



Semptom Health Researches

home page : www.semptom.org

AN EXAMINATION OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD OLDER ADULTS ACCORDING TO CERTAIN VARIABLES

ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN YAŞLI AYRIMCILIĞINA İLİŞKİN TUTUMLARININ BAZI DEĞİŞKENLER AÇISINDAN İNCELENMESİ

Sonnur İlayda TOPKAYA, Sosyal Hizmet Uzmanı, Muğla, topkayailayda2@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-6360-8382>

Doç.Dr. Aykut Can DEMİREL, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Muğla Meslek Yüksekokulu, Sosyal Hizmetler ve Danışmanlık Bölümü, aykutcandemirel@mu.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6388-7313>

SUMMARY

The main objective of this study was to examine some factors influencing university The main objective of this study was to examine some factors influencing university students' attitudes towards ageism. Within the framework of this main objective, the students' socio-demographic characteristics, whether they took a course on aging, and the effects of positive and negative discrimination they engage in towards older adults were investigated. A quantitative research method was used in the study. The research data were collected from students studying at Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University Seydikemer School of Applied Sciences and Fethiye Faculty of Health Sciences during the 2024-2025 academic year. A total of 306 students participated in the study. SPSS and Jamovi software packages were used for data analysis. The mean total score of the students on the Ageism Attitude Scale was found to be 81.74 ± 9.20 , and this result indicates that the students generally held positive attitudes toward older adults. As a result of the analyses, it was determined that female students had significantly more positive attitudes toward older adults than male students in terms of the total scale score, as well as the sub-dimensions of limiting the life of older adults (ResLife) and negative discrimination toward older adults (NegDis). However, no significant gender difference was found in the positive discrimination toward older adults (PosDis) sub-dimension. Similarly, it was found that the total ageism attitude score, as well as the subdimension scores for limiting the life of older adults and positive discrimination towards older adults, were higher among students who took courses on aging and those who planned to live with their parents in the future. In contrast, it was determined that students' income status, family type, and class level did not have a significant effect on their attitudes towards ageism.

Keywords: Attitudes toward older adults, University students, Aging, Ageism

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, üniversite öğrencilerinin yaş ayrımcılığına yönelik tutumlarını etkileyen bazı faktörleri incelemektir. Bu temel amaç çerçevesinde, öğrencilerin sosyo-demografik özellikleri, yaşlanma üzerine ders alıp almadıkları ve yaşlılara yönelik olumlu ve olumsuz ayrımcılıklarının etkileri araştırılmıştır. Çalışmada nicel araştırma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Araştırma verileri, 2024-2025 akademik yılında Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Seydikemer Uygulamalı Bilimler Yüksekokulu ve Fethiye Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi'nde öğrenim gören öğrencilerden toplanmıştır. Çalışmaya toplam 306 öğrenci katılmıştır. Veri analizi için SPSS ve Jamovi yazılım paketleri kullanılmıştır. Öğrencilerin Yaş Ayrımcılığı Tutum Ölçeği'ndeki ortalama toplam puanı $81,74 \pm 9,20$ olarak bulunmuş ve bu sonuç, öğrencilerin genel olarak yaşlılara karşı olumlu tutum sergilediklerini göstermektedir. Analizler sonucunda, genel ölçek puanı ve yaşlıların yaşamını sınırlama (ResLife) ile yaşlılara yönelik olumsuz ayrımcılık (NegDis) alt boyutları açısından, kadın öğrencilerin erkek öğrencilere göre yaşlılara karşı anlamlı derecede daha olumlu tutumlara sahip olduğu belirlenmiştir. Bununla birlikte, yaşlılara yönelik olumlu ayrımcılık (PosDis) alt boyutunda anlamlı bir cinsiyet farkı bulunmamıştır. Benzer şekilde, yaşlanma üzerine ders alan ve gelecekte ebeveynleriyle birlikte yaşamayı planlayan öğrenciler arasında, yaş ayrımcılığına yönelik toplam tutum puanının yanı sıra, yaşlıların yaşamını sınırlama ve yaşlılara yönelik olumlu ayrımcılık alt boyut puanlarının daha yüksek olduğu bulunmuştur. Buna karşılık, öğrencilerin gelir durumu, aile tipi ve sınıf düzeyinin yaş ayrımcılığına yönelik tutumları üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi olmadığı belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yaşlı yetişkinlere yönelik tutumlar, Üniversite öğrencileri, Yaşlanma, Yaş ayrımcılığı

1. INTRODUCTION

Increased global prosperity, longer life expectancy, declining birth rates, and expanded access to healthcare have led to a significant aging of the global population. This has transformed aging from a purely biological or individual process into a significant social issue requiring consideration of its social, economic, and cultural dimensions (Işık and Türk, 2023; Koçak et al., 2021; Kurtkapan, 2019). Although aging is not a new phenomenon in human history, the numerical and proportional increase in the older population within the general population has never been so pronounced. Indeed, the World Health Organizations (2025) prediction that by 2030, one in six people in the world will be 60 years and older, and that by 2050, the number of individuals in this age group will double to 2.1 billion, supports this demographic transformation.

Aging is a universal and unavoidable process that affects all living organisms, resulting in the deterioration or loss of bodily structures (Batman & Demirel, 2023). However, old age is not merely the final stage of the biological aging process but a multifaceted social reality with social, cultural, economic, and political dimensions (World Health Organization, 2021). Throughout history, people who reached old age were considered “wise” and “valuable,” but with the Industrial Revolution and the modernization process, the perspective on aging and old age changed significantly; older adults began to be seen as a “burden” on society (Sütçü & Demirel, 2020). This paradigm shift has resulted in older adults facing numerous problems in their social lives. Sütçü and Demirel (2020) classified these problems as care, housing, loneliness, economic difficulties, neglect, abuse, and discrimination.

The increase in the older population has caused structural problems in many areas, such as health, economy, social structure, and social life. The increase in these problems specific to old age has paved the way for the emergence of the concept of “ageism” in the literature (Tekin Kaya & Örsal, 2018). Considered the third most common type of discrimination after racial and gender discrimination, the concept of ageism was first used by gerontologist Robert Butler in 1969 and defined as an ideology that can turn into negative actions against older adults (Batman & Demirel, 2023). In general, discrimination is a situation in which individuals are treated differently and unfairly because of their race, age, gender, religious beliefs, etc., and their free participation in daily life activities is prevented (Özütürker, 2021; Pekesen et al., 2021). The most common use of the concept in the field of aging is, as Palmore (1999) states, that it is a term encompassing prejudices, attitudes, and behaviors directed towards older individuals (Özdemir & Bilgili, 2014).

Ageism manifests in various forms, including unfair treatment, exclusionary practices, and stereotype-based policies. Societal stereotypes, fear of death, the medias emphasis on youth and physical attractiveness, the modern structure focused on economic production, and cultural codes form the basis of ageism (Altun & Demirel, 2020; Batman & Demirel, 2023; Demirel & Sütçü, 2021; Özütürker, 2021). This situation has devastating effects on older adults in terms of psychological, economic, and familial issues and access to healthcare services (Batman & Demirel, 2023). This social problem, which targets individuals solely because of their age, damages intergenerational relations, social solidarity, and social integration. The proliferation of supposedly humorous and demeaning posts targeting older adults on digital platforms, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, has demonstrated how visible this discrimination can be in daily life and in the cyber realm (Demirel & Sütçü, 2021).

Although ageism affects all segments of society, university students, who will constitute the future adult population, professionals, and decision-makers, represent a critical group in this regard. The perceptions and attitudes of students, particularly those studying health, social services, and human relations-based professions, towards aging have the potential to directly influence the quality of services they will provide in the coming years and their professional approaches towards older individuals. Therefore, determining university students’ attitudes towards ageism is of great importance for building an age-friendly society and developing educational policies aimed at preventing discrimination.

A review of the literature reveals numerous studies examining university students’ attitudes towards ageism in terms of sociodemographic variables. A significant portion of

these studies show that female students, compared to male students (Balcı & Ünal, 2026; Boz et al., 2017; Cinar et al., 2018; Daş Geçim and Akyol Güner, 2023; Gençtürk, 2023; Güven et al., 2012), and those in higher grades, compared to those in lower grades (Güven et al., 2012; Işık & Türk, 2023; Pekesen et al., 2021), have more positive and less discriminatory attitudes towards older individuals. However, there are also conflicting findings reporting that gender and class level did not create a significant difference in attitudes (Ceylan & Sevgili, 2023; Yılmaz et al., 2012), and similarly, that marital status (Kaçan et al., 2018) and income level (Balcı & Ünal, 2026) have inconsistent effects. In contrast to these partial differences in sociodemographic characteristics, there is a broad consensus in the literature that students who receive specific training in areas such as aging, gerontology, or care of older adults the curriculum exhibit significantly more positive attitudes than their peers who do not receive such training (Boz et al., 2017; Daş Geçim & Akyol Güner, 2023; Güdük et al., 2023). Another strong determinant supporting this theoretical framework is intergenerational contact. It has been observed that experiences and tendencies such as having an older adult in the family, sharing the same living space with older adults, frequent interaction (Çilingir et al., 2017; Gençtürk, 2023; Güdük et al., 2023), desiring to live with older parents in the future (Apak, 2025), or aiming to work in the field of welfare of older adults after graduation (Sönmez Sarı & Yıldırım Gürkan, 2022) minimize ageist attitudes. Although university students in Türkiye generally have an acceptably positive orientation towards older adults (Bahçecioğlu Turan et al., 2021; Koçak et al., 2021), the effect of different variables on these attitudes is not fully clear.

In this context, this study aimed to examine the factors influencing university students' attitudes towards ageism. Within the scope of this main aim, the following sub-objectives are formulated:

- 1) Do students' attitudes towards ageism differ according to their socio-demographic characteristics (gender, family type, income level, etc.)?
- 2) Do participants' attitudes towards ageism differ according to whether they have taken courses on aging?
- 3) Do participants' attitudes towards ageism differ according to their desire to live with their parents in their later years?

2. METHOD

2.1. Research Model

This study, which aimed to examine factors influencing university students' attitudes towards ageism, was conducted using a correlational research model from quantitative research designs. Correlational research is a type of research conducted to determine the relationships between

two or more variables (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017).

2.2. Sample Group

The study population consisted of students enrolled at Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University Seydikemer School of Applied Sciences and Fethiye Faculty of Health Sciences during the spring semester of 2024-2025. The study sample aimed to include 300 students, both those taking and not taking the geriatrics course, studying at Seydikemer School of Applied Sciences and Fethiye Faculty of Health Sciences, and 306 people were reached.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

The survey planned for this research was prepared in two parts. In the first part, the Personal Information Form, which included questions about the sociodemographic (age, gender, department, family type) characteristics of the participant, was administered. In the second part, the Ageism Attitude Scale (AAS) developed by Vefikuluçay was used to measure ageism attitudes. The AAS is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 23 items, developed by Vefikuluçay (2008) to evaluate individuals' attitudes towards older adults. The items on the scale are rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), with the response options Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Agree, and Strongly Agree. The scale includes both positive and negative expressions. While positive expressions were scored from 1 to 5, negative expressions were scored in reverse. The lowest and highest scores that can be obtained from the scale are 23 and 115, respectively. While the increase in the total scale score indicates more positive attitudes towards older individuals and a lower tendency towards ageism, a decrease in the scores indicates more negative attitudes towards older individuals and a higher tendency towards ageism (Vefikuluçay, 2008).

The scale consists of three sub-dimensions: "Restricting the Life of Older Adults (ResLife)", "Positive Discrimination Toward Older Adults (PosDis)" and "Negative Discrimination Toward Older Adults (NegDis)". Restricting the Life of Older Adults subscale consists of nine items, and the scores that can be obtained from this dimension vary between 9 and 45. Higher scores in this dimension indicate a decrease in negative views of limiting the social life and daily activities of older adults. Positive Discrimination Toward Older Adults consists of eight items, and the scores that can be obtained from this dimension vary between 8 and 40. High scores in this dimension indicate that protective, supportive, and positive approaches towards older adults are more frequently adopted. Negative Discrimination Toward Older Adults dimension consists of six items, and the scores that can be obtained from this dimension vary between 6 and 30.

Higher scores on this subscale indicate that prejudiced and discriminatory attitudes towards older adults are at a lower level (Vefikuluçay, 2008). While Cronbachs alpha was calculated as .80 in the original study of the scale (Vefikuluçay, 2008), it was found to be .74 in this study.

2.4. Data Collection and Analysis

Before starting the collection of research data, ethical approval was obtained from the Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee (25.06.2024/90). Subsequently, administrative permission was obtained from the administrations of Seydikemer Applied Sciences College and the Fethiye Faculty of Health Sciences to administer the survey. After obtaining the necessary permissions, announcements were made to students in the relevant faculties regarding participation in the research. The survey was conducted among students who volunteered to participate in this study. The completion time for each survey was approximately 10-15 minutes. A total of 306 university students participated in this study. The sociodemographic characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 1. Of the participants, 232 (75.8%) were female and 74 (24.2%) were male. The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 30 years, with an average age of 20.75 years.

Of the participants, 292 (95.4 %) were single and 14 (4.6 %) were married. Of the participants, 153 (50.0%) considered their income sufficient, 127 (41.5%) considered it partially sufficient, and 26 (8.5%) considered it insufficient. When the distribution according to family type was examined, it was found that 251 (82.0%) had a nuclear family and 55 (18.0%) had an extended one. Regarding their desire to live with their parents in the future, 224 (73.2%) wanted to live with their parents, while 82 (26.8%) did not. When the departments in which the participants were studying were examined, it was found that 112 (36.6%) were studying Social Work, 72 (23.5%) nursing, 69 (22.5%) Nutrition and Dietetics, 20 (6.5%) gerontology, 18 (5.9%) Accounting and Financial Management, and 15 (4.9%) Customs Administration. When the distribution according to class level was examined, 93 (30.4%) were first-year students, 101 (33.0%) were second-year students, 73 (23.9%) were third-year students, and 39 (12.7%) were fourth-year students. Regarding whether participants had taken courses on aging, 137 (44.8%) had taken courses on aging, while 169 (55.2%) had not. Participants who had received education on aging had taken courses in Gerontology, Geriatrics, Sociology of Aging, and Care of Older Adults.

SPSS 25 and Jamovi 2.7 software packages were used for data analysis. Descriptive and explanatory statistics were used. Before proceeding with the analyses, the skewness and kurtosis values of the data were examined. As shown in Table 2, because the values of the data were within the range

of 2 (George & Mallery, 2010), parametric tests were used in the analyses. In this study, the mean total score of the participants on the Ageism Attitude Scale (AAS) was 81.74 ± 9.20 .

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed using Jamovi 2.7. Various fit indices were examined to assess the model fit (Table 3). Table 3 shows that the model's χ^2/sd (2.34), CFI (0.925), TLI (0.916), RMSEA (0.065), and SRMR (0.066) values are within the acceptable fit criteria suggested in the literature. These findings confirm the three-factor structure of the Age Attitude Scale (AAS) in the research sample and demonstrate an acceptable level of fit with the data collected.

2.5. Use of Artificial Intelligence

During the preparation of this manuscript, AI-assisted tools were used solely for English language editing.

3. FINDINGS

In this section, the participants' attitudes towards ageism were examined in terms of gender, income level, family type, field of study, class level, taking courses on aging, future desire to live with their parents, and other sociodemographic characteristics. An independent samples t-test was applied to determine whether the total AAS score and sub-dimension scores of the participants differed according to gender. According to the analysis results, a significant difference was found between gender and the total AAS score ($t(102.58) = 3.66, p < .001$), the ResLife sub-dimension ($t(101.65) = 4.73, p < .001$), and the NegDis sub-dimension ($t(304) = 2.22, p = .027$) (Table 4). Female participants had higher total AAS scores and higher ResLife and NegDis sub-dimension scores than male participants. In contrast, no significant difference was found between the PosDis sub-dimension and gender ($t(108.34) = 1.31, p = .194$).

An ANOVA was conducted to determine whether the AAS and sub-dimension scores differed according to the participants' income level. According to the analysis results, no statistically significant difference was found between income level and the total AAS score ($F(2,303) = 1.61, p = .201$), ResLife ($F(2,303) = 2.23, p = .110$), PosDis ($F(2,303) = 1.28, p = .279$), and NegDis ($F(2,303) = 0.00, p = .998$) sub-dimension scores (Table 4).

An independent samples t-test was applied to determine whether the total AAS score and its sub-dimensions differed according to participants' desire to live with their parents in the future. According to the analysis results, a statistically significant difference was found between the desire to live with their parents in the future and the total AAS score ($t(304) = 4.12, p < .001$), ResLife sub-dimension ($t(304) = 3.60, p < .001$), and PosDis sub-dimension ($t(304) = 3.86, p < .001$)

(Table 4). It was determined that the total AAS score and the ResLife and PosDis sub-dimension scores of the participants who wanted to live with their parents in the future were higher than those of the participants who did not want to live with them. In contrast, no significant difference was found between the NegDis sub-dimension and the desire to live with their parents in the future ($t(304) = 1.07, p = .284$).

An independent samples t-test was applied to determine whether the total AAS score and its subdimensions differed according to the participants' status of taking courses on aging. According to the analysis results, a statistically significant difference was found between the status of taking courses on aging and the total AAS score ($t(304) = 2.92, p = .004$), and the ResLife ($t(304) = 2.32, p = .021$) and PosDis ($t(304) = 2.55, p = .011$) sub-dimensions (Table 4). The total AAS score and the ResLife and PosDis sub-dimension scores of the participants who took courses on aging were higher than those who did not take courses. In contrast, no significant difference was found between the NegDis sub-dimension and the status of taking courses on aging ($t(304) = 1.36, p = .176$).

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether the total AAS score and its sub-dimensions differed according to the participants' class level. According to the analysis results, no statistically significant difference was found between class level and AAS total score ($F(3,302) = 0.26, p = .852$), ResLife sub-dimension ($F(3,302) = 0.63, p = .594$), PosDis sub-dimension ($F(3,302) = 0.63, p = .597$), and NegDis sub-dimension ($F(3,302) = 0.90, p = .442$) (Table 4).

4. DISCUSSION

This study, which aimed to examine factors influencing university students' attitudes towards ageism, showed that attitudes towards older individuals are influenced not only by sociodemographic characteristics but also by perspectives on receiving education about aging, family values, and intergenerational relationships. The findings obtained within the scope of this research are discussed below considering the literature.

The study found that female students had significantly higher overall ageism attitude scores and higher scores on the sub-dimensions of limiting the life of older adults (ResLife) and negative discrimination towards older adults (NegDis) compared to male students. However, no significant difference was observed between genders in the positive discrimination towards older adults (PosDis) sub-dimension. This finding indicates that female students hold more supportive attitudes towards older individuals, particularly in terms of avoiding restrictive behaviors and rejecting prejudiced approaches, while their tendency toward protective or overly favorable discrimination does

not differ from male students. A review of the literature reveals that many studies conducted with university students support this finding in favor of female students (Balci & Ünal, 2026; Boz et al., 2017; Can et al., 2020; Cinar et al., 2018; Daş Geçim & Akyol Güner, 2023; Gençtürk, 2023; Güven et al., 2012; Seven & Dülger, 2020). Indeed, a similar trend was demonstrated in a systematic review by Güdük et al. (2023), which covered samples from Türkiye. Conversely, a limited number of studies have reported that gender does not play a decisive role in ageism (Ceylan & Sevgili, 2023; Yılmaz et al., 2012). This discrepancy between studies may be attributed to the socio-cultural characteristics of the sample groups and their frequency of contact with older adults. In this context, the more positive attitude exhibited by female students is related to: The association of caregiving responsibilities with women due to gender roles, cultural norms, and the higher empathetic tendencies of women may have been influential factors. The lack of a significant difference in the positive discrimination sub-dimension suggests that while female students may be more sensitive to negative stereotypes and restrictions, they do not necessarily exhibit more protective or paternalistic attitudes toward older adults compared to their male counterparts.

No statistically significant difference was found between students' perceived income levels, family structures, and ageism scores. This result indicates that attitudes towards older individuals can be shaped independently of economic conditions and the family model in which they grew up. This finding largely aligns with the literature showing that income (Can et al., 2020; Ceylan & Sevgili, 2023; Çilingir et al., 2017) and family structure (Balci & Ünal, 2026) are not determining variables of ageism. The systematic review by Güdük et al. (2023) and the World Health Organizations (2021) global report also emphasize the inconsistent relationship between socioeconomic status and attitudes towards aging, highlighting that the quality of intergenerational communication within the family is more important than family type. Accordingly, it can be said that perceptions of old age are influenced more by an individuals level of knowledge about old age and their socio-cultural values than by macroeconomic or structural factors.

Students who planned to live with their parents in the coming years had significantly higher overall ageism attitude scores, as well as higher scores on the sub-dimensions of limiting the life of older adults and positive discrimination towards older adults, compared to those who did not want to live with them. However, there was no difference in the negative discrimination dimension. This finding indicates that students aiming to live with their parents in the future see old age as a natural and acceptable part of family life and develop more positive attitudes

toward it. This result is consistent with the findings of Apak (2025), Çilingir et al. (2017), and Gençtürk (2023), suggesting that living in the same house as older adults and having frequent interactions with them reduces discrimination. Similarly, students aiming to work in the field of welfare of older adults after graduation also demonstrated more positive attitudes towards older adults (Sönmez Sarı & Yıldırım Gürkan, 2022). As emphasized by the World Health Organization (2021) and Güdük et al. (2023), intergenerational interaction and regular contact are among the most fundamental protective elements against ageism.

The study found that students who took courses on aging had higher scores than those who did not, highlighting the critical role of gerontological education in building positive attitudes toward older adults. Literature in the health and social services fields also confirms that students who receive education on aging exhibit more sensitive and empathetic approaches (Can et al., 2020; Daş Geçim & Akyol Güner, 2023). The World Health Organization (2021) defines gerontological education as the most effective intervention for preventing ageism. However, the study found that attitudes did not differ significantly according to class level. Although this result aligns with certain previous studies (Yılmaz et al., 2012; Ceylan & Sevgili, 2023), it contrasts with research reporting that attitudes toward older adults improve significantly with advancing academic year (Güven et al., 2012; Işık & Türk, 2023; Pekesen et al., 2021). This suggests that not only the time spent at university but also the content of the education received during this period and the quality of interaction established with older individuals (clinical practice, field work, etc.) are the main determining factors in attitude transformation. Therefore, the widespread inclusion of courses on aging and intergenerational projects in higher education curricula should be considered strategically necessary.

4.1. Limitations and Recommendations

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged when interpreting the findings. First, the research was conducted with a sample of students from only two academic units (Seydikemer School of Applied Sciences and Fethiye Faculty of Health Sciences) at a single university (Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University). This limits the generalizability of the results to other university students in Türkiye or in different socio-cultural contexts. Second, the cross-sectional design of the study prevents establishing causal relationships between the examined variables and attitudes toward ageism. Third, the data were collected through self-report questionnaires, which may be subject to social desirability bias, particularly on sensitive topics such as discrimination. Fourth, although the study examined

several sociodemographic and educational variables, other potentially influential factors—such as frequency and quality of contact with older adults, personal experiences, cultural values, and personality traits—were not measured.

Despite these limitations, the findings provide valuable insights into the factors influencing university students' attitudes toward ageism. For future research, it is recommended to conduct multi-center studies with larger and more diverse samples from different regions and types of universities. Longitudinal studies are also needed to examine how attitudes toward ageism change over time and in response to educational interventions. Additionally, qualitative studies could provide a deeper understanding of the underlying reasons for the observed gender differences and the impact of intergenerational contact. Finally, future research should also investigate the effectiveness of specific educational content and experiential learning opportunities (e.g., clinical practice, field work, intergenerational projects) in reducing ageist attitudes among university students.

5. CONCLUSION

This study revealed that university students' attitudes towards ageism differ in terms of sociodemographic characteristics and some variables related to aging. The mean total score on the Ageism Attitude Scale was 81.74 ± 9.20 , indicating that university students generally have positive attitudes towards older adults. According to the research findings, gender, the desire to live with parents in later years, and taking courses on aging significantly affected students' attitudes towards ageism, while income level, family type, and class level did not have a significant effect. The findings show that attitudes towards older adults are influenced not only by individual characteristics but also by knowledge gained about aging, interactions with older adults, and family values. In this respect, the research results reveal that focusing only on sociodemographic characteristics is insufficient to reduce ageism.

It is believed that the research findings will contribute to the development of training programs, especially those related to social services, health, and care of older adults. The increasing older population, both globally and specifically in Türkiye, makes it almost imperative to include more topics related to aging and gerontology in the university curricula. Increasing hands-on training, where students can directly interact with older adults, and expanding social responsibility projects that support intergenerational solidarity can contribute to developing positive attitudes towards ageism. Furthermore, examining the psychosocial variables influencing ageism through studies in different professions and disciplines can enrich the literature on the subject and contribute to developing more comprehensive policies and practices to combat ageism.

6. REFERENCES

- Altun, A., & Demirel, B. (2020). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığıyla ilgili tutumları: Keskin MYO örneği. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 9(1), 423–434. <https://doi.org/10.33206/mjss.679054>
- Apak, E. (2025). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumlarının incelenmesi. *Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 30, 558–567. <https://doi.org/10.29029/busbed.1689645>
- Bahçecioğlu Turan, G., Özer, Z., Usta, Ş., & Ahmed, A. A. (2021). Üniversite öğrencilerinin empatik eğilimlerinin ve yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumlarının incelenmesi. *Kocaeli Medical Journal*, 10(3), 359–366.
- Balci, S., & Ünal, V. (2026). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığı tutumlarının incelenmesi: Bayburt örneği. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, 105, 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.17753/sosekev.1780511>
- Batman, H., & Demirel, A. C. (2023). Yaşlı ayrımcılığı ve yaşlı birey üzerindeki etkileri. İçinde M. Avcı & Z. Tekin Babuç (Ed.), *Yaşlılara yönelik yaş ayrımcılığı: Çok boyutlu bir bakış* (ss. 21–40). Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Boz, H., Gökçe, N., Özcan, A., vd. (2017). Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi ve İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumları. *Sağlık Akademisi Kastamonu*.
- Boz, H., Gökçe, N., Özüstün Kırıl, A., Mutlu, E., Selvi, N., Ünlü, D., & Yılmaz, G. (2017). Comparison of attitudes of faculty of health sciences and faculty of economics and administrative sciences' students towards elder discrimination. *Health Academy Kastamonu*, 2(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.25279/sak.303050>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2017). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (23rd ed.). Pegem Akademi.
- Can, R., Tanbağ, H., Duman, F., & Hüzmeli, E. D. (2020). Öğrencilerin yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumları: Bir üniversite örneği. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*. <https://doi.org/10.30569/adiyamansaglik.669761>
- Ceylan, H., & Sevgili, A. (2023). Sosyal hizmet öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığı tutumlarının belirlenmesi: Şırnak Üniversitesi örneği. *Turkish Studies - Economics, Finance, Politics*, 18(1), 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.63620>
- Çilingir, D., Bulut, E., & Hintistan, S. (2017). Hemşirelik bölümü öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumları. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi*, 10(3), 137–143.
- Cinar, D., Karadakovan, A., & Sivrikaya, S. K. (2018). Investigation of the attitudes of university students to discrimination of the elderly. *Northern clinics of Istanbul*, 5(1), 25–30. <https://doi.org/10.14744/nci.2017.10437>
- Daş Geçim, G. Y., & Akyol Güner, T. (2023). Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumları ile yaşlıya bakım verme istekliliği arasındaki ilişki. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 13(2), 180–187. <https://doi.org/10.5961/higheredusci.1241052>
- Demirel, A. C., & Sütçü, S. (2021). Covid-19 salgınında Türkiye’de yaşlılara yönelik uygulamalar ve hizmetlerin değerlendirilmesi. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 17(Pandemi Özel Sayısı), 3641–3675. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.858337>
- Gençtürk, Z. (2023). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumlarının belirlenmesi. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(1), 55–78.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*, 17.0 update (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Güdük, O., Shirvan, S. J., & Ozaydin, O. (2023). University students' attitudes towards age discrimination and affecting factors in Turkey: A systematic review. *Akademik Araştırmalar ve Çalışmalar Dergisi*, 6(Özel Sayı), 394–435. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10004569>
- Güven, Ş., Ucakan Muz, G., & Efe Ertürk, N. (2012). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumları ve bu tutumların bazı değişkenlerle ilişkisi. *Anadolu Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15(2), 99–105.
- Işık, A., & Türk, A. (2023). Sosyal hizmet öğrencilerinde sosyodemografik değişkenler ve empatinin yaşlı ayrımcılığına etkisi. *Sosyal Çalışma Dergisi*, 7(2), 128–141.
- Kaçan, H., Dibekli, E., & Akkan, K. (2018). Toplumda yaşayan bireylerin yaşlı ayrımcılığı tutum düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Yaşlı Sorunları Araştırma Dergisi*, 11(2), 8–15.
- Koçak, O., Aydın, S., Tomaç, N., & Younis, M. Z. (2021). College students' attitudes toward the elderly: An exploratory study in Turkey. *Ageing International*, 46(4), 383–394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12126-020-09393-8>
- Kurtkapan, H. (2019). Gençlerin yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumları: Nevşehir örneği. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi*.
- Özdemir, Ö., & Bilgili, N. (2014). Sağlık hizmetlerinde yaşlı ayrımcılığı. *Gülhane Tıp Dergisi*, 56(2), 128–131. <https://doi.org/10.5455/gulhane.32088>
- Özütürker, M. (2021). Yaşlı ayrımcılığı. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 17(36), 3043–3056. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.883434>
- Palmore, E. B. (1999). *Ageism: Negative and positive* (2nd ed.). Springer Publishing Company.
- Pekesen, M., Akdeniz, Ş., & Sinan, A. (2021). Üniversite

öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumlarının belirlenmesi. *Tıbbi Sosyal Hizmet Dergisi*, 18, 82–103. <https://doi.org/10.46218/tshd.961336>

Seven, A., & Dülger, H. (2020). Sağlık bakım hizmetleri bölümü öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumları ve etkileyen faktörler. *Pearson Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 5(7), 363–371. <https://doi.org/10.46872/pj.108>

Sönmez Sarı, E., & Yıldırım Gürkan, D. (2022). Yaşlı bakımı programı öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığına ilişkin tutumlarının belirlenmesi. *YOBU Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(2), 97–105.

Sütçü, S., & Demirel, A. C. (2020). Yaşlılık ve yaşlı sorunları. İçinde N. Çalış & Z. Karataş (Ed.), *Kavramsal ve güncel boyutlarıyla sosyal sorunlar* (ss. 173–206). Efe Akademi Yayınevi.

Tekin Kaya, N., & Örsal, Ö. (2018). Türkiye’de üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşlı ayrımcılığı davranışlarını etkileyen faktörler: Sistemik derleme. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(67), 540–557. <https://doi.org/10.16992/ASOS.13517>

Tosun, S. (2021). *Uyum istatistikleri (En uygun modelin seçimi ve model-veri uyumu)*. Medium. <https://selmatosun.medium.com/uyum-i-CC%87statistikleri-en-uygun-modelin-se-C3%A7imi-ve-model-veri-uyumu-4e62d4d7fd80>

Vefikuluçay, D. (2008). *Attitudes of university students toward ageism* [Doctoral dissertation] Hacettepe University.

World Health Organization. (2021). *Global report on ageism*. World Health Organization. <https://doi.org/10.4060/9789240016866>

World Health Organization. (2025). *Ageing and health*. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health>

Yılmaz, D., Kisa, S., & Zeyneloğlu, S. (2012). University students’ views and practices of ageism. *Ageing International*, 37(2), 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12126-010-9097-5>

Table 1. Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants

Variable		n	%
Gender	Female	232	75,8
	Male	74	24,2
Marital Status	Single	292	95,4
	Married	14	4,6
Perceived Income Level	Sufficient	153	50,0
	Partially sufficient	127	41,5
	Insufficient	26	8,5
Family Type	Nuclear family	251	82,0
	Extended family	55	18,0
Intention to Live with Parents in the Future	Yes	224	73,2
	No	82	26,8
Department	Social Work	112	36,6
	Nursing	72	23,5
	Nutrition and Dietetics	69	22,5
	Gerontology	20	6,5
	Accounting and Finance Management	18	5,9
	Customs Management	15	4,9
Year of Study	First year	93	30,4
	Second year	101	33,0
	Third year	73	23,9
	Fourth year	39	12,7
Received Education on Ageing	Yes	137	44,8
	No	169	55,2

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Participants Scores on the Ageism Attitude Scale (AAS) and Its Subscales

Variables	n	Min.	Max.	M	SD	Skewness		Kurtosis	
						Statistic	SE.	Statistic	SE.
AAS	306	49	106	81.74	9.2	-0.362	0.139	0.484	0.278
PosDis	306	13	40	28.35	4.66	-0.518	0.139	0.896	0.278
NegDis	306	9	25	17.35	3.57	0.578	0.139	2.255	0.278

<i>ResLife</i>	306	20	45	36.04	4.4	- 0.546	0.139	0.237	0.278
----------------	-----	----	----	-------	-----	---------	-------	-------	-------

Tablo 3. Goodness-of-Fit Indices for the Ageism Attitude Scale (AAS)

Fit Indices	Criteria for Excellent Fit	Criteria for Acceptable Fit	Study Result
χ^2/sd	$0 \leq \chi^2/sd \leq 2$	$2 \leq \chi^2/df \leq 3$	2.34
CFI	$0.95 \leq CFI \leq 1.00$	$0.90 \leq CFI < 0.95$	0.925
TLI	$0.95 \leq TLI \leq 1.00$	$0.90 \leq TLI < 0.95$	0.916
RMSEA	$0.00 \leq RMSEA \leq 0.05$	$0.05 < RMSEA \leq 0.08$	0.065
SRMR	$0.00 \leq SRMR \leq 0.05$	$0.05 < SRMR \leq 0.08$	0.066

(Tosun, 2021)

Table 4. Table 4. Comparison of Ageism Attitude Scale (AAS) and Subscale Scores According to Participants' Sociodemographic Characteristics

Variables			ASS		ResLife		PosDis		NegDis	
		n	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Gender	1. Female	232	82.94	8.33	36.78	3.89	28.56	4.45	17.60	3.54
	2. Male	74	77.96	10.73	33.73	5.09	27.68	5.26	16.55	3.57
	<i>t</i>		3.66		4.73		1.31		2.22	
	<i>p</i>		<.001*		<.001*		.194		.027	
Perceived Income Level	1. Sufficient	153	82.44	8.93	36.50	4.16	28.58	4.54	17.36	3.21
	2. Partially sufficient	127	81.43	8.38	35.75	4.22	28.34	4.18	17.35	3.80
	3. Insufficient	26	79.08	13.56	34.77	6.15	27.00	7.03	17.31	4.45
	<i>F</i>		1.61		2.23		1.28		0.00	
	<i>p</i>		.201		.110		.279		.998	
Family Type	1. Nuclear family	251	81.52	8.94	36.00	4.38	28.20	4.58	17.32	3.57
	2. Extended family	55	82.75	10.34	36.24	4.55	29.04	4.98	17.47	3.61
	<i>t</i>		-0.90		-0.36		-1.21		-0.28	
	<i>p</i>		.371		.719		.226		.778	
Intention to Live with Parents in the Future	1. Yes	224	83.02	9.00	36.58	4.13	28.96	4.55	17.48	3.38
	2. No	82	78.24	8.90	34.57	4.79	26.68	4.58	16.99	4.05
	<i>t</i>		4.12		3.60		3.86		1.07	
	<i>p</i>		<.001*		<.001*		<.001*		.284	
Received Education on Ageing	1. Yes	137	83.42	8.66	36.69	4.00	29.08	4.16	17.66	3.74
	2. No	169	80.37	9.43	35.52	4.65	27.75	4.97	17.10	3.42
	<i>t</i>		2.92		2.32		2.55		1.36	
	<i>p</i>		.004		.021		.011		.176	
Year of Study	1. First year	93	81.13	8.49	35.55	4.19	28.08	4.29	17.51	3.20
	2. Second year	101	81.70	8.81	36.21	4.15	28.14	4.77	17.36	3.92
	3. Third year	73	82.26	9.95	36.44	4.49	28.99	4.81	16.84	3.45
	4. Fourth year	39	82.31	10.57	36.05	5.35	28.33	5.00	17.92	3.68
	<i>F</i>		0.26		0.63		0.63		0.90	
	<i>p</i>		.852		.594		.597		.442	