OPINIONS ON EUTHANASIA AMONG CZECH SENIORS
AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Jana VLCKOVA, Milan KUBIATKO, Muhammet USAK, Halil AYDIN

Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială, 2015, vol. 50, pp. 193-208

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:
Expert Projects Publishing House

On behalf of:
„Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University,
Department of Sociology and Social Work
and
Holt Romania Foundation

REVISTA DE CERCETARE SI INTERVENTIE SOCIALA
is indexed by ISI Thomson Reuters - Social Sciences Citation Index
(Sociology and Social Work Domains)
Opinions on Euthanasia among Czech Seniors and University Students

Jana VLCKOVA¹, Milan KUBIATKO², Muhammet USAK³, Halil AYDIN⁴

Abstract

The research is focused on finding differences in opinions on euthanasia between seniors and university students. The influence of independent variables on euthanasia, namely the influence of gender, religion and health, was examined. In addition, the research concentrates on the influence of study fields, i.e. the difference between students at a faculty of medicine, students who chose humanities and the seniors’ education. The questionnaire with 31 Likert-type five point scale items was used for the research. The data analysis was made with the test of inductive statistics (ANOVA) and post-hoc tests (Fisher’s LSD post-hoc test). In sum, 209 questionnaires were included in the analysis (84 seniors and 125 university students). Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was applied to verify the reliability of the questionnaire. The attitude of all respondents was, in general, moderately positive. The results also showed that the opinions on euthanasia between seniors and university students differed only in some areas of the topic. Religion is a very important factor which influences opinions on euthanasia. There were differences in opinions between students of faculty of medicine and students of humanities. In contrary, the health of seniors and their education did not have influence on their attitudes towards euthanasia.
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Introduction

The increasing average age of people represents a problem in many countries all over the world (Saad & BouJaoude, 2012; Sengupta, 2013; Prokop, & Kubiatko, 2014). The information about decreasing amount of people in productive age, about increasing length of life and similar indicators occur more often in media than in the past. This new situation brings new problems, which concerns everyone. The situation with population which grows older reveals topics which have been sometimes a taboo so far. In many societies it is still so. One of these topics is euthanasia. It is discussed among laic and expert society and there is a need to react to this situation. Questions have been arising among people: Why do the requests on the legalization of euthanasia still grow? Is it a reaction on the increasing amount of older and ill people, who, in many cases, suffer from incurable diseases or insufferable pain? These questions appear more and more in countries where euthanasia is not legal. The discussions are often and lively, mainly in the field of medicine and law (i.e. in the specialized fields). Yet it is important that not only doctors but also other professions (e.g. social workers) take care of terminally ill patients. The social work with a dying person is a topic which should be more open and continually developing. The most important fact is that everybody has to have the possibility of a free choice.

Theoretical background

In the following chapter, we briefly introduce the basic concept of euthanasia, its history and laws concerning euthanasia in the Czech Republic. For the purpose of the study, the euthanasia is understood as an active ending of another person’s life in order to prevent the person’s continuing suffering or indignity (sometimes called “active euthanasia”). A similar definition is possible to be found in many studies (Teisseyre, Mullet & Sorum, 2005). When we shortly look at the history of euthanasia, the work of Emanuel (1994) brings important information. Debates about the ethics of euthanasia date back to ancient Greece and Rome. After the development of ether, physicians began advocating the use of anaesthetics to relieve the pain of dying. In 1870, the use of anaesthetics and morphine was first proposed in order to end a patient’s life intentionally. Over the next 35 years, discussions about the ethics of euthanasia raged in the US and Great Britain, culminating in 1906 with the Ohio bill (the aim of which was to legalize euthanasia). The bill was ultimately defeated. Nevertheless, there were efforts to legalize euthanasia in the next years. It was successful in some countries. For example, Switzerland legal system does not consider suicide a crime or assisting suicide as a complicity in a crime. It views suicide as possibly rational. However, it does not give physicians a special status in assisting it. When an assisted suicide
is declared, a police inquiry is started, as in all cases of “unnatural death” (Hurst & Mauron, 2003). The first country where euthanasia was legalized was Netherlands in 2002. Even before the act, it was socially accepted and openly practiced in the Netherlands for about two decades (Emanuel, 2001). After that, euthanasia has been legalized in Belgium since 2002 (Cohen et al., 2012) and in Luxembourg since 2008. Assisted suicide is legal in Switzerland (as it was mentioned above) and in the U.S., in the states of Washington, Oregon, Vermont and Montana. In the conditions of the Czech Republic, euthanasia is not legalized, legal norms do not include the term “euthanasia”, but it is indirectly regulated by numbers of norms, particularly by the Criminal Code and the Civil Code. The Criminal Code says: “If the culprit kills another person out of compassion to accelerate his unavoidable near death and thereby liberates this person from cruel pain caused by incurable illness, the court can exceptionally mitigate the sentence or can refrain from punishment”. However, an interesting fact exists in the conditions of the Czech legal system - though euthanasia is not legalized, according to the Criminal Code, it depends on the court and the judge who decides whether to punish a doctor who helped his patient or not. Some studies exist in the Czech Republic which the issue of euthanasia is investigated in. The sample is created, in most cases, by students of medicine or future nurses. Nevertheless, these studies are simple opinion pools or final thesis of university students. But nearly all of these studies are written in Czech language. However, it is also possible to find studies written in an international format (e.g. Kure, 2011), where broader context, as well as arguments why euthanasia should be legalized (in the Czech Republic), are presented.

Current state of literature

The studies concerning the issue of euthanasia have different characters. For example, Parpa et al. (2010) focused on the comparison of opinions on euthanasia between doctors and laic society. The research was done in Greece. Authors found out that both groups did not differ in their opinions; approximately half of respondents from both groups had positive opinions on euthanasia. The similar result showed Chong & Fok (2007) among public society and doctors from Hong-Kong. The laic society and doctors were the aimed sample groups in the study of Fok, Chang & Tang (2000). However, their results differ from those of the previous study. According to them, the laic society had more positive attitudes towards euthanasia than the doctors. Dickinson et al. (2002) showed doctors from UK had got positive attitudes toward euthanasia. But this study took into account another factor – religion. The believers had negative attitudes towards euthanasia; this trend was found out in the both groups of sample size. The question if religion influences euthanasia is discussed in the study of Stempsey (2010). The study of
Smets et al. (2011) showed the influence of age and religion on the attitudes and practising of euthanasia among Belgian doctors. Younger doctors and atheists had positive attitudes towards euthanasia and they were more open to practice it. Some authors investigated the change of opinions on euthanasia with time. Authors registered the change of attitudes in positive way with time (Cohen et al., 2006; Emanuel, 2002; Materstvedt & Kaasa, 2002; Radulovic & Mojsilovic, 1998; Van der Maas, Pijnenborg & Van Delden, 1995). Students of medicine were often sample size in these studies. For example Fekete, Osvath & Jegesy (2002) found out that students who had got experiences with terminally ill patients had more positive attitudes towards euthanasia in comparison with students who did not have such experience. Gabel et al. (2005) found out positive perception of euthanasia among medicine students. They also compared younger and older students, but their perception of euthanasia did not differ. On the other hand, Karlsson, Strang & Milberg (2007) found out negative attitudes towards euthanasia among medicine students. Juth, Nilsonne & Lynoe (2013) explored the reasons pro and contra euthanasia among medicine students through students’ written text. The doctors and medicine students belong among the most frequent respondents in the research studies concerning opinions and attitudes towards euthanasia (except above mentioned studies e.g. Chattopadhyay & Simon, 2008; Gielen et al., 2011), but it is also possible to find some studies with other groups. Authors of these research works found out more positive attitudes towards euthanasia among other professions in comparison with future doctors and doctors (Cohen et al., 2006; Radulovic & Mojsilovic, 1998). A small amount of research works investigated terminally ill patients and their attitudes towards euthanasia. All research works presented positive attitudes towards euthanasia among terminally ill patients (Breitbart et al., 2000; Eliott & Olver, 2008; Emanuel, 2001; Tiernan et al., 2002; Varelius, 2007; Wilson et al., 2000). Cohen et al. (2012) found out relatively positive attitudes among public. The study of these authors was focused on the comparison of nations in Belgium, so it is irrelevant for our study. Some studies (Aghababaei, 2014; Aghababaei, Wasserman & Hatami, 2014) showed relatively negative attitudes toward euthanasia. The research was done among Iranian university students and as it was mentioned, the students had not positive opinions on euthanasia.

Therefore, it may be concluded that most of the studies used quantitative approach in order to find out attitudes of respondents towards euthanasia. Authors of this study used some of the studies as a source for their own research tool (see subchapter Research tool). Most of the studies concerning euthanasia had sample respondents from medical environment (doctors and students). Not so often, other working groups were the object of research. Some studies also showed the influence of different variables. Religion of respondents seems an important variable. The disunity of the current state complicates the situation with the analysis of research studies and also comparing the results of realized investigations.
Moreover, different authors used different groups of respondents, different research tools, different variables, which makes the comparison of the results harder.

**Purpose of the study**

The aim of this study is to bring new findings in the perception of euthanasia. In the Czech Republic, there is a relatively big gap in this issue. The situation is also similar in surrounding countries. Stronger voices about the legalization of euthanasia grow in the Czech Republic as well as in many other countries. Therefore, one of the first steps is to find out whether there are more supporters or opponents of the legalization. In our study we chose the variables which occur in the studies concerning euthanasia and our aim is to find out the influence of these variables. Our research is focused on the opinions of seniors and students on the euthanasia issue. These two groups were chosen because of their relatively big age difference and because they are likely to have different attitudes due to different life experience. The research studies with samples of seniors exist (Bowman & Singer, 2001), as well as research work where students are the sample (see previous chapter). However, the comparison of opinions of these two groups is very rare. Moreover, our study does not include only medicine students but also students from the faculty of education. These students were chosen because of their future work where they may influence their pupils and students.

The main aim of the study was to find out opinions of seniors, medicine students and future teachers on the euthanasia. Other aims were to find out whether and how their opinions on euthanasia are influenced by religion, seniors’ state of health and the educational level.

The research questions are following: (1) Is there any difference between opinions of seniors and university students on euthanasia? (2) Is there any difference between opinions of medicine students and future teachers on euthanasia? (3) Are opinions on euthanasia influenced by religion? (4) Does the state of health influence seniors’ opinions on euthanasia? (5) Does the level of education influence opinions on euthanasia?
Methodology

Research tool

A questionnaire was used as the research tool. This method was chosen on the basis of literature research. The same research tool was chosen by other research works dealing with this topic (Fok, Chong & Tang, 2000; Chidoori, 2009; Smets et al., 2011). The questionnaire contains Likert-type five items scale. The questionnaire is divided into two parts. The first part includes demographic items. This part was considered to contain independent variables. There are two versions of the questionnaire (one version for seniors and one for students). Demographic items in both versions are: gender, age, religion, educational background and state of health. In addition, seniors are asked about their profession and their current residence. Students are asked about their field of study. The second part, focused on attitudes and opinions on euthanasia, consists of 31 five scale items of Likert type. This part of the questionnaire is the same for both students and seniors. The items in the second part are divided into 6 categories (inspired by questionnaire of authors introduce higher). These categories are: (1). Euthanasia (6 items); (2). Conditions of euthanasia (8 items). (3). Who makes decision about euthanasia (5 items); (4). Perception of personal euthanasia (3 items); (5). Person who carries euthanasia out (4 items); (6). Legalization and realization of euthanasia in the Czech Republic (5 items). Some items of the second part are constructed positively and some were constructed negatively. Generally, there are 17 items constructed positively and 14 negatively. Validity of the questionnaire was provided by consultation with specialists on questionnaire design and specialists in the social field. The specialists commented on the comprehensibility of each item and they proposed changes. Authors have modified items according to the specialists’ comments. All the comments were stylistic.

Respondents

Respondents are divided into two groups. The first group includes seniors (n = 84) and the second group is represented by students (n = 125). Questionnaire was filled in by students at a faculty of medicine and students at a faculty of education. The distribution of respondents is presented in Table 1.
Table 1 Distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>In total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believer</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With small health</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting health</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-74</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-89</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 and more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With husband or wife</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home for the elderly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis

The questionnaire was anonymous. Each respondent has been acquainted with its purpose. Likert scale questions comprise five points ranking: “strongly agree” (5 points), “slightly agree” (4 points), “neutral” (3 points), “slightly disagree” (2 points), and “strongly disagree” (1 point). Negatively constructed items are evaluated in reverse order. There is the same score for neutral possibility (3) in both positively and negatively constructed items. Low score means a negative attitude and high score means a positive. Demographic items represent independent variables. The second part of the questionnaire (Likert-type five point items scale) includes dependent variables. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (\( \alpha \)) was applied to verify the reliability of the questionnaire. The reliability of this research tool is high (\( \alpha = 0.93 \)). Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for data of students is \( \alpha = 0.94 \) and \( \alpha = 0.91 \) for data of seniors. The data analysis of independent variables was made with the test of inductive statistics (ANOVA) and post-hoc tests (Fisher’s LSD post-hoc test).
Results

The authors did not reveal a statistically significant difference in the results between students and seniors ($F = 0.01; p = 0.93$) concerning their perception of euthanasia. Both groups had similar opinions on euthanasia, i.e. moderately positive. Students reached score $\bar{x} = 3.40; SD = 0.08$ and seniors $\bar{x} = 3.40; SD = 0.06$.

Influence of independent variables

Statistical difference between students of medicine and students of humanities was revealed ($F = 3.97; p < 0.05$). Students of medicine ($\bar{x} = 3.53; SD = 0.09$) had more positive opinions on euthanasia than students of humanities ($\bar{x} = 3.28; SD = 0.09$). This result is illustrated in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Opinions on euthanasia according to the study field](image)

Religion represents a statistically significant difference influencing the opinions on euthanasia ($F = 24.19; p < 0.001$). Believers had lower score ($\bar{x} = 3.21; SD = 0.06$) than atheists ($\bar{x} = 3.66; SD = 0.07$). This result is illustrated in Figure 2.
Concerning students, a statistically significant difference concerning religion was proved as well ($F = 46.76; p < 0.001$). Atheist students ($\bar{x} = 3.74; SD = 0.07$) had more positive opinions than believers ($\bar{x} = 2.98; SD = 0.08$). On the other hand, religion was not a statistically significant independent variable among seniors ($F = 0.001; p = 0.98$). The score of believers was $\bar{x} = 3.40; SD = 0.08$ and the score of atheist was $\bar{x} = 3.40; SD = 0.15$.

A statistically significant difference in the result between seniors according to their state of health was not revealed ($F = 1.23; p = 0.30$). Neither Fishers’ LSD post-test showed the statistically significant difference. Seniors in the first group had the highest score (healthy, $\bar{x} = 3.63; SD = 0.19$). The score decreased along with deteriorating health (With small health complication $\bar{x} = 3.41; SD = 0.10$; Limiting health complication $\bar{x} = 3.27; SD = 0.13$).

A statistically significant difference in the results between seniors according to their educational background was not found ($F = 0.86, p = 0.49$). The score is presented in Table 2.
Table 2. Score according to the educational background among seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational background</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Influence of independent variables on given categories**

The second part of the questionnaire (Likert-type five point items scale) includes dependent variables which are divided into 6 categories. The score according to the categories is presented in Figure 3.

![Figure 3](image)

**Figure 3. Distribution of score according to categories**

Male respondents reached a higher score than female respondents in all categories except for the category “Person who carries euthanasia out”, where the score was similar (see Figure 4). A statistically significant difference between gender has been revealed only in the category “Who makes the decision about euthanasia”. Male respondents perceived euthanasia more positively than female respondents. It may be caused by female personality which is more sensitive and emotional (Brody 1985).
Religion has statistically significant influence on all categories except for the
category “Who makes the decision about euthanasia” (Figure 5). The biggest
difference appears in the category “Person who carries euthanasia out”. The
atheists had more positive opinions than believers.

Figure 4. Distribution of score according to category focused on gender

** Figure 5. Distribution of score according to category focused on religion

** NS – non-significant difference; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001
The influence of the state of health was different in each category (see Figure 6). A statistically significant difference has been revealed in the category “Who makes the decision about euthanasia” \( (F = 3.25; \ p < 0.05) \). It means that the respondents with only small health complications and the respondents with limiting health complications have more positive opinions on “Person who makes the decision about euthanasia”. Post-hoc test revealed a statistically significant difference in the category “Person who carries euthanasia out” \( (F = 6.67; \ p < 0.01) \). In this case, healthy respondents perceive euthanasia more positively than the respondents with small health complications and the respondents with limiting health complications. This finding is interesting in comparison with the findings about the category “Who makes the decision about euthanasia” mentioned above. Post-hoc test revealed a statistically significant difference between healthy respondents and respondents with small health complications \( (p < 0.05) \) and between the respondents with limiting health complications \( (p < 0.01) \).

\[ NS – non-significant difference; * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01 \]

Figure 6. Distribution of the score in the category focused on the state of health
Discussion and Conclusion

The general attitude of all respondents on euthanasia was moderately positive. The main aim of the research (and the first research question) was to find out if the opinions of seniors and students differed. In spite of the generation gap and different life experience, the opinions of these two groups were not different. The second research question was: Is there any difference between opinions of medicine students and future teachers on euthanasia? The results revealed that the students of medicine had more positive opinion on euthanasia than students of humanities. The third research question focused on how religion influences opinions on euthanasia. Its influence is significant. The next research question was concentrated on the influence of seniors’ the state of health. However, it was not a statistically significant independent variable. Health complications and other difficulties which resulted from the state of health did not influence the opinion on euthanasia. The education background did not have a significant influence on the opinions on euthanasia among seniors, as well.

On the other hand, religion was an important factor which influences opinions on euthanasia. The research revealed that the atheists had more positive opinions. The same results were showed in the research of Fok, Chong & Tang (2000) and Smets et al. (2011). This finding suggests that religion still influences people in our modern society to a great extent. The results of this study showed that students of medicine had more positive opinion on euthanasia than students of humanities. Similar studies were not found during the research. In contrast, the studies of Radulovic & Mojsilovic (1998) and Cohen et al. (2006) were quite similar. These authors compared opinion on euthanasia among different professions and they revealed more positive opinions on euthanasia among professions other than doctors. These results are in contradiction with our findings. It can be caused by inexperience of the students of medicine. They do not have so much experience with terminally ill patients from practice as the doctors. Fekete, Osvath & Jegesy (2002) present that students who have experience with terminally ill patients have more negative perception of euthanasia than students who do not have this experience.

Other studies are focused on perception of euthanasia among doctors. These studies do not compare opinions of doctors with different specializations. A positive attitude towards euthanasia among doctors was discovered in Belgium (Smets et al., 2011). Moreover, a study from the Great Britain (Seale, 2009) showed the same results. A study realized in Hong Kong showed a more positive attitude of doctors towards passive euthanasia than towards active euthanasia. A more negative attitude was revealed among doctors from Hong Kong who had experience with taking care of terminally ill patients (Fok, Chong & Tang, 2000). Contradictory results were found in Greece. Less than a half of the doctors and
nurses agreed with the statement that the resuscitation should not be done to terminally ill patients during heart attack or respiratory failure (Parpa, 2010).

The results of this study revealed that seniors with worse state of health had more positive attitudes than healthy seniors. Breitbart et al. (2000), Emanuel (2001), Tiernan et al. (2002) and Wilson et al. (2000) present similar results. They quote more positive attitudes towards euthanasia among terminally ill patients. This can be caused by the awareness of the approaching end of life, insufferable pain or the fact that the patients cannot find different solution of their situation.

One category relates to the legalization of euthanasia in the Czech Republic. The results show that more than a half of respondents do not want to legalize euthanasia in the Czech Republic because they are afraid of abuse or they do not trust the doctors and other professionals who should make the decisions about euthanasia. However, there are countries where people change opinions on euthanasia, step by step, from negative to more positive (Cohen et al., 2006). This may happen in the Czech Republic too. This topic offers a lot of possibilities for research. This study had limiting possibilities. Therefore space for further researchers arises. For example, researchers can focus on students of medicine and carry out a longitudinal study.
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