



Optimal Zenith Spor Bilimleri Dergisi

Journal of Optimal Zenith Sport Science

E-ISSN: 3023-8005 Optimal Zenith Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, Mayıs 2024
1(1):1-9

University Students' Levels of Examining Sporting Environments

Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Spor Ortamlarını İnceleme Düzeyleri

Asst. Professor Adem KAYA¹, Alperen Kaan DEMİRCİ², Yiğit ÇAM³

Bowie State University, ABD, akaya@bowiestate.edu, ORCID: 0000-0001-9529-1354

Avrasya Üniversitesi, Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi, Türkiye, alperendemirci@avrasya.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-3895-6097

Avrasya Üniversitesi, Meslek Yüksekokulu, Türkiye, yigit.cam@avrasya.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-2321-1404

MAKALE BİLGİSİ/ARTICLE INFORMATION

Makale Türü/Article Types: Araştırma Makalesi

Geliş Tarihi/Received: 17 Ocak/January 2024

Kabul Tarihi/Accepted: 20 Nisan/April 2024,

Yıl/Year: 2024 Cilt/Volume: 1 Sayı/Issue: 1 Sayfa/Pages: 1-9

Atıf/Cite as: Kaya, A., Demirci, A., Çam, Y., "University Students' Levels of Examining Sports Environments" Journal of Optimal Zenith Sport Science, 1(1), May 2024: 1-9

Sorumlu Yazar/Corresponding Author: Asst. Professor Adem KAYA

Etik Kurul Beyanı/Ethics Committee Approval: "Araştırma için Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşerî Bilimler Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu 28.04.2023 tarih ve 2023-386 sayılı kararı ile etik kurul onayı alınmıştır.

University Students' Levels of Examining Sports Environments

Abstract

In the study conducted to examine the existence, effects and usability of sports environments, which are essential for transferring various achievements of sports to students, in terms of university students, whether the total scores of the scale differ according to gender and sport type were determined by Student's t-test, income level, department, grade, age were determined by One-Way Analysis of Variance and intergroup differences were determined by Tukey multiple comparison test. In the study, male participants' scale total score, sports facilities and university sports clubs sub-dimension total scores were higher than female participants. In the sub-dimension of sports facilities, the total sub-dimension scores of female participants were higher than male participants. No statistically significant difference was found in terms of the total score and sub-dimension total of the total score of the university sports environment review of the students according to the type of sport they do. According to the age groups of the students in the study, a statistically significant difference was found in terms of the total score and sub-dimension total scores of the university sports environment review (except for the sub-dimensions of university sports clubs and sports facilities). A statistically significant difference was found in terms of the total score and sub-dimension total scores (except the sub-dimension of university sports clubs) of the university sports environment review levels according to the income status declared by the students. No statistically significant difference was found in terms of the total score and other sub-dimension total scores of the university sports environment review levels according to the departments in which the students study, which is the other variable. As a result of the findings, it is thought that there are few studies based on the literature and the use of the sports environment scale should be studied more. It is thought that future studies should be conducted with more sample groups for the sub-dimension of the sport scale.

Keywords: Sports, Sporting Environments, Perception of Sporting Environments

Öz

Sporun çeşitli kazanımlarını öğrencilere aktarabilmek için elzem olan spor ortamlarının var oluşlarını etkilerini ve kullanılabilirliğini üniversite öğrencileri açısından incelemek amacıyla yapılan çalışmada, ölçek toplam puanlarının cinsiyet ve spor türü durumuna göre farklılık gösterip göstermediği student t testi, gelir düzeyi, bölüm, sınıf, yaş, ise Tek Yönlü Varyans Analizi ve gruplar arası farklılıklar Tukey çoklu karşılaştırma testi ile belirlenmiştir. Araştırmada, erkek katılımcıların ölçek toplam puan, spor tesisleri ve üniversite spor kulüpleri alt boyut toplam puanları kadın katılımcılara göre yüksek tespit edilmiştir. Spor tesisleri alt boyutunda ise kadın katılımcıların alt boyut toplam puanları erkek katılımcılara göre yüksek bulunmuştur. Yaptığı spor türüne göre öğrencilerin üniversite spor ortamı inceleme toplam puanı ve alt boyut toplam açısından istatistiki olarak anlamlı farklılık tespit edilmemiştir. Araştırmada öğrencilerin yaş gruplarına göre öğrencilerin üniversite spor ortamı inceleme toplam puanı ve alt boyut toplam puanları açısından (üniversite spor kulüpleri ve spor tesisleri alt boyutları hariç) istatistiki olarak anlamlı farklılık tespit edilmiştir. Öğrencilerin beyan ettiği gelir durumuna göre üniversite spor ortamı inceleme düzeyleri toplam puanı ve alt boyut toplam puanları (üniversite spor kulüpleri alt boyutu hariç) açısından istatistiki olarak anlamlı farklılık tespit edilmiştir. Diğer değişken olan öğrencilerin öğretim gördükleri bölümlere göre üniversite spor ortamı inceleme düzeyleri toplam puanı ve diğer alt boyut toplam puanları açısından istatistiki olarak anlamlı farklılık tespit edilmemiştir. Bulgular neticesinde literatüre dayalı çalışmaların az olması ve spor ortamı ölçeğinin kullanımının daha fazla çalışılması düşünülmektedir. Bundan sonra yapılacak araştırmalarda spor ölçeği alt boyutu için daha fazla örneklem grubunda yapılacak araştırmaların olması gerektiği düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Spor, Spor Ortamları, Spor Ortamlarının Algılanması

Introduction

The university process represents a critical transitional period where students experience the freedom to make their own decisions. At this stage, students tend to join university communities, sports teams, dance and music groups to meet their need for social interaction and fulfill their desire for belongingness. However, the way each student embraces this tendency varies based on individual differences. While some students prefer to maintain an active lifestyle they acquired during their childhood years, others take a step towards an active lifestyle by participating in such activities during their university years. Additionally, some students may choose to avoid participating in such activities (Yavuz & İlhan, 2023). Each change brings about an adaptation process in life. The university years symbolize a period of peak confusion, coinciding with the final stage of adolescence from both social and biological perspectives. Alongside the complexities of adolescence, this period includes uncertainties such as leaving home, transitioning to independent living from family, choosing friends and groups, making career decisions, and finding employment (Özkan and Yılmaz, 2010).

In order to assess the development and popularization of sports, it is necessary to pay attention to the effective establishment of a sports environment in a country, including an adequate number of sports fields, facilities, equipment, coaching staff, and managers. The sports environment encompasses sports fields, facilities, sports equipment, instructors, and managers, along with sports education and organizations (Tutar and Sevinç., 2023). In the absence of any of these elements, it is not possible to talk about the healthy development of sports in that country. In this context, providing the necessary infrastructure and resources for the effective spread of sports is crucial (Arıkan, et al., 2004). Sports, as an important tool for students' social interaction and performance development, draw attention with their positive effects in higher education institutions. Additionally, students who actively and efficiently utilize sports environments and participate in sports activities can positively support their communication skills by interacting with other students. (Çakıcı et al., 2023). Universities should be evaluated not only as institutions focused on scientific production and vocational education, but also as places playing an important role in the integration of healthy individuals into society. Therefore, the importance given to social and sporting activities in universities holds a significant place as a factor contributing to the development of individuals' character (Sivrikaya and Pehlivan, 2015). Promoting sports, organizing sporting activities, implementing programs that encourage students to engage in sports, and providing opportunities for socialization and individual character development during the crucial period of education coincide with the significant role of universities.

Universities generally provide various sports facilities to encourage students' participation in physical activities and support a culture of sports. These sports facilities can be offered through facilities located on or near campus. Examples of sports facilities provided by universities to students include gymnasiums and fitness centers, sports fields and stadiums, swimming pools, tennis and basketball courts, running tracks and outdoor sports areas, as well as dance and aerobics studios. The presence and effective utilization of sports facilities can generally enhance students' quality of life. The expected gains from the existence and effective use of sports facilities for students can be categorized as improvements in physical and mental health, social connections, stress management, cognitive development, self-esteem, and confidence, along with instilling discipline and a sense of responsibility. Therefore, it is important for universities to establish a healthy sports culture to provide students with these benefits. Based on this information, the primary aim of the current research is to examine the impact and usability of the existence of sports facilities on university students from the perspective of conveying various benefits of sports to them.

Method

The research obtained ethical approval from the Ethics Committee for Social and Human Sciences Research of Ondokuz Mayıs University, with Decision No. 2023-386 dated April 28, 2023.

Research Model

In the research, a survey research model, which is commonly used to understand the current situation about a topic or population, has been employed. Survey models can be used to gain a general idea about the current status of a topic before conducting a more comprehensive study (Karasar, 1999).

Research Group

The population of the study consists of students enrolled in the sports sciences faculty of universities, while the sample comprises 214 individuals selected through random sampling method among students studying at the Yaşar Doğu Faculty of Sports Sciences at Ondokuz Mayıs University during the academic year 2023/2024.

Data Collection Instruments

As the data collection tool, a personal information form developed by the researchers and the "University Sports Environment Scale," adapted to Turkish culture by Yılmaz and Esentürk (2020) following the validity and reliability study conducted by Shin and Lee (2018), were utilized. The personal information form included questions regarding the age, type of sports engaged in, gender, academic year and department of the participating students in the sports sciences faculty. The "University Sports Environment Scale" is a scale used to determine university students' levels of examination regarding sports environments at the university. The scale consists of 14 items and is evaluated in 4 subscales. The subscales are: sports classes (1,2,3,4), sports facilities (5,6,7,8), university sports teams (9,10,11), university sports clubs (12,13,14), and there are no reverse-scored items in the scale. For each item in the scale, a 7-point Likert-type rating is used for responses, ranging from "1: Strongly Disagree" to "7: Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating higher levels of the respective dimension.

Data Collection

Before administering the survey questions to the students of the sports sciences faculty who formed the research group, necessary explanations about the research purpose were provided, and attention was paid to the relevant considerations. The research surveys were conducted on a voluntary basis via Google Forms and physical survey methods from May 5, 2023, to June 15, 2023, among students of the sports sciences faculty.

Data Analysis

To assess the internal consistency of the responses provided by the participants to the scale items, reliability coefficients (Cronbach's Alpha) were calculated (Table 1).

Table 1. Internal consistency coefficients for participants' responses to scale items

Scale	Internal Consistency Coefficient	Assessment
University Sports Environment Scale	0,882	Highly Reliable
Sports Lessons	0,884	Highly Reliable
Sports Facilities	0,890	Highly Reliable
University Sports Teams	0,897	Highly Reliable
University Sports Clubs	0,645	Moderately Reliable

In the research, the internal consistency of the responses given to all items and sub-dimension items of the "University Sports Environment Scale" was found to be moderately and highly reliable..

In the statistical evaluation of the data, firstly, the assumption of normality was examined using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests ($P>0.05$). In the study, whether there were differences in total scale scores according to gender and type of sport was determined using the independent samples t-test, while differences between income level, department, class, age, were determined using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and post-hoc pairwise comparisons were conducted using the Tukey multiple comparison test. SPSS version 22.0 was used for all statistical calculations. Research findings are presented as frequencies (%), means, and standard deviations, with results considered significant at $P<0.05$.

Results

The distribution of university students enrolled in the Yaşar Doğu Faculty of Sports Sciences at Ondokuz Mayıs University, who voluntarily participated in the research, according to their demographic characteristics, is provided in Table 2.

Table 2. The frequency and percentage distributions of participants' demographic characteristics

Gender	n	%	Type of Sport	n	%
Female	181	84,6	Individual	162	75,7
Male	33	15,4	Team	52	24,3
Total	214	100	Total	214	100
Age (years)	n	%	Income Level	n	%
18-22	61	28,5	Low (Income<Expense)	22	10,3
23-24	122	57,0	Medium(Income=Expense)	179	83,6
25 and above	31	14,5	High (Income>Expense))	13	6,1
Total	214	100	Total	214	100
Department	n	%	Class	n	%
Physical Education and Sports Teaching	114	53,3	1. Class	88	41,1
Sports Management	28	13,1	2. Class	31	14,5
Coach Education	39	18,2	3. Class	51	23,8
Recreation	33	15,4	4. Class	44	20,6
Total	214	100	Total	214	100

Among the individuals who voluntarily participated in the research, 84.6% were female, 75.7% engaged in individual sports, 57% were in the age range of 23-24, 83.6% had a moderate income level, 53.3% were from the department of physical education and sports teaching, and 23.8% were third-year students (Table 2).

Table 3. The examination levels of university sports environments by participants according to gender status

Scale and Sub-dimensions	Gender	n	Mean	SS	P-value
University Sports Environment Scale	Female	181	73,76	10,16	0,001
	Male	33	75,27	19,24	
Sports Lessons	Female	181	23,36	2,94	$P>0,001$
	Male	33	22,94	6,54	
Sports Facilities	Female	181	17,86	5,11	$P>0,001$
	Male	33	18,85	7,77	
University Sports Teams	Female	181	15,52	3,24	0,069
	Male	33	16,33	4,55	
University Sports Clubs	Female	181	17,02	2,64	0,017
	Male	33	17,15	4,12	

In the research, statistically significant differences were found in terms of the total scale score and total scores of all subscales (except for the university sports teams subscale) of students according to gender status. Male participants were found to have higher total scale scores, as well as total scores in the sports facilities and university sports clubs subscales, compared to female participants. However, in the sports facilities subscale, female participants' subscale total scores were found to be higher than those of male participants ($P<0.05$; Table 3).

Table 4. The examination levels of university sports environments by participants according to the type of sport

Scale and Sub-dimensions	Type of Sport	n	Mean	SS	P-value
University Sports Environment Scale	Individual	162	72,47	12,21	0,553
	Team	52	78,75	9,87	
Sports Lessons	Individual	162	22,97	3,92	0,386
	Team	52	24,31	2,73	
Sports Facilities	Individual	162	17,33	5,42	0,618
	Team	52	20,13	5,64	
University Sports Teams	Individual	162	15,25	3,52	0,134
	Team	52	16,90	3,02	
University Sports Clubs	Individual	162	16,92	3,06	0,095
	Team	52	17,40	2,32	

In the research, no statistically significant difference was found in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of subscales according to the type of sport practiced by students ($P>0.05$; Table 4).

Table 5. The examination levels of university sports environments by participants according to age

Scale and Sub-dimensions	Age	n	Mean	SS	P-value
University Sports Environment Scale	18-22	61	73,43ab	10,13	0,059
	23-24	122	75,36a	11,25	
	25 and above	31	69,74b	16,57	
Sports Lessons	18-22	61	23,16ab	3,32	0,082
	23-24	122	23,68a	2,97	
	25 and above	31	22,03b	6,12	
Sports Facilities	18-22	61	17,98	5,14	0,378
	23-24	122	18,34	5,79	
	25 and above	31	16,77	5,64	
University Sports Teams	18-22	61	15,44ab	3,29	0,053
	23-24	122	16,07a	3,31	
	25 and above	31	14,42b	4,16	
University Sports Clubs	18-22	61	16,84	2,81	0,355
	23-24	122	17,27	2,75	
	25 and above	31	16,52	3,60	

In the research, statistically significant differences were found in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of subscales (except for university sports clubs and sports facilities subscales) according to students' age groups ($P<0.05$; Table 5).

Table 6. The examination levels of university sports environments by participants according to income status

Scale and Sub-dimensions	Income Level	n	Mean	SS	P-value
University Sports Environment Scale	Low (Income<Expense)	22	66,77b	15,35	0,005
	Medium (Income=Expense)	179	75,11a	10,00	
	High (Income>Expense))	13	70,85ab	22,85	
Sports Lessons	Low (Income<Expense)	22	20,95b	6,00	0,006
	Medium (Income=Expense)	179	23,61a	2,93	
	High (Income>Expense))	13	22,92ab	6,44	
Sports Facilities	Low (Income<Expense)	22	15,32b	5,49	0,048
	Medium (Income=Expense)	179	18,39a	5,34	
	High (Income>Expense))	13	17,46ab	7,95	

University Sports Teams	Low (Income<Expense)	22	13,68b	3,56	0,009
	Medium(Income=Expense)	179	15,96a	3,15	
	High (Income>Expense))	13	14,77ab	5,97	
University Sports Clubs	Low (Income<Expense)	22	16,82	3,33	0,198
	Medium(Income=Expense)	179	17,16	2,62	
	High (Income>Expense))	13	15,69	5,11	

In the research, statistically significant differences were not found in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of subscales (except for university sports clubs subscale) according to the income status declared by students ($P>0.05$; Table 6). According to the findings, participants who declared to have a moderate income level had higher levels of examining university sports environments compared to other income statuses.

Table 7. The examination levels of university sports environments by participants according to department

Scale and Sub-dimensions	Department	n	Mean	SS	P-value
University Sports Environment Scale	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	114	73,65	12,25	0,714
	Sports Management	28	72,64	13,76	
	Coach Education	39	74,31	9,52	
	Recreation	33	75,97	12,25	
Sports Lessons	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	114	22,94	3,94	0,361
	Sports Management	28	23,14	4,38	
	Coach Education	39	23,79	2,62	
	Recreation	33	24,06	3,30	
Sports Facilities	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	114	18,35	5,39	0,463
	Sports Management	28	17,07	5,87	
	Coach Education	39	17,15	5,94	
	Recreation	33	18,67	5,64	
University Sports Teams	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	114	15,50	3,38	0,781
	Sports Management	28	16,04	4,06	
	Coach Education	39	16,00	3,12	
	Recreation	33	15,42	3,76	
University Sports Clubs	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	114	16,86	2,98	0,198
	Sports Management	28	16,39	3,57	
	Coach Education	39	17,36	2,21	
	Recreation	33	17,82	2,64	

In the research, statistically significant differences were not found in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of other subscales according to the departments where students were enrolled ($P>0.05$; Table 7).

Table 8. The examination levels of university sports environments by participants according to class

Scale and Sub-dimensions	Class	n	Mean	SS	P-value
University Sports Environment Scale	1.Class	88	73,32	12,68	0,302
	2. Class	31	71,26	15,08	
	3. Class	51	74,98	9,14	
	4. Class	44	76,14	10,77	
Sports Lessons	1.Class	88	22,89	4,38	0,079
	2. Class	31	22,45	4,66	
	3. Class	51	23,57	2,07	
	4. Class	44	24,39	2,63	
Sports Facilities	1.Class	88	18,13	5,23	0,994

	2. Class	31	18,03	5,02	
	3. Class	51	17,96	5,73	
	4. Class	44	17,84	6,60	
University Sports Teams	1. Class	88	15,39	3,56	0,376
	2. Class	31	15,10	3,92	
	3. Class	51	15,86	3,01	
	4. Class	44	16,32	3,47	
University Sports Clubs	1. Class	88	16,92ab	3,02	0,015
	2. Class	31	15,68a	4,26	
	3. Class	51	17,59b	1,76	
	4. Class	44	17,59b	2,24	

In the research, statistically significant differences were not found in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of subscales (except for the university sports clubs subscale) according to the classes of students. However, the total scores of the university sports clubs subscale for 3rd and 4th-year students were found to be higher compared to 2nd-year students ($p>0.05$; Table 8).

Conclusion

This study aimed to examine the levels of examining university sports environments among students enrolled in sports sciences faculties, considering various variables. Overall, the internal consistency coefficients of the responses provided by the participants to the scale items were found to be high. According to gender status, statistically significant differences were detected in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of all subscales (except for the university sports teams subscale). In the research, male participants were found to have higher total scale scores, as well as total scores in the sports facilities and university sports clubs subscales, compared to female participants. However, in the sports facilities subscale, female participants' subscale total scores were found to be higher than those of male participants.

Among the individuals who voluntarily participated in the research, 84.6% were female, 15.4% were male, 75.7% engaged in individual sports, and 24.3% participated in team sports. Regarding age distribution, 28.5% were in the 18-22 age range, 57% were in the 23-24 age range, and 14.5% were 25 years old and above. In terms of income level, 10.3% had low income, 83.6% had moderate income, and 6.1% had high income. Regarding academic departments, 53.3% were from the physical education and sports teaching department, 13.1% were from the sports management department, 18.2% were from the coaching education department, and 15.4% were from the recreation department. Furthermore, 41.1% were first-year students, 14.5% were second-year students, 23.8% were third-year students, and 20.6% were fourth-year students. In the research, statistically significant differences were detected according to gender status in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of all subscales (except for the university sports teams subscale). In the research, male participants were found to have higher total scale scores, as well as total scores in the sports facilities and university sports clubs subscales, compared to female participants. However, in the sports facilities subscale, female participants' subscale total scores were found to be higher than those of male participants. When looking at the literature, our study shows similarities with the works of Ayyıldız (2022), Özgenel and Bozkurt (2019), Bellici (2015), Özgök and Sarı (2016), Fernandez-Zabala et al. (2016). Regarding the type of sport practiced by students, no statistically significant difference was found in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of subscales. This finding is consistent with the study conducted by Çakıcı et al. (2023), and no other findings related to the type of sport variable were encountered in the literature. Statistically significant

differences were detected in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of subscales (except for university sports clubs and sports facilities subscales) according to the age groups of the students. When examining the age distribution of university students, it is observed that Ayyıldız (2022) found no significant difference, while the studies of Süleymanoğulları et al. (2021), Daly et al. (2019), and Bellici (2015) showed similarities. In the research, statistically significant differences were found in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of subscales (except for university sports clubs subscale) according to the income status declared by students ($p>0.05$). According to the findings, participants who declared to have a moderate income level had higher levels of examining university sports environments compared to other income statuses. On the other hand, in the study by Süleymanoğulları et al. (2021), it was found that students with high income levels had higher levels of examining sports environments, suggesting that this should be further investigated in subsequent studies. In the research, statistically significant differences were not found in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of other subscales according to the departments where students were enrolled. When examining the literature, studies conducted by Özdemir (2012), Polat (2023), and Çakıcı et al. (2023) did not find statistically significant differences among university departments, which is consistent with our study's findings. Regarding the class levels of students, statistically significant differences were not found in terms of the total score of examining university sports environments and total scores of subscales (except for the university sports clubs subscale). The total scores of university sports clubs subscale for 3rd and 4th-year students were found to be higher compared to 2nd-year students ($p>0.05$). In the study by Çakıcı et al. (2023), significant differences were found in the subscale scores of coaching education and sports management students compared to other departments. In the study by Polat (2023), no significant differences were found in the examination of sports subscales among students from different departments.

As a result of the research findings, it is considered that there is a scarcity of literature-based studies and further exploration of the use of the sports environment scale is needed. In future research, it is believed that there should be more studies conducted with larger sample groups for the subscales of the sports scale.

References

- Arıkan, A. N., Gökteş, Z., & Yıldırım, I. (2004). Farklı Branşlardaki Spor Seyircilerinin Spor Ortamına İlişkin Görüşleri. *Gazi Üniversitesi Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, Cilt12- Sayı2.
- Ayyıldız, E. (2022). Investigation of University Students' Burnout Levels in Sports. *International Journal of Sport Culture and Science*, 10(3), 94-101.
- Bellici, N. (2015). Ortaokul Öğrencilerinde Okula Bağlanmanın Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(1), 48-65.
- Çakıcı, H. A., Cevahircioğlu, B., & Alparslan, I. (2023) Sporcuların Üniversite Ortamları ile Hedef Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Türk Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 59-67.
- Daly, B. P., Shin, R. Q., Thakral, C., Selders, M., & Vera, E. (2009). School Engagement Among Urban Adolescents of Color: Does Perception of Social Support and Neighborhood Safety Really Matter? *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38, 63-74.
- Fernández-Zabala, A., Goñi, E., Camino, I., & Zulaika, L. M. (2016). Family And School Context in School Engagement. *European Journal of Education and Psychology*, 9(2), 47-55.

- Karasar, N. (1999). Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi: Kavramlar, İlkeler, Teknikler, Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
- Özdemir, M. (2012). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Okul Yaşamının Niteliğine İlişkin Algılarının Cinsiyet ve Fakülte Değişkenlerine Göre İncelenmesi. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 2(2), 225-242.
- Özgenel, M., & Bozkurt, B. N. (2019). Two Factors Predicting the Academic Success of High School Students: Justice in Classroom Management and School Engagement. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi.
- Özgök, A., & Mediha, S. (2016). Ortaokul Öğrencilerin Okula Aidiyet Duygusu ve Arkadaş Bağlılık Düzeyi. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 25(3), 71-86.
- Özkan, S., & Yılmaz, E. (2010). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Üniversite Yaşamına Uyum Durumları (Bandırma Örneği). Fırat Sağlık Hizmetleri Dergisi, 5(13), 153-171.
- Polat, H., (2023). Kampüs İçindeki Spor Ortamının Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Okul Bağlılığına Olan Etkisinin İncelenmesi. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi
- Shin, S., Chiu, W. ve Lee, H. W. (2018). For A Better Campus Sporting Experience: Scale Development and Validation of The Collegiate Sportscape Scale. Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, 22, 22-30.
- Sivrikaya, Ö., & Pehlivan, M. (2015). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Spor Yapmasını Etkileyen Faktörlerin Belirlenmesi. Spor Yönetimi ve Bilgi Teknolojileri, 10(1), 37-47.
- Süleymanoğulları, M., Doğan, A., & Bayraktar, G. (2021). Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Hedef Bağlılığı Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, 6(1), 173-183.
- Tutar, M., & Sevinç, A. (2023). Açık ve Kapalı Alan Egzersizlerinin Yaşam Kalitesine Etkisi. Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 10(3).
- Yavuz, Ü., & İlhan, E. L. (2023). Spor Yapmak ve Psikolojik İyi Oluş: Üniversite Öğrencileri Profili. Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 28(1), 1-7.
- Yılmaz, A., & Esentürk, O. K. (2020). Üniversite Spor Ortamı Ölçeği (Üsoö): Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. Opus International Journal of Society Researches, 15(23), 1699-1724.