The Roles of Value Preferences and Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies on Prediction of Dating Violence

Seda Donat Bacıoğlu[1] & Oya Onat Kocabıyık[2]

[1,2]Trakya University, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to determine in what extends gender, age, relationship status, value preferences and cognitive emotion regulation strategies predict the dating violence. The study group was comprised of 335 university students. Attitudes Towards Dating Violence Scale, Cognitive Emotional Regulation Scale and Values Scale were used in data collection. According to the findings obtained from research, it was found that there were positive significant relationships between gender and social values, career values, intellectual values, spirituality and dating violence. On the other hand, the findings showed that gender and age variables are significant predictors of dating violence. Social values, intellectual values and freedom values positively predict dating violence. Spirituality, human dignity, romantic values and futuwwa negatively predict dating violence. Increasing the importance given to the social values, intellectual values and freedom values increases the attitudes that not supporting dating violence. On the other hand, increasing the importance given to spirituality, human dignity, romantic values and futuwwa decreases the attitudes supporting dating violence. It was found that there was a positive significant relationship between age and materialistic values and negative significant relationship between age and dating violence. Findings support that gender, age, cognitive emotion regulation strategies and value preferences are significant predictors of dating violence.

1.Introduction

Dating violence is generally expressed as all of the behaviours and limitations of deliberate damage that one of the partners or both of the partners trying to gain power and control over the other during a romantic relationship or after the relationship. The concept of dating violence is considered in literature as a synonym of a type of violence or a sub-type of violence such as violence in a romantic relationship, in a close relationship, domestic violence and among concept of interpersonal violence as in a partner/spouse relationship or in a couple relationship (Breiding, Basile, Smith, Balack & Mahendra, 2015; Kepir-Savoly, Ulaş & Demirtaş-Zorbaz, 2014; Öngün & Ünsal, 2018; Polat, 2016).

The most common types of incidence of dating violence in societies are known as physical, sexual, psychological, digital and stalking. Summarize, physical violence is undesired behaviours based on physical power and force to the partner for deliberate damage – such as pushing, hitting or kicking. Sexual violence is undesired behaviours forcing or oppressing the partner for a sexual action such as harassment and rape. Psychological violence, the unseen type of violence, is defined as suppressing the partner with the actions such as insulting, embarrassing, teasing or frightening. Digital violence, control and pressure towards the partner,

---

[1] Corresponding author's address: Trakya University, Education Faculty, Guisance & Counseling Department
Telephone:+90 0284 212 08 08
Fax:+90 0 284 214 62 79
e-mail:sedadonatbacioglu@trakya.edu.tr

is realized by digital tools as phone or computer on internet or social media. There is another definition in the literature described by Wells (1997), stalking is generally due to an obvious or hidden sexual drive or tendency to someone, is following somebody constantly and unity in actions could be defined as molestation or harassment. When the literature is examined, the riskiest group for high prevalence of dating violence was regarded as adolescents and young adults (Stappenbeck & Fromme, 2010). In the studies conducted among high school students, it was seen that the frequency of any kind of exposing dating violence in the last year varied between 15-50% (Foshee, Linder & MacDougall, 2001; Alleyne-Green, Coleman-Cowger & Henry, 2012). In university students, 31.6% of female and 24.4% of male were exposed to physical violence in 2007 (Straus, 2008); in the USA, it was also found that one in every 5 female students and one in every 10 male students were subjected to dating violence in the last year (Vagi, Olsen, Basile, Vivolo-Kantor, 2015). When the frequency of dating violence in the world was examined according to the types of violence; it was reported that between 9% and 40% to physical violence, between 1% and 13% to sexual violence, between 29% and 90% psychological violence were experienced at least once. In the study conducted among adolescents and young people aged between 15 and 24 in Mexico, 75% of the participants stated that they were exposed to verbal-emotional violence, 27% were exposed to sexual violence, 14% to physical violence and 16% were exposed to threatening behaviour (Instituto Mexicano de la Juventud, 2008). In the study of Toplu and Hatipoğlu-Sümer (2011) in Turkey, it was seen that 40,0% of female and 34,7% of male students were subjected to physical dating violence at least once in their lives; and 85,2% of female and 75,6% of male students were subjected to psychological dating violence. It is estimated that in university students' dating relationships, the psychological violence is 80%, physical violence is 20-30% and sexual violence is 10-15%. Although men are more likely to perpetrate sexual violence, both men and women generally perpetrate psychological and physical violence at the same level (Shorey et al, 2012). Evaluating the conducted studies, it could be stated that both genders can be exposed to dating violence among university students, yetthe dating violence rates are higher in women (Dikmen, Özaydın & Yılmaz, 2018; Kepir-Savoly et al., 2014).

In addition to studies aimed at determining the rates of exposure of dating violence both genders among university students, the studies on determining the factors causing dating violence are gaining importance. Studies conducted in this subject; gender roles (patriarchal societies), family structures, socio-cultural norms and values are considered to be the factors that lead to the emergence of dating violence (Karahan & Kul-Uçtu, 2016; Polat, 2016). It is stated that not gaining social and individual values by the individuals increases the likelihood of encountering quite important problems in the personality development process (Dilmaç, 2015). In order to understand the cause of an important problem as the dating violence, in this study the value preferences of individuals were examined on the basis of classifications such as social values, career values, intellectual values, spirituality values, materialistic values, values of human dignity, romantic values, freedom values and futuwwa (generosity and courage) values (Dilmaç, Arıcak & Cesur 2012). Values are closely related to the feelings, thoughts and behavioural dimensions of people. Most of the social scientists pointed that values have fundamental importance in explaining human behaviour (Kuşdil & Kağıtcıbaşı, 2000). The studies showed that humanitarian values significantly reduced the individuals' negative attitudes and behaviour levels such as aggression and violence; instead, they increased positive attitudes and behaviours such as empathy and democracy (Çokdolu, 2013; Sağkal, 2011).

When the other factors that cause the emergence of dating violence among university students were examined, the causes were seen as problems in family relations (divorce, abuse, etc.), exposure of abuse and violence in the past, trauma, psychological problems, problems of adaptation to university life, use of alcohol and substance, lack of coping with rejection feelings and despair in romantic relationships, continuous anger and lack of emotion regulation skills (Atak, 2011; Avşar-Baldan & Akış, 2017; Dikmen et al, 2018; Fidan & Yeşil, 2018; Öngün & Ünsal, 2018). Among the factors listed above, in this study, especially emotion regulation skills of individuals were examined. Since emotion regulation skills of individuals are regarded as an important and necessary precursor in order to solve problems and managing anxiety and difficulties (Gross, 1998; Thompson, 1991), emotion regulation skills were examined in the context of the use of cognitive processes in this study. In the emotion regulation through cognitive processes, individuals develop cognitive strategies related to any situation before they react and then they respond emotionally through these strategies (Garnefski, Kraaij & Spinhoven, 2001).Examining the studies on cognitive emotion regulation strategies, it was stated that cognitive emotion regulation strategies help individuals to manage their feelings after stressful events (Garnefski et al., 2001; Garnefski & Kraaij, 2006). However, when cognitive emotion regulation strategies were examined; it was

seen that they were made up of positive adaptive strategies (acceptance, positive refocusing, refocus on planning, positive reappraisal and putting into perspective) and negative maladaptive strategies (self-blame, rumination, catastrophizing, other-blame) (Garnefski et al., 2001).Therefore, individuals who have low skills in using positive strategies in cognitive emotion regulations can easily show aggressive outbursts/blow-ups (Eisenberg, Fabes, Nyman, Bernzweig, Bernzweig & Pinuelas, 1994). Different studies similarly reported that individuals with low emotional regulation skills exhibit aggressive behaviours when they experience negative emotions, thus there is a positive relationship between aggression and emotion regulation (Bookhaut, Hubbard & Moore, 2018; Cohn, Jakupcak, Seibert, Hildebrandt & Zeichner, 2010; Davidson, Jackson & Kalin, 2000; Gardner & Waadjid, 2018; Hicks, 2018; Sullivan, 2010). In this case, most of the young adults could find themselves in aggressor and victim roles in dating relationships because of their negative cognitive emotion regulation strategies (Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999; Cited in Hatipoğlu, 2010).

Examining some of the short and long term consequences of dating violence especially on young people, these might be substance use, eating and sleep disorders, risky sexual behaviours, unintended pregnancy, fear, anxiety, trauma, suicide, murder, social isolation, embarrassment, guilt and anger (Ackard, Eisenberg & Neumark-Sztainer, 2007). It can be said that dating violence that can be seen in all parts of the society is an important public health problem considering the short and long term physical and psychological consequences (Breiding, Black & Ryan, 2008; Logan & Cole, 2007; Murray, Wester & Paladino, 2008). Considering the prevalence, types, causes and consequences of dating violence, the aim of this study is to determine in what extend gender, age, relationship status, value preferences and cognitive emotion regulation strategies predict the dating violence in the purpose of shedding the light on preventive studies for dating violence in young adults.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

The study group was comprised of 335 university students studying at Trakya University - Faculty of Education in 2017-2018 academic year. 243 of the students (72,5%) were female and 92 of them (27,5%) were male. 134 students (40%) were stated that they had a relationship at that moment, 201 of them (60%) stated that they did not have a relationship. The age of participants varied between 18-25 and the average of age was 20.64 (SD = 1.60).

2.2. Data Collection

Attitudes towards Dating Violence Scale: Developed by Terzioğlu, Gönenç, Özdemir, Güvenç, Kök, Sezer Yılmaz and Hiçyılmaz Demirtaş (2016), Attitudes towards Dating Violence Scale is a 28-item Likert type scale developed for determining individuals' attitudes towards violence in their dating relationships. It has 5 sub-dimension as general violence, physical violence, economic violence, emotional violence and sexual violence. Cashier Meyer Olkin (KMO) value was 0.795 and Bartlett Sphericity test was statistically significant in terms of variables (p <0.001). Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient calculated for determining reliability was 0.91, and Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of subscales were calculated as 0.72-0.85. In the test-retest reliability test, the difference between the two measurement scores was statistically insignificant (p>0.05).

Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (CERQ): The scale is a 36-item Likert type measurement tool developed by Garnefski, Kraaij and Spinhoven (2001). In the original form of the scale, Cronbach Alpha coefficient was determined between .67 and .81. The scale has nine sub-dimensions such "self-blame", "rumination", "acceptance", "positive refocusing", "refocus on planning", "positive reappraisal" and "putting into perspective", "catastrophizing", "other-blame". The Turkish adaptation, validity and reliability of the scale were conducted by Onat and Otrar (2010) and the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was found as $α$=,784 and test-retest reliability coefficient was "r=,1,00". Criterion-related validity method was used inthe scope of reliability of the scale. There was a statistically significant relationship between Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire and Negative Mood Regulation Scale (r=,-572).

Values Scale: It was developed by Dilmaç, Arıcak and Cesur (2012). 39 values falling under nine factors were obtained as a result of the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. Explanatory and confirmatory factor analyzes revealed that the scale explained 64.74% of the total variance (KMO = .910, Bartlett's Sphericity = 9133.26, *df* = 741, *p* = .000). Factor loadings ranged from .51 to .86. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients of the Values Scale were calculated on a factor basis. As a result of the analyses, Cronbach alpha values were calculated as .90 for "Social Values," .80 for "Career Values" .78 for "Intellectual Values," The values were found as .81 for "Spirituality," .78 for "Materialistic Values," .61 for "Human Dignity," .66 for "Romantic Values," .65 for "Freedom," and .63 for "Futuwwa (Generosity and Courage)."

2.3. Analysis

In the data analysis depending on the variables in the study, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Hierarchical Regression Analysis were completed by using SPSS 18.0 program.

3.Results

In this section of the study, statistical analysis of the obtained data and results were discussed according to the scope of the study.

3.1. Prediction of Gender, Age, Relationship Status and Values to Dating Violence

The correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationships between dating violence and gender, age and relationship status variables and the findings were shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Correlations Between Dating Violence and Gender, Age, Relationship Status and Values

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.Gender	.73	.45	1												
2. Age	20.64	1.60	-.22**	1											
3.Relationship Status	.40	.49	.05	.16**	1										
4.Social Values	8.23	.67	.13*	.08	.07	1									
5.Career Values	7.50	1.07	.12*	.00	-.06	.50**	1								
6.Intellectual Values	8.00	.80	.12*	.11	.02	.48**	.61**	1							
7.Spirituality	6.54	2.14	.21**	.02	.02	.35**	.36**	.37**	1						
8.Material Values	6.14	2.00	.02	.13*	-.02	.11*	.41**	.29**	.22**	1					
9.Human Dignity	7.84	1.27	.02	.07	-.06	.38**	.39**	.40**	.58**	.24**	1				
10. Romantic Values	6.58	1.75	-.08	.04	.30**	.25**	.23**	.23**	.12*	.21**	.19**	1			
11. Freedom	8.18	.77	-.01	-.00	-.04	.41**	.44**	.37**	.11*	.11*	.18**	.24**	1		
12. Futuwwa	7.45	1.35	-.05	-.01	-.04	.41**	.39**	.47**	.31**	.10	.28**	.18**	.34**	1	
13. Dating Violence	4.57	.31	.31**	-.19**	.05	.12*	.05	.07	-.12*	-.05	-.17**	-.10	.13*	-.13*	1

Note: * *p*< .05.** *p*< .01. Gender: Female=1, Male=0; Relationship Status: Yes=1, No=0

As seen in Table 1, positive significant relationships were found between gender and social values (*r*=.13, p< .05), career values (*r*=.12, *p*< .05), intellectual values (*r*=.12, *p*< .05) and spirituality values (*r*=21. , *p*< .01). Accordingly, women put more emphasis on aforementioned values. Besides, positive significant relationship was found between gender and dating violence (*r*=.31, *p*<.01). That is to say, women do not support dating violence compared to men.

Positive significant relationships were found between age and materialistic values (*r*=.13, *p*< .05); whereas, negative significant relationships were found between age and dating violence (*r*=-.19, *p*< .05). Correspondingly, the more age increases, the more weight is given to materialistic values. In addition, as age increases, attitudes towards supporting dating violence decreases with attachment.

There was a positive significant relationship between relationship status and romantic values (r=.30, p< .01). According to this result, the participants who are in a relationship consider romantic values more important. No significant relationship was found between the relationship status and dating violence (r=.05, p> .05). Consequently, it was found that there were positive significant correlations between dating violence and social values (r=.12, p< .05) and freedom (r= .13, p<.05); negative significant correlations between dating violence and spirituality (r = -.12, p <.05), dating violence and human dignity (r= -.17, p <.05) and futuwwa values (r= -.13, p< .05). In the next phase, in order to analyze the effects of values and cognitive emotion regulation on dating violence, because of the effect of gender, age, relationship status were wanted to control, hierarchical regression analysis was applied (Green & Salkind, 2005) and the findings were shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results Related to Prediction of Gender, Age, Relationship Status and Values to Dating Violence

Model	Predictive Variable	B	SH B	B	R^2	ΔR^2
1	(Constant)	4.95	0.22		11***	11***
	Gender	.19	0.04	.28***		
	Age	-.03	0.01	-.13*		
	Relationship Status	.03	0.03	.05		
2	(Constant)	4.33	0.29		24***	13***
	Gender	.17	0.04	.24***		
	Age	-.03	0.01	-.16**		
	Relationship Status	.04	0.03	.07		
	Social Values	.09	0.03	.19**		
	Career Values	.00	0.02	-.02		
	Intellectual Values	.06	0.03	.15*		
	Spirituality	-.02	0.01	-.13*		
	Materialistic Values	.00	0.01	.01		
	Human Dignity	-.04	0.02	-.16*		
	Romantic Values	-.02	0.01	-.13*		
	Freedom	.06	0.02	.15*		
	Futuwwa	-.05	0.01	-.20**		

Note: Gender: Female=1, Male=0; Relationship Status: Yes=1, No=0
* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001

As seen in Table 2, gender, age and relationship status jointly explained 11% of dating violence [F(3, 331) = 13.97, p< .001]. However, only gender (β = 28, p <.001) and age (β = -.13, p <.05) were significant predictors. Value scale factors were entered into the analysis in the second block. The total explained variance rate reached to 24% [F (12, 322) = 8.50, p< .001].

Accordingly, when gender, age and relationship status were checked, value preferences explained 13% of dating violence[F(9, 322) = 6.05, p< .001]. Among the values, social values (β = .19, p <.01), intellectual values (β = .15, p <.05) and freedom values (β = .15, p <.05) positively predicted the dating violence; however, spirituality (β = -.13, p <.05), human dignity (β = -.16, p <.05), romantic values (β = -.13, p <.05) and futuwwa values (β = -.20, p <.01) negatively predicated the dating violence.

3.2. Prediction of Gender, Age, Relationship Status and Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies to Dating Violence

The correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationships between dating violence and gender, age, relationship status and cognitive emotion regulation strategies. The findings were shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Correlations Between Dating Violence and Gender, Age, Relationship Status and Cognitive Emotion Regulation

Variables	M	SS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Gender	.73	.45	1												
2. Age	20.64	1.60	-.22**	1											
3.Relationship Status	.40	.49	.05	.16**	1										
4. Self-blame	2.95	.60	-.12*	-.09	-.12*	1									
5. Acceptance	3.00	.73	-.10	-.04	-.19**	.39**	1								
6. Rumination	3.80	.72	.15**	-.07	.01	.30**	.15**	1							
7.Positive Refocusing	3.11	.72	-.02	.14*	-.03	-.15**	.03	-.10	1						
8.Refocus on Planning	3.99	.64	-.05	.05	.08	-.09	-.10	.23**	.32**	1					
9.Positive Reappraisal	3.74	.73	-.03	.05	.03	-.18**	-.05	.11	.41**	.59**	1				
10.Putting into Perspective	3.27	.71	.04	-.06	-.03	.09	.21**	.11	.35**	.16**	.36**	1			
11.Catastrophising	2.36	.84	-.18**	.14*	-.05	.35**	.24**	.18**	-.15**	-.25**	-.32**	.12*	1		
12.Other-Blame	2.70	.66	-.04	.13*	-.06	.08	.10	.16**	.02	-.09	-.04	.10	.36**	1	
13.Dating Violence	4.57	.31	.31**	-.19**	.05	-.04	-.06	.12*	-.02	.12*	.12*	.05	-.26**	-.14*	1

Note: *$p < .05$.** $p < .01$. Gender: Female=1, Male=0; Relationship Status: Yes=1, No=0

As seen in Table 3, there were positive significant correlations between dating violence and rumination ($r=.12$, $p<.05$), refocus on planning ($r=.12$, $p<.05$) and positive reappraisal ($r=.12$, $p<.05$). It was found that there were negative significant correlations between dating violence and catastrophizing ($r= -.26$, $p<.01$) and other-blame ($r= -.14$, $p<.05$)

In the next phase, hierarchical regression analysis was applied to determine whether cognitive emotion regulation strategies predict dating violence, and the findings were shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results Related to Prediction of Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies to Dating Violence

Model	Predictive Variable	B	SH B	β	R^2	ΔR^2
1	(Constant)	4.95	0.22		.11***	.11***
	Gender	.19	0.04	.28***		
	Age	-.03	0.01	-.13*		
	Relationship Status	.03	0.03	.05		
2	(Constant)	4.78	0.27		.19***	.07**
	Gender	.17	0.04	.25***		
	Age	-.02	0.01	-.10		
	Relationship Status	.02	0.03	.03		
	Self-blame	.02	0.03	.05		
	Acceptance	.00	0.02	.01		
	Rumination	.04	0.03	.08		
	Positive Refocusing	-.01	0.03	-.03		
	Refocus on Planning	.02	0.03	.05		
	Positive Appraisal	.03	0.03	.08		
	Putting into Perspective	-.03	0.03	-.08		
	Catastrophizing	-.07	0.02	-.18**		
	Other-blame	-.02	0.03	-.05		

Not: Gender: Female=1, Male=0; Relationship Status: Yes=1, No=0

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001

As seen in Table 4, gender, age and relationship status and cognitive emotion regulation jointly explained 19% of dating violence [$F(12, 322) = 5.83$, $p< .001$]. When gender, age and relationship status were controlled, cognitive emotion regulation explained 7% of dating violence [$F(9, 322) = 2.88$, $p< .01$]. Only "catastrophizing" had a significant effect among the dimensions of cognitive emotion regulation (β = -.18, $p< .01$). Accordingly, the more catastrophizing increases, the more attitudes towards supporting dating violence increases.

4. Discussion

According to the findings obtained from research, it was found that there were positive significant relationships between gender and social values, career values, intellectual values, spirituality and dating violence. It is possible to come across similar findings when examining the studies oriented gender and violence relationship in the literatüre (Bharat, Jain, Gupta & Bharat, 2018; Baş & Hamarta, 2015; Karabacak & Çetinkaya, 2015; Terzioğlu et al, 2016; Vagi et al., 2015). It is thought that this stems from culture, upbringing and gender roles in society. According to the result, it can be said that women give more importance to the values than men and they do not support dating violence. Also, gender and age variables are significant predictors of dating violence. Social values, intellectual values and freedom positively predict dating violence. Spirituality, human dignity, romantic values and futuwwa negatively predict dating violence. The more increasing the importance given to the social values, intellectual values and freedom values increases the attitudes that not supporting dating violence. On the other hand, increasing the importance given to spirituality, human dignity, romantic values and futuwwa decreases the attitudes supporting dating violence. It was found that there was a positive significant relationship between age and materialistic values and negative significant relationship between age and dating violence. Belk (1985) associated materialism with personal features such as possessing, stinginess, jealousy (envying) (Ersoy-Quadır, 2012). The studies presented the relationship of materialism and age generally stated that the more age increases, the more materialism level increases as well (Chan, 2013; Goldberg, Gorn, Peracchio & Bamossy, 2003). By reason of having a dating relationship means social acceptance, high self-confidence and identity, having a dating relationship for the individuals who have materialistic values may stand for happiness, success and socialising. As the age increases, the violence in the relationship decreases with sense of possessiveness,

however, the results are more severe (Munoz-Rivaz, Grana & O'Leary, 2009; Wekerle, 1999). A positive significant relationship was found between relationship status and romantic values; whereas, there was no significant relationship between relationship status and dating violence. In terms of value preferences, especially romantic values (love, spouse/partner, delight/ pleasure) is associated with dating. According to Sternberg (1986), romantic love is a combination of components of intimacy and passion. According to this, it is thought that establishing a love relationship of the individual in a sense brings together the loyalty to the partner, passion and togetherness. It was found that there were positive significant relationships between dating violence and social values and freedom; and negative significant relationships between dating violence and spirituality, human dignity and futuwwa values. Social values (such as love, respect, tolerance, freedom, goodness, righteousness and responsibility) and freedom values are an important element that supports universal values (basic rights and freedoms) and enables them to be accepted via internalizing them by individuals who make up societies (Göz, 2014). As these behaviours described as goodness increase, dating violence is not supported. On the other hand, as the spirituality, human dignity (honour, pride, justice, fairness) and futuwwa values (generosity and courage) increase, the attitudes that supporting dating violence decrease. It can be said that human dignity is a self-value that differentiate human from other living creatures and the base of human rights.

Another finding is cognitive emotion regulation strategies are associated with dating violence. Positive significant relationships were found between dating violence and the sub-dimensions of emotion regulations as rumination, refocus on planning and positive reappraisal. A negative significant relationship was found between dating violence and sub-dimensions as catastrophizing and other-blame. In other words, emotion regulation strategies such as catastrophizing which is focusing on terrifying aspects of events in the past and other-blame increases, dating violence increases as well; in contrast, as refocus on planning, which is systematic thinking on what steps should be taken to cope with an incident, and positive reappraisal, which is giving a positive meaning to the incident in terms of self-improvement increase, dating violence decreases. One of the sub-dimensions of cognitive emotion regulation, catastrophizing is significant predictors of dating violence. The studies in the literature supported that there is a relationship between increasing difficulties with emotion regulation and increasing aggressiveness (Norstrom & Pape, 2010; Sullivan et al, 2010; Tager, Good & Brammer, 2010). Within the scope of inadequate emotion regulation, behaviour emerged as a reaction of emotion is generally experienced inseparably with the emotion (Gratz & Tull, 2010) and the individual cannot use the emotion regulation strategies that are necessary to control the behaviours. For instance, an individual who has controlled the intense anger, otherwise, can start to shout out to the person who would like to have a good relationship. Other-blame is often explained in relation to the way expressing anger (Conway, 2005, Martin & Dahlen, 2005). Perpetual thinking over negative emotions and thoughts in negative experiences prevents effective problem solving skills (Nolen-Hoeksema, 2000). Rey & Extremera (2012) was found that there was a positive relationship between impulsive aggression expressions of young adults and other-blame and catastrophizing from emotion regulation strategies; however, there was an inverse significant relationship between impulsive aggression expressions of young adults and refocus on planning and positive reappraisal. Particularly, the non-adaptive cognitive emotion regulation strategies such as other-blame and catastrophizing are significant predictors on impulsive aggression of young adults. These findings are in parallel with the results of the study. The relationship between inadequate emotion regulation and aggression is not limited to intense anger experiences. Emotions such as unhappiness (Sprott & Doob, 2000), fear (Bitler, Linnoila, & George, 1994) and general negative affectivity (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Pastorelli, Cermak & Rosza, 2001) are associated with aggression. For sure, negative emotions can be effectively regulated and anyone who experiences negative emotions does not exhibit aggressive behaviours (Roberton, Daffem & Bucks, 2012). In addition, if the individuals have difficulties to regulate an emotion circumstance, if they live negative or uncomfortable, generally they remain with a hard to endure emotion experience. In this case, they may be more likely to behave aggressively to put right, abolish or prevent the emotional state.

Based on the results of the research, it seems that gender, age, cognitive emotion regulation strategies and value preferences are significant predictors of dating violence. Future studies should be included in universities in order to enable the youth to develop safe and healthy relationships. For this reason, it is recommended that preventive studies should be conducted to improve values education and emotion regulation skills in studies aiming at preventing dating violence among young adults.

References

Ackard, D. M., Eisenberg, M. E. & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2007). Long-term impact of adolescent dating violence on the behavioral and psychological health of male and female youth. *Journal of Pediatrics*, *151*(5), 476–481. doi: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2007.04.034

Alleyne-Green, B., Coleman-Cowger, V.H. &Henry, D.B.(2012). Dating violence perpetration and/or victimization and associated sexual risk behaviors among a sample of inner-city African American and Hispanic adolescent females. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27,1457-1473. doi: 10.1177/0886260511425788

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55, 469-480. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469

Atak, H. (2011). Kimlik gelişimi ve kimlik biçimlenmesi: Kuramsal bir değerlendirme. *Psikiyatride GüncelYaklaşımlar*, 3(1),163-213. http://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423911138.pdf

Avşar-Baldan, G. & Akış, N. (2017). Flört şiddeti. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi*, 43 (1) 41-44. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/uutfd/issue/35308/391935

Baş, V. & Hamarta, E. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinde değerler ve yaşamın anlamı arasındaki ilişki. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 13(29), 369-391. https://ded.dem.org.tr/gorsel/pdf/ded-29-makale-12.pdf

Belk, R. W. (1985). Materialism: Trait aspects of living in the material world. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12 (3), 265-279. doi: 10.1086./208515

Bharat, A., Jain, N., Gupta, B.K. & Bharat, V.(2016). To determine the pattern and effects of verbal, emotional and physical abuse in both sexes. *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health*, 3(4), 818-25. doi:10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20160729

Bitler, D.A., Linnoila, M. & George, D.T. (1994). Psychosocial and diagnostic characteristics of individuals initiating domestic violence. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 182 (10), 583-585.

Breiding, M.J., Basile, K.C., Smith, S.G., Black, M.C. & Mahendra, R. (2015). .Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements, Version 2.0. Atlanta (GA): Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Bookhout, M.K., Hubbard, J.A. & Moore, C.C. (2018). Emotion regulation. Retrieved from https://www.psych.udel.edu/lab-sub-site/jhubbard-sub site/Documents/Bookhout%2C%20Hubbard%2C%20Moore%20%282018%29.pdf

Caprara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli,C., Cermak, I. & Rosza, S. (2001). Facing guilt: Role of negative affectivity, need for reparation, and fear of punishment in leading to prosocial behaviour and aggression. *European Journal of Personality*, 15 (3), 219-237. doi: 10.1002/per.402

Chan, K. (2013). Development of materialistic values among children and adolescents. *Young Consumers*, 244-257. doi: 10.1108/YC-01-2013-00339

Cohn, A.M., Jakupcak, M., Seibert, L.A., Hildebrandt, T.B. & Zeichner, A.(2010). The role of emotion dysregulation in the association between men's restrictive emotionality and use of physical aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11 (1), 53-64. doi: 10.1037/a0018090

Conway, A. M. (2005). Girls, aggression and emotion regulation. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatr*, 75; 2, 334 339. doi: 10.1037/0002-9432.75.2.334

Çelik, H. & Kocabıyık-Onat, O. (2014). Genç yetişkinlerin saldırganlık ifade biçimlerinin cinsiyet ve bilişsel duygu düzenleme tarzları bağlamında incelenmesi. *Trakya University Journal of Education*, 4(1), 139-155. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/200334

Çokdolu, N. (2013). Karakter eğitimi programının ilköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerinin çatışma çözme ve saldırganlık düzeylerine etkisi. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek lisans tezi*, Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Konya.

Davidson, R.J. & Jackson, D.C. & Kalin, N.H. (2000). Emotion, plasticity, context, and regulation: perspectives from affective neuroscience. *Psychol Bull.*, 126(6), 890-909. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.126.6.890

Dikmen, H.A., Özaydın, T. & Yılmaz, S.D.(2018). Üniversitedeki kadın öğrencilerde yaşanan flört şiddeti ile anksiyete ve umutsuzluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *ACU Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(2),170-176. doi: 10.31067/0.2018.9

Dilmaç B. & Ekşi, H. (2007). Değerler eğitimi: Temel tartışmalar ve yaklaşımlar. *İlköğretmen Dergisi*, 14, 21–29. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/302509

Dilmaç, B., Arıcak, O.T. & Cesur, S.(2014). A validity and reliability study on the development of the values scale in turkey. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 14(5), 1661-1671. doi: 10.12738/estp.2014.5.2124

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Nyman, M., Bernzweig, J., Bernzweig, J. & Pinuelas, A. (1994). The relations of emotionality and regulation to children's anger-related reactions. *Child Development,* 65, 109-128. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8131642

Ersoy-Quadır, S. (2012). Materyalist değer eğiliminin gelişiminde tüketici sosyalizasyonunun rolü. *Eğitim ve İnsani Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(6), 31-50. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/210601

Fidan, F. & Yeşil, Y. (2018). Nedenleri ve sonuçlarıyla flört şiddeti. *Balkan ve Yakın Doğu Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi,* 04 (01), 16-24. http://www.ibaness.org/bnejss/2018_04_01/03_Fidan_and_Yesil_1.pdf

Foshee, V.A., Linder, F. & MacDougall, J.E. (2001). Gender differences in the longitudinal predictors of adolescent dating violence. *Prev Med*, 32,128-41. doi: 10.1006/pmed.2000.0793

Garner, P.W. & Waajid, B. (2019) Sociodemographic variations in the linkage between emotion regulation and peer victimization, *Journal of School Violence*, 18(1), 121-133. doi: 10.1080/15388220.2017.1418670

Garnefski, N., Kraaij, V. & Spinhoven, P. (2001). Negative life events, cognitive emotion regulation and emotional problems. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30, 1311–1327. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00113-6

Garnefski, N. & Kraaij, V. (2006). Relationships between cognitive emotion regulation strategies and depressive symptoms: A comparative study of five specific samples. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 1659–1669. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.12.009

Goldberg, M. E., Gorn, G. J., Peracchio, L. A., & Bamossy, G. (2003). Understanding materialism among youth. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 13 (3), 278-288. doi: 10.1207/S15327663JCP1303_09

Göz, K. (2014). Toplumsal değerler bağlamında yaşama hürriyeti. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(1), 85-101. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/pauifd/issue/17355/181200

Gratz, K.L. & Tull, M.T. (2010). Emotion regulation as a mechanism of change in acceptance- and mindfulness-based treatments. R.A. Baer (Ed.), *Assessing mindfulness and acceptance: Illuminating the processes of change*, New Harbinger Publications, Oakland, CA.

Green, S.B. & Salkind, N.J. (2005). Using SPSS for windows and macintosh: *Analyzing and Undestanding data* (4th Edition) New Jersey: Pearson.

Gross, J. J. (1998). Antecedent-and response-focused emotion regulation: Divergenr consequences for experience, expression and physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 74, 224-237. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.74.1.224

Hatipoğlu, Ü.S. (2010). *Başkent Üniversitesi öğrencilerinde flört şiddeti prevelansı anketi*. Uzmanlık Tezi. Başkent Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Adli Tıp Anabilim Dalı. Instituto Mexicano de la Juventud, (2008). National Youth Programme. Retrieved from http://www.youthpolicy.org/national/Mexico_2009_National_Youth_Programme.pdf 15.11.2018

Kafadar, M.F. (2013). *Hukuk, Sivil Toplum ve Demokrasi: 'İnsan Onuru'*, Umut Vakfı Araştırma Merkezi, 3. Hukukun Gençleri Sempozyumu, Antalya.

Karababa, A. & Dilmaç, B. (2015). Ergenlerde insani değerlerin sürekli öfke ve öfke ifade biçimlerini yordamadaki rolü. İlköğretim Online, 14(3), 1149-1158. http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr/index.php/io/article/view/1275

Karabacak, A. & Çetinkaya, S. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinin şiddet kabul düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 1(1), 13-21. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ekuad/issue/25920/273147

Karahan, N. & Kul-Uçtu, A. (2016). Sağlık Yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin cinsiyet rolleri, toplumsal cinsiyet algısı ve şiddet eğilimleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(8), 2882-2905. http://www.itobiad.com/tr/issue/25175/267086

Kepir-Savoly, D.D., Ulaş, Ö. & Demirtaş-Zorbaz,S. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin çiftler arası şiddet kabul düzeylerini etkileyen etmenler. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal,* 5 (42), 173-183. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/200264

Kublay, D. & Oktan, V. (2015). Evlilik uyumu: Değer tercihleri ve öznel mutluluk açısından incelenmesi.

Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 5 (44), 25-35. file:///C:/Users/hp/Downloads/30-60-1-SM.pdf

Kuşdil, M. E., & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerin değer yönelimleri ve Schwartz değer kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 15*(45), 59-76. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2001-17473-004

Logan, T., & Cole, J. (2007). The impact of partner stalking on mental health and protective order outcomes over time. *Violence and Victims*, 22(5), 544-560. doi: 10.1891/088667007782312168

Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2000). The role of rumination in depressive disorders and mixed anxiety/depressive symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 109, 3, 504-511. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11016119

Norstrom, T. & Pape, H. (2010). Alcohol, suppressed anger and violence. *Addiction*, 105 (9), 1580-1586. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2010.02997.x

Martin, R. C. & Dahlen, E. R. (2004). Irrational beliefs and the experience and expression of anger. *Journal of Rational Emotive and Cognitive-Behavior Therapy*, 22, 3–20. doi:10.1023/B:JORE.0000011574.44362.8f

Muñoz-Rivas M, J., Graña, K. & O'Leary, M. G. (2007). Aggression in adolescent dating relationships: prevalence, justification, and health consequences. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40, 298–304. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.11.137

Murray, C.E., Wester, K.L. & Paladino, D.A. (2008). Dating violence and self- injury among undergraduate college students: Attitudes and experiences. *Journal of College Counseling*, 11 (1), 42-57. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-1882.2008.tb00023.x

Polat, O. (2016). Şiddet. *Marmara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Hukuk Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 22(1), 15-34. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/maruhad/issue/27591/290653

Onat, O. & Otrar, M. (2010). Bilişsel duygu düzenleme ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışmaları. *Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 31, 123-143. http://dspace.marmara.edu.tr/bitstream/handle/11424/961/853-1654-1-SM.pdf?sequence=1

Öngün, E. & Ünsal, G. (2018). Üniversite yaşamında yakın ilişkiler ve istismar. *G.O.P Taksim E.A.H. JAREN*, 4(1), 52-58. https://www.journalagent.com/jaren/pdfs/JAREN_4_1_52_58.pdf

Rey, L. & Extremera, N. (2012). Physical-verbal aggression and depression in adolescents: The role of cognitive emotion regulation strategies. *Universitas Psychologica*, 11, 4, 1245-1254. http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/rups/v11n4/v11n4a18.pdf

Roberton, T., Daffem, M. & Bucks, R.S. (2012). Emotion regulation and aggression. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(1), 72-82. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2011.09.006

Sağkal, A. S. (2011). Barış eğitimi programının ilköğretim 6. sınıf öğrencilerinin saldırganlık eğilimleri, empati düzeyleri ve barışa ilişkin görüşleri üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek lisans tezi*, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.

Shorey, C.R., Zucosky, H., Brasfield, H., Febres, J., Cornelius, L.T. & Chelsea, S. (2012). Dating violence prevention programming: Directions for future interventions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17: 289-96. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2012.03.001

Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, 93, 119- 135. http://pzacad.pitzer.edu/~dmoore/psych199/1986_sternberg_trianglelove.pdf

Sprott, J.B. & DubBad, I.N. (2000). Sad, and rejected: The lives of aggressive children. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 42 (2), 123-133. https://serials.unibo.it/cgi-ser/start/en/spogli/ds-s.tcl?fasc_issn=0704-9722&language=ENGLISH&data_ins=Tutti

Stappenbeck, C.A. & Fromme, K.(2010). A longitudinal investigation of heavy drinking and physical dating violence in men and women. *Addict Behav*iour, 35(5):479-85. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2009.12.027

Straus, M.A. (2008). Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. *Child Youth Services Review*. 30(3):252–75. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2007.10.004

Sullivan, T.N., Helms, S.W., Kliewer, W. & Goodman, K.L. (2010). Associations between sadness and anger regulation coping, emotional expression, and physical and relational aggression among urban adolescents. *Social Development*, 19 (1), 30-51. doi: 10.1111/2Fj.1467-9507.2008.00531.x

Tager, D., Good, G.E. & Brammer, S. (2010). "Walking over 'em": An exploration of relations between emotion dysregulation, masculine norms, and intimate partner abuse in a clinical sample of men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11 (3), 233-239. doi: 10.1037/a0017636

Terzioğlu, F., Gönenç, İ.M., Özdemir, F., Güvenç, G., Kök, G., Sezer Yılmaz, N., & Hiçyılmaz Demirtaş, B.

(2016). Flört şiddeti tutum ölçeği geçerlilik ve güvenirlilik flört çalışması, *Anadolu Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*,19(4): 225-232. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/275548

Thompson, R. A. (1991). Emotional regulation and emotional development. *Educational Psychology Review,* 3,269-307. doi: 10.1007/BF01319934

Toplu, E. & Hatipoglu-Sümer, Z. (2011). *Flört ilişkisinde şiddetin yaygınlığı ve türleri*. Paper presented at the meeting of the XI. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi, Selçuk, Izmir.

Vagi, K.J., Olsen E.O., Basile, K.C. & Vivolo-Kantor, A.M. (2013). Teen dating violence (physical and sexual) among us high school students. Findings from the 2013 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey. *JAMA Pediatrics,* 169, 474-482. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2014.3577.

Wekerle, C. & Wolfe, D.A. (1999). Dating violence in mid-adolescence: theory, significance, and emerging prevention initiatives. *Clinical Psychology Review,* 19(4), 435-456. doi: 10.1016/S0272-7358(98)00091-9

Wells, C. (1997). Stalking: The criminal law response. *Criminal Law Review,* 765 (9), 463-470. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojp/186157.pdf