

**The Role of Parental, Societal and Personal Factors
in Predicting Attitudes towards Intimate Partner
Violence**

Alev Gündost

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Developmental Psychology

Eastern Mediterranean University
September 2017
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnu Raman
Chair, Department of Psychology

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnu Raman
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnu Raman

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. İlmiye Seçer

ABSTRACT

Intimate partner violence (IPV), a type of common violence, is a public health problem, that cause psychological, physical or mental health problems for the victims and likely to require psychosocial interventions. For this reason, it is important to understand the risk factors that play a role in determining attitudes towards partner violence. Therefore, the present study aimed to investigate; (a) gender differences in attitudes towards partner violence, (b) the roles of parental (i.e., perceived mother and father conflict), societal (i.e., gender role stereotyping) and personal factors (i.e., ambivalent, hostile and benevolent sexism beliefs) in predicting attitudes towards IPV. The sample consisted of 120 (n = 60 males; n = 60 females) Turkish speaking participants who had a current romantic relationship, between the ages of 18 to 25 years (Mean= 22.0, SD= 1.98). Participants completed self-report measures of Perception of Gender Scale, Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, Children's Perception of Inter-Parental Conflict Scale and Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale. Results showed that benevolent sexism (BS) alone predicted attitudes towards IPV in both genders. In addition, males had more positive attitudes towards IPV and had higher hostile sexism (HS) beliefs; while females had more positive gender role stereotyping and more self-blame toward themselves for inter-parental conflict. Results are interpreted under feminist theory.

Keywords: Inter-parental conflict, Gender roles, Sexism, Attitudes towards IPV, Feminist theory

ÖZ

Şiddetin en yaygın görülen çeşitlerinden biri yakın ilişkilerde şiddettir (YİŞ), toplumsal bir sağlık problemi olarak kabul edilir ve mağdur olan bireylerde psikolojik, fiziksel veya zihinsel sağlık problemlerine neden olur, ayrıca psikososyal müdahaleler gerektirmektedir. Bu nedenle partnere yönelik şiddet tutumuna yol açan risk faktörlerini anlamak önem arz etmektedir. Bu araştırmada; (a) partnere yönelik şiddet tutumu üzerindeki cinsiyet farklılıkları (b) YİŞ'i öngörebilecek; ailesel (algılanan anne ve baba çatışması), toplumsal (cinsiyet rolleri algısı) ve kişisel (çelişikli duygulu cinsiyetçilik, düşmanca ve korumacı cinsiyetçilik) faktörlerin incelenmesi hedeflenmiştir. Çalışmada, Türkçe konuşan, duygusal ilişkisi olan ve yaş aralığı 18-25 (Ort= 22.0, Ss= 1.98) olan 120 (n = 60 erkek; n = 60 kadın) katılımcı yer almıştır. Bu çalışmada Toplumsal Cinsiyet Algısı Ölçeği, Çelişikli Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Envanteri, Çocukların Evlilik Çatışmasını Algılaması Ölçeği ve Yakın İlişkilerde Şiddete Tutum Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen verilere göre, YİŞ'e yönelik tutumlara sadece korumacı cinsiyetçilik neden olmaktadır. Bununla birlikte, bulgulara göre erkekler yakın ilişkilerde şiddete karşı daha olumlu tutum sergilemektedirler ve düşmanca cinsiyetçilik inanışları daha fazladır. Kadınlar ise cinsiyet rolleri algısına daha olumlu bakmaktadırlar ve ebeveyn evlilik çatışmasında kendilerini daha fazla suçlamaktadırlar. Veriler, feminist teorisine bağlı olarak yorumlanmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Evlilik çatışması, Cinsiyet rolleri, Cinsiyetçilik, YİŞ tutumları, Feminist teori

To My Family

and

To the Survivors of Intimate Partner Violence

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

With endless appreciation and love, I would first like to extend my sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsni Raman. Her door was always open whenever I was in need or had a question about my research. Without her passionate my thesis would not have been successfully completed. I am gratefully for her every valuable comment, encouraging advices, and faith in me throughout this process.

I take this opportunity to convey my gratefulness and thank to all of my lecturers over the 2 years who had a significant role in completing my studies with joy, valuable comments, and endearing me to the field.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my family for always been there in my least part of the time and for being tolerant, patient throughout this process. I also appreciate their support and unconditional love. Lastly, I would like to thank my classmates/friends for their continuous support, motivation and encouragements when I was going through difficult and stressful moments during my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZ	iv
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS	x
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Who Experiences IPV?	3
1.1.1 Young adulthood and the experience of IPV	5
1.2 Impact of IPV on Health	7
1.3 Why does IPV occur?	7
1.4 Inter-Parental Conflict	9
1.4.1 Inter-Parental Conflict and IPV Attitudes	10
1.5 Societal Perspectives of Gender and Gender Roles	12
1.5.1 Gender Perceptions and IPV Attitudes	13
1.6 Ambivalent Sexism Theory	16
1.6.1 Hostile Sexism and Benevolent Sexism	16
1.6.2 Ambivalent Sexism and IPV Attitudes	18
1.7 The Current Study	18
2 METHOD	23
2.1 Participants	23
2.2 Materials	23
2.2.1 Demographic Information Form	23

2.2.2 Perception of Gender Scale	24
2.2.3 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	24
2.2.4 Children’s Perception of Inter-Parental Conflict Scale	25
2.2.5 Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale	26
2.3 Design	26
2.4 Procedure	27
3 RESULTS	28
3.1 Analysis of Gender Differences	28
3.1.1 Correlation Analysis	29
3.2 Regression Analysis of IPV Attitudes	30
4 DISCUSSION	32
REFERENCES	43
APPENDICES	73
Appendix A: Demographic Information Form	74
Appendix B: Perception of Gender Scale	75
Appendix C: Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	77
Appendix D: Children’s Perception of Inter-Parental Conflict Scale	79
Appendix E: Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale	81
Appendix F: Department’s Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter.....	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations on all Variables for Females and Males ..	29
Table 2: Pearson Correlation Coefficient Values of the Variables	30
Table 3: Predictors of Attitude towards IPV.....	31

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

B	Unstandardized coefficients
β	Standardized coefficients
SEb	Standard error
e.g.	Example given
et al.	And others
etc.	Et cetera
i.e.	That is
F	F-ratio
M	Mean
p	Probability
r	Pearson's Correlation Coefficient
SD	Standard Deviation
t	Critical Value
$>$	Greater than
$<$	Smaller
n	Number

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Intimate relationship is an interpersonal relationship which includes emotional (i.e., trust, security, warmth, attachment) and physical intimacy (i.e., cuddling, attraction to appearance) (Ben-Ari & Lavee, 2007; Mahler, Pine & Bergman, 1975; Bowlby, 1969). Intimate relationships involve sexual affection (Ben-Ari & Lavee, 2007) and the feelings of liking or loving (Mills, Wakeman & Fea, 2001), with emotional and personal support between one or more people (Parks & Floyd, 1996). Although sexual affection, attachment and feelings of security may cause happiness, unfavorably feelings can also be seen. Strong bonding can also cause strong dysfunctional feelings, such as showing high tolerance to those who hurt us and endurance for people to hurt those whom they love (Heyman, Slep & Foran, 2015). In accordance to Wolfe et al. (2001) aggressive behaviors (i.e., verbal harassment) can also occur with alarming density in relationships. This is a collected risk factor for more significant abusive behaviors in intimate relationships. Beyond the risk factors in a relationship, there is a major health problem known as intimate partner violence (IPV) (Heyman et al., 2015).

IPV is defined as violence committed by a boyfriend, girlfriend, husband, wife or ex-spouse (Modi, Palmer & Armstrong, 2014). According to the World Report on Violence and Health (WRVH) by the World Health Organization (2010), IPV is explained as:

“behavior within an intimate relationship that causes physical, sexual or psychological harm, including acts of physical aggression, sexual coercion, psychological abuse and controlling behaviors” (p. 11).

Additionally, violence perpetrated by an intimate partner can be seen in different types (i.e., physical, psychological and sexual), and each type comprise one or more acts as described below (Pico-Alfonso et al., 2006). Firstly, physical violence is defined as the use of physical force with the aim to cause injury or even death (Yusuf, Arulogun, Oladepo & Olowokeere, 2011). This type of violence can involve pushing, shoving, biting, punching, burning, shaking, slapping, kicking, hitting or using a weapon to harm (Capaldi, Knoble, Shortt & Kim, 2012). The violent act can occur in private and public environments; and both women and men can be affected. Physical violence can take place regardless of gender, age, sexuality or wealth (Yusuf et al., 2011).

Secondly, psychological aggression is defined as the use of verbal and non-verbal communication with the purpose to control another person or to harm the person either mentally or emotionally (Maiuro, 2001). Psychological aggressive behavior can be seen in many different forms, for instance, name-calling or humiliating ways which is an expressive aggression act or coercive control that can be seen as limiting people to access for money, friends, and family or even transportation (Breiding, Basile, Smith, Black & Mahendra, 2015). Although physical violence and psychological aggressive acts are different terms, in several situations psychological aggressive acts are not perceived as aggressive behavior, due to the covertness in certain circumstances. Additionally, psychological aggression can have manipulative effects such as; not allowing using birth control tablets and coerced pregnancy terminations (Breiding et al., 2015). Psychological aggression acts also have a

negative impact on psychological well-being (Baldry, 2003) similar to that of physical violence (Kelly, 2004).

Lastly, sexual violence is defined as an attempt to force an individual towards sexual acts or make unwanted sexual comments. Sexual violence may occur in any setting and in any form, such as home and work, and at the extreme level, the trafficking of women (WHO, 2002). Trafficking of women is defined as forcing women for prostitution and other forms of sexual exploitation (i.e., engaging in unwanted sexual activity multiple times per day, escort services and use in pornographies), which is the most extreme form of sexual violence (Hodge, 2008).

1.1 Who Experiences IPV?

Violence has been found to be prevalent in intimate partner relationships (Barnett, Miller-Perrin & Perrin, 2010; Schumann & Valente, 2002) and has no limit within any class, culture, age, sex, religion, race or socioeconomic status (Hassan et al., 2004; FVPPF, 2004). Findings from researches specified that there is no country in which violence does not occur (Walker, 1999) this also includes gender too such that both men and women can be victims of violence (Whiting, Oka & Fife, 2012).

According to the World Health Organization (2013), one-third of women experience physical or sexual violence in their lifetime. Furthermore, violence against women prevalence rates worldwide stated by WHO (2013) show that 29.8% occurs in the regions of America, 36.6% in Africa, 25.4% in European region, 37.0% in Eastern Mediterranean region, 37.7% in South-East Asia region and 24.6% Western Pacific region.

Moreover, women who experience violence are likely to be raped, injured or murdered by their partners (e.g., husbands, boyfriends) (Seimer, 2004). Although violence against women is prevalent, more than 100 studies have also reported that women can show physical aggression as much as men (Straus, 1999). However, it has been suggested that women are more likely to use violence to defend themselves and to protect their children (Johnson, 2006). Also, violence occurring by men is more likely to lead to injury compared to women's and is more motivated to dominate or terrorize their partners (Dasgupta, 2002; Rennison & Welchans, 2000).

Underreporting of IPV is one of the major problems among IPV victims. This is because an IPV victim mainly does not report the abuse, and victims are afraid to report events to anyone by reason of shame or fear of avenging (Simmons, Farrar, Frazer & Thompson, 2011). In addition, if the society does not disapprove of IPV or has lenient attitudes toward IPV, it will result in less reporting of abuse, less empathy or support towards victims, and less discouraging of perpetrators (Gracia, 2004). Another factor is that violence is generally seen as a family issue by the police who dismiss the cases by getting bribed or not believing the victim's report (Horne, 1999). Relatedly, perceptions of violence towards women can be influenced by gender roles and the gender system within a society, which increases the level of violence against women and reducing the reporting of it (Walker, 1999). For instance, people are known to view the world by making the categorization of good and bad, such that women who comply with the traditional rules of being feminine are viewed as good, whereas women who violate these rules will be viewed as bad (Lee, 2013). As a result, women may develop defense mechanisms such as blaming themselves for the abuse and accepting the violence (Goldner, 1999). Also, women

who are beaten in childhood may develop lower self-esteem, which makes them more willing to accept negative behavior from their spouses and not to report (Kantor & Asdigian, 1997; Miller, Downs & Testa 1993). Due to such factors violence against women continues to be unreported.

1.1.1 Young Adulthood and the Experience of IPV

The current study included participants of young adulthood period and their experiences of IPV. The development of intimate relationships is an important life task during these years with the potential for partner violence, therefore the characteristics of individuals during this period will be briefly covered below.

The period of young adulthood (age range includes 18-39 years) is one in which people are often more socially dominant, warm, responsible, agreeable, and emotionally stable (Helson, Jones & Kwan, 2002; Robins, Fraley, Roberts & Trzesniewski, 2001). Additionally, according to previous research, during young adulthood openness to experience, conscientiousness and agreeableness increases, and neuroticism decreases (McGue, Bacon & Lykken, 1993; Robins et al., 2001). However not all people change in the same direction over the same developmental period. This is because each individual experience different normative changes of life tasks and roles (i.e., begin to college or have full-time jobs) (Robins et al., 2001; Roberts, Walton & Viechtbauer, 2006; Roberts, Caspi & Moffitt, 2003).

Relatedly, emerging adulthood (ages 18-25 years) is the developmental period also followed by late adolescence period. Individuals are characterized with several distinctive features, such as identity explorations, instability, self-focus, self-efficacy and feeling in-between (Arnett, 2000). Also, during the period of emerging

adulthood several types of risk behavior peak (i.e., unprotected sex, substance use, and risky driving behaviors) which are of importance for the likelihood of IPV (Arnett, 2000; Schulenberg, O'Malley, Bachman, Wadsworth & Johnston, 1996).

Romantic relationships are more likely to occur during these years and feelings of affection, intimacy and commitment become stronger and there is an increase in sexual activity (Ponti, Guarnieri, Smorti & Tani, 2010). Therefore, IPV mostly peaks in adolescence and in young adulthood (Capaldi & Kim, 2007; Halpern, Spriggs, Martin & Kupper, 2009).

A multi-national study (India, Korea, New Zealand, Germany, Greece, Russia, UK, USA, Canada, Israel, Australia, Belgium, Sweden, and Switzerland) reported that IPV victim prevalence was 26% in dating partners among university students in which 30% were physically assaulted and 24% were sexual coercion victims (Chan, Straus, Brownridge, Tiwari & Leung, 2008). Another study, in which the sample was collected from around the world in 31 universities between the ages of 18 to 40, revealed that 7% of students had been injured in the previous 12 months by their intimate partner (Straus, 2004). Also, male and female students showed similar results in the prevalence of physical assault within intimate partners, which were reported as 25% of men and 28% of women (Straus, 2004). In another study conducted in the United States, adolescents and young adults between the ages 12-21 experienced some type of violence victimization. Almost 3 out of 10 in romantic/dating relationships, and almost 1 in 10 were victims to physical violence (Halpern, Oslak, Young, Martin & Kupper, 2001).

1.2 Impact of IPV on Health

People who experience IPV are highly likely to experience health problems and view their health as indigent (Campbell & Soeken, 1999; Green, Flowe-Valencia, Rosenblum & Tait, 1999). IPV causes poor health outcomes on people, for instance, headaches, insomnia, choking sensations, chest, back pain, pelvic pain and gastrointestinal symptoms, which are the most seen somatic complaints by victims of IPV (Dutton, Haywood & El-Bayoumi, 1997). Also, IPV victims display emotional disturbances as a result of violence, which results in an inability to deal with negative emotions in a healthy way, and to have less ability to solve conflicts (Robertson & Murachver, 2009). In addition, physical health concerns are also likely, such as; HIV and sexually transmitted diseases, drug abuse, and attempted suicides (Yawn, Yawn & Uden, 1992; Zierler, Witbeck & Mayer, 1996). Children can also be accidental victims and may suffer injuries while the IPV occur between the parents. Previous research done with 139 children who have been injured from IPV accident found that 39% of these children were trying to stop the violence or 59% were injured while being held by mother or father (Christian, Scribano, Seidl & Pinto-Martin, 1997).

1.3 Why does IPV occur?

Several predictors (i.e., traumatic head injury, low self-esteem, genetic defects, alcohol abuse, personality disorders, insecure attachment, and low social skills) have been mentioned in the literature that can play a role on the onset and maintenance of IPV. In accordance with the evolutionary theory genetic defects, traumatic head injury or chemical changes in the brain increase the risk of IPV (Hanks, Temkin, Machamer & Dikmen, 1999). This is because traumatic head injury survivor faces

difficulties with anger management and impairment in impulse control mechanisms which increases aggressive behaviors (Ali & Naylor, 2013).

On the other hand, personality disorders especially borderline personality disorder or antisocial personality traits increase violent/abusive behavior among intimate partners (Dutton, 1995; Dutton & Golant, 1995). Perpetrators with borderline personality disorder may use violence physically at their partners when they become distressed as a way to regulate negative emotions (Keltner & Kring 1998).

Additionally, an insecure attachment toward the spouse/ intimate partner is a risk that increases the occurrence of IPV and this reflects on the adult relationships. When a child experience abuse or insecure attachment with parents in future might lead to expect from others to be hostile or rejecting as well, therefore they may behave the same manner in their intimate relationships (Egeland, 1993; Hines & Saudino, 2002; Zeanah & Zeanah, 1989).

Furthermore, psychological factors such as low self-esteem has been found to be another risk factor that increases the risk of IPV. This is because intimate partners who have low self-esteem use violence to defend themselves and to increase their self-worth (Crocker, Thompson, McGraw & Ingerman, 1987; Papadakaki, Tzamalouka, Chatzifotiou & Chliaoutakis, 2009). Additionally, social skills for instance communication and problem-solving skills have been found to be related with IPV. People with poor communication skills or poor problem-solving skills display negative behavior (i.e., aggressiveness or shouting) and engage in less positive communication (i.e., criticizing, disagreeing, or not smiling) during the

interactions within their intimate partners (Cordova, Jacobson, Gottman, Rushe & Cox, 1993; Holtzworth-Munroe, Smutzler & Stuart, 1998) and when people lack these skills it becomes unable to resolve the conflicts and the use of violence may increase (Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 1998).

Furthermore, alcohol abuse and IPV has a positive relationship (O'farrell & Murphy, 1995). This can be further explained such that men use alcohol to take away from the responsibility of violence and provide excuses for justifying their violence within a relationship (Ali & Naylor, 2013). On the other hand, women may use alcohol as a strategy for coping with violence perpetrated against them (Clark & Foy, 2000; Simmons, Lehmann & Cobb, 2008).

In light of such findings, the current thesis examined the role of certain parental (perceived mother and father conflict), societal (gender role stereotyping) and personal factors (ambivalent; hostile and benevolent sexist beliefs). The following sections will thus cover these below:

1.4 Inter-Parental Conflict

The violence in families viewed by children can vary as parent beating, threatening, using weapons or forcing intimacy (Fosco, DeBoard & Grych, 2007). The impact of the conflict on the child differs from family to family as cultural differences play an important role in what is perceived as a conflict and how it is expressed. Similarly, children from different ethnic groups or cultures respond to conflict in different ways (McLoyd, Harper & Copeland, 2001). Not just the racial group but gender differences have also been shown to have different outcomes on the child (Davies & Lindsay, 2001). Boys and girls give different reactions to the distress they experience

and coping strategies are different as well. Boys may express their distress through aggression, whereas girls may express their distress through fear or over involvement in parental problems (Davies & Lindsay, 2001). Another interesting finding came from Cox, Paley and Harter (2001) showing that inter-parental conflict had different effects on child depending on the gender of the parent and gender of the child, they stated that it was more likely to affect the child with aggressive opposite gender parent rather than the same gender parent.

Children observing inter-parental conflict and anger can become increasingly distressed and aggressive, that can lead to long term problems in behavior (i.e., hostility and impulsiveness), interpersonal skills, emotional, social competence as well as academic skills (Cummings & Davies, 1994). It is shown that children growing in a home witnessing inter-parental conflict become more vulnerable towards aggression also internalizing their anxiety and depression and increase their externalizing problems such as impulsivity, disruptiveness, aggression, and overactivity (Block, Block & Gjerde, 1986; Cummings & Davies, 1994; McDonald & Grych, 2006). Studies have shown when inter-parental conflict is frequently present in a household, in a long lasting and bitter manner the children become at greater risk of developing emotional and behavioral difficulties (Cummings & Davies, 1994).

1.4.1 Inter-Parental Conflict and IPV Attitudes

Being exposed to view inter-parental violence in childhood can also play a crucial role in shaping a child's future intimate relationships (Fosco, DeBoard & Grych, 2007) and can be influenced by the parenting style and relationships with parents (Kopp, 1989; Siegel, 1999). As a result, negative parental modeling (i.e., high

parental conflict, not being supportive or positive, aggressive, authoritarian) experiences in childhood may increase the risks for IPV, although once again the type of experiences and reactions may vary by gender (Chen & White, 2004). This is because of the different socialization processes for men and women. For instance, men may learn to react physically aggressive to some situations and may be more likely to develop behavior problems, whereas women may learn to react verbally aggressive to some situations and may be more likely to develop emotional problems (Bettencourt & Miller, 1996; Cummings & Davies, 1994) but both genders are more likely to commit aggressive behavior in their adulthood as a result of this kind of a family environment (Chen & White, 2004).

Relatedly, children who are exposed to domestic violence or witness partner abuse, excessively have problem-solving deficits with their intimate partner's in adulthood (Dodge, Bates & Pettit, 1990). A recent research conducted on 34 children (7-12 years) from ethnically diverse backgrounds (African American: 41.2%; Latina: 41.2%; Caucasian: 14.7%; Biracial: 2.9%) revealed that children who witness inter-parental aggression at home generally blamed the mother as provoking the aggression/violence (DeBoard-Lucas & Grych, 2011). Ultimately, children try to understand the causes of the violence which they perceive, and have an important impact when they develop beliefs on the use of IPV (DeBoard-Lucas & Grych, 2011). As a result, children, who view inter-parental aggression, become more eager to use violence towards their partners during adolescence and adulthood, due to their belief of violence being an effective and acceptable behavior to solve conflicts (Ehrensaft et al., 2003). Thereby, victims have high risk of showing violence towards

their intimate partners compared to people who do not experience this violation in the home (Robertson & Murachver, 2009).

1.5 Societal Perspectives of Gender and Gender Roles

While sex is defined as the biological differences in genetic composition and reproductive anatomy and function; gender on the other hand is described as the characteristics and traits considered socio-culturally appropriate for males and females; traits comprising of masculinity and femininity (Unger, 1979). Accordingly, males generally are counted as more powerful, instrumental and effectual, whereas women are seen as affective and communal (Bussey & Bandura, 1999). Although, gender differences primarily occur from biological factors, most gender roles are shaped by cultural factors (Bandura, 1986; Epstein, 1997) and gender-linked outcomes are prescribed socially rather than intrinsically (Bussey & Bandura, 1999). Gender roles emerge from socially prescribed behaviors, roles or activities (Diekmann & Eagly, 2000) and society expects women and men to occupy appropriate behaviors according to their gender-typical tasks (i.e., women to cook and men to provide) (Wood & Eagly, 2002). The gender-typical tasks become stereotypic for women and men, this is because women are expected to occupy the domestic activities more than men, and men are expected to occupy the productive activities more than women. These skills, values or motives become stereotypic gender-typical task by society, and are incorporated into female and male gender role (Eagly, Wood & Diekmann, 2000).

Therefore, traditional gender role ideologies refer to how men and women should behave in society (Santana, Raj, Decker, Marche & Silverman, 2006). In a societal context, feminine gender roles are viewed as nurturing her family (i.e., becoming

mothers or being warm) and be affective and communal. On the other hand, masculine gender roles include being the provider of finance (breadwinners) and to make important family decisions (i.e., having the power) (Weisgram, Dinella & Fulcher, 2011; Eagly & Wood, 1999).

Characteristics of individuals who hold traditional gender roles include holding onto a strong gender-belief system, authoritarianism, and social dominance perspective (Whitley & Egisdottir, 2000). Furthermore, men hold more traditional gender role attitudes than do women; this is because men receive more gender role socialization and greater power and privilege compared to women (Huston, 1984). On the other hand, people who do not maintain traditional gender roles believe that there should not be a specific role with regards to how to behave according to one's sex category. They believe in egalitarian relationships between men and women and also believe that people should have the power to decide which roles they want to go on (Eagly & Wood, 1999).

1.5.1 Gender Perceptions and IPV Attitudes

There are several theories (social-cognitive, biological, feminist) that help explain the role of gender stereotypes on IPV. The evolutionary theory suggests that gender differences occur from mate preferences, reproductive strategies and from the aggressive nature of males which increases the risk of IPV (Buss, 1989). Men and women have different demands according to their reproductivity, for instance males seek for many partners (to ensure a larger dissemination of genes in the gene pool) but females prefer few romantic partners and seek for the best choice as a provider for their basic needs of life (Buss, 1989). As a result, from these conflicting reproductive interests, males seeking more partners and having more strength will

lead to show aggressive dominance over females and other males to control their sexuality and resolve problems with aggression, on the other hand, females become more responsible in parenting roles and obey the power distance (Trivers, 1972; Smuts, 1992, 1995).

On the other hand, the social-cognitive theory suggests that children or adolescents learn behaviors by modeling (Bandura, 1986). And parents play a major role on children while developing gender stereotypes (Bussey & Bandura, 1999). As a result, when children observe the mother as dependent and the father as an authority figure, in return these roles become categorized by children as acceptable such as women should be homemaker and men should make the important family decisions (Karraker, Vogel & Lake, 1995; Bussey & Bandura, 1999). So, when the expected appropriate stereotypes are violated by women IPV risk increases (Nutt, 1999), also when children observe the violent behavior at home it leads to children to find the behavior acceptable, which in return influences tolerant attitudes of using violence in their own intimate relationships (Jouriles, McDonald, Mueller & Grych, 2012).

On the other hand, this current thesis is based on the feminist theory (Dobash & Dobash, 1977). In accordance to feminist theory, men are given more advantage or stronger dominance/power in social, economic or legal structures over women, and this causes IPV to be more common (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). IPV may also occur due to a man's need to maintain dominance over women (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Another factor is that men want to show power when they believe that they have loss of control over women or to direct the intimate relationship (Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson & Gottman, 1993). In other words, when men lose power they show

violence to regain that power (Babcock et al., 1993). There are several factors where the violent act increases by men; for instance, when women's economic and political power is high it threatens the men's power (Archer, 2006). This is also observed in men who have a masculine ideology: The belief of use of power to control women as legitimate, or, a belief of "violence as manly" (Good, Heppner, Hillenbrand-Gunn & Wang, 1995). Furthermore, when women have higher education or income the violence increases (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). Hence, according to this perspective the underlying cause of IPV in relationships is the (mis)use of power.

Relatedly, women who challenge traditional gender role expectations can be more vulnerable to IPV (Nutt, 1999) when their partners are more supportive of male dominance and hyper-masculinity (Sullivan & Mosher, 1990). For instance, in the case where the woman refuses to have sexual intercourse with the partner, argues or disobeys (WHO, 2002). A study that was conducted in Canada found that males who had traditional gender role stereotype beliefs (i.e., preventing partners access to family income, socially isolating their partners or knowing where/who the partner is with) were more likely to physically attack their partner when the women did not obey the traditional gender roles (Brownridge, 2002). Similarly, a study conducted in Boston, U.S. found that Hispanic and Black young urban men who held more traditional masculine gender role beliefs were more likely to engage in unprotected sex and IPV within intimate relationships compared to men who hold more egalitarian gender role belief (Santana et al., 2006).

Related to gender roles and its perception in society is the negative attitudes held toward men and women, i.e. sexism.

1.6 Ambivalent Sexism Theory

Sexism is generally defined as antipathy toward women (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Sexism is marked by ambivalence and is a prejudice toward the sex class of a person (Glick & Fiske, 1996), which can be defined by Allport's (1954) classic definition of prejudice: "an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization" (p.191).

Ambivalent sexism theory (AST) (Glick & Fiske, 1996; 1997; 2001) points two basic elements, which suggests that sexism has both positive and negative affect that works together: (a) hostile attitude toward women, by negative stereotypes or (b) women who have less power and status obey the traditional gender roles. In addition, the power imbalance between men and women creates a combination to generate ambivalent hostile and benevolent ideologies, such as men have the power status but also are responsible to be provider.

AST suggests that hostility and benevolence, work differently in intimate relationships. The theory categorizes the power difference between genders in a relationship, which can be explained by using traditional stereotyping roles of men and women in society and having contradictory ideas consisting both hostile and benevolent elements (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Therefore, the link between the understanding of traditional gender roles and sexist beliefs, theory suggests that hostile sexism (HS) is aimed towards women who intimidate male superiority and benevolent sexism (BS) is aimed towards women who act in accordance with the expected female roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

1.6.1 Hostile Sexism and Benevolent Sexism

AST consist of two opposite distinct types of sexism directed towards women. Women are being categorized in two distinct contrary groups which include positive

prejudice made towards women who behave accordingly with gender role expectations and give dominance to men (BS). On the other hand, the less favored second group is made up of women who threaten the male dominance (HS) (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

BS is the traditional expectations from a woman on how they should behave in society and during a romantic relationship (Glick & Fiske, 1996). In BS women are expected to love, care, and support, also provide the basic needs of their spouse such as cooking and cleaning and in return men should provide feelings of security and bring the bread home (Fletcher, Simpson, Thomas & Giles, 1999). As BS is beneficial for both sides it is perceived as good manner and the right thing rather than sexism (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Sarlet, Dumont, Delacollette & Dardenne, 2012). This causes women to be respected and men to become more protective and caring (Overall, Sibley & Tan, 2011). However, it functions to keep women in their current (lower) status and not question a man's authority (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

Contrarily, HS is the least favorable as women who compose this group come against the normal acceptable norms of traditional women. They believe women are less adequate than men and that women manipulate to gain dominance by using their sexuality (Glick & Fiske, 1996). People high in HS believe women are competing men to show strength in relationships causing the treatment of women in disequilibrium way (Swim, Aikin, Hall & Hunter, 1995). HS is identified with the term sexist towards women who challenge men power (Glick & Fiske, 2001).

1.6.2 Ambivalent Sexism and IPV Attitudes

In accordance to Glick and Fiske (1996, 2001) attitudes toward violence are related to levels of ambivalent sexism (AS) (i.e., BS and HS) cross-nationally. According to a previous study conducted in the United States, Latina women who had more benevolent sexist beliefs reported less abuse from their partners (Harris, Firestone & Vega, 2005). Also, relating to Abrams, Viki, Masser, and Bohner (2003) study showed that the effect of AS in IPV is significant. They showed that women who endorsed BS beliefs reported less abuse from partners. One explanation to this can be that women who are viewed more traditional and in line with such beliefs is believed to be valuable and in need of security. However, when women are perceived as challenging their lower status, they are not worthy of protection. Moreover, the same study found that the hostile sexist males were more likely to report positive attitudes to raping women who did not obey traditional gender roles (Abrams et al., 2003). This is because when a woman tries to dominate over men they in return use violence, from the reason of the belief that women should be controlled by men (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Similarly, according to Yamawaki, Ostenson and Brown (2009) found that in both America and Japan individuals who held ambivalent sexist beliefs had minimizing attitudes toward domestic violence, but in contrast individuals who held BS belief were more liable to blame the victim. Also, Hillier and Foddy (1993) conducted a study in the United States and found similar results, in which individuals who held high AS beliefs were more likely to have justifying attitudes toward domestic violence.

1.7 The Current Study

Since the 19th century women rights in the Turkish culture have started to rapidly change (Öngen, 2006). The movement for Turkish women rights begun, and by that

time women started to have more chance to make decision or to vote for politics, but still Turkish culture highly held traditional masculine and feminine roles, such as male providing the protection and female to stay at home (Öngen, 2006; Celikten, 2005). The notable characteristics of the Turkish family is to be male-dominated, and men to control the sexual behavior of women (Celikten, 2005; Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 1992). Also, the Turkish society holds a strict gender ideology in which women are seen as a second-class citizen surviving in a male constructed system (Müftüler-Bac, 1999). On the other hand, women in the Turkish culture have started to change their gender role view, for instance they no longer perceive housework and nurturing to be only their duty (Öngen, 2006). Men in contrast still think women should hold traditional female roles and still hold sexist views (Öngen, 2006). In addition, the Turkish culture has been found to be high in AS (Glick et al., 2000). Research findings show that men hold higher HS but women held more BS beliefs (Glick et al., 2000; Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2001).

In terms of the prevalence of violence within intimate partners in Turkey, one research cited 29.9% of physical violence and 31.3% of sexual violence to occur (Akar, Aksakal, Demirel, Durukan & Özkan, 2010) whereas another study found that the prevalence of psychological violence among intimate partners in Turkey was 53.8% (Kocacık & Dogan, 2006). According to Altınay and Arat (2007) 34.5% of women who live in Turkey experienced physical violence by their spouse at least once during their lives. On the other hand, controlling women's behavior (i.e., not giving permission to go out) by men in Turkey was found to be 59.6% (Akar et al., 2010).

As for research findings in Cyprus, one study conducted with Turkish speaking participants in the north of Cyprus found that 54% of women experience psychological violence, 36.7% physical violence and 20% sexual violence (Çakıcı et al., 2001). Furthermore, a previous study that was conducted with Greek Cypriots reported that at least 28% of women experience violence during their life-time, 19.3% psychological violence, 15.5% sexual violence, and 13.4% physical violence (Mavrikiou, Apostolidou & Parlalis, 2014).

Research findings in Turkey have shown that traditional gender ideologies contribute to IPV. According to Sakallı-Uğurlu (2001) Turkish individuals who held HS beliefs have more tolerance for victimizing women beating. Additionally, BS beliefs in Turkish individuals had a less positive attitude toward sexual violence victims (Sakallı-Uğurlu, Yalçın & Glick, 2007). Also, in a comparative study of Brazil and Turkey, Turkish speaking individuals who held HS and BS beliefs showed support on legitimizing wife beating (Glick et al., 2000). In addition, according to a previous study conducted with Turkish individuals, those who held traditional gender ideology used violence over women in their intimate relationships (Kocacık & Çağlayandereli, 2009).

Research findings in the north of Cyprus with Turkish speaking individuals are quite limited. However, in an early study conducted by Mertan et al. (2012) it was found that police officers reported negative attitudes toward domestic violence while those groups who had received training on domestic violence issues were more positive in their attitudes. Another study which was conducted in North Cyprus with a Turkish speaking population found that traditional gender myths (such as ‘spare the rod, spoil

the child [girl]’) increases positive attitudes for wife beating and in return increases the abuse over women in intimate relationships (Husnu & Mertan, 2015). Similarly, another study that was conducted a Turkish speaking population in Cyprus found that the relationship between victim blaming and positive attitudes towards IPV was mediated by ambivalent sexism and beating beliefs (Parlan, 2015). To further understand the predictors of IPV in the Turkish culture, this study aimed to investigate certain factors that play a role on the attitudes towards partner violence. The aim of the study was therefore to explore the role of parental (perceived mother and father conflict), societal (gender role stereotyping) and personal factors (ambivalent, hostile and benevolent sexism beliefs) in predicting attitudes towards IPV. The hypotheses of this research were as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Positive attitudes towards intimate partner violence, hostile sexism beliefs and conflict sub-scores for parental conflict will be higher among males compared to females. However, benevolent sexism beliefs, gender role stereotyping, self-blame and threat sub-scores for parental conflict will be higher among females compared to males.

Hypothesis 2: Perceived parental conflict (witnessing mother to father psychological/physical aggression and witnessing father to mother psychological/physical aggression) will be positively associated with attitudes of intimate partner violence.

Hypothesis 3: Gender role stereotyping will be positively associated with supportive attitudes towards intimate partner violence.

Hypothesis 4: High hostile sexist beliefs will be positively associated with attitudes towards intimate partner violence.

Hypothesis 5: High benevolent sexist beliefs will be positively associated with attitudes towards intimate partner violence.

Chapter 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

One hundred and twenty Turkish speaking participants from different cities (i.e., Kyrenia, Nicosia) in North Cyprus who had a current romantic relationship volunteered to take part in the study. In the sample, there were 60 males (50%) and 60 females (50%). Participants were between 18 years and 25 years old. The mean age of the sample was 22.0 years ($SD = 1.98$). The participants were a convenience sample, randomly acquired by the snowballing technique.

The inclusion criteria for the current study included any Turkish speaking volunteers without regard to their nationality and who were also involved in a romantic relationship.

2.2 Materials

All of the scales were self-report measures. The questionnaires included Perception of Gender Scale, Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale and Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale.

2.2.1 Demographic Information Form

Demographic information form was given to the participants to gather more detailed information, which is designed by the researcher. It included basic demographic

questions such as gender, age, relationship status etc. The form consisted of 4 questions in total (See appendix A).

2.2.2 Perception of Gender Scale

The perception of gender scale is a Turkish scale developed by Altınova and Duyan in 2013. It is a 25-item multiple-choice self-report scale that assesses people's perception of gender. The scale was proved to be high in validity and reliability. 10 items were positive (e.g., "marriage does not prevent women from working") and 15 items were negative (e.g., "women should not work after marriage") questions. All of the items were answered by using a 5-point Likert scale format ranging from 5 (*strongly agree*) to 1 (*strongly disagree*). Negative questions were scored reverse. The total score from the scale changed from 25 to 125. High scores indicate people's gender role stereotypes as positive. The internal consistency of the scale in the current study was high, Cronbach' $\alpha = .91$. (See appendix B).

2.2.3 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

ASI was developed by Glick and Fiske in 1996. It is a 22-item multiple-choice self-report inventory. The inventory included measures of sexist attitudes 11-item hostile sexism (e.g., "women are too easily offended"; Cronbach's $\alpha = .83$) and 11- item benevolent sexism (e.g., "men are not complete without women"; Cronbach's $\alpha = .78$) with the dimensions of paternalism, gender differentiation and heterosexuality. All items were answered by using a 6-point Likert scale format ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). The inventory had a high reliability and a good validity to use as a measurement. There were no reverse items in the scale. High scores indicate greater sexism.

The Turkish adaptation of the scale was made by Sakallı-Uğurlu in 2002. The Turkish version of Ambivalent Sexism Inventory had a high reliability and a good validity, $\alpha = .82$ for the total scale in the current study (See appendix C).

2.2.4 Children's Perception of Inter-Parental Conflict Scale (CPICS)

CPICS was developed by Grych, Seid and Fincham in 1992. Although the scale was developed for children, Moura, Santos, Rocha and Matos (2010) adapted the CPICS for adolescents and emerging adults and found the same factor structure and were therefore applied to the sample of the current study.

CPIC is a 35-item self-report scale that assesses children's view of inter-parental conflict. The scale had three subscales which were; conflict (17-items) (e.g., "After my parents stop arguing, they are friendly toward each other"; Cronbach's $\alpha = .92$) that reflect conflict which occurs regularly, involves higher levels of hostility, and is poorly resolved. Threat (9-items) (e.g., "My parents often nag and complain about each other around the house"; Cronbach's $\alpha = .78$) that measure children's threat degree and their coping ability with inter-parental conflict when it occurs. Self-blame (9-items) (e.g., "When my parents argue I'm afraid that they will yell at me too"; Cronbach's $\alpha = .79$) that measure children's blaming degree toward themselves for inter-parental conflict and the degree of child-related conflict.

All items were answered by using a 3-point Likert scale format ranging from 1 (*True*) to 3 (*False*). The items 1., 2., 6., 9., 15., 19., 20., 25., 28., 34 were reverse coded items in the scale. The high scores for each subscale indicate greater negative perception of children toward inter-parental conflict.

The Turkish adaptation of the scale was conducted by Ulu and Fıfılođlu in 2004. Results of the reliability and validity study indicated that the Turkish version of the Children's Perception of Inter-Parental Conflict Scale was a reliable and valid instrument. The internal consistency of the scale in the current study was high, Cronbach' $\alpha = .92$. (See appendix D).

2.2.5 Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale (IPVAS)

IPVAS was developed by Smith, Thompson, Tomaka and Buchanan in 2005. It is a 20-item multiple-choice self-report scale that assess attitudes towards intimate partner violence. The scale included three factors abuse (e.g., "As long as my partner doesn't hurt me, 'threats' are excused"), control (e.g., "It is okay for me to tell my partner not to talk to someone of the opposite sex"), and violence (e.g., "It would not be appropriate to ever kick, bite, or hit a partner with one's fist"). All items were answered by using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores on the scale indicated having more positive/supportive attitudes towards intimate partner violence.

The Turkish translation and back translation was completed by the research supervisor (unpublished masters' theses). The scale remained with 19 questions in total after deleting item 6. Internal consistency of the scale in the current study was $\alpha = .65$. (See appendix E).

2.3 Design

The present study used the survey method to explore the role of parental (perceived mother and father conflict), societal (gender role stereotyping) and personal factors (ambivalent; hostile and benevolent sexist beliefs) in predicting attitudes towards

IPV. For this study three independent variables (parental, societal and personal factors) and one dependent measure (intimate partner violence) were used.

2.4 Procedure

Firstly, an approval was taken from the EMU Psychology Department Ethics and Research Committee to conduct this study. The data was collected over a duration of 2 months by administering a questionnaire to the participants by using the snowball technique from different cities in North Cyprus to have a representative sample. Before conducting the study, the informed consent form was given to the participants to explain the purpose of this study. The informed consent was freely given without influence, and the right of withdrawal at any time was clearly explained to the participant. After ensuring the participants were willing to take part as volunteers, the questionnaires were given to the participants. It took approximately 35 minutes for the participants to complete the surveys, after they were debriefed and thanked.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

The present study used IBM SPSS 20 statistical package for data analysis. By means of purpose of the study an independent sample t-test was used to examine any gender differences. Afterward, correlations were analyzed, and lastly a standard multiple regression was used to assess the influence of the independent variables on dependent variable.

3.1 Analysis of Gender Differences

The means and standard deviations for each variable are presented in Table 1. In order to test hypothesis one which concerned gender differences on perception of gender, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, children's perception of inter-parental conflict (self-blame, conflict, threat) and intimate partner violence an independent samples t-test was used. The assumptions of the t-test have been met.

Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations on all Variables for Females and Males

Variables	Female	Male	<i>t</i>
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	
PGS	3.85 (0.61)	3.17 (0.79)	5.24**
ASI-HS	3.19 (0.89)	4.10 (0.91)	-5.52**
ASI-BS	3.97 (0.98)	3.95 (0.85)	0.12
CPICS-CONFLICT	2.28 (0.48)	2.23 (0.53)	0.58
CPICS-THREAT	2.34 (0.46)	2.35 (0.48)	-0.09
CPICS-SELFBLAME	2.63 (0.35)	2.49 (0.41)	2.02*
IPVAS	3.01 (0.54)	3.22 (0.43)	-2.32*

Note: * $p < 0.05$ level, ** $p < 0.01$. PGS= perception of gender scale ranged from 1 to 5, HS= hostile sexism (1 to 6), BS = benevolent sexism (1 to 6), CPICS = children's perception of inter-parental conflict scale (1 to 3), and IPVAS = intimate partner violence attitude scale (1 to 5).

3.1.1 Correlation Analysis

A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to analyze the relationship between perception of gender, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, children's perception of inter-parental conflict (self-blame, conflict, threat) and intimate partner violence. The simple correlations of the variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Pearson Correlation Coefficient Values of the Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.PGS	-						
2.HS	-.43	-					
3.BS	.02	.21	-				
4.IPVAS	-.19*	.21*	.25**	-			
5.Conflict	.14	.01	.12	-.04	-		
6.Threat	.12	.04	.15	-.07	.64	-	
7.Self Blame	.32	-.12	.22	.11	.33	.33	-

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level; * $p < 0.05$ level. PGS= perception of gender scale, HS= hostile sexism, BS = benevolent sexism, CPICS = children's perception of inter-parental conflict scale, IPVAS = intimate partner violence attitude scale

3.2 Regression Analysis of IPV Attitudes

Standard multiple regression analysis was used to measure the role of three variables in predicting Intimate Partner Violence Attitudes (IPVAS): Perception of gender, Ambivalent Sexism and Children's perception of inter-parental conflict. Firstly, analyses were conducted to ensure there were no violations on normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. Standard multiple regression results are given in Table 3.

Table 3: Predictors of Attitude towards IPV

<i>Variables</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SEb</i>	<i>β</i>
PGS	-.11	.06	-.18
HS	.06	.05	.11
BS	.12	.05	.21*
Conflict	-.02	.11	-.02
Threat	-.15	.12	-.14
Self-Blame	.23	.13	.18
R ² = .14			

Note: * $p < 0.05$ level, ** $p < 0.01$. PGS= perception of gender scale, HS= hostile sexism, BS = benevolent sexism, CPICS = children's perception of inter-parental conflict scale, IPVAS = intimate partner violence attitude scale

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The present study examined whether perception of gender, ambivalent sexism (hostile sexism, HS and benevolent sexism, BS), and children's perception of inter-parental conflict (conflict, threat and self-blame) predicted attitudes towards partner violence in a Turkish sample. In addition, the second purpose of the current study was to examine gender differences in attitudes towards partner violence.

Analysis of gender differences supported the first hypothesis, in which significant gender differences were obtained such that males had more positive/supportive attitudes towards IPV compared to females. The result of the present study was in line with that of past research, where men reported more supportive attitudes towards IPV compared to women (Simon et al., 2001). Also, men in Armenia, Nepal, and Turkey were more likely to support IPV attitudes (Rani & Bonu, 2009). Contrary to these findings, other previous researchers that has been conducted in Uganda and in multi-nations (i.e., Palestine, Jordan, Nigeria and etc.) have found that women had more supportive attitudes towards IPV compared to men (Speizer, 2010; Waltermaurer, 2012). It is likely that this difference is due to cultural norms within the Turkish society. The Turkish culture is one in which traditional gender roles are more common and attitudes towards women's roles are less liberal (Celikten, 2005). Similarly, the Turkish culture is a context which is male-dominated and patriarchal,

therefore it is not surprising that men may accept such views of violence as a normal part of a union (Celikten, 2005; Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 1992; Müftüler-Bac, 1999).

This can also be explained in reference to feminist theory. Accordingly, in male-dominated societies, patriarchal relationships are sustained through applicable social gender roles for both males and females (Herzog, 2007). These traditional gender-role attitudes hold the idea of dominant male figures being welcomed by society to use physical violence towards their female spouse to control them, thus brings the result of inequality within the relationships (Herzog, 2007). Most studies on violence against women show a consistent result of the traditional belief to gain power over women by using force against them. By holding on to this ideology males tend to justify their assaults made against women and maintain their dominancy (Herzog, 2007). Together, these factors might account for men increased positive attitudes towards IPV as compared to women.

In the current study women showed more positive gender role stereotyping compared to males. In another word, women held less gender stereotypical roles compared to men. Turkish undergraduate women have progressively started to be less subordinate to men (Öngen, 2006). Recently, Turkish women have become more active in outside activities and spend less time in household roles compared to previous times, despite findings that show that men think women should hold traditional female roles (Öngen, 2006).

Another finding obtained in the present study demonstrated that male participants had higher HS beliefs than did female participants, as were in line with the previous

studies conducted with Turkish populations and abroad (Glick et al., 2000; Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2001). HS is about justifying male power and traditional gender roles (Glick & Fiske, 1997) whereas, BS is about intimacy seeking and protective paternalism (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Men have more commonly been found to hold hostile sexist beliefs. This is because men have the motivation to dominate, and to be more powerful (i.e., dominative paternalism). Also, some men have a tendency to see themselves more superior compared to women (Glick, 2006). Moreover, men have been found to endorse more hostile sexist attitudes, because they believe women should be controlled by themselves (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Critically, traditional gender stereotypes, play an important role in increasing men's hostile sexist attitudes. For instance, when society supports men to be in a higher-position and to have more power, while on the other hand, supporting women to be in a lower status and to be suited for domestic roles, this increases the self-confidence in men by thinking they are better than women, and they believe that they should have the power (Eagly, 1987; Glick & Fiske, 1997).

Furthermore, results in the present study showed that, while men had higher HS beliefs, there were no gender differences in the belief of BS. The result was in line with past researcher's findings, which demonstrated that in the Turkish culture men have greater HS beliefs and women have more or equal BS beliefs (Glick et al., 2000; Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2001). This is understandable, and an expected result, because when women stick to the stereotypical gender roles they become worthy of protection and are rewarded (Yamawaki, Ostenson & Brown, 2009; Abrams et al., 2003). Furthermore, women believe BS has benefits, such as receiving respectful attitudes, being cherished and being economically provided for by men (Chen, Fiske

& Lee, 2009). In addition, women endorse more BS in countries where gender inequality and HS sexism is high, because it is the least risky way to deal with hostile and aggressive behaviors of men (Sibley, Overall & Duckitt, 2007). Also, from the belief that men's power will be to their advantage by being promised with high security (Glick et al., 2000). Consequently, women who endorse BS, perceive the social norms as legal because stereotypes are shown to women as positive and also having unique qualities (i.e., warm and nurturer) that men do not have (Jost & Kay, 2005).

Correlation analyses in the present study showed that IPV attitudes were positively correlated with HS and BS. This shows that as the hostile and benevolent sexist belief scores increase, positive attitude towards IPV scores also increase. The findings in this study supports the feminist theory, where the theory argues that sexism and gender inequality are the main causes of IPV (Dobash & Dobash, 1977; Lenton, 1995). Furthermore, the results were in line with past researcher's findings, where AS was associated with attitudes that support domestic violence (Glick, Sakallı-Uğurlu, Ferreira & Souza, 2002).

Surprisingly, however the results of the current study demonstrated that HS did not predict positive attitudes towards IPV in the regression analysis while BS did. The results were contrary with other studies' (Abrams et al., 2003; Glick & Fiske, 1997; Hillier & Foddy, 1993), where HS was found as a predictor of IPV. The reason of HS did not predict positive attitudes towards IPV in this study can be explained as participants may have had the idea that gaining superiority by IPV should be the last attempt. Therefore, participants may support that a 'real man' should not need to use

violence towards their spouses in order to obtain supremacy, and women on the hand should know how to avoid the threatening condition (Goicolea, Öhman, Torres, Morras & Edin, 2012). On the other hand, the participants who had hostile sexist belief may have not supported IPV, because they have conditioned themselves as violence is not only a way to show domination in a society, but it also can be counted as deficiency by the society (Goicolea et al., 2012). However, this should be further examined in future research.

Moreover, in the present study women reported equal BS beliefs to men, which BS by definition does not challenge men's power or dominance in order to be protected. This may be a reasonable explanation for the lack of HS in the results of this study, where men do not need to resort to IPV, because in patriarchal societies in which an inequality of power exists, women are not expected to challenge men's power from the fear of violation of norms and losing out on the benefits of protection (Glick et al., 2000; Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2001; Yamawaki et al., 2009; Abrams et al., 2003).

BS however did predict attitudes towards IPV. The result is in line with past researcher's findings, which Glick and colleagues (2002), argued that BS is only a protective factor towards IPV, when women obey the traditional gender roles. Furthermore, one study found that benevolently sexist men supported IPV as a reasonable behavior towards women, when they challenge the male authority and violate traditional gender roles/ femininity (Viki & Abrams, 2002). Also, according to other studies findings, BS was positively related with attitudes that validate domestic violence (Glick et al., 2002). Although BS is a protective factor in relationships, it is still sexism where men are domineering and overbearing women

with benevolence, and separating women in marriages as a low status (Chen, Fiske & Lee, 2009).

Additionally, intimate partners who strongly endorse BS as was the case in the current study believe that women should be a caregiver and loyal to traditional gender roles and men should be a caretaker and protector will have less tolerance to conflicts, thus will be more likely to react negatively and hostile when intimate partners fail to live up to the ideal standards and expectations (Hammond, Sibley & Overall, 2014). Overall, as a result BS may not prevent violence or may not prevent harsh behavior within intimate partners, because once women or men do not conform with the sexist expectations, the promise in the relationship which is protection and affection may be disengagement (Glick & Fiske, 2011).

Also, results in the current study demonstrated that there was a negative relationship between IPV attitude and perception of gender in Turkish speaking participants in North Cyprus. This means when the positive attitude towards IPV increased, gender stereotyping perception in males and females decreased. This is in line with research that states that traditional gender ideology and thinking is linked to violence attitudes and behaviors (Santana et al., 2006; Pleck & O'donnell, 2001). Once again when taking the current population into consideration, this is more likely in traditional cultures and male-dominated countries, since abuse and abusive attitudes can be tolerated for instance when wives do not support traditional gender roles, this has been found to increase the anger of husbands and lead them to use violence towards their wives (Jayatilleke et al., 2011). Similarly, when society supports the imbalance of power; men are less likely to be blamed for showing violence towards their wives

(Müftüler-Bac, 1999; Hillier & Foddy, 1993). Moreover, women who hold more traditional gender roles justify their abuse and let their spouse to control them (Folingstad, Rutledge, McNeill-Hawkins & Polek, 1992), which can contribute to an increase in positive attitudes towards IPV.

The study also found differences between males and females in self-blame, and no gender differences in threat or conflict. As a result, because of the perceived unresolved conflict within their families, females in the current sample self-blamed themselves more than males. The reason of the differences might be from their use of coping strategies, which according to a past study participants who self-blame themselves from inter-parental conflict had less secondary coping strategy (Fear et al., 2009). Women, for instance, might have used more helplessness and powerlessness and less positive refocusing or reappraisal coping strategies which might account for their higher self-blame. This is a speculative explanation as in the current study, the level of coping strategy in females and males were not measured and should be tackled in future research.

In the current study, perceived parental conflict was not predictive of positive attitudes towards IPV. This is in contrast to the hypothesis and a number of studies that report a significant relationship between violent childhood experiences and the risk of IPV (Whitfield, Anda, Dube & Felitti, 2003; Lichter & McCloskey, 2004). The lack of such an influence might be because the participants of the current study may have chosen a different path in which witnessing IPV early in life is a good learning process to stand apart from romantic relationships that involve IPV. Therefore, those who witnessed IPV in childhood, may develop coping strategies or

learn behaviors that prevent IPV and exclude IPV in their own romantic relationships as adults (Ernst et al., 2007). Widom (1989) for instance reported that children who witness violence in their families do not always end up as perpetrators in future romantic relationships. The protective factor that has broken the cycle of violent attitudes may be that participants in the current study had an insightful understanding by knowing the negative effects of violence to oneself and to the relationship quality, or may had a stable and satisfying relationship with their intimate partners negating the role of any parental conflict during childhood (Egeland, 1993). Moreover, participants may have dissociated the childhood parental conflict experiences with their own dating relationship, instead of idealizing the past experiences (Egeland, 1993). However, these possible explanations must be tested by future studies to support such claims.

The current study has a number of limitations. Past research has shown that conflicts in relationships are more likely to occur in socially and economically disadvantaged families (Fergusson & Horwood, 1998). The role of such confounding social, familial and contextual factors was not evaluated in the current study hence future studies should take into consideration such psychosocial factors, these may include divorce, family stress, nature and extent of conflict, perceived interpretation of the conflict and ability to cope with stressful parental conflicts (Fergusson & Horwood, 1998). In addition, data was collected retrospectively, hence participants had to rely on their memory when thinking about their parental relationships and conflicts within the home, this may have led to a lack of findings for parental conflict variables. Additionally, participants' appraisal (i.e., frequency, intensity and resolution) or interpretation of parental arguments was also not evaluated which might have

increased its likelihood of playing a role on IPV (Kerig, 1998). Perceived control which includes the belief that parental conflict can be controlled and includes making attempts to stop the parental abuse is an important variable that should be included in future research (Rossman & Rosenberg, 1992), to see if participants who report high control are the ones who are influenced the most by parental arguments. Additionally, the current study only accounted for 14% of the variance in IPV attitudes with the predictors assessed. It is great of importance that other factors which can account for the remaining variance such as alcohol use, personality disorders or attachment styles also be assessed to obtain a more encompassing understanding of IPV.

The current study has a number of implications for reducing IPV in the Turkish population. Firstly, one of the risk factors that is related with IPV, is found to be traditional gender stereotyping (Brownridge, 2002; Santana et al., 2006). Therefore, intervention programs should focus on changing attitudes of gender roles in society (Miller et al., 2012; Taylor, Stein, Mumford & Woods, 2013). Towards such an aim, firstly it is important to target early childhood, because in these years children start to develop gender role stereotype beliefs (Trepanier-Street & Romatowski, 1999). Additionally, it is important to target the adolescence period, because romantic relationship conflicts mostly occur in these years, and the interpersonal violence continues to adulthood (Bouchey & Furman 2003; Ponti et al., 2010). According to a past research 70% of emerging adult experienced psychological violence and 27% experienced physical violence by their intimate partner (Black, Sussman & Unger, 2010). Therefore, to prevent IPV in these years it is suggested that workshops are organized which present egalitarian literature in classes to children's and to emerging

adults (Miller et al., 2012; Taylor et al., 2013). This is because, egalitarian intentions show benefits in individuals, such as developing high self-esteem, positive mental health, better adjustment and more fulfilling relationships (Helmreich, Spence & Holahan, 1979; Ickes & Barnes, 1978). Also, according to a past research that has been conducted with children at ages between 4 to 5 years old, showed a significant reduction in stereotypic thinking after exhibiting egalitarian literature for 5 days (Flerx, Fidler & Rogers, 1976).

Secondly, sexism beliefs are another target that should be considered. This is because many studies have shown that sexism is a risk factor of IPV (Abrams et al., 2003; Hillier & Foddy, 1993). Moreover, according to the research reducing BS and HS are the main purposes for developing successful treatments, because sexism serves gender inequality justification (Glick & Fiske, 2001) and it has been shown that less sexist attitudes are related with less domestic violence (Abrams et al., 2003; Glick et al., 2002; Yamawaki et al., 2009). Thus, critically education should be given to individuals about the negative consequences of BS, because people are less likely to recognize BS as a sexist attitude compared to HS (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005). Also, a past research has found that when participants were informed about the negative results of BS, they were more likely to reject BS beliefs (Fehr & Sassenberg, 2009). Moreover, giving education on psychology of gender in classes may successfully reduce sexism beliefs, because it informs the harms of sexism (Jones & Jacklin, 1988). In addition, workshops should be developed on minimizing reactance and raising empathy to make people understand better about the negative effects of sexist attitudes in order to reduce the hostility behaviors and negative reactions (Becker & Swim, 2011; Vescio, Sechrist & Paolucci, 2003).

Considering that, IPV is a serious health problem that physically and psychologically harms individually (i.e., men, women and children) (Kimberg, 2008), implicating policy to screen for in health care settings and in schools is crucial as it can help identify who is experiencing IPV and is in need of help (Speizer, 2010).

Another important implication is that community-based programs targeting interpersonal relationships (i.e., healthy relationships) be developed to be included in school settings and family settings which target, anger management and communication skills training in order to educate individuals on how to overcome conflicts within romantic relationships without showing violent behaviors. Also, youngsters should be instructed to on the alert signs of an abusive relationship from an early age, in order to prevent becoming part of an abusive relationship. All of these factors are possible predictors of violence that need further assessment.

The current study is one of the few attempts to explore the role of parental, societal and personal factors in predicting attitudes towards intimate partner violence with a sample of Turkish speaking participants in North Cyprus. The findings illustrate that benevolent sexism is a predictor of intimate partner violence as a global public health problem that requires psychosocial interventions that can target victims of violence and reduce the likelihood of its occurrence.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(1), 111-125. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111
- Akar, T., Aksakal, F. N., Demirel, B., Durukan, E., & Özkan, S. (2010). The prevalence of domestic violence against women among a group woman: Ankara, Turkey. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(5), 449-460. doi: 10.1007/s10896-010-9306-8
- Ali, P. A., & Naylor, P. B. (2013). Intimate partner violence: A narrative review of the biological and psychological explanations for its causation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 18(3), 373-382.
- Allen, C. T., Swan, S. C., & Raghavan, C. (2009). Gender symmetry, sexism, and intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(11), 1816-1834. doi: 10.1177/0886260508325496
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.
- Altınay, A. G., & Arat, Y. (2007). *Türkiye’de kadına yönelik şiddet*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Punto Baskı Çözümleri.

- Altınova, H. H., & Duyan, V. (2013). Toplumsal cinsiyet algısı ölçeğinin geçerlik güvenirlik çalışması (The validity and reliability of perception of gender scale). *Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet (Journal of Society and Social Work)*, 24(2), 9-22.
- Archer, J. (2006). Cross-cultural differences in physical aggression between partners: A social-role analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(2), 133-153. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_3.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging *adulthood*: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55, 469–480.
- Babcock, J. C., Waltz, J., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (1993). Power and violence: The relation between communication patterns, power discrepancies, and domestic violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61, 40–50.
- Baldry, A. C. (2003). “Sticks and stones hurt my bones but his glance and words hurt more”: The impact of psychological abuse and physical violence by former and current partners on battered women in Italy. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 2, 47-57.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Barnett, O. W., & Fagan, R. W. (1993). Alcohol use in male spouse abusers and their female partners. *Journal of Family Violence, 8*(1), 1-25.
- Barnett, O. W., Miller-Perrin, C. L., & Perrin, R. D. (2010). *Family violence across the lifespan: An introduction*. Sage Press.
- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005). The burden of benevolent sexism: How it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*(5), 633-642.
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2011). Seeing the unseen: Attention to daily encounters with sexism as way to reduce sexist beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(2), 227-242.
- Ben-Ari, A., & Lavee, Y. (2007). Dyadic closeness in marriage: From the inside story to a conceptual model. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24*(5), 627-644.
- Bettencourt, B., & Miller, N. (1996). Gender differences in aggression as a function of provocation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*(3), 422-447.
- Black, D. S., Sussman, S., & Unger, J. B. (2010). A further look at the intergenerational transmission of violence: Witnessing interparental violence in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(6), 1022-1042.

- Block, J. H., Block, J., & Gjerde, P. F. (1986). The personality of children prior to divorce: A prospective study. *Child Development*, 827-840.
- Bouchey, H. A., & Furman, W. (2003). Dating and romantic experiences in adolescence. In G. R. Adams & M. D. Berzonsky (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of adolescence* (pp. 313-330). Australia: Blackwell Press.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss, Vol. 1: Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Breiding, M., Basile, K. C., Smith, S. G., Black, M. C., & Mahendra, R. R. (2015). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: uniform definitions and recommended data elements version 2.0*. Atlanta: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Press.
- Brownridge, D. A. (2002). Cultural variation in male partner violence against women: A comparison of Québec with the rest of Canada. *Violence against Women*, 8(1), 87-115.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 1-49.
- Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review*, 106(4), 676-713.

Çakıcı, M., Çakıcı, E., Bayraktar, F., Subaşı, B., Karademir, D., Kayagül, F., Kayda, A., Kırçalılar, G., Abatay, E. (2001). KKTC’de kadına yönelik şiddet. *Kıbrıs Türk Tıp Dergisi*, 2 (2), 4-23.

Campbell, J. C., & Soeken, K. L. (1999). Forced sex and intimate partner violence: Effects on women's risk and *women's* health. *Violence against Women*, 5(9), 1017-1035.

Capaldi, D. M., Kim, H. K. (2007). Typological approaches to violence in couples: A critique and alternative conceptual approach. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27(3), 253-265.

Capaldi, D. M., Knoble, N. B., Shortt, J. W., & Kim, H. K. (2012). A systematic review of risk factors for intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse*, 3(2) 231–280.

Celikten, M. (2005). A perspective on women principals in Turkey. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 8(3), 207-223.

Chan, K. L., Straus, M. A., Brownridge, D. A., Tiwari, A., & Leung, W. C. (2008). Prevalence of dating partner violence and suicidal ideation among male and female university students *worldwide*. *Journal of Midwifery and Women's Health*, 53(6), 529-537.

- Chen, P. H., & White, H. R. (2004). Gender differences in adolescent and young adult predictors of later intimate partner violence: A prospective study. *Violence Against Women, 10*(11), 1283-1301.
- Chen, Z., Fiske, S. T., & Lee, T. L. (2009). Ambivalent sexism and power-related gender-role ideology in marriage. *Sex Roles, 60*(11-12), 765-778.
- Christian, C. W., Scribano, P., Seidl, T., & Pinto-Martin, J. A. (1997). Pediatric injury resulting from family violence. *Pediatrics, 99*(2), 1-4.
- Clark, A. H., Foy, D. W. (2000). Trauma exposure and alcohol use in battered women. *Violence against Women, 6*(1), 37-48.
- Cordova, J. V., Jacobson, N. S., Gottman, J. M., Rushe, R., & Cox, G. (1993). Negative reciprocity and communication in couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102*(4), 559-564.
- Cox, M. J., Paley, B., & Harter, K. (2001). Interparental conflict and parent-child relationships. *Interparental Conflict and Child Development: Theory, Research, and Applications, 249-272.*
- Crocker, J., Thompson, L. L., McGraw, K. M., & Ingerman, C. (1987). Downward comparison, prejudice, and evaluations of others: effects of self-esteem and threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(5), 907-916.

- Cummings, E. M., & Davies, P. (1994). *Children and marital conflict: The impact of family dispute and resolution*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Dasgupta, S. D. (2002). A framework for understanding women's use of nonlethal violence in intimate heterosexual relationships. *Violence Against Women, 8*, 1364-1389.
- Davies, P. T., & Lindsay, L. L. (2001). Does gender moderate the effects of marital conflict on children. In J. H. Grych & F. D. Fincham (Eds.), *Interparental conflict and child development: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 64-97). U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- DeBoard-Lucas, R. L., & Grych, J. H. (2011). Children's perceptions of intimate partner violence: Causes, consequences, and coping. *Journal of Family Violence, 26*(5), 343-354.
- Diekmann, A. B., & Eagly, A. H. (2000). Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(10), 1171-1188.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1977). Wives: The appropriate victims of marital violence. *Victimology, 2*, 426-442.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.

- Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Pettit, G. S. (1990). Mechanisms in the cycle of violence. *Science*, *250*, 1678–1683.
- Dutton, D. (1995). Trauma symptoms and PTSD-like profiles in perpetrators of intimate abuse. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *8*(2), 299–316.
- Dutton, D. G., & Golant, S. K. (1995). *The batterer: A psychological profile*. New York: Basic Books.
- Dutton, M. A., Haywood, Y., & El-Bayoumi, G. (1997). Impact of violence on women's health. In *Health care for women: Psychological, social, and behavioral influences* (pp. 1-56). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American psychologist*, *54*(6), 408-423.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. *The developmental social psychology of gender*, 123-174.

- Egeland, B. (1993). A history of abuse is a major risk factor for abusing the next generation. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 197-208). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ehrensaft, M. K., Cohen, P., Brown, J., Smailes, E., Chen, H., & Johnson, J. G. (2003). Intergenerational transmission of partner violence: a 20-year prospective study. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology, 71*(4), 741-753.
- Epstein, C. F. (1997). The multiple realities of sameness and difference: Ideology and practice. *Journal of Social Issues, 53*(2), 259-278.
- Ernst, A. A., Weiss, S. J., Del Castillo, C., Aagaard, J., Marvez-Valls, E., D'Angelo, J., ... & Coffman, B. (2007). Witnessing intimate partner violence as a child does not increase the likelihood of becoming an adult intimate partner violence victim. *Academic Emergency Medicine, 14*(5), 411-418.
- Fear, J. M., Champion, J. E., Reeslund, K. L., Forehand, R., Colletti, C., Roberts, L., & Compas, B. E. (2009). Parental depression and interparental conflict: Children and adolescents' self-blame and coping responses. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*(5), 762-766. doi:10.1037/a0016381.
- Fehr, J., & Sassenberg, K. (2009). Intended and unintended consequences of internal motivation to behave nonprejudiced: The case of benevolent discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*(6), 1093-1108.

- Fergusson, D. M., & Horwood, L. J. (1998). Exposure to interparental violence in childhood and psychosocial adjustment in young adulthood. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 22(5), 339-357.
- Flerx, V. C., Fidler, D. S., & Rogers, R. W. (1976). Sex role stereotypes: Developmental aspects and early intervention. *Child Development*, 47(4) 998-1007.
- Fletcher, G. J., Simpson, J. A., Thomas, G., & Giles, L. (1999). Ideals in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(1), 72-89.
- Folingstad, D. R., Rutledge, L. L., McNeill-Hawkins, K., & Polek, D. S. (1992). Factors related to physical violence in dating relationships. *Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 121-135.
- Fosco, G. M., DeBoard, R. L., & Grych, J. H. (2007). Making sense of family violence: Implications of children's appraisals of interparental aggression for their short-and long-term functioning. *European Psychologist*, 12(1), 6-16.
- FVVPF. (2004). *National consensus guidelines on responding to domestic violence victimization in health care settings*. San Francisco, CA
- Glick, P. (2006). 13 Ambivalent sexism, power distance, and gender inequality across cultures. *Social comparison and social psychology: Understanding Cognition, Intergroup Relations, and Culture*, 283-302.

- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491-512. doi: 10.1037/0022-3515.70.3.491.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 119-135. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00104.x.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist, 56*(2), 109-118. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.56.2.109
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2011). Ambivalent sexism revisited. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(3), 530-535.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J., Abrams, D., Maser, B., . . . López-López, W. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(5), 763-775. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763
- Glick, P., Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Ferreira, M. C., & Souza, M. A. (2002). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward wife abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*(4), 292-297. doi:10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00068

- Goicolea, I., Öhman, A., Torres, M. S., Morras, I., & Edin, K. (2012). Condemning violence without rejecting sexism? Exploring how young men understand intimate partner violence in Ecuador. *Gender and Health, 5*(1), 1-12.
- Goldner, V. (1999). Morality and multiplicity: Perspectives on the treatment of violence in intimate life. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 25*, 325–336.
- Good, G. E., Heppner, M. J., Hillenbrand-Gunn, T. L., & Wang, L.-F. (1995). Sexual and psychological violence: An exploratory study of predictors in college men. *Journal of Men's Studies, 4*, 59-71.
- Gracia, E. (2004). Unreported cases of domestic violence against women: Towards an epidemiology of social silence, tolerance, and inhibition. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 58*, 536–537.
- Green, C. R., Flowe-Valencia, H., Rosenblum, L., & Tait, A. R. (1999). Do physical and sexual abuse differentially affect chronic pain states in women?. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management, 18*(6), 420-426.
- Halpern, C. T., Oslak, S. G., Young, M. L., Martin, S. L., & Kupper, L. L. (2001). Partner violence among adolescents in opposite-sex romantic relationships: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*(10), 1679-1685.

- Halpern, C. T., Spriggs, A. L., Martin, S. L., Kupper, L. (2009). Patterns of intimate partner violence victimization from adolescence to young adulthood in a nationally representative sample. *Journal of Adolescence Health, 45*(5), 508-516. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.03.011.
- Hammond, M. D., Sibley, C. G., & Overall, N. C. (2014). The allure of sexism: Psychological entitlement fosters women's endorsement of benevolent sexism over time. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 5*(4), 422-429.
- Hanks, R. A., Temkin, N., Machamer, J., & Dikmen, S. S. (1999). Emotional and behavioral adjustment after traumatic brain injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 80*(9), 991-997.
- Harris, R. J., Firestone, J. M., & Vega, W. A. (2005). The interaction of country of origin, acculturation, and gender role ideology on wife abuse. *Social Science Quarterly, 86*(2), 463-483.
- Hassan, F., Sadowski, L. S., Bangdiwala, S. I., Vizcarra, B., Ramiro, L., De Paula, C. S., Bordin, I. A. S., & Mitra, M. K. (2004). Physical intimate partner violence in Chile, Egypt, India and the Philippines. *Injury Control and Safety Promotion, 11*(2), 111-116.

- Helmreich, R. L., Spence, J. T., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Psychological androgyny and sex role flexibility: A test of two hypotheses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(10), 1631-1644.
- Helson, R., Jones, C., Kwan, V. S. Y. (2002). Personality change over 40 years of adulthood: Hierarchical linear modeling analyses of two longitudinal samples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(3), 752-766.
- Herzog, S. (2007). Public Perceptions of Sexual Harassment: An Empirical Analysis in Israel from Consensus and Feminist Theoretical Perspectives. *Sex Roles*, 57, 579- 592.
- Heyman, R. E., Slep, A. M. S., & Foran, H. M. (2015). Enhanced definitions of intimate partner violence for DSM-5 and ICD-11 may promote improved screening and treatment. *Family Process*, 54(1), 64-81.
- 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.
- Hines, D. A., & Saudino, K. J. (2002). Intergenerational transmission of intimate partner violence: A behavioral genetic perspective. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 3(3), 210-225.
- Hodge, D. R. (2008). Sexual trafficking in the united states: A domestic problem with transnational dimensions. *Journal of Social Work*, 53(2), 143-152.

- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Smutzler, N., & Stuart, G. L. (1998). Demand and withdraw communication among couples experiencing husband violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66*(5), 731-743. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.66.5.731
- Horne, S. (1999). Domestic violence in Russia. *American Psychologist, 54*(1), 55–61.
- Hotaling, G. T., & Sugarman, D. B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. *Violence and Victims, 1*, 101-124.
- Husnu, S., & Mertan, B. E. (2015). The roles of traditional gender myths and beliefs about beating on self-reported partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1*-18. doi: 10.1177/0886260515600879
- Huston, A. C. (1984). Sex-typing. In E. M. Hetherington (ed.), *Handbook of child psychology*. New York: Wiley.
- Ickes, W., & Barnes, R. D. (1978). Boys and girls together and alienated: On enacting stereotyped sex roles in mixed-sex dyads. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*(7), 669-683.
- Jayatilleke, A., Poudel, K. C., Sakisaka, K., Yasuoka, J., Jayatilleke, A. U., & Jimba, M. (2011). Wives' attitudes toward gender roles and their experience of

intimate partner violence by husbands in Central Province, Sri Lanka. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(3), 414-432.

Johnson, M. P. (2006). Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 12(11), 1003-1018.

Jones, G. P., & Jacklin, C. N. (1988). Changes in sexist attitudes toward women during introductory women's and men's studies courses. *Sex Roles*, 18(9), 611-622.

Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 498-509.

Jouriles, E. N., McDonald, R., Mueller, V., & Grych, J. H. (2012). Youth *experiences* of family violence and teen dating violence perpetration: Cognitive and emotional mediators. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 15(1), 58-68. doi: 10.1007/s10567-011-0102-7

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Sunar, D. (1992). Family and socialization in Turkey. In J. L. Roopnarine & D. B. Carter (Eds.), *Annual advances in applied developmental psychology: Vol. 5. Parent-child socialization in diverse cultures* (pp. 75-88). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Kantor, G. K., & Asdigian, N. (1997). Gender differences in alcohol-related spousal aggression. *Gender and Alcohol: Individual and Social Perspectives*, 312-334.
- Karraker, K. H., Vogel, D. A., & Lake, M. A. (1995). Parents' gender stereotyped perceptions of newborns: The eye of the beholder revisited. *Sex Roles*, 33, 687-701.
- Kelly, V. A. (2004). Psychological abuse of women: A review of the literature. *The Family Journal*, 12(4), 383-388.
- Keltner, D., Kring, A. M. (1998). Emotion, social function, and psychopathology. *Review of General Psychology*, 2 (3), 320-342.
- Kerig, P. K. (1998). Gender and appraisals as mediators of adjustment in children exposed to interparental violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 13(4), 345-363.
- Kimberg, L. S. (2008). Addressing intimate partner violence with male patients: a review and introduction of pilot guidelines. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 23(12), 2071-2078.
- Kocacık, F., & Çağlayandereli, M. (2009). Ailede kadına yönelik şiddet: Denizli ili örneği. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 25-43.

- Kocacık, F., & Dogan, O. (2006). Domestic violence against women in Sivas, Turkey: survey study. *Croatian Medical Journal*, 47(5), 742-749.
- Kopp, C. B. (1989). Regulation of distress and negative emotions: A developmental view. *Developmental Psychology*, 25(3), 343-354.
- Lee, I. C. (2013). Endorsement of sexist ideology in Taiwan and the United States: Social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, and deferential family norms. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(3), 254-262.
- Lenton, R. L. (1995). Power versus feminist theories of wife abuse. *Canadian J. Criminology*, 37, 305-330.
- Lichter, E. L., & McCloskey, L. A. (2004). The effects of childhood exposure to marital violence on adolescent gender-role beliefs and dating violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28(4), 344-357.
- Mahler, M. S., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (1975). *The psychological birth of the human infant: Symbiosis and individuation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Maiuro, R. D. (2001). *Psychological abuse in violent domestic relations*. Springer Publishing Company.
- Mavrikiou, P. M., Apostolidou, M., Parlalis, S. K. (2014). Risk factors for the prevalence of domestic violence against women in Cyprus. *Journal of Social Science*, 51, 295-301.

- McDonald, R., & Grych, J. H. (2006). Young children's appraisals of interparental conflict: Measurement and links with adjustment problems. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*(1), 88-99.
- McGue, M., Bacon, S., Lykken, D. T. (1993). Personality stability and change in early adulthood: A *behavioral* genetic analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 29* (1), 96-109.
- McLoyd, V. C., Harper, C. I., & Copeland, N. L. (2001). Ethnic minority status, interparental conflict, and child adjustment. *Interparental Conflict and Child Development: Theory, Research, and Application, 98-125.*
- Mertan, B., Maner, U., Bayraktar, F., Husnu, S., Pehlivan, G., Celik, D. (2012). Knowledge and attitudes toward domestic violence against women: The case of north cyprus/kadına yönelik aile içi şiddete yönelik bilgi ve tutumlar: Kuzey kıbrıs örneği. *Kadin/Woman 2000, 13*(2), 47.
- Miller, B. A., Downs, W. R., & Testa, M. (1993). Interrelationships between victimization experiences and women's alcohol use. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Supplement, (11)*, 109-117.
- Miller, E., Tancredi, D. J., McCauley, H. L., Decker, M. R., Virata, M. C. D., Anderson, H. A., ... & Silverman, J. G. (2012). "Coaching boys into men": A cluster-randomized controlled trial of a dating violence prevention program. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 51*(5), 431-438.

- Mills, T. L., Wakeman, M. A., & Fea, C. B. (2001). Adult grandchildren's perceptions of emotional closeness and consensus with their maternal and paternal grandparents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(4), 427-455.
- Modi, M. N., Palmer, S., Armstrong, A. (2014). The role of violence against women act in addressing intimate *partner* violence: A public health issue. *Journal of Women's Health*, 23(3), 253-259.
- Moura, O., dos Santos, R. A., Rocha, M., & Matos, P. M. (2010). Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale (CPIC): Factor structure and invariance across adolescents and emerging adults. *International Journal of Testing*, 10(4), 364-382. doi: 10.1080/15305058.2010.487964
- Müftüleri-Bac, M. (1999). Turkish women's predicament. *Women's studies International Forum*, 22(3), 303-315.
- Nutt, R. L. (1999). Women's gender-role socialization, gender-role conflict, & abuse. In M. Harway & J. M. O'Neil (Eds.), *What causes men to be violent against women* (pp. 117-134). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- O'farrell, T. J., & Murphy, C. M. (1995). Marital violence before and after alcoholism treatment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 63(2), 256-262.

- Overall, N. C., Sibley, C. G., & Tan, R. (2011). The costs and benefits of sexism: resistance to *influence* during relationship conflict. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(2), 271-290.
- Öngen, D. (2006). Attitudes towards women: A study of gender and academic domain differences in a sample of Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *34*(5), 467-486.
- Papadakaki, M., Tzamalouka, G. S., Chatzifotiou, S., & Chliaoutakis, J. (2009). Seeking for risk factors of intimate partner violence (IPV) in a Greek national sample: The role of self-esteem. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *24*(5), 732-750.
- Parks, M. R., & Floyd, K. (1996). Meanings for closeness and intimacy in friendship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *13*(1), 85-107.
- Parlan, Y. (2015). *Intimate partner violence: who is to blame?* (master's thesis). Eastern Mediterranean University, Gazimağusa, North Cyprus.
- Pico-Alfonso, M. A., Garcia-Linares, M. I., Celda-Navarro, N., Blasco-Ros, C., Echeburua, E., Martinez, M. (2006). The impact of physical, psychological, and sexual intimate male partner violence on women's mental health: Depressive symptoms, posttraumatic stress disorder, state anxiety, and suicide. *Journal of Women's Health*, *15*(5), 599-611.

- Pleck, J. H., & O'donnell, L. N. (2001). Gender attitudes and health risk behaviors in urban African American and Latino early adolescents. *Maternal and Child Health Journal, 5*(4), 265-272.
- Ponti, L., Guarnieri, S., Smorti, A., & Tani, F. (2010). A measure for the study of friendship and romantic relationship quality from adolescence to early-adulthood. *The Open Psychology Journal, 3*, 76-87.
- Rani, M., & Bonu, S. (2009). Attitudes toward wife beating: a cross-country study in Asia. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(8), 1371-1397.
- Rennison, C. M., & Welchans, S. (2000). *Intimate partner violence*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Roberts, B. W., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E. (2003). Work experiences and personality development in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84* (3), 582-593.
- Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., Viechtbauer, W. (2006). Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 132* (1), 1-25.
- Robertson, K., & Murachver, T. (2009). Attitudes and attributions associated with female and male partner violence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(7), 1481-1512.

- Robins, R. W., Fraley, R. C., Roberts, B. W., Trzesniewski, K. H. (2001). A longitudinal study of personality change in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality, 69*(4), 618-640.
- Rossmann, B. B., & Rosenberg, M. S. (1992). Family stress and functioning in children: The moderating effects of children's beliefs about their control over parental conflict. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 33*(4), 699-715.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2001). Beliefs about wife beating among Turkish college students: The effects of patriarchy, sexism and sex differences. *Sex Roles, 44*, 599-610. doi:10.1023/A:1012295109711
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2002). Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması (Ambivalent sexism inventory: a study of reliability and validity). *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi (Journal of Turkish Psychology), 17*(49), 47-58.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Yalçın, Z. S., & Glick, P. (2007). Ambivalent sexism, belief in a just world, and empathy as predictors of Turkish students' attitudes toward rape victims. *Sex Roles, 57*(11-12), 889-895.
- Santana, M. C., Raj, A., Decker, M. R., Marche, A. L., & Silverman, J. G. (2006). Masculine gender roles associated with increased sexual risk and intimate

partner violence perpetration among young adult men. *Journal of Urban Health*, 83(4), 575-585.

Sarlet, M., Dumont, M., Delacollette, N., & Dardenne, B. (2012). Prescription of protective paternalism for men in romantic and work contexts. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36(4), 444-457.

Schulenberg, J., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., Wadsworth, K. N., Johnston, L. D. (1996). Getting drunk and growing up: trajectories of frequent binge drinking during the transition to young adulthood. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 57(3),289-304.

Schumann, L., & Valente, S. M. (2002). Evaluating intimate partner violence. *Journal of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners*, 14(11), 505-516.

Seimer, B. S. (2004). Intimate violence in adolescent relationships recognizing and intervening. *MCN: The American Journal of Maternal/Child Nursing*, 29(2), 117-121.

Sibley, C. G., Overall, N. C., & Duckitt, J. (2007). When women become more hostilely sexist toward their gender: The system-justifying effect of benevolent sexism. *Sex Roles*, 57(9-10), 743-754.

Siegel, D. J. (1999). *The developing mind: Toward a neurobiology of interpersonal experience*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Simmons, C. A., Farrar, M., Frazer, K., & Thompson, M. J. (2011). From the voices of women: Facilitating survivor access to IPV services. *Violence Against Women, 17*(10), 1226-1243. doi: 10.1177/1077801211424476
- Simmons, C. A., Lehmann, P., Cobb, N. (2008). Women arrested for partner violence and substance use: An exploration of discrepancies in the literature. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*(6), 707-727.
- Simon, T. R., Anderson, M., Thompson, M. P., Crosby, A. E., Shelley, G., & Sacks, J. J. (2001). Attitudinal acceptance of intimate partner violence among US adults. *Violence and Victims, 16*(2), 115-126.
- Smith, B. A., Thompson, S., Tomaka, J., & Buchanan, A. C. (2005). Development of the Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale (IPVAS) with a predominantly Mexican American college sample. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 27*(4), 442-454. doi: 10.1177/0739986305281233.
- Smuts, B. (1992). Male aggression against women: An evolutionary perspective. *Human Nature, 3*, 1-44.
- Smuts, B. (1995). The evolutionary origins of patriarchy. *Human Nature, 6*, 1-32.
- Speizer, I. S. (2010). Intimate partner violence attitudes and experience among women and men in Uganda. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(7), 1224-1241.

- Straus, M. A. (1999). The controversy over domestic violence by women. *Violence in Intimate Relationships*, 17-44.
- Straus, M. A. (2004). Prevalence of violence against dating partners by male and female university students worldwide. *Violence Against Women*, 10(7), 790-811.
- Sullivan, J. P., & Mosher, D. L. (1990). Acceptance of guided imagery of marital rape as a function of macho personality. *Violence and Victims*, 5, 275-286.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(2), 199-214.
- Taylor, B. G., Stein, N. D., Mumford, E. A., & Woods, D. (2013). Shifting Boundaries: an experimental evaluation of a dating violence prevention program in middle schools. *Prevention Science*, 14(1), 64-76.
- Trepanier-Street, M. L., & Romatowski, J. A. (1999). The influence of children's literature on gender role perceptions: A reexamination. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 26(3), 155-159.
- Trivers, R. L. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual selection and the descent of man 1871-1971* (pp. 136-172). Chicago: Aldine.

- Ulu, İ. P., & Fıfılođlu, H. (2004). Çocukların Evlilik Çatıřmasını Algılaması Ölçeđi'nin geçerlik ve güvenirlilik çalıřması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 7(14), 61-75.
- Unger, R. K. (1979). Toward a redefinition of sex and gender. *American Psychologist*, 34(11), 1085-1094.
- Vescio, T. K., Sechrist, G. B., & Paolucci, M. P. (2003). Perspective taking and prejudice reduction: The mediational role of empathy arousal and situational attributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33(4), 455-472.
- Viki, G. T., & Abrams, D. (2002). But she was unfaithful: Benevolent sexism and reactions to rape victims who violate traditional gender role expectations. *Sex Roles*, 47(5), 289-293.
- Walker, L. E. (1999). Psychology and domestic violence around the world. *American Psychologist*, 54(1), 21.
- Waltermaurer, E. (2012). Public justification of intimate partner violence: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 13(3), 167-175.
- Weisgram, E. S., Dinella, L. M., & Fulcher, M. (2011). The role of masculinity/femininity, values, and occupational value affordances in shaping young men's and women's occupational choices. *Sex roles*, 65(3-4), 243-258. doi: 10.1007/s11199-011-9998-0

- Widom, C. S. (1989). The cycle of violence. *Science*, 160-166.
- Whitfield, C. L., Anda, R. F., Dube, S. R., & Felitti, V. J. (2003). Violent childhood experiences and the risk of intimate partner violence in adults: Assessment in a large health maintenance organization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(2), 166-185.
- Whiting, J. B., Oka, M., & Fife, S. T. (2012). Appraisal distortions and intimate partner violence: Gender, power, and interaction. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 38(s1), 133-149.
- Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Egisdottir, S. A. (2000). The gender belief system, authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Sex Roles*, 42(11), 947-967.
- Wolfe, D. A., Scott, K., Reitzel-Jaffe, D., Wekerle, C., Grasley, C., & Straatman, A. L. (2001). Development and validation of the conflict in adolescent dating relationships inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 13(2), 277-293.
- Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(5), 699-727. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.128.5.699
- World Health Organization. (2002). Krug, E. G., Dahlberg, L. L., Mercy, J. A., Zwi, A. B., & Lozano, R. (Eds.). *World report on violence and health*.

- World Health Organization. (2013). *Responding to intimate partner violence and sexual violence against women: WHO clinical and policy guidelines*. World Health Organization.
- World Health Organization, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. (2010). *Preventing intimate partner and sexual abuse against women: Taking action and generating evidence*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Yamawaki, N., Ostenson, J., & Brown, C. R. (2009). The functions of gender role traditionality, *ambivalent* sexism, injury, and frequency of assault on domestic violence perception: A study between Japanese and American college students. *Violence Against Women, 15*(9), 1126-1142.
- Yawn, B. P., Yawn, R. A., & Uden, D. L. (1992). American Medical Association diagnostic and treatment guidelines on domestic violence. *Archives of Family Medicine, 1*, 39.
- Yusuf, O. B., Arulogun, O. S., Oladepo, O., & Olowokeere, F. (2011). Physical violence among intimate partners in Nigeria: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of Public Health and Epidemiology, 3*(5), 240-247.
- Zeanah, C. H., & Zeanah, P. D. (1989). Intergenerational transmission of maltreatment: Insights *from* attachment theory and research. *Psychiatry, 52*(2), 177-196.

Zierler, S., Witbeck, B., & Mayer, K. (1996). Sexual violence against women living with or at risk for HIV infection. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *12*(5), 304-310.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Demographic Information Form

1.Cinsiyet: Kadın Erkek

2.Yaşınız:.....

3. Uyuşgunuz.....

4. Şu anki ilişkiniz ne kadar zamandır devam ediyor?

Appendix B: Perception of Gender Scale

Aşağıda yer alan ifadelere ne derece katıldığınızı “**Tamamen katılmıyorum**”, “**Katılmıyorum**”, “**Kararsızım**”, “**Katılıyorum**”, “**Tamamen katılıyorum**” seçeneklerinden birini (x) işareti ile belirtiniz. Lütfen hiçbir soruyu cevapsız bırakmayınız.

1-Tamamen katılmıyorum, 2-Katılmıyorum, 3-Kararsızım, 4-Katılıyorum, 5-Tamamen katılıyorum

	Tamamen Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Tamamen Katılıyorum
1. Evlilik, kadının çalışmasına engel olmaz.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Kadın sadece ailesinin ekonomik sıkıntısı varsa çalışmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Çalışan kadın da çocuklarına yeterince zaman ayırabilir.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Kadınlar anne olduktan sonra çalışmamalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Kadın siyasetçiler de başarılı olabilir.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Kadınlar evlendikten sonra çalışmamalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Çalışma hayatı kadının ev işlerini aksatmasına neden olmaz.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Çalışan bir kadın hayattan daha çok zevk alır.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Kadınlar erkekler tarafından her zaman korunmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Kocasız kadın çalışmamalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Kadınlar yönetici olabilir.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Çalışan bir kadın kazandığı geliri eşine vermelidir.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Çalışan bir kadın çocuklarına daha iyi anne olur.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Erkekler de çamaşır bulaşık gibi ev işlerini yapmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Kocasız kadın sahipsiz eve benzer.	1	2	3	4	5

16. Bir ailenin gelirini erkekler sağlamalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Kadınlar kendi başına ticarethane gibi yerler (kafe, market, emlakçı gibi) açmamalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Kadınların birinci görevi ev işlerini üstlenmektir.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Bir kadın kocasından fazla para kazanmamalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Erkek her zaman evin reisi olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Toplumun liderliği genellikle erkeklerin elinde olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Kız çocuklarına da erkek çocuklar kadar özgürlük verilmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Bir kadın kendi haklarına sahip olabilmesi için gerekirse kocasına karşı çıkabilmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Kadın kocasından yaş olarak daha küçük olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Ailedeki önemli kararları erkekler vermelidir.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C: Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

Aşağıda yer alan ifadelere ne derece katıldığınızı “**Tamamen karşıyım**”, “**Oldukça karşıyım**”, “**Biraz karşıyım**”, “**Biraz katılıyorum**”, “**Oldukça Katılıyorum**”, “**Tamamen katılıyorum**” seçeneklerinden birini (x) işareti ile belirtiniz. Lütfen hiçbir soruyu cevapsız bırakmayınız.

1. Tamamen karşıyım, 2. Oldukça karşıyım, 3. Biraz karşıyım, 4. Biraz katılıyorum, 5. Oldukça katılıyorum, 6. Tamamen katılıyorum

	Tamamen Karşıyım	Oldukça Karşıyım	Biraz Karşıyım	Biraz Katılıyorum	Oldukça Katılıyorum	Tamamen Katılıyorum
K.1 -Ne kadar başarılı olursa olsun bir kadının sevgisine sahip olmadıkça bir erkek gerçek anlamda bütün bir insan olamaz.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.2 -Gerçekte birçok kadın “eşitlik” arıyoruz maskesi altında işe alınmalarda kendilerinin kayırılması gibi özel muameleler arıyorlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
K.3 -Bir felaket durumunda kadınlar erkeklerden önce kurtarılmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.4 -Biraz kadın masum söz veya davranışları cinsel ayrımcılık olarak yorumlamaktadır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.5 -Kadınlar çok çabuk alınırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
K.6 -Karşı cinsten biri ile romantik ilişki olmaksızın insanlar hayatta gerçekten mutlu olamazlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.7 -Feministler gerçekte kadınların erkeklerden daha fazla güce sahip olmalarını istemektedirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
K.8 -Biraz kadın çok az erkekte olan bir saflığa sahiptir.	1	2	3	4	5	6
K.9 -Kadınlar erkekler tarafından el üstünde tutulmalı ve korunmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.10 -Biraz kadın erkeklerin kendileri için yaptıklarına tamamen minnettar olmamaktadırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.11 -Kadınlar erkekler üzerinde kontrolü sağlayarak güç kazanmak hevesindedir.	1	2	3	4	5	6

K.12 -Her erkeğin hayatında hayran olduğu bir kadın olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
K.13 -Erkekler kadınsız eksiktirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.14 -Kadınlar işyerlerindeki problemleri abartmaktadırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.15 -Bir kadın bir erkeğin bağlılığını kazandıktan sonra genellikle erkeğe sıkı, bir yular takmaya çalışır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.16 -Adaletli bir yarışmada kadınlar erkeklere karşı kaybettikleri zaman tipik olarak kendilerinin ayrımcılığa maruz kaldıklarından yakınır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
K.17 -İyi bir kadın erkeği tarafından yüceltilmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.18 -Erkekler cinsel yönden yaklaşılabılır olduklarını gösterircesine şakalar yapıp daha sonra erkeklerin tekliflerini reddetmekten zevk alan birçok kadın vardır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
K.19 -Kadınlar erkeklerden daha yüksek ahlaki duyarlılığa sahip olma eğilimindedirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
K.20 -Erkekler hayatlarındaki kadın için mali yardım sağlamak için kendi rahatlarını gönüllü olarak feda etmelidirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.21 -Feministler erkeklere makul olmayan istekler sunmaktadırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
K.22 -Kadınlar erkeklerden daha ince bir kültür anlayışına ve zevkine sahiptirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix D: Children's Perception of Inter-Parental Conflict Scale

Her ailede anne ve babanın anlaşamadığı, tartıştığı zamanlar olur. Anne-babaları tartıştığı zaman çocuklar çok farklı duygular yaşarlar. Biz de sizin anne ve babanız tartıştığında neler hissettiğinizi öğrenmek istiyoruz.

(Eğer anne ve babanız birlikte, sizinle aynı evde yaşamıyorsa, sorulara, aynı evde yaşarken anlaşamadıkları zamanları düşünerek cevap veriniz).

Lütfen her cümleyi dikkatle okuyup, **Doğru**, **Bazen/Biraz Doğru**, **Yanlış** cevaplarından size en uygun olanını (X) işareti koyarak belirtiniz.

1. Anne-babamın tartıştıklarını hiç görmedim.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
2. Anne-babam tartıştıklarında genellikle sorunu çözerler.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
3. Anne-babam sık sık benim okulda yaptıklarım yüzünden tartışırlar.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
4. Anne-babam tartışırken çıldırmış gibi olurlar.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
5. Anne-babam tartıştıklarında korkarım.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
6. Anne-babamın tartışmaları benim suçum değil.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
7. Anne-babam benim bildiğimin farkında değil ama onlar çok tartışırlar.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
8. Anne-babamın tartışmaları bittikten sonra bile birbirlerine olan kızgınlıkları devam eder.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
9. Anne-babam bir anlaşmazlıkları olduğunda sakince konuşurlar.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
10. Anne-babam tartıştıklarında ne yapacağımı bilemem.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
11. Anne-babam yanlarında ben olsam bile birbirlerine sık sık kötü davranırlar.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
12. Anne-babam tartıştıklarında bana ne olacak diye endişelenirim.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
13. Anne-babamın tartışmaları genellikle benim suçumdur.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
14. Anne-babamı sık sık tartışırken görürüm.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
15. Anne-babam bir konu hakkında anlaşamadıklarında genellikle bir çözüm bulurlar.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
16. Anne-babamın tartışmaları genellikle benim daha önce yaptığım bir şeyle ilgilidir.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
17. Anne-babam tartıştıklarında kötü bir şey olacak diye korkarım.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
18. Anne-babam tartıştıklarında, söylemeseler bile suçlu benim.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış
19. Anne-babam çok az tartışırlar.	Doğru	Bazen/Biraz Doğru	Yanlış

		Dođru	
20. Anne-babam tartıřtıklarında genellikle hemen barıřırlar.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
21. Anne-babam genellikle benim yaptıđım řeyler yzunden tartıřırlar.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
22. Anne-babam tartıřtıklarında onları durdurmak iin hibirsey yapamam.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
23. Anne-babam tartıřtıklarında ikisinden birine zarar gelecek diye korkarım.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
24. Anne-babam evde sıka birbirlerinden řikayet ederler.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
25. Anne-babam tartıřırken ok az bađırırılar.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
26. Anne-babam sık sık ben yanlıř bir řey yaptıđımda tartıřmaya bařlarlar.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
27. Anne-babam tartıřırken bir řeyler kırar veya fırlatırlar.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
28. Anne-babam tartıřmaları bittikten sonra birbirlerine arkadařa davranırlar.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
29. Anne-babam tartıřtıklarında bana da bađıracaklarından korkarım.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
30. Anne-babam tartıřtıklarında beni sularlar.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
31. Anne-babam tartıřırken birbirlerini itip kakarlar.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
32. Anne-babam tartıřtıklarında bořanabilirler diye korkarım.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
33. Anne-babam tartıřmaları bittikten sonra birbirlerine kt davranmaya devam ederler.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
34. Anne-babamın tartıřmaları genellikle benim hatam deđildir.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř
35. Anne-babam tartıřırken benim sylediđim hibirseyi dinlemezler.	Dođru	Bazen/Biraz Dođru	Yanlıř

Appendix E: Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scale

Aşağıda yer alan ifadelere ne derece katıldığınızı “Kesinlikle katılmıyorum”, “Katılmıyorum”, “Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum”, “Katılıyorum”, “Kesinlikle katılıyorum” seçeneklerinden birini (x) işareti ile belirtiniz. Lütfen hiçbir soruyu cevapsız bırakmayınız.

1. Kesinlikle katılmıyorum, 2. Katılmıyorum, 3. Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum, 4. Katılıyorum, 5. Kesinlikle katılıyorum

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne Katılıyorum Ne Katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
1. Partnerim canımı yakmadığı sürece “tehditleri” kabul edebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Gergin bir tartışma esnasında partnerimi incitmek için geçmişinden bir konuyu gündeme getirmek benim için kabul edilebilir.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Partnerimi kıskandırmak ilişkimize yardımcı olur.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Partnerimin beni kıskandırmak için yaptığı şeyleri sorun etmem.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Gergin bir tartışma esnasında partnerimi sırf incitmek için bir şeyler söylemem kabul edilebilir.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Başkalarının önünde partnerimin beni aşağılamasını sorun saymam.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Partnerimin yaptığı yanlışların suçunu kabullenebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Yanlış şeyler yaptığımda partnerimi suçlamak benim için kabul edilebilir.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Başkalarının önünde partnerimi aşağılamak benim için uygun değildir.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Beni incitmek amacıyla partnerimin geçmişinden bir şeyi gündeme getirmesi kabul edilemez.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Partnere bir nesne ile vurmak veya	1	2	3	4	5

vurmaya çalışmak uygun olmaz.					
12. Partnere tekme atmak, ısırarak, vurmak veya yumruklamak hiçbir şekilde uygun değildir.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Partneri bıçak veya silahla tehdit etmek hiçbir zaman uygun değildir.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Partnere ait herhangi birşeye zarar vermenin yanlış olduğunu düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Partnerimin başkalarıyla birşeyler yapmasını engellemeye çalışmam.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Partnerimin karşı cinsten biriyle konuşmamı söylemesi gururumu okşar.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Beni başkalarıyla bir şeyler yapmaktan alıkoymaya çalışan bir partnerle birlikte olmam.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Partnerime karşı cinsten birileriyle konuşmamasını söylemek normaldir.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Partnerimin bana günün her dakikasını ne yaptığını sorması hoşuma gitmez	1	2	3	4	5
20. Partnerimin gün içerisinde neler yaptığını bana dakikası dakikasına anlatması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix F: Department's Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter



**Eastern
Mediterranean
University**
"For Your International Career"

P.K.: 99628 Gazimağusa, KUZEY KIBRIS /
Famagusta, North Cyprus,
via Mersin-10 TURKEY
Tel: (+90) 392 630 1995
Faks/Fax: (+90) 392 630 2919
bayek@emu.edu.tr

Etik Kurulu / Ethics Committee

Sayı: ETK00-2016-0167

16.11.2016

Sayın Alev Gündost
Psikoloji Bölümü
Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulu'nun **07.11.2016** tarih ve **2016/33-22** sayılı kararı doğrultusunda, "**The Role of Parental, Sociaetal and Personal Factors in Predicting Attitudes Toward Intimate Partner Violence**" konulu tez çalışmanızı, Doç. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman'ın danışmanlığında araştırmanız Bilimsel ve Araştırma Etiği açısından uygun bulunmuştur.

Bilginize rica ederim.



Doç. Dr. Şükrü Tüzmen
Etik Kurulu Başkanı

ŞT/sky.

www.emu.edu.tr