

**The Role of Masculinity/Femininity Discrepancy
Stress and Ambivalent Sexism on Controlling
Behaviors in Young Adult's Romantic Relationship**

Özlem Melike Şahan

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
January 2020
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Director

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

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar
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.

Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsni Raman
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsni Raman

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Çığır Kalfaoğlu

ABSTRACT

The traditional gender roles and the stress experienced by individuals who feel they are not suitable for these roles can be an important variable in romantic relationships. The control behavior of partners may trigger physical, psychological or sexual violence. The current study was conducted to analyze control behaviors toward partner and control behaviors by partners based on ambivalent sexism (hostile and benevolent sexism), male role norms, femininity/masculinity discrepancy and femininity/masculinity discrepancy stress.

A sample of 194 Turkish speaking university students (102 female, 92 male) in Eastern Mediterranean University completed the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, Male Role Norm Scale, Gender Role Discrepancy and Discrepancy Stress Scale and The Controlling Behaviors Scale. It was hypothesized that men would report higher controlling behaviors in their romantic relationships as well as higher hostile sexism and greater endorsement of masculinity norms compared to women; whereas women would endorse benevolent sexism as much as men. Additionally, male young adults high in ambivalent sexism and masculinity discrepancy stress were expected to show more controlling behaviors in their romantic relationships. Lastly, it was expected that female young adults high in ambivalent sexism and femininity discrepancy stress would also show more controlling behaviors toward their romantic partners.

Finding of the study showed that there were no gender differences on control behaviors toward partner and by partner. Also, it was found that reciprocal control

behaviors by partner were very high. Men were found to score high in hostile sexism. Women and men were equal in their benevolent sexism scores. Additionally, men endorsed male masculinity role norms more than women. Correlational analyses showed that women and men who endorse benevolent sexism and femininity/masculinity discrepancy stress tended to control their partner more. The implications of the findings for university counseling centers and training young adults to recognize signs of controlling behaviors as a source of violence in romantic relationships is further discussed.

Keywords: Ambivalent Sexism, Male Role Norms, Control Behaviors, Romantic Relationships, Gender Discrepancy Stress

ÖZ

Geleneksel toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri ve bu rollere uygun olmadıklarını düşünen bireylerin yaşadıkları stres, romantik ilişkilerde önemli bir değişken olabilir. Partnerlerin kontrol davranışları fiziksel, psikolojik veya cinsel şiddeti tetikleyebilir. Bu çalışma, kişilerin partnerleri tarafından uygulanan kontrol davranışlarını ve bireylerin partnerlerine uyguladığı kontrol davralarını, kararsız cinsiyetçilik (düşmanca ve yardımsever cinsiyetçilik), erkek rol normları, kadınlık / erkeklik tutarsızlığı ve kadınlık / erkeklik tutarsızlığı stresine dayanarak analiz etmek için yapılmıştır. Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi'ndeki 194 Türkçe konuşan üniversite öğrencisi (102 kadın, 92 erkek), Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği, Erkek Rolü Normları Ölçeği, Cinsiyet Rolü Tutarsızlığı ve Tutarsızlık Stresi Ölçeği ve Kontrol Davranışları Ölçeği'ni tamamlamıştır. Erkekler, romantik ilişkilerinde daha fazla kontrol edici davranışların yanı sıra daha fazla düşmanca cinsiyetçilik tutumlarını destekleyeceği ve erkeklik normlarını daha fazla onaylayacakları varsayılmıştır. Kadınların da erkekler kadar korumacı cinsiyetçiliği destekleyeceği varsayılmıştır. Ayrıca, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliği ve erkeklik tutarsızlığı stresi yüksek genç erkeklerin romantik ilişkilerinde daha kontrol edici davranışlar göstermesi beklenmektedir. Son olarak, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve kadınlık tutarsızlığı stresi yüksek genç kadınların da romantik partnerlerine karşı daha kontrol edici davranışlar göstermeleri beklenmiştir. Çalışmanın bulguları bireylerin kontrol davranışlarında cinsiyet farklılığı olmadığını göstermiştir. Ayrıca, partnerin karşılıklı kontrol davranışlarının çok yüksek olduğu bulunmuştur. Erkeklerin düşmanca cinsiyetçilikte yüksek puan aldıkları görülmüştür. Kadınlar ve erkekler korumacı cinsiyetçilik puanlarında

eşittir. Ek olarak, erkekler, erkeklik role normlarını kadınlardan daha fazla onaylamıştır. Korelasyon analizleri, korumacı cinsiyetçiliği ve kadınlık / erkeklik tutarsızlığı stresini destekleyen kadınların ve erkeklerin, partnerlerini daha fazla kontrol etme eğiliminde olduğunu göstermiştir. Genç yetişkinlerin romantik ilişkilerde, şiddetin kaynağı olarak kontrol etme davranışlarını tanımaları ve üniversite danışmalık merkezlerinin bu konunun farkında olmaları tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik, Erkeklik Rolü Normları, Kontrol Davranışları, Romantik İlişkiler, Cinsiyet Tutarsızlığı Stresi

DEDICATION

To my family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like begin by expressing my appreciation to my thesis supervisor Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman for sharing her valuable knowledge, experiences, patience and providing a pleasant in the realization of this work thesis process. I am extremely grateful for her encouraging advices, suggestions and endearing me the field. Her enthusiasm, motivation and faith in me throughout this process have been very helpful in completing my thesis with joy.

Most importantly, my family has very important role in achieving what I have aimed until now and I would like to give my wholehearted appreciation to them for their unconditional love, limitless patience and understanding in the moments of the thesis process. Lastly my very profound appreciation to my boyfriend and my friends for their limitless support and encouragements in this process. I am so grateful for everyone who does not withhold their small or big help. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them. Thank you so much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Young Adult’s Romantic Relationships.....	1
1.2 Intimate Partner Violence in Young Adulthood Romantic Relationships.....	2
1.2.1 Controlling Behaviors	5
1.2.2 Negative Effects of Violence	6
1.2.3 Predictors of Violence	7
1.3 The Role of Gender Ideology in Romantic Relationships	8
1.3.1 Ambivalent Sexism & Male Role Norms	10
1.3.2 Femininity/Masculinity Discrepancy Stress.....	13
1.4 The Current Study	15
2 METHOD.....	17
2.1 Participants	17
2.2 Materials	17
2.2.1 Demographic Information Sheet	17
2.2.2 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory.....	18
2.2.3 Male Role Norm Scale (MRNS)	18

2.2.4 Gender Role Discrepancy and Discrepancy Stress Scale.....	18
2.2.5 The Controlling Behaviors Scale	19
2.3 Procedure.....	20
3 RESULTS	22
3.1 Preliminary Analysis: Gender Differences.....	22
3.2 Preliminary Analysis: Correlations between Study Variables	23
3.2.1 Males	22
3.2.2 Females.....	23
3.3 Regression Analysis.....	24
3.3.1 Predictors of Controlling Behaviors in Males.....	25
3.3.2 Predictors of Controlling Behaviors in Females	26
4 DISCUSSION	28
REFERENCES.....	37
APPENDICES	54
Appendix A: Demographic Questionnaire	55
Appendix B: Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	56
Appendix C: Male Role Norm Scale.....	58
Appendix D: Masculinity Discrepancy and Discrepancy Stress Scale	59
Appendix E: Femininity Discrepancy and Discrepancy Stress Scale	61
Appendix F: The Controlling Behaviors Scale	62
Appendix G: Eastern Mediterranean University Psychology Department’s Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Independent sample T-test for variables	22
Table 2: Correlations between hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, male role norms, masculinity discrepancy, masculinity discrepancy stress, control behaviors toward partner and control behaviors by partner in males	23
Table 3: Correlations between hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, male role norms, femininity discrepancy, femininity discrepancy stress, control behaviors toward partner and control behaviors by partner in females	24
Table 4: Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Predicting Control behaviors in Masculinity / Femininity Discrepancy Stress, Male Role Norm and Ambivalent Sexism.....	27

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Young adulthood which is roughly between 18 to 25 years of age is the period of time which includes explorations and new roles in an individual's life including leaving the parental home and having a different place of residence, relationship status, different perspectives about world, getting married, completing the education and becoming a parent (Scales, Benson, Oesterle, Hill, Hawkins, & Pashak, 2016). Studies have identified three major groups of young adults following different indicator pathways.

The first major group involves young adults who establish their own families and postpone their education such as finding a partner and getting married. The second group involves becoming parent and investing little for education because of full-time work. The third major group involves those who invest in education or career development and postpone the family formation (Macmillan & Eliason, 2003; Oesterle, 2013; Oesterle, Hawkins, Hill, & Bailey, 2010; Oesterle, Hawkins, & Hill, 2011; Osgood, Ruth, Eccles, Jacobs, & Barber, 2005; Sandefur, Eggerling-Boeck, & Park, 2005; Schulenberg, O'Malley, Bachman, & Johnston, 2005). In this study, the third group will be used as a sample.

1.1 Young Adult's Romantic Relationships

The term "romantic relationships" refers to mutually accepted ongoing voluntary interactions (Brown, Feiring & Furman, 1999). Compared to peer relationships,

romantic ones typically have a distinctive intensity, such as expressions of affection and current or anticipated sexual behavior. This term is valid for same gender relationships as well as mixed-gender relationships (Collins, Welsh & Furman, 2009). Breiding, Basile, Smith, Black and Mahendra, 2015 suggested that intimate partners are close to each other personally and they have knowledge about each other's lives. Intimate partners are connected emotionally and there are regular contacts physically and sexually (Breiding et al., 2015). Additionally, married couples, boyfriends/girlfriends, dating partners, and ongoing sexual partners can be referred to as intimate partners (Breiding et al., 2015). According to Erikson, (1968) there are two important tasks for late-teens and early-twenties to achieve. The first one is to build a sense of self-identity separate from parents and then from peers. The second one is the establishment of an intimate relationship with a romantic partner (Erikson, 1968). Hence, those individuals with well-established self-identities tend to have more mature and healthy romantic relationships.

Achievements in building and keeping social relationships are important for successful development because social relationships are the most fundamental sources of positive functioning and well-being for an individual (Scales et al., 2016). Dating or having a romantic relationship may represent entering adulthood (Seiffge-Krenke, Shulman & Kiessinger, 2001). The quality of romantic relationship is an important indicator for young adult's well-being such as being loving, supporting, warm and caring (Scales et al., 2016). According to Romantic Relationships Theory by Furman and Wehner (1994), in adolescence period, individuals replace the family with partners and partners serve more

supportive and companionable behaviors toward each other. Partners expect support, care and attention in times of stress. Over the course of time, partners fulfill emerging sexual interests as well. Thus, the romantic partner becomes an important figure by serving care, affiliate and sexual behavior in adolescence and the young adulthood stage (Furman & Wehner, 1997).

1.2 Intimate Partner Violence in Young Adulthood Romantic Relationships

Black (1983) emphasized that individuals use violence to achieve revenge or justice, to support their self-image or protect the image when it is threatened and effect or control the behavior of others. In the most general sense, the term "violence" is defined as the use of physical force or power intentionally (Black, 1983). Violence can be against a person, group, or community and include a threat or actual violence. As a result of violence, injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation might occur (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi, & Lozano, 2002). There are some dimensions in which violence is separated such as self-directed (suicidal behaviors) violence, interpersonal violence and collective violence (war, terrorism etc.). Moreover the typology by the World Health Organization, (2002) separates interpersonal violence into family and partner settings (Krug et al., 2002). According to Saltzman, Fanslow and McMahon, (2002) physical violence, sexual violence, stalking and psychological aggression by a current or previous intimate partner can count as *intimate partner violence*. Physical violence includes; pushing, shaking, slapping, punching, scratching, biting, choking, sexual violence includes; use of physical force, pushing a person to engage in sexual act, stalking includes; unwanted phone calls, messages, watching from distance, leaving letters or flowers, harming the property of victim

and psychological aggression includes; trauma in victim by threatening, controlling, humiliating, shaming, isolating from family or from friends (Saltzman, Fanslow & McMahon, 2002).

In the young adulthood period between 25-55% of young adults report experiencing intimate partner violence in their romantic relationships (Brown & Bulanda, 2008). Berger, Wildsmith, Manlove and Steward-Streng, (2012) reported that physical violence in romantic relationships is very common between young adults. A study showed that there are few gender differences on reporting frequency of violence (Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, Newman, Fagan & Silva, 1997). However, Sharpe and Taylor, (1999) suggested that men report less relationship violence than women. According to National Violence Against Women Survey, (1998) in United States, women experience sexual and physical violence more than men. Also women are more likely to be stalked by their intimate partners compared to men and as result they face high rates of concern about their safety and they think about carrying something to defend themselves more frequently (Tjaden& Thoennes, 2000). A study done in the USA among 1507 young adults showed that 42% of the couples either perpetrate or experience different kinds of violence (such as hitting, threatening or getting injured) (Berger et al.,2012). Kaura and Allen (2004) found that, among college students dating violence perpetration occurs when dissatisfaction with power in the relationship exists for men and women. Similar to previous studies Felson and Messner (2000) indicated that dating violence takes place when partners do not share in the decision making process and the power.

Toplu and Hatipoglu-Sümer's (2011) research including 834 Turkish university students (who had romantic relationship in the past and who had a partner at the time) found that on average 46% of female and 34% of male students reported a minimum of at least once in their life perpetrating physical violence. Of the students who were in a romantic relationship at the time (640 participants), 25%, 6% and 10% experienced psychological, sexual and physical violence, respectively.

1.2.1 Controlling Behaviors

Graham-Kevan and Archer, (2003) suggested that controlling behaviors, which are a type of violence in relationships can include threats, intimidation, emotional abuse and isolation. At the same time controlling behaviors are crucial risk factors for injurious and physical aggressions. The use of controlling behaviours on partners has been found to be a predictor for domestic violence (Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003). Johnson and Ferraro (2000) stated that violence is motivated by a desire to have control over a partner. They also suggested that controlling behaviors are an important dimension for understanding the relationship, such that controlling behaviors may prepare the pathway to intimate partner violence; in this regard controlling one's partner can turn into violence.

In one analysis of controlling and coercive behaviors Dutton and Goodman (2005) suggested that coercive control is both multidimensional and repetitive such that the perpetrator has a number of demands that eventually lead to compliance because the survivor of abuse believes that there will be more severe consequences for not complying to the demands and will be rewarded for complying. Stark (2007) further adds that microregulation of the abused partner by

the perpetrator by making it clear that he will punish incidents of noncompliance and does so by surveilling the partner (e.g., by phone calls, texts or stalking behaviors).

In a study conducted by Krantz and Vung (2009) controlling behaviors over females by their male partners was shown to cause serious psychological problems such as sadness, depression and suicidal thoughts. Interestingly, among controlling behavior, sexual violence and physical violence, controlling behaviors showed more important effect on suicidal thoughts than physical and sexual violence. The researchers also suggested that controlling behaviors are invisible and difficult to reveal. That's why they are more destructive psychologically and have more negative outcomes on women's physical health (Krantz & Vung, 2009). Individuals who experience controlling behaviors (criticism, insults, humiliation) from their partners are also at the risk of post relationship harassment and stalking (Roberts, 2005). Furthermore, the author analyzed the characteristic features of men who control their partners and found that younger men, less educated, living in poor households and men who have more than one partner tend to show controlling behaviors toward their partners.

Controlling behaviors of partners can often include emotional abuse (Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause & Polek, 1990). Being exposed to emotional abuse may alter women's perspectives about themselves, interaction with others and position in the world (Kirkwood, 1993). Furthermore women feel depressed and trapped in an abusive relationship (Chang, 1996). Renzetti (1992) emphasized that battering is not only for men it has been seen among lesbian couples as well.

1.2.2 Negative Effects of Violence

Violence in relationships causes a range of adverse physical and mental health consequences for men and women. It has been found to range from gastrointestinal problems, migraines, anxiety and depression to post-traumatic stress disorder, suicidal thoughts and behavior (Randle & Graham, 2011; Stewart & Erlick Robinson, 1998). According to Sharpe and Taylor, (1999) females experience lower self-esteem when they face long term intimate partner violence compared to males. However, males distribute their self-worth to different domains thus, they are less likely to experience decline in self-esteem, and even they can perceive their self-worth as positive when they face with relationship difficulties. As far as it was checked, no relevant findings were found in the literature. However, the reason why men perceive their own value positively when faced with a problem in the relationship may be related to gender roles and having sexist beliefs toward women. For example, a man can see a woman as a problem maker and a sensitive human being. Blaming women may comfort men. Wayland, Roth and Lochman, (1991) found that women who are exposed to physical assault tend to show maladaptive social functioning such as a decline in interaction with family and occupational performance.

1.2.3 Predictors of Violence

There are some predictors that can affect the individual later in life such as experiencing abuse as a child, low socioeconomic status, cultural and environmental differences (having aggressive-speaking parents or a group of friends who use inappropriate words, TV shows that contain violence, aggression or crime, ignoring violence and not intervening), parental maltreatment and witnessing the violence of parents against each other (Heyman & Slep, 2002;

Neugebauer, 2000; Lewis, Travea & Fremouw, 2002). According to social cognitive theory, violence can be modeled by parents because they are powerful and peers because they are similar, in this way there are direct significant influences and there are major effects in young adult's relationships (Bandura, 1997). Feiring and Furman,(2000) emphasized that children who are exposed to abuse from parents may face rejection from "normal" peers and seek new friendships. Consequently they might have deviant peer groups and choose romantic partners from these groups (Feiring & Furman, 2000). This might prepare the ground for violence (Feiring & Furman, 2000). Additionally, in a study conducted with police officers in North Cyprus, it was found that domestic violence is only concerned couples and it is private. In this regard, police officers' attitude toward violence was the violence does not require intervention (Mertan, Maner, Bayraktar, Hüsünü, Pehlivan & Çelik, 2012). Importantly for the focus of the current study, gender roles which include beliefs and appropriate roles about women and men are important predictive factors for supporting the use of violence against women (McHugh & Frieze, 1997).

1.3 The role of Gender Ideology in Romantic Relationships

Gender roles have been one of the most influential areas in determining the relationship between women and men (Descutner &Thelen,1991). Büken and Sahinoglu (2006) underlined that violence takes its power from the existing patriarchy of a society. Moreover, they added that patriarchy takes the power from the culturally based system of social, political, intellectual and cultural dominations and it transfers from one individual to another, in the end, it results in inequalities between males and females.

Studies have found that individuals who stick to traditional gender roles tend to show negative attitudes towards women. For instance, according to Mayerson and Taylor (1987), there was a positive relation between stereotypical gender role attitudes and acceptance of rape myths, sexual and physical violence. A study done by Finn (1986) found that among 300 college students (160 male, 140 female) who support traditional gender role behaviors reported the need of force in marriage. Another study showed that among college students (28 male, 92 female) internalizing the gender role attitudes was the reason for blaming the victim and underestimating the seriousness of violence (Willis, Hallinan & Melby, 1996).

According to Kandiyoti (1988) masculinity is characterized by domination and control whereas femininity is characterized by submissiveness and sexual purity. Masculinity involves an achievement for status. For example men have to work and protect all the time to achieve status. However, femininity is an ascribed status that has to accept the predetermined obligations, duties, roles that has been determined by the culture and these obligations limit the construction of their reality (Kandiyoti, 1988).

Harris, (1994) emphasized that gender roles show differences between different cultures and ethnic groups. When one turns to the Turkish family structure, it has been found that families prefer to have sons (84%) more than daughters (16%) (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). The preference of a son was related with taking care of the family and parents, and carrying the name of the family to the next generation. However, the reason for not preferring a daughter was perceived to be that daughters were viewed as the “property of strangers” (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). Similarly, Turkish men see themselves as the powerful one in the family thus

women may particularly face physical violence (Adana, Arslantaş, Ergin, Biçer, Kıranşal & Şahin, 2011).

Hüsnü and Mertan (2017) have found that university students who believe in traditional gender myths such as a 'husband can love and beat his wife' also have more tendency to use violence (especially male participants) toward their partners. Similarly, a study by Parlan and Hüsnü (2015) indicated that those who support ambivalent sexism, who have positive beliefs on wife-beating and who support traditional gender myths about women tend to blame female victims for the violence they experience. In addition a study by Mertan et al (2012) found that male police officers were tend to blame women victims in North Cyprus.

Despite women in Turkey have equal in rights to some degree; they face inequalities in public and private areas. For example, a study found Turkish university students who did not believe in equality between men and women, who accepted the gender roles including women's duties and who witnessed violence once in their life were more likely to support wife-beating (Adana et al., 2011).

1.3.1 Ambivalent Sexism & Male Role Norms

Glick and Fiske (1996) suggested that contemporary sexism is ambivalent in nature and composes of hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. They suggested that hostile sexism is related with men's power, dominance and prejudiced attitudes toward women such as anger and aggression. Benevolent sexism is related with expressions and attitudes which related with protecting women, helping, and cherishing women.

Additionally both women and men can have prejudicial thoughts toward men as well. For example women may have benevolent sexism toward women. The reason might be that women may seek protection and want to be dominant gender group, on the other hand women may have anger and hostility toward men because of sexual and social aggressiveness of men (Glick & Fiske, 1999). On the other hand, one study by Yakushko (2005) showed that women held benevolent views toward women and hostile views toward men more than men do.

Sakallı, (2001) aimed to assess if ambivalent sexism had an impact on wife beating in Turkey. Results showed that hostile sexism was an important predictor for possessing the idea of beating one's wife. However the effects of benevolent sexism were less than hostile sexism. Shortly, hostile sexism had more important effects than benevolent sexisms on wife beating. Similar to previous study, Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira and Souza (2002) aimed to compare two different cultures (Brazil and Turkey) to see whether ambivalent sexism predicts violence. Researchers found that two countries were similar in many ways. Hostile sexism was the stronger predictor for wife abuse in both countries. Turkey and Brazil are also agreed on man's dominance. In its widest sense for both countries, a man's tendency to use control over his wife is an important part of masculine identity. Turkish and Brazilian cultures have had traditional cultural norms which give importance to men's power. (Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira & Souza, 2002).

On the other hand individuals in Turkey who have the sexist beliefs and attitudes strongly accepted traditional gender roles. They see women as worthless and women need a man to be completed. In this regard in Turkey individuals with sexist beliefs/behaviors have prejudiced thoughts toward homosexuality as well.

The reason is that they believe that proper sexual and emotional relationship should be between males and females (Sakalli, 2002).

Taşdemir and Sakallı-Uğurlu, (2010) underlined that religiosity was differently correlated with Hostile sexism and benevolent sexism for both genders. They found that Muslim men scored high in hostile sexism compared to women. However, Muslim women scored high in benevolent sexism compared to men. Muslim women believe that women need to be under protection of men. Additionally, religious men reported that they feel free to express their aggressive and negative attitudes toward women.

Sakallı-Uğurlu and Ulu (2003) conducted a study among Turkish married couples and their findings were; male participants who scored high in hostile sexism showed more tolerant attitudes to physical-verbal wife abuse and female participants who scored high in benevolent sexism were more tolerant to verbal abuse.

Similarly, researchers have suggested that there are negative influences of strict adherence to gender norms and roles, for men. Masculinity ideology emphasizes social norms and culturally based ideology scripting gender relations, attitudes, and beliefs (Thompson & Pleck, 1986). Masculinity symbolizes a set of social beliefs, attitudes and norms about the expectations and qualifications associated with men (Linykh, 2011). Social constructionist perspective explains that men are not passive victims of social roles and cultures, and that men are active agents in constructing the dominant norms of masculinity (Courtenay, 1999).

A man's masculine ideology reflects on his behaviors and this might cause negative and harmful outcomes to himself or others. For example, men are expected to be harsh, strong, and dominant; and with time men ultimately feel pressure to internalize these gender norms (Pleck, 1995). Courtenay (2000) underlined that internalizing the ideas of men being strong, tough, competitive and not sharing feelings can have harmful effects on men's physical and mental health. According to Addis and Mahalik (2003) masculinity ideologies, norms and gender roles are important dimensions that play a role for men not seeking help. Studies have found that men are less likely to seek help for problems that they face such as depression, substance abuse, physical disabilities and stressful life events because the majority of men think; staying strong, being one's own man or not letting anyone do things are important aspects of manhood (Husaini, Moore & Cain, 1994; McKay, Rutherford, Cacciola & Kabasakalian-McKay, 1996; Padesky & Hammen, 1981; Thom, 1986). Therefore, the results show that men's beliefs and behaviors are more stereotypic than women's (Katz & Ksiansnak, 1994; Rice & Coates, 1995; Street et al., 1995; Levant & Majors, 1998). Similarly Eisler, Skidmore and Ward (1988)'s investigated if individuals are more stubborn about traditional gender roles for themselves vs. others and found that men are more likely to stick to gender roles than women. Additionally, they suggested that male individuals who stick to stereotypic male roles tend to evaluate situations that require "feminine" behaviors (feel hurt by the words of others, doing housework) as stressful. As a result of this stress, smoking, a high level of alcohol consumption, dangerous driving habits and problems in diet and exercise may occur.

1.3.2 Femininity/Masculinity Discrepancy Stress

Not many studies have done about gender role discrepancy stress. However, one of the important predictors of gender discrepancy stress might be the attribution of stereotypic gender roles to individuals. Culturally, socially or politically there are predetermined obligations, duties, norms and roles which women and men should accept and should act (Kandiyoti, 1988). In the end, they may experience gender role discrepancy stress when they feel that they do not comply with these roles and norms set by society (Reidy, Berke, Gentile & Zeichner, 2014). Also, the changing gender roles, the woman's putting into business life, and the egalitarian mindset can also cause the occurrence of gender roles stress.

Discrepancy stress is a form of gender role stress that occurs when an individual does not have ideal masculinity nourished by social structures (Pleck, 1995). One of the outcomes of experiencing masculinity discrepancy stress is high-risk sexual behaviors to confirm the masculinity to others and self in men (Vandello & Bosson, 2013). Men who experience discrepancy stress will then have a tendency to show to themselves and to others stereotypic masculine norms such as aggressive behaviors (Reidy et al., 2014). For instance, Reidy, Berke, Gentile and Zeichner, (2014) suggested that men who are highly connected with masculine gender norms are more likely to show acts of violence or abusive behaviors to their female partners. They also suggested when a man believes he is insufficient in “manly” behaviors, it can result in discrepancy stress. Reidy et al. (2014) hypothesized that men with a high level of gender role discrepancy and discrepancy stress would cause more intimate partner violence. In their research 600 men participated between the ages of 18-50 years. Their findings were

consistent with the hypothesis. Men who believed and perceived themselves as less masculine than the typical man showed abusive behaviors, challenges and aggressions toward their partner. They also found that discrepancy stress caused other crimes, such as risky sexual behaviors, alcohol use and drug use. Researchers also suggest that masculine role stress is highly related with psychological states such as anger, anxiety and risky health conditions as well as low self-esteem (Jakupcak, Lisak & Roemer, 2002). They also suggested that between partner violence might occur when men stick with the male gender norms which promotes men to have power, control and competitiveness. Jakupcak, Lisak and Roemer (2002) aimed to investigate the role of masculinity ideology and discrepancy stress in romantic relationships. They took 165 male university students to the study. They found that those who strongly related to masculinity ideology showed more masculinity stress which caused physiological reactivity (autonomic arousal) and higher physical aggressiveness while arguing with a female partner compared to males who do not highly related with masculinity ideology. Although not controlling behavior as a dependent measure, another study by Reidy et al. (2015), showed boys who show masculine discrepancy stress because they are not like the "average male" showed more physical and sexual violence to their partners.

Similar to masculine discrepancy stress, female discrepancy stress can lead to negative outcomes. The literature on female discrepancy stress is much more limited compared to male discrepancy and its related stress. To date, there have been only a handful of studies and researchers assessing this particular type of stress in women. Reidy, Kernsmith, Malone, Vivolo-Kantor and Darden (2018)

hypothesized that feminine discrepancy will predict discrepancy stress for girls, they expected that feminine discrepancy stress will predict trauma and psychosocial maladjustment. They found that there was a positive correlation between feminine discrepancy and discrepancy stress. Additionally those who had discrepancy stress showed psychosocial maladjustment. Discrepancy stress may have effects on social, behavioral, physical, mental health of women. Additionally it might show long term negative outcomes in the future such as depression, low academic performance, poor physical health, poor relationships (Reidy, Kernsmith, Malone, Vivolo-Kantor & Darden, 2018).

1.4 The Current Study

The aim of the current study will be to assess the roles of gender role discrepancy in young adult's romantic relationships, mainly on controlling behaviors. Based on the literature review above, the current study had the following hypotheses:

- a) Men will report higher controlling behaviors in romantic relationships as well as higher hostile sexism and endorsement of masculinity norms compared to women. Women however will endorse an equal amount of benevolent sexism compared to men.
- b) Young adults high in ambivalent sexism and masculinity/femininity discrepancy stress will *show* more controlling behaviors in their romantic relationships.

It is hoped that this study will shed light on the role discrepancy stress plays on controlling behaviors, how this differs between males and females in young adults and build on the limited literature in this new area of study.

Chapter 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

In the current study, data was collected from 194 participants (102 female, 92 male) by using convenience sampling and snowballing technique from Northern Cyprus. Participants were aged between 18 and 24 years ($M=19.78$ $SD=2.29$). Individuals who were Turkish speakers, who were in a romantic relationship as well as individuals whose romantic relationship had recently ended (max. 6 months prior to data collection), were included in the study. As the study was aimed at heterosexual relationships it was conducted with heterosexual and cis-gender individuals alone, therefore 4 LGBTQ individuals were removed from the study.

2.2 Materials

In the study Turkish versions of four different questionnaires and one demographic information sheet were used:

2.2.1 Demographic Information Sheet

Demographic questionnaire included five questions which was developed by the researcher and supervisor of the researcher to collect basic information about the participants. Questions included age, gender, sexual orientation, relationship status and if no relationship, end date (See appendix A).

2.2.2 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

The scale was developed by Glick and Fiske (1995) to assess the sexist ideologies with two subscales. The scale consists of 22 items; 11 items related with hostile sexism (e.g., ‘women exaggerate problems they have at work’) and the other 11 items related with benevolent sexism (e.g., ‘women should be cherished and protected by men’). The scale is a 5-point-Likert scale and participants rated from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree (See appendix B). Turkish version was developed by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002). In the current study, the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient for hostile sexism subscale was .81 and for benevolent sexism subscale was .79.

2.2.3 Male Role Norm Scale (MRNS)

This scale was developed by Thompson and Pleck (1986) and aims to assess traditional masculinity ideology of individuals. It consists of agreements and disagreements with 30 beliefs about men’s expected behaviors (how men should think, behave and feel). The MRNS includes three subscales: Status Norm Scale, Toughness Norm Scale and Anti-femininity Norm Scale, however the total scale was used in the current study (See appendix C). It is 5 point-Likert scale and each term scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In the current study the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .89.

2.2.4 Gender Role Discrepancy and Discrepancy Stress Scale

Reidy, Brookmeyer, Gentile, Berke and Zeichner (2014) developed the scale which aims to measure perceived gender role discrepancy and discrepancy stress of individuals. There are masculine and feminine versions of the scale. Terminologies show differences such as masculine version is "manly", feminine version is "girly". It has 10 items; 5 of them related with gender role discrepancy

(e.g., 'I am less masculine/feminine than the average men/women') and 5 of them related with discrepancy stress (e.g., 'I worry that people judge me because I'm not like the typical man/woman'). Response options range from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree, see appendix D and E). Scales were translated by researcher and supervisor using back translation method. In the current study the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was .96 for gender discrepancy and .92 for discrepancy stress in males. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .93 for gender discrepancy and .89 for discrepancy stress for females.

2.2.5 The Controlling Behaviours Scale

Graham-Kevan and Archer (2003) developed the scale which measures partner's violent behaviors toward each other's. A control behavior by partner is; in a romantic relationship, an individual is exposed to controlling behaviors by his/her partner. Control behavior toward partner is; in a romantic relationship, an individual is showing controlling behaviors toward his/her partner. (See appendix F). The scale does not consist of physical aggression but economic abuse (e.g., 'did you/your partner feel it was necessary to have control of the other's money'), threats (e.g., 'did you/your partner threaten to leave the other and/or commit suicide?'), intimidation (e.g., 'did you/your partner use looks, actions, and/or gestures to change the other's behavior?'), emotional abuse (e.g., 'did you/your partner try to humiliate the other in front of others?') and isolation (e.g., 'did you/your partner limit the other's activities outside the relationship?'). In the current study economic abuse was not used since the population were university students and less likely to be sharing financial issues with each other. Once again, the total scale was utilized in the current study. Respondents answered on a range from 1 (never) to 5 (always). Once again, the scale was translated by the

researcher and supervisor using back translation method. Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the scale for control behaviors toward partner was .79 and control behaviors by partner was .85.

2.3 Procedure

Ethical approval was obtained from the Department of Psychology Ethics Committee of Eastern Mediterranean University (See appendix G). After the approval, the ethics committee approval letter was sent to faculties. E-mails were sent to the instructors of the courses from different faculties. They were asked to devote twenty minutes from the course hours in an available time and day. After taking appointments from instructors, students filled the scales in the classroom. Data was collected from different faculties (Law Faculty, Arts and Sciences, Education Faculty and Tourism Faculty). Additionally, public areas in the university campus (cafes, restaurants) were used to collect data by using snowball technique. Before giving the informed consent form, information was given to individuals related with the study. Data were collected from those who agreed to participate in the research as participant. Firstly, informed consent form was given to the participants and informed consent form included information about the study, confidentially and their right to withdraw anytime they wanted. Secondly, individuals who accepted to take part in the study took twenty minutes to complete questionnaires. After the completion of questionnaires, participants were given debriefing form and thanked. When all data was collected, statistical analysis was conducted using the computer program Statistical Package for Social Sciences. The study conducted was a cross-sectional design. The predictor variables were hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, male role norms, femininity/masculinity

discrepancy and femininity/masculinity discrepancy stress and the dependent variable was control behaviors toward partner.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

In accordance with the purpose of the study, the variables were analyzed by using independent sample t-test, correlations and hierarchical multiple regression.

3.1 Preliminary Analysis: Gender Differences

The means and standard deviations for each variable are given in Table 1. Independent sample t-test was conducted to assess gender differences on Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, Male Roles Norms and Controlling Behaviors. As can be seen in Table 1, significant differences were found on hostile sexism and males were higher than females. Additionally male participants scored higher on male role norms. There was no gender difference found for benevolent sexism, control behaviors toward partner and control behaviors by partner.

Table 1: Independent sample T-test for variables

Variables	Female	Male	<i>T-value</i>
	M (<i>SD</i>)	M (<i>SD</i>)	
Hostile Sexism	2.72 (0.58)	3.26 (0.71)	-5.83*
Benevolent Sexism	3.10 (0.73)	3.10 (0.74)	0.38
Male Role Norms	2.66 (0.47)	2.97 (0.57)	-4.12*
Control Bh. by Partner	1.81 (0.56)	1.83 (0.44)	-1.69
Control Bh. toward Partner	1.90 (0.68)	1.92 (0.56)	-1.87

Note: * $p < .001$

3.2 Preliminary Analysis: Correlations between Study Variables

3.2.1 Males

To analyze the relationships between variables correlation analysis was conducted for males and females separately. As presented in Table 2, there was a positive correlation between hostile sexism and control behaviors of toward partner ($r=.25$, $p=.02$), and control behaviors by partner ($r=.27$, $p=.01$) for males whereas there was no correlation between control behaviors of both toward partner, by partner and benevolent sexism. Also, significant positive correlation was found between control behaviors toward partner and control behaviors by partner ($r=.67$, $p<.001$). Additionally, control behaviors toward partner and masculinity discrepancy stress revealed positive relationship ($r=.24$ $p=.02$). Furthermore, increases in masculinity discrepancy were positively correlated with masculinity discrepancy stress ($r=.80$, $p<.001$).

Overall there were no correlations between ambivalent sexism and masculinity discrepancy and discrepancy stress. However, with the increase of male role

norms, benevolent sexism increased as well ($r=.41, p<.001$). Lastly there were no statistically significant correlations between masculinity discrepancy and control behaviors toward partner and control behaviors by partner.

Table 2: Correlations between hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, male role norms, masculinity discrepancy, masculinity discrepancy stress, control behaviors toward partner and control behaviors by partner in males

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Hostile Sexism	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Benevolent Sexism	.26*	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Male Role Norms	0.19	.41**	-	-	-	-	-
4. Masculinity Discrepancy	0.04	0.1	0.07	-	-	-	-
5. Masculinity Discrepancy Stress	0.02	0.19	0.14	.80**	-	-	-
6. Control Bhvs. toward Partner	.25*	0.04	0.17	0.18	.24*	-	-
7. Control Bhvs. by Partner	.27**	0.02	0.2	0.1	0.14	.67**	-

Note: *. Correlation is significant at 0.05 level
 **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

3.2.2 Females

Table 3 presents the correlations for females. As can be seen hostile ($r=.39, p<.001$) and benevolent sexism ($r=.62, p<.001$) were positively correlated with male role norms for females. In addition to this, there were positive correlations between hostile sexism and both variables; femininity discrepancy ($r=.24, p=.02$) and control behaviours toward partner ($r=.20, p=.04$).

Just like males, females showed positive correlation between femininity discrepancy and femininity discrepancy stress ($r=.67, p<.001$). However, femininity discrepancy was not correlated with control behaviors (for both toward partner and by partner). Interestingly, there were significantly positive correlations

between control behaviors toward partner and control behaviors by partner ($r=.67$, $p<.001$). Also there was strong positive correlation between benevolent sexism and male role norms ($r=.62$, $p<.005$).

Table 3: Correlations between hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, male role norms, femininity discrepancy, femininity discrepancy stress, control behaviors toward partner and control behaviors by partner in females

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Hostile Sexism	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Benevolent Sexism	.42**	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Male Role Norms	.39**	.62*	-	-	-	-	-
4. Femininity Discrepancy	.24*	0.01	0.1	-	-	-	-
5. Femininity Discrepancy Stress	0.15	0.04	0.04	.67**	-	-	-
6. Control Bhvs. toward Partner	.20*	0.11	.27**	-0.07	-0.03	-	-
7. Control Bhvs by Partner	0.09	-0.01	0.1	-0.15	-0.13	.67**	-

Note: *. Correlation is significant at 0.05 level

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

3.3 Regression Analysis

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to test which variables predicted controlling behaviors toward partner. These independent variables were; hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, male role norms, masculinity/femininity discrepancy, masculinity/femininity discrepancy stress, control behaviors toward partner and dependent variable was control behaviors by partner. In order to test the predictors of control behaviors by partner, age and control behaviors toward partner were entered into the first step. After that gender related variables (Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, Male Role Norms Scale) were entered in the second step. Lastly masculinity/femininity discrepancy, masculinity/femininity discrepancy stress were entered separately for males and females. Control behaviors toward partner was significantly correlated with DV (control behaviors

by partner) and the literature contains reciprocal violence thus, 1st model conducted. Hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and male role norms were related to gender roles thus model 2 contained these variables. Lastly, gender role discrepancy and discrepancy stress were related to each other in terms of the topic 3rd model included related variables. Preliminary analyses showed that there were no violations of the assumptions of multicollinearity, normality, linearity and homoscedasticity (all p s > 0.05).

3.3.1 Predictors of Controlling Behaviors Toward Partner in Males

Assumptions were met for VIF and Tolerance. Highest VIF for variables of male was 3.02 for male discrepancy stress. The lowest tolerance was .33 for again male discrepancy stress.

Age and control behaviors toward partner were entered in the first block in which 46.7%, $F(2, 81) = 35.54, p < .001$ of the variance in control behaviors by partner were explained. After entry of hostile sexism, benevolent sexism and endorsement of male role norms at step two, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 48.8%, $F(5, 78) = 14.84, p < .001$. Lastly, entrance of male discrepancy and male discrepancy stress explained the variance for the total models as 48.8%, $F(7, 76) = 10.35, p < .001$. The five measures failed to explain any additional variance in controlling behaviors by partner after controlling for age and control behaviors toward partner, R square change = .00, F change (2, 76) = 0.31, $p = .97$. In the final model only one measure was statistically significant in predicting control behaviors by partner which was control behaviors toward partner ($\beta = .63, p < .001$). There was also a marginal effect for age ($\beta = .14, p = .09$) (see Table 4).

3.3.2 Predictors of Controlling Behaviors Toward Partner in Females

Assumptions met for VIF and Tolerance. Highest VIF for variables of female was 2.00 for and the lowest tolerance was .49 for both female discrepancies. Age and control behaviors toward partner were entered in the first block which explained 44.7%, $F(2, 87) = 35.10, p < .001$ of the variance in control behaviors by partner. After entry of hostile sexism, benevolent sexism and endorsement of male role norms at step two, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 45.6%, $F(5, 84) = 14.05, p < .001$. Lastly entrance of female discrepancy and female discrepancy stress explained the variance for the total model as 46.9%, $F(7, 82) = 10.34, p < .001$. The five measures explained .013% in control behaviors by partner after controlling for the age and control behaviors toward partner, R square change = 0.013, F change (2, 82) = 1.37, $p = .35$. As can be seen in Table 4, in the final model only one measure was statistically significant with control behaviors by partner which was once again control behaviors toward partner ($\beta = .68, p < .001$).

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The study aimed to assess the roles of ambivalent sexism (hostile and benevolent sexism), male role norms and gender role discrepancy in young adult's romantic relationships, mainly on controlling behaviors. In terms of gender differences, it was hypothesized that; men would report higher controlling behaviors in their romantic relationships as well as higher hostile sexism and greater endorsement of masculinity norms compared to women; whereas women would endorse benevolent sexism as much as men. Additionally, young male adults high in ambivalent sexism and masculinity discrepancy stress were expected to show more controlling behaviors in their romantic relationships compared to those low in ambivalent sexism. Lastly, it was expected that female young adults high in ambivalent sexism and femininity discrepancy stress would also show more controlling behaviors toward their romantic partners compared to those who score low in these variables.

In order to assess differences between genders, analyses showed that male participants scored higher on male role norms than females, as hypothesized. This finding is consistent with the literature in that men are more likely to stick to gender roles than women such that aspects of manhood and patriarchy play an important role for males enforcing them to follow gender roles closely (Eisler, Skidmore & Ward, 1988; Büken & Sahinoglu, 2006). In addition to this, hostile

sexism was significantly higher in male participants than female participants. This is consistent with findings done abroad and with Turkish speaking samples (e.g., Glick et al., 1996; Glick et al., 2002), in which hostile sexism is higher in men compared to women and an important predictor of wife-beating. High conformation of hostile sexism by men gives freedom to express their aggressive and negative attitudes toward women (Taşdemir & Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2010). Also, masculinity is an important dimension for "being a man" and symbolization of domination whereas femininity symbolized as submissiveness and purity (Kandiyoti, 1988). In this regard, when women break the gender stereotypes and become independent, man might display aggressive and hostile behaviors toward women.

On the other hand compared to male participants, female participants scored high in benevolent sexism and low in the hostile sexism. The reason might be that women may have benevolent sexism more than hostile sexism because they may seek protection which is provided by benevolent gender ideology (Glick & Fiske, 1999). Between female and male participants there was no difference for benevolent sexism and both genders scored almost the same. Benevolent sexism is more related with taking advantage from male's power (Glick & Fiske, 2001). There is endearing feature of benevolent sexism which promises that men will protect women, provide opportunities and in the end females are depending on/perceiving men as protectors and providers (Glick & Fiske, 2001). As an example some of the women do not have career goals because they can rely on a husband who can provide them economically a good future and when they find a man who is economically strong, a woman is less likely to complain about men's

power and less independent (Rudman & Heppen, 2000). Men's benevolent sexism fosters from the dependency to women such as they rely on women to fulfill men's sexual and intimacy needs, providing arrangements in home environment, reproduction and taking care of children make women precious resource (Guttentag & Secord, 1983).

Male role norms and ambivalent sexism was positively correlated for females. Both women and men can have prejudicial thoughts toward men as well (Glick & Fiske, 1999). On the other hand, women may have hostility toward women as well such as a study by Becker, (2010) indicated that women answered the hostile sexism subscale with high scores while they think about feminists and career women, not to women in general. The reason behind it might be that female participants categorized feminists and career women as competent and independent which contradict with the belief of women in general (Becker, 2010). However, they perceived stereotypic women as "weak but wonderful". Besides, women and men who accept the sexist ideologies tend to accept stereotypic gender roles more strongly such as "a woman needs a man otherwise she would not be completed" (Sakalli, 2002). It can be understood that in the current study females confirmed stereotypic gender roles and sexism.

In line with the hypothesis the correlation analyses were conducted separately for male and female participants and results for males indicated that hostile sexism was positively correlated with control behaviors of both toward partner and by partner. As mentioned before, controlling behaviors can include threats, intimidation, emotional abuse and isolation (Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003). A

study indicated that men with hostile sexist attitudes were more likely to use verbal aggression toward partners (Forbes, Adams-Curtis & White, 2004).

It was also found that there was a significant positive correlation between control behaviors toward partner and control behaviors by partner for both genders. In the literature reciprocal dating violence is very common. In one study among 4131 participants; 39% of the males and 50% of female college students in the U.S. reported reciprocal dating violence (Swahn, Alemdar & Whitaker, 2010). They also found that violence is more frequent when it is mutual. A longitudinal study in which data was collected in 1995 and then again in 2000 revealed that in 1,136 cohabiting or married couples (i.e., those who had an ongoing romantic relationship with the same person) those who were experiencing mutual partner violence reported this to also be occurring in the follow up, in the year 2000. However, those who did not report they had mutual partner violence in 1995 reported no mutual partner violence in 2000 as well (Field & Caetano, 2005). Compared to one-sided violence, two-sided violence is more common and results of the violence is more harmful (Gray & Foshee, 1997). Similarly, in a representative sample of U.S. young adults 49.7% of 11370 heterosexual couples reported reciprocal violence in their relationships (Whitaker, Haileyesus, Swahn & Saltzman, 2007). In this regard reciprocity has an important contribution to increase and maintenance of violence (Testa, Hoffman & Leonard, 2011).

Relatedly, there was a positive correlation between masculinity discrepancy stress and control behaviors toward partner. Literature does not contain studies related with discrepancy stress and control behaviors specifically however experiencing discrepancy stress has important effects on aggressive behaviors (stereotypic

masculine norms) of males in relationships (Reidy, Berke, Gentile & Zeichner, 2014). Similarly, there was a significant correlation between masculinity/femininity discrepancy and discrepancy stress for both genders. Reidy et al., (2014) suggested that when an individual believes he/she is insufficient in stereotypic masculine and feminine behaviors, it can result in discrepancy stress. Conversely, they found that gender role discrepancy does not predispose of stress such that there are men or women who perceive themselves as less masculine or feminine but who do not experience stress. Additionally, correlation analysis also showed that there was a positive correlation between control behaviors toward partner and male role norms for females. A suggestion by McGraw (2001) was women and men who conformed to traditional masculinity gender norms, resulted with higher in intrusiveness. In this regard that means that females who are accepting male role norms tend to exhibit intrusive behaviors such as control behaviors toward partner, overprotecting the partner, and stalking in order to monitor partner's attitudes. That is very common in collectivist countries and one of the reasons behind it might be that partners monitor each other because one's behavior (if it is not appropriate) can affect partner's family as well (Lavy, Mikulincer, Shaver & Gillath, 2009). In individualistic cultures, where each person is held responsible for his/her own behavior, there may be less need to influence a partner's behaviors (Lavy et al., 2009).

Based on the hierarchical regression analysis, only one independent variable (control behaviors toward partner) was an important predictor for dependent variable (control behaviors by partner) in romantic relationship for female and male participants. Maltreated individuals have been found to perceive their

partners as more controlling and more domineering (Wolfe, Wekerle, Reitzel-Jaffe & Lefebvre, 1998). Violence is motivated by a desire to have control over a partner and control behaviors of partners might be the pathway of upcoming intimate partner violence (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000). Individuals use violence to achieve revenge or justice, to support their self-image or protect the image when it is threatened and effect or control the behavior of others (Black, 1983).

Researchers suggested that both members of couples can be victim and perpetrator of violence for instance both females and males; victims of emotional controlling behaviors tend to perpetrate emotional controlling behaviors in relationship as well (Próspero & Kim, 2009). As it was mentioned in correlation analysis reciprocal violence might be the reason for the predictor which is control behaviors toward partner. Especially, for females the reason they show reciprocal violence is because of self-defense (O'Leary, & Smith Slep, 2003). In the present study gender differences were slightly different from each other such as for female participants were higher in control behaviors toward their partner. Although there was very small difference, it was consistent with the literature. For example, in Harned (2001)'s study men were more likely to experience control behaviors (psychological, isolation, intimidation, economic abuse and threats) from their female partners. Additionally, men were more experiencing jealousy and withdrawal from their female partners than women do (Kasian & Painter, 1992). Another suggestion from Stets (1995) is that women seek to control because women feel less mastery in relationships. Stets (1995) also emphasized that passive and dependent individuals tend to allow their partner to control.

Masculinity discrepancy did not predict control behaviors toward partner and control behaviors by partner. Conversely, past study showed that those who experience discrepancy stress will then have a tendency to show to themselves and to others aggressive behaviors, challenges or abusive behaviors (Reidy et al., 2014). Similarly femininity discrepancy stress did not affect the control behaviors toward partner and by partners as well. As mentioned before, previous studies show that femininity stress can cause trauma and depression. However, there are no studies for females who are exposed to psychological violence because of femininity stress. One of the reasons why this might be the case is that gender role discrepancy alone does not lead to stress conditions. For example there are individuals who consider themselves as less masculine/feminine but they do not feel stress. On the other hand they might turn to drug, alcohol, putting themselves in unsafe conditions and risky sexual behaviors (Reidy et al., 2014). Individuals may also reflect their distress in other relationships not in their romantic relationship such as that with family or friends. In this regard it would be very beneficial to investigate on interpersonal relationships and individuals who exhibit high risky behaviors (crime, violence, abuse, drug use etc.) (Reidy et al., 2014).

One of the major reasons why hypotheses were not supported might be not asking individuals the duration of their romantic relationship with their partners. For instance women and men reported that psychological abuse is very common when length of relationship increases (Sharpe & Taylor, 1999). Similarly, being exposed to physical aggression from dating partner is more common if the relationship is long term and serious (Ray & Gold, 1996; Roscoe & Benaske, 1985). Another limitation might be that number of dating partners was not controlled for, such that

according to Bergman, (1992) there is a positive correlation between number of dating partner and violence. One possible explanation Bergman (1992) suggested that an individual might invest more time on dating, frequently changing partner and not very selective on partner choice. Participants were mostly first semester of university students, their age mean was nineteen that's why they might not have too many dating experiences. Additionally, the small sample size might also be one the limitations. Some of the studies conducted for psychological violence or controlling behaviors kept the participant range wide (e.g. Follingstad, Bradley, Helff & Laughlin, 2002; Próspero & Kim, 2009).

Despite these limitations, the study has important implications from a practical point of view. From a practical and applied view, university psychological centers, psychological counselors and psychologists should be aware that mutual dating violence is a common component for individuals who are experiencing any kind of violence, particularly controlling behaviors. Because controlling behaviors are hard to elicit and it is invisible compared to physical and sexual violence (Krantz & Vung, 2009). They also suggested that control behaviors result in important psychological problems such as depression or suicidal thoughts. In this regard, control behaviors have been found to be more destructive for females (Krantz & Vung, 2009). As seen in the study findings, control behaviors of partners can be a sign of violence in a romantic relationship which can also show a pathway for future violence (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000). In this regard there should be prevention programs especially for high schools and universities which train students on the benefits and methods of keeping a good and healthy relationship, and explaining to them suitable ways to find solutions to disagreements in their

romantic relationships. Also the results of coercive behaviors, sources of violence in romantic relationships, and the development of violence should be the main components of these programs. Lastly, although the study only included heterosexual and cis-gender participants, such programs should also consider applying this to all genders and LGBTQ individuals. In the university environment giving importance to terms like decision making, self-esteem, self-respect, self-regulation, and self-efficacy might all be beneficial for self-development to prevent and not tolerate violence.

Legal and policy infrastructures should be prepared and implemented in real life and need to be included in the law. Encouraging individuals who are experiencing psychological abuse and control behaviors from partners to go to social support centers / women's and men's shelters will be beneficial. In such places, trained consultants on controlling behaviors should be employed. If the individual does not have that opportunity online systems created by professionals should also be available.

Lastly, by abolishing the patriarchy and leaving the masculine structure aside, by supporting women's education, increasing the areas in which they can work and supporting their economic freedom can prevent violence in intimate relationships.

REFERENCES

- Adana, F., Arslantaş, H., Ergin, F., Biçer, N., Kıranşal, N., & Şahin, S. (2011). Views of male university students about social gender roles; an example from east of Turkey. *Journal of Family Violence, 26*(7), 519-526. doi: 10.1007/s10896-011-9385-1.
- Addis, M. E., & Mahalik, J. R. (2003). Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help seeking. *American Psychologist, 58*(1), 5-14. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.58.1.5.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Becker, J. C. (2010). Why do women endorse hostile and benevolent sexism? The role of salient female subtypes and internalization of sexist contents. *Sex Roles, 62*(7-8), 453-467. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9707-4.
- Berger, A., Wildsmith, E., Manlove, J., & Steward-Streng, N. (2012, June). Relationship violence among young adult couples. *Child Trends Research Brief*. Retrieved from <https://www.childtrends.org/>.
- Bergman, L. (1992). Dating violence among high school students. *Social Work, 37*(1), 21-27. doi:10.1093/sw/37.1.21.
- Büken, N. Ö., & Sahinoglu, S. (2006). Violence against women in Turkey and the role of women physicians. *Nursing Ethics, 13*(2), 197-205. doi: 10.1191/0969733006ne838oa.

Black, D. (1983). Crime as social control. *American Sociological Review*, 48(1), 34-45. doi: org/10.2307/2095143.

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*. Retrieved from <https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/31292>.

Brown, B. B., Feiring, C., & Furman, W. (1999). Missing the love boat: Why researchers have shied away. In Brown, B. B., Feiring, C., & Furman, W. (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence*, (pp. 1-18). United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, S. L., & Bulanda, J. R. (2008). Relationship violence in young adulthood: A comparison of daters, cohabitators, and marrieds. *Social Science Research*, 37(1), 73-87.

Collins, W. A., Welsh, D. P., & Furman, W. (2009). Adolescent romantic relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60(25), 631-652. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163459.

Courtenay, W. H. (1999). Situating men's health in the negotiation of masculinities. *The Society for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity Bulletin (The American Psychological Association)*, 4(2), 10-12.

- Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science and Medicine*, 50(2000), 1385–1401. doi: 10.1016/s0277-9536(99)00390-1.
- Chang, V. N. (1996). *I just lost myself: Psychological abuse of women in marriage*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Eisler, R. M., Skidmore, J. R., & Ward, C. H. (1988). Masculine gender-role stress: Predictor of anger, anxiety, and health-risk behaviors. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52(1), 133-141. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_12.
- Felson, R. B., & Messner, S. F. (2000). The control motive in intimate partner violence. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(1), 86-94. doi:10.2307/2695883.
- Feiring, C., & Furman, W. C. (2000). When love is just a four-letter word: Victimization and romantic relationships in adolescence. *Child Maltreat*, 5(4), 293-298. doi: 10.1177/1077559500005004001.
- Finn, J. (1986). The relationship between sex role attitudes and attitudes supporting marital violence. *Sex Roles*, 14(5-6), 235-244. doi: org/10.1007/BF00287576.
- Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2005). Longitudinal model predicting mutual partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States

general population. *Violence and Victims*, 20(5), 499-511. doi: 10.1891/088667005780927557.

Follingstad, D. R., Bradley, R. G., Helff, C. M., & Laughlin, J. E. (2002). A model for predicting dating violence: Anxious attachment, angry temperament, and need for relationship control. *Violence and Victims*, 17(1), 35. doi: 10.1891/vivi.17.1.35.33639.

Follingstad, D. R., Rutledge, L. L., Berg, B. J., Hause, E. S., & Polek, D. S. (1990). The role of emotional abuse in physically abusive relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, 5(2), 107-120. doi: 10.1007/BF00978514.

Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L. E., & White, K. B. (2004). First- and second-generation measures of sexism, rape myths and related beliefs, and hostility toward women. *Violence Against Women*, 10(3), 236-261. doi: 10.1177/1077801203256002.

Furman, W., & Wehner, E. A. (1994). Romantic views: Toward a theory of adolescent romantic relationships. In R. Montemayor, G. R. Adams, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Advances in adolescent development: Personal relationships during adolescence* (p. 168–195). United States: Sage Publications Inc.

Furman, W., & Wehner, E. A. (1997). Adolescent romantic relationships: A developmental perspective. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 1997(78), 21-36. doi: org/10.1002/cd.23219977804.

- Golding, J. M. (1999). Intimate partner violence as a risk factor for mental disorders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Violence, 14*(2), 99-132. doi:10.1023/A:1022079418-229.
- Guttentag, M., & Secord, P. (1983). *Too many women? the sex ratio question*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512. doi: 10.4324/9781315187280.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The Ambivalent toward Men Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23*(3), 519–536. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00379.x.
- Glick, P., Sakalli-Ugurlu, N., Ferreira, M. C., & Souza, M. A. D. (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.
- Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2003). Intimate terrorism and common couple violence: A test of Johnson's predictions in four British samples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*(11), 1247-1270. doi: 10.1177/0886260503256656.
- Gray, H. M., & Foshee, V. (1997). Adolescent Dating Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*(1), 126–141. doi:10.1177/088626097012001008.

- Harned, M. S. (2001). Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. *Violence and Victims, 16*(3), 269-285. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.16.3.269.
- Harris, A. C. (1994). Ethnicity as a determinant of sex role identity: A replication study of item selection for the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Sex Roles, 31* (3-4), 241–273. doi: 10.1007/BF01547717.
- Heyman, R. E., & Slep, A. M. S. (2002). Do child abuse and interparental violence lead to adulthood family violence?. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*(4), 864-870. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00864.x.
- Husaini, B. A., Moore, S. T., & Cain, V. A. (1994). Psychiatric symptoms and help-seeking behavior among the elderly: An analysis of racial and gender differences. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 21*(3-4), 177-196. doi:10.1300/J083V21N03_12.
- Husnu, S., & Mertan, B. E. (2017). The roles of traditional gender myths and beliefs about beating on self-reported partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 32*(24), 3735-3752. doi: 10.1177/0886260515600879.
- Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., & Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perpetration of relationship violence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 3*(2), 97-106. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.3.2.97.

- Johnson, M. P., & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(4), 948-963. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00948.x.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & Society*, 2(3), 274-290. doi: 10.1177/089124388002003004.
- Kasian, M., & Painter, S. (1992). Frequency and severity of psychological abuse in a dating population. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7(3), 350-364. doi: 10.1177/088626092007003005.
- Kaura, S. A., & Allen, C. M. (2004). Dissatisfaction with relationship power and dating violence perpetration by men and women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(5), 576-588. doi: 10.1177/0886260504262966.
- Katz, P. A., & Ksansnak, K. R. (1994). Developmental aspects of gender role flexibility and traditionality in middle childhood and adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(2), 272-282. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.30.2.272.
- Kirkwood, C. (1993). *Leaving abusive partners: From the scars of survival to the wisdom for change*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.
- Krantz, G., & Vung, N. D. (2009). The role of controlling behaviour in intimate partner violence and its health effects: A population based study from rural Vietnam. *BMC Public Health*, 9(1), 143-155. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-9-143.

- Kwong, M. J., Bartholomew, K., & Dutton, D. G. (1999). Gender differences in patterns of relationship violence in Alberta. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, 31(3), 150-160. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-9-143.
- Lavy, S., Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R., & Gillath, O. (2009). Intrusiveness in romantic relationships: A cross-cultural perspective on imbalances between proximity and autonomy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 26(6-7), 989-1008. doi: 10.1177/0265407509347934.
- Levant, R. F., Majors, R. G., & Kelley, M. L. (1998). Masculinity ideology among young African American and European American women and men in different regions of the United States. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health*, 4(3), 227-236. doi: 10.1-037/1099-9809.4.3.227.
- Lewis, S. F., Travea, L., & Fremouw, W. J. (2002). Characteristics of female perpetrators and victims of dating violence. *Violence and Victims*, 17(5), 593–606. doi: 10.1891-/vivi.17.5.593.33711.
- Linykh, S. A. (2011). Multiple masculinity. *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*, 7, 101-109.
- Macmillan, R., & Eliason, S. R. (2003). Characterizing the life course as role configurations and pathways: A latent structure approach. In J. T. Mortimer & M. J. Shanahan (Eds.), *Handbook of the Life Course* (pp. 529–554). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Newman, D. L., Fagan, J., & Silva, P. A. (1997). Gender differences in partner violence in a birth cohort of 21-year-olds: Bridging the gap between clinical and epidemiological approaches. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65*(1), 68-78. doi: 10.1037//0022-006x.65.1.68.

Mayerson, S. E., & Taylor, D. A. (1987). The effects of rape myth pornography on women's attitudes and the mediating role of sex role stereotyping. *Sex Roles, 17*(5-6), 321-338. doi: 10.1007/BF00288456.

Mertan, B., Maner, U., Bayraktar, F., Hüsnü, Ş., Pehlivan, G., & Çelik, D. (2012). Knowledge and attitudes towards domestic violence against women: The case of North Cyprus. *Women 2000, Journal for Women Studies, 13*(2), 47-60.

Mcgraw, S. L. (2001). *Masculinity ideologies, men's relationship behavior, and relationship satisfaction in heterosexual couple relationships* (Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Information & Learning).

McHugh, M. C., & Frieze, I. H. (1997). The measurement of gender-role attitudes: A Review and Commentary. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*(1), 1-16. doi: 10.1111-1/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00097.x.

McKAY, J. R., Rutherford, M. J., Cacciola, J. S., Kabasakalian-McKay, R., & Alterman, A. I. (1996). Gender differences in the relapse experiences of

cocaine patients. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 184(10), 616-622. doi: 10.1097/0-0005053-199610000-00006.

Neugebauer, R. (2000). Research on intergenerational transmission of violence: The next generation. *Lancet*, 355(9210), 1116-1117. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02056-0.

O'Leary, K. D., & Smith Slep, A. M. (2003). A dyadic longitudinal model of adolescent dating aggression. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 32(3), 314-327. doi: 10.1207/S15374424JCCP3203_01.

Oesterle, S. (2013). Pathways to young adulthood and preventive interventions targeting young adults. Institute of Medicine and National Research Council, Improving the health, safety, and well-being of young adults: Workshop summary (pp. 147–176). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Oesterle, S., Hawkins, J. D., & Hill, K. G. (2011). Men's and women's pathways to adulthood and associated substance misuse. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 72(5), 763–773. doi: 10.15288/jsad.2011.72.763.

Osgood, D. W., Ruth, G., Eccles, J. S., Jacobs, J. E., & Barber, B. L. (2005). Six paths to adulthood: Fast starters, parents without careers, educated partners, educated singles, working singles, and slow starters. In R. A. Stettersen, Jr., F. F. Furstenberg, Jr., & R. G. Rumbaut (Eds.), *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research and Public Policy* (pp. 320–355). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Padesky, C. A., & Hammen, C. L. (1981). Sex differences in depressive symptom expression and help-seeking among college students. *Sex Roles, 7*(3), 309-320. doi:10.1007/BF00287545.
- Parlan, Y., Husnu, S. (2015). Intimate Partner Violence – Who is to Blame? Eastern Mediterranean University. Unpublished master’s dissertation.
- Pleck, J.H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R.F. Levant, W.S. Pollack (Eds.), *A New Psychology of Men*, (pp. 11-32). New York: Basic Books.
- Randle, A. A., & Graham, C. A. (2011). A review of the evidence on the effects of intimate partner violence on men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12*(2), 97-111. doi: 10.1037/a0021944.
- Ray, A. L., & Gold, S. R. (1996). Gender roles, aggression, and alcohol use in dating relationships. *Journal of Sex Research, 33*(1), 47-55. doi: 0.1080/00224499609551813.
- Renzetti, C. M. (1992). *Violent betrayal: partner abuse in lesbian relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Reidy, D. E., Berke, D. S., Gentile, B., & Zeichner, A. (2014). Man enough? Masculine discrepancy stress and intimate partner violence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 68*, 160-164. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.04.021.

- Reidy, D. E., Kernsmith, P. D., Malone, C. A., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., & Smith-Darden, J. P. (2018). Feminine discrepancy stress and psychosocial maladjustment among adolescent girls. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development, 49*(2), 176-186. doi: 10.1007/s10578-017-0739-7.
- Reidy, D. E., Smith-Darden, J. P., Cortina, K. S., Kernsmith, R. M., & Kernsmith, P. D. (2015). Masculine discrepancy stress, teen dating violence, and sexual violence perpetration among adolescent boys. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 56*(6), 619-624. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.02.009.
- Rice, T. W., & Coates, D. L. (1995). Gender role attitudes in the southern United States. *Gender & Society, 9*(6), 744-756. doi: 10.1177/089124395009006007.
- Roberts, K. A. (2005). Associated characteristics of stalking following the termination of romantic relationships. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice, 1*(1), 15-35.
- Roscoe, B., & Benaske, N. (1985). Courtship violence experienced by abused wives: Similarities in patterns of abuse. *Family Relations, 34*(3), 47-55. doi: 10.2307/583582.
- Rudman, L. A., & Heppen, J. (2000). *Someday my prince will come: Implicit romantic fantasies and women's avoidance of power*. Unpublished manuscript, Rutgers: The State University of New Jersey.

- Sakallı, N. (2001). Beliefs about wife beating among Turkish college students: The effects of patriarchy, sexism, and sex differences. *Sex Roles, 44*(9-10), 599-610. doi: 10.1023/A:1012295109711.
- Sakalli, N. (2002). The relationship between sexism and attitudes toward homosexuality in a sample of Turkish college students. *Journal of Homosexuality, 42*(3), 53-64. doi: 10.1300/J082v42n03_04.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., & Ulu, S. (2003). Evlilikte kadına yönelik şiddete ilişkin tutumlar: Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik, yaş, eğitim ve gelir düzeyinin etkileri. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları, 6*(11), 53-65.
- Saltzman, L. E., Fanslow, J. L., & McMahon, P. M. (2002). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements*. Retrieved from https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/7537/cdc_7537_DS1.pdf.
- Seiffge-Krenke, I., Shulman, S., & Kiessinger, N. (2001). Adolescent precursors of romantic relationships in young adulthood. *Journal of social and Personal Relationships, 18*(3), 327-346. doi:10.1177/0265407501183002.
- Simonelli, C. J., Mullis, T., Elliott, A. N., & Pierce, T. W. (2002). Abuse by siblings and subsequent experiences of violence within the dating relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(2), 103-121. doi: 10.1177/0886260502017002001.

- Scales, P. C., Benson, P. L., Oesterle, S., Hill, K. G., Hawkins, J. D., & Pashak, T. J. (2016). The dimensions of successful young adult development: A conceptual and measurement framework. *Applied Developmental Science, 20*(3), 150-174. doi: 10.1080/10888691.2015.1082429.
- Schulenberg, J., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Johnston, L. D. (2005). Early adult transitions and their relation to well-being and substance use. In R. A. Stettersen, Jr., F. F. Furstenberg, Jr., & R. G. Rumbaut (Eds.), *On the frontier of adulthood: Theory, Research and Public Policy* (pp. 417–453). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sharpe, D., & Taylor, J. K. (1999). An examination of variables from a social-developmental model to explain physical and psychological dating violence. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement, 31*(3), 165-175. doi: 10.1037/h0087085.
- Stets, J. E. (1995). Role identities and person identities: Gender identity, mastery identity, and controlling one's partner. *Sociological Perspectives, 38*(2), 129-150. doi: 10.2307/1389287.
- Stewart, D. E., & Erlick Robinson, G. (1998). A review of domestic violence and women's mental health. *Archives of Women's Mental Health, 1*(2), 83-89. doi: 10.1007/s007370050010.

Street, S., Kimmel, E. B., & Kromrey, J. D. (1995). Revisiting university student gender role perceptions. *Sex Roles*, 33(3-4), 183-201. doi: 10.1007/BF01544610.

Taşdemir, N., & Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2010). The relationships between ambivalent sexism and religiosity among Turkish university students. *Sex Roles*, 62(7-8), 420-426. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9693-6.

Testa, M., Hoffman, J. H., & Leonard, K. E. (2011). Female intimate partner violence perpetration: Stability and predictors of mutual and nonmutual aggression across the first year of college. *Aggressive Behavior*, 37(4), 362-373. doi: org/10.1002/ab.20391.

Toplu, E., & Hatipoglu-Sümer, Z. (2011). *Flört ilişkisinde şiddetin yaygınlığı ve türleri [Prevalence and types of dating violence]*. Paper presented at the meeting of XI. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi [XI. National Congress of Psychological Counseling and Guidance], Selçuk, İzmir.

Thom, B. (1986). Sex differences in help-seeking for alcohol problems—1. The barriers to help-seeking. *British Journal of Addiction*, 81(6), 777-788. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.1986.tb00405.x.

Thompson Jr, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29(5), 531-543. doi: 10.1177/000276486029005003.

- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (July, 2000). *Extent, nature, and consequences of intimate partner violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/181867.pdf>.
- Vandello, J. A., & Bosson, J. K. (2013). Hard won and easily lost: A review and synthesis of theory and research on precarious manhood. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14*(2), 101–113. doi: 10.1037/a0029826.
- Yakushko, O. (2005). Ambivalent sexism and relationship patterns among women and men in Ukraine. *Sex Roles, 52*(9-10), 589-596. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-3727-5.
- Wayland, K., Roth, S., & Lochman, J. E. (1991). The relation between physical assault and psychological functioning in a sample of university women, and the relative effects of physical and sexual assault. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 4*(4), 495-514. doi: 10.1007/BF00974586.
- Wolfe, D. A., Wekerle, C., Reitzel-Jaffe, D., & Lefebvre, L. (1998). Factors associated with abusive relationships among maltreated and nonmaltreated youth. *Development and Psychopathology, 10*(1), 61-85. doi: 10.1017/S0954579498001345.
- 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*.

Whitaker, D. J., Haileyesus, T., Swahn, M., & Saltzman, L. S. (2007). Differences in frequency of violence and reported injury between relationships with reciprocal and nonreciprocal intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Public Health, 97*(5), 941-947. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2005.079020.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Demographic Questionnaire

Yaş:

Cinsiyet: Kadın Erkek

Cinsel Yönelim: Karşı cinse ilgi duyuyorum

Kendi cinsime ilgi duyuyorum

Hem kendi cinsime hem de karşı cinse ilgi duyuyorum

İlişki Durumu: İlişkisi var İlişkisi yok

İlişkisi devam etmiyorsa bitme tarihi (Ay olarak): _____

Appendix B: Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

Aşağıdakilerden size uygun olanını işaretleyiniz.

	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Ne katılıyorum Ne katılmıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1. Ne kadar başarılı olursa olsun bir kadının sevgisine sahip olmadıkça bir erkek gerçek anlamda bütün bir insan olamaz.					
2. Gerçekte birçok kadın "eşitlik" arıyoruz maskesi altında işe alınmalarda kendilerinin kayırılması gibi özel muameleler arıyorlar.					
3. Bir felaket durumunda kadınlar erkeklerden önce kurtarılmalıdır.					
4. Birçok kadın masum söz veya davranışları cinsel ayrımcılık olarak yorumlamaktadır.					
5. Kadınlar çok çabuk alınırlar.					
6. Karşı cinsten biri ile romantik ilişki olmaksızın insanlar hayatta gerçekten mutlu olamazlar.					
7. Feministler gerçekte kadınların erkeklerden daha fazla güce sahip olmalarını istemektedirler.					
8. Birçok kadın çok az erkekte olan bir saflığa sahiptir.					
9. Kadınlar erkekler tarafından el üstünde tutulmalı ve korunmalıdır.					
10. Birçok kadın erkeklerin kendileri için yaptıklarına tamamen minnettar olmamaktadırlar.					
11. Kadınlar erkekler üzerinde kontrolü sağlayarak güç kazanmak hevesindedirler.					
12. Her erkeğin hayatında hayran olduğu bir kadın olmalıdır.					
13. Erkekler kadınsız eksiktirler.					
14. Kadınlar işyerlerindeki problemleri abartmaktadırlar.					
15. Bir kadın bir erkeğin bağlılığını kazandıktan sonra genellikle o erkeğe sıkı bir yular takmaya çalışır.					
16. Adaletli bir yarışmada kadınlar erkeklere karşı kaybettikleri zaman tipik olarak kendilerinin ayrımcılığa maruz kaldıklarından yakınırırlar.					
17. İyi bir kadın erkeği tarafından yüceltilmelidir.					

18. Erkekler cinsel yönden yaklaşılabılır olduklarını gösterircesine şakalar yapıp daha sonra erkeklerin tekliflerini reddetmekten zevk alan birçok kadın vardır.					
19. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha yüksek ahlaki duyarlılığa sahip olma eğilimindedirler.					
20. Erkekler hayatlarındaki kadın için mali yardım sağlamak için kendi rahatlarını gönüllü olarak feda etmelidirler.					
21. Feministler erkekler makul olmayan istekler sunmaktadırlar.					
22. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha ince bir kültür anlayışına ve zevkine sahiptirler.					

Appendix C: Male Role Norm Scale

Lütfen fikrinizi en iyi şekilde yansıtan yanıtı seçiniz.

1. İş yerinde başarı temel bir hedeftir.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Genç erkekler, çok çalışarak saygı kazanır.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Erkek, ailesi için yüksek gelir kazanmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Erkek, ek mesai çalışmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Erkek, daima ailesinin saygısını hakeder.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Saygı duyulmak, erkek için esastır.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Erkek asla vazgeçmemelidir.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Kendinden emin erkekleri severim.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Erkek mantıklı olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Bir erkek her zaman kendine güvenmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Erkek, kendi ayakları üzerinde durmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Şikayet etmeyen erkekleri severim.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Bir erkek acılarını belli etmemelidir.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Endişelerini belli eden erkekleri kimse sevmez.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Kısmen sert görünen erkekleri severim.	1	2	3	4	5
16. İşler zorlaştığında, güçlü olan sıyrılıp geçer.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Genç bir erkek, fiziksel olarak güçlü olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Güçsüzlüklerini gösteren erkekler beni iğrendirir.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Bazen yumruklar gereklidir.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Gerçek bir erkek, biraz tehlikeden hoşlanır.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Bir erkek, her zaman kavgaya hazır olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Bir erkek, kavga etmeyi reddetmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Kadınsı bir hareket yapan erkekler beni rahatsız eder.	1	2	3	4	5

24. Yemek yapan, dikiş yapan erkekler çekici değildir.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Kadınlara yönelik bir meslekte çalışmak utanç vericidir.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Bir erkek, sekreter olarak çalışmamalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Kuaför ve aşçı, erkeksi meslekler sayılmaz.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Erkeklerin saç boyaması iğrenç bir durumdur.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Erkek çocuğuna yemek yapmak, dikiş yapmak öğretilmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Erkeklerin film izlerken ağlaması utanç vericidir.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D: Male Discrepancy and Discrepancy Stress Scale

Aşağıdaki maddelerden düşüncelerinize en yakın olanı işaretleyiniz.

	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
1. Ortalama bir erkekten daha az erkeksiyim.					
2. Tanıdığım kadınların çoğu benim, arkadaşlarım kadar erkeksi olmadığını söyler.					
3. Çoğu erkek, onlara kıyasla çok erkeksi olmadığını söyler					
4. Erkek arkadaşlarıma kıyasla çok erkeksi değilim.					
5. Çoğu kadın, normal/tipik bir erkekten daha az erkeksi olduğumu düşünür.					
6. Keşke daha çok erkeksi olsaydım.					
7. Keşke diğer erkeklerin ilginç bulduğu şeylerle ilgileniyor olsaydım.					
8. İnsanların beni yargılamalarından endişeleniyorum çünkü normal bir erkek gibi değilim.					
9. Bazen erkekliğim için endişeleniyorum.					
10. Kadınların beni daha az çekici bulduklarından endişeleniyorum çünkü diğer erkekler gibi maço değilim.					

Appendix E: Female Discrepancy and Discrepancy Stress Scale

Aşağıdaki maddelerden düşüncelerinize en yakın olanı işaretleyiniz.

	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
1. Ortalama bir kadından daha az kadınsıyım.					
2. Tanıdığım erkeklerin çoğu benim, arkadaşlarım kadar kadınsı olmadığını söyler.					
3. Çoğu kadın, onlara kıyasla çok kadınsı olmadığını söyler					
4. Kız arkadaşlarıma kıyasla çok kadınsı değilim.					
5. Çoğu erkek, normal/tipik bir kadından daha az kadınsı olduğumu düşünür.					
6. Keşke daha çok kadınsı olsaydım.					
7. Keşke diğer kadınların ilginç bulduğu şeylerle ilgileniyor olsaydım.					
8. İnsanların beni yargılamalarından endişeleniyorum çünkü tipik kadın gibi değilim.					
9. Bazen kadınsılığım için endişeleniyorum.					
10. Erkeklerin beni daha az çekici bulduklarından endişeleniyorum çünkü diğer kadınlar gibi kadınsı değilim.					



Appendix F: The Controlling Behaviors Scale

Aşağıda belirtilen ilişki içerisindeki durumlarla ne kadar sıklıkla karşılaştığınızı sorulmaktadır. Bu tür şeylerin sizin başınıza ne sıklıkta geldiği ve sizin tarafınızdan ne sıklıkta yapıldığını belirtmeniz istenmektedir. Lütfen aşağıdaki durumlarla hem ne sıklıkla karşılaştığınızı hem de ne sıklıkla sizin tarafınızdan yapıldığını uygun rakamı işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

1= HİÇ BİR ZAMAN 2= NADİREN 3= BAZEN 4= OLDUKÇA SIK 5= SIK SIK

	Ne sıklıkta <u>partneriniz</u> tarafından bu davranışlarına maruz kaldınız?					Ne sıklıkta <u>kendiniz</u> bu tür davranışlarda bulundunuz?				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. Zarar vereceğine dair tehdit etme.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. Terk etmek ile tehdit etme.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3. İntihar etmek ile tehdit etme.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4. Polise şikayet etmek ile tehdit etme.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5. Daha önce yapılmayan yasadışı davranışlar sergilemeye cesaretlendirmek.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. Davranışını değiştirmek için bakış, yüz ifadesi ve/veya hareket kullanmak.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. Bakış, yüz ifadesi ve/veya hareketten dolayı korkutma.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. Kızgın/öfkeliyken eşyalara zarar verme.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. Başkaların önünde (arkadaş, aile, öğretmen) küçük düşürmeye çalışma.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10. Çıldırdığını (/delirdiğini) söyleme.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
11. Hoş olmayan isimlerle çağırma.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
12. Arkadaş ve/veya aileyle geçirilen süreyi kısıtlamaya çalışma.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
13. Dışarı çıkıldığında, nereye gidildiği ve kiminle konuşulduğunu bilmek isteme.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
14. İlişki dışında yapılan etkinlikleri sınırlandırma	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
15. Kıskanma ve şüphe hissetme.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
16. Kıskanma ve şüpheden dolayı faaliyetleri takip etmek ve kontrol etmek.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

**Appendix G: Eastern Mediterranean University Psychology
Department's Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter**

 <p>Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi "Erdem, Bilgi, Gelişim"</p>	<p>Eastern Mediterranean University "Virtue, Knowledge, Advancement"</p>	<p>99628, Gazimağusa, KUZEY KIBRIS / Famagusta, North Cyprus, via Mersin-10 TURKEY Tel: (+90) 392 630 1995 Faks/Fax: (+90) 392 630 2919 E-mail: bayek@emu.edu.tr</p>
<p>Etik Kurulu / Ethics Committee</p>		
<p>Reference No: ETK00-2019-0003</p>	<p>24. 01. 2019</p>	
<p>Subject: Application for Ethics.</p>		
<p>RE: Özlem Melike Sahan Psychology Department</p>		
<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p>		
<p>On the date of 24.01.2019, (Meeting number 2019/02-01), EMU's Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee (BAYEK) has granted, Özlem Melike Sahan from the, Psychology Department to pursue with her MA. thesis work "The role of masculinity/femininity discrepancy stress and ambivalent sexism on controlling behaviors in adolescent romantic relationships" under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsni Raman. This decision has been taken by the majority of votes.</p>		
<p>Regards,</p>		
<p> Prof. Dr. Fatma Güven Lisaniler Director of Ethics Committee</p>		
<p>FGL/ba.</p>		
<p>www.emu.edu.tr</p>		