



EXAMINATION OF ATTITUDES OF NURSING STUDENTS ON DATING VIOLENCE

Satı DOĞAN*

Melek ALTUN**

Elif Deniz KAÇMAZ***

Abstract

The research was conducted to examine the attitudes of nursing students towards dating. 407 nursing students constituted the sample of the descriptive cross-sectional study. Student Nurse Introductory Information Form and Dating Violence Attitudes Scales were used as data collection tools in the study. It was determined that the acceptance level of dating violence of nursing students was not high. It was determined that the students who experienced violence in relation to dating and students who used violence had higher levels of acceptance of violence. Violence in relation to dating and experiencing violence may arise as the cause or consequence of the level of acceptance of students' violence. Increasing awareness of students about dating violence plays significant role.

Keywords: Nurse, Student, Dating Violence, Attitude.

1.INTRODUCTION

According to the definition of the World Health Organization, violence is the intentionally use of physical force or power by an individual which may possibly cause injury, death, development disorder or loss as a threatening action (World Health Organisation, 2017).

Dating violence, which is considered among the interpersonal violence, is one of the most common types of violence in the world. Dating violence is the physical, emotional and sexual violence action or threat and social restrictions in dating relation (Uluocak, Gökulu & Bilir, 2014:381; Aslan et al., 2008:9). Flirt is defined as beyond friendship, as a relationship in which two people are connected emotionally, romantically and / or sexually, and that there is no bond such as marriage or engagement. Despite the fact that most research in the literature includes heterosexual couples, this definition includes all flirting relationships (Murray, & Kardatzke, 2007).

Although dating violence is observed in all age groups, it is more common in university period (Page, & İnce, 2008:90; Murray, & Kardatzke, 2007:79; Schwartz, Griffin, Russell, & Frontovra-Duck, 2006:90). The attitudes of the university students who are in adolescence and young adulthood period are more sensitive subject to relations they have established and their attitudes towards relations in this period play significance. Individuals in this age group may not be aware of the violence because the vital values are newly formed. Dating violence negatively affects the psychological well-being of students. At the same time they may tend to ignore violence because they do not know how to deal with the violence they have experienced (Bugay, & Çok, 2015:16; Martins et al., 2014:132, Aslan et al., 2008:10). Besides, violence can be concealed, due to embarrassment, fear, being blamed etc. (Kalkan, 2008:136). In this context, it is important to examine the attitudes and behaviors of university students towards dating violence. When the national and international literature on violence is examined, it has been seen noticed that significance was attributed to studies on dating violence of university students (Ozaki & Otis, 2017:1076; Kamimura, Nourian, Assasnik, & Franchek-Roa, 2016-a:51; Kamimura, Nourian, Assasnik, & Franchek-Roa, 2016-b:352; Wang, 2016:1; Terzioğlu et al., 2016:225; Edwards, 2015:359; Bugay, & Çok, 2015:16; Yumuşak, & Şahin, 2014:233; Kılınçer, & Tuzgöl Dost, 2014:160; Martins et al., 2014:129, Kepir Savoly, Ulaş, & Demirtaş Zorbaz, 2014:173; Umena, Fowole, & Adeoya, 2014:1; Flake, Barros, Schraiber, & Menezes, 2013:801; Conner et al., 2013:233;

* Assistant Professor-Department of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, Ege University, Faculty of Nursing.

** Clinical Nurse-Erciyes University Medical Faculty, Pediatric Nephrology and Rheumatology Service.

*** Research Assistant-Department of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, Ege University, Faculty of Nursing.



McDermott, & Lopez, 2013:127; Beccaria et al., 2013:907; Hatipoğlu, 2010:95; Chan et al., 2008:529; Aslan et al., 2008:10 ;Murray, & Kardatzke, 2007:79; Luthra, & Gidycz, 2006:717; Schwartz, Griffin, Russell, & Frontovra-Duck, 2006:90; Amar, & Gennora 2005:232; Straus, 2004:790).

Nurses have important roles in the identification of individuals at risk of violence and abuse, in providing access to support and assistance, and in planning appropriate interventions for individuals and families (Crombie, Hooker, & Reisenhofer, 2017:2100; Doran, & Hutchinson, 2016:2286; Beccaria et al., 2013:907; Robinson, 2010:572).When nurses are thought to be involved in protective, therapeutic and rehabilitative teams in the community, their attitudes towards violence are thought to have a decisive role in their training and interventions.At the same time, it is thought that, from the risky ages, the sensitivity of student nurses to dating and awareness raising will be important in later relationships. For this reason, this research was conducted to determine the attitudes of nursing students towards dating violence.

2.METHOD

2.1. Type of Study:Research is descriptive and sectional type.

2.2. Universe and Sampling: 407 students who agreed to participate in the research from the students who are studying the universe of the research in a faculty of nursing have created the sample of the research.

2.3. Data Collection Tools: Student Nurse Introducing Information Form and attitude towards dating violence scale were used as data collection tools in the study.

Student Nurse Introducing Information Form: It is aimed to provide information about students' social demographic (age, gender etc),family characteristics (parents education status, sibling number, sibling presence), personal perceptions (existence of dating, number, condition of applying/being subject to violence), that is composed of 24 questions.

TheAttitudesTowardsDatingViolenceScales: The scale developed by Price, Byers and the dating research team (1999) was adapted to Turkish by Yumuşak A. Sahin R. (2014). The scale is used to determine the attitudes of women and men in physical, psychological and sexual violence in dating. The answers to the questionnaire are based on an evaluation ranging from "I strongly disagree" to "I strongly agree". TheAttitudesTowardsDatingViolence Scales involves four scales. "1. TheAttitudesTowards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale", "2.TheAttitudesTowards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale", "3. TheAttitudesTowards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale", "4. The AttitudesTowardsFemalePhysical Dating Violence Scale". The high scores from the scales indicate the high level of acceptance for dating violence (Yumuşak & Şahin, 2014:233).

2.4. Data analysis:The data were evaluated in the SPSS 20 package program. Once the descriptive (number, percentage, mean) statistics were made, the normal distribution appropriateness of the data was tested. Since normal distribution of all data, t-test and one way varianceanalysis were applied in statistical analyzes.

2.5. Ethics:The ethics committee has been granted permission to conduct the research.Permission of Ahmet Erdem Yumuşak, who adapts the scale to Turkish, was taken due to use of Attitude towards Dating Violence Scales as the measurement tool of the research. Before the data collection tools were applied, students were informed about the research and written consent was obtained from the students who agreed to participate in the study.

3. FINDINGS

The distribution of nursing students according to their descriptive characteristics is given in Table 1.



Table 1. The distribution of nursing students according to their descriptive characteristics(n=407)

DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS	n	%
Sex		
Female	280	68.8
Male	127	31.2
Grade		
1	143	35.1
2	106	26.0
3	98	24.1
4	60	14.7
Family type		
Nuclear family	326	80.1
Extended family	55	13.5
Fragmented family	26	6.3
Mother education level		
Primary school	182	44.7
Middle school	113	27.8
High school	77	18.9
College	21	5.2
Unschoolled	14	3.5
Father education level		
Primary school	118	29.0
Middle school	87	21.4
High school	129	31.7
College	73	17.9
Have sisters		
Yes	267	65.6
No	140	34.4
Have brothers		
Yes	232	57.0
No	175	43.0
Longest living place		
Village/town	62	15.2
County	131	32.2
Province	214	52.6
Socioeconomic status		
Income less than expense	53	13.0
Equal income and expenses	296	72.7
Income more than expense	58	14.3
Housing situation at the moment		
With parents	98	24.1
With friends	109	26.8
Alone	5	1.2
In the dormitory	195	47.9

The average age of the nursing students participating in the survey is 20.68 ± 1.60 . 68.8% of the students are female, 26% are studying in the second grade. It was determined that 80.1% of the students had a core family, 44.7% state their mothers are graduated from primary school, 31.7% of their parents had high school graduation, 65.6% have sisters and 57% have brothers. It was determined that students mostly lived in provinces, 72.7% of them had equal income and expenses and 47.9% of the students lived in the dormitories at the moment (Table 1).

The distribution of nursing students according to their dating and violence experience is given in Table 2.



Table 2. The distribution of nursing students according to their dating and violence experience(n=407)

Dating And Violence Experiences	n	%
Have a dating relationship		
Yes	194	47.7
No	213	52.3
Dating time		
0-1 year	97	49.2
2-4 years	87	44.2
5 years and over	13	6.6
Exposed to violence in dating		
Yes	28	6.9
No	379	93.1
Reaction to violence in dating (n=27)		
Felt sorry	8	29.6
Felt angry	3	11.1
Did not talk	3	11.1
End a relationship	7	25.9
Used violence	1	3.7
Felt sorry and angry	4	14.8
Felt angry ve used violence	1	3.7
Used violence in dating		
Yes	29	7.1
No	378	92.9
Reaction to violence in dating of partner (n=28)		
Felt sorry	11	39.3
Felt angry	5	17.9
Reacted normally	3	10.7
Did not talk	5	17.9
Used violence	2	7.1
Felt sorry and angry	1	3.6
Felt sorry and angry and used violence	1	3.6
After use violence in dating, I..... (n=27)		
Felt sorry	10	37.0
Felt angry	1	3.7
Regreted	8	29.6
Thought that deserved	6	22.2
Felt sorry and angry	1	3.7
Felt sorry and regreted	1	3.7
Someone who used violent in family		
Yes	66	16.2
No	341	83.8
Who used violence in family (n=66)		
Mother	9	13.6
Father	37	56.1
Sister	1	1.5
Brother	10	15.2
Father and brother	5	7.6
Mother and father	3	4.5
Stepfather	1	1.5
Exposed to violence in family		
Yes	49	12.0
No	358	88.0

It was determined that 47.7% of the students had a dating relationship and 49.2% of the students had a maximum of one year of dating. It was determined that 6.9% of the students were exposed to violence in dating, 29.6% felt sorry for this situation 7.1% engaged in violence and 39.3% of said their partners and %37 themselves felt sorry for this case. It was determined that 16.2% of the students were violent in the family, 56.1% of them were subject to violence from their fathers and 12% of them were victims of domestic violence (Table 2).



The average scores of the nursing students' attitude scales for violence in dating are given in Table 3.

Table 3. The average scores of the nursing students' attitude scales for violence in dating(n=407)

SCALES	Mean±SD	Research Min-Max	Scale Min-Max
The Attitudes Towards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale	30.35±0.48	15.00-67.00	15.00-75.00
The Attitudes Towards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale	20.19±0.41	12.00-53.00	12.00-60.00
The Attitudes Towards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale	23.83±0.37	11.00-54.00	11.00-55.00
The Attitudes Towards Female Physical Dating Violence Scale	23.65±0.44	12.00-58.00	12.00-60.00

It was determined that the average point obtained from TheAttitudesTowards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale is 30.35±0.48, the average point obtained from TheAttitudesTowards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale is 20.19±0.41, the average point obtained from TheAttitudesTowards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale is 23.83±0.37 and the average point obtained fromThe AttitudesTowardsFemalePhysical Dating Violence Scale is 23.65±0.44 (Table3).

Distribution of nursing students' the attitudes towards dating violence scales average points according to students some definitive characteristics given in Table 4.

Table 4. Distribution of nursing students' the attitudes towards dating violence scales average points according to students some definitive characteristics (n=407)



Some Definitive Characteristics	n	The Attitudes Towards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale			The Attitudes Towards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale			The Attitudes Towards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale			The Attitudes Towards Female Physical Dating Violence Scale		
		Mean±SD	t/F value	p value	Mean±SD	t/F value	p value	Mean±SD	t/F value	p value	Mean±SD	t/F value	p value
Sex													
Female	280	28.65±7.97	t= -4.817	0.00	18.88±7.24	t=-4.890	0.00	23.98±7.70	t=0.605	0.55	23.43±9.13	t= -0.730	0.47
Male	127	34.11±11.60			23.09±9.56			23.50±6.63			24.13±8.30		
Grade													
1	143	20.38±7.74	F=3.648	0.01	29.29±8.72	F=2.387	0.07	24.66±7.34	F=3.173	0.02	25.69±8.76	F=5.198	0.00
2	106	19.64±8.79			30.95±11.30			23.79±6.92			22.00±8.89		
3	98	18.77±6.91			29.65±7.29			21.98±6.91			21.98±8.49		
4	60	23.07±9.85			32.95±11.12			24.95±8.53			24.43±8.83		
Family type													
Nuclear family	326	29.93±9.23	F=5.312	0.01	19.82±8.13	F=6.875	0.00	23.61±7.18	F=0.756	0.47	23.30±8.78	F=1.744	0.18
Extended family	55	34.02±11.80			23.69±9.17			24.82±7.60			25.71±8.55		
Fragmented family	26	27.89±6.78			17.46±5.61			24.54±9.29			23.65±8.88		
Mother education level													
Primary school	182	29.78±9.33	F=2.076	0.08	19.96±7.78	F=3.047	0.02	23.83±7.00	F=1.137	0.34	24.43±8.15	F=1.426	0.22
Middle school	113	29.55±8.45			18.94±7.86			23.96±8.47			22.03±9.58		
High school	77	31.03±9.99			20.73±8.89			23.27±6.27			23.77±8.86		
College	21	34.10±12.46			24.76±10.72			26.62±7.55			24.95±10.81		
Unschoolled	14	30.35±9.59			23.64±7.39			21.79±8.01			23.65±8.88		
Father education level													
Primary school	118	20.72±7.84	F=1.768	0.15	30.59±9.98	F=1.489	0.22	24.60±7.07	F=0.893	0.45	25.75±8.30	F=4.115	0.01
Middle school	87	18.90±7.04			28.48±7.96			23.55±8.62			23.32±8.97		
High school	129	19.76±8.58			30.85±9.79			23.14±6.89			21.85±8.76		
College	73	21.66±9.48			31.30±10.22			24.15±7.14			23.84±9.29		
Have sisters													
Yes	267	30.93±9.86	t=1.733	0.08	20.60±8.32	t=1.365	0.17	23.61±7.16	t=0.407	0.68	23.61±8.49	t=-0.104	0.92
No	140	29.25±8.96			19.43±8.12			23.62±7.81			23.71±9.59		
Have brothers													
Yes	232	30.00±9.65	t=-0.853	0.40	20.47±8.65	t=0.788	0.43	23.53±7.38	t=-0.939	0.35	23.78±9.01	t=0.330	0.74
No	175	30.82±9.50			19.83±7.72			24.23±7.39			23.48±8.71		
Longest living place													
Village/town	62	31.32±10.34	F=3.898	0.02	22.82±9.15	F=0.416	0.66	25.19±7.84	F=1.653	0.19	26.36±9.64	F=5.140	0.01
County	131	30.37±8.98			20.02±7.99			24.05±7.88			24.27±9.10		
Province	214	30.06±9.74			19.54±8.04			23.31±6.90			22.49±8.32		



For the students, meaningful differences ($p < 0.05$) were determined in The Attitudes Towards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale according to their gender, class, family type, and the place where they live the longest. Parent education status and sibling presence variables were not found to be effective in students' Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale. For the students, meaningful differences ($p < 0.05$) were determined in The Attitudes Towards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale according to their family type and educational status of mother. Class, educational status of fathers, existence of sisters or brothers and the longest place of living variables were not found to be effective in students' Male Physical Dating Violence Scale.

For the students, meaningful differences ($p < 0.05$) were determined in The Attitudes Towards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale according to class. Gender, family type, educational status of parents, sibling presence and longest place to live variables were not found to be effective in students' Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale. For the students, meaningful differences ($p < 0.05$) were determined in The Attitudes Towards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale according to class, status of father education and longest place to live. Gender, family type, educational status of mother, sibling presence and longest place to live variables were not found to be effective in students' Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale (Table 4).

Distribution of nursing students' the attitudes towards dating violence scales average points according to students dating and family relationships is given in Table 5.



Table 5: Distribution of nursing students' the attitudes towards dating violence scales average points according to students dating and family relationships (n=407)

Dating And Family Relationships	n	The Attitudes Towards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale			The Attitudes Towards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale			The Attitudes Towards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale			The Attitudes Towards Female Physical Dating Violence Scale		
		Mean±SD	t/F value	p value	Mean±SD	t/F value	p value	Mean±SD	t/F value	p value	Mean±SD	t/F value	p value
Have a dating relationship	213	29.98±9.37			20.01±7.80			23.01±7.17			23.74±8.53		
Yes	194	30.76±9.82	t=-0.814	0.42	20.39±8.75	t=-0.458	0.65	24.74±7.52	t=-2.380	0.02	23.55±9.26	t=0.221	0.83
No													
Dating time													
0-1 year	97	20.64±9.51			30.49±10.03			24.40±7.05			22.78±9.23		
2-4 years	87	19.94±7.16	F=0.238	0.79	31.20±9.15	F=0.177	0.84	25.36±7.96	F=1.114	0.33	24.00±9.01	F=0.644	0.53
5 years and over	13	21.38±11.91			29.85±12.55			22.23±7.53			25.23±11.05		
Exposed to violence in dating													
Evet	28	34.96±11.03	t=2.659	0.01	23.61±9.92	t=2.277	0.02	26.79±8.03	t=2.204	0.03	27.61±10.35	t=2.461	0.01
Hayır	379	30.01±9.40			19.94±8.08			23.62±7.30			23.36±8.70		
Used violence in dating													
Evet	29	35.93±13.22		0.00	24.66±11.96		0.00	26.66±8.92	t=2.146	0.03	28.07±11.14	t=2.807	0.01
Hayır	378	29.92±9.13	t=3.292		19.85±7.82	t=3.049		23.62±7.22			23.31±8.60		
Someone who used violent in family													
Evet	66	29.96±10.17			20.33±9.29			23.23±8.26			23.35±10.08		
Hayır	341	30.43±9.48	t=-0.367	0.71	20.17±8.06	t=0.149	0.88	23.95±7.21	t=-0.728	0.47	23.71±8.64	t=-0.300	0.76



For the students, meaningful differences ($p<0.05$) were determined in TheAttitudesTowards Male Psychological and Physical Dating Violence Scale according to their conditions of engaging and being subject to violence. For the students, meaningful differences ($p<0.05$) were determined in TheAttitudesTowards Female Psychological and Physical Dating Violence Scale according to having a dating relationship and conditions of engaging and being subject to violence. For the students, meaningful differences ($p<0.05$) were determined in TheAttitudesTowards FemalePhysical Dating Violence Scale according to engaging and being subject to violence (Table 5).

4.DISCUSSION

Dating violence is unfortunately a common experience for most university students (Murray, & Kardatzke, 2007:79). International studies have shown that university students have a range of 26-84% of engaging dating violence and 29-30% have become subject to daing violence (Spencer, Haffejee, Candy, & Kaseke, 2016:1129; Kamimura, Nourian, Assasnik, & Franchek-Roa, 2016-a:53; Umena, Fowole, & Adeoye, 2014:1; Chan et al., 2008:529; Amar, & Gennora, 2005:232; Straus, 2004:790). When the studies in Turkey on dating violence experience of university students are examined, Terzioğlu and colleagues (2016) stated that attitudes of university students were not supportive on dating violence, in his study on assessing prevalence of dating violence, Hatipoğlu (2010) stated students had higher levels of becoming subject to dating violence and increasing aggression levels in their dating relations (Terzioğlu et al., 2016:231; Hatipoğlu, 2010:4). Studies have shown that university students differ in terms of engaging and being subject to violence in dting relations of university students. This may be due to differences in the extent to which students can describe violence and be aware of the types of violence and can express the level of violence experienced. In our study, it was determined that 6.9% of the nursing students are subject to dating violence and 7.1% have become subject to violence. Similar to our findings, Er Güner (2016) in study on nursing students, states that 4.1% of the students report they have engaged violence to their partners (Er Güneri, 2016:52). In addition to these findings, in the study on nursing college students, Aslan and colleagues (2008) found that 21.6% of students were exposed to violence while 18.4% of them had engaged in violence, Conner and colleagues (2013) reported that 40% of nursing students were exposed to any type of violence in the partner relationship (Aslan et al., 2008:31,33; Conner et al., 2013:236). When compared with the results of the research conducted in the field of literature, it can be said that nursing students have lower rates of engaging and exposing to dating violence. This may be related to the increased awareness of nursing education in the steps of prevention and intervention of violence. However, it is thought that although the rates are low, dating violence should not be ignored. When the averages of the scores of students obtained from Attitudes of Male and Female Psychological and Physical violence are investigated, it was determined that students' scores for dating violence were below the scale average.

It can be said that the levels of acceptance of students, male and female psychological violence are higher than those of physical violence. In the study undertaken by Kabasakal and Girli (2012) on opinions and experiences of university students subject to violence to women, it was determined that during dating period men show behaviors of emotional and verbal violence than physical violence (Kabasakal, & Girli, 2012:117). Behaviors such as excessive control, excessive jealousy, blocking, threatening, verbal violence may be regarded as positive features in a relationship (Bugay, & Çok, 2015:16). This may be due to students' normalization of psychological violence in dating relationship.

Attitude scales average points of nursing students on Male Psychological and Physical violence and Female Psychological and Physical violence are compared according to some definitive characteristics of students. When examined by gender, male students participating in the survey were found to have a higher acceptance level for psychological and physical violence compared to women. The literature supports this finding. Anderson and colleagues (2011) reported in study carried out among university students that, male students had higher levels of acceptance of psychological violence compared to women (Anderson et al., 2011:631). Another study Wang (2016) conducted with university students indicated that men had higher levels of acceptance of partner violence (Wang, 2016:13). Terzioğlu and colleagues (2016) reported in the study on university students that although they do not support dating violence, male students support dating violence more than female students (Terzioğlu et al., 2016:231). Studies in which violence attitudes of university students are examined, prove that men tend to have more violent tendencies than women (Kul Uçtu, & Karahan, 2016:2899; Karabacak & Kodan Çetinkaya, 2015:16; Yüksel, Engin, & Öztürk Turgut, 2015:838; Kodan Çetinkaya, 2013:28). The higher levels of men's acceptance of violence and the greater tendency to violence can be attributed to gender roles and patriarchy's characterization of man's violence.



When the students were examined by family type, it was determined that those who have large families had higher acceptance levels of psychological and physical violence in dating period other family types. This finding may be due to the normalization of the traditional violence by men, who have a large family structure and who grow up in a patriarchal cultural structure (Uluocak, Gökulu, & Bilir, 2014:383).

When the students were surveyed according to their longest living places, it was determined that the students who live in villages and towns had a higher acceptance level of attitude toward male psychological dating violence and attitude toward female physical dating violence than the students living in the other settlements. Hatipoğlu (2010) studied the prevalence of dating violence in university students and reported that the students living in provinces are less subject to violence (Hatipoğlu, 2010:92). Likewise, Aslan and colleagues (2008) reported that the students who live in the village until the end of elementary school period exposed to more violence in their current dating relations than those living in provinces and districts (Aslan et al., 2008:37). Neill and Hammatt (2015) point out that partner dating violence in rural field is more prevalent in their study of the severity of dating violence in rural and urban areas (Neill, & Hammatt, 2015:93). Edwards (2015) noted that the likelihood of dating violence is similar in urban and rural areas when studying the prevalence of partner violence in urban and rural areas (Edwards, 2015:369). These findings suggest that the attitudes of students towards violence tend to be affected by the place where students live the longest on their individual attitudes.

The attitude scale point averages of nursing students on attitude towards male psychological and physical dating violence and attitude towards female psychological and physical dating violence, are compared due to dating and violence experiences. It was determined that students who were related to dating had higher levels of acceptance of attitudes towards female psychological violence in comparison with the ones who do not have dating relationship. Hatipoğlu (2010) stated that in study examining the prevalence of dating, women are in aggression position in terms of emotional violence in their current relationships (Hatipoğlu, 2010:53). Karabacak and Kodan Çetinkaya (2015) reported that there was no difference in the acceptance level of violence according to the dating experience of the students in university students (Karabacak, & Kodan-Çetinkaya, 2015:17). The existence of psychological violence in relation to dating and the differences in acceptance can be related to innocence and ignorance since there is no concrete evidence of violence.

Students who experienced violence in relation were found to have higher levels of acceptance of psychological and physical violence of women and men and students who engaged violence have higher levels of acceptance of attitudes towards female and male psychological and physical dating violence than the ones who do not have similar experience. Findings of the study support the literature in this aspect. Ozaki and Otis (2017) found that verifying violence was an important predictor of implementing physical and psychological violence to their partners in university students (Ozaki, & Otis, 2017:1076). In the study examining partner violence of university students, Kamimura and colleagues (2016-b) reported that those who implement violence during relationship have a higher incidence of being subject to physical violence (Kamimura, Nourian, Assasnik, & Franchek-Roa, 2016-b:352). Temple and colleagues (2016) noted that engaging psychological violence is related with accepting dating violence (Temple, et al., 2016:197). This suggests that accepting dating violence may be the cause or consequence of implementing or being exposed to violence. The finding of increased risk of violence in relation to dating and violence suggests that violence is both cause and effect and constitutes a cycle of violence.

5.RESULT AND SUGGESTIONS

Determination of attitudes towards violence is important in terms of creating awareness in the individuals, preventing violence and composing solutions. As a result of the research, it has been determined that most of the students are not exposed to violence and engage in violence in relation to dating. Accepting levels of nursing students towards dating violence is under the average.

However, levels of acceptance of psychological violence are relatively higher than levels of acceptance of physical violence. In addition, students are more likely to accept attitudes of male physical and psychological dating violence. Students who are experiencing and practicing violence in relation to dating have higher levels of acceptance of violence.

As a result, although the incidence of nursing students is low, prevention of flirting violence and adding curriculum to intervention courses, initiatives to be aware of the violence experienced by the individuals they give care for and and if necessary, organizing seminars on problem solving and effective communication may be suggested. Programs should be organized related with reflections of social gender roles and preventing formation of dating violence. It is thought that today's student nurses' attitudes



towards dating violence would have an impact on their attitudes towards professional roles as nurses in the future and further research is needed to take necessary measures before the problem of violence emerges.

REFERENCES

- World Health Organization (WHO). <http://www.who.int/topics/violence/en/> Erişim Tarihi 26.07.2017
- Uluocak, Şeref, Gökulu, Gökhan, Bilir, Olgun. (2014). Kadına Yönelik Şiddetin Önlenmesinde Stratejik Bir Başlangıç Noktası: Partner Şiddeti. *International Journal Of Human Sciences*, 11(2), pp. 362-387. Doi: 10.14687/Ijhs.V11i2.2942
- Aslan, Dilek, Vefikuluçay, Duygu, Zeyneloğlu, Simge, Erdost, Türküler, Temel, Fehminaz (2008). Ankara'da İki Hemşirelik Yüksekokulunun Birinci Ve Dördüncü Sınıflarında Okuyan Öğrencilerin Flört Şiddetine Maruz Kalma, Flört İlişkilerinde Şiddet Uygulama Durumlarının Ve Bu Konudaki Görüşlerinin Saptanması Araştırması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Kadın Sorunları Araştırma Ve Uygulama Merkezi, Teknik Rapor*, Ankara. pp. 1-62
- Murray, Christine E., Kardatzke, Kerrie N.(2007). Dating Violence Among College Students: Key Issues For Collage Counselors. *Journal Of Collage Counseling*, 10, s. 79-89.DOI: 10.1002/J.2161-1882.2007.Tb00008.X
- Page, Ayten Zara., İnce, Merve (2008). Aile İçi Şiddet Konusunda Bir Derleme. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 11(22):81-94.
- Schwartz, Jonathan P, Griffin, Linda D., Russell, Melani M., Frontovra-Duck, Serannette (2006). Prevention Of Dating Violence On College Campuses:An Innovative Program. *Journal Of Collegecounseling*, 2006;9, s. 90-96.DOI: 10.1002/J.2161-1882.2006.Tb00096.X
- Bugay Aslı, Çok Figen (2015). Gençlerde Romantik İlişkilerde Şiddet Ve İstismar. *Okul Psikolojik Danışmanı E.Bülteni*, 5, s. 15-19.
- Martins, Conceição, Ana, Gouveia, Chaves, Melanie, Lourenço, Rafael, Marques, Sara, Santos, Telmo (2014). Dating Violence And Nursing Student Well-Being. *Aten Primaria*, 46(1), s. 129-134. Doi: 10.1016/S0212-6567(14)70079-4.
- Kalkan, Melek (2008). Ergenler İçin Romantik İlişkilerde Sorun Çözme Ölçeğinin (Erişçö) Geliştirilmesi, Geçerlik Ve Güvenirliği. *Çocuk Ve Gençlik Ruh Sağlığı Dergisi*, 15(3), s. 131-138.
- Ozaki, Reiko, OTİS, Melanie D. (2017). Genderequality, Patriarchal Cultural Norms And Perception Of Intimate Partner Violence Comparison Of Male University Students İn Asian And European Cultural Contexts. *Violenceagainstwoman*, 23(9), s. 1076-1099. DOI:10.1177/1077801216654575
- Kamimura, Akiko, NOURİAN, Maziar M., ASSASNİK, Nushean, FRANCHEK-ROA, Kathy (2016-a). Depression And Intimate Partner Violence Among College Students İn Iran. *Asianjournal Of Psychiatry*, 23, s. 51-55. Doi: 10.1016/J.Ajp.2016.07.014.
- Mimura, Akiko, Nourian, Maziar M., Assasnik, Nushean, FrancheK-Roa,. (2016-b). Factor Associated With Perpetration Of Intimate Partner Violence Among College Students in China. *Inj. Prev*, Oct;22(5), s. 352-357. Doi: 10.1136/Injuryprev-2015-041890
- Wang, Lili. (2016). Education, Perception Factors, And Prevention Of Intimate Partner Violence: Empirical Research On Chinese University Students' Perceptions And Attitudes Concerning Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal Of Interpersonalviolence*, s. 1-22. DOI: 10.1177/0886260516652263
- Terzioğlu, Füsün, Gönenc, İlknur Münevver, Özdemir, Funda, Güvenç, Gülten, Kök, Gülşah, Yılmaz Sezer, Neslihan., Demirtaş Hiçdurmaz, Başak. (2016). Flört Şiddeti Tutum Ölçeği Geçerlik Ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Anadolu Hemşirelik Ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*. 19(4), s. 225-232.
- Edwards, Katie M.(2015). Intimate Partner Violence And Therural-Urban-Suburban Divide: Mythor Realty? A Critical Review Of The Literature. *Trauma, Violence&Abuse*, 16(3), s. 359-373. Doi: 10.1177/1524838014557289
- Yumuşak Ahmet, Şahin Rukiye. (2014). Flörtte Şiddete Yönelik Tutum Ölçeklerinin Güvenirlik Ve Geçerlik Çalışması. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 13(49), s. 233-252. DOI: [Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.17755/Esosder.55295](http://dx.doi.org/10.17755/Esosder.55295)
- Kılınçer, Ahmet Selçuk, Tuzgöl Dost, Meliha (2014). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Romantik İlişkilerde Algıladıkları İstismar. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma Ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 5(42), s. 160-172.
- Kepir Savoly, Didem, Ulaş, Özlem, Demirtaş Zorbaz, Selen.(2014). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Çiftler Arası Şiddeti Kabul Düzeylerini Etkileyen Etmenler.*Türk Psikolojik Danışma Ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 5(42), s. 173-183.
- Umena, Joseph E, Fowole, Olufunmilayo, Ikeola, ADEOYEIA. (2014). Prevalance And Correlates Of Intimate Partner Violence Towards Female Students Of The University Of Ibedan, Nigeria. *BMC Woman's Health*, 14(131), s. 1-8.DoI: 10.1186/1472-6874-14-131
- Flake, Tania Aldrighi., BARROS, Claudia, SCHRAİBER, Lilia B., MENEZES, Paulo Rossi. (2013). Intimate Partner Violence Among Undergraduate Students Of Two Universities Of The State Of Sao Paulo, Brazil. *Revista Brasileira De Epidemiologia*, 16(4), s. 801-816.[Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1590/S1415-790X2013000400001](http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1415-790X2013000400001)
- Conner, Pamela D., Nover, Simonne S., Speck Patricia M., Mackey, SeeTrail N., Tipton Nathan G. (2013). Nursing Students And Intimate Partner Violence Education: Improving And Integrating Klowledge Into Health Care Curricular. *Journal Of Professional Nursing*. 29(4), s. 233-239.DoI: 10.1016/J.Profnurs.2012.05.011.
- Mcdermott, Ryon C., Lopez, Frederick G. (2013). College Men's Intimate Partner Violence Attitudes: Contributions Of Adult Attachment And Gender Role Stress. *J. Counspsychol*. 60(1), s. 127-36. Doi: 10.1037/A0030353
- Beccaria, Gavin, Beccaria, Lisa, Dawson, Rhonda, Gorman, Don, Harris, Julia A., Hossain, Delwar (2013). Nursing Student's Perceptions And Undertsanding Of Intimate Partner Violence. *Nurse Education Today*,33, s. 907-911.
- Hatipoğlu, Sevgi. (2010). *Başkent Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinde Flört Şiddeti Prevelansı Anketi*. Uzmanlık Tezi, Başkent Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Adli Tıp A.D. Uzmanlık Tezi. Ankara.
- Chan, Ko Ling, Straus, Murray A., Brownsidge, Douglas A., Tiwari, Agnes, Leung, W.C. (2008). Prevalance Of Dating Partner Violence And Suicidal Ideation Among Male And Female University Students Worldwide. *Journal Of Midwifery&Women's Health*, 53(6), s. 529-537.DoI: 10.1016/J.Jmwh.2008.04.016
- Luthra, Rohini, Gidycz, Christine A. (2006). Dating Violence Among College Men And Women. Evaluation Of A Theoretical Model. *Journal Of Interpersonalviolence*, 2006;21(6), s. 717-731. DOI: 10.1177/0886260506287312
- Amar, Angela Frederick, Gennora, Susan. (2005). Dating Violence in College Women: Associated Physical Injury, Health Care Usage, And Mental Helath Syptoms. *Nursing Research*, 54(4), s. 232-242.
- Straus, Murray A. (2004). Prevalance Of Violence Against Dating Partners By Male And Female University Student Worldwide. *Violenceagainstwomen*, 10(7), s. 790-811.
- Crombie, Nerissa, Hooker, Leesa, Reisenhofer, Sonia. (2017). Nurse And Midwifery Education And Intimate Partner Violence: A Scoping Review. *Journal Of Clinical Nursing*, 26, S. 2100-2125. Doi: 10.1111/Jocn.13376.
- Doran, Frances, Hutchinson, Marie. (2016). Student Nurses' Klowledge And Attitudes Towards Domestic Violence: Results Of Survey Highlight Need For Continued Attention To Undergraduate Curriculum. *Journal Of Clinicalnursing*, 26, s. 2286-2296.DoI: 10.1111/Jocn.13325



- Robinson, Ruthie. (2010). Myths And Stereotypes: How Registered Nurses Screen For Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal Of Emergencynursing*, 36(6), s. 572-576. Doi: 10.1016/J.Jen.2009.09.008.
- Spencer, K., Haffejee, M., Candy, G., Kaseke, E. (2016). Intimate Partner Violence At A Tertiary Institute. *South African Medical Journal*, Nov 2;106 (11), s. 1129-1133. Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.7196/Samj.2016.V106i11.12013
- Er Güneri, Sezer. (2016). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Kadına Uygulanan Şiddete Yönelik Tutumlarının Belirlenmesi. *Türkiye Klinikleri*, 2(2) s. 49-56.
- Kabasakal, Zekavet, Girli, Alev. (2012). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Kadına Yönelik Şiddet Hakkındaki Görüşlerinin, Deneyimlerinin Ve Bazı Değişkenler Ve Yaşam Doyumu İle İlişkisi (Deü Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Örneği) *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14(2), s. 105-123.
- Anderson, J.R., Chen, W.C., Johnson, M.D., Lyon, S.E., Lee, C-Y.S., Zheng, F., Ratcliffe, G.C., Peterson, R. (2011). Attitudes Toward Dating Violence Among College Students In Mainland China: An Exploratory Study. *Violence And Victims*, 26(5), s. 631-647.
- Kul Uçtu, Arzu, Karahan, Nazan. (2016). Sağlık Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Cinsiyet Roller, Toplumsal Cinsiyet Algısı Ve Şiddet Eğilimleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *İnsan Ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(8), s. 2882-2905.
- Karabacak, Aynur, Kodan Çetinkaya, Semanur (2015). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Şiddet Kabul Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Eğitim Kuram Ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), s. 13-21.
- Yüksel, Ayşegül, Engin, Esra, Öztürk Turgut, Emel (2015). Hemşirelik Öğrencilerinin Şiddet Eğilimlerinin İncelenmesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8(41), s.834-840.
- Kodan Çetinkaya, Semanur. (2013). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Şiddet Eğilimlerinin Ve Cinsiyet Rollerine İlişkin Tutumlarının İncelenmesi. *Nesne*, 1(2), s. 21-43.
- Neill, Karen, Hammatt, Julia. (2015). Beyond Urban Places: Responding To Intimate Partner Violence In Rural And Remote Areas. *Journal Of Forensicnursing*, 11(2), s. 93-100.DOI:10.1097/JFN.0000000000000070
- Temple, Jeff R., Choi, Hye Jeong., ELMQUIST, JoAnna , HECHT, Michael, MILLER-DAY, Michelle, STUART, Gegory L., BREM, Meagan, Wolford-Clevenger, Caitlin. (2016). Psychological Abuse, Mental Health An Acceptance Of Dating Violence Among Adolescents. *Journal Of Adolescenthealth*, 59(2), s. 197-202.Doi: 10.1016/J.Jadohealth.2016.03.034