

# Can Posting be a Catalyst for Dating Violence?

## Social Media Behaviors and Physical Interactions

Maria Matsangidou<sup>1\*</sup>,<sup>a</sup>, Jahna Otterbacher<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Engineering and Digital Arts, University of Kent, Kent, UK

<sup>b</sup>Faculty of Pure and Applied Sciences, Open University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

### Abstract

Although Social Media can fuel jealousy between romantic partners, by providing a convenient and socially acceptable means of monitoring one another's online behavior, little has been written about the possible role of Social Media in Dating Violence. We examine if and how Social Media behaviors fuel victimization during physical interactions. In addition, we consider if and how one's partner in a physical relationship attempts to manipulate his or her Social Media behaviors. We carried out parallel questionnaires using the Dating Violence Questionnaire (DVQ), using both the unaltered version of the instrument as well as one in which questions were adapted to the Social Media setting (e.g., "Has your partner beaten you *as a consequence of something you said or did on social media*?""). Participants (n = 144), were equally selected from both genders, in a counterbalanced experimental design. We assigned half of the participants (n =72) to the Control group, who were administered the unaltered instrument, and half to the Social Media group. Similar rates of Dating Violence were reported by both groups. Respondents in the Social Media group reported experiencing physical, sexual and psychological violence, because of something said or done on Social Media. We also found that physical interactions between the romantic partners affects and alters the Social Media behaviors; Social Media spaces were often monitored by one's partner, and altered in response to the partner's demands. Overall, those involved in stable relationships were less likely to have experienced victimization, with men reporting more victimization as compared to women. To conclude, up to 76% of respondents experienced some form of Dating Violence and up to 83% of respondents experienced some form of manipulation related to their Social Media use, demonstrating the significance of this phenomenon in the lives of today's youth.

**Keywords.** Dating Violence · Social Media Behaviors · Physical Interactions · Victimization · Romantic Relationships

---

<sup>1\*</sup> Correspondence: M.Matsangidou@kent.ac.uk

## 1 Introduction

Awareness of Dating Violence (DV), and its consequences for one's mental and physical health, has increased during the past two decades, as it occurs at alarming rates among late adolescents and young adults, aged between 16 to 24 (Hickman, Jaycox & Aronoff, 2004; Wolfe, Scott, Wekerle & Pittman, 2001). Research has shown that individuals in violent relationships are more likely to suffer from mental illnesses such as depression and stress (Hanson, 2002). Therefore, the increasing trends of violence among youth are especially troubling, with one in three teenagers having experienced physical, sexual or emotional violence in a dating relationship (Dating abuse statistics, 2017).

Little has been written about the role of Social Media (SM) in DV, despite the connection researchers have made between SM behaviors and jealousy in romantic relationships. In physical relationships, DV is often the direct result of jealousy, with men cited as being responsible for the majority of cases in which there is serious harm done to a partner (Mullen, 1995). In addition to that, it causes distrust, which often results in *monitoring* – by one or both partners (Knobloch, Solomon & Cruz, 2001). The use of SM increased the opportunities for *monitoring*. Research has shown that 36% of college students, experienced digital dating abused, since they were forced by their romantic partner to give their computer, email or passwords (Fifth & Pacific Companies, 2010). A reasonable interpretation might be that the part of the self of the one partner that is presented on SM may evoke feelings of jealousy in the other partner (Mod, 2010).

With few exceptions (e.g., Ramirez, Fleuriet & Cole, 2014), little research has considered simultaneously the SM behaviors and physical interactions of dating partners, and how they might influence one another, focusing instead on either online dating or offline interactions. Toward filling this gap, we consider how SM behaviors may result in physical victimized. For example, if the individual chooses to add a post of his preference on his social network space, ignoring his partner's desire, that might bring about a reaction in the physical context (e.g., physical, sexual or emotional abuse such as hitting, nonconsensual sex and threatening). Secondly, we consider whether or not one's romantic relationship, consummated in the physical world, influences one's behaviors via SM.

Previous research has shown that SM affects the nature of relationships and the ties between partners in very real ways. In comparison to communication in conventional (i.e., strictly physical) relationships, cyber-interactions do not involve physical bodies; nonetheless, they have consequences in the physical world (Batinic, Reips & Bosnjak, 2002). Evidence is provided by a study, which found that online exposure to an ex-partner via Facebook often obstructs the procedure of healing and moving on (Marshall, 2012).

In sum, it is easy to see how actions – or lack of actions – taken in SM could bring about an effect on physical interactions. For this reason, we address the question of whether SM behaviors affect what happens within the physical relationship, and vice versa:

**RQ1:** What is the relationship between youths' Social Media behaviors and those that take place within the physical relationship?

**H1a:** Social Media behaviors might be the stated cause for victimization (e.g., Dating Violence).

**H1b:** Social Media behaviors might be monitored, imposed upon or manipulated by the romantic partner.

DV can be characterized by “the use or threat of force or restraint carried out with the intent of causing pain or injury to another person within a dating relationship” (Lewis & Fremouw 2001). In many cases, DV, in terms of physical interactions, can be predicted based on demographic characteristics, such as gender and relationship type. Generally speaking, women report being victimized by partners nearly twice as often as men (Dating abuse statistics, 2017; Makepeace, 1986). However, physical violence, including hitting, punching, or throwing objects at one's partner, emerges as a factor that is perpetrated more by women than men (Hickman et al., 2004; Luthra & Gidycz, 2006; O'Keefe, 1997; Shook, Gerity, Jurich, & Segrist, 2000; Straus & Ramirez, 2004; Wolfe, et al., 2001).

Psychological violence, which includes humiliation and hurtful comments, is perpetrated approximately at the same rate by both genders (Hickman, et al., 2004; Shook et al., 2000). On the contrary, sexual violence, which refers to the use of coercion, or force to perform nonconsensual sexual acts, emerges as a factor that primarily affects women (Hickman et al., 2004; Jackson, 1999; O'Keefe, 1997). Finally, men and women resort to violence to achieve different ends. Men tend to use violence

to handle and manipulate the victim while women report to use violence as a personal defense measure (Jackson, 1999). It worth mentioning that, the use of violence in romantic relationships from both genders depends on the relationship context, meaning that the more seriously involved the partners are, the more likely violence is to transpire (Arias, Somios & O’Leary, 1987; Lewis et al., 2001).

Having the above in mind, we propose the following research question and hypothesis:

**RQ2:** How do participants’ demographic characteristics correlate to their having experienced Dating Violence as a result of Social Media behaviors?

**H2a:** Women report having experienced Dating Violence as a result of their Social Media use more often than men.

**H2b:** Respondents who are in stable, serious relationships will be more likely to report victimization as compared to respondents who are in more casual relationships.

## **2 Method**

We conducted two parallel questionnaires, which were both based on the same instrument, as will be detailed below. More specifically, participants were recruited and assigned to one of two groups. In the first group, participants were questioned only about violence in their physical relationships, while the second group was specifically queried with respect to the role of SM in DV. As will be described, we compared the responses of the two groups in order to better understand the degree to which SM plays a role in DV, and how responses differ when participants are asked to recall their experiences strictly in the physical world versus their dating relationships in which cyber-interactions play a central role.

### **2.1 Participants**

The participants in our study were 144 secondary and university students, who were currently or very recently in a romantic relationship. Participants’ ages ranged from 16 to 24 years (mean= 20.50, SD=2.30). Most reported being “in a stable relationship” (n=66). The remaining respondents reported being “single” (n=55), or in an “occasional relationship” (n=23). The duration of respondents’ relation-

ships ranged from 1 month to 6 years (mean=1.93 years, SD=1.65). All of our participants were Facebook users. Seventy two participants (men(n) = 36) were assigned to the control and 72 participants (men(n) = 36) to the SM group. No significant differences were detected between the two groups in terms of demographics.

## 2.2 Instruments

### 2.2.1 Dating Violence Questionnaire

The study used the unaltered Dating Violence Questionnaire (DVQ) (Presaghi, Manca, Rodriguez-Franco, & Curcio, 2015) for the control group. The DVQ consists of 42 items (eight factors) which measures abusive behaviors in intimate relationships, at a 5-point Likert scale (0 to 4). A number of studies, reported high degree of reliability and validity (Bernardino, et al., 2016; Rodríguez-Díaz, et al., 2017; Torres, Mohand & Espinosa, 2018).

For the SM group, the DVQ was modified to be relevant to the SM context. For example, the question “Has your partner beaten you?” was transformed into “Has your partner beaten you *as a consequence of something you said or did on SM?*” The modified questionnaire (see Appendix) consists of 43 behavioral indicators on a 5-point Likert scale (0 to 4), and was found to have a high degree of both reliability and validity (Table 1).

Table 1.

Items, explained variance and Cronbach’s Alpha for each factor in the Dating Violence questionnaire.

Factor	Label	No. of items	Eigenvalue	Cronbach alpha	Total explained variance
1	Physical	5	4.010	.935	
2	Sexual	6	4.112	.901	
3	Psychological	3	2.640	.929	
4	Detachment	7	4.449	.902	
5	Humiliation	7	5.733	.962	74.578%
6	Derision	5	2.045	.629	
7	Coercion	7	4.376	.921	
8	Instrumental	4	2.163	.675	

### 2.2.2 Social Media Behaviors Questionnaire

To better understand how one's SM behaviors might be altered as a result of a partner's behavior, we included a second questionnaire (see Appendix), which gauges the experience of a partner's attempts to alter one's SM behavior via three means: 1) *Monitoring*, which consists of five questions of monitoring behaviors. 2) *Imposition*, which refers to direct acts through which a partner attempts to manipulate the SM account of the victim. Specifically, we define two types of imposition: when a partner insists that the victim delete or add something to the (victim's) account. Therefore, Imposition consists of 2 factors (*Deletion, Addition*) with six questions each. 3) *Intention-Free Will*, which refers to the manner in which the relationship might indirectly influence the respondent's behaviour. This factor consists of seven questions. SM behaviors questionnaire was measured on a 5-point Likert scale (0 to 4) shown to be reliable and valid (Table 2).

Table 2.

Items, explained variance and Cronbach's Alpha for each factor in the Social Media behaviors questionnaire.

Factor	No. of items	Eigenvalue	Cronbach alpha	Total variance explained
Monitoring	5	4.049	.941	
Imposition:				
Case 1: Removal	6	4.499	.931	71.33%
Case 2: Addition	6	5.142	.964	
Intention-Free Will	7	5.127	.931	

## 3 Results

### 3.1 Control Group

To begin with, we examined the rates of violence that were reported by the control group concerning their physical interactions. Our findings revealed high rates of violence between the romantic partners. Specifically we found the following rates of reported experiences amongst participants: Physical Violence = 38.9%, Sexual Violence = 36.1%, Psychological Violence = 30.6%, Detachment = 68.1%, Humiliation = 43.1%, Coercion = 80.6%, Derision = 6.9% and Instrumental Violence = 19.4%.

One-way ANOVAs were run with each of the 8 DV factors as the response, and each of the two categorical demographic variables (gender, relationship type) as the independent variable. The effect of relationship type was significant for Physical Violence, Psychological Violence, Detachment, Humiliation, Coercion and Instrumental Violence (**Table 3**). Interestingly, no significant differences were found between men and women. The only close to significant result was Physical Violence  $F(1,70)=3.95$ ,  $p = .051$ , with males ( $M = .76$ ,  $SD = 1.22$ ) to report twice as much victimization as females ( $M = .30$ ,  $SD = .64$ ).

Table 3.

Analysis of variance on Relationship type and Dating Violence (\*\* $p<0.01$ ; \* $p<0.05$ ).

Factors		M	SD	df	F	p
Physical	Single	.54	.94	2	8.25	.001**
	Occasional Relationship	1.45	1.58	69		
	Stable Relationship	.14	.28			
Psychological	Single	.57	.89	2	3.15	.049*
	Occasional Relationship	.88	1.37	69		
	Stable Relationship	.17	.45			
Detachment	Single	.95	.86	2	3.92	.024*
	Occasional Relationship	1.16	.84	69		
	Stable Relationship	.80	.73			
Humiliation	Single	.66	.89	2	4.21	.019*
	Occasional Relationship	.65	.95	69		
	Stable Relationship	.16	.30			
Coercion	Single	.93	.92	2	4.73	.012*
	Occasional Relationship	1.32	1.58	69		
	Stable Relationship	.46	.88			
Instrumental	Single	.52	1.18	2	4.71	.012*
	Occasional Relationship	1.12	1.62	69		
	Stable Relationship	.02	.13			

### 3.2 Social Media group

In order to identify the precise rate of DV behavior that emerged from actions or lack of actions in SM, we examined the percentage of participants who experienced and reported, at least once, a particular

type of violence in their romantic relationships and/or alternations to their SM behaviors. We found that SM behaviors may be cause for victimization and at the same time may be monitored, manipulated or otherwise influenced by the physical relationship. In particular, we found the following rates of DV amongst the participants in the Social Media group (SMg): Physical Violence = 30.6%, Sexual Violence = 38.9%, Psychological Violence = 37.5%, Detachment = 76.1%, Humiliation = 50.7%, Coercion = 66.7%, Derision = 16.7% and Instrumental Violence = 59.7%. In terms of participants' experiences with respect to their relationships' impact on their SM behaviors we found: Monitoring = 16.7%, Imposition: Removal = 83.3%, Imposition: Addition= 80.6% and Intention-Free Will = 70.8%.

Pairwise linear correlations between all DV factors, except derision, were positive and statistically significant ( $p < 0.01$ ). In contrast, the pairwise correlations between the DV and the SM factors the interactions were negative and statistically significant ( $p < 0.01$ ) only for the factors of Imposition and limitations on his or her Intention-Free Will (**Table 4**).

Table 4.

Correlations: Dating Violence and Social Media factors (\*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \* $p < 0.05$ ).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Physical	–	.66**	.67**	.69**	.77**	-.08	.83**	.71**	-.08	-.70**	-.73**	-.60**
2. Sexual		–	.75**	.79**	.87**	.01	.85**	.50**	.01	-.59**	-.64**	-.66**
3. Psychological			–	.68**	.73**	.12	.78**	.56**	.12	-.69**	-.76**	-.61**
4. Detachment				–	.78**	.23	.81**	.64**	.23	-.59**	-.64**	-.62**
5. Humiliation					–	-.05	.90**	.59**	-.05	-.57**	-.61**	-.63**
6. Derision						–	-.05	0.13	.01**	-.01	-.05	-.04
7. Coercion							–	.66**	-.05	-.73**	-.73**	-.71**
8. Instrumental								–	.13	-.63**	-.56**	-.51**
9. Monitoring									–	-.01	-.05	-.04
10. Imposition: Removal										–	.76**	.65**
11. Imposition: Addition											–	.63**
12. Intention-Free Will												–

One-way ANOVAs were run with each of the 12 factors as the response, and each of the two categorical demographic variables (gender, relationship type) as the independent variable. Results show significant differences between factors. Among the DV factors, the effect of gender was significant for Physical Violence  $F(1,70)=6.68, p < .05$ , Sexual Violence  $F(1,70)=8.96, p < .005$ , Psychological Violence  $F(1,70)=6.64, p < .05$ , Detachment  $F(1,69)=5.21, p < .05$ , Coercion  $F(1,70)=6.26, p < .05$  and Instrumental Violence  $F(1,70)=4.23, p < .05$ . Gender was also a predictor for Imposition: Removal,  $F(1,70)=12.14, p < .005$ , and Addition,  $F(1,70)=9.12, p < .005$ .

Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that men experience and report higher rates of DV because of their SM actions. On the other hand women reported experiencing higher rates of Imposition based on their SM use (**Table 5**).

Table 5.

Gender and Dating Violence based on Social Media behaviors.

	M ( <i>men, women</i> )	SD ( <i>men, women</i> )
Physical	.74, .18	1.12, .66
Sexual	.75, .16	1.09, .46
Psychological	1.05, .35	1.24, 1.04
Detachment	1.29, .70	1.16, 1.01
Coercion	1.16, .50	1.26, .95
Instrumental	.87, .44	.97, .80
Imposition: Removal	1.58, 1.88	.45, .23
Imposition: Addition	1.63, 1.90	.46, .25

Among the DV factors based on SM behaviors, the effect of relationship type was significant only for Sexual Violence ( $F(2,71)=4.76, p < .005$ ), with Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicating that serious relationships predict lower rates of DV (**Figure 1**).




Figure 1. Social Media behaviors predict Sexual Violence based on Relationship Type.

### 3.3 Comparing between the Control and the SM groups

Independent sample t-test revealed that both groups, self-reported on violence were similar with no significant difference.

To investigate whether there was a difference between the 2 Groups (control vs. SM) x 2 genders (Men vs. Woman) x 8 DV factors (Physical, Sexual, Psychological, Detachment, Humiliation, Coercion, Derision and Instrumental), a factorial MANOVA was conducted. The analysis revealed significant differences only in terms of psychological violence  $F(1, 141) = 4.75, p < .05$ , with the control group ( $M_{men} = .47, SD_{men} = .17$ ) ( $M_{women} = .46, SD_{women} = .17$ ) reporting lower rates of psychological violence for males and higher for females in comparison with the SM group ( $M_{men} = 1.11, SD_{men} = .17$ ) ( $M_{women} = .35, SD_{women} = .16$ ).

Similarly, to investigate whether there was a difference between the 2 Groups (Control vs. SM) x 3 Relationship types (Single vs. Occasional vs. Stable) x 8 DV factors (Physical, Sexual, Psychological, Detachment, Humiliation, Coercion, Derision and Instrumental), a factorial MANOVA was conducted once again. The analysis revealed significant differences only in terms of reported Physical Violence  $F(2, 141) = 4.69, p < .05$ , with the control group reporting lower rates of physical violence for single participants and those who were involved in a stable relationship and higher rates of violence for those in an occasional relationship, in comparison with the SM group (**Figure 2**).




Figure 2. Physical Violence based on Relationship Type for both groups.

#### 4 Discussion

We transformed the DVQ, for use in the SM context, in which one’s SM behaviors are taken into account as an important possible catalyst of violence within a dating relationship. We then examined its applicability in measuring the relationship between one’s SM behaviors and DV, through an analysis of the responses of participants in the SM group. The analysis supports high reliability and validity of the DV questionnaire and yielded eight factors. Therefore, the analysis *confirmed hypothesis H1a*; SM behaviors may be cause for victimization.

The SM behaviors questionnaire, which examines how one’s relationship might affect their SM behaviors, was analyzed in the same manner, yielding three factors with high reliability and validity. The analysis *confirmed hypothesis H1b*; SM behaviors may be monitored, manipulated or otherwise influenced by the offline relationship.

Perhaps the most important finding of our study was the sheer extent to which DV resulting from SM behaviors is experienced by today’s youth. In our study, the proportion of participants having experienced this type of DV was 76.1%. While one should be careful about making inferences from our study to more general contexts, we can note how alarming it is to find such a high incidence of DV.

In addition, we found positive correlations between all DV factors, except derision and negative correlations in terms of DV and Imposition, Intention-Free will. We interpret these correlations as follows: when a partner experiences physical abuse, is likely to experience other forms of violence as well (Sexual, Psychological, Detachment, Humiliation, Coercion and Instrumental). However, when a

partner experiences Imposition and limitations on Intention-Free Will in SM behaviors, it is unlikely the individual to experience DV.

Our study found that gender is highly correlated to Physical, Sexual, Psychological, Detachment, Coercion and Instrumental Violence. We were surprised to find that the men participants in our study frequently self-reported their victimization. We believe this is an area for fruitful future research, as studies of DV often focus on men as the perpetrators of violence rather than as potential victims (Hickman et al., 2004; Jackson, 1999; O'Keefe, 1997; Shook et al., 2000). However, it seems that the rise of SM may have significantly altered the dynamics between the genders. Therefore, *hypothesis H2a is partially rejected*. While women do not report having experienced more violence, they do report higher rates of imposition. However, when we consider the influence of the physical relationship on one's SM behaviors, we observe the opposite trend, with women experiencing, more often than men, a partner imposing on their SM behaviors. As mentioned, previous literature suggests that men use violence as a means to handle or manipulate their victims, whereas women resort to violence to defend themselves (Jackson, 1999). Our findings do not entirely support this. We found women doing the manipulation in the physical setting.

Similarly, *hypothesis H2b is rejected*. Previous studies predict stable relationships to result in increased victimization (Arias et al., 1987; Lewis et al., 2001), however, our findings did not support that claim. However, the fact that young people would choose to remain in abusive, manipulative relationships is quite alarming. Moreover, they often choose to stay in a relationship where their partner monitors their online behaviors, imposing their own wants or needs on them, and depriving them of their Intention-Free will. Future work should investigate all aspects of this serious issue. The strong correlations we observe lead us to conclude that indeed, the SM behaviors are related to the victimization during physical interactions. It appears that SM could be a place where violence can develop, with very real consequences for romantic partners. Interestingly, taking into consideration the results of the additional questionnaire that measured alterations in one's SM behaviors as a result of the romantic relationship, it appears that partners' monitoring of one another on SM may actually serve as a measure preventing or impeding DV. More specifically, when a partner monitors his or her partner's SM behav-

iors, and imposes his or her own desires on the behaviors, and when individuals do not act intentionally or entirely at their free will, we actually observe fewer incidences of DV.

To conclude, our results suggest that the rise of SM has complicated the manner in which romantic partners communicate and negotiate the terms and boundaries of their relationship. The behaviors of a partner on SM often impact and bring about physical consequences for the individual. For instance, the choice of the individual to add content on his/her SM profile (e.g., a picture or a post of his or her preference) ignoring the partner's desire, could have as a consequence physical, sexual or emotional abuse such as hitting, nonconsensual sex or threatening. This leaves little doubt that the individual's SM behaviors, affects his or her physical interactions.

## 5 Bibliography

- Alleyne, E., Gannon, T. A., Ciardha, C. Ó., & Wood, J. L. (2014). Community males show multiple-perpetrator rape proclivity: Development and preliminary validation of an interest scale. *Sexual Abuse, 26*(1), 82-104.
- Arias, I., Somios, M. & O'Leary, K. D. (1987). Prevalence and correlations of physical aggression during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2*, 82-90.
- Batinic, B., Reips, U. D., & Bosnjak, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Online social sciences*. Seattle, WA: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Bernardino, Í. M., Barbosa, K. G. N., Nóbrega, L. M., et al. (2016). Profile of men who are victims of physical violence by an intimate partner. *Journal of family violence, 31*(5), 617-624.
- Blake, E., & Gannon, T. A. (2010). The implicit theories of rape-prone men: An information-processing investigation. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology, 54*(6), 895-914.
- Bohner, G., Pina, A., Tendayi Viki, G., & Siebler, F. (2010). Using social norms to reduce men's rape proclivity: Perceived rape myth acceptance of out-groups may be more influential than that of in-groups. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 16*(8), 671-693.
- Dating Abuse Statistics – [www.loveisrespect.org](http://www.loveisrespect.org). (n.d.). Retrieved August 11, 2017, from <http://www.loveisrespect.org/is-this-abuse/dating-violence-statistics>.
- Debowska, A., Boduszek, D., & Willmott, D. (2017). Psychosocial Correlates of Attitudes Toward Male Sexual Violence in a Sample of Financial Crime, Property Crime, General Violent, and Homicide Offenders. *Sexual Abuse*,
- Fifth & Pacific Companies, Inc. (Formerly: Liz Claiborne, Inc.), Conducted by Knowledge Networks, (December 2010). "College Dating Violence and Abuse Poll," Available at: <https://www.breakthecycle.org/surveys>.
- Hanson, R. F. (2002). Adolescent Dating Violence: Prevalence and psychological outcomes. *Child abuse & neglect, 26*(5), 447-451.

- Hickman, L. J., Jaycox, L. H., & Aronoff, J. (2004). Dating Violence among adolescents: Prevalence, gender distribution, and prevention program effectiveness. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 5*, 123–142.
- Jackson, S. M. (1999). Issues in the Dating Violence Research: A Review on the Literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 4*(2), 233-247.
- Knobloch, L. K., Solomon, D. H., & Cruz, M. G. (2001). The role of relationship development and attachment in the experience of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships, 8*(2), 205-224.
- Lewis, S. F. & Fremouw, W. (2001). Dating Violence: A critical Review of the Literature. *Clinical Psychology Review, 21*(1). 105-127.
- Luthra, R., & Gidycz, C. A., (2006). Dating Violence among college men and women: Evaluation of a theoretical model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*, 717–731.
- Makepeace, J. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimisation. *Family Relations, 35*, 383–388.
- Marshall, T. C. (2012). Facebook surveillance of former romantic partners: associations with post-breakup recovery and personal growth. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 15*(10), 521-526.
- Mod, G. B. B. (2010). Reading romance: The impact Facebook rituals can have on a romantic relationship. *Journal of Comparative Research in Anthropology and Sociology, 2*, 61-77.
- Mullen, P. E. (1995). Jealousy and violence. *Hong Kong Journal of Psychiatry, 5*, 18-24.
- O’Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of Dating Violence among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 546–568.
- Presaghi, F., Manca, M., Rodriguez-Franco, L., et al. (2015). A questionnaire for the assessment of violent behaviors in young couples: The Italian version of Dating Violence Questionnaire (DVQ). *PLoS one, 10*(5).
- Ramirez, A., Sumner, E. M., Fleuriet, C., & Cole, M. (2014). When online dating partners meet offline: The effect of modality switching on relational communication between online daters. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 20*(1), 99-114.
- Rodríguez-Díaz, F. J., Herrero, J., Rodríguez-Franco, L., et al. (2017). Validation of Dating Violence Questionnaire-R (DVQ-R). *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 17*(1), 77-84.
- Shook, N. J., Gerrity, D. A., Jurich, J., et al. (2000). Courtship violence among college students: A comparison of verbally and physically abusive couples. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*, 1–22.
- Straus, M. A., & Ramirez, I. L. (2004). Criminal history and assault of dating partners: The role of type of prior crime, age of onset, and gender. *Violence and Victims, 19*, 413–434.
- Torres, L. H., Mohand, L. M., & Espinosa, S. C. (2018). Psychological Well-Being, Self-Concept, and Couple Relations in University Students. In *Violence Prevention and Safety Promotion in Higher Education Settings*. IGI Global, 174-194.

Wolfe, D. A., Scott, K., Wekerle, C., et al. (2001). Child maltreatment: Risk of adjustment problems and Dating Violence in adolescence. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 40, 282–289.

Stets, J. E. (1991). Cohabiting and marital aggression: The role of social isolation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53(3), 669-680.

Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1987). Violence in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50(3), 237-246.

## **6 Appendix**

### **Dating Violence – Social Media Questionnaire:**

1. Does he/she put your love to the test, setting you traps to find out if you cheat on him/her, loves him/her, or are faithful (e.g., he is monitoring your online profile or asked you to prove your love via social media)?
2. You feel compelled to post online sexually related content in order not to have to explain why you don't want to (e.g., an image in which you are kissing him/ her)?
3. Does he/she mock women or men in social media?
4. Has he/she stolen your passwords, mobile/laptop to search your social media?
5. Has your partner beaten you as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
6. Is he/she a good student, but is not always responding to your text messages right away, does not fulfill his/her promises and is irresponsible in regards to the online content of your relationship?
7. Does he/she humiliate you because of something you said or did on social media?
8. Does he/she refuse to have sex with you or give you affection to express his/her anger/annoyance as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
9. Does he/she insist to delete your ex-girlfriend/boyfriend or any attractive person of the opposite sex from your social media?
10. Does he/she insist on touching you in a way that you don't like and don't want and that could be a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
11. Does he/she believe that the opposite sex is inferior, and say that women should obey men (or vice-versa) for their actions on social media?
12. Does he/she take your mobile, laptop or tablet away from you?
13. Has he/she slapped your face, pushed or shaken you as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?

14. Does he/she not acknowledge any responsibility regarding the couple relationship or what happens to both of you (e.g., Does not publish anything about your relationship online)?
15. Does he/she criticize you, underestimate you, or humiliate you because of something you said or did on social media?
16. Does he/she refuse to give you support or affection as punishment of something you said or did on social media?
17. Does he/she threaten to commit suicide or hurt himself/herself as a consequence of something you did or didn't do on social media (e.g., insist to post a picture of yours as a couple, or add "in a relationship" as a status)?
18. Has he/she treated you as a sexual object and that could be a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
19. Has he/she thrown blunt instruments at you as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
20. Has your partner hurt you with some object as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
21. Has your partner ridiculed or insulted women or men as a group based on their images or posts on social media?
22. Does he/she impose rules on the relationship (e.g., the content you post online for your relationship), at his/her exclusive convenience?
23. Does he/she ridicule your way of expressing yourself via social media?
24. Does he/she threaten to abandon you as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
25. Has he/she physically stopped you from leaving as a consequence of something you said or did on social media (e.g., because you refused to post or delete content about your relationship)?
26. Do you feel forced to perform certain sexual acts as a consequence of something you said or did on social media (e.g., to forgive you)?

27. Has he/she made fun of you or discredited you as a “woman/man” based on your actions on social media?
28. Has your partner made you go into debt as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
29. Has he/she damaged precious objects of yours as a consequence of something you said or did on social media or forced you to close your social media account?
30. Has he/she ignored your feelings in regards to his/her social media acts (e.g., "Like" pictures/posts of other women/men even though he/she knows that you don't like it)?
31. Does he/she criticize you, insult you, or yell at you because of something you said or did on social media?
32. Does he/she stop talking to you or disappears for several days, without any explanation, to show his/her annoyance of something you said or did on social media?
33. Does he/she lie to you to manipulate your social media actions?
34. Has he/she not taken into account your feelings about sex as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
35. Do you feel he/she unjustly criticizes your sexuality based on your social media pictures?
36. Does he/she insult you in the presence of friends or relatives as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
37. Has he/she refused to help you when you were in real need as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
38. Does he/she invade your online space (e.g., comments in your posts/pictures/profile or/and tags you in pictures)?
39. Does he/she force you to strip even if you don't want to as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?
40. Has he/she ridiculed or insulted your beliefs, religion or social class because of something you said or did on social media?
41. Does he/she ridicule or insult you for the ideas you uphold via social media?
42. Do you feel you can't argue with him/her because he/she is almost always annoyed at you as a consequence of something you said or did on social media?

43. Has he/she used social media in order to express him/her self to you (e.g., to express his annoyance via a post)?

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Related Questions</b>
Physical	5, 12, 20, 21, 29
Sexual	2, 10, 18, 26, 34, 39
Psychological	8, 16, 24
Detachment	6, 14, 22, 30, 32, 33, 37
Humiliation	7, 15, 23, 31, 36, 40, 41
Derision	3, 11, 19, 27, 35
Coercion	1, 9, 17, 25, 38, 42
Instrumental	4, 12, 28

**Table 6:** Answer key

#### **Social Media Behaviors Questionnaire:**

Does he/she monitor your:

- Pictures
- Posts
- LIKEs
- New Friends (ADDs)
- Comments
- He/she is not monitoring me via social media

Did he/she force you to delete content in the form of:

- Pictures
- Posts
- LIKEs
- New Friends (ADDs)

- Comments
- None of the above

Did he/she force you to add content about your relationship in the form of:

- Pictures
- Posts
- LIKES
- New Friends (ADDs)
- Comments
- None of the above

Before adding content, do you consider whether it will hurt your partner:

- Pictures
- Posts
- LIKES
- New Friends (ADDs)
- Comments
- None of the above

For Citations of Questionnaire(s) / Manuscript:

Matsangidou, M., & Otterbacher, J. Can Posting Be a Catalyst for Dating Violence? Social Media Behaviors and Physical Interactions. *Violence and Gender*.