



OPEN ACCESS

EURASIA Journal of Mathematics Science and Technology Education  
ISSN: 1305-8223 (online) 1305-8215 (print)  
2017 13(8):5413-5423  
DOI: 10.12973/eurasia.2017.00839a



## Determination on Attitude and Behaviors of the Students from Libya and Turkey about Environmental Concerns

Fidan Aslanova

Near East University, N. CYPRUS

Gouma M. A. Almarous

Near East University, N. CYPRUS

Khaled Alemari

Near East University, N. CYPRUS

Ramzi M. F. Awida

Near East University, N. CYPRUS

Hediye Sucuoğlu

Near East University, N. CYPRUS

Received 23 February 2017 • Revised 16 May 2017 • Accepted 14 June 2017

### ABSTRACT

This research studies whether the environmental attitudes and behaviors of Libyan and Turkish students studying in the universities of N.Cyprus are efficient or not. The study aims to get information about the relationship between these attitudes and behaviours of the students and the classes and departments they study in, and to make a general evaluation about efficiency and effectiveness of the environmental education in our country. The data obtained from the results of the survey were evaluated by using SPSS20 program. According to the findings obtained from the research, there has been found an meaningful differences in environmental attitudes among Libyan and Turkish students, studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus. However, no meaningful differences in their behaviors. It can be said that the students from Libya have a higher attitude level than the students from Turkey. When we look at the answers, we understood that they have efficient environmental knowledge.

**Keywords:** environment, environmental education, attitude, behavior

### INTRODUCTION

During the last 30 years, environmental issues have become increasingly important for people throughout the world. The major environmental problems that the world faces are deforestation, lose of biodiversity, ozone depletion, global climate change, pollution and over-consumption of natural resources (Kilbert, 2000). Protecting the environment is important because long term consequences affect people's life significantly (Schultz, P.W., L. Zeleny, 1999). Previous studies focused more on environmental awareness instead of trying to change people's attitudes and values about it (Pooley, J.A., M. O'Connor, 2000).

Social scientists have been measuring these components using several instruments. Many of these researchers believed that the knowledge and attitude are linked to each other where attitude is further connected

© **Authors.** Terms and conditions of Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) apply.

**Correspondence:** Fidan Aslanova, *Near East University, Nicosia, N.Cyprus.*

✉ [fidanaslanova@yahoo.com](mailto:fidanaslanova@yahoo.com)

#### State of the literature

- Environmental education helps to achieve awareness, knowledge, attitude and responsible behavior about environment.
- Teaching of public to actively participate in environmental programs where finally the environmental education, promote the wise use of natural resources for sustainability.
- Programmers' are most likely to change behavior involves concrete, environmentally positive, action oriented experiences, a relevant content and long term involvement support follow-up and reinforcement by role model.

#### Contribution of this paper to the literature

- Attitudes and behaviors of the students from Libya and Turkey, who study in the University of Northern Cyprus, towards the environment were analyzed.
- One of the most important indicators of this is that there are just a few students who are willing to take environmental lessons and to participate in the activities of environmental organizations
- It can be said that the students from Libya have a higher attitude level than the students from Turkey.

to the behaviour (Flamm, 2006). The assumption believes on “if people become more knowledgeable about the environment and its associated issues, they will, in turn become more aware of the environment and its problems and, thus, be more motivated to act toward the environment in more responsible ways” (Fahlquist, 2008). National Advisory Council on Environmental Education declared the valuable goals of Environmental Education. These values included eliminating or minimizing the destruction of environment and highlight the necessity of help to save the environment. This goes logically trough teaching of public to actively participate in environmental programs where finally the environmental education promote the wise use of natural resources for sustainability. Other researches showed the modern and specific characteristics of environmental education.

The increase of the quality of the environment in order to achieve the sustainability, environmental education should not be limited only to schools where the topic is beyond the school approaches to show the environmental problems. He believed that environmental education can increase the attitude and knowledge about environment that is necessary to understand and solve problems (Department of the Environment and Heritage, 2005). Moreover, some researchers (Day, B.R., M.C. Monroe, 2000) believed that, environmental education as a tool helps people to understand and solve the environmental issues. Based on Tbilisi’s declaration environmental education should prepare opportunity for people in the participation processes to solve environmental problems and create a sense and commitment among them than to their living environment (Yarkandi, A.H., N.H. Yarkandi, 2012). Furthermore, they recommended the environmental education as a goal to develop the curriculum. Hence, environmental education is necessary to rebuild the current educational system (Courtenay-Hall, P., L. Rogers, 2002).

Environmental education helps to achieve awareness, knowledge, attitude and responsible behavior about environment. It has been defined and reviewed over the past twenty-five years. “It is generally agreed that environmental education is a process that creates awareness and understanding of the relationship between humans and their many environments-natural, man-made, cultural and technological. Environmental education is concerned with knowledge, values and attitudes where has its responsibility on environmental behaviour” (Hafezi, S., S.M. Shobiri, M.R. Sarmadi and Abass, Ebadi, 2013). As mentioned earlier there are some effective factors on environmental education components (awareness, knowledge, behavior and attitude) such as gender, age, political issues, parent’s income and their educational level (De Le Vega, E., 2006).

Sharma (2006) showed that specially the behavior involved various aspects of handling hazardous and controlled wastes in a sample of 642 United States Army soldiers’. Despite the strong army culture in which the “chain of command is highly emphasized, intentions across behavior were primarily attitude driven. Furthermore, this attitude-behavioral intention link was mediated by variable levels of situational constraints. Behavior

**Table 1.** The status of the participants

<b>Participants</b>	<b>No. of The Students</b>
Libyan students	150
Turkish students	150
<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>

associated with high situational constraints reflected a strong attitude-intentional relation than those behavior under more volitional control.

Thote (2007) found that knowledge, attitude-behavior model describe that increase in knowledge will change attitude which will in turn influence behavior. Consequently environment-knowledge and attitude have been frequently evaluated when attempting to determine the effect of outdoor education programme on the development of environmental responsibility. Programmers' are most likely to change behavior involves concrete, environmentally positive, action oriented experiences, a relevant content and long term involvement support follow-up and reinforcement by role model.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

In the study conducted to determine the attitude and behaviors of the students from Libya and Turkey, who study in universities of Northern Cyprus, about environment, "scan model" was used. Scan researches were conducted with the aim to gather data about significant aspects of a group (Büyükoztürk et al., 2009). According to Karasar (1999), scan models are the research approaches aiming to describe a situation, happened in the past or still happening, as the way it is.

## PARTICIPANTS AND SAMPLE

The population of the study comprises of the university students from Turkey and Libya studying in the universities in Northern Cyprus. The sample of this study comprises of 300 university students from Turkey 150 and from Libya 150 studying in the universities in Northern Cyprus in the 2015-2016 academic years as shown in [Table 1](#).

## DATA GATHERING TOOL

In this research, the "Personel Information", "Environmental Awareness Knowledge Test", "Environmental Conscious Attitude Test" and "Environmental Conscious Behavior Test" was used as the data gathering tool.

## SCORING SCALE CLASSIFICATION OF THE SUBSTANCE

The levels of knowledge of the university students participating in this research about environmental education were revealed and interpreted in regards to the survey questions.

## DATA ANALYSIS

The data obtained from the surveys were evaluated in computer environment by using SPSS 20.0 program. While determining their awareness level change according to their genders about the attitude and behaviors of the students from Libya and Turkey, who study in universities of Northern Cyprus and participated in this study, about environment, unrelated t-test was used; and while determining their awareness level change according to their educational background, ANOVA, Scheffe, MANOVA, tests were used.

**Table 2.** Anova Test about The Level of Attitudes of the Students from Libya and Turkey towards The Environment

Attitude	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Explanation	
Between Groups	882.182	2	441.091	3.22	.041	p<.05	Difference
Within Groups	40612.734	297	136.743				exist
Total	41494.916	299					3-2
Behavior	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Explanation	
Between Groups	169.851	2	84.925	0.564	.569	p>.05	Difference
Within Groups	44700.094	297	150.505				Exist
Total	44869.946	299					

1: TC  $\bar{X}$ =57.02      2: TRNC  $\bar{X}$ =55.58      3: Libya  $\bar{X}$ =59.25

## FINDINGS

What is the level of attitude and behaviors of the students from Libya and Turkey, who study in universities of Northern Cyprus, about environmental problems? Within the first sub-problem, the level of attitude and behaviors of the participants was tried to be detected. If there are more than 2 sub-groups of a coefficient which will be analyzed, Anova analysis will be used as the method. In order to analyze which groups have differences between each other as the result of Anova analysis; sub-tests such as Turkey, LSD or Sheffe will be used if the data shows normal distribution. In this study, Scheffe test was preferred (Büyüköztürk, 2002). In order to compare all the possible linear combinations among the groups, the Sheffe method was developed, and this method is regarded as a type, the most flexible and conservative one, of post hoc which can control  $\alpha$  error margin when there is a great number of the groups required to be compared, and which does not pay regard to the hypothesis that number of observations may be equal in the groups (Scheffe, 1953.,Scheffe, 1959).

It is shown in **Table 2** that there is a meaningful difference in attitudes( $p=.041$ ) of the students from Libya and Turkey, but there was no meaningful difference in their behaviors ( $p=.569$ ). When the difference found in the attitudes was analyzed in accordance with Scheffe test, it was found that the attitude level of students from Libya ( $\bar{X}=59.25$ ) was higher than the students attitude from TRNC ( $\bar{X}=55.58$ ). It can also be said that the attitude level of the students from Libya was higher than the students attitude from Turkey ( $\bar{X}=57.02$ ). In a general meaning, all these findings show that the students from Libya have the highest attitude level than the others.

Is there any kind of relationship between gender parameters and level of attitude and behaviors of the students from Libya and Turkey, who study in universities of Northern Cyprus, about environment? As the second sub-problem, it was focused on finding whether there was any kind of relationship between the gender parameters and the level of attitude and behaviors of the participants towards the environment. In the situations that two independent parameters affect on dependent parameters more than one, two-way MANOVA is used. It is used to define the common effect (wilks lambda) of the independent parameters more than one on the dependent parameters (Büyüköztürk, 2002). In this study, also, two-way MANOVA was used because two independent parameters affect the dependent parameters more than one.

In **Table 3**, it is seen that the common effect between the level of attitude and behaviors of the students, studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus, towards environment and the genders of Libyan and Turkish students was not meaningful [wilks lambda  $\wedge$  = .986,  $F=1.057$ ,  $p>.05$ ]. However, it was found that the attitudes of the students differ meaningfully according to gender ( $p=.012$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Yet, there was found no meaningful difference in behaviors ( $p=.203$ ,  $p>.05$ ). At the results of Scheffe test which was conducted in order to find out where this difference occurred, it was understood that this difference occurred between the students from TRNC and the students from Libya. When we analyzed the distribution of this difference by gender, it was discovered that female students( $\bar{X}=56.25$ ) and male students ( $\bar{X}=54.75$ )from TRNC have lower attitude level compared to female students ( $\bar{X}=60.45$ ) and male students ( $\bar{X}=58.86$ ) from Libya.

**Table 3.** The Level of Relationship Between The Levels of Attitude and Behaviors Towards The Environment & Gender Parameter, Manova Test

Source	Variable	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	p	Explanation
<b>Gender</b>	Attitude	862.977	1	862.977	6.394	<b>.012</b>	p<.05
	Behavior	245.999	1	245.999	1.629	.203	p>.05
<b>Nationality</b>	Attitude	994.769	2	497.384	3.685	.026	p<.05
	Behavior	295.933	2	147.966	0.979	.377	p>.05
<b>YxC</b>	<b>Attitude</b>	<b>488.837</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>244.418</b>	<b>1.810</b>	<b>.165</b>	<b>p&gt;.05</b>
	<b>Behavior</b>	<b>112.135</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>56.067</b>	<b>0.371</b>	<b>.690</b>	<b>p&gt;.05</b>
<b>Error</b>	Attitude	39680.151	294	134.966			
	Behavior	44397.456	294	151.011			
Total Correct	Attitude	41494.916	299				
	Behavior	44869.946	299				

[wilkis lambda  $\Lambda$ = .986, F=1.057, p=318 (p>.05)]

**Table 4.** The Level of Relationship Between The Levels of Attitude and Behaviors Towards The Environment & Class Parameter, Manova Test

Source	Variable	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p	Explanation
<b>Class</b>	Attitude	1345.809	3	448.603	3.509	<b>.016</b>	<b>p&lt;.05</b>
	Behavior	237.578	3	79.192	0.524	.666	p>.05
<b>Nationality</b>	Attitude	12.276	2	6.138	0.048	.953	p>.05
	Behavior	164.584	2	82.292	0.545	.580	p>.05
<b>YxC</b>	<b>Attitude</b>	<b>2022.583</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>337.097</b>	<b>2.636</b>	<b>.017</b>	<b>p&lt;.05</b>
	<b>Behavior</b>	<b>812.520</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>135.420</b>	<b>0.897</b>	<b>.497</b>	<b>p&gt;.05</b>
<b>Error</b>	Attitude	36818.770	288	127.842			
	Behavior	43458.436	288	150.897			
Total Correct	Attitude	41494.916	299				
	Behavior	44869.946	299				

[wilkis lambda  $\Lambda$ = .938, F=1.726, p=.048 (p<.05)]

Is there any kind of relationship between class parameters and level of attitude and behaviors of the students from Libya and Turkey, who study in universities of Northern Cyprus, about environment? As the third sub-problem, it was focused on finding whether there is any kind of relationship between the class parameters and the level of attitude and behaviors of the participants towards the environment, or not.

As it is seen in **Table 4**, when the common effect between the level of attitude and behavior of the students studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus towards the environment and when the class of the Turkish and Libyan students was analyzed, [wilkis lambda  $\Lambda$ = .938, F=1.726, p=.048, p<.05] it was seen that the interaction between class\*nationality has meaningful effect on the attitudes. However, there was seen no effect on the behaviors. As it is seen, again, in **Table 1**, there is a meaningful difference on the attitudes in class\*nationality combination (p=.017, p<.05). Yet, there is no difference in behaviors (p=.497, p>.05). When we analyzed the results Scheffe test which was conducted in order to find out between which nationality groups this difference occurred, it was seen that this difference occurred between the students from TRNC and the students from Libya (p=.034, p<.05).

According to another finding, it was discovered that the attitude level of the students from TRNC was lower than the students' attitudes from Libya. On the other hand, it was found that the 3rd graders from TRNC have

**Table 5.** Level of Relationship Between The Levels of Attitude and Behaviors Towards The Environment & The Departments They Study In, Manova Test

Source	Variable	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p	Explanation
<b>Department</b>	Attitude	2643.327	16	165.207	1.330	.178	p>.05
	Behavior	1631.323	16	101.957	0.675	.817	p>.05
<b>Nationalty</b>	Attitude	59.703	2	29.851	0.240	.785	p>.05
	Behavior	151.064	2	75.532	0.500	.607	p>.05
<b>YxC</b>	<b>Attitude</b>	<b>569.234</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>56.923</b>	<b>0.458</b>	<b>.916</b>	<b>p&gt;.05</b>
	<b>Behavior</b>	<b>1366.478</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>136.647</b>	<b>0.904</b>	<b>.529</b>	<b>p&gt;.05</b>
<b>Error</b>	Attitude	33657.426	271	124.197			
	Behavior	40931.258	271	151.037			
Total Correct	Attitude	41494.916	299				
	Behavior	44869.946	299				

[wilkis lambda  $\Lambda$  = .956, F = .615, p = .903 (p > .05)].

**Table 6.** Level of Relationship Between The Levels of Attitude and Behaviors Towards The Environment & The Educational Background of The Fathers, Manova Test

Source	Variable	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p	Explanation
<b>Father education</b>	Attitude	594.629	5	118.925	.871	.501	p>.05
	Behavior	584.072	5	116.814	.792	.556	p>.05
<b>Nationalty</b>	Attitude	351.064	2	175.532	1.286	.277	p>.05
	Behavior	49.981	2	175.532	.169	.844	p>.05
<b>YxC</b>	<b>Attitude</b>	<b>1675.299</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>167.529</b>	<b>1.227</b>	<b>.272</b>	<b>p&gt;.05</b>
	<b>Behavior</b>	<b>2210.075</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>221.007</b>	<b>1.498</b>	<b>.139</b>	<b>p&gt;.05</b>
<b>Error</b>	Attitude	38488.499	282	136.484			
	Behavior	41589.038	282	147.478			
Total Correct	Attitude	41494.916	299				
	Behavior	44869.946	299				

lower attitude levels than the other 3rd graders. According to this finding, it is concluded that all the students (from all grades/classes) from TRNC have the lowest attitude level among the others.

Is there any kind of relationship between the departments the students study in and level of attitude and behaviors of the students from Libya and Turkey, who study in universities of Northern Cyprus, about environment? As the fourth sub-problem, it was focused on finding whether there is any kind of relationship between the departments the students study in and the level of attitude and behaviors of the participants towards the environment, or not.

In **Table 5**, it is shown that the common effect between the level of attitude and behavior of the students studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus towards the environment and the classes Turkish and Libyan students study in was not meaningful [wilkis lambda  $\Lambda$  = .956, F = .615, p = .903 (p > .05)]. Also, there wasn't found any kind of meaningful differences between the departments of all the students in general meaning and their attitudes (p = .178 p > .05) and their behaviors (p = .817 p > .05). As a result of these findings, it is clear that there are no meaningful relationship and difference between the students' attitudes and behaviors and their departments.

Is there any kind of relationship between the educational background of the parents and level of attitude and behaviors of the students from Libya and Turkey, who study in universities of Northern Cyprus, about

**Table 7.** Level of Relationship Between The Levels of Attitude and Behaviors Towards The Environment & The Educational Background of The Mothers, Manova Test

Source	Variable	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p	Explanation
<b>Mather education</b>	Attitude	1140.060	5	228.012	1.729	.128	p>.05
	Behavior	208.745	5	41.749	.281	.923	p>.05
<b>Nationalty</b>	Attitude	491.973	2	245.986	1.865	.157	p>.05
	Behavior	167.889	2	83.944	.566	.568	p>.05
<b>YxC</b>	<b>Attitude</b>	<b>2343.871</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>234.387</b>	<b>1.777</b>	<b>.064</b>	<b>p&gt;.05</b>
	<b>Behavior</b>	<b>1998.500</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>199.850</b>	<b>1.348</b>	<b>.204</b>	<b>p&gt;.05</b>
<b>Error</b>	Attitude	37181.503	282	131.849			
	Behavior	41800.818	282	148.229			
Total Correct	Attitude	41494.916	299				
	Behavior	44869.946	299				

[wilkis lambda  $\Lambda$ = .900, F=2.105, p=.068 (p>.05)]

**Table 8.** Level of Relationship Between The Levels of Attitude and Behaviors Towards The Environment & Monthly Income of The Family, Manova Test

Source	Variable	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p	Explanation
<b>Salary</b>	Attitude	1278.935	4	319.733	2.358	.062	p>.05
	Behavior	204.153	4	51.038	.336	.853	p>.05
<b>Nationalty</b>	Attitude	693.746	2	346.873	.559	.079	p>.05
	Behavior	240.677	2	120.338	.794	.453	p>.05
<b>YxC</b>	<b>Attitude</b>	<b>1134.178</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>141.772</b>	<b>1.045</b>	<b>.402</b>	<b>p&gt;.05</b>
	<b>Behavior</b>	<b>1120.430</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>140.053</b>	<b>.924</b>	<b>.497</b>	<b>p&gt;.05</b>
<b>Error</b>	Attitude	38630.447	285	135.545			
	Behavior	43215.83	285	151.634			
Total Correct	Attitude	41494.916	299				
	Behavior	44869.946	299				

[wilkis lambda  $\Lambda$ = .954, F=.850, p=.628 (p>.05)]

environment? As the fifth sub-problem, it was focused on finding whether there is any kind of relationship between the educational background of the parents and the level of attitude and behaviors of the participants towards the environment, or not.

As it is seen in **Table 6**, the common effect between the level of attitude and behavior of the students studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus towards the environment and the educational background of their fathers was not meaningful [wilk is lambda  $\Lambda$ = .917, F=1.240,p=.215 (p>.05)]. Moreover, it is also shown in **Table 19** that there is no meaningful difference between the educational background of the students' fathers and their attitudes (p=.501 p>.05) and their behaviors (p=.556 p>.05). As a result of these findings, it is understood that there are no meaningful relationship and difference between the students' attitudes and behaviors and the educational background of their fathers.

In **Table 7**, it is shown that the common effect between the level of attitude and behavior of the students studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus towards the environment and the educational background of their mothers was not meaningful [wilkis lambda  $\Lambda$ = .900,F=2.105, p=.068 (p>.05)].

Furthermore, it is also shown in **Table 2** that there is no meaningful difference between the educational background of, in general meaning, all the students' mothers and their attitudes ( $p=.128$   $p>.05$ ) and their behaviors ( $p=.923$   $p>.05$ ). As a result of these findings, it is understood that there are no meaningful relationship and difference between the students' attitudes and behaviors and the educational background of their mothers.

Is there any kind of relationship between monthly income of the family and level of attitude and behaviors of the students from Libya and Turkey, who study in universities of Northern Cyprus, about environment? As the sixth sub-problem, it was focused on finding whether there is any kind of relationship between monthly income of the family and the level of attitude and behaviors of the participants towards the environment, or not.

In **Table 8**, it is shown that the common effect between the level of attitude and behavior of the students studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus towards the environment and the monthly income of their families was not meaningful [ $\eta^2=.954$ ,  $F=.850$ ,  $p=.628$  ( $p>.05$ )]. Also, it is shown in **Table 2** that there is no meaningful difference between the monthly income of the students' families and their attitudes ( $p=.62$   $p>.05$ ) and their behaviors ( $p=.853$   $p>.05$ ). As a result of these findings, it is understood that there are no meaningful relationship and difference between the Turkish and Libyan students' attitudes and behaviors and the monthly income of their families.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this research, attitudes and behaviors of the students from Libya and Turkey, who study in the university of Northern Cyprus, towards the environment were analyzed. At the end of the research, the results mentioned below, have been specified in 6 clauses:

1. While there has been seen a meaningful difference in the attitudes of the students from Libya and Turkey, studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus, towards the environment ( $p=.041$ ), there has been found no meaningful differences in their behaviors ( $p=.569$ ). When the difference found in the attitudes was analyzed in accordance with the Scheffe test, it has been seen that the students from Libya ( $\bar{X}=59.25$ ) have higher attitude level towards the environment than the students from TRNC ( $\bar{X}=55.58$ ). Likewise, it can be said that the students from Libya have higher attitude level than the students from Turkey ( $\bar{X}=57.02$ ). According to these findings, it is seen that, in a general meaning, the students from Libya have the highest attitude level. By taking this result as a basis, it can be said that the behaviors of the students is not at the desired level even if they have high level of attitude towards the environment. One of the most important indicators of this is that there are just a few students who are willing to take environmental lessons and to participate in the activities of environmental organizations. Because similar results have been obtained from many researches conducted on with the university students (Yılmaz et al., 2002., Erol, 2005., Altın, 2001., Yücel & Morgil, 1999., Çabuk & Karacaoğlu, 2003., Gündüz & Aslanova, 2011), it is revealed that the environmental education in our country to increase awareness of the environment needs to be practiced more efficiently. Educational programs which can draw the students' attention towards the environment and environmental problems should be developed; and problem solving ability of the students should be improved in addition to the positive environmental attitudes and behaviors towards the environment. Because this will not only improve their solution finding attitude in an active way for the problems, yet also have an important role in their decisions they will need to make during the efforts for evaluating environmental effect in their future jobs.

2. It was seen that the common effect between the level of attitudes and behaviors of the students, studying in universities of Northern Cyprus, towards the environment and the genders of Turkish and Libyan students was not found meaningful [ $\eta^2=.986$ ,  $F=1.057$ ,  $p>.05$ ]. However, it was discovered that there is a meaningful difference in the attitudes of the students according to their genders ( $p=.012$ ,  $p<.05$ ). This result has parallels with the results of many researches analyzing the effect of gender on the environmental attitudes (Sadık & Çakan, 2010; Çınar, et al., 2010; Sadık & Sari, 2008; Uzun & Sağlam, 2006; Erol, 2005; Yılmaz, et al., 2004; Eagles & Demare, 1999; Shari, 1999; Grifford, Hay & Boros, 1983). In the study of Şama (2003) which has similar results, it is found that the environmental attitude points of both males and females are higher than the environmental behavior point average; and it was also found that both groups cannot make behavior out of their thoughts. Some of the environmental attitude researches, carried out at different education levels, support this results (Meydan&

Doğu, 2008., Arslanyolu, 2010., Aydın, 2010., Sağır, Aslan & Cansaran, 2008., Gündüz & Aslanova, 2011). Yet, in most of the researches carried out about this matter, the gender has had effect on the environmental attitude of the students (Ekici, 2005., Tuncer et al., 2005., Deniz & Genç, 2007., Çubuk & Karacaoğlu, 2003., Erol & Gezer, 2006., Şama, 2003., Aydın & Çepni, 2010., Gökçe et al. 2007., Baş, 2010., Atasoy, 2005., Özpınar, 2009., Sağır, Aslan & Cansaran, 2008., Bodur, 2010; Özden, 2008., Kahyaoğlu et al. 2008., Ek et al. 2009., Çabuk & Karacaoğlu, 2003).

3. When the common effect between the class the students study in and the level of attitudes and behaviors of the students, studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus, towards the environment was analyzed, [wilkis  $\lambda = .938$ ,  $F=1.726$ ,  $p=.048$ ,  $p<.05$ ] it was seen that the effect of the interaction on attitudes was meaningful. Furthermore, there was also a meaningful difference just between the class parameter and the attitudes ( $p=.016$ ,  $p<.05$ ). According to the results of Scheffe test conducted in order to find where this difference occurs, it was observed that there is a difference among the 2nd, the 3rd and the 4th graders from TRNC and Libya. However, when it is analyzed in a general matter, it is seen that the more the level of class is, the more the attitudes of the students from TRNC and Libya increase. On the other hand, according to another finding, the 2nd graders from TRNC have lower attitude level compared to the 2nd graders from Libya. Likewise, the 3rd graders from TRNC have lower attitude level than the other the 3rd graders. According to this finding, it is concluded that the students from TRNC have the lowest attitude level among all the grades. Atasoy (2005), Alp et al. (2006) and Baş (2010) did not detect any kind of difference between the environmental attitude and class parameter in their researches. On the other hand, Deniz & Genç (2007), Sağır et al. (2008) and Çeken (2009) detected a meaningful difference in inter-classes in terms of environmental attitude. The results of all these researches are parallel with the results of this research.

4. The common effect between the class at which Turkish and Libyan students study and the level of attitudes and behaviors of the students, studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus, towards the environment was not found meaningful [wilkis  $\lambda = .956$ ,  $F=.615$ ,  $p=.903$  ( $p>.05$ )]. When **Table 18** was analyzed, there was found no meaningful differences between the departments the students study in and their attitudes ( $p=.178$   $p>.05$ ) and their behaviors ( $p=.817$   $p>.05$ ). According to this finding, it is revealed that there are no meaningful difference and relationship between the attitudes and behaviors of Turkish and Libyan students and their departments. In his study, Arslanyolu (2010) found that the class level has no effect on the students' attitudes and behaviors towards the environment. Whereas, it is known that raising individuals who are sensible and aware is the most efficient way to find permanent solutions for environmental problems (Aslan, Uluçınar-Sağır ve Cansaran, 2008). A qualified environmental education should be started from pre-school period; and it must be aimed to maintain this education program in an efficient way at every stage individuals go through, all along primary school, secondary school and university, by organizing it in parallel with physical and mental development process (Ak, 2008). Although some researches support this (Aydın, 2010., Sağır, Aslan and Cansaran, 2008), environmental attitudes of most students have differed according to their class level (Çabuk & Karacaoğlu, 2003., Özpınar, 2009., Baş, 2010., Meydan & Doğu, 2008., Arslanyolu, 2010., Aydın et al., 2011., Çelen et al. 2002., Özden, 2008., Bodur, 2010., Aydın & Kaya, 2011).

5. The common effect between the educational background of the students' fathers and the level of attitudes and behaviors of the students, studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus, towards the environment was not found meaningful [wilkis  $\lambda = .917$ ,  $F=1.240$ ,  $p=.215$  ( $p>.05$ )]. As it is seen in the **Tables (19 and 20** p. 46 - 47), there was found no meaningful differences between the educational background of the students' fathers and their attitudes ( $p=.501$   $p>.05$ ) and their behaviors ( $p=.556$   $p>.05$ ). According to this finding, it is understood that there are no meaningful differences and relationships between the educational background of Turkish and Libyan students' fathers and their attitudes and behaviors. The common effect between the educational background of the students' mothers and the level of attitudes and behaviors of the students, studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus, towards the environment was not found meaningful, either [wilkis  $\lambda = .900$ ,  $F=2.105$ ,  $p=.068$  ( $p>.05$ )]. When the results were analyzed, it was seen that there is no meaningful differences between the educational background of the students' mothers and their attitudes ( $p=.128$   $p>.05$ ) and their behaviors ( $p=.923$   $p>.05$ ). According to this finding, it is understood that there are no meaningful difference and relationship between the educational background of Turkish and Libyan students' mothers and their attitudes and behaviors. While

some of the researches support this result (Gökçe et al. 2007), some researches do not. (Özdemir, 2003., Baş, 2010., Özpınar, 2009). On the other hand, in some other researches, it was found that the educational background of the parents has different effects on the students' environmental attitudes and behaviors. It is thought that this difference is because of the roles of the parents in social life. Some researchers have explained this difference by saying, "While the mother worries about the matters related to welfare and health of the family (these matters are related to the quality of local environmental conditions such as water, air, solid waste etc.), the father worries about financial and economic matters of the family." (George & Southwell, 1986., Dietz, Stern & Guagnano, 1998).

6. The common effect between the monthly income of the parents and the level of attitudes and behaviors of the students, studying in the universities of Northern Cyprus, towards the environment was not found meaningful [ $\eta^2 = .954$ ,  $F = .850$ ,  $p = .628$  ( $p > .05$ )]. As it is seen in **Table 21** (p. 49), there was found no meaningful differences between the monthly income of the parents and the students' attitudes ( $p = .62$   $p > .05$ ) and the students' behaviors ( $p = .853$   $p > .05$ ). According to this finding, it is understood that there are no meaningful difference and relationship between the monthly income of Turkish and Libyan students' parents and the students' attitudes and behaviors. Atasoy (2005), Erol (2006), Gökçe et al. (2007), Gündüz and Aslanova (2015), Kesicioğlu and Alisinanoğlu (2009) found, in their studies, no differences between the economical level and the environmental attitudes. There is similarity between this study and our study.

7. When we look at the answers the participants gave to the questions about efficient environmental knowledge, it is seen that they have efficient environmental knowledge. In a study which has a similar result with this, Gündüz and Aslanova (2011), Sadık and Sarı (2007) state that the reason why the students have environmental knowledge and view is because the chances they get to participate in environmental activities such as trips, experiments, researches etc.

## REFERENCES

- Altın, M. (2001). *Biyoloji Öğretmeni Adaylarında Çevre Eğitimi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Day, B. R., & Monroe, M. C. (2000). *Environmental Education and Communication for a Sustainable World. Handbook for International Practitioners*. Academy for Educational Development, Washington.
- Department of the Environment and Heritage (2005). *Education For Sustainable Future A National Environmental Education Statement for Australian Schools*. Published by Curriculum Corporation, ISBN: 1 86366 5978, Carlton South Vic 3053, Australia.
- De Le Vega, E. (2006). *A Preliminary Evaluation of Awareness, Knowledge and Attitude in Environmental Education Specialist, Instructors, Students and Parents in South West Florida*. PhD thesis. Florida Gulf Coast University, Fort Myers, USA.
- Eagles, P. F. C., & Demare, P. (1999). Factors Influencing Children's Environmental Attitudes. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 30(4), 33-37.
- Erol, G. H., & Gezer, K. (2006). Teachers Attitudes Toward Environment And Environmental Problems. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 1(1), 65-77.
- Flamm, B. J. (2006). *Environmental Knowledge, Environmental Attitudes and Vehicle Ownership and Use*. Doctor of Philosophy. University of California, Berkeley.
- Fahlquist, J. N (2008). Moral Responsibility For Environmental Problems-Individual Or Institutional? *J. Agric. Environ. Ethics*. doi:10.1007/s10806-008- 9134-5
- Gündüz, S., & Aslanova, F. (2012). Azerbaycan'da Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Çevre Sorunlarına Yönelik Tutumları ve Çevre Eğitimi İle İlgili Bilgi Düzeylerinin Saptanması. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi, KKTC.
- Gündüz, S., Dağlı, G., & Aslanova, F. (2015). Comparative Evaluation of the Environmental Consciousness Levels of High School Students in Northern Cyprus, Turkey and Azerbaijan. *The Anthropologist (KRE)*, 22(3), 622-635.

- Hafezi, S., Shobiri, M., Sarmadi, R., & Abass, E. (2013). Novel of Environmental Communal Education: Content Analysis Based on Distance Education Approach. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE*, 14(1), 13.
- Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Kilbert, N. C. (2000). *An Analysis Of The The Correlations Between The Attitude, Behaviour And Knowledge Components Of Environmental Literacy In Undergraduate University Students*. Unpublished MS Thesis, University of Florida, USA.
- Pooley, J. A., & O'Connor, M. (2000). Environmental Education and Beliefs Are What Is Needed. *Environ. Behaviour*, 32, 711-723.
- Sadık, F., & Çakan, H. (2010). Biyoloji Bölümü Öğrencilerinin Çevre Bilgisi Ve Çevre Sorunlarına Yönelik Tutum Düzeyleri. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 19(1), 351-365, Adana.
- Scheffe, H. (1953). A method of judging all contrasts in the analysis of variance. *Biometrika*, 40, 87-104.
- Scheffe, H. (1959). *The Analysis of Variance*. John Wiley Press, New York.
- Sharma, S. (2003). *Social Environment and Physical Environment*. PhD thesis. 37(1S): S107-12, USA,
- Thote, P., & Archana, T. (2007). Study of Environmental Attitude Among Senior Secondary Students. *Acase Study Journal of Human Welfare and Ecology Vol II* PP182-183.
- Uzun, N. & Sağlam, N. (2006). Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Çevreye Yönelik Bilgi ve Tutumlarına Çevre ve İnsan Dersi İle Gönüllü Çevre Kuruluşlarının Etkisi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 210-218.
- Yarkandı, A. H., & Yarkandı, N. H. (2012). Strengthening Environmental Education in School Curricula. *Journal of Education and Vocational Research*, 3(8), 264-270.
- Yılmaz, Ö., Boone, W. J., & Anderson, H. O. (2004). Views of Elementary and Middle School Turkish Students Toward Environmental Issues. *International Journal of Science Education*, 26(12), 1527-1546.
- Yılmaz, A., Morgil, İ., Aktuğ, P., & Göbekli, İ. (2002). Ortaöğretim ve Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Çevre, Çevre Kavramları ve Sorunları Konusundaki Bilgi ve Öneriler. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22, 156-162.
- Yücel, A. S., & Morgil, İ. (1999). Çevre Eğitiminin Geliştirilmesi. *BAÜ Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(1), 76-89.