

DOI No: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14225/Joh1400>

Geliş Tarihi: 09.09.2018

Kabul Tarihi: 10.10.2018

THE EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF STUDENTS LEARNING AT THE HIGH SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT

Mehmet Dalkılıç¹ - Hüdaverdi Mamak²

Abstract

The purpose of this study is; Niğde University Physical Education and Sports at Department of sports administrator and Department of physical education and sport teacher the quality of the environment in which students are presented to the university. A total of 251 people voluntarily participated in the survey, 101 of which were sports administrators and 150 were physical education teachers. The data in the study were collected using the "University Quality of Life Scale" developed by Doğanay and Sarı in 2004. University Quality of Life Scale is a measure of 33 items collected in 7 factors. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was 0.87 for the total score. 26,3% of the students were 21 years old, 21,1% were 22 years old, 15,1% were 20 or 23 years old; 62.9% were male and 37.1% were female. 59.8% are in the department of physical education and sports teacher, and 40.2% are students in the department of sports administration. As a result of this research, between the ages of the students and university quality of life scale scores. There was no significant difference between the gender of the students and university quality of life scale scores and between students' sections and university life quality scale scores. SPSS (20) statistical program was used in the evaluation of the obtained data and the level of significance ($P < 0.05$) was taken.

Key words: Physical Education Sports, Life Quality

¹ Dr.Öğr. Üyesi Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu

² Doç. Dr. Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu

The Evaluation Of The Quality Of Life Of Students Learning At The High School Of Physical Education And Sport

Introduction

According to the agreed definition, democracy is the self-rule of the people. Democracy is a term of political science whose meaning is the people's administration. Its roots are derived from the word "democratia" in ancient Greek. In ancient Greek, the demos became the people, meaning the kratos administration. Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, made the most famous definition of democracy and preserved its validity today: "Democracy is the use of political power in society, society, and society itself" (Kaldırım, 2005).

The concept of democracy, structured in line with the needs and needs of the community to which it belongs, has been divided into many types by its application. But these species have been classified under the roof of the "classical democracy" concept of democracy where it first emerged, without losing its general principles.

According to "Doğanay and Sari" (2004) "It is generally thought that while democratic education in the school is contributing to the democratic political process, it can be an important implication of examining the influence of universities as a school, especially in this process". It is thought that universities should undertake the responsibility of educating young people as professional and autonomous individuals as active participants and decision makers in a democratic society while preparing young people for professional life (Doğanay and Sari, 2004). According to the Report of the Sub-Group on Quality Management in Higher Education (1996) provided by the Working Group on Accreditation Rules and Institutions of the European Union Science-Technology-Engineering Areas of the European Union under the TUBITAK (1996), "In a period of change and leap defined as information age, the sovereign citizen is a concept that must be integrated on a general quality of life level. The quality of education will play a special role in the achievement of this integration, which we can briefly define as "development in democracy", emphasizing the importance of education in democracy for the development of education in order to raise the awareness of the intellectual individuals and to have a share in the qualified labor force. (BTSTP, 1996). Accordingly, the importance of school life quality has begun to be discussed in our country, primarily in other countries, and researches and articles have been published. "Sari" (2006), "Korkmaz" (2009), which defines the measurement of school life quality and its variables in its published article, tried to determine the perceived levels of school life quality of teachers working in primary schools in Master thesis study. "Tekkanat" (2008) has set an example in the studies of quality of life studies carried out at the academic level by conducting a research that determines the quality of life and physical activity levels of university students studying in the master's thesis.

Material

The purpose of this study is to determine the quality of the environment in which the students of the Sports Administration and Physical Education Teaching Department of Niğde University Physical Education and Sports College presented to them. The students of the department of sport management 101 and the students of the department of physical education teachers participated in the research voluntarily.

The data in the study were collected using the "University Quality of Life Scale" developed by Doğanay and Sarı in 2004. University Quality of Life Scale is a measure of 33 items collected in 7 factors. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was 0.87 for the total score.

This dimension is named as "Instructor-Student Communication" because the students in the scale 31, 30, 24, 25, 18 and 33 are the expressions about the level and quality of the communication with the instructors.

The second sub-dimension, 17, 6, 12, 8 and 23, which expresses perceptions of students about their organizational identity in the university and their level of general satisfaction with being a student of this university, is called "identity".

The extent to which items 20, 7, 2, 14 and 29 related to socio-cultural facilities related to cinema, theater, concerts, sports and hobbies in the university are called as "social facilities".

The 4th, 27th, 32nd, 22nd, 11th, and 16th items, in which the students participate in these decision-making processes, are called "Participation in Decisions".

The dimension in which the 10, 5, 26 and 19 items aimed at determining the quality of the communication of the students to the other students is called "Student-Student Communication".

This dimension is called "Future" because students 1, 13, and 28 include students' future thinking about universities.

The dimension of 3, 15, 21, and 9, which point to various aspects of the classroom environment, is called the "Classroom Environment".

The Evaluation Of The Quality Of Life Of Students Learning At The High School Of Physical Education And Sport

RESULTS

Table 1. Age, gender and departmental information of students

		N	%
Age	18	4	1,6
	19	8	3,2
	20	38	15,1
	21*	66	26,3
	22	53	21,1
	23	38	15,1
	24	26	10,4
	25	13	5,2
	26	2	,8
	27	2	,8
	28	1	,4
Gender	Male*	158	62,9
	Famale	93	37,1
Department	Sports Management	101	40,2
	Physical Education and Sports Teacher Training*	150	59,8

According to Table 1, 26.3% of the students were 21 years old, 21.1% were 22 years old, 15.1% were 20 or 23 years old; 62.9% were male and 37.1% were female. 59,8% is in the department of physical education and sports, and 40,2% is in the department of sports administration.

Table 2. University quality of life scale scores of students

Lower dimension	N	X	ss	Min.	Max.
Instructor-Student Communication	251	4,04	,26	3,67	4,33

ID	251	1,94	,45	1,00	2,60
Social Opportunities	251	2,85	,27	2,60	3,40
Participation in Decisions	251	2,49	,27	2,00	3,17
Student-Student Communication	251	3,23	,34	2,50	3,75
Future	251	3,61	,35	3,00	4,33
Classroom Environment	251	2,97	,17	2,50	3,25

According to Table 2, students' teaching staff-student communication subscale scores $X = 4,04 \pm ,26$, identity subscale scores $X = 1,94 \pm ,45$; social facilities subscale scores $X = 2,85 \pm ,27$; attendance subscale scores for decisions $X = 2,49 \pm ,27$; student-student communication subscale scores $X = 3,23 \pm ,34$; Future subscale scores were calculated as $X = 3,61 \pm ,35$ and classroom subscale scores as $X = 2,97 \pm ,17$.

Table 3. Comparison of university students' age and university quality of life scale scores

		Sum of squares	SD	Squares average	F	P
Instructor-Student Communication	Between groups	,647	10	,065	,922	,514
	In groups	16,847	240	,070		
	Total	17,494	250			
ID	Between groups	,942	10	,094	,453	,919
	In groups	49,921	240	,208		
	Total	50,863	250			
Social Opportunities	Between groups	,529	10	,053	,669	,753
	In groups	18,965	240	,079		
	Total	19,494	250			
Participation in Decisions	Between groups	,748	10	,075	,961	,478
	In groups	18,675	240	,078		

The Evaluation Of The Quality Of Life Of Students Learning At The High School Of Physical Education And Sport

	Total	19,423	250			
Student-Student Communication	Between groups	,859	10	,086	,716	,709
	In groups	28,798	240	,120		
	Total	29,657	250			
Future	Between groups	,794	10	,079	,623	,793
	In groups	30,573	240	,127		
	Total	31,367	250			
Classroom environment	Between groups	,126	10	,013	,403	,944
	In groups	7,477	240	,031		
	Total	7,603	250			

According to Table 3, no significant difference was found between the age of the students and university quality of life scale scores.

Table 4. Comparison of students' gender and university quality of life scale scores

	Gender	N	X	ss	t	p
Instructor-Student Communication	Male	158	4,0369	,2743 0	-,902	,368
	Female	93	4,0681	,2472 5		
ID	Male	158	1,9684	,4512 0	1,032	,303
	Female	93	1,9075	,4506 6		
Social Opportunities	Male	158	2,8418	,2718 7	-1,154	,249
	Female	93	2,8839	,2909 1		

Participation in Decisions	Male	158	2,4979	,2738 9	,532	,595
	Female	93	2,4785	,2878 6		
Student-Student Communication	Male	158	3,2642	,3423 9	1,515	,131
	Female	93	3,1962	,3454 9		
Future	Male	158	3,6097	,3369 1	-,146	,884
	Female	93	3,6165	,3836 8		
Classroom environment	Male	158	2,9810	,1774 4	1,173	,242
	Female	93	2,9543	,1687 0		

According to Table 4, no significant difference was found between students' gender and university quality of life scale scores.

Table 5. Comparison of university students' scores with university quality of life scale scores

	Department	N	X	ss	t	p
Instructor-Student Communication	Sports Management	101	4,0363	,2734 6	-,597	,551
	Physical Education and Sports Teacher Training	150	4,0567	,2589 4		
ID	Sports Management	101	1,9644	,4430 8	,534	,594

The Evaluation Of The Quality Of Life Of Students Learning At The High School Of
Physical Education And Sport

	Physical Education and Sports Teacher Training	150	1,9333	,4574 0		
Social Opportunities	Sports Management	101	2,8455	,2784 0	-,550	,583
	Physical Education and Sports Teacher Training	150	2,8653	,2804 6		
Participation in Decisions	Sports Management	101	2,4917	,2711 9	,049	,961
	Physical Education and Sports Teacher Training	150	2,4900	,2846 0		
Student-Student Communication	Sports Management	101	3,2450	,3390 8	,226	,821
	Physical Education and Sports Teacher Training	150	3,2350	,3490 5		
Future	Sports Management	101	3,6040	,3454 9	-,303	,763
	Physical Education and Sports Teacher Training	150	3,6178	,3610 1		
Classroom environment	Sports Management	101	2,9728	,1764 3	-,123	,902
	Physical Education and Sports Teacher Training	150	2,9700	,1735 9		

According to Table 5, there was no significant difference between the compartmentalisations and university quality of life scale scores.

Discussion

The purpose of this study is to determine the quality of the environment in which the students of the Sports Administration and Physical Education Teaching

Department of Niğde University Physical Education and Sports College presented to them. The students of the department of sport management 101 and the students of the department of physical education teachers participated in the research voluntarily.

The data in the study were collected using the "University Quality of Life Scale" developed by Doğanay and Sarı in 2004. University Quality of Life Scale is a measure of 33 items collected in 7 factors.

26,3% of the students were 21 years old, 21,1% were 22 years old, 15,1% were 20 or 23 years old; 62.9% were male and 37.1% were female. 59,8% is in the department of physical education and sports, and 40,2% is in the department of sports administration. Student's teaching-student communication subscale scores $X = 4,04 \pm, 26$, identity subscale scores $X = 1,94 \pm, 45$; social facilities subscale scores $X = 2.85 \pm, 27$; attendance subscale scores for decisions $X = 2,49 \pm, 27$; student-student communication subscale scores $X = 3,23 \pm, 34$; Future subscale scores were calculated as $X = 3.61 \pm, 35$ and classroom subscale scores as $X = 2.97 \pm, 17$.

Korkmaz "(2000), in the article titled" Problems of Higher Education Youth ", argued that appropriate structured classroom environments would positively affect the teaching staff - student communication as well, he made the interpretation that he could climb. However, while the Gaziantep Physical Education And Sports High School students' opinion on the dimension of "Instructor-Student Communication" shows the second lowest average among the other university Physical Education And Sports High School's, it turns out that this is not very compatible with the classroom environment.

"Argon and Kösterelioğlu" (2008) used the same scale for their research titled "The Opinions of University Teachers about Life Quality of University Teachers (Abant İzzet Baysal University)" and in the same scale that Doğanay and Sarı (2004) In the research titled "Assessment of related perceptions in the frame of Democratic Life Culture" (Çukurova University Example), there was no significant sex-related difference in the perceptions of students in the university quality of life. Thus paralleling our study.

The Evaluation Of The Quality Of Life Of Students Learning At The High School Of Physical Education And Sport

In the New Education Journal's "Danish Educational Initiative 1", it is recognized that the Danish education system is at the highest level based on participation in freedoms and decisions, and that students from secondary education institutions, from the youngest to the university, can participate in decisions about school and education they are expected to do this from themselves. In the article; school, students, free, equality-based and democratic society, and that this preparation may be provided by participating in the decisions to be made, by giving consciousness to responsibility, and by teaching them their rights and obligations.

According to Güllü and Çiftçi (2016) survey; participants' quality of life did not differ significantly by gender in the physical, psychological, social and environmental domains.

When considered by the gender variable, a significant difference was found in the psychological and environmental domains. In the psychological domain, the participants whose ages varied between 23 and 26 had a higher quality of life than those whose ages were 31 and above. Those whose ages varied between 27 and 30 also had higher quality of life than those whose ages were 31 and above. In the environmental domain, the participants whose ages varied between 23 and 26 had higher quality of life than those whose ages varied between 18 and 22 and were 31 and above. On the other hand, a statistically significant difference was found only in the psychological domain in terms of the income level variable. The life quality of those whose income were lower than try 1500 were significantly found to be lower than those whose income were higher than try 3000.

"Doğanay ve Sarı" (2004) The evaluation of the students' perceptions about the quality of life in universities in the framework of Democratic Life Culture (Çukurova University Example), Çukurova University; Faculty of Architecture and Engineering, Faculty of Fine Arts, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Faculty of Dentistry, Faculty of Fisheries, Faculty of Agriculture, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Science and Literature and Faculty of Theology. In this research

conducted between faculties, the highest average was the dimension of "Identity" and immediately followed the dimension of "Participation in Decisions". In this context, Çukurova University Physical Education And Sports High School students do not overlap with other faculty students and University Quality of Life Scale Dimensions. For this reason, it can be considered that Physical Education And Sports High School students have a different organizational climate compared to other faculties and departments.

YÖK has defined students' active participation in higher education in the publication "Restructuring in Higher Education: Bologna Process Implementations in 66 Questions" as an equal, stakeholder participation in the decision-making process, as well as changes in the field of higher education as qualified, active and constructive partners and that they are seen as part of the driving forces for this. He noted that active student participation is a prerequisite for the success of the higher education system at all levels of the European Higher Education Area, nationally, regionally and institutionally.

As a result; No significant difference was found between the age of the students and university quality of life scale scores. There was no significant difference between the students' gender and university quality of life scale scores. There was no significant difference between the sections of the students and university quality of life scale scores.

References

Argon T, Köstereliöđlu M.A. Opinions of Physical Education Teacher Candidates about University Quality of Life "(Abant İzzet Baysal University Example), 10th International Sports Science Congress, Bolu, 23-25 October 2008

Assessment of Students' Perceptions on the Quality of Life in University on Democratic Life Culture (Çukurova University), International Symposium on Democracy Education, Çanakkale, 20-21 May 2004.

The Evaluation Of The Quality Of Life Of Students Learning At The High School Of Physical Education And Sport

Dođanay, A., & Sarı, M. (2004). Öğrencilerin üniversitedeki yaşam kalitesine ilişkin algılarının demokratik yaşam kültürü çerçevesinde değerlendirilmesi (Çukurova üniversitesi örneđi). *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(2), 107-128

Educational tradition in Denmark: I. The New Educational Amendment (Electronic Journal), 2008

Güllü, S., Çiftçi, E.G. (2016). Spor Merkezlerine Üye Olan Bireylerin Yaşam Kalitesinin İncelenmesi. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research*, 2 (3), 1251-1265.

Higher Education Council. Restructuring in Higher Education: Bologna Process Practices in 66 Questions.

Korkmaz A. Problems of Higher Education Youth. Ministry of National Education Publications. 2000.

Korkmaz G. Investigation of Perceived Levels and Professional Attitudes of School Life Quality Teachers in Primary Schools. Master Thesis, Cukurova University, Adana, 2009

Pavement E. Perception of Democracy of 8th Grade Primary School Students. *Gazi Education Faculty Magazine*, 2005; 3: 143-162.

Sarı M. School Life Quality: Definition, Variables and Measurement. *Cukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 2006; 4: 32-33.

Science-Technology Industry Discussion Platform (BTSTP) Working Group on Accreditation Rules and Institutions of the European Union for Scientific and Technological Engineering Areas. Published Quality Management Sub-Group Report in Higher Education. February. 1996.

Mehmet DALKILIÇ - Hüdaverdi MAMAK

Tekkanat Ç. Life Quality and Physical Activity Levels in Students Who Read in the Department of Teaching. Master Thesis, Pamukkale University, Denizli, 2008