



# New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences



Issue 3 (2017) 387-393

ISSN 2421-8030

[www.prosoc.eu](http://www.prosoc.eu)

Selected paper of 5th Cyprus International Conference On Educational Research (Cyicer-2016) 31 March-02 April 2016,  
University Of Kyrenia, Kyrenia North Cyprus

## Determination Of University Student Attitudes Toward Violence

**Hande Sahin**<sup>a\*</sup>, Kirikkale University Faculty of Health Sciences Department of Social Work Kirikkale, Turkey

**Sibel Erkal**<sup>b</sup>, Hacettepe University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Department of Family and Consumer Sciences Ankara, Turkey

### Suggested Citation:

Sahin, H. & Erkal, S. (2017). Determination Of University Student Attitudes Toward Violence. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences* [Online]. 03, pp 387-393. Available from: [www.prosoc.eu](http://www.prosoc.eu)

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Assist. Prof. Dr. Cigdem Hursen, Near East University

©2017 SciencePark Research, Organization & Counseling. All rights reserved.

### Abstract

This study aims to determine university student attitudes toward violence with respect to their individual characteristics. The sample group of the study comprised 353 students attending the Department of Child Development and the Department of Nursing at Kirikkale University Faculty of Health Sciences. In the study, the "Adolescents' Attitudes towards Violence Scale (ATVS)" served as the data collection tool. In data analysis, standard deviation, arithmetic mean, the Mann-Whitney U Test and the Kruskal-Wallis H Test were used. There was statistically significant difference in student attitudes towards violence with respect to age, gender and year at university ( $p < 0.05$ ). More research should be conducted to identify other factors associated with attitudes toward violence than age, gender and year at university.

Keywords: Adolescents' Attitudes towards Violence Scale, Attitudes toward violence, University students.

---

\* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Hande Sahin**, Kirikkale University Faculty of Health Sciences Department of Social Work Kirikkale-Turkey

E-mail address: [hande\\_k1979@yahoo.com](mailto:hande_k1979@yahoo.com) /Tel.: +90 318 3573738

## 1. Introduction

According to the definition by the World Health Organization, violence is the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, which either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation (WHO, 2013). Anger, aggression and violence are intervolved concepts that considerably impact daily life, quality of life and interpersonal relationships. Propensity for violence is a significant factor underlying interpersonal conflicts and the continuously increasing acts of violence encountered in printed and visual media (Haskan & Yildirim, 2012).

Although the terms violence and aggression are often used interchangeably, violence is a predominantly physical form of aggression with a high rate of injury (Haskan & Yildirim, 2012). According to global and regional statistics, young people are at highest risk of violence among all disadvantaged groups. Violence committed by youth is one of the most prominent forms of violence in the public eye (Haskan, 2009). One of the most important issues research on the causes of youth violence focus on is the impact of being victim or witness to violence on psychological development. Being exposed to violence at home or in the society impacts the child's perception of the social world, damaging his/her sense of security. Research on the subject shows that propensity for violence is a coping mechanism for the child to feel secure, and that the adoption of cognitive strategies to normalize aggressive behavior perpetuates the problem (Kilic, 2012).

There are many factors that influence the actualization of violence into behavior. Past research indicates various factors that cultivate violence (Haskan & Yildirim, 2012). One of these factors is explained by attitude toward violence. Based on the consistency between attitude and behavior, Fishenbein and Ajzen (1975) asserted that the behavior of an individual could be predicted from his/her attitude. A positive attitude toward violence is considered to be an indicator of perpetrating violence (as cited in Cetin, 2011). A review of literature yielded various studies on violent behavior among the youth (Borum, 2000, Dahlberg and Potter, 2001, Dogan, 2001, Wolfe and Foshee, 2003). These studies indicated that violence was more frequently observed among young men than young women, as well as those who felt lonely, that violence advocacy increased with decreasing age, and that peer influence was a significant factor in violent behavior (Covie, 2000; Cetin, 2004; Heinrich & Gullone, 2006; Krug et al., 2002). This study was planned and conducted to determine the attitudes of university students toward violence.

## 2. Method

The population of this study aimed at determining university student attitudes toward violence comprised the students attending the Department of Child Development and the Department of Nursing at Kirikkale University Faculty of Health Sciences. Due to time and cost limitations, the researchers chose to employ sampling. The sample the study consisted of 353 students selected with systematic sampling, a probability sampling method.

## 3. Data Collection

In the study, the questionnaire method was used for data collection. In the questionnaire with two sections, the first section included the individual characteristics of the students while the second section comprised the "Adolescents' Attitudes towards Violence Scale" developed by Cetin (2011). The scale is a five-point Likert-type scale with 10 items consisting of "strongly disagree", "disagree", "undecided", "agree" and "strongly agree" options.

#### 4. Data Evaluation

The data was analyzed with the SPSS 21.0 software. In the analysis, appropriate tests were chosen according to normality analysis results. Normality analysis showed scale scores did not have a normal distribution; therefore, the researchers decided to use non-parametric test methods. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to compare the scale scores of variables with two groups and the Kruskal-Wallis H Test was used in the comparison of variables with three or more groups.

The maximum score and the minimum score respondents obtained in the “Adolescents’ Attitudes towards Violence Scale” were respectively 50 and 10, with a mean of 19.55±8.13.

#### 5. Results

Among the 353 students participating in the study, 78.8% were female and 21.2% were male, while 54.1% studied Nursing and 45.9% studied Child Development. The percentages of students in the first year, second year, third year and fourth year and above were 29.2%, 28.6%, 22.9% and 19.3%, respectively, while the percentages of respondents aged 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 and older were 15.0%, 12.7%, 25.5%, 25.5%, 15.6%, 7.6% and 4.5%, respectively.

19.8% of the fathers and 9.1% of the mothers were university graduates, and monthly household incomes of 14.2% of the families were equal to or below minimum wage. The percentages of students with one, two, three, four and five siblings were respectively 29.7%, 28.9%, 14.4%, 9.6% and 12.2%, whereas 7.1% did not have any siblings.

The comparison of student attitudes toward violence by age group was presented in Table 1. According to the results of the Kruskal Wallis H Test, there was a statistically significant difference in student attitudes toward violence between age groups ( $p < 0.05$ ). Mean rank scores of respondents aged 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 and older were 192.63, 200.52, 195.98, 173.08, 133.34, 131.33, and 195.84. 19 year-old students had the highest mean rank scores for attitudes toward violence.

**Table 1: Comparison of Student Attitudes toward Violence by Age Group**

Age	n	Mean Rank	X <sup>2</sup>	P
18 years old	53	192.63		
19 years old	45	200.52		
20 years old	90	195.98		
Adolescents’ Attitudes towards Violence Scale	21 years old	67	173.08	22.978 .001
	22 years old	55	133.34	
	23 years old	27	131.33	
	24 years old and older	16	195.84	

The comparison of student attitudes toward violence by gender was presented in Table 2. According to the results of the Mann Whitney U Test carried out for female and male students, there was a statistically significant difference in student attitudes toward violence between female and male students ( $p < 0.05$ ). Mean rank scores for female and male students were 156.59 and 252.65, respectively. Male students had higher mean rank scores for attitudes toward violence.

**Table 2: Comparison of Student Attitudes toward Violence by Gender**

Gender		n	Mean Rank	U	P
Adolescents' Attitudes towards Violence Scale	Female	278	156.59	4751.000	.000
	Male	75	252.65		

According to the results of the Mann Whitney U Test, the researchers found no statistically significant difference in student attitudes toward violence between students attending different departments ( $p>0.05$ ).

The comparison of student attitudes toward violence by year at university was presented in Table 3. According to the results of the Kruskal Wallis H Test, there was a statistically significant difference in student attitudes toward violence between students attending different years at the university ( $p<0.05$ ). Mean rank scores for students in the first year, second year, third year and fourth year and above were 199.44, 188.91, 157.14 and 148.98, respectively. First year students had the highest mean rank scores for attitudes toward violence.

**Table 3: Comparison of Student Attitudes toward Violence by Year at University**

Year at University	n	Mean Rank	X2	P	
Adolescents' Attitudes towards Violence Scale	1	103	199.44	14.623	.002
	2	101	188.91		
	3	81	157.14		
	4 and more	68	148.98		

According to the results of the Kruskal Wallis H Test, there was no statistically significant difference in student attitudes toward violence with respect to monthly household income, the number of siblings, educational level of mother and father ( $p>0.05$ ).

## 6. Discussion

Determination of adolescent attitudes toward violence and the underlying factors is essential to the prevention of violence. Gelmann and Delucia (2006) reported a positive relationship between attitudes towards violence and use of violence.

In the study, there was a statistically significant difference in student attitudes toward violence between age groups. Mean rank scores of respondents aged 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 and older were 192.63, 200.52, 195.98, 173.08, 133.34, 131.33, and 195.84. 19 year-old students had the highest mean rank scores for attitudes toward violence. According to this result, 19 year-old students were the age group with the highest propensity for violence, and attitudes for violence scores decreased with increasing age. Although this result indicated propensity for violence in university students decreased with age, it also revealed the necessity of education programs for preventing violent tendencies in both domestic and school lives.

In the study, there was a statistically significant difference in student attitudes toward violence between female and male students ( $p < 0.05$ ). Mean rank scores for female and male students were 156.59 and 252.65, respectively. Male students had higher mean rank scores for attitudes toward violence. According to this result, male students have a greater propensity for violence than female students. A review of literature also yields numerous studies (Campbell, 2006; Avci, 2010; Kaya, Bozaslan and Genc, 2012; Kodan and Cetinkaya, 2013; Gencoglu, Kumcagiz and Ersanli, 2014) reporting greater propensity for violence in men in comparison to women, which supports the findings of the present study. This might be explained by the stylistic differences in the parenting of female and male children, and the role ascribed to men by the society. Parents and society teach boys to be aggressive and competitive, whereas girls are raised to be sedate, affectionate and supportive (Kaplan, 2012; Kodan & Cetinkaya, 2013). The study carried out by Haskan (2009) revealed male adolescents watched more films involving violence and heroism than female adolescents and, therefore, had a greater propensity for violence.

In the study, there was a statistically significant difference in student attitudes toward violence between students attending different years at the university ( $p < 0.05$ ). Mean rank scores for students in the first year, second year, third year and fourth year and above were 199.44, 188.91, 157.14 and 148.98, respectively. First year students had the highest mean rank scores for attitudes toward violence. According to this result, first year students had the highest propensity for violence, and attitudes for violence scores decreased with increasing year at university. This could be attributed to the fact that first year students were at the beginning of their university education, or to their lack of knowledge on violence and of professional experience.

According to the comparison of the student attitudes toward violence by monthly household income, there was no statistically significant difference in student attitudes toward violence with respect to monthly household income ( $p > 0.05$ ). Kodan & Cetinkaya (2013) similarly did not find a significant difference in student attitudes toward violence by monthly household income. However, some studies have emphasized the existence of a significant correlation between income level and violence (Ozgur et al., 2011; Kocacik & Caglayandereli, 2009). Ercan (2009) suggested that this discrepancy resulted from the greater association of violence-related attitudes with factors other than income level. Kula (2009) reported that students from low income families displayed attitudes that were more supportive of violence against women. The difference in study results could be due to factors such as individual characteristics of participants, area of residence, etc.

According to the comparison of student attitudes toward violence by number of siblings, there was no statistically significant difference in student attitudes toward violence with respect to the number of siblings ( $p > 0.05$ ).

In the study, there was no statistically significant difference in student attitudes toward violence by educational level of the parents ( $p > 0.05$ ). Similarly, Kodan & Cetinkaya (2013) also reported no significant difference in violent tendencies of university students with respect to the educational level of parents. Gencoglu et al. (2014) found a significant difference in violent tendencies only for the children of mothers with high educational level and reported violent tendencies in children was not significantly associated with the educational level of fathers. Guler et al. (2002) reported that mothers perpetrated greater physical abuse/neglect behavior against their children as the educational level of the mother decreased. The study carried out by Kula (2009) did not reveal a significant difference between university student overall scores for violence against women with respect to the educational level of parents.

## 7. Conclusion And Suggestions

The study results revealed significant differences in university student attitudes toward violence with respect to age, gender and year at university. However, the researchers did not find any statistically significant difference with respect to educational attainment of parents, household income level and number of siblings.

The researchers would like to make the following suggestions based on the results of the study:

- Education programs aimed at preventing violent tendencies in adolescents and raising awareness on the subject should be developed and implemented in both formal and non-formal education. These programs should focus especially on domestic violence, family values and violence prevention.
- Protection and prevention programs should be developed and promoted in the media in order to enable adolescents to change their attitudes toward violence and to improve their coping skills.
- Nationwide exhaustive studies should be conducted to identify adolescent attitudes toward violence in Turkey.

## References

- Avci, A. (2010). Egitimde Siddet Olgusu Lise Ogrencilerinde Siddet, Saldirganlik ve Ahlaki Tutum Iliskisi Kucukcekmece Ilcesi Ornegi. *(Yayinlanmamis doktora tezi) Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Istanbul.*
- Borum, R. (2000). Assessing Violence Risk Among Youth. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56* (10) .
- Campbell, R. (2006). Sex Differences In Direct Aggression: What Are The Psychological Mediators? *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11* (3).
- Cetin, H. (2004). *Ogrenci Ergenlerin Siddete Yonelik Tutumlari: Yas Ve Cinsiyete Gore Bir Inceleme.* (Yayimlanmamis yuksek lisans tezi) Ankara Universitesi Egitim Bilimleri Enstitusu, Ankara.
- Cetin, H. (2011). The Validity And Reliability For The Adolescents' Attitudes Toward Violence Scale. *Elementary Education Online, 10* (1).
- Cowie, H. (2000). Bystanding or Standing By: Gender Issues In Coping With Bullying In Schools. *Aggressive Behavior, 26.*
- Cowie, H. (2000). Bystanding or standing by: Gender issues in coping with bullying in English schools. *Aggressive behavior, 26* (1).
- Dahlberg, L. L. & Potter, L. B. (2001). Youth violence: Developmental pathways and prevention challenges. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 20* (1).
- Dogan, S. (2001). *Farkli Sosyo-Ekonomik Duzeylere Mensup Ergenlik Cagindaki Kiz Ve Erkeklerin Saldirgan Davranislariyla Ana-Baba Tutumlari Arasindaki Iliskiler.* (Yayimlanmamis yuksek lisans tezi) Kocaeli Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Kocaeli.
- Ercan, N. (2009). *Evlilikte Kadina Yonelik Fiziksel Siddete Iliskin Tutumlarin Yordayicilari: Celisik Duygulu Cinsiyetcilik, Sistemi Mesrulastirma ve Dini Yonelim.* (Yayimlanmamis yuksek lisans tezi) ODTU Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Ankara.
- Gellman, R. A. & Waack-Delucia, J.L. (2006). Predicting School Violence: A Comparison of Violent and Nonviolent Male Students on Attitudes Towards Violence, Exposure Level to Violence, and PTSD Sypmtomatology, *Psychology in the Schools, 43* (5).

- Gencoglu, C., Kumcagiz, H. & Ersanli, K. (2014). Ergenlerin Siddet Egilimine Etki Eden Ailevi Faktorler. *Turkish Studies- International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 9 (2).
- Guler, N., Uzun, S., Boztas, Z. & Aydogan, S. (2002). Anneleri Tarafindan Cocuklara Uygulanan Duygusal ve Fiziksel Istismar/ Ihmal Davranisi ve Bunu Etkileyen Faktorler. *C.U.Tip Fakultesi Dergisi*, 24 (3).
- Haskan, O. & Yildirim, I. (2012). Siddet Egilimi Olceginin Gelistirilmesi. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 37 (163).
- Haskan, O. (2009). *Ergenlerde Siddet Egilimi, Yalnizlik ve Sosyal Destek*. (Yayinlanmamis yuksek lisans tezi ) Hacettepe Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Ankara.
- Heinrich, L. M. & Gullone, E. (2006). The Clinical Significance Of Loneliness: A Literature Review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 26.
- Kaplan, B. (2012). *Ergenlerde Baglanma ve Saldirganlik Davranislari Arasindaki Iliskinin Incelenmesi*. (Yayimlanmamis yuksek lisans tezi). Ege Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Izmir.
- Kaya, A., Bozaslan, H. & Genc, G. (2012). Universite Ogrencilerinin Anne-Baba Tutumlarinin Problem Cozme Becerilerine, Sosyal Kaygi Duzeylerine ve Akademik Basarilarina Etkisi, *Dicle Universitesi Ziya Gokalp Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 18.
- Kocacik, F. & Caglayandereli, M. (2009). *Ailede Kadina Yonelik Siddet: Denizli Ili Ornegi*. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6 (2).
- Kodan-Cetinkaya, S. (2013). *Universite Ogrencilerinin Siddet Egilimlerinin ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerine Iliskin Tutumlarının Incelenmesi*. *Nesne*, 1 (2)
- Krug, E. G., Mercy, A. J., Dahlberg, L. L. & Zwi, A. B. (2002, Oct.). *The World Report On Violence And Health*. *The Lancet*, 360 .
- Kula, A. (2009). *Kocaeli Universitesi 2008–2009 Akademik Yili 1.ve 6. Sinif Tip Ogrencilerinin Evlilikte Kadina Yonelik Siddete Iliskin Tutumlari*. (Yayimlanmamis yuksek lisans tezi) Kocaeli Universitesi Saglik Bilimleri Enstitusu, Kocaeli.
- Ozgun, G., Yorukoglu, G. & Baysan-Arabaci, L. B. (2011). Lise Ogrencilerinin Siddet Algilari, Siddet Egilim Duzeyleri ve Etkileyen Faktorler. *Journal of Psychiatric Nursing*, 2 (2).
- WHO, (2013). Violence <http://www.who.int/topics/violence/en/>
- Wolfe, K. A. & Foshee V. A. (2003). Family Violence, Violence Expression Styles and Adolescent Dating Violence. *Journal of Family Violence*. 18 (6).
- Zinnur Kilic, E. (2012). Ergenlerde Siddet Kullanimi: Bireysel Ve Ailesel Etkenler. *Noropsikiyatri Arsivi* 49.