

Examination of Agression of University Students by the Level of Playing Sports

Rıza Erdal¹, Mehmet Yılmaz², Zekiye Basaran³, Serap Çolak³

¹Inst, Kocaeli University, Faculty of Sport Science, Department of Sport Management, Turkey

²Graduated Student, Kocaeli University, Faculty of Sport Science, Department of Sport Management, Turkey

³Assoc.Prof.Dr., Kocaeli University, Faculty of Sport Science, Department of Sport Management, Turkey

Correspondence: Zekiye Basaran, Assoc.Prof.Dr., Kocaeli University, Faculty of Sport Science, Department of Sport Management, Turkey.

Received: October 10, 2018

Accepted: October 27, 2018

Online Published: November 29, 2018

doi:10.11114/jets.v6i11a.3818

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i11a.3818>

Abstract

The aim of this research is to examine aggression of university students by the level of playing sports. 215 students constituted the sample of this study. Personal information form and "Aggression Scale" were used as a data collection tool. Mann-Whitney U Test and Anova Test were performed for difference between groups and Cronbach's Alfa (.898) was performed in order to measure reliability of data concerning scale ($p < 0.05$).

As a conclusion; it was determined that sport is effective on the aggression level of university students. It was stated that the average aggression level of people who play sports is lower than people who don't play sports. As there is no difference between ways of playing sports, there is a difference between departments. Males have higher aggression level than females. It is possible to say that sport has aggression reducing effect besides health and entertainment benefits in the direction of these findings.

Keywords: aggression, sport, student

1. Introduction

Reactions people showed to incidents are different depending on personal features, cultural structure and living conditions. These reactions consist of life experiences and accumulations in a period of time from the process of growing up to the reacting degree. These accumulations may be at variable levels from a simple reaction to the violence degree. As reaction given against action is expressed as fight, its upper level is aggression.

Aggression which involves actions harming people and aimed at life, property and psychology in general is a harmful, destructive behavioral pattern aimed at other people or objects.

As aggression is defined to be a spontaneous impulse, according to Freud's psychoanalytical theory, behaviorists define aggression with extroversive behaviors. Besides that, there are opinions defending that hormones and genetic structure and even social and cultural environment are effective on aggressive behaviors of individuals.

Destructive feelings such as grudge, hate, hostility, violence in various levels may exist in aggressive behaviors besides anger and furiousness. It shows up as a reaction against situations such as being threatened, being insulted, being precluded and functions as a motive. Intensity of aggression feeling and frequency of turning this feeling into a behavior is subjective. The current conditions individual has determine this. In a way, aggression is expressed directly proportional to inhibition (Acet, 2005). Components such as "damaging, harming" or "intention, purpose" are preferential in aggressive behaviors. Besides there are purposes such as freedom achievement, status acquisition, controlling other people, constituting authority and gaining accomplishment (Bilgin, 1988; Kurtyilmaz, 2005; Ozdevecioglu&Yalcin, 2010).

Aggression is classified in various ways. These are; passive aggression with only hurting intention and its action version; active aggression. Purpose of instrumental aggression is not to hurt the other person but to prevent to get into action. Aggressions committed to carry its point are goal-oriented aggressions. To display behaviors demanded by people around is aggression under social reward, approval and command (Bilgin 1988; Dervent, 2007).

Furthermore; sub-degrees of aggression consist of (way of behavior people who are angry and unsuccessful to control their impulses) “physical aggression”, (way of behavior people who are stubborn and disputant) “verbal aggression”, (emotional reactions given to unsatisfied demands, unintended consequences and unmet expectations) “anger”, (people who reflect social disharmony and serious psychopathological and even physical disorders) “hostility” and (way of behavior of people who show a tendency to get angry in cases of avoiding direct confrontation) “indirect aggression” (Bilgin, 1988; Karatas, 2008).

Subjects researched in aggression-sports relation in literature is related to playing sports individually or as a team, branch of sports, satisfaction of sports, whether sports is in way of a contest, expectations from contest in general (Ozdevecioglu & Yalcin 2010; Karagun 2011). Besides that; the manners of parents, age, gender, type of school, educational level and income level of the family (Tuzgol, 2000), upbringing, environment, genetic structure, cultural effect, reasons of aggression and violence in sports (Ziyagil et al. 2012; Yucel et al. 2015) and students’ aggression tendencies/levels (Durmus & Gurkan 2005; Kurtyilmaz 2005; Karatas 2008; Yıldız 2009; Derwent et al. 2010; Ceylan 2012, Bahadir & Erdogan 2016).

Current problems in society designate direction of aggression. As a result of this; people participate in religious, political or other types of movements. It serves for a certain movements with its personal anger. Irregularities, inequalities it witnessed around creating a reaction in their personality. Besides; the fact that ways out front are engorged, drives them to despair; they get in search of freedom by identifying its personal destiny with society’s destiny (Durmus & Gurgan, 2005).

Young people group is the one in which these emotions and reactions are most intensive. Their wish to gain a place in society and to be respected increases with psychological and physical changes they had. Tendency to immediate responses, angry and aggressive behaviors is felt more often. Sport is one of the events which bring their energy under control and relax them psychologically.

Our research’s goal in our study is to examine effect of sports on aggression according to condition of playing sports, department and gender of students studying at Faculty of Sport Sciences.

2. Methodology

Sample of Research

Sample of our study consists of 215 volunteer students, including 69 females and 146 males studying at Kocaeli University, Faculty of Sport Sciences in 2017-2018 academic year. These are students of Coaching Training Department (AEP), Physical Education and Sports Teaching Department (BES), Recreation Department (REK) and Department of Sport Management (SYP).

Research Method

Research is made with quantitative research method and screening model was used. The application was carried out with face-to-face interview technique between May 1st and May 30th, 2018 in the spare time of the students.

Data Collection Tools

Personal information form and “Aggression Scale” invented by Buss and Perry (1992) and adapted to Turkish by Can (2002) were used as data collection tool.

Personal Information Survey

Questions concerning the level of playing sports and way of playing sports, gender, age, departments of student were involved in this survey.

Scale of Aggression

Scale called “Aggression Questionnaire” invented by Buss and Perry in 1992 and updated by Buss & Warren in 2000 was adapted to Turkish by Can (2002). This scale consisting of 34 articles has 5 sub-scales including physical aggression (8 articles), verbal aggression (5 articles), anger (8 articles), hostility (7 articles) and indirect aggression (6 articles) sections. The lowest point of the scale is 34 and the highest point of the scale is 170 (Karatas, 2008), and in five-Likert type; (1) it is not conformable to my character at all (2) it is slightly conformable (3) it is conformable to a degree (4) it is very conformable and (5) it is completely conformable.

As test repetition levels of scale performed by Buss and Perry (1992) varies between 0,72 and 0,80, Alpha Coefficient was calculated as 0,91 for total measurement; for sub-scales; 0,83-0,85 in physical aggression, 0,36-0,59 in verbal aggression, 0,72-0,74 in anger, 0,74-0,75 in hostility, 0,36-0,53 in indirect aggression ($P < 0,05$). High point obtained from each sub-component of the scale shows that an individual has aggressive behavior related to that factor. Cronbach’s Alpha was calculated as ,898 for total measurement; ,858 for physical aggression; ,561 for verbal

aggression; ,667 for anger; ,704 for hostility and ,723 for indirect aggression.

Data Analysis

Data obtained from scales were evaluated in SPSS 25 packaged software. Frequency and percent distributions were received for demographic information. Cronbach's Alpha technique was used to measure reliability of data, Mann-Whitney U Test technic was used for paired comparisons and one-way variance analysis (One-Way ANOVA) technic was used for multiple comparisons. Pearson Correlation Test was performed in order to understand if there is a relation between departments. Level of significance was accepted as $p < 0.05$.

3. Findings

Table 1. Gender of Students

Gender	F	%
Female	69	32,1
Male	146	67,9
Total	215	100

Table 2. Situation Whether Do Sport of Students

Situation Do Sport	F	%
Play sport	177	82,3
Not play sport	38	17,7
Total	215	100,0

69 (32,1%) were female and 146 (67,9%) were male according to Table 1. (Table 2), 177 (82,3%) of them played sports and 38 (17,7%) didn't play sports.

Table 3. Age Table Descriptive Statistics According to Gender

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Women Age	69	19	32	22,61	2,613
Men Age	146	18	32	22,46	2,346

The age range of women is between 19-32, with an average of $22,61 \pm 2,613$ according to Table 3. Age range of men is between 18 to 32 with an average of $22,46 \pm 2,346$.

Table 4. Number of Students by Departments

	F	%
SYP	86	40,0
ANT	30	14,0
REK	23	10,7
BES	76	35,3
Total	215	100,0

86 (40%) students in the sample group are SYP, 30 (14%) are AEP, 23 (10,7%) are REK and 76 (35,3 %) are BES students according to Table 4.

Table 5. Styles Do Sport of Students

Style Do Sport	F	%
Not Playing	38	17,6
Licensed sportsmen	84	39,1
For health	93	43,3
Total	215	100,0

38 of the students (17,6%) does not play sports, 84 (39,1%) are licensed sportsmen and 93 (43,3%) are doing sports for health according to Table 5.

Table 6. Number of Athletes and Non-Athletes According to Department

			Doing Sport	Not doing sport	Total
Department	SYP	N	70	16	86
		%	81,4%	18,6%	100,0%
	ANT	N	27	3	30
		%	90,0%	10,0%	100,0%
	REK	N	18	5	23
		%	78,3%	21,7%	100,0%
BES	N	62	14	76	
	%	81,6%	18,4%	100,0%	
Total	N	177	38	215	
	%	82,3%	17,7%	100,0%	

90% of AEP, 81% of SYP and BES, and 78% of REK are playing sports according to Table 6. 3 students in the AEP stated that they did not play sports.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Students according to Sports Status

Aggression		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Doing Sport	Physical	177	8,00	40,00	20,0847	7,85006
	Verbal	177	5,00	25,00	14,1751	3,53840
	Anger	177	10,00	40,00	21,9435	5,60410
	Hostility	177	7,00	35,00	18,1695	5,46940
	Indirect	177	6,00	30,00	14,3672	5,31461
Not Doing Sport	Physical	38	8,00	40,00	22,4474	7,27341
	Verbal	38	9,00	25,00	15,5000	3,38319
	Anger	38	14,00	36,00	24,1842	5,74153
	Hostility	38	11,00	31,00	19,8158	4,59645
	Indirect	38	8,00	24,00	15,3158	4,30025

When aggression dimensions are examined, it is determined that the average aggression of students who do not play sports is higher than sportsmen at all scales according to Table 7.

Table 8. Aggression of Students According to the Status of Playing Sports (Mann-Whitney U Test)

Aggression	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Z	P
Physical	215	20,5023	7,78741	8,00	40,00	-1,910	,056
Verbal	215	14,4093	3,54014	5,00	25,00	-2,146	,032
Anger	215	22,3395	5,68002	10,00	40,00	-2,193	,028
Hostility	215	18,4605	5,35271	7,00	35,00	-1,787	,074
Indirect	215	14,5349	5,15348	6,00	30,00	-1,332	,183

There was a statistically significant difference in verbal aggression (032) and anger dimension (028) when there was a difference between the sportsmen and non-sportsmen according to Table 8. Although there was a difference in the average of the other dimensions, this difference was not statistically significant.

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics of Aggressiveness According to Departments

Department	Aggression	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
SYB	Physical	86	8,00	35,00	19,9767	6,79961
	Verbal	86	5,00	24,00	13,9767	3,39888
	Anger	86	10,00	31,00	21,3837	4,55598
	Hostility	86	8,00	31,00	17,7209	4,69205
	Indirect	86	6,00	24,00	13,2791	4,13778
AEB	Physical	30	8,00	40,00	22,3667	9,53572
	Verbal	30	9,00	25,00	15,9000	3,96841
	Anger	30	10,00	40,00	25,1333	6,78097
	Hostility	30	11,00	35,00	21,0000	6,54428
	Indirect	30	6,00	30,00	16,7333	6,87290
REK	Physical	23	9,00	38,00	21,6522	7,84862
	Verbal	23	9,00	23,00	14,5652	2,84167
	Anger	23	13,00	34,00	22,9130	5,50135
	Hostility	23	9,00	28,00	19,1304	5,25966
	Indirect	23	7,00	24,00	15,8261	4,43798
BES	Physical	76	8,00	40,00	20,0132	8,06555
	Verbal	76	5,00	25,00	14,2632	3,61614
	Anger	76	12,00	36,00	22,1447	6,12907
	Hostility	76	7,00	35,00	18,0921	5,35208
	Indirect	76	6,00	26,00	14,6974	5,29659

When the aggression status of the students according to Table 9 is examined; AEP students were found to have a higher average than the other three. The lowest aggression was found in SYP students at all scales.

Table 10. Aggression Comparisons Between Departments (ANOVA)

Aggression		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Physical	Between Groups	176,624	3	58,875	,970	,408
	Within Groups	12801,124	211	60,669		
	Total	12977,749	214			
Verbal	Between Groups	84,939	3	28,313	2,300	,078
	Within Groups	2597,043	211	12,308		
	Total	2681,981	214			
Anger	Between Groups	323,176	3	107,725	3,454	,017
	Within Groups	6581,038	211	31,190		
	Total	6904,214	214			
Hostility	Between Groups	261,148	3	87,049	3,129	,027
	Within Groups	5870,266	211	27,821		
	Total	6131,414	214			
Indirect	Between Groups	320,976	3	106,992	4,210	,006
	Within Groups	5362,513	211	25,415		
	Total	5683,488	214			

When the aggression cases between the departments were compared, there was a statistically significant difference between the dimensions of anger (017), hostility (027) and indirect aggression is (006) according to Table 10.

Table 11. Presence of Difference Aggression Among Departments

Aggression	Department	Departments	Mean Difference			95% Confidence Interval	
			(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Physical	SYP	ANT	-2,38992	1,65159	,896	-6,7887	2,0089
		REK	-1,67543	1,82845	1,000	-6,5453	3,1944
		BES	-,03641	1,22626	1,000	-3,3024	3,2296
	ANT	SYP	2,38992	1,65159	,896	-2,0089	6,7887
		REK	,71449	2,15872	1,000	-5,0350	6,4639
		BES	2,35351	1,67945	,975	-2,1195	6,8265
	REK	SYP	1,67543	1,82845	1,000	-3,1944	6,5453
		ANT	-,71449	2,15872	1,000	-6,4639	5,0350
		BES	1,63902	1,85366	1,000	-3,2979	6,5760
	BES	SYP	,03641	1,22626	1,000	-3,2296	3,3024
		ANT	-2,35351	1,67945	,975	-6,8265	2,1195
		REK	-1,63902	1,85366	1,000	-6,5760	3,2979
Verbal	SYP	ANT	-1,92326	,74390	,062	-3,9045	,0580
		REK	-,58847	,82357	1,000	-2,7819	1,6050
		BES	-,28641	,55233	1,000	-1,7575	1,1846
	ANT	SYP	1,92326	,74390	,062	-,0580	3,9045
		REK	1,33478	,97233	1,000	-1,2549	3,9244
		BES	1,63684	,75646	,190	-,3779	3,6516
	REK	SYP	,58847	,82357	1,000	-1,6050	2,7819
		ANT	-1,33478	,97233	1,000	-3,9244	1,2549
		BES	,30206	,83492	1,000	-1,9216	2,5258
	BES	SYP	,28641	,55233	1,000	-1,1846	1,7575
		ANT	-1,63684	,75646	,190	-3,6516	,3779
		REK	-,30206	,83492	1,000	-2,5258	1,9216
Anger	SYP	ANT	-3,74961*	1,18420	,011	-6,9036	-,5957
		REK	-1,52932	1,31101	1,000	-5,0210	1,9624
		BES	-,76102	,87924	1,000	-3,1028	1,5807
	ANT	SYP	3,74961*	1,18420	,011	,5957	6,9036
		REK	2,22029	1,54782	,918	-1,9021	6,3427
		BES	2,98860	1,20418	,083	-,2186	6,1958
	REK	SYP	1,52932	1,31101	1,000	-1,9624	5,0210
		ANT	-2,22029	1,54782	,918	-6,3427	1,9021
		BES	,76831	1,32909	1,000	-2,7715	4,3081
	BES	SYP	,76102	,87924	1,000	-1,5807	3,1028
		ANT	-2,98860	1,20418	,083	-6,1958	,2186
		REK	-,76831	1,32909	1,000	-4,3081	2,7715
Hostility	SYP	ANT	-3,27907*	1,11842	,022	-6,2578	-,3003
		REK	-1,40950	1,23819	1,000	-4,7073	1,8882
		BES	-,37118	,83040	1,000	-2,5828	1,8405
	ANT	SYP	3,27907*	1,11842	,022	,3003	6,2578
		REK	1,86957	1,46184	1,000	-2,0239	5,7630
		BES	2,90789	1,13730	,068	-,1211	5,9369
	REK	SYP	1,40950	1,23819	1,000	-1,8882	4,7073
		ANT	-1,86957	1,46184	1,000	-5,7630	2,0239
		BES	1,03833	1,25526	1,000	-2,3049	4,3815
	BES	SYP	,37118	,83040	1,000	-1,8405	2,5828
		ANT	-2,90789	1,13730	,068	-5,9369	,1211
		REK	-1,03833	1,25526	1,000	-4,3815	2,3049
Indirect	SYP	ANT	-3,45426*	1,06896	,009	-6,3013	-,6072
		REK	-2,54702	1,18343	,195	-5,6989	,6049
		BES	-1,41830	,79368	,452	-3,5322	,6956
	ANT	SYP	3,45426*	1,06896	,009	,6072	6,3013
		REK	,90725	1,39719	1,000	-2,8140	4,6285
		BES	2,03596	1,08700	,375	-,8591	4,9310
	REK	SYP	2,54702	1,18343	,195	-,6049	5,6989
		ANT	-,90725	1,39719	1,000	-4,6285	2,8140
		BES	1,12872	1,19975	1,000	-2,0666	4,3241
	BES	SYP	1,41830	,79368	,452	-,6956	3,5322
		ANT	-2,03596	1,08700	,375	-4,9310	,8591
		REK	-1,12872	1,19975	1,000	-4,3241	2,0666

There is a statistically significant difference between the SYP and AEP in the Anger, Hostility and Indirect Aggression sub-dimensions according to Table 11.

Table 12. Descriptive Statistics of Aggression by Gender

Gender	Aggression	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Women	Physical	69	8,00	38,00	19,5652	7,76205
	Verbal	69	5,00	20,00	13,4638	2,94848
	Anger	69	12,00	36,00	21,4783	5,58519
	Hostility	69	8,00	31,00	18,1739	5,37411
	Indirect	69	6,00	28,00	14,0145	5,49731
Men	Physical	146	8,00	40,00	20,9452	7,78662
	Verbal	146	5,00	25,00	14,8562	3,71389
	Anger	146	10,00	40,00	22,7466	5,69793
	Hostility	146	7,00	35,00	18,5959	5,35573
	Indirect	146	6,00	30,00	14,7808	4,98341

When the aggression cases, according to gender are examined according to Table 12; the averages of hostility and indirect aggression are close to each other in terms of men and women. However, in terms of physical aggression, verbal aggression and anger, men's averages were higher than women's.

Table 13. Comparison of Aggression by Gender

	Physical Aggression	Verbal Aggression	Anger	Hostility	Indirect Aggression
Mann-Whitney U	4571,000	3981,500	4455,000	4927,500	4557,500
Wilcoxon W	6986,000	6396,500	6870,000	7342,500	6972,500
Z	-1,095	-2,490	-1,369	-,258	-1,129
P	,273	,013	,171	,797	,259

When the aggressiveness is compared between the genders, there is a statistically significant difference in the Verbal Aggression sub-dimension, but not in the other dimensions according to Table 10.

4. Discussion

This study was carried out for the purpose of examining the aggressiveness of the students of the Faculty of Sport Sciences in terms of sporting situation and gender; 177 students were playing sports, 38 students were not playing sports. As 84 of them are licensed active sportsman/sportswoman, 93 of them stated that they play sports for recreational purposes and for health. The average age is 22.61 ± 2.6 . 69 are female and 146 are male.

It was determined that the aggression scores of the students of the Faculty of Sports Sciences constituting the sampling group were low. In the study, it was determined that the average scores of those who did not play sports were higher than those who play sports at five scales. However, statistically significant differences were found in the scales of "verbal aggression" ($p = 0.032$) and "Anger" ($p = 0.028$) but not in other scales. There was no difference in the way of playing sports. This result shows that doing sports reduces the level of aggression. Considering there was the difference between who doing active sports and less sports, we can say that sport reduces people's negative feelings and excess energy and makes them more calm.

While Bahadır & Erdogan (2016) stated that the level of aggression of the students of physical education and sports high school are on the middle level, Yıldız (2009) found non-sporting secondary school students have higher aggression scores than those who did sports. This result supports our work. In addition, it has been determined that participation in the study by Dervent et al. (2010) did not reduce aggression in high school students. Again in Kilcigil and Bostan's (2008) study, it was determined that the students of the Sports Faculty were more destructive and passive aggressive than the other faculty students. These contradictory results suggest that the form of sport will vary according to the characteristics of the group studied and the expected pattern. Because Ozdevecioglu and Yalcin (2010), found negative relation between sports satisfaction and stress and aggression, and found positive relationships between stress and aggression in their research. Therefore; as the level of sport satisfaction of the athletes increases, their aggression and stress are decreasing. Or, as the stress of the players increases, the level of aggression also increases.

When we examined the aggression scores according to the departments in our study, it was seen that the scores of the

sub-aggression dimension of the AEP were higher than the scores of all sub-aggression and that of the SYP was the lowest. It is interesting that the SYP, which has little practical sports lessons, is less than the aggression scores of the AEP students who have higher aggression scores and have more active sports lessons. This result brought our mind the question if competition and ambition increase the aggression? Or made us think if the competition more likely to increase aggression in terms of team sports or class success?

When the comparisons between the departments were examined, a statistically significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of Anger ($p=0.017$), Hostility ($p=0.027$), and Indirect Aggressiveness ($p=0.006$). It is seen that the difference between these departments is between the AEP and the SYP. Ceylan (2012) found that the aggression scores of Sport faculty students were different according to their grade levels and that final grade students were more aggressive than their first year students. Karatas (2008) when the aggression and anger scores were examined according to the field types of the students who worked with high school students, only significant differences were found between the indirect aggression point averages. In contrary to these results, Bahadır and Erdogan (2016) found a significant difference in terms of aggression levels of the students, age, gender, athlete license status, mother's education level and father's education level; class level and departmental variables.

In the research, when the situation between gender and aggression was examined, it was determined that the aggression scores of males were higher than females in terms of anger, verbal and physical aggression although the average scores of hostility and indirect aggression were the same in both males and females. However, statistically, this difference was found to be significant only in verbal aggression ($p=0.013$). Gülcen (2010), in her study, stated that individuals who have a large face structure are more likely to attack because their level of testosterone is high. Karatas (2008) did not find a statistically significant difference between males and females in terms of general aggression and destructive aggression in high school students. He concluded that female scores are higher for general aggression and male scores are higher for destructive aggression with no significant difference. It can be assumed that this may be due to the testosterone hormone in men.

As a result; sports, university students have been found to be influential on aggression levels. It was determined that the average aggression level of the athletes was lower than those who did not. While there is no difference between the forms of playing sports, there is a difference between the gender and the departments studied in. Males have a higher level of aggression than female. In the direction of these findings, it can be said that the sport has health and entertainment benefits as well as aggression reducing effect. For this reason it will be useful to organize the events so that all students can participate at school. The sport, especially recreative sports, will relax them and make them more happy and calm.

Suggestions;

- In order to reduce the aggression, especially the preparation of the environment where the youth can do sports will be useful both in terms of their physical, psychological and socialization. They will throw away their excess energy through sports and become more calm, positive, harmonious and happy individuals.
- Projects that will make university clubs more active will be better organized and supported. Increased interest in the organization of interdepartmental will be constantly active.
- Making this research with students either sportsman/sportswoman or not who are from different cities, different schools, who are at different ages and different sports branches will provide better results in terms of research results.

References

- Acet, M. (2005). Sporda Şiddet ve Saldırganlık, Morpo Kültür Yayınları Ltd Ş., İstanbul
- Bahadır, Z., & Erdoğan, Ç. H. (2016). Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *Inesjournal Uluslararası Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(7), 33-48.
- Bilgin, N. (1988). Sosyal Psikolojiye Giriş. Ege Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, İzmir
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 452–459. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.3.452>
- Buss, A. H., & Warren, W. L. (2000). The Aggression Questionnaire Manual. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Can S (2002) "Aggression questionnaire" Adlı Ölçeğin Türk Popülasyonunda Geçerlilik ve Güvenilirlik Çalışması. Genel Kurmay Başkanlığı, Gülhane Askeri Tıp Akademisi Haydarpaşa Eğitim Hastanesi Ruh Sağlığı ve Hastalıkları Servis Şefliği, Yayınlanmamış Uzmanlık Tezi, İstanbul.

- Ceylan, D. (2012). BESYO Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi, Mezuniyet Tezi, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu.
- Dervent, F. (2007). Lise Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeyleri ve Sportif Aktivitelere Katılımla İlişkisi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Ana Bilim Dalı, Ankara
- Dervent, F., Arslanoğlu, E., & Şenel, Ö. (2010). Lise Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeyleri ve Sportif Aktivitelere Katılımla İlişkisi (İstanbul İli Örneği). *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(1), 521-534. ISSN: 1303-5134
- Durmuş, E., & Gürkan, U. (2005). Lise Öğrencilerinin Şiddet ve Saldırganlık Eğilimleri. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(3), 253-269.
- Gülçen, B. (2010). Genç Erişkin Bireylerde Yüz ve Kafa Boyutlarında Gözlenen Cinsiyet Farklılıkları ve Saldırgan Tutumla Olan İlişkisi. Başkent Üniversitesi, Tıp Fakültesi, Anatomi Anabilim Dalı, Uzmanlık Tezi, Ankara
- Karagün, E. (2011). Şiddet ve Spor. *Türkiye Klinikleri J Psychiatry-Special Topics*, 4(2), 79-85
- Karataş, Z. (2008). Lise Öğrencilerinde Öfke ve Saldırganlık. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 17(3), 277-294.
- Kılıçgil, E., & Bostan, G. (2008). Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Yüksekokulu Öğrencisi Olan Ve Olmayan Ankara Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Boyutları.SPORMETRE Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2008, VI(3), 133-140
- Kurtyılmaz, Y. (2005). “Öğretmen Adaylarının Saldırganlık Düzeyleri İle Akademik Başarıları İletişim Ve Problem Çözme Becerileri Arasındaki İlişkiler” Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı
- Özdevecioğlu, M., & Yalçın, Y. (2010). Spor Tatmininin Sporcuların Stres Ve Saldırganlık Düzeyleri Üzerindeki Etkisi. *Nigde University Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 4(1), 63-76.
- Tuzğd, M. (2000). Ana-Baba Tutumları Farklı Lise Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin Çeşitli değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 2(14), 39-48.
- Yıldız, S. (2009). Spor Yapan ve Yapmayan Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı, Konya
- Yücel, A. S., Atalay, A., & Gürkan, A. (2015). Factors Affecting Violence And Aggression in Sports. *International Journal Of Psychiatry And Psychological Researches*, 2(2), 68-90. <https://doi.org/10.17360/UHPPD.201529603>
- Ziyagil, M. A., Bilir, P., Çeken, R., & Temur, C. S. (2012). Aggression and Violence in Sports and Solution Proposals in Turkey CBU, *Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*. 2(1), 1-14.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](#) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.