



Original Article

Violence responsibility, attitudes toward violence, and factors affecting violence: Examining the intimate relationships of university students

Nilgün Avcı,¹ Zehra Gürsoy,² Merve Murat³

¹Department of Midwifery, Faculty of Health Sciences, Biruni University, Istanbul, Türkiye

²Department of Nursing, Faculty of Health Sciences, Arel University, Istanbul, Türkiye

³Department of Psychiatric Nursing, Hamidiye Faculty of Nursing, University of Health Sciences, Istanbul, Türkiye

Abstract

Objectives: The goal of this research is to evaluate the university students' violence responsibility and attitudes toward intimate relationship.

Methods: The research was performed in a descriptive and cross-sectional design with students at the Health Sciences Faculty of a private university in Istanbul. The research universe consisted of 2057 students in the 2017–2018 academic year. On the other hand, the sampling was calculated by using the formula with a known universe, and it was found that at least 384 students should be reached. 424 of the students who volunteered to participate in the study between February and July 2018. The data were collected via e-mail using a Personal Information Form, Attitudes Toward Dating Violence Scales, and Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale.

Results: It was determined that 89.6% of the students were female, 98.3% were single, 40.6% were studying in the nursing department, and 29.7% were first year students. It was found that 20% of the students used violence before, 57.1% witnessed, 5.7% were exposed to violence in the relationship, and 2.6% used violence in the relationship. A statistically significant relationship was found between the attitudes toward dating violence and gender ($p < 0.05$). It was observed that as the students' grades increased, the level of intimate violence responsibility decreased. It was determined that the mean scores of the sub-dimension of violence recognition in The Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale were higher and significant ($p < 0.05$) for those who used violence and those who were exposed to violence.

Conclusion: It was determined that one-fifth of university students exposed to violence, and more than half of them witnessed. It was found that age, gender, family type, and the use of violence affect the level of violence acceptance. The students' responsibility in intimate violence was found to be associated with gender, class, family type, and duration of relationship.

Keywords: Intimate relationship; intimate violence; university student; violence responsibility.

While the Turkish Language Association defines the concept of violence as "extremism in emotion and behavior," the World Health Organization (WHO) evaluates with this concept in a more comprehensive way. Violence is considered as a situation which gives rise to physical and psychological harm to oneself or to the other party as a result of the delib-

erate application of physical force to the individual or to the individual/individuals around him according to WHO.^[1-3] It is seen that the issue of domestic violence was discussed in many studies, but the issue of violence experienced by adolescents and young adults in their relationships has been ignored when we review the literature.^[4,5]

Address for correspondence: Nilgün Avcı, Biruni Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, Ebelik Bölümü, İstanbul, Türkiye

Phone: +90 538 987 66 26 **E-mail:** navci@biruni.edu.tr **ORCID:** 0000-0003-0629-6386

Submitted Date: October 12, 2020 **Revised Date:** March 21, 2022 **Accepted Date:** May 24, 2022 **Available Online Date:** December 29, 2022

©Copyright 2022 by Journal of Psychiatric Nursing - Available online at www.phdergi.org



What is known about this subject?

- Intimate violence is a type of violence which is difficult to intervene due to the particular that individuals try to hide and / or solve it by themselves, and its incidence in society is considered to be increasing day by day.

What does this article add to the facts that are known?

- It was seen that there were studies on the types and incidence of intimate violence, but there are no studies that measure the level of individuals' sense of violence responsibility when literature review was done. This study is performed to evaluate the responsibility and attitude of university students toward violence in their intimate relationships, and it is considered that it will be able to fill the gap in the literature.

What is its contribution to the practice?

- Being a serious public health problem, first of all, the goal should be to change the violent behavior that is influenced by attitudes in order to prevent intimate violence. In this process, by means of a multidisciplinary approach, early detection of cases and giving priority to individuals in high-risk groups will enable these people to establish and maintain healthy relationships.

Intimate relationship (close relationship) is a type of relationship which is established with the expectation of love, friendship, and happiness by planning social activities with opposite sex. Intimate relationships, which help individual to form and develop his identity, also contribute to the development of the sense of responsibility of both individuals in understanding each other and to learn to cooperate. But the individuals who are in an intimate relationship may sometimes have conflicts and may resort to violent behaviors during this conflict process.^[6]

Intimate violence is a type of violence which is difficult to intervene because individuals generally try to hide and/or solve it within themselves.^[7] Besides, it is considered that the rate incidence of intimate violence, like other types of violence, is increasing day by day. Aslan et al.^[7] defined intimate violence, which is one of the types of interpersonal violence, as the sexual, verbal and emotional violence of the partners against each other or the social restrictions on each other's behaviors. On the other hand, American Center for Disease Protection and Prevention defines intimate violence as any physical, verbal, emotional, and/or sexual abuse applied during the relationship.^[8]

Intimate violence is evaluated in three groups as verbal, psychological/emotional, and sexual/gamic intimate violence. Behaviors such as slapping, pushing, and scratching lead to physical dating violence; humiliating, insulting can be shown as examples of emotional/psychological intimate violence, and harassing behaviors, rape, and attempted rape are some of the behaviors which can be shown as examples of sexual/gamic intimate violence.^[9,10]

The rate of verbal violence applied during the dating period is 11%–15%; it has been reported that the rate of physical violence varies between 9 and 43%.^[11] It was determined that 8.9% of women were exposed to sexual abuse before the age of 15 according to the Research on Domestic Violence Against Women in Türkiye (2015).^[12] In the report published by WHO (2013), the rate of being exposed to violence in the relationships of individuals is 29.4% in people having age in the range of 15–19, while it is 31.6% in individuals between the ages of 20–24.^[13]

The first intimate violence research was conducted in 1981 by Makepeace et al.^[14] As a result of this study, it was stated that 61% of their relatives experienced violence during dating and one out of every five university students was subjected to intimate violence. It was determined that the rate of exposure to dating violence varied between 15% and 50% in the last year in another study conducted with nearly 2200 high school students in the USA.^[15,16] It was determined that one out of every three women has been exposed to intimate violence in the last year, and men have been exposed to violence as much as women.^[17]

The researches in this area are limited in our country. In a study involving vocational school students, it was found out that 12.9% of first-year students and 25.8% of fourth-year students were exposed to violence in their current relationship.^[7] In another study, university students' attitudes toward violence in intimate relationships were evaluated and it was seen that boys were more approving of intimate violence than girls.^[18] It is reported that there are strong links between the attitude toward violence and the implementation of violence. There are many factors which affect attitudes toward interpersonal violence. Some of these include witnessing or being exposed to violence. In the literature, it is emphasized that especially in the presence of domestic violence, the aggression of individuals who are taken as role models outside the family, or the children who are rejected by their parents, display violent behaviors more frequently in later ages. Domestic violence can be considered the same as intimate violence which can be seen in the following years. The importance of attitudes toward intimate violence in social psychology is also emphasized, and it is reported that attitudes have a place in the transformation and acceptance of behavior.^[7,19,20]

It was seen that studies on the types and incidence of intimate violence are more common, while studies which measure the level of individuals' sense of responsibility for violence are limited when the literature is reviewed.^[9,16,17] This research was carried out to determine the level of responsibility and attitude of university students toward violence in intimate relationships and to examine the relationship with the factors affecting them.

Research Questions

1. What are attitude levels of university students toward intimate relationships?
2. What are levels of violence responsibility of university students in intimate relationships?
3. What are the factors which affect attitudes of university students toward intimate relationships?
4. What are factors which affect violence responsibility of university students toward intimate relationships?
5. What is the relationship between attitudes of university students toward intimate relationships and their violence responsibilities?

Materials and Method

Type and Design

While the independent variables of the research, which was carried out in descriptive, relationship-seeking, and cross-sectional design, are constituted of university students' gender, department, class, marital status, income level, who you live with, and family type, the dependent variables are attitude scores toward dating violence, intimate violence responsibility scores, exposure to dating violence, witnessing, and/or application situations.

Place and Time

Research data were obtained from students studying at the Faculty of Health Sciences of a foundation university in Istanbul between February and July 2018.

Universe and Sample

The population of the research consisted students ($n=2.057$) studying at this faculty in the 2017–2018 academic year. Its goal was to reach at least 384 students by using the sample formula whose universe is known in the selection of the sample. 424 of the students who volunteered to participate in the research and were actively enrolled in the school at the time of the research constituted the sample of the research.

Data Collection Process

The research data were collected online by sending the data collection tools to the students' e-mail addresses via Google Forms after obtaining the permission of the ethics committee and the institution. In this process, an online survey form was sent to the university e-mail addresses of the students. A letter stating the purpose and scope of the research was sent to the e-mail addresses of the students. If they wanted to participate in the study, they were first provided to give their consent on the informed consent page. Afterwards, the students accessed the data collection tools and the students who answered all the questions were evaluated within the scope of the research.

Process

Data were collected using the "Personal Information Form," "the attitudes toward dating violence scales" and "The Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale."

a. Personal Information Form

This form, which was created by the researchers by reviewing the literature, was composed of a total of 18 questions which include the introductory characteristics of the students, the use of violence and/or witnessing and exposure to violence.^[5,12,21]

b. The Attitudes Toward Dating Violence Scales

The goal of the scales developed by Price, Byers, and the Dating Violence Research Team in 1999 is to determine the physical, psychological, and sexual violence attitudes of girls and boys in the dating relationship. The Turkish validity and reliability study of the scale was carried out by Yumuşak and Şahin in 2014. The scale is a 5-point Likert (1 strongly disagree, 5 strongly agree) type and consists of a total of fifty items, four of which are subscales. There are also reverse scored items in the scale. Sub-dimensions of scale are as follows:

- Scale of attitudes toward psychological violence perpetrated by men in dating: 15 items (reversely scored items: 1, 2, 5, 9, 10 and 13)
- Scale of attitudes toward physical intimate violence by men: 12 items (reversely scored items: 1, 3, 5, and 7)
- Attitude scale toward psychological violence perpetrated by women in dating: 11 items (reversely scored item: 1)
- Scale of attitudes toward physical intimate violence by women in dating: 12 items (reversely scored items: 7, 8, 10, and 12)

The scale is interpreted on both the total score and the subscale scores, and high scores obtained from the scale and subscales indicate that the level of acceptance for dating violence is high.^[18]

The internal consistency Cronbach's Alpha values of the subscales of the scale were found to be between 0.75 and 0.87.^[18] In this study, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale was found to be between 0.73 and 0.78.

c. The Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale

It was developed by Yun and Vonk in 2011 to determine the attitudes of individuals toward the level of responsibility for their violent behavior toward their partners. The validity and reliability study of the scale was carried out in our country by Akin et al.^[22] in 2012. The scale, which consists of 20 items, is in a 5-point Likert type (1 strongly disagree, 5 completely agree). There is no reverse scored item in the scale. The scale is comprised of 4 sub-dimensions which constitute the structure of violence responsibility as minimization (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, $\alpha=0.81$), violence recognition (items 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, $\alpha=0.83$), partner blame (items 13, 14, 15 and 16, $\alpha=0.80$) and distal blame (items 17, 18, 19 and 20, $\alpha=0.64$). In this study, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.84, 0.70, 0.89 and 0.79, respectively. It is seen that as the score obtained from all sub-dimensions of the scale increases, the individual's violence responsibility in the relevant sub-dimension also increases.

Ethical Responsibilities

The research was performed with the approval of the Ethics Committee and the permission of the institution with the letter dated 26.02.2018 and numbered 2018/13-30 from the "Non-Interventional Ethics Committee" of a university in Istanbul.

Data Analysis

The number, frequency, and mean and standard deviation values of the data analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Windows 24.0 (IBM Corp.) statistical package program were determined by descriptive statistical tests. The conformity of the variables to the normal distribution was evaluated with the Shapiro-Wilk test. The Mann-Whitney U test was used for pairwise group comparisons for non-normally distributed data, and the Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for group comparisons of three or more. Spearman correlation test was used in determining the relationship between the attitudes toward dating violence scales, and The Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale. Statistical significance level was accepted as $p < 0.05$.

Results

The average age of 424 students participating in the study was 20.6 ± 2.5 . It was determined that 89.6% of the students were female, 40.6% were studying in the nursing department, 29.7% were first year students, 98.3% were single, and 63.9% had an income level equal to their expenses. It was observed that 80% of the participants had a nuclear family and 84.4% of them lived with their families (Table 1).

It was determined that average number of dates the student had was 2.4 ± 5.4 . It was determined that 20% of people in the sample had used violence before, 57.1% had witnessed violence, 5.7% were exposed to violence in the relationship, and 2.6% resorted to violence in the relationship. It was learned that 23.3% of them stated that they were exposed to any type of violence in, 68.7% of those who were exposed to violence experienced emotional and 66.7% verbal violence when students' exposure to domestic violence is examined (Table 2).

The participants' mean score of violence responsibility in The Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale was 52.23 ± 9.10 (min: 20, max: 100), minimization sub-dimension mean score was 23.59 ± 7.11 (min: 7, max: 35), and the violence recognition mean score was 12.28 ± 4.50 (min: 5, max: 25), partner blame sub-dimension mean score was 10.73 ± 4.88 (min: 4, max: 20) and distal blame sub-dimension mean score was 5.58 ± 2.77 (min: 4, max: 20). When the attitudes toward dating violence scales are examined, it is seen that total mean score of scale is 81.73 ± 23.44 (min: 50, max: 250), attitudes toward male psychological dating violence scale mean score was 25.39 ± 8.01 (min: 15, max: 75), attitudes toward male physical dating violence scale mean score was 15.94 ± 5.82 (min: 12, max: 60), attitudes toward female psychological dating violence scale mean score was 20.20 ± 7.50 (min: 11, max: 55), and attitudes toward female physical dating violence scale mean score was 20.17 ± 8.18 (min: 12, max: 60).

A statistically significant relationship was found between all subscales of the attitudes toward dating violence scales and gender ($p < 0.05$). Men's acceptance level of psychological and physical violence in dating was higher than women. It

Table 1. Distribution of Students' Socio-demographic Characteristics (n=424)

Socio-demographic Characteristics	n	%
Sex		
Female	380	89.6
Male	44	10.4
Department		
Emergency Aid and Disaster Management	2	0.5
Nutrition and Dietetics	40	9.4
Child Development	50	11.8
Speech and Language Therapy	14	3.3
Midwifery	50	11.8
Occupational therapy	16	3.8
Physical therapy and rehabilitation	22	5.2
Gerontology	3	0.7
Nursing	172	40.6
Audiology	29	6.8
Healthcare Management	13	3.1
Social services	13	3.1
Grade		
1. Year	126	29.7
2. Year	123	29.0
3. Year	85	20.0
4. Year	90	21.3
Marital Status		
Married	7	1.7
Single	417	98.3
Socioeconomic Status		
Income less than expenses	53	12.5
Income equal Expenses	271	63.9
Expenses less than income	100	23.6
Family Type		
Nuclear Family	339	80.0
Extended Family	70	16.5
Fragmented Family	15	3.5
Who do you live with?		
Alone	16	3.8
With my family	358	84.4
With my friends	24	5.7
With foreigners (at dormitory)	7	1.6
Others	19	4.5
Total	424	100.0

was also seen that the acceptance level of psychological and physical violence applied by women during dating was lower than that of men. It was observed that the level of acceptance of dating violence decreased as the grades of the students increased, while the acceptance level of dating violence increased for those who had an extended family type, but these conditions were not significant ($p > 0.05$). Only the mean score of the attitudes toward female psychological dating violence scale was found to be statistically significant while it was seen

Table 2. Distribution of Characteristics of Students' Violence Experiences and Knowledge

Descriptive Characteristics	n	%
Previous use of violence		
Yes	85	20.0
No	339	80.0
Previous witnessing violence		
Yes	242	57.1
No	182	42.9
Exposure to violence in a relationship		
Yes	24	5.7
No	400	94.3
Using violence in a relationship		
Yes	11	2.6
No	413	97.4
Exposure to domestic violence		
Yes	99	23.3
No	325	76.7
Type of violence by survivors of domestic violence*		
Physical violence	29	29.3
Emotional violence	68	68.7
Verbal violence	66	66.7
Sexual violence	2	2.0
Economic violence	19	19.2

*More than one option is marked.

that the level of acceptance of dating violence was lower for those who had a relationship of 4 years or more at the time of the study, ($p < 0.05$). It was determined that those who resorted to violence had a higher level of acceptance of dating violence (Table 3).

It was found that exposure to violence did not affect the level of acceptance of dating violence. It was seen that the mean score of the attitudes toward male psychological dating violence scale was higher for those who were exposed to economic violence in the family, and it was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

The male mean score of minimization and distal blame subscales in The Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale was higher than females; it was determined that female mean scores of violence recognition and partner blame were higher than male, but these situations were not statistically significant. It was found that grade, family type, and current dating status did not affect the students' mean scores of The Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale, and these were not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$) (Table 4).

It was determined that the mean scores of the violence recognition and partner blame sub-dimension in intimate relationships of the perpetrators and victims of violence were higher, and it was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). It was seen that the cases of minimization and partner blame were lower,

and it was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) (Table 4).

It was determined that those who were exposed to domestic violence in all types of domestic violence had lower mean scores for minimization and higher mean scores for violence recognition. It was determined that the mean score of partner blame was higher in all types of violence except physical violence, and these situations were found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). A weak and linear relationship was found between the students' level of the attitudes toward dating violence scales and The Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale ($r = 0.094 - 0.185$) (Table 5).

Discussion

Phenomenon of violence affects more and more people in each passing day, and it comes out as an important public health problem. Individuals from all segments of society may be exposed to at least one of the types of violence in their daily life, they may witness, and sometimes resort to violence. The violence perpetrated by young adults against their close partners has recently attracted the attention of some researchers. Dating violence is an important sociological problem in that it is the determinant of violence both in the period of violence and in the following periods and that it can continue throughout life.^[7,21,23] This research was conducted to evaluate university students' violence responsibility in close relationships and their attitudes toward violence.

Violence, which is a learned behavior, is also likely to be repeated. Also, previous exposure to or witnessing violence increases the likelihood of intimate violence.^[23,24] Using violence is synonymous with accepting the existence of violence. Exposure to violence is one of the factors which affect the acceptance level of violence, as is resorting to violence. In this study, it was determined that 57.1% of the individual's witnessed violence, 20% of them used violence before, 2.6% of them resorted to violence in the relationship, and 5.7% of them were exposed to violence in the relationship (Table 2). In the booklet published by WHO (2013), it is stated that 30% of women worldwide have experienced physical or sexual violence from their partners.^[13] In a study conducted by Ohnishi et al.^[25] (2011) in determining intimate relationship abuse among Japanese university students, 47.8% of the students stated that they had experienced physical, verbal, and sexual violence from their partners at least once. It is stated that 36% of women across the country are exposed to physical violence, 12% to sexual violence, and one out of every five women with a university or higher education is exposed to physical violence according to the results of the Research on Domestic Violence Against Women in Türkiye (2014).^[26] In the study of Yumuşak (2013), it was stated that the attitudes of medical students toward intimate violence were significantly lower than those from other faculties.^[11] It is stated that 16% of 1st grade students and 19.6% of 4th grade students practice intimate violence in another study which examined nursing students' exposure to or practice of dating violence.

Table 3. Comparison of Students' Socio-demographic Characteristics with The Attitudes Towards Dating Violence Scales Mean Scores

	The Attitudes Towards Dating Violence Scales											
	Attitudes Towards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale			Attitudes Towards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale			Attitudes Towards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale			Attitudes Towards Female Physical Dating Violence Scale		
	Mean	SS	Med.	Mean	SS	Med.	Mean	SS	Med.	Mean	SS	Med.
Sex												
Female	24.35	7.1	23.0	15.42	4.9	13.0	19.85	7.4	18.0	19.86	7.9	17.0
Male	34.34	9.6	35.0	20.5	9.7	17.5	23.31	7.6	24.5	22.93	9.8	21.0
Mann-Whitney U	U=3.401. p=0.000			U=4.979. p=0.000			U=6.096. p=0.003			U=6.678 p=0.028		
Grade												
1. Year	26.14	8.6	25.0	17.13	7.5	14.0	21.54	8.0	20.5	21.73	9.2	18.0
2. Year	26.11	7.7	25.0	15.64	4.6	14.0	20.22	7.4	19.0	19.68	7.7	17.0
3. Year	24.35	6.9	23.0	15.28	4.5	14.0	18.94	6.5	17.0	19.69	6.9	18.0
4. Year	24.34	8.2	22.5	15.33	5.3	13.0	19.51	7.4	17.5	19.13	7.9	17.0
Kruskal Wallis	X ² =5.307. p=0.151			X ² =6.081. p=0.108			X ² =6.345. p=0.096			X ² =5.146. p=0.161		
Family Type												
Nuclear	25.13	7.7	24.0	15.57	5.0	14.0	19.88	7.4	18.0	20.03	8.1	18.0
Extended	26.58	9.3	25.5	17.57	8.4	15.0	21.52	7.7	19.0	21.35	8.5	19.0
Fragmented	25.66	7.2	25.0	16.86	6.5	14.0	21.46	7.0	19.0	18	6.7	15.0
Kruskal Wallis	X ² =1.008. p=0.604			X ² =3.122. p=0.210			X ² =3.988. p=0.136			X ² =3.551. p=0.169		
Current Dating Status												
No	25.18	8.0	24.0	16.10	6.0	14.0	20.12	7.4	19.0	20.42	8.0	18.0
Yes/0-1 years	27.15	8.4	27.0	16.19	6.1	14.0	22.17	7.8	22.0	20.79	8.7	18.0
Yes/2-3 years	24.97	7.4	24.0	15.55	4.4	14.0	19.89	7.7	18.0	19.87	9.2	16.0
Yes/4 years and above	24.2	7.4	23.0	15.06	5.1	13.0	17.86	6.6	15.0	18.11	6.2	16.0
Kruskal Wallis	X ² =4.733. p=0.192			X ² =1.814. p=0.612			X ² =10.034. p=0.018			X ² =4.071. p=0.254		
Previous Using Violence												
Yes	26.81	8.4	27.0	16.36	6.6	14.0	22.27	10.0	20.0	21.54	10.0	18.0
No	25.35	8.0	24.0	15.93	5.8	14.0	20.15	7.4	19.0	20.14	8.1	18.0
Mann-Whitney U	U=1.995. p=0.490			U=2.210. p=0.875			U=2.074. p=0.623			U=2.134. p=0.731		

p<0.005.

[7] In another study conducted with students in an intimate relationship; 52.9% of the participants stated that they were exposed to violence in an intimate relationship, and 52% of them stated that they used violence in an intimate relationship.^[21] In the results of the study, although the rates of using or witnessing violence before were found to be high, similar to the results of other studies, it can be thought that since the majority of the students are female students, they try to be more selfless in their dating relationships, and therefore the rates of being exposed to or resorting to violence are lower. In addition, this result may be due to the fact that the students studying in health-related fields mostly cover the concept of human value within the scope of their vocational courses.

Various studies, both in our country, and abroad, have shown that the acceptance level of boys for using psychological and

physical violence during dating is higher than girls.^[5,12,21,27,28] Research findings also showed that, in line with the literature, both men and perpetrators of violence had a higher acceptance level of violence than others (Table 3). Differences in the cultural upbringing of children brought up according to gender roles affect the perception of violence. In this process, while girls are supported to be compliant and docile, it is supported, and even tolerated, especially for boys, to be more aggressive, and freer. The fact that the violent attitudes of men who resort to violence more frequently are high indicates that attitudes can easily turn into behaviors. Additionally, it should be noted that as the level of acceptance of dating violence increases, the presence of violence in the relationship may increase.

It is expected that people's attitudes toward violence will change in a positive way, and they will gain awareness about

Table 4. Comparison of Students' Socio-demographic Characteristics with The Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale Mean Scores

	The Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale (IVRS)											
	Minimization			Violence recognition			Partner Blame			Distal Blame		
	Mean	SS	Med.	Mean	SS	Med.	Mean	SS	Med.	Mean	SS	Med.
Sex												
Female	23.3	6.9	23.0	12.5	4.4	12.0	10.9	4.8	12.0	5.5	2.7	4.0
Male	25.9	7.8	26.0	10.6	4.4	10.0	9.63	5.3	9.0	6.2	3.1	4.0
Mann-Whitney U	U=1.067. p=0.102			U=1.074. p=0.093			U=1.168. p=0.229			U=1.304. p=0.567		
Grade												
1. Year	22.6	6.6	22.0	11.4	3.9	11.5	11.7	5.1	12.0	6.6	3.9	5.0
2. Year	24.3	7.5	25.5	12.1	4.3	12.0	9.97	4.9	9.0	5.1	2.0	4.0
3. Year	24.3	7.3	24.5	12.8	4.8	12.5	10.9	5.1	11.0	5.3	1.6	4.0
4. Year	23.4	7.1	23.0	13.1	4.8	13.0	10.2	4.1	11.0	5.2	2.2	4.0
Kruskal Wallis	X ² =2.383. p=0.497			X ² =3.732. p=0.292			X ² =3.249. p=0.355			X ² =6.189. p=0.103		
Family Type												
Nuclear	23.6	7.5	24.0	12.1	4.5	12.0	10.5	4.9	12.0	5.4	2.1	4.0
Extended	23.6	5.1	24.0	12.8	4.3	12.5	11.9	4.5	12.0	6.4	4.4	4.0
Fragmented	23.0	7.6	20.0	13.7	4.1	14.5	10.3	5.0	9.5	6.0	3.4	5.0
Kruskal Wallis	X ² =0.199. p=0.905			X ² =1.171. p=0.557			X ² =2.094. p=0.351			X ² =0.840. p=0.657		
Those Who Are Currently Dating												
Yes / 0-1 years	23.9	6.6	25.0	11.6	4.5	12.0	11.4	5.1	12.0	5.9	3.1	4.0
Yes / 2-3 years	24.1	7.2	25.0	12.4	3.8	12.0	9.91	4.5	10.0	4.9	1.7	4.0
Yes / 4 years and above	22.5	7.7	22.5	13.3	4.9	13.0	10.5	4.7	11.0	5.8	2.9	5.0
Kruskal Wallis	X ² =1.406. p=0.495			X ² =3.437. p=0.179			X ² =2.310. p=0.315			X ² =5.032. p=0.081		
Previous Using Violence												
Yes	20.5	7.0	20.0	16.87	3.4	16.5	13.62	3.9	14.0	5.87	3.1	4.5
No	23.75	7.1	24.0	12.05	4.4	12.0	10.59	4.8	11.0	5.57	2.7	4.0
Mann-Whitney U	U=4.44. p=0.163			U=2.51. p=0.004			U=3.94. p=0.068			U=5.93. p=0.723		
Previous Exposure to Violence												
Yes	20.0	5.9	20.5	15.93	4.2	17.0	14.0	4.1	14.5	6.0	4.0	4.0
No	23.97	7.1	24.0	11.9	4.3	12.0	10.39	4.8	11.0	5.54	2.6	4.0
Mann-Whitney U	U=8.03. p=0.032			U=5.85. p=0.001			U=6.95. p=0.005			U=1.184. p=0.887		

p<0.05.

violence and have the ability to establish healthy relationships with the increase in age and education level. In the Research on Domestic Violence Against Women in Türkiye (2014), it is stated that 45% of men with no education or who have not completed primary school, and 20% of men with undergraduate and graduate education have committed physical violence.^[26] It was found that partners with short relationship duration inflict more emotional violence on each other in the study of Aydın Avcı et al.^[27] (2014). However, in the studies of Kepir-Savoly et al.^[29] (2014) and Karabacak and Kodan (2015), it was found that there was no significant difference between university students' relationship years and acceptance levels of violence.^[28] In the study, it was determined that the level of acceptance of violence decreased as students' grades and duration of relationship increased (Table 3). This may be due to the fact that as the duration of the relationship increases,

the level of acceptance of violence may decrease due to the increase in the dependence of the individuals on each other or the fear of loss, or the fact that it becomes more difficult to break away from the relationship as the dependence increases, even if there is violence in the relationship. In Aslan's (2008) study, it is seen that 18% of the students studying in the 1st year of nursing and 41% of the students studying in the 4th grade stated that they were exposed to intimate violence.^[7] It can be seen that the acceptance levels of violence vary depending on socio-cultural variables when the findings of the study are compared with the literature. As the class of the person increases, since his age also increases, he matures, clarifies his own truths, is more confident in himself, and accordingly, it is thought that he does not accept violence. More studies are needed to make clearer conclusions in this area.

Table 5. The Correlation between the Attitudes Towards Dating Violence Scales and the Intimate Violence Responsibility Scale

Variables	The Intimate Violence Responsibility	Minimization	Violence Recognition	Partner Blame	Distal Blame	Attitudes Towards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale	Attitudes Towards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale	Attitudes Towards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale	Attitudes Towards Female Physical Dating Violence Scale
Minimization									
r	.384								
p	0.000								
Violence Recognition									
r	.508	-.290							
p	0.000	0.000							
Partner Blame									
r	.534	-.308	.306						
p	0.000	0.000	0.000						
Distal Blame									
r	.300	-.318	.281	.293					
p	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000					
Attitudes Towards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale									
r	0.094	-0.143	0.134	.169	.275				
p	0.229	0.068	0.083	0.029	0.000				
Attitudes Towards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale									
r	0.145	0.022	0.026	.175	.187	.496			
p	0.064	0.783	0.735	0.024	0.015	0.000			
Attitudes Towards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale									
r	.159	-0.118	0.143	.257	.171	.571	.456		
p	0.041	0.131	0.065	0.001	0.027	0.000	0.000		
Attitudes Towards Female Physical Dating Violence Scale									
r	.184	-0.055	0.108	.275	0.139	.378	.506	.543	
p	0.018	0.485	0.165	0.000	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.000	
The Attitudes Towards Dating Violence Scales									
r	.185	-0.100	0.134	.284	.233	.781	.688	.837	.777
p	0.017	0.201	0.084	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Spearman's rank correlation coefficient test, p<0.05.

The family type of individuals and their experience of domestic violence can also affect the level of acceptance of violence and the attitude toward violence although the occurrence of violence is not the only determinant.^[21] It is reported that corporal punishment is frequently used as a discipline method in child-rearing methods in the traditional Turkish family structure.^[24] The inequality-based position of women in the family environment and the insignificance of their labor lead to violence, especially in families with a patriarchal structure. Because this situation is almost a show of power for the spouse who is thought to be in a stronger position than herself.^[30] In Türkiye, the rate of married women being exposed to economic violence at any time in their lives has been reported as 30%.^[26] In the study, it was observed that the acceptance level of intimate violence was high among those who have an extended family type and those who are exposed to domestic

economic violence (Table 3). It is thought that the individual views and attitudes of people who grow up or who are grown up in a large family structure are affected by family members considering that the majority of the society has a patriarchal structure, which causes domestic violence to be perceived as a more tolerable event. Especially in people who are financially dependent on their spouse, violence is more common, which can lead to acceptance of violence.

Violence responsibility refers to the attitude of responsibility that the individual has for his violent behavior toward his partner during the dating relationship. It was found that the male students participating in the study had a higher mean score of minimizing violence in close relationships and blaming external factors when the relationship between violence responsibility and gender was examined in the study, while the mean score of accepting violence and blaming the partner was

higher for female students, but these conditions were not statistically significant (Table 4). In the study of Yumuşak (2013), it was found that the average of blaming external factors is higher among women, and they see their husbands' behaviors as selfish and accusatory.^[11] Studies examining students' violence tendencies in relationships show that male students have a higher tendency to violence.^[24,28] It is an expected result that their tendency to violence is higher, that they are ignored due to the normalization of violence, that they do not feel responsible for violence and that violence is attributed to other factors taking into account that the perpetrators of violence are mostly men. Considering the opposite, it is natural for people who are exposed to violence to accept violence unwillingly and to blame their partner. It is thought that the research on the subject of violence responsibility is limited although the results of the research are similar to the literature, and the results about the gender variable may vary due to the time of the research and individual and social differences.

In the study, it was observed that the 1st grade students were more likely to blame their partner and external factors in dating violence (Table 4). This may be due to the fact that students have a shorter relationship period due to their age, and they tend to blame their partner or other factors without resorting to seeking solutions for the problem.

Individuals' level of perception of the problems in their relationships and the strategies they will develop for solutions are directly related to the socio-cultural factors of the society they grew up in.^[30] For this reason, the socio-cultural characteristics and family structure of the individuals may be effective in the tendency of the individual to show violence or violent behavior. It is stated that students whose parents are separated are more likely to resort to bullying behaviors or are victims of physical violence.^[21] The research supports this statement and shows that those with a broken family structure accept the violence responsibility more, although they do not minimize violence, while those with an extended family structure attribute the violence responsibility to their partner or other external factors. This result indicates that acceptance due to the violence witnessed or exposed as a child is seen more in the broken family; On the other hand, in the extended family, the majority of the society is in a patriarchal structure and therefore, it is thought that the correctness of the decisions taken is mostly not questioned, therefore the partner, or external factors are more blamed.

In the literature, it is stated that the violence experienced or witnessed in childhood increases the probability of perpetrating violence in men and doubles the exposure to violence in women.^[22] In the study, it was seen that students who used or were exposed to violence had higher scores for accepting violence and blaming their partner or external factors. Therefore, it has been observed that he blames external factors as well as himself and his partner in the event of violence. In this case, it should not be forgotten that the victim of violence can also be the perpetrator of violence. It may be caused by the transfer

of violence by social learning theory or the perception of violence by partners as a sign of love and interest.

It was found that there was a weak and linear relationship between the level of attitudes toward intimate violence and the level of violence responsibility in close relationships of the participants within the scope of the study (Table 5). The level of acceptance toward intimate violence also increases as the level of attitudes toward intimate violence increases. It is seen that as the average score obtained from the sub-dimensions of the violence responsibility in close relationships scale increases, the individual's violence responsibility in the relevant sub-dimension also increases. Violence responsibility increases even though a little bit (*Levels of violence recognition, minimization, and partner and distal blame*) as the level of acceptance toward intimate violence increases. This situation may be due to the fact that violence is perceived as a normal event for the person with the potential to commit violence and that the source of this event is due to other people/factors other than himself. In addition, this situation assumes that although the victim of violence does not want to accept the violence, they may experience violence depending on the partner/other factors.^[18,22]

Limitation of the Study

The research is limited to the data obtained from the students registered at the Faculty of Health Sciences of a foundation university in Istanbul at the time of the research, it cannot be generalized to all students.

Conclusion

It was observed that there are fewer studies that determine attitudes of university students toward close relationships and the level of violence responsibility while information about types and incidence of intimate violence is found in the literature. This research is capable of filling the gap in the literature. In line with the results obtained from the research, it was determined that one-fourth of the university students experienced domestic violence, one-fifth of them resorted to violence, and more than half of them witnessed violence. It was observed that age, gender, family type, duration of intimate relationship, use of violence and exposure to domestic economic violence affected the level of acceptance of violence. It was determined that majority of the scores obtained were at a moderate level when the scales of violence responsibility in intimate relationships and attitudes toward violence are examined. Attitudes toward close relationships and responsibility for intimate violence were found to be associated with gender, class, family type, duration of relationship, resorting to or being exposed to violence. It was observed that those who were exposed to violence in all types of domestic violence minimized violence more in intimate relationships, accepted violence more and blamed the partner more in other types of violence other than intimate violence. It was determined that there was a weak and linear relationship between

level of attitude toward intimate violence and level of violence responsibility in close relationships.

Suggestions

Attitudes of individuals affect their behavior. It is necessary to define violence correctly and to increase the awareness of individuals in attitudes toward intimate violence. In this way, the individual will give healthy reactions to violence and will develop healthy coping methods. To prevent violence, it should be aimed to change the violent behavior. It should not be forgotten that intimate violence is a serious public health problem. For this reason, early detection of cases with a multidisciplinary approach and giving priority to individuals in high-risk groups will allow them to establish and maintain healthy relationships.

In attitudes toward intimate violence, first of all, individual and cultural characteristics and violence situations should be defined. Education programs on intimate violence should be established for individuals who have been exposed to and witnessed violence. Comprehensive emergency support plans should be established to know how to respond in the event of violence. At all education levels, it should be aimed to raise awareness of both students and educators by adding courses on intimate violence to the curriculum and organizing symposiums. In addition to educators, nurses who are among the health professionals who are the first to encounter individuals being exposed to violence, should also be informed about intimate violence and the legal and judicial issues of intimate violence. It is recommended to create training programs on intimate violence and anger control, conduct experimental research, and plan descriptive studies to detect anger, aggression, and rage before violence.

Conflict of interest: There are no relevant conflicts of interest to disclose.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Authorship contributions: Concept – N.A., Z.G., M.M.; Design – N.A., Z.G., M.M.; Supervision – N.A.; Fundings - M.M., N.A.; Data collection &/or processing – N.A., Z.G.; Analysis and/or interpretation – Z.G., M.M.; Literature search – N.A., Z.G., M.M.; Writing – N.A., Z.G., M.M.; Critical review – N.A..

References

1. Turkish Language Association. Violence. Available at: <http://sozluk.gov.tr/> Accessed Apr 15, 2020.
2. World Health Organization. Definition and typology of violence. Available at: <http://www.who.int/violenceprevention/approach/definition/en/>. Accessed Feb 12, 2020.
3. Polat O. Violence. *Marmara Univ Fac Law J Leg Stud* 2016;22:15–34.
4. Tuz C, Öksüz ME, Tekiner SA. Reliability and validity of Turkish version of the severity of violence against women scale and sexual experiences survey-victimization version. *Euras J Fam Med* 2015;4:83–9.
5. Kaya Sakarya A. Dating violence over young people studying at university. Master thesis. Konya: Necmettin Erbakan University Institute of Educational Sciences; 2013.
6. Atakay C. Risk factors for intimate partner violence. *Nesne J Psy* 2014;2:1–9.
7. Aslan D, Vefikuluçay D, Zeyneloğlu S, Erdost T, Temel F. Ankara'da iki hemşirelik yüksek okulunun birinci ve dördüncü sınıflarından okuyan öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine maruz kalma, flört ilişkilerinde şiddet uygulama durumlarının ve bu konudaki görüşlerinin saptanması araştırması. Kadın Sorunları Araştırma Merkezi. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi; 2008 Available at: http://www.huksam.hacettepe.edu.tr/Turkce/SayfaDosya/flort_siddeti.pdf. Accessed May 18, 2020.
8. Solak A. Aile Eksenli Şiddetten Sosyal Travmalara. Samsun valiliği. 2018. Available at: <https://www.oka.org.tr/assets/upload/dosyalar/aile-eksenli-siddetten-sosyal-travmalara-yayini.pdf>. Accessed May 18, 2021.
9. Sünnetçi B, Say A, Gümüştepe B, Enginkaya B, Yıldızdoğan Ç, Yalçın M. Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddeti algıları üzerine bir araştırma. *Ufku Ötesi Bilim Derg* 2016;16:56–83.
10. Öztürk N. Gençler arası ilişkilerde flört şiddeti. Available at: <https://cinselsiddetlemucadele.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/flort-brosur-internet.pdf>. Accessed May 18, 2021.
11. Yumuşak A. The relationship among university students' attitudes towards dating violence, sexism, and their narcissistic personality traits. Master Thesis. Tokat: Gaziosmanpaşa University Institute of Educational Sciences; 2013.
12. Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı. Türkiye'de kadına yönelik aile içi şiddet araştırması. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü. 2015. Available at: <https://dspace.ceid.org.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1/135/ekutuphane3.5.1.1.1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>. Accessed May 5, 2021.
13. World Health Organization. Global and regional estimates of violence against women. 2013. Available at: <http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/9789241564625/en/>. Accessed Mar 3, 2020.
14. Makepeace JM. Courtship violence among college students. *Fam Relat* 1981;30:97–102.
15. Alleyne-Green B, Coleman-Cowger VH, Henry DB. Dating violence perpetration and/or victimization and associated sexual risk behaviors among a sample of inner-city African American and Hispanic adolescent females. *J Interpers Violence* 2012;27:1457–73.
16. Baldan GA, Akış N. Dating violence. *J Uludağ Univ Med Fac* 2017;43:41–4.
17. Straus M. Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. *Child Youth Serv Rev* 2008;30:252–75.
18. Yumuşak A, Şahin R. The validity and reliability of attitudes towards dating violence scales. *Electron J Soc Sci [Article in Turkish]* 2014;13:233–52.
19. Özkan Y, Uysal M, Topçu G, Danişmaz Sevin M, Ertan Koçak Y. Validity and reliability study of adaptation of the scale of attitudes on violence in Turkish. *J Turk Soc Res* 2018;22:821–44.
20. Duman N, Bridge E, Dağ B. Investigation of attitudes towards vi-

- olence in adult relations. *Motif Acad J Folklore* 2019;12:1210-22.
21. İftar M, Güler G. Attitudes and behaviors of university students towards dating violence. *Int Anatol Acad Online J Health Sci* 2020;6:151-67.
 22. Akın A, Gülşen M, Aşut S, Akça M. The reliability and validity of the Turkish version of the intimate violence responsibility scale. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Univ J Fac Educ* 2012;12:175-84.
 23. Yıldırım S, Terzioğlu F. A Different side of violence: Dating violence, effects and influencing factors. *J Anatol Nurs Health Sci* 2018;21:285-92.
 24. Güleç Öyekçin D, Yetim D, Şahin EM. Psychosocial factors affecting various types of intimate partner violence against women. *Turk Psikiyatri Derg* 2012;23:75-81.
 25. Ohnishi M, Nakao R, Shibayama S, Matsuyama Y, Oishi K, Miyahara H. Knowledge, experience, and potential risks of dating violence among Japanese university students: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health* 2011;11:339.
 26. Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı. Türkiye'de kadına yönelik aile içi şiddet araştırması. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü. Available at: http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/TKAA2014_Ozet_Rapor.pdf. Accessed Jun 5, 2020.
 27. Aydın Avcı İ, Öz Ö, Dürdane Y, Çelik Eren D. University students' problem-solving behaviors and exposure to dating abuse in their romantic relationship. *Progress Health Sci* 2014;4:123-30.
 28. Karabacak A, Kodan Çetinkaya S. Investigation of university students' acceptance of violence levels in terms of different variables. *J Educ Theory Pract Res* 2015;1:13-21.
 29. Kepir-Savoly DD, Ulaş Ö, Demirtaş-Zorbaz S. Factors that influence level of couple violence acceptance among university students. *Turk Psychol Couns Guidance J* 2014;5:173-83.
 30. Akkaş İ, Uyanık Z. Violence against women. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Univ J ISS* 2016;6:32-42.
 20. Mikulincer M, Florian V, Tolmacz R. Attachment styles and fear of personal death: A case study of affect regulation. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1990;58:273-80.
 21. Kesebir S, Kökçü F, Dereboy F. Erişkin bağlanma biçimi ölçeği: Geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Yeni Symposium* 2012;50:99-104.
 22. Ayers S, Radoš SN, Balouch S. Narratives of traumatic birth: Quality and changes over time. *Psychol Trauma* 2015;7:234-42.
 23. Sigurðardóttir VL, Gamble J, Guðmundsdóttir B, Sveinsdóttir H, Gottfreðsdóttir H. Processing birth experiences: A content analysis of women's preferences. *Midwifery* 2019;69:29-38.
 24. Waldenström U, Hildingsson I, Rubertsson C, Rådestad I. A negative birth experience: Prevalence and risk factors in a national sample. *Birth* 2004;31:17-27.
 25. Pınar G, Doğan N, Algier L, Kaya N, Çakmak F. Factors that affecting mothers' postnatal comfort. *Dicle Med J [Article in Turkish]* 2009;36:184-90.
 26. Erbay E, Topal S, Tiryaki Ö, Çınar N. Evaluation of the relationship between maternal experience and liking of children levels and factor affecting. *Ege Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Fakültesi Dergisi [Article in Turkish]* 2018;34:34-44.
 27. Bilgin NÇ, AK B, Potur DC, Ayhan F. Satisfaction with birth and affecting factors in women who gave birth. *HSP* 2018;5:342-52.
 28. Spaich S, Welzel G, Berlit S, Temerinac D, Tuschy B, Sütterlin M, et al. Mode of delivery and its influence on women's satisfaction with childbirth. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 2013;170:401-6.
 29. Afshar Y, Mei JY, Gregory KD, Kilpatrick SJ, Esakoff TF. Birth plans-Impact on mode of delivery, obstetrical interventions, and birth experience satisfaction: A prospective cohort study. *Birth* 2018;45:43-9.
 30. Smorti M, Ponti L, Tani F. Maternal depressive symptomatology during pregnancy is a risk factor affecting newborn's health: A longitudinal study. *J Reprod Infant Psychol* 2019;37:444-52.
 31. Quenby S, Gallos ID, Dhillon-Smith RK, Podeseck M, Stephenson MD, Fisher J, et al. Miscarriage matters: The epidemiological, physical, psychological, and economic costs of early pregnancy loss. *Lancet* 2021;397:1658-67.
 32. Karakoç H, Özkan H. The relationship with prenatal attachment of psychosocial health status of pregnant women. *Int J Health Sci* 2017;5:36-46.
 33. Akarsu RH, Tunca B, Alsaç SY. Evidence-based applications in mother-infant attachment. *Gümüşhane Univ J Health Sci* 2017;6:275-9.
 34. Hammond A, Foureur M, Homer CS. The hardware and software implications of hospital birth room design: A midwifery perspective. *Midwifery* 2014;30:825-30.
 35. Lorentzen I, Andersen CS, Jensen HS, Fogsgaard A, Foureur M, Lauszus FF, et al. Study protocol for a randomised trial evaluating the effect of a "birth environment room" versus a standard labour room on birth outcomes and the birth experience. *Contemp Clin Trials Commun* 2019;14:100336.
 36. Waldenström U, Schytt E. A longitudinal study of women's memory of labour pain—from 2 months to 5 years after the birth. *BJOG* 2009;116:577-83.
 37. Elmir R, Schmied V, Wilkes L, Jackson D. Women's perceptions and experiences of a traumatic birth: A meta-ethnography. *J Adv Nurs* 2010;66:2142-53.
 38. Bossano CM, Townsend KM, Walton AC, Blomquist JL, Handa VL. The maternal childbirth experience more than a decade after delivery. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2017;217:342.e1-e8.
 39. Taheri M, Takian A, Taghizadeh Z, Jafari N, Sarafraz N. Creating a positive perception of childbirth experience: Systematic review and meta-analysis of prenatal and intrapartum interventions. *Reprod Health* 2018;15:73.
 40. Moloney S, Gair S. Empathy and spiritual care in midwifery practice: Contributing to women's enhanced birth experiences. *Women Birth* 2015;28:323-8.
 41. Chabbert M, Rozenberg P, Wendland J. Predictors of negative childbirth experiences among french women. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs* 2021;50:450-63.
 42. Croce Nanni R, Troisi A. Maternal attachment style and psychiatric history as independent predictors of mood symptoms in the immediate postpartum period. *J Affect Disord* 2017;212:73-7.
 43. Ford E, Ayers S. Stressful events and support during birth: The effect on anxiety, mood and perceived control. *J Anxiety Disord* 2009;23:260-8.