



Attitudes about and Perpetration of Violence against Women among Turkish Men

**Nursen Bolsoy¹, Selma Sen^{1*}, Seval Cambaz Ulas¹, Aynur Çetinkaya²,
Dilek Özmen² and Beyhan Cengiz Özyurt³**

¹Department of Midwifery, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Turkey.

²Department of Public Health Nursing, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Health Sciences,
Turkey.

³Department of Public Health, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Medicine, Turkey.

Authors' contributions

The study was planned and applied as a project. The project was planned by authors NB and SS. The data were collected and recorded by authors NB, SS, SCU, DO and AC. The statistical analyses were performed by authors SCU, BCO and AC. The study was put into report form by authors NB, SS, AC, SCU, DO and BCO. Authors NB and DO drafted the manuscript with the assistance of other authors in editing. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JALSI/2020/v23i1230201

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Palanisamy Arulsevan, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia.

Reviewers:

(1) KanKana De, Vidyasagar University, India.

(2) Afsaneh Malekpour Tehrani, Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences, Iran.
Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/63087>

Original Research Article

Received 02 October 2020
Accepted 07 December 2020
Published 21 December 2020

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the attitudes of men regarding violence against women. This was a cross-sectional descriptive study. Research data were collected using a Men's Information Form and a Scale of Attitude towards Violence against Women.

The mean age of the participating men was 39.54 ± 13.55 years. The men's general mean score for attitude regarding violence was 52.02 ± 10.81 , which showed that such attitudes had a patriarchal tendency. In the univariate analyses, there was a significant difference between age group, education status, place of residence, situations of domestic violence and violent behaviour against mothers or wives, years of marriage and wife's education status and the scores of the Scale of Attitudes towards Violence against Women ($p < 0.05$).

Based on our findings, it is suggested that socioeconomic factors such as witnessing and experiencing violence in childhood, female unemployment, low education level, unemployment and poverty, and place of residence affect and increase violence against women.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: selmasen77@gmail.com;

Keywords: Gender; violence; men; attitude.

1. INTRODUCTION

Violence against women, which is thought to have existed throughout the history of humanity, is one of the most important conditions that disrupt and threaten health and is among the emphasized social problems in our century [1,2,3]. Violence continues in some cultures despite both social and religious sanctions [3]. Domestic violence against women has been considered a problem of women for years. However, it is a global humanity problem that exceeds cultural, geographical, religious, social and economic limits [4]. Because violence usually occurs in particular areas, it remains a secret without revealing its real dimensions [5].

The Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1993, defines violence against women as 'any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual, or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life' [6].

Even though its extent and context vary, violence against women is a common reality worldwide. According to World Health Organization (WHO) data, one in three women are exposed to physical or sexual violence by her partner or other people [7]. The reports of the General Principles of European Union agency for fundamental rights (FRA) showed that the amount of spousal abuse in the countries of the European Community ranged from 13% to 32% in 2014 [8]. According to the research, one of three women are exposed to physical or sexual violence from the age of 15. Only 14% of the domestic violence cases are reported. One of 10 women above the age of 15 is exposed to sexual violence. Two of five women (43%) remarked that they were exposed to psychological violence by their ex-husbands or life partners (25% abasement, 5% being imprisoned in the house, etc.) [8].

According to the results of the Research on domestic violence against women in Turkey 2009, 39% of women in Turkey are exposed to physical violence, 15% of them are exposed to sexual violence, and 44% of them are exposed to emotional violence [9]. According to the results of the Research on domestic violence against

women in Turkey 2014, 36% of the women in Turkey are exposed to physical violence. In other words, approximately 4 of 10 women are exposed to violence by their husbands or life partners. In the same report, 12% of the women are exposed to sexual violence, and 44% of them are exposed to emotional violence. According to the study, 'Violence against women in family', 38%, 12% and 44% of women are exposed to physical, sexual and emotional violence, respectively [10]. People tend to think of physical violence first; however, violence against women is distinguished into four groups: physical, emotional, sexual and economic. The results of this research suggest that the prevalence of women exposed to violence in Turkey and in the world is high.

In all societies, innate biological differences may be culturally interpreted and evaluated. Thus, social expectations regarding the behaviours and activities men and women may adopt and the rights and authorities that may or ought to be owned by whom and to what degree vary [11]. The perception and definition of violence against women are usually shaped based on cultural values of society and individuals. Thus, when the use of violence is brought up for a purpose that is adopted and justified by society, it becomes difficult to perceive or not to perceive that behaviour as violence. Some societies perceive violence against women as an acceptable behaviour and consider it a common feature of marriage [2,3,12].

While many factors influence the emergence of or increased violence against women, the fundamental source of violence is sociological gender inequality, or asymmetric power between men and women due to the patriarchal sociological structure [13]. Sociological gender is a concept that determines roles, responsibilities and sociological status. Violence due to social gender inequality aims to pressure and rule women. Violence is a means by which the strong force the weak to accept their will [14]. Sociological gender is acquired by observance, starting from the family. Due to patriarchal structures, female disobedience of expected conduct or social norms is seen by men as a justification of violence. The aim of violence is rule women based on fear. In reality, there is always a power inequality in favour of men in all incidents of violence [15]. In societies in which traditional values are common, the opinion that

men have the right to physically punish women is supported and made acceptable. In recent years in Turkey, although combating violence against women has achieved significant gains in both the legal and institutional sense, it has been observed that violence has continued to increase with each passing day [16].

It is important to learn about the attitudes of men, who are the perpetrators of violence, regarding violence against women. Accordingly, we performed this study with the aim of learning the attitudes of men regarding violence against women in the province of Manisa.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Study Design and Sample

The cross-sectional study was conducted in the central district of Manisa between 15 November, 2013, and 1 January, 2014. Manisa is in Western Turkey in the Aegean Region.

The target population of the study consisted of men aged >18 years living in 13 towns and 85 villages in Central Manisa (according to the 2012 Turkish Statistical Institute Address-Based Population Registration System, in the central district of Manisa, N = 256484). The minimum sample size of the study was calculated as 1830 men using Epi Info 7.0 software and taking the frequency of domestic violence against women in our society as 42%, with a confidence limit of 99% and margin of error of 3%. As there were likely to be losses in the sample, the sample size was determined as 2000 men. People to be included in the study were selected from registration at Manisa Provincial Public Health Directorate via stratified simple random sampling. Men aged >18 years who had been married at least once were included within the scope of the research. The study was completed with 1847 men completing the data forms in full.

2.1.1 Application procedures and materials

In the first stage of the study, an announcement was made to midwifery and nursing students, and students who applied to work as pollsters in the present study were selected (40 midwifery and 10 nursing students). The pollsters were given 1-day training by the researchers on the subject and content of the study, ethical issues and how the forms to be used were to be applied. After completing training, the pollsters were separated into groups of 10, and each

group was placed under the responsibility of one researcher. The required permissions for using the questionnaires were obtained from the governorship, and the relevant district managers (mayors and local leaders) were informed accordingly.

In the second stage of the study, the pollsters visited the addresses specified in the sample and informed prospective participants about the study. They collected data from people who volunteered to participate in the study. The pollsters collected the research data door-to-door at the participants' homes using a face-to-face meeting method. The pollsters read out the survey questions, and the polls were completed in accordance with the participants' responses. The pollsters visited the homes of 2000 participants for the interviews. Prospective participants who refused the interview and who were not at their addresses were not included in the study. The Men's Information Form and the Scale of Attitude towards Violence against Women were used for the 2000 male participants who were interviewed. The pollsters' transportation and lunch expenses were paid within the scope of the project.

In the third stage of the study, the researcher responsible for each group collected the data, checked them and recorded them in the database. Incomplete and erroneous forms were excluded, and the data from a total of 1847 men were recorded in the system. The number of people to be included in the target sample was 2000 but the calculated number (n = 1830) was reached.

2.2 Measurements

The data were collected using the Men's Information Form consisting of 28 items, and the Scale of Attitude towards Violence against Women, which the researchers prepared in accordance with the literature. All data collection tools were in Turkish in a form understandable for the participants.

2.2.1 Men's information form

The information form consisted of questions on the men's sociodemographic and marital features, income status, residence, family type (nuclear, extended, etc.) education background, number of children and state of being exposed to violence.

2.2.2 Scale of attitude towards violence against women

The scale involves 19 attitude statements regarding the violence perpetrated by a husband towards his wife. The Scale of Attitude towards Violence against Women, developed by Gombul in 2000, determines the attitude towards violence against women as perpetrated by their husbands. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale was 0.82 according to Gombul [17]. In 2014, Kaplan and colleagues found that the scale's Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.76 with both male and female students [18]. The scale is valid and consistent for both sexes. Statements in this scale refer to physical, emotional, psychological, sexual and economic violence against women, as well as myths regarding violence. The total lowest possible score is 19, and the highest is 95. The scale has no cut-off point. It consists of four subgroups with: (i) seven questions on economic violence (statements 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19); (ii) six questions on emotional, psychological and sexual violence (statements 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13); (iii) three questions on legitimising myths (statements 1, 2, 3); and (iv) three questions on rationalizing myths (statements 4, 5, 6). The scale is a Likert assessment instrument using scales of 1–5, namely, 'strongly disagree' (1), 'disagree' (2), 'undecided' (3), 'agree' (4), and 'strongly agree' (5). Among the 19 questions, six (7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13) were coded in reverse. The scale attitude mean score was 57 (min = 19, max = 95). The sub-scale attitude mean scores were 21 (min = 7, max = 35) for economic violence; 18 (min = 6, max = 30) for emotional, psychological and sexual violence; and 9 (min = 3, max = 15) for legalizing and explaining myths. High scores signify an increase in negative attitude towards violence, and low scores signify a positive attitude. The scale has no cut-off point. The higher score mean more negative attitude toward violence [17]. Here, we determined that the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale was 0.85.

2.3 Data Analysis

Descriptive data are presented as number, percentage and mean \pm standard deviation. The data gathered were compared with the Student t-test, Mann Whitney U test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). In statistical modelling, regression analysis was used as a set of statistical processes for estimating the relationships among variables with the Enter

method. The Enter method of entry is simultaneous (the standard method): all independent variables are entered into the equation at the same time, and independent variables create the best prediction equation.

All analyses were carried out using SPSS for Windows, release 15.0 (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). A p-value of <0.05 was deemed significant for all analyses.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Definitive Features of the Research Group

In the descriptive features of the people comprising the study group, the mean age of the men was 39.54 ± 13.55 years. In total, 74.9% of the men were currently married. Regarding education background, 1.6% of the men were illiterate, 3.6% had never gone to school but were literate, and 20.2% were university graduates. Approximately 95.7% of the men were worked. But their wives had lower education levels and very low rates of employment in general (Table 1).

Regarding individual exposure to violence, the men had mostly been exposed to physical (77.5%) and verbal violence (44.3%), mostly from their parents. According to the participants' declarations and perceptions, 15.1% of the men had frequently experienced violence. The men who had been exposed to violence usually preferred to remain silent. Up to 11.5% of the men had been violent against their mothers or wives, and most of them (67.9%) used physical violence (Table 2).

3.2 Attitudes of the Research Group Regarding Violence against Women

Table 3 shows the attitudes of the men. In examining the participants' statements regarding violence against women, 49.5% of the men agreed with the statement, 'I think it is natural for a husband not to allow his wife to work if he is wealthy enough', and 56.1% of the men agreed with the statement, 'A woman's opinions about household expenses are also important, but the final word should belong to the husband'. 68.7% of the men agreed with the statement, 'Nothing should justify a man beating his wife'; 60.5% of the men agreed with the statement, 'When a man does not answer his wife's questions, this

humiliates the woman', and 59.1% of the men agreed with the statement, 'Damaging things in the house (like plates or glasses) when angry is also a type of violence against women'. In total, 29.7% of the men agreed with the statement, 'A husband beats his wife because he is jealous',

and 61.5% of the men agreed with the statement, 'If a woman behaves meekly and humbly, she will not be exposed to violence'. 38.1% of the men agreed with the statement, 'It is natural for a woman who does not obey her husband to be exposed to violence' (Table 3).

Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of the men of Manisa, 2014

Characteristics		Men	
		n	%
Age	18-27 years	388	21.0
X± SD	28-37 years	535	29.0
(39.54± 13.55)	38-47 years	395	21.4
Min:18 Max:90	48-57 years	324	17.5
	58-67 years	140	7.6
	68 years and ↑	65	3.5
Education Status	Illiterate (Elementary school not finished)	30	1.6
	Literate (Elementary school not finished)	67	3.6
	Elementary School	541	29.3
	Secondary School	356	19.3
	High School	479	25.9
Current Marital Status	College	374	20.2
	Married	1383	74.9
	Bachelor	6	0.3
Duration of marriage	Widow, Divorcee, Living as Single	458	24.8
	X± SD (15,55± 12,27) Min:1 Max:67		
Employment Status	Working	1768	95.7
	Unemployed	79	4.3
Perception of Economic Status (n: 1756)*	Low	238	12.9
	Middle	1428	77.3
	High	181	9.8
Age of his wife	18-27 years	243	13.2
	X± SD	431	23.3
	(39,54± 12.45)	352	19.1
	Min:17 max:85	229	12.2
	(n=1383)	92	5.0
		68 years +	41
Education status of his wife (n=1383)	Illiterate (Elementary school not finished)	83	4.5
	Literate (Elementary school not finished)	85	4.5
	Elementary School	595	32.2
	Secondary School	240	13.0
	High School	255	13.8
	College	131	7.0
Working status of his wife	Working	747	40.4
	Unemployed	1100	59.6
Place of residence	Urban	1220	66.1
	Rural	204	11.0
	Slum	423	22.9
TOTAL		1847	100.0

* Based on people's self-report; Low: Perceived income is expressed as less than expense, Middle: perceived income as equivalent to expense, High: perceived income as more than expense

Table 2. Exposure and applied to violence in individuals of the study population, 2014

Features		Men	
		n	%
*Exposure to domestic violence	Yes	471	25.5
	No	1376	74.5
**Types of Violence Men (n=471)	Physical violence	365	77.5
	Emotional violence	143	30.3
	Sexual violence	3	0.6
	Verbal violence	209	44.3
	Economic violence	20	4.2
Person committing violence Men (n=400)***	Mother	123	30.8
	Father	252	63.0
	Sibling	15	3.7
	Partner	8	2.0
	Mother-in-law	2	0.5
	Father-in-law	-	-
Frequency exposure to violence Men (n=437)	Rarely	160	36.6
	Sometimes	156	35.7
	Generally	45	10.3
	Frequently	66	15.1
	Always	10	2.3
Behaviour displayed when exposed to violence Men (n=467)	I kept silent	340	72.8
	She/he said she/he was sorry and we reconciled	55	11.8
	I went to the police station	7	1.4
	I left home	25	5.4
	Other	40	8.6
Violence was applied at wife or mother	Yes	212	11,5
	No	1635	88,5
Type of violence applied (n=212)	Physical violence	144	67,9
	Emotional violence	20	9,4
	Sexual violence	-	-
	Verbal violence	46	21,8
	Economic violence	2	0,9
TOTAL		1847	100.0

*The data that were acquired in the table show the verbal statements of individuals, and no scale was used;

Regarding the types of violence being committed, more than one option was marked; *The first person committing the violence was taken into consideration

3.3 Attitudes of the Research Group towards Violence against Women and their Subgroup Score Means

It was determined that the total score average of Scale of attitude towards violence against women was 52.02±10.81 in men. It can be said that men's attitudes towards violence against women are patriarchal, that is, negative. When the sub-dimension score averages of the men are examined, it is determined that Attitude Towards Economic Violence score averages of the sub-dimension 20.11±5.19, Attitude Towards Emotional, Psychological, Sexual Violence score averages of the sub-dimension 14.96±4.46, Attitude towards Legalizing Myths score

averages of the sub-dimension 8.33±2.98 and Attitude Towards Reason-Explaining Myths score averages of the sub-dimension 8.60±2.72 (Table 4).

3.4 Comparison of the Attitudes of the Research Group Regarding Violence against Women

In examining the participants' general attitudes regarding violence against women and their subgroup mean scores, a significant difference was found between men in every subgroup in terms of the total scale score. The univariate analyses showed a significant difference between the age groups, education status, place

of residence, situations of domestic violence and violent behavior against their mothers or wives, years of marriage, and the wife's educational status and the Scale of Attitude towards Violence against Women scores ($p < 0.05$). In multivariate analysis, the most important determinant explaining the Scale of Attitudes towards

Violence against Women was violence against mother or wife ($B = 5.963$, $p = 0.000$). The determinants of the men's attitudes towards violence were (respectively) wife's working status, the man's education level, wife's education level, and place of residence ($p < 0.05$).

Table 3. Attitude statements of individuals of the study population regarding violence against women, 2014

Attitude statements	Men		
	Agree %	Undecided%	Disagree%
It is natural to expect the women to carry household responsibilities, even in families in which women work.	41.7	15.3	43.0
I think it is natural for a husband not to allow his wife to work if he is wealthy enough.	49.5	18.2	32.3
It is a husband's right to ask his wife to have a tubal ligation by saying, "The responsibility of birth control belongs to women".	22.9	9.1	58.0
It is natural for a husband to insist on registering the properties that are bought in marriage with a title deed.	24.4	13.0	52.6
It is natural for a man to claim all the money his wife earns.	20.2	12.4	67.4
If a husband says, "You are not allowed to go to work as of tomorrow", he must be right.	46.9	20.5	32.6
A woman's opinions about the house expenses are also important, but the final word should belong to the husband.	56.1	12.3	31.6
Nothing should justify a man beating his wife.	68.7	14.9	16.4
When a man does not answer his wife's questions, this will humiliate the woman.	60.5	16.6	22.9
When a man threatens his wife for a possible quit, it means he abuses his wife.	55.6	20.0	24.4
Damaging the things in the house (like plates, glasses) when angry is also a type of violence against women.	59.1	14.9	26.0
When a husband does not allow birth control, it is a type of sexual abuse.	59.8	17.5	22.6
I believe that a husband who criticizes his wife for being unattractive sexually abuses his wife.	56.3	20.2	23.5
A husband beats his wife because he envies her.	29.7	10.0	60.3
In families with financial difficulties, it is natural for a man to commit violence against his wife.	21.5	8.3	70.1
If a woman is a bit meek and humble, she will not be exposed to violence.	61.5	11.8	26.7
In compassionate marriages, women will not be exposed to violence.	37.4	18.9	43.7
I think educated men will not commit violence against their wives.	33.1	15.9	51.1
It is natural for a woman who does not obey her husband to obtain exposed to violence.	38.1	14.6	47.3

Table 4. General attitudes of individuals of the study population towards violence against women and their subgroup score means

SUBGROUPS	Number of items	Men (Mean and Standard Deviation)
Attitude Towards Economic Violence	7	20.11±5.19
Attitude Towards Emotional, Psychological, Sexual Violence	6	14.96±4.46
Attitude Towards Legalizing Myths	3	8.33±2.98
Attitude Towards Reason-Explaining Myths	3	8.60±2.72
Total Scale Score	19	52.02±10.81

Table 5. Model of multiple regressions explaining the scale of attitude towards violence against women scores

Scale of Attitude towards Violence against Women (n=1847)	R ² = 0.152	β	P
Constant			0.000
Exposure to domestic violence (0. No /1. Yes)		0.032	0.223
Violence was applied at wife or mother (0. No /1. Yes)		0.195	0.000
Education Status (0. Secondary School↑ / 1. Elementary School and↓)		0.138	0.000
Education status of his wife (0. Secondary School↑ / 1. Elementary School and↓)		0.118	0.000
Place of residence (0. Urban/ 1. Rural/ 2. Slum)		0.079	0.002
Working status of his wife (0. Working/ 1. Unemployed)		0.168	0.000

4. DISCUSSION

Domestic violence is a social problem that, at the most basic level, threatens the lives of women and children and prevents them from participating fully in social and cultural life. It remains a current issue in Turkey, as in many other countries.

In Turkey, the educational level of women is not at the required standard. According to the National Research of Violence against Women, which was conducted in Turkey in 2014, 19% of men and 32% of women are either illiterate or, despite being literate, have never gone to school, and only 10.1% of men and 6.1% of women are university graduates [10]. According to the Population and Health Research that was conducted in Turkey in 2013, 16.1% of men and 28.2% of women are either illiterate or, although literate, have never gone to school, and 29.1% of men and 20.5% of women completed high school or higher education [19]. In both studies, the rate of illiteracy or lack of attendance at school despite being literate was almost twice as large among women than men. In our study, the rate of

illiteracy or lack of attendance at school despite being literate was low level men.

Although men can also be exposed to violence, the study shows that women experience greater violence from their partners than men [20]. In the study, men were exposed to physical violence by their parents, particularly their fathers. However, the fact that men had been exposed to violence from their mothers and fathers suggests that they experienced this violence in their childhoods. As humans are social beings, even their personal behaviours are affected by the society they live in. Women may practice domestic violence mainly on their children. In Turkish society, mothers are primarily responsible for the education of their children. Women who feel socially responsible for the education of their children may be violent towards them simply by imitating the way they themselves were raised. Fathers in Turkey are both esteemed and feared, which usually legitimises their violent behaviours [21]. The presence of violence in the family environment during childhood may cause a higher number of both women and men to later accept violence as normal. This normalization of

violence causes it to be passed on from generation to generation, which is among the most important characteristics of violence [21,22].

In the present study, the male participants had high mean scores for the Scale of Attitudes towards Violence against Women (52.02 ± 10.81), and this shows that their attitudes towards violence had a traditional tendency. When the items of the scale were considered individually, traditional point of views were prominent, especially for six items, such as 'women are not exposed to violence if they stay on good side of men and are obedient' (61.5%); 'it is normal that a woman who does not obey her husband is exposed to violence' (38.1%); 'it is normal that household responsibilities are expected from women in families even if they work' (41.7%); 'it is normal that a husband can confiscate all properties received in the marriage' (49.5%); 'a husband who says, "you will not go to work after tomorrow" to his wife surely knows something' (47.0%); 'the opinions of women about living expenses are also important, but husbands have the last say' (56.0%). The social role and nature of women in a patriarchal family is defined according to norms that are masculine [23]. Women are at risk of violence because patriarchal structures and value systems still play an active role today. Societies adopting traditional gender roles based on patriarchal values have higher levels of violence against women [24,25,26]. We believe that the present results are important for showing the opinions on male dominance and the prevalence of male domination in Turkish society.

The multivariate analysis showed that the determinants explaining the attitudes regarding male-on-female violence are violence against mother or wife, wife's working status, the man's education level, wife's education level, and place of residence.

Children learn all cultural norms from their parents. The behavioural characteristics of people considered role models directly affect a person's behaviour. The structure that primarily and firstly affects a person's socialization is the intrafamilial relationship between their parents [27]. According to the social learning theory, it is suggested that individuals who have been exposed to beatings or violence in their immediate surroundings are more prone to violence in increased age [28,29,30]. If violence is used as a problem-solving method in the

family and social environment, a person will easily adopt violence as a problem-solving method [27]. Unfortunately, male children who are subjected to violence in this cycle carry violence to their later lives and see violence against women as their right.

Here, we observed that one out of every four men had experienced domestic violence frequently in childhood and had been exposed to the highest rates of physical violence. The perpetrators of the violence were mainly their parents. The vast majority of men, who experiences of domestic violence remain silent in the face of violence. According to the 20-year study of White and Widom (2003), those who had witnessed domestic violence or who had been exposed to violence in childhood had a 12% higher tendency to use violence against their families in the following years than those who had not exposed to violence in childhood [31]. In the present study, 11.5% of the men stated that they used violence against their mothers or wives. Primarily, they used physical violence, similar to the types of violence that had been used against them. This situation shows that behaviours are learned and passed down from one generation to another.

The multivariate analysis showed that the most important determinant explaining the violent attitudes of men towards women are violence against mothers or spouse; this finding is consistent with the literature. We believe that these men learned violence from their families and use violence as a problem-solving method. Therefore, learned violence should not be overlooked. When more studies are carried out in this direction, the origins and causes of violence can be determined more accurately.

In the literature, it has been observed that women who are exposed to violence have low education and socioeconomic status and are unemployed. Studies conducted in many different regions have shown that physical violence against women in the family is observed in all socioeconomic groups, but poor women who are unemployed are exposed to this violence more [32,33,34,35,36,37,38]. In the present study, men whose spouses were unemployed had higher violent attitudes towards women. Particularly according to the conflict theory, the basis of inequalities between women and men and therefore violence against women is largely based on economic inequality between

men and women [27]. Men who hold economic power perceive this as an advantage.

In Turkey, one of the most important obstacles to participation in occupational life and income earning is the inequality of education received between men and women. On the other hand, recent studies have indicated a significant relationship between the education levels of women and men and violence against women [39]. These studies have found that low education levels in both women and men increase the risk of violence against women [32,33,34,35,40,41,42]. The present study findings are in parallel with the literature. According to Altınay and Arat (2007), women at all levels of education may be exposed to violence. On the other hand, as the education levels of men and women increase, the rate of violence decreases significantly. Two of the most important factors in the fight against the patriarchal structure, which is a discriminatory practice that confers power and privileges to men, seem to be the education of men and women and the participation of women in business life. Ensuring the acculturation of elimination of the factors and behaviours that may cause all kinds of violence in the transmission of social gender roles is also believed to be important [43].

Socioeconomic pressure factors such as the fact that violence is seen as a value judgment shared by society, poverty, being unlucky in life, lack of expectations and qualifications are among the social reasons that increase violence [44]. Our study, men living in the suburban slum areas had higher violent attitudes towards women. This finding was interpreted in that this may be because of higher poverty, lower education levels in women and men, and lower employment rates of women living in slum areas, as the study also involved illiterate people. In parallel with our study, similar studies have determined that male poverty and low socioeconomic status increase violence [41,45].

In addition, as the duration of marriage is shortened, men's violent attitudes towards women increase. Studies have emphasized that violence occurs more often at the younger ages or that being younger is accepted as a reason for violence in some cases [46,47,48]. In parallel with our study, other studies have determined that younger age in men and shorter marriage durations increase violence [47,48,49]. The reasons for this are men's jealousy in the

first years of marriage, the efforts of men to dominate women, lack of confidence in their spouse/lack of self-confidence, acceptance of men's attitudes and women adapting to the process as a result of intimidation from men over time.

Briefly, the present findings show that men's attitudes towards violence against women are associated with their gender roles in society. A patriarchal culture based on gender discrimination between female and male children and spouses in the family is a factor that legitimizes domestic violence. Therefore, there is a need for mechanisms to support women and men's education and economic status in society.

5. CONCLUSION

We determined that the attitude scores of men regarding violence against women were higher and more traditional. We found that one in four men had frequently/generally experienced domestic violence in childhood; the most important determinant of men's violent attitudes towards women was violence against their mothers or spouses. Next, the determinants of the violent attitudes of men towards women were the wife's employment status, the man's education level, wife's education level, place of residence and marriage period.

Considering our findings, the fact is that men having been exposed to or having witnessed violence in childhood increases violence against women. In addition, we may say that unemployment and poverty, and living in rural areas increase violence against women.

Despite the efforts and laws to end violence against women, domestic violence is still frequently observed. Moreover, the differences between men and women such as role, status, age, sex and job may lead to the obtaining of the dominant power and the legitimization of violence by men (Şenol and Yıldız 2013; Demir and Nam 2014). Therefore, there is a need for a socioeconomic and cultural revolution to break this vicious cycle to eliminate such acts of violence and to reduce the impact of the patriarchal, sexist mentality in society. To achieve this, the socioeconomic levels and basic education of men and women must be improved. In the short-term, it is recommended that awareness and educational work be carried out on men.

6. LIMITATIONS

Our study has several limitations. The pollsters read out the survey questions, and the polls were completed in accordance with the participants' responses. The pollsters completed the questionnaires. If the participants could fill out the forms by themselves, the results would be more reliable. There is a possibility that their responses were affected by the fact that participants had to declare their beliefs, and also the gender of the pollster can be another factor that has affected their responses. Accordingly, there is a possibility of underestimation of reported violence. It is considered that this situation as the most important limitation of the study. Also it was carried out in a specific region due to financial difficulty and time constraints. During the study, data were collected via personal statements. The results of this study only belong to the region where it is carried out and cannot be generalized to Turkey.

CONSENT AND ETHICAL APPROVAL

The necessary written Consent for using the 'Scale of Attitude towards Violence against Women' were obtained from Gombul, who developed the scale, and from the relevant bodies associated with the establishment where the study was conducted. Before the meetings were held, the researchers informed the participants about the purpose, duration and practical benefits of the study, and the written consent of the participants was obtained accordingly.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study data included the findings of the Project on Combating Violence, Substance Abuse and Juvenile Delinquency named 'Hopes to Blossom', financially supported by the Zafer Development Agency (No.TR33/12/SKMDP/0162.), which included the findings of only male participants.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Erkal S. Domestic violence and the elderly. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyolojik Araştırmalar E-Dergisi. 2008;1-11.

- Available:<http://www.sdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/makaleler/yasivesiddet.pdf>.
2. Nasrullah M, Zakar R, Zakar MZ. Child marriage and its associations with controlling behaviors and spousal violence against adolescent and young women in Pakistan. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2014;55:804-809. DOI: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.06.013
 3. Sharma I. Violence against women: Where are the solutions? *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2015;57(2):131-139. DOI: 10.4103/0019-5545.158133
 4. Lee FH, Yang YM, Wang HH, Huang JJ, Chang SC. Conditions and patterns of intimate partner violence among Taiwanese Women. *Asian Nursing Research*. 2015;9:91-95. DOI: 10.1016/j.anr.2015.05.004
 5. Janet MT, Cassio L, Richard MG. Intimate partner violence. *JAMA*. 2010;304(5):596.
 6. General assembly resolution 48/104 Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women; 1993.
 7. WHO, Violence against women. Intimate partner and sexual violence against women. Switzerland: Publications of the World Health Organization; 2016.
 8. European union agency for fundamental rights (FRA), Violence against women: an EU-Wide survey. Luxembourg: Publication office of the European Union; 2014.
 9. Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies (HUIPS), Research on domestic violence against women in Turkey; 2009. ISBN: 978-975-19-4498-6.
 10. Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies (HUIPS). Research on domestic violence against women in Turkey; 2014. ISBN: 978-605-4628-75-9.
 11. Gunay G, Bener O. Perception of family life in frame of gender roles of women. *Turkish Journal of Social Research*. 2011; 15(3):157-171.
 12. Guler N, Tel H, Tuncay FO. The view of womans' to the violence experienced within the family. *Cumhuriyet Medical Journal*. 2005;27(2):51-56.
 13. Basar F, Demirci N. Gender inequality and violence. *Journal of Women's Health Nursing*. 2015;2(1):41-52.
 14. Unlu S, Bayram M, Uluyagcı C, Uzoglu B. A research on violence against women on TV serials. *Journal of Selcuk Communication*. 2009;5(4):96-104.
 15. Uluocak S, Gokulu G, Bilir O. A strategic starting point for the elimination of violence

- against women: Intimate partner violence. *International Journal of Human Sciences*. 2014;11(2):362-387.
16. Sen AA. The cooperation process between violent combating against women and the applicability of law no. 6284 in Turkey. *Motif Academy Journal of Folklore*. 2018; 11(22):141-161.
 17. Gombul Ö. Nurses attitudes towards violence imposed on women by her husband in the family and their professional role in violence. *Journal of Nursing Research Development*. 2000; 2(1):19-32.
 18. Kaplan S, Akalın A, Pınar G, Yılmaz T. Attitudes of students nursing toward domestic violence against women and professional roles in domestic violence. *Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Hemşirelik E-Dergi*. 2014;2(1):26-35.
 19. Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies (HUIPS), Turkey Demographic and Health Survey (TDHS); 2014. ISBN 978-975-491-390-3
 20. Keeling J, Wormer KV. Social worker interventions in situations of domestic violence: What we can learn from survivors' personal narratives? *The British Journal of Social Work*. 2011;42(7):1-17. DOI: 10.1093/bjsw/bcr137
 21. Senol D, Yıldız S. Kadına yönelik şiddet algısı -Kadın ve Erkek Bakış Açılıyla; 2013. ISBN: 978-605-5307-05-9
 22. Incecik Y, Kurdak H, Özcan S, Akpınar E, Saatci E, Bozdemir N. Partner violence and family medicine. *Turkish Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care (TJFMPC)*. 2009;3(1):1-7.
 23. Pıra A, Elgün A. Toplumsal cinsiyeti inşa eden bir kurum olarak medya; Reklamlar aracılığıyla ataerkil ideolojinin yeniden üretilmesi; 2004. Available:<http://cim.anadolu.edu.tr/pdf/2004/1130848482.pdf> Available date, 14.05.2019
 24. Talbani A, Hasanali P. Adolescent females between tradition and modernity: Gender role socialization in South Asian immigrant culture. *Journal of Adolescence*. 2000; 23(5):615-627.
 25. Bhanot S, Senn CY. Attitudes towards violence against women in men of South Asian Ancestry: Are acculturation and gender role attitudes important factors? *J Fam Vio*. 2007;22:25-31. DOI: 10.1007/s10896-006-9060-0
 26. Stickle A, Kislitsyna O, Timofeeva I, Vägerö D. Attitudes toward intimate partner violence against women in Moscow, Russia. *J Fam Viol*. 2008;23:447-456. DOI: 10.1007/s10896-008-9170-y
 27. Can Y. Bases of violence against woman: Niğde case. *Journal of World of Turks*. 2013;5(1):203-216.
 28. Gulec H, Topaloğlu M, Ünsal D, Altıntaş M. Violence as a vicious cycle. *Current Approaches in Psychiatry*. 2012;4(1):112-137. DOI:10.5455/cap.20120408
 29. İbiloğlu AO. Domestic violence. current approaches in psychiatry. 2012;4(2):204-222.
 30. Stith SM, Rosen KH, Middleton KA, Busch AL, Lundeberg K, Carlton RP. The intergenerational transmission of spouse abuse: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2000;62(3):640-654.
 31. White HR, Widom CS. Intimate partner violence among abused and neglected children in young adulthood: The mediating effects of early aggression, antisocial personality, hostility and alcohol problems. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*. 2003;29(4):332-345.
 32. Akbağ M, Barakas R. An examination on the perception of violence and its relation to self-esteem among Turkish women. *International Journal of Human Sciences*. 2010;7(2):1- 14.
 33. Efe SY, Ayaz S. Domestic violence against women and women's opinions related to domestic violence. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2010;11:23- 29.
 34. Guler N. Physical, emotional, sexual, and economic violence by spouse during pregnancy and associated factors. *Dokuz Eylül University Nursing Faculty Electronic Journal*. 2010;3(2):72- 77.
 35. Djikonovic B, Jansen HAFM, Otasevic S. Factors associated with intimate partner violence against women in Serbia: A cross-sectional study. *J. Epidemiol Community Helath*. 2010;64:728- 735.
 36. Bostock J, Plumpton M, Pratt R. Domestic violence against women: Understanding social processes and women's experiences. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*. 2009;19:95-110.
 37. Riggs SD, Caulfield BM, Street EA. Risk for domestic violence: Factors associated with perpetration and victimization. *Journal*

- of Clinical Psychology. 2000;56(10):1289–1316.
38. Johnson PM, Ferraro JK. Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 2000;62:948–963.
39. Karal D, Aydemir E. Violence against women in Turkey. USAK Publications; 2012. ISBN: 978-605-4030-64-4.
40. Schuler SR, Islam F. Women's acceptance of intimate partner violence within marriage in rural Bangladesh. *Studies in Family Planning*. 2008;39(1):49-58.
41. Basar F, Demirci N, Cicek S, Saglam HY. Attitudes toward violence against women and the factors that affect them in Kutahya, Turkey. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*. 2019;23(1):16-26.
42. Civi S, Kutlu R, Marakaoglu K. The frequency of violence against women and the factors affecting this: A study on women who applied to two primary health care centres. *Gulhane Medical Journal*. 2008;50:110-116.
43. Altınay GA, Arat Y. Violence against women in Turkey. İstanbul; 2007. Available:http://research.sabanciuniv.edu/1418/1/Violence_Against_Women_in_Turkey.pdf
44. Yetim D, Şahin M. Approach to violence against women. *Journal of Family Medicine*. 2008;2(2):48-53.
45. Adibelli D, Yuksel R. Views of Turkish men about violence against women: A community mental health issue. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*. 2019;12(1):149-162.
46. Demir SA, Nam UD. The role of men to prevent domestic violence against women. *Suleyman Demirel University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*. 2014;19(3):211-227.
47. Harwell TS, Moore KR, Spence MR. Physical violence, intimate partner violence, and emotional abuse among adult American Indian men and women in Montana. *Prev Med*. 2003;37(4):297-303.
48. Diop-Sidibé N, Campbell JC, Becker S. Domestic violence against women in Egypt-wife beating and health outcomes. *Soc Sci Med*. 2006;62:1260-77.
49. Peek-Asa C, Zwerling C, Young T, Stromquist AM, Burmeister LF, Merchant JA. A population based study of reporting patterns and characteristics of men who abuse their female partners. *Injury Prevention*. 2005;11(3):180-185.

© 2020 Bolsoy et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/63087>*