Available online at ijci.wcci-international.org

International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction 13(3) (2021) 3231–3247

IJCI
International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction

Reviewing the perception of quality of education in students who take physical education and sports education in different universities

Fatma Yeşim Körmükçü [a] *, Hakan Akdeniz [b],

[a] *Kocaeli University, Campus, Kocaeli, Turkey*
[b] *Kocaeli University, Campus, Kocaeli, Turkey*

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to review the perception of quality of education in students who take physical education and sports education in three different universities. Descriptive survey model was used in this study to reveal the current situation. The Six-Question Personal Information Form and also Scale of Quality of Education in Universities Providing Physical Education and Sports Education that was developed by Paktaş were utilized to determine the demographic attributes of participants. It is observed at the end of the analyses that there is a significant relationship between perception of quality of education and gender; university and department (p<0,05). According to the results, considering the dimensions and subdimensions, the perception of quality of education in students in Bülent Ecevit University is higher compared to the same perception in other students from other universities.

Keywords: Quality of Education, Sports Sciences, Physical Education

1. Introduction

Quality is to completely and continuously meet the demand and needs of customers starting from the designing stage or to produce goods and services in the most economic way (Kelesbayev, 2014).

The main items of the system of education are the students, teachers, educational programs, executives, educationists, educational technology, physical and financial resources (Şişman, 2007).

Quality of educational services can be defined as an in which all employees of an institution adopt a culture of continuous improvement to achieve the highest quality and mega excellence in all educational and educational activities (Bridge, 2003).

* Corresponding author name. Phone.: +90 532 578 2025
E-mail address: yesim.kormukcu@kocaeli.edu.tr

The most serious side of education process is the quality of education. The quality of education is the fact that the educated population can respond to the needs and wishes of the population at a desired level and degree with their knowledge, skills and behaviors related to their own education (Bayrak, 1997).

The chief goal of quality in education is to provide continuity in raising qualified manpower. Quality of education rises in organizations where bring students in the ability to seek, find and evaluate information; teaches students to be doubtful about cases within scientific borders; finally, ensure the training of a population with knowledge, skills, and even experience that can compete with scientists in developed countries. This can be achieved by increasing the quality of the education provided by the educational institution. However, first of all, the institution must determine where it is in terms of educational quality. Therefore, the starting point for improving the quality of education is to measure the current quality of education (Aktaş, 2015).

Providing quality services in a higher education environment is the key for all the educational institutions from all over the world. The quality of higher education, in general, is essential for industrial, economic, and social development (Sohail and Hasan,2021).

Quality in higher education is a multidimensional fact including institutional, physical, and psychological components. The quality of service in universities is not only related to the quality of the services offered, but also to the added value and transformative effect provided to the students (Yılmaz, 2019).

In order to answer the sub-problems of this research, the following hypotheses were tried to be proven:

- There is statistically significant difference between the level of education quality of the students studying at the Faculty of Sport Sciences and the gender variable?
- There is statistically significant difference between the education quality of the Faculty of Sport Sciences and the department status?
- There is statistically significant difference between the education quality of the Faculty of Sport Sciences and the university status?

Hacıfazlıoğlu (2006) expressed that there can be raised qualified manpower if quality management in education is provided at every stage of education and in all areas affecting education. These are the criteria such as physical infrastructure (such as building, sports facilities, open space), syllabus, examination, and evaluation system, academic and administrative personnel procurement and development system, research and publications institutional development plan (strategic planning), and university-industry-society relations. Ruben (1995) divided the dimensions of quality into three parts as academic quality (learning, research, outreach), management quality (processes, systems, procedures, information flow), and relationship quality (relationship with consumers and stakeholders, interpersonal sensitivity, and ability, solidarity and cooperation, service orientation) (Meraler and Adıgüzel, 2012).

Student satisfaction is an important dimension of examining educational institutions in terms of quality. The satisfaction of the trainees towards the institution where they study is a multidimensional phenomenon that includes different dimensions such as the quality of

education, physical spaces, application opportunities, social, cultural, and sportive opportunities, and the unique characteristics of the student (Özberk,2017)

Students and other internal customers specify the level of quality of educational services in Schools of Physical Education and Sports. A high level of educational service raises knowledgeable and skilled individuals while a low level of educational service may bring along defective information, defective communication, defective individuals. These institutions should continuously determine the factors affecting the quality of education in the light of a method; they also should take action and put them into practice (Adatepe,2018).

With the entry into force of the Higher Education Quality Assurance Regulation (2015), Higher Education Quality Board was established to define the national policy and strategy for quality assurance and accreditation in higher education; support the establishment of internal quality assurance systems in higher education institutions and also to guide higher education institutions in this regard. Specifying the expectations, satisfaction, and quality perceptions of students, who are the most important buyers of higher education services, regarding the services and opportunities offered to them is extremely important in terms of increasing the quality of higher education (Ataman and Adıgüzel, 2019; Demirhan and Yüksel, 2011; Donalds and Denison, 2001; Güzel, 2006; İçli and Vural, 2010; Watty, 2006).

Quality in universities is even more important for newly opened faculties and colleges. Considering the universities in our country, it is a well-known fact that the well-established universities that have made a name, in general, come to mind. The reason for this is that the number of people aiming to receive a quality education and quality living standards as a result of this education is very high. For this reason, the goal should be to increase universities that are capable of meeting expectations, rather than a large number of schools. It can be emphasized starting from this point of view that providing quality education can be possible by meeting the expectations of the audience in need of education regardless of the university.

2. Method

In this research, descriptive survey method was used to reveal the current situation of the level of education quality students receive. Data was gathered from the students who are studying at the Faculty of Sports Sciences and BESYO at Kocaeli, Sakarya and Bülent Ecevit Universities. Education quality levels are evaluated with statistical procedures in terms of students' sexes, faculty and university. Due to Covid-19 pandemic the interviews could not be performed by face to face. Therefore, a detailed Google form survey sheet is sent to students in order to create the sample.

In this study below subsections are studied in order to answer hypothesis.

- Is there a relationship between the level of education quality of the students studying at the Faculty of Sport Sciences and the gender variable?
- Is there a relationship between the education quality of the Faculty of Sport Sciences and the department status?
- Is there a relationship between the education quality of the Faculty of Sport Sciences and the university status?

The population of the study consisted of students receiving formal and secondary education in Kocaeli, Sakarya, Bülent Ecevit Universities, Faculty of Sports Sciences, and School of

Physical Education and Sports (SPES) in the 2018-2019 academic year. The sample group was constituted by randomly selecting from a total of 486 students whose 142 (35.3%) from Kocaeli University, 138 (31.9%) from Sakarya University, and finally, 162 (32.8%) from Bülent Ecevit University.

Personal Information Form and Quality of Education Scale in Universities that provide Physical Education and Sports Education that was developed by Paktaş (2015) were utilized in this study to collect data. The scale is a 5 Point Likert Scale; options for positive expressions are ‘’Totally Agree’’ ‘’Agree’’ ‘’Neutral’’ ‘’Little Agree’’ ‘’Totally Disagree’’ while it has eight sub-dimensions and is scored as 5, 4, 3, 2, 1.Sample size, power, and precision.

Since the data showed normal distribution, parametric tests, unpaired T-test, and ANOVA were used in research statistics. Personal characteristics, frequency, and percentage values were analyzed; the significance level was accepted as .05.

2. Results

Table 1. Demographic Attributes and Descriptive Statistics

		n	**%**
University	Bülent Ecevit University	142	32,8
	Sakarya University	138	31,9
	Kocaeli University	153	35,3
	Total	433	100,0
Department	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	187	43,2
	Sports Management	72	16,6
	Coaching	68	15,7
	Recreation	106	24,5
	Total	433	100,0
Grade	2	137	31,6
	3	137	31,6
	4	159	36,7
	Total	433	100,0
Gender	Male	293	67,7
	Female	140	32,3
	Total	433	100,0

Table 2. T-test Distribution of Research Group by Gender Variable

Factors	Gender	n	x̄	Sd	t	P
Physical Conditions	Male	293	18,3720	5,02339	2,259	,024
	Female	140	17,2214	4,81315		
Executive Features	Male	293	42,4915	8,99909	,918	,359
	Female	140	41,6429	9,00206		
Executive Vision	Male	293	17,0034	3,49020	,333	,739
	Female	140	16,8857	3,33951		
Instructor Features	Male	293	35,9863	7,64449	,313	,754
	Female	140	35,7429	7,40928		
Education Programs	Male	293	32,2287	6,79940	-,514	,607
	Female	140	32,5857	6,67432		
Teaching Methods	Male	293	23,5836	4,45110	,499	,618
	Female	140	23,3500	4,76034		
Assessment and Evaluation	Male	293	12,5734	3,33191	-,826	,409
	Female	140	12,8500	3,10471		
Support Services	Male	293	24,8942	5,55721	1,517	,130
	Female	140	24,0429	5,25860		

($p<0.05$)

As is seen in Table 2, there is a statistically significant difference in physical conditions subdimension between the perception of quality of education and gender.

Table 3. ANOVA Test Distribution of research group by University Variable

Factors	Universities	N	x̄	Sd	F	p	Groups with Difference
Physical Conditions	Bülent Ecevit University(1)	142	17,7324	5,17484	,521	,594	
	Sakarya University(2)	138	18,3333	4,80166			
	Kocaeli University(3)	153	17,9477	4,96937			
Executive Features	Bülent Ecevit University(1)	142	45,5704	8,63064	23,683	,000	1-2* 1-3* 2-3*
	Sakarya University(2)	138	42,6232	8,57615			
	Kocaeli Üniversitesi(3)	153	38,7386	8,47967			
Executive Vision	Bülent Ecevit University(1)	142	17,6620	3,47409	9,487	,000	1-3* 2-3*
	Sakarya University(2)	138	17,2826	3,53912			
	Kocaeli University(3)	153	16,0327	3,11494			
Instructor Features	Bülent Ecevit University(1)	142	38,2113	7,28822	21,523	,000	1-3* 2-3*
	Sakarya University(2)	138	36,8551	7,20761			
	Kocaeli University(3)	153	32,9150	7,18455			

Education Programs	Bülent Ecevit University(1)	142	34,4507	6,34982	14,503	,000	1-2* 1-3* 2-3*
	Sakarya University(2)	138	32,3986	6,71586			
	Kocaeli University(3)	153	30,3399	6,58663			
Teaching Methods	Bülent Ecevit University(1)	142	24,1127	4,60049	4,934	,008	1-3* 2-3*
	Sakarya University(2)	138	23,8986	4,39856			
	Kocaeli University(3)	153	22,5948	4,51960			
Assessment and Evaluation	Bülent Ecevit University(1)	142	13,4296	3,25380	9,905	,000	1-3* 2-3*
	Sakarya University(2)	138	12,8333	2,93627			
	Kocaeli University(3)	153	11,7974	3,35677			
Support Services	Bülent Ecevit University(1)	142	25,7535	5,77127	7,498	,001	1-3* 2-3*
	Sakarya University(2)	138	24,8551	5,27292			
	Kocaeli University(3)	153	23,3529	5,12280			

($p<0.05$)

As is seen in Table 3, there is no statistically significant difference in physical conditions subdimension between the perception of quality of education and university variable while there is a statistically significant difference in the other seven subdimensions.

Table 4. ANOVA Test Distribution of Research Group by Department Variable

Factors	Departments	N	x̄	Sd	F	p	Variance Resource
Physical Conditions	Physical Education and Sports Teaching (1)	187	17,8824	4,94671	,902	,440	
	Sports Management(2)	72	18,5972	4,73423			
	Coaching(3)	68	17,3088	5,35670			
	Recreation(4)	106	18,2453	4,95852			
Executive Features	Physical Education and Sports Teaching (1)	187	44,8503	8,53576	11,296	,000	1-2* 1-3* 1-4*
	Sports Management(2)	72	41,1667	8,74683			
	Coaching(3)	68	38,5294	8,37992			
	Recreation(4)	106	40,6509	9,11831			
Executive Vision	Physical Education and Sports Teaching (1)	187	17,5668	3,41401	3,760	,011	1-3* 1-4*
	Sports Management(2)	72	16,8472	3,37622			
	Coaching(3)	68	16,3382	3,44080			
	Recreation(4)	106	16,3868	3,39066			

Instructor Features	Physical Education and Sports Teaching (1)	187	37,3636	7,17495	5,276	,001	1-3* 1-4*
	Sports Management(2)	72	35,6944	8,01695			
	Coaching(3)	68	33,4853	7,85217			
	Recreation(4)	106	35,0377	7,27150			
Education Programs	Physical Education and Sports Teaching (1)	187	33,9679	6,24405	8,702	,000	1-3* 1-4* 2-3*
	Sports Management(2)	72	32,5417	6,72171			
	Coaching(3)	68	29,8235	6,31733			
	Recreation(4)	106	30,9623	7,19778			
Teaching Methods	Physical Education and Sports Teaching (1)	187	23,9679	4,25644	1,203	,308	
	Sports Management(2)	72	23,0556	4,86114			
	Coaching(3)	68	23,0147	4,37255			
	Recreation(4)	106	23,3208	4,91557			

Assessment and Evaluation	Physical Education and Sports Teaching (1)	187	13,2032	3,12833	5,274	,001	1-3* 1-4* 2-4*
	Sports Management(2)	72	12,8056	3,23118			
	Coaching(3)	68	11,4559	3,37875			
	Recreation(4)	106	12,3868	3,23543			
Support Services	Physical Education and Sports Teaching (1)	187	25,4118	5,47786	4,182	,006	1-3* 2-3*
	Sports Management(2)	72	24,8611	5,06939			
	Coaching(3)	68	22,7794	5,50670			
	Recreation(4)	106	24,2358	5,45554			

As is seen in Table 4, there is a significant difference between the perception of quality of education and department in terms of the subdimensions of executive features, executive vision, instructor features, educat

Variables	Two-way MANOVA											
	Main Effect						Interaction Effect					
	Λ	df	F	Sig.	ŋ²	power	Λ	df	F	Sig.	ŋ²	Power
Gender	.956	3;191	2.898	.036*	.044	685	-	-	-	-	-	
Grade	.977	3;191	1.471	.224	.023	385	-	-	-	-	-	
GPA	.978	3;191	1.459	.227	.022	383						
Grade*Gender	-	-	-	-	-	-	.971	3;191	1.920	.128	.029	.491
Gender*GPA	-	-	-	-	-		.958	3;191	2.825	.040*	.042	.672
Grade *GPA							.961	3;191	2.606	.053	.039	.633

3. Discussion

Results are evaluated in this chapter and also discussed by associating to other research results regarding this field.

As is seen in Table 3, regarding the "University" variable which determines the attitudes towards the quality of education, the satisfaction levels of the students in all universities participating in the research are close to each other based on the "physical conditions" sub-dimension of quality of education. Students at Sakarya University stated that they have a higher quality perception than other students from other universities. Bülent Ecevit University was the university that expressed the lowest quality perception. It can be thought that the physical conditions in Bülent Ecevit University, which has students only in the Department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching; fewer SPES students compared to Kocaeli and Sakarya universities and is newer in its foundation year are more limited compared to other two universities. One of the first stages of the educational process is to prepare the educational environment. The educational environment is related to both the teacher's teaching success and the students' academic success. It enables teachers and students to adapt and be more successful in educational activities when it is well organized (Aydın, 2014). According to Özer et al. (2010), strengthening the human and physical infrastructure in higher education institutions will directly and positively contribute to quality practices in higher education. Therefore, first of all, the need for human resources in universities should be met and physical equipment should be completed at the same time. For Can's (2020) research results, students want physical and technological classrooms, equipment, internet infrastructure, libraries and laboratories to be developed in higher education (Can, 2021). Erden (2005) stated that the existence of the school building and other facilities belonging to SPESs and their accessible location for students, teaching staff, and other personnel are among the factors affecting the quality of education services. Moreover, he also stated that factors such as the qualitative and quantitative adequacy of classrooms, sports facilities, laboratories, and other units such as meeting rooms, conference rooms, libraries, the presence of toilets and showers, ventilation, heating, and lighting of all units affect the quality of education and training (Paktaş, 2015). Yenel et al. (2003) researched students studying in coaching education and sports management departments in sports education institutions. According to the results, 54.1% of the students who received sports education stated that the physical facilities of the departments were insufficient while 13.6% of them reported that they were not at a sufficient level. Songur (2015) conducted a study with the students of Şereflikoçhisar Berat Cömertoğlu Vocational School and highlighted that physical conditions are the lowest quality variable and education institutions should have modern-looking buildings and working spaces to increase the quality of service in education. Devebakan et al. (2019) researched Dokuz Eylül University İzmir Vocational School students and stated that the students' perception of quality in terms of physical characteristics remained at the lowest level. Moreover, for their results, the physical facilities of the school, especially the old building and equipment, negatively affect the perception of service quality in the relevant dimension. It is seen that the students in all universities participating in the research have a medium level of quality perception regarding the sub-dimension of instructor features.

In this context, we can say when students' perception levels are examined that students at Bülent Ecevit University have a higher quality perception than other universities. Subdimensions of executive features, executive vision, instructor features are effective on each other. University students who have a high-quality perception in terms of executive features also have a high-quality perception in terms of executive vision and teaching staff characteristics. The students in all universities participating in the research have a medium level of quality perception regarding the subdimension of teaching methods. Concerning students' perception levels, students at Bülent Ecevit University stated that they have a higher quality perception than students from other universities. It can be said in line with these results that there is a relationship between the subdimensions of teaching methods and education programs.

It is seen when Table 4 is examined that the perception levels of the students in the Physical Education Teaching department in the subdimension of "executive features" are at a higher level compared to other students. Regarding the perception levels in the subdimension of "executive vision", the perception levels of the students in the Physical Education Teaching department have a higher level of quality perception compared to other students. There are no significant differences among Sports Management, Coaching, and Recreation departments in terms of quality perception towards executive vision subdimension. Regarding the subdimension of "executive features", students in the Physical Education Teaching department have a higher level of quality perception compared to other students. There are no significant differences among Sports Management, Coaching, and Recreation departments in terms of the quality perception towards the subdimension of "executive features'". Regarding the "Education programs" subdimension, students in Physical Education Department have a higher level of quality perception compared to the students in the Coaching and Recreation departments. It is observed that the students in the Sports Management department have a higher quality perception than the students in the Recreation Department while no significant difference was found between the Physical Education Teaching Department and the Sports Management Department. In this context, we can comment that there is a relationship between the subdimensions of education programs and assessment and evaluation. Regarding the support services subdimension, students in Physical Education Department have a higher level of quality perception compared to the students in the Coaching department while and the students in the Sports Management department have a higher quality perception than the students in the Coaching department. According to these results, for Table 4, the students in the Physical Education Department have a higher perception of quality compared to all sub-dimensions, and the reason for this is that the students who get high scores in the exams of the Student Selection and Placement Center (SSPC), which is the admission condition for these departments, in other words, the students with better academic success are selected. Kayışoğlu and Yüksel (2016) conducted a study at Karabük University Hasan Doğan School of Physical Education and Sports. They found no significant difference among physical education and sports teaching and sports management departments in terms of education quality satisfaction. It can be thought that the low number of students and the fact that the study was carried out in only two parts caused this result.

In our study, a statistically significant difference was found between the perception of quality of education and the gender variable in the physical conditions sub-dimension. On the

other hand, there is no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of executive features, executive vision, instructor features, education programs, teaching methods, assessment and evaluation, support services. Paktaş and Mumcu (2021) conducted a study called "Quality of Education in Physical Education and Sports Teaching: A Study on Sports Management Departments". For their results, the perception of quality of education in Sports Management departments did not vary in any of the sub-dimensions in terms of gender. Another research was made by Jarafova and Demirtaş (2020); they highlighted that the satisfaction levels of the students from the faculty of education did not show a significant difference according to gender. These results jibe with our study findings. We can say that perception of quality of education did not vary in terms of gender due to distance education in relevant studies conducted in the pandemic period. Meraler and Adıgüzel (2012) conducted a study titled "Determining the Views of the Faculty of Education Students on Quality in Higher Education". They expressed at the end of the survey that a significant difference was found due to female participants when students' views on quality were examined in terms of gender. This difference might be rooted the fact that women have a higher perception of quality than men due to their general structure.

There is no statistically significant difference between the perception of quality of education and the physical conditions sub-dimension while there is a significant difference in the subdimensions of executive features, executive vision, instructor features, education programs, teaching methods, assessment and evaluation, and support services. A statistically significant difference was found between the perceptions of quality of education and the university in terms of all sub-dimensions in Paktaş's (2015) study called Quality of Education in Universities Providing Physical Education and Sports Teaching in the Framework of Student Perceptions. A significant difference was found between the students' views on quality and the university variable in Meraler and Adıgüzel's (2012) study called "Determining the Views of Faculty of Education Students on Quality in Higher Education’’. Their results jibe with our study findings.

A statistically significant difference can be seen between the perception of quality of education and department in terms of the subdimensions of executive features, executive vision, instructor features, education programs, assessment and evaluation, and support services. On the other hand, there is no significant difference in the subdimensions of physical conditions and teaching methods. Regarding Paktaş's (2015) study called "Quality of Education in Universities Providing Physical Education and Sports Education in the Framework of Student Perceptions", there is a significant difference between the perception of quality of education and department in terms of in the subdimensions of the physical conditions, executive vision, instructor features, education programs, teaching methods, assessment and evaluation, and support services. Again, for his study results, there is no significant difference in terms of the subdimension of teaching methods. His results jibe with our study findings.

4. Conclusions

This paper that scrutinizes whether the quality of education in universities providing physical education sports education varies by gender, department, and university variables

revealed that the perceived quality of education in students from Bülent Ecevit University was higher compared to others. Considering the number of students at Bülent Ecevit University School of Physical Education and Sports is less, we can express that the low number of students, especially in these institutions providing applied education, increases the quality perception and the quality perceptions of the students with high academic success are also high.

We, finally, emphasize that there is a need for an evaluation regarding the quality of education in terms of different factors in universities that provide physical education and sports education. Connecting the current education quality to common standards and carrying out studies that will improve the understanding of total quality management will increase the quality of education.

References

Adatepe, E. (2018). Measuring Perceptions of Quality of Education in Physical Education and Sports School Students (Bartın University Case). Bartin University Institute of Educational Sciences Physical Education and Sports Teaching Department Physical Education and Sports Education Unpublished Master's Thesis

Ataman, O., Adıgüzel, A. (2019). Quality perception in higher education: Düzce University Case Journal of Electronic Educational Sciences. Vol:8, Issue:15

Aydın, Z.D. (2014). *Student Opinions on the Effect of the Physical Conditions of the Environment where the Exams are Held on Performance. Yeditepe University Institute of Social Sciences Educational Administration and Supervision Master's Program Unpublished master's thesis*

Bayrak, S. (1997). *"Education and Quality Relationship", Türk Yurdu Magazine, v.17, issue:123*

Bridge, B. (2003). Total Quality Management Practices in Education. (1st Edition). Beyaz Publications. İstanbul.

Can, E . (2021). Quality Indicators in Higher Education According to Student Opinions(Kırklareli Üniversitesi Örneği) . Journal of Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University Faculty of Education , 8 (1) , 54-71 . DOI: 10.21666/muefd.754193

Can, E. (2020). Opinions of vocational school students for quality in higher education. Anemon Mus Alparslan University Journal of Social Sciences, 8(3), 699-710.

Demirhan-Yüksel, Y. (2011). Perceptions of university students regarding the concepts of quality and quality university (Gazi University-Gazi Education Faculty Case).Unpublished Master's Thesis. Gazi University, Ankara

Devebakan, N., Egeli, H.A., Koçak, N. (2019). Evaluation of Service Quality in Higher Education Institutions Based on Student Expectations and Perceptions with SERVQUAL Scale: A Research at Dokuz Eylul University Izmir Vocational School. Journal of higher education. Volume:9, Issue:2

Donald, J.G. and Denison, D.B. (2001). Quality assessment of university students: student perceptions of quality criteria. The Journal of Higher Education, 72(4) 478-502

Erden, M. (2005) Introduction to the teaching profession. Epsilon Publishing House.

Güdül, F. (2007). A Constructivist Approach to Teacher, Student and Executive Features. Niğde University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences, Unpublished Master's Thesis.

Güzel, N.G. (2006).Tourism education and service quality in higher education, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Hacıfazlıoğlu, Ö. (2006) European Union Higher Education Quality Indicators and the Case of Turkey. Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences. Educational Sciences. USA Educational Administration and Supervision Unpublished Doctoral Thesis.

İçli, G.E. and Vural, B.B. (2010). Kırklareli University Vocational Schools Student Satisfaction Survey within the framework of total quality management and practices. Marmara University Journal of F.E.A.S, 28(1), 335-349.

Kayışoğlu, B., Yüksel, Y. (2016). Physical education and sports students' education quality satisfaction level. Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise. Volume:18- İssue:1 DOI:10.14314

Kelesbayev, D. (2014). Common Issue in the Education System of the Turkish World: Journal of Turkish Literature Education Issue: 3/2

Maleyka, J., Demirtaş, Z. (2020). Student Satisfaction in Education Faculties (Sakarya University Case). Journal of Sakarya University Faculty of Education Volume 20 Issue 2

Meraler, S., Adıgüzel A. (2012)Determining the Views of Faculty of Education Students on Quality in Higher Education. Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences Institute Year :5 Issue : 9

Özberk, E. B. Ü. (2017), *A Scale Development Study to be Used in the Training Centers for the Personnel of Penal Institutions of the Ministry of Justice: Education Satisfaction Scale, Inonu University Journal of Education Faculty, vol. 18, no. 1,*

Özer, M., Gür, B. S., Küçükcan, T. (2010). Quality assurance in higher education. Ankara: SETA Publications.

Paktaş, Y. (2015). *"Quality of Education in Universities Providing Physical Education and Sports Education in the Frame of Student Perceptions"* Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences Physical Education and Sports Teaching Department Unpublished Doctorate Thesis.

Paktaş, Y., Mumcu H. E. (2021). Quality of Education in Physical Education and Sports Teaching: A Study on Sports Management Departments. Ondokuz Mayıs University Journal of the Faculty of Education. Volume 40 Issue 1

Ruben, (1995) Quality İn Higher Education New Brunswick, U.S.A. : Transaction Publishers. 17.05.2020 tarihinde http://www.google.com/books adresinden erişildi

Sohail, M. Sadiq., Hasan, M .(2021) Students' perceptions of service quality in Saudi universities: the SERVPERF model. Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives Vol. 17 No. 1, Emerald Publishing Limited 2077-5504 DOI 10.1108/LTHE-08-2020-0016

Songur, L. (2015).Measuring service quality in education with the SERVQUAL method: Aksaray University Şereflikochisar Berat Cömertoğlu Vocational School Case. Journal of International social Studies Volume: 8 Issue:41

Şişman, M. (2007). *Introduction to Education Science, Pegem A Publishing.*

Yenel, İ. F., Gökyürek, B., Turgut, M. (2003). A Study on the Reasons and Expectations of Students Studying in the Departments of Coaching and Sports Management in Physical Education and Sports Colleges. Social Fields Congress in Physical Education and Sports, Ankara.

Yılmaz, D. V. (2019) UnilQual: Scale of University Life Quality. International Journal of Society Studies. Volume: 10 Issue:17

Higher Education Quality Assurance Regulation (2015). Official Gazzette, 23.07.2015, Issue: 29423

Watty, K. (2006). Want to know about quality in higher education? Ask an academic. Quality in Higher Education, 12 (3), 291–301.
Hockly, N. (2013). Interactive whiteboards. *ELT Journal, 67*(3), 354-358.