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Abstract

AIM: In this study, the aim is to evaluate student nurses’ sociotropic-autonomic personality traits and orientation to the caring role in line with these advancements and requirements in the profession.

METHOD: This descriptive study included 372 nursing students studying in the 2018-2019 spring term. A 9-question questionnaire, 60-item Sociotropy Autonomy Scale and 24-item Nursing Care Role Orientation Scale were used to collect data. In the analysis of the data, descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum were applied. An independent sample t-test was used to compare the means of two independent groups and a one-way ANOVA test was used to compare more than two independent groups. Written consent was obtained from the participants.

RESULTS: It was determined that the total Sociotropy Autonomy Scale (SAS) average score of the students was 152.35 ± 19.96 while the total score of the Nursing Care Role Orientation Scale (NCROS) was 79.48 ± 7.51. In addition, there were significant differences in SAS score averages related to age, gender, parental education status, and parental attitudes. Meaningful differences were also found in the total scores of NCROS according to age, gender, class grade, mother’s education level, and willingness to choose the nursing department. There was no statistically significant correlation between SAS total score and NCROS total score (p > .05).

CONCLUSION: In line with the results obtained from the research, it can be recommended that the courses which can contribute to the orientation of the students to the sociotropic and autonomic personality characteristics and the orientation of nursing care roles contents should be developed, and the training and activities of awareness should be conducted.
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Introduction

Nursing is a science and an art form that has been continuously developing from the past to the present while caring for the individual, family, and society, protecting, maintaining, and improving the individual’s health. In the case of deviation from health, it is an applied profession that helps the individual regain their health (Can & Acaroğlu, 2015; Kaya et al., 2016).

Nursing development can be accomplished by the provision of evidence-based and quality care services. The individual needs care at every stage of one’s life. In this sense, the healthy/sick individual should be assessed from a holistic and humanistic perspective. In meeting the individual’s care requirements, the nurse should provide and maintain appropriate and qualified care by including the individual. It is a vital issue to define and explain the concept of “care,” which forms the basis of the science and philosophy of nursing and the profession’s independent function. The primary function of nursing is to help the individual, to protect them and improve their health, and the main function in achieving this purpose is the care function (Atar & Aştı, 2012; Edvardsson et al., 2017).

Tendencies, which are described as the manifestation of the interaction of mental processes such as emotions, thoughts, and behavior, that cannot be defined within the biological state and social environment of an individual, are explained as a personality (Buyukbayram et al., 2016; Taymur & Hakan Türkçapar, 2012). In Beck’s cognitive theory, it is stated that personality has two sub-dimensions, which are sociotropy and autonomy (Kaya et al., 2006). Autonomy refers to a person’s self-management, the will to decide between conflicting demands and tendencies, and the ability to take active steps to control one’s own life and to make one’s own decisions (Karagözoglu et al., 2015; MacDonald, 2002). It is divided into individual and professional autonomy. Individual autonomy, which is shaped in the socialization process, is significant for nursing since it is based on professional status (Karagözoglu et al., 2015; Seren, 2001). Professional autonomy refers to members of the profession’s ability to control their professional practice (Karagözoglu et
al., 2015; Stewart et al., 2004). In this regard, nurses with high autonomy are reported as individuals with strong motivation and job satisfaction, high performance, and problem-solving skills (Akgün, 2017; Kaya et al., 2006). Sociotropy and autonomy are recognized as essential personality traits in nursing. Autonomy is a fundamental criterion for the professionalization of nursing. The fact that nurses are composed of individuals with autonomic personality traits will contribute to nursing professionalization (Kaya & Tosun, 2018).

In the process of providing primary education in nursing, it is regarded as a prerequisite for students to take responsibility for teaching the basic concepts of nursing, gaining care behaviors, and adopting their professional roles. Accordingly, in nursing education, besides scientific knowledge, it is vital to acquire nursing values distinct to effective areas, caring behaviors, and emotional intelligence skills that supervise these behaviors to continue and direct (Can & Acaroğlu, 2015; Culha & Acaroglu, 2019).

In the literature, the terms applied in the definition of nursing care are safe, quality, experimental, coordinated, individualized, teamwork-based, ethical, compassionate, holistic, and evidence-based (DalPezzo, 2009; Timmins, 2006). When nursing care is defined according to its functions, it covers the concepts of evaluation, detecting, prevention, listening, anticipating, training, advocacy, and monitoring/surveillance among the standard functions. The concept of care involves several dimensions, and when the definitions of nursing theorists are considered, it is observed that there are variations (Carroll, 2005; DalPezzo, 2009).

Nursing is essentially an applied discipline based on care (Huisman’d de Waal et al., 2018). Nursing care is the action that occurs in all functions to protect and improve the individual’s health and for the healing process in cases of deviation from health. The literature states that care is a fundamental activity of nursing, and it is necessary to focus on determining the care needs of the individual (Culha & Acaroglu, 2018; Martins & Perroca, 2017). Sociotropy and autonomy are essential personality traits in nursing. Nurses being individuals with autonomic personality traits will contribute to the professionalization of nursing. In other words, providing autonomy to nurses and allowing them to benefit from autonomy to become professional will pave the way for their socialization (Kaya & Tosun, 2018; Mrayyan, 2005). For a sustainable profession, individuals should possess positive personality traits and positive professional thoughts (Zencirci & Yalçın, 2013).

It has been revealed that nurses’ sociotropic-autonomic personality traits have essential effects on nursing care to increase their professional, scientific knowledge, to perform effectively in interpersonal relationships, practice critical thinking skills and emotional intelligence skills, perform nursing care roles efficiently, meet professionalization criteria, and socialize (Dolgun & Erdoğan, 2012). Developments in nursing have allowed members of the profession to work independently, mainly in care practices. In particular, developments in nursing roles have significantly influenced the quality of care provided to patients (Karaahmetoğlu & Alpar, 2017; Pektekin, 2013). Debates continue in the literature concerning the expansion of nurses’ roles and their taking on new roles. Therefore, they should share scientific developments with their colleagues (Gibson, 1999). In this study, the aim is to evaluate student nurses’ sociotropic-autonomic personality traits and orientation to the caring role in line with these advancements and requirements in the profession.

Research Questions
1. What are the sociotropic-autonomic personalities of nursing students according to their sociodemographic characteristics?
2. What is the nursing care role orientation of the students?

Methods
Study Design
This was a descriptive study.

Sample
The universe of the research consisted of 372 undergraduate nursing students who continued their education in the spring semester of the 2018-2019 academic year of a health college. The nursing students (402 students) at a public university health college Health School in the 2018-2019 academic year, formed the population of the research. It was aimed to reach all students before calculating the sample, and the sample consisted of 372 nursing students who accepted to participate in the study (participation 92.53%).

Data Collection
Student Information Form, Sociotropy Autonomy Scale (SAS), and Nursing Care Role Orientation Scale (NCROS) were used to collect data. The research was implemented in at a public university health college Health School in the spring semester of 2018-2019 academic year. After the briefing, the data of the students, who agreed to participate in the study, were collected in the classroom environment where they spent their free time outside the school hours.

Data Collection Tools
Student Information Form
This form, provided by the researcher in line with the literature (Erikmen & Vatan, 2019), consisted of nine questions concerning the individual characteristics of the students, such as age, gender, marital status, income status, class grade, and parents’ educational status.

Sociotropy Autonomy Scale-SAS
It was developed by Beck et al. (1983) to measure personality traits of being dependent on others and being autonomous. The scale has two subscales, sociotropy and autonomy. The scale with 60 items in total and based on self-report is graded in 5-Likert type (0 = not identifying at all, 4 = identify very well). The scale’s reliability study concluded that the Cronbach alpha coefficient was between .89 and .94 for the sociotropy sub-scale and .83-.95 for the autonomy sub-scale. The sociotropy sub-scale consists of disapproval anxiety, separation anxiety,
and pleasing others, while the autonomy sub-scale consists of personal accomplishment, freedom, and desiring loneliness (Şahin et al., 1993). In this study, the Cronbach alpha value was found to be .816.

**Nursing Care Role Orientation Scale-NCROS**
The original version of the scale was prepared by Stemple (1988) to evaluate the orientation of nurses to the caring role, and a Turkish validity and reliability study was carried by Karaahmetoğlu and Alpar (2017). It is a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = I agree entirely with the first statement, 5 = I agree entirely with the second statement). The scale consists of 24 items, and the total score of the scale is between 24 and 120. Higher scores on the scale show a high orientation to the nursing care role. The scale includes sub-dimensions of collaboration, research, nurse/patient interaction, and autonomy. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was .87 in the original validity and reliability study of the scale, and .65 in the Turkish validity and reliability study (Karaahmetoğlu & Alpar, 2017). In this study, the Cronbach alpha value was found to be .749.

**Statistical Analysis**
The data obtained from the research were analyzed using the SPSS v22.0 (IBM SPSS Corp., Armonk, NY, USA) statistical software. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum were applied to analyze the data. An independent sample t-test was applied to compare the means of two independent groups, and a one-way ANOVA test was employed to compare more than two independent groups. An ANOVA test was done, when variance homogeneity was provided for group differences, Tukey honestly significant difference test was used, when not, Tamhane multi-group comparison test was done. The Pearson correlation coefficient was applied in the scales’ correlation analysis, and Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was used in the reliability analysis. All test results were evaluated at a .05 significance level (p < .05).

**Ethical Considerations**
The study to be conducted was approved by the Van Yüzüncü Yıl University Van School of Health (Date: 22.04.2019 No: 32282) and the ethics committee approval from Van Yüzüncü Yıl University Health Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee (The meeting started after the decision dated 02/04/2019 and numbered 2019/02-01 and Number: 26302). Written permission was obtained from the authors who made the scale and its validity/reliability to use the study scales. The study started by filling out the Informed Consent Form prepared for the voluntary participation and written consent of the students. The confidentiality principle was adhered to by informing the students that the personal information received would not be shared with anyone other than the researcher or that this information could not be accessed by anyone other than the researcher and would not be utilized for purposes other than research.

**Results**

When Table 1 is examined the average age of the students is 21.33 ± 1.98 years, 58.9% of them are in the range of 17–21 age group, 59.7% are female (n = 222), 97.6% are single (n = 363),
and 52.7% (n=196) chose the nursing department willingly, 55.4% (n=206) had less than their expenses, 55.6% of their fathers (n=207) were elementary school graduate, and 51.3% of them (n=191) had parents with a protective attitude (Table 1).

It was determined that the mean score of male students “pleasing others” (15.07 ± 4.11) was significantly higher than the mean score (14.00 ± 4.19) of female students (t = –2.453; p < .05). In the study, when the scores of the students’ autonomic personality sub-dimensions “personal accomplishment,” “freedom,” and “enjoying loneliness” are evaluated according to their sociodemographic characteristics, no statistically significant difference was observed within the students’ “personal achievement” score and their sociodemographic characteristics (p > .05) (Table 2).

It was observed that there was no significant difference among the SAS total score averages of the students according to their gender, marital status, class level, economic status, parents’ educational status, and the students’ status of choosing the nursing department willingly (p > .05) (Table 2).

The sum NCROS score of female students (80.96 ± 7.89) is more statistically significant (p < .01) from the male students’ score (77.29 ± 6.33), with the mean score of “collaboration” from the NCROS sub-dimensions. It was concluded that there was a statistically significant difference (p = .05) between sociodemographic characteristics, gender, age, and class grade. It was concluded that the average score of “collaboration” of female students (27.16 ± 4.11) was higher than male students (26.09 ± 4.15). The average score of “cooperation” of students aged 22 and over (27.54 ± 3.93) was significantly higher than that of students aged 17–21 (26.36 ± 4.28) (p = .05) (Table 3).

There was a significant difference between the students’ mean score of “collaboration,” one of the NCROS sub-dimensions, and their class grade (p < .05). It was discovered that the mean scores of “cooperation” of the first-grade students (25.79 ± 3.88) were lower than the scores of the third (27.14 ± 4.46) and fourth-grade students (27.42 ± 4.24) (Table 3).

It was concluded that the average score of the “research” of female students (25.53 ± 3.73) was statistically significantly higher than that of male students (24.26 ± 3.72).

There was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the “research” according to the students’ age, marital status, class grade, and the status of choosing the nursing department (p > .05) (Table 3). It was discovered that the mean score of “autonomy,” one of the NCROS sub-dimensions, revealed a statistically significant difference according to the students’ gender, age, and the status of willingly choosing the nursing department (p < .05).

In the study, when the relationship between SAS total and sub-dimensions and NCROS total and sub-dimensions were evaluated with the Pearson correlation test, a negative, weak and significant relationship was found among the sum SAS score and the NCROS “collaboration” sub-dimension (r = –.106) (p < .05) (Table 4). A negative, weak and significant correlation was found between “disapproval anxiety,” one of the SAS sub-dimensions, and the sum NCROS score (r = –.121) and its sub-dimensions “autonomy” (r = –.143) (p < .05). A negative, weak, and significant relationship was observed between the SAS sub-dimension “pleasing others” and the sum NCROS score (r = –.134) and its sub-dimension “autonomy” (r = –.173) (p < .05). A positive, weak, and significant relationship was discovered between the SAS sub-dimensions “personal success” (r = .180) and “freedom” (r = .113) and “autonomy” from the NCROS sub-dimensions (p < .05).

There was no significant relationship between the sum SAS score and the sum NCROS score (p > .05) (Table 4).

Discussion

Today, nursing has to serve a continually evolving health environment. Nurses face individuals with acute and complex health problems (Rhodes & Curran, 2005). Short stay periods and early discharge of individuals in the hospital have become a basis in health services in quality. Such environments demand student nurses to provide quality care, fulfill their professional roles, and make effective patient care decisions. Consequently, nursing students necessitate excellent training to gain the competence to serve in more technologically advanced and complex healthcare environments (Karadag et al., 2016; Sankoç et al., 2016).

The average age of the students involved in the study was 21.33 ± 1.98. This finding is consistent with the age of starting higher education in Turkey and is related to earlier research findings with nursing students (Aydın et al., 2017; Karaca et al., 2015; Oktay et al., 2019; Özdemir Özkan et al., 2015). A total of 59.7% of the students are female students, and in the study conducted by Kaya et al. (2006), the percentage of female students is 99.2%. Although the number of male students in nursing schools increased day by day after the Nursing Law in 2007, the number of female students is still higher than that of men. A total of 55.4% of the students stated that their income did not meet their expenses (Table 1). In Yılmaz et al.’s (2017) study, 70.4% of the students and in Turan et al.’s (2019) study, 70.9%, mentioned that their income covered their expenses. These findings of the study are distinct from the earlier studies, and it is quite thought-provoking that more than half of the students have economic difficulties.

The literature states that the selection of the nursing profession willingly and lovingly allows the profession to be done with love and sincerity and improves professional satisfaction and professionalism. It is observed that 52.7% of the students within the research scope have willingly chosen the nursing profession. Although this finding is similar to prior studies (Kalkım et al., 2015; Özveren et al., 2018; Tosunöz et al., 2019; Zencir, 2016), it is quite thought-provoking that 47.3% of students involuntarily chose the profession. In the study, 51.3% of the students emphasized that their parents’ attitudes toward them are “protective.” This result, which is in line with similar studies in the literature (Aktas et al., 2018; Akyanat Gırgin, 2016; Süt & Demir, 2016; Yüksel, 2015), is considered to reflect the sociocultural characteristics of in Turkey.
Table 2: Comparison of Sociotropic Autonomic Personality Traits of Students According to Their Sociodemographic Characteristics (N = 372)

| Gender | Anxiety About Disapproval | Separation Anxiety | Pleasing Others | Personal Success | Freedom | Enjoying Loneliness | SAS Total |
|--------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|---------|--------------------|-----------|
|        | t/F (p)                   | t/F (p)            | t/F (p)        | t/F (p)          | t/F (p) | t/F (p)            | t/F (p)   |
| Female | 20.18 ± 6.65 (.313)       | 32.73 ± .176      | 14.00 ± 4.19  | 35.00 ± 5.48     | 34.52 ± .531 | 16.40 ± .103     | 152.81 ± .536 |
| Male   | 20.85 ± 6.33              | 32.87 ± 7.21      | 15.07 ± 4.11  | 33.83 ± 6.20     | 33.30 ± 5.10 | 15.76 ± .68      | 151.68 ± .204 |

| Age    | Anxiety About Disapproval | Separation Anxiety | Pleasing Others | Personal Success | Freedom | Enjoying Loneliness | SAS Total |
|--------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|---------|--------------------|-----------|
|        | t/F (p)                   | t/F (p)            | t/F (p)        | t/F (p)          | t/F (p) | t/F (p)            | t/F (p)   |
| 17–21  | 20.86 ± 6.60 (.141)       | 33.09 ± 9.41      | 14.52 ± 4.12  | 34.58 ± 5.94     | 34.63 ± .847 | 16.46 ± .368     | 154.14 ± .869 |
| 22 and over | 19.84 ± 6.39              | 32.34 ± 7.81      | 14.30 ± 4.29  | 34.46 ± 5.62     | 33.16 ± 5.46 | 15.69 ± .373      | 149.80 ± .208 |

| Marital status | Anxiety About Disapproval | Separation Anxiety | Pleasing Others | Personal Success | Freedom | Enjoying Loneliness | SAS Total |
|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|---------|--------------------|-----------|
| Married        | 21.67 ± 8.86 (.571)       | 33.67 ± 7.41      | 16.00 ± 4.03  | 36.56 ± 5.92     | 34.33 ± .829 | 15.67 ± .371     | 157.89 ± .698 |
| Single         | 20.42 ± 6.47              | 32.76 ± 7.58      | 14.39 ± 4.19  | 34.48 ± 5.80     | 34.02 ± 5.36 | 16.15 ± .372      | 152.22 ± .198 |

| Grade level | Anxiety About Disapproval | Separation Anxiety | Pleasing Others | Personal Success | Freedom | Enjoying Loneliness | SAS Total |
|-------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|---------|--------------------|-----------|
| First grade | 21.86 ± 6.30 (.113)       | 33.31 ± 7.62      | 14.17 ± 3.98  | 34.22 ± 6.27     | 34.34 ± .589 | 16.58 ± .393     | 154.48 ± .567 |
| Second grade| 19.69 ± 5.85              | 32.62 ± 3.97      | 13.78 ± 3.97  | 35.14 ± 5.61     | 34.46 ± .594 | 16.00 ± .362      | 151.70 ± .190 |
| Third grade  | 20.31 ± 7.22              | 33.03 ± 4.11      | 15.37 ± 4.11  | 34.11 ± 5.94     | 33.62 ± 5.47 | 16.09 ± .341      | 152.53 ± .203 |
| Fourth grade | 20.00 ± 6.56              | 32.17 ± 4.57      | 14.40 ± 5.39  | 34.61 ± 4.86     | 33.67 ± 4.86 | 15.91 ± .392      | 150.76 ± .208 |

| Willingness to choose the department | Anxiety About Disapproval | Separation Anxiety | Pleasing Others | Personal Success | Freedom | Enjoying Loneliness | SAS Total |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|---------|--------------------|-----------|
| Yes                                | 20.53 ± 6.65 (.805)       | 32.74 ± 4.35      | 14.39 ± 4.35  | 34.67 ± 5.85     | 34.19 ± .620 | 16.27 ± .364     | 152.79 ± .444 |
| No                                 | 20.36 ± 6.40              | 32.82 ± 4.01      | 14.47 ± 4.01  | 34.37 ± 5.76     | 33.84 ± .551 | 16.01 ± .380      | 151.87 ± .190 |

(Continued)
Table 2.
Comparison of Sociotropic Autonomic Personality Traits of Students According to Their Sociodemographic Characteristics (N = 372) (Continued)

| Parent's attitude toward the person | Anxiety About Disapproval t/F (p) | Separation Anxiety t/F (p) | Pleasing Others t/F (p) | Personal Success t/F (p) | Freedom t/F (p) | Enjoying Loneliness t/F (p) | SAS Total t/F (p) |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Indifferent                       | 24.30 ± 8.41                     | 33.65 ± 9.11              | 15.90 ± 4.89           | 31.90 ± 5.94            | 1.765 ± 6.67   | 15.65 ± 4.13                | 154.60 ± 27.76    |
|                                  |                                  |                           | 4.89                   | 5.94                    | (.153)         | (.56)                       | (.058)            |
|                                  | **5.244 (.001)**                  | **5.581 (.001)**          | **3.564 (.014)**       | **33.20 (.247)**        | **1.386 (.27)** | **15.65 (.56)**             | **154.60 (.09)**  |
| Democratic                       | 19.21 ± 6.51                     | 30.43 ± 4.4               | 13.61 ± 5.35           | 35.11 ± 5.34            | 33.64 ± 5.34   | 16.17 ± 3.24                | 148.17 ± 18.94    |
|                                  | 7.77                             | 4.44                      | 5.35                   | 5.34                    | 3.24           | 3.24                        | 148.17 ± 18.94    |
| Authoritarian                    | 22.29 ± 6.19                     | 34.83 ± 4.63              | 15.56 ± 5.87           | 34.63 ± 4.17            | 35.33 ± 4.17   | 16.77 ± 4.25                | 159.40 ± 16.83    |
|                                  | 7.78                             | 4.63                      | 5.87                   | 4.17                    | 4.25           | 4.25                        | 159.40 ± 16.83    |
| Protective                       | 20.25 ± 6.18                     | 33.48 ± 4.96              | 14.44 ± 5.97           | 34.44 ± 5.45            | 33.98 ± 5.45   | 16.01 ± 3.78                | 152.59 ± 19.91    |
|                                  | 6.96                             | 3.72                      | 5.97                   | 5.45                    | 3.78           | 3.78                        | 152.59 ± 19.91    |

Note: *Independent sample t-test; †One-way analysis of variance; *p ≤ .05, †p < .01.
Table 3. Comparison of NCROS Total and Sub-dimension Scores According to Students’ Sociodemographic Characteristics (N = 372)

|                          | Cooperation | t/F (p) | Research | t/F (p) | Interaction | t/F (p) | Autonomy | t/F (p) | NCROS Total | t/F (p) |
|--------------------------|-------------|---------|----------|---------|------------|---------|----------|---------|-------------|---------|
| **Gender**               |             |         |          |         |            |         |          |         |             |         |
| Female                   | 27.16 ± 4.11| 2.464   | 25.53 ± 3.73 | 3.228   | 17.76 ± 2.55 | 1.481   | 10.51 ± 2.26 | 3.999 (.000**) | 80.96 ± 7.89 | 4.759 (.000**) |
| Male                     | 26.09 ± 4.15|         | 24.26 ± 3.72 |        | 17.34 ± 2.82 |        | 9.60 ± 1.97 |         | 77.29 ± 6.33 |         |
| **Age**                  |             |         |          |         |            |         |          |         |             |         |
| 17–21                    | 26.36 ± 4.28| -2.050  | 25.29 ± 3.53 | 1.648   | 17.39 ± 2.67 | -1.740  | 10.43 ± 2.16 | 3.100 (.002*) | 79.47 ± 7.69 | -0.25 (.980) |
| 22 and over              | 27.54 ± 3.93|         | 24.63 ± 4.08 |        | 17.88 ± 2.65 |        | 9.73 ± 2.18 |         | 79.49 ± 7.28 |         |
| **Marital Status**       |             |         |          |         |            |         |          |         |             |         |
| Married                  | 24.89 ± 6.35| -1.345  | 25.44 ± 5.64 | .342    | 16.22 ± 3.38 | -1.599  | 10.22 ± 2.05 | .110 (.912) | 76.78 ± 5.83 | -1.092 (.275) |
| Single                   | 26.77 ± 4.09|         | 25.01 ± 3.73 |        | 17.62 ± 2.64 |        | 10.14 ± 2.20 |         | 79.55 ± 7.54 |         |
| **Grade Level**          |             |         |          |         |            |         |          |         |             |         |
| First grade              | 25.79 ± 3.88| 2.768   | 25.14 ± 2.89 | 1.723   | 16.99 ± 2.69 | 5.059   | 10.13 ± 2.21 | .540 (.655) | 78.06 ± 6.92 | 2.652 (.049*) |
| Second grade             | 26.55 ± 3.90|         | 24.61 ± 3.81 |        | 17.23 ± 2.58 |        | 10.37 ± 2.03 |         | 78.76 ± 6.39 |         |
| Third grade              | 27.14 ± 4.46|         | 25.68 ± 3.91 |        | 17.78 ± 2.65 |        | 9.99 ± 2.35 |         | 80.59 ± 8.21 |         |
| Fourth grade             | 27.42 ± 4.24|         | 24.63 ± 4.30 |        | 18.38 ± 2.58 |        | 10.07 ± 2.19 |         | 80.50 ± 8.19 |         |
| **Willingness to Choose the Department** |             |         |          |         |            |         |          |         |             |         |
| Yes                      | 26.55 ± 4.11| -1.894  | 24.92 ± 3.68 | -1.541  | 17.51 ± 2.57 | -1.598  | 9.90 ± 2.08 | 3.281 (.023*) | 78.87 ± 6.98 | 1.646 (.101) |
| No                       | 26.93 ± 4.22|         | 25.13 ± 3.88 |        | 17.68 ± 2.78 |        | 10.41 ± 2.29 |         | 80.15 ± 8.03 |         |
| **Parent’s Attitude Toward the Person** |             |         |          |         |            |         |          |         |             |         |
| Indifferent              | 27.40 ± 3.90| .404 (.750) | 25.05 ± 5.66 | .254 (.859) | 17.75 ± 1.97 | .165 (.920) | 9.70 ± 2.08 | 2.207 (.087) | 79.90 ± 7.10 | .123 (.947) |
| Democratic               | 26.67 ± 4.61|         | 25.17 ± 3.97 |        | 17.61 ± 2.92 |        | 10.25 ± 2.36 |         | 79.70 ± 8.21 |         |
| Authoritarian            | 27.12 ± 3.63|         | 24.62 ± 3.93 |        | 17.77 ± 2.73 |        | 9.50 ± 2.16 |         | 79.00 ± 6.88 |         |
| Protective               | 26.59 ± 4.06|         | 25.04 ± 3.38 |        | 17.51 ± 2.57 |        | 10.3 ± 2.10 |         | 79.44 ± 7.35 |         |

Note: *Independent sample t-test; †One-way analysis of variance; *p ≤ .05, **p < .01.
Individuals with sociotopic personalities attach importance to getting approval from other people, to love and be loved. In the study, the students' mean scores for “sum sociotropy” are moderate. Similar results were obtained in studies conducted with nursing students (Dikmen et al., 2016; Kaya et al., 2006; Malak & Üstün, 2011). These results reveal that sociotropy personality traits should be further developed and widespread among students to create a sense of professional commitment and unity.

Autonomy enables the individual to recognize oneself, make conscious decisions, plan strategies, and provide purposeful and quality care. Individuals with autonomic personality traits are influenced by personal success and failure. Autonomic people necessitate to control the situations occurring in their environment and be successful (Malak & Üstün, 2011). Autonomy in nursing is a professional criterion, and nurses should have a high level of autonomy to provide adequate care. In the study, it can be stated that the students “total autonomy” score averages are high. This result is in line with previous studies and is satisfying (Erikmen & Vatan, 2019; Karagözoğlu & Kangalli, 2009; Kaya & Tosun, 2018; Kaya et al., 2006).

In the study, the students’ orientation to the nursing care role was moderate. In the NCROS Turkish validity and reliability study (Karaahmetoğlu & Alpar, 2017), it was stated that the NCROS total average score of nurses was 82.93 ± 8.9. It can be said that this result of the study is in line with the literature. Although there is no significant difference (p > .05) between students’ marital status, class grade, and nursing choice status, and between the sum SAS score averages and sub-dimension scores (p > .05), it is stated in the literature that certain variables can affect sociotropy and autonomy personality traits (Kaya et al., 2006). The study discovered that the average SAS total score of students in the 17-21 age group is statistically significantly higher than the average score of students aged 22 and above is in line with the findings of the previous study (Atalay et al., 2005; Dikmen et al., 2016; Kaya et al., 2006; Mrayyan, 2005). It was determined that as the class grades of the students increased, their NCROS total score and their collaboration and interaction sub-dimension scores also increased. With the increase in nursing education and practices, it is an anticipated result that students’ cooperation tendencies, theoretical and practical knowledge, and interpersonal interaction levels increase.

It was discovered that those who involuntarily chose the nursing department got higher scores in the autonomy sub-dimension (p < .05). To be successful in an individual’s chosen profession, one must know their biophysiological characteristics, and knowingly and willingly choose the profession and be psychologically ready for the profession (İnce & Khorshid, 2015; Mooney et al., 2008). Studies reveal that the main reason for choosing to nurse is helping and caring for others (Atar & Aştı, 2012), other reasons include, nursing experience by a sick relative or friend (Grainger & Bolan, 2006), observation of relatives or friends in healthcare professions or family members who are cared for by nurses in the hospital. Also, it is said that nursing is favored due to the high probability of getting a job (Mooney et al., 2008). According to the study results, although the nursing department was unintentionally chosen, it is pleasing that students know and adopt the autonomic characteristics of nursing within the scope of their orientation to the nursing care role.

There was no significant relationship between the sums of SAS score and NCROS score (p > .05). There was a negative and significant relationship between the sum SAS score and the NCROS sub-dimension “cooperation” (p < .05), and this was due to the relationship between the “cooperation” sub-dimension and the “freedom” sub-dimension. Autonomic personality is regarded with the nature of independence, control, and personal accomplishment (Sato & McCann, 2007). It is important that nursing students collaborate with other healthcare team members, the patient, and their families. Still, it is an expected

Table 4.
The Relationship Between SAS and NCROS Scores (N=372)

|                | SAS Total | Anxiety About Disapproval | Separation Anxiety | Pleasing Others | Personal Success | Freedom | Enjoying Loneliness |
|----------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------|--------------------|
| NCROS Total    | r         | -.071                     | -.121              | -.058           | -.131*           | .096    | -.020              | -.023 |
|                | P         | .169                      | .20                | .266            | .010             | .066    | .697               | .659  |
| NCROS Subscales|           |                           |                    |                 |                  |         |                    |
| Cooperation    | r         | -.106*                    | -.063              | -.058           | -.058            | -.011   | -.112*             | -.093 |
|                | P         | .042                      | .222               | .263            | .265             | .827    | .030               | .072  |
| Research       | r         | .021                      | -.030              | .010            | -.069            | .093    | .027               | .042  |
|                | P         | .681                      | .565               | .850            | .186             | .074    | .605               | .425  |
| Interaction    | r         | -.042                     | -.080              | -.011           | -.048            | .008    | -.013              | -.001 |
|                | P         | .418                      | .122               | .829            | .353             | .881    | .802               | .982  |
| Autonomy       | r         | -.030                     | -.143*             | -.091           | -.173*           | .180*   | .113*              | .029  |
|                | P         | .568                      | .006               | .080            | .001             | .000    | .029               | .583  |

Note: Pearson correlation, *p < .05, **p < .01.
result that students with high “freedom” autonomic characteristics tend to show more independent behavior, and their orientation toward “cooperation” is low. It was concluded that there is a negative and significant relationship between “disapproval anxiety” and the sum NCROS score and “autonomy” (p < .05). It is characterized by a high need for approval, being dependent on others in interpersonal relationships, and needing someone else’s approval and affection (Kaya et al., 2006). As students’ anxiety levels of disapproval increase, their level of autonomy in nursing decreases.

A negative and significant relationship was observed between “pleasing others” from the SAS sub-dimensions and “autonomy” from the sum NCROS score and the NCROS sub-dimensions (p < .05). The higher the satisfaction with others, the lower the sum NCROS score and autonomy levels. Autonomy is a concept expressing the individual’s ability to make decisions and being independent. According to the result, it made us think that compromising one’s personality and life by pleasing others might adversely affect the individual’s independence and decisions.

**Study Limitations**

Since the research was conducted with nursing students only at a health college, generalization cannot be made.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

The sociotropic and autonomic personality traits of the nursing students and their high orientation to the nursing care role will provide a better quality of their future health care services. Thus, creating course content that will contribute to the development of students’ sociotropic and autonomic personality traits and their orientation to the nursing care role, and realizing awareness training and activities, to obtain generalizable results, it may be suggested to conduct similar studies examining students’ sociotropic-autonomic personality traits and orientation levels to nursing care roles in larger sample groups.
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