



ISSN: 2687-265X

J Eurasia Sports Sci Med
<http://dergipark.gov.tr/jessm>

Volume 1, Issue 2
August 2019, 74-78

-  **Dilek UYAR** ¹
 **Merve SÖYLEMEZ** ¹
 **Ömer Faruk GÖNÜL** ¹
 **Oğuzhan ÇUMRALIĞİL** ¹
 **Bengü ALKAN** ¹
 **Eyüp Buğra GÜVENDİ** ¹
 **Fatma ILGIN** ¹
 **Mustafa BALLI** ¹
 **Mehmet ALTIN** ²

¹ Health Sciences Institute, Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey.

² Department of Recreation, Sports Science Faculty, Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey.

Corresponding author: D. Uyar

e-mail: uyardilek42@hotmail.com

Received: 28.07.2019

Accepted: 03.09.2019

Scrutinizing the Changes in the Aggression of the Students of Faculty of Sports Sciences Studying at Different Departments

Abstract

The objective of this study is to examine the aggressive behaviors and proclivity of the students of Faculty of Sports Sciences of Selçuk University, studying at different departments. The study group is constituted by total 349 students, being 155 males and 194 females, studying at different departments of Faculty of Sports Sciences of Selçuk University. While the personal information form was used for the socio-demographic information, a 7-item likert-type Aggression Scale developed by Kiper (1984) was utilized to obtain the values of aggression. Following testing the homogeneousness and variances of the data, Independent Sample t Test was used in identifying the changes for the gender factor, One-Way Anova for multiple comparisons, and Tukey HSD test in determining the source of the difference. The Crombach Alpha value for this study was determined as 0,82. Statistical changes were observed in the aggression values depending on the gender and department factors ($p<0.05$). While no change was found in the destructive aggression category in view of the gender variable, it was determined that the average values of males were statistically higher than females in the categories of assertiveness, passivity, and overall aggression ($p<0.05$). It was found that the students of the coaching department have the highest average value in the entire aggression subcategories and that the changes are statistically significant ($p<0.05$). In the light of such findings, it is considered that the new functional model charged by the society on females and males will be effective in the changes found between the male and female students, along with the socio-cultural structure, social status, and roles. In addition, the reason for the changes depending on the department factor among the students can be considered as the fact that they are made subject to different recruitment criteria and examinations when being placed into departments, in addition to the differences of their sportive fields where they are studying. It is a noteworthy result that the aggression scores of the coaching students is high despite the fact that they take more practice-based classes. Regardless of its cause and source, sense of aggression must be considered as a sense and behavior that must be brought under control without reaching a dimension that inflicts damage on persons and the society.

Keyword: Aggression, sports, university student.

INTRODUCTION

Intention is an important factor to determine whether a behaviour is aggressive or not. Freedman et al describes aggressive behaviour as an act that has the intention of hurting somebody. Target may not be the source of the aggressiveness but only the observable excuse (Lorenz 1968). If under control, aggressiveness is not a concerning issue to society. An act of aggressiveness full of purpose and intention is undoubtedly destructive.

Emotions and behaviours like anger, stress, anxiety and aggressiveness are important for all ages and education levels. Especially, since university students are towards the end of their puberty and beginning of their profession and partner selection, it is a critical time to get their aggressive behaviours under control. Aggressive behaviour could be under a complicated structure that it is not possible to evaluate it isolated from the events it causes. Aggressiveness is not a pure act, emotions such as anger, hostility and outburst companies this behaviour (Gergen & Gergen, 1986). This may not be just towards individuals or society. Krech and Crutchfield (1980) has reported that it could be observed as aggression, rage, anger, financial damage to goods and people, offensiveness and destructive purposes. Aggressiveness may not always result in violence. Partal and Kilcigil (2003) has described violence as the end point of aggressiveness but emphasized that aggressiveness does not have to involve violence.

Aggressiveness has the purpose or intention to hurt somebody physically or verbally, an act not carrying these properties cannot be described as aggressiveness (Atkinson et al, 2002). Cüceloğlu (2005) reports, aggressiveness might as well be towards the individual themselves rather than to an object, event, situation, individual or society. In literature there are different classifications and descriptions of aggressive emotion and act. Aggressiveness is evaluated under 3 main titles. Destructive, passive and bold. These 3 main titles could be summerized as follows. Destructive aggressiveness involves hostility. Passive aggressiveness is satisfying your aggressive emotions without angering the opposition. And being aggressive with the purpose of defending your own existence and rights with no intention of hurting anybody is defined as `bold` aggressiveness.

Alongside with aggressiveness, related concepts such as anger, hostility and violence should also be discussed. Not every aggressive act is violent but every violent act is aggressive. For example, a small kid hitting their friend during play time is not violence. Violence represents endpoints of aggressiveness. Injuring or killing could be given as examples to this. Anger is the underlying emotion behind aggressiveness. Hostility is the cognitive that leads to aggressiveness (Anderson & Bushman, 2002).

Since university involves the puberty it is an intensive time concerning emotions and behaviours. Enjoying violence and aggressive acts increases as a consequence of growing physical power and environmental circumstances (Yavuzer, 1992). Sports sciences faculties which helps sports industry with staff alongside with scientific support, serves variety of different professions likes of coaching, sports management, recreational and physical education. Behavioural acting disorders of our age are believed to be able to controlled under different scopes of studies. In this context we believe this study can be a help to future studies on this subject.

METHOD

Research Design

The objective of this study is to examine the aggressive behaviors and tendency of the students of Selçuk University, who study at different departments of sport sciences faculty. The study group consists of 155 male and 194 female students adding up to 349 total students. Who study at different departments of Selcuk Universities Sport Sciences Faculty.

Data Collection Tool

While the personal information form was used for the socio-demographic information, a 7-item likert-type Aggression Scale developed by Kiper (1984) was utilized to obtain the values of aggression. Participants were asked to select an option out of 7 options that were given. Options scaled from "it fits me very well" (+3 points) to "it does not fit me at all" (-3 points). Points differentiating from -3 to +3 were summed and for every sub scale the total was summed with +31 to get rid of negative points. For each sub scale a point between 1 to 61 was obtained. The Crombach Alpha value for this study was determined as 0.82.

Data Analysis

Variance and homogeneity of the obtained data were tested and for the statistical analysis independent Sample t test was used. One-way Anova and Tukey HSD tests were used as multi-comparison tests.

FINDINGS

Table 1. Aggressiveness Scores Depending on Sex

Gender	n	Destructive Aggressiveness		Bold Aggressiveness		Passive Aggressiveness		General Aggressiveness	
		x	SD	x	SD	x	SD	x	SD
Female	194	20.90	5.21	27.07	5.88	12.88	4.88	60.85	10.00
Male	155	20.43	5.84	31.06	6.93	13.15	4.74	64.64	12.50
Total	349	20.69	5.50	28.84	6.66	13.00	4.81	62.53	11.32
t		.794		-5.723		-.514		-3.069	
p		.422		.000*		.606		.002*	

* Significance value between groups (p<0.05).

As can be seen from table 1, Destructive and passive aggressiveness has no statistical significance between two groups while bold and general aggressiveness values are higher in male students (p<0.05).

Table 2. Aggressiveness Scores Depending on Department

Department	n	Destructive Aggressiveness		Bold Aggressiveness		Passive Aggressiveness		General Aggressiveness	
		x	SD	x	SD	x	SD	x	SD
Coaching	71	23.73	5.17 ^a	35.00	6,31 ^a	15,41	5,00 ^a	74,14	10,12 ^a
Sports Management	106	19.46	4.57 ^b	25.46	5,81 ^b	12,10	4,32 ^b	57,03	8,03 ^c
Recreation	49	19.55	7.16 ^b	27.00	6,14 ^b	11,10	3,03 ^c	57,65	11,15 ^c
Physical Education	123	20.45	5.05 ^b	28.94	5,15 ^b	13,14	5,15 ^b	62,52	9,38 ^b
F		10,601		41.171		10.528		52.329	
p		,000*		.000*		.000*		.000*	

*,ab= Significance value between groups (p<0.05).

As can be seen from table 2, all aggressiveness types has a statistically significant difference between faculties.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, which aimed to investigate the aggressive behaviour tendencies of students from different departments there were no statistically significant differences seen dependent on shelter, while there were differences dependent on gender and departments. In literature there are a lot of studies reporting more male aggressiveness (Gönültaş & Atıcı, 2014; Halıcı & Baran, 2006; Eroğlu, 2009; Efiltili, 2006), there are some that reports no difference between gender (Dervent, 2007; Ağlamaz, 2005). In this study there was no statistically significant difference between destructive and passive aggressiveness. Reason for this could be the changing roles and status of men and women dependent on the social structure. Socio cultural roles and different upbringing styles that Turkish society embraced through time could be the reason for higher aggressiveness in men.

Our study found that students of sports sciences faculty have a statistically significant difference on aggressiveness dependent on faculty. It is normal that students of different school, faculty and area have different types and amplitudes of aggressiveness. In this study highest aggressiveness scores were obtained from coaching students. This result is thought to be caused by the difference of the licence program of coaching and also the uniqueness of the program. Coaching department has a higher mean score of destructive aggressiveness and bold aggressiveness scores than other departments while others possess similar scores. Even though passive aggressiveness has a similar result, students of recreation department have the lowest scores. In terms of General aggressiveness while the coaching department has the highest scores, physical education, recreation and sports management follow it respectively. Ağlamaz (2005) reported that students have different aggressiveness points dependent on their Majors. Karataş (2008) showed, high school students have significant differences dependent on their choice of major. Kocatürk (1982) reports students who choose sports have higher aggressiveness scores than who choose education. Although they are in the same corporate constitution, sports sciences faculties have different licence programs, different staff and different environment. This situation is thought to be the causation of the difference observed in this study.

Having our emotions and behaviour under control is important for both ourselves and the society. There is a need to increase the number of studies investigating emotions like anger, stress, anxiety, aggressiveness of university students under different scopes and areas. It is believed that this study will be a light for the upcoming studies in this area.

REFERENCES

- Ağlamaz, T. (2006). *High school students' aggression point interms of examining self-disclosure, school type, sex, class level, parent's education level and families monthly income level*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Samsun University, Samsun.
- Anderson, C.A., & Bushman, B.J. (2002). Human Aggression, Annual Reviews of Psychology
- Atkinson, R.L., Atkinson, R.C., Smith, E.E., Bem, D.J., Hoeksema, S.N. (2002). *Hilgard's Introduction to Psychology* (Y. Alogan, Çev.). Ankara: Arkadaş Yayınevi.
- Cüceloğlu D. (2005). *Human and Behavior*. Remzi Bookstore, Istanbul.
- Dervent, F., Arslanoğlu, E., & Şenel, Ö. (2010) Aggressivity levels of the high school students and relation with their participation to sport activities (Sample of Istanbul), *Journal of Human Sciences*, 7 (1), 523–525.

- Efiliti, E. (2006). *Orta öğretim kurumlarında okuyan öğrencilerin saldırganlık, denetim odağı ve kişilik özelliklerinin karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Selçuk University, Konya.
- 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.
- Freedman, J. L., Sears, D. O., Carlsmith, J. M. (1998). *Social Psychology* (A. Dönmez, Çev.). Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Gergen K.J., & Gergen M.M. (1986). *Social Psychology* (Second Edition). New York: Springer-Verlag,226.
- Gönültaş, O., & Atıcı, M. (2014) Ortaokul son sınıf öğrencilerinin öfke düzeyleri ve saldırganlık düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi, *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 23 (1), 370-386.
- 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*, 3(2), 23-30.
- Hasta, D., & Güler, M. E. (2013). Saldırganlık: Kişilerarası ilişki tarzları ve empati açısından bir inceleme. *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 4 (1).
- Karataş, Z. (2008). Lise Öğrencilerinde öfke ve Saldırganlık. *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17, (3).
- Kiper, İ. (1984). *Saldırganlık türlerinin çeşitli ekonomik, sosyal ve akademik değişkenlerle ilişkisi*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ankara.
- Kocatürk R. (1982) Saldırganlık güdüsünün spor ve eğitim alanında meslek seçimine etkisi, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ankara.
- Krech, D.,Crutchfield, R.S. (1980). *Sosyal Psikoloji Teori ve Problemler*. (E. Güngör, Çev.). İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.
- Lorenz, K. (1968). *Das Sogenannte Böse. Zur Naturgeschichte der Aggression*. 1nd ed. Wien, Borotha-Schoeler Press, 21-22.
- 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*, 2.
- Tutkun, E., Güner, B.Ç., Ağaoğlu, S.A., & Soylu, R. (2010). Assessment on the Aggression Levels of the Sportspeople doing Team Sports and Individual Sports. *Sports and Performance Studies Journal*, 1(1), 23-29.
- Yavuzer, H. (1992). *Child Psychology*. İstanbul: Remzi Publishing House.