Scrutiny on the Organizational Image Levels of the Students Studying at the School of Sports Sciences in Line with Some Variables

Sirin Pepe[1], Kerim Bahar[2], Baris Karaoglu[3], Yusuf Tas[4] & Gurkan Ates[5]

[1] Erenkoy Zeki Altindag Secondary School, Physical Training Teacher, Konya, Turkey

[2] Selcuk University, Akoren Ali Riza Ercan Vocational School, Konya, Turkey

[3] Bingol University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Bingol, Turkey

[4] Emirgazi Genclik ve Spor Ilce Mudurlugu Spor Egitim Uzmani, Konya, Turkey

[5] S.U, Saglik Bilimleri Enstitusu, Spor Yoneticiligi A.B.D. Yuksek Lisans Ogr., Turkey

Correspondence: Sirin Pepe, Erenkoy Zeki Altindag Secondary School, Physical Training Teacher, Konya, Turkey. E-mail: sirinpepe@gmail.com

Abstract

The objective of this study is to scrutinize the organizational image levels of the students studying at the school of sports sciences in line with some variables.

The subject group of the study consists of the prospective sportspeople studying in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th years of the departments of Teacher Training on Physical Training and Sports, Recreation Training, Coaching Training, and Sports Management in the School of Sports Sciences at Selçuk University. The data collection tools used in the study are Organizational Image Scale and socio-demographic information form.

In the assessment of the data, SPPS 25 (IBM Corp. Released 2017. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.) statistics package program was used. The average ± standard deviation as well as percentage and frequency values of the variables were taken into account. The variables were assessed following the checks on the preconditions of normality and homogeneousness of the variances (Shapiro Wilk and Levene Test). In performing the analysis of the data, Independent 2 group t test (Student's t test), Mann Whitney-U test when the preconditions were not met, One Way Variance Analysis for the three or more group comparisons; and Tukey HSD test, one of the multiple comparison tests; or, when it failed to fulfill the preconditions, the Kruskal Wallis and Bonferroni-Dunn test, also one of the multiple comparison tests; were used. The relation between two constant variables was evaluated via the Pearson Correlation Coefficient and in the cases that the parametric test preconditions were not met, via the Spearman Correlation Coefficient. For the significance level of the tests, the value of $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$ was accepted.

In view of the data obtained, it was determined that the organizational image levels of the participants were at a "moderate" level and that a statistically significant difference was present in the entertainment image as per genders; program and general appearance and physical infrastructure image as per their ages; quality, program, sports, general appearance, and physical infrastructure, social environment and accommodation-catering image as per grades; and in all image sub-topics when it comes to satisfaction with the university where they study.

It is considered in conclusion of the study that the university can create a stronger corporate image through taking some factors like university's general appearance, its physical infrastructure, personnel's qualification, and enhancement of social environments, into account, for improving the organizational image levels of the university more and more.

Keywords: sports sciences, organizational image

1. Introduction

In our present time, in which information develops fast by means of being renewed and which is qualified as the age of information, the most important factor in the development of societies is educated people and educated workforce without a doubt. It is because information is produced by qualified and educated people and it is known that only the societies possessing such productive capacity can survive.

The property of the environmental conditions of our present times, oriented to constant development and competition, has steered institutions toward fulfilling the needs and expectations of the environment (Erkmen & Çerik, 2007). It is known that constant improvement, the property oriented to meet the needs and expectations of the environment in competition, appears to be used under the name of "image", a phenomenon we frequently encounter in many sectors.

As image is not a concrete phenomenon, it covers the emotions, thoughts, and at the same time behaviors, which depend on mental perceptions of people (Fettahlıoğlu, 2016).

Organizational image can be defined as the perception brought along by people's knowledge, experience, belief, emotions, and impressions (Nguyen & Leblanc, 2002; Abratt & Mofokeng, 2001) and their negative or positive thoughts (Ayhan & Karatepe, 2000) concerning an institution.

Educational institutions are obliged to try to survive in the competitive market of today and, for that purpose, have a positive and powerful image. In this context, the image they present must be manifest, beneficial, and different from a contest as education is not a contest. The educational programs that they present, the physical amenities of school environments, lecturers, graduates, and presently studying students constitute a few of the elements that create the image of that educational institution (Karacabey, Özdere, & Bozkuş, 2016).

While universities attract successful students to themselves, they motivate their students toward success through their positive images, whereby making it possible to observe increase in the performances and academic achievements of students (Polat, 2011).

Their belief in the extent of fulfillment of the requirements of the profession that the student contemplate carrying out and the expectations of that profession by the program chosen by students, the quality of the education they receive throughout that program, and the diploma that they will receive upon successfully completing the education, can be considered their organizational images.

When we pore over the literature, we can see that some studies that examine the organizational images of universities (Traverso, Roman, & Gonzalez, 2012; Polat, 2011) and students studying in some departments of universities (Cerit, 2006; Polat & Tülübaş, 2015) exist but no study scrutinizing the organizational images of students educated at schools of sports sciences has been encountered. The objective of this study is to scrutinize the organizational image levels of the students studying at the school of sports sciences in line with some variables.

2. Material and Method

2.1 Study Group

The study has a descriptive nature as the identification of the status in terms of the relations between the organizational image levels of students studying at the school of sports sciences and demographic properties of the candidates will be conducted.

2.2 Data Collection Tools

The data collection tools used in the study are Organizational Image Scale and socio-demographic information form.

2.3 Constitution of the Volunteer Groups

The subject group of the study consists of the prospective sportspeople studying in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th years of the departments of Teacher Training on Physical Training and Sports, Recreation Training, Coaching Training, and Sports Management in the School of Sports Sciences at Selçuk University.

2.4 Socio-Demographic Information Form

The socio-demographic information form consists of four questions oriented to determine the levels of the participants' gender, age, grade, and satisfaction with the university where they study.

2.5 Organizational Image Scale

The organizational image perception scale with 37 articles, developed by Polat (2011) in five Likert-type rated between 'I never agree' and 'I definitely agree' was used as a data collection tool. The scale has seven factors and those factors have been named as quality image, program image, sports image, general appearance and physical infrastructure image, social environment image, entertainment image, and accommodation-catering image. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of the factors vary between $\alpha = .62$ and $\alpha = .85$. It was found through the analysis of the data obtained from this study that the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of the factors are between $\alpha = .61$ and $\alpha = .87$.

2.6 Analysis of Data

In the assessment of the data, SPPS 25 (IBM Corp. Released 2017. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.) statistics package program was used. The average ± standard deviation as well as percentage and frequency values of the variables were taken into account. The variables were assessed following the checks on the preconditions of normality and homogeneousness of the variances (Shapiro Wilk and Levene Test). In performing the analysis of the data, Independent 2 group t test (Student's t test), Mann Whitney-U test when the preconditions were not met, One Way Variance Analysis for the three or more group comparisons; and Tukey HSD test, one of the multiple comparison tests; or, when it failed to fulfill the preconditions, the Kruskal Wallis and Bonferroni-Dunn test, also one of the multiple comparison tests; were used. The relation between two constant variables was evaluated via the Pearson Correlation Coefficient and in the cases that the parametric test preconditions were not met, via the Spearman Correlation Coefficient. For the significance level of the tests, the value of $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$ was accepted.

3. Result

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the participants

		N	%
Gender	Male	248	57.9
	Female	180	42.1
Age (Years)	18–21	222	51.9
	22–25	184	43.0
	26+	22	5.1
Grade	1st Year	126	29.4
	2nd Year	83	19.4
	3rd Year	129	30.1
	4th Year	90	21.0
Satisfaction with the Uni.	Yes	167	39.0
	Partially	182	42.5
	No	79	18.5
	Total	**428**	**100.0**

It was found that of the students taking part in the study, 57.9% were male, 42.1% were female; in age groups, 57.9% were 18–21 years, 43.0% were 22–25 years, 5.1% were 26 years and above; in grade levels, 29.4% were in the 1st year, 19.4% were in the 2nd year, 30.1% were in the 3rd year, 21.0% were in the 4th year; in the case of their university satisfaction levels, 39.0% said yes, 42.5% said partially, and 18.5% said no.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the scores obtained by the participants from the organizational image scale

	N	Minimum	Maximum	X	Std. Deviation
Quality image	428	1.00	5.00	3.2973	0.74216
Program image	428	1.00	5.00	3.2807	0.81242
Sports image	428	1.00	5.00	3.3435	0.87890
General appearance and physical infrastructure image	428	1.00	5.00	3.2994	0.83070
Social environment image	428	1.00	5.00	3.1822	0.93749
Entertainment image	428	1.00	5.00	3.3248	0.92247
Accommodation-catering	428	1.00	5.00	3.2438	0.90307

It is apparent in Table 2 that, among the sub-topics for organizational image scale of university students, quality image level was 3.29 ± 0.74, program image level was 3.28 ± 0.81, sports image level was 3.34 ± 0.87, general appearance and physical infrastructure image level was 3.29 ± 0.83, social environment image level was 3.18 ± 0.93, entertainment image level was 3.32 ± 0.92, and accommodation-catering image level was 3.24 ± 0.90.

Table 3. Organizational image levels of the participants as per their genders

Gender	Male	Female	P
	n = 248	n = 180	
Quality image	3.31 ± 0.73	3.27 ± 0.76	0.570
Program image	3.31 ± 0.81	3.25 ± 0.81	0.450
Sports image	3.35 ± 0.87	3.34 ± 0.89	0.960
General appearance and physical infrastructure image	3.35 ± 0.8	3.24 ± 0.87	0.180
Social environment image	3.23 ± 0.92	3.12 ± 0.96	0.220
Entertainment image	3.25 ± 0.93	3.42 ± 0.91	0.040*
Accommodation-catering	**3.28 ± 0.87**	**3.19 ± 0.95**	**0.320**

Note. *p < 0.05 **p < 0.01.

It was determined in Table 3 that when organizational image levels are scrutinized in terms of the university students' genders, statistically significant differences were determined in the entertainment image subcategory but no statistically significant differences were found in the subcategories of quality image, program image, sports image, general appearance and physical infrastructure image, social environment image and accommodation-catering image (p > 0.05).

Table 4. Organizational image levels of the participants as per their ages

Age	18-21	22-25	26+	p
	n = 222	n = 184	n = 22	
Quality image	3.31 ± 0.77	3.24 ± 0.72	3.57 ± 0.61	0.13
Program image	3.33 ± 0.81	3.18 ± 0.81	3.58 ± 0.77	0.04
Sports image	3.4 ± 0.91	3.25 ± 0.84	3.59 ± 0.81	0.09
General appearance and physical infrastructure image	3.32 ± 0.84	3.23 ± 0.84	3.67 ± 0.56	0.05
Social environment image	3.19 ± 0.96	3.15 ± 0.93	3.36 ± 0.74	0.61
Entertainment image	3.35 ± 0.91	3.26 ± 0.95	3.61 ± 0.77	0.2
Accommodation-catering	3.31 ± 0.87	3.14 ± 0.95	3.42 ± 0.73	0.12

Note. *p < 0.05 **p < 0.01.

Table 4 shows that in view of university students' organizational image levels as per their ages, statistically significant differences were found in the subtopics of program image and general appearance and physical infrastructure image, while no statistically significant differences were found in the quality image, sports image, social environment image, entertainment image, accommodation-catering image subtopics (p > 0.05).

Table 5. Organizational image levels of the participants as per their grades

Grade Group Variable	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	p
	n = 126	n = 83	n = 129	n = 90	
Quality image	3.47 ± 0.67[a]	3.27 ± 0.85[a]	3.12 ± 0.73[b]	3.34 ± 0.7[a]	0.001**
Program image	3.45 ± 0.76[a]	3.31 ± 0.89[b]	3.1 ± 0.8[c]	3.27 ± 0.78[b]	0.01*
Sports image	3.52 ± 0.82[a]	3.33 ± 1.01[b]	3.14 ± 0.89[c]	3.4 ± 0.76[b]	0.01*
General appearance and physical infrastructure image	3.45 ± 0.77[a]	3.28 ± 0.86[b]	3.1 ± 0.85[c]	3.39 ± 0.81[a]	0.01*
Social environment image	3.41 ± 0.91[a]	3.01 ± 0.97[c]	3.03 ± 0.94[c]	3.24 ± 0.9[b]	0.001**
Entertainment image	3.44 ± 0.88	3.34 ± 0.97	3.21 ± 0.91	3.31 ± 0.94	0.29
Accommodation-catering	3.44 ± 0.81[a]	3.23 ± 0.97[b]	3.07 ± 0.95[c]	3.23 ± 0.84[b]	0.02*

Note. *p < 0.05 **p < 0.01.

It reads in Table 5 that a statistically significant difference was found in the entertainment image subcategory as per students' grade levels, but no statistically significant differences were found in the subcategories of quality image, program image, sports image, general appearance and physical infrastructure image, social environment image and accommodation-catering image (*p* < 0.05).

Table 6. Organizational image levels of the participants as per their level of satisfaction with the university where they study

Satisfaction with the University where they study	Yes	Partially	No	p
	n=167	n=182	n=79	
Quality image	3.56 ± 0.76^a	3.15 ± 0.63^b	3.09 ± 0.8^b	0.001**
Program image	3.54 ± 0.83^a	3.13 ± 0.68^b	3.07 ± 0.91^b	0.001**
Sports image	3.55 ± 0.9^a	3.25 ± 0.82^b	3.14 ± 0.88^b	0.001**
General appearance and physical infrastructure image	3.53 ± 0.86^a	3.18 ± 0.74^b	3.09 ± 0.85^b	0.001**
Social environment image	3.4 ± 0.95^a	3.06 ± 0.85^b	2.99 ± 1.01^b	0.001**
Entertainment image	3.56 ± 0.96^a	3.21 ± 0.79^b	3.08 ± 1.01^c	0.001**
Accommodation-catering	3.47 ± 0.97^a	3.09 ± 0.79^b	3.11 ± 0.92^b	0.001**

Note. *p<0.05 **p<0.01.

Table 6 indicates that statistically significant differences were found in the subcategories of entertainment image, quality image, program image, sports image, general appearance and physical infrastructure image, social environment image and accommodation-catering image, in terms of their level of satisfaction with the university where they study ($p < 0.05$).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

We perceive things as a whole and the integrity of the traces remaining as well the judgments invoked upon such perception constitute the images concerning those things. As judgments depend on subjective perceptions in the creation of an image, the images of different things can be expressed differently by everyone. For example, a person who or an object or an organization that has a positive image for most people might create a negative one for a group of people from a different circle of a society because numerous parts from the social, cultural, and demographic properties of the society can actually be found in the concept of image expressed with a single word. Regardless of our approach, whether positive or negative, the concept of image has now become an inseparable part of our lives (Biber, 2004).

In this study presented, it was found that among the sub-topics for organizational image scale of university students, quality image level was $3.29 \pm 0,74$, program image level was 3.28 ± 0.81, sports image level was 3.34 ± 0.87, general appearance and physical infrastructure image level was 3.29 ± 0.83, social environment image level was 3.18 ± 0.93, entertainment image level was 3.32 ± 0.92, and accommodation-catering image level was 3.24 ± 0.90 (Table 2). In the study, arithmetic averages were examined to determine the university's organizational image level as per the students' perceptions. In the construal of the arithmetic averages, the ranges were evaluated at 1.00–1.79 as "very low", 1.80–2.59 as "low", 2.60–3.39 as "moderate", 3.40–4.19 as "high", and 4.20–5.00 as "very high". In line with the data obtained, it can be said that the participants' organizational image levels are at a "moderate" level. In the literature, Tezişçi (2013), Çillioğlu (2010), Cerit (2006) and Polat (2011) determined in their study on students that their organizational image perceptions were at a "moderate" level in the generality of the scale. Such findings obtained from the literature are supportive of our findings. In the studies conducted by Gürbüz (2008) on executives, students, and parents and by Akbulut (2015) on teachers working in secondary schools, they determined that their organizational image levels were "high". In this study presented, it was found that the students' organizational image perceptions regarding their schools where they study are generally positive.

It was determined in Table 3 that when organizational image levels are scrutinized in terms of the university students' genders, statistically significant differences were determined in the entertainment image subcategory but no statistically significant differences were found in the subcategories of quality image, program image, sports image, general appearance and physical infrastructure image, social environment image and accommodation-catering image. In the literature, in the studies conducted by Korkmaz (2012) on security officers, by Tezişçi (2013) on students, by Kılıçaslan (2011) and Demiröz (2014) on teachers, and by Büyükgöze (2012) on the employees of Yıldız Technical University, they determined that the organizational image perceived in line with the gender variable did not differentiate. In their studies conducted by Ayar (2010) on the employees of Turkish Labor Agency; by Şişli (2012), Polat (2011) and İbicioğlu (2005) on university students, by Şanlı (2014) and Akbulut (2015) on teachers, it was found that the organizational image perceptions have statistically significant differences in the gender variable. In this study presented, it can be said that genders of students as males and females affect their image perceptions concerning their schools and that, as the organization of cultural events like festivals or concerts etc. oriented to students has a significant impact in the determination of the entertainment image, the significant difference could stem from the fact that the

expectations of the female students regarding such events can be more than those of the male students.

Table 4 shows that in view of university students' organizational image levels as per their ages, statistically significant differences were found in the subtopics of program image and general appearance and physical infrastructure image, while no statistically significant differences were found in the quality image, sports image, social environment image, entertainment image, accommodation-catering image subtopics. In the literature, statistically significant differences were not found in the organizational image perceptions in terms of the age variable in the studies carried out by Korkmaz (2012) on security officers and Tezişçi (2013) on students. In this study presented, as opposed to the information in the literature, statistically significant differences were found in the subtopics of program image and general appearance and physical infrastructure image in view of the university students' ages. In addition, while no statistically significant difference was determined in the other organizational image subtopic levels, it was found that the image perceptions of the students in the age group of 26 and above were higher than those who were within the age groups of 18–21 and 22–25. It can be asserted that the reason for the fact that the image perceptions of the students in the age group of 26 and above were higher than the students in other age groups was that they were more satisfied with the general appearance of their schools, sports, arts, entertainment, social environment, and educational staff.

An easier and desired image can be created by taking the expectations and needs of the groups that have expectations from a given organization into account (Nguyen & LeBlanc, 2001). Hence, university executives wanting to create a high-level university image can increase the image perception regarding their university by way of considering the expectations and needs of students and responding to such expectations and needs (Polat, 2011).

It reads in Table 5 that a statistically significant difference was found in the entertainment image subcategory as per students' grade levels, but no statistically significant differences were found in the subcategories of quality image, program image, sports image, general appearance and physical infrastructure image, social environment image and accommodation-catering image. When it comes to the literature, Cerit (2006) and Tezişçi (2013) determined in their study on students that organizational image perceptions have statistically significant differences in terms of the grade variable. The results obtained from their studies are parallel to our study. It was found in this study presented that the perceptions of the 1st-year students in terms of the concept of image toward their schools were higher than the students studying in other grades. It is considered that the reason for it could be the fact that their period of presence at the university is shorter than the students studying in other grades and, hence, they might not have discovered the negative aspects of the university yet.

It can be said that the period of presence at the university will ensure the acquisition of detailed information concerning the university and have an impact on the increase of being impressed by the university environment. Thus, the level of being knowledgeable about the university affects the perception of organizational image.

Table 6 indicates that statistically significant differences were found in the subcategories of quality image, program image, sports image, general appearance and physical infrastructure image, entertainment image, social environment image and accommodation-catering image, in terms of their level of satisfaction with the university where they study. In the literature, Tezişçi (2013) found statistically significant differences in terms of the students' levels of being satisfied with the university where they study in the study conducted on students.

Organizational image forms upon the experiences and endeavors of persons and the impact created by the respective organization on the target group (Avşar, 2002). In that process, the judgments regarding the organization, level of informing, and the organization's amenities-services play a significant part in the formation of the image perception of individuals (Tolungüç, 2000). When the students' levels of being satisfied with the university where they study is scrutinized in this study presented, it was found that the organizational image perceptions of students who responded as "Yes" were higher than those who responded as "Partially" and "No". It is contemplated that the reason for it could arise from the fact that universities take the needs and expectations of students into account and adopt management policies that will fulfill such needs and expectations.

It is considered in conclusion of the study that the university can create a stronger corporate image through taking some factors like university's general appearance, its physical infrastructure, personnel's qualification, and enhancement of social environments into account, for improving the organizational image levels of the university more and more.

References

Abratt, R., & Mofokeng, N. T. (2001). Development and Management of Corporate Image in South Africa.

European Journal of Marketing, *35*(3/4), 368–386. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560110382075

Akbulut, B. (2015). *The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction Levels and Organizational Image Perceptions of Secondary School Teachers*. Hacettepe University, Department of Educational Sciences, PhD Thesis, Ankara.

Avşar, A. (2002). *The Effect of Public Relations Activities on the Establishment of the Organizational Image and Application of the Turkish Armed Forces Rehabilitation and Care Center*. Unpublished master's thesis, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.

Ayar, Ö. (2010). *Corporate Image Management; Turkish Employment Agency Example*. Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences Department of Business Studies, Master of Science, Ankara.

Ayhan, D. Y., & Karatepe, O. M. (2000). *Variables Determining Corporate Image: An Empirical Evaluation* (p. 176). 5. National Marketing Congress, Antalya.

Biber, A. A. (2004). *Theoretical Framework in Public Relations* (1st ed., p. 47). Vadi Yayınları, Ankara, October.

Büyükgöze, T. (2012). *Investigation of the Relationship Between Employees' Corporate Image Perception and Motivation*. Yıldız Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences Department of Business Administration Human Resources Management, Master Thesis, Istanbul.

Cerit, Y. (2006). Perceptions of Faculty of Education Students on Organizational Image Level of the University. *Journal of Educational Management in Theory and Practice*, *12*(47), 343–365.

Çillioğlu, A. (2010). *Institutional Reputation of Anadolu University According to the Evaluations of Internal and External Stakeholders*. Master Thesis, Anadolu University Institute of Social Sciences, Eskisehir.

Demiröz, S. (2014). *The Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, organizational image perceptions and Student Success of School Teachers*. Hacettepe University, Department of Educational Sciences, PhD Thesis, Ankara.

Erkmen, T., & Çerik, Ş. (2007). Investigation of Organizational Loyalty in the Context of Organizational Identity Dimensions, which forms Corporate Image: An Application on University Students. *Marmara University Institute of Social Sciences Proposal Journal*, *7*(28), 107–119.

Fettahlıoğlu, Ö. O. (2016). *The Impact of Creativity on Perception of Corporate Image and Reputation as a Glass Shield of Businesses* (pp. 154–167). 3rd International Congress on Social Sciences, China, Adriatic, 27-30 October 2016, Antalya.

Gürbüz, S. (2008). *Organizational Image of Private and Public Primary Schools in Ankara According to Administrators, Teachers and Parents*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara

İbicioğlu, H. (2005). Factors Affecting Organizational Image Perceptions of University Students. İİBF. A Research on Students. *Süleyman Demirel University İ. İ. B. F. Journal*, *10*(2), 59–73.

Karacabey, M. F., Özdere, M., & Bozkuş, K. (2016). Organizational Image Perceptions of University Students. *Journal of Academic Social Research*, *4*(33), 459–473. https://doi.org/10.16992/ASOS.3457

Kılıçaslan, H. (2011). *The Perceptions of Administrators and Teachers Towards the Institutional Image of Primary Schools, Bolu Province Central District Example*. Master Thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University Institute of Social Sciences, Bolu.

Korkmaz, İ. (2012). *Public Relations Practices and Analysis of Perceptions Towards Organizational Image, Investigation in terms of Kütahya Provincial Security Directorate*. Dumlupınar University, Institute of Social Sciences, Kütahya.

Nguyen, N., & LeBlanc, G. (2001). Image and Reputation of Higher Education Institutions in Students' Retention Decisions. *The International Journal of Education Management*, *15*(6/7), 303–311. https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000005909

Nguyen, N., & Leblanc, G. (2002). Contact Personnel, Physical Environment and The Perceived Corporate Image of Intangible Services by New Clients. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, *13*(3), 242–262. https://doi.org/10.1108/09564230210431965

Öz, N. D., & Üstün, F. (2019). E-Sport Participation Motivation Scale (EPMS) Validity and Reliability Study. *The Journal of Turkish Sport Sciences*, *2*(2), 115–125.

Polat, S. (2011). Organizational Image of Kocaeli University According to University's Students. *Education and Science*, *36*(160), 105–119.

Polat, S. (2011a). The Relationship Level Between Organizational Image Perceptions and Academic Achievements of University Students. *Educational Sciences in Theory and Practice*, *11*(1), 249–262.

Polat, S., & Tülübaş, T. (2015). Perception and Importance Levels of University's Foreign Language Preparatory Class Students Regarding to Instructor's Image. *Journal of Academic Social Research*, *9*, 17–28.

Şanlı, Ö. (2014). *Effect of perception of organizational identity and organizational image perception of Teachers working in Secondary Schools on their organizational loyalty*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Fırat University Institute of Educational Sciences, Elazig.

Şişli, G. (2012). *The Relationship between Corporate Culture and Institutional Image An Application on State and Foundation Universities*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Celal Bayar University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration and Organization Program, Manisa.

Taşgin, E., Öz, N. D., Üstün, F., & Özlü, M. (2018). Investıgatıon of the Expectatıons from Sports and Sports Centers for Dıfferent Varıables. *Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise*, *20*(3), 273–276. https://doi.org/10.15314/tsed.492503

Tezişçi, S. (2013). *Perceptions of Students of the Faculty of Education on Organizational Image of Universities*. Marmara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Master Thesis, Istanbul.

Tolungüç, A. (2000). *Marketing, Advertising, Communication*. Ankara: AU Ilef Advertising Workshop.

Traverso, J., Roman, M., & Gonzalez, R. (2012). Construction of the Image of the University: A Major Stakeholder Approach: the Students. *Higher Education Review*, *44*(2), 43–62.