Investigation of the relationship between irrational beliefs in romantic relationships and attitudes towards dating violence

Bahar Şahan [a], Alper Çuhadaroğlu [b]*

a Maltepe Unversity, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, İstanbul 34857, Turkey
b Maltepe Unversity, faculty of Education, İstanbul 34857, Turkey

Abstract

This study aims to examine the relationship between the irrational beliefs of individuals in romantic relationships and their attitude towards dating violence. The research group of the study is consisted of 442 students studying at Istanbul Maltepe University between the 2019-2020 academic years. Participants were determined by the "Simple Random Sampling Method" and participation was voluntary. In the research, "Personal Information Form", "Irrational Beliefs in Romantic Relationships (IRRBS)", "Dating Violence Attitude Scale (DVAS)" were used as data collection tools. As a result of the research, when the relationship between the total score of the "Irrational Beliefs in Romantic Relationships Scale (IRRBS)" scale and the total score of the "Dating Violence Attitude Scale (DVAS)" scale is examined; It has been revealed that there is a moderate, negative, and meaningful relationship. In other words, the increase in the scores of irrational beliefs in romantic relationships indicates that the scores of attitudes towards dating violence decrease. Therefore, it is known that decreasing DVAS scores in the DVAS scale increases the attitude towards dating violence. As a result, the increase in irrational beliefs in romantic relationships increases the attitude towards dating violence.

Keywords: Irrational beliefs; romatic relationships; dating violence; intimate partner violence

1. Introduction

Individuals build close relationships at every stage of their lives; these relationships are friendship, parental and romantic relationships. Close relationships first start with the mother or caregiver, and later on, this intimacy turns into a romantic relationship in adulthood. According to Sternberg (1986), a close relationship refers to mutual understanding, as well as emotional attachment to the person one loves. A romantic relationship is expressed as a relationship in which individuals share material and

spiritual with each other. Moreover, they have mutual intense feelings and cause pain in the individual when the relationship is terminated (Aydoğdu, 2010).

According to Kalkan and Yalçın (2012), one of the relationship types, romantic relationship, contains the features of love, attachment, emotional support, and belonging, and that these features improve and enrich human life. Connolly, Craig, Goldberg, and Pepler (2004) state that romantic relationships usually begin in adolescence. Adolescents first communicate with people of the opposite sex in their peer group, then participate in group interviews, and finally establish bilateral romantic relationships (Zimmer-Gembeck, 2002).

It is very important for young adults to establish healthy romantic relationships in their social life in terms of their development. Healthy and functional romantic relationships contribute to the individual's existing physical and emotional well-being (Kalkan & Yalçın, 2012). One of the most striking issues in romantic relationships experienced by young adults today is irrational beliefs. The irrational beliefs of individuals have an impact on their romantic relationship processes (Ausraite & Zardeckaite Matulaitiene, 2019). The cognitive-behavioral approach states that irrational beliefs also called dysfunctional beliefs or cognitive distortions, cause dysfunctional behaviors of individuals (Beck, 1976; Ellis, 1962). Rational relationship beliefs that reflect the real aspects of relationships are expressed as healthy because they positively improve the individual's harmony, satisfaction, and development with the relationship (Sullivan & Scwebel, 1995). In addition, irrational relationship beliefs are accepted as exaggerated, illogical, and resistant beliefs about the structure of the individual's relationship, himself, and others (Ellis, 1986).

Irrational relationship beliefs are expressed as rigid, exaggerated, strong, illogical, and dysfunctional expectations, beliefs, or thoughts about the individual, his partner, and his relationship (Sharp & Ganong, 2000; Tikdarinejad & Moghadam, 2017). According to Sullivan and Schwebel (1995), beliefs about romantic relationships are explained as individuals' expectations for their relationships and partners, from how they perceive the events they experience. When individuals have beliefs about relationship such as "love at first sight", "the first and only love I have lived and can experience", "true love lasts forever", "true love overcomes all difficulties", these exaggerated expectations that cannot be met by their partner can harm the relationship (Sprecher & Metts, 1999).

Romans and De Bord (1995) listed beliefs about relationships as follows: (1) We must always be open and honest with each other, (2) We must read each other's minds, (3) We must do everything together, (4) We must meet all of each other's needs (5) We should be able to change each other's characteristics, (6) Romantic idealism, (7) It should be easy to maintain good relationships, (8) Everything should be perfect between us, (9) A person is not integrated with himself without having a romantic relationship. Fletcher and Kininmonth (1992) mentioned four variables related to relationship beliefs. These

variables were intimacy, external factors, passion, individuality. On the other hand, DeBord, Romans, and Krieshok's (1996) study examining partner adjustment evaluated relationship-specific irrational beliefs by separating them from general irrational beliefs and stated that relationship-specific beliefs affected the change in dyadic adjustment more.

1.1. Dating Violence

Hortaçsu (2003) defines dating as the process of getting to know each other and seeing the harmony between the opposite sex by experiencing the stages of friendship, love, and sexuality. Straus (2004) defines the dating relationship as the participation of two people in social activities and the continuation of their social relations until one or both partners want to end the relationship. On the other hand, Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) explain the concept of dating as a dual interaction based on activities that can increase the possibility of future relationships, emotional attachment or sexual intimacy, and activities that will make each other happy.

As in all relationships, human beings experience conflicts in dating relationships, and they try to solve these problems by resorting to violence from time to time (Atakay, 2014). Dating violence, which is one of the types of interpersonal violence, is the practice of behaviors that cover emotional, physical, sexual, and verbal violence types against each other and impose social restrictions on each other (Aslan et al., 2008). Anderson and Danis (2007) accepted a relationship as a dating relationship and expressed it as both heterosexual and homosexual relationships starting from the first meeting to living together except marriage. They defined dating violence as physical, sexual, verbal abuse/harassment, or threatening by one party to implement the behavior towards the other party. Anasuri (2016) stated that dating violence affects both women and men and is not limited to age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, or religion.

Types of violence experienced in romantic relationships; physical, emotional, economic, sexual violence. Physical dating violence is expressed as slapping, strangling, shaking, pushing, hitting, or using a weapon the willful use of physical force that may cause death, mutilation, injury, or injury to the victim (Brooks-Russell, Foshee, & Reyes, 2015; Leen, Sorbring, Mawer, Holdsworth, Helsing, & Bowen, 2013). According to Solmus (2010a, 2010b), emotional violence is defined as harming the mental, emotional health, and psycho-social development level of the partner to meet the emotional needs of the individual who is in a romantic relationship, or forcing him, humiliating, punishing, venting his anger, or using it as a sanctioning tool to keep him under pressure. Economic violence, which is one of the types of dating violence, appears in different behaviors such as preventing women from working, forced labor, and taking away their money (Karal & Aydemir, 2012). According to Polat (2016), economic violence is depriving women of their economic freedom. "Forcing a woman to have sexual intercourse in an unwanted place, at

a time when she is unwilling and in unwanted ways (rape), whether she is married or not, to have sexual intercourse with another person, to harm the genitals, to give birth or not to give birth, to have an abortion, to incest, to force prostitution, to force behaviors such as getting married, engaging in sexually disturbing behaviors by phone, letter or verbally include sexual violence" (Turkish Republic Women's Status Presidency Handbook on Combating Domestic Violence, 2008).

The main purpose of this study is to determine whether there is a relationship between irrational beliefs in romantic relationships and attitudes towards dating violence. Individuals' having irrational relationship beliefs and determining their attitudes towards dating violence may contribute to revealing the problems seen in romantic relationships. For these reasons, it is thought that individuals with romantic relationships can have healthy relationships and contribute to the preparation of preventive programs for these problems. In addition, this research will be important in terms of determining the acceptance status of dating violence in university students, developing rational behaviors related to the subject, taking precautions against violence and its types, and being a reference for research to be made on this subject.

2. Method

2.1. Study Group

This research consisted of 265 women (60%) and 177 men (40%) out of 442 university students determined by the "Simple Random Sampling Method". In the Simple Random Sampling method, each participant in the sample could be selected equally and independently of each other, without bias. The valid and best way of the sampling method representing the research is the random sampling method (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012).

2.2. Data Collection Tools

2.2.1. Personal Information Form
An informed consent form was given on the first page of this form about the purpose of the study, what is covered, and by whom it was conducted. Then, the personal information and demographic information part used to collect data was presented. In this section, there were questions about gender, class level, dating relationship status, income level, and faculty of education, exposure to violence in dating relationships, and exposure to parental violence.

2.2.2. Irrational Romantic Relationship Beliefs Scale (IRRBS)
The scale, developed by Sarı (2008) to measure irrational beliefs about romantic relationships, consists of 30 items with 6 factors (Over-expectations, Use of Social Time,

Physical Intimacy, Mind Reading, Gender Differences, Different Thinking). Two of these 30 items are scored in the opposite direction. The scale is a five-point Likert type. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient, which was reliable for the overall total of the scale, was found to be .85. As a result of the overall reliability analysis of the scale, which was conducted within the scope of this study, Cronbach's alpha value was found to be .87. Confidence coefficients for sub-dimensions; over-expectations were 0.79, the use of social time was .80, mind reading was .78, different thinking was .64, physical intimacy was .61 and gender differences were .64.

2.2.3. Dating Violence Attitude Scale (DVAS)

The scale, developed by Terzioğlu et al. (2016) to measure students' attitudes towards dating violence, consists of 28 items in 5 sub-dimensions (Sexual Violence, Emotional Violence, General Violence, Economic Violence, and Physical Violence). The scale was five-point Likert type. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which was reliable for the overall total, was found to be .91. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient, which was reliable for the overall total of the scale made within the scope of this study, was found to be .88. The reliability coefficient for sexual violence was .74, emotional violence was .76, general violence was .71, economic violence was .73, and physical violence was .68.

2.3. Data Analysis

SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) program was used in the analysis of the data obtained during the research. Frequency and percentage values were used in the analysis of the data and the level of significance was taken as .05. Normally distributed data were tested with parametric t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) methods, and non-normally distributed data were tested with non-parametric Kruskal Wallis H and Mann Whitney U analysis methods. Multiple comparison tests (Post Hoc) were used to find the source of significant differences. Among these tests, the "Scheffe Test" was preferred in cases where variance homogeneity was ensured and the difference between the sample numbers of the independent variable was large. The relationship between the dependent scales in the study was tested with the Spearman Correlation Analysis method.

3. Results

Frequency and percentage analyze were applied to examine the variables of gender, class level, dating relationship status, income level, faculty, exposure to violence in a dating relationship, exposure to parental violence of university students participating in the research.

The frequency and percentage values of the variables of gender, class level, dating relationship status, income level, types of faculties, and exposure to dating violence, exposure to parental violence of university students are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Values of Independent Variables

Variables		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	265	60
	Male	177	40
	Total	442	100
Class Level	1st Grade	85	19.2
	2nd Grade	69	15.6
	3rd Grade	58	13.1
	4th Grade	230	52.0
	Total	442	100
Relationship Status	I have no relationship	216	48.9
	I have a relationship	185	41.9
	Engaged	16	3.6
	Married	25	5.7
	Total	442	100
Income Level	0-2000 TL	40	9.0
	2001-4000 TL	131	29.6
	4001-6000 TL	123	27.8
	6001 and more	148	33.5
	Total	442	100
Types of Faculties	Faculty of Education	123	27.8
	Faculty of Architecture	51	11.5
	Faculty of Law	31	7.0
	Faculty of Engineering	85	19.2
	Faculty of Medicine	57	12.9
	Faculty of Communication	26	5.9
	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences	69	15.7
	Total		100
Exposure to dating violence	Yes	177	40.0
	No	265	60.0
	Total	442	100
Exposure to parental violence	Yes	188	42.5
	No	254	57.5
	Total	442	100

According to Table 1, the distribution of university students participating in the research by gender was examined, it is seen that 265 (60.0%) of the total 442 people were female and 177 (40.0%) were male. When the distribution of the participants according to

the grade level was analyzed, 85 (19.2%) of the 442 participants were 1st Graders, 69 (15.6%) were 2nd Graders, 58 (13.1%) were 3rd Graders, and 230 (52.0%) were 4th Graders. The dating relationship status of the students showed that 216 (48.9%) of 442 participants were "not in a relationship", 185 (41.9%) had a "regular relationship", 16 (3.6%) were "engaged", 25 (5.7%) were "married". the distribution of income level of participants revealed that 40 (9.0%) of the 442 participants were "0-2000 TL", 131 (29.6%) were "2001-4000", 123 (27.8%) were "4001-6000" and, 148 (33.5%) of them were "6001 and above". When the distribution of university students according to the faculties was examined, it is seen that 123 (27.8%) of the 442 participants were in the "faculty of education", 51 (11.5%) were in the "faculty of architecture", 31 (7.0%) were in the "faculty of law", and 85 (19.2%) of them were in the "engineering faculty", 57 (12.9%) of them in the "faculty of medicine", 26 (5.9%) of them were in the "faculty of communication", and 69 (15.6%) of them were in the "faculty of humanities and social sciences". The results of exposure to dating violence showed that 177 (40.0%) of 442 participants gave the answer "yes" and 265 (60.0%) gave the answer "no". When the distribution of participants according to exposure to parental violence is analyzed, it is seen that 188 (42.5%) of 442 participants gave the answer "yes", while 254 (57.5%) gave the answer "no".

In order to determine the mean of IRRBS for university students by gender and whether the difference between these averages is statistically significant, t-test analysis was performed on Independent Groups, and the results were given in Table 2.

Table 2. Examination of the Differences in the IRRBS Total and Sub-Dimensions Scores Obtained by University Students According to Gender Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Gender	N	X	SS	SD	t	p
Different Thinking	Female	265	8.38	2.69	440	-.326	.744
	Male	177	8.47	2.74			
Mind Reading	Female	265	19.87	4.32	440	2.643	.009
	Male	177	18.76	4.34			
Gender Differences	Female	265	9.38	2.69	440	2.012	.045
	Male	177	8.87	2.54			
Physical Intimacy	Female	265	8.03	2.89	440	1.739	.083
	Male	177	7.53	3.02			
Use of Social Time	Female	265	11.55	4.07	440	-3.498	.001
	Male	177	13.05	4.87			
Over-expectations	Female	265	29.38	5.08	440	.734	.463
	Male	177	29.00	5.72			
IRRBS Total	Female	265	86.62	14.24	440	.637	.524
	Male	177	85.70	15.76			

*p<.05

When the data in Table 2 were examined, the t-test results in terms of the gender variable in Irrational Beliefs in Romantic Relationships Scale (IRRBS) showed that the score of the mind-reading sub-dimension (t(440) = 2.643, p<.05) was statistically significant. Considering this significant difference, it was found out that the female's mind-reading sub-dimension mean score (X = 19.87) was higher than the male's mean score (X = 18.76). Furthermore, there was a statistically significant difference in the scores of the students in the sub-dimension of gender differences (t $_{(440)}$ = 2.012, p<.05). The gender differences sub-dimension mean score of females (X = 9.38) was higher than the mean score of males (X = 8.87). The scores of use of social time sub-dimension (t $_{(440)}$ = -3.498, p<.05) were statistically significant. Also, the male's use of social time sub-dimension means score (X = 13.05) was higher than the female's mean score (X = 11.55). In terms of other sub-dimensions, thinking differently sub-dimension (t $_{(440)}$ = -.326, p>.05), physical intimacy sub-dimension (t $_{(440)}$ = 1.739, p>.05), over-expectations sub-dimension (t $_{(440)}$ = .734, p>.05) and IRRBS total (t $_{(440)}$ = -.637, p>.05) scores did not show a statistically significant difference.

The t-test analysis was used in order to determine the mean of participants in IRRBS according to Exposure to Dating Relationship Violence and whether the difference between these means was statistically significant, and the results were given in Table 3.

Table 3. Examination of the Differences in the IRRBS Total and Sub-Dimensions Scores of Participants According to the Variable of Exposure to Dating Relationship Violence

Sub-Dimensions	Exposure to Dating Violence	N	X	SS	SD	t	p
Different Thinking	Yes	177	8.53	2.69	440	.720	.472
	No	265	8.34	2.72			
Mind Reading	Yes	177	19.71	4.54	440	1.094	.275
	No	265	19.24	4.22			
Gender Differences	Yes	177	9.85	2.67	440	4.512	.000
	No	265	8.72	2.53			
Physical Intimacy	Yes	177	7.58	3.02	440	-1.474	.141
	No	265	8.00	2.89			
Use of Social Time	Yes	177	11.79	4.49	440	-1.393	.164
	No	265	12.40	4.44			
Over-expectations	Yes	177	28.98	5.41	440	-.770	.442
	No	265	29.38	5.30			
IRRBS Total	Yes	177	86.47	16.28	440	.250	.803
	No	265	86.11	13.86			

*p<.05

According to Table 3, the t-test results in terms of exposure to dating violence variable revealed that the scores they got from the gender differences sub-dimension ($t_{(440)}$ = 4.512, p<.05) was statistically significantly. The gender differences sub-dimension mean score of the answers given as yes (X = 9.85) was higher than the mean score of the responses given as no (X = 8.72). In terms of other sub-dimensions, thinking differently sub-dimension ($t_{(440)}$ = .720, p>.05), mind-reading sub-dimension ($t_{(440)}$ = 1.094, p>.05), physical intimacy sub-dimension (t $_{(440)}$ = -1.474, p>.05), use of social time sub-dimension ($t_{(440)}$ = -1.393, p>.05), over-expectations sub-dimension ($t_{(440)}$ = .-770, p>. 05) and IRRBS total ($t_{(440)}$ = .250, p>.05) scores did not show a statistically significant difference.

Mann-Whitney U Analysis was performed in order to determine the mean of the Dating Violence Attitude Scale (DVAS) among university students by gender and whether the difference between these means was statistically significant, and the results were stated in Table 4.

Table 4. Examination of the Differences in the Scores Obtained from the Total and Sub-Dimensions of DVAS by Gender Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
General Violence	Female	265	237.87	63036	19114.00	.000
	Male	177	196.99	34867		
Physical Violence	Female	265	237.68	62985	19165.00	.000
	Male	177	197.28	34918		
Emotional Violence	Female	265	242.46	64251	17899.00	.000
	Male	177	190.12	33652		
Economic Violence	Female	265	251.45	66635	15515.00	.000
	Male	177	176.66	31268		
Sexual Violence	Female	265	252.65	66951.50	15198.00	.000
	Male	177	174.87	30951.50		
DVAS Total	Female	265	257.84	68326.50	13823.500	.000
	Male	177	167.10	29576.50		

*p<.05

The Mann Whitney U test results in terms of the gender variable in the Dating Violence Attitude Scale of the participants showed that general violence sub-dimension (U = 19114.00 , p<.05), physical violence sub-dimension (U = 19165.00, p<.05), emotional violence sub-dimension (U = 17899.00, p<.05), economic violence sub-dimension (U = 15515.00, p<.05), sexual violence sub-dimension (U = 15198.00, p<.05) and DVAS total (U = 13823.500, p<.05) scores had a statistically significant difference. When the mean rank was considered, the scores of women in all sub-dimensions of the Dating Violence Attitude Scale and in total DVAS were found to be statistically significantly higher than that of men.

Mann Whitney U Analysis was performed in order to determine the means of the DVAS and whether there was a significant difference between these means and the results were given in Table 5.

Table 5. Examination of the Differences in the Scores Obtained from the Total and Sub-Dimensions of the University Students in the DVAS according to the Variable of Exposure to Dating Relationship Violence

Sub-Dimensions	Exposure to Dating Violence	N	Mean Ranks	Sum of Ranks	U	p
General Violence	Yes	177	230.93	40875	21783.00	.153
	No	265	215.20	57028		
Physical Violence	Yes	177	221.89	39275	23383.00	.954
	No	265	221.24	58628		
Economic Violence	Yes	177	235.22	41634.50	21023.50	.063
	No	265	212.33	56268.50		
Sexual Violence	Yes	177	230.35	40772.50	21885.50	.209
	No	265	215.59	57130.50		
DVAS Total	Yes	177	231.46	40969.00	21689.00	.180
	No	265	214.85	56934.00		

The results of the Mann Whitney U test in terms of exposure to dating violence found that general violence sub-dimension (U = 21783.00, p>.05), physical violence sub-dimension (U = 23383.00, p>.05), emotional violence sub-dimension (U = 22492.50, p>.05), economic violence sub-dimension (U = 21023.50, p>.05), sexual violence sub-dimension (U = 21885.50, p>.05) and DVAS total (U = 21689.00, p>.05) scores were not statistically significant.

The Spearman Correlation Analysis, which was conducted to examine the relationship between the sub-dimensions of the Irrational Beliefs in Romantic Relationships scale and the sub-dimensions of the Dating Violence Attitude Scale was shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Spearman Correlation Coefficients between Irrational Beliefs Sub-Dimensions in Romantic Relationship and Dating Violence Attitude Scale Sub-Dimensions

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.General Violence	-	.34**	.29**	.36**	.31**	-.21**	-.11*	.02	-.20**	-.28**	-.09	-.21**	.53**
2.Physical Violence		-	.51**	.35**	.30**	-.19**	-.13**	-.10*	-.26**	-.37**	-.18**	-.33**	.62**
3.Emotional Violence			-	.51**	.37**	-.27**	-.23**	-.10*	-.27**	-.47	-.27**	-.44**	.79**
4.Economic Violence				-	.36**	-.23**	-13**	-.03	-.12*	-.35**	-.22**	-.28**	.76**
5.Sexual Violence					-	.23**	.01	.01	-.06	-.25	.02	-.12*	.68**
6.Different Thinking						-	.31**	.26**	.30**	.35**	.11*	.52**	-.32**
7.Mind Reading							-	.22**	.28**	.27**	.45**	.69**	-.17**
8.Gender Differences								-	.23**	.13**	.17**	.42**	-.07
9.Physical Intimacy									-	.46**	.31**	.64**	-.25**
10.Use of Social Time										-	.35**	.68**	-.50**
11.Over Expectations											-	.70**	-.21**
12.Total IRRBS												-	-.40**
13.Total DVAS													-

In Table 6, when the relationships between the scores of university students from the sub-dimensions of the dating violence attitude scale and the sub-dimensions of the scale of irrational beliefs in romantic relationships were examined; there was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the physical violence sub-dimension (r = .34, p<.01). There was a low, positive, and significant relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the emotional violence sub-dimension (r = .29, p<.01). Also, there was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the economic violence sub-dimension (r = .36, p<.01). There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the sexual violence sub-dimension (r = .31, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the different thinking sub-dimension (r = -.21, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the mind-reading sub-dimension (r = -.11, p<.05). On the contrary, there was no significant relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the gender differences sub-dimension (r = .02, p>.05). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the physical proximity sub-dimension (r = -.20, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the use of social time sub-dimension (r = -.28, p<.01) while there was no significant relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the over-expectations sub-dimension (r = -.09, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the general severity sub-dimension and the total IRRBS (r = -.21, p<.01). Moreover, there was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the total DVAS (r = .53, p<.01).

A moderate, positive, and significant relationship was found between the physical violence sub-dimension and the emotional violence sub-dimension (r = .51, p<.01). Similarly, there was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the physical violence sub-dimension and the economic violence sub-dimension (r = .35, p<.01). There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the physical violence sub-dimension and the sexual violence sub-dimension (r = .30, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the physical violence sub-dimension and the different thinking sub-dimension (r = -.19, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the physical violence sub-dimension and the mind-reading sub-dimension (r = -.13, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the physical violence sub-dimension and the gender differences sub-dimension (r = -.10, p<.05). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between physical violence sub-dimension and physical intimacy sub-dimension (r = -.26, p<.01). While there was a moderate, negative, and significant relationship between

physical violence sub-dimension and use of social time sub-dimension ($r = -.37$, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the physical violence sub-dimension and the over-expectations sub-dimension ($r = -.18$, p<.01). There was a moderate, negative, and significant relationship between physical violence sub-dimension and total IRRBS ($r = -.33$, p<.01). Likewise, there was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between physical violence sub-dimension and total DVAS ($r = .62$, p<.01).

The results showed that there was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the emotional violence sub-dimension and the economic violence sub-dimension ($r = .51$, p<.01). There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the emotional violence sub-dimension and the sexual violence sub-dimension ($r = .37$, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the emotional violence sub-dimension and the different thinking sub-dimension ($r = -.27$, p<.01). A low, negative, and significant relationship between the emotional violence sub-dimension and the mind-reading sub-dimension was found out ($r = -.23$, p<.01). Also, there was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the emotional violence sub-dimension and the gender differences sub-dimension ($r = -.10$, p<.01). A low, negative, and significant relationship was revealed between the emotional violence sub-dimension and the physical intimacy sub-dimension ($r = -.27$, p<.01). There was no significant relationship between the emotional violence sub-dimension and the use of social time sub-dimension ($r = -.47$, p>.05). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the emotional violence sub-dimension and the over-expectations sub-dimension ($r = -.27$, p<.01). There was a moderate, negative, and significant relationship between the emotional violence sub-dimension and the total IRRBS ($r = -.44$, p<.01) while there was a high, positive and significant relationship between the emotional violence sub-dimension and the total DVAS ($r = .79$, p<.01).

When the sub-dimension of economic violence was analyzed a moderate, positive, and significant relationship was found out between it and the sub-dimension of sexual violence ($r = .36$, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the sub-dimension of economic violence and the sub-dimension of thinking differently ($r = -.23$, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the economic violence sub-dimension and the mind-reading dimension ($r = -.13$, p<.01). There was no significant relationship between the sub-dimension of economic violence and the dimension of gender differences ($r = -.03$, p>.05). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the sub-dimension of economic violence and the dimension of physical intimacy ($r = -.12$, p<.05). There was a moderate, negative, and significant relationship between the economic violence sub-dimension and the use of social time dimension ($r = -.35$, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the sub-dimension of economic violence and the dimension of over-expectations ($r = -.22$, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship

between the sub-dimension of economic violence and the total IRRBS (r = -.28, p<.01) while there was a high, positive, and significant relationship between the economic violence sub-dimension and the total DVAS (r = .76, p<.01).

The analysis of the sub-dimension of sexual violence and the different thinking sub-dimension showed a low, negative, and significant relationship between the sexual violence sub-dimension (r = -.23, p<.01). There was no significant relationship between sexual violence sub-dimension and mind-reading sub-dimension (r = .01, p>.05). Similarly, there was no significant relationship between sexual violence sub-dimension and gender differences sub-dimension (r = .01, p>.05). There was no significant relationship between sexual violence sub-dimension and physical intimacy sub-dimension (r = -.06, p>.05). There was no significant relationship between sexual violence sub-dimension and the use of social time sub-dimension (r = -.25, p>.05). Likewise, there was no significant relationship between sexual violence sub-dimension and over-expectations sub-dimension (r = .02, p>.05). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the sexual violence sub-dimension and the total IRRBS (r = -.12, p>.05) while there was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the sexual violence sub-dimension and the total DVAS (r = .68, p>.05).

The thinking differently sub-dimension results was stated as follows; there was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the thinking differently sub-dimension and the mind-reading sub-dimension (r = .31, p<.01). There was a low, positive, and significant relationship between the thinking different sub-dimension and the gender differences sub-dimension (r = .26, p<.01). A low, positive, and significant relationship was found out between the thinking different sub-dimension and the physical intimacy sub-dimension (r = .30, p<.01). There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the thinking different sub-dimension and the use of social time sub-dimension (r = .35, p<.01). There was a low, positive, and significant relationship between the thinking different sub-dimension and the over-expectations sub-dimension (r = .11, p<.05). There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the thinking differently sub-dimension and the total IRRBS (r = .52, p<.05). Similarly, there was a moderate, negative, and significant relationship between the thinking different sub-dimension and the total DVAS (r = -.32, p<.05).

According to findings of the mind-reading sub-dimension, there was a low, positive, and significant relationship between the gender differences sub-dimension and the mind-reading sub-dimension (r = .22, p<.01). A low, positive, and significant relationship was found out between mind reading sub-dimension and physical proximity sub-dimension (r = .28, p<.01). There was a low, positive, and significant relationship between the mind-reading sub-dimension and the use of social time sub-dimension (r = .27, p<.01). There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the mind-reading sub-dimension and the over-expectations sub-dimension (r = .45, p<.01). There was a

moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the mind-reading sub-dimension and the total IRRBS (r = .69, p<.01). There was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the mind-reading sub-dimension and the total DVAS (r = -.17, p<.01).

The difference between the gender differences sub-dimension the physical proximity sub-dimension showed a low, positive, and significant relationship (r = .23, p<.01). Also, there was a low, positive, and significant relationship between the gender differences sub-dimension and the use of social time sub-dimension (r = .13, p<.01). There was a low, positive, and significant relationship between the gender differences sub-dimension and the over-expectations sub-dimension (r = .17, p<.01). There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the gender differences sub-dimension and the total IRRBS (r = .42, p<.01) while there was no significant relationship between the gender differences sub-dimension and the total DVAS (r = -.07, p<.01).

When the physical intimacy sub-dimension and use of social time sub-dimension were analyzed a moderate, positive, and significant relationship was found out (r = .46, p<.01). There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the physical intimacy sub-dimension and the over-expectations sub-dimension (r = .31, p<.01). There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the physical proximity sub-dimension and the total IRRBS (r = .64, p<.01) while there was a low, negative, and significant relationship between the physical proximity sub-dimension and the total DVAS (r = -.25, p<.01).

The use of social time sub-dimension results showed that there was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship was found out between the use of social time sub-dimension and the over-expectations sub-dimension (r = .35 p<.01). There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between the use of social time sub-dimension and the total IRRBS (r = .68 p<.01). There was a moderate, negative, and significant relationship between the use of social time sub-dimension and the total DVAS (r = -.50 p<.01).

There was a high, positive, and significant relationship between the over-expectations sub-dimension and the total IRRBS (r = .70 p<.01) while there was a low, negative and significant relationship between the extreme expectations sub-dimension and the total DVAS (r = -.21 p<.01). There was a moderate, negative, and significant relationship between total IRRBS and total DVAS (r = -.40 p<.01).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The results showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the scores of the participants in the irrational beliefs in romantic relationships scale according to the gender variable, in the sub-dimensions of over-expectation of physical intimacy, and in

the total scores of IRRBS. On the other hand, it was concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in the scores they got from the sub-dimensions of gender differences, mind reading, and use of social time. The mean scores of female students in the sub-dimensions of gender differences and mind-reading were higher than that of male students, and the mean scores obtained by male students from the sub-dimension of the "use of social time" was higher than that of female students. According to the literature review, research results were obtained from the mind-reading sub-dimension (Atılgan, 2020; Pala, 2018) and the gender differences sub-dimension (Eken, 2019), which showed that university students' irrational beliefs in romantic relationships differed in terms of women. Furthermore, there were studies where the mean score of male participants in the use of social time sub-dimension was higher than the mean score of female participants (Atılgan, 2020; Eken, 2019; Gündoğdu, Yavuzer, & Karataş; 2018; Güven & Yılgör, 2020; Sarı, 2008). At the same time, the relationship beliefs sub-dimension, which was stated as "we should do everything together" in the study of Gizir (2013), showed similar results with the "use of social time" sub-dimension. Accordingly, male students' scores in the sub-dimension "we must do everything together" were higher than female students (Gizir, 2013; Tuncer, 2019).

In the present study, it was concluded that university students' irrational beliefs in romantic relationships did not differ significantly in terms of different thinking, mind-reading, physical intimacy, use of social time, over-expectations sub-dimensions, and IRRBS total scores in terms of exposure to dating violence variable. Besides, it was concluded that the scores they got from the gender differences sub-dimension showed a significant difference. Considering this significant difference, it showed that the gender differences sub-dimension mean score of the answers given as yes was higher than the mean score of the answers given as no. In terms of other sub-dimensions, there was no significant difference which of them includes irrational beliefs such as "men and women will probably never adequately understand the opposite sex". It can be concluded that the disagreements experienced by individuals who have romantic relationships stem from gender differences because they have different physiological, biological, and emotional structures by nature, and they are exposed to dating violence due to the fact that their flirts do not understand them. Individuals who believe that men and women are emotionally and biologically different may cause problems in their romantic relationships by negatively affecting their communication (Saraç, 2013).

On the other hand, the dating violence attitude scores of university students showed a significant difference in terms of gender variables. It was concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between the sub-dimensions of general violence, physical violence, emotional violence, economic violence, sexual violence, the total DVAS scores, and the gender variable. In all sub-dimensions and in total, the scores of female participants were found to be statistically significantly higher than male participants. This result showed that female participants supported dating violence less than male

participants. When the literature was examined, many studies investigating whether the attitude towards dating violence differed according to gender yielded results consistent with the findings of the present research (Bacıoğlu & Kocabıyık, 2020; Çakır, 2020; Karadayı, 2020; Süzer, 2019; Terzioğlu et al., 2016; Yıldırım, 2016). The present study also differed in terms of gender variable from the other studies conducted to investigate the attitudes of university students towards dating violence (Ayyıldız & Taylan, 2018; Caldwell, Swan & Woodbrown, 2012; Dudular, 2021; Kepir-Savoly et al., 2014; Lee, Stefani & Park, 2014; Sakarya-Kaya, 2013; Sezer & Sumbas, 2018; Xie, Heimer & Lauritsen, 2012). According to these results, the reason why violence in romantic relationships was more supported by male students could be explained by the prevalence of violence against women and the fact that in the patriarchal order, men generally associated violence against women with power. In line with the cultural role patterns that society imposes on men, stereotypes such as seeing men as a superior gender than women and seeing it as a man's duty to initiate or end a romantic relationship can increase the likelihood of men committing violence, as well as increase women's exposure to violence (Karatay, Karatay, Baş- Gürarslan, Baş, 2018).

It was concluded that university students' sub-dimensions of dating violence attitude and DVAS total scores did not show a significant difference in terms of the variable of exposure to dating violence. When the literature was examined, studies showing that university students' dating violence attitude scores differed according to exposure to dating violence (Balcı- Devrim, 2019; Özdere, 2019; Yumuşak, 2013) while there were studies showing that it did not differ according to relationship status (Boivin, Lavoie, Hébert, & Gagné, 2011; Yıldırım, 2016).

When the relationship among the sub-dimensions of irrational beliefs in romantic relationships and the total scores of IRRBS, and the sub-dimensions of attitudes towards dating violence and the total scores of DVAS were analyzed, a low and positive relationship was found between the general violence sub-dimension of the dating violence attitude scale and the emotional violence sub-dimension. A moderate and positive relationship was found between the general violence sub-dimension and the physical, economic, and sexual violence sub-dimensions. A low and negative relationship was found between the general violence sub-dimension and the sub-dimensions of thinking differently, mind-reading, physical intimacy, and use of social time. There was no relationship between the general violence sub-dimension and the gender differences and over-expectations sub-dimensions. A low and negative correlation was found between the general violence sub-dimension and the total IRRBS. A moderate and positive relationship was found between the general violence sub-dimension and the total DVAS. In other words, the increase in the scores of irrational beliefs in romantic relationships indicated that the scores of attitudes towards dating violence decreased. Therefore, when the results of the DVAS scale were considered, the decrease in DVAS scores increased the attitude towards dating violence. As a result, the increase in irrational beliefs in

romantic relationships increased the attitude towards dating violence. This result showed that people who had irrational beliefs in their romantic relationship supported dating violence more. In parallel with this result, in the study conducted by Kepir-Savoly, Ulaş, Demirtaş-Zorbaz (2014), it was stated that the irrational beliefs of individuals about their relationships or themselves could affect the dynamic of the relationship, as well as differentiating their attitudes and acceptance levels towards possible violence. Therefore, a link can be established among people in the society having irrational thoughts, acceptance of violence, and irrational beliefs.

The present research was conducted with male-female university students aged 18 and over, as irrational beliefs in romantic relationships and attitudes towards dating violence were thought to be common issues in the lives of young adults. One of the main questions of the research is "Is there a significant relationship between university students' irrational beliefs about romantic relationships and their attitudes towards dating violence?". It was supported by other research in the literature by answering this question. As a result of the findings obtained from the present study, it can be concluded that the increase in irrational beliefs in romantic relationships can cause the attitude towards dating violence to increase. In the same line, it can be stated that individuals who have more irrational beliefs in romantic relationships have more supportive attitudes towards dating violence. This inference reveals that the more irrational beliefs of young adults in their romantic relationships, the more they may accept dating violence.

The results of this research can be used in individual and couple therapy to develop therapeutic interventions tailored to the needs of people with irrational beliefs or violence. In individual or couple therapies in the field of psychological counseling, it is thought that individuals can focus on their needs in order to solve their problems rationally as a result of having irrational beliefs in their romantic relationships and to reduce the violent experiences in the relationship. It is suggested that studies can be carried out to support rational thinking in therapies in order to carry out a healthy romantic relationship process.

References

Anasuri, S. (2016). Intimate partner violence on college campuses: an appraisal of emerging perspectives, *Journal of Education and Human Development, 5*(2), 74-86.

Anderson, K. M., & Danis, F. S. (2007). Collegiate sororities and dating violence: An exploratory study of informal and formal helping strategies. *Violence Against Women, 13,* 87 – 100.

Aslan, D., Vefikuluçay, D., Zeyneloğlu, S., Erdost, T. & Temel, F. (2008). *A study to determine the exposure of first and fourth-grade students of two nursing schools in Ankara to dating violence, their use of violence in dating relationships, and their views on this subject.* Women's Research and Implementation Center, Technical Report, Ankara.

Atakay, C. (2014). Risk factors for intimate partner violence. *Nesne Journal of Psychology, 2*(3), 1-9.

Atılgan, I. (2020). *The romantic relations of university students in the examination of the relationship between object relationships of the non-rational religious beliefs and the relationship of the relationship* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). İstanbul Gelişim University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.

Ausraite, M. & Zardeckaite Matulaitiene, K. (2019). The relationship between irrational relationship beliefs and conflict resolution strategies in young adulthood. *International Journal of Psychology, 23*, 77-93. doi: https://doi.org/10.7220/2345-024X.23.4

Aydogdu, I. (2010). *Romantic relationships examining in terms of personality traits*. (Unpublished Master Thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Ayyıldız, A.B. & Taylan, H. H. (2018). Dating violence attitudes in university students: The case of Sakarya University. *Journal of Academic Social Research*, 6(86), 413-427.

Bacıoğlu, S. D., & Kocabıyık, O. O. (2020). The Roles of Value Preferences and Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies on Prediction of Dating Violence. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, *7*(1), 96-107.

Balcı- Devrim, S. (2019). The effect of nursing students' perception of social gender on flirt violence. (Unpublished Master Thesis). Okan University, Institute of Health Sciences, Istanbul.

Beck, A. (1976). *Cognitive therapy and emotional disorder.* New York: Basic Books.

Boivin, S., Lavoie, F., Hébert, M., & Gagné, M.H. (2011). Past Victimizations and Dating Violence Perpetration in Adolescence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(4), 662–684. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511423245

Brooks-Russell, A., Foshee, V.A. & Reyes, H.L.M. (2015). *Dating Violence*. In: Gullotta T., Plant R., Evans M. (eds) Handbook of Adolescent Behavioral Problems. Springer, Boston, MA. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-7497-6_29

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E.K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, S. & Demirel, F. (2012). Scientific Research Methods (12th Edition). Ankara: Pegem Academy Publications.

Caldwell, J. E., Swan, S. C. and Woodbrown, V. D. (2012). Gender differences in intimate partner violence outcomes. *Psychology of Violence, 1*, 42-57.

Connolly, J., Craig, W., Goldberg, A., & Pepler, D. (2004). Mixed-gender groups, dating, and romantic relationships in early adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 14*(2), 185–207. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2004.01402003.x

Cakir, G. (2020). *Studying the relationship between self-respect and attitude towards the flirt abuse in the childhood of college students*. (Unpublished Master Thesis). Selcuk University Institute of Social Sciences, Konya.

DeBord, J., Romans, J. S. C., & Krieshok, T. (1996). Predicting dyadic adjustment from general and relationship-specific beliefs. *The Journal of Psychology, 130*(3), 263-280. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1996.9915008

Dudular, K. (2021). *The influence of the dating violence attitude and depression level on demand withdraw communication patterns*. (Unpublished Master Thesis). Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

Eken, O. (2019). *The influence of the dating violence attitude and depression level on demand withdraw communication patterns*. (Unpublished Master Thesis). Okan University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.

Ellis, A. (1962). Rational Psychotherapy. *Journal of General Psychology, 59*, 35-49.

Ellis, A. (1986). Rational emotive therapy applied to relationship therapy. *Journal of Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy, 4*, 14-2.

Fletcher, G. J. O., & Kininmonth, L. A. (1992). Measuring relationship beliefs: An individual difference scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 26*(4), 371- 397. https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(92)90066-D

Gizir, C. A. (2013). Examination of university students' relationship beliefs according to gender and romantic relationship status. Education and Science, 38(170), 372-383. http://egitimvebilim.ted.org.tr/index.php/EB/article/view/2334

Gündoğdu, R., Yavuzer, Y., & Karataş, Z. (2018). Irrational beliefs in romantic relationships as the predictor of aggression in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, *6*(3), 108-115.

Güven, N. & Yılgör, S. (2020). An investigation of the relationships between university students' irrational beliefs about romantic relationships, attitudes towards marriage, and their psychological symptoms. *International Social Sciences Studies Journal*, *6*(63), 2216-2227.

Hortaçsu, N. (2003). Human relationship. Ankara: Imge Bookstore.

Kalkan, M. & Yalçın, I. (2012). Pre-Marriage Period and Romantic Relationships. In: M. Kalkan and Z. Hamamcı (Ed.), Pre-Marriage Psychological Counseling. Ankara: Ani Publishing

Karadayı, A. (2020). *The effect of social gender perception and ambivalent sexism on dating violence and attitudes on dating violence in university students*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Haliç University, Istanbul.

Karal, D and Aydemir, E. (2012). Violence against women in Turkey. Ankara: Usak Publications.

Karatay, M., Karatay, G., Gürarslan Baş, N. and Baş, K., (2018). Attitudes and behaviors of university students regarding dating violence. STED/Journal of Continuing Medical Education, 27(1), 62-71.

Kepir-Savoly, D. D., Ulaş, O, & Demirtaş- Zorbaz, S. (2014). Factors affecting university students' acceptance levels of couple violence. Turkish Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, 5(42), 173-183.

Lee, M., Stefani, K. M. & Park, E. (2014). Gender-specific differences in risk for intimate partner violence in South Korea. *BMC Public Health*, *14*, 1-19.

Leen, E., Sorbring, E., Mawer, M., Holdsworth, E., Helsing, B., & Bowen, E. (2013). Prevalence, dynamic risk factors and the efficacy of primary interventions for adolescent dating violence: An international review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18*: 159–174.

Özdere, M. (2019). Attitudes of University Students towards Dating Violence. *The Journal of Academic Social Sciences. 95.* 314-331. DOI:10.16992/ASOS.15167

Pala Akbaba, T. (2018). *Investigating the relationship between irrational beliefs and happiness on the romantic relations of university students.* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Akdeniz University, Antalya.

Polat O. (2016), Violence, Marmara University Journal of Legal Research, *22* (1), 15-34

Romans, J. S., & DeBord, J. (1995). Development of the relationship beliefs questionnaire. *Psychological Reports, 76*, 1248-1251.

Sakarya Kaya, A. (2013). *Dating violence over young people studying at university.* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya.

Saraç, A. (2013). *The role of irrational beliefs and perceptions related to premarital relationships in predicting romantic relationship satisfaction of university students.* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Çukurova University, Adana.

Sarı, T. (2008). The Relationships between irrational beliefs, attachment dimensions, and relationship satisfactions regarding romantic relationships in university students. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

Sezer, Ö, & Sumbas, E. (2018). Examination of university students' acceptance of violence between couples in terms of various variables. International Journal of Social Studies, 11(56): 638-649.

Sharp, E. A., & Ganong, L. H. (2000). Raising awareness about marital expectations: are unrealistic beliefs changed by integrative teaching?, *Family Relations*, *49* (1), 71-76.

Solmus, T. (2010a). Romantic terrorism and romantic rape. Istanbul: Sistem Publishing.

Solmus, T. (2010b). Romantic relationships, marriage, and parent-child relationships. Ankara: Nobel Academic Publishing

Sprecher, S., & Metts S. (1999). Romantic beliefs: Their influence on relationships and patterns of change over time. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships,16*, 834-851.

Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A Triangular Theory of Love. *Psychological Review. 93*, 119-135.

Straus, M. (2004). Prevalence Of Violence against Dating Partners by Male and Female University Students Worldwide. *Violence Against Women, 10 (*7), 790-811.

Sugarman, D. B., & Hotaling, G. T. (1989). Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk markers. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging Social issues* (pp. 3–32). New York, NY: Praeger

Sullivan, B. F., & Schwebel, A. I. (1995). Relationship belief and expectations of satisfaction in marital relationships: Implications for family practitioners. *The Family Journal, 3*, (4), 298-305.

Suzer, G. (2019). Investigation of attitudes towards dating violence needs for social approval and fear of negative evaluation in emerging adulthood. (Unpublished master's thesis). Çağ University Institute of Social Sciences, Mersin.

T.C. Prime Ministry General Directorate of Women's Status. Handbook on Combating Domestic Violence. Ankara. Access Site: https://turkey.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/aismelkitabi.pdf

Terzioğlu, F., Gönenç, İ.M., Özdemir, F., Güvenç, G., Kök, G., Sezer Yılmaz, N., & Yüksekyılmaz Demirtaş, B. (2016). Validity and Reliability Study of the Dating Violence Attitude Scale, Anadolu Journal of Nursing and Health Sciences, 19(4): 225-232.

Tikdari Nejad, A., & Khezri Moghadam, N. (2017). Relationship between irrational beliefs and marital conflicts in couples based on rational-emotive behavior therapy. *Journal of Patient Safety & Quality Improvement*, *5*(2), 526-530.

Tuncer, S. (2019). The predictive power of university students' close relationship beliefs and self-changes on the quality of their romantic relationships. (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Xie, M., Heimer, K. & Lauritsen, J. L. (2012). Violence against women in US metropolitan areas: Changes in women's status and risk, 1980-2004. *Criminology, 50,* 105-143.

Yıldırım, R. D. (2016). Evaluation of irrational beliefs with ontological well-being variables. (Unpublished master's thesis). Arel University, Istanbul.

Yıldırım, S. (2016). The effect of university students' self-esteem and gender attitudes on their attitudes towards dating violence. (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Yumuşak, A. (2013). The relationship between university students' attitudes towards dating violence, gender, and narcissistic personality traits. (Unpublished master's thesis). Gaziosmanpaşa University Institute of Educational Sciences, Tokat.

Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2002). The development of romantic relationships and adaptions in the system of peer relationships. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 31*(l6), 216–225.