

Summary

Justification of Violence and Male Dominance Scale: Reliability and Validity Study

Sebil Ayrall¹

Inje University

Eda Karacan

Ufuk University

Today it is possible to encounter inequality or injustice in many areas. Although being a *woman* in many societies corresponds to positive attributions, especially within the framework of gender-based stereotypes such as kind, loving, empathetic, compassionate, it puts women in a disadvantageous position in terms of competence (Jost & Kay, 2005). However, it is seen that those who suffer from inequality due to being in a disadvantaged position, often accept this situation and justify the current system. In this direction, the concept of justifying the system has been put forward to explain the reasons why the individual accepts the system despite the negative consequences of social systems (Jost & Banaji, 1994).

Basically, according to the System Justification Theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994) people tend to maintain the current system and this happens regardless of the hierarchical position of the group to which s/he belongs. The justification of the system creates the belief that the existing political, economic, and social order is fair. It satisfies the need to be precise, correct and feel secure (Jost & Hunyady, 2005). It ensures the internalization of inequalities, the reduction of contradiction and the rationalization of the status quo (Jost & Hunyady, 2002). In many studies conducted in the literature using the System Justification Theory, it is seen that the level of perception of the justification of the system also varies depending on gender and age. Accordingly, it is stated that women's level of justification perception of the system is lower than men (Koskos Gürel, 2019; Yıldırım & Akgün, 2013) and the perception of justifying the system increases with increasing age (Koskos Gürel, 2019).

According to studies on intimate partner violence, cases such as emotional abuse, isolation, threats, intimidation, contempt, and physical abuse perpetrated by men against women are basically the ability to have control over women (Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003) and to influence women with this control impulse. It is the aim of establishing dominance on women (Hearn,

1998). In Turkey, under the name of honor culture, it is perceived that the main duty of men is to protect the honor of the family, that is, to control the sexual behavior of women (Sakallı Uğurlu & Akbaş Uslu, 2013). When the opposite situation arises, the man undertakes the duty of protecting the honor of the family by taking the necessary actions, and because of this situation, women blame herself for the violence of the man against her and defends the perception that the situation is justifiable (Efe & Ayaz, 2010). In addition, it is stated that women exhibit positive attitudes towards being protected by men in such situations (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2008). Işık (2008), who deals with violence against women within the framework of the system justification theory, shows that there is a positive relationship between the scores of violence against women to protect honor and the scores of justifying the economic system. In addition, male participants were found to have higher scores for seeing violence against women as justifiable than female participants.

Although there are Turkish adaptations of scales that measure justification, such as the Justification the Economic System Scale (Jost & Thompson, 2000) and Justification the Gender-Based System Scale (Jost & Kay, 2005), no scale that directly measures the justification of violence has been encountered in our country. It has been observed that there is no specific measurement tool in our country regarding the violence perpetrated by men, especially in intimate partner relationships, and the belief that violence used for the solution of the problems in relationships. Considering the increase and effects of violence against women in our country in recent years, the importance of addressing this issue has increased. For this reason, the main purpose of this study is to adapt the Justification of Violence and Male Dominance Scale (Diaz-Aguado & Martinez, 2015) into Turkish and to examine the psychometric properties of this scale on women and men who are in romantic relationships.

Methods

Participants and Procedure

In the current study, data were collected from individuals between the ages of 18 to 35 and who have been in a relationship for at least one year. For this purpose, a total of 573 participants, 375 women (65.4%) and 198 men (34.6%) were selected through convenient sampling.

The Justification of Violence and Male Dominance (SEEM) Scale was developed by Diaz-Aguado and Martinez (2015). It measures male dominance and violence by men against women in intimate partner relationships. The scale consists of 10 items with a 4-point Likert type (0 = Strongly Disagree, 3 = Strongly Agree). Scale includes statements such as 'If a woman has been abused by her partner, she must have done something to provoke him.' It consists of 2 factors. While seven items in the scale measure *male dominance and intimate partner violence by men against women*, other three items measure *justification of violence used in problem solving*. In the validity and reliability study of the scale, the Cronbach's Alpha of internal consistency coefficient was found to be .76 for male dominance and intimate partner violence by men against women, and .77 for justification of violence (Diaz-Aguado & Martinez, 2015). The scale was translated into Turkish by the authors using the standard translation-re-translation method.

Alongside the SEEM scale, Dating Violence Attitude Scale (Terzioğlu et al., 2016), The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus et al., 1996), Ambivalent Sexism Scale (Glick & Fiske, 1996) and demographic information form were also applied. Participation in the study was voluntary basis. Before the application, the participants were informed about the purpose of the research and the scales in line with the Informed Consent Form. The scales were administered online to the participants in a single session.

Results

Firstly, factor analysis was performed on 10 items of the scale using the Varimax method. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value (.88) showed that the data was suitable for factor analysis. The factor number decision was made by examining the eigenvalues, the explained variance ratio, the reliability values, and the graphic distribution of the eigenvalues. Without any limitation of the number of factors, the first factor analysis results in 2 factors. The first factor explained 47% of the total variance whereas second factor explained 10% of the total variance. Since the first component explained more variance in total, and the Cattell's scree test was examined.

As a result, it was decided to keep the single component for further analysis. The one-component solution explained 47.1% of the total variance. It is seen that the lowest factor load is .59 and the highest factor load is .76. The Cronbach's Alpha of internal consistency coefficient of the only factor found as .76.

The single factor structure of the scale was tested using the AMOS 26 program. Considering the modification suggestions, the model fit was achieved when the covariance was created between the items. According to the results obtained, the measurement model was found to be acceptable both for female samples [$\chi^2(32, n = 375) = 120.40, p < .000, GFI = .94, AIC = 166.40, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .08$] and for male samples [$\chi^2(33, n = 198) = 95.81, p < .000, GFI = .91, AIC = 139.81, CFI = .90, RMSEA = .09$].

Conclusion

The purpose of the present study was to investigate reliability and validity of Turkish version of Justification of Violence and Male Dominance Scale (Diaz-Aguado & Martinez, 2015). The scale measures male dominance in intimate partner relationships of adults, the violence committed by men, and the justification level of violence. The findings of the study showed that the Turkish version of the scale was valid and reliable. As a result of the reliability analysis, Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as .86 for the whole sample, .84 for the female sample, and .87 for the male sample.

Item-total correlation analysis were conducted to determine the reliability of the scale. A significant correlation was determined between each item score with the scale total. The two-half reliability of the scale was also examined. In addition, as a proof of the validity of the scale, the significance of the gender differences in the scores was examined. The results were consistent with the relevant literature (Koskos Gürel, 2019; Yıldırım & Akgün, 2013). The level of justification of male dominance was lower in female participants than in male participants.

To support the criterion-related validity of the scale, the relationships between the justification of male dominance with the attitudes towards dating violence, ambivalent sexism and dating violence behavior levels were examined separately in male and female samples. According to the results, the justification of male dominance in both female and male samples had a positive and significant relationship with all variables. Thus, it was concluded that the criterion-related validity test results of the scale were consistent with the relevant literature (eg., Chapleau & Oswald, 2014; Işık, 2008; Sakallı Uğurlu & Akbaş Uslu, 2013).

Gender-related differences in justification of male dominance was consistent with the literature (eg., Ercan, 2009; Işık, 2008; Koskos Gürel, 2019; Kray et al., 2017; Martini & de Piccoli, 2020; Yıldırım & Akgün, 2013). It was observed that the level of justification of male dominance was higher in male participants than female participants. According to the system justification theory, society places men and women on different levels hierarchically (Jost & Banaji, 1994). For men, they see the current system as just and fair by internalizing themselves with masculine features. They identify with their own group under the direction of the ego, group, and system. For women, this is different. They renounce ego and group impulses to meet the impulses of the system. The masculine characteristics taught by the system are in any case more valuable and superior to the feminine characteristics. This superiority causes women to perceive the system as justified (Kray et al., 2017). As a result, a cycle occurs in which both gender groups justify the system and make it fair. However, with the influence of institutions, organizations, and media that defend women's rights, which have increased in intensity in recent years, the perception of women in current system is believed as wrong day by day. This may explain why the level of justification of male dominance is lower in women than in men.