

Original Article

Examination of State Anxiety, Self-Esteem and Problem-Solving Skills of Women Victims of Violence

Mervener Atalay

Specialist, Gaziantep University, Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Public Health Nursing, Gaziantep, Turkey

Zeynep Gungormus, PhD

Professor, Gaziantep Islamic Science and Technology University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Public Health Nursing, Gaziantep, Turkey

Hatice Serap Kocak, PhD

Gaziantep University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Public Health Nursing, Gaziantep, Turkey

Correspondence: Zeynep Gungormus, PhD, Professor, Gaziantep Islamic Science and Technology University, Faculty of Health Sciences. Department of Public Health Nursing, Gaziantep, Turkey gungormusz@yahoo.co.uk

Abstract

This research is conducted by the means of designating the women of the state anxiety level, self respect and problem solving skills of the women who apply to women's sheltering house and emergency service due to the violence. Scope of the research is the women applying to the emergency room and women's shelter due to being exposed to violence between December 2018 and August 2019. And the sample of the investigation is consisted of a total of 82 women, including 45 women staying in the sheltering house and 37 women. In collecting the data, socio-demographic information form, Problem Solving Inventory, State Anxiety inventory (STAI-I), Coppersmith Self-Esteem Scale were used. Problem solving scale, confidence in problem solving ability (CPSA) sub-dimension average score is 35.0 ± 15.3 , approach-avoidance sub-dimension average score is 39.7 ± 15.3 , personal control sub-dimension average score is 16.1 ± 3.6 , total score average is 90.9 ± 28.6 , the state anxiety scale total score average is 45.9 ± 5.5 , self-esteem total score average is 12.3 ± 2.0 .

Key Words: Domestic violence, nursing, self-esteem, state anxiety, women's shelter, problem solving, violence

Introduction

Violence against women is one of the important public health problems in Turkey, as in the world. Being a woman is the main risk factor for exposure to violence (Fernandez et al., 2018). At least one in every three women in the world is subjected to physical violence, forced into sexual intercourse or harassed by their family or someone they know at some point in their lives. Violence against women, which is a violation of human rights, is an important public health problem that prevents women from participating in society and socio-economic development (AITB, 2004). In the report on violence against women published

by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2014, it is stated that the cause of death of women worldwide is mostly partner violence; In the 2013 report, 13-61% of women aged 15-49 were exposed to physical violence by their husbands at least once in their lives, 6-59% were forced to have sexual intercourse at least once, and 1-28% were pregnant. It has been reported that she was physically abused by her husband during her marriage (GDSW, 2015). While the 12-month prevalence of spousal violence is 4% in high-income countries such as Denmark, England, Ireland and the USA, it exceeds 40% in some low-income countries such as Ethiopia (Heise and Kotsadam, 2015). In the "Research on Domestic Violence Against Women in

Turkey (2015)" conducted by the Ministry of Family, Labor and Social Services on violence against women, it is stated that the group that exposes women to violence the most is men with whom they have close relationships. In the same study, it was stated that the rate of physical violence that women were exposed to at some point in their lives by their spouses or intimate partners was 36%, the rate of sexual violence was 12%, the rate of emotional violence was 44%, and the rate of economic violence was 30% (GDSW, 2015).

In women exposed to violence, intense fear, helplessness, insecurity, hopelessness, intense anxiety, panic attacks, sleep disorders, eating disorders, somatic and psychosomatic complaints, anger and anger outbursts, alcohol and drug addiction, suicide, death, murder, difficulty in close relationships. Situations such as self-destructive behavior, dissociative disorders, and isolation from society and the environment may develop (UNHCR, 2003). In a study evaluating the problem-solving skills of women who stayed in a women's shelter for 6-12 months after exposure to violence, it was stated that the problem-solving skills of women were insufficient (AITB, 2004). In another study where anxiety and depression levels were evaluated in women who were and were not victims of violence, it was found that the anxiety and depression levels of women who were victims of violence were higher than those who were not abused (Ghahari et al., 2018). In addition, in a different study, it was stated that women with high levels of anxiety and depression had lower self-esteem (Costa and Gomes, 2018).

Women who are subjected to violence want to get away from the environment where they are exposed to violence in order to continue their lives and apply to a women's shelter. Women's shelters are key institutions in the fight against violence. The aim of women's shelters, which were established in the 1970's around the world and in 1990 in Turkey, is to combat women's thoughts of isolation and helplessness, to support women, to enable women to make free decisions about their own lives and to support their empowerment (Acikel, 2009).

A solution-focused approach to abused women recommended. With this approach,

she emphasizes that women should focus on their strengths and competencies rather than focusing on problems. Studies based on social support and empowerment projects have shown improvements in women's sense of self and coping abilities (Acikel, 2009; Lloyd et al., 2017; Bahadır Yılmaz and Oz, 2019).

Solution-oriented urgent interventions are needed regarding violence against women, which continues to be an important public health problem with a global prevalence of 30% worldwide (Gracia and Merlo, 2016). In order to empower women who are victims of violence and to develop solution-oriented approaches, it is very important to determine the self-esteem, problem-solving skills and state anxiety levels of women who started living in shelters or applied to the emergency service after being exposed to violence. This study, which was conducted to determine the self-esteem, problem-solving skills and state anxiety levels of women who stayed in women's shelters and applied to the emergency service due to exposure to violence, will contribute to the literature and present applicable targets to policy makers.

Material Method

Type of Research: This study is a cross-sectional study.

Population and Sample of the Research: The population of the research consists of a total of 82 women (37 women) who applied to the emergency department of Diyarbakir Selahaddin Eyyubi State Hospital due to exposure to violence between December 2018 and August 2019 and (45 women) living in two separate women's shelters affiliated with the same institution in the city. The sample size was not calculated in the study, and the sample consisted of 82 women who stayed in the shelter and applied to the emergency room between December 2018 and August 2019, who met the inclusion criteria and agreed to participate in the research.

Location and Characteristics of the Research: An average of 8 people stay in each shelter at the same time, and while there are women who stay for 6 months, there are also women who stay for a week or leave the shelter and return in a short time. Women and their children can also stay in shelters. An average of 150 people per day are brought to Selahaddin Eyyubi State Hospital by security forces within the scope of different legal

cases. The average number of women exposed to violence comes to the hospital is 5 per week. This study was conducted on a voluntary basis. Ethics committee and institutional permissions were obtained. Data were collected by interviewing women face to face in shelters and hospitals, in a suitable room for individual interviews.

Research Inclusion Criteria:

1. Being exposed to domestic violence
2. Agreeing to participate in the study after being informed
3. No mental or auditory disability

Data Collection Tools: The data was collected using a 23-question survey form that includes socio-demographic characteristics and introductory features regarding marriage and types of violence experienced, the "Problem Solving Inventory" consisting of 35 questions, the "State Anxiety Inventory" consisting of 20 questions and the "Coppersmith Self-Esteem Scale" consisting of 25 questions collected.

Problem Solving Inventory was developed by Heppner and Peterson (1982). Turkish validity and reliability studies were conducted by Taylan (1990). The original scale consists of 35 items and 3 subscales Problem Solving Confidence; items 5, 10, 11, 12, 19, 23, 24, 27, 33, 34, 35; Approach-Avoidance; items 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 28, 30, 31; Personal Control; items 13, 14, 25, 26, 27, 32 is formed. The scale is a 6-point Likert type. "1" means I always act like this, "2" I usually act like this, "3" I often act like this, "4" I sometimes act like this, "5" I rarely act like this, "6" I never act like this. The items consist of positive and negative judgments about problem solving, and negative items are reversed in scoring (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21, 25, 26, 30, 34). Some items in the scale are excluded from scoring (items 9, 22, 29). The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 32 and the highest score is 192. High total scores from the scale indicate that the individual perceives himself as insufficient in problem-solving skills, and low scores indicate that the individual perceives himself as sufficient in problem-solving skills.

State Anxiety Inventory was developed by Spielberger et al. (1985). The validity and reliability of the scale in Turkey was determined by Oner and Le Compte (1985). The scale consists of 20 questions and is a 4-

point Likert type with expressions ranging from "1-Not at all" to "4-Completely". The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 20 and the highest score is 80. As the score increases, the anxiety level increases. Direct expressions express negative emotions, while inverted expressions express positive emotions. The reversed expressions in the scale are items 1, 2, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 19 and 20. After finding the total weights of direct and reverse expressions separately, the total weight score of reverse expressions is subtracted from the total weight score obtained for direct expressions. A predetermined and unchanging value is added to this number. For the State Anxiety Scale, this unchanged value is 50. The last value obtained is the individual's anxiety score.

Coppersmith Self-Esteem Inventory; The scale developed by Coppersmith (1981) consists of 25 items and is a 2-point Likert type with two statements: "it suits me" and "it does not suit me". Turkish validity and reliability study was conducted by Turan and Tufan (1987). The lowest score that can be obtained from this scale is "0" and the highest score is "100", and as the scores increase, self-esteem also increases.

Evaluation of Data: The data obtained from the research were evaluated with the SPSS 20 program.

Ethical Dimension of Research: In order to conduct the research, written institutional permission was obtained from Diyarbakır Provincial Health Directorate and Diyarbakır Provincial Directorate of Family Labor and Social Services in order to conduct a survey on women who were exposed to violence and women who were exposed to violence staying in a shelter. We applied to the Gaziantep University Clinical Research Ethics Committee and obtained an Ethics Committee Approval (Decision No: 2018/170 date: 04.07.2018).

Informed Consent: After informing the patients and their relatives about the purpose of the research and explaining that the obtained information will be used only for this research, their verbal and written consents were obtained.

Results

When the introductory features and the problem solving inventory sub-dimensions and the total score are compared, the average

score of the “Confidence in Problem Solving Ability” sub-dimension; those who did not stay in a shelter (40.4 ± 16.2), those whose spouses were literate (41.3 ± 15.7), those whose income was less than their expenses (38.0 ± 15.6), those who did not work in an income-generating job (37.0 ± 15.3); “approach-avoidance” sub-dimension mean score; those whose income is less than their expenses (43.6 ± 15.7); “personal control” sub-dimension mean score; in women who do not work in an income generating job (16.6 ± 3.4); if the scale total score average is; It was found to be higher in those whose spouses were literate (100.3 ± 26.0), those with less financial income (98.3 ± 29.3) and those who did not work in an income-generating job (94.5 ± 25.9) ($p < 0.05$) (Table 1). It was determined that the total mean score of the state anxiety scale was higher in those living in the shelter (47.4 ± 5.5) ($p < 0.01$) (Table 1). Self-esteem scale total score average; It was found to be higher in those whose spouses were university graduates (15.2 ± 2.7), those whose income was equal to their expenses (13.9 ± 2.3), those who worked in an income generating job (14.2 ± 2.4), and those whose spouses worked in an income generating job (12.9 ± 2.6) ($p < 0.05$).) (Table 1).

When the marital characteristics of the women who were victims of violence were compared with the sub-dimensions and total score of the problem solving inventory, it was determined that the women who did not change their city after marriage had the highest PCYG score (38.4 ± 16.8) ($p < 0.05$) (Table 2).

When the types of violence, problem solving inventory sub-dimensions and total score averages of women who have been exposed to violence are compared, the average score of the confidence in problem-solving ability sub-dimension; In those who did not experience violence for economic reasons (35.7 ± 15.5), those who experienced emotional/psychological violence (36.2 ± 15.8), Approach, Avoidance sub-dimension mean score; It was found that the mean score of the scale was higher in those who did not experience violence because of their objections (42.8 ± 15.0), and those who did not experience violence for economic reasons (91.9 ± 29.2) and those who did not experience cyber violence (91.3 ± 28.8) ($p < 0.05$) (Table 3).

Between the problem solving scale total score average and the self-esteem total score average ($r = -0.510$); and state anxiety scale total mean score and self-esteem scale total score mean ($r = -0.244$), there is a weakly negative and significant correlation ($p < 0.01$) (Table 4).

Problem solving inventory confidence in problem solving ability (PCYG) sub-dimension mean score 35.0 ± 15.3 , approach-avoidance sub-dimension mean score 39.7 ± 15.3 , personal control sub-dimension mean score 16.1 ± 3.6 , total score 90.9 ± 28.6 , state anxiety scale total the mean score is 45.9 ± 5.5 , the mean self-esteem total score is 12.3 ± 2.0 . (Table 5).

Table 1. Comparison of Descriptive Characteristics and Problem Solving, State Anxiety, and Self-Esteem Scales.

Descriptive Features	Total and Sub-Dimensions of Problem Solving Scale (X±SD)				State Anxiety Scale (X±SD)	Self-Esteem Scale (X±SD)
	Confidence in problem solving ability	Approach, avoidance	Personal control	Total		
Staying in a shelter	30.5±13.1	40.0±14.7	15.8±3.2	86.4±26.4	47.4±5.5	12.5±2.7
Not staying in a shelter	40.4±16.2	39.4±16.3	16.5±4.0	96.4±30.4	44.1±4.8	12.1±2.9

t, p	t:-2.989 p:0.004	t:0.171 p:0.865	t:-0.902 p:0.370	t:-1.595 p:0.115	t:2.783 p:0.007	t:0.640 p:0.524
Age						
20 years under	30.3±14.4	45.0±14.5	18.5±3.8	93.8±29.1	46.2±7.6	11.1±3.1
20-30 years	34.1±14.6	37.8±15.8	15.5±3.2	87.5±28.0	45.4±5.9	12.9±2.3
30-40 years	35.2±15.1	41.3±16.2	16.1±3.8	92.7±30.5	46.4±4.2	12.08±3.4
40 years above	48.5±18.7	35.1±6.5	16.0±2.9	99.6±26.6	46.0±1.09	11.5±1.6
F, p	F:2.031 p:0.116	F:0.919 p:0.436	F:2.196 p:0.095	F:0.428 p:0.734	Kw:0.175 p:0.982	F:1.625 p:0.190
Region of Birth						
Southeastern Anatolia	36.0±15.9	40.4±15.6	16.2±3.6	92.7±29.6	46.0±5.3	12.3±2.8
Other regions	30.0±10.8	36.6±13.8	15.7±3.6	82.4±21.8	45.3±6.1	12.4±2.9
t, p	t:1.702 p:0.101	t:0.838 p:0.405	t:0.517 p:0.606	t:1.227 p:0.223	t:0.423 p:0.673	t:-0.143 p:0.886
Educational Status						
Literate	39.0±15.3	41.8±13.0	16.2±3.2	97.1±24.7	46.3±4.3	11.6±3.4
Primary school	37.3±17.7	41.0±17.7	15.4±4.5	93.8±34.4	45.9±4.9	11.8±1.9
secondary school	32.0±14.5	38.5±15.2	16.4±3.4	87.0±26.0	46.4±4.9	12.6±2.5
High school	32.0±14.7	40.7±18.3	17.0±3.7	89.9±34.9	45.1±8.6	13.3±2.7
Universty	25.7±6.2	25.7±5.2	14.2±2.0	65.7±8.1	42.2±4.9	14.0±2.1
F, p	F:1.255 p:0.295	F:1.035 p:0.395	F:0.661 p:0.621	Kw:5.790 p:0.215	Kw:1.422 p:0.840	F:1.331 p:0.266
Spouse's Educational Status						
literate	41.3±15.7	43.1±14.2	15.8±3.2	100.3±26.0	45.5±4.2	11.6±2.9
Primary school	26.6±13.1	37.2±16.6	15.5±2.5	79.4±27.6	47.0±3.8	12.4±1.9
secondary school	37.3±13.6	41.6±15.4	17.3±4.4	96.3±26.3	46.5±7.3	11.6±2.4
High school	34.0±16.1	36.6±15.2	16.1±3.6	86.8±29.6	45.3±4.1	13.3±1.9
Universty	21.2±6.7	25.0±5.9	13.2±1.8	59.5±11.6	43.0±6.0	15.2±2.7
F, p	F:3.013 p:0.024	F:1.627 p:0.177	F:1.305 p:0.277	F:2.919 p:0.027	F:0.597 p:0.666	F:2.960 p:0.026
Income and Expenditure Balance						
Lo income	38.0±15.6	43.6±15.7	16.6±3.4	98.3±29.3	46.2±5.9	11.6±2.8
Equals	28.6±12.0	30.0±10.7	15.5±4.0	74.2±20.9	45.0±4.2	13.9±2.3
Income more	32.0±17.9	42.8±11.5	14.5±3.0	89.3±22.1	46.1±5.7	12.5±1.3
F, p	Kw:6.287 p:0.043	F:7.458 p:0.001	F:1.482 p:0.233	Kw:12.014 p:0.002	F:0.407 p:0.667	F:6.286 p:0.003
Working Status						
Yes	27.6±13.3	35.8±19.0	14.6±3.8	78.1±34.3	45.5±4.3	14.2±2.4
No	37.0±15.3	40.8±14.1	16.6±3.4	94.5±25.9	46.0±5.8	11.7±2.7

t, p	t:-2.377 p: 0.020	t:-1.221 p:0.226	t:-2.119 p: 0.037	t:-2.205 p: 0.030	t:-0.371 p:0.712	t:3.419 p: 0.001
Spouse's employment status						
Yes	33.6±15.6	38.5±14.5	15.4±3.3	87.5±27.0	45.1±4.6	12.9±2.6
No	38.4±15.0	41.1±16.3	17.2±3.7	96.7±29.5	47.1±5.7	11.3±2.2
t, p	t:-1.291 p:0.201	t:-0.715 p:0.477	t:-2.219 p:0.30	t:-1.376 p:0.173	t:-1.668 p:0.100	t:2.760 p: 0.007

Table 2. Comparison of Marital Characteristics and Problem Solving, State Anxiety, and Self-Esteem Scales.

Marital features	Total and Sub-Dimensions of Problem Solving Scale ($\times\pm SD$)				State Anxiety Scale ($\times\pm SD$)	Self-Esteem Scale ($\times\pm SD$)
	Confidence in problem solving ability	Approach, avoidance	Personal control	Total		
Type of marriage						
Civil marriage	37.4±12.6	49.2±7.3	14.8±2.4	101.4±18.1	46.6±7.4	10.2±4.9
Religious marriage	31.7±15.1	39.2±16.6	16.7±4.2	87.7±28.7	45.6±5.3	12.6±2.8
Religious and civil marriage	36.7±15.8	38.6±14.9	15.9±3.3	91.3±28.8	45.9±4.9	12.4±2.1
F, p	F:0.781 p:0.462	F:1.118 p:0.333	F:0.693 p:0.503	F:0.471 p:0.626	F:0.076 p:0.927	Kw:0.960 p:0.619
Way of marriage						
By meeting	32.5±14.2	33.7±15.6	15.3±3.4	81.6±28.4	45.2±5.2	12.6±2.7
Arranged	39.3±16.5	42.3±15.0	16.7±3.6	98.4±29.1	45.4±4.4	12.2±2.0
Other	31.4±13.9	41.8±13.4	15.7±3.5	89.0±22.8	47.3±6.4	12.2±3.4
F, p	F:2.111 p:0.129	F:2.456 p:0.093	F:1.237 p:0.296	F:2.574 p:0.083	F:0.978 p:0.381	F:0.234 p:0.792
Number of marriages						
One	35.5±15.1	38.9±15.5	15.8±3.5	90.4±29.0	45.7±5.1	12.4±2.5
Two or more	34.3±19.0	43.6±10.9	18.2±3.4	96.2±19.2	46.5±5.8	11.5±3.2
T, p	t:0.207 p:0.836	t:-0.816 p:0.417	t:-1.833 p:0.071	t:-0.553 p:0.582	t:-0.364 p:0.717	t:0.977 p:0.332
Being a child from another partnership						
There is a kid	36.0±17.3	40.0±15.6	16.0±3.3	92.1±27.1	44.4±5.6	13.3±2.5
No children	35.3±15.2	39.3±15.1	16.1±3.6	90.7±28.5	46.1±5.0	12.1±2.5
T, p	t:0.159 p:0.874	t:0.155 p:0.877	t:-0.103 p:0.918	t:0.158 p:0.875	t:-1.078 p:0.285	t:1.605 p:0.113
City change after marriage						
Yes	31.4±12.6	37.4±15.1	16.1±3.5	85.0±25.8	46.2±5.2	12.7±2.4
No	38.4±16.8	41.0±15.1	16.0±3.6	95.4±29.2	45.5±5.1	12.0±2.6

T, p	t:-2.043 p: 0.045	t:-1.022 p:0.310	t:0.195 p:0.846	t:-1.600 p:0.114	t:0.551 p:0.584	t:1.258 p:0.212
Where he lived after marriage						
With his wife's family	35.7±14.8	41.8±15.8	16.3±3.9	94.0±28.3	46.2±5.3	12.2±2.4
In your own home	34.9±16.6	35.4±13.1	15.6±2.8	86.0±27.4	45.2±4.8	12.5±2.8
T, p	t:0.225 p:0.822	t:1.814 p:0.074	t:0.840 p:0.403	t:1.197 p:0.235	t:0.841 p:0.403	t:-0.485 p:0.629
Family violence before marriage						
Yes	34.6±15.7	42.4±16.3	16.5±3.7	93.6±30.6	46.2±6.1	11.9±3.1
No	35.3±15.1	36.8±13.8	15.7±3.4	87.9±26.3	45.5±4.6	12.7±2.3
T, p	t:-0.186 p:0.853	t:1.651 p:0.103	t:1.021 p:0.310	t:0.904 p:0.369	t:0.526 p:0.600	t:-1.429 p:0.157
First time of violence						
First 6 months	35.2±15.4	38.0±15.9	16.3±3.8	89.6±29.5	46.3±5.5	12.5±2.4
First 7 months-5 years	32.3±15.3	43.4±14.9	14.4±2.4	90.2±27.5	45.8±4.3	11.8±3.2
After 5 years	42.5±15.3	33.8±9.0	16.8±3.4	93.2±24.6	44.0±4.5	12.0±1.6
Other (fiancee, postpartum)	35.7±17.0	46.2±13.9	17.0±3.1	99.0±28.0	45.0±5.0	12.5±3.1
F, p	F:0.753 p:0.524	F:1.324 p:0.273	F:1.416 p:0.245	F:0.236 p:0.871	F:0.537 p:0.659	F:0.306 p:0.821

Table 3. Comparison of Causes and Types of Violence and Problem Solving, State Anxiety, Self-Esteem Scales.

Causes and Types of Violence	Total and Sub-Dimensions of Problem Solving Scale (×±SD)				State Anxiety Scale (×±SD)	Self-Esteem Scale (×±SD)
	Confidence in problem solving ability	Approach, avoidance	Personal control	Total		
Causes of Violence						
Economic						
Yes	24.0±5.7	34.8±8.5	17.4±2.8	76.2±9.3	47.6±5.8	13.2±3.7
No	35.7±15.5	40.1±15.6	16.0±3.6	91.9±29.2	45.8±5.5	12.2±2.7
t, p	t:-3.736 p: 0.005	t:-0.746 p:0.458	t:0.784 p:0.435	t:-2.947 p: 0.014	t:0.700 p:0.486	t:0.708 p:0.481
Substance use						
Yes	35.0±18.1	39.8±19.3	17.2±4.3	92.1±35.7	46.2±4.2	13.2±3.0
No	34.9±14.8	39.7±14.5	15.9±3.4	90.7±27.2	45.8±5.7	12.1±2.7

t, p	t:0.019 p:0.985	t:0.020 p:0.984	t:1.191 p:0.237	t:0.170 p:0.865	t:0.266 p:0.791	t:1.291 p:0.200
To object						
Yes	33.0±14.4	35.8±14.9	15.9±3.9	84.8±27.5	45.2±4.7	12.8±2.1
No	36.5±16.0	42.8±15.0	16.3±3.3	95.7±28.8	46.4±6.0	11.9±3.2
t, p	t:-1.015 p:0.313	t:-2.117 p:0.037	t:-0.500 p:0.619	t:-1.742 p:0.085	t:-1.026 p:0.308	t:1.424 p:0.159
Jealousy						
Yes	28.7±8.2	32.5±7.5	15.2±3.8	76.5±18.1	46.7±8.7	13.2±3.4
No	35.3±15.5	40.1±15.5	16.2±3.6	91.6±28.9	45.8±5.3	12.2±2.8
t, p	t:-1.463 p:0.214	t:-0.972 p:0.334	t:-0.521 p:0.604	t:-1.036 p:0.303	t:0.305 p:0.761	t:0.665 p:0.508
Complaint from family/environment						
Yes	34.2±15.7	36.8±12.8	16.4±4.6	87.5±23.5	45.3±5.1	12.1±1.6
No	35.0±15.4	40.1±15.6	16.1±3.5	91.3±29.2	46.0±5.5	12.3±2.9
t, p	t:-0.160 p:0.873	t:-0.528 p:0.553	t:0.240 p:0.811	t:-0.375 p:0.708	t:-0.341 p:0.734	t:-0.244 p:0.808
Man's Deception						
Yes	27.2±11.6	43.0±6.6	14.7±3.3	85.0±10.9	49.0±8.3	13.0±2.4
No	35.3±15.4	39.6±15.6	16.2±3.6	91.2±29.2	45.7±5.3	12.2±2.8
t, p	t:-1.036 p:0.303	t:0.428 p:0.670	t:-0.805 p:0.423	t:-0.978 p:0.369	t:1.148 p:0.254	t:0.484 p:0.630
Unexplained violence						
Yes	34.9±14.9	40.2±15.9	15.8±3.2	91.0±29.3	45.8±6.0	12.3±3.0
No	35.1±16.8	38.3±13.6	17.1±4.4	90.6±27.1	46.0±3.6	12.2±2.2
t, p	t:-0.066 p:0.948	t:0.498 p:0.620	t:-1.440 p:0.154	t:0.052 p:0.958	t:-0.162 p:0.872	t:0.170 p:0.865
Types of Violence						
Physical Violence						
Yes	35.4±15.7	39.8±15.6	16.1±3.6	91.4±29.1	45.9±5.4	12.4±2.8
No	30.0±9.6	39.1±13.0	16.1±2.8	85.2±23.2	45.4±6.2	11.5±2.9
t, p	t:1.342 p:0.211	t:0.114 p:0.909	t:0.021 p:0.983	t:0.545 p:0.587	t:0.249 p:0.804	t:0.739 p:0.462
Verbal Violence						
Yes	35.3±15.4	39.4±15.1	16.2±3.6	90.9±28.7	46.0±5.4	12.2±2.8
No	29.0±12.1	46.0±20.3	15.2±3.8	90.2±29.7	43.7±5.8	13.7±1.5
t, p	t:0.800 p:0.426	t:-0.829 p:0.410	t:0.521 p:0.604	t:0.050 p:0.960	t:0.810 p:0.421	t:-1.030 p:0.306
Emotional/psychological Violence						
Yes	36.2±15.8	40.2±15.7	16.0±3.6	92.5±29.6	45.5±5.5	12.4±2.6
No	27.5±9.7	37.2±13.0	17.0±3.6	81.9±20.6	48.3±4.3	11.7±3.8
t, p	t:2.558 p:0.018	t:0.615 p:0.540	t:-0.947 p:0.346	t:1.187 p:0.239	t:-1.658 p:0.101	t:0.766 p:0.446
Sexual Violence						
Yes	34.5±15.2	39.6±14.8	16.1±3.3	90.4±28.2	46.5±5.7	12.3±2.4
No	35.2±15.5	39.8±15.8	16.1±3.8	91.3±29.1	45.4±5.3	12.3±3.0
t, p	t:-0.203 p:0.840	t:-0.051 p:0.959	t:-0.050 p:0.961	t:-0.143 p:0.887	t:0.874 p:0.385	t:-0.015 p:0.988

Economic Violence						
Yes	36.1±15.7	39.2±15.1	16.1±3.5	91.5±28.6	46.5±5.1	12.2±2.7
No	31.8±14.1	41.1±16.0	16.3±3.8	89.2±29.2	44.2±6.1	12.5±3.1
t, p	t:1.138 p:0.258	t:-0.482 p:0.631	t:-0.223 p:0.824	t:0.320 p:0.750	t:1.714 p:0.090	t:-0.505 p:0.615
Cyber violence						
Yes	23.5±9.1	35.5±13.4	16.0±0.0	75.0±4.2	51.0±1.4	12.0±1.4
No	35.2±15.4	39.8±15.4	16.1±3.6	91.3±28.8	45.8±5.5	12.3±2.8
t,p	t:-1.073 p:0.286	t:-0.397 p:0.692	t:-0.428 p:0.670	t:-3.711 p:0.016	t:1.326 p:0.188	t:-0.166 p:0.869

Table 4. The Relationship Between Total and Sub-Dimensions of the Women's Problem Solving Scale, the State Anxiety Scale, and the Total Mean Scores of the Self-Esteem Scale

Scales	Total and Sub-Dimensions of Problem Solving Scale (×±SD)				State Anxiety Scale(×±SD)
	Confidence in problem solving ability	Approach avoidance	Personal control	Total	
Approach, avoidance	r:0.525 p:0.000	-	-	-	-
Personal control	r:0.351 p:0.001	r:0.432 p:0.000	-	-	-
Total	r:0.863 p:0.000	r:0.873 p:0.000	r:0.546 p:0.000	-	-
State Anxiety Scale	r:-0.177 p:0.113	r:-0.020 p:0.861	r:0.110 p:0.325	r:-0.091 p:0.414	-
Self-Esteem Scale	r:-0.385 p:0.000	r:-0.456 p:0.000	r:-0.469 p:0.000	r:-0.510 p:0.000	r:-0.244 p:0.027

Table 5. Problem Solving Inventory, State Anxiety Inventory, and Self-Esteem Inventory Expected and Observed Min.- Max. Scores and Average Scores

Expected and observed min.-max scores, total score averages of the scales	Total and Sub-Dimensions of Problem Solving Scale (×±SD)				State Anxiety Scale (×±SD)	Self-Esteem Scale (×±SD)
	Confidence in problem solving ability	Approach, avoidance	Personal control	Total		
Expected min.-max scores	11-66	16-96	6-36	32-192	20-80	0-100

Observed min.-max scores	14-63	17-81	10-27	46-168	33-62	2-18
Total score averages of the scales	35.0±15.3	39.7±15.3	16.1±3.6	90.9±28.6	45.9±5.5	12.3±2.8

Discussion

Evaluating the problem-solving skills, state anxiety levels and self-esteem of women who have been subjected to violence and who have taken shelter in shelters after this exposure or who prefer to continue their lives in the environment where violence has been experienced will provide important goals to community leaders and policy makers in the solution phase of violence against women, which is a public health problem. When the literature is examined, no study has been found that examines the violence experienced by women who are victims of violence and stay in shelters within the framework of their problem-solving skills, state anxiety levels and self-esteem. This makes this research important in terms of its contribution to the literature.

In the study, women who do not stay in shelters find themselves insufficient in trusting their problem-solving skills. In a study conducted on women staying in shelters, it was found that while 44.7% of women had sufficient problem-solving skills, 2.5% were inadequate (Gulmus and Keskin, 2017). In this study, it is thought that the current situation is due to the fact that women who are exposed to violence cannot get away from the environment where they are exposed to violence and that the situation of exposure to violence continues.

In the study, the problem solving scale "Confidence in problem solving ability" sub-dimension and total score average were found in women whose spouses were literate or illiterate, whose income was less than their expenses, and who did not work in an income-generating job; approach-avoidance sub-dimension average income is less than expenses; personal control sub-dimension mean score is higher in women who do not work in a job that generates income. The fact that the low education level of the spouse

causes a decrease in the problem-solving ability of the woman who is exposed to violence is one of the striking data in the study. It is thought that this situation is associated with the confidence of the woman in solving her own problems and the decrease in the trust of the woman in her spouse with the decrease in the education level of the spouse. At the same time, low economic level causes a decrease in confidence in problem solving ability, while re-evaluating initial problem solving efforts for future reference and acting actively for alternative solutions causes a decrease in women's ability to maintain control in problematic situations.

In the study, women who do not move away from their birthplace and family after marriage are less confident in their problem-solving abilities. Despite being in the same city as her family, the woman who was subjected to violence could not tell about the events in the family, and the family (not wanting to intervene in family matters, never accepting the divorce situation due to traditional attitudes, and not wanting the abused woman to return to her parents' home) provided the necessary support to the abused woman. It is thought that the problem solving ability of women is low due to the fact that women do not provide a solution and struggle to overcome the violence situation on their own.

According to the study, the problem-solving skills of women who were not exposed to economic violence were found to be lower. Donmez et al. (2012), one third of men inflict economic and physical violence on their wives. In the study, it is thought that the concept of economic violence as a type of violence against women is not fully perceived by the women participating in the study.

In the study, it is seen that the problem-solving skills of women who have been subjected to emotional/psychological

violence are less. Considering the results of the study, it is thought that the reason for this situation is that women who are exposed to this type of violence feel weaker and their self-confidence is shaken against their problems. Mahruliana, et al., 2020, it was found that the problem-solving skills of women who were victims of violence, including emotional violence, were insufficient and that these skills were higher in those who received training or counseling on the subject.

Considering the type of violence, women staying in shelters are exposed to cyber violence at the rate of 4.4%, while the group not staying in shelters is not exposed to this type of violence. In this study, cyber violence emerged as forcing women to watch inappropriate images of others or making others watch inappropriate images of women by their spouses. As a result of the study, it is thought that the reason for the low rate of cyber violence is related to the fact that this type of violence is not perceived as violence.

In this study conducted on women who were exposed to violence, their problem-solving skills were found to be "above average". In a study conducted to investigate the socio-demographic characteristics of women in shelters and the characteristics of the violence they are exposed to, results consistent with this study were found (Ogulmus and Keskin, 2017). Based on these results obtained from the study, it is thought that the woman who has been subjected to violence has difficulty in overcoming the circle created by cultural values during the struggle with violence and that she is exposed to social pressure, and that she has acquired the ability to solve her problems and developed these skills during the efforts to combat this situation.

In the study, it is seen that the anxiety level is higher in women staying in shelters than in women who do not stay in shelters. Babol compared the anxiety and depression status of women who were abused and not abused by their spouses in a study he conducted with women who applied to the Primary Health Care Service in 2017, and it was found that the anxiety levels of women who were victims of violence were higher (Ghahari et al., 2018). In a study conducted on women who were victims of violence who did not stay in a shelter, it was reported that the state and trait

anxiety levels of women who stayed in a shelter were higher than those who did not stay in a shelter (Kazancı, 2010). In another similar study, anxiety was found in approximately 80% of women with a medium or long stay in shelters (Fernandez et al., 2018). In line with all these results, although women staying in shelters are safe and comfortable during their stay, It is thought that their anxiety levels increase due to the uncertainties they will experience after leaving, the possible problems they will encounter, their fears for the future and the loss of existing support.

In this study conducted on women who were exposed to violence, it was determined that the state anxiety level of women was "below the average". In the study of Kazancı, the anxiety level of women who were exposed to violence was found to be high (Fernandez et al., 2018). Loxton et al. (2006) According to his study in Australia; Women diagnosed with depression, anxiety, or another "other" psychiatric disorder were more likely to be exposed to domestic violence. Ferrari t al.,(2016) cross-sectional study of women seeking help from domestic violence support services recently found it was found that women who were exposed to and survived high levels of domestic abuse developed high levels of anxiety. In the study, it is thought that the reason for the low level of anxiety of women despite being exposed to violence is that women consider violence as a normal and habitual situation in their lives.

In the study, self-esteem was found to be higher in those whose spouses were university graduates, whose income was equal to their expenses, and those whose spouses and themselves worked in an income-generating job. In a study investigating the relationship between the working status of women and their self-esteem, it was found that the self-esteem of working women was higher than that of non-working women (Sahin and Ermis, 2019). In this study, it is thought that the reason for the higher self-esteem among women who are victims of violence is that they feel freer in the economic sense and have been able to find alternative solutions.

In the study, women's self-esteem was found to be "below the average". Karaoglan (2020), a positive relationship was found between exposure to violence and low self-esteem. In

another study conducted with women who were victims of violence, it was observed that the self-esteem score of women was below the average (Bacanli, 2009), and this situation is in parallel with the present study.

When the relationship between the total score averages of the problem solving scale, the state anxiety scale and the self-esteem scale is examined; A negative significant relationship was found between the total mean scores of the self-esteem scale, the problem-solving scale and the state anxiety scale. In this study, it is emphasized that the decrease in problem-solving skills and the increase in anxiety in women who are exposed to violence negatively affect the self-esteem of women who are exposed to violence.

Conclusion: The following results were found in this study:

- Confidence in problem solving ability, approach-avoidance, personal control sub-dimensions, total score averages, and state anxiety level and self-esteem total score averages for the problem solving scale were found to be “below the average”.
- Confidence in Problem Solving Ability sub-dimension score average of the Problem Solving Scale; It was found to be significantly higher in women who do not stay in a shelter, whose spouse is literate/illiterate, whose income is higher than their expenses, who do not work in any job, who do not change cities after marriage, who are not exposed to violence for economic reasons, and who are subjected to emotional/psychological violence.
- Approach/Avoidance sub-dimension mean score of the Problem Solving Scale; It was found to be significantly higher in women whose income is less than their expenses and who have not been subjected to violence due to objection.
- Personal Control sub-dimension mean score of the Problem Solving Scale; It was found to be significantly higher in unemployed women.
- Total mean score of the Problem Solving Scale; It was found to be significantly higher in women whose spouses are literate/illiterate, whose income is less than their expenses, who do not work in any job, who are not exposed to violence for economic reasons, and who are not exposed to cyber violence.

- State Anxiety Scale mean score; It was found to be significantly higher in women staying in shelters.

- Self-Esteem Scale mean score; It was found to be significantly higher in women whose spouses are university graduates, whose income is equal to their expenses, and who work in any job.

- It was determined that there was a negative significant relationship between the total mean score of the problem solving scale and the mean total score of self-esteem, and between the mean total score of state anxiety and the total mean score of self-esteem.

Recommendations: According to the results of the research, the recommendations are as follows:

- Most of the women who were exposed to violence were born in the Southeastern Anatolia Region. Despite the fact that the rate of violence in this region is quite high in other studies on the subject, the number of shelters opened is insufficient and their capacities are quite limited. As stated in the Municipality Law, it is recommended to open shelters affiliated to municipalities with a population of more than 50,000 in every region of Turkey, and to increase the number of shelters in residential areas with shelters.
- Among the services provided for women staying in shelters, there should be psychological support, some studies aimed at changing and raising the awareness of women about the phenomenon of violence, and raising awareness about gender inequality.
- Women exposed to violence should be informed and encouraged about their orientation to shelters. There is a great lack of information among women regarding the application to shelters and the subsequent process. This shortcoming can be eliminated through the media, and the security forces who bring women who have been subjected to violence to the emergency room should also be informed through in-service training, and the flow of information should be directed towards the women who have been subjected to violence.
- Within the framework of the public health approach, it is recommended that security forces be trained on violence and shelters through in-service training, home visits are made to identify women who have been subjected to violence, and information is

given to risk groups and women who have been subjected to violence.

• According to the results of the research, we see that the anxiety level of women who have been subjected to violence is below the average. This is one of the striking results of our study. When the interviews are evaluated, it is seen that the anxiety level of the women is quite high, but the anxiety level is anger, anger, resentment, helplessness, etc. Anxiety levels were found below what was expected throughout the study. The woman, who cannot fully describe her emotional state, cannot struggle with this situation. Within the scope of violence against women, which is very important in terms of public health, it is very important for women to receive psychological support and to be able to characterize and combat the situation they are in.

References

- Fernandez-Gonzalez, L., Calvete, E., Orue, I., & Mauri, A. (2018). Victims of domestic violence in shelters: impacts on women and children. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 21, E18.
- AITB (Amnesty International Turkey Branch) (2004). <https://www.amnesty.org.tr/public/uploads/files/Report/eur440132004tr.pdf>. Retrieved on: 02.05.2023.
- Heise, L. L., & Kotsadam, A. (2015). Cross-national and multilevel correlates of partner violence: an analysis of data from population-based surveys. *The Lancet Global Health*, 3(6), e332-e340.
- GDSW (General Directorate on the Status of Women) (2015). Research on Domestic Violence Against Women in Turkey, <https://www.uploads.ksgm/uploads/pages/pdf> Retrieved on 01.05.2023.
- UNHCR (The office of the united nations high commissioner for refugees) 2003. <https://www.unhcr.org/statistics/unhcrstats/40d015fb4/2003-global-refugee-trends-overview-refugee-populations-new-arrivals-durable.html>, Retrieved on 29.04.2023.
- Ghahari, S., Khademolreza, N., Ghasemzad, S., Babagholzadeh, H., & Ghayoomi, R. (2018). Comparison of Anxiety and Depression in victims of spousal abused and Non-Abused women in Primary Health Care (PHC) in Babol-Iran. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 6(02).
- Costa, E. C., & Gomes, S. C. (2018). Social support and self-esteem moderate the relation between intimate partner violence and depression and anxiety symptoms among Portuguese women. *Journal of Family Violence*, 33, 355-368.
- Acikel, S (2009). The Case of Women's Shelter in Combating Violence Against Women: The Case of Turkey. T.R. Ankara University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Women's Studies, Master Thesis, Ankara.
- Gracia, E., & Merlo, J. (2016). Intimate partner violence against women and the Nordic paradox. *Social Science & Medicine*, 157, 27-30.
- Lloyd, M., Ramon, S., Vakalopoulou, A., Videmšek, P., Meffan, C., Roszczynska-Michta, J., & Rollè, L. (2017). Women's experiences of domestic violence and mental health: Findings from a European empowerment project. *Psychology of Violence*, 7(3), 478.
- Bahadir Yilmaz, E., & Oz, F. (2019). An Empowerment Program for Women Exposed to Domestic Violence. *HEAD*, 16(4):338-342.
- Taylan, S. (1990). Adaptation, Reliability and Validity Studies of Heppner's Problem Solving Inventory. Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Psychological Services in Education, Master's thesis, Ankara.
- Heppner, P. P., & Petersen, C. H. (1982). The development and implications of a personal problem-solving inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 29(1), 66.
- Spielberger, C.D. (1985). Assessment of state and trait anxiety: conceptual and methodological issues. *The Southern Psychologist*, 2, 6-16.
- Oner, N & Le Compte A. (1985). State trait anxiety inventory handbook. Istanbul: Bogazici University Press.
- Coopersmith, S. (1981). *Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventories (CSEI)* [Database record]. APA PsycTests. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t06456-000>
- Turan, N & Tufan, B (1987) The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) validity-reliability study. Istanbul 23rd National Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences Congress.
- Ogulmus, S & Keskin, A. (2017). Investigating the Socio- Demographic Properties of Women in Shelters and Characteristics of Violence That They are Exposed. *Biomedical Research*, 28 (6): 2384-2390.
- Donmez, G., Simsek, H., & Gunay, T. (2012). Spouse violence and related factors in married men. *Turkish Journal of Public Health*, 10(3), 151-159.
- Mahruliana, N. C., Hariyani, H., & Syahputra, Y. (2020). Problem solving for women victims of domestic violence: Descriptive analysis with JASP based on demographics. *Psychocentrum Review*, 2(2), 56-68.

- Kazanci, D. (2010). Anxiety and Depression Levels of Women Accommodating in Women's Shelter due to the Violence They Have Endured in Their Marriages, Maltepe University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Psychology, Istanbul.
- Loxton, D., Schofield, M., & Hussain, R. (2006). Psychological health in midlife among women who have ever lived with a violent partner or spouse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(8), 1092-1107.
- Ferrari, G., Agnew-Davies, R., Bailey, J., Howard, L., Howarth, E., Peters, T. J., ... & Feder, G. S. (2016). Domestic violence and mental health: a cross-sectional survey of women seeking help from domestic violence support services. *Global Health Action*, 9(1), 29890.
- Sahin, M., & Ermis, E. (2019). Reversal Of The Remaining Women's Shelter And Women's Selfesteem, Depression And Psychosomatic Symptoms. *Eurasian Journal Of Researches In Social And Economics (EJRSE)*, 6(11), 81-110.
- Karaoglan, C. (2020). A Study on Depression, Resilience and Self-Esteem of Violent Women. T.R. Bursa Uludag University Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Psychiatry (Clinical Psychology-Adult) Master's Thesis, Bursa.
- Bacanli, B. (2009). Evaluation of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Self Perception in terms of History of Violence in Women Staying in Shelter, Istanbul University Institute of Forensic Medicine, Department of Social Sciences, Istanbul.