

The Relationship Between Nursing Students' Solution-Oriented Levels and Their Attitudes to Dating Violence: Descriptive Research

Hemşirelik Öğrencilerinin Çözüm Odaklılık Düzeyleri ile Flört Şiddeti Tutumlarının İlişkisi: Tanımlayıcı Araştırma

¹Ebru ÖZTÜRK ÇOPUR^a, ²Fatma KARASU^b, ³Zehra CAN^b

^aDepartment of Nursing, Division of Public Health Nursing, Kilis 7 Aralık University Yusuf Şerefoğlu Faculty of Health Sciences, Kilis, Türkiye

^bDepartment of Nursing, Kilis 7 Aralık University Yusuf Şerefoğlu Faculty of Health Sciences, Kilis, Türkiye

This article was presented as an oral presentation at the 7th International Congress on Women's and Children's Health and Education, May 24-25, 2021, Online.

ABSTRACT Objective: The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between nursing students' solution-oriented levels and their attitudes towards dating violence. **Material and Methods:** This descriptive study was conducted with 210 nursing students. "Personal Information Form, the Solution Focused Inventory (SFI), and the Dating Violence Scale (DVS)" were used to collect the data and ethics committee approval was obtained. The data were evaluated in SPSS 24.0 (Statistical Packet for Social Sciences for Windows) statistical program. **Results:** It was determined that 12.9% of the participants were exposed to violence in their dating relationship and 8.1% considered committing violence against their partner. The SFI mean score was 46.47±11.20 and the DVS mean score was 4.10±0.39 and the subscale mean scores was found 4.60±0.61 for physical violence, 4.56±0.56 for general violence, 3.61±0.60 for emotional violence, 3.64±0.40 for sexual violence, and 3.48±0.46 for economic violence. There was a positive weak correlation between the solution focality levels and dating violence. **Conclusion:** As a consequence, the present study found a positive weak correlation between the solution focality level and dating violence. It is believed that as the solution-focused thinking level increased, it will show a positive effect in decreasing dating violence attitude.

Keywords: Student; dating violence; solution focality; nursing

ÖZET Amaç: Bu çalışmanın amacı, hemşirelik öğrencilerinin çözüm odaklılık düzeyleri ile flört şiddeti tutumlarının ilişkisini incelemektir. **Gereç ve Yöntemler:** Tanımlayıcı tipteki bu çalışma, 210 hemşirelik öğrencisi ile yapılmıştır. Verilerin toplanmasında "Kişisel Bilgi Formu, Çözüm Odaklı Envanter [Solution Focused Inventory (SFI)] ve Flört Şiddeti Ölçeği [Dating Violence Scale (DVS)]" kullanılmış ve etik kurul onayı alınmıştır. Veriler SPSS 24.0 (Statistical Packet for Social Sciences for Windows) istatistik programında değerlendirilmiştir. **Bulgular:** Katılımcıların %12,9'unun flört ilişkisinde şiddete maruz kaldığı ve %8,1'inin partnerine şiddet uygulamayı düşündüğü belirlenmiştir. SFI ortalama puanı 46,47±11,20 ve DVS ortalama puanı 4,10±0,39 ve alt ölçek puan ortalamaları fiziksel şiddet için 4,60±0,61, genel şiddet için 4,56±0,56, duygusal şiddet için 3,61±0,60, cinsel şiddet için 3,64±0,40 ve ekonomik şiddet için 3,48±0,46 bulunmuştur. Çözüm odaklılık düzeyleri ile flört şiddeti arasında pozitif ve zayıf bir korelasyon bulunmuştur. **Sonuç:** Sonuç olarak bu çalışmada, çözüm odaklılık düzeyi ile flört şiddeti arasında pozitif yönde zayıf bir ilişki bulunmuş olup, çözüm odaklı düşünme düzeyi arttıkça flört şiddetini azaltmada olumlu etki göstereceğine inanılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğrenci; flört şiddeti; çözüm odaklılık; hemşirelik

Violence has become an important social problem encountered around the world. One of the types of interpersonal violence is dating violence.¹ Dating is defined as a type of relationship in which people interact

socially and attempt to continue or discontinue the relationship and then finish it in line with the desires of one party or both parties or continue with an official relationship (engagement, marriage or living together).

Correspondence: Ebru ÖZTÜRK ÇOPUR

Department of Nursing, Division of Public Health Nursing, Kilis 7 Aralık University Yusuf Şerefoğlu Faculty of Health Sciences, Kilis, Türkiye

E-mail: ebruozturkcopur@kilis.edu.tr



Peer review under responsibility of Türkiye Klinikleri Journal of Nursing Sciences.

Received: 07 Jan 2022

Received in revised form: 26 Mar 2022

Accepted: 12 Apr 2022

Available online: 18 Apr 2022

2146-8893 / Copyright © 2022 by Türkiye Klinikleri. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Dating violence is one of the sub-types of close partner violence and is encountered in people who are not officially married.^{2,3} In a report presented by the World Health Organization in 2018, it is indicated that close partner violence is a term approaching both official relationships (marriage) and non-official relationships (dating relationship, sexual relationship, out-of-wedlock relationship).⁴ It is seen that dating violence types have similar classifications with other violence types and are classified as physical, psychological and sexual dating violence. Physical dating violence comprises behaviors such as kicking, slapping, pushing, and punching. Psychological dating violence comprises behaviors which are not physical but are psychologically hurtful, such as mocking, nicknaming or restraining him/her from seeing his/her family and friends. Sexual dating violence refers to situations such as forcing a person into sexual intercourse without his/her consent or re-tailing about it when he/she rejects. Stalking the person is also regarded as a violent behavior.^{2,5}

It is stated that the most risky groups in dating violence exposure are young adult and adolescent age groups. In the studies conducted by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention entitled the Youth Risk Behavior Survey and the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, it was reported that nearly one out of 11 girls and one out of 15 boys are exposed to physical dating violence, nearly one out of 9 girls and one out of 36 boys experience sexual dating violence and 26% of women and 15% of men experiencing sexual violence, physical violence or being stalked by a close partner are younger than 18 years.⁶ In a study conducted with university students in Türkiye, it was concluded that 28.6% of students are exposed to dating violence and 22.1% committed violence against their partner.⁷ Dating violence short-term effects are injury and even death, its long-term effects are smoking and alcohol use, eating disorders, posttraumatic stress disorder, decrease in self-confidence, and bursts of anger. In addition, there might be risky sexual behaviors such as early sexual intercourse or unprotected sexual intercourse and sexually transmitted infections which develop as a result and long term health outcomes such as unintended pregnancy.^{2,5} Prevention of dating violence prevents most violence types to occur in the future.^{5,8}

Solution-focused approach can be defined as strengthening the resources and increasing the indomitableness in order for people to change in a positive direction and sustain that change.⁹ Solution focality includes going towards the solution rather than the problem. Solution focality of the person also indicates focusing on the solution rather than the problem in stressful situations, being strong and resilient and coping with problems.¹⁰ When examining the literature; we have encountered no study examining solution-focused approaches in dating violence. The solution-oriented levels of nurses and nurse trainee students, who are among the important health professionals and are in constant contact with people, who are important professional groups in preventing violence and raising awareness of the society, are very important. It is thought that it will also have a positive effect in preventing dating violence. The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between nursing students' solution-oriented levels and their attitudes towards dating violence.

Research Questions

1. How are the solution-focused thinking levels of nursing students?
2. How are the dating violence attitude levels of nursing students?
3. Is there any correlation between the solution-focused thinking levels and dating violence attitudes of nursing students?

MATERIAL AND METHODS

POPULATION AND SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

Nursing candidates, who are among the important health professionals of the future, who are thought to show preventive approaches against violence and contribute to the awareness of the society with solution-oriented approaches in this direction, were included in this study. The population of this cross-sectional study consisted of nursing students (n=384) studying at Kilis 7 Aralık University Yusuf Şerefoğlu Faculty of Health Sciences. The sample of the study consisted of at least 193 students at the 95% confidence interval and 5% significance level. The study was conducted with 210 nursing students who

met the inclusion criteria and agreed to participate in the study.

DATA COLLECTION

The study was conducted with 210 students who agreed to participate in the study between 01.03.2021 and 01.04.2021. It took approximately 10-15 minutes to complete the survey.

Inclusion criteria

- Aged over 18 years,
- Being a nursing student in Kilis 7 Aralık University,
- Being voluntary to participate in the study.

DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

The data of the study were collected using “the Personal Information Form, Solution-Focused Inventory (SFI), and the Dating Violence Scale (DVS).” In order to minimize face-to-face interaction due to the pandemic, a digital survey was prepared by the researchers. The digital survey form was submitted to the students via WhatsApp (Meta, Inc. California, USA) and e-mail.

Personal Information Form: The socio-demographic data form was prepared by the researchers upon literature review.^{7,11-14} This form has a total of 19 questions aiming to obtain information about socio-demographic characteristics and dating violence.

SFI: Developed by Grant et al., (2012) and adapted into Turkish by Şanal-Karahan and Hamarta (2015), the inventory is based on short-term solution-focused therapy and thus measures solution-focused thinking (Grant et al., 2012).¹⁵ In the 12-item 6-point likert inventory (1=strongly disagree; 6=strongly agree), items 1, 2, 4, and 5 are rated reversely. The inventory has three subscales (Problem disengagement: items 1, 2, 4, and 5; goal orientation: items 9, 10, 11, and 12; and resource activation: items 3, 6, 7, and 8). Higher scores indicates higher solution-focused thinking. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was found to be 0.77 for the problem disengagement subscale, 0.84 for the goal orientation subscale, and 0.70 for the resource activation subscale, and 0.84 for the overall inventory.¹⁵ In this study, the Cronbach’s

alpha coefficient was found to be 0.75 for the problem disengagement subscale, 0.93 for the goal orientation subscale, 0.87 for the resource activation subscale, and 0.88 for the overall inventory.

DVS: Developed by Terzioğlu et al., the 5-point likert scale (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree) has 28 items and 5 subscales (physical, general, emotional, sexual, and economic violence) and aims to determine the violence attitudes of people in dating relationships. As the scores obtained from the scale approach 1, this indicates that the person has an attitude supporting dating violence. Twenty three items in the scale are rated reversely. In the Turkish validity-reliability study of the scale developed by Terzioğlu et al., the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was found to be 0.91.¹⁶ In this study, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was found to be 0.86 for the overall inventory.

STATISTICAL METHOD

The data were assessed in the SPSS 24.0 (Statistical Packet for Social Sciences for Windows) (IBM SPSS, USA) statistics program. In the statistical analysis, compatibility of the data normal distribution was evaluated via the Skewness and Kurtosis (± 1) distribution test. It was determined that the data were not normally distributed. Descriptive statistics (percentage, frequency, mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum) were used in evaluating the data. The Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests were used in comparing the non-normally distributed independent variables. In order to measure the correlation between the SFI and DVS scores, the Pearson’s correlation analysis was used. The Pearson’s correlation coefficients were expressed as: <0.2 very weak, $0.2-0.39$ weak, $0.4-0.59$ medium, $0.6-0.79$ high, and ≥ 0.8 very high correlation. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In order to conduct the study, ethics committee approval was obtained (date: February 3, 2021, no: 2021/03). The purpose of the study was written on the online form and consent was received from the participants. Participation in the study was based on voluntariness. The study was conducted in accordance with the Principles of Helsinki Declaration.

RESULTS

It was determined that 51.9% of the students were aged 20-21 years, 71.0% were female, 34.8% were second-year students, 93.3% were single, 85.7% were unemployed, 65.7% had an income equal to expense, 42.9% had ≥ 5 siblings, 97.6% had parents living together, 86.7% had mother with \leq primary education, and 66.2% had father with \leq primary education. It was determined that there was a statistically significant difference between the employment of the students and the SFI total score ($p < 0.05$). There was a statistically significant difference between the gen-

der, grade and number of siblings of the students and the DVS total score ($p < 0.05$) (Table 1).

Of the students, 69.0% had no boyfriend/girlfriend, 16.2% had a boyfriend/girlfriend for 1-3 years, 40.5% planned to marry the person they dated, 12.9% were exposed to violence (physical, emotional, economic or sexual violence) in their dating relationship at least once so far, 8.1% considered committing violence (physical, emotional, economic or sexual violence) in their dating relationship at least once so far, 14.3% were subjected to domestic violence, 16.2% had a family member (such as mother, father, sibling) subjected to domestic violence, 6.7% had a psychiatric dis-

TABLE 1: The comparison of socio-demographic characteristics and SFI and DVS mean scores of the students (n=210).

		n (%)	SFI		DVS	
			Mean \pm SD	Significance	Mean \pm SD	Significance
Age	18-19 years	44 (21.0)	48.77 \pm 8.26	KW=4.250	4.13 \pm 0.40	KW=0.683
	20-21 years	109 (51.9)	44.98 \pm 11.76	$p=0.119$	4.09 \pm 0.37	$p=0.711$
	≥ 22 years	57 (27.1)	47.54 \pm 11.78		4.07 \pm 0.42	
Gender	Female	149 (71.0)	47.52 \pm 9.71	Z=-1.233	4.14 \pm 0.40	Z=-4.374
	Male	61 (29.0)	43.90 \pm 13.95	$p=0.217$	3.98 \pm 0.33	$p=0.000$
Grade	1 st year	47 (22.3)	48.52 \pm 7.22	KW=7.184	4.16 \pm 0.38	KW=7.899
	2 nd year	73 (34.8)	43.13 \pm 13.76	$p=0.066$	3.98 \pm 0.46	$p=0.048$
	3 rd year	44 (21.0)	46.50 \pm 11.02		4.13 \pm 0.35	
	4 th year	46 (21.9)	49.60 \pm 8.81		4.18 \pm 0.25	
Marital status	Single	196 (93.3)	46.94 \pm 10.72	KW=3.401	3.83 \pm 0.66	KW=1.864
	Married	6 (2.9)	40.33 \pm 10.51	$p=0.183$	4.11 \pm 0.38	$p=0.394$
	Engaged	8 (3.8)	39.50 \pm 19.19		4.03 \pm 0.25	
Employment	Yes	30 (14.3)	38.13 \pm 13.99	Z=-3.684	4.05 \pm 0.38	Z=-1.003
	No	180 (85.7)	47.86 \pm 10.05	$p=0.000$	4.10 \pm 0.39	$p=0.316$
Income level	Income less than expenses	63 (30.0)	44.49 \pm 11.20	KW=5.034	4.17 \pm 0.31	KW=3.717
	Income equal to expenses	138 (65.7)	47.03 \pm 11.038	$p=0.081$	4.05 \pm 0.42	$p=0.156$
	Income higher than expenses	9 (4.3)	51.66 \pm 4.33		4.26 \pm 0.15	
Number of siblings	1-2 siblings	39 (18.5)	47.64 \pm 9.20	KW=1.845	4.19 \pm 0.39	KW=6.984
	3-4 siblings	81 (38.6)	45.41 \pm 11.16	$p=0.397$	4.07 \pm 0.37	$p=0.030$
	≥ 5 siblings	90 (42.9)	46.91 \pm 12.02		4.08 \pm 0.39	
Living together with parents	Yes	205 (97.6)	46.57 \pm 11.28	Z=-1.614	4.11 \pm 0.36	Z=-1.045
	No	5 (2.4)	42.40 \pm 5.89	$p=0.106$	3.53 \pm 0.86	$p=0.296$
Educational level of the mothers	\leq primary school	182 (86.7)	47.10 \pm 10.48	Z=-1.440	4.12 \pm 0.34	Z=-0.730
	\geq high school	28 (13.3)	42.35 \pm 14.62	$p=0.150$	3.97 \pm 0.59	$p=0.466$
Educational level of the fathers	\leq primary school	139 (66.2)	46.93 \pm 11.32	KW=2.462	4.11 \pm 0.37	KW=0.297
	High school	47 (22.4)	45.93 \pm 11.47	$p=0.292$	4.07 \pm 0.45	$p=0.862$
	\geq university	24 (11.4)	44.83 \pm 10.15		4.08 \pm 0.35	
	Total	210 (100.0)				

Z=Mann Whitney U test; KW: Kruskal Wallis H test; $p < 0.05$; SFI: Solution-Focused Inventory; DVS: Dating Violence Scale; SD: Standard deviation.

order and 2.9% took psychiatric medicine. There was a statistically significant difference between the dating time of the students and the SFI total score ($p<0.05$). It was determined that there was a statistically significant difference between the dating time of the students and their exposure to violence (physical, emotional, economic or sexual violence) in their dating relationship at least once so far, their consideration of committing violence (physical, emotional, economic or sexual violence) in their dating relationship at least once so far, their exposure to domestic violence and the DVS total score ($p<0.05$) (Table 2).

The SFI total mean score of the students was found to be 46.47 ± 11.20 and the subscale mean scores were 12.61 ± 4.30 for problem disengagement,

16.68 ± 4.30 for goal orientation, and 17.17 ± 5.02 for resource activation. The DVS total mean score was 4.10 ± 0.39 and the subscale mean scores were 4.60 ± 0.61 for physical violence, 4.56 ± 0.56 for general violence, 3.61 ± 0.60 for emotional violence, 3.64 ± 0.40 for sexual violence, and 3.48 ± 0.46 for economic violence (Table 3).

It was determined that there was a positive weak correlation between the solution focality levels of the nursing students and dating violence ($r=0.229$, $p=0.001$) (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

Violence has begun to be an ever-increasing important problem in all communities. Together with the

TABLE 2: The comparison of dating violence-associated characteristics and SFI and DVS mean scores of the students (n=210).

	n (%)	SFI		DVS		
		Mean±SD	Significance	Mean±SD	Significance	
The presence of having a boy/girl friend	Yes	65 (31.0)	47.07±12.21	Z=-1.043	4.09±0.43	Z=-0.260
	No	145 (69.0)	46.20±10.74	p=0.297	4.10±0.37	p=-0.260
Time of dating	None	145 (69.0)	46.39±10.46	KW=14.464	4.10±0.36	KW=7.968
	<1 year	21 (10.0)	38.66±17.41	p=0.001	3.85±0.59	p=0.019
	1-3 years	34 (16.2)	48.88±7.78		4.23±0.29	
	≥4 years	10 (4.8)	55.80±1.81		4.10±0.30	
Thinking to marry the person dated	Yes	85 (40.5)	46.95±12.14	KW=2.007	4.07±0.40	KW=0.066
	No	69 (32.9)	45.84±9.86	p=0.157	4.09±0.36	p=0.797
Being exposed to violence (physical, emotional, economic or sexual violence) in their dating relationship at least once so far	Neutral	56 (26.6)	46.51±11.42		4.14±0.41	
	Yes	27 (12.9)	47.51±9.11	KW=1.535	3.98±0.57	KW=6.062
	No	165 (78.5)	46.66±11.29	p=0.464	4.14±0.33	p=0.048
Considering committing violence (physical, emotional, economic or sexual violence) in their dating relationship at least once so far	Neutral	18 (8.6)	43.11±13.07		3.87±0.47	
	Yes	17 (8.1)	42.88±15.16	KW=4.601	4.05±0.26	KW=6.922
	No	179 (85.2)	47.10±10.78	p=0.100	4.12±0.38	p=0.031
Being exposed to domestic violence	Neutral	14 (6.7)	42.71±10.22		3.86±0.47	
	Yes	30 (14.3)	44.43±14.01	Z=-0.460	3.98±0.44	Z=-2.063
The presence of a family member exposed to domestic violence (mother, father, sibling etc.)	No	180 (85.7)	46.81±10.66	p=0.646	4.11±0.38	p=0.039
	Yes	34 (16.2)	46.23±12.83	Z=-0.227	4.05±0.45	Z=-0.508
The presence of any psychiatric disease	No	176 (83.8)	46.51±10.89	p=0.821	4.10±0.37	p=0.611
	Yes	14 (6.7)	44.00±14.26	Z=-0.105	3.96±0.58	Z=-1.042
Using psychiatric drugs	No	196 (93.3)	46.64±10.97	p=0.917	4.11±0.37	p=0.297
	Yes	6 (2.9)	40.66±14.29	Z=-1.122	40.66±0.43	Z=-0.502
	No	204 (97.1)	46.64±11.09	p=0.262	4.10±0.39	p=0.616
Total	210 (100.0)					

Z=Mann Whitney U test; KW: Kruskal Wallis H test; $p<0.05$; SFI: Solution-Focused Inventory; DVS: Dating Violence Scale; SD: Standard deviation.

TABLE 3: Distribution of SFI, DVS and subscale mean scores and minimum-maximum values.

	Mean	SD	Maximum-minimum values
SFI total	46.47	11.20	13-66
Problem disengagement	12.61	4.30	4-23
Goal orientation	16.68	5.01	4-24
Resource activation	17.17	5.02	4-24
DVS total	4.10	0.39	2.25-4.68
Physical violence	4.60	0.61	1.20-5
General violence	4.56	0.56	2.20-5
Emotional violence	3.61	0.60	1.33-5
Sexual violence	3.64	0.40	2.43-5
Economic violence	3.48	0.46	2.20-4.40

SFI: Solution Focused Inventory; DVS: Dating Violence Scale; SD: Standard deviation.

increase of social violence events, violence has begun to be common among young people. Dating violence which is one of interpersonal violence types is especially common among young people and may have a physical, social and psychological negative effect on

them.^{1,7} It is believed that solution-focused approaches will facilitate the solution of problems and enable people to cope with their difficulties especially today when violence is gradually increasing. This study was conducted to examine the effect of the solution focality levels especially in nursing students who will be one of the important healthcare professionals of the future on their dating violence attitudes.

In this study, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference between the employment of the students and the SFI total score and the employed students had lower solution focality levels (Table 1). In a study conducted by Bilge and Engin on the effectiveness of solution-focused therapy for interpersonal relationships, they determined that employed health high school students had a lower problem solving competence.¹¹ In this study, it was determined that the students who were male, had 3-4 siblings and second-year students obtained lower scores from the DVS and thus they displayed attitudes supporting dating violence (Table 1). In a study

TABLE 4: Correlation distribution of SFI, DVS, and subscale scores.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 SFI total	r									
	p									
2 Problem disengagement	r	0.544								
	p	0.000								
3 Goal orientation	r	0.868	0.140							
	p	0.000	0.043							
4 Resource activation	r	0.897	0.216	0.817						
	p	0.000	0.002	0.000						
5 DVS total	r	0.229	0.070	0.268	0.303					
	p	0.001	0.312	0.000	0.000					
6 Physical violence	r	0.177	0.040	0.215	0.215	0.325				
	p	0.010	0.565	0.002	0.002	0.000				
7 General violence	r	0.347	0.049	0.345	0.387	0.805	0.321			
	p	0.000	0.483	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000			
8 Emotional violence	r	0.019	0.094	0.063	0.063	0.750	0.586	0.425		
	p	0.782	0.177	0.362	0.387	0.000	0.000	0.000		
9 Sexual violence	r	0.286	0.025	0.262	0.286	0.557	0.324	0.479	0.104	
	p	0.000	0.715	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.132
10 Economic violence	r	0.128	0.039	0.131	0.188	0.562	0.281	0.345	0.349	0.184
	p	0.065	0.575	0.058	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

SFI: Solution Focused Inventory; DVS: Dating Violence Scale.

conducted by Yıldırım, it was determined that the DVS scores were lower in the male students compared to the female students. Also concerning the number of siblings which is one of the other variables affecting attitudes towards dating violence, it was determined that the students with 3 and more siblings had lower dating violence attitude scores.¹² Similar studies in the literature have found significant differences between dating violence and gender, too.^{17,18} In another study, it was revealed that women supported dating violence.¹⁹ In a study conducted by Yolcu and Akbay, it was found that second-year university students displayed more supportive attitudes towards dating violence.¹³ This study is compatible with other studies in the literature in general; however, the fact that the number of siblings was higher in the study might be associated with failure of parents to adequately take care of their children, lower educational level of parents and more traditional attitudes of parents in gender roles.

In this study it was determined that among the nursing students who had a boyfriend/girlfriend; most of them had a boyfriend/girlfriend for 1-3 years and highly planned to marry the person they dated (Table 2). A certain number of them were exposed to violence in their dating relationship or considered committing violence against their partner and were exposed to domestic violence or had a family member exposed to domestic violence. In addition considering the participants in general, it was determined that a low rate of them had a psychiatric disorder and a certain number of those with a psychiatric disorder took psychiatric medicine. In a study conducted by Devrim with nursing students, it was determined that 16.6% of the students had been with someone for less than a year, 31.4% planned to marry the person they dated, 11.4% were exposed to violence during their dating relationship, 7.4% were exposed to domestic violence, 8.6% had a family member subjected to domestic violence and 2.3% had a psychiatric disorder.²⁰ In another study, it was found that 45.8% of the participants were with someone and 32.9% had a relationship for 1 year to 3 years.²¹ The present study is compatible with other study findings in the literature.

In this study, it was determined that the students who had been with someone for ≥ 4 years had higher

solution focality levels (Table 2). There is no study on this matter. It is thought that the results obtained were associated with the fact that couples know each other, spend time together and keep in touch as the time of dating extends.

In the study, it was determined that the students who had been with someone for less than <1 year, those who were exposed to violence (physical, emotional, economic or sexual violence) in their dating relationship, those who considered committing violence (physical, emotional, economic or sexual violence) in their dating relationship and those who were exposed to domestic violence had attitudes supporting dating violence. Dating violence experiences play a key role in determining dating violence attitudes (Table 2). It is indicated that the more people support dating violence attitudes, the greater the risk of committing and being exposed to dating violence.²² In the study conducted by Devrim with nursing students, it was determined that there was no significant difference between the time of dating, exposure to domestic violence and the DVS score. There was a statistically significant difference between the exposure to violence in a dating relationship and the DVS mean score.²⁰ In a study conducted by Karadayı aimed at university students, it was determined that there was no significant difference between the time of dating and the DVS scores. However, statistically significant differences were obtained in the exposure to violence and commitment of violence in a dating relationship.²³ Jouriles et al., stated in their study that people having a relationship with those who had committed violence or had been victimized in their previous relationships might have an increased risk of being exposed to dating violence.²⁴ Duran and Ünsal determined in their study that students who were exposed to domestic violence had higher rate of committing violence against others and there was a positive correlation between the violence committed by father against mother and the violence committed by father against another person.²⁵ In another study, it was determined that young people who were exposed to domestic violence had higher aggressive behaviors and violence commitment risks.²⁶ The reason behind why dating time in the present study findings was different from the findings of other similar

studies is thought to be associated with the fact that partners cannot know each other precisely within a time less than a year, as well as lack of communication and difference of the region where the study was conducted.

In this study, it was determined that the solution-focused thinking levels of the students were low and while the highest mean score was observed in the resource activation subscale, the lowest mean score was obtained in the problem disengagement subscale (Table 3). Goal orientation contains focusing on goals and bringing them into the forefront and focusing on a purpose desired. Problem disengagement contains focusing on drifting away from problems and problem-oriented thoughts.¹⁵ Also in order for people to achieve their goals, they need to overcome the difficulties they experience, disengage from their problems and seek new ways for solution.^{27,28} In a study conducted by Karahan with university students in 2016, it was determined that problem disengagement was 14.95, goal orientation was 17.44 and resource activation was 18.26.²⁹ In another study the solution-focused problem disengagement mean score was found to be 14.83, the goal orientation mean score was 17.59 and the resource activation mean score was 18.92.³⁰ In line with the findings obtained from this study, the reason that the lowest mean score of the participants was in the problem disengagement subscale is thought to be associated mainly with communicational problems and inadequate problem solving skills. This study is similar with other study findings in the literature.

It was determined that the nursing students had a positive dating violence attitude in general and while they had the lowest mean score in the economic violence subscale, the highest mean score was determined in the physical violence subscale (Table 3). In a study conducted with nursing students, the DVS total mean score was reported to be 4.53 ± 0.96 .²⁰ In another study conducted with university students, it was determined that the general violence mean score which was the dating violence scale subscale was 23.77 ± 2.64 , the physical violence mean score was 23.30 ± 3.08 , the emotional violence total mean score was 26.88 ± 4.09 , the economic violence total mean

score was 21.67 ± 3.46 , the sexual violence total mean score was 29.55 ± 3.49 and the total violence mean score was 125.17 ± 12.96 .²¹ This study is different from other study findings in the literature in certain aspects. It is thought to be associated with cultural and social differences of the study region and the change in the attitude towards dating violence. Findings of the present study are compatible with the findings of Devrim's study.²⁰

In the present study it was determined that there was a correlation between the solution focality levels of the nursing students and dating violence (Table 4). As higher solution focality level will increase approaches aimed at solving a problem rather than problems, it is believed to be an important factor in preventing violence. Jung and Kang determined in their study that the greater the dating violence experience of nursing students is, the higher their tolerance to dating violence and the higher the tolerance to dating violence is, the more negative the skill of solving social problems.¹⁴ In another study, it was determined that young people committed violence in their dating relationship, which proves the need for applying effective prevention strategies. In the study, it was revealed that couples committing violence are different from couples not committing violence due to their tendency of applying to negative emotions as a solution strategy when they experienced a conflict. The study stressed the necessity of preventing dating violence by encouraging healthy relationship skills (such as communication, conflict solution).³¹ The present study found that the solution focality level may make a positive contribution to the prevention of dating violence, which is compatible with studies in the literature.

LIMITATIONS

The limitations of this study are that it is a local study. For this reason, it will contribute to the generalization of the study by conducting it with more nursing students in different regions investigating dating violence.

CONCLUSION

As a consequence, the present study found a positive weak correlation between the solution focality level

and dating violence. It is believed that the increase of the solution focality level in dating violence which is one of the sub-types of violence that has become a gradually increasing social problem especially today and poses an important risk factor among young people, will have a positive effect on reducing violence. Also it is indicated that young people who commit and are exposed to dating violence will have a significantly increased risk of aggressive and violent behaviors in the future and those who are exposed to domestic violence and violence comprise more risky groups in terms of committing dating violence. It is thought to be important to apply necessary approaches concerning solution focality which plays a key role especially in the solution of problems and conflicts. It is recommended that violence in nursing students who will be among the important healthcare professionals of the future, solution-focused approaches be added and more studies be conducted on this subject.

Source of Finance

During this study, no financial or spiritual support was received neither from any pharmaceutical company that has a direct connection with the research subject, nor from a company that provides or produces medical instruments and materials which may negatively affect the evaluation process of this study.

Conflict of Interest

No conflicts of interest between the authors and / or family members of the scientific and medical committee members or members of the potential conflicts of interest, counseling, expertise, working conditions, share holding and similar situations in any firm.

Authorship Contributions

Idea/Concept: Ebru Öztürk Çopur, Fatma Karasu, Zehra Can; **Design:** Ebru Öztürk Çopur, Fatma Karasu; **Control/Supervision:** Ebru Öztürk Çopur, Fatma Karasu; **Data Collection and/or Processing:** Ebru Öztürk Çopur, Zehra Can; **Analysis and/or Interpretation:** Ebru Öztürk Çopur, Fatma Karasu; **Literature Review:** Ebru Öztürk Çopur, Fatma Karasu, Zehra Can; **Writing the Article:** Ebru Öztürk Çopur, Fatma Karasu, Zehra Can; **Critical Review:** Ebru Öztürk Çopur, Fatma Karasu.

REFERENCES

1. Yıldırım S, Terzioğlu F. Şiddetin farklı bir yüzü: flört şiddeti, etkileri ve etkileyen faktörler [A different face of violence: dating violence, its effects and influencing factors]. *Anatolian Journal of Nursing and Health Sciences*. 2018;21(4):285-92. [Link]
2. Baldan GA, Akış N. Flört şiddeti [Dating violence]. *Journal of Uludag University Faculty of Medicine*. 2017;43(1):41-4. [Link]
3. Fidan F, Yeşil Y. Nedenleri ve sonuçları itibarıyla flört şiddeti [Dating violence in terms of causes and consequences]. *Balkan and Near East Journal of Social Sciences*. 2018;4(01):16-24. [Link]
4. World Health Organization (WHO) [Internet]. [Cited: 20.04.2021]. © 2021 WHO. Violence Against Women Prevalence Estimates, 2018. Available from: [Link]
5. Türk B, Hamzaoğlu N, Yayak A. Flört şiddeti üzerine bir inceleme [A review on dating violence]. *Türkiye Klinikleri J Foren Sci Leg Med*. 2020;17(1):73-81. [Crossref]
6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Preventing Teen Dating Violence. Cited: April 20, 2021. Available from: [Link]
7. Karatay G. Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddetine ilişkin tutum ve davranışları [Attitudes and behaviors of university students towards dating violence]. *STED/Journal of Continuing Medical Education*. 2018;27(1):62-71. [Link]
8. Jouriles EN, Choi HJ, Rancher C, Temple JR. Teen dating violence victimization, trauma symptoms, and revictimization in early adulthood. *J Adolesc Health*. 2017;61(1):115-9. [Crossref] [PubMed] [PMC]
9. Grant AM, Cavanagh MJ, Kleitman S, Spence G, Lakota M, Yu N. Development and validation of the solution-focused inventory. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*. 2012;7(4):334-48. [Crossref]
10. Sari E, Uyumaz G, Kaya C. Çözüm odaklılığın yordayıcı değişkenleri: yaşam doyumu, stres, depresyon ve yılmazlık [Predictive variables of solution orientation: Life satisfaction, stress, depression and resilience]. *Karadeniz Journal of Social Sciences*. 2019;11(21):423-38. [Link]
11. Bilge A, Engin E. Kişilerarası ilişkiler kuramı temelli çözüm odaklı terapinin etkinliği: geriye dönük bir inceleme [The effectiveness of solution-focused therapy based on interpersonal relations theory: a retrospective review]. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2016;17(4):261-9. [Crossref]
12. Yıldırım S. Üniversite öğrencilerinin benlik saygısı ve toplumsal cinsiyet tutumlarının flört şiddetine yönelik tutumlarına etkisi. [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü; 2016. [Erişim tarihi: 20.04.2021]. Erişim linki: [Link]
13. Yolcu D, Akbay SE. Üniversite öğrencilerinde flört şiddeti: benlik saygısı, algılanan ilişki özyeterliliği ve bağlanma biçimlerinin rolü [Dating violence among university students: the role of self-esteem, perceived relationship self-efficacy and attachment styles]. *European journal of Education Studies*. 2020;7(10):241-7.
14. Jung GH, Kang MK. The convergent relationship between dating violence experience, violence tolerance, and social problem solving ability of nursing college students. *Journal of the Korea Convergence Society*. 2018;9(2):33-42. [Crossref]
15. Şanal Karahan F, Hamarta E. Çözüm odaklı envanter: güvenilirlik ve geçerlik çalışması [The solution focused inventory: reliability and validity study]. *Elementary Education Online*. 2015;4(2):757-69. [Link]
16. Terzioğlu F, Gönenç İM, Özdemir F, Güvenç G, Kök G, Yılmaz Sezer N, Demirtaş Hiçyılmaz B. Flört şiddeti tutum ölçeği geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması [The validity and reliability study of the dating violence attitude scale]. *Anadolu Journal of Nursing and Health Sciences*. 2016;19(4):225-32. [Link]

17. Ferreira M, Lopes A, Aparicio G, Cabral L, Duarte J. Teens and dating: study of factors that influence attitudes of violence. *Aten Primaria*. 2014;46 Suppl 5(Suppl 5):187-90. [Crossref] [PubMed] [PMC]
18. Ulloa EC, Jaycox LH, Skinner SK, Orsburn MM. Attitudes about violence and dating among Latino/a boys and girls. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*. 2008;17(2):157-76. [Crossref]
19. Pradubmook-Sherer P. Youth attitudes toward dating violence in Thailand. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*. 2011;55(2):182-206. [Crossref] [PubMed]
20. Devrim BS. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet algısının flört şiddeti tutumuna etkisi. [Yüksek lisans tezi]. İstanbul: İstanbul Okan Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü; 2019. [Erişim tarihi: April 24, 2021]. Erişim linki: [Link]
21. Gümüş B. Üniversite öğrencilerinin flört şiddeti, bağlanma biçimleri, aldatma eğilimi ve romantik yakınlık arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. [Master Thesis]. İstanbul: Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi; 2020. [Erişim tarihi: 24.04.2021]. Erişim linki: [Link]
22. De Puy J, Hamby SL, Lindemuth C. Teen dating violence in French-speaking Switzerland: attitudes and experiences. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJCV)*. 2014;8(2):305-15. [Link]
23. Karadayı A. Üniversite öğrencilerinde toplumsal cinsiyet algısı ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin flört şiddeti ve flört şiddetine yönelik tutumlara etkisi. [Yüksek Lisans tezi]. İstanbul: Haliç Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü; 2020. [Erişim tarihi: 25.04.2021]. Erişim linki: [Link]
24. Jouriles EN, Platt C, McDonald R. Violence in adolescent dating relationships. *The Prevention Researcher*. 2009;6(1):3-7. [Link]
25. Duran S, Ünsal G. Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi Sağlık Yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin aile içi şiddete maruz kalma oranı ile kişinin başkalarına karşı şiddet kullanımı ve saldırganlık eğilimi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Erzurum: II. Uluslararası VI. Ulusal Psikiyatri Hemşireliği Kongresi; 2012. [Link]
26. Foshee VA, McNaughton Reyes HL, Chen MS, Ennett ST, Basile KC, DeGue S, et al. Shared risk factors for the perpetration of physical dating violence, bullying, and sexual harassment among adolescents exposed to domestic violence. *J Youth Adolesc*. 2016;45(4):672-86. [Crossref] [PubMed] [PMC]
27. Pangallo A, Zibarras L, Lewis R, Flaxman P. Resilience through the lens of interactionism: a systematic review. *Psychol Assess*. 201;27(1):1-20. [Crossref] [PubMed]
28. Lee JH, Nam SK, Kim AR, Kim B, Lee MY, Lee SM. Resilience: a meta-analytic approach. *Journal of Counseling and Development*. 2013;91:269-79. [Crossref]
29. Karahan FŞ, Hamarta E. The relationship between solution-focused thinking, depression, anxiety, stress and psychology well-being among university students. *Turkish Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance*. 2020;10(59):649-60. [Link]
30. Koç H, Arslan C. Analyzing interpersonal problem solving in terms of solution focused approach and humor styles of university student. *Online Submission*. 2017;8(27):18-28. [Link]
31. Fernet M, Hébert M, Paradis A. Conflict resolution patterns and violence perpetration in adolescent couples: a gender-sensitive mixed-methods approach. *J Adolesc*. 2016;49:51-9. [Crossref] [PubMed] [PMC]