



## Research Paper

# Exploring the Attitudes of the Violence Knowledge Levels Among the Different Branch Teachers

Accepted 24<sup>th</sup> July, 2020

### ABSTRACT

Violence is a common public problem in the society. Furthermore, the aggressive and violent behaviors of adolescents have negative impacts on the society. Exposure to violence has been shown to negatively affect success, motivation and mental health. The goal of the study was to describe the attitudes to the violence in a sample of Turkish different branches teachers. Three types of attitudes were assessed: Crime and war, corporal punishment and partner violence. Data were obtained from 149 Turkish different branch teachers. To measure the attitude of different branches teachers' towards to violence a 17 item likert scale developed by Davidson ve Canivez (2012) and adapted into Turkish by Akın et al. (2016) was used. The skewness and kurtosis normality distribution test was used to determine whether the measurements are suitable for normality. As a result, t-test and One way - Anova tests were applied because of the normal distribution in all dimensions. And post hoc sheff tests were used to determine the source of the difference. In conclusion, general attitudes of the teachers towards violence and crime and war scores were about mid level, corporal punishment scores and partner violence were significantly lower. The results highlight the importance of research on violence attitudes to assess gender differences. So men have higher attitudes to the violence than the women.

Veysel Temel\*, Kazım Nas and Mehmet Dalkılıç

Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, Physical Education And Sports High School, Turkey.

\*Corresponding author. E-mail:veyseltemel@kmu.edu.tr, Tel: +90.534.666 11 11

**Key words:** Attitude, violence, teachers.

## INTRODUCTION

Violence is a global public health problem with short term and long-term consequences (World Health Organization, 2002). The way in which violence is manifested does not limit itself to the act of harming someone by using only elements that contain force. At the same time, violence has a dimension that creates mental pressure and creates negative effects on the individual (Ünsal, 1996). In the definition made by Erol Mutlu (1997), violence is the most common form of behavior associated with aggression. Violence is seen as a concept that has taken place in every stage of human development and has been examined. Adolescence is one of these periods. While adolescence is defined as a period of storm and stress on one hand, it is seen as a period in which adolescence's individuality develops (Adams, 1995). Although the effects of violence are different, more than one million people in

the world die every year due to violence and are injured as a result of violence against them or mass violence. Violence is the leading cause of death among individuals aged 15-44 worldwide (Krug et al., 2002). WHO states that the causes of violence cannot be explained based on a single factor. The causes of violence are complex and consist of different levels (Krug et al., 2002).

According to Vernberg and Jacobs (1999), there is a relationship between positive attitude towards violence and aggression towards friends. A strong belief that aggression is acceptable and justified and that it is considered to be deserved, is associated with the victims' violent behavior. Considering the attitude towards violence as one of the causes of violence behavior, it was thought that the attitude towards violence should be measured. Although the connection is complex, there is a relationship

between attitudes and behaviors. First, behavior affects attitude and behaviors are attitudes (Smith and Mackie, 1995). Second, attitudes also affect behavior. The positive or negative perspective towards the attitude object may have an effect on behaviors (Smith and Mackie, 1995). The fact that the behaviors and attitudes are related does not mean that this relationship always follows each other. Sometimes a person can watch violent movies, even if they hate violence in the media. Because attitude is just one of many factors that affect behavior. The effect of attitudes on behavior is sometimes weakened, may disappear and social norms may become more important to the person. When norms are weaker or there is no social pressure, attitudes affect behavior more (Smith and Mackie, 1995).

The relationship between attitude and behavior is also affected by the nature of the attitude. Features that can affect this relationship; the degree of coherence between cognitive and emotional elements, whether the attitude is the basis of personal experiences, the person's attitude. It is influenced by its acceptance and whether it has become stationary over time (Michener et al., 1990; Akt. Kağıtçıbaşı, 1999). Another feature that affects the relationship between attitudes and behavior is the past is the experience. If the person has behaved in the past, he will probably be in the future. Therefore, by looking at the past behavior of the person, it can be estimated whether he / she has an attitude towards an object and whether he will behave in the future. Ajzen stated the person's attitude towards behavior as one of the factors affecting the intention to do the behavior. Attitude intention and intention also affect behavior (Michener et al., 1990; Akt. Kağıtçıbaşı, 1999). As a result, if the person has a strong attitude towards something and if the environmental effects encourage the person, the relationship between behavior and attitude is strong and the probability of emergence increases. However, if the environmental effect does not match the person's attitude or the attitude is weak, attitude and behavior are less affected by each other (Michener et al., 1990; Akt. Kağıtçıbaşı, 1999). The fact that the school is a social institution, and it is directly based on human-human relations, brings with it some problems and situations that can turn into violence. Administrators, teachers, students and parents, who are in the school climate, are either the subject or object of these problems and violence (Tezcan, 2010). According to Meadows (2005), some of the general profile characteristics of the practitioners of violence against human resources are a history of violence, mental balance disorder, harmful substance habit, depression, passion for firearms, irritability disorder and personality disorder. Research results related to psychological burnout show that teachers experiencing psychological wear in schools accelerate loss of emotion and professional excitement and teachers lose the thought of maintaining the profession for a long time (Brouwers and Tomic, 1999). In schools where there is a lot of violence, it is necessary to determine the things to be

done against the school rules and to determine the social rules by not following them and to publish and announce them. The club, which enables students to act together in schools, provides a safer school atmosphere for students with their sports activities. What the manager and all the teachers have to do here is that the students who are exposed to violence and who commit violence show a common stance in cooperation with their families and expressly declare that such behavior will not be tolerated (MEB, EARGED, 2008). The goal of this article is to describe the attitudes of the different branches teachers to the violence.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Research model**

This study is a descriptive method aimed to investigate the various variables of sustainability of different branches teachers. Descriptive method is a research method aiming to define existing event / phenomenon without intervention of researcher (Karasar, 1995). Descriptive studies aim to define typical characteristics of a particular group and to make conclusions about how people in a particular group will behave in response to certain situations (Borg and Gall, 1989).

### **Research group**

There were 149 teachers participating in Karaman Province. The research scale was voluntarily applied on teachers face to face by being interviewed where they learned.

### **Data collection tools**

The data collection tools required to reach the determined objectives related to the research are given below:

### **Personal information form**

In order to collect information about the personal characteristics of the participants and to establish the independent variables of the research, an information form consisting of 9 variables (Gender, marital status, age, branch, place of residence, doing sports, type of sports, sports year and difficulty in leisure time) were prepared by the researcher.

### **The attitudes toward violence scale (ATVS)**

The Attitude Scale towards Violence, developed by Davidson and Canivez (2012) in order to evaluate the effects of violence on individuals, is a 7-point Likert-type

**Table 1:** Distribution of demographic characteristics of the sample group participated in the study.

<b>Personal features of participants</b>		<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Gender	Female	58	38.9
	Male	91	61.1
Marital status	Single	37	24.8
	Married	112	75.2
Age	23-30	35	23.5
	31-38	55	36.9
	39-46	34	22.8
	47 and +	25	16.8
Branch	Physical education and sports teaching	69	46.3
	Religious culture teaching	26	17.4
	English teaching	29	19.5
	Guidance teaching	25	16.8
Place of residence	Metropole	28	18.8
	City	93	62.4
	Town	28	18.8
Doing sports	Doing sports	41	27.5
	Not doing sports	108	72.5
Type of sports	Individual sports	25	16.8
	Team sports	16	10.7
Sports year	0-2 Year	5	3.4
	3-5 Year	12	8.1
	6-8 Year	6	4.0
	9 Year and +	18	12.1
Difficulty in leisure time	Sometimes	39	26.2
	Never	110	73.8

measurement tool consisting of 17 items and three sub-dimensions. There are no inverse items in the scale. High scores obtained from the scale show that the attitude towards violence is high. Sub-dimensions of the scale: crime and war (7 items), corporal punishment (6 items) and partner violence (4 items). Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the scale were found to be 0.73 for crime and war sub-dimension, 0.91 for corporal punishment sub-dimension, 0.89 for partner violence sub-dimension and 0.91 for the entire scale.

### Measures

During the analysis and evaluation of the data. The data were analyzed using the Spss 25.0 for Windows package program. Percentage and frequency methods were used to determine the distribution of the personal information of the participants. In order to test whether the sub-dimensions of the scale show normal distribution, histograms were examined and finally, ATVS and all sub-dimensions were found to have normal distribution. Accordingly, One Way Anova and t-Test analysis were performed to determine the main differences. After this process, complementary post-hoc analysis techniques were

used to determine from which groups the significant difference determined.

## RESULTS

### Personal characteristics of the research group

The data and comments on the demographic characteristics of the participants are given below. According to Table 1, 38.9 % of the participants is female and 61.1 % is male. 24,8 % of the participants is single and 75.2 % is married. 23.5 % of the participants is between 23-30 year old, 36.9 % is between 31-38, 22.8 % is between 39-46 and 16.8 % is between 47 year-old and above. According to the branches of the teachers, 46.3 % of the teachers are physical education and sports teachers, 17.4 % of the teachers are religious culture teachers, 19.5 % of the teacher are english teachers and 16,8 % of the teachers is guidance teachers. according to the place of residence, 18.8% metropolitan, 62.4% the city and 18.8% town. 27.5 % of the participants are teachers doing sports and 72.5% not doing sports. 16.8 % of the participants is teachers doing individual sports and 10.7% doing team sports. According to sports year, 3.4% is between 0-2 years, 8.1% between 3-5 years, 4.0%

**Table 2:** Results of participants regarding general attitude and sub-dimension levels against violence

	n	Ort.	Ss	Min	Max
Crime and war	149	4.69	1.254	2.43	7.00
Corporal punishment	149	1.99	1.532	1.00	6.17
Partner violence	149	1.99	1.463	1.00	5.50
Total attitudes toward violence	149	3.11	1.199	1.59	6.18

**Table 3:** Independent group t Test results to determine whether the attitude towards violence scale general and sub-dimension scores differ according to the gender variable of the participants

	Groups	N	Mean	ss	Shg	t Test		
						t	Sd	p
Crime and war	Male	58	3.9729	1.07687	0.14140	-6.307	14	0.000*
	Female	91	5.1554	1.14001	0.11951		7	
Corporal punishment	Male	58	1.3477	0.97447	0.12795	-4.374	14	0.000*
	Female	91	2.4103	1.67725	0.17582		7	
Partner violence	Male	58	1.2457	0.73820	0.09693	-5.453	14	0.000*
	Female	91	2.4725	1.60747	0.16851		7	
Total attitudes toward violence	Male	58	2.4047	0.82169	0.10789	-6.448	14	0.000*
	Female	91	3.5553	1.18941	0.12468		7	

\*p<0,05

between 6-8 years and 12.1% between 9 years and over. According to the difficulty in evaluating leisure time, 26.2% of the participants has sometimes difficulty in leisure time is sometimes and 73.8% has never. In Table 2, the attitudes of the participants towards the total violence and sub-dimensions of the scale scores of the attitudes towards violence were analyzed. As a result of this review. The average score of the teachers who participated in the study about the total attitude towards violence is 3.88%. So, their attitude levels towards violence is close to the middle level. Crime and war average from the sub-dimensions of attitude towards violence is 4.69%. So it is close to medium level, corporal punishment average from the sub-dimensions of attitude towards violence is 1.99%. So it is low level. And also, partner violence average from the sub-dimensions of attitude towards violence is 1.99%. So it is again low level.

As seen in Table 3, the general attitude towards violence according to the gender variable was found statistically significant ( $t = -6.448$ ;  $p < .05$ ). The difference was in favor of female teachers. The crime and war dimension from the sub-dimensions of attitude towards violence scale according to the gender variable was found statistically significant ( $t = -6.307$ ;  $p < .05$ ). The difference was in favor of female teachers. The corporal punishment dimension from the sub-dimensions of attitude towards violence scale according to the gender variable was found statistically significant ( $t = -4.374$ ;  $p < .05$ ). The difference was in favor of female teachers. The partner violence dimension from the sub-dimensions of attitude towards violence scale according to the gender variable was found statistically significant ( $t = -5.453$ ;  $p < .05$ ). The difference was in favor of female teachers. In Table 4, as a result of one-way

analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine whether the Attitude Against Violence scale dimensions Total Attitude towards violence and sub-dimensions arithmetic averages show a significant difference according to age variable. The difference between total attitude towards violence, crime and war dimension, corporal punishment and partner violence dimensions and arithmetic averages of age variable groups were found statistically significant. Accordingly, it is seen that the participants who are between the ages of 23-30 in all dimensions have a low level attitude towards total violence compared to the participants between 39-46 and 47 and over.

In Table 5, as a result of the one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) conducted in order to determine whether the attitude towards violence against total attitude scale and sub-dimension arithmetic averages differ according to the branch variable, the attitude towards total violence, crime and war the difference between the size, corporal punishment and partner violence dimensions and the arithmetic means of the branch variable groups was found statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). According to this, general attitude levels towards violence according to the branch variable, it is seen that the guidance teachers' attitude levels towards total violence are lower than physical education and sports teachers and religious culture teachers. According to the branch variable, the level of crime and war levels among the sub-dimensions of attitude scale towards violence, it is seen that the guidance teachers' crime and punishment attitude levels are lower compared to physical education and sports, religious culture and English teachers. Among the sub-dimensions of the attitude towards violence scale, the levels of corporal punishment

**Table 4:** One-way variance analysis (ANOVA) results to determine whether the attitude towards violence scale general and sub-dimension scores differ according to the age variable of the participants

<i>f, x and ss Values</i>					<b>Anova Results</b>							
	<b>Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>ss</b>		<b>KT</b>	<b>Sd</b>	<b>KO</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>		
<b>Crime and War</b>	23-30	35	4.15	1.20	<b>Between Groups</b>	23.705	3	7.902	5.485	0.001*	1-3 1-4	
	31-38	55	4.56	1.33		<b>Inner Groups</b>	208.893	145				1.441
	39-46	34	5.07	1.11		<b>Total</b>	232.598	148				
	47 and +	25	5.24	0.98								
<b>Corporal Punishment</b>	23-30	35	1.77	1.46	<b>Between Groups</b>	20.840	3	6.947	3.085	0.029*	1-3 1-4	
	31-38	55	1.65	1.20		<b>Inner Groups</b>	326.464	145				2.251
	39-46	34	2.48	1.88		<b>Total</b>	347.304	148				
	47 and +	25	2.42	1.57								
<b>Partner Violence</b>	23-30	35	1.69	1.39	<b>Between Groups</b>	23.043	3	7.681	3.790	0.012*	1-3 1-4	
	31-38	55	1.67	1.05		<b>Inner Groups</b>	293.891	145				2.027
	39-46	34	2.43	1.68		<b>Total</b>	316.934	148				
	47 and +	25	2.54	1.78								
<b>Total Attitudes Toward Violence</b>	23-30	35	2.73	1.16	<b>Between Groups</b>	21.073	3	7.024	5.315	0.002*	1-3 1-4	
	31-38	55	2.85	0.97		<b>Inner Groups</b>	191.631	145				1.322
	39-46	34	3.54	1.32		<b>Total</b>	212.704	148				
	47 and +	25	3.61	1.24								

\*p<0,0

**Table 5:** One-way variance analysis (ANOVA) results to determine whether the attitude towards violence scale general and sub-dimension scores differ according to the branch variable of the participants.

<i>f, x and ss Values</i>					<b>Anova Results</b>							
	<b>Grup</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>ss</b>		<b>KT</b>	<b>Sd</b>	<b>KO</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>		
<b>Crime and War</b>	Physical Education and Sports Teachers	69	4.95	1.23	<b>Between Groups</b>	25.124	3	8.375	5.853	0.001*	4-1 4-2 4-3	
	Religious Cultural Tecahers	26	4.82	1.24		<b>Inner Groups</b>	207.474	145				1.431
	English Teachers	29	4.74	1.19		<b>Total</b>	232.598	148				
	Guide Teachers	25	3.80	1.05								
<b>Corporal Punishment</b>	Physical Education and Sports Teachers	69	2.05	1.41	<b>Between Groups</b>	41.963	3	13.988	6.643	0.000*	2-3 2-4	
	Religious Cultural Tecahers	26	2.95	2.05		<b>Inner Groups</b>	305.340	145				2.106
	English Teachers	29	1.68	1.37		<b>Total</b>	347.304	148				

Table 5:

	Guide Teachers	25	1.21	0.71							
<b>Partner Violence</b>	Physical Education and Sports Teachers	69	2.08	1.43	<b>Between Groups</b>	53.186	3	17.79			
	Religious Cultural Teachers	26	3.06	1.85	<b>Inner Groups</b>	263.748	145	1.819	9.747	0.000*	4-1 4-2 4-3
	English Teachers	29	1.58	0.99	<b>Total</b>	316.934	148				
	Guide Teachers	25	1.14	0.70							
<b>Total Attitudes Toward Violence</b>	Physical Education and Sports Teachers	69	3.25	1.12	<b>Between Groups</b>	30.988	3	10.39			
	Religious Cultural Teachers	26	3.74	1.50	<b>Inner Groups</b>	181.716	145	1.253	8.242	0.000*	4-1 4-2
	English Teachers	29	2.92	1.00	<b>Total</b>	212.704	148				
	Guide Teachers	25	2.26	0.67							

\*p<0.05

Table 6: Independent group t-Test results to determine whether the attitude towards violence scale general and sub-dimension scores differ according to the variable of the participants' sports status

	Groups	N	Mean	ss	Shg	t Test		
						t	Sd	p
Crime and war	Teachers doing sports	41	4.29	1.27	0.198	-2.477	147	0.014*
	Teachers not doing sports	108	4.85	1.22	0.117			
Corporal punishment	Teachers doing sports	41	1.48	0.96	0.150	-2.586	147	0.011*
	Teachers not doing sports	108	2.19	1.66	0.159			
Partner violence	Teachers doing sports	41	1.52	0.87	0.135	-2.493	147	0.014*
	Teachers not doing sports	108	2.17	1.60	0.154			
Total attitudes toward violence	Teachers doing sports	41	2.64	0.81	0.126	-2.973	147	
	Teachers not doing sports	108	3.28	1.28	0.123			

\*p<0,05

according to the branch variable show that religious culture teachers have a high level of attitude towards physical punishment compared to the English and guidance teachers. Among the sub-dimensions of the attitude towards violence scale, the partner violence dimension levels are low compared to the branch variable, the guidance teachers' attitude levels towards the partner violence compared to the physical education and sports, religious culture and English teachers. In Table 6, the

arithmetic of the general attitude dimension against violence according to the sports status of the independent group t test conducted in order to determine whether the teachers forming the sample show a significant difference in terms of the general attitude scale against violence and the sub-dimension scores according to the variables of the teachers doing sports. The difference between the means was found to be statistically significant ( $t = -2.477$ ;  $p < .05$ ). The difference occurred in favor of teachers not playing

**Table 7:** Independent Group t Test Results to Determine Whether General and Sub Dimension Scores of the Coping Scale Difference According to the Type of Sports of the Participants

	Groups	N	Mean	ss	Shg	t- Test		
						t	Sd	p
Crime and War	Individual Sports	25	3.82	1.003	0.200	-2.759	3	0.009*
	Team Sports	16	4.74	1.096	0.274		9	
Corporal Punishment	Individual Sports	25	1.27	0.719	0.144	-1.724	3	0.093
	Team Sports	16	1.79	1.210	0.302		9	
Partner Violence	Individual Sports	25	1.34	0.850	0.170	-0.710	3	0.482
	Team Sports	16	1.53	0.826	0.206		9	
Total Attitudes Toward Violence	Individual Sports	25	2.34	0.732	0.146	-2.614	3	0.013*
	Team Sports	16	2.94	0.711	0.178		9	

\*p&lt;0,05

sports. The difference between the sub-dimensions of attitude towards violence scale between arithmetic averages of crime and war according to the variable of doing sports was found statistically significant ( $t = -2.586$ ;  $p < .05$ ). The difference occurred in favor of teachers not playing sports. The difference between the sub-dimensions of the attitude towards violence scale between arithmetic averages of the corporal punishment dimension according to the variable of doing sports was found statistically significant ( $t = -2.49$ ;  $p < .05$ ). The difference occurred in favor of teachers not playing sports. The difference between the sub-dimensions of attitude towards violence scale between arithmetic averages of the partner violence dimension according to the variable of doing sports was found statistically significant ( $t = -2.973$ ;  $p < .05$ ). The difference occurred in favor of non-sports teachers.

In Table 7, the general attitude scale against violence according to the type of sports, at the end of the independent group t test conducted in order to determine whether the teachers who make up the sample show a significant difference between the general attitude scale and sub-dimension scores of the teachers. The difference between the arithmetic means was statistically significant ( $t = -2.759$ ;  $p < .05$ ). This difference occurred in favor of the teachers doing team sports. The difference between the sub-dimensions of the attitude towards violence scale and the corporal punishment dimension between arithmetic averages was found to be statistically significant ( $t = -, 710$ ;  $p < .05$ ). This difference occurred in favor of the teachers doing team sports.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

It was concluded that total attitude toward violence level of the teachers participating in the study and sub dimensions (crime and war, corporal punishment and partner violence)

of the attitude towards total violence Scale of the teachers' levels are low. It can be concluded that the reason for this is that they are not exposed to violence themselves. According to the study of Hatunoglu (2005), teachers think that violence is an inevitable consequence of the approach to the student. And also in another study, physical punishment is the most common violent behavior towards the student from the teacher (Gözütok, 1993). This result shows that it does not support the study. According to the gender variable, statistically significant difference was found between gender and the general attitude towards violence dimension, gender and crime and war, corporal punishment and partner violence dimensions from sub-dimensions of the attitude towards violence ( $p < .05$ ). The difference was in favor of female teachers. It can be said that male students are more violent and are more aggressive, and are consistent with research results (Karagülmez et al., 2006; Kepenekçi, 2003; Pişkin, 2002). And also, in four separate studies on physical education and sports, primary education, secondary education and high school teachers, gender was not determined in terms of perception of psychological violence (Alkan et al., 2011). Avcı (2010); found that men's tendency to violence is higher than women. In addition, Loeber (1998) concluded that men are more prone to violence than women. According to the age variable, statistically significant difference was found between age and the general attitude towards violence dimension, age and crime and war, corporal punishment and partner violence dimensions from sub-dimensions of the attitude towards violence ( $p < .05$ ). Accordingly, it is seen that the participants who are between the ages of 23-30 in all dimensions have lower total attitude level towards violence than teachers between 39-46 and 47 and over. According to the Mete and his friends' study (2015), 31-40 age group is exposed to more mobbing behavior than 20-30 age group. It supports this study with the results. And also, Genitty et

al. (2017) stated that there was no significant difference in their research according to age factor.

According to the branch of the teachers variable, statistical significant difference was found between branch and total attitude towards violence dimension, branch, crime and war, corporal punishment and partner violence dimensions from sub-dimensions of the attitude towards violence ( $p < .05$ ). Accordingly, total attitude towards violence of the guide teachers' levels are lower than the physical education and sports teachers and religious culture teachers. Guide teachers' crime and punishment levels from the sub-dimensions of attitude towards violence scale are lower than physical education and sports teachers', religious culture teachers' and english teachers' levels. Religious culture teachers' corporal punishment levels are higher than the English teachers' and guide teachers' levels, Guide teachers' partner violence dimension levels from the sub-dimensions are lower than physical education and sports teachers', religious culture teachers' and english teachers' levels. According to the Mete and his friends' study (2015), there is no statistically meaningful difference about branch of the teachers. Again, this finding is consistent with the studies of Toker Gökçe (2006) and Apak (2009). As a result of the independent group t test conducted in order to determine whether the teachers' total attitude towards violence and the sub-dimension scores show a significant difference according to the variable of teachers' sports situation. Statistically significant difference was found between sports situation and the total attitude towards violence dimension, sports situation and crime and war, corporal punishment and partner violence dimensions from sub-dimensions of the attitude towards violence ( $p < .05$ ). Accordingly, the difference in all dimensions resulted in favor of teachers not doing sports. As a result of the independent group t test conducted in order to determine whether the teachers' total attitude towards violence and the sub-dimension scores show a significant difference according to the variable of teachers' type of doing sports. Statistically significant difference was found between the type of sports variant and the total attitude towards violence dimension and the type of sports variant and crime and war from sub-dimensions of the attitude towards violence ( $p < .05$ ). Accordingly, the difference in all dimensions resulted in favor of teachers not doing sports. Accordingly, the difference occurred in favor of the teachers doing team sports in both dimensions. Violence tendency of athletes engaged in individual and team sports in the literature no studies on levels have been found. However, Tutkun et al. (2010) found that individual athletes 'aggression scores were higher than team athletes in their research. Koruç and Bayar (1989), on the other hand, stated that men doing individual sports exhibit more aggressive behavior than men doing team sports.

Finally, the results show that teachers' attitudes toward violence are low, teachers' violent crime shouldn't be

punished violently, teachers participating in the study have the idea that the habitual disobedience of a student should not be punished physically. And also, teachers think that if one of the partners is not honest with the other, it is not correct to hit him.

## REFERENCES

- Adams JF (1995). *Understanding Puberty*. Ankara: Image Publishing.
- Alkan E, Yıldız SM, Bakır M (2011). The Effect of Mobbing on the Burnout of Physical Education and Sports Teachers. *Selcuk University J. Physical Educ. Sports Sci.* 13(3): 270-280.
- Apak EG (2009). *Mobbing and organizational devotion relationship: a research on primary school teachers*. Unpublished master degree thesis, Marmara University Education Sciences Institute.
- Avcı A (2010). *The Phenomenon of Violence In Education The Relationship Between Violence, Aggression And Moral Attitude İn High School Students (Example of Küçükçekmece District)*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Marmara University. Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Borg WR, Gall M (1989). *Educational research: An introduction*. New York: Longmen. 939p.
- Brouwers A, Tomic W (1999). Teacher Burnout, Perceived Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management, And Student Disruptive Behaviour in Secondary Education. *Curriculum and Teaching.* 14(2): 7-26.
- Davidson MM, Canivez GL (2012). Attitudes Toward Violence Scale: Psychometric Properties With A High School Sample. *J. Interpers. Violence.* 27(18): 3660-3682.
- Genitty C, Kim JYE, Slater D, Reynolds B, Bragg N (2017). Comprehensive Assessment of Youth Violence In Five Caribbean Countries: Gender And Age Differences. *J. Human Behav. Soc. Environ.* 27(7): 745-759.
- Gözütok FD (1993). Teacher behaviors for discipline. *Ankara University. J. Educ. Sci. Faculty.* 25: 703-711.
- Hatunoglu Y, Hatunoglu A (2005). Conceptions of teachers about physical punishment. *Atatürk University J. Soc. Sci.* 6(2): 105-115.
- Kağıtçıbaşı C (1999). *New People and People*. (10th Edition). Evrim Publishing House: Istanbul.
- Karagülmez C, Dinçyürek S, Kırallı Y, Şahin S (2006). Investigation of Aggression Levels of Primary School 5th Grade Students In Terms of Various Variables. 1. Violence and School: Violence against Children in the School and its Environs and Measures to Be Taken Symposium Proceeding Book with International Participation, Istanbul.
- Karasar N (1995). *Scientific Research Method*. Ankara: 3A Research Training Consultancy. 292p.
- Koruç Z, Bayar P (1989). *Effects of Sport on Personality Research Report*, Youth and Sports General Directorate. SESAM, Ankara.
- Krug EG, Mercy AJ, Dahlberg LL, Zwi AB (2002). The World Report On Violence and Health. *Lancet.* 360: 1083-1082.
- Loeber R, Stouthamer-Loeber M (1998). Development Of Juvenile Aggression And Violence. *Am. Psychol.* 53(2): 242-259.
- Meadows RJ (2005). *Understanding Violence and Victimization*. New Jersey: Pearson. [https://www.pearsonhighered.com/assets/preface/0/1/3/4/0134868\\_250.pdf](https://www.pearsonhighered.com/assets/preface/0/1/3/4/0134868_250.pdf).
- Minister of Education (2018). *Teachers' Knowledge, Observations, Evaluations and Solution Suggestions on Violence*. Education Research and Development Department, Ankara.
- Mete M, Unal OF, Akyüz B, Kılıç R (2015). Effect Of Mobbing On Work-Related Burnout: A Survey On Teachers In Batman Province Of Turkey. *Suleyman Demirel University. J. Visionary.* 6(12): 37-61.
- Mutlu E (1997). *Television, children and violence*. Istanbul University Faculty Commun. J. 4: 41-77.
- Smith ER, Mackie DM (1995). *Social psychology*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Tezcan M (1996). School as an Environment of Violence. *J. Cogito.* 6(7): 105-108.
- Toker GA (2006). *Intimidation at Work: A Research on Private and Official Primary School Teachers and Administrators*, Unpublished Doctoral



Thesis, Ankara University Institute of Educational Sciences. Ankara.  
Tutkun E, Güner B, Agaoglu S, Soslu R (2010). Evaluation of Aggression Levels of Athletes Engaged In Team Sports And Individual Sports. *J. Sports Performance Res.* 1(1): 23-29.  
Unsal A (1996). An Extended Typology of Violence. *J. Cogito.* 6(7): 29-36.  
Vernberg EM, Jacobs AK, Hershberger SL (1999). Peer Victimization and Attitudes About Violence During Early Adolescence. *J. Clin. Child Psychol.* 28(3): 386-396.

World Health Organization (2002). *World report on violence and health.* Geneva, Switzerland: Author.