



Determining the attitudes and behaviors of university students towards dating violence, and the levels of psychological resilience and burnout

Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine yönelik tutum ve davranışları ile psikolojik sağlık ve tükenmişlik düzeylerinin belirlenmesi

Derya Yanık¹, Çiçek Ediz²

¹Batman University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Nursing, Batman, Türkiye

²Hakkari University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Nursing, Hakkari, Türkiye

ABSTRACT

Aim: This study aims to determine the relationship between the dating violence attitudes and behaviors of university students, who will be the health professionals of the future, and their psychological resilience and burnout levels.

Methods: This descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted with students studying in the undergraduate (Nursing) and Associate Degree (First and Emergency Aid, Elderly Care, Physiotherapy, Medical Laboratory) departments of a state university. In the research, 234 students filled out the data collection forms reliably. The research data were collected using the 'Socio-Demographic Characteristics Information Form,' 'Dating Violence Attitude Scale,' 'Short Psychological Resilience Scale,' and 'Couple Burnout Measure-Short Form'.

Results: The students' dating violence attitude scale mean score was 4.23±0.55, short psychological resilience scale mean score was 9.57±2.75, and couple burnout measure mean score was 29.70±15.35. There were statistically significant relationships between the genders of the students participating in the study and their dating violence attitude ($p=0.001$) and psychological resilience ($p=0.010$) separately. The current study found no statistically significant relationship of the "students' attitudes towards dating violence" with their psychological resilience and couple-burnout levels separately ($p>0.05$). There was a statistically significant relationship between the university students' psychological resilience and their couple-burnout levels ($r=-0.238$, $p=0.003$).

Conclusion: The study results showed that the gender of the students was influential on their dating violence attitudes and psychological resilience levels, and their psychological resilience affected their burnout levels.

Keywords: burnout; intimate partner violence; psychological resilience; health occupations students

ÖZET

Amaç: Bu çalışma, geleceğin sağlık profesyoneli olacak üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddeti tutum ve davranışları ile psikolojik sağlık ve tükenmişlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Yöntem: Tanımlayıcı kesitsel olarak planlanmış olan bu çalışma, bir devlet üniversitesinin sağlık ile ilgili lisans (Hemşirelik) ve Ön lisans (İlk ve Acil Yardım, Yaşlı Bakım, Fizyoterapi, Tıbbi Laboratuvar) bölümlerinde okuyan öğrenciler ile yapılmıştır. Araştırma, veri toplama formlarını eksiksiz dolduran 234 öğrencinin katılımı ile tamamlanmıştır. Araştırmanın verileri; 'Sosyo-Demografik Özellikler Bilgi Formu', 'Flört Şiddeti Tutum Ölçeği', 'Kısa Psikolojik Sağlık Ölçeği' ve 'Eş Tükenmişlik Ölçeği Kısa Formu' kullanılarak toplanmıştır.

Bulgular: Öğrencilerin flört şiddeti tutum ölçeği puan ortalamaları 4.23±0.55, kısa psikolojik sağlık ölçeği puan ortalamaları 9.57±2.75 ve eş tükenmişlik ölçeği puan ortalamaları 29.70±15.35 olarak bulunmuştur. Çalışmaya katılan öğrencilerin cinsiyetleri ile flört şiddeti tutumu ($p=0.001$) ve psikolojik sağlık ($p=0.010$) düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Çalışmamızda öğrencilerinin flört şiddeti tutumları ile psikolojik sağlamlıkları ve flört şiddeti tutumları ile eş tükenmişlik düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ilişki saptanmamıştır ($p>0.05$). Araştırmaya katılan üniversite öğrencilerinin psikolojik sağlamlıkları ile eş tükenmişlik düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ilişki saptanmıştır ($r=-0.238$, $p=0.003$).

Sonuçlar: Çalışmamızdan elde edilen sonuçlara göre öğrencilerin cinsiyetlerinin flört şiddeti tutumları ile psikolojik sağlık düzeyleri üzerinde etkili olduğu, psikolojik sağlamlıklarının ise tükenmişlik düzeylerini etkilediği sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: tükenmişlik; yakın partner şiddeti; psikolojik dirençlilik; sağlık meslek okulu öğrencileri

Introduction

Flirting is defined as a homosexual or heterosexual union in which two individuals share an emotional, romantic, or sexual relationship beyond the friendship that lasts outside of marriage, engagement, and cohabitation (Toplu-Demirtaş & Fincham, 2020). Dating violence, on the other hand, is the covert or overt harmful behaviors including the physical, psychological, sexual, and economic violence of one or both of the individuals in a dating relationship used to gain power and control over each other (Ayyıldız & Taylan, 2018; Blais et al., 2020). As a type of intimate partner violence, the prevalence of dating violence is not clearly known, but its rate is estimated

between 2-76% worldwide and 9-46% in adolescents (Selçuk et al., 2018; Froidevaux et al., 2020). Dating violence is reportedly more common among adolescents and university students than the adult population and therefore university campuses are risky environments for dating (Duval et al., 2018; Ameral et al., 2017). Dating violence negatively impacts young people's physical, sexual and psychological development in the short and long term and causes significant health problems (Selçuk et al., 2018). Studies have revealed that young people exposed to dating violence might experience health problems such as severe physical injuries, sexually transmitted infections because of unsafe sexual intercourse

and unwanted pregnancies, anxiety, depression, eating and sleep disorders, as well as risky behaviors such as suicide attempts, alcohol, and substance use, and aggression (Froidevaux et al., 2020; Grest et al., 2020). In addition, some studies have emphasized that exposure to or witnessing dating violence during adolescence or university is a significant factor in accepting violent behavior as reasonable and causing domestic violence in the future (Ayyıldız & Taylan, 2018).

Exposure to violence not only causes psychological and behavioral problems in individuals but also affects their psychological resilience (Dosil et al., 2020). Psychological resilience is the ability of individuals to cope with negative experiences, risky life events, and crises, and the capacity to adapt to a new situation (Duman et al., 2020; Choi et al., 2019). Conditions such as traumatic life events, bad environmental conditions, exposure to violence are protective factors that contribute to the development of psychological resilience (Snaychuk & O'Neil, 2020; Duman et al., 2020). However, although traumatic life experiences at a young age may contribute to the development of resilience, studies suggest that long-term traumatic experiences or exposure to violence reduce resilience in adulthood (Choi et al., 2019).

Individuals who have high psychological resilience and who can use effective coping techniques in the face of the experienced problems are less likely to develop burnout syndrome (García & Gambarte, 2020; Pérez-Fuentes et al., 2021). Burnout is a psychological response resulting from prolonged exposure to stress factors (Abram & Jacobowitz, 2021). In long-term emotional relationships, the differences between parties' demands, expectations, and realities can also lead to burnout (Doğan & Şirin, 2019). It has been reported that the feeling of burnout, especially in adolescence, may cause an increase in the tendency of aggression and violence in young people (Pérez-Fuentes et al., 2021).

Studies on burnout have revealed that burnout is a prevalent occupational hazard in health care staff because of arduous working conditions; and exposure to violence causes burnout, which reduces resilience by negatively affecting physical and mental health (Abram & Jacobowitz, 2021; Ching et al., 2020).

The literature review has shown no study investigating the level of dating violence, resilience, and burnout among university students. Therefore, the current study, which aimed to determine the health professional university students' dating violence attitudes and behaviors, psychological resilience, and burnout levels, is expected to will contribute to the literature and guide for the measures to be taken and the interventions to be made.

Methods

Type of research

This descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted with voluntarily participating students in Nursing (undergraduate) and First and Emergency Aid, Elderly Care, Physiotherapy, Medical Laboratory (associate degree) departments of a state university.

Population and sample of the research

The research population consisted of 518 students studying at Health High School and Vocational School of Health Services in a state university in Turkey. The required sample size for the study was calculated as 234 students using the statistical power analysis tool, G power, based on a 95% confidence level, 5% margin of error, and 50% survey

response rate. A simple random sampling method was used to select the classes and branches in the schools. The study covered 234 students.

Instruments

Research data were collected using the Socio-Demographic Characteristics Information Form, Dating Violence Attitude Scale, Short Psychological Resilience Scale, and Couple Burnout Measure Short Form.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics Information Form

This form was prepared by researchers in line with the relevant literature to discover the introductory characteristics of the students (Ayyıldız & Taylan, 2018; Kısa & Zeyneloğlu, 2018; Özdere & Kürtül, 2018). This form comprises 13 questions, including student age, gender, department, class, marital status, family type, income status, domestic violence experience, current/past dating violence experience, and violent behaviors.

Dating Violence Attitude Scale

The scale developed by Terzioğlu et al. in 2016 contains 28 questions rated on a 5-point Likert scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree. The scale has five sub-dimensions: General Violence, Physical Violence, Economic Violence, Emotional Violence, and Sexual Violence. Of the 28 items on the scale, 23 are reverse scored. On the scale, the lowest score for each item is 1pt, and the highest score is 5pt. Higher scores approaching 5pt shows non-supportive individual attitudes towards dating violence. The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was 0.91, and the Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficients of the subscales were 0.72-0.85 (Terzioğlu et al., 2016). The current study found the Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient of 0.87.

Short Psychological Resilience Scale

The scale was developed by Smith et al. (2008) to measure the resilience of individuals. Doğan (2015) tested the Turkish validity and reliability of the scale to measure the psychological resilience levels of university students. In the 5-point Likert-type scale, which consists of six questions, the statements are evaluated between 1=Not at all Appropriate and 5=Completely Appropriate. Items 2, 4, and 6 on the scale are reverse-coded. The higher total score obtained after rephrasing reverse-coded items indicates an increase in psychological resilience. In the validity study of the scale, the Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was 0.83 (Doğan, 2015). The current study found the Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient of 0.74.

Couple Burnout Measure Short Form (CBMS)

The 21-item Couple Burnout Measure measures the dating, engaged, or cohabitant individuals' burnout level. Later, in 2011, Pines et al. (2011) produced a ten-item short form, Çapri (2013) tested the Turkish validity and reliability of the Couple Burnout Measure Short Form in 2013 (Pines et al., 2011; Çapri, 2013). In the 7-Likert type scale, which consists of ten questions, the statements are evaluated between 1=Never and 7=Always. On the scale, the lowest score is 10pt, and the highest is 70pt. The scale score is calculated by dividing the total score by the number of items. As the mean score of the scale increases, couple burnout also increases. In the validity study of the scale, the Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was 0.91 (Çapri, 2013). The current study found the Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient of 0.92.

Data collection

At the outset, the voluntary students, who were informed about the purpose and method of the study, voluntarily filled out the data collection forms themselves after getting information about filling out the forms. Each student answered the data collection forms within an average of 15-20 minutes and returned them to the researcher.

Data analysis

SPSS 24.0 statistical package program was used in the analysis of the data. The number of units (n), percent (%), arithmetic mean (\pm), and standard deviation (sd) values were calculated within descriptive statistics. The normal distribution of the data was tested by the Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. In the comparisons, t-test and Mann-Whitney U test were used in independent samples, and Pearson correlation analysis was used in comparing the scales with each other. The $p < 0.05$ value was considered statistically significant in the study. Variables of the study.

Ethical aspect of research

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. This study was approved by Ethics committee of Batman University (Approval No: E.11412-2021/01-20 date: 09/04/2021). In addition, all participant students informed by the researchers filled out the questionnaire forms themselves with their voluntary consents.

Results

The participant students' mean age was 21.95 ± 0.15 . Of the participants, 54.3% were female, 64.5% were undergraduate students, 38.5% were second graders, 96.1% were single, 49.1% were living with their family/spouse, 83.3% were in a nuclear family, 56.4% had income equal to expenses, 81.7% had no current dating relationship, 65.8% had previous dating relationships, 76.5% faced no violence in the family. Of those who have a current dating relationship, 86.1% stated no exposure to dating violence, 95.4% expressed that they applied no dating violence. Of those who had a dating relationship in the past, 94.1% stated no exposure to dating violence, 98.8% expressed that they applied no dating violence (Table 1).

The university students' "Dating Violence Attitude Scale" mean score was 4.23 ± 0.55 , the "Short Psychological Resilience Scale" mean score was 9.57 ± 2.75 , and the "Couple Burnout Measure" mean score was 29.70 ± 15.35 . There was no statistically significant relationship of the students' education levels, current dating relationships, domestic violence experiences, exposure to and perpetration of violence in the current and previous dating relationships with their dating violence attitude, psychological resilience, and couple burnout levels ($p > 0.05$).

There was a statistically significant relationship between the gender of the students participating in the study and their dating violence attitude ($p = 0.001$) and psychological resilience ($p = 0.010$). Accordingly, the current study determined that female students did not support dating violence, and their psychological resiliences were lower than male students. There was no statistically significant relationship between the gender of university students and their couple burnout levels ($p > 0.05$) (Table 2).

Table 1. University students' socio-demographic characteristics

Characteristics	n	%	$\bar{X} \pm SD$
Age			21.95±0.15
Gender			
Female	127	54.3	
Male	107	45.7	
Education			
Undergraduate student	151	64.5	
Associate degree student	83	35.5	
Grades			
1st grader	24	10.3	
2nd grader	90	38.5	
3rd grader	54	23.0	
4th grader	66	28.2	
Marital status			
Married	9	3.9	
Single	225	96.1	
Place of Residence			
With family or spouse	115	49.1	
With friends	28	12.0	
Dormitory	91	38.9	
Family type			
Nuclear family	195	83.3	
Extended family	33	14.2	
Single parent family	6	2.5	
Income status			
Income less than expenses	65	27.8	
Income equal to expenses	132	56.4	
Income more than expenses	37	15.8	
Current dating			
Yes	43	18.3	
No	191	81.7	
Previous dating			
Yes	154	65.8	
No	80	34.2	
Domestic violence experience			
Yes	55	23.5	
No	179	76.5	
Violence in the current dating			
Exposure to violence			
Yes	6	13.9	
No	37	86.1	
Perpetration of violence			
Yes	2	4.6	
No	41	95.4	
Violence in previous datings			
Exposure to violence			
Yes	9	5.9	
No	145	94.1	
Perpetration of violence			
Yes	2	1.2	
No	152	98.8	

Table 3 shows the relationship between some characteristics of university students and the subgroups of the Dating Violence Attitude Scale. There was no statistically significant relationship of the students' education level, current dating relationship, exposure to domestic violence, exposure to and perpetration of violence in present and previous dating relationships with the Dating Violence Attitude Scale's Subgroups ($p > 0.05$). A statistically significant relationship existed between the genders of the students and all sub-dimensions of the Dating Violence Attitude Scale (overall violence, physical violence, emotional violence, economic violence, and sexual violence) ($p < 0.001$). The study determined that female students were more opposed to any forms of dating violence (general violence, physical violence, emotional violence, economic violence, and sexual violence) than male students (Table 3).

Table 2. The relationships between some characteristics of university students and the Dating Violence Attitude Scale, Short Psychological Resilience Scale, and Couple Burnout Measure Short Form (n=234)

Characteristics	Dating violence attitude scale $\bar{X} \pm SD$	Short psychological resilience scale $\bar{X} \pm SD$	Couple burnout measure short form $\bar{X} \pm SD$
Scales' $\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.23±0.55	9.57±2.75	29.70±15.35
Gender			
Female	4.48±0.40	9.08±2.81	31.29±15.77
Male	3.94±0.57	10.14±2.58	27.74±14.69
Z/p*	-6.966/0.001	-2.576/0.010	-1.448/0.148
Education			
Undergraduate student	4.20±0.56	9.80±2.73	29.01±13.95
Associate degree student	4.31±0.52	9.12±2.77	31.18±18.07
Z/p	-1.214/0.225	-1.714/0.087	-0.319/0.719
Current dating			
Yes	4.30±0.48	9.21±2.81	28.93±16.13
No	4.22±0.56	9.66±2.74	29.87±15.27
Z/p	-0.535/0.593	-0.909/0.364	-0.333/0.739
Domestic violence experience			
Yes	4.15±0.52	8.82±3.15	32.83±12.69
No	4.25±0.63	9.78±2.57	29.76±15.48
Z/p	-1.488/0.137	-2.142/0.032	-2.002/0.045
Exposure to violence in the current dating			
Yes	4.22±0.26	11.00±2.19	36.33±14.15
No	4.19±0.56	9.54±2.74	29.79±16.31
Z/p	-0.279/0.780	-1.298/0.194	-1.062/0.288
Perpetration of violence in the current dating			
Yes	3.73±0.58	8.66±3.55	38.83±12.02
No	4.20±0.55	9.64±2.68	29.23±16.08
Z/p	-1.721/0.075	-0.791/0.331	-1.778/0.075
Exposure to violence in previous datings			
Yes	4.50±0.51	10.37±1.92	23.00±7.89
No	4.23±0.52	9.72±2.75	29.98±15.49
Z/p	-1.656/0.294	-0.440/0.660	-1.049/0.294
Perpetration of violence in previous datings			
Yes	3.98±0.75	7.50±0.70	37.50±24.78
No	4.25±0.52	9.73±2.71	29.44±15.04
Z/p	-1.163/0.245	-1.474/0.141	-0.547/0.584

The current study found no statistically significant relationship between university students' attitudes towards dating violence and psychological resilience ($p > 0.05$). There was a statistically significant weak negative correlation between the university students' psychological resilience and couple burnout levels ($r = -0.238$, $p = 0.003$). As students' burnout levels increased, their psychological resilience decreased. There was no statistically significant relationship between university students' attitudes towards dating violence and their level of couple burnout ($p > 0.05$) (Table 4).

Discussion

Studies on dating violence have revealed that this common problem is a risk factor for individuals' health and that early-onset violent behaviors are a precursor to adult violence (Özdere & Küntül, 2018). For this reason, individuals need to be aware, starting from an early age, of possible violent behaviors in a dating relationship besides general types of violence to establish and maintain healthy relationships. In the USA, over 80% of individuals between 18-24 use or experience violence in a dating relationship (Cantor et al., 2021). In a study conducted with students of the Faculty of

Health Sciences, Cangür et al. (2021) found that 19% of the students were exposed to violence in their dating relationships, and 14.6% of them used violence in their dating relationships. Another study conducted with university students in our country found that 14.8% of young people were exposed to violence in close relationships, and 17.2% of them resorted to violence (Özdere & Küntül, 2018). The current study determined that 13.9% of the currently dating participants were exposed to dating violence, and 4.6% of them inflicted violence on their partners. In the literature, the studies conducted with university students on dating violence have stated that various variables such as gender, department and class, family type, parent education level, domestic violence exposure are demographic variables affecting attitudes towards dating violence (Cantor et al., 2021; Cangür et al., 2021). Gökkaya and Öztürk (2021) have reported that childhood violence history is a significant determinant of being an aggressor or victim in a dating relationship; individuals who had domestic violence in childhood experience dating violence more in their relationships, whether they are a violator or a victim. Auslander et al., (2018) in their study with 234 girls between the ages of 12-19, have remarked that the probability of experiencing dating violence in adolescence increases in those exposed to maltreatment in childhood. The current study has found the dating violence prevalence at a lower level than previous research results, and demographic factors other than gender do not affect the dating violence attitude. This result may have been related to the fact that most of the students participating in the study had no current dating relationship and that a significant percentage of the students witnessed no violence in their family or previous dating relationship.

Gender variable matters in the emergence of dating violence, and men's dating violence attitudes are more supportive than women's (Courtain & Glowacz, 2021). In addition, attitudes are also one of the central determinants of dating violence. If individuals' attitudes towards dating violence are supportive, they are more likely to be involved in a relationship that will eventually produce dating violence (Foshee et al., 2016). The current study has found female students' acceptance levels for all dimensions of dating violence (overall violence, physical violence, emotional violence, economic violence, and sexual violence) significantly lower than men. In their study with health sciences department students, Gökkaya and Öztürk (2021) have revealed that male students' Dating Violence Attitude Scale mean scores are significantly higher than females, and students highly accepting violent behaviors embrace a traditional approach that was irrelevant to their professional roles.

Altan Sarıkaya and Çömez İkican (2019), in their study with nursing department students, have determined that a significant difference exists between gender and accepting intimate relationship violence. According to this finding, they have stated that male students' mean scores of adopting violence between couples were higher compared to female students. In their study with university students, Ayyıldız and Taylan (2018) have found that men's acceptance levels for all dimensions of dating violence were significantly higher than females'. The results obtained from our study are almost identical to the literature.

Psychological resilience protects against stressful or traumatic situations and ensures healthy communication in close relationships (Kovan et al., 2021). Hoşoğlu et al. (2018) conducted with university students, female participants

Table 3. The relationship between university students' some characteristics and the dating Violence Attitude Scale's subgroups (n=234)

Characteristics	Overall violence $\bar{X} \pm SD$	Physical violence $\bar{X} \pm SD$	Emotional violence $\bar{X} \pm SD$	Economic violence $\bar{X} \pm SD$	Sexual violence $\bar{X} \pm SD$
Subgroups' $\bar{X} \pm SD$	4.48±0.69	4.38±0.74	4.13±0.74	3.79±0.69	4.28±0.82
Gender					
Female	4.64±0.56	4.63±0.51	4.33±0.67	4.12±0.63	4.56±0.68
Male	4.27±0.77	4.09±0.87	3.89±0.75	3.39±0.72	3.94±0.86
Z/p*	-4.027/ 0.001	-5.279/ 0.001	-4.579/ 0.001	-7.177/ 0.001	-5.975/ 0.001
Education					
Undergraduate student	4.46±0.72	4.33±0.78	4.10±0.75	3.72±0.79	4.27±0.82
Associate degree student	4.49±0.63	4.49±0.67	4.17±0.72	3.92±0.71	4.31±0.83
Z/p	-1.112/0.911	-1.525/0.127	-0.573/0.566	-1.772/0.076	-0.406/0.685
Current dating					
Yes	4.56±0.67	4.53±0.56	3.99±0.78	3.80±0.61	4.42±0.81
No	4.46±0.69	4.36±0.77	4.17±0.72	3.79±0.80	4.25±0.82
Z/p	-1.114/0.265	-0.968/0.332	-1.247/0.212	-0.290/0.772	-1.296/0.195
Domestic violence experience					
Yes	4.50±0.60	4.27±0.70	4.03±0.86	3.65±0.70	4.27±0.82
No	4.46±0.71	4.41±0.76	4.16±0.71	3.82±0.78	4.28±0.82
Z/p	-1.298/0.194	-1.443/0.149	-1.909/0.056	-2.098/0.036	-2.374/0.018
Exposure to violence in the current dating					
Yes	4.80±0.34	4.68±0.46	4.66±0.40	3.84±0.72	4.00±0.85
No	4.40±0.72	4.32±0.77	4.05±0.78	3.69±0.79	4.24±0.82
Z/p	-1.114/0.265	-1.028/0.304	-1.657/0.98	-0.372/0.710	-0.613/0.540
Perpetration of violence in the current dating					
Yes	4.28±0.99	4.23±0.76	3.33±1.14	3.48±0.70	4.11±0.93
No	4.42±0.70	4.35±0.76	4.09±0.76	3.72±0.78	4.22±0.83
Z/p	-0.66/0.97	-0.507/0.612	-1.738/0.082	-1.011/0.312	-0.290/0.771
Exposure to violence in previous datings					
Yes	4.37±0.79	4.73±0.47	4.42±0.70	4.07±0.69	4.31±0.86
No	4.51±0.65	4.38±0.73	4.16±0.74	3.71±0.73	4.24±0.80
Z/p	-0.164/0.870	-1.544/0.123	-1.181/0.238	-1.298/0.194	-0.196/0.845
Perpetration of violence in previous datings					
Yes	4.60±0.56	4.60±0.56	3.83±0.94	3.20±0.56	3.78±0.70
No	4.49±0.67	4.40±0.72	4.17±0.75	3.73±0.73	4.25±0.80
Z/p	-0.098/0.922	-0.270/0.787	-0.708/0.479	-1.227/0.220	-0.997/0.319

resilience is significantly lower than that of male participants, while Sizer and Kul Parlak (2021) conclude in their study that the resilience level does not differ according to gender. The current research has determined that female students' psychological resilience is lower than male students. Boyacı and Özhan (2021) found a negative relationship between psychological resilience and burnout levels of university students. Accordingly, they have stated that as students' psychological resilience levels increase, they will experience less burnout and feel less personal inadequacy. Çelikkaleli (2019) has concluded that a negative-significant relationship exists between resilience and burnout, and individuals who consider themselves psychologically resilient may experience less burnout. A study conducted with nurses and midwives has determined that as psychological resilience increases, burnout decreases (Yörük & Güler, 2020). The current study, has found a statistically significant weak negative correlation between the university students' psychological resilience and couple burnout levels. Correspondingly, as students' psychological resilience increases, their burnout levels decrease. Considering that the students participating in the study will be health professionals in the future, their high

psychological resilience and healthy relationships will be a protective factor against occupational risks, such as burnout. Psychological resilience, defined as an individual's ability to face adversities positively, is affected by environmental factors, such as violence, spirituality, social and bilateral relations (Firat, 2021).

Table 4. Relationship among Dating Violence Attitude Scale, Short Psychological Resilience Scale, and Couple Burnout Measure Short Form

Scales	Dating violence attitude scale		Short psychological resilience scale	
	r	p	r	p
Dating Violence Attitude Scale	-	-	-0.111	0.127
Short Psychological Resilience Scale	-0.111	0.127	-	-
Couple Burnout Measure Short Form	-0.206	0.016	-0.238	0.003

Literature review shows that the psychological resilience is lower in women exposed to domestic violence by their husband or father than those who have been not (Tsirigotis & Luczak, 2018) and married adults' resilience levels are higher than those who have a date/partner (Kovan et al., 2021). The current study found no statistically significant relationship between university students' attitudes towards dating violence and psychological resilience.

The present study determined no statistically significant relationship between university students' attitudes towards dating violence and burnout levels. It is thought that studies on this subject with students studying at different universities or different departments will contribute to the literature.

Limitations of the research

The research was conducted in a single state university in the Southeast of Turkey with participants of limited cultural diversity, which limits the generalizability of our results.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The present study, taking into account the obtained results, concluded that the gender of university students studying in health-related departments affects their dating violence attitudes and psychological resilience levels, while their psychological resilience affects their burnout levels. Gender is a significant factor in terms of violence in our country as well as in the world, and it is highly urgent to produce gender-centered violence prevention programs. In addition, efforts to reduce and stop dating violence will contribute to the protection of individuals' physical and mental health and strengthen their psychological resilience while preventing violence in future relationships. In this sense, the authors of this study suggest that the education and training curriculum should include subjects about violence-related problems, such as violence awareness and prevention or the relationship between violence and mental health, etc. to encourage affective skills and develop and strengthen close relationships.

Conflict of interest

There is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all participants for their participation for helping with the recruitment process for this study.

Sources of funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Ethics Committee Approval

This study was approved by Ethics committee of Batman University (Approval No: E.11412-2021/01-20 date: 09/04/2021).

Informed Consent

Voluntary consent was obtained from all students participating in the study.

Peer-review

Externally peer-reviewed.

Author Contributions

D.Y.: Concept, Materials, Data Collection and/or Processing, Analysis and/or Interpretation, Writing Manuscript.

Ç.E.: Literature Search, Design, Supervision, Critical Review, Writing Manuscript.

References

- Abram, M. D., & Jacobowitz, W. (2021). Resilience and burnout in healthcare students and inpatient psychiatric nurses: A between-groups study of two populations. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 35(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2020.10.008>.
- Altan Sarıkaya, N. & Çömez İkan, T. (2019). Level of intimate partner violence among nursing faculty students and related factors. *Journal of Nursology*, 22(2), 114-120.
- Ameral, V., Palm Reed, K. M., & Hines, D. A. (2020). An analysis of help-seeking patterns among college student victims of sexual assault, dating violence and stalking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(23-24), 5311-5335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517721169>
- Auslander, W., Tlapek, S. M., Threlfall, J., Edmond, T., & Dunn, J. (2018). Mental health pathways linking childhood maltreatment to interpersonal revictimization during adolescence for girls in the child welfare system. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(7), 1169-1191.
- Ayyıldız, A. B., & Taylan, H. H. (2018). Dating violence attitudes in university students: case of Sakarya University. *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, 6(86), 413-427.
- Blais, M., Hébert, M., Bergeron, F. A., & Lapierre, A. (2020). Dating violence experiences among youths with same-gender and multi-gender dating partners: A dyadic concordance type approach. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520957688>
- Boyacı, M. & Özhan, M. B. (2021). School burnout in university students: the role of psychological resilience, hope, and positivity. *Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 19(2), 1178-1198. <https://doi.org/10.37217/tebd.896692>
- Cangür, Ş., Başver, T., Temür, B., Odabaş, S., Demir, F., Kılıç, S., ... & Diri, B. (2021). The assessment of the attitudes of health sciences faculty students towards dating violence. *Journal of Duzce University Health Sciences Institute*, 11(3), 331-340.
- Cantor, N., Joppa, M., & Angelone, D. J. (2021). An examination of dating violence among college student-athletes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(23-24), NP13275-NP13295. doi:[10.1177/0886260520905545](https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520905545)
- Ching, S. S. Y., Cheung, K., Hegney, D., & Rees, C. S. (2020). Stressors and coping of nursing students in clinical placement: A qualitative study contextualizing their resilience and burnout. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 42, 102690. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2019.102690>.
- Choi, A. W. M., Lo, B. C. Y., Lo, R. T. F., To, P. Y. L., & Wong, J. Y. H. (2019). Intimate partner violence victimization, social support, and resilience: Effects on the anxiety levels of young mothers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(21-22), 12299-12323 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519888532>
- Courtain, A., & Glowacz, F. (2021). Exploration of dating violence and related attitudes among adolescents and emerging adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(5-6), NP2975-NP2998. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518770185>
- Çapri, B. (2013). The Turkish adaptation of the Burnout Measure-Short Version (BMS) and Couple Burnout Measure-Short Version (CBMS) and the relationship between career and couple burnout based on psychoanalytic-existential perspective. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13(3), 1408-1417. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2013.3.1576>
- Çelikkaleli, Ö. (2019). The mediating role of resilience in the direct and indirect relationships between stress and burnout in emerging adults. *Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 10(1), 1-21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22521/jesr.2020.101.1>

- Doğan, T. (2015). Adaptation of the Brief Resilience Scale into Turkish: A validity and reliability study. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 3(1), 93-102.
- Doğan, K., & Şirin, H. D. (2019). The predictive power of adult attachment dimensions on couple burnout: The case of university academic staff. *Journal of Selçuk University Social Sciences Institute*, 42, 23-32.
- Dosil, M., Jaureguizar, J., Bernaras, E., & Sbicigo, J. B. (2020). Teen dating violence, sexism, and resilience: A multivariate analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17, 2652. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17082652>
- Duman, N., Göksoy, P., Köroğlu, C., & Talay, A. (2020). Mental well-being and psychological resilience relationship in university students. *Life Skills Journal of Psychology*, 4(7), 9-17. <https://doi.org/10.31461/ybpd.668737>
- Duval, A., Lanning, B. A., & Patterson, M. S. (2020). A systematic review of dating violence risk factors among undergraduate college students. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 21(3), 567–585. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018782207>
- Firat, B. (2021). An investigation of the relationship between emotion regulation skills and psychological resilience levels of married individuals and their life satisfaction. *Academic Platform Journal of Education and Change*, 4(1), 111-130.
- Foshee, V. A., Reyes, H. L. M., Chen, M. S., Ennett, S. T., Basile, K. C., DeGue, S., ... & Bowling, J. M. (2016). Shared risk factors for the perpetration of physical dating violence, bullying, and sexual harassment among adolescents exposed to domestic violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(4), 672-686.
- Froidevaux, N. M., Metcalf, S., Pettit, C., Penner, F., Sharp, C., & Borelli, J. L. (2020). The link between adversity and dating violence among adolescents hospitalized for psychiatric treatment: Parental emotion validation as a candidate protective factor. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 37(5-6), 3492-3527. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520926323>
- García, V. V., & Gambarte, G. (2020). Associated factors with resilience and burnout: a cross-sectional study in a teaching group in Spain. *Aula Abierta*, 49(2), 177-184. <https://doi.org/10.17811/rifie.49.2.2020.177-84>
- Gökkaya, V. B., & Öztürk, M. (2021). An investigation of the relationship between history of domestic violence in childhood and dating violence. *Manisa Celal Bayar University Journal of Social Sciences*, 19(4), 219-240.
- Grest, C. V., Cederbaum, J. A., Lee, D. S., Choi, Y. J., Cho, H., Hong, S., Yun, S. H., & Lee, J. O. (2020). Cumulative violence exposure and alcohol use among college students: Adverse childhood experiences and dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 37(1-2), 557–577. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520913212>
- Hoşoğlu, R., Kodaz, A. F., Bingöl, T. Y., & Batık, M. V. (2018). The resilient levels of preservice teachers. *International Journal of Society Researches*, 8(14), 217-239.
- Kisa, S., & Zeyneloğlu, S. (2019). Perceptions and predictors of dating violence among nursing and midwifery students. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 5, 2099–2109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13982>
- Kovan, A., Usta, M., & Ormanlı, N. (2021). Examining the relationship between relationship satisfaction and resilience levels of adults: example of COVID-19 pandemic process. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(2), 29-44.
- 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.
- Öztürk, R., Mete, D., Altıntaş, M. & Pekmez, M. A. (2021). The relationship between health sciences students' dating violence attitudes and their professional roles against violence. *Turkish Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 15(1), 142-53. <https://doi.org/10.21763/tjfm.807519>
- Pérez-Fuentes, M. C., Gázquez-Linares, J. J., Molero-Jurado, M. M., Martos-Martinez, A., Barragán-Martín, A. B., & Simón-Márquez, M. M. (2021). Student burnout and engagement: Relationship with adolescent use of alcohol and attitudes towards authority. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 21(2), 100225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2021.100225>.
- Pines, A. M., Neal, M. B., Hammer, L. B., & Ickerson, T. (2011). Job burnout and couple burnout in dual-earner couples in the sandwiched generation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 74, 361-386.
- Selçuk, K. T., Avcı, D., & Mercan, Y. (2018). Exposure to dating violence among university students: relationship between exposure to violence and attitudes towards dating violence and perception of gender. *Acıbadem University Health Sciences Journal*, 9(3), 302-308. <https://doi.org/10.31067/0.2018.29>
- Sizer, Z. M., & Kul Parlak, N. (2021). A quantitative study on the relationship between emotional intelligence and psychological resilience of social work students. *Journal of Management and Economics Research*, 19(4), 213-231. <https://doi.org/10.11611/yead.996667>
- Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Jennifer Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 15, 194–200.
- Snaychuk, L. A., & O'Neill, M. L. (2020) Technology-facilitated sexual violence: Prevalence, risk, and resiliency in undergraduate students. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 29(8), 984-999. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2019.1710636>
- Terzioğlu, F., Gönenç, İ. M., Özdemir, F., Güvenç, G., Kök, G., Yılmaz-Sezer, N., & Demirtaş- Hiçyılmaz, B. (2016). The validity and reliability of the Dating Violence Scale. *Journal of Nursing*, 19(4), 225-232.
- Toplu-Demirtaş, E., & Fincham, F. D. (2020). I don't have power, and I want more: Psychological, physical, and sexual dating violence perpetration among college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520951319>
- Tsirigotis, K., & Luczak, J. (2018). Resilience in women who experience domestic violence. *Psychiatr Q*, 89, 201–211. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11126-017-9529-4>
- Yörük, S. & Güler, D. (2021). The relationship between psychological resilience, burnout, stress, and sociodemographic factors with depression in nurses and midwives during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study in Turkey. *Perspect Psychiatr Care*, 57, 390- 398. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ppc.12659>