

Investigation of the Prediction Status of Love Styles and Gender on Attitudes towards Dating Violence*

Meltem YILDIZ¹

Jale ELDELEKLİOĞLU²

Abstract

Attitudes that support dating violence are also related to the severity and frequency of aggression in romantic relationships. It is therefore important to understand the variables that influence this attitude. The aim of this study was to reveal the mediation status of love styles in attitudes towards dating violence in gender in emerging adults aged 18-25. The study was conducted on 268 emerging adults (54% female, 46% male) aged 18-25 years ($\bar{X}=20.34$). In the research, the "Dating Violence Attitude Scale" and "Love Attitudes Scale-Short Form" were used to measure attitudes towards dating violence and attitudes towards love, respectively. As a result of the mediation analysis, it was determined that the Ludus and Pragma love styles partially mediated the relationship between gender and attitudes towards general violence and physical violence in romantic relationships. The Ludus, Mania, and Pragma love styles were related to the relationship between gender and attitudes towards emotional violence in romantic relationships. It was determined that the Eros, Pragma and Agape love styles partially mediated the relationship between gender and attitudes towards economic violence in romantic relationships. It was determined that only the Ludus love style mediated the relationship between gender and attitudes towards sexual violence in romantic relationships, while the Ludus, Mania and Pragma love styles partially mediated the relationship between gender and the mean attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships. Looking at the results of the mediation analysis, it was determined that the Ludus, Pragma, and Mania love styles partially mediated the relationship between gender and attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships. It can be said that men with the Ludus love style have a more accepting attitudes towards general, physical, emotional and sexual violence in romantic relationships compared to their female peers with this love style. It can be said that women with the Pragma love style have a more accepting attitudes towards general, physical, emotional and economic violence in romantic relationships compared to their female peers with this love style. It can be said that women with the Mania love style have a more accepting attitudes towards emotional violence in romantic relationships.

Keywords: Attitudes towards dating violence, love styles, Turkish youth

Introduction

Gender, which is one of the demographic characteristics that are the most subject to scientific research, has maintained its importance as a variable in the field of violence in romantic relationships as it has in many research areas. Gender differences in being the perpetrator or victim of violence in romantic relationships have been the subject of many studies (Abel, 2001; Anderson et al., 2011; Bookwala et al., 1992; Caldwell, Swan & Woodbrown, 2012; Felson, 1997; Forbes et al., 2004; Henton et al., 1983; Iftar, 2016; Russell & Oswald, 2002; Sis, 2018; Yakut, 2012). The literature on gender differences in attitudes towards dating violence is

* Presented as an oral presentation at the Vth International Eurasian Educational Research Congress (2018).

¹ Bursa Uludag University, Faculty of Education, meltemyildiz@uludag.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4535-6903>

² Bursa Uludag University, Faculty of Education, eldelek@uludag.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7978-0975>

limited (Mazur, 1996; Mercer, 1988). The term acceptability of dating violence is equated with a person's positive attitude, defense or tolerance towards violence (Kaura & Lohman, 2007). Researchers in this related literature have stated that men believe more than women that the use of violence against their partners is necessary under certain conditions (Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1989; Foshee et al., 2001; Karlson et al., 2016; Lauritsen & Heimer, 2009; Torres et al., 2012; Xie, Heimer & Lauritsen, 2012; Wang, 2016).

Forbes et al. (2005) revealed that men accept both physical and psychological violence more in their romantic relationships than women. There is also research showing that emerging adults are more accepting of women's physical violence in romantic relationships than men (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Bethke & DeJoy, 1993). The relevant literature has expanded with the information that these attitudes begin in young adolescents and that more acceptance of female violence in romantic relationships includes psychological and sexual violence (Price, Byers & DVRT, 1999). When we look at the studies on the subject in our country, there are studies showing that men have a more accepting attitude towards violence in romantic relationships (Altan-Sarıkaya & Çömez-İkican, 2019; Ayyıldız & Taylan, 2018; Erdem & Şahin, 2017; Özgür, Yörükoğlu & Baysan-Arabacı, 2011; Sezer, 2008, Sezer & Sumbas, 2018; Süneci et al., 2016; Terzioğlu et al., 2016; Yumuşak, 2013). However, there are also studies showing that women have a more accepting attitude than men (Yumuşak & Sürücü, 2012; Yüzügülen, 2016). Özdere and Kürtül (2018) investigated whether emerging adults' attitudes towards psychological and physical violence in their romantic relationships differed with training. As a result of their research, the attitude scores of men towards psychological and physical violence perpetrated by individuals of both genders in their romantic relationships were higher than those of women before and after the training (Özdere & Kürtül, 2018). In the study by Doğan, Altun, and Kaçmaz (2018), it was found that men had higher levels of acceptance of psychological and physical violence in romantic relationships than women.

In some romantic relationships, love and aggression may occur together (Ellis & Malamuth, 2000). Researchers began investigating Lee's love typology to examine whether there was a relationship between certain love styles and violence in romantic relationships (Lewis, Travea & Fremouw, 2002). They revealed that some love styles lead to a more unhealthy romantic relationship than others. (Açikel, 2013; Durmaz & Ercan, 2019; Eren, 2019; Goodboy, Myers & Member of Investigating Communication, 2010). The Mania and Ludus love styles are an important catalyst in experiencing problems in relationships (Goodboy, Myers & Member of Investigating Communication, 2010). According to Russell and Oswald's (2002) study, men who forced their partners to have sex scored higher on the Ludus love style. In the same study, men who forced their partners sexually also scored lower on the Agape love style (Russell & Oswald, 2002). In another study examining the relationship between sexual aggression and love styles, the Ludus love style among six love styles was found to be the best predictor of verbal sexual coercion (Sarwer et al., 1993). It has been proven that Mania love style is associated with dominance and control over one's partner (Levy & Davis, 1988). In addition, it was determined that the same love style was the strongest predictor of violence in romantic relationships for women (Bookwala et al., 1992). According to Küçük-Helvacı (2012), there is a positive relationship between the Ludus love style and physical and emotional abuse in romantic relationships. There is also a negative relationship between physical abuse in romantic relationships and the Eros love style, and a negative relationship between emotional abuse and the Agape and Eros love styles (Küçük-Helvacı, 2012). According to Lewis, Travea and Fremouw (2002), both the perpetrator and the victim of violence in romantic relationships have a low level of altruistic love style.

Most research on gender differences and love focuses on mate selection strategies from the perspective of evolutionary psychology (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Sex differences in love, mate preferences, and sexuality

reflect, on the one hand, the social structures that influence male and female sexual behavior, and on the other hand well illustrate the basic psychological characteristics of sexual psychology, such as the mechanisms of physical reproduction and the number of males and females considered to be the result of differences in parental investment. (Ohno, 1967; Trivers, 1972; Walsh, 1993). Gender difference is constantly reported in research on close relationships in such a context (Smith & Klases, 2016). According to Regan (2016), men adopt an unconditional, self-sacrificing orientation towards their romantic partners more than women. Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) found that men scored higher than women in the Ludus love style. They found that women scored higher than men in the Storge, Pragma and Mania love styles. There was no gender difference in the love styles of Agape and Eros (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). Lin and Huddleston-Casas (2005) conducted a study focusing on Agape love attitudes and found that men scored higher than women in this selfless, altruistic love style. Contrasting with this finding, in his study, Davies (2001) found that the Agape love style is socially desirable for women but undesirable for men. Neto (2007) found that Chinese men were more supportive of the Storge and Agape love styles, while Chinese women tended to approve of the Pragma love styles. Considering the studies on the subject in our country, in the study by Yücel (2014), the Agape and Ludus love styles were mostly preferred by men, while the Pragma love style was more preferred by women. Ercan (2016) and Öztemel (2017) also revealed a result that supports this finding, and they also found that women preferred the Mania love style more. Büyükşahin (2006) similarly determined that women preferred the Eros love style more in addition to the results supporting the finding that men adopted the Agape love style more. While Tüfekçi (2008) supported these findings, Küçük-Helvacı (2012) did not find a significant gender difference in the Mania, Storge and Eros love styles. Durmaz and Ercan (2019), on the other hand, determined in their study that the Eros, Storge, Ludus and Agape love styles were preferred mostly by men, while the Pragma love style was preferred by women more. Açikel (2013), on the other hand, found that women scored high on the Agapa and Pragma love styles, while men scored high on the Ludus love style.

Researchers have found a significant relationship between university students' beliefs that support violence in a romantic relationship and their aggressive behavior towards their partners (Archer & Graham-Kevan, 2003; Locke & Richman, 1999; Nabors et al., 2006; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996). Stith et al. (2004) meta-analysis found a strong correlation between attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships and being a perpetrator of violence in relationships. Attitudes that support violence in romantic relationships are also associated with the severity and frequency of aggression in romantic relationships (Hanson et al., 1997; Stith & Farley, 1993). Researchers examining the factors affecting attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships have revealed that gender is an important factor (Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2009; Locke & Richman, 1999; Rhatigan et al., 2011; Stewart et al., 2012). It is also important to look at gender differences in love styles and to clarify findings in this area, as the literature shows that men and women may love differently (Bailey et al., 1987; Dion & Dion, 1973; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). The paradoxical coexistence of love and aggression in romantic relationships has also been reported by many researchers (Arias et al., 1987; Cate et al., 1988). One possible explanation is that certain love patterns may facilitate the emergence of aggression in a close relationship (Bookwala et al., 1994). There are no studies investigating the relationship between certain love styles and attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships. Although there are studies in the literature between attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships and gender, love styles and gender, no study has been found that directly addresses attitudes towards violence and love styles in romantic relationships. While the current research aims to fill this gap, it will add to the literature the mediation of love styles in the relationship between gender and attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships.

The aim of the present study is to reveal the mediation status of love styles in attitudes towards violence in gender and romantic relationships in emerging adults aged 18-25. For this purpose, answers to the following research questions were sought:

1. Is there a significant relationship between gender, attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships and love styles (Eros, Ludus, Storge, Mania, Pragma, Agape) of emerging adults?
2. What is the mediating role of love styles (Eros, Ludus, Storge, Mania, Pragma, Agape) in the effect of gender on attitudes towards general violence in romantic relationships?
3. What is the mediating role of love styles (Eros, Ludus, Storge, Mania, Pragma, Agape) in the effect of gender on attitudes towards physical violence in romantic relationships?
4. What is the mediating role of love styles (Eros, Ludus, Storge, Mania, Pragma, Agape) in the effect of gender on attitudes towards emotional violence in romantic relationships?
5. What is the mediating role of love styles (Eros, Ludus, Storge, Mania, Pragma, Agape) in the effect of gender on attitudes towards economic violence in romantic relationships?
6. What is the mediating role of love styles (Eros, Ludus, Storge, Mania, Pragma, Agape) in the effect of gender on attitudes towards sexual violence in romantic relationships?

Method

Research Design

This research, which was conducted to reveal the relationship between emerging adults' genders, their attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships, and their love styles, is an example of a correlational research type of quantitative research.

Study Group

The research was carried out with 268 emerging adults between the ages of 18-25 studying at the faculty of education of a university in the Marmara Region of Turkey in the fall semester of the 2017-2018 academic year. 54% of the participants were girls and 46% were boys (mean age 20.34, standard deviation, 1.81). 15.7% of the emerging adults participating in the research were studying in Special Education, 23.1% in English Language Teaching, 18.3% in Computer and Instructional Technologies Teaching, 22% in Preschool Teaching and 20.9% in Psychological Counseling and Guidance. Of the participants in the study group, 41.4% were first-year students, 17.2% were second-year students, 29.1% were third-year students, and 12.3% were fourth-year students.

Data Collection Tools

Dating Violence Attitude Scale

This scale used in the research was developed by Terzioğlu et al. (2016) in 2016 in order to determine the attitudes of university students towards violence in their romantic relationships. The internal consistency coefficient of the overall scale is .91, while the internal consistency coefficients of the subscales range between .72 - .85. In the test-retest reliability test, no statistically significant difference was found between the

measurements. It is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 28 items and five sub-dimensions under the headings of general violence, physical violence, emotional violence, economic violence, and sexual violence.

The general violence sub-dimension consists of 5 items and the sample items are as follows: "Threats can be used as a tool to maintain the relationship in girl/boy friendship", and "Violence in girl/boy friendship is an indication of the lack of mutual respect". Sample items in the physical violence sub-dimension consisting of 5 items are as follows: "Boys can hit their girlfriends when necessary", and "Girls can hit their boyfriends when necessary". The emotional violence sub-dimension consists of 6 items and the sample items are: "Girls should do whatever their boyfriend wants", and "Boys should do whatever their girlfriend wants". Sample items in the sub-dimension of economic violence, which consists of 5 items, are as follows: "Boys should control the money their girlfriend earns", and "Girls should control the money their boyfriend earns". The sexual violence sub-dimension consists of 7 items and the sample items are: "Men should not sexually coerce their girlfriends", and "Girls should not sexually coerce their boyfriends".

While 23 of the attitude statements in the scale are reverse scored, the highest score that can be obtained for each item is 5 and the lowest score is 1. The fact that the mean score of the scale approaches 5 is interpreted as that young people do not support violence in romantic relationships. The internal consistency coefficient of the scale for this study was found to be .88. In this study, Confirmatory Factor Analysis was performed for the construct validity of the scale. The fit index values are as follows: $\chi^2/df= 1.68$, RMSEA= 0.051, CFI= 0.86, TLI= 0.84, SRMR= 0.068.

Love Attitudes Scale-Short Form

This scale used in the study was developed by Hendrick, Hendrick and Dicke (1998) based on Lee's (1973) classification to determine the love styles that are effective in the romantic relationships of young people, and the internal consistency coefficients are between .62 and .88 for each sub-dimension. It is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 24 items and six sub-dimensions under the headings of Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania and Agape.

Eros sub-dimension consists of 4 items and the sample items are: "My partner and I are in perfect physical harmony", and "We really understand each other". Sample items in Ludus sub-dimension, which consists of 4 items, are as follows: "I believe that what he does not know about me will not hurt him", and "I like to play the 'game of love' with my partner and many others". The sub-dimension of Storge consists of 4 items and the sample items are as follows: "Our love is the best of all loves because it is born from a long-term friendship", and "Our love is not a mysterious, mystical feeling, it is a true friendship". Sample items in Pragma sub-dimension consisting of 4 items are as follows: "Before I have an intense relationship with the person I am with, I try to find out how compatible his/her hereditary characteristics are with mine if we have a child", and "The most important factor when choosing the person I am with is whether he/she would be a good parent". Mania love style consists of 4 items and the sample items are: "When the person I am with does not show interest in me, I feel sick from head to toe", and "If I suspect that the person I am with is with another person, I cannot be comfortable". Sample items in Agape sub-dimension, which consists of 4 items, are as follows: "I will endure anything for the person I am with", and "I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes so that my partner can fulfill their wishes".

A separate score is obtained from each sub-dimension in the scale, and a minimum of 4 points and a maximum of 20 points can be obtained from a sub-dimension. An increase in the scores in a subscale indicates that the individual prefers the love style named after that dimension more than the others. The

validity and reliability study for university students in our country was conducted by Büyüksahin and Hovardaoglu (2004). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found to be .70, and the split-half test reliability coefficient was found to be .70. The criterion-related validity coefficient varies between .47 and .63. The internal consistency coefficient of each subscale is respectively .82 for Agape, .77 for Storge, .66 for Eros, .62 for Pragma, .39 for Ludus, and .52 for Mania. For this study, the internal consistency coefficient of each subscale is respectively .76 for Agape, .78 for Storge, .62 for Eros, .55 for Pragma, .23 for Ludus, and .52 for Mania.

The fact that the internal consistency coefficient of the playful love sub-dimension is low is a situation that has also been encountered by other researchers. E.g., Wan-Shahrazad, Hoesni & Chong adapted the scale to Malaysian culture in 2012. The internal consistency coefficients of the scale were determined as .79 for Eros, .87 for Storge, .82 for Pragma, .72 for Mania and .83 for Agape. The lowest internal consistency coefficient was calculated as .39 for Ludus (Wan-Shahrazad, Hoesni & Chong, 2012). Levy and Davis (1988) also claimed that some items in the love dimensions of the Love Attitudes Scale have low reliability. In this study, Confirmatory Factor Analysis was performed for the construct validity of the scale. The fit index values are as follows: $\chi^2/df= 1.90$, RMSEA= 0.058, CFI= 0.81, TLI= 0.78, SRMR= 0.071.

Data Collection Process

Data collection was carried out in the fall semester of the 2017-2018 academic year over a two-week period. According to American Psychological Association (APA, 2017) ethical codes, it was stated that the study was assumed not to cause significant stress or harm, and informed consent could not be obtained in studies conducted in educational environments where the identity of the participants was not specified in the data collection tools. In this study, the participants were informed about the research, and their identities were kept confidential without obstructing the course. The scales used in the research were applied by the researchers to the students during class hours. Before the application, the purpose of the research was explained to the students. It was stated that they wanted to collect information from students who have a romantic partner in the current situation or who have had one in the past, and those who volunteered were asked to participate.

Data Analysis

Although data were collected from 300 students, 32 scale data were not included in the analysis because they were filled incompletely. The sub-problems of the research were tested with mediation analysis in the Amos 24 software program. A path model and ADF parameter estimation method were used in the mediation analysis. In the mediation analysis, it was first tested whether the extrinsic variable predicted the endogenous variable significantly or not, without including the basic model, that is, the mediator variable in the analysis. Then, the mediator variable was added to the model and the direct and indirect effects were examined. External variables (gender) were categorical, internal variables (types of violence) and mediator variables (love styles) were the continuous variables in the analyses. Gender scores consist of two categories (Female and Male). In this study, being male was coded as 0 and being female as 1 and turned into a two-category variable. The critical value of $p= 0.05$ was used to examine the significance of the path coefficients in all models.

The students' genders, love styles and attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships were examined by Point-Biserial Correlation. Since the multivariate normality assumption, which is one of the conditions of mediation analysis, was not met by the data, the weighted least squares (ADF) method was used as the

The Relationship Between Dating Violence And Love Styles

parameter estimation method. In order to obtain reliable results in this estimation method, it is necessary to have at least 10 times more data than the estimated number of parameters (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2000). In an example given by Byrne (2016), the sample size should be at least 470 in a study with 47 predicted parameters. For the study in this example, the ADF estimation method will not give accurate results for a sample size of 372 data (Byrne, 2016). The number of estimated parameters in each of the determined basic models is 2. Accordingly, in order to use this estimation method, it is necessary to have at least 200 data. Since the sample size of this study is 268, there is no obstacle in choosing the use of this estimation method.

The mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis values of the sub-dimensions of the scales used in Table 1 are presented by dividing the data set into two according to gender. Looking at the table, it is seen that men have a more supportive attitude than women in all sub-dimensions of violence. Looking at Table 1, the three most preferred love styles by men are seen to be Eros, Mania and Agape. The three most preferred love styles by women are Eros, Storge and Mania. Ludus was the least preferred love style for both genders.

Table 1

The Mean and Standard Deviations of the Scores Obtained from Emerging Adults' Dating Violence Attitude Scale and Love Attitudes Scale-Short Form

Gender		M	SD	Skewness		Kurtosis		N
				Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error	
Female	General Violence	4.92	.13	-1.38	.20	.76	.40	144
	Physical Violence	4.66	.41	-1.17	.20	.61	.40	144
	Emotional Violence	4.26	.55	-.67	.20	.04	.40	144
	Economic Violence	4.12	.56	-.32	.20	-.29	.40	144
	Sexual Violence	5	.00	144
	Average Dating Violence Attitude	4.61	.22	-.62	.20	.20	.40	144
	Eros	15.31	2.81	-.57	.20	.39	.40	144
	Ludus	9.04	2.53	.25	.20	.66	.40	144
	Storge	12.73	3.95	-.09	.20	-.85	.40	144
	Mania	12.33	2.82	.24	.20	-.55	.40	144
	Pragma	12.10	3.01	.34	.20	-.43	.40	144
	Agape	10.58	3.30	.09	.20	-.22	.40	144
Valid N (listwise)								144
Male	General Violence	4.44	.68	-1.34	.22	1.40	.43	124
	Physical Violence	4.13	.78	-1.08	.22	1.24	.43	124
	Emotional Violence	3.97	.68	-.32	.22	-.31	.43	124
	Economic Violence	3.59	.80	-.02	.22	-.64	.43	124
	Sexual Violence	4.34	.67	-.87	.22	.02	.43	124

Average Attitude	Dating	Violence	4.11	.50	-.49	.22	-.19	.43	124
Eros			14.37	2.77	-.25	.22	.03	.43	124
Ludus			10.49	2.61	.10	.22	-.41	.43	124
Storge			12.41	3.91	-.14	.22	-.64	.43	124
Mania			13.08	3.22	-.12	.22	-.45	.43	124
Pragma			10.87	3.25	.01	.22	-.64	.43	124
Agape			12.96	3.52	-.31	.22	-.31	.43	124
Valid N (listwise)									124

Findings

Within the scope of the first problem of the study, correlations were calculated in order to determine the relationships between emerging adults' genders, attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships and love styles. The obtained results are given in Table 2.

Table 2

Correlation Results between Emerging Adults' Gender, Attitudes towards Dating Violence and Love Styles

Variables	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.
1. Gender	1	.45**	.40**	.23**	.36**	.59**	.56**	.17**	-.27**	.04	-.12*	.19**	-.33**
2. General Violence		1	.64**	.32**	.32**	.50**	.72**	.11	-.31**	.02	-.12	-.08	-.08
3. Physical Violence			1	.49**	.36**	.51**	.81**	.03	-.23**	.04	-.09	-.07	-.08
4. Emotional Violence				1	.38**	.34**	.71**	-.022	-.21**	.09	-.23**	-.09	-.18**
5. Economic Violence					1	.32**	.67**	-.09	-.07	-.16**	-.12	-.08	-.35**
6. Sexual Violence						1	.74**	.09	-.29**	.003	-.08	.09	-.17**
7. Average Dating Violence Attitude							1	.03	-.29**	-.01	-.17**	-.06	-.24**
8. Eros								1	-.21**	.26**	.04	-.08	.24**
9. Ludus									1	-.04	.17**	.03	.02
10. Storge										1	.08	-.07	.11
11. Mania											1	.16**	.41**
12. Pragma												1	0.04
13. Agape													1

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

When Table 2 is examined, gender was found to be positively correlated with general violence ($r = 0.45$, $p < 0.01$), physical violence ($r = 0.40$, $p < 0.01$), emotional violence ($r = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$), economic violence ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.01$), sexual violence ($r = 0.59$, $p < 0.01$) and mean violence attitude ($r = 0.56$, $p < 0.01$). Accordingly, it can be said that female emerging adults do not have a supportive attitude towards any type of violence in a

romantic relationship. Looking at Table 2, gender was found to be positively associated with the Eros love style ($r= 0.17, p<0.01$) and Pragma love style ($r= 0.19, p<0.01$), while it showed a significant negative correlation with the Ludus love style ($r= -0.27, p<0.01$), Mania love style ($r= -0.12, p<0.05$) and Agape love style ($r= -0.33, p<0.01$). Accordingly, it can be said that women prefer the Eros and Pragma love styles, while men prefer the Agape, Ludus and Mania love styles. No significant relationship was found between the Storge love style and gender.

The mediating role of love styles in the effect of gender on the total and subscale scores of attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships in emerging adults was examined by mediation analysis. In this context, firstly, the direct effect of gender on the total and subscale scores of attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships was examined without adding mediator variables (Eros, Ludus, Pragma, Storge, Mania, Agape) to the model (basic model). In the basic model, which was examined without adding love styles, it was observed that gender significantly affected all of the total and subscale scores of attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships in a positive way ($p<0.001$). It was determined that the path coefficients obtained were between 0.291 and 0.665 and that the explained variances were between 0.13 and 0.35.

Secondly, in the mediation analysis, the mediator variables were added to the model and the direct and indirect effects were examined. Table 3 shows the mediating role of love styles in the effect of gender on attitudes towards physical violence in romantic relationships. Accordingly, it was observed that gender significantly predicted the attitude towards physical violence in romantic relationships and the Eros and Pragma love styles positively, and negatively predicted the Ludus, Agape and Mania love styles. It was determined that gender positively predicted the Storge love style, but that it was not significant. It was determined that the Ludus love style positively predicted the attitude towards physical violence in romantic relationships, while the Pragma love style positively predicted it. The direct effect between the Eros, Storge, Mania and Agape love styles and attitudes towards physical violence in romantic relationships was not significant.

Table 3

The Effect of Gender and Love Styles on Violence Types in Romantic Relationships

MODEL TYPE			RW	P	SRW	R ²	INTERPRETATION
MODEL_GENERAL_1	Eros	<--- Gender	0,942	0,006	0,166	0,028	
	General Violence	<--- Gender	0,472	***	0,446	0,206	
	General Violence	<--- Eros	0,007	0,434	0,039		
MODEL_GENERAL_2	Ludus	<--- Gender	-1,457	***	-0,273	0,075	There is mediation.
	General Violence	<--- Gender	0,42	***	0,397	0,244	
	General Violence	<--- Ludus	-0,041	***	-0,205		
MODEL_GENERAL-3	Storge	<--- Gender	0,318	0,508	0,04	0,002	
	General Violence	<--- Gender	0,479	***	0,453	0,205	
	General Violence	<--- Storge	0	0,968	0,002		
MODEL_GENERAL-4	Mania	<--- Gender	-0,747	0,045	-0,123	0,015	
	General Violence	<--- Gender	0,47	***	0,445	0,209	

	General Violence	<---	Mania	-0,011	0,271	-0,065		
MODEL_GENERAL-5	Pragma	<---	Gender	1,233	0,001	0,194	0,038	There is mediation.
	General Violence	<---	Gender	0,515	***	0,487	0,235	
	General Violence	<---	Pragma	-0,03	0,004	-0,177		
MODEL TYPE				RW	P	SRW	R²	INTERPRETATION
MODEL_GENERAL-6	Agape	<---	Gender	-2,383	***	-0,331	0,109	
	General Violence	<---	Gender	0,508	***	0,48	0,211	
	General Violence	<---	Agape	0,012	0,202	0,084		
MODEL_PHYSICAL -1	Eros	<---	Gender	0,942	0,006	0,166	0,028	
	Physical Violence	<---	Gender	0,539	***	0,407	0,162	
	Physical Violence	<---	Eros	-0,01	0,455			
MODEL_PHYSICAL -2	Ludus	<---	Gender	-1,457	***	-0,273	0,075	There is mediation.
	Physical Violence	<---	Gender	0,484	***	0,366	0,175	
	Physical Violence	<---	Ludus	-0,032	0,045	-0,127		
MODEL_PHYSICAL -3	Storge	<---	Gender	0,318	0,508	0,04	0,002	
	Physical Violence	<---	Gender	0,529	***	0,399	0,161	
	Physical Violence	<---	Storge	0,004	0,656	0,025		
MODEL_PHYSICAL -4	Mania	<---	Gender	-0,747	0,045	-0,123	0,015	
	Physical Violence	<---	Gender	0,524	***	0,396	0,162	
	Physical Violence	<---	Mania	-0,009	0,536	-0,04		
MODEL_PHYSICAL -5	Pragma	<---	Gender	1,233	0,001	0,194	0,038	There is mediation.
	Physical Violence	<---	Gender	0,57	***	0,43	0,183	
	Physical Violence	<---	Pragma	-0,032	0,008	-0,155		
MODEL_PHYSICAL -6	Agape	<---	Gender	-2,383	***	-0,331	0,109	
	Physical Violence	<---	Gender	0,558	***	0,421	0,164	
	Physical Violence	<---	Agape	0,011	0,322	0,062		
MODEL TYPE				RW	P	SRW	R²	INTERPRETATION
MODEL_EMOTIONAL-1	Eros	<---	Gender	0,942	0,006	0,166	0,028	
	Emotional Violence	<---	Gender	0,304	***	0,241	0,057	
	Emotional Violence	<---	Eros	-0,014	0,271	-0,062		
MODEL_EMOTIONAL-2	Ludus	<---	Gender	-1,457	***	-0,273	0,075	There is mediation.
	Emotional Violence	<---	Gender	0,236	0,003	0,187	0,077	
	Emotional Violence	<---	Ludus	-0,038	0,009	-0,16		
MODEL_EMOTIONAL-3	Storge	<---	Gender	0,318	0,508	0,04	0,002	

The Relationship Between Dating Violence And Love Styles

	Emotional Violence	<---	Gender	0,287	***	0,228	0,059	
	Emotional Violence	<---	Storge	0,012	0,197	0,076		
MODEL_EMOTIONAL-4	Mania	<---	Gender	-0,747	0,045	-0,123	0,015	There is mediation.
	Emotional Violence	<---	Gender	0,259	***	0,206	0,095	
	Emotional Violence	<---	Mania	-0,043	0,002	-0,207		
MODEL_EMOTIONAL-5	Pragma	<---	Gender	1,233	0,001	0,194	0,038	There is mediation.
	Emotional Violence	<---	Gender	0,325	***	0,258	0,072	
	Emotional Violence	<---	Pragma	-0,028	0,021	-0,14		
MODEL_EMOTIONAL-6	Agape	<---	Gender	-2,383	***	-0,331	0,109	
	Emotional Violence	<---	Gender	0,242	0,004	0,192	0,066	
	Emotional Violence	<---	Agape	-0,021	0,082	-0,118		
MODEL_EKONOMIĆ-1	Eros	<---	Gender	0,942	0,006	0,166	0,028	There is mediation.
	Economic Violence	<---	Gender	0,568	***	0,389	0,155	
	Economic Violence	<---	Eros	-0,039	0,005	-0,152		
MODEL TYPE				RW	P	SRW	R²	INTERPRETATION
MODEL_EKONOMIĆ-2	Ludus	<---	Gender	-1,457	***	-0,273	0,075	
	Economic Violence	<---	Gender	0,544	***	0,373	0,133	
	Economic Violence	<---	Ludus	0,009	0,584	0,034		
MODEL_EKONOMIĆ-3	Storge	<---	Gender	0,318	0,508	0,04	0,002	
	Economic Violence	<---	Gender	0,541	***	0,371	0,164	
	Economic Violence	<---	Storge	-0,033	0,002	-0,178		
MODEL_EKONOMIĆ-4	Mania	<---	Gender	-0,747	0,045	-0,123	0,015	
	Economic Violence	<---	Gender	0,518	***	0,355	0,137	
	Economic Violence	<---	Mania	-0,017	0,279	-0,071		
MODEL_EKONOMIĆ-5	Pragma	<---	Gender	1,233	0,001	0,194	0,038	There is mediation.
	Economic Violence	<---	Gender	0,574	***	0,394	0,155	
	Economic Violence	<---	Pragma	-0,035	0,009	-0,154		
MODEL_EKONOMIĆ-6	Agape	<---	Gender	-2,383	***	-0,331	0,109	There is mediation.
	Economic Violence	<---	Gender	0,405	***	0,277	0,193	
	Economic Violence	<---	Agape	-0,053	***	-0,261		
MODEL_SEXUAL -1	Eros	<---	Gender	0,942	0,006	0,166	0,028	
	Sexual Violence	<---	Gender	0,666	***	0,593	0,351	
	Sexual Violence	<---	Eros	-0,001	0,9	-0,006		
MODEL_SEXUAL -2	Ludus	<---	Gender	-1,457	***	-0,273	0,075	There is mediation.
	Sexual Violence	<---	Gender	0,623	***	0,555	0,367	

	Sexual Violence	<---	Ludus	-0,028	0,017	-0,135		
MODEL TYPE				RW	P	SRW	R ²	INTERPRETATION
MODEL_SEXUAL-3	Storge	<---	Gender	0,318	0,508	0,04	0,002	
	Sexual Violence	<---	Gender	0,666	***	0,593	0,351	
	Sexual Violence	<---	Storge	-0,003	0,678	-0,021		
MODEL_SEXUAL-4	Mania	<---	Gender	-0,747	0,045	-0,123	0,015	
	Sexual Violence	<---	Gender	0,664	***	0,591	0,351	
	Sexual Violence	<---	Mania	-0,001	0,891	-0,008		
MODEL_SEXUAL-5	Pragma	<---	Gender	1,233	0,001	0,194	0,038	
	Sexual Violence	<---	Gender	0,67	***	0,597	0,351	
	Sexual Violence	<---	Pragma	-0,005	0,602	-0,026		
MODEL_SEXUAL_6	Agape	<---	Gender	-2,383	***	-0,331	0,109	
	Sexual Violence	<---	Gender	0,678	***	0,604	0,352	
	Sexual Violence	<---	Agape	0,005	0,536	0,035		
MODEL_AVEDATVIOATTI -1	Eros	<---	Gender	0,942	0,006	0,166	0,028	
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Gender	0,514	***	0,569	0,316	
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Eros	-0,011	0,165	-0,067		
MODEL_AVEDATVIOATTI -2	Ludus	<---	Gender	-1,457	***	-0,273	0,075	There is mediation.
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Gender	0,465	***	0,516	0,334	
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Ludus	-0,026	0,003	-0,156		
MODEL_AVEDATVIOATTI -3	Storge	<---	Gender	0,318	0,508	0,04	0,002	
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Gender	0,505	***	0,559	0,313	
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Storge	-0,003	0,555	-0,028		
MODEL TYPE				RW	P	SRW	R ²	INTERPRETATION
MODEL_AVEDATVIOATTI -4	Mania	<---	Gender	-0,747	0,045	-0,123	0,015	There is mediation.
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Gender	0,491	***	0,545	0,323	
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Mania	-0,016	0,046	-0,109		
MODEL_AVEDATVIOATTI -5	Pragma	<---	Gender	1,233	0,001	0,194	0,038	There is mediation.
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Gender	0,534	***	0,592	0,34	
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Pragma	-0,024	***	-0,172		
MODEL_AVEDATVIOATTI -6	Agape	<---	Gender	-2,383	***	-0,331	0,109	
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Gender	0,484	***	0,536	0,316	
	AVEDATVIOATTI	<---	Agape	-0,008	0,233	-0,066		

Table 4

Direct, Indirect and Total Effects in Mediation Models

Estimated Variables	Predictive variables	Standardized Regression Coefficients		
		Direct	Indirect	Total
GENERALV_2 (R ² =0.244)	LUDUS	-0.205*	0.000	-0.205*
	GENDER	0.397*	0.056*	0.453*
GENERALV_5 (R ² =0.235)	PRAGMA	-0.177*	0.000	-0.177*
	GENDER	0.487*	-0.034*	0.453*
PHYSICALV_2 (R ² =0.175)	LUDUS	-0.127*	0.000	-0.127*
	GENDER	0.366*	0.035*	0.400*
PHYSICALV_5 (R ² =0.183)	PRAGMA	-0.155*	0.000	-0.155*
	GENDER	0.430*	-0.030*	0.400*
EMOTIONALV_2 (R ² =0.077)	LUDUS	-0.160*	0.000	-0.160*
	GENDER	0.187*	0.044*	0.231*
EMOTIONALV_4 (R ² =0.095)	MANIA	-0.207*	0.000	-0.207*
	GENDER	0.206*	0.025*	0.231*
EMOTIONALV_5 (R ² =0.072)	PRAGMA	-0.140*	0.000	-0.140*
	GENDER	0.258*	-0.027*	0.231*
ECONOMICV_1 (R ² =0.155)	EROS	-0.152*	0.000	-0.152*
	GENDER	0.389*	-0.025*	0.364*
ECONOMICV_5 (R ² =0.155)	PRAGMA	-0.154*	0.000	-0.154*
	GENDER	0.394*	-0.030*	0.364*
ECONOMICV_6 (R ² =0.193)	AGAPE	-0.261*	0.000	- 0.261*
	GENDER	0.277*	0.086*	0.364*
SEXUALV_2 (R ² =0.367)	LUDUS	-0.135*	0.000	-0.135*

	GENDER	0.555*	0.037*	0.592*
AVEDATVIOATTI_2 (R²=0.334)	LUDUS	-0.156*	0.000	-0.156*
	GENDER	0.516*	0.043*	0.558*
AVEDATVIOATTI_4 (R²=0.323)	MANIA	-0.109	0.000	-0.109
	GENDER	0.545*	0.013*	0.558*
AVEDATVIOATTI_5 (R²=0.340)	PRAGMA	-0.172*	0.000	-0.172*
	GENDER	0.592*	-0.033*	0.558*

* $p \leq 0.05$

In the model in which the Ludus love style was the mediator, the direct effect of gender on the attitude towards general violence in romantic relationships was significant ($p < 0.001$); when the mediator was added to the model, the indirect effect was significant ($p < 0.05$) and the direct effect was significant ($p > 0.05$). For this reason, it was determined that the Ludus love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards general violence in romantic relationships. In the model in which the Pragma love style was the mediator, the direct effect of gender on the attitude towards general violence in romantic relationships was significant ($p < 0.001$); when the mediator was added to the model, the indirect effect was significant ($p < 0.05$) and the direct effect was significant ($p > 0.05$). For this reason, it was determined that the Pragma love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards general violence in romantic relationships. For this reason, it was determined that the Ludus and Pragma love styles had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards general violence in romantic relationships.

In the model in which the Ludus love style was the mediator, the direct effect of gender on the attitude towards emotional violence in romantic relationships was significant ($p < 0.001$); when the mediator was added to the model, the indirect effect was significant ($p < 0.05$) and the direct effect was significant ($p > 0.05$). For this reason, it was determined that the Ludus love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards emotional violence in romantic relationships. In the model in which the Mania love style was the mediator, the direct effect of gender on the attitude towards emotional violence in romantic relationships was significant ($p < 0.001$); when the mediator was added to the model, the indirect effect was significant ($p < 0.05$) and the direct effect was significant ($p > 0.05$). For this reason, it was determined that the Mania love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards emotional violence in romantic relationships. The direct effect of gender on the attitude towards emotional violence in romantic relationships without adding a mediator in the model in which the Pragma love style was the mediator was significant ($p < 0.001$); when the mediator was added to the model, the indirect effect was significant ($p < 0.05$) and the direct effect was significant ($p > 0.05$). For this reason, it was determined that the Pragma love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards emotional violence in romantic relationships. For this reason, it was determined that the Ludus, Mania and Pragma love styles had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards general violence in romantic relationships.

In the model in which the Eros love style was the mediator, the direct effect of gender on the attitude towards economic violence in romantic relationships was significant ($p < 0.001$); when the mediator was added to the

model, the indirect effect was significant ($p < 0.05$) and the direct effect was significant ($p > 0.05$). For this reason, it was determined that the Eros love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards economic violence in romantic relationships. In the model in which the Pragma love style was the mediator, the direct effect of gender on the attitude towards economic violence in romantic relationships was significant ($p < 0.001$); when the mediator was added to the model, the indirect effect was significant ($p < 0.05$) and the direct effect was significant ($p > 0.05$). For this reason, it was determined that the Pragma love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards economic violence in romantic relationships. In the model in which the Agape love style was the mediator, the direct effect of gender on the attitude towards economic violence in romantic relationships was significant ($p < 0.001$); when the mediator was added to the model, the indirect effect was significant ($p < 0.05$) and the direct effect was significant ($p > 0.05$). For this reason, it was determined that the Agape love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards emotional violence in romantic relationships. For this reason, it was determined that the Eros, Pragma and Agape love styles had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards general violence in romantic relationships.

In the model in which the Ludus love style was the mediator, the direct effect of gender on the attitude towards sexual violence in romantic relationships was significant ($p < 0.001$); when the mediator was added to the model, the indirect effect was significant ($p < 0.05$) and the direct effect was significant ($p > 0.05$). For this reason, it was determined that the Ludus love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the attitude towards sexual violence in romantic relationships.

In the model in which Ludus love style was the mediator, the direct effect of gender on the mean attitude towards violence in romantic relationships without adding a mediator was significant ($p < 0.001$); when the mediator was added to the model, the indirect effect was significant ($p < 0.05$) and the direct effect was significant ($p > 0.05$). For this reason, it was determined that the Ludus love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the mean attitude towards violence in romantic relationships. In the model in which the Mania love style was the mediator, the direct effect of gender on the mean attitude towards violence in romantic relationships without adding the mediator ($p < 0.001$) and the direct effect ($p < 0.05$) when added to the mediator model were found to be significant. However, it was determined that the indirect effect was not significant ($p > 0.05$). In interpreting the mediating role, it is important that the effect of the independent variable on the mediator and the mediator on the dependent variable is significant (Fiedler, Schott & Meiser, 2011). For these reasons, it was determined that the Mania love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the mean attitude towards violence in romantic relationships. In the model in which Pragma love style was the mediator, the direct effect of gender on the mean attitude towards violence in romantic relationships without adding a mediator was significant ($p < 0.001$); when the mediator was added to the model, the indirect effect was significant ($p < 0.05$) and the direct effect was significant ($p > 0.05$). For this reason, it was determined that the Pragma love style had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the mean attitude towards violence in romantic relationships. For this reason, it was determined that the Ludus and Pragma love styles had a partial mediating role in the effect of gender on the mean attitude towards violence in romantic relationships.

Discussion

In this study, it was aimed to reveal the mediation status of love styles in attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships gender and in emerging adults aged 18-25. For this purpose, first of all, the

relationships between gender, attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships and love styles were examined. As a result of the correlation analysis, positive significant relationships were determined between gender and attitudes towards general violence, physical violence, emotional violence, economic violence, sexual violence and mean violence in romantic relationships. Accordingly, it can be said that female emerging adults do not have a supportive attitude towards any type of violence in a romantic relationship. This finding is supported by studies showing that women support violence in romantic relationships less than men (Feiring et al., 2002; Geiger et al., 2004; Pradubmook-Sherer, 2011; Weisz & Black, 2001). According to Gini (2008), this finding may reflect gender role socialization, where women relate more to victims and men to perpetrators, as modern society reinforces these as appropriate roles for each gender in the context of violence in romantic relationships. Our finding that female emerging adults do not support sexual violence the most in romantic relationships is supported by the finding of Sünnetçi et al. (2016) that the most difference between women's and men's perceptions of violence in romantic relationships is in expressions containing sexual violence. The finding that female emerging adults do not support physical violence the most after sexual violence in romantic relationships contradicts the finding of Sünnetçi et al. (2016) that women tolerate verbal and psychological violence less than men.

According to Forbes et al. (2006), individuals with a sexist attitude towards women are more accepting of violence in romantic relationships. According to Bookwala et al. (1992), men who have protective sexist attitudes towards women have lower levels of acceptance of violence against women. However, there are also studies showing that men with sexist attitudes have higher levels of acceptance of violence in romantic relationships (Ryan, 1995; Yumuşak, 2013). Straus (1977), on the other hand, argued that corporal punishment establishes a link between love and violence. According to him, men who were exposed to more physical punishment in their childhood also normalize this in their other close relationships (Libby & Straus, 1980).

According to the results of the correlation analysis, it was determined that gender was positively correlated with the Eros and Pragma love style; while it showed negative significant relationships with the Ludus, Mania and Agape love styles. Accordingly, it can be said that women prefer the Eros and Pragma love styles, while men prefer the Agape, Ludus and Mania love styles. No significant relationship was found between the Storge love style and gender. Differences in sociocultural background and different display rules produce group differences in the six varieties of love. Indeed, studies have consistently found that men use the Ludus style more frequently than women, supporting the findings of the present study, while women are more likely to display each of the Mania, Pragma, and Storge love styles (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986, 1988; Hendrick et al., 1984). According to Neto's (1993) study, women reported more Eros love styles than men, while men reported higher Ludus and Agape love styles than women. In Spain, women scored lower in the Ludus love style and higher in the Mania and Eros love styles than men (Rodriguez-Santero et al. 2017). In Brazil, men scored higher than women on the Agape, Storge and Ludus love styles (Cassepp-Borges, 2021; Cassepp-Borges & Ferrer, 2019).

Looking at the results of the mediation analysis, it was determined that the Ludus, Pragma, and Mania love styles partially mediated the relationship between gender and attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships. Accordingly, the Ludus, Pragma and Mania love styles have a partial effect on the acceptance levels of violence in romantic relationships of male or female participants. It can be said that men with the Ludus love style have a more accepting attitude towards general, physical, emotional and sexual violence in romantic relationships compared to their female peers with this love style. Supporting this finding, there are studies showing that the Ludus love style is positively associated with sensation seeking, aggression and the

need for play, a stronger desire to flirt, and having more dating relationships (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1987; Woll, 1989). According to Craig (1990), these qualities overlap with many of the tendencies that characterize sexually compulsive men. According to Sarwer et al. (1993), the Ludus love style may serve as a unifying construct for personality traits related to sexual aggression in men. It can be said that women with the Pragma love style have a more accepting attitude towards general, physical, emotional and economic violence in romantic relationships compared to their female peers with this love style. It can be said that men with the Mania love style have a more accepting attitude towards emotional violence in romantic relationships.

Studies that directly support the findings of the present study could not be found. Only people with this love style and researches that reveal the characteristics of their romantic relationships have been accessed. Some studies have looked at the relationship between love styles and personality traits and found that the Mania and Pragma love styles are positively related to neuroticism, while the Mania and Ludus love styles are negatively related to responsibility (Heaven et al., 2004; Wan et al., 2000; White et al., 2004; Zeng et al., 2016). Those who use the Mania and Ludus love styles tend to produce problematic relationships, because the person who chooses the Ludus love style tends to play in the relationship, and the person who chooses the Mania love style tends to be dependent, jealous and obsessive in the relationship (Fricker & Moore, 2002; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). It has been stated that psychopathological symptoms in individuals are positively related to other styles except the Eros and Storge love styles (Yücel, 2014). According to Uzun Özer and Tezer's (2008) study, it was revealed that the Mania and Agape love styles predicted negative emotions. In studies examining the relationship between personality and temperament traits and love styles, it has been determined that there is a positive relationship between the neuroticism personality trait and the Mania love style, a negative relationship between agreeableness and the Ludus love style, and a negative relationship between rational love and openness to innovation (Açikel, 2013; Durmaz & Ercan, 2019). In addition, the neurotic personality trait predicts the Eros and Mania love styles; the psychoticism personality dimension predicts the Eros, Mania, Agape, Storge and Pragma love styles, the lying personality dimension predicts the Ludus, Storge, Mania and Pragma love styles, and an irritable temperament predicts the Eros, Ludus, Pragma, Mania and Agapa love styles (Öztemel, 2017). Eren (2019), in his study which aimed to examine the relationship between forgiveness behaviors and love styles in the romantic relationships of university students, revealed that the Mania and Ludus love styles significantly explained the avoidance and revenge dimensions, while the Agape love style significantly explained the revenge and benevolence dimensions.

In this study, the relationship between gender, love styles and attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships of emerging adults was examined. It was determined that female emerging adults have less supportive attitudes in all dimensions of violence than their male peers. It was determined that female emerging adults mostly preferred the Eros and Pragma love styles, while their male peers preferred the Agape, Ludus and Mania love styles. In addition, it was determined that these love styles, which differ according to gender, also explain the positive view of violence in romantic relationships. While the results of this study reveal that love styles play a mediating role between gender and attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships, there are also some important limitations about the study group. Some of these limitations are as follows: The number of female emerging adults participating in the study is higher than that of males. The study includes only heterosexual individuals. The number of students in the study group is small. In the study, only biological sex was discussed, while gender roles or sexual orientations were not examined. Individuals studying in only one region of Turkey (Marmara), one province (Bursa), one university (BUÜ) and only one faculty (Faculty of Education) were included in the study. Although this

university and the related faculty have students from different regions of Turkey from different socio-economic levels, this limits the generalizability of the research results. In addition, since the reliability score of the Ludus subscale in the Love Attitudes Scale-Short Form is relatively low, the findings for this subscale should be approached critically.

Future studies should also explore the situation in homosexual relationships. At the same time, it can be examined whether love styles mediate the relationship between gender roles in heterosexual couples and attitudes towards violence in romantic relationships. Researchers can also evaluate the love styles of individual partners and try to use this in the mediation relationship. Accepting attitudes towards dating violence are also a widely used criterion for single-sex and mixed-gender prevention programs aimed at changing social norms (Cornelius & Resseguie, 2007; Whitaker, Murphy, Eckhardt, Hodges & Cowart, 2013). In addition, the effect of different love styles on the attitude of supporting violence in romantic relationships was determined in this study. Therefore, practitioners understanding the correlates of attitudes toward male acceptance of psychological, physical, and sexual violence against female dating partners in both male and female samples can provide important clues for prevention.

References

- Abel, E.M. (2001). Comparing the social service utilization, exposure to violence, and trauma symptomology of domestic violence female "victims" and female "batterers". *Journal of Family Violence, 16(4)*, 401-420. DOI: 10.1023/A:1012276927091
- Açikel, M. (2013) *Relationship between love styles and personality traits of university students* (Master Thesis). Available from Council of Higher Education Thesis Center. (Thesis No: 339075).
- Altan-Sarıkaya, N., & Çömez -İkican, T. (2019). Level of intimate partner violence among nursing faculty students. *Journal of Anatolia Nursing and Health Sciences, 22(2)*, 114-120. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ataunihem/issue/46381/427674>
- American Psychological Association (2017). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. Washington: American Psychological Association. Available from: <https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/ethics-code-2017.pdf>
- Anderson, J.R., Chen, W.C., Johnson, M.D., Lyon, S.E., Lee, C-Y.S., Zheng, F., Ratcliffe, G.C., & Peterson, R. (2011). Attitudes toward dating violence among college students in mainland China: An exploratory study. *Violence and Victims, 26(5)*, 631-647. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/16477639.pdf>
- Archer, J. and Graham-Kevan, N. (2003). Do beliefs about aggression predict physical aggression to partners? *Aggressive Behavior, 29(1)*, 41-54. DOI: 10.1002/ab.10029
- Arias, I., Samios, M., & O'Leary, D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2(1)*. DOI: 10.1177/088626087002001005
- Arias, I., & Johnson, P. (1989). Evaluations of physical aggression among intimate dyads. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4(3)*, 298-307. DOI: 10.1177/088626089004003004
- Ayyıldız, A.B., & Taylan, H. H. (2018). Dating violence attitudes in university students: Case of Sakarya university. *The Journal of Academic Social Sciences, 6 (86)*, 413-427. Retrieved from

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330105063> UNIVERSITE OGRENCILERINDE FLORT SIDD ETI TUTUMLARI

- Bailey, W.C., Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1987). Relation of sex and gender role to love, sexual attitudes, and self-esteem. *Sex Roles*, 16(11-12), 637-648. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/BF00300378.pdf>
- Bethke, T. M., & DeJoy, D. M. (1993). An experimental study of factors influencing the acceptability of dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8(1), 36-51. DOI: 10.1177/088626093008001003
- Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., & Smith, C., & Ryan, K.(1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multivariate analysis'. *Violence and Victims-7(4):* 297-310. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/21848144> Predictors of Dating Violence A Multivariate Analysis
- Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., & Grote, N. K. (1994). Love, aggression and satisfaction in dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 11(4), 625-632. DOI: 10.1177/02654075941141010
- Burke, P. J., Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1989). Gender identity, self-esteem, and physical and sexual abuse in dating relationships. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 72-93). Praeger Publishers. Reprinted from *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51(3), 272-285.
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100(2), 204-232. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.100.2.204
- Büyükşahin, A. (2006). *Commitment in close relationship: The investigation of investment model in terms of attachment styles and some relational variable* (Doctoral Thesis). ~~Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.~~ Available from Council of Higher Education Thesis Center. (Thesis No: 186996).
- Büyükşahin, A., & Hovardaoglu, S. (2004). A study of couples' love attitudes within Lee's multidimensional love styles framework. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 19(54), 59-72. Retrieved from <http://psikiyatridizini.net/articles.aspx?journalid=80&year=2004&volume=19&number=54>
- Bryant, S. A., & Spencer, G. A. (2003). University students' attitudes about attributing blame in domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18(6), 369-376. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1023/A:1026205817132.pdf>
- Byrne, B. M. (2016). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS. Structural equation modeling with AMOS: basic concepts, applications, and programming* (3 ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Caldwell, J. E., Swan, S. C., & Woodbrown, V. D. (2012). Gender differences in intimate partner violence outcomes. *Psychology of Violence*, 2(1), 42-57. DOI: 10.1037/a0026296
- Cassepp-Borges, V. (2021). Should I stay or should I go? Relationship satisfaction, love, love styles and religion compatibility predicting the fate of relationships. *Sexuality & Culture*, 25(876), 871-883. DOI: 10.1007/s12119-020-09798-2
- Cassepp-Borges, V., & Ferrer, E. (2019). Are we missing the circumplexity? An examination of love styles. *Journal of Relationships Research*, 10(e21),1-10. DOI: 10.1017/jrr.2019.13.

- Cate, R. M., Lloyd, S. A., & Long, E. (1988). The role of rewards and fairness in developing premarital relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 50(2)*, 443-452. DOI: 10.2307/352009
- Craig, M. E. (1990). Coercive sexuality in dating relationships: A situational model. *Clinical Psychology Review, 10(4)*, 395-423. DOI: 10.1016/0272-7358(90)90045-C
- Cornelius, T. L., & Resseguie, N. (2007). Primary and secondary prevention programs for dating violence: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12(3)*, 364-375. DOI: 10.1016/j.avb.2006.09.006
- Davies, M. F. (2001). Socially desirable responding and impression management in the endorsement of love styles. *The Journal of Psychology, 135(5)*, 562-570. DOI:10.1080/00223980109603719
- Dion, K. L., & Dion, K. K. (1973). Correlates of romantic love. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41(1)*, 51-56. DOI:10.1037/h0035571
- Doğan, S., Altun, M., & Kaçmaz, E. D. (2018). Examination of attitudes of nursing students on dating violence. *The Journal of International Social Research, 11(56)*, 335-346. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/973f/67036e6c1af3e04910505d7e445c9f5be0f5.pdf>
- Durmaz, H., & Ercan, H. (2019). Beliren yetişkinlikte aşk stillerinin demografik değişkenler, ana babaya bağlanma ve kişilik özellikleri açısından incelenmesi. *Başkent University Journal of Education, 6(1)*, 98-110. Retrieved from <https://earsiv.kmu.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11492/4266/Durmaz%2c%20Hakan.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Ellis, B. J., & Malamuth, N. M. (2000). Love and anger in romantic relationships: A discrete systems model. *Journal of Personality, 68(3)*, 525-556. DOI: 10.1111/1467-6494.00105
- Ercan, H. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin aşk stillerinin demografik değişkenler ve ana babaya bağlanma ile ilişkisi. *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 7(1)*, 25-37. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/399592>
- Eren, E. (2019). *Predicting forgiveness in romantic relationships according to love styles* (Master Thesis). Available from Council of Higher Education Thesis Center (Thesis No. 583746).
- Erdem, A., & Şahin, R. (2017). Undergraduates' attitudes toward dating violence: Its relationship with sexism and narcissism. *International Journal of Higher Education, 6(6)*, 91-105. DOI: 10.5430/ijhe.v6n6p91
- Feiring, C., Deblinger, E. Espada, A-H., & Haworth, T. (2002). Romantic relationship aggression and attitudes in high school students: The role of gender, grade, and attachment and emotional styles. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31(5)*, 373-385. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1023/A:1015680625391.pdf>
- Felson, R. B. (1997). Anger, aggression, and violence in love triangles. *Violence and Victims, 12(4)*, 345-362. Retrieved from <https://richardfelson.files.wordpress.com/2013/06/love-triangles.pdf>
- Fiedler, K., Schott, M., & Meiser, T. (2011). What mediation analysis can (not) do. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47(6)*, 1231-1236. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.05.007
- Fricker, J., & Moore, S. (2002). Relationship satisfaction: The role of love styles and attachment styles. *Current Research in Social Psychology, 7(11)*, 182-204. Retrieved from

[https://researchbank.swinburne.edu.au/file/5bf7e7b2-8bcd-41fa-a80c-121c21488789/1/PDF%20\(Published%20version\).pdf](https://researchbank.swinburne.edu.au/file/5bf7e7b2-8bcd-41fa-a80c-121c21488789/1/PDF%20(Published%20version).pdf)

- Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L. E., & White, K. B. (2004). First and second-generation measures of sexism, rape myths and related beliefs, and hostility toward women. *Violence Against Women, 10*(3), 236–261. DOI: 10.1177/1077801203256002
- Forbes, G. B., Jobe, R. L., White, K. B., & Adams-Curtis, L. E. (2005). Perceptions of dating violence following a sexual or nonsexual betrayal of trust: Effects of gender, sexism, acceptance of rape myths, and vengeance motivation. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 52*(3-4), 165–173. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-005-1292-6
- Forbes, G., Adams-Curtis, L., Pakalka, A., & White, K. (2006). Dating aggression, sexual coercion, and aggression-supporting attitudes among college men as a function of participation in aggressive high school sports. *Violence Against Women, 12*(5), 441–455. DOI: 10.1177/1077801206288126.
- Foshee, V. A., Linder, F., MacDougall, J. E., & Bangdiwala, S. (2001). Gender differences in the longitudinal predictors of adolescent dating violence. *Preventive Medicine, 32*(2), 128–141. DOI: 10.1006/pmed.2000.0793
- Geiger, B., Fischer, M., & Eshet, Y. (2004). Date-rape-supporting and victim-blaming attitudes among high school students in a multiethnic society: Israel. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(4), 406–426. DOI: 10.1177/0886260503262080
- Gini, G. (2008). Associations among overt and relational victimization and adolescents' satisfaction with friends: The moderating role of the need for affective relationships with friends. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 37*(7), 812–820. DOI: 10.1007/s10964-007-9236-9
- Goodboy, A. K., Myers, S. A., & Members of Investigating Communication (2010). Relational quality indicators and love styles as predictors of negative relational maintenance behaviors in romantic relationships. *Communication Reports, 23*(2), 65–78. DOI:10.1080/08934215.2010.511397
- Hamby, S., & Jackson, A. (2010). Size does matter: the effects of gender on perceptions of dating violence. *Sex Roles, 63*(5-6), 324–331. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-010-9816-0
- Hanson, R. K., Cadsky, O., Harris, A., & Lalonde, C. (1997). Correlates of battering among 997 men: family history, adjustment, and attitudinal differences. *Violence and Victims, 12*(3), 191–208. DOI: 10.1891/0886-6708.12.3.191
- Heaven, P. C. L., Da Silva, T., Carey, C., & Holen, J. (2004). Loving styles: Relationships with personality and attachment styles. *European Journal of Personality, 18*(2), 103–113. DOI: 10.1002/per.498
- Hendrick, C., Hendrick, S. S., Foote, E. H., & Slapion-Foote, M. J. (1984). Do men and women love differently? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 1*(2), 177–195. DOI: 10.1177/0265407584012003
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(2), 392–402. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.50.2.392
- Hendrick, S., & Hendrick, C. (1987). Love and sexual attitudes, self-disclosure and sensation seeking. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4*(3), 281–297. DOI: 10.1177/026540758700400303
- Hendrick, S., & Hendrick, C. (1988). Lovers wear rose colored glasses. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5*(2). 161–183 DOI: 10.1177/026540758800500203

- Hendrick, C., Hendrick, S. & Dicke, A. (1998). The love attitudes scale: Short form. *Journal of Personal and Social Relationships, 15*(2), 147-159. DOI: 10.1177/0265407598152001
- Henton, J., Cate, R., Koval, J., Lloyd, S., & Christopher, S. (1983). Romance and violence in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Issues, 4*(3), 467-482. DOI: 10.1177/019251383004003004
- İftar, M. (2016). *Attitudes towards dating violence and behavior of university students* (Master Thesis). Available from Council of Higher Education Thesis Center (Thesis No: 460101).
- Karlsson, M. E., Temple, J. R., Weston, R., & Le, V. D. (2016). Witnessing interparental violence and acceptance of dating violence as predictors for teen dating violence victimization. *Violence Against Women, 22*(5), 625-646. DOI: 10.1177/1077801215605920
- Kaura, S. A., & Lohman, B. J. (2007). Dating violence victimization, relationship satisfaction, mental health problems, and acceptability of violence: A comparison of men and women. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(6), 367-381. DOI: 10.1007/s10896-007-9092-0
- Küçük-Helvacı, F. (2012). *Relationship between and problem solving and social interest with love attitudes in romantic relationships* (Master Thesis). Available from Council of Higher Education Thesis Center (Thesis No: 308753).
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Friend, J., & Powell, A. (2009). Adolescent suicide, gender, and culture: A rate and risk factor analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14*(5), 402–414. DOI: 10.1016/j.avb.2009.06.010
- Lauritsen, J. L., & Heimer, K. (2009). *Gender and violent victimization, 1973-2005*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Lee, J. A. (1973). *The colors of love: An exploration of the ways of loving*. Toronto: New Pres.
- Levy, M. B., & Davis, K. E. (1988). Love styles and attachment styles compared: Their relations to each other and to various relationship characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relations, 5*(4), 439- 471. DOI: 10.1177/0265407588054004
- Lewis, S. F., Travea, L., & Fremouw, W. J. (2002). Characteristics of female perpetrators and victims of dating violence. *Violence and Victims, 17*(5), 593–606. DOI: 10.1891/vivi.17.5.593.33711
- Libby, R. W., & Straus, M. A. (1980). Make love not war? Sex, sexual meanings, and violence in a sample of university students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 9*(2), 133–148. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/BF01542265.pdf>
- Lin, L. W., Huddleston-Casas, C.A. (2005). Agape love in couple relationships. *Children, Youth and Family Studies 20*(4), 29-48. DOI: 10.1300/J002v37n04_03
- Locke, L. M., & Richman, C. L. (1999). Attitudes toward domestic violence: Race and gender issues. *Sex Roles, 40*(3/4), 227-247. DOI: 10.1023/A:1018898921560
- Mercer, S. (1988). Not a pretty picture: An exploratory study of violence against women in high school dating relationships. *Resources for Feminist Research, 17*(2), 15–25. Retrieved from <https://library.wur.nl/WebQuery/titel/741024>
- Mazur, A. G. (1996). *Gender bias and the state: symbolic reform at work in fifth republic france*. London: University of Pittsburgh Press.

- Nabors, E. L., Dietz, T. L., & Jasinski, J. L. (2006). Domestic violence beliefs and perceptions among college students. *Violence & Victims, 21*(6), 783-799. DOI: 10.1891/vv-v21i6a007
- Neto, F. (1993). Love styles and self-representations. *Personality and Individual Differences, 14*(6), 795-803. DOI: 10.1016/0191-8869(93)90092-H
- Neto, F. (2007). Love styles: A cross-cultural study of British, Indian, and Portuguese college students. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 38*(2), 239-254. DOI: 10.3138/JCFS.38.2.239
- Ohno, S. (1967). *Sex Chromosomes and Sex-linked Genes*. N.Y.: Springer-Verlag.
- Özdere, M., & Kürtül, N. (2018). The effect of dating violence training on the attitudes of university students towards dating violence. *Social Science Development Journal, 3*(9), 123-136. Retrieved from http://www.ssdjournal.org/Makaleler/1665436475_8_3-9.ID46.%20%c3%96zdere&K%c3%bcrt%c3%bcl_123-136.pdf
- Öztemel, O. (2017). *Study on university students' personality and temperament features' effects upon their manners relating to love* (Master Thesis). Available from Council of Higher Education Thesis Center (Thesis No.525882).
- Özgür, G., Yörükoğlu, G., & Baysan-Arabacı, L. B. (2011). High school student's perception of violence, level of tendency to violence and effective factors. *Journal of Psychiatric Nursing, 2*(2), 53-60. Retrieved from http://www.journalagent.com/phd/pdfs/PHD_2_2_53_60.pdf
- Pradubmook-Sherer, P. (2011). Youth attitudes toward dating violence in Thailand. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 55*(2), 182-206. DOI: 10.1177/0306624X09360659.
- Price, E. L., Byers, E. S., & the Dating Violence Research Team. (1999). The Attitudes towards Dating Violence Scales: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Family Violence, 14*(4), 351-375. Retrieved from http://www.ncds.org/images/JFV_Attitudes-towards-dating-violence-scales-development-and-initial-validation_1999.pdf
- Raykov, T., & Marcoulides, G. A. (2000). A method for comparing completely standardized solutions in multiple groups. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 7*(2), 292-308. DOI: 10.1207/S15328007SEM0702_9
- Regan, P. C. (2016). Loving unconditionally: Demographic correlates of the agapic love style. *An International Journal on Personal Relationships, 10*(1), 28-35. DOI: 10.5964/ijpr.v10i1.199
- Rhatigan, D. L., Stewart, C., & Moore, T. M. (2011). Effects of gender and confrontation on attributions of female-perpetrated intimate partner violence. *Sex Roles, 64*(11-12), 875-887. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-011-9951-2
- Riggs, D., & O'Leary, K. (1996). Aggression between heterosexual dating partners: An examination of a causal model of courtship aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11*(4), 519-540. DOI: 10.1177/088626096011004005
- Rodríguez-Santero, J., Muñoz, A. G. C., & Galvez, A. M. P. (2017). Love attitudes styles amongst college students. Differences by sex-gender. *Revista Internacional De Sociología, 75*(3), e073. DOI: 10.3989/ris.2017.75.3.15.171

- Russell, B. L., & Oswald, D. L. (2002). Sexual coercion and victimization of college men: The role of love styles. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17(3)*, 273-285. DOI: 10.1177/0886260502017003003
- Ryan, K. M. (1995). Do courtship-violent men have characteristics associated with a "battering personality"? *Journal of Family Violence, 10(1)*, 99-120. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/BF02110539.pdf>
- Sarwer, D. B., Kalichman, S. C., Johnson, J. R., Early, J., & Ali, S. A. (1993). Sexual aggression and love styles: An exploratory study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 22(3)*, 265-275. DOI: 10.1007/bf01541771
- Sezer, Ö. (2008). The adaptation of acceptance of couple violence scale into Turkish: Validity and reliability studies. *Journal of the Faculty of Education, 9(16)*, 1- 15. Retrieved from <https://toad.halileksi.net/sites/default/files/pdf/ciftler-arasi-siddeti-kabul-olcegi-toad.pdf>
- Sezer, Ö., & Sumbas, E. (2018). Investigation of acceptance of pairs violence among university students in terms of different variables. *The Journal of International Social Research, 11(56)*, 638-649. DOI: 10.17719/jisr.20185639036
- Sis, F. (2018, October). Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine karşı tutumları. *Paper presented at II. International Symposium of Educational Sciences and Social Science, Çanakkale, Turkey*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/37975895/II.ULUSLARARASI_E%C4%9E%C4%B0T%C4%B0M_B%C4%B0L_%C4%B0MLER%C4%B0_VE_SOSYAL_B%C4%B0L%C4%B0MLER_SEMPOZYUMU_II.Uluslararası%C4%B1_E%C4%9Fitim_Bilimleri_ve_Sosyal_Bilimler_Sempozyumu
- Smith R., & Klases, A. (2016). Predictors of love attitudes: The contribution of cultural orientation, gender attachment style, relationship length and age in participants from the UK and HongKong *An International Journal on Personal Relationships, 10(1)*, 90-108. DOI: 10.5964/ijpr.v10i1.204
- Stewart, C., Moore, T., Crone, T., DeFreitas, S. C., & Rhatigan, D. (2012). Who gets blamed for intimate partner violence? The relative contributions of perpetrator sex category, victim confrontation, and observer attitudes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27(18)*, 3739-3754. DOI: 10.1177/0886260512447571
- Stith, S. M., & Farley, S. C. (1993). A predictive model of male spousal violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 8(2)*, 183-201. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/BF00981767.pdf>
- Stith, S. M., Smith, D. B., Penn, C. E., Ward, D. B., & Tritt, D. (2004). Intimate partner physical abuse perpetration and victimization risk factors: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression & Violent Behavior, 10(1)*, 65-98. DOI: 10.1016/j.avb.2003.09.001
- Straus, M. A. (1977). Sociological perspective on the prevention and treatment of wife-beating. In M. Roy (Ed.). *Battered women: A psychological study of domestic violence*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Süneci, B., Say, A., Gümüştepe, B., Enginkaya, B., Yıldızdoğan, Ç., & Yalçın, M. (2016). A research on university students' perception of dating violence. *Beyond the Horizon of Scientific Journal, 16(1)*, 56-83. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/pub/uobild/issue/42561/513072>
- Terzioğlu, F., Gönenç, İ. M., Özdemir, F., Güvenç, G., Kök, G., Yılmaz-Sezer, N., & Demirtaş-Hıçyılmaz, B. (2016). The validity and reliability of the dating violence scale. *Journal of Anatolia Nursing and Health Sciences, 19(4)*, 225-232. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/275548>

- Torres, J., Schumm, J. A., Weatherill, R. P., Taft, C. T., Cunningham, K. C., & Murphy, C. (2012). Attitudinal correlates of physical and psychological aggression perpetration and victimization in dating relationships. *Partner Abuse, 3*(1), 76-88. DOI: 10.1891/1946-6560.3.1.76
- Trivers, R. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In Campbell, B. (Ed.), *Sexual Selection and the Descent of Man* (pp. 136–179). New York: Aldine de Gruyter. (4) (PDF) *Parental Investment Theory*. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345346708_Parental_Investment_Theory [accessed Nov 15 2021].
- Tüfekci, S. (2008). *An assessment of love attitudes and characteristics of young adults in romantic relationships in terms of transactional analysis ego states* (Master Thesis). Available from Council of Higher Education Thesis Center (Thesis No: 226433).
- Uzun-Özer, B., & Tezer, E. (2008). Love attitude styles as the predictors of positive and negative affect. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal, 3*(30), 19-29. Retrieved from <http://turkpsdrdergisi.com/index.php/pdr/article/view/241>
- Walsh, A. (1993). Love styles, masculinity/femininity, physical attractiveness, and sexual behavior: A test of evolutionary theory. *Ethology & Sociobiology, 14*(1), 25–38. DOI: 10.1016/0162-3095(93)90015-A
- Wan, W. W. N., Luk, C. L., & Lai, J. C. L. (2000). Personality correlates of loving styles among Chinese students in Hong Kong. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*(1), 169–175. DOI: 10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00185-3
- Wang, L. (2016). Education, perception factors, and prevention of intimate partner violence: Empirical research on Chinese university students' perceptions and attitudes concerning intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 34*(8), 1611-1632. DOI: 10.1177/0886260516652263
- Wan Shahrazad, W. S., Hoesni, S. M., & Chong, S. T. (2012). Investigating the factor structure of the Love Attitudes Scale (LAS) with Malaysian samples. *Asian Social Science, 8*(9), 66- 73. DOI: 10.5539/ass.v8n9p66
- Weisz, A. N., & Black, M. (2001). Evaluating a sexual assault and dating violence prevention program for urban youths. *Social Work Research, 25*(2), 89–100. DOI: 10.1093/swr/25.2.89
- White, J. K., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2004). Big five personality variables and relationship constructs. *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*(7), 1519-1530. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2004.02.019
- Whitaker, D. J., Murphy, C. M., Eckhardt, C. I., Hodges, A. E., & Cowart, M. (2013). Effectiveness of primary prevention efforts for intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse, 4*(2), 175–195. DOI: 10.1891/1946-6560.4.2.175
- Woll, S. B. (1989). Personality and relationship correlates of loving styles. *Journal of Research in Personality, 23*(4), 480–505. DOI: 10.1016/0092-6566(89)90016-0
- Xie, M., Heimer, K., & Lauritsen, L. J. (2012). Violence against women in US metropolitan areas: Changes in women's status and risk, 1980-2004. *Criminology, 50*(1), 105-143. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/335e/b8491aa4017e6c151a08a40eb2d015844deb.pdf>
- Yakut, S. (2012). *The relationship between religiosity and violence tendency in high-school students* (Master Thesis). Available from Council of Higher Education Thesis Center (Thesis No: 321724).

- Yumuşak, A. (2013). *The relationship among university students' attitudes towards dating violence, sexism and their narcissistic personality traits* (Master Thesis). Available from Council of Higher Education Thesis Center (Thesis No: 350200).
- Yumuşak, A., & Sürücü, Ş. (2012, May). An analyse of university students' acceptance levels of dating violence. *Paper presented at from International Counseling and Education Conference, İstanbul, Turkey*. 3-5 May (Publishing No: 105760).
- Yücel, D. (2014). *The effect of childhood abuse on attachment processes, psychopathological symptoms, psychological tendencies associated with intimate relationships and love attitudes in adulthood* (Doctoral Thesis). Available from Council of Higher Education Thesis Center (Thesis No: 377042).
- Yüzügülen, A. (2016). *The role of gender, romantic jealousy and intimate partner violence on relationship satisfaction during young adulthood* (Master Thesis). Retrieved from <http://i-rep.emu.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11129/3740/y%C3%BCz%C3%BCg%C3%BClenakile.pdf?sequence=1>
- Zeng, X., Pan, Y., Zhou, P., Yu, S., & Liu, X. (2016). Exploring different patterns of love attitudes among chinese college students. *PLoS ONE, 11(11)*, 1-12. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0166410