



Investigation of Aggression Levels of Secondary School Students Studying in Public and Private Schools, Playing and Non-Sports

Ayşegül ÇELİK^{1A} İbrahim BOZKURT^{1B}

¹ Selçuk University Sports Science Faculty Physical Education and Sports Teaching Konya/TURKEY

Address Correspondence to A. Çelik: e-mail: ayseince4242@hotmail.com

(Received): 29/04/2022 (Accepted): 19.08.2022

A:Orcid ID: 0000-0002-2448-0382 B:Orcid ID: 0000-0003-1413-853X

Abstract

This study was conducted to determine the aggression levels of secondary school students studying in public and private schools with various sub-dimensions. While the secondary education institutions in Konya constitute the universe of the research, the sample group consisted of a total of 1200 students, 600 male and 600 female, studying in 6 private and 9 state secondary education institutions located in the central districts of Konya. The schools where we conduct our study are secondary education institutions with the status of science high school, anatolian high school, sports high school and vocational high school. Personal information form was used for the socio-demographic information of the students, and the aggression inventory consisting of 30 items and the reliability of which was developed by İpek İltter KİPER was used to determine the aggression levels.

For our study, Cronbach's Alpha value was determined as 0.87 for all of the items in the aggression inventory, while the Cronbach's Alpha value was determined as 0.81 for the Destructive aggression sub-dimension, 0.80 for the Assertiveness sub-dimension, and 0.79 for the Passive Aggression sub-dimension. In the examinations made, statistically significant differences were observed between the groups according to school types, gender, grade level and age. As a result; It has been observed that students studying in private schools are more aggressive than students studying in public schools. In general, it was concluded that while assertiveness and destructive aggression were high in the groups, passive aggression was low. In summary, it can be said that sports increase assertiveness and destructive aggression and decrease passive aggression.

Keywords: State Schools, Private Schools, Aggression, Sports

Devlet Okullarında ve Özel Okullarda Öğrenim Gören Spor Yapan ve Yapmayan Orta Öğretim Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi

Özet

Bu araştırma, devlet ve özel okullarda öğrenim gören ortaokul öğrencilerinin saldırganlık düzeylerini çeşitli alt boyutlarıyla belirlemek amacıyla yapılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini Konya ilindeki ortaöğretim kurumları oluştururken, örneklem grubunu Konya ili merkez ilçelerinde bulunan 6 özel ve 9 devlet ortaöğretim kurumunda öğrenim gören 600 erkek ve 600 kız olmak üzere toplam 1200 öğrenci oluşturmuştur. Çalışmamızı yürüttüğümüz okullar fen lisesi, anadolu lisesi, spor lisesi ve meslek lisesi statüsündeki ortaöğretim kurumlarıdır. Öğrencilerin sosyo-demografik bilgileri için kişisel bilgi formu, saldırganlık düzeylerini belirlemek için İpek İltter KİPER tarafından güvenilirliği geliştirilmiş 30 maddeden oluşan saldırganlık envanteri kullanılmıştır. Araştırmamız için saldırganlık envanterindeki tüm maddeler için Cronbach's Alpha değeri 0.87, Cronbach's Alpha değeri ise Yıkıcı saldırganlık alt boyutu için 0.81, Atılğanlık alt boyutu için 0.80 ve Girişkenlik alt boyutu için 0.79 olarak

belirlenmiştir. Pasif saldırganlık altboyutu. Yapılan incelemelerde okul türü, cinsiyet, sınıf düzeyi ve yaşa göre gruplar arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılıklar gözlenmiştir. Sonuç olarak; Özel okullarda okuyan öğrencilerin devlet okullarında okuyan öğrencilere göre daha saldırgan oldukları gözlemlenmiştir. Genel olarak gruplarda atılganlık ve yıkıcı saldırganlığın yüksek olduğu, pasif saldırganlığın ise düşük olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır. Özetle sporun atılganlığı ve yıkıcı saldırganlığı artırdığı, pasif saldırganlığı azalttığı söylenebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Devlet okulları, Özel okullar, Saldırganlık, Spor

INTRODUCTION

Physical education and sports activities have an important place in the physical development of the child and have positive contributions in terms of social and emotional development. Physical education and sport activities bring out skills such as creativity and leadership. The struggle also develops personality traits such as hard work, harmony, productivity, decisive, tolerant, respectful, obeying rule, acting together, acting independently, disciplining oneself, being diligent (1).

Activities that are carried out as a profession within the context of leisure time activities, either individually or collectively, with or without a vehicle, under certain rules that improve the ability of the individual to achieve his or her natural environment as a social environment are called sports. The cultural phenomenon that socializes, integrates with society and develops spirits and physical condition which is competitive and solidarist is also called sports (2,4). Physical education and sport's effects on a development of a person are possible studied under four headings; physical development, psycho-motor development, mental development, emotional and social development (5,9).

When people's past daily experience is examined, we encounter the concept of aggression in the acts of killing, violence and wounding. The origin of the word aggressiveness (aggression) is Latin. The concept of aggressiveness which means moving in one direction or fronting has also meanings of taking a stance and reacting (10).

The aggression itself can be defined as behaviors that hurt or bother animate or inanimate beings except himself / herself (11). Aggressiveness can be regarded as a person's tendency to injure or harm to another person (12). Aggression is the action which an individual harms to the environment he has lived deliberately and consciously or tendencies includes physical and emotional goals to get under control his social environment, to suppress as dominating in

his environment (13). The behavior of aggressive may arise in the way of not accepting different thoughts, criticizing others in society, taking digs at someone immediately indicating that they do not have a different idea, feeling of revenge, accusation, enjoying news reading or watching violent news from sources (14).

In the studies of aggressive behavior, researchers have explored aggression as active or passive aggression, physical or verbal aggression, direct or indirect aggression (15). There are theories about the causes of aggression begins with the existence of mankind and how it happens. These theories are instinct theory, biological theory, the theory of inhibition aggression and hint-stimulation theories.

In sport the acts of aggression appear as injuring his opponent deliberately or actions done for injuring. Having difficulty in getting the intended achievement or delay of success triggers aggressive behavior. Injuries are perceived as provocation or blocked according to the athlete. The provocation increases aggression, and the drive arouses actions as harassing provocation arises by the actions such as, disturbing, mocking and insulting an athlete (16).

MATERIAL AND METHOD

Objective: In this study, it is aimed to determine the aggression behaviors of secondary school students who attend public schools and private schools.

Models of Research: In our secondary school students who did and did not perform sports, we used a screening method to measure aggression levels with their general dimensions and sub dimensions. Through the screening method, it is aimed to determine the situations that have been seen in the past and still exist. The elements of the research were taken as they are. Things wanted to be known or to be determined have been observed (17).

Collection of Data: To determine aggression levels in our study groups, the aggression inventory,

consisting of 30 items, which was developed by İpek İlter KİPER (1984) was used. Question and answer forms of the aggressiveness inventory used consists of two main parts. In the first part demographic characteristics belonging to the participants are determined while the second part is the inventory of aggressiveness.

Universe And Sampling: The universe of our research are enrolled in private and public secondary schools (1,200 students; 600 in state and 600 in private school) in the Selçuklu district of the Ministry of National Education in Konya province.

Inventory Of Aggressiveness: In this section, there are 30 questions totaly for general aggression, 10 questions for destructive aggressiveness, 10 questions for imperishableness, and 10 questions for passive aggression. Which are subbranches of aggressiveness.

According to the inventory, the seven-digit likert type scale is formed in the answers. The answer for "they do not obey me at all" is -3 and the answer for "very good", the value of the answer is +3. The subject who answers all questions as "don't apply to me" gets -30 (-3*10=-30) points for each aggression subscale and for the answers "it applies to me completely gets +30 (3*10=30) points for each aggression subscale. Statistically, zero-number can cause problems. We have not used these points as they are statistically impossible to use as natural. That's why we added 31 points to each group to get a zero. The scores obtained from each subgroup on this count will be at most 61 and at least 1.

Reliability of Aggressiveness Inventory: The reliability of the aggressiveness inventory was developed by İpek İlter KİPER in 1984.

Analysis of Data: In our study, homogeneity and variance analyzes were performed by recording the responses of the students to their demographic characteristics and aggression inventory.

The Independent Samples t test was used to compare school type, gender and non-sports parameters, One Way Anowa test was used to determine differences between groups for more than one feature, and Tukey test was used to determine which groups differed. While cronbach's Alpha value was determined to be 0.87 for all of the items in the aggression inventory for our study, Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.81 for the subversive aggression subscale, 0.80 for the assertiveness subscale, and 0.79 for the passive aggression subscale.

Statistical analyzes: The available data were calculated and the results were analyzed according to the SPSS 10.00 program. According to the normality test, t-test and One-Way ANOVA were used for the parametric tests which is independent of the parametric tests, and Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis H tests were used for the nonparametric tests. According to the homogeneity of variance, Tamhane and Tukey tests were used from Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons tests. Frequency and % calculations for the independent variables are also made. Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship among sub-dimensions of aggression. In this study, the error level is $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$

RESULTS

Table 1. table for number of students by gender and sport in private and state schools

	Public Schools		Private Schools		Total
	Female	Male	Female	Male	
Athlete	150	150	150	150	600
Non-Athlete	150	150	150	150	600
Total	300	300	300	300	1200

Table 1 shows the numerical distribution of students in the study we conducted on a total of 1200 students, 600 in 600 private schools in public schools.

Table 2. According to the types of school destructive aggression, assertiveness, passive aggression, and general aggression the scores of.

School Type	Number of Students	Percentage %	Disruptive Aggressiveness $\bar{x} \pm Ss$	Assertiveness $\bar{x} \pm Ss$	Passive Aggression $\bar{x} \pm Ss$	General Aggression $\bar{x} \pm Ss$
Public	600	50,0	31,44±12,31	42,94±11,49	27,75±12,20	102,12±26,99
Private	600	50,0	34,86±12,47	44,93±9,67	29,92±12,46	109,72±26,90
		t	0,46	13,63	1,27	1,40
		P	,000*	,001*	,002*	,000*

* $p < 0,05$ Significant difference between groups

As seen in Table 2, average of destructive aggression of students in public schools (31.44 ± 12.31) were found to be lower than the average of students in private schools (34.86 ± 12.47), and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.05$). The averages (42.94 ± 11.49) of the students attending public schools in the assertiveness subscale were lower than the average of the students in the private school (44.93 ± 9.67) and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.05$). In the passive aggression subscale, the average of the students in public schools

(27.75 ± 12.20) was lower than the average of the students in private schools (29.92 ± 12.46) and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.05$). It was found that the general aggression averages (102.12 ± 26.99) of the students in public schools were lower than the average of the students in private schools (109.72 ± 26.90) and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.05$).

Table 3. According to the genders destructive aggression, assertiveness, passive aggression, and general aggression scores

Gender	Number of Students	Percentage %	Disruptive Aggressiveness $\bar{x} \pm Ss$	Assertiveness $\bar{x} \pm Ss$	Passive Aggression $\bar{x} \pm Ss$	General Aggression $\bar{x} \pm Ss$
Males	600	50	$34,57 \pm 12,30$	$43,20 \pm 11,20$	$30,23 \pm 12,11$	$107,99 \pm 27,57$
Females	600	50	$31,74 \pm 12,56$	$44,67 \pm 10,05$	$27,45 \pm 12,48$	$103,85 \pm 26,69$
		t	1,43	3,36	1,53	0,47
		P	,000*	,017*	,000*	,008*

* $p < 0,05$ Significant difference between groups

As seen in Table 3, it was determined that the average of destructive aggression of males ($34,57 \pm 12,30$) was higher than the average of females ($31,74 \pm 12,56$) and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0,05$). In the assertiveness subscale, the average of males ($43,20 \pm 11,20$) was lower than the average of females ($44,67 \pm 10,05$) and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0,05$). In the passive aggression subscale, the average of males

($30,23 \pm 12,11$) was higher than the average of females ($27,45 \pm 12,48$) and the difference between them was statistically significant ($P < 0,05$). The general aggression averages were higher in males ($107,99 \pm 27,57$) than in females ($103,85 \pm 26,69$) and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0,05$).

Table 4. According to the grades destructive aggression, assertiveness, passive aggression, and general aggression scores

Grade	Number of Students	Percentage %	Disruptive Aggressiveness $\bar{x} \pm Ss$	Assertiveness $\bar{x} \pm Ss$	Passive Aggression $\bar{x} \pm Ss$	General Aggression $\bar{x} \pm Ss$
9.Grade	472	39,3	$32,20 \pm 12,55$	$44,12 \pm 10,48$	$28,23 \pm 12,46$	$104,55 \pm 26,95$
10.Grade	315	26,2	$33,95 \pm 13,13^b$	$43,03 \pm 10,99$	$30,31 \pm 12,77^a$	$107,29 \pm 30,13$
11.Grade	273	22,8	$34,58 \pm 11,85^b$	$44,29 \pm 10,41$	$29,31 \pm 11,44$	$108,18 \pm 24,32$
12.Grade	140	11,7	$31,75 \pm 11,85^a$	$44,64 \pm 10,94$	$26,66 \pm 12,59^b$	$103,06 \pm 26,13$
		F	3,13	1,10	3,46	1,81
		P	,025*	,348	,016*	,14

* $p < 0,05$ Significant difference between groups

Table 4 shows that the mean of the 10th grade ($33,95 \pm 13,13$) and the 11th grade ($34,58 \pm 11,85$) in the destructive aggression subscale were higher than the other grades and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0,05$). It is seen that the 12th grade averages ($31,75 \pm 11,85$) were lower in the destructive aggression subscale than the other grades and statistically significant ($P < 0,05$). In the passive aggression subscale, the averages of the 10th class

($30,31 \pm 12,77$) are higher than the other class averages and the difference is statistically significant ($P < 0,05$). The mean of the 12th grade ($26,66 \pm 12,59$) was low and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0,05$). It was determined that the difference in general aggression level and assertiveness sub-dimension according to the classes was statistically insignificant ($P > 0,05$).

Table 5. According to the age destructive aggression, assertiveness, passive aggression, and general aggression scores

Age	Number of Students	Percentage %	Disruptive Aggressiveness x±Ss	Assertiveness x±Ss	Passive Aggression x±Ss	General Aggression x±Ss
Under 14 years	45	3,8	26,80±14,70 ^a	44,80±9,67	25,16±12,54	96,76±27,03 ^a
15 Years	400	33,3	31,77±11,91	42,79±10,99	28,03±11,94	102,58±26,50
16 Years	346	28,8	34,73±12,78 ^b	44,05±10,62	30,45±12,71	109,23±28,65 ^b
17 Years	288	24,0	34,50±12,48 ^b	44,91±10,10	29,37±12,27	108,78±26,05 ^b
Above 18 Years	121	10,1	32,35±11,67	44,74±11,08	26,98±12,40	104,07±26,11
		F	6,60	2,02	3,75	5,07
		P	,000*	,09	,0052	,000*

* p<0,05 Significant difference between groups

According to Table 5, it was determined that the difference among the groups according to ages in the assertiveness and passive aggression subscale was statistically insignificant ($P>0,05$). In the subscale of destructive aggression, it was determined that 16 years old (34,73±12,78) and 17 years old group ratio (34,50±12,48) were higher than the other age groups and statistically significant ($P<0,05$). 14 and under 14 age group (26.80 ±14.70) were lower than the other age groups and the difference was statistically significant ($P<0,05$). It was determined that general aggression levels were higher in the age group of 16 (109,23±28,65) and 17 years group (108,78±26,05) than the other age groups and statistically significant ($P<0,05$). 14 and under14 age groups (96,76±27,03) were lower than the other age groups and the difference was statistically significant ($P<0,05$).

Table 6. According to the states of doing sports, or not doing sports destructive aggression, assertiveness, passive aggression, and general aggression scores

Doing Sports	Number of Students	Percentage %	Disruptive Aggressiveness x±Ss	Assertiveness x±Ss	Passive Aggression x±Ss	General Aggression x±Ss
Sportsmen	600	50,0	33,51±12,36	44,56±10,55	28,61±12,71	106,68±27,25
Non-Sportsmen	600	50,0	32,79±12,65	43,31±10,74	29,07±12,04	105,16±27,15
		t	0,53	0,88	1,8	0,02
		P	0,31	0,41	0,52	0,33

* p<0,05 Significant difference between groups

In Table 6, there was no statistically significant difference between the groups in terms of general aggression according to whether they did sports or not and in all sub-dimensions ($P>0,05$). It is seen that the rate of passive aggression is higher among those who do not play sports, while the rate of destructive aggression, assertiveness and general aggressiveness are high in sportsmen.

Table 7. School type according to destructive aggression, assertiveness, passive aggression, and general aggression scores

School Types	Number of Students	Percentage %	Disruptive Aggressiveness x±Ss	Assertiveness x±Ss	Passive Aggression x±Ss	General Aggression x±Ss
Vocational High School	328	27,3	31,97±13,52 ^b	45,88±9,29 ^a	27,66±13,37 ^b	105,51±27,99
Sports High School	124	10,3	36,51±10,80 ^a	39,00±11,02 ^c	32,27±11,77 ^a	107,78±28,72
Science High School	77	6,4	30,06±11,43 ^b	46,03±9,20 ^a	26,91±11,44 ^b	103,00±23,25
Anatolian High School	671	55,9	33,46±12,27	43,65±11,06 ^b	29,00±11,97 ^b	106,11±26,96
		F	5,721	14,08	4,889	,526
		P	,001*	,000*	,002*	,665

* p<0,05 Significant difference between groups

In Table 7, it was determined that the mean of the students of the sports high school ($36,51\pm10,80$) in the subscale of aggression subscale was higher than the other groups and statistically significant ($P<0,05$). The mean of the vocational high school students ($31,97\pm13,52$) and the average of science students ($30,06\pm11,43$) were lower than the other groups and the difference was statistically significant ($P<0,05$). In the assertiveness subscale, the difference between all groups was statistically significant ($P<0,05$). In the assertiveness subscale, it was found that the high school lychees ($46,03\pm9,20$), the high school seniors ($45,88\pm9,29$) and the average of the anatolian high school students ($43,65\pm11,06$) were high and the assertiveness averages ($\pm11,02$) were lower than the other school groups and the difference was statistically significant ($P<0,05$). In passive aggression sub-dimension, the difference between the groups was found to be statistically significant ($P<0,05$). The mean of passive aggression ($32,27\pm11,77$) of sports high school students was higher than the other groups and the average of science high school students ($26,91\pm11,44$) was lower than the other groups and the difference was statistically significant ($P<0,05$). There was no statistically significant difference between groups in general aggression dimension ($P>0,05$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In our study, a questionnaire consisting of two parts was conducted as a means of gathering information. The first part is the section where the demographic information belongs to the participants and the second part is the aggressiveness inventory which is used to determine the general aggression and aggressiveness sub-dimensions. The reliability of the used aggressiveness inventory was developed by İpek İlter KİPER (1984). The same inventory will be preferred in many scientific studies and will give us an advantage in comparing the results of our studies al (13,16,18,27).

We did our work on a total of 1,200 students studying in private and public schools located in the Selçuklu district of Konya. (Table 1) In the study of Scharf (28) 129, Giles & Heyman (29) 41, Derwent (13) 354, Yıldız (27) 600 We tried to determine the aggressive behavior on 600 secondary school students. In similar studies ,such as in the study of Solak (23), there are 514 students, Bayram (30) 1452, Yılmaz (25) 400, Karabulut (20) 128, Oproiu (31) 106 , Çakır (16) 490, Gökçiçek (19) 1868, Keskin (21) 400 it was tried to determine the levels of aggression on the student.

When we look at the numbers of samples in similar studies, it is seen that sample numbers are around 41-1868 in general. In the studies conducted, the average number of samples seems to be concentrated around 200-400 students. The number of researchers using 1000 samples and above is very limited (19,30). However, the fact that our study was carried out on 1,200 students is important both in terms of its independence and its statistical reliability.

The general aggressiveness and the average of all sub-dimensions of private schools are higher than the public schools and the difference is statistically significant ($P<0,05$). (table 2). Menteş (32) reported that high school athletes had higher averages of assertiveness of normal high school students and low assertiveness levels of private schools, and that the difference was statistically significant, according to the study of high school students in determining the athletic effect on the assertiveness level. While we have negatively impacted the comparison of the results of limited studies with private schools before ours, our results with the above study are not compatible.

It was determined that the average of destructive aggression, passive aggression and general aggression in males who attended private and public secondary schools were higher than females and the difference was statistically significant ($P<0,05$). In the assertiveness subscale, the average of males was lower than females and the difference was statistically significant ($P<0,05$). (table 3).

Keskin (21) has dealt with the aggression behaviors of the students in secondary education in Zonguldak with different dimensions. He determined that males had higher destructive aggression scores than females and that females had higher assertiveness scores than males. Çakır (16) has determined that male athletes are more aggressive than girls in their study of the athletes' study of aggression. Karabulut (20) determined that female hockey athletes under 16 years of age had a higher assertiveness score than males and males had higher levels of destructive aggression and general aggression than females. Bayram (30) reported that males athletes who did or did not play in the 14-18 age group were more aggressive than female students in their study of aggression levels. Yıldız (27) found that the average score of the women in the average aggression was high when they were working with secondary school students who do sports and do not play sports; and that the score of men is high in the case of destructive aggression.

Dervent (13) reported in determining the relationship between sport and aggressiveness that girls doing sports were more playful than boys doing sports, and were close to one of the other odds. Menteş (32) reported in a study of high school students about the determination of the sport effect on the assertiveness level, depending on sex that girls were more playful than boys.

When we examine the studies done in this subject, it is seen that men generally have destructive aggressiveness, passive aggression and general aggression averages, and girls have high averages of assertiveness, and these studies support our results.

When the destructive aggression at the class level is examined, it is seen that the destructive aggressiveness is high in the 10th and 11th grades and the difference between the groups is significant ($P<0,05$). Passive aggression subscale is higher in the 10th grade and the difference is statistically significant ($P<0,05$). It was determined that the difference between the classes in the subscale of general aggression and assertiveness is meaningless ($P>0,05$). (table 4).

Özyürek & Özkan (33) as a result of studying the relationship between the anger levels of the adolescents and their attitudes towards the parents, determined that as the class level increases, the hostile attitudes and beliefs about the students increase. Gündoğdu (34) determined meaningful differences in various sub-dimensions according to the criteria such as gender, material situation in his study conducted by 9th grade student in Mamak district Ankara. Efiltili (35) in a comparative study between the aggression and control of students in secondary education institutions, determined that the level of aggression of high school third graders is higher than that of high school second graders, and that the difference is significant. Karataş (36) reported in his classroom-level study that 11th grade students had higher scores on aggression than other class levels, and that this may be the upcoming university exams.

It is evident that the results obtained in similar studies, especially the results of the 11th grade, support our results. Although there is an opinion in society that the aggressiveness averages increase as the class grows, the results in our study show that the average aggression of the 12th graders is lower than all classes.

According to ages, the difference between the groups in assertiveness and passive aggression

subscale was statistically insignificant ($P>0,05$). It was determined that the mean of the 16 and 17 age groups were higher than the other age groups according to ages in the destructive aggression subscale and general aggression dimension and the difference was statistically significant ($P<0,05$). (table 5).

Oda (37) examined the level of aggression and optimism of students who did and did not play sports between the ages of 11-13, and stated that there was no significant difference. Ersoy et al. (38) aimed to determine the aggression levels of young wrestlers aged between 16 and 18 with sociodemographic methods. In the analysis of the data, they examined the level of aggression by age and it was determined that there was no meaningful difference in the results of different analyzes between the aggression levels of the groups. Oproiu (31) studied aggression behavior in the 14-19 age group playing in national soccer teams in his work on sport and aggression. He reported that According to the 14-15 age group, aggression level of the 17-18 age group is quite high. Karabulut (20) examined the aggression level of Turkish hockey athlete under 16 in our country. He reported that age and aggressive aggression were directly related to the sport.

The results of studies carried out before us in different age groups are quite different. However, the general aggression average of the 16 and 17 age group generally supports our work.

There is no significant difference in the dimension of assertiveness, passive aggression, destructive aggression and general aggressiveness in the groups that did and did not play sports ($P>0,05$). While the average of destructive aggressiveness, assertiveness and general aggressiveness were found to be high in sportsmen, the average of passive aggressiveness in non-sportsmen was found to be high. (table 6).

Oda (37) investigated the level of aggression and optimism of students who did or did not play sports between the ages of 11-13. He reports that According to the obtained data, there was no significant difference in aggression and optimism scores between those who do and those who do not. Çetin et al. (18) determined that there is no meaningful difference in passive aggression among those who do sports and those who do not do sports as a result of studying with students who study in the Physical Education and Sports Teaching Department. Reza (39) reported that the athletes' violent tendencies were not related to sport in their study of university

students in various sports to compare aggression behaviors.

Gökçiçek (19) tried to determine the aggression level of the students who do and do not participate in secondary education. The researcher concluded that sportsmen are more aggressive and agile than those who do not do sports. Keskin (21) dealt with aggression behaviors in different dimensions in the study ,which she conducted in Zonguldak province, in order to determine the levels of aggression of secondary school students. He dealt with aggressive behavior in different dimensions. It has been seen that those who play 5 years and more show more aggressive behaviors than those who play 4 years and less. Çakır (16) determined that the aggression behavior of the athletes increased with age in his study of secondary school students who participated in sporting events to determine the level of aggression. Yılmaz (25) examined the relationship between empathic tendency and aggression levels in secondary school students who do and do not play sports, and as a result, they pointed out that the average scores of the aggression and all aggression subscales of the sportsmen were higher than the non-sportsmen. Akoğuz (40) stated that the level of aggressiveness of the athletes was not high in the research which was conducted to determine the level of aggression in university students and to reveal the relation of aggressiveness with sport.

In general, we see that the above results are in support of our results. We do not see any significant difference between students who do sports and those who do not. However, those who do sports do not do sports, and those who have a high level of aggression are overlapped with the work done before us again.

There is no statistically significant difference between general aggression groups according to school types ($P>0,05$). It is determined that the average of the sports high school is higher in the destructive aggression subscale, the average of the profession and science school is lower and the difference between the groups was statistically significant ($P<0,05$). In the assertiveness subscale, the difference between the ratios of all groups was found to be statistically significant ($P<0,05$). It is determined that the average of science high school is high and the average of sports high school is low compared to other school groups. Passive aggression subscale is statistically significant ($p<0,05$). It is found that there is a significant difference between all school groups and that the average of sports high school is higher than other school groups and the mean of science

high school is lower than other school groups. (table 7).

Efilti (35) as a result of her work with secondary school students, reported that high school students and high vocational high school students had higher levels of aggressiveness than science high school and religious high school and the difference is statistically significant. Menteş (32) reported that high school athletes had higher averages of assertiveness of normal high school students and low assertiveness levels of private schools, and that the difference is statistically significant, according to the study of high school students in determining the athletic effect on the assertiveness level. Çakır (16) determined that the athletes who were educated in vocational high schools were more aggressive than the general high school students in their study of secondary school students.

Preliminary studies have shown that while the school scale is limited, we can not make a healthy comparison, but when the results of the studies are examined, the average of the sports non-athletic subscales is high enough to support our work.

As a result of our efforts to determine the aggression levels of sportemen and non-sportsmen students who study in private and state secondary schools, it has seen that the students who are educated in private schools have a higher average in the dimension of destructive aggression, assertiveness, passive aggression and general aggression than students in public schools. Generally speaking, in groups we found out that there are high level of assertiveness and destructive aggressiveness, while passive aggressiveness was low. In sum, it can be said that sport increases assertiveness and destructive aggression and reduces passive aggression.

REFERENCES

1. Adak N. Bir Sosyalizasyon Aracı Olarak Televizyon ve Şiddet. *Bilgi Dergisi*, 2004;30:27-38.
2. Akoğuz N. Bireysel ve Takım Sporlarında Üniversiteler Arası Yarışmalara Katılan Öğrencilerin Saldırganlık Düzeyleri. Y Taşmektepligil (ed) Uluslararası Sporda Şiddetin Temelleri ve Önlenmesi Yöündeki Stratejiler Sempozyumu Samsun, 2013;181-187.
3. Aracı H. Okullarda Beden Eğitimi. Ankara: Bağırğan Yayınevi. 1999;2(13):3.
4. Bayram Y. Spor Yapan ve Yapmayan 14-18 Yaş Grubu Öğrencilerin Saldırganlık Tutumlarının İncelenmesi. Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans tezi, Kütahya: Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, 2012.
5. Boxer P, Tisak MS. Children's Beliefs About The Continuity of Aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 2005;31(2):172-88.

6. Çakır H. Liseler Arası Müsabakalara Katılan Sporcu Öğrencilerin Saldırganlık Durumlarının Araştırılması (Rize İli Örneği) Yüksek lisans tezi, Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Kütahya, 2014.
7. Çetin MÇ, Gezer E, Yıldız Ö, Yıldız M. Investigation of The Relationship Between Aggression Levels and Basic Psychological Needs School of Physical Education and Sports Students. Journal of Human Sciences, 2013;10(1):1738-53.
8. Derwent F. Lise Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeyleri ve Sportif Aktivitelere Katılımla İlişkisi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara[In Turkish], 2007.
9. Doğan B. Spor Sosyolojisi ve Uygulamalı Spor Sosyolojisine Giriş: Nobel,2007.
10. Doğan O. Spor Psikolojisi (2. Baskı). Adana: Nobel Kitabevi, 2005;70.
11. Efilti E. Orta Öğretim Kurumlarında Okuyan Öğrencilerin Saldırganlık, Denetim Odağı ve Kişilik Özelliklerinin Karşılaştırmalı Olarak İncelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya, 2006.
12. Ersoy A, Tazegül Ü, Sancaklı H. Güreşçilerin Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin Sosyo-Demografik Açından İncelenmesi (Ankara Örneği). Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 2012;9(1):385-97.
13. Giles JW, Heyman GD. Young Children's Beliefs About The Relationship Between Gender and Aggressive Behavior. Child Development, 2005;76(1):107-21.
14. Gökççek S. 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, Kütahya, 2015.
15. Gündoğdu R. 9 Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Çatışma Çözme Öfke Ve Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2010;19(3):257-76.
16. Güneş A. Okullarda Beden Eğitimi ve Oyun Öğretimi: PeGemA Yayıncılık, 2003.
17. İnamoğlu C. Aktif Olarak Spor Yapan ve Yapmayan Lise Öğrencilerinin Beden Eğitimi Dersine Karşı Tutumlarının Karşılaştırılması. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Öğretmenliği Ana Bilim Dalı, Ankara, 2011.
18. Karabulut EO. 16 Yaş Altı Çim Hokeyi Sporcularının Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Bakımından İncelenmesi. Ankara Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi Spormetre Dergisi, 2013;11(2):139-47.
19. Karasar N. Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi, İlkeler, Teknikler, İstanbul, Nobel, 2005.
20. Karataş ZB. Anne Baba Saldırganlığı İle Lise Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlığı Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi Adana: Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2002.
21. Keskin C. Liseler Arası Müsabakalara Katılan Lise Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Durumlarının Araştırılması (Zonguldak-Kozlu örneği). Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kütahya, 2015.
22. Köknel Ö. Bireysel ve Toplumsal Şiddet: Altın, İstanbul, 2000.
23. Kumartaşlı M. İlköğretim İkinci Kademe Öğrencilerinin Beden Eğitimi Dersine İlişkin Tutumlarının ve Yaşam Doyum Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Anabilim Dalı, Ankara, 2010.
24. Menteş A. Lise Öğrencilerinin Atılganlık Düzeyine Sporun Etkisi. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2007.
25. Mirzeoğlu D. Spor Bilimlerinin Eğitimsel (Pedagojik) Temelleri. Spor Bilimlerine Giriş Mirzeoğlu, N(Ed), Bağırhan Yayınevi, Ankara, 2003.
26. Oda B. 11-13 Yaş Grubundaki Spor Yapan ve Yapmayan Öğrencilerin İyimserlik İle Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Samsun, 2014;107.
27. Oproiu I. A Study On The Relationship Between Sports and Aggression. Sport Science Review, 2013;22(1-2):33-48.
28. Özyürek A, Özkan İ. Ergenlerin Okula Yönelik Öfke Düzeyleri İle Anne Baba Tutumları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2015;15 (2):280-96.
29. Pulur A, Tamer K. Beden Eğitimi ve Sporda Öğretim Yöntemleri. Ankara: Kozan Ofset. 2001.
30. Ramirez JM. Justification of Aggression in Several Asian and European Countries With Different Religious and Cultural Background. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 2007;31(1 Ser):9-15.
31. Reza AB. Comparing The Incidence of Aggression Among Student Athletes In Various Sports Disciplines At The University Of Tiran. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2012;47:1869-73.
32. Scharf SC. Gender Differences in Adolescent Aggression: an Analysis of Instrumentality vs. Expressiveness, UMI; 2000.
33. Siedentop D, Van der Mars H. Introduction to Physical Education, Fitness, and Sport: McGraw-Hill New York, 2004.
34. Solak S. Spor Yapan Ve Yapmayan Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeyleri İle Empatik Eğilim Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2011.
35. Şenyüzlü E. Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Spora Katılımın Saldırgan Davranışlar Üzerine Etkilerinin İncelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Kütahya, 2013.
36. Tutkun E, Güner BÇ, Ağaoğlu SA, Soslu R. Takım Sporları ve Bireysel Sporlar Yapan Sporcuların Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin Değerlendirilmesi. Spor ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2010;1(1):23-9.
37. Yıldırım A, Abakay U. Hokeycilerin İletişim Becerileri Ve Saldırganlık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. İnönü Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2015;2(1):17-28.
38. Yıldız S. Spor Yapan Ve Spor Yapmayan Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Saldırganlık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi: Selçuk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2009.
39. Yılmaz S. Spor Yapan ve Yapmayan Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Empatik Eğilimleri ile Saldırganlık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (İstanbul İli Bayrampaşa İlçesi Örneği). Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul, 2013.
40. Yiğit G. Polis Meslek Yüksek Okullarında Okuyan Öğrencilerden Daha Önce Spor Yapmış Olanlarla Yapmamış Olanların Psikolojik İhtiyaçlarının Karşılaştırılması. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2002;9.