

# Exposure to Violence and Its Sociodemographic Correlates in a Sample of Turkish Adolescents in Samsun City Center

## Samsun İl Merkezindeki Adolesanlarda Şiddete Maruziyet ve Şiddetle İlişkili Sosyodemografik Özellikler

Ahmet Tevfik SÜNTER, MD,<sup>a</sup>  
Sevgi CANBAZ, MD,<sup>a</sup>  
Cihad DÜNDAR, MD<sup>a</sup>  
Şennur DABAK, MD,<sup>a</sup>  
Yıldız PEKŞEN, MD<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Public Health,  
Ondokuz Mayıs University  
Faculty of Medicine, Samsun

*This study was presented as poster presentation at "Anatolian Forensic Sciences Congress" on September 08-10, 2006 in Samsun, Turkey.*

Geliş Tarihi/Received: 25.02.2009  
Kabul Tarihi/Accepted: 06.11.2009

Yazışma Adresi/Correspondence:  
Ahmet Tevfik SÜNTER, MD  
Ondokuz Mayıs University  
Faculty of Medicine,  
Department of Public Health,  
Samsun,  
TÜRKİYE/TURKEY  
asunter@omu.edu.tr

**ABSTRACT Objective:** The aim of this study was to determine the prevalence and forms of violence in the family and in the community against adolescents living in Samsun city center, and perpetrators as perceived by adolescents, the determinants of violence, the consequences and the coping mechanisms that adolescents adopt. **Material and Methods:** A cross-sectional study was conducted between September 15 and October 15, 2005, in high school students in Samsun city center. The study sample comprised of 1415 randomly selected 9th through 11th grade students attending 10 randomly selected high schools. A self-report survey questionnaire, prepared by the researchers was administered in the classroom in the presence of the guidance counselor and classroom teacher. **Results:** The prevalence of exposure to violence in the family and in the community was found as 5.9% and 4.1%, respectively. The students living in a nuclear family reported the lowest ratio of exposure to violence (5.2%). Illiterate, alcohol using and conflicting parents and unemployed fathers were more likely than the others to apply violence towards their children. Of the participants, 44.6% reported that the perpetrators of the violence in the family were their fathers. In logistic regression analysis, male gender, single parent family type, illiterate, unemployed and alcohol using father and marital conflict between parents were found to be the risk factors for exposure to both domestic and community violence. **Conclusion:** To initiate educational activities such as workshops, seminars, and conferences may increase awareness of different patterns of violence in the family and in the community, as well as the risks and consequences of such violence.

**Key Words:** Adolescent; violence; family

**ÖZET Amaç:** Bu çalışmada Samsun il merkezinde yaşayan adolesanların aile içinde ve toplumda maruz kaldıkları şiddetin sıklığı ve türlerini, şiddeti uygulayanların kim olduğunu, şiddetin belirleyicilerini, sonuçlarını ve adolesanların şiddetle mücadele mekanizmalarını belirlemek amaçlanmıştır. **Gereç ve Yöntemler:** Kesitsel tipteki bu çalışma 15 Eylül–15 Ekim 2005 tarihleri arasında, Samsun il merkezindeki lise öğrencilerinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çalışma grubunu rasgele seçilen 10 liseye devam eden 9.–11. sınıflardaki öğrencilerden rasgele seçilen 1415'i oluşturmuştur. Katılımcılardan araştırmacılar tarafından hazırlanan anket formlarını rehber öğretmenleri ve sınıf öğretmenleri gözetiminde doldurmaları istenmiştir. **Bulgular:** Aile içinde ve toplumda şiddete maruziyet sıklığı sırasıyla %5.9 ve %4.1 olarak bulunmuştur. En düşük şiddete maruziyet sıklığının çekirdek aileye sahip öğrencilerde (%5.2) olduğu saptanmıştır. Şiddeti en çok okur yazarlığı olmayan, alkol kullanan ve geçimsizlik yaşayan ebeveynler ile işsiz babalar uygulamaktaydı. Katılımcıların %44.6'sı aile içinde şiddet uygulayan kişinin babaları olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Lojistik regresyon analizinde erkek cinsiyetin, tek ebeveynli aile yapısının, okur yazar olmayan, işsiz ve alkol kullanan babaya sahip olmanın ve ebeveynler arası geçimsizliğin aile içi ve toplumsal şiddet için risk faktörleri olduğu saptanmıştır. **Sonuç:** Şiddet konusunda atölye çalışmaları, seminerler ve konferanslar gibi eğitim aktivitelerinin başlatılmasının aile içi ve toplumda karşılaşılan şiddetin değişik türleri, riskleri ve sonuçları konusunda farkındalığı artıracakı düşünülmektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Ergen; şiddet; aile

The World Health Organization defines violence as “the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person or against a group or community that either resulting in or has a likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation”, and classifies it into three broad categories according to the characteristics of those who commit the violent act: self-directed, interpersonal, and collective violence.<sup>1</sup> Violence is a daily reality for people living all over the world and exposure to violence is a risk for physical injury and has implications for mental health. As violence affects all age groups, youths between the ages of 12 and 24 are more likely to be victims of violent crimes compared to persons of other ages, and especially vulnerable to its consequences because adolescence is the life period when socialization mostly occurs.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Both international and local studies indicate that those who witness or are victims of traumatic events may experience a range of negative outcomes, including symptoms of depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder.<sup>5-7</sup> Aside from psychiatric symptoms, adolescents who have been victims or witnesses of violence are also likely to exhibit poor school performance and behavioral disorders which jeopardize their ability to function well later in life.<sup>6-9</sup> On the other hand, witnessing violence in the home or being physically or sexually abused, for instance, may condition children or adolescents to regard violence as an acceptable means of resolving problems. Although understanding the factors that increase the risk of young people being the victims or perpetrators of violence is essential for developing effective policies and programs to prevent violence, in Turkey there are no large national studies regarding violence against adolescents, but only local investigations.<sup>1,2,10</sup> The aim of this study was to determine the prevalence and forms of violence against adolescents in the family and in the community, and perpetrators as perceived by adolescents, the determinants of violence, the consequences and the coping mechanisms that adolescents adopt.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

A cross-sectional study was conducted between September 15 and October 15, 2005, in high scho-

ol students in Samsun city center. Samsun is the largest city of the Black Sea Region of Turkey with a population of 400,000. Ethical permission for this study was obtained from the Ministry of Education.

In this study, the sample was stratified on the basis of the location of the district, school types and grades. Schools, chosen from a list provided by the Department of Education, were the primary sampling units and they were general or vocational, and public or private. The study sample comprised 1502 randomly selected 9<sup>th</sup> through 11<sup>th</sup> grade students attending 10 randomly selected high schools. The classrooms were also selected randomly. Students were sampled using a proportionally stratified random sampling method according to grades. The minimum number of sample was calculated as 1439 by using the formula given below;

$$n = \frac{Nt^2pq}{d^2(N-1) + t^2pq}$$

$$N= 21553, t= 1.96, p =0.20, q =0.80, d =0.02$$

There were 8831(41.0%), 7462 (34.6%) and 5260 (24.4%) students at 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grades, respectively and 615, 520 and 366 students were selected from each grade, respectively.

The participants of this study were also the participants of another simultaneous study related to pathological use of internet.

Researchers visited the selected schools and informed the school principals, the guidance counselor and the students on the study. A self-report survey questionnaire, prepared by the researchers, was administered to the volunteered students in the classroom in the presence of the guidance counselor and the classroom teacher.

The a questionnaire consisted of 32 questions gathering information on;

- Selected demographic characteristics (age, gender, type of family, family income per month, educational and employment status and alcohol use of parents),

- Whether the participants exposed to violence in the family or the community and, in case they exposed, what the reason was and how they responded to the violence,

- Whether they carry any weapon or weapon-like device for any possibility of exposure to violence.

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

For the univariate analysis, chi square test and Fisher's exact test were used to compare categorical variables. Binary logistic regression analysis was used to determine the independent variables related to exposure to violence.

## RESULTS

The total number of adolescents in this study was set at 1502. However, due to exclusion of unreliable and uncompleted questionnaires (n= 87), the total sample was 1415 (94.2%) adolescents. Of the participants, 753 (53.2 %) were girls and the mean age was  $15.3 \pm 1.0$  years in the study group. The prevalence of exposure to family or community violence was found as 7.2%. Separately, prevalences of exposure to violence in the family and in the community were found as 5.9% and 4.1%, respectively. While 44 (43.1%) and 19 (18.6%) of the victims of violence were only exposed to violence in the family and in the community, respectively, 39 (38.2%) were exposed to violence both in the family and in the community. Boys were exposed to violence more than the girls both in the family (9.1% vs 3.0%) and in the community (7.7% vs 0.9%), and the difference between the genders was statistically significant [ $X^2= 32.7$ ,  $df= 1$ ,  $p< 0.001$ ,  $OR= 3.6$  (95%  $CI:2.2-5.9$ )] (Table 1).

The type of the family that the adolescents were living in was found as an important factor for exposure to violence. While the students living in a nuclear family reported the lowest ratio of exposure to violence (5.2%), adolescents living in a single parent family reported the highest ratio (27.3%). The differences among the ratios of exposure to violence with respect to the type of family were statistically significant ( $X^2= 57.5$ ,  $df= 2$ ,  $p< 0.001$ ) (Table 2).

The level of the income of the family was not found related with domestic violence. Although the ratio of adolescents exposed to violence was increasing from 5.8% to 9.5% in the families with an income over the poverty line (1,580.- TL=1,216 US\$)<sup>11</sup> and under the minimum wage (350.- TL=270 US\$)<sup>11</sup>, respectively, there was no statistically significant difference in exposing to the violence according to income ( $X^2=5.5$ ,  $df=3$ ,  $p>0.05$ ) (Table 3).

The adolescents, whose parents were illiterate, were found to be exposed to violence higher than the others both in the family and in the community and the difference between ratios of exposure to violence according to the educational level of the parents was statistically significant (Table 4).

In this study it was also found that alcohol using and conflicting parents and unemployed fathers were more likely than the others to apply violence towards their children (Tables 5-7).

**TABLE 1:** Exposure to violence with respect to gender.

	Exposure to Violence											
	In the family				In the community				TOTAL			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*
Gender												
Male (n=662)	60	9.1	602	90.9	51	7.7	611	92.3	76	11.5	586	88.5
Female (n=753)	23	3.0	730	97.0	7	0.9	746	99.1	26	3.5	727	96.5
TOTAL	83	5.9	1332	94.1	58	4.1	1357	95.9	102	7.2	1313	92.8
	$X^2=23.0$ , $df=1$ , $p<0.001$				$X^2=41.1$ , $df=1$ , $p<0.001$				$X^2=32.7$ , $df=1$ , $p<0.001$			
	OR=3.1				OR=8.9				OR=3.6			
	(95% CI:1.9 – 5.3)				(95% CI:4.0 – 23.3)				(95% CI:2.2 – 5.9)			

\*Row percent

**TABLE 2:** Exposure to violence with respect to family type.

Family type	Exposure to violence											
	In the family				In the community				TOTAL			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*
Large	19	12.0	139	88.0	15	9.5	143	90.5	22	13.9	136	86.1
Nuclear	48	4.0	1143	96.0	30	2.5	1161	97.5	62	5.2	1129	94.8
Single-parent	16	24.2	50	75.8	13	19.7	53	80.3	18	27.3	48	72.7
TOTAL	83	5.9	1332	94.1	58	4.1	1357	95.9	102	7.2	1313	92.8
	$X^2=58.5, df=2, p<0.001$				$X^2=60.1, df=2, p<0.001$				$X^2=57.5, df=2, p<0.001$			

\*Row percent

**TABLE 3:** Exposure to violence according to the level of the income of the family.

Income**	Exposure to Violence											
	In the family				In the community				TOTAL			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*
Under 270.- US\$	12	9.5	114	90.5	6	4.8	120	95.2	14	11.1	112	88.9
270 – 400.- US\$	23	6.8	313	93.2	14	4.2	322	95.8	26	7.7	310	92.3
401 – 1,216.-US\$	35	4.8	696	95.2	24	3.3	707	96.7	43	5.9	688	94.1
Over 1,216.- US\$	13	5.8	209	94.2	14	6.3	208	92.7	19	8.5	203	91.5
TOTAL	83	5.9	1332	94.1	58	4.1	1357	95.9	102	7.2	1313	92.8
	$X^2=5.2, df=3, p>0.05$				$X^2=4.3, df=3, p>0.05$				$X^2=5.5, df=3, p>0.05$			

\*Row percent

\*\*Minimum wage = 270.- US\$ per month

Hunger line = 400.- US\$ per month

Poverty line = 1,216.-US\$ per month

Of the participants exposed to violence in the family, 37 (44.6%), 24 (28.9%) and 22 (26.5%) reported that the perpetrators were their father, mother and siblings, respectively.

The most common reason for violence in the family was reported as failure in the school (37.3%), and slapping (37.3%) was the most common method used for punishment.

While 49 (59.0%) of the adolescents were not reacting against the perpetrators, 19 (22.9%) were retorting by the same method. Of the non-reacting ones, 23 (27.7%) felt sad and 26 (31.3%) began crying.

Of the victims of community violence, 22 (37.9%) reported that there was “no reason” for the violence they were exposed, and 21 (36.2%) of the perpetrators were their friends. The most common reaction type against the community violence was retorting by the same method (39.7%). Of the participants, 62 (4.4%) were carrying an instrument, such as a knife, a pocketknife or a nail clipper in the community and at school to defend themselves.

In logistic regression analysis, male gender, single parent family type, illiterate, unemployed and alcohol using father and marital conflict between parents were found to be the risk factors for exposure to both domestic and community violence (Table 8).

**TABLE 4:** Exposure to violence and the educational level of the parents.

Educational Level		Exposure to Violence								TOTAL			
		In the family				In the community				Yes		No	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	n	%*	n	%*
Mother													
	Illiterate	25	16.7	125	83.3	17	11.3	133	88.7	27	18.0	123	82.0
	Primary school	25	4.1	577	95.9	12	2.0	590	98.0	29	4.8	573	95.2
	Secondary school	10	4.3	221	95.7	9	3.9	222	96.1	15	6.5	216	93.5
	High school /University	23	5.3	409	94.7	20	4.6	412	95.4	31	7.2	401	92.8
TOTAL		83	5.9	1332	94.1	58	4.1	1357	95.9	102	7.2	1313	92.8
		$X^2=36.1, df=3, p<0.001$				$X^2=27.1, df=3, p<0.001$				$X^2=31.4, df=3, p<0.001$			
Father													
	Illiterate	13	30.9	29	69.1	8	19.0	34	81.0	13	30.9	29	69.1
	Primary school	22	5.4	386	94.6	13	3.2	395	96.8	24	7.8	284	92.8
	Secondary school	17	6.8	233	93.2	12	4.8	238	95.2	21	8.4	229	91.6
	High school/University	31	4.3	684	95.7	25	3.5	690	96.5	44	6.2	671	93.8
TOTAL		83	5.9	1332	94.1	58	4.1	1357	95.9	102	7.2	1313	92.8
		$X^2=51.4, df=3, p<0.001$				$X^2=25.7, df=3, p<0.001$				$X^2=34.3, df=3, p<0.001$			

\*Row percent

**TABLE 5:** Exposure to violence with respect to the alcohol use of the parents

Alcohol use		Exposure to Violence								TOTAL			
		In the family				In the community				Yes		No	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	n	%*	n	%*
Mother													
	Yes	16	18.6	70	81.4	15	17.4	71	82.6	17	19.7	69	80.3
	No	67	5.0	1262	95.0	43	3.2	1286	96.8	85	6.4	1244	93.6
TOTAL		83	5.9	1332	94.1	58	4.1	1357	95.9	102	7.2	1313	92.8
		$X^2=24.5, df=1, p<0.001$				Fisher's exact test				$X^2=19.6, df=1, p<0.001$			
		OR=4.3				P<0.001				OR=3.6			
		(95% CI:2.3 – 8.1)								(95% CI:1.9 – 6.6)			
Father													
	Yes	43	11.5	330	89.5	35	9.3	338	82.6	51	19.7	322	80.3
	No	40	3.8	1002	96.2	23	2.2	1019	96.8	51	6.4	991	93.6
TOTAL		83	5.9	1332	94.1	58	4.1	1357	95.9	102	7.2	1313	92.8
		$X^2=28.0, df=1, p<0.001$				$X^2=34.2, df=1, p<0.001$				$X^2=30.3, df=1, p<0.001$			
		OR=3.2				OR=4.6				OR=3.1			
		(95% CI:2.0 – 5.2)				(95% CI:2.6 – 8.1)				(95% CI:2.0 – 4.7)			

\* Row percent

## DISCUSSION

The paper presented and analyzed the results of a cross-sectional self-report survey dealing with the

prevalence of exposure to violence in the family and in the community among Turkish adolescents. Furthermore, it documented the relevance of the adolescents' and families' socio-demographic char-

**TABLE 6:** Exposure to violence with respect the employment status of the parents.

		Exposure to Violence											
		In the family				In the community				TOTAL			
		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
Employment	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	
Mother													
Employed	17	6.5	243	93.5	15	5.8	245	94.2	22	8.5	238	91.5	
Unemployed	66	5.7	1089	94.3	43	3.7	1112	96.3	80	6.9	1075	93.1	
TOTAL	83	5.9	1332	94.1	58	4.1	1357	95.9	102	7.2	1313	92.8	
		$X^2=0.13, df=1, p>0.05$				$X^2=1.7, df=1, p>0.05$				$X^2=0.5, df=1, p>0.05$			
Father													
Employed	63	4.8	1238	95.2	41	3.1	1260	96.9	78	6.0	1223	94.0	
Unemployed	20	17.5	94	82.5	17	14.9	97	85.1	24	21.0	90	79.0	
TOTAL	83	5.9	1332	94.1	58	4.1	1357	95.9	102	7.2	1313	92.8	
		$X^2=28.0, df=1, p<0.001$				$X^2=34.2, df=1, p<0.001$				$X^2=30.3, df=1, p<0.001$			
		OR=3.2				OR=4.6				OR=3.1			
		(95% CI:2.0 – 5.2)				(95% CI:2.6 – 8.1)				(95% CI:2.0 – 4.7)			

\* Row percent

**TABLE 7:** Exposure to violence with respect to the level of spousal relation between the parents.

		Exposure to Violence											
		In the family				In the community				TOTAL			
		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
Spousal Relation	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	n	%*	
Excellent, good	37	3.3	1092	96.7	28	2.5	1101	97.5	50	4.4	1079	95.6	
Bad	26	12.1	188	87.9	16	7.5	198	92.5	30	14.0	184	86.0	
Worse	20	27.8	52	72.2	14	19.4	58	80.6	22	30.5	50	69.5	
TOTAL	83	5.9	1332	94.1	58	4.1	1357	95.9	102	7.2	1313	92.8	
		$X^2=91.6, df=2, p<0.001$				$X^2=56.8, df=2, p<0.001$				$X^2=86.5, df=2, p<0.001$			

\* Row percent

acteristics to the violence. The results indicated that the prevalence of exposure to violence in the family (5.9%) was higher than the prevalence of exposure to violence in the community (4.1%).

As far as exposure to violence is concerned, the following socio-demographic characteristics of adolescents are the most significant risk factors, as reflected in logistic regression analyses:

Adolescent's gender (males exposed to violence more than females), single parent family (ado-

**TABLE 8:** Independent variables associated with exposure to violence in logistic regression analysis.

Variables	$\beta$	p	Exp. ( $\beta$ )	95% CI	
				Lower	Upper
Single parent family	2.098	.000	8.146	2.866	23.157
Conflict between parents	2.021	.000	7.548	3.308	17.222
Alcohol using father	1.496	.012	4.465	1.394	14.303
Illiterate father	1.415	.006	4.116	1.503	11.268
Male gender	1.257	.000	3.515	1.921	6.433
Unemployed father	0.781	.034	2.183	1.061	4.490

lescents living in a single parent family exposed to violence more than the adolescents living in a nuclear or large family), father's education level (illiterate fathers abused their offspring more than the others), father's occupation (unemployed fathers abused their offspring more than employed fathers) and father's alcohol use (alcohol using fathers abused their offspring more than nonuser fathers). In addition, the results revealed that in the presence of conflict between the parents, the more likely that they were to physically abuse their adolescent offspring.

As demonstrated by other researches,<sup>10,12-15</sup> males were more likely to suffer exposure to violence. It is possible that experiencing violence is particularly problematic for teenage boys as an impediment to their sense of competence as a male.

Conflicting with our results, children living in the nuclear families were found to be more likely to receive physical punishment than those living in grandparent-present families, in a Korean study,<sup>15</sup> while children living in the large families were found to be more likely to receive physical punishment than the others in an Arabic study.<sup>13</sup> The differences might be due to the different cultural and traditional characteristics of the nations in which the studies were conducted.

In this study, alcohol using fathers were found more likely than the others to apply violence towards their children. In some studies on domestic marital violence among Turkish women, men's alcohol intake was found as an important factor for wife abuse.<sup>16-18</sup>

Although family income was not found as a predictor of family violence, the results mentioned above are highly consistent with Farrington's family stress theory and Allen and Straus' family resources theory about the causes of family violence.<sup>19,20</sup> Generally speaking, the main premise shared by these two theories is that lack of resources in the family is one of the main triggers of family stress, and that the combination of these factors may be a significant predictor of family violence besides cultural traditions. Culture is a society's common beliefs and behaviors, and its concepts of how people should conduct them. Included in these concepts are

ideas about what acts of omission or commission might constitute abuse and neglect.<sup>21,22</sup> Different cultures have different rules regarding what constitutes acceptable parenting practices. In Turkish society, maxims such as "beating heals bad manners and so leads to the heaven (beating has come out of heaven)" and "the fact that a mother beats her child leads him/her to obedience and good deeds (roses grow everywhere on the body of a child beaten by his/her own mother)" are widespread. Such maxims reflect cultural traditions of Turkish society with respect to the punishment of a child or solving the problems among the parents and children.<sup>23</sup>

Of the participants exposed to violence in the family, 44.6% were punished by their fathers, 28.9% by mothers, and 26.5% by older siblings, which reflected the authority and the primacy of Turkish fathers' traditional roles in disciplining children.

The most common perpetrators were the friends of the adolescents (36.2%) in the community. This finding may be the reflection of the way of resolving interpersonal conflicts of the adolescents. Another important finding is that 15.7% of the adolescents responded that they did not understand why they were exposed to violence either in the family or in the community. Although getting a bad mark (32.5%) at school was found as the most common reason for being exposed to violence in the family, the fact that a considerable proportion of adolescents felt that they were punished without understanding the reason for the punishment had implies a strong possibility that violence may frequently be applied in the name of disciplining adolescents.

Regarding the reactions against the perpetrators, the results showed that 59.0% of the adolescents exposed to violence in the family were not reacting against the perpetrators, and, 27.7% and 31.3% felt themselves sad and began crying, respectively. In addition to the physical harm that exposure to physical violence can cause, the associated psychological and behavioral characteristics can be grave. Internalizing problems,<sup>24-28</sup> low self-esteem,<sup>24</sup> posttraumatic stress,<sup>28-30</sup> externalizing behavior<sup>24,27,31</sup> and approval of aggression<sup>32</sup> are among the documented sequelae of violence expo-

sure. It is thought that adolescents who do not react against the perpetrators are at a higher risk of these sequelae than the ones who react.

Carrying a weapon is both an important risky behavior and a predominantly male activity among young people at school age. There are, however, major variations in the prevalence of weapon carrying as reported by adolescents in different countries. In Cape Town, South Africa, 9.8% of males and 1.3% of females in the secondary schools reported carrying knives to school during the previous four weeks.<sup>33</sup> In Scotland, 34.1% of males and 8.6% of females aged 11-16 years said that they had carried weapons at least once during their lifetime.<sup>34</sup> In this study, 4.4% of the adolescents reported that they carried a weapon in the community and at school to defend themselves. This ratio is smaller than the ones found in foreign countries and even in Istanbul (8.0%), which is the crowded metropolitan of Turkey.<sup>2</sup> This difference may be due to the relative safety of Samsun city center with a population of 400 000.

## SUGGESTIONS

The current survey focused on a highly sensitive problem encountered in many societies throughout the world. As the current cross-sectional findings suggest that male adolescents endure frequent exposure to violence, the development and implementation of specific prevention and intervention programs should be encouraged. Although alcohol using parents and especially the fathers were found more likely than the others to apply violence towards their children in this study, establishing alcohol abuse control units for men and also for women could be a key point for the prevention of violence towards adolescents. On the other hand, to initiate educational activities such as workshops, seminars, and conferences for educators, educational counselors, health and mental health practitioners, social workers and law enforcement officers may increase awareness of different patterns of violence in the family and in the community, and the risks and consequences of such violence.

## REFERENCES

- Krug EG, Dahlberg LL, Mercy JA, Zwi, A, Lozano, R, eds. Violence-A Global Public Health Problem. In: World Report on Violence and Health. Geneva: WHO; 2002. p.3-21.
- Alikasifoglu M, Erginoz E, Ercan O, Uysal O, Kaymak DA, İter O. Violent behaviour among Turkish high school students and correlates of physical fighting. *Eur J Public Health* 2004;14(2):173-7.
- Paxton KC, Robinson WL, Shah S, Schoeny ME. Psychological distress for African-American adolescent males: exposure to community violence and social support as factors. *Child Psychiatry Hum Dev* 2004;34(4):281-95.
- Ward CL, Flisher AJ, Zissis C, Muller M, Lombard C. Exposure to violence and its relationship to psychopathology in adolescents. *Inj Prev* 2001;7(4):297-301.
- Ursano RJ, Grieger TA, McCarroll JE. Prevention of posttraumatic stress: consultation, training and early treatment. In: Van der Kolk BA, McFarlane AC, Weisaerh L, eds. *Traumatic Stress: The Effects of Overwhelming Experience on Mind, Body and Society*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. New York: Guildford Press; 1996. p.441- 62.
- Pillay Y, Magwaza A, Petersen I. Civil conflict in Mpumalanga: some mental health sequelae in a sample of children and their caregivers. *South Afr J Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 1992;4(1):42-5.
- Dawes A, Tredoux C, Feinstein A. Political violence in South Africa: some effects on children of the violent destruction of their community. *Int J Ment Disorder* 1989;18(1): 16- 43.
- Schwab-Stone M, Chen C, Greenberger E, Silver D, Lichtman J, Voyce C. No safe haven. II: The effects of violence exposure on urban youth. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 1999;38(4):359-67.
- Glodich AM. Traumatic exposure to violence: a comprehensive review of the child and adolescent literature. *Smith Coll Stud Soc* 1998;68(3):321- 45.
- Yavuz MF, Atan YK, Atamer TA, Golge ZB. [Evaluation of physical violence for high school students: Violence in school and in family and violence by the student]. *Turkish Journal of Forensic Sciences* 2003;2(3):39-47.
- Resmi Gazete (30.12.2004/) 25686 Sayılı Asgari Ücret Tespit Komisyonu Kararı; 2004/8300.
- Singer, MI. The Mental Health Consequences of Adolescents' Exposure to Violence. Final Report. Cleveland, OH: Center for Practice Innovations, Case Western Reserve University; 1994. p.1-98.
- Haj-Yahia MM, Ben-Arieh A. The incidence of Arab adolescents' exposure to violence in their families of origin and its sociodemographic correlates. *Child Abuse Negl* 2000;24(10): 1299-315.
- Purugganan OH, Stein RE, Silver EJ, Benenson BS. Exposure to violence among urban school-aged children: is it only on television? *Pediatrics* 2000;106(4 Suppl):949-53.
- Doe SS. Cultural factors in child maltreatment and domestic violence in Korea. *Child Youth Serv Rev* 2000;22(3/4):231-6.
- Ergin N, Bayram N, Alper Z, Selimoglu K, Bilgel N. Domestic violence: a tragedy behind the doors. *Women Health* 2005;42(2):35-51.
- Alper Z, Ergin N, Selimoglu K, Bilgel N. Domestic violence: a study among a group of Turkish women. *Eur J Gen Pract* 2005;11(2):48-54.
- Ozcakir A, Bayram N, Ergin N, Selimoglu K, Bilgel N. Attitudes of Turkish Men toward wife beating: A study from Bursa, Turkey. *J Fam Violence* 2008;23(7):631-8.



19. Farrington KM. Stress and family violence. In: Straus MA, Hotaling GT, eds. *The Social Causes of Husband-to Wife Violence*. 1st ed. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press; 1980. p.94-114.
20. Allen CM, Straus MA. Resources, power and husband-wife violence. In: Straus MA, Hotaling GT, eds. *The Social Causes of Husband-to Wife Violence*. 1st ed. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press; 1980. p.188-208.
21. Estroff SE. A cultural perspective of experiences of illness, disability and deviance. In Henderson GE, King NMP, Strauss RP, Estroff SE, Churchill LR, eds. *The Social Medicine Reader*. 1st ed. Durham, NC: Duke University Press; 1997. p.6-11.
22. Korbin JE. Cross-cultural perspectives and research directions for the 21st century. *Child Abuse Negl* 1991;15(Suppl 1):67-77.
23. Can G, Topbas M, Okten A, Kizil M. Child abuse as a result of enuresis. *Pediatr Int* 2004;46(1):64-6.
24. Lai DW. Violence exposure and mental health of adolescents in small towns: an exploratory study. *Can J Public Health* 1999;90(3):181-5.
25. Martinez P, Richters JE. The NIMH community violence project: II. Children's distress symptoms associated with violence exposure. *Psychiatry* 1993;56(1):22-35.
26. Singer MI, Anglin TM, Song LY, Lunghofer L. Adolescents' exposure to violence and associated symptoms of psychological trauma. *JAMA* 1995;273(6):477-82.
27. Schwab-Stone M, Chen C, Greenberger E, Silver D, Lichtman J, Voyce C. No safe haven. II: The effects of violence exposure on urban youth. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 1999;38(4):359-67.
28. Mazza JJ, Reynolds WM. Exposure to violence in young inner-city adolescents: relationships with suicidal ideation, depression, and PTSD symptomatology. *J Abnorm Child Psychol* 1999;27(3):203-13.
29. Fitzpatrick KM, Boldizar JP. The prevalence and consequences of exposure to violence among African-American youth. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 1993;32(2):424-30.
30. Springer C, Padgett DK. Gender differences in young adolescents' exposure to violence and rates of PTSD symptomatology. *Am J Orthopsychiatry* 2000;70(3):370-9.
31. Schwartz D, Proctor LJ. Community violence exposure and children's social adjustment in the school peer group: the mediating roles of emotion regulation and social cognition. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2000;68(4):670-83.
32. Shahinfar A, Kupersmidt JB, Matza LS. The relation between exposure to violence and social information processing among incarcerated adolescents. *J Abnorm Psychol* 2001;110(1):136-41.
33. Flisher AJ, Ziervogel CF, Chalton DO, Leger PH, Robertson BA. Risk-taking behaviour of Cape Peninsula high-school students. Part VII. Violent behaviour. *S Afr Med J* 1993;83(7):490-4.
34. McKeganey N, Norrie J. Association between illegal drugs and weapon carrying in young people in Scotland: schools' survey. *BMJ* 2000;320(7240):982-4.