

Investigation Of University Students' Overall Quality Of College Life And Their Satisfaction With This Life Terms Of Their Genders And Departments

Osman DALAMAN^{1A}, Rabia ÖZKURT^{2B}, Kadir PEPE^{3C}

¹Necmettin Erbakan University, Ahmet Keleşoğlu Faculty of Education, Konya/Turkey

²Burdur Provincial Directorate for National Education, Physical Education and Sports Teacher, Burdur/TURKEY

³Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Burdur/Turkey

Address Correspondence to O. Dalaman: e-mail: osmndalaman@gmail.com

(Received): 06.02.2020/ (Accepted): 28.04.2020

A:Orcid ID: 0000-0001-9265-0446- B:Orcid ID: 0000-0003-1726-7687-C:Orcid ID: 0000-0002-3207-6726

Abstract

The current study was conducted to investigate university students' life quality and life satisfaction in the campus. The study was designed in the survey model. The population of the study is comprised of the students attending the Physical Education and Sports School, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences and Faculty of Education in the central campus of Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University. The sample consists of 400 students selected from among the population through random sampling. The data were collected through the questionnaire method. As the questionnaire, "The University Life Quality Scale" adapted to Turkish by (13) was used. From this scale, the overall life quality and overall life satisfaction dimensions were taken. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was calculated to be 0.85 for the overall life quality dimension and 0.83 for the overall life satisfaction dimension. The questionnaire was administered to the students through face-to-face method. A total of 400 students (212 females and 188 males) responded to the questionnaire. In order to analyze the collected data, percentages (%) were calculated and Independent Samples T Test and Kruskal-Wallis Test, Bivariate Correlation were used. In the determination of the differences between the variables, 0.05 was taken as the confidence interval. The obtained findings have revealed that the students' overall life quality and life satisfaction in the campus mean scores are low, that while their mean scores do not vary significantly by gender, their overall life quality mean scores vary significantly depending on the faculty they attend ($p<0,05$). As a result, it can be said that the participating students' overall life quality and life satisfaction in the campus mean scores are low.

Keywords: University, Quality of life, Life satisfaction, Student

INTRODUCTION

The concept of quality is the feature of a person, object or life which indicates the quality of this person, object or life and can measure and evaluate its distinctive superiority on other things (4). The concept of quality of life, on the other hand, is defined as "the way people perceive their situation

within the whole of their culture and value judgments in connection with their goals, expectations, standards and interests" (40). In another definition, the World Health Organization defines it as "one's perception of his/her own life in a culture and value system according to his/her own goals, expectations, standards and interests." The

important point here is that the standards that are the basis for achieving the targets of a quality life are not imposed from the outside, that they are determined by the person himself/herself (5, 33).

Quality of life refers to measurable, physical (spatial) and social components of the environment and the way they are perceived (34). Quality of life is seen as an emerging and developing concept with the development of modern life and the modernization of societies. The focus of the studies looking at the quality of life is the human-human relationship and the environment-human relationship where the daily life continues (16).

The science of sociology evaluates the quality of life in terms of living standards, life style, and relations between social classes in general within the framework of "social indicators" approach (29).

Quality of life has a complex structure that is affected by the physical, social, psychological and personal beliefs of individuals and the environment they live in (19). It is a multi-faceted concept that reflects the subjective assessment of the satisfaction taken from the environment in which the person lives and interacts with other individuals (17). "Quality of life is individuals' perceptions of their own lives within the culture and values system they live in" (6). "Life satisfaction" is the emotional reaction or attitude of the person to his/her life at work, leisure and in other time frames (15).

Life satisfaction is a process in which an individual evaluates the quality of his/her life in general in line with the criteria he/she chooses (8). In this sense, life satisfaction is a judgment that each individual achieves by comparing the standards he/she sets for himself with the conditions he/she is in. Therefore, life satisfaction is determined as a result of not taking the generally accepted criteria of quality of life, but the criteria that individuals prefer for themselves (20, 21). Thus, life satisfaction stands out as a subjective judgment in which the quality of life is evaluated as a whole (26).

Recently, students' life quality has become an important subject and concept in higher education research (2). Quality of college life, which is a sub-dimension of general life quality, expresses the feeling of satisfaction that students experience throughout their student life (30). Quality of college life in this connection can be defined as conscious and positive experiences arising from the sense of control on the emergence of situations such as subjective well-being, happiness, having fun and life

satisfaction experienced by students throughout their university life.

Among the factors that affect students' quality of life, issues such as the services provided in the university environment and their functioning, standards of the academic program, quality and management of student services, and social relations come to the fore (2). Quality of college life is seen as a concept that includes emotional and cognitive dimensions (9). The concept of quality of college life manifests itself as the positive and negative levels of satisfaction and emotional balance experienced by students in their university life including academic, administrative, social, cultural and economic services (35).

Seen from this perspective, quality of college life refers to the extent to which the needs of students throughout their university life are met and the experiences that lead to positive emotionality (14). While positive emotionality gives rise to emotions such as willingness and enthusiasm, vigilance, interest, determination, excitement, strength, pride, attention, negative emotionality induces emotions such as anxiety, fear, sadness, depression, tension, shyness, guilt and aggression (22, 10).

Students' life satisfaction refers to the subjective assessment of their experiences of life satisfaction and education, and the various outcomes they achieve. This assessment continues to take shape because of the repetitive experiences of students throughout their university life (11). Students' life satisfaction depends on the extent to which the university they attend responds to their priorities (3). In this sense, strengthening students' life satisfaction should be seen as an important goal of the university administration (7).

Conditions of the social and physical environment in which people live, their expectations, the extent to which they have achieved their expectations and how much they are influenced by internal and external factors affect their life quality and life satisfaction. Life quality and life satisfaction levels positively or negatively affect individuals physically, mentally, socially and psychologically. Individuals who are good in terms of life quality and life satisfaction form a happy and successful community; communities form a nation.

The high life quality and life satisfaction levels of young individuals who will form the future of a society are important for their good upbringing. The

life quality and life satisfaction levels of university students who come from different parts of the country and different backgrounds to study in higher education for a certain period of time will affect their physical, social, psychological and academic success.

In this regard, the current study was conducted to investigate university students' life quality and life satisfaction in the university environment. The findings of the current study are believed to contribute to the training of healthy, happy and qualified individuals in the society by revealing university students' life quality and life satisfaction in the university environment and how they change depending on some variables.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

The current study was conducted to determine university students' life quality and life satisfaction in the university environment.

The current study employed the survey model. The population of the current study are the students attending the Physical Education and Sports School, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences and Faculty of Education in the central campus of Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University. The sample consists of 400 students

selected from among the population through random sampling.

The data were collected through the questionnaire method. As the questionnaire, "The University Life Quality Scale" adapted to Turkish by (13) was used. From this scale, the overall life quality and overall life satisfaction dimensions were taken. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was calculated to be 0.85 for the overall life quality dimension and 0.83 for the overall life satisfaction dimension.

The questionnaire was administered to the students through face-to-face method. A total of 400 students (212 females and 188 males) responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire data were transferred to the computer environment in the appropriate statistical program for statistical processing. In order to analyze the collected data, percentages (%) were calculated and Independent Samples T Test and Kruskal-Wallis Test, Bivariate Correlation were used. In the determination of the differences between the variables, 0.05 was taken as the confidence interval.

FINDINGS

Variables	N. (Distribution)	% (Distribution)	
Gender	Female	212	53.0
	Male	188	47.0
	Total	400	100.0
Department Attended	Physical Education and Sports School	100	25.0
	Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences	100	25.0
	Faculty of Health Sciences	100	25.0
	Faculty of Education	100	25.0
Grade Level	Total	400	100.0
	1 st year	84	21.0
	2 nd year	62	15.5
	3 rd year	144	36.0
	4 th year	110	27.5
	Total	400	100.0

In Table 1, the demographic features of the participants are presented. As can be seen, 53% of the participants are females and 47% of them are males; 25% are from the Physical Education and Sports School, 25% are from the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 25% are from the Faculty of Health Sciences, and 25% are from the Faculty of Education; 36% of them are 3rd year students, 27.5% are 4th year students, 21% are 1st year students and 15.5% are 2nd year students.

Table 2. Results of the Independent Samples T Test Conducted to Determine whether the Students' Overall Life Quality and Life Satisfaction Mean Scores Vary depending on Gender

Variables		N	\bar{X}	S	df	t	p
Overall life quality	Female	212	2.8858	0.97747	398	0.505	0.614
	Male	188	2.9372	1.05774			
Overall life satisfaction	Female	212	2.7991	0.86435	398	0.262	0.793
	Male	188	2.7755	0.92963			

P<0.05*

As can be seen in Table 2, the participating students' overall life quality mean scores do not vary significantly depending on the gender variable [$t(398)=0.505, p=0.614$] ($p>0.05$). The overall life quality mean scores found for the male and female students are as follows: males ($\bar{X}=2.9372$), females ($\bar{X}=2.8858$).

Moreover, the participating students' overall life satisfaction mean scores were also found to be not varying significantly depending on the gender variable [$t(398)=0.262, p=0.793$] ($p>0.05$). The overall life satisfaction mean scores found for the male and female students are as follows: males ($\bar{X}=2.7755$), females ($\bar{X}=2.7991$).

Table 3. Results of the Kruskal Wallis Test Conducted to Determine whether the Students' Overall Life Quality and Life Satisfaction Mean Scores Vary depending on Grade Level

Variables		N	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p
Overall life quality	Physical Education and Sports School	100	168,10	3	17.665	0.001*
	Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences	100	236,27			
	Faculty of Health Sciences	100	196,78			
	Faculty of Education	100	200,86			
	Total	400				
Overall life satisfaction	Physical Education and Sports School	100	194,88	3	4.174	0.243
	Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences	100	197,15			
	Faculty of Health Sciences	100	189,62			
	Faculty of Education	100	220,35			
	Total	400				

P<0.05*

As can be seen in Table 3, the participating students' overall life quality mean scores vary significantly depending on grade level [$\chi^2=(sd=3, n=400)=17.665, p=0.001$] ($p<0.05$).

On the other hand, the participating students' overall life satisfaction mean scores were found to be not varying significantly depending on grade level [$\chi^2=(sd=3, n=400)=4.174, p=0.243$] ($p>0.05$).

Table 4. Distribution of the Correlations between the Participants' Overall Life Quality and Life Satisfaction

Variables		Overall life quality	Overall life satisfaction
Overall life quality	Pearson Correlation	1	0.546(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	400	400
Overall life satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	0.546(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	400	400

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As can be seen in Table 4, there is a significant, high and positive correlation between the students' overall life quality and overall life satisfaction ($r=0.546$, $p<0.01$).

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

A total of 400 university students participated in the current study conducted to determine the quality of college life and satisfaction with this life. The demographic features of the students have revealed that 53% of the participants are females and 47% of them are males; 25% are from the Physical Education and Sports School, 25% are from the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 25% are from the Faculty of Health Sciences, and 25% are from the Faculty of Education; 36% of them are 3rd year students, 27.5% are 4th year students, 21% are 1st year students and 15.5% are 2nd year students (Table 1).

The participating students' overall life quality mean scores were found to be not varying significantly depending on the gender variable [$t(398)=0.505$, $p=0.614$] ($p>0.05$). The overall life quality mean scores found for the male and female students are as follows: males ($\bar{X}=2.9372$), females ($\bar{X}=2.8858$). These values show that the overall life quality of the students is medium. Moreover, the participating students' overall life satisfaction mean scores were also found to be not varying significantly depending on the gender variable [$t(398)=0.262$, $p=0.793$] ($p>0.05$). The overall life satisfaction mean scores found for the male and female students are as follows: males ($\bar{X}=2.7755$), females ($\bar{X}=2.7991$). These values show that the students are undecided about their overall life satisfaction (Table 2).

The participating students' overall life quality mean scores were found to be varying significantly depending on grade level [$X^2=(sd=3, n=400)=17.665$, $p=0.001$] ($p<0.05$). This shows that the students' overall life quality varies depending on the department they attend. When the mean rank calculated for the responses given by the

participants was examined, it was found to be 236.27 for the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 200.86 for the Faculty of Education, 196.78 for the Faculty of Health Sciences and 168.10 for the Physical Education and Sports School. These values show that while the students from the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences are moderately content with their life quality, the students' life quality scores are low in general.

On the other hand, the participating students' overall life satisfaction mean scores were found to be not varying significantly depending on the department they attend [$X^2=(sd=3, n=400)=4.174$, $p=0.243$] ($p>0.05$). When the mean rank calculated for the responses given by the participants was examined, it was found to be 220.35 for the Faculty of Education, 197.15 for the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 194.88 for the Physical Education and Sports School and 189.62 for the Faculty of Health Sciences. These values show that the majority of the participants are undecided about their life satisfaction. Thus, it can be said that the overall life satisfaction scores of the participants are low.

A significant, high and positive correlation was found between the participants' overall life quality and life satisfaction ($r=0.546$, $p<0.01$). Thus, it seems that with increasing life quality, life satisfaction also increases. This finding concurs with the findings reported in many studies in the literature (18, 32, 35, 36, 31, 39, 1).

The existing research has revealed that students' life quality and life satisfaction vary depending on many factors such as positive relationships they establish with their friends and families (7, 27), good physical and mental health (37), quality of sleep (24), housing conditions (28) and having financial resources to meet their needs

(25, 38) while negative experiences associated with these factors decrease their life satisfaction (12).

As a result, it can be said that though some small differences based on gender and grade level occur, in general the students' life quality and life satisfaction scores are low, that they are not content with the quality of their college life and life satisfaction, that there is a significant correlation between overall life quality and life satisfaction and that their life quality and life satisfaction perceptions tend to change in the same direction. In light of the findings of the current study, the following suggestions can be made:

- Various environments should be prepared for students to get engaged in activities to develop themselves in their free time in the university.
- More social living areas such as canteens, cafeterias, cinemas should be provided for students.
- Students should be provided with the opportunities for accommodation and transportation suitable for their financial situation.
- Factors that negatively affect the expectations of students from the future should be investigated in depth and measures should be taken to make them more optimistic about the future.
- Factors that cause loneliness of students experiencing high levels of loneliness should be examined and educational activities should be organized for these students to enhance their communication skills and social skills.
- The quality of the services offered to students in schools should be increased and they should be student-centred, and qualified consultancy services should be offered to students.
- Psychological Counselling and Guidance units should be established for students at universities.
- The problems that reduce the quality of life and life satisfaction of students should be identified and eliminated.

REFERENCES

1. Arslan S, Akkaş OA. Quality of college life (QCL) of students in Turkey: Students' life satisfaction and identification. *Social Indicators Research*, 2014; 115, 869-884.
2. Benjamin M. The quality of student life: Toward a coherent conceptualization. *Social Indicators Research*, 1994; 31, 205-264.
3. Borden VMH. Segmenting student markets with a student satisfaction and priorities survey. *Research in Higher Education*, 1995; 36(1), 73-88.
4. Bozkurt N. Kaliteli Yaşamın Felsefesi. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 2003; 2-3, 15-24.
5. Bilir N, Özcebe H, Vazioğlu SA, Aslan D, Subaşı N, Telatar TG. "Van İlinde 15 Yaş Üzeri Erkeklerde SF-36 ile Yaşam Kalitesinin Değerlendirilmesi", *Türkiye Klinikleri Journal of Medical Sciences*, 2005; 25, 663-668.
6. Bowling A. *Measuring Health, a Review of Quality of Life Measurement Scales*, Buckingham, Open University Press, 1997; 1-23.
7. Chow HPH. Life satisfaction among university students in a Canadian prairie city: A multivariate analysis. *Social Indicators Research*, 2005; 70, 139-150.
8. Diener E. Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1984; 95(3), 542-575.
9. Diener E, Smith H, Fujita F. The personality structure of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1995; 69, 130-141.
10. Diener E, Oishi S, Lucas RE. Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 2003; 54, 403-425.
11. Elliott KM Shin D. Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 2002; 24(2), 197-209.
12. Gilman R, Huebner ES. Review of life satisfaction measures for adolescents. *Behaviour Change*, 2000; 17(3), 178-195.
13. Kangal Demir A. Üniversite Yaşam Kalitesi Ölçeğinin Türkçe Uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması, e-international journal of educational research. 2012; Volume: 3 Issue: 1- Winter 2012, pp. 16-32
14. Kapıkıran NA. Positive and negative affectivity as mediator and moderator of the relationship between optimism and life satisfaction in Turkish university students. *Social Indicators Research*, 2012; 106, 333-345.
15. Köker S. Normal ve Sorunlu Ergenlerin Yaşam Doyumu Düzeyinin Karşılaştırılması, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara. 1991.
16. Marans R. Kentsel Yaşam Kalitesinin Ölçülmesi. Çev. H. Dülger Türkoğlu, *Mimarlık Dergisi*, 2007; 335, 23-35.
17. Martilla RJ, Rinne UK. "Epidemiology of Parkinson's Disease in Finland", *Acta Neurologica Scandinavica*, 1976; 53, 81-102.
18. Michalos AC, Orlando JA. A note on student quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 2006; 79, 51-59.
19. Orley J, Kuyken W. "Quality of Life Assessment: International Perspectives". Proceedings of the Meeting Organized by the Who and the Foundation IPSEN, Paris, July 1993; 2-3, 41-57.
20. Pavot W, Diener E, Colvin CR, Sandvik E. Further validation of the satisfaction with life scale: Evidence for the cross-method convergence of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 1991; 57(1), 149-161.
21. Pavot W, Diener E. Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 1993; 5(2), 164-172.
22. Pavot W, Fujita F, Diener E. The relation between self-aspect congruence, personality and subjective well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 1997; 22(2), 183-191.
23. Posadzki P, Musonda P, Debska G, Polczyk R. Psychosocial conditions of quality of life among undergraduate students: A cross sectional survey. *Applied Research Quality of Life*, 2009; 4, 239-258.
24. Pilcher JJ. Affective and daily event predictors of life satisfaction in college students. *Social Indicators Research*, 1998; 43, 291-306.

25. Pichler F. Subjective quality of life of young Europeans. Feeling happy but who knows why. *Social Indicators Research*, 2006; 75, 419-444.
26. Proctor CL, Linley PA, Maltby J. Youth life satisfaction: A review of the literature. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 2009; 10, 583-630.
27. Ratelle CF, Simard K, Guay F. University students' subjective well-being: The role of autonomy support from parents, friends and the romantic partner. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 2013;14, 893-910.
28. Rode JC, Arthaud-Day ML, Mooney CH, Near JP, Baldwin TT, Bommer WH, Rubin RS, Life satisfaction and student performance. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2005; 4(4), 421-433.
29. Sapançalı F. Toplumsal açıdan yaşam kalitesi. İzmir: Altın Nokta. 2009.
30. Sirgy MJ, Grzeskowiak S, Rahtz D. Quality of college life (QCL) of students: Developing and validating a measure of well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 2007; 80, 343-360.
31. Sirgy MJ, Lee DJ, Grzeskowiak S, Yu GB, Webb D, El-Hasan K, Vega JG, Ekici A, Johar JS, Krishen A, Kangal A, Swoboda B, Claiborne CB, Maggino F, Rahtz D, Canton A, Kuruuzum A. Quality of college life (QCL) of students: Further validation of a measure of well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 2010; 99, 375-390.
32. Sirgy MJ, Grzeskowiak S, Rahtz D. Quality of college life (QCL) of students: Developing and validating a measure of well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 2000; 80, 343-360.
33. Top MŞ, Özden SY, Sevim ME. "Psikiyatride Yaşam Kalitesi", *Düşünen Adam*, 2003; (1), 18-23.
34. Van Kamp I, Leidelmeijer K, Marsman A, Hollander de A. Urban environmental quality and human well-being. Towards a conceptual framework and demarcation of concepts; a literature study, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 2003; No: 65, 5-18.
35. Yu GB, Lee DJ. A model of quality of college life (QCL) of students in Korea. *Social Indicators Research*, 2008; 87, 269-285.
36. Yu GB, Kim JH. Testing the mediating effect of the quality of college life in the student satisfaction and student loyalty relationship. *Applied Research Quality Life*, 2008; 3, 1-21.
37. Zullig KJ, Valois RF, Huebner ES, Drane JW. Adolescent health-related quality of life and perceived satisfaction with life. *Quality of Life Research*, 2005; 14, 1573-1584.
38. Xiao JJ, Tang C, Shim S. Acting for happiness: Financial behavior and life satisfaction of college students. *Social Indicators Research*, 2009; 92, 53-68.
39. Wang WC, Kao CH, Huan TC, Wu CC. Free time management contributes to better quality of life: A study of undergraduate students in Taiwan. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 2011; 12, 561-573.
40. World Health Organization QOL Group). The World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment. Position Paper from the World Health Organization, *Social Science and Medicine*, 1995; 41, 1403-1409.