

Relationship between health science students' gender-related attitudes and perception of honor

Anahit Margirit Coşkun¹  | Yeliz Varışoğlu²  | Nebahat Koca Çavdar³  |
Leman Kutlu⁴ 

¹Department of Midwifery, Faculty of Health Sciences, Haliç University, Istanbul, Turkey

²Department of Nursing, Faculty of Health Sciences, Istanbul Medipol University, Istanbul, Turkey

³Institute of Health Science, Bezmialem Vakıf University, Istanbul, Turkey

⁴Department of Nursing, Faculty of Health Science, Atlas University, Istanbul, Turkey

Correspondence

Yeliz Varışoğlu, Department of Nursing, Faculty of Health Sciences, Istanbul Medipol University, 19 Kavacak, Istanbul 34810, Turkey.

Email: yvarisoglu@medipol.edu.tr and yeliz_turhal@hotmail.com

Abstract

Purposes: This study aimed to determine the perceptions of gender and honor of students ($n = 427$) in various health science faculties and the relationship between those perceptions.

Design and Methods: An introductory information form, the Gender Roles Attitude Scale (GRAS), and the Attitude Scale for Women-Related Conception of "Honor" (ASWRCH) were used as data collection tools.

Findings: The students' average scores on GRAS and ASWRCH were 159.7 ± 23.1 and 104.1 ± 15.5 , respectively, demonstrating that students had an egalitarian attitude and perception of honor.

Conclusions: Students from health science faculties, trained to provide service for healthy/sick individuals, were found to have strong egalitarian attitudes in terms of gender and perception of honor.

Practice Implications: Raising health sciences students, with an egalitarian approach in terms of gender and honor perception will enable them to adopt an egalitarian attitude in their personal and professional lives and to become agents of change in initiating and sustaining social change.

KEYWORDS

egalitarianism, gender, perception of honor, Turkish students

1 | INTRODUCTION

Gender refers to the socially constructed roles and responsibilities of men and women. It is a concept associated with how society, as men and women, sees us, perceives us, and how it considers and expects us to behave.¹ Gender-typical patterns of femininity and masculinity are learned within the social structure starting from childhood. This process, which is learned within the family, remains throughout schooling, professional and social life, and all social relationships and shapes individuals' lives. Patriarchal or traditional society expects women to act according to general customs and traditions and to lead a more passive life while giving an active role to men. This perception brings along a range of human rights violations and

violence against women, restricting their lives and allowing them to live an unhealthy life. Intensity of violence may even lead to honor killings.²⁻⁴

The perception and interpretation of the concept of honor varies from culture to culture.⁵ In Turkey, it may be interpreted as "dignity" while it is also used to refer to "female chastity." The fact that honor has been reduced to female body and sexuality is creating a basis for potential problems: women's movements are restricted and limited, they are prevented from expressing themselves, their lives are suppressed, their health is negatively affected, and their right to live is taken away, particularly in traditional patriarchal structures.^{6,7}

There is a gender-based distinction between men's and women's perception of honor in developing countries similar to

Turkey. The concept of honor defines women within the frame of “shame” while defining men within the frame of “dignity.” Men interpret the concept of honor as being honest, trustworthy and protecting one’s family, especially women, while women perceive it as a responsibility for protecting their sexual innocence. The honor of an unmarried woman is identified with her virginity. In this context, women are tasked with protecting men’s dignity by restricting their own sexual involvement, while men are responsible for protecting and overseeing women’s sexual purity by resorting to violence or other coercion.⁸ Consequently, in another respect, honor as a phenomenon may also be interpreted as a reflection of gender inequality.⁹

In rural areas of Turkey and in areas where especially traditional structures predominate, the role of women may be considered related to household chores and childcare, in parallel with their traditional gender roles.¹⁰

The reflections of gender inequality, experienced in multiple extensions around the world, is still discussed in different areas, such as social life, marriage and family life, roles, professional life, education status, politics and decision-making, and health service benefits.¹¹ All segments of society, including professional organizations, nongovernmental organizations, young and dynamic populations, and governments, have a great responsibility in preventing this inequality. Throughout history, the contributions of civil society organizations and young populations to social changes have been enormous. Training health science students, who are expected to provide service for healthy/sick individuals, with an egalitarian approach in terms of gender and perception of honor will help them demonstrate egalitarian attitudes in their personal and professional lives and become an agent of change in initiating and maintaining social change.

The literature indicates there is still an insufficient number of scientific studies on this subject in Turkey. Social value judgments and taboos may prevent such studies to be conducted with university students to some extent and also limit the degree of voluntary participation. It is important for university administrations and academics in institutions providing higher education to raise awareness about the subject, plan and conduct studies, and share results. This study was conducted to determine the relationship between gender-related attitudes and perception of honor of students at different departments of health sciences faculties (HSF) in Istanbul, Turkey.

In the study, answers were sought to the following questions: Specific to students of health science faculties:

- (1) What is the level of their attitude toward gender roles?
- (2) Is there any difference between gender-related attitudes based on their demographic characteristics?
- (3) What is the level of their perception of honor?
- (4) Is there any difference between perception of honor based on their demographic characteristics?
- (5) Is there a relationship between their attitudes towards gender roles and perception of honor?

2 | METHODS

This descriptive correlational research study aimed to determine gender-related attitudes and perception of honor of students studying in different departments of 10 HSF in Istanbul, Turkey and any relationships between the two.

2.1 | Study sample

The sample comprised 4178 second-year undergraduate students in the all departments (nursing, midwifery, nutrition dietetics, physiotherapy, management of health) faculty of health sciences of 10 universities (three state and seven foundation) in Istanbul, Turkey from which research permission was obtained.

Reasons for inclusion of second-year students from all departments of the health sciences faculty they have been adapted to the university environment, neutrality among students is ensured since an elective course in gender studies is offered for those above the second year in some of the relevant faculties.

The sample size was determined using a sample calculation formula, and a minimum of 352 students were needed to be included. The sample population of the study was calculated with the known sample formula ($n = N \cdot t_{2,p,q} / d^2(N - 1) + t_{2,p,q}$; $n = 4178 \times (1.96)^2 \times 0.50 \times 0.50 / (0.05)^2 \times (4177 - 1) + (1.96)^2 \times 0.50 \times 0.50 = 351.88$). Proportioning was set to a degree representing the sample size of students ($p = 0.05$). Through probability sampling, the sample of the study comprised a total of 437 students agreeing to participate. This number is 17.56% higher than the number of samples determined in the study (75 students more) and includes an increase of seven to eight students from each faculty. Because 10 students inadequately filled out the questionnaires and were excluded, the study was conducted with a total of 427 students.

3 | INCLUSION CRITERIA

- Being a student at a faculty of health sciences in Istanbul,
- Being a second-year student,
- Being able to speak and understand Turkish,
- Volunteering to participate in the study.

3.1 | Data collection tools

3.1.1 | Introductory information form

Sociodemographic characteristics of the individuals participating in the study were obtained by the researchers using a questionnaire including a total of 14 questions prepared in light of the literature.^{6,12} The information form and scales were completed in social areas, such as classrooms and canteens, during after-class hours between September 2017 and May 2018 after students' informed consent was received.

3.1.2 | Gender roles attitude scale (GRAS)

This 5-point Likert scale was developed by Zeyneloğlu, Terzioğlu,⁴ to determine the attitudes of university students regarding gender roles. It contains 38 items and 5 subscales. The scale consists of the 8-item subscales “egalitarian gender role,” “female gender role,” “gender role in marriage,” and “traditional gender role” and the 6-item subscale “male gender role.” The lowest possible score is 38 and the highest possible score is 190. A high score obtained from the scale indicates that the student has an “egalitarian attitude” toward gender roles, and a low score indicates that the student has a “traditional attitude.”

3.1.3 | Attitude scale for women-related conception of “Honor” (ASWRCH)

This 5-point Likert scale was developed by Gürsoy in 2014 to examine the attitudes of young people aged 18–24 toward women-related perception of “honor.” It consists of three subscales and a total of 25 items: the first subscale (9 items) includes questions about the traditional perception of honor, the second (11 items) includes questions about the egalitarian approach, and the third (5 items) includes questions about premarital sexual practice/perception of honor. The highest possible score is 125 and the lowest possible score is 25. Accordingly, students receiving scores between 25 and 50 for the overall scale have a traditional and gender discriminatory attitude regarding women-related “perception of honor,” those receiving scores between 51 and 75 have an undecided attitude, and those receiving scores between 76 and 125 have an egalitarian attitude.¹³

3.2 | Ethical issues

The research protocol was approved by an University in Turkey Ethics Committee on 24.04.2017. (Decision No: 36). The deans of the health science faculties were informed in writing about the subject, purpose, and method of the study, and permission was obtained. Written consent was obtained from each student who voluntarily participated in the study.

3.3 | Data analysis

Data were evaluated using IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Statistics Version 24 package program. Kolmogorov–Smirnov and Shapiro–Wilk tests, skewness, kurtosis, and histogram graphs were used for evaluating normal distribution of dependent variables; frequency distribution of descriptive statistical analysis and percentage were used for evaluating sociodemographic characteristics; average, median, *SD*, minimum and maximum were used for scale assessment; the Kruskal–Wallis test was used for comparing scales based on

sociodemographic characteristics; LSD test and Mann–Whitney *U* test were used for further analysis, and Spearman's correlation tests were used to evaluate the relationship between the scale scores. The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$.

4 | RESULTS

The average age of the students was 20.70 (min = 18, max = 28, median = 20.0), 65.6% were female, 52.5% graduated from an Anatolian (foreign language) high school, 68.5% lived in the Marmara region for the longest period, 77.5% were living in a nuclear family, mothers of 12.2% and fathers of 23.4% graduated from a university and held higher degrees (Table 1).

When total scores and subscale scores of GRAS were evaluated, students were found to have an “egalitarian attitude.” The “male gender role” subscale, including attitude propositions such as “a man should decide how to spend the household income,” “a man should beat his wife when necessary,” and “a man should marry a woman younger than him,” was found to have the lowest average score (\bar{x} : 25.6 ± 4.3 ; *M*: 26.0), while the “gender role in marriage” subscale, including attitude propositions as “whatever a man says should be done in the household,” “in a marriage, only women are responsible for preventing an unintended pregnancy,” and “it is normal for a man to cheat on his wife,” had the highest average score (\bar{x} : 36.1 ± 5.2 ; *M*: 38.0) (Table 2).

Students were found to have an egalitarian perception of honor according to the overall average score of ASWRCH. When the scores obtained from the subscales of ASWRCH were examined, it was found that the “premarital sexual practice/perception of honor” subscale, including statements as “a decent woman should not have sexual intercourse before marriage” and “virginity is a symbol of a woman's honor,” had the lowest score, while the “egalitarian attitude” subscale, including “women are under heavy pressure because of honor” and “the honor of a woman who dresses as they wish should not be questioned,” had the highest score (Table 3).

When the relationship between the overall and subscale scores of GRAS and ASWRCH were examined (Table 4), it was found that there was a strong positive correlation between GRAS's “female gender role” and “male gender role” subscale scores and ASWRCH's overall score and “traditional perception of honor” and “egalitarian perception of honor” subscale scores, which was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). There was also a strong positive correlation between GRAS's total score and subscale scores and ASWRCH's total score and subscale scores, which was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

The comparison of students' sociodemographic characteristics and GRAS and its subscales are shown in Table 5. The type of high school that students attended, type of family, region where they lived, level of education of mother, and gender of sibling(s) were all found to affect GRAS scores.

A statistically significant difference was found between the overall scores of GRAS according to the type of high school they

TABLE 1 Students' introductory characteristics (N*: 427)

Sociodemographic characteristics of students			Sociodemographic characteristics of students		
	N	%		N	%
Gender (N: 427)			Family type (N: 418)		
Female	280	65.6	Nuclear family	331	79.2
Male	147	34.4	Extended family	83	19.8
			Nonnuclear family	4	1.0
Type of university (N: 427)			Place of longest residence (N: 421)		
State	123	28.8	Village	18	4.2
Foundation	304	71.2	Town	25	5.9
			City	176	41.2
			Metropolis	208	48.7
Completed high school (N: 426)			Economic status (N: 367)		
Health high school	17	4.0	Less than income	157	42.8
High school	98	23.0	Equal to income and expenditure	181	49.3
Foreign language high school	224	52.6	Income higher than expenditure	29	7.9
Science high school	15	3.5	Number of siblings (N: 418)		
Religious education high school	19	4.5	No sibling	35	8.4
Private high school	53	12.4	1–2 siblings	264	63.2
Region of longest residence (N: 414)			3 or more		
Marmara region	284	68.5	Siblings' gender (N: 418)		
Aegean region	23	5.6	No sibling	35	8.3
Central anatolian region	13	3.2	Only sisters	99	23.7
Eastern anatolian region	11	2.7	Only brothers	92	22.0
Southeastern anatolian region	16	3.9	Both sister and brother	104	24.8
Black sea region	30	7.2	No response	89	21.2
Mediterranean region	37	8.9			
Mother's education level (N: 425)			Father's education level (N: 426)		
Primary school	199	46.8	Primary school	119	27.9
Secondary school	78	18.4	Secondary school	82	19.3
High school	96	22.6	High school	125	29.3
University or higher	52	12.2	University or higher	100	23.5
Mother's working status (N: 424)			Father's working status (N: 422)		
Employed	116	27.4	Employed	299	70.9
Unemployed	283	66.7	Unemployed	17	4.0
Retired	25	5.9	Retired	106	25.1

Note: *The number of "N" may be different because the answers to some questions were left blank.

TABLE 2 Students' overall and subscale mean/median scores for GRAS (N = 427)

GRAS subscales	Min.	Max.	σ	$\bar{x} \pm SD$
Egalitarian Gender Role	8.0	40.0	38.0	35.6 \pm 5.6
Female Gender Role	8.0	40.0	32.0	31.2 \pm 6.1
Gender Role in Marriage	8.0	40.0	38.0	36.1 \pm 5.2
Traditional Gender Role	8.0	40.0	32.0	31.2 \pm 6.1
Male Gender Role	6.0	30.0	26.0	25.6 \pm 4.3
Total GRAS	38	190	164	159.7 \pm 23.1

Abbreviation: GRAS, Gender Roles Attitude Scale.

TABLE 3 Students' overall and subscale mean/median scores for ASWRCH (N = 427)

ASWRCH subscales	Min.	Max.	σ	$\bar{x} \pm SD$
Traditional Sense of Honor	12.0	45.0	41.0	38.2 \pm 7.1
Egalitarian Sense of Honor	14.0	55.0	51.0	49.2 \pm 5.8
Premarital Sense of Honor	5.0	25.0	16.0	16.7 \pm 5.4
Total ASWRCH	57.0	125.0	107.0	104.1 \pm 15.5

Abbreviation: ASWRCH, Attitude Scale for Women-Related Conception of "Honor".

attended (KW: 25.836 $p = 0.000$). It was found that those who obtained the highest GRAS scores graduated from a science high schools and private high schools, respectively, while those obtaining the lowest scores graduated from religious education high schools

and health high schools, respectively (Table 5). Students who graduated from science high schools and private high schools were shown to have a more egalitarian approach than those graduating from religious vocation high schools or health vocation high schools.

When the relationship between students' sociodemographic characteristics and GRAS scores were examined, the type of high school, type of family, region where they lived, mother's level of education, father's level of education, and gender of the sibling(s) were found to statistically significantly affect average scores.

When type of high school and overall ASWRCH and subscale scores were examined, type of high school was found to affect perception of honor. Students who graduated from a private high school or a science high school were found to have a more egalitarian perception of honor than those graduating from a religious vocation high school or health vocation high school (Table 6).

5 | DISCUSSION

It was found that gender attitudes of students influence their perception of honor. The overall GRAS and subscale scores indicated that they showed an "egalitarian attitude." The lowest score obtained from the scale was from the "male gender role" subscale, including propositions as "a man should decide how to spend the household income," "a man should beat his wife when necessary" and "a man should marry a woman younger than himself." Similar to our study, in a study by Köken Durgun and Cambaz Ulaş,¹⁴ conducted with mid-wifery and nursing students using GRAS, it was found that although students had an "egalitarian attitude," the lowest score obtained

GRAS subscales	ASWRCH subscales		Total scale score	
	Traditional perception of honor	Egalitarian perception of honor	Premarital sexual practice/perception of honor	Total scale score
Female Gender Role	$r: 0.660$	$r: 0.583$	$r: 0.685$	$r: 0.763$
	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.145$	$p: 0.000$
Male Gender Role	$r: 0.491$	$r: 0.427$	$r: 0.333$	$r: 0.503$
	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.702$	$p: 0.000$
Egalitarian Gender Role	$r: 0.474$	$r: 0.464$	$r: 0.235$	$r: 0.475$
	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$
Traditional Gender Role	$r: 0.615$	$r: 0.529$	$r: 0.533$	$r: 0.668$
	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$
Gender Role in Marriage	$r: 0.544$	$r: 0.414$	$r: 0.287$	$r: 0.516$
	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$
Total Scale Score	$r: 0.667$	$r: 0.581$	$r: 0.506$	$r: 0.702$
	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$	$p: 0.000$

Abbreviations: ASWRCH, Attitude Scale for Women-Related Conception of "Honor"; GRAS, Gender Roles Attitude Scale.

TABLE 4 Relationship between overall and subscale scores of GRAS and ASWRCH

TABLE 5 Comparison of sociodemographic characteristics and GRAS Scores

GRAS subscales	Female Gender Role		Male Gender Role		Egalitarian Gender Role		Traditional Gender Role		Gender Role in Marriage		Total GRAS	
	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M
Gender (425)	31.2 ± 6.1	320	25.6 ± 4.3	260	35.6 ± 5.7	380	31.2 ± 6.1	320	36.1 ± 5.2	380	159.7 ± 23.1	1640
Female (279)	32.5 ± 5.7	330	26.4 ± 3.9	270	36.7 ± 4.8	380	32.6 ± 5.7	330	37.3 ± 4.3	390	165.5 ± 20.2	1690
Male (146)	28.8 ± 6.1	290	24.3 ± 4.8	250	33.5 ± 6.6	350	28.4 ± 5.9	290	33.7 ± 5.9	350	148.7 ± 24.2	1500
	U: 12927.0 p: 0.000		U: 14869.5 p: 0.000		U: 13745.5 p: 0.000		U: 12152.5 p: 0.00		U: 11232.0 p: 0.000		U: 11486.0 p: 0.000	
Completed high school (426)	31.2 ± 6.1	320	25.7 ± 4.3	260	35.6 ± 5.6	380	31.2 ± 6.1	320	36.1 ± 5.2	380	159.8 ± 23.1	1640
Health high school (17)	29.4 ± 3.7	300	23.4 ± 3.4	230	34.2 ± 4.5	350	27.1 ± 4.8	280	33.8 ± 5.4	380	147.9 ± 17.0	1460
High school (98)	30.7 ± 5.4	310	25.1 ± 3.9	250	35.9 ± 5.2	380	30.9 ± 5.2	310	36.2 ± 5.4	380	159.1 ± 18.3	158.1
Anatolian (foreign language) high school (224)	31.7 ± 6.2	330	26.1 ± 4.4	270	35.6 ± 5.9	380	31.6 ± 6.2	330	36.6 ± 5.5	400	161.2 ± 24.0	1670
Science high school (15)	32.6 ± 6.9	350	27.3 ± 2.5	280	35.4 ± 7.8	400	32.8 ± 6.5	340	33.4 ± 7.9	360	164.7 ± 27.8	1780
Religious education high school (19)	27.4 ± 7.2	300	21.5 ± 5.0	220	33.9 ± 7.3	350	27.6 ± 7.4	290	36.6 ± 4.8	390	143.8 ± 31.4	1490
Private high school (53)	31.9 ± 6.4	320	26.7 ± 3.7	260	36.3 ± 4.3	380	31.8 ± 5.9	320	36.1 ± 5.2	380	163.4 ± 20.9	1670
	KW: 14,031 p: 0.015		KW: 38,644 p: 0.000		KW: 7,669 p: 0.175		KW: 19,020 p: 0.002		KW: 14,040 p: 0.011		KW: 22,591 p: 0.000	
Family type (427)	31.2 ± 6.1	320	25.7 ± 4.3	260	35.7 ± 5.6	380	31.2 ± 6.1	320	36.1 ± 5.2	380	159.8 ± 22.9	1640
Nuclear family (328)	31.7 ± 5.9	330	25.7 ± 4.4	260	35.9 ± 5.6	380	31.5 ± 5.9	320	36.3 ± 5.2	380	161.2 ± 22.9	1660
Extended family (83)	29.7 ± 6.0	300	25.4 ± 3.8	260	34.8 ± 5.2	360	30.1 ± 6.3	300	35.6 ± 5.0	370	155.7 ± 21.5	1570
Nonnuclear family (6)	24.7 ± 8.3	21 May	23.5 ± 2.6	230	26.0 ± 7.8	270	26.0 ± 4.8	270	28.2 ± 6.1	280	128.5 ± 23.9	130.5
	KW: 10,827 p: 0.004		KW: 3,772 p: 0.152		KW: 15,040 p: 0.001		KW: 6,082 p: 0.032		KW: 8,004 p: 0.012		KW: 11,937 p: 0.003	
Region of residence (414)	31.3 ± 6.1	320	25.7 ± 4.3	260	35.7 ± 5.6	380	31.2 ± 6.1	320	36.1 ± 5.2	380	159.8 ± 23.1	1640
Marmara region (284)	31.5 ± 5.9	320	25.7 ± 4.5	270	35.9 ± 5.6	380	31.5 ± 5.9	320	36.3 ± 5.4	380	160.9 ± 23.4	1650
Aegean region (23)	31.4 ± 7.1	330	25.7 ± 4.8	270	36.1 ± 3.5	360	29.7 ± 7.1	310	36.0 ± 4.2	360	158.9 ± 23.9	1630
Central Anatolian region (13)	32.1 ± 6.2	340	25.8 ± 3.0	260	35.5 ± 6.7	380	30.2 ± 5.8	310	36.6 ± 4.1	380	160.2 ± 20.3	1650
Eastern Anatolian region (11)	27.6 ± 5.7	260	24.5 ± 4.1	240	31.9 ± 7.2	330	27.6 ± 6.7	270	30.5 ± 6.6	310	142.0 ± 23.6	1320
Southeastern Anatolian region (16)	28.4 ± 7.6	300	25.2 ± 3.5	250	34.2 ± 5.6	350	28.4 ± 6.8	280	35.1 ± 4.1	35.5	151.4 ± 23.6	1510
Black Sea region (30)	30.7 ± 5.2	310	25.5 ± 3.7	260	36.0 ± 5.6	390	30.9 ± 4.7	31.5	35.9 ± 4.5	37.5	159.1 ± 18.3	162.5
Mediterranean region (37)	31.9 ± 6.5	340	26.2 ± 3.9	260	34.7 ± 6.1	360	32.2 ± 6.7	330	36.4 ± 4.4	380	161.4 ± 22.6	1720
	KW: 11,424 p: 0.076		KW: 3,909 p: 0.689		KW: 6,843 p: 0.336		KW: 13,927 p: 0.030		KW: 17,066 p: 0.009		KW: 10,926 p: 0.091	

(Continues)

TABLE 5 (Continued)

GRAS subscales	Female Gender Role		Male Gender Role		Egalitarian Gender Role		Traditional Gender Role		Gender Role in Marriage		Total GRAS	
	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M
Students' characteristics												
Mother's education level (425)	31.2 ± 6.1	32.0	25.7 ± 4.3	26.0	35.6 ± 5.6	38.0	31.2 ± 6.1	32.0	36.1 ± 5.2	38.0	159.7 ± 23.1	164.0
Primary school (199)	30.3 ± 6.3	31.0	25.5 ± 4.4	26.0	35.8 ± 5.5	38.0	31.0 ± 6.2	32.0	35.9 ± 5.1	38.0	158.5 ± 23.6	163.0
Secondary school (78)	31.2 ± 6.2	31 May	25.5 ± 4.1	26.0	35.2 ± 5.5	36.5	30.9 ± 5.8	31.0	36.4 ± 4.9	38.0	159.2 ± 22.1	164.5
High school (96)	32.3 ± 5.2	33.0	26.1 ± 3.9	27.0	36.4 ± 4.7	38.0	31.1 ± 5.7	31.5	36.7 ± 3.7	38.0	162.6 ± 18.9	163.0
University or higher (52)	32.7 ± 5.9	34.0	25.8 ± 5.1	27. May	34.4 ± 7.6	38.0	32.0 ± 6.6	33.0	34.7 ± 7.5	38.0	159.6 ± 28.7	169.0
	KW: 10,059 p: 0.018		KW: 2,372 p: 0.489		KW: 2,987 p: 0.394		KW: 1,784 p: 0.618		KW: 796 p: 0.850		KW: 1,902 p: 0.593	
Sibling gender (418)	31.3 ± 6.1	32.0	25.7 ± 4.3	26.0	35.7 ± 5.6	38.0	31.2 ± 6.1	32.0	36.1 ± 5.2	38.0	160.0 ± 23.1	164.0
No siblings (35)	32.9 ± 5.9	33.0	26.2 ± 4.7	27 May	35.8 ± 6.5	38.0	32.9 ± 5.1	33.5	36.5 ± 5.9	38.5	164.4 ± 24.6	171.0
Only sister(s) (99)	33.1 ± 5.3	34.0	26.6 ± 3.9	27.0	36.4 ± 5.0	39.0	32.8 ± 5.7	34.0	37.2 ± 4.2	39.0	166.1 ± 20.1	173.0
Only brother(s) (92)	31.4 ± 5.9	32.0	25.5 ± 4.4	26.0	35.5 ± 5.5	38.0	31.2 ± 6.1	32.0	35.7 ± 4.8	37.0	159.3 ± 22.3	163.0
Both sister(s) and brother(s) (104)	30.4 ± 6.2	31.0	25.4 ± 4.4	26.0	35.8 ± 5.5	38.0	30.8 ± 6.0	31.0	36.4 ± 5.1	38.0	158.8 ± 23.1	161.5
No response (89)	29.7 ± 6.5	30.0	25.1 ± 4.6	26.0	35.0 ± 5.9	36.0	29.2 ± 6.4	29.0	34.8 ± 6.0	36.0	153.9 ± 24.9	157.0
	KW: 20,208 p: 0.000		KW: 7,860 p: 0.097		KW: 4,908 p: 0.297		KW: 20,302 p: 0.000		KW: 16,532 p: 0.002		KW: 16,770 p: 0.0002	

Abbreviations: ASWRCH, Attitude Scale for Women-Related Conception of "Honor"; GRAS, Gender Roles Attitude Scale.

TABLE 6 Comparison of sociodemographic characteristics and ASWRCH scores

Students' characteristics	ASWRCH Subscales							
	Traditional perception of honor		Egalitarian perception of honor		Premarriage perception of honor		Total ASWRCH	
	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M
Gender (425)	38.2 ± 7.1	41.0	49.2 ± 5.2	51.0	16.7 ± 5.5	16.0	104.1 ± 15.5	107.0
Female (279)	40.2 ± 5.4	42.0	50.3 ± 5.2	51.0	17.5 ± 5.5	17.0	108.0 ± 13.5	110.0
Male (146)	34.4 ± 8.3	35.0	47.1 ± 6.5	48.5	15.1 ± 4.9	15.0	96.6 ± 16.5	97.5
	U: 11745,0 p: 0.000		U: 14254,0 p: 0.000		U: 15376,0 p: 0.000		U: 12182,0 p: 0.000	
Completed High School (426)	38.2 ± 7.1	41.0	49.2 ± 5.8	51.0	16.7 ± 5.4	16.0	104.2 ± 15.5	107.0
Health high school (17)	37.8 ± 6.8	36.0	47.1 ± 5.4	48.0	14.9 ± 4.4	16.0	96.8 ± 12.9	97.0
High school (98)	37.6 ± 6.7	39.0	48.5 ± 5.6	49.5	15.7 ± 5.3	16.0	101.8 ± 14.1	102.5
Anatolian (foreign language) high school (224)	38.6 ± 7.3	41.0	49.8 ± 5.6	51.5	16.9 ± 5.3	17.0	105.3 ± 15.7	109.0
Science high school (15)	39.7 ± 6.5	42.0	50.6 ± 6.6	54.0	17.3 ± 6.5	17.0	107.7 ± 16.9	113.0
Religious education high school (19)	36.3 ± 7.2	38.0	44.0 ± 8.9	47.0	14.9 ± 5.1	15.0	95.2 ± 15.4	96.0
Private high school (53)	39.6 ± 6.7	42.0	50.4 ± 4.9	51.0	18.5 ± 5.9	17.0	108.5 ± 15.0	111.0
	KW: 14,732 p: 0.000		KW: 23,073 p: 0.000		KW: 11,851 p: 0.037		KW: 22,329 p: 0.000	
Family type (427)	38.3 ± 7.1	41.0	49.2 ± 5.8	51.0	16.7 ± 5.4	16.0	104.1 ± 15.4	107.0
Nuclear family (328)	38.9 ± 6.7	41.0	49.8 ± 5.6	51.0	17.1 ± 5.4	17.0	105.8 ± 14.9	109.0
Extended family (83)	35.9 ± 7.8	38.0	47.4 ± 5.9	48.0	14.8 ± 5.1	15.0	98.1 ± 15.4	98.0
Nonnuclear family (6)	29.3 ± 5.6	29.0	41.0 ± 5.9	41.0	17.3 ± 5.3	15.5	87.65 ± 15.4	84.0
	KW: 17,999 p: 0.000		KW: 19,059 p: 0.000		KW: 10,761 p: 0.005		KW: 21,408 p: 0.000	
Region of residence (414)	38.4 ± 7.0	41.0	49.2 ± 5.9	51.0	16.7 ± 5.5	16.0	104.2 ± 15.5	107.0
Marmara region (284)	38.7 ± 6.7	41.0	49.4 ± 5.7	51.0	17.0 ± 5.3	16.0	105.1 ± 14.7	107.5
Aegean region (23)	39.6 ± 6.6	42.0	49.0 ± 6.2	50.0	17.5 ± 5.2	17.0	106.1 ± 16.1	111.0
Central Anatolian region (13)	37.5 ± 6.7	37.0	49.6 ± 6.0	50.0	15.9 ± 6.9	17.0	102.9 ± 16.1	105.0
Eastern Anatolian region (11)	31.8 ± 8.3	34.0	43.8 ± 8.4	42.0	11.8 ± 5.8	11.0	87.5 ± 18.1	88.0
Southeastern Anatolian region (16)	36.1 ± 6.9	34.0	47.1 ± 6.8	49.0	13.5 ± 5.4	12.0	96.7 ± 16.6	97.5
Black Sea region (30)	38.2 ± 7.3	41.0	50.0 ± 4.6	51.0	15.2 ± 5.3	15.0	103.5 ± 14.7	106.5
Mediterranean region (37)	38.2 ± 8.1	42.0	49.6 ± 5.6	52.0	18.1 ± 5.4	16.0	105.8 ± 17.3	111.0
	KW: 13,116 p: 0.041		KW: 7,280 p: 0.296		KW: 19,454 p: 0.003		KW: 14,748 p: 0.022	
Mother's education level (425)	38.3 ± 7.1	41.0	49.2 ± 5.9	51.0	16.7 ± 5.5	16.0	104.2 ± 15.5	107.0
Primary school(199)	37.4 ± 7.5	39.0	48.2 ± 6.5	50.0	15.8 ± 5.7	16.0	101.4 ± 16.3	103.0
Secondary school (78)	38.2 ± 7.0	40.5	49.3 ± 5.3	50.0	16.2 ± 4.9	16.0	103.7 ± 14.3	105.5
High school (96)	39.4 ± 5.8	41.0	50.4 ± 4.9	52.0	17.6 ± 5.1	16.5	107.4 ± 13.5	109.0
University or higher (52)	39.4 ± 7.2	42.0	50.9 ± 4.9	52.5	19.2 ± 5.0	19.0	109.5 ± 15.2	112.0
	KW: 7,329 p: 0.062		KW: 12,992 p: 0.005		KW: 17,243 p: 0.001		KW: 17,690 p: 0.001	
Sibling gender (418)	38.4 ± 7.1	41.0	49.3 ± 5.8	51.0	16.8 ± 5.5	16.0	104.4 ± 15.4	107.0
No siblings (35)	41.1 ± 5.1	42.5	50.5 ± 4.3	51.0	18.3 ± 4.8	18.5	109.9 ± 11.9	111.5
Only sister(s) (99)	40.5 ± 5.7	43.0	51.4 ± 4.2	53.0	18.4 ± 5.6	19.0	110.3 ± 13.5	114.0

(Continues)

TABLE 6 (Continued)

Students' characteristics	ASWRCH Subscales							
	Traditional perception of honor		Egalitarian perception of honor		Premarriage perception of honor		Total ASWRCH	
	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M	$\bar{x} \pm SD$	M
Only brother(s) (92)	38.5 ± 6.8	41.0	49.1 ± 6.0	51.0	16.8 ± 5.7	16.5	104.3 ± 16.2	109.0
Both sister(s) and brother(s) (104)	37.7 ± 7.3	40.0	48.3 ± 6.0	50.0	15.8 ± 5.2	16.0	101.7 ± 15.2	104.0
No response (89)	35.7 ± 8.1	37.0	47.8 ± 5.9	49.0	15.6 ± 5.2	16.0	99.0 ± 15.8	98.0
	KW: 28,453 p: 0.000		KW: 25,109 p: 0.000		KW: 18,782 p: 0.001		KW: 34,279 p: 0.000	

from the scale was associated with the “male gender role” subscale. In addition, Zeyneloğlu⁴ stated that gender attitudes of an individual are influenced by people they live with until the age of 18. Individuals who grow up in the patriarchal culture of Turkey may consider the gender inequality they witnessed since childhood as a part of daily life. This internalized situation prevents individuals from being aware of experienced inequalities or causes them to consider them normal. In a study by Özden and Gölbaşı,¹⁵ it was determined that the overall GRAS and subscale scores of healthcare professionals believing in gender equality in our country were higher and they had a more egalitarian attitude than those denying equality. In this study, the “gender role in marriage” subscale of the GRAS had the highest average score. In a study by Altınöz et al.,¹⁶ and Zeybek and Kurşun¹⁷ conducted with medical students, the highest scores among the GRAS's average subscale scores were obtained from the “gender role in marriage” subscale. The subscale includes propositions as “whatever the man says should be done in the household,” “in marriage, only women are responsible for preventing an unintended pregnancy” and “it is normal for a man to cheat on his wife.” It is remarkable that both male and female students take an egalitarian approach rather than traditional attitudes regarding this subscale. This improvement among university students, who will have a say in various fields across the country in the future, is promising for changing our male-dominated society.

In this study, it was determined that students had an egalitarian perception of honor in terms of overall average scores; however, the lowest average score was found to be associated with the “premarital sexual practice/perception of honor” subscale including propositions as “a decent woman should not have sexual intercourse before marriage” and “virginity is a symbol of a woman's honor.” In a study by Bora and Üstün,¹⁸ conducted with 38 female and 34 male participants in various Turkish provinces using an in-depth interview method, it was found that a similar meaning was attributed to the concept of honor. It was stated that the concept of honor was identified with female sexual behavior, and premarital or extramarital sexual activity of women was perceived as prohibition/taboo by both men and women.¹⁸ In another study by Ebeoğlu and Karacan,¹⁰ conducted with undergraduate students in their final year, male students ($n = 112$) and female students ($n = 264$) said they agreed to the proposition of “a

woman whom a man marries must be a virgin,” which was consistent with our results. In another study by Özcebe, Ünalın, Türkyılmaz, and Coşkun,¹⁹ conducted with individuals between 15 and 24 years of age, it was found that 72.7% of the participants stated that women should decide how they experience their sexuality, while 83.9% of the same participants did not approve premarital sexual activity of women. In some cultures with predominating traditional approaches, the meaning attributed to virginity provides information about the restrictions that oppress women in how they should experience their sexuality. Women who have had premarital sexual activity may be considered as a source of shame and embarrassment to their relatives, and especially men in the family, who think they are responsible for women's honor (virginity), including relatives, restricting women's lives and punishing them, which may end up with murder. Unfortunately, men may consider these initiatives as a source of pride and social obligation.

In the study, the highest score obtained from the scale was associated with the “egalitarian attitude” subscale. In a similar study by Gürsoy,⁶ it was determined that the highest average score obtained from the subscales of ASWRCH was associated with the “egalitarian approach” subscale. It is gratifying that both male and female participants showed an egalitarian approach toward the subscale, including propositions as “there is no harm in a girl flirting with a boy,” “women are under heavy pressure because of honor,” and “honor of a woman who dresses as they wish should not be questioned.” It may be concluded that there has been an improvement in the opinions and attitudes of students in Turkey over the years toward the subjects related to flirting, gender discrimination, sexuality, perception of honor, and premarital sexual activity; however, it is not sufficient.

In the study, it was determined that the overall and subscale scores of ASWRCH increased consistently with the GRAS's scores, and there was a strong positive correlation between the scales. In other words, as individuals' perception of gender improved with an egalitarian approach, perception of honor was positively affected. In the literature, no studies were found in Turkey comparing these two scales. However, in studies by Erbil,²⁰ conducted to examine the relationship between gender-related attitudes and life values of university students, it was found that as gender-related attitudes of the students improved with an egalitarian approach, their perception

of life values positively increased. The egalitarian approach of individuals with high levels of consciousness and contemporary points of view may manifest itself in every aspect of life.

In the study, when gender of the students and overall GRAS and ASWRCH and subscale scores were compared, male students were found to have a more traditional attitude than females. In a study with university students (112 men and 264 women) showed that sexual permissiveness, attitudes toward honor, and peers' approval of sexuality emerged as significant predictors of premarital sexual attitudes among men and women, while mother's approval of sexual activity is also a significant predictor among men. In addition, it was determined that the cultural values and attitudes attributed to sexuality for men and women are still continuing. In this study and similar studies, it is generally observed that female participants have a more egalitarian approach towards gender roles than males.⁶ In patriarchal societies like ours, men are assigned to protect the dignity and decency of their family by controlling female sexual behavior, while women are expected to protect their honor (sexual purity, virginity) and to be a good wife to their husband and a good mother to their children if they are married.^{10,21} Growing up in an environment dominated by this perception, a man's tendency to display behaviors consistent with the traditions and customs of the society may be considered as an expected situation.

There was a significant difference between overall GRAS and ASWRCH scores in terms of type of high school, and it was found that the students who graduated from science high schools and private high schools had a more egalitarian attitude and perception of honor than those graduating from religious high schools and health high schools. In a study by Zeyneloğlu,⁴ although type of high school was not found to affect gender-related attitudes of the students, those who graduated from science/Anatolian/private high schools had a more egalitarian attitude in terms of the "egalitarian gender role" subscale. Similarly, Gürsoy⁶ stated that students graduating from a religious high school had more traditional attitudes than others. In addition, Kardam et al.,²² stated in their study, conducted using in-depth interviews, that a participating imam expressed the moral behavior expected from women as follows: "A daughter must be decent. It would be wrong for her to talk to everyone. Girls should not work. It's not appropriate to challenge a man's dignity and reputation. It's a shame. A family is miserable when honor is lost. They should pay attention to the way they dress." Researchers who carry out such studies agree with the idea that education provided in religious high schools is usually based on Islam and the Quran. In Islam, a man considers himself to have a right to make decisions about a woman's rights.²³ In these faith-based high schools in our country, ideas adopted by Islam, such as "a woman's place is in the home" and "the most important task of a woman is motherhood and serving her spouse" may have an impact on students' attitudes. Health vocation high schools are preferred by families of lower socioeconomic status, especially due to high postgraduation employment opportunities. In general, families who live in rural areas and have a more traditional

attitude tend to adopt a guarantee-based approach in the career choices of their children, for whom they are often faced with challenges in providing education. This can be interpreted as health high school students growing up in a family environment with a more traditional attitude.

According to both scales used in the study, it was found that students living in a nuclear family had a more egalitarian attitude and perception of honor than those living in an extended or broken family. Similarly to our results, Erbil²⁰ stated that university students living in a nuclear family had a more egalitarian attitude and perception of honor than those in an extended or nonnuclear family. In a study by Aylaz et al.,²⁴ it was determined that individuals living in a nuclear family had more egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles than others. Family structure and mother education plays an important role in raising children in terms of being a role model. In extended families, children are influenced by the traditional attitudes and gender roles of their grandparents. In this kind of approach, women are usually relegated to a subordinate position within a male-dominated power structure.^{7,25} Individuals who grow up in such structure may internalize traditional behaviors rather than having a contemporary approach.

6 | CONCLUSION

In this study, it was determined that the gender-related attitudes increased consistently with the and perception of honor, and there was a strong positive correlation between the scales. In other words, as individuals' perception of gender improved with an egalitarian approach, perception of honor was positively affected.

Human rights and gender equality of healthcare workers who are in direct contact with the society on the basis of care and service should be provided. It approach and perspective, before and after graduation should be supported by educational programs.

7 | IMPLICATIONS FOR PSYCHIATRIC NURSING

Raising health sciences students, who are trained to serve healthy/sick individuals, with an egalitarian approach in terms of gender and honor perception will enable them to adopt an egalitarian attitude in their personal and professional lives and to become agents of change in initiating and sustaining social change.

Social value judgments and taboos can prevent such studies for university students to some extent, and also limit the number of voluntary participation in the study. It is important to raise awareness on this issue for university administrations and academicians who provide high-level education, to plan and carry out research and to share the results. Regardless of the area of service, all healthcare professionals must first determine their individual attitudes to understand and evaluate the person psychosocially and create the necessary awareness. Understanding and evaluating people is part of

psychiatric care. In this direction, informative conferences, symposiums or workshops that will contribute to gender equality can be organized for university students.

8 | LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The results cannot be generalized to all university students in Turkey since the study sample consisted of only second-year HSF students at ten universities in Istanbul. A relatively large number of female students in the departments of nursing, midwifery and nutrition and dietetics reduced the number of male students included in the study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank all Turkish students who participated in the study.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors declare that there are no conflict of interests.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Anahit Margirit Coşkun: designed and planned the study. She also revised the related literature, collected the data, and wrote the manuscript. **Yeliz Varışoğlu:** revised the related literature and collected the data. She wrote the manuscript and submitted the journal. **Nebahat Koca Çavdar:** wrote the manuscript and collected the data. **Leman Kutlu:** designed and planned the study. She was data analyzed.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

ORCID

Anahit Margirit Coşkun  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9155-3783>

Yeliz Varışoğlu  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6350-7218>

Nebahat Koca Çavdar  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8088-9206>

Leman Kutlu  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6393-8328>

REFERENCES

- Pandey UC, Kumar C. Understanding Gender Inequality. SDG5 – Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women and Girls (Concise Guides to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals). Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited; 2019:15-26. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78973-521-520191003>
- Akhmedshina F. Violence against women: a form of discrimination and human rights violations. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*. 2020;(1):13-23. <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1061&context=tziuj>
- Kachel S, Steffens MC, Niedlich C. Traditional masculinity and femininity: validation of a new scale assessing gender roles. *Front Psychol*. 2016;7:956.
- Zeyneloğlu S, Terzioğlu F. Development and psychometric properties gender roles attitude scale. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H.U: Journal of Education)*. 2011;40:409-420. <http://www.efdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/yonetim/icerik/makaleler/425-published.pdf>
- Anjum G, Kessler T, Aziz M. Cross-cultural exploration of honor: perception of honor in Germany, Pakistan, and South Korea. *Psychol Stud*. 2019;64(2):147-160.
- Gürsoy E, William F, Sahinoğlu S, Yavuz Genc Y. Views of women's sexuality and violence against women in Turkey: a cross-sectional investigation among university students. *J Transcult Nurs*. 2016; 27(2):189-198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043659614550485>
- Atlı A. High school students' gender role perceptions regarding various professions. *Int J Prog Educ*. 2017;13(3):6-15.
- Dogutas A. Gender based violence against syrian refugee women in Turkey. *Border Crossing*. 2019;9(2):113-124.
- Vandello JA, Cohen D. Male honor and female fidelity: implicit cultural scripts that perpetuate domestic violence. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2003;84:997-1010.
- Ebeoğlu M, Karacan E. Sexual communication and attitudes toward premarital sexuality: role of the university class level and gender. *Ege J Educ*. 2019;20(1):1-19.
- Ghosh J, Lansky M, Méda D, Ramani U (2017). Women, Gender and work. Social choices and inequalities.
- Aygör H, Çayır A. The effect of nursing students' general self-efficacy on gender roles. *Res Educ Psychol*. 2020;4(1):1-19.
- Gürsoy E, Arslan Özkan H. Female university students in Turkey on "honor" perception. *Psychiatr Nurses Assoc*. 2014;5(3):149-159.
- Köken Durgun S, Cambaz, Ulaş S. Determination of attitudes of Midwifery/nursing students towards social gender roles. *Med Scie (NWSAMS)*. 2019;14(2):93-103.
- Özden S, Gölbaşı Z SAĞLIK ÇALIŞANLARININ TOPLUMSAL CİNSİYET ROLLERİNE İLİŞKİN TUTUMLARININ BELİRLENMESİ. Determination Of Health Workers' Attitudes Towards Gender Roles Journal of Health Science Kocaeli University. 2018;4(3):95-100. <https://doi.org/10.30934/kusbed.420223>
- Altınöz AE, Günel N, Tosun Altınöz Ş, et al. The gender roles attitudes of medicals students: A cross-sectional study. *Turkish J Clin Psychiatr*. 2018; 21:271-277. <https://doi.org/10.5505/kpd.2018.08860>
- Zeybek V, Kurşun M. Attitudes of medical students towards gender roles. *Pamukkale J Med*. 2019;12(2):225-233. <https://doi.org/10.31362/patd.468353>
- Bora A, Üstün İ (2005). "Warm Family Environment": Women and Women in the Democratization Process Men, Perceptions and Mentality Structures: Gender Regime Axis. TESEV publications, Sena Offset, ISBN: 975-8112-60-0, İstanbul. https://www.tesev.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/rapor_Sicak_Aile_Ortami_Demokratiklesme_Surecinde_Kadin_Ve_Erkekler.pdf
- Özcebe H, Ünal T, Türkyılmaz S, Coşkun Y Turkey: Sexual and Reproductive Health Survey of Youth. Publication of Population Science Association and United Nations Population Fund, Ankara. 2007. <https://turkey.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/genclerdeconsagslik.pdf>
- Erbil N. The relationship between gender roles attitudes and life values of university students. *Ordu University J Nurs Stud*. 2019;2(1):33-45. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/702630>
- Işık R *The Predictors of Understanding of Honor and Attitudes Toward Honor Related Violence: Ambivalent Sexism and System Justification*. (Master thesis). Ankara: Orta Doğu TechnicalUniversity, Social Sciences Institute; 2018. <https://open.metu.edu.tr/bitstream/handle/11511/17707/index.pdf>
- Kardam F, Alpar Z, Yüksel İ, Ergün E *Honor Killings in Turkey Dynamics, Suggestions for Action Program, Final Report*. Ankara: Population Science Association Publication; 2006. <https://www.unfpa.org/publications/dynamics-honour-killings-turkey>

23. Karakaya H. Gender perception, religion and women. *J Analytic Divinity*,. 2018;2(2):36-62. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/issue-file/12689>
24. Aylaz R, Güneş G, Uzun Ö, Ünal S. University students' views on the gender role. *J Contin Med Educ*. 2014;23(5):183-189.
25. Şahin E "Honor" Perception of University Students About Women. (Master's Thesis), Okan University. Istanbul: Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Nursing; 2016.

How to cite this article: Coşkun AM, Varışoğlu Y, Koca Çavdar N, Kutlu L. Relationship between health science students' gender-related attitudes and perception of honor. *Perspect Psychiatr Care*. 2022;58:928-939. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ppc.12878>