Exploring the Relationship Between Ambivalent Sexism, Aggression, and Rejection Sensitivity in University Students

Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Düzeyleri, Saldırganlık Tutumları ve Reddedilme Duyarlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between ambivalent sexism, aggressive attitudes, and rejection sensitivity among university students. A correlational survey design was employed, involving 200 students aged 18–24 enrolled at universities in Istanbul. Data were gathered using the Demographic Information Form, Aggression Questionnaire, Ambivalent Sexism Scale, and Rejection Sensitivity Scale. Analyses were conducted in SPSS and included descriptive statistics, normality tests, reliability checks, Pearson correlations, and group comparisons via independent-samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA. Results indicated a significant positive correlation between ambivalent sexism and aggression. However, neither ambivalent sexism nor aggression was significantly associated with rejection sensitivity. Gender differences emerged: male students reported higher levels of ambivalent sexism and rejection sensitivity compared to females, while no significant differences were observed in aggression by gender. Furthermore, none of the variables showed differences based on age, relationship status, or income level. Overall, the findings suggest that higher ambivalent sexism is linked to increased aggression among university students, underscoring the role of gender-related attitudes in shaping interpersonal behaviors. These results highlight the need for educational interventions addressing sexist attitudes and promoting gender equality, which may help reduce aggression and foster healthier campus relationships.

Keywords: Aggressive Attitudes, Ambivalent Sexism, Rejection Sensitivity.

ÖZET

Bu araştırmada üniversite öğrencilerinin saldırganlık tutumları, çelişik duygulu cinsiyet düzeyleri ve reddedilme duyarlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda araştırma nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden ilişkisel tarama modeliyle yapılmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu İstanbul'da öğrenim görmekte olan 18-24 yaş aralığındaki 200 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Araştırma verilerinin toplanmasında "Demografik Bilgi Formu", "Saldırganlık Ölçeği", "Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği" ve "Reddedilme Duyarlılığı Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Araştırma verilerinin analiz edilmesinde sosyal bilimler için istatistik programı SPSS kullanılmıştır. Program dahilinde elde edilen verilerin betimsel, normallik, güvenirlik, ilişki ve fark analizleri yapılmıştır. Analizler %95 güven .05 anlamlılık düzeyinde incelenmiştir. Araştırma bulguları incelendiğinde çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik toplam ile saldırganlık toplam düzeyleri arasında pozitif yönlü anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Bunun yanında çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve saldırganlık ile reddedilme duyarlılığı arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ilişki saptanmamıştır. Son olarak cinsiyete göre çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ile reddedilme duyarlılığı arasında anlamlı fark bulunurken; yaş, ilişki durumu ve gelir düzeyine göre araştırma değişkenleri arasında anlamlı fark bulunmamıştır. Sonuç olarak üniversite öğrencisi katılımcılarda çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik düzeyleri arttıkça saldırganlık düzeylerinin de arttığı saptanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Saldırganlık davranışı, Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik, Reddedilme Duyarlılığı.

Seda Kurt [1]

INTRODUCTION

Gender is defined as a concept that encompasses the socially constructed roles and responsibilities assigned to women and men based on societal expectations. In this definition, fundamental biological differences are disregarded, and individuals are approached entirely from a traditional perspective (Verbrugge, 1985). Sexism is described as the deepening and exaggeration of these gender based differences, which ultimately places women in a disadvantaged position across various areas of life (Sakallı & Uğurlu, 2003). Glick and Fiske's (1996) approach to gender based sexism consists of two subdimensions. The first is hostile sexism, which reflects overtly negative

---

[1] Doctoral Candidate, Sigmund Freud Private University (SFU), Faculty for Psychotherapy Science, Vienna, Austria. ORCID: 0009-0002-7871-5156

attitudes toward women; the second is benevolent sexism, which appears to favor women but positions them as weak beings in need of protection. Both subdimensions are rooted in patriarchal ideologies. Since the earliest stages of human history, patriarchal structures have persisted, evolving in form while maintaining their influence to the present day. Gendered norms, deeply rooted in social traditions, continue to manifest strongly in contemporary life. Even though individuals may recognize sexism as inherently wrong, many still perpetuate it, expressing sexist attitudes in diverse forms and varying degrees of intensity (Çelik, 2018). The potential consequences of sexism, such as sexual harassment, physical violence, sexual violence, dating violence, and cyber violence, have been extensively explored in previous research (Serinyeş, 2021; Yeter, 2022; Sakallı, 2003; Ayhan, 2015). Another significant outcome of sexism is aggressive behavior. Studies have demonstrated that discriminatory attitudes toward women are often associated with aggressive actions and with a tendency to rationalize such behaviors (Abrahams, 2003, as cited in Ünal et al., 2022).

Various subtypes of aggression have been classified due to differences in how aggressive behavior is expressed. Aggression can be categorized as physical or verbal, active or passive, and direct or indirect. Verbal aggression refers to behaviors intended to harm another person through communication, such as insults or offensive language, whereas physical aggression involves behaviors aimed at causing harm to another person, oneself, or an object through the use of physical force. Active aggression occurs when an individual intentionally harms others through physical or verbal means, while passive aggression involves obstructing or interfering with another person's goals without overtly harmful actions (Buss, 1961, as cited in Algur, 2019).

Another concept that plays a significant role in the emergence of violence and aggressive behavior is rejection sensitivity. Rejection sensitivity is defined as a heightened state of vulnerability that arises from unmet needs, neglect, and significant experiences of rejection during childhood, particularly by primary caregivers (Downey & Feldman, 1996). Such early experiences contribute to the development of an expectation of rejection that persists into later stages of life. Individuals with high rejection sensitivity may display exaggerated reactions when they experience rejection or even when they perceive the possibility of being rejected (Pietrzak, Downey, & Ayduk, 2005). One study found a strong positive correlation between rejection sensitivity and aggressive behaviors, including violence. It was observed that individuals with high levels of rejection sensitivity are more inclined to respond to relational conflicts with aggression rather than remaining passive (Volz & Kerig, 2010)..In this context, the present study aims to examine the relationships among ambivalent sexism, aggressive attitudes, and rejection sensitivity within a sample of university students. Understanding the interplay between these variables may provide insights into the emotional well-being of young adults and contribute to the development of interventions designed to promote healthier interpersonal interactions.

Purpose of the Study

Recent research has drawn attention to an increase in aggressive behavior among university students, often viewed as an early marker of social violence (Karabacak & Çetinkaya, 2015; Kepir Şen, 2014; Tok, 2021). At the same time, both hostile and benevolent forms of ambivalent sexism have become more visible among young adults, frequently coinciding with different expressions of aggression (Ayan, 2014). Studies have also shown that individuals with higher rejection sensitivity are more prone to aggressive reactions (Ayduk, Gyurak, & Luerssen, 2008; Dodge & Coie, 1987; Downey, Feldman, & Ayduk, 2000; Feldman & Downey, 1994). Although each of these areas has been studied separately, research examining them together remains limited. This study seeks to address that gap by exploring how aggression, ambivalent sexism, and rejection sensitivity relate to one another in a sample of university students. It also considers whether these variables differ across gender, age, relationship status, or income level.

Significance of the Study

Understanding how these factors interact is essential for addressing growing concerns about violence and discrimination in university settings. Investigating them collectively offers a clearer view of their combined impact and may help guide psychosocial programs that support student well-being. Furthermore, greater insight into the connection between aggression, sexism, and rejection sensitivity can inform targeted prevention and educational strategies on campuses.

Research Hypotheses

The study tested the following hypotheses:

H1: Higher ambivalent sexism will be associated with stronger aggressive attitudes.
H2: Ambivalent sexism will not show a significant link with rejection sensitivity.
H3: Aggressive attitudes will not be significantly related to rejection sensitivity.

H4: Ambivalent sexism will vary significantly by gender.

H5: Aggressive attitudes will not differ significantly by gender.

H6: Rejection sensitivity will differ significantly by gender.

H7: Ambivalent sexism will not vary by relationship status.

H8: Aggression and rejection sensitivity will not vary by relationship status.

H9: Ambivalent sexism will not differ significantly by age

H10: Aggression will not differ significantly by age.

H11: Ambivalent sexism, aggression, and rejection sensitivity will not differ significantly by income level.

Assumptions

We assumed that the students answered honestly. We also assumed that the scales we used measured what they were supposed to measure validly and reliably.

Limitations

The study only included 200 students aged 18–24 from universities in Istanbul. The findings should be read with this in mind. Since we used a correlational survey design, we cannot claim any cause-and-effect relationships between the variables.

Theoretical Framework

Aggression

Aggression refers to behavior aimed at harming another person, animal, or object. This can be physical or psychological. Intent is important here; if harm happens by accident, it is not considered aggression.

Factors Influencing Aggression

Many different factors can shape aggression. Family and parenting are essential. Harsh discipline or witnessing violence at home can increase the risk of aggressive behavior later on. The media also plays a role. Watching violent TV, movies, or playing violent games can make people less sensitive to violence and more likely to copy it. Environmental stress matters too. Crowded spaces, loud noise, or hot weather have been linked to higher aggression in some studies. Some people are also more prone to anger or impulsive behavior because of their biology or genetics. Frustration is another trigger. When people are blocked from reaching their goals, they may react aggressively. Lastly, gender differences are seen. Men are more likely to show physical aggression, while women tend to use indirect or relational aggression (Dilekmen, Ada, & Alver, 2011).

Research on Aggression

Research on aggression has covered different ages and settings. For example, a study with university students found that higher anxiety and depression were linked to more physical and verbal aggression (Algur, 2019). Another study showed that students with lower empathy and weaker emotional expression skills tended to be more aggressive (Adıgüzel, 2012).

School-based research on children found that strict and authoritarian parenting could increase aggressive behavior (Ay, 2017). Studies with adolescents also showed that those involved in team sports had lower levels of aggression, suggesting that sports may help manage aggressive impulses (Esentürk, 2015).

Types of Aggression

Aggression can take different forms. It might be direct or indirect, physical or verbal, active or passive. Physical aggression is obvious things like hitting, pushing, or slapping. Verbal aggression happens through words, for example, yelling or insulting someone. Active aggression is clear and intentional. Passive aggression is not as obvious and can include refusing to cooperate or intentionally things down. Indirect aggression is more hidden, like spreading rumors or leaving someone out socially.

Theories of Aggression

There are several ways researchers explain aggression. One is **Social Learning Theory**, which argues that people pick it up by watching others, especially when aggressive behavior seems to work or gets rewarded (Bandura, 1971, as cited in Hasta & Güler, 2013). **Frustration-Aggression Theory** takes a different view. It says frustration, like when goals are blocked, can build tension that comes out as aggression (Dollard et al., 1939). Another idea, **Instinct Theory**, treats aggression as something built-in, linked to natural drives like Freud's death instinct or Lorenz's survival instinct.

Biology is also part of the picture. High testosterone or problems in specific brain areas have been tied to aggression. Then there is the **Cognitive Approach**, which looks at how people think. If someone sees the world as hostile or assumes evil intent in others, they are more likely to act aggressively (Ekşi, 2021). **Humanistic ideas** view aggression as a response to blocked needs or frustration with personal growth. **Catharsis Theory** suggests that aggression can be reduced if it is expressed safely, like through sports or competition. Finally, the **Ethological view** sees aggression as something shaped by evolution, once helping humans compete and survive.

Sexism

Sexism as a concept has emerged as a result of discrimination as a product of a social construct; that is, gender roles and social status associated with men and a women. Traditional sexism is concerned with the representation of women as passive receptors of aid and guidance, and viewing men as the dominators and figures of authority. On the other hand, Modern sexism is more covert; it is subtle and indirect, though it still reinforces the existing inequality.

Ambivalent sexism

Glick and Fiske (1996) ambivalently described the merger of hostile sexism and benevolent sexism under one umbrella as ambivalent sexism. Hostile sexism marks the negative stereotyping of women, actively punishing those who decide to diverge from the accepted sphere of womanhood. Hostile sexist patterns usually classify women as incompetent, socially irresponsible, and anti-progressive. Benevolent sexism, while labeled benevolent, is no better. It describes social beliefs that idealize women as weak and, hence, need the escort of a man, marking submission to shield, care, and protection of a man. Along with this, with the coexistence of hostile and benevolent sexism, we can largely agree that the patriarchal norms are maintained. This contradiction of negativity mixed with protective, disguised sentiments make ambivalent sexism.

Ambivalent Sexism in Society

In societies where patriarchal structures persist, many people are likely to develop ambivalent sexist views unconsciously. A man, for example, who avoids assigning physically demanding tasks to women and who frequently helps them might look as though he is being helpful. His actions, however, reveal that he helps women because he thinks they are weaker and not equals. That same manager may also fiercely oppose women being promoted to senior-level positions, which is an example of clear hostile sexism. This example illustrates the interplay of benevolent and hostile attitudes. The sociological concept of ambivalent sexism provides a helpful narrative to analyze myriad biases in society.

Research on Ambivalent Sexism

Focus on ambivalent sexism has shown its prevalence in various societies. For example, Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002) studied the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory in Turkey and reported that it was both reliable and valid, as benevolent and hostile dimensions were distinct and applicable in the local context. That study, together with others, has provided evidence that the conspiracy of benevolent sexism operates even in cultures with a comparatively greater level of gender parity (Connelly & Heesacker, 2012).

Rejection Sensitivity and Aggression

The connection between rejection sensitivity and aggression has been established in previous studies. People high in rejection sensitivity became more aggressive in the 'hot sauce paradigm' experiment toward a person who rejected them (Ayduk et al., 2008). Adolescents also seem to display higher sensitivity towards rejection and more aggressive behavior in conflict situations in romantic relationships (Volz & Kerig, 2010).

It has been noted that women tend to score higher on rejection sensitivity, which could explain some forms of relational aggression, like gossip and social exclusion (Sommerfeld & Shechory Bitton, 2020). All these findings suggest that rejection sensitivity tends to interact with gender and personality, as well as cultural elements, about aggressive behavior.

METHOD

Research Design

In this study, the relationship of aggression, ambivalent sexism, and rejection sensitivity practiced by university students was examined through the use of a correlational survey design. This design helps determine the relationships between the study variables and also assesses group differences in some demographic characteristics (Büyüköztürk et al., 2021).

The population of this study consisted of young adults aged 18–24 enrolled at universities in Istanbul as of 2024. Using convenience sampling, 200 university students were selected as the sample. The sample included 50% women (n = 100) and 50% men (n = 100).

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Participants by Gender, Age, Relationship Status, and Income Level

Variable	n	%
Female	100	50,0
Male	100	50,0
Age		
18-19	22	11,0
20-21	52	26,0
22-23	86	43,0
24-25	40	20,0
Relationship Status		
In a Relationship	86	43,0
Single / Not in a Relationship	114	57,0
Income Level		
Low	38	19,0
Medium	140	70,0
High	22	11,0

Data Gathering

The data collection process was conducted during the spring semester of the year 2024. Participants who volunteered to participate were first informed about the purpose of the study and voluntary participation. After providing informed consent, the Demographic Information Form and the scales were filled out by participants in written questionnaire format in-class. The application process was approximately 20–25 minutes. The information collected were coded for the purpose of participant anonymity and then uploaded into electronic form.

Data Analysis

The data were examined through the SPSS 26.0 software package. Data were screened for missing values and outliers as a first step. Skewness and kurtosis measures were inspected to test assumptions of normality and values ranging from ±2 showed normal distribution and hence application of parametric tests (George & Mallery, 2016). Cronbach's alpha coefficients were employed to quantify the internal consistency of scales. To ascertain the first objective of the study, Pearson correlation analysis was applied to test correlations among primary variables. To ascertain the second objective, independent samples t-tests were utilized to test between binary categorical variables such as gender and relationship status. For multi-category variables such as income level and age, one-way ANOVA was conducted, and where differences were significant, post-hoc tests were employed to determine which groups differed from each other. A level of .05 was utilized for all analyses.

RESULTS

The findings of the study are presented in line with the research questions and hypotheses, using correlation analyses and comparisons between groups. Normality and reliability of data were ascertained prior to the main analyses, and all the scales were found to be highly internally consistent. Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged above .80 for all scales. The findings are presented in three sections here: preliminary analyses, findings from correlation analyses, and comparative analyses for hypothesis testing.

Preliminary Analyses

Testing Assumptions of Normality: In order to check whether the participants' scale scores met the assumption of normality, skewness and kurtosis values were examined. According to traditional criteria, values between ±2 indicate the data are roughly normally distributed (George & Mallery, 2016). As evident in Table 2, the skewness and kurtosis values for all the scales used in this study ranged between ±1, which corroborated that the assumption of normality was met.

Table 2. Skewness and Kurtosis Values of the Scales

Scale	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
Ambivalent Sexism (ASI)	-0.579	0.172	0.958	0.342

Aggression (AQ)	0.118	0.172	0.958	0.342
Rejection Sensitivity (RSQ)	0.782	0.172	0.235	0.342

Frequency and percentage distributions are based on the demographic characteristics of the sample (N = 200).

Descriptive Analyses of the Scales:

The overall mean scores and standard deviations for the scales are presented in Table 3. From Table 3, it is evident that on the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI), the mean score was 77.67 (SD = 19.66), on the Aggression Questionnaire (AQ) was 83.73 (SD = 16.34), and on the Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (RSQ) was 8.66 (SD = 3.64). Considering the possible ranges of scores on the scales, the ratings indicate that the students in the study sample exhibited moderate ambivalent sexism and aggression, and low-to-moderate rejection sensitivity

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Scale Scores

Scale	Number of Items	Min.–Maks.	Mean (X̄)	Std. Deviation(SS)
Ambivalent Sexism	22	22 – 132	77.67	19.66
Aggression Attitudes	29	29 – 145	83.73	16.34
Rejection Sensitivity	18	18 – 108	8.66	3.64

The table presents the mean scores and standard deviations of the scales used in the study (N = 200).

Findings Regarding Correlation Analyses

To test the first three hypotheses of the study, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated among the main variables: ambivalent sexism, aggression attitudes, and rejection sensitivity. The correlation results among these variables are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Pearson Correlations of ASI, AQ, and RSQ Variables

Variable 1	Variable 2	Pearson r	p value
Ambivalent Sexism (ASI)	Aggression Attitudes (AQ)	0.482	< 0.01
Ambivalent Sexism (ASI)	Rejection Sensitivity (RSQ)	-0.133	> 0.05
Aggression Attitudes (AQ)	Rejection Sensitivity (RSQ)	0.087	> 0.05

According to the correlation analysis, there was a significant and moderate positive correlation between the ambivalent sexism levels of university students and their aggression attitudes (r = 0.482, p < 0.01). This result supports Hypothesis 1 (H1), which mentioned that students with higher levels of ambivalent sexism also have higher aggression tendencies. No statistically significant relationship was found for ambivalent sexism and rejection sensitivity (r = -0.133, p > 0.05), supporting Hypothesis 2 (H2), reflecting no significant relationship between the two. Similarly, no significant relationship was found between attitudes towards aggression and rejection sensitivity (r = 0.087, p > 0.05), supporting Hypothesis 3 (H3).In short, the findings in correlation suggest that ambivalent sexism and aggression scores differ together but rejection sensitivity does not significantly correlate with these two variables.

Findings Related to Difference Analyses

In the context of the second aim of the study, it was examined if the main variables differed significantly by demographic groups. For this purpose, independent-samples t-tests were conducted for gender and relationship status, and ANOVA tests were conducted for age and income level.

Differences by Gender:

The mean scores of ambivalent sexism, aggression attitudes, and rejection sensitivity were compared for male and female respondents. As shown by the independent-samples t-test, the level of ambivalent sexism was significantly different between genders (t(198) = -6.620, p < 0.05). Male students (M = 85.4) had a significantly higher score on ambivalent sexism compared to female students (M = 70.0). The rejection sensitivity level also significantly varied by gender (t(198) = -2.042, p < 0.05); male participants (M = 9.3) had a significantly higher score than females (M = 8.0). These results support Hypotheses H4 and H6.

By way of contrast, attitudes toward aggression did not differ significantly by gender (t(198) = -1.233, p > 0.05). The mean score on aggression for the male students (M = 85.1) was not statistically different from the mean score of the female students (M = 82.3). This finding is consistent with Hypothesis H5.

Differences by Relationship Status, Age, and Income Level

Comparative analyses were conducted to examine whether ambivalent sexism, attitudes toward aggression, and rejection sensitivity varied across relationship status, age, and income level.

Relationship Status Independent samples t-tests revealed no significant differences between participants who were in a romantic relationship and those who were single in terms of ambivalent sexism (t(198) = 0.469, p > .05), attitudes toward aggression (t(198) = -0.204, p > .05), or rejection sensitivity (t(198) = 0.469, p > .05). These findings indicate that Hypotheses H7 and H8 were not supported, suggesting that relationship status does not appear to influence these psychological variables.

Age One-way ANOVA analyses were conducted to assess whether these variables varied across four age groups (18–19, 20–21, 22–23, and 24–25). Results showed no significant differences in ambivalent sexism scores across age groups, F(3, 196) = 1.995, p > .05, failing to support Hypothesis H9. Likewise, aggression scores did not significantly differ by age, F(3, 196) = 1.233, p > .05, providing no evidence for Hypothesis H10. Post-hoc Tukey tests further confirmed that no significant pairwise differences existed between age groups. **Income Level** Similarly, one-way ANOVA results revealed no significant differences in ambivalent sexism (F(2, 197) = 0.845, p > .05), aggression (F(2, 197) = 0.612, p > .05), or rejection sensitivity (F(2, 197) = 0.327, p > .05) across participants' perceived income levels (low, medium, high). These results did not support Hypothesis H11, and post-hoc analyses confirmed the absence of significant subgroup differences.

Taken together, these findings indicate that relationship status, age, and income level do not play a significant role in shaping ambivalent sexism, aggression, or rejection sensitivity in this sample of university students.

DISCUSSION

In this section, we dive into the study's findings and how they relate to existing literature. Overall, the results reveal a noteworthy connection between university students' tendencies toward ambivalent sexism and their aggressive attitudes, while rejection sensitivity seems to play a minimal role in this dynamic.

To start, the study found a significant positive link between levels of ambivalent sexism and aggressive attitudes. This suggests that those with stronger sexist beliefs might also show more aggressive behaviors. Previous research has shown that discriminatory attitudes toward women can lead to violence and aggressive actions (Abrahams, 2003, as cited in Ünal et al., 2022). Aligning with this research, our study indicates that university students who embrace patriarchal and ambivalent sexist views are likely to exhibit higher levels of aggression. This points to the idea that sexism and aggression may stem from similar socio-cultural influences, such as norms that uphold male dominance. Additionally, it's been observed that high levels of ambivalent sexism can particularly heighten the tendency to justify or rationalize aggressive actions against women (Cross et al., 2019). Therefore, promoting awareness of gender equality in university environments is crucial not just for combating discrimination, but also for curbing potential aggressive behaviors.

The absence of a significant relationship between rejection sensitivity and ambivalent sexism is another finding of the study. Similarly, rejection was not significantly predicted by ambivalent sexism, according to Ahlqvist et al. (2013). This suggests that rather than having a direct impact on a person's sensitivity to rejection, sexist beliefs may be more strongly associated with the quality of interactions with others (such as role expectations in romantic partnerships). An ambivalently sexist male may act in a protective or paternalistic way toward women, for instance, but this may not make him feel less anxious about rejection.

This result could also be explained by the fact that the rejection sensitivity scale and the ambivalent sexism scale measure different constructs that are conceptually unrelated. According to Ayduk et al. (2008), ambivalent sexism does not directly predict rejection sensitivity; rather, any possible correlation would most likely occur through more indirect pathways. That point of view is supported by the current study's findings.

Hovewer, there were no apparent gender differences in aggressive attitudes in our study. In contrast, many research have found that men are more aggressive on average than women (Kırkbir, 2014; Dilekmen et al., 2011). The small sample size of our study or the possibility that female students in academic settings exhibit comparable degrees of aggressive attitudes could be two reasons for this difference. In fact, recent studies have shown that women are more likely to engage in indirect types of aggression, like verbal and cyber aggression (Güvendi, Demir, & Keskin, 2019). Additionally, possible gender differences may have been hidden by the aggression scale utilized in this study, which included several types of aggression into a single overall score.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These results show how important gender is for figuring out how young adults feel about sexism and rejection. Age, wealth, and relationship status were some of the other demographic characteristics that didn't have any significant effects. The link between ambivalent sexism and aggression demonstrates how vital it is to teach about gender equality and operate anti-sexism campaigns in programs that stop violence on campus and help individuals

work out their differences. Fighting against both hostile and benign sexism, especially among male students, could help stop violent conduct and make the institution a better place to be. There isn't an important connection between rejection sensitivity and ambivalent sexism. This suggests that more research has to be done on how sexist beliefs affect mental traits like anxiety and sensitivity. Also, since aggression and rejection sensitivity weren't related, interventions should assist people deal with rejection no matter how aggressive they are. This could mean getting counseling and learning how to handle their feelings.It's clear that it's crucial to reach out to men specifically due to the results were different for men and women. Programs in schools should question traditional gender roles, make it simpler for men to get help, and make emotional health resources more available to men. There are no differences based on age, wealth, or relationship status, which suggests that demographic factors alone cannot explain emotional well-being.In the end, these results support personalized and inclusive approaches to seminars on anger control, coping with rejection, and therapy that is tailored to each person's needs in order to help a wide spectrum of students feel better emotionally. By battling sexist attitudes and promoting emotional strength, teachers, mental health experts, and policymakers can make campuses safer, fairer, and more supportive of mental health.

REFERENCES

Adıgüzel, G. (2012). Examination of university students' aggression levels in terms of empathic tendency, emotional expression, and self-understanding [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Selçuk University.

Ahlqvist, S., London, B., & Rosenthal, L. (2013). Unstable Identity Compatibility: How Gender Rejection Sensitivity Undermines the Success of Women in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Fields. *Psychological Science*, 24(9), 1644-1652. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613476048

Algur, V. (2019). Investigation of the relationship between anxiety and depression levels and physical aggression, anger, hostility, and verbal aggression among university students [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Istanbul Gelişim University.

Alptekin, D. (2014). Inquiry into gender discrimination in ambivalent emotions: A study on university youth's perception of gender. Selçuk University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 32, 203-211.

Arıcak, O. T. (1995). The relationship between aggression, self-esteem, and locus of control among university students [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Marmara University.

Arslan, A., & Bardakçı, S. (2020). Investigation of the effect of digital addiction levels of university students on communication skills. Journal of Youth Research, 8(20), 36-70.

Ay, H. (2017). Investigation of aggressive behaviors of preschool children according to the opinions of mothers and teachers [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Burdur.

Ayan, S. (2014). Sexism: Ambivalent sexism. Cumhuriyet Medical Journal, 36(2), 147-156.

Aydın, E. (2022). Examination of the relationship between TV addiction and aggression among secondary school students [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Üsküdar University, Institute of Health Sciences, Istanbul.

Ayduk, O., Gyurak, A., & Luerssen, A. (2008). Individual differences in the rejection-aggression link in the hot sauce paradigm: The case of rejection sensitivity. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44(3), 775-782. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2007.07.004

Ayduk, Ö., Gyurak, A., & Luerssen, A. (2009). Rejection sensitivity moderates the impact of rejection on self-concept clarity. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35(11), 1467-1478.

Ayhan, H. (2018). Factors predicting attitudes towards sexual harassment: Ambivalent sexism, locus of control and empathy [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Haliç University.

Başegmez, A. C., & Özerk, H. (2021). Evaluation of the approaches of psychotherapy theories to human aggressive and violent behaviors. OPUS International Journal of Society Researches, 18(44), 8475-8499.

Budak, S. (2003). Dictionary of psychology. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Publications.

Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63(3), 452.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2008). Scientific research methods. Pegem Academy.

Camadan, F., & Yazıcı, H. (2017). Examination of aggression tendencies observed in university students in terms of various variables. Journal of Higher Education and Science, (2), 225–234.

Connelly, K., & Heesacker, M. (2012). Why is benevolent sexism appealing? Associations with system justification and life satisfaction. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 36(4), 432-443.

Cüceloğlu, D. (2016). Human and behavior (28th ed.). Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore.

Çelik, H. (2006). Examination of the relationship between aggression reactions, attachment styles and interpersonal schemas among first-year university students [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. Marmara University.

Çelik, H., & Kocabıyık, O. O. (2014). Examination of young adults' forms of expressing aggression in the context of gender and cognitive emotion regulation styles. Trakya University Journal of Faculty of Education, 4(1), 139-155.

Daniş, M. Z., Erkoç, B., Güç Çınar, E., & Usta, Ş. (2020). A study on the perception of ambivalent sexism. Yalova Journal of Social Sciences, 10(20), 138-151.

Dilekmen, M., Ada, G., & Alver, B. (2011). Aggression characteristics of primary school 1st stage students. Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences, 10(2), 927-944.

Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1987). Social-information-processing factors in reactive and proactive aggression in children's peer groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53(6), 1146-1158. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.53.6.1146

Downey, G., & Feldman, S. I. (1996). Implications of rejection sensitivity for intimate relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70(6), 1327.

Downey, G., Feldman, S., & Ayduk, O. (2000). Rejection sensitivity and male violence in romantic relationships. Personal Relationships, 7(1), 45-61. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2000.tb00003.x

Downey, G., Khouri, H., & Feldman, S. (1997). Early interpersonal trauma and later adjustment: The mediating role of rejection sensitivity. In D. Cicchetti & S. L. Toth (Eds.), Developmental perspectives on trauma: Theory, research, and intervention. Rochester Symposium on Developmental Psychology (Vol. 8, pp. 85–114). University of Rochester Press.

Duy, B., & Yıldız, M. A. (2014). Adaptation of the emotion regulation scale for adolescents into Turkish. Turkish Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, 5(41), 23-35.

Ekşi, H. (2021). Investigation of the relationships between parental relations, difficulty in emotion regulation, psychological control, and aggression in high school students [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Maltepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.

Emre, O. (2020). Effect of game addiction on reactive-proactive aggression in adolescents. Annals of Medical Research, 27(1), 85-91.

Erdemir, N. (2019). Investigation of the relationship between internet usage and aggression levels among students in different types of high schools [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Gaziantep University.

Eroğlu, M. (2020). Examination of aggression levels of faculty of education students. Journal of Education and New Approaches, 3(2), 135-143.

Eroğlu, S. E. (2009). Dimensions of aggressive behavior and related factors: A comparative study on high school and university students. Selçuk University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, (21), 205-221.

Erözkan, A. (2007). Investigation of rejection sensitivity and social anxiety levels among university students according to some variables. Selçuk University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, (17), 225-240.

Esentürk, O. K. (2015). Investigation of motivation and aggression levels of high school students participating in inter-school sports competitions [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Gazi University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

Feldman, S., & Downey, G. (1994). Rejection sensitivity as a mediator of the impact of childhood exposure to family violence on adult attachment behavior. Development and Psychopathology, 6, 231-247.

Galliher, R. V., & Bentley, C. G. (2010). Links between rejection sensitivity and adolescent romantic relationship functioning: The mediating role of problem-solving behaviors. Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 19(6), 603-623.

Gao, S., Assink, M., Cipriani, A., & Lin, K. (2017). Associations between rejection sensitivity and mental health outcomes: A meta-analytic review. Clinical Psychology Review, 57, 59-74.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 491-512.

Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ... & Annetje, B. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79(5), 763.

Gonzaga, G. C. (2001). Love and the commitment problem in romantic relations and friendship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81(4), 247-262. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.2.247

Göncü Köse, A., Özen Çığlak, A., & Ulaşan, E. T., & Sümer, N. (2017). Adaptation of the rejection sensitivity scale into Turkish.

Gülden, G., & Karaaziz, M. (2020). Attachment styles, childhood traumas, and psychological flexibility in sexual dysfunction: A review. Journal of Social Science Research, 12(3), 355-360.

Güler, K., & Özgörüş, Z. (2021). Examination of the relationship between aggression and loneliness in adults. OPUS International Journal of Society Researches, 18(43), 6635-6661.

Gülsün, M., & Ak, M. (2009). Marriage and sexuality from a psychiatric perspective. Current Approaches in Psychiatry, 1(1), 68-79.

Güvendi, B., Demir, G. T., & Keskin, B. (2019). Digital game addiction and aggression in secondary school students. OPUS International Journal of Society Researches, 11(18), 1194-1217.

Hasta, D., & Güler, M. E. (2013). Aggression: An examination in terms of interpersonal relationship styles and empathy. Ankara University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 4(1), 64-104.

Horney, K. (2007). The neurotic personality of our time (Selma, K., Trans.). Istanbul: Doruk Publishing.

Jeong, E. J., Kim, D. J., Lee, D. M., & Lee, H. R. (2016). A study of digital game addiction from aggression, loneliness and depression perspectives. Proceedings of the 49th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS), Koloa.

Karabacak, A., & Çetinkaya, S. K. (2015). Examination of the levels of acceptance of violence among university students in terms of various variables. Journal of Educational Theory and Practice Research, 1(1), 13-21.

Karaca, M. (2000). Exposure to aggressive behaviors in organizations and its relation to victims' personalities [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Erciyes University.

Karakaş, A. (2018). The effect of patience attitude on continuous anger expression styles and anger control. Turkish Journal of Theology Research, 2(1), 93-111.

Kepir-Savoly, D. D., Özlem, U., & Demirtaş-Zorbaz, S. (2014). Factors affecting university students' levels of acceptance of violence between couples. Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal, 5(42).

Kesebir, P. (2016). Psychology. T.C. Anadolu University Publication No: 2683. Retrieved from https://ets.anadolu.edu.tr/storage/nfs/PSI103U/ebook/PSI103U-12V1S1-8-0-1-SV1-ebook.pdf

Kılınç, E., & Murat, M. (2012). Examination of aggression levels of general high school 9th grade students in terms of some variables and continuous anxiety levels. Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences, 11(3), 835-853.

Kırkbir, F. (2014). Investigation of aggression levels of students studying at Karadeniz Technical University and competing in inter-university competitions [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Dumlupınar University, Institute of Social Sciences, Kütahya.

Kızıltaş, A. (2016). Examination of aggression levels of university students in terms of feelings of inadequacy [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Anadolu University.

Kızıltaş, A. (2016). Examination of aggression levels of university students in terms of feelings of inadequacy [Poster presentation]. 4th World Psychology and Sociology Conference, Rome.

Koç, B. (2014). The relationship between interpersonal relationship styles and aggression. International Journal of Turkish Literature, Culture and Education (TEKE), 3(4), 160-182.

Koç, B., & Büyükgöze Kavas, A. (2015). Examination of the relationships between university students' aggression, interpersonal problem-solving skills, interpersonal relationship styles, and communication skills. International Journal of Turkish Literature, Culture and Education, 4(2), 783-799.

Korkut, F. (2002). On the adaptation of the Expressive Aggression Scale (ISO) to Turkish.

Kutlu, H. (2014). Investigation of the effect of parental attitudes on aggression tendencies of 5-year-old children attending preschool institutions within the framework of psychoanalytic theory [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Maltepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.

Leary, M. R., Kowalski, R. M., Smith, L., & Phillips, S. (2003). Teasing, rejection, and violence: Case studies of the school shootings. Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression, 29(3), 202-214.

Levy, S. R., Ayduk, O., & Downey, G. (2001). The role of rejection sensitivity in people's relationships with significant others and valued social groups. In M. L. Leary (Ed.), Interpersonal rejection (pp. 251-289). Oxford University Press.

Madran, H. A. D. (2012). The validity and reliability study of the Turkish form of the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire. Turkish Journal of Psychology, 24(2), 1-6.

Marston, E. G., Hare, A., & Allen, J. P. (2010). Rejection sensitivity in late adolescence: Social and emotional sequelae. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 20(4), 959-982.

Mishra, M., & Allen, M. S. (2023). Rejection sensitivity and romantic relationships: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Personality and Individual Differences, 208, 112186.

Obuz, F. (2015). Investigation of the relationship between religious attributions regarding obstacles and aggression levels in hearing-impaired adolescents [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Hitit University.

Öz, M., & Kısa, C. (2023). Sexuality and emotions: A review. Habitus Social Science Journal, 4(4), 211-228.

Özdemir, H. (2019). Perception of masculinity and femininity from a gender perspective: A field study. Asya Studies, 4(10), 90-107.

Özdoğan, A. Ç., Haspolat, N. K., Çelik, O., & Yalçın, R. Ü. (2021). Reactive-proactive aggression and cognitive flexibility in adolescents: The mediating role of anger. Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International, 11(2), 826-851.

Özen, A., Sümer, N., & Demir, M. (2011). Predicting friendship quality with rejection sensitivity and attachment security. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 28(2), 163-181.

Özmen, S. K. (2004). Reflections of anger and aggression within the family. Ankara University Journal of Educational Sciences, 37(2), 27-39.

Sağlık, G. N. (2021). Psychoanalytic theory and social work. FLSF Philosophy and Social Sciences Journal, (31), 435-455.

Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2002). Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Validity and reliability study. Turkish Journal of Psychology, 17(49), 47-58.

Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2003). Examination of the relationship between aggression reactions, attachment styles, and interpersonal schemas among first-year university students. Turkish Psychological Articles.

Serinyeş, E. (2021). Examination of the relationship between attitudes towards violence against women, ambivalent sexism, and narcissism levels in adult men [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Üsküdar University.

Set, Z., & Ergin, Ö. (2020). Examination of the mediating effect of sexism and defense mechanisms in the relationship between homophobia and aggression. Archives of Neuropsychiatry, 57(2), 113-119.

Şakrak, K. (2023). The relationship of emotional violence with interpersonal emotion regulation and rejection sensitivity [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Haliç University.

Şimşek, D. E. (2017). Examination of the relationship between childhood traumas and aggression levels in adult individuals [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Üsküdar University.

Tayınmak, İ. (2020). Prejudiced attitudes and aggression. International Journal of Social Sciences Academic Research, 4(1), 71-87.

Tok, Y. (2001). Aggression levels of university students with different gender stereotypes [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Hacettepe University.

Tok, Y. (2001). Aggression levels of university students with different gender stereotypes [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Hacettepe University.

Turan, E. B. (2018). Examination of the relationship between athlete identity and ambivalent sexism in male athletes [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. Akdeniz University, Institute of Health Sciences, Antalya.

Tuzgöl, M. (2000). Examination of aggression levels of high school students with different parental attitudes in terms of various variables. Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, (2), 39-48.

Tülüce, H. (2017). Human and aggression: Psychological aspects of energetic conflicts (1st ed.). Barış Publishing.

Uçar, T., Derya, Y. A., Karaaslan, T., & Tunç, Ö. A. (2017). University students' attitudes towards gender roles and violent behaviors.

Uğurlu, N. (2002). Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Validity and reliability study. Turkish Journal of Psychology, 17(49), 47-58.

Uysal Çelik, Z. (2018). The relationship between university students' levels of social interest in romantic relationships and ambivalent sexism [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Ondokuz Mayıs University, Institute of Social Sciences, Samsun.

Uysal Çelik, Z., & Demir, M. (2021). Ambivalent sexism and social interest in romantic relationships. International Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences, 5(1), 103-115.

Ünal, Ö., Vargün, G. E., & Akgün, S. (2022). Perceived parental violence, sexism, and attitudes towards dating violence against women. Current Approaches in Psychiatry, (1), 308-317.

Üzümçeker, E., & Akfırat, S. (2018). The relationship of attributions regarding femicides with gender group identification, ambivalent sexism, and political ideologies. Psychology Studies, 38(1), 1-32.

Verbrugge, L. M. (1985). Gender and health: An update on hypotheses and evidence. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 156-182.

Volz, A. R., & Kerig, P. K. (2010). Relational dynamics associated with adolescent dating violence: The roles of rejection sensitivity and relational insecurity. Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 19, 587-602.

Watson, J., & Nesdale, D. (2012). Rejection sensitivity, social withdrawal, and loneliness in young adults. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42(8), 1984-2005.

World Health Organization. (1998). Gender and health. Technical Paper. Switzerland.

Yağmurcu, Y. (2015). Examination of self-objectification from the perspectives of objectification theory, system justification theory, and ambivalent sexism [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Uludağ University, Institute of Social Sciences, Bursa.

Yavuzer, Y., & Üre, Ö. (2010). The effect of a psycho-education program to prevent aggression on decreasing aggression in high school students. Selçuk University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, (24), 389-405.

Yeter, S. C. (2022). The relationship between cyber dating abuse, ambivalent sexism, and attitudes towards violence in close relationships [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Ondokuz Mayıs University.

Yildirim, A. (2015). Examination of hockey players' communication skills and aggression levels [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Gaziantep University.

Yeşiltepe, M. Ö. (2021). Examination of the relationship between ambivalent sexism and aggression: The mediating role of defense mechanisms [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Istanbul Gedik University, Graduate School of Education, Istanbul.