ARAŞTIRMA | RESEARCH

EVALUATION OF AWARENESS LEVELS OF FAMILY VIOLENCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH SOME VARIABLES OF ADULT INDIVIDUALS

Yetişkin Bireylerin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından Aile İçi Şiddet Farkındalık Düzeylerinin Değerlendirilmesi

Azime ARISOY[1]

Feriha Duygu SAMAY GÜRCÜ[2]

[1] Assoc. Prof., Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Çavdır Vocational School, ✉azimearisoy@hotmail.com
  iD 0000-0002-7136-558X

[2] Asst. Prof., Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Çavdır Vocational School, ✉duygusamav@gmail.com,
  iD 0000-0002-9298-9674

ABSTRACT

In this study, the comparison of domestic violence awareness based on various socio-demographic variables intended. For this purpose, a questionnaire was applied to 753 people, 508 women (67.5%) and 245 men (32.5%), aged 18 and over, living in Turkey. The "Domestic Violence Awareness Scale" (AİŞFÖ), the reliability and validity of which was studied by Özyürek and Kurnaz (2019), was used in the questionnaire form. In addition, the socio-demographic information of the participants was included. The research is based on examining domestic violence awareness based on demographic variables. In this context, quantitative approach and cross-sectional design were preferred while conducting the research. The model of the research was designed in the scanning model. The data obtained because of the research were analyzed in the SPSS-25 statistical program. In the analysis of the data, Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, frequency and percentage values, t test and anova tests were applied. As a result of the analyzes made; It was determined that the awareness of domestic violence showed a significant difference according to the gender and working status of the participant group.

Keywords: Domestic violence, social problem, violence awareness

ÖZ

Bu araştırmada, aile içi şiddet farkındalığının çeşitli sosyo-demografik değişkenlere (yaş, cinsiyet, eğitim düzeyi, medeni durum, çocuk sayısı, aile yapısı, gelir düzeyi, çalışma durumu, yaşanılan yer, yaşanılan bölge, daha önce şiddete maruz kalma durumu) dayalı kıyaslanması amaçlanmıştır. Bu amaçtan hareketle Türkiye'de yaşamakta

olan 18 ve üstü yaşta olan, 508 kadın (%67,5),245 erkek (%32,5) olmak üzere 753 kişiye anket uygulanmıştır. Anket formunda Özyürek ve Kurnaz (2019) tarafından güvenirlik ve geçerlik çalışması yapılan "Aile İçi Şiddet Farkındalığı Ölçeği" (AİŞFÖ) kullanılmıştır. Ayrıca katılımcıların sosyo-demografik bilgilerine yer verilmiştir. Araştırma, aile içi şiddet farkındalığını demografik değişkenlere dayalı olarak incelemeyi temel alan bir çalışmadır. Bu kapsamda, araştırma yürütülürken nicel yaklaşım ve kesitsel desen tercih edilmiştir. Araştırmanın modeli ise tarama modelinde kurgulanmıştır. Araştırmanın sonucunda elde edilen veriler SPSS-25 istatistik programında analiz edilmiştir. Verielerin analizinde; Shapiro-Wilk ve Kolmogorov-Smirnov testi, frekans ve yüzde değerleri, t testi ve anova testleri uygulanmıştır. Yapılan analizlerin sonucunda; Aile içi şiddet farkındalığının katılımcı grubunun cinsiyetine ve çalışma durumuna göre anlamlı fark göstermekte olduğu saptanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Aile içi şiddet, sosyal sorun, şiddet farkındalığı

INTRODUCTION

In Turkey and throughout the world, domestic violence, including interpersonal violence, is one of the most prevalent forms of violence, affecting people of all ages and in all social classes (Uyaroğlu, Lok & Lok, 2021). Domestic violence is a learned behavior that is applied by the strong in the family to the weak, and is a clinical issue; typically, domestic violence refers to behavior inflicted on each other by spouses or other family members, particularly toward women, children, or the elderly (Harcar, Çakır, Sürgevil & Budak, 2008:54; Moore, Frohwirth & Miller, 2010). It results from the motive of one of the family members to dominate or harm another member of the family (Kurtuldu, 2018; Weaalen et al., 2000). WHO estimates that approximately one in three women (30%) worldwide have been subjected to physical and/or sexual violence by a partner or non-spousal sexual violence (WHO, 2021). Research on Domestic Violence Against Women (2014) indicates that 38 percent of all ever-married women in Turkey have experienced some form of physical and/or sexual violence at some point in their lives. As a public health issue, domestic violence has been recognized as a criminal offense in recent years, as well as an important human right issue that needs to be addressed (Kurtuldu, 2018; Weaalen et al., 2000). Low education level, low socio-economic level, unemployment, the presence of psychiatric illness in one spouse, having a large family structure, living in rural areas for a long period of time, traditional beliefs that normalize domestic violence, early marriage with unwanted individuals, alcohol-drug-gambling addiction, and control requests can be considered important risk factors for domestic violence. A significant aspect of the problem of violence is its transmission from generation to generation (Han Almiş, Koyuncu Kütük, Gümüştaş & Çelik, 2018; Kaufman &Zigler, 1987;Kurtuldu, 2018; Uyaroğlu, Lok & Lok, 2021).

The first step in combating domestic violence is for individuals to be able to define violence and know which behaviors constitute violence. There is an important obstacle to seeking support from mechanisms for combating violence because victims of violence accept the behaviors that are defined as violence and consider them natural parts of their lives. In other words, victims of violence may not even be aware that they have been victimized due to their lack of awareness of violent behavior. In some cases, victims of violence are forced to normalize and accept violence because,

despite being aware of the violence they have experienced, they are financially dependent on the perpetrator, as a result of cultural considerations, and as a result of social pressure. Another reason for the normalization and acceptance of violence may be the lack of information about where and how to obtain support in the event of violence.

In order to prevent domestic violence, which is a major issue in society, welfare states develop and implement social policies. To achieve this, it is necessary to determine the risk groups first, to give priority to groups with a high-risk level, and to develop supportive services for these groups. In this context, scientific research on domestic violence is considered important in guiding social policy actors.

In this study, the purpose was to compare domestic violence awareness on the basis of various socio-demographic variables (age, gender, education level, marital status, number of children, family structure, income level, employment status, place of residence, region of residence, previous exposure to violence). In the literature:

In the study conducted by Altıntop and Adana (2019) with 144 participants who applied to the civil registry office in 2016 for marriage procedures, it was found that attitudes towards domestic violence were more positive in those whose place of residence was a village than in those whose place of residence was a town / town or big city, and as the participants' age increased, they also tended to normalize and generalize domestic violence. In the study, it was noted that negative attitudes towards domestic violence in marriage increased as the education level of participants decreased.

In a study conducted by Uyaroğlu et al. (2021) with 100 volunteer participants over the age of 18 who attended a sports center, it was determined that males, singles, primary school graduates, rural residents, those with extended family structures, and those with medium and low perceived income levels were less aware of domestic violence. The study found that females, those with higher levels of education, married individuals, individuals with nuclear families, individuals living in urban areas, and individuals with high income perceptions were more likely to be aware of domestic violence than those with lower levels of education. According to the study, it was the normalization of violence by individuals that led to the repetition of violence among family members.

During the study conducted by Güzel and Camadan (2021), university students were found to have a higher level of awareness of domestic violence among male participants. According to the study, the level of awareness of domestic violence among the participants living in rural areas (towns/villages) was significantly higher than that among participants living in urban areas (districts, provinces, and metropolitan areas), participants residing in the Southeastern Anatolia Region were more aware of domestic violence than participants residing in the Marmara Region, and participants with lower family income levels were more aware of domestic violence than participants with higher family incomes.

A review of the literature on domestic violence was conducted for this study, and data obtained from 753 participants, 18 and older, 508 females (67.5%) and 245 males (32.5%) living in Turkey, were analyzed. In light of the study objectives, the following hypotheses were tested during the study process:

- **H1:** Awareness of domestic violence reveals a significant difference according to the gender of the participant group.

- **H2:** Awareness of domestic violence reveals a significant difference according to the age group of the participant group.

- **H3:** Awareness of domestic violence reveals a significant difference according to the marital status of the participant group.

- **H4:** Awareness of domestic violence reveals a significant difference according to the education level of the participant group.

- **H5:** Awareness of domestic violence reveals a significant difference according to the number of children of the participant group.

- **H6:** Awareness of domestic violence reveals a significant difference according to the family structure of the participant group.

- **H7:** Awareness of domestic violence reveals a significant difference according to the income level of the participant group.

- **H8:** Awareness of domestic violence reveals a significant difference according to the employment status of the participant group.

- **H9:** The awareness of domestic violence reveals a significant difference according to the place of residence of the participant group.

- **H10:** The awareness of domestic violence reveals a significant difference according to the region of residence of the participant group lives.

- **H11:** Awareness of domestic violence reveals a significant difference according to the violence exposure of the participant group.

METHOD

Type of the Study

Based on demographic variables, this study investigated the level of awareness of domestic violence. The study was conducted using a quantitative approach and cross-sectional design in this context. The study design was based on a survey model.

Ethical Principles of the Study

In order to begin the study, permission was obtained from the Non-Interventional Clinical Research Ethics Committee (date 01.03.2023, meeting number 2023/03, decision number GO 2023/127).

Participants reached online were made aware of the purpose of data collection, the use of the scale was permitted, permission was obtained from the ethics committee, and the participants were expected to respond to the survey questions without any influence on them. As part of the principle of confidentiality, the data would be maintained and used only for scientific research purposes. There was a clear statement at the beginning of the questionnaire form that it was completely voluntary to participate in the online survey.

Sample and Population

The study population consisted of individuals aged 18 and over living in Turkey. As reported by TUIK (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu) the population of Turkey is 85 million 279 thousand 553 (TUIK, 2023). According to the data of the Supreme Electoral Council (Yüksek Seçim Kurulu, YSK)The total number of people aged 18 and over in the population is 60 million 904 thousand 499 (YSK, 2023). Following the approval of the ethics committee for the study, a questionnaire form was prepared using "Google Forms". Then, the link to the survey form was delivered to the volunteer participants through the social network. On 01.03.2023, data collection began, and after 1.5 months, 805 participants across all regions of Turkey participated online. In the analysis, however, 52 data belonging to participants under the age of 18 were excluded, which disrupted the normal distribution of the data. The data obtained from 753 participants, including 508 female participants (67.5%) and 245 male participants (32.5%), were analyzed (95% confidence interval and 3.57% error).

Domestic Violence Awareness Scale

The "Domestic Violence Awareness Scale" (DVAS), the reliability and validity study conducted by Özyürek and Kurnaz (2019), was employed in the study. There was a total of 20 items and four sub-dimensions in the DVAS. These sub-dimensions included Defining Domestic Violence with 5 items (items 1-5), Consequences of Domestic Violence with 5 items (items 6-10), Acceptance of Domestic Violence with 5 items (items 11-15) and Normalization of Domestic Violence with 5 items (items 16-20). In the scale used, a 3-point rating was used as 1) agree, 2) partially agree and 3) disagree. The items 11-20 of the scale were scored in reverse order (Özyürek & Kurnaz, 2019). There were three scores for each item, with one being the lowest and three being the highest. Based on the data obtained, the participants were able to define violence correctly by obtaining high scores on items 1-5 (Defining Domestic Violence sub-dimension). Participants who scored highly on items 6-10 (Consequences of Domestic Violence sub-dimension) demonstrated understanding of the consequences of domestic violence. The participants did not accept situations associated with domestic

violence based on their high scores from items 11-15 (Acceptance of Domestic Violence sub-dimension), and the participants did not normalize domestic violence based on their high scores from items 16-20. A high score from all items on the scale could be considered a sign of participants' high level of awareness of domestic violence, and their attitudes and behaviors were compatible with the attitudes and behaviors expected in legal and scientific fields in interpreting domestic violence.

Data Analysis

The data in this study were analyzed using the SPSS-25 statistical software. In order to conduct the relevant analyses, it was necessary to verify the distribution of the study data. Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were used to determine the normality of the data (Büyüköztürk, 2010). In the social sciences, however, normality is usually checked using skewness and kurtosis values (Yalçıntaş, 2019). The skewness and kurtosis values have been calculated based on different references in order to meet the assumption of a normal distribution. The skewness and kurtosis values between -1 and +1 were considered normal by Büyüköztürk (2010), -2 and +2 by George and Mallery (2010), and between -1 and +1.5 by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013).

Table 1. Skewness and Kurtosis Values of Domestic Violence Awareness

Dimensions	Skewness	Kurtosis
Total	-.32	1.82
Defining of Domestic Violence	-1.46	.77
Consequences of Domestic Violence	-1.83	1.74
Acceptance of Domestic Violence	1.15	.62
Normalization of Domestic Violence	1.06	1.04

As shown in Table 1, skewness and kurtosis values were determined between -2 and +2 for participants' awareness of domestic violence and the study data were accepted to be normally distributed. The analysis of normally distributed data was conducted using parametric methods (Kul, 2014). The study was therefore conducted using parametric tests such as the independent group ANOVA analysis and the t-test.

Findings

The frequency and percentage values of the demographic data collected during the study were calculated and presented in this section. ANOVA analysis was utilized in this section to compare awareness of domestic violence based on variables with more than two groups, and independent samples t-test was utilized to compare awareness of domestic violence based on variables with two groups. The results obtained were presented here.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentages Related to Demographic Information of Participants

Variable	Group	f	%
Gender	Female	508	67.5
	Male	245	32.5
Age Group	18-20 years old	173	23.0
	21-30 years old	228	30.3
	31-40 years old	106	14.1
	41-50 years old	170	22.6
	51-65 years old	76	10.1
Marital Status	Married	340	45.2
	Single	413	54.8
Educational Level	Elementary	31	4.1
	Secondary	51	6.8
	High School	308	40.9
	Associate Degree	138	18.3
	Undergraduate Degree	176	23.4
	Graduate Degree	49	6.5
Number of Children	No Children	398	52.9
	One Child	151	20.1
	Two Children	138	18.3
	Three or More Children	66	8.8
Family Structure	Nuclear Family	673	89.4
	Extended Family	80	10.6
Level of Income	Low	108	14.3
	Moderate	611	81.1
	High	34	4.5
Employment Status	Yes	381	50.6
	No	372	49.4
Place of Residence	Village	80	10.6
	District	284	37.7
	Province	389	51.7
Region of Residence	Mediterranean Region	222	29.5
	Aegean Region	172	22.8
	Marmara Region	98	13.0
	Black Sea Region	94	12.5
	Central Anatolia Region	99	13.1
	Eastern Anatolia Region	32	4.2
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	36	4.8
Violence Exposure	Yes	170	22.6
	No	583	77.4
Total		753	100.0

According to Table 2, the participants of the study were generally female (67.5%), in the 21-30 age group (30.3%), single (54.8%), high school graduates (40.9%), without children (52.9%), with a nuclear family structure (89.4%), with a moderate income (81.1%), actively employed (50.6%), living in the province (51.7%), living in the Mediterranean Region (29.5%) and not having been exposed to violence before (77.4%).

Table 3. Independent Groups T-test for Comparison of Domestic Violence Awareness by Gender

Dimension	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	sd	t	p
Total	Female	508	40.16	4.40	751	-4.04	.000
	Male	245	41.65	5.36			
Defining Domestic Violence	Female	508	13.15	3.20	751	3.61	.000
	Male	245	12.24	3.28			
Consequences of Domestic Violence	Female	508	14.14	2.14	751	1.73	.08
	Male	245	13.84	2.34			
Acceptance of Domestic Violence	Female	508	6.78	2.28	751	-8.64	.000
	Male	245	8.45	2.87			
Normalization of Domestic Violence	Female	508	6.09	2.05	751	-5.85	.000
	Male	245	7.11	2.59			

According to Table 3, when the domestic violence awareness of the participant group was compared according to gender, the total score, and the score of males in the dimensions of acceptance of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence were significantly higher than the score of females, and the score of females in the dimension of defining domestic violence was significantly higher than the score of males ($p<.05$). However, no significant difference was found in the consequences of domestic violence dimension according to gender ($p>.05$).

Table 4. ANOVA Analysis on the Comparison of Domestic Violence Awareness According to Age Group

Variable	Age Group	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	F	p	Difference
Total	18-20 years old	173	39.83	4.55	2.00	.09	
	21-30 years old	228	41.14	5.37			
	31-40 years old	106	40.92	4.52			
	41-50 years old	170	40.72	4.28			
	51-65 years old	76	40.49	4.67			
Defining Domestic Violence	18-20 years old	173	12.16	3.59	2.84	.02	4>1
	21-30 years old	228	12.93	3.29			
	31-40 years old	106	13.16	3.07			
	41-50 years old	170	13.21	2.98			
	51-65 years old	76	13.00	3.00			

Consequences of Domestic Violence	18-20 years old	173	13.84	2.39	.78	.54	
	21-30 years old	228	14.12	2.27			
	31-40 years old	106	14.11	2.05			
	41-50 years old	170	14.19	1.93			
	51-65 years old	76	13.87	2.43			
Acceptance of Domestic Violence	18-20 years old	173	7.17	2.51	.76	.56	
	21-30 years old	228	7.49	2.73			
	31-40 years old	106	7.32	2.60			
	41-50 years old	170	7.15	2.53			
	51-65 years old	76	7.58	2.64			
Normalization of Domestic Violence	18-20 years old	173	6.66	2.44	1.95	.10	
	21-30 years old	228	6.59	2.39			
	31-40 years old	106	6.33	1.99			
	41-50 years old	170	6.16	2.16			
	51-65 years old	76	6.04	2.24			

According to Table 4, when the domestic violence awareness of the participant group was compared in terms of the age group, no significant difference was found in the total score and the dimensions of the consequences of domestic violence, acceptance of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence (p>.05). However, in the dimension of defining domestic violence, the score of the participants in the 41-50 age group was significantly higher than the score of the participants in the 18-30 age group (p<.05).

Table 5. Independent Groups T-Test for Comparison of Awareness of Domestic Violence According to Marital Status

Dimension	Marital Status	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	sd	t	p
Total	Married	340	40.86	4.48	751	1.11	.27
	Single	413	40.47	5.01			
Defining Domestic Violence	Married	340	13.12	3.03	751	2.05	.04
	Single	413	12.64	3.42			
Consequences of Domestic Violence	Married	340	14.06	2.19	751	.22	.83
	Single	413	14.03	2.23			
Acceptance of Domestic Violence	Married	340	7.46	2.67	751	1.25	.21
	Single	413	7.22	2.55			
Normalization of Domestic Violence	Married	340	6.21	2.18	751	-2.22	.03
	Single	413	6.59	2.36			

According to Table 5, when the domestic violence awareness of the participant group was compared according to marital status, no significant difference was found in the total score and the dimensions of consequences of domestic violence and acceptance of domestic violence (p>.05). However, in terms of defining domestic violence, the score of married participants was significantly higher than the score of single participants, and in terms of normalization of domestic violence, the score of single participants was significantly higher than the score of married participants (p<.05).

Table 6. ANOVA Analysis on the Comparison of Domestic Violence Awareness According to Education Level

Variable	Level of Education	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	F	p	Difference
Total	Elementary	31	39.84	4.84	.97	.43	
	Secondary	51	40.24	5.91			
	High School	308	40.40	4.98			
	Associate Degree	138	40.78	4.98			
	Undergraduate Degree	176	40.98	3.90			
	Graduate Degree	49	41.57	4.43			
Defining Domestic Violence	Elementary	31	12.13	3.57	7.74	.000	6>1,2,3
	Secondary	51	12.33	3.58			
	High School	308	12.30	3.60			
	Associate Degree	138	12.72	3.38			
	Undergraduate Degree	176	13.84	2.26			
	Graduate Degree	49	14.22	1.46			
Consequences of Domestic Violence	Elementary	31	13.55	3.05	2.21	.05	
	Secondary	51	13.45	2.99			
	High School	308	13.90	2.44			
	Associate Degree	138	14.31	1.89			
	Undergraduate Degree	176	14.31	1.67			
	Graduate Degree	49	14.22	1.40			
Acceptance of Domestic Violence	Elementary	31	7.81	3.16	2.61	.02	3>5
	Secondary	51	7.63	3.02			
	High School	308	7.59	2.72			
	Associate Degree	138	7.28	2.45			
	Undergraduate Degree	176	6.78	2.24			
	Graduate Degree	49	7.12	2.47			
Normalization of Domestic Violence	Elementary	31	6.35	2.75	2.08	.07	
	Secondary	51	6.82	2.70			
	High School	308	6.62	2.33			
	Associate Degree	138	6.46	2.29			
	Undergraduate Degree	176	6.05	1.93			
	Graduate Degree	49	6.00	2.28			

According to Table 6, when the domestic violence awareness of the participant group was compared in terms of educational level, no significant difference was found in the total score and the dimensions of the consequences of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence (p>.05). However, in the dimension of defining domestic violence, the score of the participants with postgraduate degrees was significantly higher than the scores of the participants with primary, secondary and high school degrees, and in the dimension of acceptance of domestic violence, the score of the participants with high school degrees was significantly higher than the score of the participants with undergraduate degrees (p<.05).

Table 7. ANOVA Analysis on the Comparison of Awareness of Domestic Violence According to Number of Children

Variable	Level of Education	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	F	p	Difference
Total	No Children	398	40.52	4.83	1.25	.29	
	One Child	151	40.54	4.50			
	Two Children	138	40.60	4.84			
	Three or More Children	66	41.73	4.90			
Defining Domestic Violence	No Children	398	12.69	3.41	4.02	.01	3>1,4
	One Child	151	13.05	3.13			
	Two Children	138	13.53	2.79			
	Three or More Children	66	12.02	3.26			
Consequences of Domestic Violence	No Children	398	14.08	2.18	3.05	.03	1,3>4
	One Child	151	14.09	2.07			
	Two Children	138	14.25	2.11			
	Three or More Children	66	13.29	2.76			
Acceptance of Domestic Violence	No Children	398	7.24	2.56	13.29	.000	4>1,2,3
	One Child	151	7.21	2.28			
	Two Children	138	6.84	2.37			
	Three or More Children	66	9.15	3.26			
Normalization of Domestic Violence	No Children	398	6.51	2.32	5.53	.001	4>2,3
	One Child	151	6.19	2.10			
	Two Children	138	5.99	1.87			
	Three or More Children	66	7.27	2.97			

According to Table 7, when the domestic violence awareness of the participant group was compared according to the number of children, no significant difference was found in the total score (p>.05). However, in the dimension of defining domestic violence, the score of the participants with two children was significantly higher than the score of the participants with no children and those with three or more children, in the dimension of consequences of domestic violence, the score of the participants with no children and those with two children was significantly higher than the score of the participants with three or more children, in the dimension of acceptance of domestic violence, the score of the participants with three or more children was significantly higher than the score of the participants with no children and those with one and two children, and in the dimension of normalization of domestic violence, the score of the participants with three or more children was significantly higher than the score of the participants with one and two children (p<.05).

Table 8. Independent Groups T-test for Comparison of Awareness of Domestic Violence According to Family Structure

Dimension	Group	n	X̄	ss	sd	t	p
Total	Nuclear Family	673	40.53	4.61	751	-1.87	.06
	Extended Family	80	41.59	5.97			
Defining Domestic Violence	Nuclear Family	673	12.92	3.23	751	1.58	.11
	Extended Family	80	12.31	3.44			
Consequences of Domestic Violence	Nuclear Family	673	14.09	2.16	751	1.64	.10
	Extended Family	80	13.66	2.59			
Acceptance of Domestic Violence	Nuclear Family	673	7.22	2.47	751	-3.38	.001
	Extended Family	80	8.25	3.40			
Normalization of Domestic Violence	Nuclear Family	673	6.31	2.14	751	-3.94	.000
	Extended Family	80	7.36	3.12			

According to Table 8, when the domestic violence awareness of the participant group was compared according to family structure, no significant difference was found in the total score and the dimensions of defining domestic violence and the consequences of domestic violence ($p>.05$). However, in the dimensions of acceptance of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence, the score of participants living in extended families was significantly higher than the score of participants living in nuclear families ($p<.05$).

Table 9. ANOVA Analysis on the Comparison of Domestic Violence Awareness According to Income Level

Variable	Group	n	X̄	ss	F	p	Difference
Total	Low	108	41.04	6.28	1.13	.32	
	Moderate	611	40.53	4.48			
	High	34	41.53	4.50			
Defining Domestic Violence	Low	108	12.39	3.49	1.30	.27	
	Moderate	611	12.93	3.18			
	High	34	12.94	3.67			
Consequences of Domestic Violence	Low	108	13.66	2.71	1.97	.14	
	Moderate	611	14.11	2.11			
	High	34	14.03	2.24			
Acceptance of Domestic Violence	Low	108	7.99	2.92	4.33	.01	1>2
	Moderate	611	7.20	2.47			
	High	34	7.47	3.50			
Normalization of Domestic Violence	Low	108	7.00	2.98	6.18	.002	1>2
	Moderate	611	6.28	2.08			
	High	34	7.09	2.91			

According to Table 9, when the domestic violence awareness of the participant group was compared in terms of income level, no significant difference was found in the total score and the dimensions

of defining domestic violence and the consequences of domestic violence (p>.05). However, in the dimensions of acceptance of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence, the score of participants with low income was significantly higher than the score of participants with moderate level income (p<.05).

Table 10. Independent Groups T-Test for Comparison Regarding Awareness of Domestic Violence According to Employment Status

Dimension	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	sd	t	p
Total	Yes	381	41.18	4.40	751	3.12	.002
	No	372	40.10	5.08			
Defining Domestic Violence	Yes	381	12.99	3.00	751	1.11	.27
	No	372	12.72	3.49			
Consequences of Domestic Violence	Yes	381	14.08	2.08	751	.42	.67
	No	372	14.01	2.34			
Acceptance of Domestic Violence	Yes	381	7.55	2.75	751	2.39	.02
	No	372	7.10	2.43			
Normalization of Domestic Violence	Yes	381	6.56	2.46	751	1.77	.08
	No	372	6.27	2.09			

According to Table 10, when the domestic violence awareness of the participant group was compared according to employment status, the total score and the score of the participants who were employed in the dimension of acceptance of domestic violence were significantly higher than the score of the participants who were unemployed (p<.05). However, no significant difference was found in the dimensions of defining domestic violence, consequences of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence (p>.05).

Table 11. ANOVA Analysis on the Comparison of Domestic Violence Awareness According to Place of Residence

Variable	Place of Residence	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	F	p	Difference
Total	Village	80	40.08	5.24	1.99	.14	
	District	284	40.36	4.85			
	Province	389	40.97	4.61			
Defining Domestic Violence	Village	80	12.19	3.69	5.56	.004	3>1,2
	District	284	12.54	3.56			
	Province	389	13.22	2.87			
Consequences of Domestic Violence	Village	80	13.71	2.70	3.08	.05	
	District	284	13.87	2.44			
	Province	389	14.24	1.89			

Acceptance of Domestic Violence	Village	80	7.71	2.92	1.89	.15	
	District	284	7.44	2.69			
	Province	389	7.16	2.46			
Normalization of Domestic Violence	Village	80	6.46	2.06	.43	.65	
	District	284	6.51	2.39			
	Province	389	6.34	2.26			

According to Table 11, when the domestic violence awareness of the participant group was compared according to the place of residence, no significant difference was found in the total score and the dimensions of consequences of domestic violence, acceptance of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence (p>.05). However, in the dimension of defining domestic violence, the score of the participants living in the province was found to be significantly higher than the scores of those living in villages-towns and districts (p<.05).

Table 12. ANOVA Analysis on the Comparison of Domestic Violence Awareness by Region of Residence

Variable	Region of Residence	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	F	p	Difference
Total	Mediterranean Region	222	40.47	4.46	2.46	.02	
	Aegean Region	172	40.08	4.97			
	Marmara Region	98	40.16	4.17			
	Black Sea Region	94	40.50	3.87			
	Central Anatolia Region	99	41.76	5.22			
	Eastern Anatolia Region	32	42.38	6.13			
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	36	41.53	6.06			
Defining Domestic Violence	Mediterranean Region	222	12.71	3.51	2.49	.02	5>7
	Aegean Region	172	13.08	3.11			
	Marmara Region	98	12.97	3.28			
	Black Sea Region	94	13.06	3.09			
	Central Anatolia Region	99	13.35	2.82			
	Eastern Anatolia Region	32	11.84	2.75			
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	36	11.36	3.75			
Consequences of Domestic Violence	Mediterranean Region	222	14.24	1.95	4.30	.000	1,3,4,5>7
	Aegean Region	172	13.81	2.62			
	Marmara Region	98	14.49	1.57			
	Black Sea Region	94	14.19	1.71			
	Central Anatolia Region	99	14.14	2.05			
	Eastern Anatolia Region	32	13.44	2.77			
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	36	12.64	3.30			

Acceptance of Domestic Violence	Mediterranean Region	222	7.19	2.37	9.25	.000	6,7>1,2,3,4,5
	Aegean Region	172	7.05	2.42			
	Marmara Region	98	6.77	2.15			
	Black Sea Region	94	6.95	2.31			
	Central Anatolia Region	99	7.62	2.91			
	Eastern Anatolia Region	32	9.41	3.17			
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	36	9.33	3.48			
Normalization of Domestic Violence	Mediterranean Region	222	6.33	2.06	7.02	.000	6,7>1,2,3,4,5
	Aegean Region	172	6.13	2.03			
	Marmara Region	98	5.94	1.45			
	Black Sea Region	94	6.30	1.94			
	Central Anatolia Region	99	6.65	2.92			
	Eastern Anatolia Region	32	7.69	3.18			
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	36	8.19	3.32			

According to Table 12, no significant difference was found in the total score when the participant group's awareness of domestic violence was compared according to the region of residence (p>.05). However, in the dimension of defining domestic violence, the score of the participants living in Central Anatolia Region was significantly higher than the score of the participants living in Southeastern Anatolia Region, the score of the participants living in Mediterranean Region, Marmara Region, Black Sea Region and Central Anatolia Region in the dimension of consequences of domestic violence was significantly higher than the score of the participants living in Southeastern Anatolia Region, and the score of the participants living in Eastern Anatolia Region in the dimensions of acceptance of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence was significantly higher than the score of the participants living in Mediterranean Region, Aegean Region, Marmara Region, Black Sea Region and Central Anatolia Region (p<.05).

Table 13. Independent Groups t-test for Comparison of Domestic Violence Awareness According to Exposure to Violence

Dimension	Violence Exposure	n	X̄	ss	sd	t	p
Total	Yes	170	40.88	4.05	751	.74	.46
	No	583	40.58	4.97			
Defining Domestic Violence	Yes	170	13.33	2.67	751	2.16	.03
	No	583	12.72	3.40			
Consequences of Domestic Violence	Yes	170	13.98	2.19	751	-.46	.65
	No	583	14.07	2.22			
Acceptance of Domestic Violence	Yes	170	7.16	2.54	751	-.95	.34
	No	583	7.37	2.62			
Normalization of Domestic Violence	Yes	170	6.42	2.29	751	-.01	.99
	No	583	6.42	2.29			

According to Table 13, no significant difference was determined in the total score and the dimensions of consequences of domestic violence, acceptance of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence when the domestic violence awareness of the participant group was compared in terms of exposure to violence (p>.05). However, in the dimension of defining domestic violence, the score of the participants who were exposed to violence was significantly higher than the score of the participants who were not exposed to violence (p<.05).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Domestic violence is defined as violence perpetrated between family members behind closed doors (WHO, 2002). As part of the effort to combat domestic violence, it is essential that individuals recognize which behaviors constitute violence and what the consequences of violence are, as well as not normalizing and accepting violence.

In this study, domestic violence awareness was compared based on various socio-demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, educational status, number of children, family structure, income level, employment status, place of residence, region of residence, previous violence exposure). The hypotheses were discussed by analyzing the data obtained from individuals aged 18 and over living in Turkey. As a result of the study, the findings were discussed and recommendations were made in light of the studies conducted using the "Domestic Violence Awareness Scale" (DVAS), the reliability and validity study of which was conducted by Özyürek and Kurnaz (2019).

It was found in the study conducted by Güzel and Camadan (2021) that male participants had a higher awareness level regarding domestic violence than female participants. In this study, when awareness levels of domestic violence were compared by gender, as in Güzel and Camadan (2021), males scored higher in both total score and acceptance of domestic violence than females. The score of males was higher than that of females in the dimension of normalization of domestic violence. In the dimension of defining domestic violence, the score of females was higher than that of males. No gender-based differences were observed in the dimension of consequences of domestic violence. However, in the study conducted by Aydın and Parlak (2022) with the participation of Health Services Vocational School students, unlike this study, the mean scores of female participants in the sub-dimension of acceptance of violence and normalization of violence were higher than those of male participants. As a result of the study conducted by Uyaroğlu et al. (2021), females were found to have a greater awareness of domestic violence than males. According to Deleş and Kaytez (2021), the scores of female participants in the acceptance of domestic violence subdimension were higher than those of male participants. In the study conducted by Özyürek et al. (2018), it was revealed that female participants had low levels of acceptance of domestic violence and did not normalize domestic violence. In addition, Özyürek et al. found that females with higher education levels and without children had higher levels of awareness of domestic violence compared to other groups.

In their study, Ulutaş Keskinkılıç et al. (2021) found that there was no statistically significant difference according to the age groups of the participants. According to the study conducted by Özyürek et al. (2018), being younger than 34 years of age was a critical component of correctly defining and understanding domestic violence. Ataman, Bozkurt and Akdeniz (2022) found that participants aged 45 and older were more aware of domestic violence than those of other ages. In this study, when the domestic violence awareness levels of the participant group were compared according to the age group, there was no significant difference between the total score and the dimensions of the consequences of domestic violence, acceptance of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence. However, participants in the 41-50 age group scored higher than participants in the 18-30 age group in the dimension of defining domestic violence.

In their study, Ulutaş Keskinkılıç et al. (2021) found that there was no statistically significant difference according to the age groups of the participants. According to the study conducted by Özyürek et al. (2018), being younger than 34 years of age was a critical component of correctly defining and understanding domestic violence. Ataman, Bozkurt and Akdeniz (2022) found that participants aged 45 and older were more aware of domestic violence than those of other ages. It was determined in this study that there was no significant difference between the total score and the dimensions of the consequences of domestic violence, acceptance of domestic violence, and normalization of domestic violence when the awareness levels of the participants were compared according to their age group. Nevertheless, participants in the 41-50 age group scored higher than participants in the 18-30 age group in the dimension of defining domestic violence.

Based on the study conducted by Başgöl, Özdemir, and Benli (2023), a significant difference was observed between participant family structure and awareness of domestic violence. The mean scores of participants with nuclear families were found to be higher. According to Ataman, Bozkurt, and Akdeniz (2022), there was a statistically significant difference between the defining domestic violence sub-dimension of the DVAS and the family structure of the participants (p<0.05). Participants with fragmented families scored higher on the sub-dimension of defining domestic violence than those with extended families, and those with extended families scored higher than those with nuclear families. As a result, they did not find a statistically significant difference between the total mean score, normalization of domestic violence, consequences of domestic violence, and acceptance of domestic violence sub-dimensions of DVAS and the family structure of the participants. In their study conducted with Vocational School of Health Services students, Aydın and Parlak (2022) found that the mean scores of participants from nuclear families were significantly higher than those from extended families. In the study by Ulutaş Keskinkılıç et al. (2021), participants with extended families exhibited higher levels of awareness, no normalization of domestic violence, and were more likely to define domestic violence than those with nuclear families. According to this study, participants living in extended families scored higher than those living in nuclear families in terms of acceptance of

domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence. It was determined from this perspective that those with extended families did not accept and normalize domestic violence.

Using the findings of Ataman, Bozkurt, and Akdeniz (2022), it was determined that the unemployed participants scored higher on the subdimensionals of defining domestic violence, normalizing domestic violence, and accepting domestic violence than the employed participants, as well as the overall mean score. Similarly, in the study conducted by Başgöl, Özdemir, and Benli (2023) with nursing students, the level of awareness of domestic violence was higher in unemployed participants than in employed participants (p<0.05). According to the results of this study, the total score as well as the score of employed participants on the dimensions of acceptance of domestic violence were higher than the score of unemployed participants. However, no significant difference was observed in the dimensions of defining domestic violence, consequences of domestic violence, and normalization of domestic violence according to employment status (p>.05).

The findings of Ataman, Bozkurt, and Akdeniz (2022) indicated that participants with three or more children were more aware of domestic violence. In the study conducted by Özyürek et al. (2018), it was found that females who had a higher education level and did not have children had an increased level of awareness of domestic violence than other groups. Ulutaş Keskinkılıç et al. (2021) determined that participants with four or more children defined domestic violence more accurately than participants with one child or three children, and that their thoughts corresponded to the attitudes and behaviors expected of them when interpreting domestic violence, scientific and legal issues. In this study, in the dimension of defining domestic violence, the score of the participants with two children was higher than the score of those with no children and those with three or more children, in the dimension of the consequences of domestic violence, the score of the participants with no children and two children was higher than the score of those with three or more children, in the dimension of acceptance of domestic violence, the score of the participants with three or more children was higher than the score of the participants with no children and those with one and two children, and in the dimension of normalization of domestic violence, the score of the participants with three or more children was higher than the score of the participants with one and two children.

A study conducted by Güzel and Camadan (2021) revealed that participants with a low level of family economic status were more aware of domestic violence than those with a high level. In the study carried out by Uyaroğlu et al. (2021), higher levels of awareness of domestic violence were found among participants with good perceptions of income. As reported by Ataman, Bozkurt, and Akdeniz (2022), participants with higher incomes were found to have higher scores on the sub-dimension of domestic violence of the DVAS defining domestic violence than those with lower incomes. However, the researchers found that there was no statistically significant difference between the normalization of domestic violence, the consequences of domestic violence and the acceptance of domestic violence sub-dimensions, as well as the total mean score of the DVAS and the economic status of

the participants. Başgöl, Özdemir, and Benli (2023) found that there was no significant difference between the variables regarding the participants' economic status and their awareness of domestic violence (p>0.05). As a result of this study, it was observed that participants with low-income levels scored higher than those with moderate income levels in terms of acceptance of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence.

It was found that married participants had a lower level of domestic violence awareness than those who were single in the study conducted by Ataman, Bozkurt, and Akdeniz (2022). In the study by Uyaroğlu et al. (2021), married participants scored higher on domestic violence awareness than single participants. Based on the results of study conducted by Başgöl, Özdemir, and Benli (2023), there was no significant relationship between participants' marital status and their awareness of domestic violence (p>0.05). According to this study, there was no significant difference in the dimensions of domestic violence awareness, total score, consequences of domestic violence, and acceptance of domestic violence based on marital status (p>.05). It was found, however, that married participants scored higher than single participants on the dimension of defining domestic violence. It was concluded from this point of view that married participants were able to provide the correct definition of domestic violence. A significant difference was found between the scores of single participants and those of married participants on the dimension of normalization of domestic violence. To put it another way, it was understood that single participants did not normalize domestic violence.

As a result of the study conducted by Başgöl, Özdemir, and Benli (2023), no significant differences were found between the participants' place of residence and their awareness of domestic violence (p>0.05). In the study conducted by Güzel and Camadan (2021), the domestic violence awareness levels of the participants living in rural areas (town/village) were determined to be higher than the participants residing in urban areas (district, province and metropolitan). In this study, when the domestic violence awareness levels of the participants were compared according to their place of residence, no significant differences were found in the total score and the dimensions of the consequences of domestic violence, acceptance of domestic violence, and normalization of domestic violence (p>.05). The scores of participants residing in the province, however, were higher than those residing in villages, towns, and districts in terms of defining domestic violence. It was determined from this perspective that participants living in the province were able to accurately define domestic violence.

In the study conducted by Güzel and Camadan (2021), the participants living in the Southeastern Anatolia Region were determined to have higher domestic violence awareness levels than the participants living in the Marmara Region. No significant difference was found in the total score in this study (p>.05). However, in the dimension of defining domestic violence, the scores of the participants living in Central Anatolia Region were reported to be higher than the scores of the participants living in Southeastern Anatolia Region. In the dimension of the consequences of domestic violence,

the scores of the participants living in the Mediterranean Region, Marmara Region, Black Sea Region, and Central Anatolia Region were higher than the scores of the participants living in the Southeastern Anatolia Region. In the dimensions of acceptance of domestic violence and normalization of domestic violence, the scores of the participants living in Eastern Anatolia Region were higher than the scores of the participants living in the Mediterranean Region, Aegean Region, Marmara Region, Black Sea Region, and Central Anatolia Region.

In the study conducted by Ataman, Bozkurt, and Akdeniz (2022), 37.9% of the participants were found to be victims of family violence. According to the results of this study, 22.1% of the participants had previously been exposed to violence. In the study conducted by Güzel and Camadan (2021), no statistically significant differences were found in the level of awareness of domestic violence of the participants in terms of witnessing violence previously. In this study, there was no significant difference in the total score or the dimensions of consequences of domestic violence, acceptance of domestic violence, and normalization of domestic violence (p>.05). However, when it comes to the dimension of defining domestic violence, the score of participants who were exposed to violence was higher than that of participants who were not exposed to violence. As a result, it was possible to conclude that participants who had previously been exposed to violence were able to define domestic violence appropriately.

Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that the level of awareness of domestic violence differed significantly by gender and employment status of the participant group. According to our analysis, the similar results observed in studies on domestic violence awareness in the literature and those which did not overlap with this study were the result of the fact that different numbers and sample groups were used to conduct the studies.

In order for social peace to be achieved, it is believed that the prevention of violence in the family, which is the most basic building block of society, must be addressed. As a result, it has been concluded that in order to eliminate domestic violence, first and foremost, society must become aware of domestic violence behaviors, their consequences, and the institutions and organizations that can provide them with assistance if they experience domestic violence. In this respect, public trainings are a crucial component of awareness-raising activities regarding domestic violence. Training on this subject should be offered within the scope of premarital counseling services in formal and non-formal education institutions, as well as in Community Health Centers, and more public service announcements should be made. Regardless of the factor that causes domestic violence to occur, the individual who is a victim of violence should not have to accept and normalize the violence they are exposed to. It is the duty of the state to ensure the protection of individuals from violence and to protect victims of violence. In this context, it is recommended that more women's guesthouses and shelters be established and the qualifications of staff working in institutions providing services to combat violence be increased.

The future study should investigate the level of awareness of domestic violence among employees of institutions and organizations (health institutions, police, gendarmeries, courthouses, etc.) by including the empathy level variable in the process where individuals experiencing domestic violence first apply and then receive services related to their experiences.

REFERENCES

Ataman, H., Bozkurt, A. & Akdeniz, C. Ö. (2022). Kadınların aile içinde yaşanan şiddete ilişkin farkındalık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Sürekli Tıp Eğitimi Dergisi*, 31(5), 337-348. DOI: 10.17942/sted.1149434

Aydin, Ş. & Parlak, A. G. (2022). Sağlık Hizmetleri Meslek Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Aile İçi Şiddet Farkındalığı ve Etkileyen Faktörler: Tanımlayıcı Kesitsel Araştırma. Turkiye Klinikleri Journal of Nursing Sciences, 14(2). DOI: 10.5336/nurses.2021-84294

Başgöl, Ş., Özdemir, N. G. D. & Benli, C. K. (2023). Hemşirelik Öğrencilerinin Aile İçi Şiddet Farkındalıklarının Flört Şiddetine Etkisi. *Sürekli Tıp Eğitimi Dergisi*, 32(1), 27-36. DOI: 10.17942/sted.1181179

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı: İstatistik, Araştırma Deseni, SPSS Uygulamaları ve Yorum. (12. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Deleş, B. & Kaytez, N. (2021). Çocuk Gelişimci Adaylarının Aile İçi Şiddet ve Çocuk Haklarına İlişkin Farkındalık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. Iğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, (26), 325-347. Retrieved May 5, 2024, from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/2154598

George, D. & Mallery, M. (2010). SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference. Boston: Pearson.

Güzel, B. & Camadan, F. (2021). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Aile İçi Şiddet Farkindaliğinin Açiklanmasinda Aktif Yurttaşlik Öz-Yeterlik Algisi ve Çeşitli Demografik Değişkenlerin Rolü. *İmgelem*, 5(9), 479-505. https://doi.org/10.53791/imgelem.997515

Han Almış, B., Koyuncu Kütük, E., Gümüştaş, F. & Çelik, M. (2018). Kadınlarda Ev İçi Şiddet İçin Risk Faktörleri ve Ev İçi Şiddete Uğrayan Kadınlarda Ruhsal Bozulmanın Belirleyicileri. *Nöropsikiyatri Arşivi*, 55(1), 67-72. https://doi.org/10.29399/npa.19355

Harcar, T., Çakır, Ö., Sürgevil, O. & Budak, G. (2008). Kadına Yönelik Şiddet ve Türkiye'de KadınaYönelik Şiddetin Durumu. Toplum ve Demokrasi, 2 (4), Eylül-Aralık, 2008, s. 51-70. Retrieved May 5, 2024, from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/210969

Kul, S. (2014). Uygun İstatistiksel Test Seçim Kılavuzu/Guideline for Suitable Statistical Test Selection. *Plevra Bülteni*, 8(2), 26-29. DOI:10.5152/pb.2014.08

Kurtuldu, Ö. R. (2018). Toplumsal Cinsiyet Eşitsizliği ve Kadına Karşı Aile İçi Şiddetle Mücadele Kampanyaları; Sabancı Vakfı "İş Dünyası Aile İçi Şiddete Karşı" Projesi Analizi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Kadın ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(2), 97-110. DOI: 10.26695/mukatcad.2018.20

Moore, A.M., Frohwirth, L. & Miller, E. (2010). "Male Reproductive Control of Women who Have Experienced Intimate Partner Violence in The United States". *Social Science & Medicine*, 70 (11), 1737-1744. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.02.009

Özyürek, A. & Kurnaz, F. B. (2019). Aile İçi Şiddet Farkındalığı Ölçeği: Güvenirlik ve Geçerlik Çalışması. *Kalem Uluslararası Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9 (1) 227-250. DOI: 10.23863/kalem.201.126

Özyürek, A., Kurnaz, F.B. & Çetin, A. (2018). The Level of Prediction of Domestic Vıolence Awareness by Certain Demographics. *Uluslararası Medeniyet Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 3(2), 47-60. DOI: 10.26899/inciss.200

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using Multivariate Statistics. (6th Edition). Boston: Pearson.

TÜİK. (2023). Retrieved May 5, 2024, from https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Kategori/GetKategori?p=Nufus-ve-Demografi-109

Research on Domestic Violence Against Women (2014). Türkiye'de Kadına Yönelik Aile İçi Şiddet Araştırması. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü, T.C. Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı Kadının Statüsü Genel Müdürlüğü, Özet Rapor, Aralık 2014, Ankara. Retrieved April 13, 2024, from https://aihmiz.org.tr/aktarimlar/dosyalar/1428409374.pdf

Ulutaş Keskinkılıç, A., Coşanay Güley, B., Emre, O. & Kayıkçı, M. (2021). Annelerin Aile İçi Şiddet Farkındalıklarının Belirlenmesi. 5. Uluslararası Farklı Şiddet Boyutları ve Toplumsal Algı Kongresi, 23-26 Şubat 2021. Ss: 104-115.

Uyaroğlu, A. K., Lok, N. & Lok, S. (2021). Evaluation of a Sports Center Registered to Individuals of Domestic Violence Awareness. *Science, Movement and Health*, 21(1), 10-14.

Weaalen J. Goodwin M. Spitz A. Petersen R. & Saltzman L. (2000). Screening for intimate partner violence by health care providers. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*; 19(4):230-237. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(00)00229-4

WHO (2002). World Health Organization, World Report on Violence and Health. Geneva. Retrieved April 12, 2023, from http://www5.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/download.cfm?id=0000000582

WHO (2021). Retrieved April 12, 2023, from https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/violence-against-women

Yalçıntaş, M. (2019). Fen Bilimleri Öğretiminde Kuantum Öğrenme Modeli Kullanmanın İlkokul Dördüncü Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Akademik Merak, Kaygı, Özyeterlik ve Başarı Düzeylerine Etkisi (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

YSK (2023). Retrieved April 12, 2023, from https://www.ysk.gov.tr/doc/karar/dosya/82585/2023-225.pdf