

Original Article

Determination of Gender Equality Perceptions and Violence Tendencies of Nursing Students

Derya Yanik, PhD, RN

Department of Nursing, Batman University Health College, Batman, Turkey.

Nuriye Efe Erturk, PhD, RN

Assistant professor, Department of Nursing, Batman University Health College, Batman, Turkey.

Sahide Akbulut, PhD, RN

Assistant professor, Department of Nursing, Batman University Health College, Batman, Turkey.

Correspondence: Nuriye Efe Erturk, Assistant Professor, PhD., Department of Nursing, Batman University Health College, Batman, Turkey, e-mail: nuriye_efe@hotmail.com

Abstract

Background: The gender inequality and violence tendency are still continuing in a large part of the society. Aims: The aim of this study is to determine the attitudes of nursing students about gender equality and violent tendencies.

Methods: A descriptive study. Sample is consisted of 186 volunteer students that were chosen with non-probability sampling method. Data was collected using the Student Information Form, the Gender Roles Attitude Scale (GRAS), and the Violence Tendency Scale (VTS).

Results: The average age of the students is 21.10 ± 1.88 , and 62.4% are females. The total score average of the GRAS of the students was found to be 106 ± 13.04 , egalitarian sex role average 34.16 ± 5.15 , female sex role average 24.27 ± 3.74 , sex role average in marriage 16.08 ± 4.22 , traditional sex role average 20.29 ± 6.75 and male sex role average 12.06 ± 4.75 . The mean score of the VTS of the students was determined as 38.72 ± 8.91 .

Conclusions: In this study, it is determined that female students' gender perceptions are more traditional and negative in comparison to male students. Additionally, it was discovered that the tendency to violence also increased as the gender perception score increased.

Keywords: Gender Equality, Nursing Students, Turkey, Violence

Introduction

The concepts of sex and gender are often used interchangeably in society. However, while the concept of sex identifies the biological, physiological, and genetic features of the individual, the concept of gender rather defines the duties, responsibilities, and expectations attributed to the individual by society (Uctu & Karahan, 2016; Ozpulat & Ozvaris, 2019). With the concept of gender, various roles are imposed with a cultural approach on how women and men, two basic elements of society, should behave from the moment of their birth (Seven, 2019). These roles imposed on women and men in many areas of social life

often create a power imbalance in the relationships between men and women, cause women to be pushed into the background and cause discrimination against them (Levy et al., 2019). Gender discrimination, which can be seen in almost all countries of the world, it is more common in underdeveloped and developing countries. According to the Human Development Index report of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Turkey's Gender Inequality Index for 2015 was 0,328 and 0,305 for 2018.

According to these rates, while our country was ranked number 69 among 159 countries in Gender Equality ranking in 2016, it was ranked number 66 among 162 countries in 2019 (UNDP, 2019).

Attitudes regarding gender roles can be divided into two as "Egalitarian" and "Traditional." In the egalitarian attitude towards gender roles, responsibilities and roles in familial, married, social, and professional lives are assumed equally between women and men. In traditional gender attitude, however, the behaviour patterns deemed appropriate for a woman are passiveness, submissiveness towards others' decisions, being silent when faced with problems, indecisiveness, insecurity, and obedience to authority. Meanwhile, a man is expected to show a more authoritative, free, bold, and aggressive attitude. While this situation normalizes acts of physical or psychological violence by men in solving the problems between women and men, it also causes women to tend towards acceptance when faced with violence due to the traditional image of a woman (Akpınar, 2019; Ozpulat & Ozvaris, 2019).

Gender perception plays a role as important as neurobiological, socioeconomic, psychosocial, and cognitive processes in the emergence of violent behaviour (Iyanda et al., 2019). Violence is a breach of human rights and is essentially based on an imbalance of power (Kuskoff & Parsell, 2020). Violence can be defined as the application of power to oneself, another person, a group or society through threats or in person. Violent behaviour, which can be seen in almost every segment of the society and all age groups, may increase during the young adulthood period when psychological and physiological changes occur (Chon & Clifford, 2020). Young-adult university students who have witnessed/were exposed to violence in their family environment, childhood life, or within their social structure during their early years have shown a greater likelihood of resorting to violence in resolving various problems, such as living in a different city from their family, material and immaterial problems, emotional problems with the opposite sex, and difficulties experienced during their education (Ertekin-Pinar & Sabanciogullari, 2019; Kisa & Zeyneloglu, 2019).

Today, gender inequality and violent tendencies are problems that are expected to decrease due to the general increase in education level. However, these problems still exist in a large portion of the society, and they persist both as a violation of rights and as a health problem for the family and society (Serrano-Montilla et al., 2020; Chon & Clifford, 2020; Cislighi et al., 2020). Nurses who are educated at the university level and serve as important mediators in accessing the society and

since they are aware of the difficulties caused by gender perception in the society that they provide care, they will play a key role solving of the violence and gender inequality. Therefore, determining the gender equality perception and violent tendencies of nursing students who will serve as health personnel in the future is crucial in the struggle against these problems.

Methods

Study design and sample: The study was carried out descriptively to determine nursing students' perception of gender equality and violent tendencies. The study was conducted in the college of nursing of a public university in south-eastern of Turkey in 2019-2020 academic years. This college has a total of 294 students. Calculation of sample size was performed at 95% confidence interval and $\alpha = .05$, the results of which showed that 167 nurses should be included. Taking into account possible loss of participants, the sample size was increased to 200. We could reach 186 students who accepted to participate in the research and completed the data collection forms completely. The forms were applied between September 2019 and December 2019. The study's purpose was explained to the students, and they were asked to answer the questions in the forms by marking the option that they considered closest to them.

Outcome measures tools: Research data were collected using the Student Information Form, the Gender Roles Attitude Scale (GRAS), and the Violence Tendency Scale (VTS).

Student Information Form: The researchers created this form by scanning the relevant literature in order to determine the distinctive features of nursing students (Ozpulat & Ozvaris, 2019; Kavuran & Kasikci, 2018). The Student Information Form consists of 17 questions, and it includes questions on age, gender, marital status, income status, education, and professional information regarding the parents of the participants.

Gender Roles Attitude Scale (GRAS): The scale was created by Zeyneloglu and Terzioglu (2011) in 2008. This Likert type scale includes 38 items with the options of "I Strongly Disagree," "I Disagree," "I am Undecided," "I Agree," and "I Strongly Agree." The maximum score that can be obtained from the scale is "190," and the minimum score is "38". A high score obtained with this scale is interpreted as the individual having an egalitarian attitude regarding gender

roles, while a low score is interpreted as the individual having a traditional attitude regarding gender roles. The scale includes five sub-dimensions: The Egalitarian Gender Role, the Female Gender Role, the Gender Roles in Marriage, the Traditional Gender Roles, and the Male Gender Role. The scoring is performed using a scale from 1 to 5, which corresponds respectively to "I strongly disagree" and "I strongly agree." The Cronbach alpha value of the scale was calculated to be 0.92 (Zeyneloglu & Terzioglu, 2011). In this study, however, the Cronbach alpha value of the scale was calculated to be 0.72.

Violence Tendency Scale (VTS): This scale was created by Göka et al., in 1995 to measure the participants' violent tendencies (T.R. Prime Ministry Institution of Family Research, 1998). The scale consists of 20 items arranged as a 4-point Likert scale. A high score obtained on this scale indicates that the individual has a high tendency towards violence. Violence Tendency Scale consists of four factors: the feelings of violence, violence through information technologies, the idea of harming others, and committing violence against others. The Cronbach alpha value of the scale is 0.87 (T.R. Prime Ministry Institution of Family Research, 1998). In this study, however, the Cronbach alpha value of the scale was calculated to be 0.83.

Data Analysis: Data analysis was performed using the IBM SPSS 24.0 statistics package program. Within the scope of descriptive statistics, the values regarding the number of units (n), percentage (%), arithmetic mean \pm standard deviation ($M \pm SD$), median (avg.), and percentile (p) were calculated. The compliance of the data to normal distribution was determined using Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov Smirnov tests. The distribution of numerical variables was evaluated using the Shapiro-Wilk normality test. The homogeneity of the variances was tested using the Levene test. In two-group comparisons, t-test, Mann-Whitney U test, Kruskal Wallis Variance Analysis, and Post-Hoc test: Bonferroni were utilized. In comparing categorical variables, the exact method of chi-square analysis was utilized, and Pearson correlation analysis was employed in comparing one scale to another. A p-value of $<.05$ was considered to be statistically significant in the study.

Ethical Considerations: For the research, the permission numbered 18.04.2018/3516 was obtained from the Regional State Hospital Ethics

Committee. Additionally, verbal and written consent of all the participating were also obtained.

Results

The average age of the students is 21.10 ± 1.88 , and 62.4% are females. Forty-five point two percent live with their families, 80.1% are members of nuclear families, 91.4% have four or more siblings, and 52.7% have illiterate mothers of the participants. When students' responses to questions related to violence were examined; 39.2% of those were found not to have been exposed to violence; 27.4% of those who were exposed to violence were found to have been exposed to physical violence; 19.9% of those exposed to violence were found to be exposed by their fathers (Table 1). Students' total the GRAS score average was found to be 106 ± 13.04 . Their egalitarian gender role average was 34.16 ± 5.15 , female gender role average was 24.27 ± 3.74 , gender roles in marriage average was 16.08 ± 4.22 , the traditional gender roles average was 20.29 ± 6.75 , and male gender role average was 12.06 ± 4.75 . The mean score of the VTS of the students was determined to be 38.72 ± 8.91 (Table 2). Table 3 shows the distribution of the GRAS and subgroup scores according to the students' descriptive characteristics. The examination of the data reveals that the egalitarian gender role averages of women were higher than those of men, and their averages regarding gender roles in marriage, traditional gender roles, male gender role, and total scale scores were lower than those of men. Moreover, the difference between them was significant ($p <.001$). The sociodemographic characteristics of the students and their mean GRAS scores are compared in Table 4. Although no significant difference was found between the VTS mean scores of the students according to the level of grade that they are enrolled in, the last school they have graduated from, the education level of their parents, the state of their exposure to violence and their family income, it was determined that the mean violence tendency scale scores of male students were higher than those of females. Moreover, the difference between them was found to be significant ($p <.05$). A weak but significant relationship was determined between all other sub-dimension scores of the GRAS, except for the egalitarian gender role with the scale of violent tendencies. Additionally, it was determined that there was a statistically positive

and moderately significant relationship between the GRAS and the VTS ($r = .41$; $p < .001$). (Table 5).

Table 1. Socio-demographic Characteristics of Students ($N=186$)

Socio-demographic Characteristics	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Female	116	62.4
Male	70	37.6
Age (years) (M \pm SD)	21.10 \pm 1.88	
Grade		
1 th grade	39	21.0
2 nd grade	50	26.9
3 th grade	50	26.9
4 th grade	47	25.2
The last school they were graduated from		
High school	76	40.8
Anatolian/ Science high school	93	50.0
Vocational high school	5	2.7
İmam Hatip (Religious) high school	7	3.8
Others (open education high school, two-year degree, undergraduate etc.)	5	2.7
Place of living		
Live with their families	84	45.2
Public or private dormitory	72	38.8
Live with their friends/alone	30	16.0
Family structure		
Nuclear	149	80.1
Extended	37	19.9
The number of sibling		
Do not have	3	1.6
1-3	13	7.0
4 and over	170	91.4
Mother's Educational Status		
Illiterate	98	52.7
Literate	26	14.0
Primary school	46	24.7
Middle school	10	5.4
High school and over	6	3.2
Father's Educational Status		
Illiterate	19	10.2
Literate	16	8.6
Primary school	58	31.2
Middle school	28	15.0
High school	47	25.3
University and over	18	9.7
Mother's working status		
Not working	179	96.2

Working	7	3.8
Father's working status		
Not working	49	26.3
Working	137	73.7
The family's income status		
Income less than expenses	58	31.1
Equal to income and expense	113	60.7
Income more than expenses	15	8.2
The status of exposure to violence		
Yes	73	39.2
No	113	60.8
Violence types which exposure to (n=73)*		
Physical	51	27.4
Emonational	44	23.7
Psychological	49	26.3
Economic	24	12.9
Sexual assault	7	3.8
The person that violence apply (n=73)*		
Mother	21	11.3
Father	37	19.9
Sibling	2	1.1
Partner	25	13.4
Fiance	2	1.1
Darling	15	8.1
Reactions to violence		
Keep quiet	17	9.1
React	125	67.2
To respond in the same way	31	16.7
Run away	13	7.0

* Multiple options are marked and percentages are calculated based on "n".

M±SD: mean plus/ minus standard deviation

Table 2. Distributions of The Gender Roles Attitude Scale and The Violence Tendency Scale Score (N=186)

GRAS Total Score		106 ± 13.04	82-140
Sub- dimensions of GRAS	Egalitarian sex role	34.16 ± 5.15	12-40
	Female sex role	24.27 ± 3.74	13-38
	Marriage gender role	16.08 ± 4.22	9-38
	Traditional sex role	20.29 ± 6.75	8-37
	Male sex role	12.06 ± 4.75	6-27
VTS Total Score		38.72 ± 8.91	23-67

Table 3. Distribution of GRAS and Sub-Group Scores according to the Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Students

The socio-demographic characteristics	Sub- dimensions of GRAS					
	Egalitarian sex role (M ± SD)	Female sex role (M ± SD)	Marriage gender role (M ± SD)	Traditional sex role (M ± SD)	Male sex role (M ± SD)	GRAS Total Score (M ± SD)
Gender						
Female	35.75 ± 4.60	23.93 ± 3.85	14.83 ± 3.57	17.58 ± 5.26	10.65 ± 3.76	102.75 ± 11.04
Male	31.54 ± 4.97	24.85 ± 3.49	18.14 ± 4.42	24.78 ± 6.58	14.41 ± 5.28	113.75 ± 13.28
<i>p</i> *	< .001	.102	< .001	< .001	< .001	< .001
Grade						
1 th grade	34.28 ± 3.80	25.07 ± 3.04	15.97 ± 3.06	21.35 ± 5.85	13.07 ± 3.76	109.76 ± 10.67
2 nd grade	34.32 ± 6.21	24.30 ± 4.16	15.66 ± 3.82	19.32 ± 6.34	11.32 ± 4.87	104.93 ± 11.83
3 th grade	34.36 ± 5.57	24.04 ± 3.77	16.38 ± 5.32	20.86 ± 8.34	12.18 ± 5.34	107.82 ± 15.96
4 th grade	33.70 ± 4.51	23.85 ± 3.77	16.29 ± 4.22	19.85 ± 5.93	11.91 ± 4.67	105.61 ± 12.49
<i>p</i> *	.917	.462	.829	.467	.383	.295
The last school they were graduated from						
High school ^a	33.81 ± 4.86	23.34 ± 3.55	16.44 ± 4.83	19.82 ± 6.80	12.15 ± 5.14	105.59 ± 13.83
Anatolian/ Science high school ^b	34.80 ± 4.83	25.02 ± 3.71	15.77 ± 3.75	20.41 ± 7.01	11.82 ± 4.49	107.85 ± 12.48
Vocational high school ^c	31.40 ± 6.42	26.2 ± 3.96	19.2 ± 4.54	22.6 ± 2.88	15.40 ± 4.03	114.8 ± 8.34
İmam Hatip (Religious) high school ^d	32.85 ± 8.93	25.28 ± 3.98	15.42 ± 3.30	22.0 ± 4.54	11.14 ± 1.95	106.71 ± 14.57
Others (open education high school, two-year degree, undergraduate etc.) ^e	32.2 ± 7.75	21.40 ± 2.88	14.0 ± 1.87	20.4 ± 7.26	13.2 ± 6.61	101.2 ± 11.64
<i>p</i> *	.357	.05 Difference: ^{a-} _b	.272	.843	.517	.401
Place of living						
Live with their families	34.23 ± 4.41	24.59 ± 3.29	16.15 ± 3.82	20.58 ± 7.03	12.18 ± 4.70	107.75 ± 12.84
Public or private dormitory	34.51 ± 6.01	24.19 ± 4.06	15.58 ± 4.43	19.06 ± 6.36	11.30 ± 4.12	104.66 ± 12.10
Live with their friends/alone	33.07 ± 4.93	23.53 ± 4.16	17.14 ± 4.75	22.57 ± 6.35	13.67 ± 6.0	110.0 ± 15.36
<i>p</i> *	.451	.420	.249	.057	.077	.131

Family structure						
Nuclear	34.46 ± 5.27	24.31 ± 3.76	15.89 ± 4.31	19.86 ± 6.68	11.93 ± 4.61	106.48 ± 13.0
Extended	32.97 ± 4.53	24.13 ± 3.69	16.81 ± 3.81	22.02 ± 6.82	12.59 ± 5.82	108.54 ± 13.28
<i>p</i> *	.116	.794	.241	.081	.455	.393
The number of sibling						
Don't have	37.00 ± 4.35	24.00 ± 1.73	12.66 ± 0.57	13.33 ± 4.04	8.33 ± 3.21	95.33 ± 3.05
1-3	35.61 ± 5.65	24.46 ± 3.84	16.30 ± 7.47	16.69 ± 7.52	11.23 ± 5.19	104.3 ± 17.0
4 and over	34.00 ± 5.12	24.27 ± 3.77	16.12 ± 3.91	20.69 ± 6.6	12.2 ± 4.72	107.29 ± 12.75
<i>p</i> *	.353	.976	.367	<.05	.305	.221

*One-Way Anova Test was performed.

According to the ^{a,b,c,d,e} multiple comparison test result (posthoc-test: Bonferoni), different letters indicated by alphabetical superscripts suggest that there is a significant difference between the scale scores.

Table 3. Distribution of GRAS and Sub-Group Scores according to the Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Students (*more*)

The Socio-Demographic Characteristics	Sub- dimensions of GRAS					GRAS Total Score (M ± SD)
	Egalitarian sex role (M ± SD)	Female sex role (M ± SD)	Marriage gender role (M ± SD)	Traditional sex role (M ± SD)	Male sex role (M ± SD)	
Mother's educational status						
Illiterate ^a	33.82 ± 5.05	24.55 ± 3.74	16.46 ± 4.33	21.08 ± 6.29	12.48 ± 4.79	108.42 ± 12.6
Literate ^b	34.28 ± 6.79	22.04 ± 3.56	15.0 ± 4.23	18.48 ± 6.17	10.76 ± 4.18	100.56 ± 9.83
Primary school ^c	34.63 ± 4.33	24.95 ± 3.63	15.86 ± 4.19	19.8 ± 7.76	12.15 ± 5.08	107.41 ± 14.97
Middle school ^d	33.2 ± 6.14	24.8 ± 2.48	17.0 ± 3.68	22.4 ± 7.02	12.5 ± 4.11	109.9 ± 11.08
High school and over ^e	36.33 ± 3.26	23.0 ± 4.69	15.0 ± 3.34	16.33 ± 6.02	10.0 ± 4.51	100.66 ± 13.55
<i>p</i> *	.725	< .05 Difference: ^{a-} b c-b	.491	.170	.424	0.055
Father's educational status						
Illiterate	33.05 ± 6.15	24.21 ± 3.62	16.57 ± 3.73	23.21 ± 5.45	13.0 ± 4.76	110.05 ± 10.59
Literate	35.12 ± 6.74	24.31 ± 4.07	16.56 ± 4.28	20.12 ± 7.91	11.43 ± 4.39	107.56 ± 16.81
Primary school	34.0 ± 4.57	23.93 ± 3.93	15.68 ± 3.58	19.75 ± 6.20	11.58 ± 4.62	104.98 ± 12.38
Middle school	33.89 ± 5.51	25.46 ± 4.05	16.17 ± 4.20	21.35 ± 6.37	13.03 ± 4.29	109.92 ± 10.70
High school	34.06 ± 5.22	24.57 ± 3.28	16.25 ± 5.26	19.91 ± 7.15	12.59 ± 5.43	107.40 ± 14.21

University and over	35.72 ± 3.47	22.83 ± 3.38	15.77 ± 3.97	18.44 ± 7.79	10.33 ± 4.0	103.11 ± 13.65
<i>p</i> *	.669	.280	.951	.297	.334	.360
Mother's working status						
Not working	24.18 ± 5.21	24.27 ± 3.74	16.08 ± 4.27	20.35 ± 6.82	12.11 ± 4.82	107.02 ± 13.16
Working	31.66 ± 0.57	23.0 ± 3.60	15.33 ± 2.51	18.66 ± 2.88	11.33 ± 1.15	100.0 ± 9.64
<i>p</i> *	.404	.560	.762	.669	.779	.359
Father's working status						
Not working	34.10 ± 4.61	24.55 ± 3.96	16.12 ± 4.29	21.06 ± 4.77	12.57 ± 4.77	108.42 ± 13.50
Working	33.9 ± 5.57	23.9 ± 3.62	15.74 ± 3.68	19.76 ± 4.51	11.59 ± 4.51	104.89 ± 12.05
<i>p</i> *	.829	.324	.574	.274	.228	.114
The family's income status						
Income less than expenses	24.43 ± 4.94	24.41 ± 4.26	16.05 ± 4.16	20.56 ± 7.25	12.08 ± 5.13	107.56 ± 15.33
Equal to income and expense	24.15 ± 5.31	24.13 ± 3.45	15.99 ± 4.27	20.00 ± 6.59	12.06 ± 4.66	106.33 ± 12.04
Income more than expenses	33.26 ± 4.94	24.86 ± 3.85	16.86 ± 4.27	21.46 ± 6.16	12.06 ± 4.14	108.53 ± 11.12
<i>p</i> *	.739	.736	.753	.685	1000	.744

*One-Way Anova Test was performed.

According to the ^{a,b,c,d,e} multiple comparison test result (posthoc-test: Bonferoni), different letters indicated by alphabetical superscripts suggest that there is a significant difference between the scale scores.

Table 4. Distribution of The Violence Tendency Scale Scores according to the Socio-demographic Characteristics of Students

Socio-demographic Characteristics	Violence Tendency Scale (N=186) Median (%25p-%75p)		Test	<i>p</i>
Gender				
Female	36.50 (30.0-42.0)	z=3.20	KW=6.95	< .05
Male	39.0 (35.0-48.0)			
Grade				
1 th grade	39.0 (33.0-44.0)		KW=6.95	.073
2 nd grade	37.0 (30.0-43.0)			
3 th grade	39.0 (33.75-49.25)			
4 th grade	36.0 (31.0-40.0)			
The last school they were graduated from				
High school	36.0 (31.0-40.0)		KW=6.23	.182

Anatolian/ Science high school	39.0 (33.0-45.0)		
Vocational high school	35.0 (32.50-48.0)		
İmam Hatip (Religious) high school	36.0 (31.0-42.0)		
Others (open education high school, two-year degree, undergraduate etc.)	39.0 (29.0-45.0)		
Mother's Educational Status			
Illiterate	38.72 (32.0-45.0)	KW=4.38	.357
Literate	37.0 (32.0-44.5)		
Primary school	38.0(32.0-42.0)		
Middle school	38.0 (32.5-50.0)		
High school and over	31.5 (29.25-35.25)		
Father's educational status			
Illiterate	36.0 (32.0-46.0)	KW=1.940	.857
Literate	38.0 (31.25-46.25)		
Primary school	36.5 (30.75-44.0)		
Middle school	40.0 (35.0-44.5)		
High school	37.0 (32.0-44.0)		
University and over	37.0 (31.75-40.75)		
The family's income level			
Income less than expenses	38.0 (32.0-46.25)	KW=1.439	.487
Equal to income and expense	38.0 (32.0-42.5)		
Income more than expenses	35.0 (29.0-48.0)		

* Mann Whitney U Test was performed. ** Kruskal Wallis Variance Analysis was performed.

z: Mann Whitney U Test KW: Kruskal Wallis Variance Analysis

Table 5. The Relationship between the Averages of Gender Roles Attitude Scale and Violence Tendency Scale

		VTS Total Score	
		r	p*
GRAS Total Score		.41	< .001
Sub-dimensions of GRAS	Egalitarian sex role	-.12	.084
	Female sex role	.22	< .002
	Marriage gender role	.25	< .001
	Traditional sex role	.36	< .001
	Male sex role	.35	< .001

* Pearson correlation test was performed.

Discussion

In this study, the students' total average GRAS score was determined to be 106 ± 13.04 . As for other studies within the literature regarding gender perception, the study carried out by Seven (2019) with 176 students found an average of 119.87 ± 12.27 , the study conducted by Ozpulat and Ozvaris (2019) with 360 students found an average of 98.33 ± 14.85 , and the study conducted by Basar and Demirci (2018) with 907 students found an average of 144.71 ± 19.53 . In our study, the students were determined to have a traditional attitude intended for gender roles. Ozpulat and Ozvaris (2019) have stated that the gender perception of the students changes according to the regions they live in and they were reported that the difference in their study stems from the students come from Southeast Anatolia region. Also in the study of Başar and Demirci (2018), the average of the GRAS was lower for those educating in the eastern and south-eastern regions.

The fact that our sample is composed of students living in the South-eastern Anatolia region explains the low average of the GRAS. This result was seen to be consistent with the literature.

An analysis of total score and subscale mean scores of GRAS according to gender performed within the scope of this study has revealed that the female students had an average GRAS score of 102.75 ± 11.04 , while the male students had an average score of 113.75 ± 13.28 . Moreover, it was noted that the female egalitarian gender role averages were higher than those of males, and that their averages regarding the gender roles in marriage, traditional gender roles, male gender role, and total scale score were lower compared to those of males. In the studies conducted by Karacay-Yıkar et al. (2020) with 737 students, female students were determined to have a more egalitarian attitude than male students. In other studies (Seven, 2019; Uctu & Karahan, 2016), it was discovered that, in the context of gender, female students' perception of gender is more positive in comparison to male students. In a study carried out by Ozpulat and Ozvaris (2019), it was emphasized that the students' perception of gender changed according to the regions they had previously lived in, and that the GRAS average scores of the students living in the South-eastern

Anatolia region (91.10 ± 19.85) were lower in comparison to the students living in other regions. Based on a study they had conducted in Morocco, Cameroon, and Italy, Caffaro et al. (2016) stated that the cultural differences, level of development, and social structure of the countries are factors that affect the sexist perspectives in a society.

Bugay et al. (2019) have stated that, based on a study they had conducted with 3235 students from 16 universities in Turkey, political conservatism, gender, and residence area are factors that are effective in traditional attitudes towards women. In this study has determined that female students' gender perceptions are more traditional and negative in comparison to male students. This situation suggests that, despite the increases in their level of education, the women living in the South-eastern Anatolia Region may have internalized the social perspective that is based on the patriarchal and traditional upbringing style dominant in the region in question and adopted the sexist perspective prevalent in that community. Some studies within the literature indicate that gender perception is affected by variables such as the education level of the mother, the type of the family, which grade the student is in, and whether the student has received education on genders or not (Karacay-Yıkar et al., 2020; Kavuran & Kasikci, 2018; Yilmaz, 2018). Within the scope of the findings obtained as a consequence of this research, it was determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the students based on their grade levels, the last school they have graduated from, the place where they dwell in, the type of their families, their number of siblings, the education of their parents, the employment status of their parents, the income level of their families and their total GRAS scores ($p > .05$).

In this study, it was noticed that the mean VTS scores of the students were 38.72 ± 8.91 and that their tendency to violence was low. Furthermore, it was noted that the mean violence tendency scores of male students were significantly higher than those of female students ($p < .05$). The fact the men's level of violent tendencies or their level of accepting violence was higher than women's may be explained by their biological structure, their level of androgen hormones, and the roles attributed to them by society (Book et al., 2001).

Due to the traditional social structure prevalent in our country, families expect their sons to be more aggressive, strong, tough, and authoritarian, while they expect their daughters to be meeker, calmer, and self-sacrificing. In this context, the findings of our study, which indicate that the male students' tendency towards violence is higher than female students, bear similarity to results found in the literature (Alradaydeh & Alorani, 2017; Steele et al., 2020). It is well-known that the tendency towards violence may be affected by experiences of familial violence during childhood (Kisa & Zeyneloglu, 2019; Uctu & Karhan, 2016). According to the study conducted by Yapp and Pickett (2019) in Latin America, violent behavior increases in regions with increased income inequality. In this study, no significant difference was found between the mean VTS scores of the students, the grade they are studying in, the last school they have graduated from, the education level of their parents, their state of being exposed to violence, and their family income status.

In studies conducted with university students of different countries (Almerab, 2017; Alradaydeh & Alorani, 2017; Akpinar, 2019; Schuster et al., 2016), it was discovered that students exposed to all types of violence, especially physical violence. Moreover, it was also noted that they were exposed to violence the most by people in their immediate environment (their mothers, fathers, siblings, spouses, lovers, and others). In this study, it was discovered that students experienced the most violence from their fathers and that the obtained data were similar to the results of the study. When the relationship between the GRAS and the VTS was examined, it was determined that there was a statistically positive and moderately significant relationship between these factors. However, unlike other studies in the literature (Kunst et al. 2017; Uctu & Karahan 2016), it was discovered that the tendency to violence also increased as the gender perception score increased. Considering that most of the students participating in the study were women, it is clear that they perceive, due to social gender perceptions, the decision-making position of men, their authority, and their usage of violence when necessary as justified.

Conclusion: The most important finding of this study is that female students have adopted a traditional gender perspective at a deeper level

than males, despite having an egalitarian attitude regarding gender equality.

Considering the mother's role in the basic care and socialization process of the child, it is recommended to provide education at the primary school level to improve the gender perception of children in a positive manner. Although it is crucial to proliferate such education throughout the country, a special emphasis should be placed on Eastern and South-eastern regions. Most importantly, however, the education in question should be made to include women especially. Additionally, the lessons that focus on violence and social gender equality should be included in the curriculum of the nursing departments in order to provide with a perspective that is gender-sensitive, distant from sexist approaches to issues, and respectful of human rights and equality.

References

- Akpinar-Balci, R. (2019). Childhood abuse experiences, gender perceptions, violence tendencies and violent situations of university students (Original Work Published in Turkish). *Atatürk University Journal of Faculty of Letters*, 62:409-430.
- Almerab, M. (2017). The phenomenon of students' violence at Hail University: Prevalence, causes and suggested solutions from the students' perspective. *International Journal of Psychology and Counselling*, 9(6), 34-41.
- Alradaydeh, M.F., & Alorani, O. I. (2017). The relationship between aggression and perceived social support among university students in Jordan. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 7(1):200-205.
- Basar, F., & Demirci N. (2018). Attitudes of nursing students toward gender roles: A cross-sectional study. *Contemporary Nurse*, 54 (3):333-344.
- Bugay, A., Delevi, R., & Mullet, E. (2019). Attitude toward women in Turkey: Combined effect of sex, place, and culture. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-002732>.
- Caffaro, F., Mulas, C., & Schmidt, S. (2016). The perception of honour-related violence in female and Male University students from Morocco, Cameroon and Italy. *Sex Roles*, 75:555-572.

- Chon, D.S., & Clifford, J.E. (2020). Cross-national examination of the relationship between gender equality and female homicide and rape victimization. *Violence Against Women*, 1-24.
- Cislaghi, B., Weber, A.M., Gupta, G.R., & Darmstadt, G.L. (2020). Gender equality and global health: intersecting political challenges. *Journal of Global Health*, 10(1):1-10.
- Ertekin-Pinar, S., & Sabanciogullari, S. (2019). Nursing and midwifery students' attitudes towards violence against women and recognizing signs of violence against women. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 12(3):150-1529.
- Iyanda, A.E., Boakye, K.A., Olowofeso, O.H., Lu, Y., & Salcido-Giles, J. (2019). Determinants of gender-based violence and its physiological effects among women in 12 African countries. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-24.
- Karacay-Yikar, S., Aydingulu, N., Deniz-Dogan, S., Arslan, S., & Nazik, E. (2020). Determining nursing students' attitudes towards gender roles: The case of Çukurova university faculty of health sciences (Original Work Published in Turkish). *Ordu University Journal of Nursing Studies*, 3(2):104-113.
- Kavuran, E., Kasikci, M. (2018). Determination of nursing students' perspectives at Ataturk University health sciences faculty on gender equality. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 11(1):108-117.
- Kisa, S., & Zeyneloglu, S. (2019). Perceptions and predictors of dating violence among nursing and midwifery students. *Journal Advanced Nursing*, 75, 2099-2109.
- Kunst, J.R., Fischer, R., Sidaniuse, J., & Thomsen, L. (2017). Preferences for group dominance track and mediate the effects of macro-level social inequality and violence across societies. *Proceeding of the National Academy of Science of the United States of America*, 114(21):5407-5412.
- Kuskoff, E., Parsell, C. (2020). Striving for gender equality: Representations of gender in "progressive" domestic violence policy. *Violence Against Women*, 27(3-4), 470-488.
- Levy, J.K., Darmstadt, G.L., Ashby, C., Quandt, M., Halsey, E., Nagar, A., & Greene, M.E. (2020). Characteristics of successful programmes targeting gender inequality and restrictive gender norms for the health and wellbeing of children, adolescents, and young adults: a systematic review. *The Lancet Global Health*, 8(2):225-236.
- Ozpulat, F., & Ozvaris, S. B. (2019). The determination of the self-efficacy levels and gender perception among the students of the Aksehir school of health (Original Work Published in Turkish). *Journal of Continuing Medical Education*, 28(2):98-107.
- Schuster, I., Krahe, B., & Demirtaş, E. T. (2016). Prevalence of sexual aggression victimization and perpetration in a sample of female and male college students in Turkey. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 53(9):1139-1152.
- Serrano-Montilla, C., Valor-Segura, I., Padilla, J.L., Lozano, L.M. (2020). Public helping reactions to intimate partner violence against women in European countries: The role of gender-related individual and macrosocial factors. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 17, 6314.
- Seven, N. (2019). The attitudes of university students on social gender roles (Original Work Published in Turkish). *Pesa International Journal of Social Studies*, 5(2), 134-149.
- Steele, S. M., Everett, B. G., & Hughes, T.L. (2020). Influence of perceived femininity, masculinity, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status on intimate partner violence among sexual-minority women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(1-2):453-475.
- T.R. Prime Ministry Institution of Family Research. (1998). Violence in the family and in the social sphere]. Prime Ministry Edition, Ankara. Publication No: 113
- Uctu, K. A., & Karahan, N. (2016). Analysis of the relation between gender roles, social gender perception of the health college students and their violence tendency (Original Work Published in Turkish). *Journal of the Human and Social Sciences Researches*, 5(8):2882-2905.
- United Nations Development Programme (2019). Human Development Report. Beyond income, beyond averages, beyond today: Inequalities in human development in the 21st century. Retrieved from https://www.tr.undp.org/content/turkey/tr/home/library/human_development/hdr2019.html. (Accessed date: 06.02.2020)
- Book, A.S., Starzyk, K.B., & Qunisey, V.L. (2001). The relationship between testosterone

- and aggression: a meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 6:579-599.
- Yapp, E., & Pickett, K. E. (2019). Greater income inequality is associated with higher rates of intimate partner violence in Latin America. *Public Health*, 175:87-89.
- Yilmaz-Bahadir E. (2018). The effectiveness of a gender equality course in changing undergraduate midwifery students' attitudes towards domestic violence and gender roles. *Central European Journal of Nursing and Midwifery*, 9 (2):840-847.
- Zeyneloglu, S., & Terzioglu, F. (2011). Development and psychometric properties gender roles attitude scale. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 40:409-420.