Original Article

Determination of Nursing Students' Perspectives at Ataturk University Health Sciences Faculty on Gender Equality

Esin Kavuran

MSc Research Assistant, Department of Nursing Fundamentals, Nursing Faculty, Ataturk University, Central Campus, Yakutiye, Erzurum, Turkey

Magfiret Kasikci, PhD

Professor, Department Fundamentals of Nursing, Nursing, Faculty, Ataturk University, Erzurum, Turkey.

Corresppondence: Esin Kavuran Department of Nursing Fundamentals, Nursing Faculty, Ataturk University, Central Campus, Yakutiye, Erzurum, Turkey E-mail: esinkavuran@hotmail.com

Abstract

Aim: The aim of this study is to determine the perspectives of nursing students at Ataturk University Health Sciences Faculty about gender equality.

Method: Population of this descriptive research includes students who study at Ataturk University Health Sciences Faculty. Sample is made of 465 volunteer students that were chosen with non-probability sampling method. Data was collected by "Descriptive Information Form" and "Gender Equality Scale". Average, standard deviation, percentage distributions, t-test in independent group and One Way Analysis of Variance were used in data evaluation.

Results: It was determined that the socio-demographic characteristics such as place of birth, finished high school, educational status of the parents, occupation of the father, place of living, family type, marital status and sexual experience did not affect the gender equality scale point average (p > 0.005) It was determined that the students' age and grades had an effect on the scale total point average. The gender equality total score average was 48.360 ± 5.97 . The female students' scale total score average was 39.807 + 5.91 and male students' scale total average score was 39.339 + 5.56. The traditional gender norms subscale average score of students was 39.573 ± 5.73 , and the gender equality subscale average score was 8.756 ± 2.28 . The difference between "gender equality total score" average of male and female students was statistically insignificant and both groups were found to be at a moderate level.

Conclusion Accordingly, nursing students were found to be at a high level related to gender equality. It should be ensured that the subject is discussed by the students and that they are aware of the traditional views formulated by society in the symposiums and panels to be organized on gender.

Keywords: gender equality, nursing, university students.

Background

In the ever-evolving and changing world, the attitudes of society towards the nursing profession is also changing and evolving day by day (Kocaer 2004).). Male nurses in the world started to be seen after the 1970s (Sherrod 2006), and the number of male nurses in Turkey started to increase since 2007. However, it is observed that male nurses have a conflict between their professional roles and gender roles (Sari 2011, Dikmen-Ozarslan 2015) and they want to assume administrative tasks instead of

gender roles in the occupations identified with females by the society (Zamanzadeh vd. 2013, Clow and Ricciardelli, 2014, Liminana-Gras et al, 2013, Rajacich 2013). People are classified as "women" and "men" (Bekar 2010). Gender is the genetic, physiological, and biological characteristics of a female or male acquired congenitally. While gender equality refers to use of existing resources, opportunities and power

nursing (Baykal 2011, Koc 2010). In the

international literature, it is emphasized that the

male nurses sometimes have difficulty due to the

equally between men and women in the social institutions such as family life, working life, legal regulations, education, politics, religion and health, gender inequality refers to more power assigned one gender than the other in these social institutions (Coskun and Ozdilek 2012). Nursing students' gender-related considerations are as important for the health inequalities as they are for the profession. It has been revealed that touching female patients by male student nurses is disapproved in Egypt (Eswi and Saved, 2011), and that both male and female nursing students in Pakistan are found to have difficulty in touching someone of the opposite gender (Fooladi, 2008). In Taiwan, male nursing students tend to experience more gender role stress than the females (Tzeng 2009) and avoid talking about their department with other people (Cahou and Lee 2007), in South Korea they tend to escape from patient care and turn to tasks they believed more masculine (Bang 2011), while the male nursing students in Canada think that nursing is a female profession (Bartfay and Bartfay 2007), the male nursing students in the UK withdraw from their department before the graduation (McLaughlin 2010, Mulholland 2008). The first male students who received nursing education in Turkey were observed to choose the profession largely unconsciously and accidentally, and they wanted to work as managers after graduation (Baykal 2011, Temel and Karabulut 2009, Koc 2010b), whereas this rate was observed to be lower in female nursing students (Ozdemir 2008). Compared to males, female nursing students are more likely to think that nursing is a profession suitable for both genders (Koc 2010, Ozdemir 2008). Nurses have important responsibilities in adopting collective stereotypes and attitudes about gender roles in an egalitarian manner. This is because one of the main purposes of the nursing is to provide training and counseling services for the individual, the family and the community on the issues they need. The determination of nurses' attitudes towards gender roles is of great importance in this sense. It is important for nurses to have egalitarian attitudes regarding gender roles in order to provide gender equal care to the individuals served. The aim of this study is to determine the perspectives of nursing students at Ataturk University Health Sciences Faculty about gender equality.

Material and Method

Population of this descriptive research includes students who study at Atatürk University Health Sciences Faculty in 2010-2011 academic years. Research sample is made of 465 volunteer students that were chosen with non-probability sampling method. The data were gathered through the face-to-face interview method. In data evaluation process; average, standard deviation, percentage distributions, t-test in independent group and One Way Analysis of Variance were used. "Socio-Demographic Characteristics Questionnaire" and "Gender Equality Scale" were used in order to gather data.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics Questionnaire: The questionnaire developed by the researchers in accordance with the literature (Sari 2011, Rajaich, Kane, Williston, Cameron 2013;Abeer , El Sayed 2011;Koc, Cansev , Saglam 2010) includes items about the characteristics such as age, gender, year in school, type of high school graduated, parental education, and place of residence.

Gender Equality Scale: It has been developed by Pulerwitz and Barker in 2008 (Pulerwitz and Barker 2008). The reliability and validity of the scale in Turkey was carried out by Ceber et al. in 2009, and the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale has been found to be 0.78 (Ceber 2009). The scale consists of 24 items about violence against sexual partner, sharing of responsibilities for prevention of sexually transmitted diseases and reproductive health, gender roles in sexual relationship and child care.

The scale has two sub-scales, and there are 17 items in the "traditional gender norms" sub-scale and 7 items in the "egalitarian gender norms" sub-scale. The scale scores are in the range of 1-72, and increasing scores indicate that respondent has positive attitudes towards the gender equality. The minimum and maximum scores in the egalitarian gender norms sub-scale are between 7 and 21, whereas this range is between 17 and 51 for the traditional gender norms subscale. The total score calculated in the scale is evaluated as high, medium, and low. Of which, 1- 23 points indicate a low equality, 24-47 points indicate a medium equality, and 48-72 points indicate a high gender equality (24).

Ethical matters

The compatibility of the study with ethical principles was evaluated by the Ethics Committee of Erzurum Atatürk University Health Sciences Faculty. Written permission was received in order for the study to be carried out. In the process of gathering data, questions of the students who agreed to participate in the study were answered and individual counselling was conducted in line with care necessities.

Results

The distribution of the introductory characteristics of nursing students is presented in Table 1. When Table 1 was examined, it was determined that 75.0% of the female students and 68.9% of the male students were in the 19-22 age group, and that the majority of female students was senior student, whereas the majority of the male students was junior student. It was determined that 98.6% of the female students and 99.1% of the male students was single. When the place of birth of the students were examined, it was found that 72.5% of the females and 75% of the males were born in cities, and that 69.1% of the female students and 73.2% of the male students were normal high- school graduates. It was determined that 57.8% of the mothers of the female students was primary school graduate, fathers of the 44.5% of them were high school graduates, and mothers of 33.9% of the male students were not literate and that fathers of 44.6% of them were primary school graduates. When the paternal employment status of the students was examined, it was determined that fathers of 25.2% of the female students were self-employed, and fathers of 34.8% of the male students were farmers. It was determined that 49.9% of the female students and 50% of male students were living in cities, and that 81.6% of the female students and 67% of the male students were living in nuclear families. When the students' sexual experiences were examined, it was determined that 97.5% of the female students and 75% of the male students had no sexual experience.

Table 2 compares the nursing students' mean scores in the gender equality scale of the according to their genders. When Table 2 was examined, it was determined that the average score of the female students in the *Traditional*

Gender Norms Sub-Scale was 39.807±5.91 and that of male students was 39.339±5.56. As a result of the comparisons, no statistically significant difference was found between the groups (p>0.05). When the mean scores of female and male students in the Egalitarian Gender Norms Sub-Scale were compared, the means score of the female students was found to be 8.685 ± 2.34 , whereas the mean score of the male students was 8.828±2.22. According to the comparisons, there statistically was no significant difference between the groups (p>0.05).

Table 3 compares the mean scores in the gender equality scale according to the descriptive characteristics of the nursing students. When the average scores of gender equality scale according to age groups were examined, it was found that the average Traditional Gender Norms Sub-Scale score of the students who were 18 years old and younger was 37.27 ± 5.64 , it was 40.29 ± 5.59 for the students in the 19-22 age group and $38.48 \pm$ 6.43 for the students in the 23 and older age group, and the difference between the groups was found to be statistically significant (p<0.001). When the *Gender Equality Scale* total score was examined, it was found that the mean score of the students aged 18 and below was 46.10±5.48, whereas it was 49.03±5.99 for the students in the 19-22 age group, and that it was 47.13±6.72 for the students in the 23 and older age group, and the difference between the groups was found to be statistically significant (p<0.001).

It was determined that the average *Traditional* Gender Norms Sub-Scale score of freshman students was 38.23±5.24, whereas the average score of the senior students was 37.38±6.61, and that the difference between groups was not statistically significant (p<0.001). When the average scores of the Egalitarian Gender Norms *Sub-Scale* were examined, it was determined that the mean score of freshman students was 9.08±2.51, whereas it was 8.79±2.37 for the senior students, and the difference was not statistically significant (p>0.001). When the Gender Equality Scale total score was examined, it was determined that the total score average of the freshman students was 47.31±6.58 and the mean score of the senior students was 46.20±7.04 and the difference between the

groups was found to be statistically significant (p<0.001).

When the average scores of the students were examined according to their place of birth, it was found that the average score of the *Egalitarian Gender Norms Sub-Scale* was 9.40 ± 3.71 for the students born in a village, and 8.63 ± 2.20 for the students born in a city, and the difference was found to be not statistically significant (p>0.001).

When the average scores of the students were examined according to their type of high school, it was found that the average *Gender Equality* score was 47.21 ± 5.46 in the graduates of Anatolian High School, and the mean score of the normal high school graduates was 48.62 ± 6.26 , and that the difference was found to be not statistically significant (p>0.05).

Characteristics	Female Students (n=353)		Male stude	Male students (n=112)	
-	S	%	S	%	
Age					
Under 18 years old	44	12.5	3	2.5	
19-22 years	265	75.0	77	68.9	
23 years and over	44	12.5	32	28.6	
AcademicYear					
1st Year	82	23.2	25	22.3	
2 nd Year	53	15.0	28	25.0	
3rd Year	99	28.0	34	30.4	
4 th Year	119	33.8	25	22.3	
Marital status	/				
Single	348	98.6	111	99.1	
Married	5	1.4	1	0.9	
Place of birth	5		· ·		
Province	256	72.5	84	75.0	
District	94	26.6	26	23.2	
Village	3	0.9	20	1.8	
High School	5	0.0		1.0	
Normal	244	69.1	82	73.2	
Anatolian	11	3.1	3	2.7	
Private	98	27.8	27	24.1	
Mother Education	70	21.0	21	27.1	
Illiterate	45	12.7	38	33.9	
Literate	31	8.8	25	22.3	
Primary school	204	57.8	34	30.4	
Middle School	28	7.9	6	5.4	
High school and over	28 45	12.8	9	8.0	
Father Education	45	12.0	,	0.0	
Illiterate	4	1.1	5	4.5	
Literate	4 12	3.4	13	4.5	
Primary school	12	35.1	50	44.6	
Middle School	56	15.9	16	14.3	
High school and over	157	44.5	28	25.0	
Father Job	157	44.3	20	23.0	
Father Job Farmer	56	15.9	39	34.8	
Worker	56 79	22.4	21	34.8 18.8	
Artisan		13.8		18.8	
Officer	49 80		17 17		
Other	80 89	22.7 25.2	17	15.2 16.0	
	69	23.2	18	10.0	
Place of residence	176	40.0	Er	50.0	
Province	176	49.9	56	50.0	
District	118	33.4	30	26.8	

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the participants

www.internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org

Village	59	16.7	26	23.2
Family type				
Nuclear family	288	81.6	75	67.0
Extended family	65	18.4	37	33.0
Sexual experience				
Yes	9	2.5	28	25.0
No	344	97.5	84	75.0
Total	363	100.0	112	100.0

 Table 2. Comparison of Gender Equality Scale Score Averages of Nursing Students According
to Gender (n=465)

	_	Inequitable Gender Norms Subscale Scores	Equitable Gender Norms Subscale Scores	Gender Equality Scale Score
	n	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	Mean±SD
Gender				
Female	353	39.807 <u>+</u> 5.91	8.685 <u>+</u> 2.34	48.495 <u>+</u> 6.47
Male	112	39.339 <u>+</u> 5.56	8.828 <u>+</u> 2.22	48.225 <u>+</u> 5.48
		t=0.74	t=0.56	t=0.39
		p>0.05	p>0.05	p>0.05

Table 3. Comparison of Gender Equality Scale Point Average According to Characteristics of	f
Nursing Students	

Characteristics	n	Inequitable Gender Norms Subscale Scores	Equitable Gender Norms Subscale Scores Mean±SD	Gender Equality Scale Score Mean±SD
		Mean±SD	Wiean±5D	Wiean±SD
Age				
Under 18 years old	47	37.27 <u>+</u> 5.64	8.82 <u>+</u> 2.49	46.10 <u>+</u> 5.48
19-22 years	342	40.29 <u>+</u> 5.59	8.73 <u>+</u> 2.36	49.03 <u>+</u> 5.99
23 years and over	76	38.48 <u>+</u> 6.43	8.57 <u>+</u> 1.93	47.13 <u>+</u> 6.72
-		F=7.709 p=.001	F=.212 p=,809	F=6.623 p=.001
Education Year				
1st Year	107	38.23 <u>+</u> 5.54	9.08 <u>+</u> 2.51	47.31 <u>+</u> 6.58
2 nd Year	81	40.82 <u>+</u> 4.43	8.51 <u>+</u> 2.05	49.34 <u>+</u> 4.77
3rd Year	133	42.68 <u>+</u> 4.23	8.47 <u>+</u> 2.21	51.15 <u>+</u> 4.54
4 th Year	144	37.38 <u>+</u> 6.61	8.79 + 2.37	46.20 <u>+</u> 7.04
		F= 26.135 p=.000	F=1.642 p=.179	F=17.947 p=.000
Place of birth				
Province	340	39.80 <u>+</u> 5.89	8.63 <u>+</u> 2.20	48.46 <u>+</u> 6.14
District	120	39.39 <u>+</u> 5.67	8.94 <u>+</u> 2.54	48.33 <u>+</u> 6.45
Village	5	39.20 <u>+</u> 5.58	9.40 <u>+</u> 3.71	48.60 <u>+</u> 9.23
		KW=1.004 p=.605	KW=2.919 p=.232	KW=. 401 p=.818
High School				
Normal	326	39.85 <u>+</u> 5.91	8.74 <u>+</u> 2.36	48.62 <u>+</u> 6.26
Anatolian	14	38.71 <u>+</u> 5.68	8.50 <u>+</u> 1.16	47.21 <u>+</u> 5.46
Private	125	39.39 <u>+</u> 5.64	8.68 <u>+</u> 2.29	48.07 <u>+</u> 6.31
		KW=1.137 p=.566	KW=.299 p=.861	KW=1.837 p=.399

	1			
Mother Education				
Illiterate	83	39.83 <u>+</u> 5.56	8.39 <u>+</u> 1.75	48.22 +5.66
Literate	56	40.28 <u>+</u> 5.30	9.05 <u>+</u> 2.63	49.33 + 5.78
Primary school	238	39.34 <u>+</u> 6.33	8.75 <u>+</u> 2.32	48.13 + 6.83
Middle School	34	39.70 <u>+</u> 5.99	9.17 <u>+</u> 3.23	48.88 + 6.81
High school and over	48	40.38 <u>+</u> 4.13	8.40 <u>+</u> 1.89	48.79 <u>+</u> 4.29
		F= .554 p=.696	F= 1.292 p=.272	F=.535 p=.710
Father Education				
Illiterate	9	39.22 <u>+</u> 7.87	10.66 <u>+</u> 4.66	49.88 <u>+</u> 9.51
Literate	25	38.48 <u>+</u> 5.78	8.32 <u>+</u> 2.05	46.80 <u>+</u> 6.52
Primary school	174	39.77 <u>+</u> 5.90	8.67 <u>+</u> 2.00	48.49 <u>+</u> 6.12
Middle School	72	38.96 ± 5.88	8.69+2.06	47.61 ± 5.91
High school and over	185	40.10 ± 5.64	8.72 ± 2.52	48.83 ± 6.26
0		KW=5.168. p=.270	KW=1.901 p=.754	KW=4.139 p=.388
Father Job				-
Farmer	95	40.77 <u>+</u> 5.04	8.46+ 2.26	49.32 <u>+</u> 5.49
Worker	99	39.11 ± 6.72	8.67 ± 2.21	47.78+7.21
Artisan	65	38.81+5.55	8.92 + 2.12	47.74 + 5.65
Officer	97	39.94 + 6.02	8.71 + 2.28	48.65 + 6.37
Other	107	39.58 ± 5.49	8.86 ± 2.58	48.46 ± 6.13
		F=1.508 p=.199	F=.528 p=.715	F=.991 p=.412
Place of residence		<u> </u>		
Province	232	39.84 <u>+</u> 5.90	8.78 <u>+</u> 2.20	48.65 + 6.24
District	148	39.03 ± 5.90	8.47 ± 1.99	47.51 ± 6.09
Village	85	40.44 + 5.41	8.96 + 3.00	49.41 ± 6.40
U		F=1.738 p=.177	F=1.363 p=.257	F=2.816 p=.061
Family type		<u> </u>	-	Î.
Nuclear family	363	39.60 + 6.07	8.75 + 2.36	48.38 + 6.44
Extended family	102	40.00 + 4.88	8.57 + 2.11	48.57 + 5.51
•		t=675 p=.500	t=.745 p=.458	t=294 p=.769
Marital status		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	^
Single	459	39.70 <u>+</u> 5.84	8.72 <u>+</u> 2.32	48.44 <u>+</u> 6.27
Married	6	39.00+4.97	8.50 ± 1.87	47.50+4.03
		MWU=1232.00	MWU=1317.50 p=.859	MWU=1168.50
		p=.657		p=.528
Sexual experience		`		
Yes	37	38.10+5.76	9.16 <u>+</u> 2.96	47.27 <u>+</u> 5.94
No	428	39.83+5.82	8.68+2.24	48.53+6.72
		t=743 p=.089	t=.962 p=.342	t=-1.233 p=.224
		•	• •	

It was determined that the average *Egalitarian Gender Norms Sub-Scale* score of the students with illiterate mothers was 8.39 ± 1.75 , whereas it was 9.17 ± 3.23 for the students with secondary-school graduate mothers; however, the difference between the groups was not statistically significant (p>0.05). It was found that the average *Traditional Gender Norms Sub-Scale* score of the students having illiterate father was 39.22 ± 7.87 , whereas this score was 40.10 ± 5.64 in those with a high- school or higher paternal education. The average gender equality sub-scale score of the students with illiterate paternal education was found to be 49.88 ± 9.51 , whereas

it was 48.83 ± 6.26 for the students whose fathers were at least high-school graduate; however, the difference between the groups was found to be not statistically significant (p>0.05).

The average *Traditional Gender Norms Sub-Scale* score of the students who have an unemployed father was found to be 39.58 ± 5.49 , whereas the average score was 39.94 ± 6.02 for the students who have fathers employed as officers; and, the difference between the groups was found to be not statistically significant. When the *Gender Equality Scale* total score was examined, it was determined that the total score

average of the students with unemployed fathers was 48.46 ± 6.13 and the mean score of the students with fathers employed as officer was 48.65 ± 6.37 , and that the difference between the groups was not statistically significant (p>0.001).

It was found that the average *Traditional Gender Norms Sub-Scale* of the students living in the district was 39.03 ± 5.90 , whereas it was 40.44 ± 5.41 for the students living in a village; however, there was no statistically significant difference between the groups. The average *Gender Equality Sub-Scale* score of the students living in a district was found to be 47.51 ± 6.09 , whereas it was 49.41 ± 6.40 for the students living in a village; however, the difference between the groups was not statistically significant (p>0.05).

It was found that the average Traditional Gender Norms Sub-Scale score of the students living in the nuclear families was 39.60±6.07, whereas the mean score of those living in the extended families was 40.00±4.88, and the difference was not statistically significant (p>0.05). It was found that the average Egalitarian Gender Norms Sub-Scale score of the students living in the nuclear families was 8.75±2.36, whereas the mean score of those living in the extended families was 8.57±2.11, and the difference was found to be not statistically significant (p>0.05). It was determined that the average Traditional Gender Norms Sub-Scale score of the students who had a sexual experience was 38.10±5.76, whereas the mean score of the students who had no sexual experience was 39.83±5.82, and the difference was not statistically significant (p>0.05). When the average scores of the Egalitarian Gender Norms Sub-Scale were examined, it was found that the students with sexual experience had an average score of 9.16±2.96, whereas those without sexual experience had an average of 8.68±2.24, and the difference was not statistically significant (p>0.05). It was determined that the average score of the Gender Equality Scale was 47.27±5.94 for the students with sexual experience and 48.53±6.72 for the students without sexual experience, and that the difference between the groups was not statistically significant (p>0.05).

Discussion

It was determined that 68.9% of the students included in the study was in the 19-22 age group,

and that most of them was junior students (30.4%). Of the students, 73.2% graduated from regular high school. Of the students, 99.1% was single and 75.0% was found to have no sexual experience. It was determined that 75.0% of the students who participated in the study was born in a city, and 50.0% was living in a city. When the parental educational statuses of the students were examined, it was determined that 33.9% of them had illiterate mothers and 44.6% of them had primary-school graduate fathers. Of the students, 67.0% was found to live in an extended family (Table 1). These results were found to be similar to studies conducted to determine gender equality in college students (Celik and Pasinlioglu 2013, Atis 2010).

The egalitarian attitudes of the female students in terms of gender perceptions can be explained by their strong desire to have an equal position with males (Kodan Cetinkava, 2013). In this study, the total score of the female students in terms of traditional gender roles was found to be 39.807 ± 5.91 , whereas the mean total score of the male students was 39.339±5.56 and the difference between them was statistically significant (p>0.05) (Table 2). Studies conducted to determine the gender roles of college students in Turkey have shown that female students have a high-level of positive thinking towards gender equality compared to the male students (Vefikulucay, Zeyneloglu, Eroglu ve Taskin 2007). This result may be due to the rapid increase in the number of males receiving nursing education in 2007, with the change in regulation made in 2007 (Official Gazette of T.C 2007).

It may also be assumed that individuals move away from stereotyped gender roles as their age and experiences increase (Kongar 2010). When the average scores of gender equality scale were examined according to age, the mean score of the participants aged 18 and under in the traditional gender norms sub-scale was found to be 37.27 ± 5.64 , and the score of those aged 23 years and above was found to be 38.48 ± 6.43 , and that the difference was statistically significant (Table 3). According to the study conducted by Orcun et al. (2003), there was no statistically significant difference in terms of gender equality between males and females, but it has been stated that the tendency towards traditional thought increases with age. Contrary to this finding, it was observed in our study that there is a decreasing tendency in the egalitarian thought as the age progresses. The school has an important place in the lives of individuals and in the acquisition and continuance of gender roles. Although instructors may think that they behave equally to the students, they behave differently to females and males inadvertently. Instructors develop gender stereotypes about students in this process and behave to students accordingly (Acar, Gozutok, Dilek 2017). When the students' views about gender roles according to their type of highschools were examined, it was found that the average gender equality scale score of the normal high-school graduates was 48.62±6.26, whereas the gender equality scale score average for the graduates of the Anatolian High School was 47.21±5.46, and the difference between them was not statistically significant (p=.399) (Table 2). It has been found in the study conducted by Zeyneloglu (2007) that students who graduated from Super/Anatolian/Science High-School have a more egalitarian attitude towards gender equality than the ones graduated from normal high-schools (Vefikulucay, Zeyneloglu, Eroglu and Taskin 2007). Our research does not show similarities with the results of Zeyneloglu's study in this respect. It can be said that the nursing education had a positive effect on gender equality.

It is stated that children living in extended families have more traditional attitudes about gender roles. This is because women especially in the extended families internalize traditional roles due to their responsibilities such as loyalty to the family, childbearing and meeting the needs of the house (Carlson and Knoester 2011). And, it has been found in abother study that students who live in a nuclear family have adopted egalitarian views (Halimi et al., 2016). In the study, it was thought that the family type would affect students' attitudes towards gender roles. In our study, the mean traditional gender score of students raised in extended family was found to be 40.00 ± 4.88 , whereas the mean score of students raised in nuclear family was found to be 39.60 ± 6.07 . It was determined that the difference between the averages egalitarian scores of the students raised in extended and nuclear families was not statistically significant (p=.458) (Table 3).

One of the factors affecting attitudes towards gender roles is the education of the parents of the students. It was found that they have more egalitarian attitudes as the paternal education level increases (Erarslan and Rankin 2013). This is because well-educated and conscious parents more readily accept behaviors and interests of their daughters and boys towards the opposite gender. On the other hand, in our study, the mean gender equality scale score of the students who had illiterate fathers was 49.88±9.51, and the mean gender equality scale score of the students with high-school graduate fathers was 48.83 ± 6.26 , and the difference between them was not statistically significant (p=.388). There was no significant result in terms of paternal education level in the study conducted by Atis. This result can be a consequence of the nursing education provided to the students. The learning and teaching processes in the schools have the potential to transform the values and attitudes of students in a manner that supports gender equality (ERG 2008). When the average scores of the students according to their years in school were examined, it was determined that the average score of the Traditional Gender Norms Sub-Scale score of the freshman students was 38.23±5.24 and the score average of the senior students was 37.38±6.61, and the difference between the groups was not statistically significant (p<0.001). When the Gender Equality Scale total score was examined, it was determined that the total score average of the freshman students was 47.31±6.58 and the mean score of the senior students was 46.20±7.04 and the difference between the groups was found to be statistically significant (p<0.001). In a study conducted by Esen (2013), it has been observed that even with a short-term systematic training on social gender, participants began questioning their traditional value judgments and gained a motivation for change/transformation beginning with their own lives (Esenet al., 2017).

References

- Atis F. (2010) Attitudes of determine 1st and 4th class of midwifery/nursing students' regarding to gender roles. Master Thesis Adana.
- Acar Erdol T, Gozutok FD. (2017) Needs Assessment for Gender Equality Curriculum among High School Students: An Example of an Anatolian High School.Education and Science,1300-1337.

- Baykal U, Timucin A, Ozel S. (2010) Viewpoints of the First Male Students Who Study in a School of Nursing regarding the Nursing Profession and Education. Journal of Education and Research in Nursing, 7(3): 48-55.
- Bekar, M. (2010). Socialization of Women, Journal of Sociological Research, 13(2), 98-117
- Bang, Kyung Sook et al. (2011) "Professional values in Korean undergraduate nursing students" Nurse Education Today, 31 no. 1: 72–75.
- Bartfay, Wally J. ve Emma Bartfay(2007) "Canadian View of Men in Nursing Explored" Men in Nursing, 2, 2: 32-37.
- Baykal U, Timucin A, Ozel S. (2010) Viewpoints of the First Male Students Who Study in a School of Nursing regarding the Nursing Profession and Education. Journal of Education and Research in Nursing, 7(3): 48-55.
- Clow, K. A. ve Ricciardelli, R. (2014). Attitudes and Stereotypes of Male and Female Nurses: The Influence of Social Roles and Ambivalent Sexism. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du compertement, Vol. 46. No.3, 446-455.
- Coskun, A., Ozdilek, R. (2012). Gender Inequality: Reflections on the Nurse's Role in Women's Health, Journal of Education and Research in Nursing, 9(3):30-39
- Chou, Mei-Hsien, Li-Chun Lee (2007) "Initial formation of nursing philosophies following fundamental clinical practice: the experience of male nursing students" Journal of Nursing Research, 15 (2): 127–137
- Ceber E. Saydam BK. Bilge A. Mermer G. Ozturk H. Demireloz M. (2009) Improving the reproductive health attitude scale of university students.Turkish Journal of Research & Development in Nursing . 11(2):5-15
- Carlson, D. L., & Knoester, C.. (2011) Family structure and the intergenerational transmission of gender ideology. Journal of Family Issues, 32, 709-734.
- Dikmen-Ozarslan A .(2015) Male Nurses in The Context of Hegemonic Masculinity Alternative Politics, 7(1):118-142.
- Eswi, Abeer and Yousria El Sayed (2011) The experience of Egyptian male student nurses during attending maternity nursing clinical course. Nurse Education in Practice, 11(2): 93–98.
- Erarslan, A. B., & Rankin, B. (2013). Gender role attitudes of female students in single-sex and coeducational high schools in Istanbul. Sex Roles, 69, 455-468.
- ERG (2008) Education and education gender equality. http://www.egitimreformugirisimi.org/wpcontent/uploads/2017/03/ERG_Egitimde-ve-Egitimle-Toplumsal-Cinsiyet-Esitligi-1.pdf

- Esen E, Soylu Y, Siyez DM, Demirgurz G. (2017). Examination of Gender Perception of University Students According to Sex and Sex Roles ejournal of international educational research, (8,1):46-63
- Fooladi, Marjaneh M. (2008) "Gender influence on nursing education and practice at Aga Khan university school of nursing in Karachi, Pakistan" Nurse Education in Practice, 8(4), 231–238.
- Kocaer U., Oztop T., Usta N., Gokcek D., Bahcecik N., Ozturk H., Paslı E. (2004). Male Members in Nursing. Journal Of Anatolia Nursing and Health Sciences 7(2):23-29.
- Koc Z , Bal C , Saglam S. (2010) Detection of Perception of Male Student Nurses About Nursing e-Journal of Maltepe University Nursing Science and Art, Symposium Special Issue: 318-323.
- Koc Z, Cansev B, Saglam Z. (2010) The View of Female Nursing Students towards Male Nursing Students" Journal of Maltepe University Nursing Science and Art, Symposium Special Issue: 330-334.
- Kodan Cetinkaya, S. (2013). The Examination of The Relationship Between Tendency of Violence and Gender Roles Attitudes Among the University Students Nesne Journal of Psychology, 1 (2):21-43.
- Kongar E. (2010) Theories of Social Change and Reality of Turkey. p.100-107
- Liminana-Gras, R., Sanchez-Lopez M.P., Saavedra-San Roman, A. I., Corbalan-Berna, F. J. (2013) Health and Gender in Female-Dominated Occupations: The Case of Male Nurses. The Journal of Men's Studies, 21, 2, 135-148.
- McLaughlin K, Muldoon OT, Moutray M. (2010), Gender, gender roles and completion of nursing education: a longitudinal study, Nurse Education Today, 30, 4, 303–307.
- Halimi M,, Consuegra E, Struyven K, Engels N. (2016) The Relationship Between Youngsters' Gender Role Attitudes and Individual, Home, and School Characteristics: A Review, SAGE Open, July-September: 1–19 , DOI: 10.1177/2158244016656230
- Official Newspaper (2007) http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2007/03/20 070303-6.htm
- Ozan S, Aras S, Semin S, Orcin E.(2004) Sexual attitudes and behaviors of Dokuz Eylul University School of Medicine students. Journal of Dokuz Eylul University School of;18:27-39.
- Ozdemir A., Akansel N. and Tunk G.C. (2008). Gender and career: Female and male nursing students' perceptions of male nursing role in Turkey. Health Science Journal, 2(3): 153-161.
- Pulerwitz J. Barker G. (2008) Measuring attitudes toward gender norms among young men in Brezil: development and psychometric evaluation of the

www.internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org

GEM Scale, Men and Masculinities, 10(3): 322-338.

- Rajaich, D., Kane, D., Williston, C., Cameron, S. (2013). If They Do Call You A Nurse It Is Always A Male Nurse: Experiences Of Men in the Nursing Profession. Nursing Forum, 48, 1, 71-80
- Sherrod, B., Sherrod, D., R. Rasch (2006) From the bedside to the boardroom, nursing needs to increase the number of men in its ranks. Men in Nursing, 1: 34–39.
- Sari, O. (2011) The Relation Between Gender and Occupational Role: The Case of Male Students in Nursery. Erzincan University Journal of Social Sciences Institute 4(2): 493-504.
- Sis Celik A, Turkan Pasinlioglu T, Tan G, Koyuncu H. (2013) Determination of University Students' Attitudes about Gender Equality. Journal of Florence Nightingale Nursing, 21(3): 181-186.

- Tzeng, YL, Chen JZ, Tu HC, Tsai TW. (2009) Role strain of different gender nursing students in obstetrics practice: a comparative study, Journal of Nursing Research, 17(1), 1–9.
- Temel A.B, Karabulut G. (2009) "Male nursing students look after their nursing profession "12th National Nursing Congress Book. 20-24 October, Sıvas, 130.
- Zeyneloglu S. Taskin L. Vefikulucay D. Eroglu K. (2007) Perception of and Views on Gender Roles of Senior Students Enrolled at Kafkas University. Journal of Hacettepe University School of Nursing, 26-38.
- Zamanzadeh, V., Arman, A., Valizadeh, L., Keogh, B., Monadi, M., Negarandeh, R (2013). Choosing and Remaining in Nursizng: Iranian Male Nurses Perspectives. Contemporary Nurse, 45, 2, 220-227