Student Clubs at Universities: A Content Analysis on Diversity

Omur Hakan KUZU[*]

To cite this article:

Abstract: Student clubs at universities are quite significant in acquiring many skills and competencies, especially personal, cognitive, and social development, to support students' professional and academic achievements. That being the case, this paper, a descriptive case study, aims to unveil how student clubs in Turkish state universities are diversified according to their fields of operation and university types. As of January-February 2020, 207 state and foundation universities exist in Turkey, and 11.106 student clubs information on 175 websites of these universities was attained for this research. Student clubs in the study were analysed in terms of the access information of the clubs and the number of university students. In contrast, club names were coded using the content analysis method. As a result of the analyses, it was observed that these clubs are classified under three themes, eight categories, and nineteen codes. At the end of the study, it was concluded that access to information of student clubs at Turkish universities and their visibility levels on universities' websites and other social media are rather insufficient, and some suggestions were therefore made.

Keywords: University, student clubs, content analysis.

---

[*] Correspondence: Selcuk University, Konya, Turkey, ohkuzu@selcuk.edu.tr

Declaration of Conflicts of Interests: None

Introduction

Today's higher education institutions are influenced by the modifications induced by global economic, political, and social developments. They are rather focused on using information as third (Wissema, 2009) and fourth (Lukovics & Zuti, 2015) generation institutions. Therefore a university understanding that is oriented with entrepreneurial and innovative collaborations (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000) is accepted as a success model since the early 2000s. Alongside the missions of universities such as education, research, and social service, their most critical roles have been their contributions to the development of their countries.

This has not only made the universities research oriented (Froumin, 2011) in a proactive position for local economies (Lukovics & Zuti, 2013) but also elevated them to a global platform with international collaborations (Salmi, 2011). At this platform, results such as the ranking of universities by ranking agencies, subjecting them to quality and accreditation processes by internal and external evaluation institutions, cooperation activities with the industry and other stakeholders, and finally bringing the research mission to the forefront have become inevitable and, in the most general terms, the names of all these prescriptions are framed by the motto 'world-class university' (Altbach, 2011).

Digitalisation, the most important change adventure for information and communication globally, has influenced universities in all socio-economic structures and systems. Moreover, beyond a technology-driven transformation in higher education, a process of change has been initiated in which education, research, and social services are provided in line with the demands of users/beneficiaries. These beneficiaries capitalise on services in a changing competitive environment where new working models are created (Seres et al., 2018).

The main common points of the two principal factors, internationalisation and digitalisation in higher education, was that they developed solutions based on a more collaborative and distinctive/individualised researcher and student profile. Although containing an abstruse paradox, it is undeniable that the most critical indicator of a successful university today is the qualified students/graduates and many other factors typifying a university. What makes this indicator a deal is the university's obligation to respond to the demands of the sector based on the changes mentioned above, labour demand, and knowledge economy (Gallagher, 2011). Thus, as the ability to work professionally or career success/preferability is envisioned as a university's success, universities have started to regard their students as their most important stakeholders (Sears & Hall, 2000).

Students are regarded as mattering stakeholders signals that they are seen as external stakeholders who attend the university for education and internal stakeholders who are influenced and ultimately become influencers through this process inside. According to Burrows' 'multiple lenses' theory (Avci et al., 2015) regarding the application of

stakeholder theories that have a business management approach to higher education institutions; students, despite regarded as external stakeholders in terms of their 'enrollment' potentials to higher education institutions, are rather significant internal stakeholders since they are in the focus of academic and scientific activities when they start their educations. In this sense, according to the 'threat- cooperation' classification about the stakeholders, students are in the 'low threat-high cooperation' axis as the stakeholders of higher education institutions necessitating establishing the relationship with students on the 'involvement strategy' (Burrows, 1999).

According to the distinction of power, legitimacy, and urgency, based on the theory of stakeholder analysts by Mitchell et al. (1997); the stakeholder was defined primarily, and dynamism was brought to the salience of stakeholders theory according to the differentiation of the features made (Mitchell et al., 1997): (1) Attributes of stakeholders are variable, not fixed. (2) Attributes of stakeholders are built socially, not objectively. (3) There may be conscious and deliberate practices in stakeholder behaviours etc.

In this sense, students are in the position of being legal/legitimate and inevitable stakeholders. Therefore, students are directly dependent on institutional interests, which require them to be qualified as legitimate stakeholders in the institution's legitimacy. On the other hand, benefits that are expected from students (such as their graduation and future career) cause students to be transferred into the position of being inevitable and determinant for themselves and higher education institutions (Mitchell et al., 1997). This also signifies that students are regarded as significant stakeholders in higher education institutions in the sense of decision making, institutional life, multiple cultures, and their relationships with each other and the environment (Bergan, 2004).

The stakeholder approach (Bjorkquist, 2008), emerging from universities operating in isolation from socio-economic and political developments for many years, has entered into social relations (external relations) in the last century and has prompted universities to depend on an internal assessment. At this very point, students have become stakeholders with key roles in the centre of internal assessments. In many universities' strategic plans, students are defined as influenced by and affecting the institution in the stakeholder category (Hostut, 2018). Besides, students are seen as the key components of the knowledge society within the academic mobility of the universities nowadays (Sehoole & Lee, 2020). Student clubs are also classified as one of the most important stakeholders in the stakeholder analysis of some universities (Hostut, 2018).

Although various applications of these developments can be stumbled upon in education and research, universities' collaboration with students in all operations is rapidly becoming widespread due to their mission to serve the society, e.g. placing students into the centre as a requirement of social service (including them in decision-making mechanisms) and evaluation of students. This firstly stands for individual 'involvement' of students in the course of their higher education (Astin, 1984; Cooper et al., 1994; Terenzini et al., 1996) and secondly 'participation' in intra- institutional/

organisational decisions and 'being involved in the decision-making process' (Lizzio & Wilson, 2009; Menon, 2003; Zuo & Ratsoy, 1999).

Universities have become student-centred due to students' involvement in the management/governance practice (Johnson, 1991; Richter & Tjosvold, 1980). Students are the stakeholders in an individual or social sense (Jongbloed et al., 2008) and are the most affected by the institutions' decisions. The most well-known practice of student-centeredness in universities has emerged in "student club"* organisations.

It was stated that student clubs contributing to embodiment and institutionalisation of student participation have numerous socio-psychological/psycho-social benefits (Cooper et al., 1994) primarily in students' cognitive advancement (Terenzini et al., 1996), 'educational involvement/engagement', 'class participation', 'career planning', 'lifestyle planning', 'cultural and social participation', and 'academic autonomy'. Student clubs, in which the participation is defined as "physical and psychological energy that students distinguish as academic experiences" (Astin, 1984), become concrete, reinforces academic learning through student peer interaction, and contributes to the transformation of university campuses into social areas where philosophical and political thoughts related to campus activities, personal/social problems, and agendas in arts, science, technology or international relations are discussed (Schlossberg, 1989). Furthermore, this enables students to feel important and positively reflect on their universities' loyalty relations (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Student clubs are important in terms of 'retention', the students' commitment to universities, as 'personal integration & adjustment' also plays a key role in the social fabric of campus/university life as well as the effect of academic factors in getting used to university life (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994). There are studies in the literature (Ewing et al., 2009; Foreman & Retallick, 2013; Webber et al., 2013) suggesting that when university students are engaged in the social aspects of campus life, that is, when they actively participate in student clubs, they are more capable of redounding their learning and personal development and academic achievement (Huang & Chang, 2004). It is also stated that leadership tasks in these clubs contribute to their careers, academic achievements, and the development of a certain set of social skills (Logue et al., 2005). Similarly, it is asserted that the participation of students in professional organisations grants them skills such as leadership, teamwork, trust, and time management (Phillips et al., 2015).

These and many similar positive contributions of student clubs have even been used in learning processes with the name 'service-learning' as a pedagogical method such as 'experiential education', 'problem-based learning', and 'collaborative learning'.

---

* In the Turkish higher education system, student organisations use the terms 'student society/community' and 'student club' in regards to student organisations. In this study, in terms of concept unity and increasing usage rate, the term 'student club' was preferred.

Service-learning, which refers to the use of participation in student clubs as a pedagogical method for teaching lessons, includes the following functions of student participation (Chi, 2000; Jones & Abes, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Smith, 1994): (1) Students' 'commitment' to social movements and political systems, (2) Participation of students in social services in terms of helping others, understanding problems of the society, and working in volunteer jobs that will contribute to increasing their 'other-oriented' attitudes in the future, (3) Perception of social and economic inequalities, (4) The tendency to attribute these inequalities to the system, not to individuals, and (5) A sense of social responsibility.

In the literature, discussions about the reasons for student clubs' participation in community activities regarding their contribution to students' psychological, social and socio-economic achievements and what kind of gains these clubs have gained also have a significant place. Regarding these issues, the artistic, sportive, and academic clubs (Dugan, 2013), which students regard as a means of identity and expression, promote academic achievements in students (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). These clubs also provide individual, social, and civic awareness developments (Dugan & Komives, 2007).

In essence, it is observed that student clubs that contribute to the understanding of "participatory culture" in institutional and structural terms also contribute to education and research activities regarding "socialisation", "harmony", "efficiency", and "human/universal/intellectual achievements" indirectly on young people. For this reason, it becomes inevitable that student clubs are considered as structures that can offer clues in developing solutions as a complement to the student-centred/participatory education-teaching suggestions for the quality problems that arise with the globalisation and massification process of universities. In this sense, studying matters through more cases such as "how and what types of clubs students come into operation" and "what kind of outcomes they gain and what they expect from these clubs" is of great importance regarding student satisfaction and universities' basic missions.

In this context, the purpose of this study is to determine which areas student clubs at universities in Turkey focus on (resemble each other) and how they vary (diversify) at universities. Therefore the following questions were sought:

1. How are student clubs at Turkish universities distributed according to university types?
2. How do student clubs at Turkish universities vary according to their names and fields of activity?

Method

Research Designe

This study was designed by using the 'case study' model to show the distribution of fields of activity over the names of student clubs in Turkish universities. A case study is used to view a situation or phenomenon in its real-life context by applying many data types (Cohen et al., 2007). According to Yildirim and Simsek (2008), the case study ensures the analysing of one or more cases holistically within its limits (environment, time, etc.). According to Creswell (2007), a case study is a qualitative study that examines in-depth and describes situations and situational themes. In this paper, a case study pattern was used as the aim was to circumscribe the distribution (frequencies) of student clubs at Turkish universities according to their fields of activity and their differences in universities.

Study Group

All of the 'target population' (Turkish universities) are included in the study to keep track of the entire (targeted) group. As creating generalisable judgments about the target universe as much as possible in a study is aimed, the target becomes the universe that the researcher intends to examine, be interested in, determine, and generalise the results (McMillan, 1996). Since this study aims to reach student clubs in all Turkish universities, there is no set study group.

In the study, the databases of the Council of Higher Education (YOK), a "supreme institution that regulates the higher education system in the country and directs the operations of higher education institutions", were used to reach the current number and information of Turkish universities (YOK, 2020). Between December 2019 and January 2020, when the study was carried out, there were 207 universities in Turkey, 129 of which were 'state/public' and 78 foundation/private universities. As 5 of 78 foundation universities are merely vocational schools, they will be referred to as foundation-vocational schools. In this study, student clubs in these foundation-vocational schools were also examined.

Data Collection Tool

Document analysis method was used in the process of collecting data in the study. Document analysis is a method that is employed for analysing qualitative research to analyse written or visual documents, to make inferences and interpret those (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Websites of 207 Turkish universities were used to collect data. Data were obtained over 5-10 days to be least affected by changes from the establishment and/or closure of new student clubs. A separate filing system was applied to make comparisons between state and foundation universities. The data on student clubs were entered in an Excel file alphabetically for assessment and systematisation (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996).

Additionally, to make a comparative analysis in the file, the link location/menu title information on universities' websites, the basic promotion elements, and the total number of students at the universities were also included.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection was carried out between December 2019 and January 2020. Because there was no information on student clubs on the websites of 15 states, 16 foundation universities, and 1 foundation vocational school, data of those could not be acquired. However, information on 11,106 student clubs of 175 universities (85% of Turkey), 2,714 of which belong to 61 foundation and 8,392 to 114 state universities, were reached.

The content analysis method was used to determine the status of activity fields according to the names of student clubs. There are four stages in the content analysis: coding data, finding themes/categories, editing codes and themes/categories, and interpreting the findings (Yildirim & Simsek, 2008). In this study, the student clubs were coded according to their names. For those clubs (433 in the last coding), activities that cannot be found/deduced by their name, the university's social media accounts (if any), and/or their websites were tried to be used. Information about the clubs was expected to be obtained. Other clubs with similar names in other universities are taken as criteria, and coding is done accordingly for the clubs whose information was not available. After this stage, codes, categories, and themes were rechecked with the help of a colleague. Those who have different coding from student clubs under the same name are combined under a single code. As a result, student clubs are classified under three themes, eight categories, and nineteen codes. After certain revisions, the codes were digitised, and the findings obtained were interpreted. Voyant Tools and Excell programs were used in word and data analysis. Voyant Tools is a web-based application that uses more than twenty visualisation tools to analyse text (Cortés-Sánchez, 2017).

Validity and Reliability

In the study, the researcher triangulation technique (Denzin, 1970, as cited in Fusch et al., 2018) was used for internal validity. In collecting and analysing data (at the stage of determining the activity fields by name), contributions of two different specialist academics were received. Data collection and analysis were elaborated for external validity, and a systematic way was followed in all processes. Also, direct sample transfer of information obtained from secondary sources (university web pages) was included.

In the study, the formula of consensus similarity ($\Delta = C \div (C + \partial) \times 100$) of Miles and Huberman (1994) was taken as the basis for internal reliability. In this formula, Δ: is reliability, C: is the number of agreements, ∂: is the number of disagreements. In the first coding on the same output, 73% consensus (except the clubs, which cannot be inferred about the field of activity by name) was acquired. Different encodings were

retained first, and the final decision regarding the field of activity of the club was reached by considering a third researcher's opinion to ensure consensus. As a second method, if the club had detailed information on the internet, it was reached, and the inference was made for coding and category from its operations. In the second coding, the consensus rate was elevated to 84%. Eight clubs whose names could not be inferred from their activity fields and no detailed information could not be coded in any category. Instead, they were qualified under the code "entertainment and socialisation" based on the assumption that the most general purpose of all clubs is "socialisation". For the study's external reliability, the coding notes about the data were stored as prints and computer files.

Findings

The findings obtained in the study were analysed under two main parts. In the first part, qualitative information about student clubs was given, while in the second part, the clubs were classified per university types and their fields of activity. In the study, firstly, an evaluation was made regarding the availability of necessary information about student clubs accessed from universities' websites, the place of access on the website, and the frequency of words. Descriptive information about the state universities is given in Table 1 below.

Table 1.

Descriptive Information on Student Clubs at Turkish State and Foundation Universities

Indicators	State Universities		Foundation Universities	
	Content	Number	Content	Number
Information	Detailed info	102	Detailed info	53
	No detailed info	12	No detailed info	8
	No info	15	No info	17
Place on the net	Administrative menu	60	Administrative menu	10
	Separate menu	54	Separate menu	51
	No data	15	No data	17
Most repeated words	Young	538	Young	83
	Culture	250	Social	74
	Thought	247	Thought	59
	Turkish	241	Theatre	54
	Social	199	Turkish	54
Least repeated words	Research	50	Uni (abbreviation)	19
	Society	51	Responsibility	19
	Woman	51	Archery	19
	Tourism	52	Media	19
	Information	52	Public	19

Note: Voyant Tools and Excell programs were used in word and data analysis.

According to Table 1 above, 102 (79%) of state universities and 53 (68%) of foundation universities show promotional information on basic topics such as student club's contact

address, chairman, advisor, and purpose. Of these examples, the *statistical analysis* of Afyon Kocatepe and Akdeniz Universities on the activities of student clubs, Karamanoglu Mehmet Bey University's *activity ratings*, Pamukkale University's *information system portal*, and Middle East University's *video introductions* can be given as different examples in terms of their aims, activities, and visibility. On the other hand, recently established state universities such as Ankara Haci Bayram, Ankara Social Sciences, and Erzurum Technical University, and deep-rooted universities such as Bursa Uludag, Dicle, and Firat Universities can be shown as examples for universities that do not have detailed information about student clubs on their websites (The homepages of those universities were rechecked on February 15th, 2020).

Secondly, an evaluation was made on the menu title of the state and foundation universities' websites. According to the table, almost half of the state universities (n=60) and very few of the foundation universities (n=10) have information about student clubs under the menu 'Administrative Structure' belonging to the Department of Health, Sports, and Cultural Activities that conducts its operations and is responsible for student clubs as the head of the department directed by the Rectorate. However, it is seen that the other half of the state universities (n=54) and a large part of the foundation universities (n=51) employ easily accessible student club information through the menu titles such as "student, candidate student, and life on campus". Examples such as *Student Deanship* at Istanbul Okan University, *Advisory Rectorship for Student Clubs* at Gazi University, the *Student Club Management Unit* at Kahramanmaras Sutcu Imam University and the *Student Club Coordinatorship* at Selcuk University can be given as different examples in terms of the weight of the subject.

On the other hand, as can be seen in Table 1 above, the most frequently repeated words in the student club names of state universities were; *young (n=538), culture (n=250), thought (n=247), Turkish (n=241), and social (n=199)*; while they were *young (n=83), social (n=74), thought (n=59), theatre (n=54), and Turkish (n=54)* in foundation universities. In terms of quantitative assessment about student clubs, the number of student clubs and students on campus was comparatively analysed according to the types of universities. Thus, in Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5, information about 10 Turkish universities with the highest and least student clubs is given.

As shown in Table 2 above, it was found that Istanbul University has the highest number of student clubs (n=223) among the Turkish state universities. It is Turkey's first university (whose foundation dates back to the period of the Ottoman Empire). Marmara, Bursa Uludag, Hacettepe, Sivas, Dicle, and Erciyes universities, which are amongst the top ten and have the highest number of student clubs, can be held up as examples to other state universities. Another important finding in Table 2 is that the average number of clubs per student is as low as 0.30%, due to many students in state universities, generally over 50,000.

Table 2.

10 Turkish State Universities with the Highest Number of Student Clubs

University Name	The Number of Student Clubs (A)	The Number of Students (B)	The Number of Student Clubs per Student (%) (A/B)
Istanbul	223	85,620	0.26
Marmara	197	77,492	0.25
Sakarya	180	54,517	0.33
Bursa Uludag	176	70,607	0.24
Canakkale Onsekiz Mart	158	47,219	0.33
Pamukkale	154	54,556	0.28
Hacettepe	151	52,007	0.29
Sivas Cumhuriyet	148	51,751	0.28
Dicle	145	29,466	0.49
Erciyes	142	50,283	0.28

Note: The number of students in the universities is of the 2018-2019 academic year data obtained from the Higher Education Council website statistics (Access Date: February 10th, 2020).

Table 3 below provides information on 10 Turkish state universities with the least number of student clubs.

Table 3.

10 Turkish State Universities with the Least Number of Student Clubs

University Name	The Number of Student Clubs (A)	The Number of Students (B)	The Number of Student Clubs per Student (%) (A/B)
Ardahan	10	5,017	0.19
Tarsus	11	2,458	0.44
Ankara Social Sciences	12	1,070	0.33
Eskisehir Technical	12	14,320	0.08
Erzurum Technical	14	4,132	0.33
İzmir Bakircay	14	831	0.33
Mimar Sinan	14	10,886	0.12
Sakarya University of Applied Sciences	14	23,424	0.05
Batman	16	12,203	0.13
Trabzon	19	13,255	0.14

Note: The number of students in the universities is of the 2018-2019 academic year data obtained from the Higher Education Council website statistics (Access Date: February 10th, 2020).

As shown in Table 3 above, Ardahan University (n=10) has the least number of student clubs among the state universities. It is also seen that the universities on the list are mostly newly established state universities, except for Mimar Sinan University, which is a boutique and an old one. On the other hand, in state universities with a small number of student clubs, the number of clubs per student was as low as 0.20% on average. Table 4 below shows 10 foundation universities with the highest number of student clubs.

Table 4.

10 Turkish Foundation Universities with the Highest Number of Student Clubs

University Name	The Number of Student Clubs (A)	The Number of Students (B)	The Number of Student Clubs per Student (%) (A/B)
Baskent	120	16,728	0.71
I. D. Bilkent	110	12,185	0.90
Istanbul Medipol	97	30,616	0.31
Istanbul Bilgi	92	25,624	0.35
Istanbul Kultur	86	15,697	0.54
Uskudar	79	18,983	0.41
Istanbul Okan	76	22,586	0.33
Cankaya	73	8,148	0.89
Istinye	72	5,448	1.32
TOBB University of Economics and Technology	70	6,052	1.15

Note: The number of students in the universities is of the 2018-2019 academic year data obtained from the Higher Education Council website statistics (Access Date: February 10th, 2020).

According to Table 4 above, the foundation university with the highest student clubs is Baskent University (n=120). It can be stated that the other universities on the list are also relatively old, such as I. D. Bilkent, Istanbul Bilgi, Istanbul Okan, and TOBB University of Economics and Technology. It was discovered that the number of clubs per student is averagely above state universities (0.70%) since the number of students of foundation universities is lower. The information of universities with the least number of student clubs among foundation universities is given in Table 5 below.

Table 5.

10 Turkish Foundation Universities with the Least Number of Student Clubs

University Name	The Number of Student Clubs (A)	The Number of Students (B)	The Number of Student Clubs per Student (%) (A/B)
Alanya HEP	5	421	1.18
Yuksek Ihtisas	7	820	0.85
Atasehir Adiguzel	9	1,361	0.66
Ibn Haldun	11	978	1.12
Avrasya	12	6,883	0.33
Avrupa	13	2,092	0.17
Hasan Kalyoncu	16	7,931	0.20
Istanbul Gelisim	17	23,739	0.07
Cappadocia	18	4,448	0.40
Piri Reis	19	3,836	0.49

Note: The number of students in the universities is of the 2018-2019 academic year data obtained from the Higher Education Council website statistics (Access Date: February 10th, 2020).

It can be observed in Table 5 above that the university with the least number of student clubs among the foundation universities is Alanya HEP University (n=5) and that most

of the other universities are newly established ones. Thus, the number of clubs per student on the list is 0.55%.

The main three missions of universities are used as themes in the analysis. While determining the categories related to the themes, classifications were made based on these missions. The most notable benefit of extracurricular activities and student clubs (factors such as the acquisition of certain social-cognitive skills and identity/personality development, which will also contribute to students' careers and academic achievements) are shown (Foubert & Grainger, 2006; Gellin, 2003; Guardia & Evans, 2008; Logue et al., 2005). These factors are also associated with the competencies acquired by students in terms of education, research culture, and social work throughout their higher education (Star & Hammer, 2008).

As shown in Tables 6, 7, and 8 below, student clubs of 175 universities, whose data were obtained within the scope of the study, are classified under eight categories and nineteen codes. Categories include "developing research culture", "increasing scientific knowledge competence", "professional and academic solidarity", "cognitive and psychosocial development", "social responsibility and consciousness", "health and sports", "culture and art", and "activity together".

Table 6.

Turkish State and Foundation Universities, Student Club Categories and Codes (According to research theme)

Classification		State (n)	Foundation (n)	Total (n)
Category	Code			
1. Developing research culture (n=132)	R&D - Project studies	75	17	92
	Innovation	29	11	40
2. Increasing scientific knowledge competence (n=394)	Science, informatics, and technology	173	32	205
	Digitalisation	102	34	136
	Aviation and space	47	6	53
		Research Theme Total		526

According to Table 6 above, it is seen that student clubs are mostly grouped as "science, informatics and technology" code under the category of "increasing scientific knowledge competence" (n=394) and "digitisation" code (n=136) within the category of "science, informatics and technology" (n=205). From state universities, student clubs such as *Computer Society Club, Technology Transfer Club, Alternative Energy Systems Club, Educational Technology Club,* and *Science Women Club,* and from foundation universities; *Electric Vehicles Club, Science Power Plant Club, Software Development Club, Informatics and Information Technology Club,* and *Science Office Club* can be given as examples for information, informatics, and technology category. On digitalisation state universities following clubs stand out: *Robotic Application and Development Club, Artificial Intelligence and Image Processing Club, Cyber Security Club, Autonomous Systems Club,* and *Solar Car Team,* and from foundation universities:

Unmanned Vehicle Club, Nanoscience Club, Smart Cities Student Club, Personal Data Protection Club, and *Maker Club*. Table 7 below shows the categories and codes under the education theme, where the majority of the student clubs take place.

Table 7.

Turkish State and Foundation Universities, Student Club Categories and Codes (According to education theme)

Classification		State (n)	Foundation (n)	Total (n)
Category	**Code**			
3. Professional and academic solidarity (n=4,672)	Occupation and department association	2,232	872	3,104
	Academic, business and technical field partnership	1,048	209	1,257
	Career development and entrepreneurship/leadership	235	76	311
4. Cognitive and psycho-social development (n=1,268)	Thought, discussion, and common identity	885	226	1,111
	Personal development and hobby	99	58	157
	Education Theme Total			5,940

According to Table 7 above, it appears that student clubs are most commonly classified over the "profession and department association" code (n=3,104) and "academic, business, and technical field partnership" code (n=1,257) under the category of "professional and academic solidarity" (n=4,672). Another category in which student clubs are most coded is "cognitive and psychosocial development" (n=1,268); within this category, there are student clubs under the codes of "thought, discussion, and common identity" (n=1,111). Related to profession and department/program association; *Common Point - Mathematics Club, Turkish Medical Students International Committee (TURKMSIC), Young Lawyers Club, Engineering Society of Eskisehir (ESOES), Engineer Brain Club,* and *Guiders to Goals (G2G) Club* can be examples of state universities. In contrast, *Teeth and Stuff Club, Rainbow Child Development Club, IEEE Student Branch, European Medical Students Association Club (EMSA), Ergotherapy Club,* and *Red Helmet Club* are those of foundation universities. Regarding the academic, business, and technical field partnership; *Migration and Middle East Club, Strategic Research Club, Academic Development and Science Club, Mulkiye History Club,* and *University-Industry Cooperation Club* can be examples for state universities, and *Librarianship Club, Urban Studies Club, Turkish World Studies Club, Rare Diseases Club*, and *Translation Club* for foundation universities. On the other hand, concerning thought, discussion, and common identity; state universities' club examples can be *Ataturkist Ideology Club, Socialist Thought Club, Utopia Club, Idea Workshop Club, Debate Club,* and *Model United Nations Club (MUN)*, and for foundation universities; *Youth Ideas Club, Social Democracy Club, International Debating Club, TEDx,* and *Anatolian Youth Club*. Table 8 below shows the categories and codes under the social service theme of student clubs.

Table 8.

Turkish State and Foundation Universities, Student Clubs' Categories and Codes (According to social service theme)

Classification		State (n)	Foundation (n)	Total (n)
Category	Code			
5. Social responsibility and consciousness (n=1,389)	Contribution to the natural and cultural environment	241	67	308
	Community health and solidarity	582	149	731
	Positive discrimination and awareness	255	95	350
6. Health and sports (n=1,209)	Health development and problems	107	20	127
	Sportive activities and organisations	793	289	1,082
7. Culture and art (n=1,382)	Cultural differences and activities	240	37	277
	Artistic formations and activities	783	322	1,105
8. Activity together (n=660)	Fraternity and homogeneous group memberships	347	156	503
	Entertainment and socialisation	119	38	157
	Social Service Theme Total			4,640

According to Table 8 above, student clubs are mostly clustered under the following categories: "community health and solidarity" code (n=731) within the "social responsibility and consciousness" category (n=1,389), "artistic formations and activities" code (n=1,105) within the "culture and art" category (n=1,382), "sportive activities and organisations" code (n=1,082) within the "health and sport" category (n=1,209) and "fraternity and homogeneous group works" code (n=504) within the "activity together" (n=660) category. Regarding community health and solidarity, examples of student clubs from state universities are; *Children with Leukemia Foundation (LOSEV) Club, Young Red Crescent, Young Green Crescent, Young-Earth Doctors Mediterranean Club,* and *Hand-in-Hand for Life Club,* and for foundation universities: *Buddy Club, Village Schools Aid Club, Fight against Cigarette Club, Search and Rescue (AKUT) Student Club,* and *Young Volunteer Club.* Concerning artistic formations and activities, examples of student clubs from state universities are as such: *Baglama and Anatolian Music Club, Literature for Us Club, Amateur Photographers Club, Just us Theatre Club,* and *Pas De Deux Dance Club*, and for foundation universities: *Classical Turkish Music Club, Mehmet Akif Literature Club, Modern Dance Arts and Folk-Dance Club, Amateur Authors Club,* and *Magical Lantern Cinema Club.* Regarding sportive activities and organisations; *Travel and Camping Club, Amateur Sports Club, Electronic Sports Club, Women's Flag Football,* and *Free Bicycle Club* serve as examples for state universities, whereas, *Extreme and Outdoor Sports Club, Underwater Sports Club, Chess Club, Traditional Turkish Archery Club,* and *Amateur and Sportive Aviation Club* are the examples for foundation universities. Finally, for fraternity and homogeneous group works, examples from state universities are *Azerbaijan-Turkey Brotherhood Club, Syrian Youth Cultural Society, the Turkish world and Relatives Club, Turkmen Student Club,* and *the African Students Club*, and for foundation universities, examples are; *International Student Club, the Erasmus Student Network Club, Uni BJK, Uni Young FB,* and *Uni Ultraslan.*

Discussion and Conclusion

This study aims to illustrate the distribution of student clubs in Turkish universities according to university types and names. It was witnessed that there were more student clubs in state universities than in foundation universities and universities with old establishment dates compared to new ones. This finding obtained from the study coincides with Mohan Bursali and Aksel (2016)'s study that there are over 100 student clubs in one of Turkey's 30 oldest state universities (established in 1992). Besides, Turan et al. (2017) state that 70 student clubs in a state university were established in 2006. This situation coincides with the finding that the number of student clubs is high in state universities despite being newly founded. However, it can be maintained that the number of clubs per student is not relatively high due to the high number of students in state universities. As a matter of fact, in line with this finding, Yaldir, Koyuncuoglu, & Demir (2016) developed a student club management information system application for simplifying the processes of participation in student clubs. The finding of the low number of student communities per student obtained from this study is in line with the suggestion in Eskici and Aktas (2014)'s study that students' interest in clubs should be increased and student communities should be made more active and efficient. Besides, it was ascertained that basic information, especially contact information about student clubs on the universities' internet homepages, is mostly included. The examples of Hacettepe, Gazi, Marmara, Akdeniz, Erzincan Binali Yildirim, and Afyon Kocatepe Universities discerned that certain universities have relatively more statistical and visual elements and practices that can set models for other universities. Finally, it can be affirmed that student club details are more accessible on the homepages of foundation universities than state universities; they both are not sufficient in terms of the visibility of the clubs.

In the study, student clubs are grouped into eight categories due to the analyses performed on the names. Student clubs in these categories are as follows per their numbers: a) Professional and academic solidarity, b) Social responsibility and consciousness, c) Culture and art, d) Cognitive and psychosocial development, e) Health and sport, f) Activity together g) Increasing scientific knowledge competence, and h) Developing research culture. Amongst the categories, it is seen that student clubs are distributed mostly and relatively as: "Occupation and department association", "academic, business, and technical field partnership", "thought, discussion, and common identity", "artistic formations and activities", "sportive activities and organisations", "community health and solidarity", "fraternity and homogeneous group memberships", "positive discrimination and awareness", and "career development and entrepreneurship/leadership".

The study unearthed that student clubs mostly diversified under profession and department/program names (category). Secondly, it was observed that student clubs are diversified in academic research, work (profession), and technical issues. On the other hand, it was concluded that there are many student clubs in Turkish universities

operating on similar thoughts, ideologies, and/or discussion environments. This finding coincides with Dugan's (2013) 'latent' factors, 'academic careerists' and 'taxonomy' of 'affinity group affiliates', which constitutes the majority of the groups in the student' involvement experiences' classification, with his extensive research with university students actively serving in student clubs. Furthermore, the fact that the number of professional-academic and thought clubs in Turkish universities is high reveals that "students take part in clubs to make further contributions to their cognitive developments" (Terenzini et al., 1996), as well as numerous factors which also attests that this finding is also a valid case for Turkish univers.

A second category in which student clubs at Turkish universities are clustered the most is social responsibility and awareness. It was observed that the clubs with social health and solidarity are more abundant than other social responsibility groups. The study also recognised that there are many student clubs in terms of contribution to the natural and cultural environment and positive discrimination-awareness. This can be interpreted as an indication that conscious awareness (Chi, 2000; Dey et al., 2010; Jones & Abes, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Smith, 1994) such as volunteering and sensitivity in students at Turkish universities has an influential role in establishing a club. Thirdly, the concentration of student clubs at Turkish universities in the formations related to culture, arts, and sports activities is in line with the "cultural collegiate and athletes" classification of Dugan's finding (2013). This is similar to how Cooper et al. (1994) determine student clubs' cultural/social participation function.

According to the findings of this study, student clubs at Turkish universities, which stand out with their professional/academic, cultural/artistic/sports, and social responsibility activities, tally up with the diversity of students' participation in campus life in the study of Elkins et al. (2011). Besides, the distinction of "professional/departmental, sports, and special interests (hobby-oriented)" in the study of Dunkel and Schuh (1998) is likewise seen in the findings obtained in this study. In this sense, it can be said that student clubs in Turkish universities show similarities with foreign examples, except for organisations such as "Greek letter organisations, honour society, and fraternity/sorority" (Dugan, 2013; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005) seen in American/Anglo Saxon and certain European universities. The similarity of the distribution of student clubs in the Turkish state and foundation universities also shows a co-formality case (Emil, 2020); described in theories as "being influenced by organisations like them and by widely adopted models" and "compelling factors of institutional actors" (Usdiken et al., 2017) which is largely valid in Turkish universities, too.

The results of this study in terms of unveiling the diversity of student clubs at Turkish universities can be deemed an outset for universities and researchers to converge more on student clubs. It is important how students use their free time as much as the academic and social skills they will attain during their higher education period. Considering how much the habits collected during this period will significantly impact the future (Akyuz & Turkmen, 2015; Lapa & Ardahan, 2009), it appears inevitable for universities to make theoretical and practical approaches with more scientific and

academic methods. Therefore, the reasons for the membership/participation of the students in clubs, which are the most concrete reflections of student participation, the reflections of club activities on the achievements of students, the actual and legal status of clubs, and the aspects to be exploited should be examined comprehensively in higher education. This also signifies that, for decision-makers and practitioners in the higher education system, diversification in student clubs must be supported and coordinated to monitor students' attitudes and skill development towards external pressures related to learning outcomes. As in the Middle East Technical University case, practical methods such as the use of club activities as an efficient method in introducing the university to candidate students will contribute to the solution strategies of the Turkish state and foundation universities, whose quota occupancy problems are increasing daily.

Although the diversity and number of student clubs at Turkish universities are regarded as positive, there are still several issues on which universities should focus and develop. Designing student club more visibly, making them easily accessible on the website, and popularising/developing portal applications with detailed and updated information can be recommended for universities. In this sense, it can be expressed that practices such as the Student Club Coordinatorships and Student Club Management Units, which are encountered in some examples of Turkish universities, will make positive contributions to this problem. However, it should not be disregarded that the most notable contribution to the visibility and ease of access of student clubs can be presented in universities with a structure such as in "Student Club Unions" (where students can represent their clubs with a participatory management approach and strengthen their relations with the university administration). Functioning/operating such a structure, examples, and practices, which can be seen primarily in England, continental Europe, American, Leeds, and Cardiff universities as well as Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul Aydin, Cag, and Ataturk universities in Turkey, will make significant benefactions to the advancement of participatory and democratic cultures of universities.

It is a difficult sine qua non to make new student-oriented arrangements in Turkish student clubs' financial and organisational structures. The continuity and sustainability of the clubs should be improved by rising institutional, structural, operational, and financial support that enable student clubs to be professionally accessed and visualised on social platforms (Manisa Celal Bayar University example) other than universities' websites.

Research enriched with qualitative/quantitative methods can be conducted with student interviews who were previously or are still club members to reach more detailed information about clubs' activities for future studies. In addition, students' expectations from student clubs, their potential and concrete gains can be explored in depth. Student clubs at Turkish universities can be analysed comparatively with cases at universities in foreign countries.

The most prominent limitation of this study is handling student clubs only through universities' websites and performing diversity analysis by name. This may be considered

the foremost paradox of the general categorisation of student clubs that have multiple purposes and carry out various activities, as in a professional student club performing social responsibility. It is, however, quite possible to defeat this paradox via studies that analyse the aims and activities of clubs with multiple research data and methods. That way, the findings and results in this study, which is analysed through many data and internet documents, can be further enriched, and additional contributions can be made to the implications in higher education literature and practice.

References

Akyuz, H., & Turkmen, M. (2015). Investigation of university students' attitudes towards leisure time activities: Bartin University sample. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport, 4*(Special Issue 1), 340-357.

Altbach, P. G. (2011). The academic profession: The realities of developing countries. In Philip G. Altbach (Ed), *Leadership for world-class universities: Challenges for developing countries* (pp. 205-223). Routledge.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25,* 297-308.

Avci, O., Ring, E., & Mitchelli, L. (2015). Stakeholders in U.S. higher education: An analysis through two theories of stakeholders. *The Journal of Knowledge Economy & Knowledge Management, X*(II), 45-54.

Bergan, S. (2004). *Student participation in higher education governance.* Semantic Scholar. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/845a/ba2e03d09a9857682335d068d90cdda5dc06.pdf?_ga=2.141904753.210436895.1579999026-485561085.1565937251

Bjorkquist, C. (2008). Continuity and change in stakeholder influence: Reflections on elaboration of stakeholder regimes. *Reflecting Education, 4*(2), 24-38.

Burrows, J. (1999). Going beyond labels: A framework for profiling institutional stakeholders. *Contemporary Education, 70*(4), 5-10.

Chi, B. S. (2000). *Service-learning as 'citizenship' education: The promise and puzzles*, Washington DC: Corporation for National Service. Unomaha. https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1044&context=slcecurriculum

Coffey, A., Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies.* Sage.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge.

Cooper, D. L., Healy, M. A., & Simpson, J. (1994). Student development through involvement: Specific changes over time. *Journal of College Student Development, 35,* 98-102.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Cortés-Sánchez, J. D. (2017). *Mission and vision statements of universities worldwide-a content analysis.* Bogotá: Documento de investigación No. 152, Editorial Universidad del Rosario.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Sage.

Dey, E. L., Antonaros, M., Ott, M. C., Barnhardt, C. L., & Holsapple, M. A. (2010). *Developing a moral compass: What is the campus climate for ethics and academic integrity? Core commitments: educating personal and social responsibility.* Association of American Colleges and Universities. https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/core_commitments/moralcompassreport.pdf

Dugan, J. P. (2013). Patterns in group involvement experiences during college: Identifying a taxonomy. *Journal of College Student Development, 54,* 229-246.

Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study. A report from the multi-institutional study of leadership.* National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.

Dunkel, N. W., & Schuh, J. H. (1998). *Advising student groups and organizations.* Jossey-Bass.

Elkins, D. J., Forrester, S. A., & Noel-Elkins, A. V. (2011). Students' perceived sense of campus community: The influence of out-of-class experiences. *College Student Journal, 45,* 105-122.

Emil, S. (2020). What do universities' virtual faces tell at a glance? A visual and textual analysis of Turkish universities' official homepages. *Journal of Higher Education, 10*(1),1-10. https//. doi.org/10.2399/yod.19.009

Eskici, M., & Aktas, R. (2014). Universite ogrencilerinin ogrenci kuluplerine yonelik gorusleri. *Asian Journal of Instruction, 2*(1), 31-40.

Etzkowitz H., & Leydesdorff L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: From national systems and "Mode 2" to a triple helix of university-industry-government relations. *Research Policy, 29*(2), 109-123.

Ewing, J. C., Bruce, J. A., & Ricketts, K. G. (2009). Effective leadership development for undergraduates: How important is active participation in collegiate organizations? *Journal of Leadership Education, 7*(3), 118-131.

Foreman, E. A., & Retallick, M. S. (2013). Using involvement theory to examine the relationship between undergraduate participation in extracurricular activities and leadership development. *Journal of Leadership Education, 12*(2), 56-73.

Foubert, J. D., & Grainger, L. U. (2006). Effects of involvement in clubs and organizations on the psychosocial development of first-year and senior college students. *NASPA Journal, 43*(1), 166-182.

Froumin, I. (2011). Establishing a new research university: The higher school of economics, the Russian Federation. In P. G. Altbach, and J. Salmi (Eds.), *The road to academic excellence the making of world-class research universities* (pp. 293-322). The World Bank.

Fusch, P., Fusch, G. E., & Ness, L. R. (2018). Denzin's paradigm shift: Revisiting triangulation in qualitative research. *Journal of Social Change, 10*(1), 19-32.

Gallagher, M. (2011). The role of elite universities in national higher education and research systems, and the challenges of prosecuting the case for concentrating public investment in their development in Australia, In N. C. Liu, Q. Wang, and Y. Cheng (Eds.), *Paths to a world-class university* (pp. 29-66). Sense Publishers.

Gellin, A. (2003). The effect of undergraduate student involvement on critical thinking: A meta-analysis of the literature 1991-2000. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(6), 746-762.

Gerdes, H., & Mallinckrodt, B. (1994). Emotional, social, and academic adjustment of college students: A longitudinal study of retention. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 72*(3), 281-288.

Guardia, J. R., & Evans, N. J. (2008). Factors influencing the ethnic identity development of Latino fraternity members at a Hispanic Serving Institution. *Journal of College Student Development, 49,* 163-181.

Hostut, S. (2018). Turk universitelerin paydas analizi. *Erciyes İletisim Dergisi, 5*(3), 187-200.

Huang, Y., & Chang, S. (2004). Academic and cocurricular involvement: Their relationship and the best combinations for student growth. *Journal of College Student Development, 45,* 391-406.

Johnson, J. H. (1991). *Student voice motivating students through empowerment.* Oregon School Study Council.

Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2004). Enduring influences of service-learning on college students' identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(2), 149-166.

Jongbloed, B., Enders, J., & Salerno, C. (2008). Higher education and its communities: interconnections, interdependencies and research agenda. *Higher Education, 56,* 303-324.

Lapa, T. Y., & Ardahan, F. (2009). The reasons students at Akdeniz University participate in leisure activities and the ways they spend their time. *Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences, 20*(4), 132-144.

Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K. (2009). Student participation in university governance: The role conceptions and sense of efficacy of student representatives on departmental comite´s. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(1), 69-84.

Logue, C. T., Hutchens, T. A., & Hector, M. A. (2005). Student leadership: A phenomenological exploration of postsecondary experiences. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(4), 393-408.

Lukovics, M. and Zuti, B. (2015). New functions of universities in the XXI. century: fourth generation" universities. *Transition Studies Review, 22*(2), 33-48.

Lukovics, M., & Zuti, B. (2013). *Successful universities towards the improvement of regional competitiveness: fourth generation' universities.* Regional Integration: Europe, the Mediterranean and the World Economy Conference, European Regional Science Association (ERSA), Conference Paper, Palermo, Olaszország.

Martin, L. M. (2000). The relationship of college experiences to psychosocial outcomes in students. *Journal of College Student Development, 41,* 294-303.

McMillan, J. H. (1996). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer.* HarperCollins College Publishers.

Menon, M. E. (2003). Student involment in university governance: A need for negotiated educational aims? *Tertiary Education and Management, 9,* 233-246.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* (2nd ed). Sage.

Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *The Academy of Management Review, 22*(4), 853-886.

Mohan Bursali, Y., & Aksel, I. (2016). Sosyal girisimciligin genc aktorleri: Universite ogrenci topluluklari ornegi. *Journal* of Social Sciences and Humanities Researches, 17(37), 85-101.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: Vol. 2 A decade of research*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Phillips, J. A., McLaughlin, M. M., Gettig, J. P., Fajiculay, J. R., & Advincula, M. R. (2015). An analysis of motivation factors for students' pursuit of leadership positions. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 79*(1), 1-5.

Richter, F. D., & Tjosvold, D. (1980). Effects of student participation in classroom decision making on attitudes, peer interaction, motivation, and learning. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*(1), 74-80.

Salmi, J. (2011). The road to academic excellence: lessons of experience. In P. G. Altbach, and J. Salmi (Eds.), *The road to academic excellence the making of world-class research universities* (pp. 323-342). The World Bank.

Schlossberg, N. K. (1989). Marginality and mattering: Key issues in building community. *New Directions for Student Services, 48,* 5-15.

Sears, J. T., & Hall, J. D. (2000). Generational influences on contemporary curriculum thought. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 32*(2), 199-214.

Sehoole, C., & Lee, J. J. (2020). South Africa as a geopolitical hub for migration and international student mobility. *Higher Education Governance & Policy, 1*(2), 99-108.

Seres, L., Pavlicevic, V, & Tumbas, P. (2018). *Digital transformation of higher education: competing on analytics.* Proceedings of INTED2018 Conference 5th-7th March 2018, Valencia, Spain, pp. 9491-9497.

Smith, M. W. (1994). Community service learning: Striking the chord of citizenship. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*(1), 37-43.

Star, C., & Hammer, S. (2008). Teaching generic skills: Eroding the higher purpose of universities or an opportunity for renewal? *Oxford Review of Education, 34*(2), 237-251.

Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1996). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development, 37,* 149-162.

Turan, D., Duysak, A., & Kuguoglu, I. H. (2017). Universite ogrenci topluluklarinin toplumsallasmada yeri ve onemi. *Recep Tayyip Erdogan University Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(6), 203-217.

Usdiken, B., Divarci Cakmakli A., & Topaler, B. (2017). "Strategy" in public and private universities, 1982-2014. *Journal of Management Research, 13*(1-2), 8-40.

Webber, K. L., Krylow, R. B., & Zhang, Q. (2013). Does involvement really matter? Indicators of college student success and satisfaction. *Journal of College Student Development, 54*(6), 591-611.

Wissema, J. G. (2009). *Towards the third-generation university: Managing the university in tra*nsition. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Yaldir, A., Koyuncuoglu, M. U., & Demir, B. (2016). *Universiteler icin ogrenci topluluk yonetim bilgi sistemi uygulamasi.* XVIII. Akademik Bilisim Konferansi, Aydin, 936-944. https://ab.org.tr/ab16/bildiri/315.pdf

Yildirim, A., Simsek, H. (2008). *Qualitative research methods in the social sciences*. Seckin Publication.

Yuksekogretim Kurulu (YOK). 2020. *Universitelerimiz.* https://www.yok.gov.tr/universiteler/universitelerimiz

Zuo, B., & Ratsoy, E. W. (1999). Student participation in university governance. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 29*(1), 1-26.

Authors

Contact

Omur Hakan KUZU, works as an Associate Professor at Selcuk University, Beysehir Ali Akkanat Faculty of Tourism, Department of Tourism Guide. His research interest areas include strategic management, quality assurance and higher education policies.

Omur Hakan Kuzu, Selcuk University Beysehir Ali Akkanat Faculty of Tourism, Beysehir-Konya/Turkey

E-mail: ohkuzu@selcuk.edu.tr