Eurasian Journal of Educational Research
www.ejer.com.tr

Undergraduate Students' Satisfaction Levels on the Quality of Faculty Life

Nermin CIFTCI ARIDAG[1], Merve AYDIN[2], Rukiye AYDIN[3]

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Purpose: School life quality influences students in many ways with factors related to it. For this reason, the quality of life of the school needs to be taken seriously. Satisfaction with school life can contribute to students' positive attitudes toward the school. When the relevant literature is examined, it is observed that a limited number of researches have been conducted in our country. Based on this reason, it has been decided to carry out this research. **Research Methods**: The screening model was used in the study. The study population consists of year one, two and three undergraduate students who didn't receive preparatory education and who study in Yıldız Technical University Faculty of Education. The data were collected through Faculty Life Quality Scale (FLQS) and Personal information form.

Findings: According to the study, it was observed that satisfaction level of faculty life quality was higher in female students than male students with respect to all the sub-dimensions, apart from the satisfaction of faculty sub-dimension, and total scale score. Student satisfaction levels, with respect to all the sub-dimensions and total scale score, were observed to be highest in year one students; and lowest in year three students. Students, who had a "very high" and "high" satisfaction level with their department choice, were observed to have higher satisfaction levels about faculty life quality than the students with "low" and "medium" satisfaction levels. **Implications for Research and Practice**: It was observed that Faculty Life Quality Scale total score differed according to gender, grade level, satisfaction level of department choice and perceived socio-economic status.

---

[1] Yıldız Technical University, TURKEY, e-mail: nermin_ciftci@yahoo.com, ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-1993-8352

[2] Yıldız Technical University, TURKEY, e-mail: mrvydn2034@gmail.com, ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0001-9216-3410

[3] Yıldız Technical University, TURKEY, e-mail: rukiye_aydin@hotmail.com, ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-7183-3013

Corresponding Author: Nermin Çiftçi Arıdağ, Yıldız Technical University, Faculty of Education, e-mail: nermin_ciftci@yahoo.com, ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-1993-8352

Introduction

Qualified education is one of the important conditions for adapting to the change taking place throughout the world (Ihtiyaroglu, 2010). According to studies, managers and teachers are usually worked with on issues about quality (Yilmaz & Cokluk-Bokeoglu, 2006). But universities not just include managers and educators. Students are stakeholders of this system. Because they are the reason for schools' beings, student opinions on school life quality are crucial. School life quality influences students in many ways with factors related to it. For this reason, the quality of life of the school needs to be taken seriously. Satisfaction with school life can contribute to students' positive attitudes toward the school. When the relevant literature is examined, it is observed that a limited number of researches have been conducted in our country. Based on this reason, it has been decided to carry out this research.

School life quality can be defined as a feeling of good resulting from the children integrating with the school setting and getting involved in school life (Karatzias, Papadioti-Athanasiou, Power & Swanson, 2001). This concept is accepted to be a sign of general well-being (Durmaz, 2008). Bilgic (2009) defines the life quality of a school as well-being that occurs when children cohere with the school life. Parallel with these definitions, it can be considered as a synthesis of positive or negative experiences (Thien & Razak, 2013). It is obvious that the quality of school life depends on student opinions about the school setting.

Teachers, other students and managers are effective in the school life quality of students. It is believed that the cultural and social potentials offered by the school are related with school life quality (Sari, 2007). According to studies, school life quality has crucial effects on the sense of belonging to school, academic achievement, self-respect and attitudes towards teachers (Inal, 2009). According to a study conducted by Mok and Flynn (1997), school life quality is effective on academic achievement. Alaca (2011) states that school life quality is significant for personality development, academic achievement and future social experiences. High school life quality is crucial in decreasing the rate of dropping out of school and in developing the student's socialization process and learning performance through positive experiences (Ilmen, 2010). For this reason, stress should be laid on the quality of school life.

A high school life quality of students increases their satisfaction levels and enables their educational activities to be more effective (Gedik, 2014). In addition, satisfaction of school life can contribute to developing positive attitudes towards the school. Being satisfied with the educational settings will enable the educational process to be productive (Aydin, Gumus & Altintop, 2014). The state of being happy with these settings depends on how qualified the students perceive these institutions. Positive perceptions on the quality of school life can lead to positive effects on many variables such as academic achievement, commitment to school, subjective well-being; negative perceptions can lead to negative results such as absence, dropping

out of school, low academic achievement, school bullying and disobeying school rules (Kalayci & Ozdemir, 2013). Thus, studies that can increase student satisfaction levels with their school life should be carried out.

The faculty satisfaction dimension involves facts such as student reactions to the faculty, them being happy of being a member of the faculty, the sportive, social and cultural activities organized in the faculty (Cokluk-Bokeoglu & Yilmaz, 2007). The classroom setting and student relations satisfaction dimension involves facts such as student interests for activities that can contribute to the educational process, relationships among students, cooperation, friendship and classroom (Ayik & Aktas-Akdemir, 2015). The instructor satisfaction dimension involves issues such as the relationship between students and the instructor, the instructors showing interest to the students, working for the students' personal and academic development, informing and guiding them and generally their educational experiences (Cokluk-Bokeoglu & Yilmaz, 2007). When these dimensions are considered together, the students' satisfaction levels on faculty life quality becomes evident.

Enhancing quality is possible as a result of student evaluations (Tosun, 2012). It is evident in the national literature that very few studies have been carried out on this subject. Thus, satisfaction levels with the quality of faculty life was examined with respect to gender, grade, satisfaction level of department choice and perceived socio-economic status in this study. It is believed that this study will contribute to the literature by helping better understanding the factors that satisfaction level of faculty life quality. The overall purpose of the study is to examine satisfaction levels of students, studying in Yildiz Technical University, Faculty of Education, with their quality of faculty life. With this respect answer for the fallowing question was sought:

Do students' satisfaction levels on the quality of faculty life differ according to gender, grade level, their satisfaction level on department choice and their socio-economic status?

Method

Research Design

The screening model was used in the study. The purpose of screening studies is to describe the characteristics and opinions of large masses (Buyukozturk, Kilic-Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2016).

Research Sample

The study population consists of year 1., 2., and 3. undergraduate students who didn't receive preparatory education and who study in Yildiz Technical University Faculty of Education during the spring term of 2015-2016 academic year. The study sample was determined through the proportional cluster sampling method. Minimum 36% participation was enabled from the students of each department. The

study was conducted on 500 (participation level: 45%) volunteer students studying in the departments of Science Teaching (70, 50.3%), Primary School Mathematics Teaching (77, 48.1%), Pre-School Teaching (73, 46.8%), Classroom Teaching (73, 46.5%), Social Sciences Teaching (69, 47.3%), Turkish Language Teaching (54, 36%), Psychological Counseling and Guidance (84, 41.4%). Information about the general shape of the students who participated in the study is given on Table 1.

Table 1

Student Distribution Based on Various Variables

Gender	N	Percentage (%)
Female	387	77.4
Male	113	22.6
Grade Level		
Year 1.	193	38.6
Year 2.	166	33.2
Year 3.	141	28.2
Type of Department		
Science Teaching	70	14.0
Primary School Mathematics Teaching	77	15.4
Pre-School Teaching	73	14.6
Psychological Counseling and Guidance	84	16.8
Classroom Teaching	73	14.6
Social Sciences Teaching	69	13.8
Turkish Language Teaching	54	10.8
Perceived Socio-economic Level		
Low	8	1.6
Below medium	26	5.2
Medium	307	61.4
High	153	30.6
Very high	6	1.2
Total	500	100

According to Table 1, 387 (77.4%) of the students participating in the study are female and 113 (22.6%) are male. 193 (38.6%) students study in year one, 166 (33.2%) study in year two and 141 (28.2%) students study in year three. Among the student, 70 (14%) study in the department of Science Teaching, 77 (15.4%) in Primary School Mathematics Teaching, 73 (14.6%) in Pre-School Teaching, 84 (16.8%) in Psychological Counseling and Guidance, 73 (14.6%) in Classroom Teaching, 69 (13.8%) in Social Sciences Teaching and 54 (10.8%) in Turkish Language Teaching. It was observed that 8 (1.6%) students perceived their socio-economic status as "low",

26 (5.2%) as "below medium", 307 (61.4%) as "medium", 153 (30.6%) as "high" and 6 (1.2%) as "very high".

Data Collection Instruments

The data were collected through Faculty Life Quality Scale (FLQS) and Personal Information Form. Information on the data collection instruments are given below.

Personal information form. The personal information form which was developed by the researchers, includes information about the participant students' gender, grade level, satisfaction level of the department chosen, perceived socio-economic status.

Faculty Life Quality Scale (FLQS). It was developed by Yilmaz and Cokluk-Bokeoglu (2006). It consists of three dimension titles "Faculty Satisfaction", "Instructor Satisfaction" and "Classroom Setting and Student Relations Satisfaction". The scale consists of a total of 37 items, 15 items in the Faculty Satisfaction and Instructor Satisfaction sub-dimensions and 7 in the Classroom Setting and Student Relations Satisfaction sub-dimension. 17 items in the scale are scored reversely. The scale has three grades titled "I agree" (3), "I'm unsure" (2) and "I disagree" (1). The factor load values of the items in the Faculty Satisfaction sub-dimension vary between 0.32 and 0.63 and the item-total correlations vary between 0.24 and 0.49. The variance this factor accounts for itself is 23% and the Cronbach-Alpha internal consistency co-efficient is 0.75. The factor load values of the items in the Instructor Satisfaction sub-dimension vary between 0.37 and 0.67 and the item-total correlations vary between 0.32 and 0.58. The variance this factor accounts for itself is 31% and the Cronbach-Alpha internal consistency co-efficient is 0.83. The factor load values of the items in the Classroom Setting and Student Relations Satisfaction sub-dimension vary between 0.39 and 0.71 and the item-total correlations vary between 0.26 and 0.45. The variance this factor accounts for itself is 34% and the Cronbach-Alpha internal consistency co-efficient is 0.67. The Cronbach-Alpha internal consistency co-efficient of the Faculty Life Satisfaction Scale is 0.87. The internal consistency coefficient of the present study group was examined and found to be 0.875.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed through the SPSS 21 statistical software. Then the normality analysis of the data of the research variables and the subscales of the scales was done using Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. As a result of the analysis of the data obtained from the research, it was seen that the variables of the research did not show normal distribution ($p < .05$); For this reason, nonparametric tests were used in the analysis of the sub-problems of the study. During the data analysis process, the Mann Whitney U-Test was used for comparing Faculty Life Satisfaction Scale sub-dimension scores and the total score according to gender; the Kruskal Wallis H-Test was used for comparing according to grade level, satisfaction level with department choice and perceived socio-economic status variables; the Dunnett C Test was used to determine between which groups the difference occurred.

Results

Findings on Faculty Life Quality Satisfaction With Respect to the Gender Variable

Table 2. displays the Mann Whitney U-Test results, which was conducted to determine whether or not the Faculty Life Satisfaction Scale sub-dimension scores and the total score of the students who participated in the study differed according to gender.

Table 2

Comparison of the Faculty Life Quality Scale Sub-Dimension Scores and the Total Score with Respect to Gender

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Ran Sum	U	Z	P
FS Sub-Dimension	Female	387	256.91	99425.00	19384.000	-1.840	.066
	Male	113	228.54	25825.00			
IS Sub-Dimension	Female	387	259.54	100443.50	18365.500	-2.594	.009
	Male	113	219.53	24806.50			
CSSRS Sub-Dimension	Female	387	259.31	100353.00	18456.000	-2.535	.011
	Male	113	220.33	24897.00			
Total Scale	Female	387	259.71	100507.00	18302.000	-2.638	.008
	Male	113	218.96	24743.00			

It is evident on Table 2. that the mean rank scores of the Faculty Satisfaction sub-dimension with regards to gender is 256.91 for females; and 228.54 for males. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed not to be statistically significant (=-1.840; p<.05). The mean rank scores of the Instructor Satisfaction sub-dimension with regards to gender were observed to be 259.54 for females; and 219.53 for males. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (=-2.594; p<.05). It was observed that female students' satisfaction levels with the instructor are higher than the male students. The mean rank scores of the Classroom Setting and Student Relations Satisfaction sub-dimension with regards to gender were observed to be 259.31 for females; and 220.33 for males. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (=-2.535; p<.05). It was observed that female students' satisfaction levels with the classroom setting and student relations are higher than the male students. The mean ranks of the Faculty Life Quality Scale total scores with regards to gender were observed to be 259.71 for females; and 218.96 for males. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically

significant (=-2.638; p<.05). It was observed that female students' satisfaction levels with faculty life quality are higher than the male students.

Findings on Faculty Life Quality Satisfaction With Respect to Grade Level

Results of the Kruskal Wallis H-Test, which was conducted to determine whether or not the Faculty Life Quality Satisfaction Scale sub-dimension scores and the total score differed according to grade level, and the results of the Dunnett C Test, which was conducted to determine between which groups the difference occurred, are given on Table 3.

Table 3

Comparison of the Faculty Life Quality Scale Sub-Dimension Scores and the Total Score with Respect to Grade Level

	Grade	N	Mean Rank	SD	x^2	p	Difference
FS Sub-Dimension	1	193	286.32	2	24.869	.000	1>2
	2	166	245.72				1>3
	3	141	207.09				2>3
IS Sub-Dimension	1	193	268.53	2	10.607	.005	1>3
	2	166	257.28				
	3	141	217.84				
CSSRS Sub-Dimension	1	193	285.19	2	22.719	.000	1>3
	2	166	244.62				
	3	141	209.94				
Total Scale	1	193	283.76	2	23.949	.000	1>3
	2	166	250.08				2>3
	3	141	205.46				

It is evident on Table 3. that the mean rank scores of the Faculty Satisfaction sub-dimension with regards to grade level is 286.32 for year one students, 245.72 for years two students and 207.09 for year three students. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (x^2=24.869; p<.05). When the source of this difference is considered, year one students have higher faculty satisfaction levels than year two and year three students; and year two students have higher faculty satisfaction levels than year three students. The mean rank scores of the Instructor Satisfaction sub-dimension with regards to grade level was observed to be 268.53 for year one students, 257.28 for years two students and 217.84 for year three students. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (x^2=10.607; p<.05). When the source of this difference is considered, year one students were observed to have higher instructor satisfaction levels than the year three students. The mean rank scores of the Classroom Setting and Students Relations sub-dimension with regards to grade level was observed to be 285.19 for year one students, 244.62 for years two students and 209.94 for year three students. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (x^2=22.719; p<.05). When the source of this

difference is considered, year one students were observed to have higher classroom setting and student relation satisfaction levels than the year three students. The mean ranks of the Faculty Life Quality Satisfaction Scale total scores with regards to grade level was observed to be 283.76 for year one students, 250.08 for years two students and 205.46 for year three students. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (x^2=23.949; p<.05). When the source of this difference is considered, year one students were observed to have higher faculty life quality satisfaction levels than year three students; and year two students were observed to have higher faculty life quality satisfaction levels than year three students.

Findings on Faculty Life Quality Satisfaction With Respect to Satisfaction Level of Department Choice

Results of the Kruskal Wallis H-Test , which was conducted to determine whether or not the Faculty Life Quality Satisfaction Scale sub-dimension scores and the total score differed according to department choice satisfaction level, and the results of the Dunnett C Test, which was conducted to determine between which groups the difference occurred, are given on Table 4.

Table 4

Comparison of the Faculty Life Quality Scale Sub-Dimension Scores and the Total Score with Respect to Department Choice Satisfaction Level

	Satisfaction of Department Choice	N	Mean Rank	SD	x^2	p	Difference
FS Sub-Dimension	1.Very Low	25	226.02	4	10.712	.030	
	2.Low	44	204.74				
	3.Medium	186	244.12				5>2
	4.High	176	257.22				
	5.Very High	69	288.59				
IS Sub-Dimension	1.Very Low	25	231.56	4	20.857	.000	
	2.Low	44	213.68				4>3
	3.Medium	186	222.53				5>3
	4.High	176	278.21				
	5.Very High	69	285.55				
CSSRS Sub-Dimension	1.Very Low	25	239.76	4	15.645	.040	
	2.Low	44	207.84				5>2
	3.Medium	186	231.74				5>3
	4.High	176	264.96				
	5.Very High	69	295.29				
Total Scale	1.Very Low	25	226.02	4	18.923	.001	4>2
	2.Low	44	202.55				4>3
	3.Medium	186	229.88				5>2
	4.High	176	271.06				5>3
	5.Very High	69	293.07				

It is evident on Table 4. that the Faculty satisfaction sub-dimension mean rank scores with regards to satisfaction level of department choice is 226.02 for those with "very low"; 204.75 for those with "low"; 244.12 for those with "medium"; 257.22 for those with "high" and 288.59 for those with "very high" satisfaction levels. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (x^2=10.712; p<.05). When the cource of this difference is considered, it was observed that students who have "very high" satisfaction levels with their department choice have higher faculty satisfaction levels than student with "low" satisfaction levels. The instructor satisfaction sub-dimension mean rank scores with regards to satisfaction level of department choice is 231.56 for those with "very low"; 213.68 for those with "low"; 222.53 for those with "medium"; 278.21 for those with "high" and 285.55 for those with "very high" satisfaction levels. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (x^2=20.857; p<.05). When the source of this difference is considered, it was observed that instructor satisfaction levels are higher in students with "high" department choice satisfaction levels than those with "medium"; in student with "very high" than those with "medium" and "low" satisfaction levels. The classroom setting and student relations satisfaction sub-dimension mean rank scores with regards to satisfaction level of department choice is 239.76 for those with "very low"; 207.84 for those with "low"; 231.74 for those with "medium"; 264.96 for those with "high" and 295.29 for those with "very high" satisfaction levels. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (x^2=15.645; p<.05). When the source of this difference is considered, it was observed that students who have "very high" satisfaction levels with their department choice have higher classroom setting and student relations satisfaction levels than students with "low" and "medium" satisfaction levels. The mean ranks of the Faculty Life Quality Scale total scores with regards to satisfaction level of department choice was observed to be 226.02 for those with "very low"; 202.55 for those with "low"; 229.88 for those with "medium"; 271.06 for those with "high" and 293.07 for those with "very high" satisfaction levels. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (x^2=18.923; p<.05). When the source of this difference is considered, it was observed that students, who had a "high" and "very high" satisfaction levels with their department choice had higher faculty life quality satisfaction levels than the students with "low" and "medium" satisfaction levels.

Findings on Faculty Life Quality Satisfaction With Respect to Perceived Socioeconomic Status

Results of the Kruskal Wallis H-Test, which was conducted to determine whether or not the Faculty Life Quality Satisfaction Scale sub-dimension scores and the total score differed according to perceived socio-economic status, and the results of the Dunnett C Test, which was conducted to determine between which groups the difference occurred, are given on Table 5.

Table 5

Comparison of the Faculty Life Quality Scale Sub-Dimension Scores and the Total Score with Respect to Perceived Socioeconomic Status

	Socio-economic Income	N	Mean Rank	SD	x^2	p	Difference
FS Sub-Dimension	1.Low	8	220.44	4	5.513	.239	
	2.Below Medium	26	192.71				
	3.Medium	307	250.29				
	4.High	153	261.83				
	5.Very High	6	262.75				
IS Sub-Dimension	1.Low	8	245.44	4	10.744	.030	
	2.Below Medium	26	180.35				
	3.Medium	307	245.24				4>2
	4.High	153	274.01				
	5.Very High	6	230.67				
CSSRS Sub-Dimension	1.Low	8	251.56	4	12.137	.016	
	2.Below Medium	26	181.79				
	3.Medium	307	242.71				4>2
	4.High	153	276.44				
	5.Very High	6	283.92				
Total Scale	1.Low	8	236.19	4	12.003	.017	
	2.Below Medium	26	175.83				
	3.Medium	307	244.77				4>2
	4.High	153	275.21				
	5.Very High	6	256.33				

It is evident on Table 5 that the Faculty satisfaction sub-dimension mean rank scores with regards to perceived socio-economic status is 220.44 for those with "low"; 192.71 for those with "below medium"; 250.29 for those with "medium"; 261.83 for those with "high" and 262.75 for those with "very high" satisfaction levels. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed not to be statistically significant (x^2=5.513; p<.05). The Instructor Satisfaction sub-dimension mean rank scores was observed to be 245.44 for those with "low"; 180.35 for those with "below medium"; 245.24 for those with "medium"; 274.01 for those with "high" and 230.67 for those with "very high" levels with regards to perceived socio-economic status. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically

significant (x^2=10.744; p<.05). When the source of this difference is considered, it was observed that those who perceived their socio-economic status as "high" had a higher instructor satisfaction level than those who perceived it as "below medium". The Classroom Setting and Student Relations Satisfaction sub-dimension mean rank scores were observed to be 251.56 for those with "low"; 181.79 for those with "below medium"; 242.71 for those with "medium"; 276.44 for those with "high" and 283.92 for those with "very high" levels with regards to perceived socio-economic status. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (x^2=12.137; p<.05). When the source of this difference is considered, it was observed that those who perceived their socio-economic status as "high" had a higher classroom setting and student relations satisfaction level than those who perceived it as "below medium". The mean ranks of the Faculty Life Quality Satisfaction Scale total scores were observed to be 236.19 for those with "low"; 175.83 for those with "below medium"; 244.77 for those with "medium"; 275.21 for those with "high" and 256.33 for those with "very high" levels with regards to perceived socio-economic status. The difference between the mean ranks of the groups was observed to be statistically significant (x^2=12.003; p<.05). When the source of this difference is considered, it was observed that those who perceived their socio-economic status as "high" had a higher faculty life quality satisfaction level than those who perceived it as "below medium".

Discussion and Conclusion

When faculty life quality satisfaction level is considered with regards to gender, there was a significant difference between the groups. It was observed that satisfaction levels were higher in female students than male students with respect to all the sub-dimensions, apart from the faculty satisfaction sub-dimension, and total scale score. When the literature is considered, there are similar (Topsakal & Iplik, 2013; Barutcu-Yildirim, Yerin-Guneri & Capa-Aydin, 2015) and different (Egelioglu, Arslan & Bakan, 2011; Haliloglu-Tatli, Kokoc & Karal, 2011; Ozdemir, Kilinc, Ogdem & Er, 2013; Erdogan & Bulut, 2015) results with this finding. The difference between study results obligates more researchers on the subject to be carried out. In addition, that female students have higher faculty life quality satisfaction levels than male students, according to this study, can be due to the fact that female students attach more importance to education or because female and male students have a different educational level that they aim to achieve. Sahin, Zoraloglu and Sahin-Firat (2011) also observed that student opinions on the educational level they want to achieve differs according to gender; male students desire undergraduate education more and female students desire post-graduate education more. That female students have a further aim concerning the educational level they want to achieve than male students can have led them to perceive their faculty more positively. It can also be interpreted as female students desiring to make a career and male students desiring to enter into professional life as soon as they complete their university degree education.

When faculty life quality satisfaction levels of students are considered with regards to the grade level variable, there was a significant difference between the groups. It was observed that, with respect to all the sub-dimensions and the total scale score, year one students have highest; year three students have the lowest satisfaction levels. According to a study carried out by Cokluk-Bokeoglu and Yilmaz (2007), students who study in lower grades have high faculty life satisfaction levels and satisfaction decreases as their grade levels increase. Similarly, there are also studies that emphasize that year one university students have higher satisfaction levels than year four students (Haliloglu-Tatli et al., 2011; Şahin et al., 2011; Barutcu-Yildirim et al., 2015). Yelkikalan, Sumer and Temel (2006) underlined that students who are studying in year three have more positive perceptions about their faculty with respect to the students studying in year four. There is a consistency between the study findings. That faculty life quality satisfaction levels decrease as the grade level increases can be explained as because student expectations with their faculty change throughout time.

It is important for university students to be satisfied with their faculty as well as the department they study in (Altas, 2006). It is evident in the study that faculty life quality satisfaction level differs according to department choice satisfaction level. In general, students, who had a "very high" and "high" department choice satisfaction level were observed to have higher satisfaction levels than the students with "low" and "medium" satisfaction levels. Similarly, according to the study conducted by Uzgoren and Uzgoren (2007), there is a relationship between university students' being satisfied with their university and whether or not they are happy to be studying in the university. According to a study carried out by Aydin et al. (2014), there is a strong and reverse relationship between instructor satisfaction and the desire to change the department variable. It is evident that there are similarities among study findings. That satisfaction levels of students, who have a high department choice satisfaction level, are higher than students, who have a low department choice satisfaction level, can be due to the fact that students who are satisfied with their department choice are happy with their faculty and have positive perceptions about their faculty.

When faculty life quality satisfaction level is considered with regards to perceived socio-economic status, it is evident that the difference between the groups was significant in all sub-dimensions apart from the "Faculty Satisfaction" sub-dimension, and total scale score. It was observed that satisfaction levels of students, who perceived their socio-economic status as "high", were higher than the students who perceived it as "below medium". According to a study conducted by Alaca (2011), school life quality perceptions of students of various income groups do not differ. Uzgoren and Uzgoren's (2007) study underlines that students, whose families have 2000 TL and higher income a month, have a lower possibility of being satisfied with their university than students of the lowest income group. There is an inconsistency among the study findings. Thus, there should be more studies carried

out on the subject. The following recommendations have been made based on the findings of this study:

1. A study with a similar context can be carried out on students–in different faculties.

2. Because the results of the studies examining satisfaction levels of students are inconsistent with regards to the gender and perceived socio-economic status variables, further studies on these variables can be carried out.

3. Students can be given support about choosing departments that they can be satisfied with when they make department choices before starting university.

References

Alaca, F. (2011). *İki dilli olan ve olmayan öğrencilerde okul yaşam kalitesi algısı ve okula aidiyet duygusu ilişkisi* [The relationship between perceptions of quality of school life and sense of school belonging among bilingual and monolingual students]. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Altas, D. (2006). Üniversite öğrencileri memnuniyet araştırması [University students' satisfaction research]. *Marmara Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi. 11*(1), 439-458.

Aydin, S., Gormus, A. S. & Altintop, M. Y. (2014). Öğrencilerin memnuniyet düzeyleri ile demografik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin doğrusal olmayan kanonik korelasyon analizi ile incelenmesi: Meslek Yüksekokulu'nda bir uygulama [The relationship between the satisfaction level of students and their demographic features with non-linear canonical correlation analysis: An application in vocational high school]. *AİBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 14*(1), 35-58.

Ayik, A. & Atas-Akdemir, Ö. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının okul yaşam kalitesi ve okula yabancılaşma algıları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between pre-service teachers' perceptions related to quality of school life and school alienation]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi. 21*(4), 429-452.

Barutcu-Yildirim, F., Yerin-Guneri, O. & Capa-Aydin, Y. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinin memnuniyet düzeyi ve ilişkili değişkenler [University students' satisfaction level and related variables]. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama, 11*(2), 521-533.

Bilgic, S. (2009). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinde okul yaşam kalitesi algısının arkadaşlara bağlılık ve empatik sınıf atmosferi değişkenleriyle ilişkisinin incelenmesi* [Investigation of the relationships between the perception of school life quality and the variables of attachment to friends and empathic classroom atmosphere among elementary school students]. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Buyukozturk, Ş., Kilic-Cakmak, E., Akgun, O.E., Karadeniz, S. & Demirel, F. (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* [Scientific research methods] (Yirminci baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Cokluk-Bokeoglu, O. & Yilmaz, K. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin fakülte yaşamının niteliğine ilişkin görüşlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Analysis of University Students' Views about the Quality of Faculty Life Using Various Variables]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 40*(2), 179-204.

Durmaz, A. (2008). *Liselerde okul yaşam kalitesi (Kırklareli İli Örneği)* [Quality of school life in high schools (the case of Kırklareli province)]. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Trakya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Edirne.

Egelioglu, N., Arslan, S. & Bakan, G. (2011). Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin memnuniyet durumlarının akademik başarıları üzerine etkisi [The effect of satisfaction status of nursing students on their academic achievement]. *Hemşirelikte Araştırma Geliştirme Dergisi,13*(1) 14-24.

Erdogan, E. & Bulut, E. (2015). İşletme bölümü öğrencilerinin memnuniyet düzeylerini etkileyen faktörlerin araştırılması [Investigation of factors that affect satisfaction levels of business student's]. *Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi*, *11*(26), 151-170.

Gedik, A. (2014). *Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinde okul yaşam kalitesi bağlamında okula yabancılaşma.* [*Alienation to school related to school life quality in secondary school students*]. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İnönü Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Malatya.

Haliloglu-Tatli, Z., Kokoc, M. & Karal, H. (2011). Satisfaction state of Computer Education and Instructional Technologies students: Karadeniz Technical University case. *Elementary Education Online, 10*(3), 836-849.

Ihtiyaroglu, N. (2010). *Öğretmen ve öğrencilere göre kaliteli eğitim.* [Educational quality according to teachers and students]. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Adana.

Ilmen, E. (2010). *Okul grubunun okul yaşam kalitesi ve akademik başarı üzerindeki etkisi* [The effect school group on quality of school life and academic success]. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Van.

Inal, U. (2009). *Adana il sınırları içerisindeki yatılı ilköğretim bölge okullarında bulunan öğretmen ve öğrencilerin okul yaşam kalitesi algılarının incelenmesi* [Examining perception of teachers and students at elementary boarding district school in borders of the province Adana with respect to the quality of school life]. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Kalayci, H. & Ozdemir, M. (2013). Lise öğrencilerinin okul yaşamının niteliğine ilişkin algılarının okul bağlılıkları üzerine etkisi [The ınfluence of students' perceptions toward quality of school life on their school engagement]. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *33*(2), 293-315.

Karatzias, A., Papadioti-Athanasiou, V., Power, K.G. & Swanson, V. (2001). Quality of school life. A cross-cultural study of Greek and Scottish secondary school pupils. *European Journal of Education*, *36*(1), 91-105.

Mok, M. & Flynn, M. (1997). Quality of school life and students' achievement in the HSC: A multilevel analysis. *Australian Journal of Education*, *41*(2), 169-188.

Ozdemir, S., Kilic, A.Ç., Ogdem, Z. & Er, E. (2013). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin fakülte yaşamının niteliğine ilişkin memnuniyet düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Examination of the Satisfaction Levels of Students in Faculty of Education on the Quality of Faculty Life According to Different Variables]. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, (3), 228-235.

Sari, M. (2007). *Demokratik değerlerin kazananımı sürecinde örtük program: Düşük ve yüksek "Okul Yaşam Kalitesine" sahip iki ilköğretim okulunda nitel bir çalışma* [The effect of hidden curriculum on gaining democratic values: a qualitative study in two elemantary schools having low and high quality of school life]. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Sahin, I., Zoraloglu, Y.R. & Firat, N.S. (2011). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam amaçları, eğitsel hedefleri, üniversite öğreniminden beklentileri ve memnuniyet durumları [University students' aims in life, educational goals, expectations from the university and their state of satisfaction]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 17*(3), 429-452.

Thien, L.M. & Razak, N.A. (2013). Academic coping, friendship quality, and student engagement associated with student quality of school life: A partial least square analysis. *Social Indicators Research, 112*(3), 679-708.

Topsakal, Y. & İplik, F.N. (2013). Üniversite öğrencilerinin kalite algıları ile memnuniyet ve tavsiye etme düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma [A research on determining the relationship between quality perceptions of university students with the level of satisfaction and recommendation]. *Cag University Journal of Social Sciences*, *10*(2), 82-94.

Tosun, M. (2012). *Lisansüstü eğitimde kalite yönetimi: İnönü Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü'nde bir uygulama* [Quality management in postgraduate education: An application in Social Sciences Institute of University of Inonu]. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İnönü Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Malatya.

Uzgoren, N. & Uzgoren, E. (2007). Dumlupınar Üniversitesi lisans öğrencilerinin memnuniyetini etkileyen bireysel özelliklerin istatistiksel analizi-Hipotez

testi, ki-kare testi ve doğrusal olasılık modeli [The statistical analysis of the personal characteristics affecting the satisfaction of the undergraduates in Dumlupinar University- hypothesis testing, chi-square test and linear probability model]. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *17*, 173-193.

Yelkikalan, N., Sumer, B. & Temel, S. (2006). Fakültelerin değerlendirilmesinde öğrenci algılamaları: Biga İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma [Student perceptions in the evaluation of faculties: A study on the students of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences of Biga]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Karaman İ.İ.BF Dergisi,* (10), 144-160.

Yilmaz, K. & Cokluk-Bokeoglu, Ö. (2006). Fakülte yaşamının niteliği ölçeği geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması [The quality of faculty life scale a study on validity and reliability]. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 4*(2), 201-210.

Lisans Öğrencilerinin Fakülte Yaşam Niteliğinden Memnuniyet Düzeyleri

Özet

Problem Durumu: Üniversiteler içerisinde sadece yöneticileri ve eğitimcileri barındırmamaktadır. Eğitim hizmetinin sunulduğu öğrenciler de bu sistemin önemli bir paydaşıdır. Okul kurumunun varlık sebebi öğrenciler olduğundan, öğrencilerin okul yaşamının kalitesi hakkındaki görüşleri oldukça önemlidir. Okul yaşamının kalitesi, öğrencilerin okul ortamına ilişkin görüşlerine dayanmaktadır. Öğrencinin okul yaşam kalitesi üzerinde öğretmenlerin, diğer öğrencilerin ve yöneticilerin etkisi bulunmaktadır. Okul yaşam kalitesi ilişkili olduğu faktörlerle öğrencileri pek çok açıdan etkilemektedir. Bu nedenle okul yaşam kalitesi üzerinde ciddiyetle durulması gerekmektedir. Okul yaşam kalitesinin yüksek düzeyde olması, öğrencilerin okul yaşamından memnuniyet düzeylerinin artmasını sağlamaktadır. Okul yaşamından memnuniyet, öğrencilerin okula karşı olumlu bir tutum geliştirmelerine katkıda bulunabilir. Bu nedenle öğrencilerin okul yaşamından memnuniyet düzeylerinin yükselmesini sağlayacak çalışmaların yapılması gerekmektedir. Üniversite öğrencilerinin, fakülte yaşamının niteliğinden memnuniyet düzeylerini etkileyen faktörlerin bilinmesi, yükseköğretim kurumlarında verilen eğitim hizmetinin

kalitesini arttırabilmek açısından önem taşımaktadır. Ancak ilgili alan yazın incelendiğinde, ülkemizde bu konuda sınırlı sayıda araştırmanın yapıldığı gözlenmiştir. Bu gerekçeye dayanarak, bu araştırmanın yapılmasına karar verilmiştir. Araştırmada fakülte yaşamının niteliğinden memnuniyet düzeyi cinsiyet, sınıf, bölüm tercihinden memnuniyet düzeyi ve algılanan sosyoekonomik düzeye göre incelenmiştir. Araştırmanın fakülte yaşamının niteliğinden memnuniyet düzeyini etkileyen faktörlerin daha iyi bilinmesini sağlayarak, alan yazına katkıda bulunacağı düşünülmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu araştırmanın amacı, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi'nde öğrenim gören lisans öğrencilerinin fakülte yaşamının niteliğinden memnuniyet düzeylerini cinsiyet, sınıf, bölüm tercihinden memnuniyet düzeyi ve algılanan sosyoekonomik düzeye göre incelemektir.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Araştırmada nicel araştırma desenlerinden tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Çalışma evrenini Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi'nde hazırlık eğitimi almamış olan, birinci, ikinci ve üçüncü sınıf lisans öğrencileri oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın örneklemi oranlı küme örnekleme yöntemi ile belirlenmiştir. Araştırmaya gönüllülük esası ile tüm bölümlerdeki öğrencilerden en az % 36 olacak şekilde katılım sağlandığı gözlenmiştir. Bu doğrultuda Fen Bilgisi Öğretmenliği (70, % 50.3), İlköğretim Matematik Öğretmenliği (77, % 48.1), Okul Öncesi Öğretmenliği (73, % 46.8), Sınıf Öğretmenliği (73, % 46.5), Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmenliği (69, % 47.3), Türkçe Öğretmenliği (54, % 36), Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik (84, % 41.4) bölümlerinde öğrenim gören 500 gönüllü üniversite öğrencisi araştırmaya katılmıştır (katılım oranı: % 45). Veriler Fakülte Yaşamının Niteliği Ölçeği (FYNÖ), ve yazarlar tarafından geliştirilen Kişisel Bilgi Formu ile toplanmıştır. Kişisel bilgi formunda araştırmaya katılan öğrencilerin cinsiyet, sınıf düzeyi, bölüm tercihinden memnuniyet düzeyi, algılanan sosyoekonomik düzey bilgileri yer almaktadır. Fakülte Yaşamının Niteliği Ölçeği "Fakülteden Memnuniyet", "Öğretim Elemanlarından Memnuniyet", "Sınıf Ortamı ve Öğrenci İlişkilerinden Memnuniyet" başlıklı üç alt boyuttan oluşmaktadır. Araştırma 2015-2016 eğitim-öğretim yılı bahar döneminde yapılmıştır. Uygulama öncesinde gerekli izinler alınmıştır. Araştırmadaki tüm veriler gönüllülük ilkesine uygun olacak biçimde toplanmıştır. Bu doğrultuda uygulama öncesinde katılımcılara araştırmanın konusu, amacı ve önemi belirtilmiştir. Ayrıca araştırmada kimlik bilgilerinin istenmediği, ölçekteki soruların doğru cevabının olmadığı, cevapları içtenlikle ifade etmelerinin önemli olduğu ve verilerin araştırmacılar tarafından gizli tutulacağı öğrencilere aktarılmıştır. Toplanan veriler SPSS-21 istatistik programı ile analiz edilmiştir. Verilerin analizinde Fakülte Yaşamının Niteliği Ölçeği alt ölçek puanları ve toplam puanın cinsiyete göre karşılaştırılmasında Mann Whitney U-Testi; sınıf düzeyi, bölüm tercihinden memnuniyet düzeyi ve algılanan sosyoekonomik düzey değişkenlerine göre karşılaştırılmasında Kruskal Wallis H-Testi; hangi gruplar arasında farklılık olduğunu belirlemek için Dunnett C Testi ile incelenmiştir.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Araştırmada fakülte yaşamının niteliğinden memnuniyet düzeyinin fakülteden memnuniyet alt boyutu hariç tüm alt boyut ve ölçek toplam

puana göre kadın öğrencilerde erkek öğrencilere göre daha yüksek olduğu saptanmıştır. Ölçeğin, tüm alt boyutlarına ve ölçek toplam puana göre öğrencilerin memnuniyet düzeyleri birinci sınıf öğrencilerinde en yüksek; üçüncü sınıf öğrencilerinde ise en düşük olarak tespit edilmiştir. Araştırma sonucuna göre Fakülte Yaşamının Niteliği Ölçeği tüm alt boyutlar ve ölçek toplam puan saptanmıştır. Bölüm tercihinden memnuniyet düzeyi "çok yüksek" ve "yüksek" olan öğrencilerin, bölüm tercihinden "düşük" ve "orta" olan öğrencilere göre fakülte yaşamının niteliğinden memnuniyet düzeyleri daha yüksek çıkmıştır. Son olarak fakülteden memnuniyet alt boyutu hariç tüm alt boyutlarda ve ölçek toplam puanı algılanan sosyoekonomik düzeyini iyi olarak algılayan öğrencilerin, zayıf olan öğrencilere göre daha yüksek olduğu saptanmıştır.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri: Araştırma sonucuna göre kadın öğrencilerin fakülte yaşamının niteliğinden memnuniyet düzeylerinin erkek öğrencilere göre yüksek olması, kadın öğrencilerin eğitimi daha fazla önemsemelerinden ya da kadın ve erkek öğrencilerin ulaşmak istedikleri eğitim düzeyinin farklı olmasından kaynaklanıyor olabilir. Kız öğrencilerin ulaşmak istedikleri eğitim seviyesinin erkek öğrencilere göre daha yüksek olması, öğrenim gördükleri fakülteyi daha olumlu algılamalarını sağlamış olabilir. Kadın öğrencilerin kariyer yapmaya, erkek öğrencilerin ise lisans sonrası bir an önce çalışma hayatına atılma gereksinimleri ya da zorunlulukları nedeniyle olabileceği şeklinde de yorumlanabilir. Sınıf düzeyi yükseldikçe, öğrencilerin fakülte yaşamının niteliğinden memnuniyet düzeylerinin azalması, zamanla öğrencilerin fakülteden beklentilerinin farklılaşması ile açıklanabilir. Bölüm tercihinden memnuniyet düzeyi yüksek olan öğrencilerin düşük olan öğrencilere göre memnuniyet düzeylerinin daha yüksek olması, bölüm tercihinden memnun olan öğrencilerin fakülteye severek gelmelerinden ve buna bağlı olarak fakülteye yönelik olumlu algılar geliştirmelerinden kaynaklanıyor olabilir. Araştırmada sosyo-ekonomik düzeyini "iyi" olarak algılayan öğrencilerin "ortanın altı" olarak algılayan öğrencilere göre memnuniyet düzeylerinin daha yüksek olduğu saptanmış, literatürde bu bulgular, farklılık gösteren araştırmaların yer aldığı görülmüştür. Araştırma sonuçları doğrultusunda, benzer içerikte başka bir araştırmanın farklı fakültelerde öğrenim gören öğrenciler üzerinde yapılabileceği, öğrencilerin memnuniyet düzeyini inceleyen araştırmalarda cinsiyet ve algılanan sosyoekonomik düzey değişkenleri açısından tutarsız sonuçlar yer aldığından bu değişkenleri içeren başka bir araştırmanın yapılabileceği, üniversiteye başlamadan önce bölüm tercihi yapacak olan öğrencilerin memnun olacakları bölümleri tercih etmelerinin desteklenebileceği önerilmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: YTU öğrencileri, cinsiyet, bölüm tercihi, algılanan sosyoekonomik düzey.