

THE INVESTIGATION OF CANDIDATE TEACHERS' OPINIONS TOWARDS QUALITY OF LIFE AT UNIVERSITY IN TERMS OF DIFFERENT VARIABLES**Soner ARIK***Öğr. Gör. Dr., Niğde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi, sarik38sarik@gmail.com
ORCID Numarası: 0000-0002-5338-9238***Necmettin KÜRTÜL***Öğr. Gör., Niğde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi, nkurtul@ohu.edu.tr
ORCID Numarası: 0000-0002-0351-4071***Mustafa ÖZDERE***Öğr. Gör. Dr., Niğde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi, mozdere@ohu.edu.tr
ORCID Numarası: 0000-0001-7535-9024**Received: 20.05.2018**Accepted: 26.08.2018***ABSTRACT**

The history of the quality concept is as old as the production activities of man. As a result of the globalization and increasing interaction between countries, quality has also become a competitive element. Quality includes the concepts of input, process, product and output. As for university education, it focuses on the many aspects of university students' campus life, measuring their needs and desires, which are among the basic components to be considered in the educational planning together with those of the community and the country. Increasing the level of quality in education requires a holistic approach dealing with all the dimensions within the whole process between input and output, including social, physical and financial opportunities besides the interaction between lecturers, students, administrators and materials. In this case, increasing quality in education and training requires that it aim to reach the best in the mentioned elements. The main purpose of higher education institutions is to raise competitive individuals in both national and international context, which has made students' level of satisfaction in university life more important. The university life includes not only the dimensions of education but also the different dimensions such as social opportunities offered to students and participation in the processes of management. In this study, which is a descriptive one, the data were collected on voluntary basis through the "Quality of Life in University Scale", which contains the dimensions mentioned above, developed by Doğanay and Sarı (2004) and the personal information form developed by the researchers. The aim of the study is to find out whether or not candidate teachers' perceptions about the quality of university life differ significantly in terms of different variables. 1133 female and 512 male students studying at different departments in a Faculty of Education at a state university during 2017-18 scholar years were included in the study. In the study, no significant difference was found in terms of gender. However, significant differences were found between the students' perceptions of quality of life in terms of school preference order, department, type of accommodation and income level. The findings of the study were discussed within the related literature and several recommendations were made accordingly.

Key words: Quality of life, candidate teacher, university, educational planning.

INTRODUCTION

The Quality of University Life is defined as the life satisfaction or general well-being perceived by students regarding university experiences. It focuses on the many aspects of university students' campus life, measuring their needs and desires. Studies conducted on quality of university life assess various dimensions that students concern. Researchers in determining the life satisfaction of students differ in the definition of the quality of the student's university life. The studies on the quality of university life have presented numerous findings. The quality of life survey conducted in the UK focused on life costs, employment prospects, post-graduation salaries, student satisfaction, social life, mental health and finance (Telegraph, 2013). Various researchers tried to assess the quality student's university life by evaluating affective and cognitive domains (Robert & Clifton, 1992; Yu & Lee, 2008). The affective domain means the satisfaction experience in emotions, moods and the perceived satisfaction with social interactions or attitudes (Robert & Clifton, 1992). The cognitive domain expresses satisfaction with basic human needs (Sirgy et. al, 2007; Cohen et. al, 2001; Deiner, 1985). Low (2000) evaluated the quality of university life in terms of students' performance and expectations.

Review of Literature

The studies conducted differ in terms of the definition of quality, terminology, dimensions, contents, and measurement standards, yet several researchers agree that researching students' perceptions of university experience is crucial in determining the quality of university life (Seyle, H. 1974; Deiner, 1985; Roberts & Clifton, 1992; Nordenfelt, L. 1993; Low, 2000; Cohen et. al; Cha, 2003; Clifton et. al, 2004; Haron, H. et. al 2015; Peng et. al, 2006; Michalos et. al, 2006; Nussbaum, M.C. & Sen., A.K. 1993; Sirgy et. al, 2007; Yu & Lee, 2008; Kurdip, 2010; Maidinsah, H. et. al 2016; Arıdag et al., 2018). In this context, the difference between quality, expectation and service performance, in other words, perceived performance is to be evaluated according to students' point of views. Yu & Lee (2008) refers to this as a perceived inconsistency between expectation and success. Sirgy et. al (2007) conceptualized The Quality of University Life as significantly and positively correlated to students' satisfaction with academic aspects and students' satisfaction with social aspects and in turn the two were characterized by satisfaction with university services and facilities. Yu & Lee (2008) modeled and extended the quality of university life to meet the needs and balance, and supports Sirgy's educational services, administrative services and facilities in favor of the quality of university life.

In the current literature, when the satisfaction level of university quality of life is evaluated according to gender, some studies conducted a significant difference between the groups. They observed that the satisfaction levels of female students were higher than male students (Topsakal & Iplik, 2013; Barutcu Yildir, Yerin-Güneri and Çapa-Aydın, 2015), whereas others achieved different results (Egelioğlu, Arslan and Bakan, 2011; Haliloglu-Tatlı, Kokoc and Karal, 2011; Özdemir, Kilinc, Ogdem & Er , 2013, Erdoğan and Bulut, 2015, Arıdag et al., 2018), in which studies they observed no significant results.

Roberts and Clifton (1992), who developed university life quality scale measuring the affective domain of university students, found positive correlation between positive and negative impact, identity and teaching staff and overall student satisfaction. Cha (2003) found positive relationships between personality such as subjective well-being and self-esteem, collective self-esteem and optimism. Roberts and Clifton (1992), Levitz and Noel (1989) found that students' perceptions of quality of university experience were a significant influence on academic achievement. Michalos S, A., & Orlando, J. (2006) and Chow (2005) found that the level of satisfaction of students with higher income also higher than those with lower income. Chow also found that students' quality of life is associated with their relationships, friendships, and living conditions.

Efficiency of the organizations today depends on their qualities to grow, develop, compete, adapt to the changing internal and external environment conditions. As academic organizations, universities must make sure that students are satisfied with the quality of the services they provide. Moreover, the students are satisfied with the university life in order to organize their resources and capacities appropriately within these exchanges, attract more students like other service organizations do and ensure continuity of existing ones.

Individuals' quality of life is related to their values, satisfaction they perceive with their life (Filippo, 2004). Quality of life lies at the heart of university quality of life. In this context, the quality of university life is the result of university students' satisfaction, which is the end result of values that make sense of university life. In other words, the university student is concerned with the whole university experience, the subjective feelings of the university student, the satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and the general feeling that he / she experiences in university life (Kangal, 2012; Sirgy, Grezeskowiak, & Rahtz, 2007).

The quality of life in the university is a perception. It is not what is actually happening but it is related to what the students feel, what they perceive, what they think they do through, and is therefore a subjective feeling. The sense of university life is shaped by the academic and social experiences that the students experience in college. Academic experiences such as teaching staff, teaching methods, academic reputation and diversity as well as social experiences such as sports, entertainment, and student clubs are the elements that constitute the student's perception of life quality. In addition to these, opportunities and services such as housing, library, transportation and cafeteria offered by the university influence the students' academic and social experiences; in other words, the perception of quality of life. As a result, it depends on the opportunities and services offered by the academic, social and university in the subjective thought about the quality of life of university students (Kangal, 2012; Sirgy, et al., 2010).

The quality of university life is an important factor that universities must overcome, such as gaining new students, ensuring the continuity of existing students, and avoiding school dropouts. Since an organization is dependent on customer continuity and satisfaction. In terms of students, it is claimed that a satisfactory university quality of life will have a positive effect on the academic success of the student and on the commitment of the school itself (Filippo, 2004). Similarly, Tinto (1987) emphasizes that the university life of the school dropout is a sign of the social and intellectual health of the students' experiences in the university, and that the quality of the

relationship between the instructors in student continuity and the student's social integration is crucial. In addition, it has been suggested that in the quality of university life, educational services, administrative services and applications, the facilities and services offered by the university are very important and that these facilities and services lead to the students' commitment to the school (Grace & Ji-Hyun, 2008; Grace & Lee, 2008).

Universities, as service organizations, are to know how their students consider their own development, how they have images in their heads, how satisfied they are with life in college in order to keep pace with the developments and the changes emerge in time. In the current literature, various studies have been conducted in order to determine the factors affecting students' quality of university life. In these studies, psychological and social factors such as personality traits, place of residence, religiosity, anxiety level, school culture have been investigated to determine the effect of on students' quality of university life (Cha, 2003, Vaez, Kristenson, & Lafamme, 2004; Ng, 2005; Abdel-Khalek, 2010; Ünalın, Çelikten, Soyuer, & Öztürk, 2008, Argon & Kösterelioğlu, 2009).

There are several factors that affect the quality of school life of university students. For this reason, it is necessary for universities to take the quality of life of their students seriously. School life satisfaction contributes to students' positive attitudes towards the school in different aspects. Also, it is claimed that the input of educational organizations such as personnel, educational materials, physical environment, facilities, etc affect the academic achievements, happiness and well-being of students as the customers of those organizations (Ergen, 2013). Therefore, it should be certainly taken into account in educational planning within the efficiency of educational services and investigated in terms of several variables and many aspects of it comprehensively. However, when the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that there are few researches conducted in the country. Due to this reason, it has been decided to conduct this research. The purpose of the study is to find out whether candidate teachers' perceptions regarding the quality of life vary in terms of certain variables. Thus, it is aimed to seek the answer of the following question. Do candidate teachers' perceptions about the quality of university life differ significantly in terms of such variables as gender, department, preference order, grade, accommodation and income level?

METHOD

The overall aim of the research is to reveal the perceptions of university candidate teachers' quality of life in universities. The type of this study is descriptive since its purpose is to investigate the students' perceptions of the existing quality of life in their university. The research is based on the participants' opinions and attitudes with relatively large samples (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2006).

Research design

This research is a descriptive study in the survey model to determine candidate teachers' perceptions of the quality of life in the university they study at.

Participants

1133 female and 512 male candidate teachers studying at different departments in a Faculty of Education at a state university were included in the study during 2017-18 scholar year.

Data Collection Tool

In this study, the data were collected through "The Quality of University Life Scale" (QULS) developed by Doganay and Sari (2004) in order to determine the perceptions of students about the quality of life in university. The QULS consists of 33 items collected with 7 dimensions. The arithmetic mean of these items ranged from 2.35 to 3.79, and the standard deviations ranged from 1.05 to 1.44. In addition, to examine the discrimination of the items, it was seen that all the items were able to distinguish the groups significantly ($p = .001$) as a result of the t test for the upper and lower 27% groups. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sample sufficiency value (.82) was found to be significant for the solution in the 7 iteration.

As a result of factor analysis on the quality of life scale, BMD value was 0.836; The Barlett sphericity test result was also significant ($P < 0.05$). As a result of the factor analysis, 54.31% of the total scale is required to be measured. As a result of the reliability analysis, Cr alpha value was determined as 0,788. As a result of the analysis, the scale is considered valid and reliable for this study. In order to determine whether the data had normal distribution, the kurtosis and skewness coefficients according to the variables were examined and these values showed normal distribution.

FINDINGS

In line with the purpose of the study, a t-test was conducted to determine whether the participants' perceptions of quality of university life varied according to the participants' genders. Table 1 shows the results of the t test analysis.

Table 1. Results of T-Test on Gender Differences of Perceptions of Quality of University Life

Gender	N	\bar{X}	s	t	p
Female	1133	2,92	,43	,272	,786
Male	512	2,91	,43		

As can be seen in Table 1, the perceptions of university participants about the quality of life do not differ statistically significant according to the gender variable ($t_{(1645)} = .272, p > .05$).

Parallel with the purpose of the study, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted to determine whether the participants' perceptions of the quality of university life differed according to the departments in which they studied. Table 2 shows the ANOVA test analysis results.

Table 2. One-way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) Results of Differences of Participants' Perceptions of the Quality of University According to the Departments They Study

Department	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p	Source of Difference
Inter groups	5,967	8	,746			
Intra groups	299,610	1636	,183	4,073	,000	GPC-Mathematics
Total	305,577	1644				

As can be seen in Table 2, as a result of one way variance analysis (ANOVA) conducted in order to determine whether the participants had significant differences according to university variable quality of life perceptions. The difference between the arithmetic mean of the groups was found to be statistically significant ($F = 4,073$, $p < .01$). After this process, complementary post-hoc analysis techniques were utilized to determine which groups resulted from the significant difference determined after ANOVA. As a result of the post-hoc Scheffe test, a statistically significant difference was found ($p < .01$) between Mathematics and Guidance and Psychological Counseling departments in favor of Mathematics. This situation was interpreted as the fact that the students studying at the department of Mathematics perceived university life quality more positively than those studying at the department of Guidance and Psychological Counseling (GPC).

Parallel with the purpose of the study, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted to determine whether the participants' perceptions of the quality of university life differed according to their preference order. Table 3 shows the ANOVA test analysis results.

Table 3. One-way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) Results of Differences of Participants' Perceptions of the Quality of University According to Their School Preference Order

Preference	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p	Source of Difference
Inter-groups	1,840	3	,613			
Intra-groups	303,736	1641	,185	3,314	,019	1-4 3-4
Total	305,577	1644				

As can be seen in Table 3, as a result of one way variance analysis (ANOVA) conducted in order to determine whether the participants had significant differences according to university variable quality of life perceptions. The difference between the arithmetic mean of the groups was found to be statistically significant ($F = 3,314$; $p < .05$). After this process, complementary post-hoc analysis techniques were utilized to determine which groups resulted from the significant difference determined after ANOVA. As a result of the post-hoc Scheffe test, a difference was found to be statistically significant ($p < .05$) between the students who had the first preference and those with the fourth, which was against those with the fourth preference order. Moreover, there was a

significant difference the students who had the third preference and those with the fourth in favor of those who had the third preference order.

Parallel with the purpose of the study, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted to determine whether the participants' perceptions of the quality of university life differed according to which grades they study. Table 4 shows the ANOVA test analysis results.

Table 4. One-Way Variance Analysis (Anova) Results of Differences of Participants' Perceptions of the Quality of University According to Which Grades They Study

Grade	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	P
Inter-groups	,493	4	,123		
Intra-groups	305,084	1640	,186	,662	,618
Total	305,577	1644			

As can be seen in Table 4, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted to determine whether the participants' perceptions of the quality of university life differed according to which grades they study (freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior and over). After (ANOVA) analysis, the difference between the arithmetic mean of the groups was not statistically significant ($F = ,662$; $p > .05$). Table 4 shows the ANOVA test analysis results.

Parallel with the purpose of the study, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted to determine whether the participants' perceptions of the quality of university life differed according to types of accommodation. Table 5 shows the ANOVA test analysis results.

Table 5. The Participants' Perceptions of the Quality of University Life According to Types of Accommodation

Accommodation	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	P	Source of Difference
Inter-groups	3,695	3	1,232			Private/With
Intra-groups	301,882	1641	,184	6,695	,000	Family –
Total	305,577	1644				Dormitory

As can be seen in Table 5, as a result of one way variance analysis (ANOVA) conducted in order to determine whether participants had significant differences in university quality of life perceptions, the difference between the arithmetic mean of the groups was found to be statistically significant ($F = 6,695$; $p < .05$). After this process, complementary post-hoc analysis techniques were utilised to determine which groups resulted from the significant difference determined after ANOVA. As a result of the post-hoc Scheffe test, a difference was found to be statistically significant ($p < .05$) between the students who lived with their families and those who stay at dorms. It was determined that the difference was in favor of those who live with their families. This case can be

interpreted that those who live with their families perceive the quality of life in a more positive manner than those who stay at dorms.

Table 6. The Participants' Perceptions of the Quality of University Life According to Their Income Level

Income	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Squares	of F	P	Source of Difference
Inter-groups	4,199	3	1,400			501/1000 – 0/500
Intra-groups	301,378	1641	,184	7,620	,000	501/1000 – 1501 and above
Total	305,577	1644				

As can be seen in Table 6, as a result of one way variance analysis (ANOVA) conducted in order to determine whether participants had significant differences in quality of university life perceptions, the difference between the arithmetic mean of the groups was found to be statistically significant ($F = 7,620$; $p < .05$). After this process, complementary post-hoc analysis techniques were utilised to determine which groups resulted from the significant difference determined after ANOVA. As a result of the post-hoc Scheffe test, it was determined that there was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) between the students with income level of 501-1000 and those with 0-500 and 1500-above income levels, which was against the students who had income level of 501-1000 in both groupings.

DISCUSSION

There are several factors that affect the quality of school life of university students. For this reason, it is necessary for universities to take the quality of life of their students seriously. School life satisfaction contributes to students' positive attitudes towards the school in different aspects. When the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that there are few researches conducted in the country. Due to this reason, it has been decided to conduct this research. The purpose of the study is to find out whether students' perceptions regarding the quality of life vary depending on certain variables. It is aimed to determine students' perception about the quality of university life differ significantly in terms of such variables as gender, department, preference order, grade, accommodation type and income level.

When the results of the study are examined, it is determined that there are some significant differences regarding students' perceptions in terms of the quality of university life. When the satisfaction level of the quality of university life was evaluated according to gender, there was not a significant difference between the groups. It was observed that the satisfaction levels of female students were not higher than those of male students. However, when the literature is examined it is seen that similar studies have been conducted to find out the gender differences, and they determined significant differences, which contradicts the current study (Cokluk-Bokeoglu, O. & Yilmaz, K. 2007; Topsakal & Iplik, 2013; Barutcu Yildir, Yerin-Güneri and Çapa-Aydın, 2015; Arıdağ et al., 2018). On the other hand, other studies conducted related to the gender differences in terms of the quality of university life they determined that there were not significant differences. (Egelioglu, Arslan and Bakan, 2011;

Haliloglu-Tatlı, Kokoc and Karal, 2011; Özdemir, Kilinc, Ogdem & Er , 2013, Erdoğan and Bulut, 2015), which support the results of the current study. It is evident that there is not a consensus regarding the gender differences related to the quality of university life.

When the results of students' preference order were examined, there were significant differences between the students who had the first choice and those with the fourth, which was against those with the fourth preference order. Moreover, there was a significant difference between the students who had the third preference and those with the fourth in favor of those who had the third preference. It can be claimed that the students who study at the universities which are among their primary preferences perceive university life quality more positively than the others. This result is considered significant in that it is of utmost importance that university students should be satisfied with their departments (Altaş, 2006).

In the current study, while there are no significant differences between the levels of quality of university life in terms of most departments, a significant difference was found between students studying at the department of Elementary Mathematics Education and those who study at the department of Guidance and Psychological Counseling, which is in favor of the students at the Elementary Mathematics Education. This result corresponds to the results of the research conducted by Uzgoren and Uzgoren (2007), which suggests that there is a difference between university students' perceptions of quality of university life in terms of departments. It can be assumed that the difference in favor of the students at the department of Elementary Mathematics Education may have resulted from the instructors' approaches to the students.

As a result of the results to determine whether the participants' perceptions of the quality of university life differed according to the grades they study at (freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior and over). The difference between the arithmetic mean of the groups was not statistically significant, which means that the grades at which students study does not have a significant effect on their perceptions of quality of university life. In literature, no studies examining this issue could be found.

When the results regarding the accommodation type related to the level of quality of university life were examined, it was evident that there were significant differences. It was determined that there was a significant difference in favor of those who lived with their families. This case can be interpreted that those who live with their families perceive the quality of life in a more positive manner than those who stay at dorms. It is assumed the families of the students provide more opportunities for their children to facilitate their lives, making them feel more comfortable and satisfied with their lives during university education.

When the results regarding the income level related to the level of quality of university life were examined, it was evident that there were significant differences. The students with income levels of 501-1000 had lower levels of quality of university life than the students with both 0-500 and 1501 and above income levels. This case can be interpreted as that those having an income between 0-500 have lower expectations, thus feeling satisfied whatever opportunity they have been given. When it comes to the students who have 1500 or more income

level, it can be assumed that they feel satisfied with their lives at university as they have the opportunity to afford their needs. The results are similar to those obtained in the study by Alaca (2011), who found that students in different income groups have different perceptions of the quality of school life. Uzgoren and Uzgoren (2007) underscores the possibility that the perception of quality of life of students with a monthly income of TL 2000 or higher is lower than the students in the lowest income group, which both contradicts and supports the results of the current study. In this context, it may be inaccurate to say that the students with high income levels will have a high level of university quality of life satisfaction, or vice versa. For this reason, further study on this issue is required.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the results of various studies with contradicting findings regarding the effect of gender on the students' perceptions of quality of university life, it is suggested that qualitative researches should be conducted to analyze the issue deeply so that underlying factors can be investigated along with cause and effect relationships. Also, schools administrations are recommended to focus on the issue taking both genders into account separately throughout an ongoing process and plan the educational processes and facilities accordingly.

It seems that students who study at the departments which were their primary preferences were more satisfied with their quality of university lives than those who study at the departments that are their fourth or further preferences. Many universities provide various opportunities for those students who select them in their first preferences. However, when the results of this study are considered, it can be assumed crucial that university administrations should take the other students into account as well. In this context, it could be useful to provide various opportunities for successful students at the end of their first year at university notwithstanding their orders of university preference, thus motivating them to feel more committed to their schools and satisfied with their quality of university lives.

It can be assumed that students who live with their families during university education are provided with the necessary or desired opportunities by their families, which facilitates their lives making them feel more comfortable and satisfied with their lives during university education. Since it is impossible to enable every single student to live with their families during their college education, it can be recommended that the opportunities and the facilities at the dormitories should be reconsidered by the authorities. Besides, further studies should be done with a qualitative approach to investigate the cause and effects of the issue. That is, students living in the dormitories or with their families should be asked why they feel satisfied or unsatisfied with their university lives.

The results show that students with the highest and lowest incomes feel more satisfied with their quality of university lives, which is considered an unexpected result. Thus, this issue should be deeply investigated in further qualitative researches.

REFERENCES

- Abdel-Khalek, A., M. (2010). "Quality of Life, Subjective Well-being and Religiosity in Muslim College Students". *Quality of Life Research*, 19(8): 1133-1143.
- Alaca, F. (2011). *İki Dilli Olan ve Olmayan Öğrencilerde Okul Yaşam Kalitesi Algısı ve Okula Aidiyet Duygusu İlişkisi [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.
- Argon, T., & Kösterelioğlu, M. A. (2009). "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Üniversite Yaşam Kalitesi ve Fakülte Kültürüne İlişkin Algıları". *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(30): 43-61.
- Barutcu-Yildirim, F., Yerin-Güneri, O. & Capa-Aydın, Y. (2015). "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Memnuniyet Düzeyi ve İlişkili Değişkenler [University Students' Satisfaction Level and Related Variables]". *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 11(2): 521-533.
- Ciftci Arıdag, N., Aydın M. & Aydın R. (2018). "Undergraduate Students' Satisfaction Levels on the Quality of Faculty Life". *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 73: 1-20, DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2018.73.1
- Cha, K. H. (2003). "Subjective Well-being among College Students". *Social Indicators Research*, 62(1): 455-477.
- Chow, H.P.H. (2005). "Life Satisfaction among University Students in a Canadian Prairie City: A Multivariate Analysis". *Social Indicators Research*, 70(2): 139-150.
- Clifton, R. A., Perry, R.P., Stubbs, C.A. & Roberts, L.W. (2004). "Faculty Environments, Psychosocial Dispositions and the Academic Achievement of College Students". *Research in Higher Education*, 45(8): 801-828.
- Cohen, E.H., Clifton, R.A. & Roberts, L.W. (2001). "The Cognitive Domain of the Quality of Life of University Students: A Re-analysis of an Instrument". *Social Indicators Research*, 53(1): 63-77.
- Cokluk-Bokeoglu, O. & Yılmaz, K. (2007). "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Fakülte Yaşamının Niteliğine İlişkin Görüşlerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi [Analysis of University Students' Views about the Quality of Faculty Life Using Various Variables]". *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 40(2): 179-204.
- Doganay, A & Sarı, M (2004). *Öğrencilerin Üniversitedeki Yaşam Kalitesine İlişkin Algılarının Demokratik Yaşam kültürü Çerçevesinde Değerlendirilmesi*. International Democracy Education Symposium, Çanakkale 18 Mart University, Çanakkale.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen & R.J., Griffin, S. (1985). "The Satisfaction with Life Scale". *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1): 71-75.
- 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 Students]". *Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi*, 11(26): 151-170.
- Ergen, H. (2013). Türkiye’de Eğitimde Planlama Yaklaşımları ve Kullanılan Eğitim Göstergeleri. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(2): 151-167.
- Filippo, C. L. (2004). "Reflections on Quality of Life as a College Concern to Facilitate Success of Students Who Are Deaf". *TCT Education of Disabilities*, 3(1): 11-23.
- Grace, B. Y., & Ji-Hyun, K. (2008). "Testing the Mediating Effect of the Quality of College Life in the Student Satisfaction and Student Loyalty Relationship". *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 3(1): 1-21.
- Grace, Y., & Lee, D.-J. (2008). "A Model of Quality of College Life (QCL) of Students in Korea". *Social Indicators Research*, 87(2): 269-285.
- 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.
- Haron, H. et. al (2015). *Determinants of Quality of Life and Quality of University Life in Malaysia Public University*. AIP Conference Proceeding: 1643, 505-511. doi:10.1063/1.4907486
- Kangal, A. (2012). "Üniversite Yaşam Kalitesi Ölçeğinin Türkçe Uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması". *E-international journal of educational research*, 3(1): 16-32.
- Kuldip, S., Augustine, E. C. & Mahgar S. B. S. (2010). *Quality of University Life for UITM Students*. 2010 International Conference on Science and Social Research (CSSR) 978-1-4244-8986-2/10 ©2010 IEEE
- Low, L. (2000). *Are College Students Satisfied? A National Analysis of Changing Expectations*. New agenda series [TM]. Indianapolis: USA Group Inc.
- Maidinsah, H. & Sari, M. M. (2016). "Quality of University Life (QUL): A Case Study of Malay Students". *Journal of Discovering Mathematics*, (34)2: 15-21.
- Michalos, A., C. & Orlando, J., A. (2006). "A Note on Student Quality of Life". *Social Indicators Research*, 79: 51-59.
- Nordenfelt, L. (1993). *Quality of Life, Health and Happiness*. Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Ng, S. L. (2005). "Subjective Residential Environment and Its Implications for Quality of Life among University Students in Hong Kong". *Social Indicators Research*, 71(1): 467-489.
- Nussbaum, M., C. & Sen., A., K. (1993). *The Quality of Life*. World Institute for Development Economics Research. Oxford (England): Clarendon Press.
- Ozdemir, S., Kilic, A.Ç., Ogdem, Z. & Er, E. (2013). "Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Fakülte Yaşamının Niteliğine İlişkin Memnuniyet Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi [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.
- Peng, P.J. & Abu Samah, A.J. (2006). "Measuring Students' Satisfaction for Quality Education in E-Learning University". *UNITAR E-Journal*, 2(1): 11-21. doi:10.1.1.512.7710

- Roberts, L.W. & Clifton, R.A. (1992). "Measuring the Affective Quality of Life of University Students: The Validation of an Instrument". *Social Indicators Research*, 27(2): 113-137.
- Seyle, H. (1974). *The Stress of Life*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Sirgy, M. J., Grezeskowiak, S., & Rahtz, D. (2007). "Quality of College Life (QCL) of Students: Developing and Validating a Measure of Well-being". *Social Indicators Research*, 80(2): 343-360.
- Sirgy, M. J., Lee, D.-J., Grzeskowiak, S., Grace, B. Y., Webb, D., El-hasan, K. & Kuruüzüm, A. (2010). "Quality of College Life (QCL) of Students: Further Validation of a Measure of Well-being". *Social Indicators Research*, 99: 375-390.
- Topsakal, Y. & İplik, F.N. (2013). "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Kalite Algıları ile Memnuniyet ve Tavsiye Etme Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkiyi 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.
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Unalan, D., Celikten, M., Soyuer, F., & Öztürk, A. (2008). "Quality of Life in Turkish University Students and Its Relationship to Levels of State-Trait Anxiety". *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 36(3): 417-424.
- Uzgoren, N. & Uzgoren, E. (2011). "Dumlupınar Üniversitesi lisans öğrencilerinin memnuniyetini etkileyen bireysel özelliklerin istatistiksel analizi-Hipotez". *DergiPark Akademik*, 10(3): 836-849.
- Vaez, M., Kristenson, M., & Lafamme, L. (2004). "Perceived Quality of Life and Self-rated Health among First-year University Students". *Social Indicators Research*, 68(2): 221-234.
- Yu, G. & Lee, D.J. (2008). "A Model of Quality of College Life (QCL) of Students in Korea". *Social Indicators Research*, 87(2): 269-285.