



THE AGGRESSION LEVELS OF STUDENTS AT SCHOOLS THAT ADMIT STUDENTS WITH THE SPECIAL TALENT EXAM

Mehmet Altın¹ⁱ, Hayri Demir²,
Selçuk Buğdaycı², Yahya Gökhan Yalçın²

¹Selçuk University Faculty of Sport Sciences,
Recreation Department, Turkey

²Selçuk University, Faculty of Sport Sciences,
Sports Management Department, Turkey

Abstract:

This study aimed to determine the aggression levels of the students studying at schools who admit the students with the Special Talent Exam and evaluate the changes. The universe of the study consisted of the schools who admit the students with the special talent exam, the sample group also consisted of total 413 students including 226 males, 187 females studying at the Faculty of Sport Sciences (SBF) (n=148), the Dilek Sabancı Conservatory (DSK) (n=112) and the Faculty of Fine Arts (GSF) (n=153). In collection of data, the 7 point Likert Aggression questionnaire by Kiper (1984), for socio-demographical information, personal information forms were used. In our study, the Cronbach alpha value of aggression scale was found to be 0.79.

By testing homogeneity and variances of data, the One Way ANOVA for multi comparisons and the Tukey test for the determination of difference resources were utilized while the Independent Sample t test was used for the gender factor in the determination of relevant data changes.

The statistically significant differences were found out in the sub-dimensions of Impulsive, Destructive and Passive Aggressions among the students at the Faculty of Sport Sciences and the Dilek Sabancı Conservatory and the Faculty of Fine Arts (P<0.05). In accordance with gender, age and accommodation situations, there were meaningful differences in the aggression sub-dimensions between the schools (P<0.05). Gender-based passive aggression and general aggression differences may be explained with the roles attributed to male and female individuals by society, furthermore, the students at the Faculty of Sport Sciences had higher averages in the aggression sub-dimensions rather than the other school students, which may be related.

ⁱ Correspondence: email mealtin@selcuk.edu.tr

Keywords: special talent, university, aggression, student

1. Introduction

The relevant literature has almost dealt with aggression only as a singular case. Turkish Language Association (2017) describes it as an individual's effort for making people adopt the one's own opinions or behaviours against external resistances. Different meanings attributed to the aggression word are associated with which viewpoints this case is evaluated on and which scientific perspectives it is studied in. Based on the differences between the one attacking and the one being attacked, various factors and viewpoints are represented in sciences such as sociology, psychology, economy. Lorenz (1968) emphasized that aggression did not have any reasons for its resources and its relevant targets but it only had apparent excuses, that people did not carry out any attacks because of injustice, pressure, cruelty and war; they developed these mechanisms since they were aggressive in reality. Also, an example of acting out aggression by Lorenz (1968) was a recognizable event; in his opinion, the aggression behaviour occurred when continuously accumulated energy in a nervous system made an excuse and was excreted as well. Even if any external stimulus did not show itself, it would explode by itself like accumulated gases in any containers went out when they found any weak point. Çobanoğlu (2005) defined aggression as stimulation which tried to be free in human's body and expressed itself without considering external impulses enough not a reaction to external stimulus.

The aggression word derives from the words "a" (to) and "grad" (step) in Latin. The word expressed as "agressio" in English means to move forward (Şahin, 2003). In any moment of our life, all objects and events which suddenly become active and refer to us, drive us crazy and the process represents preparation. The situation and process associated with aggression are not physically experienced. Budak (2005) described every type of physical, verbal or symbolic behaviours which resulted from the reasons such as anger, hostility, competition, frustration, fear and aimed to give harm to someone in front of oneself, hinder someone or protect oneself as aggression. Masalcı (2001) suggested that inactiveness involving harms were required to be away from that description when aggression was only discussed as a behaviour, virulence and hostility not transferred to behaviours in spite of the fact that it did not involve any activities described as physical and verbal aggression. Gergen and Gergen (1986) stated that aggression was not only behavioral, it was accompanied by emotional items such as anger, hostility, bursts.

Based on the resources and reasons of aggression, the relevant literature has been highly rich in theoretical, behavioral, sociological, psychological, biological issues. In whichever aspects and scientific fields it is dealt, while we allow a controlled impulsiveness as an emotional behaviour in our experiences, we need to keep ourselves

away from destructive, oppressive aggressions for our health. If there is not any incurable and irremediable illness, aggression can be cured, improved or resolved. According to Konter (2006), violence is a forceful, actual, destructive, physical way of expressing hostility and anger feelings towards persons or objects. In this way, violence is seen in each type of conflict relations (in family, at school, in groups, in races, etc.), it is freedom of aggression, the most advanced, the most extreme dimension which ignores human will. Thus, when aggression remains at its own level and grade, it can be overcome without causing any harm at a high level. Partal and Kılıçgil (2003) defined violence as the most extreme point of aggression behaviour but aggression could not include violence all the time. In order to understand an aggressive behaviour better, it is necessary to analyze conditions which make aggressive behaviours possible (Klickpera and Klein, 2007). Within the concept of aggression, many actors such as anger, violence, power, impression, pressure may be included. It may be shown about which life resources and reasons an aggressive behaviour is based on (pain, stress, anxiety, fear, irritation, virulence, loss of consciousness, mental diseases, etc.). Considering its resources and reasons is the first step for resolving the behaviour.

On the aggression concept, Sylwester' research (1999) indicated that inborn characteristics, learning experiences, brain problems, humours, hormonal changes, biologically undeveloped, reflexive brain, media, mother-father attitudes, easily acquired guns were affective. The only living which tortures, injures, kills its prototypes, is a human, its basic needs such as nutrition, protection are met, it is not under threat and in danger, though (Köknel, 1996). Köknel (1996) stated that people gave reactions to human relations by choosing one of four different basic behaviour forms including submissive (shy), aggressive, manipulative and impulsive. Aggression was represented many various groups and classifications in literature. These classifications were done in different types of physical, instrumental, relational, emotional, defensive and destructive ones; opposition-containing, direct or indirect, verbal, hostile aggressions as well as active or passive classifications (Fromm, 1993; Wiehe, 1998; Ainsworth, 2002; Kirsh, 2006). And aggression in different resources was studied under three main titles including destructive, passive and impulsive ones. Hostility-containing, destructive aggression meant satisfaction from the aggression feeling without making an individual in front of oneself angry, passive aggression meant defense for existence and rights without having any aims for hurting, injuring another one, impulsive aggression meant a different classification type in literature (Bostan and Kılıçgil, 2008; Tutkun et al. 2010; Hasta and Güler, 2013).

The most important point of aggressive behaviour is an intention and emotion of harming a person in front of oneself. Cüceloğlu (2005) stated that aggression could be directed towards oneself like it could be against an object, an event, a situation, an attitude, a person, a society. An individual may be in a conflict by oneself and this

situation is a determinant of aggression course and dimension. Yavuzer et al. (2013) emphasized that their personal development was achieved by improving problem-solving, critical thinking and communication skills when individuals' conflicts in their inner world were positively resolved, destructive solutions encouraged anger, hostility and violence emotions. Cüceloğlu (2005) claimed that one of the reasons stimulating aggression was frustration and aggression showed itself as a typical result of that one. Also, while some of aggressive behaviours let the situation revealing the sense of frustration disappear, some of them made the situation worse. During aggression, an individual ignores someone's rights before oneself, does not respect to them, appeals to ways such as violence and force in order to carry one's opinions (Bostan and Kılıçgil, 2008; Tutkun et al. 2010; Hasta and Güler, 2013).

Whatever its reasons and resources are, all physical and mental attacks with indelicate, sarcastic, hostile, painful, anger and violence containing emotions are disturbance resources for individuals and society. They cause a starting process which impairs existence and life quality, and triggers pessimism as well as unpleasant situations in environment and conditions individuals live in. When an impulsive behaviour not containing a bad intention is preferred to destructive and passive aggressions, aggression will lose its threatening and terrifying characteristics.

2. Method

The universe of the study consisted of the schools who admit students with the special talent exam, the sample group also consisted of total 413 students including 226 males, 187 females studying at SBF (Faculty of Sport Sciences) (148), DSK (Dilek Sabancı Conservatory) (112) and GSF (Faculty of Fine Arts) (153) of Selçuk University.

In collection of socio-demographical information, the Personal Information Form; for data related with aggression, the Aggression Scale (AS) with its validity and reliability by İltar-Kiper (1984), consisting of 30 items and being separated into three sub-dimensions including Destructive, Impulsive and Passive Aggressions, were used. For each item of the scale, it was required to mark one of 7 choices from the one "it strongly fits to me" (+3 points) to the one "it never fits to me" (-3 points). The points between -3 and +3 were added and +31 was added to the relevant point for each sub-measurement as well, the values were excluded from negativity. According to this, a point between 1-61 was obtained for each sub-measurement.

By testing homogeneity and variances of data, as the Independent Sample T test was used for the gender factor from the determination of changing data, the One Way ANOVA for multi comparisons and the Tukey test for the determination of difference resources were benefited from.

3. Findings

Table 1: Changes in accordance with the gender

School	n	%	Destructive Aggression		Impulsiveness		Passive Aggression		General Aggression		
			X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	
			Male	226	54,7	21,20	5,25	30,43	6,63	13,47	5,29
Female	187	45,3	20,17	5,53	26,28	6,19	12,51	4,42	58,96	9,69	
P				,052*		,000*		,045*		,000*	

* Inter-Groups Significant Difference

At Table 1, the differences between the male and female students were observed. While the male student average was $21,2 \pm 5,25$ in the destructive aggression sub-dimension, the female student average was $20,17 \pm 5,53$, that difference was regarded to be insignificant.

In the impulsive aggression sub-dimension, the male student average was ($30,43 \pm 6,63$) higher than the female student average ($26,28 \pm 6,19$), and that difference was considered to be statistically significant ($P < 0,05$).

The passive aggression averages were $13,47 \pm 5,29$ for the male ones, $12,51 \pm 4,42$ for the female ones and that difference was also regarded to be statistically significant ($P < 0,05$).

When examined the general aggression points were examined, the average values concerning the male students ($65,11 \pm 11,74$) were higher than the female student averages ($58,96 \pm 9,69$) and that change was considered to be statistically significant ($P < 0,05$).

Table 2: Changes in accordance with the school type

School	n	%	Destructive Aggression		Impulsiveness		Passive Aggression		General Aggression		
			X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	
			Faculty of Sport Sciences	148	35,8	22,07	5,01 ^a	30,11	8,27 ^a	13,95	5,21 ^b
Conservatory	112	27,1	19,24	5,97 ^b	27,33	6,07 ^b	11,38	3,74 ^a	57,95	10,31 ^c	
Faculty of Fine Arts	153	37,0	20,53	5,20 ^b	27,94	5,16 ^b	13,37	5,15 ^b	61,84	8,94 ^b	
				,000*		,002*		,000*		,000*	

^{a b c} Inter-Groups Significant Difference

As seen at Table 2; there were significant differences in the aggressions and its all sub-dimensions among SBF, DSK and GSF students. The destructive aggression values were

(22,07 ± 5,01) for the SBF students and found to be statistically different rather than the averages of DSK (19,24 ± 5,97), GSF students (20,53 ± 5,20) (P<0.05).

The impulsive aggression values were (30,11 ± 8,27) for the SBF students and also found to be statistically different rather than the averages of DSK (27,33 ± 6,07), GSF students (27,94 ± 5,16) (P<0.05).

As the passive aggression values were (11,38 ± 3,74) for the DSK students, they were (13,95 ± 5,21) for SBF, (13,37 ± 5,15) for GSF, and those differences were statistically meaningful (P<0.05).

The general aggression averages were (66,14 ± 12,79) for the SBF students, the DSK averages were (57,95 ± 10,31), the GSF averages were (61,84 ± 8,94), and those differences were statistically significant among the three schools (P<0.05).

Table 3: Changes in accordance with the age factor

Age	n	%	Destructive Aggression		Impulsiveness		Passive Aggression		General Aggression	
			X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss
			20-23	59	14,3	22,08	6,21	28,47	6,02	13,76
24-27	258	62,5	20,72	5,44	29,10	6,73	13,24	4,99	63,06	11,56
28-31	96	23,2	19,92	4,57	27,15	7,09	12,05	4,45	59,13	9,99
				,054		,053		0,62		0,06

^{abc} Inter-Groups Significant Difference

When examined at Table 3; there were no significant differences in the Destructive, Impulsive and Passive aggression dimensions depending on the age factor. When examined about the values of general aggression, the values of the students included in the age group 28-31 (59,13 ± 9,99) were different from the 20-23 age averages (64,32 ± 11,10) and the 24-27 age averages (63,06 ± 11,56) and those differences were statistically significant (P<0.05).

Table 4: Changes in accordance with the accommodation factor

Barınma	n	%	Destructive Aggression		Impulsiveness		Passive Aggression		General Aggression	
			X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss
			Aile Yanında	93	22,5	20,65	5,93	27,32	6,61	13,96
Yurtta	197	47,7	20,56	5,27	29,06	6,96	13,13	4,76	62,75	11,13
Öğrenci Evinde	123	29,8	21,08	5,20	28,68	6,46	12,20	4,70 ^b	61,96	9,98
				,691		,121		,032*		,771

^{abc} Inter-Groups Significant Difference

As seen at Table 4, there were not any significant differences in the Destructive, Impulsive and General Aggression values in accordance with the students' accommodation situations. In the passive aggression sub-dimension; the averages of the students staying with their family were ($13,95 \pm 5,45$) higher than the students staying at the student house ($12,20 \pm 4,70$), and that difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.05$).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Within the research focused on the changes in the aggression levels of the students studying at schools which admit the students with the special talent exam; statistically significant differences were determined in the Destructive Aggression, Impulsive Aggression and Passive Aggression points between the students at the Faculty of Sport Sciences and the students at the Dilek Sabancı Conservatory and the Faculty of Fine Arts (Table 2, $P < 0.05$). Eroğlu (2009) studied about the high school and university students' aggression levels on 2242 students, revealed that the students' aggression behaviours were meaningfully different in terms of the sub-dimensions; Ağlamaz (2005) found out significant changes between the aggression points of the high school students studying at different fields in accordance with their relevant school type. Karataş (2008) observed statistically significant differences in the indirect aggression sub-dimension of the high school students in terms of their interesting field type. As our research groups; the schools which admit the students with the special talent exam, choose their students towards various criteria, and the students have different cognition and capability fields, in this way, our study represents similarities with the relevant literature.

Regarding aggression as different images and dimensions among the students having education at different fields and schools can be perceived as a normal situation. In this study, the lowest averages of aggression sub-dimension belong to the department students of Conservatory (Table 1); music and music-related items can be said to be an effective method for expressing individuals by themselves and keeping aggression at the lowest level. The values of aggression sub-dimensions relating to the students studying at the faculty of fine arts were regarded to be lower rather than the students at the faculty of sport sciences and this change was considered to be statistically meaningful ($P < 0.05$). As Sezer (2011) showed that music individuals preferred to listen in daily life had important effects on anger situations and psychological symptoms, Alaskan et al. (2015) suggested that stress levels reduced in the university students listening to the shaman drum and they could control their anger by expressing themselves better than the control group. When compared about the aggression levels of the students having education at education and sport fields of a university in a research; the students choosing sport field had higher aggression points

than the students choosing education fields (Kocatürk, 1982). This situation may explain that educational factors included in the artistic structure make more positive effects on aggression rather than physical ability education-based factors.

The changing aggression points in terms of gender have been seen in literature; even if there are more studies showing that there are differences resulting from gender (Şahin and Owen, 2009; Arslan et al. 2010; Doğan et al. 2002; Aral et al. 2004; Halıcı and Baran, 2006; Akduman et al. 2007; Campbell and Muncer, 1998; Eroğlu, 2009), there are some studies involving no differences (Dervent, 2007; Karataş, 2005; Ağlamaz, 2005; Çobanoğlu, 2005; Kurtyılmaz, 2005).

Some studies (Arslan et al. 2010; Efiltili, 2006; De Wied et al.2007, Halıcı and Baran 2006) indicated that the males were more offensive than the females, the males regarded aggression as a normal behaviour in life cycle and they sometimes directed those on the females. In this study; between the female and male students; the male student averages were higher than the female student averages in the destructive aggression sub-dimension and that difference was statistically significant ($P<0.05$; Table 1). In a longitudinal research keeping on 22 years, the male and female subjects were followed from the age 8 to the age 30 and the fixed rate of aggressive behaviours available in the male ones since the childhood years was higher than the females (Eron, 1987). Depending on the gender factor, the male student averages were higher than the female student averages in the destructive, passive, impulsive and general aggression dimensions within our study and those differences were considered to be statistically significant ($P<0.05$; Table 1). As Gökçiçek (2015) suggested that the males were more aggressive than the females, the females were more impulsive than the males; Çetinoğlu (2016) informed that self-capability did not have any effects on the destructive aggression and the passive aggression, it had meaningful and negative effects on the impulsive aggression. The reason for impulsiveness changes relating to the males and the females in literature and our study may involve sociological, physiological, psychological and economic issues, topography, experience field, individual differences, beliefs and values. The passive aggression averages associated with the male students were higher than the averages relating to the females and that difference was found to be statistically significant (Table 1, $P<0.05$). An aggressive behaviour is not approved by society and thus, individuals try to show these behaviours with implied and biting words. Indirect aggression by avoiding from struggle represents a passive aggression. The students at the faculty of sport sciences had higher values than the other school students, which may reveal that sportive activities trigger the passive aggression rather than artistic activities and capabilities more.

When examined the general aggression points, the values in the male students were considerably higher than the female student averages and that change was statistically meaningful (Table 1, $P<0.05$). Kesen et al. (2007) researched on 201

individuals staying at an orphanage and found a positive relation between the stay period of the adolescents staying at an orphanage and the impulsive and general aggression point averages even though they did not find any relations between the anger control points and the aggression sub-dimensions and the general aggression points. Baumeister and Bushman (2004) considered aggression as a strategy used for resolving social conflicts in cultural issues. According to Maxwell and Siu (2008), it was emphasized that severity of frustration feeling, tendency and frequency of vengeful understanding made individuals' aggressive behaviours possible as strategies for overcoming, and physical aggression was strategies used more by the males. In our study, the general aggression points of the individuals studying at the sport field were higher than the other schools, so it can be said that sportive activities affect general aggression less rather than artistic activities.

Depending on the age factor, any significant differences were not found in the aggression and its sub-dimensions (Table 3). Erşan et al. (2010) stated that the aggression level was not affected from socio-demographical variables. Turgut et al. (2006) were involved in a detailed medline research of 5 000 articles about aggression; informed that there was a reasonable relation between mental illness and violence, the highest violence rates were seen in individuals who used drugs and had anti-social personality disorders. Training mothers-fathers about aggression is the most appropriate solution way of preventing children's aggression at early ages; peers are affective in social strategies and aggressive behaviours in childhood period (Jarvinen, 2001). In our research, the aggression points reduced when the age group increased although there were not any statistical significant differences in the aggression sub-dimensions in terms of the age factor, and that one was similar to the literature.

In accordance with the students' accommodation situations, any significant changes were not seen in their Impulsiveness, Destructive and General Aggression values (Table 4). In the Passive Aggression sub-dimension, the students staying with their families had higher averages rather than the students staying at the student house and this change was regarded to be statistically meaningful ($P < 0.05$; Table 4). Aktaş et al. (2004) determined a significant relation between the passive aggression points and the destructive aggression points, informed that the destructive aggression points increased when the passive aggression points increased. The students staying at the student houses had lower passive aggression points rather than the students staying with their families, which may result from they have more shares and socialization process with their friends.

The reasons of changes in the aggression values observed at schools which admit the students with the special talent exam may be considered to be special talent exam criteria of schools, capability differences, affective, cognitive and psycho-motor field differences, their own specific structures. The average values in the aggression and its

all sub-dimensions from the students studying at the Faculty of Sport Sciences were higher rather than the students at the Conservatory and the faculty of Fine Arts, which indicates that art education may make more positive effects on aggression than sport education.

References

1. Ağlamaz, T. (2006). Lise öğrencilerinin saldırganlık puanlarının kendini açma davranışı okul türü, cinsiyet, sınıf düzeyi, anne-baba öğrenim düzeyi ve ailenin aylık gelir düzeyi açısından incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 19 Mayıs Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
2. Ainsworth, P.B. (2002). *Psychology and Policing*. Les Johnston. Frank Leishman, Tim Newburn (Eds.). Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing.
3. Akduman, G.G., Çolak, M., Cantürk, G. (2007). Çocuklarda kendilik algısı ve saldırganlık eğilimi ilişkisi: Erzurum Örneği. *Adli Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 4 (3), 3- 12.
4. Aktaş, Z., Çobanoğlu, G., Yazıcılar, İ. (2004). Profesyonel erkek basketbolcuların saldırganlık düzeyleri ile maç başarıları arasındaki ilişkinin araştırılması. *Sportmetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2 (3), 127-134.
5. Alaskan, A.M., Bilge, A., Şarman, Ç. (2015). Şaman Davulu Dinlemenin Ruhsal Duruma Etkisi, *Cankiri Karatekin University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences*, 6(1): 137-150.
6. Aral, N., Bütün, A., Türkmenler, B., Akbıyık, A. (2004). İlköğretim Okullarının Sekizinci Sınıfına Devam Eden İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Eğilimlerinin İncelenmesi. *Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi*, 315, 17-25.
7. Arslan, C., Hamarta, E., Arslan, E., Saygın, Y. (2010). Ergenlerde Saldırganlık ve Kişilerarası Problem Çözmenin İncelenmesi. *İlköğretim Online*, 9(1), 379-388.
8. Baumeister, R.F., Bushman, B.J. (2004). Human nature and aggressive motivation: Why do cultural animals turn violent? *International Review of Social Psychology*, 17, 205-220.
9. Bostan, G., Kılıçgil, E. (2008). Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu Öğrencisi Olan ve Olmayan Ankara Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Boyutları, *Sportmetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*. 2008; 6 (3):133–140.
10. Budak, S. (2005). *Psikoloji Sözlüğü*. İkinci Basım. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
11. Campbell, A., Muncer, S. (1998). Female Criminal Assault: An Avolutionary Perspective. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 35 (4), 413-428.
12. Cüceloğlu, D. (2005). *İnsan ve Davranışı*. Remzi Kitapevi, İstanbul.

13. Çetinoğlu, G.(2016). Bursa birinci amatör ligindeki futbolcuların özyeterlik ve saldırganlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi Yüksek Lisans Tezi Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
14. Çobanoğlu, Ş. (2005). Mobbing; İş Yerinde Duygusal Saldırı ve Mücadele Yöntemleri. Timaş Yayınları Psikoloji Dizisi, 34-35.
15. De Wied, M., Branje, S.J.T., Meeus, W.H.J.(2007). Empathy and conflict resolution in friendship relations among adolescents. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33, 48-55.
16. Dervent, F., Arslanoğlu, E., Şenel, Ö. (2010). Lise Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeyleri ve Sportif Aktivitelere Katılımla İlişkisi (İstanbul İli Örneği),*Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*.2010;7 (1): 523-525.
17. Doğan, B., Moralı, S., Kazak, Z., Tok, S. (2002). Bireylerin Spora Katılım, Cinsiyet ve Sürekli Kaygı Düzeylerine Göre Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *Ege Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu Performans Dergisi*, 8(8), 1-13.
18. Efilti, E. (2006). Orta Öğretim Kurumlarında Okuyan Öğrencilerin Saldırganlık, Denetim Odağı ve Kişilik Özelliklerinin Karşılaştırmalı Olarak İncelenmesi. Selçuk Üniversitesi, Doktora tezi.
19. Eroğlu, S. (2009). Saldırganlık davranışının boyutları ve ilişkili olduğu faktörler: lise ve üniversite öğrencileri üzerine karşılaştırmalı bir çalışma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 21, 206- 221.
20. Eron, L.D. (1987). The development of aggressive behavior from the perspective of a developing behaviorism. *American Psychologist*, 42(5), 435-442.
21. Erşan, E.E., Doğan, O., Doğan, S. (2009). Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin Sosyodemografik Açından Değerlendirilmesi, *Cumhuriyet Tıp Dergisi*, 31: 231–238.
22. Fromm, E. (1993). İnsandaki Yıkıcılığın Kökenleri. (Çeviri Şükrü Alpagut), 2. Basım, Payel yayınevi, İstanbul.
23. Gergen, K.J., Gergen, M.M.(1986). *Social psychology (Second Edition)*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 226.
24. Gökçiçek, S. (2015). Ortaöğretim Kurumlarında Spor Yapan Ve Yapmayan Öğrencilerin Saldırganlık Tutumlarının Araştırılması (Samsun İli Örneği). *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi*.
25. Halıcı, P., Baran, G. (2006). Yatılı İlköğretim Bölge Okullarına Devam Eden ve Ailesiyle Birlikte Yaşayan 12-14 Yaş Grubundaki Çocukların Saldırganlık Eğilimlerinin İncelenmesi, *Adli Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 2006; 3(2):23-30.
26. Hasta, D., Güler, M.E. (2013). Saldırganlık: Kişilerarası İlişki Tarzları ve Empati Açısından Bir İnceleme. *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 4 : (1).

27. Jarvinen, L.K. (2001). Aggressive behaviour and social problem-solving strategies: a review of the findings of a seven-year follow-up from childhood to late adolescence. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 11, 236-250.
28. Karataş, Z.B. (2005). "Anne Baba Saldırganlığı İle Lise Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlığı Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi." *Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi*. Şubat. Sayı: 317.
29. Karataş, Z. (2008). Lise Öğrencilerinde öfke ve Saldırganlık. *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Cilt 17, Sayı 3.
30. Kesen, N.F., Deniz, M.E., Durmuşoğlu, N. (2007). Ergenlerde Saldırganlık ve Öfke Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki: Yetiştirme Yurtları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17, 353 -364.
31. Kirsh, S.J. (2006). *Children, Adolescents, and Media Violence: A Critical Look at the Research*. London: Sage Publications.
32. Klickpera, B.g., Klein, G. (2007). *Okullarda Şiddeti Önlemek (1.Baskı)*. İzmir: İlya İzmir Yayınevi Matbaası.
33. Kocatürk, R. (1982). Saldırganlık Güdüsünden Spor ve Eğitim Alanında Meslek Seçimine Etkisi. A. Ü. E. Fakültesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
34. Konter, E. (2006). *Spor Psikolojisi El Kitabı*. Nobel Yayınevi, Ankara, 2006.
35. Köknel, Ö. (1996). *Bireysel ve Toplumsal Şiddet (1.baskın)*. Altın Kitaplar Basımevi, İstanbul.
36. Kurtyılmaz, Y. (2005). Öğretmen adaylarının saldırganlık düzeyleri ile akademik başarıları, iletişim ve problem çözme becerileri arasındaki ilişkiler. Eskişehir: Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
37. Lorenz, K. (1968). *Das Sogenannte Böse. Zur Naturgeschichte der Aggression*. 1nd ed. Wien, Borotha-Schoeler Press, 21-22.
38. Masalcı, E.D. (2001). *Aile İçi İletişimlerle Çocuğun Saldırganlık Düzeyi ve Uygun Davranışlarının Karsılaştırılması*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
39. Maxwell, J.P., Siu, O.L. (2008). The Chinese coping strategies scale: Relationships with aggression, anger, and rumination in a diverse sample of Hong Kong Chinese adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44 (5), 1049-1059.
40. Partal, M., Kılıçgil, E. (2003). Süper Ligde Oynayan Bir Futbol Takımı Taraftarlarının Şiddete Neden Olan Tahrik Olma Unsurları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Gazi Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, Sayı: 2, Ankara.
41. Sezer, F. (2011). Öfke ve psikolojik belirtiler üzerine müziğin etkisi, *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 8:1. ISSN1303-5134.

42. Şahin, E.S., Owen, F.K. (2009). Psikolojik İhtiyaçları Farklı Lise Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeyleri, Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, Cilt 4, Sayı 32.
43. Şahin, H.M. (2003). Sporda Şiddet ve Saldırganlık. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım. Ankara.
44. T.D.K. (2017). (<http://www.tdk.gov.tr/2017>).
45. Turgut, T., Lagace, D., İzmir, M., Dursun, S. (2006). Psikiyatri kliniklerinde şiddet ve agresyonun değerlendirilmesi: tanısal yaklaşımlar. Klinik Psikofarmakoloji Bülteni, 16 (3), 179–194.
46. Tutkun, E., Güner, B.Ç., Ağaoğlu, S.A., Soylu, R. (2010). Takım Sporları ve Bireysel Sporlar Yapan Sporcuların Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin Değerlendirilmesi. Spor ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1(1), 23-29.
47. Wiehe, V.R. (1998), Understanding Family Violence: Treating and Preventing Partner, Child, Sibling, and Elder Abuse. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
48. Yavuzer, Y., Karataş, Z., Gündoğdu, R. (2013). Ergenlerin çatışma çözme davranışlarının incelenmesi: nicel ve nitel bir çalışma. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 28 (1), 428 -440.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).