p = .178$, $R^2 = .05$, $Adj R^2 = .02$, were significant. For stalking perpetration, both the first model, $F(3, 165) = 8.90$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .14$, $Adj R^2 = .12$, and second model, $F(5, 163) = 5.30$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .14$, $Adj R^2 = .11$, were significant. **Avoidant** attachment was a significant predictor, such that those high in **avoidant** attachment were more likely to stalk their partner. No other individual predictors or interactions were significant. These data are shown in Tables 2-4.

For psychological IPA victimization, both the first model (anxious attachment, avoidant attachment, self-control), $F(3, 164) = 5.38$, $p = .001$, $R^2 = .09$, $Adj R^2 = .07$, and second model (with the addition of the attachment self-control interactions), $F(5, 162) = 3.62$, $p = .004$, $R^2 = .10$, $Adj R^2 = .07$, were significant. Avoidant attachment was a significant predictor such that those high on avoidant attachment were most likely to report victimization from psychological IPA. No other individual predictors or interactions were significant. For sexual IPA victimization, neither the first model, $F(3, 166) = 2.41$, $p = .071$, $R^2 = .04$, $Adj R^2 = .02$, nor the second model $F(5, 164) = 1.56$, $p = .175$, $R^2 = .05$, $Adj R^2 = .02$, was significant.

For stalking victimization, both the first model, $F(3, 165) = 8.91$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .14$, $Adj R^2 = .12$, and the second model, $F(5, 163) = 5.40$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .14$, $Adj R^2 = .12$, were significant. Avoidant attachment was a significant individual predictor such that those high on avoidant attachment were more likely to report that they were being stalked by their partner. No other individual predictors or interactions were significant. These data are shown in Tables 5-7.

Discussion

This study makes a novel contribution by synthesizing existing offline IPA research with Finkel's (2008) I³ model of aggression as a framework, to examine the association between intimate partner attachment style (impellance), dispositional self-control (inhibition) and experiences of cyber IPA in adulthood – both perpetration and victimization. In examining attachment style, those high on avoidant attachment were more likely to cyber stalk their partner. This finding was contrary to initial predictions and inconsistent with previous research where the relationship between anxious attachment and face-to-face IPA (Goldenson et al., 2007) and excessive monitoring and stalking of partners (Civilott et al., 2020; Creamer & Hand, 2022; Woodlock, 2017) is more commonly documented. Future research would benefit from examining the consistency of these findings within cyber IPA, and the underlying function that partner stalking may serve for those with avoidant attachment. This novel finding emphasizes the need for wider exploration of factors predictive of cyber IPA and how these may differ from face to face IPA.

Those high on avoidant attachment were also more likely to report perpetration of psychological abuse and were more likely to perceive themselves as victims of psychological abuse and stalking. Avoidant attachment is characterized by a desire to maintain independence and a rejection of intimacy (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Greater perpetration of psychological IPA (e.g., posting insulting information about a partner online) may, therefore, serve to reduce intimacy and increase emotional distance from a partner. This is consistent with previous assertions that violence against a partner may be used create psychological distance (Allison et al., 2008). The tendency for those high on avoidant attachment to report that they were being stalked by their partner (e.g., monitoring internet activity) or the target of psychological abuse (e.g., personal information shared online without permission) may reflect discomfort with physical and emotional intimacy. Future

1
2
3 research should investigate the manner in which avoidant attachment predicts perceptions of
4 appropriate online behavior and responses to a partner's monitoring.
5
6

7
8 Contrary to initial predictions, self-control did not predict engagement in cyber IPA.
9
10 Interactions between attachment and self-control were also non-significant. Findings were not
11 consistent with previous research indicating that those with elevated self-control are less
12 likely to act aggressively towards intimate partners (Finkel et al., 2009) or engage in online
13 deviance (Donner et al., 2014) and online aggression (Vazsonyi et al., 2012). Thus, self-
14 control does not appear to act as an inhibiting factor that reduces the likelihood of cyber IPA
15 either alone or in interaction with insecure attachment. However, bivariate analyses reveal a
16 relationship between self-control and anxious attachment, as well as relations with
17 psychological and stalking perpetration, and stalking victimization. In support of these
18 findings, previous research has indicated that dispositional self-control may not be sufficient
19 as a direct predictor of IPA when examined in isolation (Cooper et al., 2017; Watkins et al.,
20 2015). Watkins et al. (2015) found that reduced dispositional self-control was not predictive
21 of IPA, but that the effect of low self-control was mediated by interactions with other risk
22 factors, such as negative affect. Research has also indicated that the influence of self-control
23 may differ across genders (Watkins et al., 2015). As the current study was unable to examine
24 gender differences due to an under-representation of males, potential gender differences in
25 the effect of dispositional self-control could not be explored. While self-control was not
26 predictive of cyber IPA in this study, the indication of a relationship between self-control and
27 cyber IPA should be further explored, including consideration of other potential mediator
28 variables not captured within the current study. **The inconsistency between previous studies
29 of self-control and attachment style in IPA, and the findings of the current study, highlight
30 that there may be fundamental differences in the processes and factors at play in cyber IPA.
31 Furthermore, consideration should be given to contextual differences, recognizing how the**
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reality of interaction within the cyber world, differs greatly to that of face-to-face
4
5 interpersonal interaction.
6

7 8 *Limitations and Future Research*

9
10 Findings are limited by the use of self-report questionnaire measures that may be
11 subject to bias recall or socially desirable responding. In addition, participants may not be
12 aware that they were the target of aggressive cyber behavior (e.g., “my partner checked my
13 social media account without my permission”). Future research should, therefore, incorporate
14 objective measures of cyber activity and collect reports from both partners (e.g., Maneta et
15 al., 2013). Although it is outside the scope of the current study, which examined three forms
16 of cyber IPA (psychological, sexual, stalking), it would be beneficial for future studies to
17 further scrutinize each of these different types of IPA with more extensive measures of cyber
18 sexual abuse, to prevent overreliance on a relatively small number of questionnaire items.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 In this study, participants were female and typically married or cohabiting and of
31 ‘white’ ethnic origin. Though, caution is recommended when extrapolating findings to other
32 populations, this represents an important contribution to a research area typically dominated
33 by student, dating samples (e.g., Burke et al., 2011; Marganski & Fauth, 2013). Further, as
34 the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted on the nature of partner violence (Lyons & Brewer,
35 2021), future research may consider environmental factors such as lockdowns on the use of
36 cyber partner violence perpetration and victimization.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 As this study focused on attachment, self-control and incidence of cyber IPA as a
47 perpetrator or victim, it did not explore the manner in which attachment or self-control were
48 associated with responses to cyber IPA (e.g., confrontation). It would be expected that those
49 high on anxious and avoidant attachment to be less and more likely to terminate an abusive
50 relationship respectively. It is also noteworthy that this study extended the application of the
51 I³ model (specifically developed to understand the manifestation of IPA) to examine the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 extent to which it could also explain victimization. This approach is encouraged (e.g., Chester
4 & DeWall, 2017), so that well-established aggression models like the I³ theory can indicate
5
6 novel avenues for hypothesis-testing. Indeed, this approach has produced new and valuable
7
8 findings, yet it would be advantageous if future studies more comprehensively examined the
9
10 I³ model, which states that it is the interaction between impelling and disinhibition at the time
11
12 of instigation that increases the risk of aggressive conduct (Finkel, 2008).
13
14
15

16 17 *Conclusions*

18
19 This study addresses the paucity of cyber IPA research conducted with adult
20
21 populations. **The findings of this investigation contribute to an improved understanding of**
22
23 **online abuse perpetration and victimization, experienced in adult's intimate relationships.**
24
25 **Avoidant attachment predicted perpetration of psychological abuse and stalking and**
26
27 **victimization from psychological abuse and stalking.** Self-control did not predict experience
28
29 of cyber IPA as a perpetrator or victim. Interactions between self-control and attachment
30
31 were also non-significant. Therefore, we found evidence for the importance of impellance
32
33 factors but not inhibiting factors (Finkel, 2008). Future research should investigate responses
34
35 to perceived cyber aggression and obtain reports from both members of the relationship dyad.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **References**

- 43
44 Allison, C. J., Bartholomew, K., Mayseless, O., & Dutton, D. G. (2008). Love as a
45
46 battlefield: Attachment and relationship dynamics in couples identified for male
47
48 partner violence. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29(1), 125-150.
49
50 doi.org/10.1177/0192513X07306980
51
52
53 Babcock, J. C., Jacobson, N. S., Gottman, J. M., & Yerington, T. P. (2000). Attachment,
54
55 emotional regulation, and the function of marital violence: Differences between
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 secure, preoccupied, and dismissing violent and nonviolent husbands. *Journal of*
4
5 *Family Violence, 15*, 391-409. doi.org/10.1023/A:1007558330501
6
7
- 8 Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The strength model of self-control.
9
10 *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*(6), 351-355. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-
11
12 8721.2007.00534.x
13
- 14 Besser, A., & Priel, B. (2009). Emotional responses to a romantic partner's imaginary
15
16 rejection: The roles of attachment anxiety, covert narcissism, and self-evaluation.
17
18 *Journal of Personality, 77*(1), 287-325. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00546.x
19
20
- 21 Borrajo, E., Gamez-Guadix, M., Pereda, N., & Calvete, E. (2015). The development and
22
23 validation of the cyber dating abuse questionnaire among young couples. *Computers*
24
25 *in Human Behavior, 48*, 358-365. doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.063
26
27
- 28 Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Separation: Anxiety and anger (vol. 2)*. New York:
29
30 Basic Books.
31
- 32 Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Loss (vol. 3)*. New York: Basic Books.
33
34
- 35 Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult
36
37 attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.).
38
39 *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York, NY: Guilford
40
41 Press.
42
43
- 44 Brewer, G., & Forrest-Redfern, A. (2022). Attachment anxiety, rape myth acceptance, and
45
46 sexual compliance. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 37*(7-8), NP4626-NP4639.
47
48 doi.org/10.1177/0886260520948526
49
- 50
51 Burke, S.C., Wallen, M., Vail-Smith, K., & Knox, D. (2011). Using technology to control
52
53 intimate partners: An exploratory study of college undergraduates. *Computers in*
54
55 *Human Behavior, 27*(3), 1162-1167. doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.12.010
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Burnell, K., & Kuther, T. L. (2016). Predictors of mobile phone and social networking site
4 dependency in adulthood. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*,
5
6 19(10), 621-627. doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2016.0209
7
8
9
10 Chester, D. S., & DeWall, C. N. (2018). The roots of intimate partner violence. *Current*
11
12 *Opinion in Psychology*, 19, 55-59. doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.04.009
13
14
15 Cirici Amell, Soler, A. R., Cobo, J., & Soldevilla Alberti, J. M. (2023). Psychological
16
17 consequences and daily life adjustment for victims of intimate partner violence. The
18
19 *International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*, 58(1), 6-19.
20
21 doi.org/10.1177/00912174211050504
22
23
24 Civilotti, C., Sciaascia, C., Zaccagnino, M., Varetto, A., & Acquadro Maran, D. (2020).
25
26 States of mind with respect to adult attachment and reflective functioning in a sample of men
27
28 detained for stalking: Evaluation and clinical implications. *Sage Open*, 10(4),
29
30 2158244020962820. doi.org/10.1177/2158244020962820
31
32
33 Collins, N. L. (1996). Working models of attachment: Implications for explanation, emotion,
34
35 and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(4), 810-832.
36
37 doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.4.810
38
39
40 Cooper, A. N., Seibert, G. S., May, R. W., Fitzgerald, M. C., & Fincham, F. D. (2017).
41
42 School burnout and intimate partner violence: The role of self-control. *Personality*
43
44 *and Individual Differences*, 112, 18-25. doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.02.047
45
46
47 Creamer, C. J., & Hand, C. J. (2022). Intimate partner stalking / pursuit: A pathophysiology
48
49 of attachment style. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative*
50
51 *Criminology*, 66(5), 604-624. doi.org/10.1177/0306624X211010289
52
53
54 DeWall, C. N., Baumeister, R. F., Stillman, T. F., & Gailliot, M. T. (2007). Violence
55
56 restrained: Effects of self-regulation and its depletion on aggression. *Journal of*
57
58 *Experimental Social Psychology*, 43(1), 62-76. doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2005.12.005
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Donner, C. M., Marcum, C. D., Jennings, W. G., Higgins, G. E., & Banfield, J. (2014). Low self-control and cybercrime: Exploring the utility of the general theory of crime beyond digital piracy. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 34, 165-172.
doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.01.040
- Doumas, D. M., Pearson, C. L., Elgin, J. E. & McKinley, L. L. (2008). Adult attachment as a risk factor for intimate partner violence: The “mispairing” of partners’ attachment styles. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23, 616-634.
doi.org/10.1177/0886260507313526
- Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2008). The attachment system in fledgling relationships: An activating role for attachment anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(3), 628-647. doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.3.628
- Finkel, E. J. (2008). Intimate partner violence perpetration: Insights from the science of self-regulation. In J. P. Forgas & J. Fitness (Eds.), *Social relationships: Cognitive, affective, and motivational processes* (pp. 271-288). New York: Psychology Press.
- Finkel, E. J. (2014). The I³ Model: Metatheory, theory, and evidence. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 1-104. doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-800052-6.00001-9
- Finkel, E. J., & Slotter, E. B. (2007). An attachment theory perspective on the perpetuation of intimate partner violence. *DePaul Law Review*, 56(3), 895-908.
- Finkel, E. J., DeWall, C. N., Slotter, E. B., Oaten, M., & Foshee, V. A. (2009). Self-regulatory failure and intimate partner violence perpetration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(3), 483-499. doi.org/10.1037/a0015433
- Finkel, E. J., DeWall, C. N., Slotter, E. B., McNulty, J. K., Pond, R. S., & Atkins, D. C. (2012). Using I³ theory to clarify when dispositional aggressiveness predicts intimate

partner violence perpetration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(3), 533-549. doi.org/10.1037/a0025651

Fraley, C. R., Niedenthal, P. M., Marks, M., Brumbaugh, C., & Vicary, A. (2006). Adult attachment and the perception of emotional expressions: Probing the hyperactivating strategies underlying anxious attachment. *Journal of Personality*, 74(4), 1163-1190. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00406.x

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(2), 350-365. doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.2.350

Garcia Meraz, M. (2020). Uncertainty: Romantic attachment effects on partner surveillance on social networks. *Acta de investigacion psicologia*, 10(1), 79-79.

Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, H. A., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., & Watts, C. H. (2006). Prevalence of intimate partner violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *The Lancet*, 368(9543), 1260-1269. doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(06)69523-8

Goldenson, J., Geffner, R., Foster, S. L., & Clipson, C. R. (2007). Female domestic violence offenders: Their attachment security, trauma symptoms, and personality organization. *Violence and Victims*, 22(5), 532-545. doi.org/10.1891/088667007782312186

Gormley, B. (2005). An adult attachment theoretical perspective of gender symmetry in intimate partner violence. *Sex Roles*, 52(11-12), 785-795. doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-4199-3

Gouin, J. P., Fisher, M. L., Edelstein, R. S., Chopik, W. J., Fitzgerald, C. J., Strout, S. L. (2013). Was that cheating? Perceptions vary by sex, attachment anxiety, and behavior. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 11, 159-171.

- 1
2
3 Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process.
4
5 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524. doi.org/10.1037/0022-
6
7 3514.52.3.511
8
9
- 10 Hazan, C., Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on
11
12 close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5(1), 1-22.
13
14 doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0501_1
15
16
- 17 Kim, S., Colwell, S. R., Kata, A., Boyle, M. H., & Georgiades, K. (2018). Cyberbullying
18
19 victimization and adolescent mental health: Evidence of differential effects by sex and
20
21 mental health problem type. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47(3), 661-672.
22
23 doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0678-4
24
25
- 26 Kowalski, R., Limber, S. P., & McCord, A. (2019). A developmental approach to
27
28 cyberbullying: Prevalence and protective factors. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*,
29
30 45, 20-32. doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.02.009
31
32
- 33 Kruger, D. J., Fisher, M. L., Edelstein, R. S., Chopik, W. J., Fitzgerald, C. J., & Strout, S. L.
34
35 (2013). Was that cheating? Perceptions vary by sex, attachment anxiety, and behavior,
36
37 *Evolutionary Psychology*, 11, 159-171.
38
39
- 40 Kuijpers, K. F., van der Knaap, L. M., & Winkel, F. W. (2012). Risk of revictimization of
41
42 intimate partner violence: The role of attachment, anger and violent behavior of the
43
44 victim. *Journal of Family Violence*, 27(1), 33-44. doi.org/10.1007/s10896-011-9399-8
45
46
- 47 Kuss, D. J., Kanjo, E., Crook-Rumsey, M., Kibowski, F., Wang, G. Y., & Sumich, A. (2018).
48
49 Problematic mobile phone use and addiction across generations: The roles of
50
51 psychopathological symptoms and smartphone use. *Journal of Technology in*
52
53 *Behavioral Science*, 1-9. doi.org/10.1007/s41347-017-0041-3
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Lyons, M., & Brewer, G. (2021). Experiences of intimate partner violence during lockdown and the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Family Violence, 37*, 969-977.
doi.org/10.1007/s10896-021-00260-x
- Maneta, E. K., Cohen, S., Schulz, M. S., & Waldinger, R. J. (2013). Two to tango: A dyadic analysis of links between Borderline Personality traits and intimate partner violence. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 27*(2), 233-243.
doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2013_27_082
- Marganski, A., & Fauth, (2013). Socially interactive technology and contemporary dating: A cross-cultural exploration of deviant behaviors among young adults in the modern, evolving technological world. *International Criminal Justice Review, 23*(4), 357-377.
doi.org/10.1177/1057567713513797
- 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. doi.org/10.1177/0886260515614283
- Marshall, T. C., Bejanyan, K., Di Castro, G., & Lee, R. A. (2013). Attachment styles as predictors of Facebook related jealousy and surveillance in romantic partners. *Personal Relationships, 20*(1), 1-22. doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2011.01393.x
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics and change*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Miyagawa, Y., Kanemasa, Y. (2022). Insecure attachment and psychological intimate partner violence perpetration: Low self-compassion and compassionate goals as mediators. *Journal of Family Violence*. doi.org/10.1007/s10896-022-00436-z

- 1
2
3 Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources:
4 Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*(2), 247-259.
5
6 doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.2.247
7
8
9
10 Sheridan, L. (2023), "Special Issue on stalking: commentary", *Journal of Criminal*
11
12 *Psychology*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 72-75. doi.org/10.1108/JCP-07-2021-0029
13
14
15 Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Phillips, D. (1996). Conflict in close relationships: An
16 attachment perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*, 899-914.
17
18 doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.5.899
19
20
21 Slotter, E. B., Finkel, E. J., DeWall, C. N., Pond Jr, R. S., Lambert, N. M., Bodenhausen, G.
22 V., Fincham, F. D. (2012). Putting the Brakes on Aggression Toward a Romantic
23 Partner: The Inhibitory Influence of Relationship Commitment. *Journal of*
24 *Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(2) 291-305. doi:10.1037/a0024915
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 Spencer, C. M., Keilholtz, B. M., & Stith, S. M. (2021). The association between attachment
32 styles and physical intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization: A meta-
33 analysis. *Family Process*, *60*(1), 270-284. doi.org/10.1111/famp.12545
34
35
36
37
38 Standlee, A. (2023). Sex, romance, and technology: Efficiency, predictability, and
39 standardization in College dating cultures. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, *19*(1), 6-21.
40
41 doi.org/10.18778/1733-8077.19.1.01
42
43
44
45 Stubbs, A., & Szoeki, C. (2022). The effect of intimate partner violence on the physical
46 health and health-related behaviors of women: A systematic review of the literature.
47
48 *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, *23*(4), 1157-1172. doi.org/10.1177/1524838020985541
49
50
51 Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good
52 adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of*
53 *Personality*, *72*(2), 271-324. doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Toplu-Demirtas, E., Akcabozan-Kayabol, N. B., Araci-Iyiyaydin, A., & Fincham, F. D.
4
5 (2022). Unraveling the roles of distrust, suspicion of infidelity, and jealousy in cyber
6
7 dating abuse perpetration: An attachment theory perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal*
8
9 *Violence, 37*(3-4), NP1432-1462. doi.org/10.1177/0886260520927505
10
11
12 Trombetta, T., & Rolle, L. (2022). Intimate partner violence perpetration among sexual
13
14 minority people and associated factors: A systematic review of quantitative studies.
15
16 *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. doi.org/10.1007/s13178-022-00761-4
17
18
19 Tian, L., Huang, J., & Huebner, E. S. (2023). Profiles and transitions of cyberbullying
20
21 perpetration and victimization from childhood to early adolescence: multi-contextual
22
23 risk and protective factors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 52*(2), 434-448.
24
25 doi.org/10.1007/s10964-022-01633-1
26
27
28 Vazsonyi, A. T., Machackova, H., Sevcikova, A., Smahel, D., & Cerna, A. (2012).
29
30 Cyberbullying in context: Direct and indirect effects by low self-control across 25
31
32 European countries. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9*(2), 210-227.
33
34 doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2011.644919
35
36
37 Watkins, L. E., DiLillo, D., Hoffman, L., & Templin, J. (2015). Do self-control depletion and
38
39 negative emotion contribute to intimate partner aggression? A lab-based study.
40
41 *Psychology of Violence, 5*(1), 35-45. doi.org/10.1037/a0033955
42
43
44 Watkins, L. E., Maldonado, R. C., & DiLillo, D. (2018). The Cyber Aggression in
45
46 Relationships Scale: A new multidimensional measure of technology-based intimate
47
48 partner aggression. *Assessment, 25*(5), 608-626. doi.org/10.1177/1073191116665696
49
50
51 Wheatley, R. (2023). Introduction “stalking: what do we know about working with people
52
53 who stalk and where do we go?”. *Journal of Criminal Psychology, 13*(2), 65-71.
54
55 doi.10.1108/JCP-07-2021-0024
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Wilson, C., Sheridan, L., & Garratt-Reed, D. (2022). Examining Cyberstalking Perpetration
4 and Victimization: A Scoping Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 0*(0).

5
6
7
8 doi.org/10.1177/15248380221082937
9

10 Woodlock, D. (2017). The abuse of technology in domestic violence and stalking. *Violence*
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

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

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.
doi.org/10.1007/s10964-014-0147-2

Yahner, J., Dank, M., Zweig, J. M., & Lachman, P. (2015). The co-occurrence of physical
and cyber dating violence and bullying among teens. *Journal of Interpersonal*
Violence, 30(7), 1079-1089. doi.org/10.1177/0886260514540324

Table 1: Correlations and Descriptive Statistics for Attachment, Self-Control, Perpetration and Victimization

	ANX	AVO	CON	PSP	SEP	STP	PSV	SEV	STV	PER	VIC
ANX											
AVO	.64**										
CON	.30**	.07									
PSP	.25**	.27**	.14								
SEP	.16*	.09	.14	.17*							
STP	.33**	.33**	.16*	.56**	.11						
PSV	.25**	.28**	.10	.64**	.23**	.51**					
SEV	.20**	.13	.09	.24**	.44**	.25**	.26**				
STV	.26**	.35**	.17*	.56**	.05*	.63**	.55**	.16**			
PER	.35**	.36**	.17*	.80**	.25**	.94**	.63**	.32**	.66**		
VIC	.30**	.36**	.16*	.67**	.23**	.67**	.81**	.43**	.90**	.75**	
<i>M</i>	6.84	6.05	5.90	2.87	2.07	3.86	2.75	2.19	3.48	5.30	5.01
<i>SD</i>	1.72	1.46	.71	.81	.33	1.19	.77	.52	.96	1.26	1.11

ANX = Anxious Attachment, AVO = Avoidant Attachment, CON = Self-Control, PSP = Psychological Aggression Perpetration, SEP = Sexual Aggression Perpetration, STP = Stalking Perpetration, PSV = Psychological Aggression Victimization, SEV = Sexual Aggression Victimization, STV = Stalking Victimization, PER = Perpetration Total, VIC = Victimization Total

NB * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$. All correlations conducted post square root transformations

Table 2: Hierarchical Multiple Regression for Psychological Cyber IPA Perpetration

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE b</i>	β
Step 1			
Anxious attachment	.05	.05	.10
Avoidant attachment	.11	.06	.20*
Self-control	.10	.09	.09
Step 2			
Anxious attachment	-.17	.38	-.37
Avoidant attachment	.06	.47	.12
Self-control	-.21	.39	-.18
Anxious attachment* Self-control	.04	.06	.58
Avoidant attachment* Self-control	.01	.08	.10

Note $R^2 = .09$, $Adj R^2 = .08$ for Step 1, $R^2 = .10$, $Adj R^2 = .07$ for Step 2. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3: Hierarchical Multiple Regression for Sexual Cyber IPA Perpetration

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE b</i>	β
Step 1			
Anxious attachment	.02	.02	.12
Avoidant attachment	.00	.02	.00
Self-control	.05	.04	.10
Step 2			
Anxious attachment	-.08	.16	-.43
Avoidant attachment	.26	.19	1.16
Self-control	.19	.16	.42
Anxious attachment* Self-control	.02	.03	.67
Avoidant attachment* Self-control	-.04	.03	-1.33

Note $R^2 = .03$, $Adj R^2 = .02$ for Step 1, $R^2 = .05$, $Adj R^2 = .02$ for Step 2. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4: Hierarchical Multiple Regression for Stalking Perpetration

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE b</i>	β
Step 1			
Anxious attachment	.11	.07	.16
Avoidant attachment	.18	.08	.22*
Self-control	.15	.13	.09
Step 2			
Anxious attachment	.29	.55	.42
Avoidant attachment	.02	.67	.03
Self-control	.20	.55	.12
Anxious attachment* Self-control	-.03	.09	-.32
Avoidant attachment* Self-control	.03	.11	.22

Note $R^2 = .14$, $Adj R^2 = .12$ for Step 1, $R^2 = .14$, $Adj R^2 = .11$ for Step 2. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 5: Hierarchical Multiple Regression for Psychological Cyber IPA Victimization

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE b</i>	β
Step 1			
Anxious attachment	.05	.05	.11
Avoidant attachment	.11	.05	.21*
Self-control	.06	.09	.05
Step 2			
Anxious attachment	-.31	.37	-.67
Avoidant attachment	.08	.45	.15
Self-control	-.40	.37	-.36
Anxious attachment* Self-control	.06	.06	.98
Avoidant attachment* Self-control	.01	.07	-.06

Note $R^2 = .09$, $Adj R^2 = .07$ for Step 1, $R^2 = .10$, $Adj R^2 = .07$ for Step 2. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 6: Hierarchical Multiple Regression for Sexual Cyber IPA Victimization

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE b</i>	β
Step 1			
Anxious attachment	.06	.03	.19
Avoidant attachment	.00	.04	.01
Self-control	.02	.06	.03
Step 2			
Anxious attachment	.25	.25	.83
Avoidant attachment	-.10	.31	-.29
Self-control	.14	.25	.20
Anxious attachment* Self-control	-.03	.04	-.79
Avoidant attachment* Self-control	.02	.05	.34

Note $R^2 = .04$, $Adj R^2 = .02$ for Step 1, $R^2 = .05$, $Adj R^2 = .02$ for Step 2. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 7: Hierarchical Multiple Regression for Stalking IPA Victimization

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE b</i>	β
Step 1			
Anxious attachment	.00	.06	.00
Avoidant attachment	.22	.06	.34***
Self-control	.19	.10	.14
Step 2			
Anxious attachment	.29	.44	.53
Avoidant attachment	-.12	.54	-.18
Self-control	.19	.44	.14
Anxious attachment* Self-control	-.05	.07	-.66
Avoidant attachment* Self-control	.06	.09	.60

Note $R^2 = .14$, $Adj R^2 = .12$ for Step 1, $R^2 = .14$, $Adj R^2 = .12$ for Step 2. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$