



Past Victimization, Emotional Regulation and Cyber Dating Abuse Perpetration among Young Adults

Syeda Ariba Fatima

Department of Applied Psychology, University of Management and Technology,
Lahore. Email: fatimaariba42@gmail.com

Amna Waheed

Department of Applied Psychology, University of Management and Technology,
Lahore. Email: amnawaheed3110@gmail.com

Dr.Beenish Mubeen

Department of Applied Psychology, University of the Management and
Technology Lahore. Email: beenish.mubeen@umt.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Cyber dating abuse perpetration has become very common among young adults in Pakistan. Grounded in the framework of cyberbullying and cyber harassment, the research seeks to understand how the perception of anonymity in digital spaces may embolden individuals to engage in abusive behaviors. Furthermore, the study investigated how past victimization experiences affects the likelihood of cyber dating abuse perpetration and investigates the role of emotional regulation deficits in increasing these tendencies. The purpose of the current study was to investigate the relationship between past victimization, emotional regulation and cyber dating abuse perpetration among young adults and to find out the gender differences of cyber dating abuse perpetration. Through non-probability purposive sampling of 195 young adults with an age range of 19-35 years ($M=23.94$, $SD=4.05$) were taken. The Emotional Regulation Scale and Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire (victimization and perpetration) were used to assess the sample. Pearson product moment correlation, multiple linear regression analysis and independent sample t-test were run to test the hypotheses. The results showed positive relationship between past victimization and cyber dating abuse perpetration among young adults. Further, it was found that emotional regulation was the negative predictor of cyber dating abuse perpetration. The implementation of culturally sensitive prevention and intervention measures is crucial in prevailing against cyber dating abuse perpetration, as it takes into consideration variations in social norms, communication styles, and perspectives on technology and relationships.

Keywords. Past victimization, emotional regulation, cyber dating abuse perpetration, young adults.

INTRODUCTION

Cyberspace can be a free space where people can experience their emotions, find love, and overcome social anxieties. The online world is a place where people can improve themselves and better understand their true selves. But personal communication in cyberspace also has a dark side. Creating new people and living a different life online is not a good experience for self-improvers or visitors. While acknowledging the advantages of online communication, the research focused on the issues that can arise with self-presentation in online environments. Firstly, it was examined how people form relationships online and face the difficulties of managing offline relationships when there are differences between online and offline identities in cyberspace (Spitzberg et al., 2007).

Digital media has become a hot topic when it comes to dating. As the use of social media and mobile phones increases, there is growing concern that these media may serve as triggers for “digital dating abuse”, or the use of digital media for harassment, coercion, threat, and espionage dating partner. Although digital dating abuse were common in relationships, which is known

about the determinants digital dating abuse of perpetration or the role of gender and religious interactions in the formation of these habits (Reed et al., 2021).

Cyber dating is like using special websites or apps to find people you'd like to date. You can create a profile with photos and information about yourself. If you are interested, you can view other people's information and send them messages. These websites often use smart computers to suggest people who might be right for you. You can talk to people online before deciding whether you want to meet them in person. But it's important to be careful and safe when meeting people online. Sometimes there may be wrong information or inaccurate people.

The proliferation of cyber communication tools such as SMS, electronic mails, and face time had significantly altered social interactions among young people, especially in the context of intimate relationships. This shift has facilitated the condition of cyber dating abuse, especially among younger couples. Cyber dating perpetration includes various aggressive and coercive behaviors conducted through Information and Communication Technologies (Caridade et al., 2019). This phenomenon has been described using different terminologies in the literature and is recognized for its impact on young couples' relationships (Rodriguez-deArriba et al., 2021; Zweig et al., 2013).

Past victimization refers to when an individual has previously been subjected to manage, teasing, trolling, and abuse by their love making mate using telecommunications and digital platforms (Erika et al., 2015). Past victimization experiences may diminish the offender's self-interpretation of the offender's role in the current crime, making it less defined and more ambiguous, and instead inducing a sense of victimhood. In such situations, they may view their behavior through the lens of past victimization. The current crime may be (or may be interpreted as) a social response to past wrongdoing. In some situations, the current crime may actually be a direct retaliation for past injustice. In other cases, unrelated or even minor past victimization events may be used to justify the offender's current crime. Regardless of the sequence of events that led up to the current crime, the extent to which offenders interpret their current behavior through the lens of past victimization increases their defensiveness and makes it easier to exonerate themselves for the current crime (Woodyatt & Wenzel, 2013a; Cornish et al., 2018), decrease their feelings of guilt about their behavior (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008), and decrease their empathy for the injured victim and their willingness to reconcile.

Recognizing the complexities of victimization in cyber dating is essential, as it not only sheds light on its prevalence but also highlights its potential consequences on the mental and physical well-being of individuals. By examining these aspects, we can gain a deeper understanding of the complexities surrounding cyber-dating victimization and strive to establish safer online spaces for everyone (Jones et al., 2020).

In cases of cyber dating abuse, both perpetration and victimization occur. Many harmful effects of cyber dating abuse has drawn significant attention from researchers. Previous experiences of victimization are linked to a range of emotional and behavioral issues, including psychological factors like depression, substance abuse or delinquent behavior (Zweig et al., 2014; Van et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2018).Victims experiences may make the perpetrator's role in the current crime less clear and ambiguous, thereby diminishing the perpetrator's identity and altering perceptions of victimization. In these cases, they may view their behavior through the lens of their past victimization; in some cases, current crimes may be direct retaliation for past wrongs.

People manage their emotions, when they experience them, and how they express them through a process called emotion regulation. Thought regulation can influence one or more stages of the thought process and have been either instinctive or regulated, aware or unaware (Gross, 2003).

Emotional Regulation focuses on people's attempts to experience emotions, defined as temporal, conditional, and meaningful (positive or negative) states. Broader in scope than its predecessors, emotional regulation is not limited to the management of negative emotions (fear, anxiety, depression), but also includes the rule of thumb for up and down positive and negative emotions. While goal pursuit (and therefore emotional regulation) is often conscious and deliberate, it can also occur without awareness (Braunstein et al., 2017).

Emotional regulation is defined as the ability to control and react to emotional responses in health. Difficulty controlling emotions can lead to increased anxiety, panic attacks, and the inability to control stress; all of which can lead to aggressive behavior in relationships, including online dating. (Fernández-González et al., 2018)

Cyber dating abuse perpetration is explained to send negative comments, offensive images, and other forms of harassment to a former or current partner via email, text, chat. The study showed that online abuse is harmful and can lead to many psychological problems, including depression, anxiety, isolation and stress. There are also studies that show a link between online dating and offline abuse. While the prevalence of coercive, controlling, and threatening behavior in offline environments has been extensively studied, the factors that predict such behavior in online environments are still in their infancy. Therefore, it's important to find out the components that predict cyber dating in order to prevent this health problem.

Cyber dating abuse is explained as the impact of telecommunication-mediated violence within intimate relationships, particularly affecting young individuals. It includes a range of harmful actions such as teasing, trolling, manipulation, or other types of online violence (Zweig et al., 2014). Examples of cyber dating abuse are direct aggression, monitoring control behaviors, cyber-harassment, controlling or the increasing of gossip and humiliation through media (Rodriguez-Dearriba et al., 2021). This type of abuse is often referred to by other terms in the previous studies, involving digital dating abuse, cyber-aggression, cyber-dating violence, and cyber-partner abuse (Dick et al., 2014; Temple et al., 2016).

Cyber dating abuse perpetration presents various levels of prevalence and is among the researches review by Caridade et al. (2019) who showed that the majority of victims of violence ranged from 5.8% to 92% and the crime rate ranged from 8.1% to 93.7%. In a sample of 261 university students, approximately 68% revealed having minimum type of online dating, while 73% admitted to engaging in this behavior. Conducted a study with 390 university students in Turkey and found that 67% of university students had engaged in some form of online dating in the past six months. Furthermore, Lara (2020) found in a research of 1538 Chilean adolescents and university students that approximately three-thirds of the sample revealed being victims or perpetrators of online abuse. Moreover, it is challenging to decide the exact prevalence of cyber dating abuse perpetration due to a lack of consensus on cyber dating abuse perpetration terms, its operationalization, and cyber dating abuse perpetration measures. Likewise, the prevalence of direct aggression perpetration ranges from 10.6% to 14.7%, and that of cyber control perpetration ranges from 49.6% (Van Ouytsel et al., 2017) to 88.4% (Borrajo et al., 2015b; Borrajo et al., 2015a; Caridade et al., 2019; Curry and Zavala, 2020; Toplu Demirtaş et al. 2020).

Objectives:

- To find out the relationship between past victimization, emotional regulation and cyber dating abuse perpetration among young adults.
- To find out the predictors of cyber dating abuse perpetration among young adults.
- To find out gender differences of cyber dating abuse perpetration among young adults.

METHOD

Research Design

This study used a cross-sectional research design and was correlational in nature, aiming to identify relationships between variables. Specifically, it examined the significant role of past victimization in the perpetration of cyber dating abuse. Correlational research designs look at links between variables without involving any control or manipulation on behalf of the researcher (Gross et al., 1998). Correlation reflects the strength and/or direction of the relationship between two (or more) variables. The direction of the correlation can be positive or negative.

Sample and Sampling Strategy

Non-probability purposive Sampling technique was used to collect the data. The sample calculated from G-Power was 55 but the sample was taken from 200 young adults who were

actively engaged in cyber dating perpetration. The single, married and the people who had dated for less than 6 months were excluded from this research after screening the sample size became 195 ($N=$ Males= 95, Females= 100) age ranging from 19 to 35 years ($M=23.92$, $SD= 4.047$).

Procedure

First, the topic was selected and approved by the supervisor. Once the topic was approved, the appropriate scales were chosen, and permission was obtained from the authors. Before starting formal data collection, all ethical aspects were thoroughly addressed. The non-probability sampling strategy were used for selection of participants and then informed consent was given to each participant, that was objecting the purpose of the study. The researcher administered the tools to individuals who met the study's criteria and collected data from young adults. Participants received instructions on how to complete the questionnaires, ensuring all ethical guidelines were closely followed. Completing the form took between 5 to 10 minutes. Each participant provided informed consent and had the choice to withdraw from the research at any point. Their identities were kept private, and their responses remained confidential. After data collection, the researcher expressed gratitude to the participants for their involvement and completion of the task.

Assessment Measures

Following were the assessment measures used in this study.

Demographic Questionnaire.

Demographics include details such as age, gender, education, birth order, family system, relationship status, Family monthly income, length of your relationship, internet availability etc. were asked.

Past Victimization.

The Cyber Dating Abuse Questionnaire for victimization (CDAQ) was developed by Erika in 2015 was used as a past victimization. This scale measures two aspects i) perpetration ii) victimization. It includes the subscale of direct aggression and monitoring control in both victimization and perpetration. This is the first survey to examine online dating abuse from a broader perspective, looking at different types of online abuse from the victim's perspective. This is a 6 point Likert scale ranging from “Never to Usually”. The direct aggression victimization subscale only includes 11 question with the internal consistency of ($\alpha=.84$). The other subscale is digital monitoring which includes 9 items and has the internal consistency for victimization is ($\alpha=.87$).

Emotional Regulation.

The Emotional Regulation Scale (ERS), developed by Gross and John in 2003. The ERS is a 10-item questionnaire that measures the extent to which participants use cognitive reappraisal (6 items) or expressive suppression (4 items) to manage emotions. Participants rated each statement on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree). The internal consistency reliability of ERS subscale cognitive reappraisal ($\alpha=. 87$) and for expressive suppression ($\alpha=. 76$) (Gross et al., 2003).

Cyber Dating Abuse Perpetration.

The cyber dating abuse (CDA) was developed by Erika in 2015. This scale measures two aspects of cyber dating abuse i) perpetration ii) victimization. It includes the subscale of direct aggression in both victimization and perpetration. This is the first survey to examine online dating abuse from a broader perspective, including examining different types of online abuse from the perpetrator's perspective. This is a 6-point Likert scale ranging from “Never to Usually”. The perpetration subscale only includes 11 question of direct aggression perpetration with internal consistency of ($\alpha=.73$). The monitoring control perpetration subscale consists of 9 items with the internal consistency of ($\alpha=.81$).

Statistical Analysis

The IBM-SPSS Statistics 25 version was used to carry out the analysis. Outliers and missing data were dealt. Firstly, preliminary analysis was performed and normality analysis was carried out to check if the data was normally distributed. Descriptive Statistics and Cronbach’s alpha was calculated. In the main analysis, Pearson Product Moment Correlation, Multiple Linear Regression and Independent Sample t-test was used in the study.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics and Demographic Characteristics

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics and Demographic Characteristics of the Participants (N=195)*

Variables	M(SD)	f%
Age	23.94(4.05)	
Gender		
Female		100(51.3)
Male		95(48.7)
Education		
Matric		3(1.5)
Intermediate		12(6.2)
Bachelors		144(73.8)
Masters		32(16.4)
MPhil		3(1.5)
PhD		1(.5)
Birth Order		
First born		48(24.6)
Middle		83(42.6)
Last born		51(26.2)
Only child-		13(6.7)
Family System		
Nuclear		154(79)
Joint		41(21)
Family Environment		
Cohesive		45(23.1)
Criticizing		60(30.8)
Open		88(45.1)
Abusive		2(1.0)
Family Monthly Income	188512.82(182434.40)	
Job Status		
Working		100(51.3)
Non-working		95(48.7)
Relationship Status		
Engaged		23(11.8)
In a relationship		172(88.2)
Duration of Relationship		
6 months to 1 year		50(25.6)
1-2 year		63(32.3)
3-4 years		53(27.17)
More than 4 years		19(9.7)

Internet Availability	
Yes	195(100)
Use of Online Dating Services	
I have never used online dating services.	85(43.6)
I have used online dating services before, but not in the	51(26.2)
past year.	45(23.1)
I have used online dating services in the past year.	14(7.2)
I am currently using online dating services.	

Note: M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, f= Frequency, %= Percentage

Table 1 presented the descriptive statistics of the demographic variables. The table revealed the frequency of each demographic variable. The percentage of gender distribution showed that there were 100 females (51.3%) and 95 males (48.7%). Regarding education, the frequencies and percentages were as follows: Matric 3 (1.5%), Intermediate 12 (6.2%), Bachelors 144 (73.8%), Masters 32 (16.4%), MPhil 3 (1.5%), and PhD 1 (0.5%). Birth order frequencies and percentages were: First born 48 (24.6%), Middle 83 (42.6%), Last born 51 (26.2%), and Only child 13 (6.7%). The family system was divided into Nuclear with 154 (79%) and Joint with 41 (21%). Family environment frequencies and percentages were: Cohesive 45 (23.1%), Criticizing 60 (30.8%), Open 88 (45.1%), and Abusive 2 (1.0%). Job status showed that 100 (51.3%) were Working and 95 (48.7%) were Non-working. Relationship status frequencies and percentages were: Engaged 23 (11.8%) and in a relationship 172 (88.2%). The duration of the relationship had the following frequencies and percentages: 6 months to 1 year 50 (25.6%), 1-2 years 63 (32.3%), 3-4 years 53 (27.17%), and More than 4 years 19 (9.7%). Internet availability was reported as 195 (100%). Usage of online dating services was categorized as follows: I have never used online dating services 85 (43.6%), I have used online dating services before, but not in the past year 51 (26.2%), I have used online dating services in the past year 45 (23.1%), and I am currently using online dating services 14 (7.2%).

Table 2

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Past Victimization	65.13	32.62	--								
2. Direct Aggression Victimization	35.10	18.80	.988**	--							
3. Monitoring Control Victimization	30.03	14.31	.980**	.939**	--						
4. Emotional Regulation	32.65	13.87	.098	.089	.105	--					
5. Cognitive Reappraisal	19.10	8.54	.115	.104	.126	.974**	--				
6. Expressive Suppression	13.55	5.88	.063	.061	.064	.945**	.847**	--			
7. Cyber Dating Abuse Perpetration	61.60	33.25	.842**	.841**	.813**	.104	.129	.059	--		
8. Direct Aggression Perpetration	33.13	18.70	.842**	.850**	.802**	.103	.124	.065	.992**	--	
9. Monitoring Control Perpetration	28.46	14.90	.821**	.811**	.807**	.103	.133	.050	.987**	.958**	--

Using Pearson Moment Correlation Analysis Sample to Calculate Relationship Past Victimization, Emotional Regulation and Cyber Dating Abuse Perpetration (N=195).

*Note: M= Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, **p ≤ 0.01*

Table 2 indicated the correlations between the study variables. Monitoring Control Victimization had positive correlations with Direct Aggression Perpetration, and Monitoring Control Perpetration. Although Direct Aggression Perpetration had positive correlations with Direct Aggression Victimization, Monitoring Control Victimization, and Monitoring Control Perpetration. Emotional Regulation exhibited a negative correlation with all the variables. It had negative correlations with Direct Aggression Victimization, Monitoring Control Victimization, Direct Aggression Perpetration, and Monitoring Control Perpetration.

Table 3

Variables	<i>Direct Aggression Perpetration</i>			<i>Monitoring Control Perpetration</i>		
	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>B</i>	β	<i>SE</i>
Constant	-9.94		3.62	-5.45		3.15
Direct Aggression Victimization	.713***	.717	.109	.289***	.365	.094
Monitoring Control Victimization	.031	.024	.139	.378***	.363	.121
Cognitive Reappraisal	.260	.119	.153	.303	.174	.133
Expressive Suppression	-.252	-.079	.220	-.357	-.141	.191
<i>R</i> ²	.74			.70		

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting, Past Victimization and Cyber Dating Abuse Perpetration (N=195).

*Note: B=Unstandardized Co-efficient, β = Standardized Regression Co-efficient, SE= Standard Error, *R*² = Co-efficient of Determination*** *p* <.001*

Table 3 represents the effect of direct aggression victimization, monitoring control victimization, cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression on direct aggression perpetration among young adults. The R^2 value of .74 indicated that predictor variable explained .74% variance in the outcome variable with $F(5,189) = 112.89$, $p < .001$. The findings indicated that direct aggression victimization ($\beta = .71$), monitoring control victimization ($\beta = .02$) positively predicted direct aggression perpetration. While cognitive reappraisal ($\beta = .11$) and expressive suppression ($\beta = -.07$) negatively predicted direct aggression perpetration. The table also represents the effect of direct victimization, monitoring control victimization, cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression on monitoring control perpetration among young adults. The R^2 value of .70 indicated that predictor variable explained .70% variance in the outcome variable with $F(5,189) = 88.75$, $p < .001$. The findings indicated that direct aggression victimization ($\beta = .36$), monitoring control victimization ($\beta = .36$) positively predicted monitoring control perpetration. Moreover, cognitive reappraisal ($\beta = .17$) and expressive suppression ($\beta = -.14$) negatively predicted monitoring control perpetration.

Table 4

Independent Sample t-test Determining Gender Differences of Past Victimization, Emotional Regulation and Cyber Dating Abuse Perpetration (N=195).

Variables	Female (N=100)		Male (N=95)		$t(193)$	p	Cohen's d
	M	SD	M	SD			
1. Past Victimization	60.54	33.28	69.97	31.35	-2.03	.04	0.29
2. Direct Aggression Victimization	32.54	18.99	37.80	18.31	-1.96	.05	0.28
3. Monitoring Control Victimization	28.00	14.79	32.17	13.54	-2.05	.04	0.29
4. Emotional Regulation	32.96	13.31	32.33	14.51	.31	.75	0.02
5. Cognitive Reappraisal	19.21	8.20	18.98	8.92	.18	.85	0.02

6. Expressive Suppression	13.75	5.78	13.34	5.99	.47	.63	0.06
7. Cyber Dating Abuse Perpetration	54.41	33.22	69.17	31.72	-3.17	.00	0.45
8. Direct Aggression Perpetration	29.19	18.50	37.29	18.10	-3.09	.00	0.44
10. Monitoring Control Perpetration	25.22	15.06	31.88	14.00	-3.19	.00	0.45

Note: *M*= Mean, *SD*= Standard Deviation, *t*=Value of difference, *df* = Degree of freedom, *p*= significance, *Cohen's d* =effect size

It showed significant mean differences on past victimization with $t(193) = -2.03, p .04 < .05$. Results showed that males exhibited higher score on past victimization ($M = 69.97, SD = 31.35$) as compared to females ($M = 60.54, SD = 33.28$). The value of Cohen's *d* was 0.29 (< 0.50) which shows small effect size.

It revealed equal significance mean on direct aggression victimization with $t(193) = -1.96, p .05 = .05$. Findings showed that males exhibited higher score on direct aggression victimization ($M = 37.80, SD = 18.31$) than females ($M = 32.54, SD = 18.99$). The value of Cohen's *d* was 0.28 (< 0.50) which shows small effect size.

There was a significance mean differences on monitoring control victimization with $t(193) = -2.05, p .04 < .05$. Results showed that men exhibited more score on monitoring control victimization ($M = 32.17, SD = 13.54$) compared to women ($M = 28.00, SD = 14.79$). The value of Cohen's *d* was 0.29 (< 0.50) which indicates small effect size.

There were non- significant mean differences on emotional regulation with $t(193) = .31, p .75 > .05$. It showed that females exhibited higher score on emotional regulation ($M = 32.96, SD = 13.31$) as compared to males ($M = 32.33, SD = 14.51$). The value of Cohen's *d* was 0.02 (< 0.50) which shows small effect size.

There were non- significant mean differences on cognitive reappraisal with $t(193) = .18, p .85 > .05$. It showed that females exhibited higher score on cognitive reappraisal ($M = 19.21, SD = 8.20$) as compared to males ($M = 18.98, SD = 8.92$). The value of Cohen's *d* was 0.02 (< 0.50) which shows small effect size.

There were non- significant mean differences on expressive suppression with $t(193) = .47, p .63 > .05$. It showed that females exhibited higher score on expressive suppression ($M = 13.75, SD = 5.78$) as compared to males ($M = 13.34, SD = 5.99$). The value of Cohen's *d* was 0.06 (< 0.50) which shows small effect size.

It revealed significance mean differences on cyber dating abuse perpetration with $t(193) = -3.17, p .00 < .05$. Findings showed that males exhibited scored much on cyber dating abuse perpetration ($M = 69.17, SD = 31.72$) as compared to females ($M = 54.41, SD = 33.22$). The value of Cohen's d was $0.45 (< 0.50)$ which shows small effect size.

It showed significance mean differences on direct aggression perpetration with $t(193) = -3.09, p .00 < .05$. Findings showed that males exhibited much score on direct aggression perpetration ($M = 37.29, SD = 18.10$) as compared to females ($M = 29.19, SD = 18.50$). The value of Cohen's d was $0.44 (< 0.50)$ which shows small effect size.

It showed significance mean differences on monitoring control perpetration with $t(193) = -3.19, p .00 < .05$. Results showed that men exhibited more score on monitoring control perpetration ($M = 31.88, SD = 14.00$) compared to women ($M = 25.22, SD = 15.06$). The value of Cohen's d was $0.45 (< 0.50)$ which shows small effect size

DISCUSSION

This research was conducted to find out and investigate the relationship between Past Victimization, Emotional Regulation and Cyber Dating Abuse Perpetration among Young Adults. To determine how and to what extent these variables are interlinked. International scales were used to study the relationship between all three variables. This chapter discusses the results of the present research while also taking the previous literature into consideration. Moreover, it also discusses some recommendations, limitations, strengths and implications of study for the future.

It was hypothesized that there was likely to be a positive relationship between past victimization, and cyber dating abuse perpetration among young adults. It was proved from the findings that there was a positive relationship between all of these variables. Many researchers found that victim and perpetrator roles overlap. From previous literature it was found that past victimization and cyber dating abuse perpetration were positively related. Being the victim of cyber dating abuse in the past increases the possibility of becoming the perpetrators. Many previous studies showed that perpetrators and victims often acquire the same qualities and involve in most of the same abusive actions (Borrajao et al., 2015).

In addition, according to previous studies, the result showed that cyber dating abuse perpetration and past victimization had positive relation. This propose the idea that cyber violence is a combination of youth relationships and that youth are both perpetrators and victims of time. However, it is important to note that when victimization and perpetration rate has similar patterns and rates, youth identify with violence rather than violence itself given certain behaviors and their frequency. Studies that consider both perspectives such as Stonard in 2014 shows that there are more victims than perpetrators, especially in behaviors similar to direct aggression. It is also difficult for youth to see themselves as perpetrators (Reed et al., 2021; Stonard, 2015).

Further, it was hypothesized that emotional regulation had a negative relationship with cyber dating abuse perpetration. In the light of previous literature, it was found that there was a negative connection among emotion regulation talents and perpetration of abuse. As an example, Lilly and Mercer (2014) found perpetration of intimate companion violence through girls and the impact of poor emotion regulation skills. The effects of the preceding research showed that difficulties with emotion regulation had a relationship with perpetration of both bodily and mental courting abuse for each woman and men (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2012; McNulty & Hellmuth, 2008; Shorey, Brasfield, Febres, & Stuart, 2011; Stuart et. al, 2006; Tager et al., 2010). Additionally, it was found that females had poorer emotion regulation abilities than males (Thibert, 2016).

The study showed that the participants who had lower tendency may not regulate their emotions, had higher score for perpetration and victimization. Furthermore, cyberspace may be a platform that encourages people towards cyber dating abuse perpetration. It was also found that there was a link between perpetration and victimization. While perpetration, which is associated with difficulties in regulation his or her behavior under negative emotions; that leads towards

direct aggression and monitoring control toward their partner (Horwood et al., 2020; Peterka-Bonetta et al., 2019).

Lastly it was hypothesized, that males were more likely to be the perpetrators of cyber dating abuse perpetration. Ten percent of young people reported having engaged in cyber dating abuse; girls reported a greater frequency of cyber dating abuse than males, while male youth reported substantially higher rates of cyber dating abuse (Zweig et al., 2013).

Twelve percent of young adults in a dating relationship said they had perpetrated cyber dating abuse. Moreover, males were significantly more likely to report perpetrating cyber dating abuse. (Zweig et al., 2016)

Males were much more engaged in perpetration, so the awareness should be escalated to reduce the perpetration of cyber dating abuse perpetration. The emotional intelligence training should be taught to the people so that they will not engage in abusive behaviors online. This has critical implications for intervention purposes, particularly when we bear in mind that a few behaviors can happen without the awareness of the victim as, as an example, monitoring or snooping (Doucette et al., 2018).

This study was significant for a number of reasons. The study used a cross-sectional design, which limits the capacity to draw conclusions about the causes of the correlations between the variables. Moreover, the results might not apply to different age groups because the sample was homogeneous and limited to young adults. Furthermore, the study's relevance may have been limited because it only included people who were engaged and in relationships. Moreover, the study did not investigate the fundamental reasons why people engage in abusive cyber dating, which leaves a vacuum in our knowledge of the psychological or social aspects involved.

To effectively address the issue of cyber dating abuse perpetration within young adults, it is crucial to focus on the key factors of past victimization, and emotional regulation. Responsible online behavior and the importance of accountability should be emphasized by educational campaigns. It is important to offer counseling and intervention programs that address trauma and its link to abusive behaviors for people with a history of victimization. The programs should help victims process their experiences in a constructive manner. Youth development programs should teach young adults how to handle their emotions effectively, especially in high-pressure online situations. The research on these factors should be expanded to inform culturally relevant interventions.

Implications

The finding of the study are an addition in international and indigenous research literature investigating moderating role of past victimization, emotional regulation and cyber dating abuse perpetration among young adults. Awareness about cyber dating abuse should be spread among young adults through educational programs. Adolescents struggling with emotional regulation may benefit from emotional intelligence training or therapy to develop appropriate coping

strategies and reduce abusive behaviors. Coping strategies for victimization by taking support from family and friends and managing their emotions. People can seek help from health care professionals and therapist which will help to cope with the negative emotions. Relationship counselling and emotional regulation strategies can help individuals manage conflict constructively and reduce the likelihood of resorting to abuse.

Conclusion

This study emphasizes the critical roles that past victimization, and emotional regulation play in young individuals involving in cyber dating abuse perpetration. Furthermore, those who have experienced victimization in the past may be more probably to participate in cyber dating abuse perpetration, maybe as a maladaptive reaction to their own experiences. Deficits in emotional regulation amplify these inclinations, resulting in impulsive and damaging actions on the internet. Developing successful preventative and intervention programs requires addressing these aspects. The prevalence of cyber dating abuse perpetration may decline with programs that strengthen emotional management abilities, promote empathy, and raise knowledge of the drawbacks of internet anonymity. Encouraging safer and healthier online relationships among young adults requires culturally sensitive initiatives that consider the particularities of Pakistani society.

REFERENCES

- Álvarez-García D, Núñez JC, González-Castro P, Rodríguez C, Cerezo R. The effect of parental control on cyber-victimization in adolescence: the mediating role of impulsivity and high-risk behaviors. *Front Psychol.* 2019; 10:1159. pmid:31178790
- Borrajo, E., Gámez-Guadix, M., Pereda, N., & Calvete, E. (2015). The development and validation of the cyber dating abuse questionnaire among young couples. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48, 358-365. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.063.
- Braunstein et al. (2017). Explicit and implicit emotion regulation: A multi-level framework. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 1545–1557.
- Caridade, S., Braga, T., & Borrajo, E. (2019). Cyber dating abuse (CDA): Evidence from a systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 48, 152–168.
- Cornish, M. A., Woodyatt, L., Morris, G., Conroy, A., & Townsden, J. (2018). Self-forgiveness, self-exoneration, and self-condemnation: Individual differences associated with three patterns of responding to interpersonal offenses. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 129, 43–53.
- Curry, T. R. & Zavala, E. (2020). A multi-theoretical perspective on cyber dating abuse victimization and perpetration within intimate relationships: A test of general strain, social learning, and self-control theories. *Victims & Offenders*, 15(4), 499-519.

- 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*. doi:10.1542/peds.2014-0537
- Erika Borrajo M., (2015). The development and validation of the cyber dating abuse questionnaire. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 8. 10.1016/j.avb.2019.08.018.
- Fernández-González et al. (2018). The role of emotional dysregulation on the association between attachment and dating violence perpetration. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 227-234.
- Gross et al. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation. *An integrative review. Review of General Psychology*, 271-299.
- Gross, J.J., & John, O.P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 348-362.
- Horwood S, Anglim J. Emotion Regulation Difficulties, Personality, and Problematic Smartphone Use. *Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw*. 2020;1–11. pmid:33090002
- Internalizing Symptoms in Female Adolescents: Associations with Emotional Awareness and Emotion Regulation | Springer Link [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jan 12].
- Jones et al. (2020). Cyber dating: Understanding victimization and implications for policy. *Journal of Cybersecurity*, 45-67.
- Lara, L. (2020). Cyber dating abuse: Assessment, prevalence, and relationship with offline violence in young Chileans. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 37(5), 1681-1699.
- Lilly, M. M., & Mercer, M. C. (2014). The interaction of emotion regulation and world assumptions in predicting female intimate partner violence perpetration. *Partner Abuse*, 5(4), 439–457. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.5.4.439.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., McCullars, A., & Misra, T. A. (2012). Motivations for men and women's intimate partner violence perpetration: A comprehensive review. *Special Issue: The Partner Abuse State of Knowledge Project: Part 3*, 3(4), 429–468.
- McNulty, J. K., & Hellmuth, J. C. (2008). Emotion regulation and intimate partner violence in newlyweds. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(5), 794–797. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0013516>.
- Peterka-Bonetta J, Sindermann C, Elhaim JD, Montag C. Personality Associations with Smartphone and Internet Use Disorder: A Comparison Study Including Links to Impulsivity and Social Anxiety. *Front Public Health*. 2019; 7:1–12.
- Rodríguez-deArriba, M. L., Nocentini, A., Menesini, E., & Sanchez-Jiménez, V. (2021). Dimensions and measures of cyber dating violence in adolescents: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 58, Article 101613. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2021.101613>.

- Reed, L. A., Ward, L. M., Tolman, R. M., Lippman, J. R., & Seabrook, R. C. (2021). The Association Between Stereotypical Gender and Dating Beliefs and Digital Dating Abuse Perpetration in Adolescent Dating Relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(9-10), NP5561-NP5585.
- Shorey, R. C., Brasfield, H., Febres, J., & Stuart, G. L. (2011). An examination of the association between difficulties with emotion regulation and dating violence perpetration. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 20(8), 870–885.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2011.629342>.
- Stuart, G. L., Moore, T. M., Gordon, K. C., Hellmuth, J. C., Ramsey, S. E., & Kahler, C. W. (2006). Reasons for intimate partner violence perpetration among arrested women. *Violence Against Women*, 12(7), 609–621.
- Spitzberg, B.H., & Cupach, W.R. (Eds.). (2007). *The Dark Side of Interpersonal Communication* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203936849>.
- Smith K, Cénat JM, Lapierre A, Dion J, Hébert M, Côté K. Cyber dating violence: prevalence and correlates among high school students from small urban areas in Quebec. *J Affect Disorders*. 2018; 234:220–23.
- Stonard, K. E., Bowen, E., Lawrence, T. R., & Price, S. A. (2014). The relevance of technology to the nature, prevalence and impact of Adolescent Dating Violence and Abuse: A research synthesis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 19(4), 390–417.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.06.005>
- Stonard, K. E., Bowen, E., Walker, K., & Price, S. A. (2015). “They’ll always find a way to get to you”: Technology use in adolescent romantic relationships and its role in dating violence and abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance Online Publication. doi:10.1177/088626051559078.
- Tager, D., Good, G. E., & Brammer, S. (2010). “Walking over 'em”: An exploration of relations between emotion dysregulation, masculine norms, and intimate partner abuse in a clinical sample of men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11(3), 233–239.
- Thibert, Michelle, "Examining Emotion Regulation Levels in Perpetrators of In-Person and Cyber Dating Abuse" (2016). Undergraduate Honors Theses. 33.
- Temple, J. R., Choi, H. J., Brem, M., Wolford-Clevenger, C., Stuart, G. L., Peskin, M. F., & Elmquist, J. (2016). The Temporal Association Between Traditional and Cyber Dating Abuse Among Adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(2), 340-349.
doi:10.1007/s10964-015-0380-3.
- Toplu-Demirtaş, E., Akcabozan-Kayabol, N. B., Araci-Iyiyaydin, A., & Fincham, F. D. (2020). Unraveling the roles of distrust, suspicion of infidelity, and jealousy in cyber dating abuse perpetration: An attachment theory perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-31.
- Van Ouytsel, J., Van Gool, E., Walrave, M., Ponnet, K., & Peeters, E. (2016). Exploring the

- role of social networking sites within adolescent romantic relationships and dating experiences. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 55, Part A, 76-86.
- Van Ouytsel, J., Torres, E., Choi, H. J., Ponnet, K., Walrave, M., & Temple, J. R. (2017). The Associations Between Substance Use, Sexual Behaviors, Bullying, Deviant Behaviors, Health, and Cyber Dating Abuse Perpetration. *The Journal of School Nursing*, 33(2), 116-122.
- Woodyatt, L., & Wenzel, M. (2013a). The psychological immune response in the face of transgressions: Pseudo self-forgiveness and threat to belonging. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(6), 951–958.
- Wohl, M. J. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2008). Remembering historical victimization: Collective guilt for current in-group transgressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(6), 988–1006.
- Zweig, J. M., Dank, M., Yahner, J., & Lachman, P. (2013b). 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, 1063–1077.
- Zweig, J., 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.
- Zweig, Janine, and Dank, Meredith. Technology, Teen Dating Violence and Abuse, and Bullying in Three States, 2011-2012. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research,

