

Self-Esteem, Attachment, Gender Roles and Social Approval as Predictors of the Attitudes Toward Dating Violence*

Flört Şiddetine Yönelik Tutumların Yordayıcıları Olarak Benlik Saygısı, Bağlanma, Toplumsal Cinsiyet Roller ve Sosyal Onay İhtiyacı

Rana Turan , Baki Duy

Abstract. The main purpose of the current research was to investigate the predictive role of gender roles, attachment, self-esteem and social approval in attitudes toward dating violence among college students. The participants of the study were 842 college students studying at different faculties of Anadolu University. The instruments of the study were The Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the Gender Roles Attitudes Scale, Experience in Close Relationships Inventory-II, Social Confirmation Scale and Personal Information Form developed by the researcher was used to collect the data of the study. T-test, ANOVA, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, and hierarchical regression analysis methods were employed to analyze the data and descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation coefficients were computed. Gender comparisons showed that male college students had higher scores in abuse, and control dimensions as well as the total score. Findings of the hierarchical regression analysis yielded that gender role attitudes had predictive role in all dimensions of dating violence attitudes. As avoidant attachment dimensions significantly predicted violence dimension of dating violence, anxious attachment dimension significantly predicted abuse and control dimensions. Furthermore, self-esteem significantly predicted control dimension. Findings of the study are discussed under the light of the current literature, and suggestions are.

Keywords. Dating violence, Attachment, Gender roles, Self-esteem, College students.

Öz. Bu araştırmada, toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri tutumu, bağlanma boyutları, benlik saygısı ve sosyal onay ihtiyacının romantik ilişkide şiddete yönelik tutumları yordayıcı rolünün incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu Anadolu Üniversitesi'ndeki 842 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın verilerini toplamak için Yakın İlişkilerde Şiddete Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği-Gözden Geçirilmiş Formu, Rosenberg Benlik Saygısı Ölçeği, Toplumsal Cinsiyet Roller Tutum Ölçeği, Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri-II, Kişisel Bilgi Formu ve Sosyal Onay Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde betimleyici istatistikler, t-testi, ANOVA, Pearson Momentler Çarpımı Korelasyonu ve Doğrusal Çoklu Hiyerarşik Regresyon analizinden yararlanılmıştır. Analizler sonucunda, flört şiddeti tutum puanının şiddet alt boyutunun kadın ve erkek üniversite öğrencilerinde farklılaşmadığı; istismar, kontrol alt boyutları ve toplam şiddet düzeyinin erkeklerde daha fazla olduğu bulunmuştur. Hiyerarşik regresyon analizleri sonucunda, toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine yönelik tutumların flört şiddetine yönelik tutumların yordayıcısı olduğu; bağlanma boyutlarından kaçınan bağlanmanın, flört şiddetinin şiddet alt boyutunu; kaygılı bağlanmanın ise istismar ve kontrol alt boyutunu yordadığı bulunmuştur. Ayrıca, benlik saygısı değişkeninin flört şiddetinin kontrol alt boyutunu anlamlı düzeyde yordadığı bulunmuştur. Bu bulgular alanyazındaki bulgular çerçevesinde tartışılıp önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler. Flört şiddeti, Bağlanma, Toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri, Benlik saygısı, Üniversite öğrencileri.

*This study was produced from the master thesis prepared by the first author under the supervision of the second author and presented as a verbal presentation at the 21th International Psychological Counseling and Guidance Congress on 24-27 October 2019.

Rana Turan (Corresponding Author)

Hacettepe University, Institute of Education Sciences, Ankara, Turkey
e-mail: ranahacettepe@gmail.com

Baki Duy

Anadolu University, Faculty of Education, Eskişehir, Turkey
e-mail: bakiduv@anadolu.edu.tr

Received: 20 July 2019

Revision: 7 February 2020

Accepted: 10 February 2020

Romantic relationships in university years, including the emerging adulthood, have an important place in gaining self-knowledge and self-awareness. Considering the fact that romantic relationships during college years serve as rehearsals for marriage and family relationships about to happen after college years, these intimate relationships in college years play a crucial role in one's life. Close relationships enable individuals to meet their love, belongingness (emotional intimacy, togetherness and close relationship) and esteem (control, power) needs, and also to discover their personal characteristics that they are unaware of in intimate relationships. In addition, it is observed that psychological and physical well-being of people who have deficiency in developing and maintaining meaningful interpersonal relationships are negatively affected (Baumestier & Leary, 1995). Developing and maintaining an intimate relationship gains more importance towards the end of adolescence period and is expressed with concepts such as 'flirting', 'romantic relationship', 'love', 'emotional relationship'. These concepts are used interchangeably throughout the article.

Violence developed as a cause or consequence of various problems has been the subject of considerable number of researchers from different fields with its increasing effect on the whole society (Sakarya, 2013). Violence in romantic relationships has been one of the subjects within the phenomenon, and is named mostly as "dating violence" or "partner violence" in the literature. Dating violence is one type of interpersonal violence involving verbal, sexual, emotional and physical violence or violent behaviors of couples in a dating relationship (Aslan et al., 2008). Research has shown that psychological and physical violence are interrelated, and psychological violence is a precursor to physical violence (Muñoz-Rivas et al., 2007; Straus et al., 1996). In addition, it has been reported that the prevalence of psychological violence is considerably higher than other types of dating violence (Zorrilla et al., 2009). Women show more psychological aggression than men (Hines & Saudino, 2003). In the case of physical violence, there are findings indicating that both sexes have equal proportions of victims and aggressors (Betz, 2007; Foshee, 1996; Matud, 2007; Taylor and Sorenson, 2004), yet, women are exposed to more severe physical injuries than men (Gover, 2004). When it comes to sexual abuse in dating, it is reported that women of all ages are the victims of sexual abuse, and men are mostly the perpetrators in sexual abuse cases (Betz, 2007; Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999).

Pioneering studies on dating violence literature were done by Makepeace (1981, 1983, 1987). The violence that occurs in romantic relationships draws attention especially on university campuses (Capezza et al., 2014; Reed et al., 2015). In close relationships, physical violence behaviors that intentionally use physical force, and may result in death or injury includes such as slapping, pushing, shaking, burning, pulling hair, or using a weapon against her/him. Sexual violence involves behaviors such as to forcing the partner who is not willing to have sexual intercourse to have sexual intercourse. Behaviors such as “threatening” the partner by using words, actions or weapons are considered as emotional or psychological violence. Furthermore, behaviors such as humiliating the partner, dragging her/him to illegal activities, controlling her/his behaviors or decisions, limiting her/his communication with her/his friends, checking her/his private life or demaging her/his belongings, hiding information from her/him, using her/his money are also within the scope of psychological or emotional violence (Saltzman et al., 2002).

Individuals who have been subjected to intrafamily violence are rapidly pushed to establish a dating relationship due to their unmet need for intimacy and feelings of rejection, and they are reported to convey their feelings of loyalty to their peers in an immature manner (Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999). Dutton (1999) states that the child's experiencing violence in the family or witnessing the violence of one of his parents is critical in learning the anger. Furthermore, low socio-economic status causes low socialization and difficulty in relationships. Low socio-economic status was found to be associated especially with violence coming from man (Spriggs et al., 2009). Although there are many complex factors predicting aggression, it is claimed that individuals with low self-esteem are more prone to aggressive and anti-social behaviors (Paulson, Coombs, & Landsverk, 1990). The fact that some types of violence experienced in romantic relationships are perceived less than the actual causes the necessary measures not to be taken. Besides, unfortunately, it has been reported that some college students consider violence in romantic relationships to some degree as acceptable (Foo & Margolin, 1995). Unilateral or bilateral acceptance of violence in romantic relationships can result in individuals developing beliefs that romantic relationships are being experienced in this way. Thus, violence in romantic relationships may be perceived as normal.

It has been early reported by researchers that attachment experiences in infancy are effective in future romantic relationships (eg, Hazan & Shaver,

1994). Individuals who have an avoidant or anxious attachment style may demonstrate harassing, offensive and unsatisfactory attitude due to fear of losing the partner, and it may cause problems in romantic relationships (Weiss & Sampson, 1986). In a research conducted in a large study group, individuals who are characterized by high level of anxious attachment were found to be more prone to dating violence. The relationship between avoidant attachment style and dating violence was found to be low (Bartholomew & Allison, 2006). Violence in romantic relationships can be related not only to the relationship between man and woman, but also to the cultural values of the society, and the relations with the soicety. In this context, one of the factors that encourages men to show violent behaviors in the relationship is gender roles (Meetoo & Mirza, 2007). Ostrov et al. (2005) state that this happening started with biased socialization process in preschool period, and increased with the reinforcement of gender roles later in life. In a study conducted by Burnett, Anderson and Heppner (1995), it was found that having a masculine tendency, such as being libertarian and competitive in American society, was associated with high self-esteem.

In terms of understanding the importance of dating violence, being aware of the concequences and effects of dating violence is as valuable as understanding the casues and related factors in dating violence. Research has demonstrated short-term and long-term traumatic consequences of dating violence. The consequences of such traumatic experiences experienced in close emotional relationships are discussed in three categories; psychological symptoms (posttraumatic stress disorder etc. psychological disorders), cognitive changes (biases in attributions and attitudes), problems in communication skills (using abusive communication) (Dutton, 1993). Exposure to physical violence has been related to several emotional disorders in women such as post-traumatic stress disorder (O'campo et al., 2006), depression (Campbell, 2002), anxiety disorder (Hathawayvd., 2000), sleep disorders (Humphreys et al., 1999), social behavior disorder, suicidal thoughts and attempts (Coker et al., 2002) and other behavioral disorders (Campbell, 2002; Golding, 1999).

A quick look at the studies on dating violence in Turkey show that there has been a growing interest on the subject in recent years. Investigation of the literature on dating violence in Turkey show that studies are basically about definition, classification and assessment (Koçak & Can, 2019) of it, the relationship between attitudes towards dating violence, gender roles, and exposure to dating violence (Selçuk et al., 2018), attitudes and behaviors of

college students regarding dating violence (Karatay, 2018), mediating role of relationship satisfaction on the relationship between insecure attachment and emotional violence in university students (Toplu-Demirtaş et al., 2018), factors affecting the level of acceptance of violence in couples (Kepir-Savoly et al., 2014), antecedents of violence in romantic relationships (Atakay, 2014), and abuse perceived by university students in their romantic relationships (Kılınçer & Tuzgöl-Dost, 2014). All these studies are far from examining dating violence within a multidimensional perspective.

Dating violence is a complex, multidimensional phenomenon (Heise, 2011; Heise & Kotsadam, 2015; Jewkes et al., 2015), and research on this issue needs to be based on multidimensional approach to take account of this complexity. There is a need to identify relative contribution of each dimension (individual, interpersonal, family, culture and society) to comprehend risk factors in dating violence (Gracia & Merlo, 2016). It can be concluded from studies in the literature that some factors that may be the cause of violent behaviors are grouped under the headings of individual, relational (contextual) and social factors. In order to explain dating violence, various theories such as feminist theory, social learning theory, intergenerational transfer theory, biological theory, socio-cultural theory attempted to reveal some factors associated with the emergence of dating violence. Thus, the present study aims to provide explanation to dating violence by especially benefiting from the multidimensional perspective such as feminist theory, socio-cultural theories and social learning theory with considering individual, interpersonal and family factors. At the same time, considering the scope of dating violence, it was hypothesized that multi-dimensional approach to this concept will be important in order to understand dating violence and to find out preventive and intervention methods. Considering the fact that the prevalence of dating violence has increased in recent years, we believe that this research is going to make valuable contribution to prevention studies in dating violence and establishing healthy romantic relationships. The main purpose of this research, therefore is to examine the role of the attitudes toward gender roles, attachment, self-esteem and need for social approval in attitudes toward dating violence experienced by university students. With this end, research questions are defined as follows;

1. What is the level of attitudes of university students towards dating?

2. Does attitudes toward dating violence of university students differ in terms of gender, class, exposure to parental violence, witnessing violence between parents, relationship duration, frequency of interviews and thought related to dating relationship?
3. Are there significant relationships between university students' level of dating violence, attachment dimensions, self-esteem, attitudes towards gender roles and social approval levels?
4. Do university students' attachment dimensions, attitudes towards gender roles, self-esteem levels, and need for social approval significantly predict the severity of dating violence?
5. Do university students' attachment dimensions, attitudes towards gender roles, self-esteem levels and need for social approval significantly predict the control dimension of dating violence?
6. Do university students' attachment dimensions, attitudes towards gender roles, self-esteem levels, and need for social approval significantly predict the abuse dimension of dating violence?

METHOD

Study Group

The study group of the research consists of college students attending different faculties of Anadolu University during the academic year of 2016-2017. Data were collected from 842 students in total. However, data filled in incorrectly, missing or left blank were excluded from the analysis. Additionally, the data with extreme values were excluded from the analysis. Thus, analyses were carried out on a data set of 727 students, 481 of whom were women (66.2%) and 246 of them were men (33.8%).

Ethics Committee Approval

Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee at Anadolu University. Anadolu University Ethics Committee Registration Date: 20.10.2016; Anadolu University Ethics Committee Signature Date: 25.11.2016 and Protocol No:110715.

Data Collection Tools

The Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale-Revised. The Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale-Revised developed by Fincham Fincham, Cui, Braithwaite, & Pasley (2008) measures the attitudes of university students towards psychological and physical violence in dating relationships. The scale has 17 items and 3 dimensions (8 items of abuse, 5 items of control, and 4 items of violence) with a 5-point Likert type scaling. Adaptation studies of the scale to Turkish was done by Toplu-Demirtaş (2015). The higher the score is the stronger the attitudes towards psychological and physical aggression. The internal consistency coefficients of the scale have been calculated as .72 for the violence dimension, .62 for the control dimension and .65 for the abuse dimension. In this study, the Cronbach alpha value for the total of the scale was found as .68.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. The original version of the scale was developed by Rosenberg (1965), and adapted to Turkish by Çuhadaroğlu (1986). It consists of 10 items answered on 4-point Likert type scale. The scores vary between 10 and 40. High score indicates high self-esteem. In a study (Öner, 1994), the test-retest reliability coefficient of the scale was found as .75. The internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found as .86 (Karancı, Dirik, & Yorulmaz, 2007). Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated as .71 (Çuhadaroğlu, 1986). Cronbach Alpha value was found .87 in the present study.

Gender Roles Attitude Scale. The scale was developed by Zeyneloğlu and Terzioğlu (2011) and consists of 38 items with five subscales, namely “egalitarian gender role”, “female gender role”, “gender role in marriage” and “traditional gender role” and “male gender role”. The items of the scale are answered on a 5-point Likert type scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree). The Cronbach alpha value of the total scale was computed as .92, and the alpha values of the subscales varied between .72 and .80. Correlations among the subscales varied between .35 and .65 (Zeyneloğlu & Terzioğlu, 2011). Total alpha value of the scale for this study was found as .94.

Experiences in Close Relationships-ECR-II. The ECR-II inventory was originally developed by Fraley, Waller and Brennan (2000) to measure the attachment styles of adults and adapted to Turkish by Selçuk, Günaydın, Sümer and Uysal (2005). The inventory consisting of a total of 36 items is a 7-point Likert-type scale (1= never agree, 7= totally agree). Cronbach alpha

coefficients are .90 for the avoidant dimension, and .86 for the anxiety dimension. Test-retest reliability of the anxiety dimension was found as .82, and .81 for the avoidant dimension (Selçuk et al., 2005). In this study, the total alpha value of the scale was found to be .89.

Need for Social Approval Scale. The scale developed by Kardeş (2014) to measure the need for social approval, has a 5-point Likert type rating, and consists of 25 items with three subscales. High scores indicate high need for social approval (Kardeş & Öğülmüş, 2016). In this research, the positive impression subscale was used. The internal consistency coefficient of the three factors in the Social Approval Need Scale was .83 for the first factor, and .80 for the second and third factors. The internal consistency coefficient of the overall scale was found as .90. In this study, the alpha value of the total scale was found as .86.

Personal Information Form. A personal information form consisting of items for basic demographic characteristics of the participants such as gender, age, and grade level was developed by the authors. The form also included questions such as exposure to and witnessing parental violence in childhood, the number of previous dating relationships, and thoughts about the future of the current dating relationship.

Study Design

The present research is a correlational one aiming to determine the predictive roles of self-esteem, attachment, gender roles and the need for social approval in attitudes toward dating violence among university students. In order to test the main purpose, hierarchical regression analysis method was used. In addition, comparison tests (t-test, ANOVA) were used in order to determine the extent to which the attitude levels of dating violence differed with regard to being exposed to and witnessed domestic violence in childhood, thoughts about the current dating relationship, and frequency of dating out.

Process

The data collection tools used in the research were turned into a booklet with their rankings changed and distributed to university students studying in various faculties at Anadolu University in 2016-2017 academic year as groups in classrooms by the first author. Ethical permission was obtained from the Ethics Committee at Anadolu University. The data were collected from students who were present in the class on the specified time, and volunteered

to participate in the research. The researcher first introduced herself in each class, and then gave information about the purpose, importance of the research and how to answer the scale set. It was announced to students that students' identity information was not needed and that the collected data would be kept confidential.

Data Analysis

As a result of examining the data of 842 participants in the research, the data of 62 participants were excluded from the data set due to deficiencies in the personal information form and inappropriate answer on the scales. Additionally, the data of 53 participants were discarded from the data set due to extreme values. Analyses were performed on the data collected from 727 participants. IBMSPSS-21 Software Program was used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics, Pearson Correlation Coefficient, t-test and hierarchical regression analysis methods were employed.

FINDINGS

The first question to be answered in the research is the level of attitudes towards dating violence among university students. Considering the fact that the minimum score obtained from violence subscale is 4, and the maximum score is 19, the mean score (5.73) indicates that the participants hold low level of attitudes about violence. The minimum score obtained from the abuse subscale is 7, and the maximum score is 32. Thus, the mean score (14.11) indicates that the participants hold moderate level of attitudes about abuse in dating violence. Finally, the lowest score is 9, and the highest score is 28 for the control dimension. The mean score (16.61) indicates that the participants hold low level of attitudes about control in dating violence.

Table1. Descriptive statistics of the intimate partner violence attitude scale (N= 727)

	M	Sd	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min.	Mak.	%		
							25	50	75
Violence	5.73	2.57	2.07	4.90	4	19	4	5	7
Abuse	14.11	3.99	.52	.34	7	32	11	14	17
Control	16.61	3.50	.27	-.15	9	28	14	17	19

Gender and Dating Violence Attitudes

In order to investigate gender differences regarding dating violence attitudes, t-test for independent groups was used. It was found that there was a significant difference between male and female students with regard to total scores [$t(725) = 5.98, p < .01$], abuse [$t(725) = 5.30, p < .01$] and control [$t(725) = 4.84, p < .01$] dimension. However, no significant difference was found in terms of the mean violence dimension. Mean scores of male students with regard to total dating violence attitudes scores ($\bar{X} = 38.48$), abuse dimension ($\bar{X} = 15.18$) and control dimension ($\bar{X} = 17.47$) are significantly higher than mean scores of female students obtained from total dating violence attitudes scores, abuse dimension ($\bar{X} = 13.56$) and control dimension ($\bar{X} = 16.16$).

Grade Level and Dating Violence Attitudes

One-way ANOVA method was employed to test differences among the participants of different grades regarding attitudes toward dating violence. One-way ANOVA analysis yielded no significant differences among the participants from different grades with regard to total scores obtained from the whole scale [$F(3, 726) = .54, p > .05$], violence dimension [$F(3, 726) = 2.20; p > .05$], abuse dimension [$F(3, 726) = .69; p > .05$] and control [$F(3, 726) = .04; p > .05$] dimension.

Exposure to Maternal Violence and Dating Violence Attitudes

According to the results of the t-test for independent samples, there was no significant differences between the participants who were exposed to maternal violence during childhood and those with no such exposure with regard to scores obtained from violence dimension [$t(723) = -2.24, p > .012$], abuse dimension [$t(723) = -2.05, p > .012$] and control dimension [$t(723) = -2.36, p > .012$]. However, there was significant difference between these two groups regarding total dating violence attitude scores [$t(723) = -3.27, p < .012$] in favor of the participants who experienced violence coming from mother during childhood.

Exposure to Paternal Violence and Dating Violence Attitudes

Another t-test analysis was performed to test differences between the participants who were exposed to paternal violence during childhood and those with no such exposure. The results showed that there was no significant

difference between these two groups in terms of total scores obtained from the whole scale [$t(724) = -1.90, p > .05$], and three sub-dimensions namely violence [$t(724) = -.72, p > .05$], abuse [$t(724) = -1.77, p > .05$] and control [$t(724) = -1.26, p > .05$].

Witnessing Violence Between the Parents and Dating Violence Attitudes

Likewise to being exposed to maternal violence during childhood, there was no significant difference between the participants who witnessed violence between the parents during childhood and those who did not regarding the scores obtained from abuse dimension [$t(724) = -1.30, p > .05$] and control dimension [$t(724) = -.94, p > .05$]. scores. However, there was significant difference between these two groups regarding total dating violence attitude scores [$t(724) = -2.52, p < .05$] and violence dimension [$t(724) = -3.54, p < .05$] scores.

Thoughts about Current Relationship and Dating Violence Attitudes

In order to examine the differences among the participants who has different thoughts about their current romantic relationship (how serious they are about their current relationship), one-way analysis of variance was employed. According to the results of the ANOVA analysis, there was a significant difference regarding control dimension [$F(3, 596) = 7.70; p < .05$], however, no significant differences were found regarding the total scores obtained from the whole scale [$F(3-596) = 1.39; p > .05$], violence dimension [$F(3-596) = 2.43; p > .05$] and abuse [$F(3, 596) = 2.45; p > .05$] dimension.

Correlations Among the Study Variables

Correlation coefficients among the variables of the study were computed by the Pearson Correlation Coefficient (Table 2). The highest correlation was between the scores obtained from the abuse dimension of the attitudes toward dating violence scale and the total scores obtained from the Gender Roles Attitudes Scale ($r = .33, p < .01$) and the “male gender role” sub-dimension ($r = .33, p < .01$), while the lowest correlation was found with the scores of avoidant attachment dimension ($r = .13, p < .01$). In addition, control dimension of the attitudes toward dating violence scale had the highest correlation with “female gender roles” subdimension ($r = .43, p < .01$) and the lowest correlation with the need for social approval ($r = .18, p < .01$).

Results of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Before proceeding to hierarchical regression analysis, the assumptions of the regression analysis were tested. First of all, the relationships between independent variables and dependent variable were evaluated in terms of collinearity problem. It can be seen that the correlation values between variables ranged between .01 and .50, so there was no collinearity problem. Correlation values between variables are expected to be below $r = .80$ (Field, 2009). Multivariate normality values were also evaluated with the Mahalanobis distance coefficient and the values were found to be within the limits of normal distribution.

Table2. Correlations among study variables (N=727)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.Duration (month)	-															
2.Dating out frequency	-.10*	-														
3.Violence	-.05	.00	-													
4.Abuse	.03	-.01	.34**	-												
5.Control	.07	-.09*	.11**	.27**	-											
6.Total Score	.02	-.05	.58**	.77**	.66**	-										
7.Anxious attachment	-.15**	-.07	.10**	.27**	.21**	.30**	-									
8.Avoidant attachment	-.18**	-.11**	.20**	.13**	.06	.17**	.34**	-								
9.Self-esteem	-.01	.14**	-.15**	-.23**	-.06	-.21**	-.40**	-.28**	-							
10.Need for social approval	-.02	-.09*	.06	.17**	.18**	.20**	.41**	.24**	-.40**	-						
11.Egalitarian gender role	-.08	-.06	.36**	.26**	.23**	.40**	.12**	.21**	-.17**	.05	-					
12.Female gender role	-.03	-.06	.17**	.22**	.43**	.40**	.13**	.21**	-.10**	.14**	.58**	-				
13.Gender role in marriage	-.08	-.04	.34**	.29**	.27**	.43**	.16**	.17**	-.15**	.07*	.75**	.65**	-			
14.Traditional gender role	-.06	-.01	.22**	.31**	.42**	.46**	.17**	.15**	-.07*	.11**	.55**	.75**	.62**	-		
15.Male gender role	-.07	-.08	.30**	.33**	.29**	.44**	.16**	.18**	-.15**	.15**	.56**	.62**	.65**	.67**	-	
16.Total scores of Gender Roles	-.07	-.06	.32**	.33**	.40**	.50**	.17**	.21**	-.14**	.13**	.80**	.87**	.85**	.87**	.81**	-
Mean	16.62	4.29	5.72	14.10	16.60	36.23	64.76	55.97	31.35	22.12	13.28	17.20	11.56	16.02	68.33	-
SD	20.34	1.82	2.56	3.99	3.49	7.40	16.02	15.84	5.52	6.78	5.06	6.52	6.64	6.39	22.65	-

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

Table3.Hierarchical regression analysis results for violence dimenison

Model		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i> <i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part</i> <i>r</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>R</i> ² Δ	<i>SE</i> <i>R</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Constant	5.81	.16		35.42	.00		.01	.01	2.57	.35	.56
	Gender	-.12	.20	-.02	-.59	.56	-.02					
2	Constant	3.70	.46		7.96	.00		.04	.04	2.52	11.10	.00
	Gender	-.17	.20	-.03	-.85	.40	-.03					
	Anxious attach.	.01	.01	.04	.95	.34	.04					
	Avoidant attch.	.03	.01	.19	4.98	.00	.18					
3	Constant	1.34	.50		2.68	.01		.20	.16	2.31	22.79	.00
	Gender	.72	.21	.13	3.42	.00	.13					
	Anxious attach.	.00	.01	.00	.05	.96	.00					
	Avoidant attch.	.02	.01	.12	3.23	.00	.12					
	Egalitarian gender role	.12	.03	.24	4.57	.00	.17					
	Female gender role	-.09	.02	-.23	-4.10	.00	-.15					
	Gender role in marriage	.12	.03	.21	3.56	.00	.13					
	Traditional gender role	.04	.02	.09	1.49	.14	.06					
Male gender role	.08	.03	.13	2.54	.01	.09						
4	Constant	2.30	.91		2.53	.01		.20	.01	2.31	2.46	.00
	Gender	.71	.21	.13	3.38	.00	.13					
	Anxious attach.	.00	.01	-.02	-.39	.70	-.01					
	Avoidant attch.	.02	.01	.11	3.01	.00	.11					
	Egalitarian gender role	.12	.03	.23	4.46	.00	.16					
	Female gender role	-.09	.02	-.23	-4.10	.00	-.15					
	Gender role in marriage	.12	.03	.21	3.54	.00	.13					
	Traditional gender role	.04	.02	.09	1.59	.11	.06					
	Male gender role	.08	.03	.12	2.45	.02	.09					
	Self-esteem	-.02	.02	-.05	-1.27	.21	-.05					

Predictors of Attitudes Towards Dating Violence

Constant	2.41	.97		2.49	.01		.20	.01	2.31	18.40	.00
Gender	.71	.21	.13	3.39	.00	.13					
Anxious attach.	.00	.01	-.01	-.28	.78	-.01					
Avoidant attch.	.02	.01	.11	3.02	.00	.11					
Egalitarian gender role	.12	.03	.23	4.42	.00	.16					
5 Female gender role	-.09	.02	-.23	-4.05	.00	-.15					
Gender role in marriage	.12	.03	.21	3.52	.00	.13					
Traditional gender role	.04	.02	.09	1.59	.11	.06					
Male gender role	.08	.03	.13	2.46	.01	.09					
Self-esteem	-.02	.02	-.05	-1.31	.19	-.05					
Need for social approval	-.01	.02	-.01	-.33	.74	-.01					

Female:0, Male: 1 coded as Dummy variable.

In the first block of hierarchical regression analysis, the gender variable was entered as the predictive variable for violence dimension. Gender is defined as “Dummy” variable and female gender is coded as reference variable. It was found that the model explained approximately 1% of the observed variance ($F = .35, p > .01$) and gender did not have a significant contribution to the model ($\beta = -.02, p > .05$). As avoidant and anxious attachment dimensions were added to the model in the second block, the model explained 4% of the observed variance ($F = 11.10, p < .01$). The effect of avoidant attachment on the model ($\beta = .19, p < .05$) was significant, however, the effect of anxious attachment to the model ($\beta = -.04, p > .05$) was not significant. It is shown on the table that the addition of attachment dimensions to the model significantly contributes to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .04, F_{\text{change}} = 16.47, p < .01$). As gender roles attitudes are added to the model in the third block, the model explained 20% of the observed variance ($F = 22.79, p < .01$). Among the attitudes towards gender roles, the egalitarian gender role ($\beta = .24, p < .05$), female gender role ($\beta = -.23, p < .05$), gender roles in marriage ($\beta = .21, p < .05$) and male gender role ($\beta = .13, p < .05$) made significant contribution to the model, but traditional

gender role ($\beta = .09, p > .05$). The contribution of attitudes towards gender roles to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .16, F_{\text{change}} = 28.54, p < .05$) is significant. As self-esteem is added to the model in the fourth block, the model explained 20% of the observed variance ($F = 20.46, p < .01$). The effect of self-esteem on the model ($\beta = -.05, p > .05$) and its contribution to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .01, F_{\text{change}} = 1.61, p > .01$) is not significant. In the fifth and last block, we added the need for social approval variable to the model, and the model explained 20% of the observed variance ($F = 18.40, p < .01$). It is seen that the effect of the need social approval on the model ($\beta = -.01, p > .05$) and its contribution to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .01, F_{\text{change}} = .11, p > .01$) is not significant.

Table 3. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results for Abuse Dimension

Model		B	SE B	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Part r</i>	R ²	R ² Δ	SE R	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Constant	15.19	.25		60.74	.00		.04	.04	3.92	28.09	.00
	Gender	-1.63	.31	-.19	-5.30	.00	-.19					
2	Constant	10.32	.70		14.83	.00		.11	.07	3.77	30.06	.00
	Gender	-1.53	.30	-.18	-5.15	.00	-.19					
	Anxious attach.	.06	.01	.25	6.57	.00	.24					
	Avoidant attach.	.02	.01	.06	1.56	.12	.06					
3	Constant	7.67	.78		9.78	.00		.19	.08	3.62	20.49	.00
	Gender	-.53	.33	-.06	-1.60	.11	-.06					
	Anxious attach.	.05	.01	.21	5.87	.00	.21					
	Avoidant attach.	.00	.01	.01	.27	.79	.01					
	Egalitarian gender role	.05	.04	.06	1.18	.24	.04					
	Female gender role	-.08	.03	-.14	-2.45	.02	-.09					
	Gender role in marriage	.06	.05	.07	1.08	.28	.04					
	Traditional gender role	.10	.04	.16	2.72	.01	.10					
Male gender role	.17	.05	.18	3.42	.00	.13						
4	Constant	11.63	1.42		8.21	.00		.20	.01	3.59	19.71	.00
	Gender	-.56	.33	-.07	-1.70	.09	-.06					
	Anxious attach.	.04	.01	.17	4.42	.00	.16					

Predictors of Attitudes Towards Dating Violence

Avoidant attach.	.00	.01	-.01	-.22	.83	-.01				
Egalitarian gender role	.04	.04	.05	.93	.36	.04				
Female gender role	-.08	.03	-.14	-2.45	.02	-.09				
Gender role in marriage	.05	.05	.06	1.04	.30	.04				
Traditional gender role	.11	.04	.18	3.01	.00	.11				
Male gender role	.16	.05	.16	3.20	.00	.12				
Self-esteem	-.09	.03	-.13	-3.34	.00	-.12				
Constant	11.18	1.51		7.40	.00		.20	.01	3.61	17.80 .00
Gender	-.57	.33	-.07	-1.73	.09	-.06				
Anxious attach.	.04	.01	.16	4.02	.00	.15				
Avoidant attach.	.00	.01	-.01	-.27	.79	-.01				
Egalitarian gender role	.04	.04	.05	.99	.32	.04				
Female gender role	-.09	.03	-.14	-2.52	.01	-.09				
Gender role in marriage	.06	.05	.07	1.08	.28	.04				
Traditional gender role	.11	.04	.18	3.02	.00	.11				
Male gender role	.16	.05	.16	3.13	.00	.12				
Self-esteem	-.08	.03	-.12	-2.97	.00	-.11				
5 Need for social approval	.02	.02	.03	.85	.40	.03				

Female: 0, Male: 1 coded as Dummy variable.

The results of the hierarchical regression analysis regarding the predictors of the abuse dimension of the Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale are presented in Table 3. Gender was added to the model in the first block and it explained approximately 4% of the variance ($F = 28.09, p < .01$). It made a significant contribution to the model ($\beta = -.19, p < .05$). As attachment dimensions were added to the model in the second block of the analysis, the model explained 11% of the observed variance ($F = 30.06, p < .01$). The effect of anxious attachment on the model ($\beta = .25, p < .05$) was significant, but not

the avoidant ($\beta = .06, p > .05$). Addition of attachment dimensions to the model significantly contributed to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .07, F_{change} = 29.93, p < .01$).

As the attitudes toward gender roles are added to the model in the third block, the model explained 20% of the observed variance ($F = 22.79, p < .01$). Attitudes about female gender role ($\beta = -.14, p < .05$), traditional gender role ($\beta = .16, p < .05$) and male gender role ($\beta = .18, p < .05$) had main effect on the model, but not the egalitarian gender role ($\beta = .08, p > .05$) gender roles in marriage ($\beta = .07, p > .05$). The contribution of attitudes towards gender roles to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .08, F_{change} = 13.23, p < .05$) is significant.

In the fourth block, when self-esteem is added to the model, the model explained 20% of the observed variance ($F = 20.46, p < .01$). The main effect of self-esteem total score on the model ($\beta = -.13, p < .05$) and its contribution to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .01, F_{change} = 11.18, p < .01$) is significant. In the fifth and last block, when the social approval requirement total score is added to the model, the model explained 20% of the observed variance ($F = 18.40, p < .01$). The effect of the need for social approval on the model ($\beta = -.03, p > .05$) and its contribution to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .01, F_{change} = .72, p > .01$) is not significant.

The regression analysis results for the predictors of the control dimension of the Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results for Control Dimenison

Model		B	SE B	β	t	p	Part r	R ²	R ² Δ	SE R	F	p
1	Constant	17.47	.22		79.56	.00		.03	.03	3.44	23.44	.00
	Gender	1.31	.27	-.18	-4.84	.00	-.18					
2	Constant	14.45	.62		23.24	.00		.08	.04	3.37	19.54	.00
	Gender	-1.21	.27	-.16	-4.56	.00	-.17					
	Anxious attach.	.05	.01	.21	5.49	.00	.20					
	Avoidant attch.	.00	.01	.00	-.01	.99	.00					
3	Constant	10.80	.66		16.33	.00		.24	.17	3.06	28.95	.00
	Gender	.23	.28	.03	.83	.41	.03					
	Anxious attach.	.04	.01	.18	5.23	.00	.19					

Predictors of Attitudes Towards Dating Violence

Avoidant attach.	-.02	.01	-.09	-2.43	.02	-.09					
Egalitarian gender role	-.03	.04	-.04	-.84	.40	-.03					
Female gender role	.18	.03	.33	6.16	.00	.22					
Gender role in marriage	-.02	.04	-.03	-.45	.66	-.02					
Traditional gender role	.13	.03	.24	4.19	.00	.15					
Male gender role	-.04	.04	-.04	-.84	.40	-.03					
Constant	9.95	1.20		8.26	.00		.25	.01	3.06	25.80	.00
Gender	.24	.28	.03	.86	.39	.03					
Anxious attach.	.04	.01	.19	5.21	.00	.19					
Avoidant attach.	-.02	.01	-.08	-2.28	.02	-.09					
Egalitarian gender role	-.03	.04	-.04	-.77	.44	-.03					
Female gender role	.18	.03	.33	6.15	.00	.22					
Gender role in marriage	-.02	.04	-.03	-.43	.67	-.02					
Traditional gender role	.13	.03	.23	4.10	.00	.15					
Male gender role	-.03	.04	-.04	-.77	.44	-.03					
4 Self-esteem	.02	.02	.03	.86	.39	.03					
5 Constant	8.79	1.28		6.87	.00		.25	.01	3.05	24.08	.00
Gender	.22	.28	.03	.78	.43	.03					
Anxious attach.	.04	.01	.17	4.33	.00	.16					
Avoidant attach.	-.02	.01	-.09	-2.43	.02	-.09					
Egalitarian gender role	-.02	.04	-.03	-.58	.56	-.02					
Female gender role	.17	.03	.32	5.89	.00	.22					
Gender role in marriage	-.01	.04	-.02	-.31	.76	-.01					
Traditional gender role	.13	.03	.23	4.14	.00	.15					
Male gender role	-.04	.04	-.05	-.95	.34	-.04					
Self-esteem	.04	.02	.06	1.55	.12	.06					
Need for social approval	.05	.02	.10	2.58	.01	.10					

Female: 0, Male: 1 coded as Dummy variable.

As gender was added to the first block in the regression model generated to find out the predictive power of independent variables in control dimension of the attitudes toward dating violence, it explained 3% of the variance ($F = 23.44$, $p < .01$) in the first block, and made a significant contribution to the model ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .05$). In the second block of the analysis, when avoidant and anxious attachment dimensions were added into the model, the model explained 8% of the total variance ($F = 19.54$, $p < .01$). The effect of anxious attachment to the model ($\beta = .21$, $p < .05$) was significant, but the avoidant attachment ($\beta = .01$, $p > .05$). Addition of attachment dimensions to the model significantly contributed to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .04$, $F_{\text{change}} = 17.07$, $p < .01$).

When attitudes towards gender roles are added to the model in the third block, the model explained 24% of the observed variance ($F = 28.95$, $p < .01$). Among the attitudes towards gender roles, the female gender role ($\beta = .33$, $p < .05$) and the traditional gender role ($\beta = .24$, $p < .05$) made significant contribution to the model, but male gender role ($\beta = -.04$, $p > .05$), egalitarian gender role ($\beta = -.04$, $p > .05$) and gender roles in marriage ($\beta = -.03$, $p > .05$) The contribution of attitudes towards gender roles to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .17$, $F_{\text{change}} = 32.08$, $p < .05$) is significant.

In the fourth block, when self-esteem is added to the model, the model explained 25% of the observed variance ($F = 25.80$, $p < .01$). The effect of self-esteem on the model ($\beta = .03$, $p > .05$) and its contribution to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .01$, $F_{\text{change}} = .73$, $p > .01$) is not significant. In the fifth and last block, the need for social approval was added to the model, and the model explained 25% of the observed variance ($F = 24.08$, $p < .01$). The effect of the need for social approval on the model ($\beta = .10$, $p < .05$) and its contribution to the change in the model ($R\Delta = .01$, $F_{\text{change}} = 6.68$, $p < .01$) are significant.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between the attitudes towards dating violence and attachment, self-esteem, attitudes towards gender roles, and need for social approval among university students. When the findings on attitude levels towards dating violence among university students are examined, it was found that violence and abuse dimensions of

dating violence were at moderate level, while control dimension was found to be at low level. One of the remarkable findings of the study is that male participants have higher scores on the attitudes of toward dating violence than female participants do. It was also found that self-esteem as an individual factor, attachment as an interpersonal factor and gender roles as social factors were found to be the significant predictors of the attitudes toward dating violence. Self-esteem has a predictive power in violence and control dimensions of dating violence. In the study, there is a significant relationship among gender role attitudes and all sub-dimensions of dating violence. Further, the attitudes of gender roles have predictive power in abuse, violence and control dimensions of dating violence. Moreover, anxious attachment significantly predicted control and abuse dimensions of dating violence, and avoidant attachment significantly predicted violence dimension of dating violence. Finally, it was found that the need for social approval predicted the control dimension of dating violence.

There are multiple sources of attitudes toward dating violence reported in the literature. In addition to individual and sociocultural risk factors, contextual factors also exist in the emergence of dating violence. Having young parents, the influence of friends or neighbors (Ackard, Neumark-Sztainer & Hannan, 2003) together with low socio-economic status and parents with limited educational background were found to be risk factors (Foshee et al., 2009). Further, gender role attitudes as a social factor also contribute to the attitudes toward dating violence and violence in general individuals. We encounter and internalize the gender roles determined by the society at very early ages in life (Güvenç & Aktaş, 2006).

According to the findings obtained from the research, it was found that the average scores of the participants in terms of violence, abuse dimensions and total scores on the attitudes toward dating scale varied between 50% and 75%. These results are consistent with the research conducted by Umana, Fawole and Adeove (2014), who stated that 42.3% of university students have experienced dating violence throughout their lives. Flake et al. (2013) also reported that dating violence is widely experienced among university students.

Considerable number of studies in dating violence literature evidenced that dating violence mostly directed to women by men, and thus, women are mostly the victim of dating violence. In a study, it was found that 18.7% of men experienced one of type of dating violence while 27.8% of women is exposed to one type of dating violence (Jonasvd, 2013). Similarly, most of the research findings state that women are more exposed to violence and injuries due to violence (Swart et al., 2002; Tucker-Halpern et al., 2001) and men appear to be more aggressive and accept violent behaviors than women (Downey et al., 2000; Özgür et al., 2011). However, we found that female and male participants did not differ regarding violence dimension which is consistent with the findings of a study (Woodward et al., 2002) in which both men and women had been subjected to violence. However, women and men differ in experiencing the type of violence in intimate relationships. While women mostly experience sexual violence and are affected by their consequences, men are more likely to experience psychological violence (Anasuri, 2016). Jonas et al. (2014) showed that women experience higher rates of violence and different types of violence than men, and thus, they are at greater risk of experiencing violence.

One of the salient findings of the current study is that attachment dimensions are significant predictors of the attitudes toward dating violence. While avoidant attachment was significant predictor of violence dimension, anxious attachment was the predictor of both abuse and control dimensions of the attitudes toward dating violence. This finding is consistent with the findings in numerous studies (Bond & Bond, 2004; Kesner & McKenry, 1998; Roberts & Noller, 1998) that attachment style is a predictor of dating violence. These studies revealed that anxious attachment dimension was related to violence in male, while anxious attachment dimension was related dating violence in close relationships. In the study by Pearson (2006), it was found that anxious and avoidant attachment reported by both spouses simultaneously were predictors of male verbal and physical dating violence. In the study conducted by Kuijpers et al. (2012), it was also found that anxious attachment significantly predicted both physical and psychological violence. Anxious individuals are more likely to be jealous and psychologically ill-treated (Buunk, 1997; Rodriguez et al., 2015) and constantly worry that their spouses will abandon them (Guerrero, 1998). Individuals with high levels of anxious attachment show behaviors of closely monitoring, and spying behaviors of their spouses

(behavioral jealousy) (Guerrero, 1998; Guerrero & Afifi, 1998). In support of the current research finding, it was also found that women with a high level of anxious attachment and low avoidant attachment are likely to display violence toward their partners (Orcutt et al., 2005). Additionally, it was found that anxious attachment in women predicted both male and female violence in close relationships (Doumas et al., 2008). As Collins and Read (1990) stated, anxiety is about fear of rejection or dislike in adult romantic relationships.

Another important finding of this study is that gender role attitudes predicted significantly violence dimension of the attitudes toward dating violence. Próspero (2008) found supporting evidence for this finding that the masculine attitude is the predictor of all types of dating violence. Similarly, the traditional gender role has been found to be the predictor of physical and psychological violence toward women (Herrero et al., 2017). Supporting current research findings, Locke and Mahalik (2005) found that gender roles are strong predictors of sexual aggression against women. However, in the current research, unlike studies in the literature, the role of the egalitarian gender has also emerged as a predictor violence. We hypothesize that this finding may be explained with manipulation of the items about egalitarian attitudes in which participants might have given the impression that as if they have egalitarian gender role attitudes despite the fact that they do not. It was also found in the present study that female gender role attitudes, male gender role attitudes and traditional gender role attitudes predicted abuse dimension in dating violence significantly. Further, female gender role attitudes and traditional gender role attitudes have predictive role in control dimension of dating violence. Theories about gender role conflict suggest that socially structured gender roles can physically and emotionally harm individuals and their relatives (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Mahalik et al., 1998). A study in line with the current research findings showed that male gender role attitudes is related to abusive behaviors of young men in their romantic relationships (Conroy, 2013; Santana et al., 2006). These findings highlight a need to create a climate free of sexist attitudes for children at home and at school to lessen violence in intimate relationships.

Another finding of the study is that self-esteem significantly predicted abuse dimension of dating violence indicating that high self-esteem is negatively related to attitudes toward dating violence. This finding suggests that

participants with high self-esteem holds negative attitude about dating violence. The findings of the research carried out by Tagay et al. (2018) support these findings. According to a study by Papadakaki et al. (2009), low self-esteem may cause women to have doubts about themselves and thus, maintain their relationships with the abuser. Although there are research findings stating that low self-esteem predicts violent behaviors in intimate relationships, causative studies have contradictory findings indicating that high self-esteem was not related to reduced levels of dating violence in young people (Vezina & Hebert, 2007). It seems that new studies are needed to clear the relationship between self-esteem and dating violence.

We also found that the need for social approval was a significant predictor of the abuse dimension of dating violence attitudes stating that high need for social approval is related to high control attitudes in dating violence even though the relationship is weak. There is limited number of studies examining the relationship between dating violence attitudes and need for social approval. In a meta-analytic study about intimate violence and need for social desirability by Sugarman and Hotaling (1997), it was found concluded that there is a weak to moderate negative relationship between these two constructs regarding reviewed studies. They also reported that gender has little moderating effect on the violence reporting and social desirability relationship. Visschers et al. (2017) also reported that there was a negative relationship between reported intimate partner violence and impression management a part of social desirability. Similarly, Dutton and Hemphill (1992) found negative relationships between impression management and reports of both verbal and physical intimate partner violence perpetration, and reports of verbal, but not physical, intimate partner violence victimization. Our finding is contrary to these findings. We may explain our finding with some other related constructs. It was reported earlier (Huta & Hawley, 2010) that high need for social approval was negatively associated with low level of life-satisfaction, positive-affect and self-esteem and positively correlated with negative affect and depression. We also found a negative relationship between self-esteem and need for social approval. Thus, we may conclude that individuals with low self-esteem and high social approval need may be more dependent in both intimate relationships and social relationship. So, they may be more manipulating in their relationships. Thus,

they have high a need for control in the intimate relationship, thus, attempting to eliminate the risk of being abandoned by the partner.

As with any research, this research has some limitations, too. One of these limitations is that the research findings are limited to university students since the research is a cross-sectional study. In addition, the research was carried out with individuals considered to have a heterosexual relationship. Therefore, caution should be exercised in generalizing the findings to other age groups and homosexual relationships. Because multiple constructs (individual, parental, and social) were involved in the study to explain the attitudes toward dating violence, a large number of items had to be included in the data set. The loss of data in the study is related to using several measures causing tiredness or boredom during answering them. Finally, it should be also mentined that the kurtosis value of the total scores on the attitude toward dating violence scale is above the accepted limits.

This research is a cross-sectional study. There is no longitudinal study upto date on the subject in Turkey, and there is a limited longitudinal studies in the literature. Thus, such a longitudinal study will make important contribution to dating violence and intimate partner violence. In addition, there is a need to investigate dating violence among homosexual and transsexual couples in Turkey. Regarding multiculturalism, attitudes toward dating violence and intimate partner violence may be intestigated in different groups of different cultures, ages. In addition, considering the fact that dating violence is increasing among adolsecents, there is a need for research on attitudes towards dating violence among high school students. Most of the studies in the literature are quanttitative. Thus, there is a need for quantitative and mixed desing studies.

Although romantic relationships are generally a source of joy and comfort, the harmful attitudes in the relationship can be a great source of pain (Gordon et al., 2019). For this reason, it is thought that the psychological counseling and guidance centers in universities can have an important role in alleviating dating violence among college students by giving seminars to arouse awareness about the topic or providing trainings about how to begin and maintain a healthy intimate relationship or to cope with dating violence. They may also offer

intervention programs for the perpetrators of violence in close relationships or the victims of dating violence. Including subjects such as dating violence and gender equality in the curriculum of all educational levels, especially universities, will help and support individuals in developing their repertoire of living healthy romantic relationships.

About Authors / Yazarlar Hakkında

Rana Turan. She graduated from Counseling and Guidance program at Hacettepe University, Turkey. She earned her master's degree in Counseling and Guidance program at Anadolu University, Turkey. She has been currently a doctoral student in Counseling and Guidance program at Hacettepe University. Miss Turan currently serves as a school counselor in a state school in Eskişehir. Her research interests include violence in intimate relationships, attachment, cognitive-behavioral therapy and gender roles.

Rana Turan lisans derecesini Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik programında almıştır. Yüksek Lisans derecesini ise Anadolu Üniversitesi, Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik programında tamamlamıştır. Turan, Eskişehir'de bir devlet okulunda psikolojik danışman olarak görev yapmakta ve doktora çalışmalarına Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik programında devam etmektedir. Turan'ın ilgi duyduğu çalışma konuları arasında yakın ilişkilerde şiddet, bağlanma, bilişsel davranışçı terapi ve toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri konuları bulunmaktadır.

Baki Duy. He holds a bachelor degree in Counseling and Guidance from Hacettepe University, Turkey. He has a master's degree in School Counseling from St. John's University, New York. Mr. Duy earned his doctorate degree in Counseling and Guidance from Ankara University. He currently serves as a full-time scholar at the department of Counseling and Guidance in Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey. His research interests include loneliness, cognitive-behavioral therapy, bullying, interpersonal relationships and emotion regulation.

Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik programında lisans eğitimini tamamlayan Baki Duy, New York'ta bulunan St. John's Üniversitesinde, Okul Psikolojik Danışmanlığı alanında yüksek lisans derecesini almıştır. Doktora eğitimini ise Ankara Üniversitesinde, Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik programında tamamlamıştır. Baki Duy halen Anadolu Üniversitesi, Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Anabilim Dalında tam zamanlı öğretim üyesi olarak görev yapmaktadır. Duy'un ilgili duyduğu çalışma konuları arasında yalnızlık, bilişsel-davranışçı terapi, zorbalık, kişilerarası ilişkiler ve duygu düzenleme bulunmaktadır.

Author Contributions / Yazar Katkıları

The first author of the study, RT, was responsible in gathering the data, analyzing the data, and writing the Turkish draft of the manuscript. Second author of the study, BD, had mentored the first author about every details of the study and the manuscript, advised about analyses, written the English

version of the manuscript, and made corrections and additions on the manuscript.

Makalenin ilk yazarı olan RT, araştırma verilerinin toplanmasından, verilerin analizinden ve makalenin Türkçe metninin yazılmasından sorumlu olmuştur. Makalenin ikinci yazarı olan BD, araştırmanın gerçekleştirilmesi ve makalenin yazılmasında dair her ayrıntıda ilk yazara danışmanlık yapmış, makale üzerinde düzeltmeler ve eklemeler yapmış ve makalenin İngilizce metnini yazmıştır.

Conflict of Interest/ Çıkar Çatışması

The authors of the study declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Araştırmacılar başka kişilerle herhangi bir çıkar çatışmasının olmadığını bildirirler.

Funding / Fonlama

No funding support was received for the study.

Araştırma için herhangi bir maddi destek alınmamıştır.

ORCID

Rana Turan  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4984-192X>

Baki Duy  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6082-8518>

REFERENCES

- Aslan, D., Vefikuluçay, D., Zeyneloğlu, S., Erdost, T., & Temel, F. (2008). *Ankara'da iki Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu'nun birinci ve dördüncü sınıflarında okuyan öğrencilerin flört şiddetine maruz kalma, flört ilişkilerinde şiddet uygulama durumlarının ve bu konudaki görüşlerinin saptanması araştırması*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Kadın Sorunları Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi.
- Ackard, D.M., Neumark-Sztainer, D., & Hannan, P. (2003). Dating violence among a nationally representative sample of adolescent girls and boys: Associations with behavioral and mental health. *The Journal of Gender-specific Medicine: JGSM: The Official Journal of the Partnership for Women's Health at Columbia*, 6(3), 39-48.
- Atakay, C. (2014). Romantik yakın ilişkilerde şiddetin öncülleri. *Nesne Psikoloji Dergisi*, 2(3), 1-9.
- Bartholomew, K., & Allison, C. J. (2006). An Attachment Perspective on Abusive Dynamics in Intimate Relationships. In M. Mikulincer & G. S. Goodman (Eds.), *Dynamics of romantic love: Attachment, caregiving, and sex*(pp. 102-127). New York: Guilford Press.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529.
- Betz, C. (2007). Teen dating violence: an unrecognized health care need. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing: Nursing Care of Children & Families*, 22(6), 427-429.
- Blazina, C., & Watkins Jr, C. E. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes towards help-seeking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43(4), 461-465
- Bond, S. B., & Bond, M. (2004). Attachment styles and violence within couples. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 192(12), 857-863.
- Burnett, J. W., Anderson, W. P., & Heppner, P. P. (1995). Gender roles and self esteem: A consideration of environmental factors. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 73(3), 323-326.
- Buunk, B. P. (1997). Personality, birth order and attachment styles as related to various types of jealousy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 23, 997-1006. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(97)00136-0
- Campbell, J. C. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *The Lancet*, 359(13), 1331-1336.
- Capezza, N. M., Schumacher, E. C., & Brady, B. C. (2015). Trends in intimate partner violence services provided by substance abuse treatment facilities: Findings from a national sample. *Journal of Family Violence*, 30(1), 85-91.
- Coker, A. L., Davis, K. E., Arias, I., Desai, S., Sanderson, M., Brandt, H.M., & Smith, P. H. (2002). Physical and mental health effects of intimate partner violence for men and women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 23(4), 260-268.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(4), 644-663.
- Conroy, N. E. (2013). Rethinking adolescent peer sexual harassment: Contributions of feminist theory. *Journal of School Violence*, 12(4), 340-356.

- Çelikkaleli, Ö. & Avcı, R. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin cinsiyet ve toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine göre bağlanma biçimlerinin incelenmesi. *Journal of Computer and Education Research*, 4(7), 103-125.
- Çuhadaroğlu, F. (1986). *Adolesanlarda benlik saygısı*. (Yayınlanmamış Uzmanlık Tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- 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(5), 616-634.
- Dutton, M. A. (1993). Understanding women's responses to domestic violence: A redefinition of battered woman syndrome. *Hofstra Law Review*, 21(4), 2.
- Dutton, D. G. (1999). Traumatic origins of intimate rage. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 4(4), 431-447.
- Eaton A. A., & Rose S. (2011). Has dating become more egalitarian? A 35 year review using sex roles. *Sex Roles*, 64, 843–862.
- Fincham, F. D., Cui, M., Braithwaite, S. R., & Pasley, K. (2008). Attitudes towards intimate partner violence in dating relationships. *Psychological Assessment*, 20, 260-269.
- Flake, T. A., Barros, C., Schraiber, L. B., & Menezes, P. R. (2013). Intimate partner violence among undergraduate students of two universities of the state of São Paulo, Brazil. *Revista Brasileira de Epidemiologia*, 16, 801-816.
- Foo, L. & Margolin, G. (1995). A multivariate investigation of dating aggression. *Journal of Family Violence*, 10(4), 351-377.
- Foshee, V. A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse prevalence, types and injuries. *Health Education Research*, 11(3), 275-286.
- Foshee, V.A., Benefield, T., Suchindran, C., Ennett, S.T., Bauman, K.E., Karriker - Jaffe, K.J. & Mathias, J. (2009). The development of four types of adolescent dating abuse and selected demographic correlates. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 19(3), 380-400
- Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 350-365
- Furjman, W., & Schaffer, L. (2003). *The role of romantic relationships in adolescent development*. P. Florsheim (Ed.), *Adolescent romantic relations and sexual behavior: Theory, Research, and practical implications* içinde (pp. 3- 22). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Golding, J. M. (1999). Intimate partner violence as a risk factor for mental disorders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14(2), 99-132.
- Gordon, K. C., Amer, Z., Lenger, K. A., Brem, M. J., Baucom, D. H., & Snyder, D. K. (2019). Forgiveness and the Dark Side of Intimate Relationships: Infidelity, Intimate Partner Violence, and Divorce. In E. L. Worthington, Jr. & N. G. Wade (Ed.), *Handbook of Forgiveness* (pp. 153-163). NY: Routledge.
- Gover, A. R. (2004). Risky lifestyles and dating violence: A theoretical test of violent victimization. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(2), 171-180.
- Gracia, E., & Merlo, J. (2016). Intimate partner violence against women and the Nordic paradox. *Social Science & Medicine*, 157, 27-30.
- Guerrero, L. K. (1998). Attachment-style differences in the experience and expression of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships*, 5(3), 273-291

- Guerrero, L. K., & Afifi, W. A. (1998). Communicative responses to jealousy as a function of self-esteem and relationship maintenance goals: A test of Bryson's dual motivation model. *Communication Reports, 11*, 111-122.
- Güvenç, G. & Aktas, V. (2006). Ergenlik döneminde yas, toplumsal cinsiyet, bireysel ve ilişkisel tutumlar, benlik değeri ve yaşam becerilerine ilişkin algı arasındaki ilişkiler. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 21*(57), 45-64.
- Hathaway, J. E., Mucci, L. A., Silverman, J. G., Brooks, D. R., Mathews, R., & Pavlos, C. A. (2000). Health status and health care use of Massachusetts women reporting partner abuse. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 19*(4), 302-307.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry, 5*, 1-22.
- Heise, L. (2011). What Works to Prevent Partner Violence? an Evidence Overview. STRIVE, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London.
- Heise, L., & Kotsadam, A. (2015). Cross-national and multilevel correlates of partner violence: an analysis of data from population-based surveys. *The Lancet Global Health 3*(6), e332-e340.
- Herrero, J., & Rodríguez, F. J., & Torres, A. (2017). Acceptability of partner violence in 51 societies: The role of sexism and attitudes toward violence in social relationships. *Violence Against Women, 23*(3), 351-367.
- Hines, D. A., & Saudino, K. J. (2003). Gender differences in psychological, physical, and sexual aggression among college students using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales. *Violence and Victims, 18*(2), 197.
- Humphreys, J., Lee, K., Neylan, T., & Marmar, C. (1999). Trauma history of sheltered battered women. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 20*(4), 319-332.
- Huta, V. & Hawley, L. (2010). Psychological strengths and vulnerabilities: are they two ends of the same continuum or do they have independent relationships with well-being and ill-being? *Journal of Happiness Studies, 11*(1), 71-93.
- Jewkes, R., Flood, M., & Lang, J. (2015). From work with men and boys to changes of social norms and reduction of inequities in gender relations: a conceptual shift in prevention of violence against women and girls. *Lancet 385*, 1580-1589.
- Karancı, N., Dirik, G., & Yorulmaz, O. (2007). Eysenck kişilik anketi-gözden geçirilmiş kısaltılmış formu'nun (EKA-GGK) Türkiye'de geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi, 18*(3), 1-8.
- Karaşar, B. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının bağlanma stilleri ve sosyal kaygı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Amasya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 3*(1), 27-49.
- Karaşar, B., & Öğülmüş, S. (2016). Sosyal onay ihtiyacı ölçeği: geçerlik ve güvenilirlik analizi. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi, 17*(1), 84-104.
- Karatay, G. D. G. (2018). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Flört Şiddetine İlişkin Tutum ve Davranışları. *STED/Sürekli Tıp Eğitimi Dergisi, 27*(1), 62-71.
- Kepir-Savoly, D., Ulaş, Ö. & Demirtaş-Zorbaz, S. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin çiftler arası şiddeti kabul düzeylerini etkileyen etmenler. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 5*(42), 173-183.
- Kesner, J. E., & McKenry, P. C. (1998). The role of childhood attachment factors in predicting male violence toward female intimates. *Journal of Family Violence, 13*(4), 417-432.

- Kılınçer, A.S. & Dost, M.T. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinin romantik ilişkilerinde algıladıkları istismar. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 5(42), 160-172.
- Koçak, Y. Ç. & Can, H. Ö. (2019). Flört Şiddeti: Tanımı, Sınıflaması ve Değerlendirmesi. *Türkiye Klinikleri Obstetric-Women's Health and Diseases Nursing-Special Topics*, 5(3), 43-53.
- Kuijpers, K. F., Van der Knaap, L. M., & Winkel, F. W. (2012). Risk of revictimization of intimate partner violence: The role of attachment, anger and violent behavior of the victim. *Journal of Family Violence*, 27(1), 33-44.
- Locke, B. D., & Mahalik, J. R. (2005). Examining masculinity norms, problem drinking, and athletic involvement as predictors of sexual aggression in college men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(3), 279-283.
- Logan, T.K., Shannon, L., Cole, J. & Walker, R. (2006). The impact of differential patterns of physical violence and stalking on mental health and help-seeking among women with protective orders. *Violence Against Women*, 12(9), 866- 886
- Mahalik, J. R., Cournoyer, R. J., DeFranc, W., Cherry, M., & Napolitano, J. M. (1998). Men's gender role conflict and use of psychological defenses. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 45(3), 247-255.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. *Family Relations*, 30(1), 97-102.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1983). Life events stress and courtship violence. *Family Relations*, 32(1), 101-109.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1987). Social factor and victim-offender differences in courtship violence. *Family Relations*, 36(1), 87-91.
- Matud, M. P. (2007). Dating violence and domestic violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40(4), 295-297.
- Meetoo, V., & Mirza, H.S. (2007). There is nothing 'honourable' about honour killings: Gender, violence and the limits of multiculturalism. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 30(3), 187-200.
- Muñoz-Rivas, M. J., Graña, J. L., O'Leary, K. D., & González, M. P. (2007). Aggression in adolescent dating relationships: Prevalence, justification, and health consequences. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40(4), 298-304.
- O'Leary, K. D., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1994). Physical aggression in early marriage: Prerelationship and relationship effects. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62, 594-602.
- O'campo, P., Kub, J., Woods, A., Garza, M., Jones, A. S., Gielen, A. C., & Campbell, J. (2006). Depression, PTSD, and comorbidity related to intimate partner violence in civilian and military women. *Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention*, 6(2), 99-110.
- Orcutt, H. K., Garcia, M., & Pickett, S. M (2005). Female-perpetrated intimate partner violence and romantic attachment style in a college student sample. *Violence and Victims*, 20(3), 287-302.
- Ostrov, J. M., Crick, N. R., & Keating, C.F. (2005). Gender-biased perceptions of preschoolers' behavior: how much is aggression and prosocial behavior in the eye of the beholder? *Sex Roles*, 52(5-6), 393-398.

- Öner, N. (1994). *Türkiye’de kullanılan psikolojik testler: Bir başvuru kaynağı*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Papadakaki, M., Tzamalouka, G.S, Chatzifotiou, S., & Chilaoutakis, J. (2009). Seeking for risk factors of intimate partner violence in a Greek national sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(5), 732-750.
- Paulson, M. J., Coombs, R. H., & Landsverk, J. (1990). Youth who physically assault their parents. *Journal of Family Violence, 5*(2), 121-133.
- Pearson, C. L. (2006). Adult attachment as a risk factor for intimate partner violence. *McNair Scholars Research Journal, 2*(1), 41-46.
- Próspero, M. (2008). Effects of masculinity, sex, and control on different types of intimate partner violence perpetration. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*(7), 639-645.
- Reed, K. M., Hines, D. A., Armstrong, J. L., & Cameron, A. Y. (2015). Experimental evaluation of a bystander prevention program for sexual assault and dating violence. *Psychology of Violence, 5*(1), 95-102.
- Reyes, H. L. M., Foshee, V. A., Niolon, P. H., Reidy, D. E., & Hall, J. E. (2016). Gender role attitudes and male adolescent dating violence perpetration: Normative beliefs as moderators. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 45*(2), 350-360.
- Roberts, N., & Noller, P. (1998). The associations between adult attachment and couple violence: The role of communication patterns and relationship satisfaction. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 317-350). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Rodriguez, L. M., Dibello, A. M., Øverup, C. S., & Neighbors, C. (2015). The price of distrust: trust, anxious attachment, jealousy, and partner abuse. *Partner Abuse, 6*(3), 298-319.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sakarya, A. (2013). *Üniversitede öğrenim gören gençlerde flörtte şiddet*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Saltzman, L., Fanslow, J. L., McMahon, P. M., & Shelley, G. A. (2002). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: uniform definitions and recommended data elements*, version 1.0. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 1, 89-104.
- Santana, M. C., Raj, A., Decker, M. R., La Marche, A., & Silverman, J. G. (2006). Masculine gender roles associated with increased sexual risk and intimate partner violence perpetration among young adult men. *Journal of Urban Health, 83*(4), 575-585.
- Selçuk, E., Günaydın, G., Sümer, N., & Uysal, A. (2005). Yetişkin bağlanma boyutları için yeni bir ölçüm: Yakın ilişkilerde yaşantılar envanteri-II'nin Türk örnekleminde psikometrik açıdan değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları, 8*(16), 1-13.
- Selçuk, K. T., Avcı, D., & Mercan, Y. (2018). Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Flört Şiddetine Maruziyet: Flört Şiddetine Yönelik Tutumların ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Algısının Şiddete Maruziyet ile İlişkisi. *ACU Sağlık Bil Derg, 9*(3), 302-8.
- Smith, P. H., White, J. W., & Holland, L. J. (2003). A longitudinal perspective on dating violence among adolescent and college-age women. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*(7), 1104-1109.

- Spriggs, A. L., Halpern, C. T., Herring, A. H., & Schoenbach, V. J. (2009). Family and school socioeconomic disadvantage: Interactive influences on adolescent dating violence victimization. *Social Science & Medicine*, *68*(11), 1956-1965.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2) development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*, *17*(3), 283-316.
- Sugarman, C. B. & Hotaling, G. T. (1997). Intimate violence and social desirability: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *12*, 275-290.
- Taylor, C. A., & Sorenson, S. B. (2004). Injunctive social norms of adults regarding teen dating violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *34*(6), 468-479.
- Toplu-Demirtaş, E., Murray, C. & Hatipoglu-Sümer, Z. (2018). Attachment insecurity and restrictive engulfment in college student relationships: The mediating role of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JACPR-11-2017-0333>. (Erişim tarihi: 12.05.2018).
- Umana, J. E., Fawole, O. I., & Adeoye, I. A. (2014). Prevalence and correlates of intimate partner violence towards female students of the University of Ibadan, Nigeria. *BMC Women's Health*, *14*(1), 131.
- Vezina, J., & Hebert, M. (2007). Risk factors for victimization in romantic relationships of young women: A review of empirical studies and implications for prevention. *Trauma, Violence ve Abuse*, *8*(1), 33-66.
- Visschers, J., Jaspaert, E., & Vervaeke, G. (2015). Social desirability in intimate partner violence and relationship satisfaction reports: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *32*, 1401-1420. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515588922>.
- Weiss, J., & Sampson, H. (1986). *The psychoanalytic process: theory, clinical observation: An Ampirical Research*. New York: Guilford press.
- Wekerle, C., & Wolfe, D. A. (1998). The role of child maltreatment and attachment style in adolescent relationship violence. *Development & Psychopathology*, *10*(3), 571-586.
- Zeyneloğlu, S., & Terzioğlu, F. (2011). Toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri tutum ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi ve psikometrik özellikleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *40*, 409-420
- Zorrilla, B., Pires, M., Lasheras, L., Morant, C., Seoane, L., Sanchez, L. M., & Durbán, M. (2009). Intimate partner violence: last year prevalence and association with socio-economic factors among women in Madrid, Spain. *European Journal of Public Health*, *20*(2), 169-175.

Genişletilmiş Türkçe Özet

Giriş: Romantik ilişkiler geliştirmek önemlidir, çünkü bazı psikososyal ihtiyaçları karşılamanın yanında, bir partnerin ilişkide partneri için bir ayna olmasına izin vererek bireylerin birbirlerini tanımalarını sağlar. Ayrıca, potansiyel bir evlilik ve aile hayatına hazırlanmada önemli işlev görür. Bireylerin romantik ilişkilerde nasıl düşündükleri, davrandıkları ve hissettikleri büyük ölçüde çeşitli bireysel/biyolojik etmenlerin yanı sıra, büyüdüğü kültür ve aile yapısına da bağlıdır. Bununla birlikte, romantik ilişkilerde işler ters gittiğinde, çiftin benimsediği stratejiler ve bu sorunlarla başa çıkarken tercih edilen davranış kalıpları bazen şiddeti de içeren ciddi olumsuz sonuçlara yol açabilir. Flört ilişkisinde şiddet kendisini fiziksel, cinsel ve psikolojik bağlamda gösterebilmekte. Özellikle ergenler ve üniversite öğrencileri arasında flört şiddeti türü davranışların arttığına dair bulgular rapor edilmektedir. Flört şiddetinin yetişkinlik yıllarında evlilikte yaşanan şiddetin yordayıcısı olduğuna dair bulgular da bulunmaktadır.

Flört şiddetine kaynaklık eden çeşitli etmenlerin sınıflandırmaları yapılmış olsa da, temelde üç alt başlıkta incelenmektedir: bireysel nedenler, bağlamsal nedenler ve sosyo-kültürel nedenler. Bu nedenler birbiriyle yakından ilişkili görünmektedir. Yakın ilişkilerde yaşanan şiddetin nedenleri hakkında daha fazla bilgi edinme yoluyla bu şiddet türünün altında yatan etmenleri daha iyi anlamamız ve daha etkili önleyici ve müdahale programlarının geliştirilmesi mümkün olacaktır. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışmada üniversite öğrencileri arasında flört şiddete yönelik tutumların ne düzeyde olduğunu ve bu tutumlar üzerindeki bireysel değişken olarak benlik saygısının, ailevi değişken olarak bağlanmanın, kültürel etmen olarak toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine yönelik tutumların ve sosyal değişken olarak da sosyal onay ihtiyacının bu tutumlar üzerindeki yordayıcı rolünün incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır.

Yöntem: Araştırmanın katılımcıları, Anadolu Üniversitesinin çeşitli fakültelerinde öğrenimine devam eden öğrenciler arasından uygun örnekleme yöntemiyle belirlenmiş gönüllü 727 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmada flört şiddetine yönelik tutumları belirlemek amacıyla Yakın İlişkilerde Şiddete Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği-Gözden Geçirilmiş Formu, benlik saygısını belirlemek amacıyla Rosenberg Benlik Saygısı Ölçeği, toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine yönelik tutumları belirlemek amacıyla Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerine Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği, bağlanma biçimlerini belirlemek amacıyla Yakın İlişkilerde Yaşantılar Envanteri-II ve son olarak sosyal onay ihtiyacını belirlemek amacıyla da Sosyal Onay İhtiyacı Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Katılımcıları flört şiddetine yönelik tutum puanlarının ne düzeyde olduğunu belirlemek için yüzdeler ve merkezi dağılım ölçüleri kullanılmıştır. Diğer analizler için t-testi, ANOVA, Pearson Korelasyon Katsayısı ve hiyerarşik regresyon analizinden yararlanılmıştır. Araştırma öncesinde Anadolu Üniversitesi, Etik Kurulundan onay alınmış ve katılımcılardan bilgilendirilmiş onay formu alınmıştır.

Bulgular: Analizlerden elde edilen bulgular, şiddet tutum puanlarının erkek ve kız öğrenciler arasında şiddet boyutu açısından farklılık göstermediğini, ancak erkeklerde istismar, kontrol ve toplam şiddet puanlarının kadınlara göre daha yüksek olduğunu, erkek cinsiyeti değişkeninin istismar ve kontrol boyutlarının anlamlı yordayıcısı olduğunu göstermiştir. Hiyerarşik regresyon analizleri sonucunda güvensiz bağlanma boyutu olan kaçınmalı bağlanmanın şiddet boyutunu, kaygılı bağlanmanın ise istismar ve kontrol boyutlarını anlamlı düzeyde yordadığı bulunmuştur. Ayrıca, cinsiyet rollerine yönelik tutumların eşitlikçi cinsiyet rolü, kadın cinsiyet rolü, evlilik cinsiyet rolü ve erkek cinsiyet rolü boyutlarının flört şiddetine yönelik tutumların şiddet boyutunun anlamlı birer yordayıcısı olduğu bulunmuştur. İstismar boyutunda ise eşitlikçi rol ve evlilikte cinsiyet rolü botuları dışındaki tün boyuların anlamlı yordayıcılar olduğu bulunmuştur. Analizler geleneksel cinsiyet rol tutumlarının ve kadın rol tutumlarının kontrol boyutunu anlamlı düzeyde yordadığını göstermiştir. Ayrıca, benlik saygısı değişkeninin yalnızca istismar boyutunun anlamlı yordayıcısı olduğu bulunmuştur. Son olarak, sosyal onay ihtiyacının flört şiddeti tutumlarından yalnızca kontrole dair tutumları anlamlı düzeyde yordadığı bulgusu elde edilmiştir.

Tartışma ve Sonuç: Çalışmadan elde edilen bulgular, romantik ilişkilerde şiddete yönelik tutumlar ile cinsiyet, bağlanma, toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine yönelik tutumlar, benlik saygısı ve sosyal onay ihtiyacı arasında anlamlı ilişkiler olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu konuda yapılan çalışmaların sınırlı olduğu düşünüldüğünde, özellikle ergen gruplarla, eşcinsel bireylerle, farklı kültürel özelliklere sahip bireylerle kesitsel ve boylamsal çalışmalar duyulan ihtiyacın yüksek olduğu görülmektedir. Ergenler ve üniversite öğrencileri arasında flört şiddetinin arttığına dair bulguların varlığı, özellikle liselerde okul psikolojik danışmanları, üniversitelerde de Psikolojik Danışma Merkezlerinde gören yapan ruh sağlığı uzmanlarının önlemeye ve müdahaleye yönelik çalışmalar yapmalarının elzem olduğu görülmektedir.