

Undergraduates' Attitudes toward Dating Violence: Its Relationship with Sexism and Narcissism

Ahmet Erdem¹ & Rukiye Şahin¹

¹ Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Education, Gaziosmanpaşa University, Tokat, Turkey

Correspondence: Ahmet Erdem, Department of Educational Sciences Faculty of Education, Gaziosmanpaşa University, Tokat, Turkey. E-mail: drahmeterdem@gmail.com

Received: November 6, 2017

Accepted: November 24, 2017

Online Published: November 27, 2017

doi:10.5430/ijhe.v6n6p91

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n6p91>

This paper was produced from the first author's master thesis named as "The Relationship among University Students' Attitudes towards Dating Violence, Sexism and their Narcissistic Personality Traits", which was accepted by Institute of Educational Sciences of Gaziosmanpaşa University.

Abstract

In this research, whether the undergraduates' attitude levels towards the dating violence differed in terms of gender, dating relationship status, being exposed to the dating violence and resorting to the dating violence was investigated. The sample of the study was composed of 1171 undergraduates. In the research, "The Attitudes toward Dating Violence Scales, Ambivalent Sexism Scale, Ambivalence toward Men Scale, Narcissistic Personality Inventory, and Personal Information Form" were used as the data collection tools. In conclusion, significant differences were determined in the university students' attitudes towards the dating violence according to the different demographic variables (gender, dating relationship status, being exposed to the dating violence and resorting to the dating violence). Moreover, university students' attitudes towards dating violence were determined to positively and significantly correlate with their ambivalence sexism levels. Ambivalence toward men was determined to positively and significantly correlate with their attitudes towards dating violence. In addition, university students' narcissistic personality traits were found to positively and significantly correlate with their attitudes towards dating violence.

Keywords: Dating violence, Gender, Narcissism, Dating Violence of Male, Dating Violence of Female

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduce the Problem

In modern Western societies, there are two opposite views on aggression within couples and its consequences (Archer, 2006). The first view emphasizes that both males and females can be victims or offenders. On the other hand, the second view argues that females are always the victims in intimate relations while males are the offenders (Archer, 2006; Archer, 2010). In the national literature, there are studies dealing with the issue from the perspective of females (Uluocak, Gökulu, & Bilir, 2014; Demirtaş, Hatipoğlu-Sümer, & White, 2013; Güvenç, Akyüz, & Cesario, 2014; Ergöçmen, Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, & Jansen, 2013) while some studies focus on the violence against females and males (Toplu-Demirtaş, Hatipoğlu-Sümer, & Fincham, 2017). Conducting a study focusing on the violence committed by males and females against each other from the perspective of being a male or female would contribute to the literature in terms of understanding the violence between the couples. The number of studies focusing on dating violence, one of the violence types between couples, is limited. Therefore, determination of the attitude towards dating violence and the variables that could be linked with it will help the concept understood better and contribute to the prevention of violence.

1.2 Dating Violence

Dating violence is one of the types of interpersonal violence, and it involves any sexual harassment, physical violence, verbal or emotional maltreatment with the scope of a dating relationship (Ramisetty-Mikler, Goebert, Nishimura, & Caetano, 2006). It is understood from the literature that dating violence is classified as psychological dating violence, verbal/emotional dating violence, and sexual dating violence (Foshee et al., 2007; Makepeace, 1981,1983,1987; Price, Byers, & Dating Violence Research Team, 1999; Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999).

Foshee and his colleagues (2007) exemplified the physical dating violence behaviors as scratching, slapping, slamming someone against a wall, biting, trying to choke, burning, beating, and assaulting with a knife or gun. Humiliating, insulting or scolding are among the verbal/emotional dating violence behaviors (Offenhauer & Buchalter, 2011). Moreover, threats to hurt or damaging the partner's objects, throwing something to the partner but deliberately missing, preparing to hit the partner but stopping at the last second, emotional harassment, death threat, ignoring and threats to walk out are also examples of verbal/emotional dating violence (Smith & Donnelly, 2001). Additionally, overuse of technological devices such as cellphones and social networks as a mean of violence can be considered as verbal/emotional dating violence behaviors (Draucker et al., 2010). As for the sexual dating violence, sexual abuse involving rape, rape attempt, birth control, and abortion can be mentioned as an example (Rickert, Wiemann, Vaughan, & White, 2004; Miller, Decker, Reed, Raj, Hathaway, & Silverman, 2007). Forcing the partner to have sex against his/her will is among the sexual dating violence behaviors (Smith & Donnelly, 2001). Apart from the type and content of the violence, risk factors and variables predicting the violence were also focused by researchers. Attitude towards the violence is a variable predicting the violence in intimate relations (Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992). Dating violence generally affects adolescents and the young (Makepeace 1981; 1983; 1987); males are mostly the offenders (Foshee et al., 2016); and males have more positive attitudes towards violence when compared to females; however, verbal aggression behaviors are more frequent in females, and being exposed to violence by both males and females is associated with committing violence (Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992). Studies based on gender show that males have more positive attitudes towards the dating violence committed by males (Price et al., 1999) and their level of dating violence acceptance is higher than females according to studies conducted in different cultures (Mercer, 1988; O'Keefe, 1997; Sezer, 2008). Dating violence has negative consequences for those being exposed to violence in terms of psychological health. Substance abuse, eating and sleeping disorders, risky sexual behaviors, unintended pregnancy, fear, anxiety, trauma, suicide, murder, social isolation, shame, guilt, and anger are among the effects of dating violence (Holt & Espelage, 2005). There is a relationship between dating violence and being a victim. In adolescents, being the offender of bullying was associated with being the offender of dating violence (Foshee et al., 2016). In undergraduates, being exposed to partner violence was associated with committing violence to the partner (Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992). The violence inflicted to the partner by those who commit violence also in peer relations shows the strength of personal traits in addition to social or relational conditions. The males who witnessed violence between their parents were found to be more inclined to commit violence against their dating partners (O'Keefe, 1997; Carr, & VanDeusen, 2002). Thus, it can be stated that being the witness of and being exposed to violence increases the risk of being the offender of violence.

1.3 Attitude towards Violence, Sexism, and Narcissism

Some studies have revealed that gender and narcissism are among the variables that are associated with dating violence (Campbell & Foster, 2002; Ryan, Weikel & Sprechini, 2008). Narcissism is based on a myth about a young man who fell in love with his own reflection. It means self-love; however, its equivalent in psychology is artificially increased egoism (Baumeister, Smart, & Boden, 1996). Men are more narcissist than women (Blinkhorn, Lyons, & Almond, 2016). In a relationship, narcissists focus on themselves, meet their power needs (Carroll, 1987), and try to maintain their authority (Bradlee & Emmons, 1992). They are unable to have sincere relations and develop empathy, and they are impulsive. They are more inclined to demonstrate violence in relationships and interfamily relations, and there is a positive relationship between narcissism and being the offender of violence (Beasley & Stoltenberg, 1992; Carton & Egan, 2017; Craig, 2003; Hamberger & Hastings, 1990; Okuda et al., 2015; Simmons, Lehmann, Cobb & Fowler, 2005, as cited in Ryan, Weikel & Sprechini, 2008). Narcissism is not only associated with attitudes towards violence in intimate relationships but also linked with attitudes towards violence in a broader manner (i.e. capital punishment, attitude towards war, physical punishment to children) (Blinkhorn et al., 2016). As suggested by the relevant studies, narcissism is a personal trait that can help researchers understand violence (Lambe, Hamilton-Giachritsis, Garner & Walker, 2016). However, although it is closely related to violence, it isn't a variable that affects the violence by itself (Kiire, 2017).

Accepted as an aspect of narcissism, entitlement is a strong predictor of ambivalent sexism despite some differences between men and women (Grubbs, Exline, & Twenge, 2014). Sexism involves a hostility similar to violence. However, the explanation of ambivalent sexism involving hostile and protective dimensions and the classification of protective sexism involving an attitude representing privileging women or showing special concern in terms of conceptualization of sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996) provide a more comprehensive viewpoint to understand cultures in which the sexist attitude is widespread and which has a power difference against women. Studies classifying sexism as hostile and protective reveal that these two sexist attitudes lead a difference in attitudes towards violence.

Men with a higher level of dating violence acceptance were found to have higher sexist attitudes (Ryan, 1995; Sigelman, Berry & Wiles, 1984). In their studies conducted in Turkey and Brazil, Glick and his colleagues (2002) found a relationship between protective and hostile sexism and attitudes towards justification of violence against the partner. According to a study conducted by Forbes, Adams-Curtis, Pakalka, and White (2006), individuals with sexist attitudes towards women had higher levels of dating violence acceptance. Moreover, hostile dimension of ambivalent sexism is positively associated with dating violence (Forbes, Adams-Curtis & White, 2004). Similarly, individuals who are more conservative or traditionalist have higher levels of dating violence acceptance (Brown, Sumner & Nocera, 2002; Follingstad, Rutledge, Polek & McNeill-Hawkins, 1988). According to Jenkins and Aube (2002), being an offender of psychological violence is strongly associated with having traditional gender roles. The relationship between men's acceptance level of dating violence and their perceptions of gender roles was found to be stronger (Berkel, Vandiver & Bahner, 2004; Hillier & Foddy, 1993; Hilton, Harris & Rice, 2003). Understanding having attitudes towards gender and narcissism's association with violence and attitudes towards violence will help researchers and practitioners understand the phenomenology of violence and take precautions to prevent it.

Within this scope, this study aimed at revealing whether undergraduates' attitudes towards dating violence differ in terms of gender, dating status, being exposed to violence in a relationship, and committing violence in a relationship. Additionally, the relationship of undergraduates' attitudes towards dating violence with gender and narcissism was examined.

Research questions;

- 1-Do undergraduates' attitudes towards psychological and physical violence committed by males in a relationship;
 - a. significantly differ in terms of their gender?
 - b. significantly differ in terms of their dating status?
 - c. significantly differ in terms of being exposed to dating violence?
 - d. significantly differ in terms of committing violence in a relationship?
- 2- Do undergraduates' attitudes towards psychological and physical violence committed by females in a relationship;
 - a. significantly differ in terms of their gender?
 - b. significantly differ in terms of their dating status?
 - c. significantly differ in terms of being exposed to dating violence?
 - d. significantly differ in terms of committing violence in a relationship?
- 3- Are undergraduates' attitudes towards psychological and physical violence committed by males and females correlated with ambivalent sexism and its sub dimensions?
- 4- Are undergraduates' attitudes towards psychological and physical violence committed by males and females correlated with ambivalence toward men its sub dimensions?
- 5- Are undergraduates' attitudes towards psychological and physical violence committed by males and females correlated with their narcissistic personality traits and its sub dimensions?

2. Method

2.1 Participants

A total of 1171 undergraduates participated in this study. The demographic information of participants can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. The Distribution of Participants in terms of Demographics

Variables	Categories	F	%
Gender	Female	456	38.9
	Male	715	61.1
Faculty	Education	315	26.9
	Agriculture	119	10.2
	Science and Literature	161	13.7
	Economics and Administrative Sciences	225	19.2
	Engineering	161	13.7
	Medical	147	12.6
	Theology	43	3.7
Dating Status	Yes	443	37.8
	No	728	62.2
Being Exposed to Violence in a relationship	Yes	52	4.4
	No	1119	95.6
Committing Violence in a relationship	Yes	83	7.1
	No	1088	92.9
Total		1171	100

2.2 Data Collection Tools

The data of this study were collected using The Attitudes toward Dating Violence Scales (Price, Byers, & Dating Violence Research Team, 1999), which were adapted into Turkish by Yumuşak and Şahin (2014); Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, which was adapted into Turkish by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002); Ambivalence toward Men Scale, which was adapted into Turkish by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2008); and Narcissistic Personality Inventory, which was adapted into Turkish by Kızıltan (2000). The Attitudes toward Dating Violence Scales were developed by Price, Byers, and Dating Violence Research Team (1999) in order to measure the attitudes of men and women towards physical, psychological, and sexual violence in a relationship. The items are rated from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree) on a 5-point Likert scale. The scales were adapted into Turkish by Yumuşak and Şahin (2014). The scales were named as Attitudes towards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale, Attitudes towards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale, Attitudes towards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale, and Attitudes towards Female Physical Dating Violence Scale. The total variances explained by each scale were found to be 27.881; 41.381; 30.598; and 35.354, respectively. In the current study, the Cronbach alpha values were estimated to be .81; .87; .75; and .82, respectively. In the original study, the Cronbach alpha values of each scale were estimated separately for men and women. Accordingly, the Cronbach alpha coefficients of the data obtained from participants using Attitudes towards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale were .85 and .76 for men and women, respectively. These values were found to be .84 and .81 for Attitudes towards Male Physical Dating Violence Scale. They were found to be .72 and .78 for Attitudes towards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale. Finally, these values were found to be .81 and .86 for Attitudes towards Female Physical Dating Violence Scale (Price, Byers, & Dating Violence Research Team, 1999). The higher scores obtained from scales indicate a higher level of acceptance of dating violence (Price, Byers, & Dating Violence Research Team, 1999).

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory was developed by Glick and Fiske (1996) in order to measure individuals' hostile and protective sexism attitudes. It is composed of 22 items. The items of the inventory are rated on a 6-point Likert scale. Its adaptation into Turkish was carried out on the data obtained from 1023 undergraduates studying at Middle East Technical University. Of these participants, 517 were male, and 506 were female. The mean age of all participants, male participants, and female participants were 21.21 ($S = 2.00$), 21.59 ($S = 1.84$), and 20.82 ($S = 2.10$), respectively (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002). Factor analysis with varimax technique was conducted to test the construct validity of the adapted scale. This analysis yielded 4 factor with eigenvalues higher than 0.1. Similar to results of Glick and Fiske's (1996) study, protective sexism involved three sub factors (Protective Paternalism, Complementary Gender

Differentiation, Heterosexual Intimacy), and hostile sexism constituted one factor (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002). Factor loadings of items in hostile sexism varied between .67 and .77, while they varied between .67 and .81 in protective sexism. The items were placed under the same factors and sub factors as under the original study (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002). The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the total scale, hostile sexism factor, and protective sexism scale were found to be .85, .87, and .78, respectively. The adapted version of Ambivalent Sexism Inventory was concluded to be a valid and reliable tool to measure individuals' ambivalent sexism attitudes towards women.

Glick and Fiske (1996) developed Ambivalence toward Men Scale to measure the ambivalent emotions of society about men (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2008). It was composed of 20 items. The items are rated from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) on a 6-point Likert scale. Higher scores obtained from the scale indicate higher hostile and protective attitudes towards men (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2008). The scale was applied with a total of 584 students enrolled in "Introduction to Psychology" and "Introduction to Social Psychology." 412 of participants were male, and 442 were female. The mean age of all participants, male participants, and female participants were 20.59 ($S = 1.80$), 21.07 ($S = 1.87$), and 20.14 ($S = 1.62$), respectively. Factor analysis with varimax technique was conducted to test the construct validity of the adapted scale. The factor analysis was forced to yield two factorial solution since earlier studies yielded two factors (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2008). As a result, the factors of MHA and MPA, which were determined by Glick and his colleagues (2004) were obtained. The item loadings under MHA factor ranged between .46 and .72. The factor loadings under MPA factor ranged between .48 and .79 (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2008). The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the total scale (number of items = 19), MHA, and MPA were found to be .82, .82, and .83, respectively (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2008). These values are consistent with both Glick and Fiske's (1999) study and Glick and his colleagues' (2004) original study (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002). To sum up, it is a valid and reliable study to measure undergraduates' ambivalence toward men.

The original Narcissistic Personality Inventory, which was developed by Raskin and Hall (1979) and revised by Raskin and Tyler, is composed of 40 items (Kızıltan, 2000). After the translation and linguistic equivalence studies of Narcissistic Personality Inventory, it was conducted with a total of 399 undergraduates. The analysis showed that item-total correlation varied between .008 and .50. It was observed that item 14 didn't significantly contribute to the model ($r=.008$, $p>.05$). Thus, it was excluded from the scale (Kızıltan, 2000). After a month, the scale was conducted with 104 participants again. The correlation coefficient between the first and second application was .89 and significant at .000 level (Kızıltan, 2000). Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted. The analysis confirmed the seven factorial construct and it explained 45.5% of the total variance (Kızıltan, 2000). However, the items 12, 13, 17, 28, and 35 weren't loaded under the relevant factors, and they were excluded from the scale. As a result, it was concluded that the Narcissistic Personality Inventory was a valid and reliable tool (Kızıltan, 2000).

2.3 Personal Information Form

A Personal Information Form was developed in order to obtain the demographic information of the participants. This form included questions regarding the undergraduates' gender, age, geographical region, where they lived longest, faculty, department, grade level, parents' education level (mother and father separately), number of siblings, family's income level, dating status, dating duration, the status of being exposed to violence in a relationship, and the status of committing violence in a relationship.

2.3.1 Data Collection

The participants of this study were chosen among the undergraduates studying at a state university located in Central Black Sea Region during the 2012-2013 academic year using convenient sampling technique. The required permission was obtained from the university administration, and the data were collected. The participants were given information about the scope and purpose of the study, and the volunteers filled in the forms. Finally, the participants were thanked for their participation in the study.

2.3.2 Data Analysis

The dataset was examined in a general sense, and the cases including missing data were or circling more than one choices excluded from the study. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows 20.0 software was utilized to perform the analyses.

3. Findings and Interpretation

Whether the undergraduates' attitudes towards male psychological dating violence differed in terms of gender, dating status, being exposed to violence, and committing violence in a relationship was examined using t-test. The results can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. t-test results of undergraduates' attitudes towards male psychological dating violence in terms of gender, dating status, being exposed to violence, and committing violence in a relationship

		<i>n</i>	\bar{x}	<i>sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender	Male	456	43.90	7.56	22.08	.000
	Female	715	33.22	8.36		
Dating Status	Yes	443	38.36	9.65	2.740	.006
	No	728	36.78	9.51		
Being Exposed to Violence	Yes	52	42.26	8.90	3.777	.000
	No	1119	37.15	9.57		
Committing Violence in a Relationship	Yes	83	42.71	9.28	5.307	.000
	No	1088	36.97	9.50		

$p < 0.05$

Undergraduates' attitudes towards male psychological dating violence differed significantly in terms of gender, $t(1169)=22.08$, $p < 0.01$. Male undergraduates' mean score ($\bar{x}=43.90$) was higher than female undergraduates' mean score ($\bar{x}=33.22$). Female undergraduates' acceptance level of male psychological violence was lower than males. Similarly, undergraduates' attitudes towards male psychological dating violence differed significantly in terms of dating status, $t(1169)=2.74$, $p < 0.05$. The mean score of undergraduates in a dating relationship ($\bar{x}=38.36$) was found to be higher than the mean score of their counterparts that aren't in a dating relationship ($\bar{x}=36.78$). Acceptance level of male psychological violence of undergraduates that weren't in a dating relationship was lower than the mean score of undergraduates in a dating relationship. Undergraduates' attitudes towards male psychological dating violence differed significantly in terms of being exposed to violence, $t(1169)= 3.77$, $p < 0.05$. The mean score of undergraduates that were exposed to dating violence ($\bar{x}=42.26$) was higher than the mean score of undergraduates that weren't exposed to dating violence ($\bar{x}=37.15$). Acceptance level of male psychological violence of undergraduates that weren't exposed to dating violence was lower than the mean score of undergraduates that were exposed to dating violence. Undergraduates' attitudes towards male psychological dating violence differed significantly in terms of committing violence in a relationship, $t(1169)= 5.30$, $p < 0.05$. The mean score of undergraduates that committed dating violence ($\bar{x}=42.71$) was higher than the mean score of undergraduates that didn't commit dating violence ($\bar{x}=36.97$). Acceptance level of male psychological violence of undergraduates that didn't commit dating violence was lower than the mean score of undergraduates that committed dating violence.

Whether the undergraduates' attitudes towards male physical dating violence differed in terms of gender, dating status, being exposed to violence, and committing violence in a relationship was examined using t-test. The results can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. t-test results of undergraduates' attitudes towards male physical dating violence in terms of gender, dating status, being exposed to violence, and committing violence in a relationship

		<i>n</i>	\bar{x}	<i>sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender	Male	456	32.91	8.42	14.77	.000
	Female	715	25.27	8.75		
Dating Status	Yes	443	28.47	9.37	.636	.525
	No	728	28.11	9.42		
Being Exposed to Violence	Yes	52	32.92	8.64	3.689	.000
	No	1119	28.03	9.38		
Committing Violence in a Relationship	Yes	83	33.63	9.09	5.488	.000
	No	1088	27.83	9.29		

$p < 0.05$

Undergraduates' attitudes towards male physical dating violence differed significantly in terms of gender, $t(1169)=14.77$, $p<0.01$. Male undergraduates' mean score ($\bar{x}=32.91$) was higher than female undergraduates' mean score ($\bar{x}=25.27$). Female undergraduates' acceptance level of male physical violence was lower than males. Undergraduates' attitudes towards male physical dating violence didn't differ significantly in terms of dating status, $t(1169)=.63$, $p<0.05$. Undergraduates' attitudes towards male physical dating violence differed significantly in terms of being exposed to violence, $t(1169)= 3.68$, $p<0.05$. The mean score of undergraduates that were exposed to dating violence ($\bar{x}=32.92$) was higher than the mean score of undergraduates that weren't exposed to dating violence ($\bar{x}=28.03$). Acceptance level of male physical violence of undergraduates that weren't exposed to dating violence was lower than the mean score of undergraduates that were exposed to dating violence. Undergraduates' attitudes towards male physical dating violence differed significantly in terms of committing violence in a relationship, $t(1169)= 5.48$, $p<0.05$. The mean score of undergraduates that committed dating violence ($\bar{x}=33.63$) was higher than the mean score of undergraduates that didn't commit dating violence ($\bar{x}=27.83$). Acceptance level of male physical violence of undergraduates that didn't commit dating violence was lower than the mean score of undergraduates that committed dating violence.

Whether the undergraduates' attitudes towards female psychological dating violence differed in terms of gender, dating status, being exposed to violence, and committing violence in a relationship was examined using t-test. The results can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. t-test results of undergraduates' attitudes towards female psychological dating violence in terms of gender, dating status, being exposed to violence, and committing violence in a relationship

		<i>n</i>	\bar{x}	<i>sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender	Male	456	28.61	5.27	-3.41	.001
	Female	715	29.72	5.52		
Dating Status	Yes	443	29.56	5.53	1.340	.181
	No	728	29.12	5.40		
Being Exposed to Violence	Yes	52	30.38	5.60	1.477	.140
	No	1119	29.24	5.44		
Committing Violence in a Relationship	Yes	83	31.12	5.90	3.179	.002
	No	1088	29.15	5.39		

$p<0.05$

Undergraduates' attitudes towards female psychological dating violence differed significantly in terms of gender, $t(1169)= -3.417$, $p<0.01$. Male undergraduates' mean score ($\bar{x}=28.61$) was lower than female undergraduates' mean score ($\bar{x}=29.72$). Female undergraduates' acceptance level of female physical violence was higher than males. Undergraduates' attitudes towards female psychological dating violence didn't differ significantly in terms of dating status, $t(1169)=1.34$, $p<0.05$. Undergraduates' attitudes towards female psychological dating violence didn't differ significantly in terms of being exposed to violence, $t(1169)= 1.47$, $p<0.05$. Undergraduates' attitudes towards female psychological dating violence differed significantly in terms of committing violence in a relationship, $t(1169)= 3.17$, $p<0.05$. The mean score of undergraduates that committed dating violence ($\bar{x}=31.12$) was higher than the mean score of undergraduates that didn't commit dating violence ($\bar{x}=29.15$). Acceptance level of female psychological violence of undergraduates that didn't commit dating violence was lower than the mean score of undergraduates that committed dating violence.

Whether the undergraduates' attitudes towards female physical dating violence differed in terms of gender, dating status, being exposed to violence, and committing violence in a relationship was examined using t-test. The results can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. t-test results of undergraduates' attitudes towards female physical dating violence in terms of gender, dating status, being exposed to violence, and committing violence in a relationship

		<i>n</i>	\bar{X}	<i>sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender	Male	456	29.52	7.62	2.86	.004
	Female	715	28.02	8.94		
Dating Status	Yes	443	28.59	8.50	-.153	.879
	No	728	28.67	8.48		
Being Exposed to Violence	Yes	52	31.94	7.98	2.878	.004
	No	1119	28.48	8.48		
Committing Violence in a Relationship	Yes	83	32.06	8.23	3.829	.000
	No	1088	28.38	8.45		

p<0.05

Undergraduates' attitudes towards female physical dating violence differed significantly in terms of gender, $t(1169)=2.863, p<0.01$. Male undergraduates' mean score ($\bar{X}=29.52$) was higher than female undergraduates' mean score ($\bar{X}=28.02$). Female undergraduates' acceptance level of female physical violence was lower than males. Undergraduates' attitudes towards female physical dating violence didn't differ significantly in terms of dating status, $t(1169)= -.15, p<0.05$. Undergraduates' attitudes towards female physical dating violence differed significantly in terms of being exposed to violence, $t(1169)= 2.87, p<0.05$. The mean score of undergraduates that were exposed to dating violence ($\bar{X}=31.94$) was higher than the mean score of undergraduates that weren't exposed to dating violence ($\bar{X}=28.48$). Acceptance level of female physical violence of undergraduates that weren't exposed to dating violence was lower than the mean score of undergraduates that were exposed to dating violence. Undergraduates' attitudes towards female physical dating violence differed significantly in terms of committing violence in a relationship, $t(1169)= 3.82, p<0.05$. The mean score of undergraduates that committed dating violence ($\bar{X}=32.06$) was higher than the mean score of undergraduates that didn't commit dating violence ($\bar{X}=28.38$). Acceptance level of female physical violence of undergraduates that didn't commit dating violence was lower than the mean score of undergraduates that committed dating violence.

The results of Pearson correlation analysis among undergraduates' attitudes towards male and female psychological and physical violence and ambivalent sexism and its sub dimensions can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. The results of Pearson correlation analysis among the attitudes towards male psychological and physical violence, female psychological and physical violence, and ambivalent sexism and its sub dimensions

	Attitudes towards Male Psychological Dating Violence		Attitudes towards Male Physical Dating Violence		Attitudes towards Female Psychological Dating Violence		Attitudes towards Female Physical Dating Violence	
	<i>r</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Protective Sexism	-.151(**)	.000	-.120(**)	.000	.250(**)	.000	.102(**)	.000
Heterosexual Intimacy	-.008	.790	-.019	.518	.232(**)	.000	.091(**)	.002
Protective Paternalism	-.058(*)	.047	-.040	.166	.210(**)	.000	.096(**)	.001
Complementary Gender Differentiation	-.315(**)	.000	-.240(**)	.000	.122(**)	.000	.043	.145
Hostile Sexism	.274(**)	.000	.251(**)	.000	.131(**)	.000	.081(**)	.006
Ambivalent Sexism Total	.081(**)	.006	.085(**)	.003	.234(**)	.000	.113(**)	.000

**p<0.01 *p<0.05

When the analysis results were examined, it was observed that the attitudes towards male psychological dating violence; was negatively and significantly correlated with protective sexism ($r=-.151$; $p=.000$); wasn't significantly correlated with heterosexual intimacy ($r=-.008$; $p=.790$); was negatively and significantly correlated with protective paternalism ($r=-.058$; $p=.047$) and complementary gender differentiation ($r=-.315$; $p=.000$). Moreover, the attitudes towards male psychological dating violence was positively and significantly correlated with hostile sexism ($r=.274$; $p=.000$) and ambivalent sexism total score ($r=.081$; $p=.006$). The attitudes towards male physical dating violence was negatively and significantly correlated with protective sexism ($r=-.120$; $p=.000$) and complementary gender differentiation ($r=-.240$; $p=.000$). However, it was significantly correlated with heterosexual intimacy ($r=-.019$; $p=.518$) and protective paternalism ($r=-.040$; $p=.166$). On the other hand, it was positively and significantly correlated with hostile sexism ($r=.251$; $p=.000$) and ambivalent sexism total score ($r=.085$; $p=.003$).

It was found that attitudes towards female psychological dating violence were positively and significantly correlated with protective sexism ($r=.250$; $p=.000$), heterosexual intimacy ($r=.232$; $p=.000$), protective paternalism ($r=.210$; $p=.000$), complementary gender differentiation ($r=.122$; $p=.000$), hostile sexism ($r=.131$; $p=.000$), and ambivalent sexism total score ($r=.234$; $p=.000$). Similarly, attitudes towards female physical violence were positively and significantly correlated with protective sexism ($r=.102$; $p=.000$), heterosexual intimacy ($r=.91$; $p=.002$), protective paternalism ($r=.096$; $p=.001$), hostile sexism ($r=.081$; $p=.006$) ambivalent sexism total score ($r=.113$; $p=.000$). However, it wasn't significantly correlated with complementary gender differentiation ($r = .043$; $p = .145$).

The results of Pearson correlation analysis among undergraduates' attitudes towards male and female psychological and physical violence and ambivalence toward men and its sub dimensions can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. The results of Pearson correlation analysis among the attitudes towards male psychological and physical violence, female psychological and physical violence, and ambivalence toward men and its sub dimensions

	Attitudes towards Male Psychological Dating Violence		Attitudes towards Male Physical Dating Violence		Attitudes towards Female Psychological Dating Violence		Attitudes towards Female Physical Dating Violence	
	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Men Protective Sexism	.209(**)	.000	.206(**)	.000	.212(**)	.000	.089(**)	.002
Men Hostile Sexism	-.265(**)	.000	-.207(**)	.000	.164(**)	.000	.051	.082
Ambivalence toward men total score	-.054	.063	-.020	.499	.219(**)	.000	.081(**)	.006

** $p<0.01$ * $p<0.05$

When the analysis results were examined, it was observed that the attitudes towards male psychological dating violence; was positively and significantly correlated with attitudes towards men protective sexism ($r=.209$; $p=.000$); was negatively and significantly correlated with attitudes towards men hostile sexism ($r=-.265$; $p=.000$); wasn't significantly correlated with ambivalence toward men total score ($r=-.054$; $p=.063$). Similarly, the attitudes towards male physical dating violence was correlated with attitudes towards men protective sexism positively and significantly ($r=.206$; $p=.000$), while it correlated with attitudes towards men hostile sexism negatively and significantly ($r=-.207$; $p=.000$). However, it wasn't significantly correlated with ambivalence toward men total score ($r=-.020$; $p=.499$).

It was found that attitudes towards female psychological dating violence was positively and significantly correlated with attitudes towards men protective sexism ($r=.212$; $p=.000$), attitudes towards men hostile sexism ($r=.164$; $p=.000$), and ambivalence toward men total score ($r = .219$; $p = .000$). Moreover, attitudes towards female physical dating violence was positively and significantly correlated with attitudes towards men protective sexism ($r=.89$; $p=.002$) and ambivalence toward men total score ($r=.081$; $p=.006$). However, it wasn't significantly correlated with attitudes towards men hostile sexism ($r=.051$; $p=.082$).

The results of Pearson correlation analysis among undergraduates' attitudes towards male and female psychological and physical violence and narcissistic personality traits and its sub dimensions can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8. The results of Pearson correlation analysis among the attitudes towards male psychological and physical violence, female psychological and physical violence, and narcissistic personality traits and its sub dimensions

	Attitudes towards Male Psychological Dating Violence		Attitudes towards Male Physical Dating Violence		Attitudes towards Female Psychological Dating Violence		Attitudes towards Female Physical Dating Violence	
	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Authority	.141(**)	.000	.100(**)	.001	.064(*)	.028	.014	.637
Self-Sufficiency	.071(*)	.014	.043	.137	.050	.085	.036	.224
Superiority	.150(**)	.000	.114(**)	.000	-.038	.189	.098(**)	.001
Exhibitionism	.096(**)	.001	.093(**)	.001	.149(**)	.000	.106(**)	.000
Exploitativeness	.137(**)	.000	.119(**)	.000	.041	.164	.038	.193
Vanity	.043	.144	.012	.690	.028	.346	-.022	.443
Entitlement	.145(**)	.000	.097(**)	.001	.049	.091	.108(**)	.000
Narcissistic Personality Traits Total	.164(**)	.000	.116(**)	.000	.082 (**)	.005	.070(*)	.016

**p<0.01 *p<0.0

The results showed that the attitudes towards male psychological dating violence was positively and significantly correlated with authority ($r=.141$; $p=.000$), self-sufficiency ($r=.071$; $p=.014$), superiority ($r=.150$; $p=.000$), exhibitionism ($r=.096$; $p=.001$), exploitativeness ($r=.137$; $p=.000$), entitlement ($r=.145$; $p=.000$), and narcissistic personality traits total score ($r=.164$; $p=.000$). However, it wasn't significantly correlated with vanity ($r=.043$; $p=.144$). The attitudes towards male physical dating violence was positively and significantly correlated with authority ($r=.100$; $p=.000$), superiority ($r=.114$; $p=.000$), exhibitionism ($r=.093$; $p=.001$), exploitativeness ($r=.119$; $p=.000$), entitlement ($r=.097$; $p=.001$), and narcissistic personality traits total score ($r=.116$; $p=.000$). However, it wasn't significantly correlated with self-sufficiency ($r=.043$; $p=.137$) and vanity ($r=.012$; $p=.690$).

The attitudes towards female psychological dating violence were positively and significantly correlated with authority ($r=.064$; $p=.028$), exhibitionism ($r=.149$; $p=.000$), and narcissistic personality traits total score ($r=.082$; $p=.005$). However, it wasn't significantly correlated with self-sufficiency ($r=.050$; $p=.085$), superiority ($r=-.038$; $p=.189$), exploitativeness ($r=.041$; $p=.164$), vanity ($r=.028$; $p=.346$), and entitlement ($r=.049$; $p=.091$). The attitudes towards female physical dating violence was positively and significantly correlated with superiority ($r=.098$; $p=.001$), exhibitionism ($r=.106$; $p=.000$), exploitativeness ($r=.038$; $p=.193$), entitlement ($r=.108$; $p=.000$), and narcissistic personality traits total score ($r=.070$; $p=.016$). However, it wasn't significantly correlated with authority ($r=.014$; $p=.637$), self-sufficiency ($r=.036$; $p=.224$), and vanity ($r=-.022$; $p=.443$).

4. Discussion

The findings showed that male participants had higher attitudes towards male psychological dating violence, male physical dating violence, and female physical dating violence than female participants. The literature indicates that men have higher attitudes towards male psychological dating violence (Price et al., 1999). Moreover, both national and international literature shows that men have higher acceptance levels of dating violence compared to women (Mercer, 1988; O'Keefe, 1997; Sezer, 2008; Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992). Considering the Turkey's cultural characteristics, it can be stated that the paternalistic structure is dominant, and the men can be expressed to play an approving role of the existent dating violence.

The findings showed that female participants had higher attitudes towards female psychological dating violence than male participants. The literature presents limited support to this finding (Yumuşak & Sürücü, 2012). According to a study conducted by Yumuşak and Sürücü (2012), female participants had higher acceptance levels of dating violence. Childhood conditions, traditions, and customs might play a role in this situation. However, Zeyneloğlu, Vefikuluçay, Erdost, Temel, and Aslan (2007) found that most of the participants were exposed to violence, committed violence, and perceived dating violence as a demonstration love. The participants' attitudes towards female physical dating violence differed significantly in favor of male participants as it did for male psychological and physical dating

violence. To sum up, male participants had higher attitudes in all types of dating violence except for female psychological dating violence. This finding is consistent with the literature.

The results also showed that participants who are in a relationship had higher attitudes towards male psychological dating violence than those who aren't in a relationship. However, attitudes towards male physical, female psychological, and female physical dating violence didn't differ significantly in terms of dating status. Having higher attitudes towards male psychological dating violence might mean that they justify the dating violence committed by males.

The results showed that the attitudes towards male psychological, male physical, and female physical dating violence differed significantly in terms of being exposed to violence. However, attitudes towards female psychological violence didn't differ significantly in terms of this variable. The literature shows that having a relationship involving violence increases the acceptance level of dating violence (Windle & Mrug, 2009; Price et al., 1999). Moreover, the relationship between being exposed to violence and committing violence (Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992) and the relationship between being the victim and witness of violence and being the offender (Foshee et al., 2016; O'Keefe, 1997; Carr, & VanDeusen, 2002) emphasize the victims' risk of being the offender after a while. Considering the relationship between committing violence and the positive attitude towards dating violence, it can be indicated that being the victim of violence directly or indirectly might lead to positive attitudes towards dating violence. The indifference of attitudes towards female psychological dating violence might be explained by living in a socially sexist community. It also might be explained by that the individuals in a relationship might characterize the female psychological violence behaviors as usual, or perceive them as not violent from the perspective of socially sexist perceptions.

According to the findings, participants' attitudes towards dating violence differed significantly in terms of committing violence in a relationship. Participants who expressed to have committed violence in a relationship had higher acceptance levels of dating violence compared to those who didn't commit violence. This finding is supported by Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, and Ryan (1992), who found that attitude towards violence predicted violent behaviors. Another explanation is that the individuals justified violence in order to avoid criticizing their own behaviors.

The results showed a significant and negative relationship between female protective sexism and male psychological and physical dating violence, and also significant and positive relationship between female psychological and physical violence and female protective sexism. Moreover, it was also found that female hostile sexism was positively and significantly correlated with both male and female psychological and physical dating violence. The results showed a relationship between ambivalent sexism and attitude towards dating violence, which is supported by the literature. Glick and his colleagues (2002) found a relationship between protective and hostile sexism and justification of violence towards the partner in their study conducted in Turkey and Brazil. Forbes, Adams-Curtis, Pakalka, and White (2006) found that individuals with sexist attitudes towards women had higher acceptance levels of dating violence and, they also found a positive relationship between hostile sexism and dating violence. In the current study, it was also found that male protective sexism was positively correlated with both female and male psychological and physical dating violence. Also, male hostile sexism was negatively correlated with male psychological and physical dating violence, while it was positively correlated with female psychological dating violence.

There was a significant and positive relationship between narcissistic personality traits and male and female psychological and physical dating violence. The literature supports this finding. A number of studies suggest that narcissists tend to commit violence in man-woman and family relationships, and narcissism is positively correlated with being the offender of the violence (Hamberger & Hastings, 1990; Beasley & Stoltenberg, 1992; Craig, 2003; Simmons, Lehmann, Cobb & Fowler, 2005, as cited in Ryan, Weikel & Sprechini, 2008; Carton & Egan, 2017; Okuda et al., 2015). Considering the positive correlation between being the offender and the attitude towards the violence, it can be expressed that this study is consistent with the literature. It can be stated that narcissism is generally associated with the attitude towards violence (Blinkhorn et al., 2016).

The results showed that men had more positive attitudes towards dating violence compared to women, and revealed that attitude towards violence was associated with narcissism and ambivalent sexism. These findings are supported by the literature. Causal explanations weren't possible as a result of this study. Therefore, conducting studies focusing on the causal relationships would be enlightening in terms of both explaining the violence and leading studies focusing on prevention and intervention.

References

- Archer, J. (2006). Cross-cultural differences in physical aggression between partners: A social-role analysis. *Personality and social psychology review*, 10(2), 133-153. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_3
- Archer, J. (2010). Derivation and assessment of a hypermasculine values questionnaire. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49(3), 525-551. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466609X471525>
- Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: the dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological Review*, 103(1), 5-33. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.103.1.5>
- Beasley, R., & Stoltenberg, C. D. (1992). Personality characteristics of male spouse abusers. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 23(4), 310. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.23.4.310>
- Bell, K. & Naugle, A. (2008). Intimate partner violence theoretical considerations: Moving towards a contextual framework. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28, , 1096-1107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2008.03.003>
- Berkel, L. A., Vandiver, B. J., & Bahner, A. D. (2004). Gender role attitudes, religion, and spirituality as predictors of domestic violence attitudes in white college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(2), 119-133. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2004.0019>
- Birimoğlu, C. (2012). *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Şiddete Bakışları*. Gaziantep: Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Gaziantep Üniversitesi.
- Blinkhorn, V., Lyons, M., & Almond, L. (2016). Drop the bad attitude! Narcissism predicts acceptance of violent behaviour. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 98, 157-161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.025>
- Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., Smith, C., & Ryan, K. (1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multivariate analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 7(4), 297-311.
- Bradlee, P. M. & Emmons, R. A. (1992). Locating Narcissism Within The Interpersonal Circumplex and The Five-Factor Model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 821-830. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(92\)90056-U](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(92)90056-U)
- Brown, T. J., Sumner, K. E., & Nocera, R. (2002). Understanding sexual aggression against women: An examination of the role of men's athletic participation and related variables. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(9), 937-952. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260502017009002>
- Budak, S. (2000). *Psikoloji Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Campbell, W. & Foster, C. (2002). Narcissism and Commitment in Romantic Relationships: An Investment Model Analysis. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*, 28, 484-495. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202287006>
- Carr, J. L., & VanDeusen, K. M. (2002). The relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence in college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(6), 630-646. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260502017006003>
- Carroll, L. (1987). A Study of Narcissism, Affiliation, Intimacy, and Power Motives Among Students in Business Administration. *Psychological Reports*, 61, 355-358. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1987.61.2.355>
- Carton, H., & Egan, V. (2017). The dark triad and intimate partner violence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 105, 84-88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.09.040>
- Cicchetti, D. & Howes, P. (1991). Developmental Psychopathology in The Context of The Family: Illustrations From The Study of Child Maltreatment. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 23, , 257-281. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0079020>
- Craig, R. J. (2003). Use of the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory in the psychological assessment of domestic violence: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 8(3), 235-243. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789\(01\)00058-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(01)00058-1)
- Crittenden, P. & Ainsworth, M. (1989). *Attachment and child abuse*. In D. Cicchetti & V. Carlson (Eds.), *Child Maltreatment: Theory and Research On The Causes and Consequences of Child Abuse and Neglect*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 432-462. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511665707.015>
- Draucker, C., Martsof, D., Stephenson, P., J, R., Heckman, T., Sheehan, D., . . . Ferguson, C. (2010). Aggressive events in adolescent dating violence. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing* 31, no. 9, 599-610. <https://doi.org/10.3109/01612841003793056>

- Erg öçmen, B. A., Yüksel-Kaptanođlu, İ., & Jansen, H. A. (2013). Intimate partner violence and the relation between help-seeking behavior and the severity and frequency of physical violence among women in Turkey. *Violence against women, 19*(9), 1151-1174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801213498474>
- Follingstad, D. R., Rutledge, L. L., Polek, D. S., & McNeill-Hawkins, K. (1988). Factors associated with patterns of dating violence toward college women. *Journal of Family Violence, 3*(3), 169-182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00988973>
- Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L. E., & White, K. B. (2004). First-and second-generation measures of sexism, rape myths and related beliefs, and hostility toward women: Their interrelationships and association with college students' experiences with dating aggression and sexual coercion. *Violence Against Women, 10*(3), 236-261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801203256002>
- Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L. E., Pakalka, A. H., & White, K. B. (2006). Dating aggression, sexual coercion, and aggression-supporting attitudes among college men as a function of participation in aggressive high school sports. *Violence Against Women, 12*(5), 441-455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801206288126>
- Foshee, V., Bauman, K., Linder, F., Rice, J. & Wilcher, R. (2007). Typologies of adolescent dating violence identifying typologies of adolescent dating violence perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(5), 498-519. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506298829>
- Foshee, V. A., Benefield, T. S., Reyes, M., Luz, H., Eastman, M., Vivolo - Kantor, A. M., ... & Faris, R. (2016). Examining explanations for the link between bullying perpetration and physical dating violence perpetration: Do they vary by bullying victimization?. *Aggressive Behavior, 42*(1), 66-81. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21606>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Glick, P., Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Ferreira, M. C., & Aguiar de Souza, M. (2002). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward wife abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*(4), 292-297. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00068>
- Grubbs, J. B., Exline, J. J., & Twenge, J. M. (2014). Psychological entitlement and ambivalent sexism: Understanding the role of entitlement in predicting two forms of sexism. *Sex Roles, 70*(5-6), 209-220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-014-0360-1>
- Güven ç G., Akyüz, A., & Cesario, S. K. (2014). Intimate partner violence against women in Turkey: A synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Family Violence, 29*(3), 333-341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-014-9579-4>
- Hamberger, L. K., & Hastings, J. E. (1993). *Court-mandated treatment of men who assault their partner: Issues, controversies, and outcomes*. Legal responses to wife assault Newbury Park: Sage, 188-229.
- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511-524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.511>
- Hillier, L., & Foddy, M. (1993). The role of observer attitudes in judgments of blame in cases of wife assault. *Sex Roles, 29*(9), 629-644. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00289209>
- Hilton, N. Z., Harris, G. T., & Rice, M. E. (2003). Adolescents' perceptions of the seriousness of sexual aggression: Influence of gender, traditional attitudes, and self-reported experience. *Sexual Abuse, 15*(3), 201-214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107906320301500304>
- Holt, M. & Espelage, D. (2005). Social support as a moderator between dating violence victimization and depression/anxiety among african american and caucasian adolescents. *School Psychology Review, 34*(3), 309-328.
- Hutchinson, K. (2012). Predictors of college students' dating violence perceptions and help-seeking recommendations. (*Doctoral dissertation, The University of Akron*).
- Jenkins, S. S., & Aub é J. (2002). Gender differences and gender-related constructs in dating aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(8), 1106-1118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672022811009>
- Kızıltan, H. (2000). Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) Ölçeğinin Türkçe Formu Dil Eşdeğerliliği, Güvenilirlik ve Geçerlilik Çalışmaları. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İÜSBE, İstanbul*.

- Kiire, S. (2017). Psychopathy rather than Machiavellianism or narcissism facilitates intimate partner violence via fast life strategy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 104*, 401-406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.08.043>
- Lambe, S., Hamilton-Giachritsis, C., Garner, E., & Walker, J. (2016). The role of narcissism in aggression and violence: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 1-22*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838016650190>
- Luthra, R. & Gidycz, C. (2006). Dating Violence Among College Men and Women: Evaluation of A Theoretical Model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*, 717-731. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506287312>
- Makepeace, J. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. *Family Relations, 30*, 97-102. <https://doi.org/10.2307/584242>
- Makepeace, J. (1987). Social factors and victim offender differences in courtship violence. *Family Relations, 36*, 87-91. <https://doi.org/10.2307/584654>
- Makepeace, J. M. (1983). Life events stress and courtship violence. *Family Relations, 32*, 101-109. <https://doi.org/10.2307/583984>
- Mercer, S. (1988). Not a pretty picture: An exploratory study of violence against women in high school dating relationships. *Resources for Feminist Research, 17*, 15-25.
- Miller, E., Decker, M., Reed, E., Raj, A., Hathaway, J. & Silverman, J. (2007). Male Partner Pregnancy-Promoting Behaviors and Adolescent Partner Violence: Findings From A Qualitative Study With Adolescent Females. *Ambulatory Pediatrics, 7(5)*, 360-366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ambp.2007.05.007>
- National Youth Violence Prevention Resource Center. (2001). *Intimate Partner and Family Violence*. 11 20, 2006 tarihinde <http://www.safeyouth.org/scripts/facts/docs/intimate.pdf> adresinden alındı
- O'Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of dating violence among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 546-568. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626097012004005>
- Offenhauer, P. & Buchalter, A. (2011). *Teen dating violence: A literature review and annotated bibliography*. United States: National Institute of Justice.
- Okuda, M., Olfson, M., Wang, S., Rubio, J. M., Xu, Y., & Blanco, C. (2015). Correlates of intimate partner violence perpetration: Results from a National Epidemiologic Survey. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 28(1)*, 49-56. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.21986>
- Price, E.L; Byers, E.S; Dating Violence Research Team. (1999). The attitudes towards dating violence scales: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Family Violence. Vol. 14, No.4,19*, 351-375. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022830114772>
- Ramisetty-Mikler, S., Goebert, D., Nishimura, S. & Caetano, R. (2006). Dating violence victimization: Associated drinking and sexual risk behaviors of asian, native hawaiian and caucasian high school students in hawaii. *Journal of School Health, 76 (8)*, 423-429. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2006.00136.x>
- Rickert, V., Wiemann, C., Vaughan, R. & White, J. (2004). Rates and risk factors for sexual violence among an ethnically diverse sample of adolescents. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 158(12)*, 1132. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.158.12.1132>
- Riggs, D. & O'Leary, D. (1989). *A theoretical model of courtship aggression. violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues*. New York, : NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Ryan, K. (1995). Do Courtship-Violent Men Have Characteristics Associated With A "Battering Personality?" *Journal of Family Violence, 10*, 99-120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02110539>
- Ryan, K., Weikel, K. & Sprechini, G. (2008). Gender Differences in Narcissism and Courtship Violence in Dating Couples. *Sex Roles, 58(11-12)*, 802-813. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9403-9>
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2002). Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlilik çalışması. *Türk psikoloji dergisi, 17(49)*, 47-58.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2008). Erkeklerle İlişkin Çelişik Duygular Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye Uyarlanması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları (Turkish Psychological Articles), 11 (21)*, 1-11.
- Sezer, Ö. (2008). The adaptation of acceptance of couple violence scale into Turkish: Validity and reliability studies. *Journal of the Faculty of Education, 9(16)*, 1-15.

- Shorey, R., Cornelius, T. & Bell, K. (2008). A critical review of theoretical frameworks for dating violence: Comparing the dating and marital fields. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13*(3), 185-194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2008.03.003>
- Sigelman, C., Berry, C. & Wiles, K. (1984). Violence in College Students' Dating Relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 14*, 530-548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1984.tb02258.x>
- Simmons, C. A., Lehmann, P., Cobb, N., & Fowler, C. R. (2005). Personality profiles of women and men arrested for domestic violence: An analysis of similarities and differences. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 41*(4), 63-81. https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v41n04_03
- Smith, D. M. & Donnelly, J. (2001). Adolescent dating violence: A multi-systemic approach of enhancing awareness in educators, parents, and society. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community, 21*(1), 53-64. https://doi.org/10.1300/j005v21n01_04
- Straus, M. (1977). Wife beating: How common and why? . *Victimology, 2*, 443-458.
- Stuart, G., Moore, T., Gordon, K., Hellmuth, J., Ramsey, S. & Kahler, C. (2006). Reasons for intimate partner violence perpetration among arrested women. *Violence Against Women, 12*, 609-621. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801206290173>
- Toplu-Demirtaş, E., Hatipoğlu-Sümer, Z., & White, J. W. (2013). The relation between dating violence victimization and commitment among Turkish college women: Does the Investment Model matter?. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJCV), 7*(2), 203-215.
- Toplu-Demirtaş, E., Hatipoğlu-Sümer, Z., & Fincham, F. D. (2017). Intimate partner violence in Turkey: The Turkish Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale-Revised. *Journal of Family Violence, 1*-8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-016-9852-9>
- Uluocak, Ş., Gökulu, G., & Bilir, O. (2014). A strategic starting point for the elimination of violence against women: Intimate partner violence. *International Journal of Human Sciences, 14*, 2, 362-387. <https://doi.org/10.14687/ijhs.v11i2.2942>
- Waters, E., Posada, G., Crowell, J. & Keng-ling, L. (1993). Is attachment theory ready to contribute to our understanding of disruptive behavior problems? *Development and Psychopathology, 5*, 215-224. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004351>
- Wekerle, C. & Wolfe, D. (1999). Dating violence in mid-adolescence: Theory, significance, and emerging prevention initiatives. *Clinical Psychology Review, 19*(4), 435-456. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358\(98\)00091-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358(98)00091-9)
- Windle, M. & Mrug, S. (2009). Cross-gender violence perpetration and victimization among early adolescents and associations with attitudes toward dating conflict. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*(3), 429-439. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9328-1>
- World Health Organization. (1998). *Gender and Health, Technical Paper*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization Publication.
- Yumuşak, A. (2013). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine yönelik tutumları, toplumsal cinsiyetçilik ve narsisistik kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Tokat.
- Yumuşak, A., Sürücü, Ş. (2012). *An analyse of university students' acceptance levels of dating violence(Bildiri)*. ICEC, İstanbul.
- Yumuşak, A., & Şahin, R. (2014). Flörtte Şiddete Yönelik Tutum Ölçeklerinin Güvenirlilik Ve Geçerlik Çalışması. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 49*(49), 233-252. <https://doi.org/10.17755/esosder.55295>
- Zeyneloğlu, S., Vefikuluçay, D., Erdost, T., Temel, F. ve Aslan, D. (2007). Ankara'da hemşirelikte lisans eğitimi veren iki üniversitenin birinci ve dördüncü sınıfında okuyan öğrencilerin flört şiddetine maruz kalma ve uygulama durumları ile flört şiddetine ilişkin görüşlerinin belirlenmesi. *Sağlık ve Toplum Dergisi, 17*(3), 67-75.