



EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES OF AMBIVALENT SEXISM AND DATING VIOLENCE

Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik ile Flört Şiddetine Yönelik Tutum Arasındaki İlişki

Olca TİRE¹ ve Akgün YEŞİLTEPE²

¹Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Munzur Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, Tunceli, olcaytire@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0002-7622-062X

²Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Munzur Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, Ebelik Bölümü, Tunceli, akgunyesiltepe@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0002-4720-3118

Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article

Makale Bilgisi

Geliş/Received:
27.03.2023

Kabul/Accepted:
05.09.2023

DOI:

10.18069/firatsbed.1271765

Keywords

Ambivalent sexism,
dating violence, student

Anahtar Kelimeler

Çelişik duygulu
cinsiyetçilik, flört
şiddeti, öğrenci

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between attitudes towards dating violence and conflicting sexist attitudes. This descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted using a total of 283 students at the Faculty of Letters of Munzur University in Türkiye between February and June 2021. The data were collected using a descriptive information form, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and the Dating Violence Questionnaire, and analyzed using Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis tests, Spearman's correlation analysis and Bonferroni test. A statistically significant moderately positive relationship was found between the students' attitudes of ambivalent sexism and dating violence. The students had a high level of ambivalent sexism and a low level of dating violence. In the study, it was determined that men (74.93±22.41) exhibit higher ambivalent sexism attitudes than women (60.14±22.02), and the mean dating violence rate of men (1.56±0.38) is higher than that of women (1.30±0.29). As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the hostile and protective sexist attitude, which is the sub-dimensions of ambivalent sexism, is higher in male students than in female students. Finally, it was found that those with high protective sexism attitudes have more dating violence attitudes than those with high hostile sexism attitudes. The findings reveal that the ambivalent sexist attitude supports dating violence.

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın amacı flört şiddetine yönelik tutum ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçi tutum arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmaktır. Araştırma Şubat-Haziran 2021 tarihleri arasında Munzur Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesinde öğrenim gören 283 öğrencinin katılımı ile tanımlayıcı ve kesitsel türde yapılmıştır. Veri toplamada; Tanımlayıcı bilgi formu, Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik tutum ile Flört şiddeti tutum ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde Mann Whitney U ve Kruskal Wallis testi, Spearman korelasyon analizi ve bonferroni testi yapılmıştır. Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik tutumu ile flört şiddetine yönelik tutum arasında pozitif yönlü anlamlı ilişki bulunmuştur. Araştırmaya katılan öğrencilerde çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin yüksek düzeyde; flört şiddetinin düşük düzeyde olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Araştırmada erkeklerin (74.93±22.41), kadınlara (60.14±22.02) göre daha yüksek çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik tutum sergiledikleri ve erkeklerin flört şiddeti ortalamasının (1.56±0.38), kadınlardan (1.30±0.29) daha yüksek olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Analizler sonucunda çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin alt boyutları olan düşmanca ve korumacı cinsiyetçi tutumun, erkek öğrencilerde kadın öğrencilere göre yüksek olduğu belirlenmiştir. Son olarak korumacı cinsiyetçilik tutumu yüksek olanların, düşmanca cinsiyetçilik tutumu yüksek olanlara göre daha fazla flört şiddeti tutumuna sahip oldukları bulunmuştur. Bulgular, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik tutumunun flört şiddetini desteklediğini ortaya koymaktadır.

Atf/Citation: Tire, O. ve Yeşiltepe, A. (2023). Examining The Relationship Between Attitudes of Ambivalent Sexism and Dating Violence. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 33, 3, 1401-1411.

Sorumlu yazar/Corresponding author: Olca TİRE, olcaytire@gmail.com

1.Introduction

Dating violence is one of the most common types of violence, which is an important social problem today. Dating violence disrupts both physical and psychological health, removing individuals from social life and reducing their quality of life. Dating relationship that causes dating violence is a type of relationship in which people who are not married or engaged have emotional, romantic and sexual relations (Doğan, 2018). Dating violence is defined as the use of physical force, threats or restraint with the intent to harm or hurt another person (Sugarman and Hotaling, 1991). Dating violence is considered a type of interpersonal violence and is defined as the use of physical, verbal, emotional or sexual violence to each other in a dating relationship and imposing social restrictions on their behaviors (Aslan et al. 2008). Dating violence is caused by the desire of one partner to dominate, control and show their power over the other through distinct types of violence (Fidan and Yeşil, 2018). Dating violence includes physical, psychological/emotional, sexual and economic violence. When thinking about physical violence, comes to mind first and is easily noticed, including beating, slapping, punching, hitting, kicking, biting, pinching, stabbing, pulling hair, strangling, shooting behaviors (Akış et al. 2019; Özdere 2019; Türk, Hamzaoğlu, and Yayak 2020; Yıldırım and Terzioğlu 2018). Psychological/emotional violence includes behaviors aiming to disrupt partner's psychology, such as name-calling, embarrassing, humiliating, preventing them from seeing their family or friends, insulting, and scolding (Avşar and Akış 2017; Fidan and Yeşil 2018; Özdere 2019). Sexual violence appears as forced sexual intercourse, rape and sexual harassment (Aslan, Bulut, and Arslantaş 2020; Fidan and Yeşil 2018). Economic violence, on the other hand, includes preventing partner from getting a job, restricting access to financial resources, and confiscating goods, money and assets (Türk, Hamzaoğlu, and Yayak, 2020).

Both sexes are exposed to dating violence, but women are most affected by dating violence. Uzel et al. (2018) conducted a study on the dating attitudes of university students and found that 59.8% of students who used physical violence to their partner were males. This is because of gender roles and gender inequality. In patriarchal societies, men are expected to be strong, authoritarian, independent, active, rational, competitive, ambitious, and successful, while women are expected to be dependent, affectionate, emotional, gentle, caring, patient, altruistic, and obedient. These stereotypes, which consider women as inferior to men, approve men's violence against women. Therefore, having a traditional perspective on gender, asymmetrical power relations between women and men due to patriarchal social structure, and perceiving violence as a normal behavior are the main sources of dating violence (Öztürk et al., 2021). Sexism is at the root of violence and is defined as the discrimination one suffers because of their gender. Sexism includes keeping women inferior to men in economic, legal and political fields due to negative attitudes and behaviors towards women in patriarchal society (Glick and Fiske 1996; Sakallı 2002, 2003). Glick and Fiske (1996) argue two types of sexism: hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. They developed the ambivalent sexism theory, differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism (Glick and Fiske 1996, 1997, 2001). Hostile sexism refers to gender discrimination in which negative attitudes towards women are clearly evident, women are considered weak, powerless and inferior to men, and are perceived as dependent on men (Sakallı 2002, 2003). Benevolent sexism, on the other hand, refers to a gender discrimination suggesting that women should be protected, glorified, loved and supported by men because of their naivety and powerlessness (Glick and Fiske, 2001). This benevolent approach to women is valid only as long as women fulfill their traditional roles as mothers and/or wives (Glick and Fiske, 1996). Benevolent sexism rewards women who adopt traditional gender roles, while hostile sexism punishes women who break out of these roles. This carrot and stick approach in sexism is used to encourage women to adapt and obey traditional gender roles (Glick and Fiske, 2001). Benevolent sexism supports male superiority and traditional sexist stereotypes and harms women, even though it arouses positive feelings in people (Sakallı, 2002). Both hostile and benevolent sexism serve the same purpose, arguing that women are weaker than men and should have traditional gender roles. Both sexisms serve to justify and perpetuate patriarchal social structures. Therefore, benevolent sexism is used to compensate or justify hostile sexism (Glick and Fiske, 1996; Glick and Fiske, 1997). Benevolent sexism shows itself as working for women, protecting them and glorifying them, thus prevents women from reacting to hostile sexism (Sakallı, 2003).

Hostile sexism and benevolent sexism consist of three common components: patriarchy, gender differentiation and heterosexuality. Each component reflects a set of beliefs (Glick and Fiske, 1996).

Patriarchy means the economic, political and social supremacy of men in society, and includes hostile and benevolent forms. In patriarchy, women are considered weak, powerless and in need of protection by men.

While these stereotypes are more negatively dominated by men in hostile patriarchy, benevolent patriarchy considers male domination positively such as men's helping, directing, supporting and earning money for women, who are perceived as weak and powerless. In both cases it supports male domination (Glick and Fiske, 1996, 1997, 2001; İşkil et al., 2023; Sakallı, 2002, 2003).

Gender differentiation relates to the different social roles assigned to men and women in several cultures. Gender differentiation in hostile sexism considers women as the opposite sex and inferior to men. In benevolent sexism, men and women are considered complementary elements, suggesting that men should work outside the home and women should work inside the home (Glick and Fiske 1996, 1997; Sakallı 2002, 2003).

In heterosexuality and sexual productivity, a romantic relationship between opposite sexes is considered the most important source of happiness in life, which is called heterosexual hostility and intimacy. Heterosexual hostility argues that women are sex objects and use their sexual attraction to control men. Heterosexual intimacy, on the other hand, suggests that men are dependent on women for their sexual and reproductive needs (Alptekin, 2014; Ayrıl, 2021). Hostile sexism encompasses male power and traditional gender roles and justifies men's treatment and abuse of women as sexual objects. Benevolent sexism, on the other hand, justifies male dominance in a more subtle and gentle way (Şahin and Özerdoğan, 2014).

In the light of the above information, this study aims to analyze the relationship between attitudes of dating violence and ambivalent sexism, including hostile and benevolent Sexism. Studies have reported a positive relationship between the attitudes of dating violence and ambivalent sexism. Morelli et al. (2016), who conducted a study with a total of 715 participants with dating relationship in Italy (Morelli et al., 2016), and Dosil et al. (2020), who conducted a study with a total 268 young people in Spain (Dosil et al., 2020), found a positive relationship between dating violence and hostile and benevolent sexism. Fernández et al. (2020) examined the relationship between dating violence and sexism and determined a positive relationship between them (Fernández et al., 2020). There is a limited number of studies about the relationship between dating violence and ambivalent sexism in Turkey. Erdem and Şahin (2017) examined whether attitudes of dating violence differed by gender and found a positive relationship between the attitudes of ambivalent sexism and dating violence. There is also a master's thesis on this subject. Ayrıl (2021) examined the relationship between attitudes of dating violence and ambivalent sexism in terms of legitimizing violence and male domination and found a positive relationship between ambivalent sexism and attitude towards dating violence. As can be seen, both national and international literature, research examining the relationship between these two variables is quite limited. At the same time, the studies focused on the phenomenon of youth and no specific studies were found in the focus of students in the university period where flirting was intense. In this context, this research is expected to contribute to the literature. From this point of view, this research aims to examine the relationship between attitudes towards dating violence and ambivalent sexism in university students. For this purpose, the following hypotheses have been tested.

H₁: Participants' attitudes to ambivalent sexism differ according to gender.

H₂: Participants' attitudes to dating violence differ according to gender.

H₃: There is a significant relationship between participants' attitudes to dating violence and attitudes to ambivalent sexism.

2. Material and Method

2.1. Objective, Population and Sample of the Study

This study aimed to examine the relationship between attitudes of ambivalent sexism and dating violence. The population of the study consisted of students who studied at the Faculty of Letters (sociology, literature, history, geography, English, psychology and philosophy) in Munzur University between February and June 2021. The data were collected using online Google survey forms from those who agreed to participate in the study and filled out the consent form and data collection forms completely. Those who did not agree to participate in the study were excluded from the sample. The sample size was calculated from a known universe, using the following formula. The universe of the study consists of 1000 people. In the calculation, it was determined that 278 people were sufficient for the minimum sample. The research was conducted with 283 students over the age of 18 who volunteered to participate.

$$n = \frac{Nt^2 pq}{d^2 (N-1) + t^2 pq}$$

2.2. Data Collection Tools

The data were collected using a descriptive information form, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI), and the Dating Violence Questionnaire (DVQ).

2.2.1. Descriptive Information Form

The form was prepared by the researchers in line with the literature (Elmalı et al., 2011; Haynie and South, 2005; Kul Uçtu and Karahan, 2016; Lotfi et al., 2022; Topuz and Erkanlı, 2016). It consists of 15 questions about the students' socio-demographic characteristics such as age, gender, department, grade, monthly income, type of family, parents' education level, parents' occupation, place of residence, number of siblings, daily hours watching television.

2.2.2. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

The scale was developed by Glick and Fiske (1996). The Turkish adaptation of the scale was made by Sakallı (2002). The scale consists of 22 items, including 11 to measure benevolent sexism and 11 to measure hostile sexism. It has no item coded in reverse. This is a 6-point Likert-type scale, scoring from "1=strongly disagree" to "6=strongly agree". High scale scores indicate high levels of benevolent and hostile sexism.

2.2.3. Dating Violence Questionnaire

The scale was developed by Terzioğlu et al. (2016) and consists of a total of 28 items and five subscales, including Sexual Violence (7 items), Emotional Violence (6 items), General Violence (5 items), Economic Violence (5 items) and Physical Violence (5 items) and. Total scale score is evaluated over total scores of each item. This is a 5-point Likert type scale, scoring from "1=strongly disagree" to "5=strongly agree" (Terzioğlu et al., 2016).

2.3. Data Evaluation

The data were analyzed using the SPSS 25 program, and evaluated using descriptive statistical methods. The data were checked for normal distribution. Mann Whitney U test, Kruskal Wallis, Bonferroni and Spearman's correlation analysis analysis were performed.

3. Findings

3.1. Descriptive Statistics on Socio-demographic Characteristics

The mean age of all students was 22.03±3.08 years, the majority of them were over the age of 21 years. Of them, 78.1% were females, 37.2% were first grade students, 35.3% were sociology students, 60.8% had nuclear family, and 54.1% lived in city the longest. In addition, 67.5% of them did not have a romantic relationship, 87.3% did not experience violence in their relationship, and 57.6% did not experience violence in their childhood. Considering the frequency of those who experienced violence in their childhood; the most and least common types of violence were psychological and sexual violence, respectively (psychological violence= 42.9%, physical violence, 35.5%, economic violence= 13.2%, sexual violence= 8.2%)

3.2. Regarding the Scales and Sub-dimensions Used in the Research Mean Scores and Reliability Coefficients

The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was found as 0.907 for the ASI and 0.789 for the DVQ. The students' ASI mean score was 122.00±63.38, suggesting a high level of ambivalent sexism. Their benevolent and hostile sexism mean scores were 33.06±12.90 and 30.31±12.90, respectively. In addition, their DVQ mean score was 1.36±0.335, suggesting a low level of dating violence. Their DVQ subscale mean scores were

1.20±0.34 for general violence, 1.24±0.39 for physical violence, 1.51±0.58 for emotional violence, 1.56±0.63 for economic violence, and 1.24±0.48 for sexual violence (Table 1).

Table 1. Mean Scores and Reliability Coefficients of The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and Its Subscales and Dating Violence Questionnaire and Its Subscales (n=283)

Scales and Subscales	Item Number	Scale Items	$\bar{X}\pm SD$	Cronbach's Alpha
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	22	1-22	122.00±63.38	0.907
<i>Benevolent Sexism</i>	11	1,3,6,8,9,12,13,17,19,20,22	33.06±12.90	
<i>Hostile Sexism</i>	11	2,4,5,7,10,11,14,15,16,18,21	30.31±12.90	
Dating Violence	28	1-28	1.36±0.33	0.789
<i>General Violence</i>	5	1,2,3,4,5	1.20±0.34	
<i>Physical Violence</i>	5	6,7,8,9,10	1.24±0.39	
<i>Emotional Violence</i>	6	11,12,13,14,15,16	1.51±0.58	
<i>Economic Violence</i>	6	17,18,19,20,21	1.56±0.63	
<i>Sexual Violence</i>	6	22,23,24,25,26,27,28	1.24±0.48	

3.3. Spearman's Correlation Analysis Results

A statistically significant positive moderate correlation was found between Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and Dating Violence Questionnaire ($r=0.455$, $p=0.000$). A statistically significant correlation was determined between ambivalent sexism, physical violence ($r=0.304$, $p=0.000$), emotional violence ($r=0.419$, $p=0.000$), economic violence ($r=0.338$, $p=0.000$) and sexual violence ($r=0.170$, $p=0.000$) ($p<0.05$). In addition, a statistically significant correlation was found between benevolent sexism, dating violence ($r=0.430$, $p=0.000$), physical violence ($r=0.261$, $p=0.000$), emotional violence ($r=0.433$, $p=0.000$), economic violence ($r=0.323$, $p=0.000$) and sexual violence ($r=0.124$, $p=0.036$) ($p<0.05$). Moreover, a statistically significant correlation was found between hostile sexism, dating violence ($r=0.385$, $p=0.000$), physical violence ($r=0.288$, $p=0.000$), emotional violence ($r=0.330$, $p=0.000$), economic violence ($r=0.275$, $p=0.000$) and sexual violence ($r=0.136$, $p=0.002$) ($p<0.05$). However, there was no statistically significant relationship between general violence, ambivalent sexism, benevolent sexism and hostile sexism ($p>0.05$) (Table 2).

Table 2. Correlation Analysis Results for Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and Dating Violence Questionnaire

Scales and Subscales	Dating Violence Questionnaire	General Violence	Physical Violence	Emotional Violence	Economic Violence	Sexual Violence
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	$r= 0.455$ $p=0.000^*$	$r= 0.072$ $p=0.395$	$r=0.304$ $p=0.000^*$	$r= 0.419$ $p=0.000^*$	$r= 0.338$ $p=0.000^*$	$r= 0.170$ $p=0.000^*$
<i>Benevolent Sexism</i>	$r= 0.430$ $p=0.000^*$	$r= 0.069$ $p=0.249$	$r=0.261$ $p=0.000^*$	$r= 0.433$ $p=0.000^*$	$r= 0.323$ $p=0.000^*$	$r= 0.124$ $p=0.036^{**}$
<i>Hostile Sexism</i>	$r= 0.385$ $p=0.000^*$	$r= 0.074$ $p=0.4212$	$r=0.288$ $p=0.000$	$r= 0.330$ $p=0.000^*$	$r= 0.275$ $p=0.000^*$	$r= 0.187$ $p=0.002^*$

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

3.4. Comparison of sub-dimensions of Ambivalent Sexism Inventory scores by Gender

A statistically significant difference was found between hostile and benevolent sexism and gender ($p<0.05$). The males had higher hostile and benevolent sexism mean scores than the females (Table 3).

Table 3. Comparison of Hostile Sexism and Benevolent Sexism Scores by Gender (n =283)

Subscales	Sex	n	$\bar{X}\pm SD$	Median	U	p
<i>Hostile Sexism</i>	Male	62	38.61±13.72	38.50		
	Female	221	27.99±11.68	26.00	3880.00	**0.000
<i>Benevolent Sexism</i>	Male	62	36.32±12.48	38.50		
	Female	221	32.14±128.2	32.00	5519.00	*0.019

***p<0.05, **p<0.01**

3.5. Comparison of sub-dimensions of Dating Violences Scores by Gender

A statistically significant difference was determined between general violence, physical violence, emotional violence, economic violence, sexual violence and gender ($p<0.05$). The males had higher general violence, physical violence, emotional violence, economic violence and sexual violence mean scores than the females (Table 4)

Table 4. Comparison of General Violence, Physical Violence, Emotional Violence, Economic Violence and Sexual Violence Scores by Gender (n =283)

Subscales		n	$\bar{X}\pm SD$	Median	U	p
<i>General Violence</i>	Male	62	1.28±0.36	1.00	5733.00	*0.021
	Female	221	1.17±0.32	1.00		
<i>Physical Violence</i>	Male	62	1.35±0.44	1.20	5374.00	**0.003
	Female	221	1.20±0.37	1.00		
<i>Emotional Violence</i>	Male	62	1.67±0.62	1.66	5538.00	*0.019
	Female	221	1.47±0.56	1.33		
<i>Economic Violence</i>	Male	62	1.95±0.74	1.66	3958.00	**0.000
	Female	221	1.45±0.55	1.33		
<i>Sexual Violence</i>	Male	62	1.45±0.65	1.00	5336.00	**0.001
	Female	221	1.17±0.41	1.00		

***p<0.05, **p<0.01**

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between attitudes of dating violence and ambivalent sexism and revealed the distribution of students' attitudes towards hostile and benevolent sexism and dating violence by gender. The students' ASI mean score was 122.00±63.38, suggesting a high level of dating violence. Their benevolent sexism mean score was higher than their hostile sexism mean score. These results are consistent with those in the literature (Ayan, 2014; Daniş, Erkoç, Çınar and Usta, 2020). However, Bal (2018) found higher hostile sexism attitudes than benevolent sexism attitudes in male athletes. (Bal, 2018). The result of our study suggesting a high level of benevolent sexism may be because the number of female participants in the study was higher than that of male participants. In societies like Turkey, where sexism is high, women react negatively to hostile sexism compared to men, and positively to benevolent sexism (Glick and Fiske, 1996; Sakallı, 2003).

In addition, benevolent sexist attitudes were found to be significantly higher in the male students (74.93±22.41) compared to the females (60.14±22.02). This result complies with those reported by Alptekin (2014), Güneş (2020) and Koçyiğit and Meşe (2020). All three studies were conducted with university students and revealed that male participants had higher ambivalent sexism attitudes than female participants. These results suggest that female students have more egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles (Koçyiğit and Meşe, 2020), whereas male students have higher sexist attitudes. Gender is the basis of sexism. Gender enables people to form their male-female identities and learn social roles and stereotypes (independent-dependent, rational-emotional, etc.) of that identity in the socialization process. Therefore, as a result of negative stereotypes imposed on women, women are subject to discrimination and considered inferior to men. Men who grow up with these stereotypes

have sexist attitudes (Sakallı, 2003). In addition, our study found that male participants had higher hostile and benevolent sexism tendencies than female participants. This result coincides with those reported by Fernández, Cuadrado and Martín (2020), Daniş, Erkoç, Çınar and Usta (2020), and Ayrıl (2021). These studies found lower levels of hostile and benevolent sexism in females than in males. The present study determined a significant positive relationship between the levels of hostile and benevolent sexism in male participants. While the males had higher level of hostile sexism, but there was an insignificant difference between their hostile and benevolent sexism attitudes. This result shows that the males adopted ambivalent sexist attitudes towards the females. Males adopt hostile attitudes towards females based on prejudiced, wrong and inflexible stereotypes, and also have benevolent attitudes towards them as they consider that women should be protected, glorified and loved as long as they fulfill traditional gender roles because they are powerless (Ayan, 2014).

As one of the most significant results of the present study, the male students had higher hostile sexism and the female students had higher benevolent sexism compared to the general population. This result is consistent with those in the literature. Several studies have shown that men adopt hostile sexism and women adopt benevolent sexism (Alptekin, 2014; Ayan, 2014; Ayrıl, 2021; Cengiz, 2020; Daniş et al., 2020; Demirel et al., 2019; Glick et al., 2000; Koçyiğit and Meşe, 2020; Morelli et al. 2016; Sakallı, 2002; Şahin and Özerdoğan, 2014). The results show that gender is determinant in gender perception (Ayrıl, 2021; Koçyiğit and Meşe, 2020). In societies with high sexism, women react very negatively to hostile sexism, while generally supporting benevolent sexism. In other words, while women consider hostile sexism as prejudice and discrimination, they approach benevolent sexism positively (Glick and Fiske, 1996, 2001). Although hostile and benevolent sexism are different, both are complementary and cross-cultural ideologies that predict gender inequality (Glick and Fiske 2001). The results of this study are also in line with those reported by Glick and Fiske (1996 and 2001). The results show that male and female students have sexist attitudes of both genders. Benevolent sexism supports male superiority and traditional sexist stereotypes and harms women, although it arouses positive feelings (protecting, loving, glorifying and earning money for women) in people (Sakallı, 2002). Benevolent sexism is more likely to be accepted by women and is dangerous because it is a gentler form of prejudice (Glick and Fiske 2001). Güneş (2020) has emphasized that while female students avoid traditional sexist attitudes, they cannot display the same state of consciousness against benevolent sexist attitudes.

As another remarkable results in the study, the students' DVQ total mean score was low, but there was a significant difference between the DVQ mean scores of males and females. The males had higher DVQ mean score and also had higher mean scores of general violence, physical violence, emotional violence, economic violence and sexual violence than the females. These results are in line with those reported by Terzioğlu et al. (2016). The present study revealed that the attitudes of both female and male students towards dating violence were not supportive, but the male students had more supportive attitudes towards dating violence than the females. This result overlaps with those of other studies conducted in Turkey and abroad, where male students have higher attitudes towards dating violence (Ayrıl, 2021; Ayyıldız and Taylan, 2018; Bilican-Gökkaya ve Öztürk, 2021; Demir and Biçer, 2017; Dosil et al. 2020; Erdem and Şahin, 2017; Fernandez, Cuadrado and Martín 2020; Fidan and Yeşil, 2018; Morelli et al., 2016; Özdere, 2019; Öztürk and Bilican-Gökkaya, 2022; Selçuk, Dilek and Mercan, 2018; Uzel, et al. 2018; Yolcu, 2019). Men are more pro-violent due to patriarchal culture and gender roles. The idea that men are superior to women due to patriarchal culture and traditional sexist roles causes men to perceive violence against women as a normal behavior. In other words, violence is associated with masculinity, which leads to the glorification, welcome and encouragement of men's attitudes and behaviors that involve violence against women. The dominance of patriarchal culture in Turkey causes men to approve dating violence (Demir and Biçer, 2017; Özdere, 2019).

As the most significant and final result of the study, there was a significant positive relationship between the attitudes of ambivalent sexism and dating violence. A significant positive relationship was also found between the attitudes of hostile and benevolent sexism, physical, emotional, economic and sexual violence for both women and men. However, dating violence attitude was found to be higher in the male students than in the females. The results of this study are consistent with those in the literature. Ayrıl (2021) conducted a study on individuals aged 18-35 who had a dating relationship for at least one year and found that attitudes of ambivalent sexism (hostile and benevolent sexism) and dating violence (physical, psychological, etc.), economic, sexual) were positively correlated, where men had higher dating violence attitudes than women. Similarly, Morelli et al. (2016) found significant positive relationships between dating violence behaviors and hostile and

benevolent sexism attitudes in Italian participants aged 13-30 years with dating relationship, where women reported to be exposed to higher levels of dating violence. Erdem and Şahin (2017) reported a positive relationship between ambivalent sexism and attitude towards dating violence among university students. However, they found that male students with benevolent sexism engaged in more dating violence. Dosil et al. (2020) found that students who used violence against their partners had higher levels of sexism than those who never used violence against their partners. Like our study, Dosil et al. found a positive relationship between the participants' benevolent sexism and dating violence scores. In other words, those with high benevolent sexism attitudes were found to have more dating violence attitudes than those with high hostile sexism attitudes. Benevolent sexism includes positive attitudes and behaviors towards women by suggesting that women should be protected, loved and glorified (Sakallı, 2002), thus it aims to prove the superiority of men just like hostile sexism does. As it does so in a softer and more positive way, sexism is hidden. Therefore, benevolent sexism prevents certain attitudes to be recognized as truly sexist (Dosil et al., 2020), causing benevolent sexism to be accepted by women, whereby they cannot notice the dating violence caused by benevolent sexist attitudes. Fernández et al. (2020) examined the relationship between acceptance of dating violence and sexist attitudes and found that in dating relationships with traditional gender roles, men were independent, dominant while women were passive and dependent, therefore men's controlling and dominating behaviors were normalized by women through perceived positive, protective and emotional tone of benevolent sexist attitudes. The present study found that the higher the perceived dating violence, the higher the benevolent sexism, compared to the hostile sexism. Similarly, Sakallı and Ulu (2003) examined the attitudes towards violence against women in marriage and found that men with ambivalent sexism had attitudes towards violence against women in marriage. However, they found that female participants were more tolerant of discriminatory behaviors explained by benevolent sexism, such as verbal violence. On the other hand, Morelli et al. (2016) revealed that those with high benevolent sexism used less dating violence than those with a high hostile sexism, and that men with higher hostile sexism used more dating violence.

Our study suggests that ambivalent sexism is one of the important determinants of dating violence. In this study, it was found that there was a positive relationship between the attitude of protective sexism and the attitude of dating violence. People with ambivalent sexism use dating violence to protect women, which is an acceptable phenomenon for both sexes in societies with deep gender inequalities (Sakallı and Ulu, 2003). Benevolent sexism is an indicator of dating violence. As benevolent sexism curtails dating violence in a more positive tone by protecting, loving and glorifying women, it may not be considered as violence, and most of the time people may not even be aware of it. Like hostile sexism, benevolent sexism includes sexist attitudes and is associated with dating violence (Dosil et al. 2020). This is due to patriarchal culture and traditional gender roles. In patriarchal culture, the acceptance of men as superior and stronger than women leads to sexist attitudes and dating violence.

Based on the results of this study, ambivalent sexism causes dating violence. Therefore, sexist attitudes must be eliminated to prevent dating violence. The family is the first place where traditional gender roles are learned. An education on gender equality should be given to parents without having children and they should raise their children equally without imposing gender discrimination. In patriarchal culture, boys are taught to protect and watch over women, while girls are taught that they need to be protected and taken care of by men. This type of socialization leads to the acceptance of benevolent sexism for both sexes, leading to dating violence.

It is important to raise awareness about gender inequality in society and to educate against sexism. Training programmes on gender equality and respect for relationships should be organised in schools, youth groups and public places. It is important for society to post messages that reject sexist stereotypes in the media, arts, sports and other platforms to create a culture that promotes gender equality. It is very important to recognize the signs of dating violence and raise awareness about it. It is important that services that offer support to victims of dating violence are accessible and responsive. These services should encourage them to make sure they are safe and to seek help if necessary. Legal regulations and laws should be used to deter and punish dating violence. It is important to enforce laws aimed at protecting victims and preventing violence. Preventing dating violence and sexism is a long-term process that requires work at different levels of society and in all age groups. These recommendations can help reduce these negative behaviors, but they require sustained effort and societal change.

This study has some limitations. As the study was conducted in the faculty of literature, its sample included higher number of females than males. Generally, faculties of literature include higher number of female students than male students. The number of female students was more than three times that of male students in this study, requiring a sensitivity in the interpretation of its results. In addition, as relevant subjects such as gender equality and violence are included in the content of courses for the departments of the faculty of literature (sociology, psychology, English language and literature, etc.), this may have affected the results. Therefore, it is important for future studies to have a research sample including similar number of students from both faculty departments and gender.

In addition, the samples of this study and those conducted separately on ambivalent sexism and dating violence were university students. Therefore, the generalizability of the results can be increased by including employed/unemployed young people and adults who are not university students, in the sample.

References

- Akış, N., Korkmaz, N.H., Taneri, P.E., Özkaya, G., and Güney, E. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinde flört şiddeti sıklığı ve etkileyen etmenler. *Eskişehir Türk Dünyası Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi Halk Sağlığı Dergisi*, (3), 294-300.
- Alptekin, D. (2014). Çelişik duygularda toplumsal cinsiyet ayrımcılığı sorgusu: üniversite gençliğinin cinsiyet algısına dair bir araştırma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 32, 203-211.
- Aslan, D., Vefikulucay, D., Zeyneloğlu, S., Erdost, T., and Temel, F. (2008). Ankara'da iki hemşirelik yüksekokulu'nun birinci ve dördüncü sınıflarında okuyan öğrencilerin flört şiddetine maruz kalma, flört ilişkilerinde şiddet uygulama durumlarının ve bu konudaki görüşlerinin saptanması araştırması. Ankara: *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Kadın Sorunları Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi*.
- Aslan, R., Bulut, M., and Arslantaş, H. (2020). Flört şiddeti. *The Journal of Social Science*, 7(45), 365-384.
- Avşar, B.G., and Akış, N. (2017). Flört şiddeti. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi*, 43(1), 41-44.
- Ayan, S. (2014). Cinsiyetçilik: Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik. *Cumhuriyet Tıp Dergisi*, 36, 147-156.
- Ayral, S. (2021). *Flört şiddetine yönelik tutumların çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ile şiddetin ve erkek egemenliğinin meşrulaştırılması açısından incelenmesi*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ufuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Psikoloji Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.
- Ayyıldız, A.B., and Taylan, H.H. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinde flört şiddeti tutumları: Sakarya Üniversitesi Örneği. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(8), 413-427.
- Bal, T.E. (2018). *Erkek sporcularda sporcu kimliğinin çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ile ilişkisinin incelenmesi*. (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Hareket ve Antrenman Anabilim Dalı, Antalya.
- Bilican-Gökkaya, V., and Öztürk, M. (2021). Çocukluktaki aile içi şiddet öyküsü ile flört şiddeti arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19 (4), 219-240. <https://doi.org/10.18026/cbayarsos.959425>
- Cengiz, A. A. (2020). Narsisizm ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik: Cinsiyet bağlamında bir inceleme. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 4, 39-51.
- Danış, M.Z., Erkoç, B., Çınar, G. E. ve Usta, Ş. (2020). Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik algısına yönelik bir araştırma. *Yalova Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(20), 138-151.
- Demir, G., and Biçer, S. (2017). Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine maruz kalma durumları ve etkileyen faktörler. *Turkish Studies International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 12(13), 171-188 <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.11639> ISSN: 1308-2140.
- Demirel, G., Kaya, N., Pınar, Ş.E, Değerli, B., and Gökmen, E. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin kadına ilişkin namusa, şiddete ve cinsiyetçiliğe yönelik tutumları. *Sağlık Bilimleri ve Meslekleri Dergisi*, 6(3), 479-490.
- Doğan, S. (2018). *Erkeklik rollerini kabullenmenin ve erkekliğe yönelik tehdit algısının üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine yönelik tutumları ile ilişkisi*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Gaziantep.
- Dosil, M., Jaureguizar, J., Bernaras, E., and Sbicigo, J.B. (2020). Teen dating violence, sexism, and resilience: a multivariate analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(8), 2652. Doi: 10.3390/ijerph17082652
- Elmalı, F., Erten, Z.K., Zincir, H., Özen, B., and Balcı, E. (2011). Hemşire ve ebelerin aile içi fiziksel şiddete bakış açıları. *Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 20(1), 39-47.
- Erdem, A., and Şahin, R. (2017). Undergraduates' Attitudes toward dating violence: Its relationship with sexism and narcissism. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6(6), 91-105. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n6p91>

- Fernández-Antelo, I., Cuadrado-Gordillo, I. and Martín-Mora Parra, G. (2020). Synergy between acceptance of violence and sexist attitudes as a dating violence risk factor. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(14), 5209. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17145209
- Fidan, F., and Yeşil, Y. (2018). Nedenleri ve sonuçları itibariyle flört şiddeti. *Balkan ve Yakın Doğu Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(1), 16-24
- Glick, P., and Fiske, S.T. (1996). The Ambivalent sexism inventory: differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491-512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Glick, P., and Fiske, S.T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(1), 119-135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00104.x>
- Glick, P., Fiske, Susan T., Mladinic, A., Saiz J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., Adetoun, B., Osagie, J. E., Akande, A., Alao, A., Brunner, A., Willemsen, T. M., Chipeta, K., Dardenne, B., Dijksterhuis, A., Wigboldus, D., Eckes, T., SixMaterna, I., Exposito, F., Moya, M., Foddy, M., Kim, H. J., Lameiras, M., Sotelo, M. J., Mucchi-Faina, A., Romani, M., Sakalli, N., Udegbe, B., Yamamoto, M., Ui, M., Ferraira, M. C. and Lopez, W. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 763-775. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763>
- Glick, P., and Fiske, S.T. (2001). An Ambivalent alliance: hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, 50(2), 109-118. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109
- Güneş, H.N. (2020). Toplumsal cinsiyet dersinin cinsiyetçi tutumlar üzerine etkileri. *Uluslararası Toplum ve Kültür Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 6, 33-51.
- Haynie, D.L., and South, S.J. (2005). Residential mobility and adolescent violence. *Social Forces*, 84(1), 361-374. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2005.0104>
- İşkil, R., Öztürk, M., and Türk, A. (2023). Eş şiddeti mağduru kadınların travma sonrası stres bozukluğu ile stresle başa çıkma stratejileri arasındaki ilişki. In M. Bulut and Z. Karacagil (Eds.), *Sosyal Bilimlerde Güncel Tartışmalar-12* (pp. 995-1004). Ankara: Bilgin Kültür Sanat Yayınları.
- Koçyiğit, M., and Meşe, G. (2020). Ruh sağlığı çalışan adaylarının toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğe ilişkin tutumları. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 21(1), 01-18
- Kul Uçtu, A., and Karahan., N. (2016). Sağlık yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin cinsiyet rolleri, toplumsal cinsiyet algısı ve şiddet eğilimleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(8), 2882-2905.
- Lotfi, S., Özkan, A.O., Babacan, M., and Akduman, Ö. (2022). Sosyal hizmet öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet algılarının ve flört şiddeti tutumlarının çeşitli değişkenler bağlamında incelenmesi. *Journal of Society & Social Work*, 33(2), 463-482.
- Morelli, M., Bianchi, D., Baiocco., R, Pezzuti, L., and Chirumbolo, A. (2016). Notallowed sharing of sexts and dating violence from the perpetrator's perspective: The moderation role of sexism. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 56, 163-169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.11.047>
- Özdere, M. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine ilişkin tutumları. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(95), 314-331
- Öztürk, M., and Bilican Gökkaya, V. (2022). Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddeti mağduriyetleri ile mücadele stratejileri. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 32(2), 795-806. DOI:10.18069/firatsbed.1059029
- Öztürk, R., Mete, D., Altıntaş, M., and Pekmez, M.A. (2021). Sağlık bilimleri öğrencilerinin flört şiddeti tutumlarının şiddete karşı profesyonel rolleri ile ilişkisi. *TJFMPC*, 15(1), 142-153. doi:10.21763/tjfmpe.807519
- Sakallı, U.N. (2002). Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ölçeği: geçerlik ve güvenirlilik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 17, 47-58.
- Sakallı, U.N. (2003). Cinsiyetçilik: kadınlara ve erkeklere ilişkin tutumlar ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 6, 1-20.
- Sakallı, U.N. and Ulu, S. (2003). Evlilikte kadına yönelik şiddete ilişkin tutumlar: çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik, yaş, eğitim ve gelir düzeyinin etkileri. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 6(11-12), 53-65
- Selçuk, K.T., Avcı, D., and Mercan, Y. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinde flört şiddetine maruziyet: Flört şiddetine yönelik tutumların ve toplumsal cinsiyet algısının şiddete maruziyet ile ilişkisi. *Acıbadem Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(3), 302-308.
- Sugarman, D.B. and Hotaling, G.T. (1991). Dating violence: A review of contextual and risk factors. In B. Levy (Ed.), *Dating violence: Young women in danger*, 100-118. Seattle, WA: Seal Press.

- Şahin, M.B. and Özerdoğan, N. (2014). Sağlık yüksekokulu öğrencilerinde romantik ilişkilerle ilgili kalıp yargılara karşı tutumlar ve cinsiyetçilik. *Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi Hemşirelik E-Dergisi*, 2, 1-10
- Terzioğlu, F., Gönenç, İ. M., Özdemir, F., Güvenç, G., K. G., Yılmaz, S. N., and Demirtaş, H. B. (2016). Flört şiddeti tutum ölçeği geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Anadolu Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 19(4), 225-232
- Topuz, S.K., and Erkanlı, H. (2016). Toplumsal cinsiyet bağlamında kadın ve erkeğe atfedilen anlamların metafor yöntemiyle analizi. *Alternatif Politika*, 8(2), 300-321
- Türk, B., Hamzaoğlu, N., and Yayak, A. (2020). Flört şiddeti üzerine bir inceleme. *Türkiye Klinikleri Adli Tıp ve Adli Bilimler Dergisi*, 17(1), 73-81
- Uzel, A., Yılmaz, D.V, Emül, T.G, and Erdoğan, S. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetini kabul etme düzeylerinin belirlenmesi (Mersin örneği). *Researcher: Social Science Studies*, 6(4), 12-27
- Yıldırım, S., and Terzioğlu F. (2018). Şiddetin farklı bir yüzü: flört şiddeti, etkileri ve etkileyen faktörler. *Anadolu Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 21(4), 285-292
- Yolcu, D. (2019). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde flört şiddeti: benlik saygısı, algılanan ilişki özyeterliliği ve bağlanma biçimlerinin rolü*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Mersin.

Etik, Beyan ve Açıklamalar

1. Etik Kurul izni ile ilgili;

Bu çalışmanın yazar/yazarları, Munzur Üniversitesi Girişimsel Olmayan Etik Kurulu'nun tarih **2021/7** sayı ve karar **03** ile etik kurul izin belgesi almış olduklarını beyan etmektedir.

2. Bu çalışmanın yazar/yazarları, araştırma ve yayın etiği ilkelerine uyduklarını kabul etmektedir.

3. Bu çalışmanın yazar/yazarları kullanmış oldukları resim, şekil, fotoğraf ve benzeri belgelerin kullanımında tüm sorumlulukları kabul etmektedir.

4. Bu çalışmanın benzerlik raporu bulunmaktadır.
