EXAMINATION OF THE FACTORS AFFECTING THE HAPPINESS OF MUSIC STUDENTS FROM STUDYING AT KASTAMONU UNIVERSITY FINE ARTS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT MUSIC EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Assistant Prof.Dr. Mustafa KABATAŞ
Kastamonu University, Faculty of Education, Kastamonu / Turkey
ORCID NO: 0000-0002-3790-4455

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the existence of factors that affect the university satisfaction level of music students. The study group of the research; In the spring semester of the 2018-2019 academic year, a total of 48 students, 27 male and 21 female students, who studied at the Department of Music Education, Department of Fine Arts Education at Kastamonu University and participated in the study voluntarily. In the research, as a data collection tool, "Student Satisfaction Scale" consisting of five sub-dimensions was used. According to the results of the structural equation model of the study; The factor affecting students' university satisfaction the most; It has been observed that there are measurement and evaluation activities, followed by education programs and instruction, academic counseling and guidance, services provided to students and opportunities to support the academic environment and learning. It was concluded that the values obtained for the model were significant in explaining the university satisfaction implicit variable of all factors, and the fit index values of the model remained within acceptable values.

Keywords: Music, Music Education, Student, Satisfaction, Music Student Satisfaction

1. INTRODUCTION

Education, according to behavioral psychology, is the process of creating desired behavioral changes in the individual through learning experiences. According to the constructivist approach, education is the process of constructing their own cognitive schemas through experiences, by experiencing, observing, trial and error. Throughout history, the main purpose of education was to spread culture to all generations. Education, according to behavioral psychology, is the process of creating desired behavioral changes in the individual through learning experiences. According to the constructivist approach, education is the process of constructing their own cognitive schemas through experiences, by experiencing, observing, trial and error (Işıkgöz, M. E., Esentaş, M. 2018). Throughout history, the main purpose of education was to spread culture to all generations. The role and function of education in social development has an important place. Because education, with its economic and social dimensions, is one of the most important resources of the economic development process and plays a critical role in increasing the welfare and quality of life of the society (Hoşgörür & Hoşgörür, 2011).

Universities have an important place in fulfilling this role in the context of formal education. Universities provide the transition between social layers as dynamic educational institutions that provide scientific, technical knowledge and professional skills in order to improve the quality of social and individual life (Scott, 2002). Therefore, universities play an important role in the economic, social, cultural, scientific, technological, ethical and intellectual development of societies (Uzgören & Uzgören, 2015). University life encompasses a wide area that includes both academic, administrative and human relations. Among these living spaces, the main inputs of the academic dimension are students (Şahin, 2011).

When starting university, most of the students make their choice of department consciously and start their university education with great expectations. Especially if we consider the fact that students of the music department enter with special talent exams. Whether or not their expectations come true at the end of the term indicates their satisfaction with the university (Altaş, 2006). Satisfaction is defined as the perception that the service received is performed satisfactorily (Oliver, 1999).

Students' satisfaction with the university where they studied is basically a multidimensional phenomenon. This phenomenon; The quality of education can be examined with an approach that includes different dimensions such as physical spaces, application possibilities, social, cultural and sports opportunities and individual characteristics of the student (Uzgören & Uzgören, 2015). In the examination of the satisfaction of the university students, besides the physical conditions, the opinions of the faculty members in their department and department can be taken into consideration (Altaş, 2006). It is inevitable to know the expectations of the new students and the changes in the expectations of the students who are studying in their

departments and to make new arrangements in this regard, to make and implement new decisions, to enable universities to fulfill their functions in a better and realistic way (Naralan & Kaleli, 2012). Quality in education and training is the continuous improvement of systems that will improve students' social, psychological, scientific and moral values that will increase their commitment to their school and society now and in the future (Baykara, 1999). The quality of the education system as a whole depends on the quality and mutual harmony of the elements that form and direct the system (Yüksel, 2011). For these reasons, learning and teaching environments prepared by considering the individual, professional, social, emotional and democratic needs of students will increase the satisfaction level of individuals (Oğuz, 2002). There are some dimensions by which students' level of satisfaction with the education and training process can be measured. These dimensions; academic environment and opportunities that support learning, services provided to students, educational programs and teaching, measurement and evaluation, academic counseling and guidance (Işıkgöz, M. E., Esentaş, M. 2018).

The educational process is not limited to academic teaching in the classroom, but also includes out-of-class student-lecturer relations, the curriculum, and the academic advisory and guidance of the instructor (Ekinci & Burgaz, 2007). The success of the student is possible primarily by adapting to university life in a short time. At this point, universities aim to solve the possible adaptation problem through academic advisors and support students to start their university life in a healthy way (Köser & Mercanlıoğlu, 2010). Universities basically aim to be preferred by students by maximizing student satisfaction and minimizing dissatisfaction, and to rank high in university rankings (Şahin, 2009). Since education is a service and universities are institutions that produce services, the education service provided by students who are customers of the education service and the satisfaction they provide from this service are important for universities (Tayyar & Dilşeker, 2013). Because, considering the expectations and requests for student satisfaction by the university administration will provide the university with versatile opportunities (Elliot & Shin, 2002). From this point of view, it is thought that this study, which examines the factors affecting the university satisfaction and happiness of music students studying at Kastamonu University Fine Arts Education Department Music Education Department, with a multivariate analysis method, will contribute to the literature.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

When the literature is examined; Examining the satisfaction levels of students studying at various faculties and departments under various variables and factors (Barutçu, Güneri, & Aydın, 2015; Erdoğan & Bulut, 2015; Aydın, Görmiş & Altıntop, 2014; Tatlı, Kokoç & Karal, 2014; Akan , 2014; Eren, Özgül and Çullu, 2013; Onursal, Cömert and Akman, 2011; Şahin, Zoraloğlu and Fırat, 2011; Egelioğlu, Arslan and Bakan, 2011; Ekinci and Burgaz, 2007; Atay and Yıldıırm, 2008; Uzgören and Uzgören , 2015; Yangın and Kırca, 2013; Naralan and Kaleli, 2012; Tütüncü and Doğan, 2003; Baltacı, Üngüren, Avsalli and Demirel, 2012; Altaş, 2006; Yıldırım, Güneri and Aydın, 2015; Turan and Ünsel, 2014; Karahan , 2013; Tayyar & Dilşeker, 2013), developing a scale of satisfaction with studies (Tatar et al., 2017; Şahin, 2009; Erdoğan & Uşak, 2005; Baykal, Sökmen, Korkmaz & Akgün, 2002; Pace, 1984; Betz, Klingensmith, and Menne, 1970) and Işıkgöz, ME, Esentaş, M., & Işıkgöz, M. (2015). Investigation of secondary school students' value levels towards Physical Education and Sports Lesson in terms of various variables: Batman province example. International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research, 4 (4), 661-676. It seems that their work. However, there are no studies investigating the factors affecting the satisfaction levels of students studying in Physical Education and Sports programs.

3. METHOD

The aim of this study is to measure the effects of the factors affecting the university satisfaction of the students of Kastamonu University Fine Arts Education Department Music Education Department. The hypothesis tested for this purpose is as follows; H1: (A) Academic Environment and Opportunities Supporting Learning, (B) Services Provided to Students, The dependent variables of (C) Education Programs and Instruction, (D) Measurement and Evaluation and (E) Academic Counseling and Guidance significantly affect Student Satisfaction. The working group of the research in the spring semester of 2018-2019 A total of 48 students, 27 male and 21 female students, who study at Kastamonu University Fine Arts Education Department Music Education Department and participate voluntarily in the study. Necessary permissions were obtained from the university administration for the survey. In the study, the data were collected through a questionnaire consisting of two parts.

The questionnaire consists of two parts and the first part includes 6 questions to determine the socio-demographic characteristics of the students. In the second part of the questionnaire, "Student Satisfaction

Scale" of Atatürk University was used to determine the satisfaction levels of the students. The scale has 5 factors, 13 questions in the factor "(A) Academic Environment and Learning Supporting Facilities", 16 questions in the "(B) Services Provided for Students" factor, 17 questions in the "(C) Education Programs and Teaching" factor, "(D) Measurement and Evaluation "factor, 5 questions, and" (E) Academic Counseling and Guidance "factor, total 57 questions. The scale items are 5-point Likert type and graded as "5: Strongly Agree, 4: Partially Agree, 3: Undecided, 2: Partially Disagree, 1: Strongly Disagree". The calculated Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of the scale in the study were calculated between 0.81 and 0.90 in terms of factors and 0.94 in total. According to these findings, it shows that the data obtained from the scale are reliable. Confirmatory factor analysis was chosen instead of exploratory factor analysis since the structure of the scale was established previously (Thompson, 2004). The data of the study were analyzed with SPSS (22.0) and Lisrel (8.8) programs. In the study, the socio-demographic characteristics of the students and their scores from the scale were analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques, and the Structural Equation Model (SEM) was used to determine the factors affecting university satisfaction. In the study, it is thought that the five (A, B, C, D, E) factors of the scale affect student satisfaction positively and significantly as dependent variables. In this context, the compatibility of the model and the available data has been evaluated by considering the fit index values in Table 1.

Tablo 1. Structural equation models fit index values

İndex	Normal Value	Acceptable Value
χ^2 /sd	>2	>5
GFI	>0.95	>0.90
AGFI	>0.95	>0.90
CFI	>0.95	>0.90
RMSEA	>0.05	>0.08
SRMR	>0.05	>0.08

Source: Şimşek, 2007

4. FINDINGS

The working group of the research in the spring semester of 2018-2019 A total of 48 students, 27 male and 21 female students, who study at Kastamonu University Fine Arts Education Department Music Education Department and participate voluntarily in the study.

Table 2. Distribution of the demographic characteristics of the students participating in the study

Gender	n	%
Male	27	53,5
Women	21	46,5
Age		
21-25	20	46,2
26-30	28	53,8
Department		
Fine Arts Education Department Music Education Department	48	100
Class		
4.Class	18	40,0
3.Class	13	25,2
2.Class	10	19,6
1.Class	7	15,2
Education Type		
Normal Education	48	100
Socio-Economic Status		
Lower Level	6	10,3
Intermediate Lower Level	13	25,2
Middle Upper Level	18	40,2
High level	11	24,3
Total	48	100,0

According to Table 2, 27 (53.5%) of the students are male and 21 (46.5%) are female. As the age range, 20 (46.2%) of the students are between 21-25 and 28 (53.8%) are between 26-30. 48 (100%) of the students are studying at Fine Arts Education Department Music Education. 7 of the students (40.0%) 1st year, 10 (15.2%) 2nd year, 13 (19.6%) 3rd year, 18 (15.2%) 4 He is a class student. As a type of education, 48 (100%) of the

students receive normal education. Socio-economic status of the students 6 (10.3%) Lower Level, 13 (25.2%) Intermediate Lower Level, 18 (40.2%) Middle Upper Level, 11 (24%) , 3) It is in the high level socio-economic group.

Tablo 3. Descriptive statistics results of the scores students got from satisfaction scale factors

Factors	Ort.	S.S.	Distortion	Flatness	Min.	Max.
(A) Academic Environment and Opportunities Supporting Learning	3,41	0,86	-0,12	-0,51	13,00	65,00
(B) Services Provided to Students	2,74	0,76	0,74	1,00	16,00	80,00
(C) Education Programs and Teaching	3,12	0,93	-0,06	-0,37	17,00	85,00
(D) Quantification and Consideration	3,18	1,14	0,00	-0,95	5,00	25,00
(E) Academic Counseling and Guidance	3,39	1,21	-0,26	-1,00	6,00	30,00

According to Table 3, when the average of the scores the students got from the factors of the university satisfaction scale is examined; it is seen that they got the highest average from the factor "(A) Academic Environment and Learning Supporting Facilities (3.41 ± 0.86)" and the lowest average from the factor "(B) Services Provided to Students (2.74 ± 0.76)". The average of other factors, respectively; "Academic Counseling and Guidance (3.39 ± 1.21)", "Measurement and Evaluation (3.18 ± 1.14)" and "Education Programs and Teaching (3.12 ± 0.93)". When the distribution of the scores obtained from the factors of the satisfaction scale was examined, it was evaluated that the distribution was normal because the skewness and kurtosis coefficients remained within ± 1 limits (Howitt & Cramer, 2011; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Indeed multivariate Skewness and kurtosis coefficients can be used as descriptive methods to examine normality (Thode, 2002; Mardia, 1970).

After examining the general values about the factors, the Structural Equation Model was created with the Lisrel 8.8 program. The model obtained is given in Figure 1. According to the model, the model explaining students' university satisfaction is as follows: Satisfaction = 0.53 (A) Academic Environment and Opportunities Supporting Learning + 0.60 * (B) Services Provided to Students + 0.90 (C) Education Programs and Teaching + 0.91 (D) Measurement and Evaluation + 0.86 * (E) Academic Counseling and Guidance Typically, path analysis involves the construction of a path diagram for all variables in which the relationships between the normal directions between them are specifically arranged. When performing a path analysis, a first shows the entry path diagram, which may be a structure, hypothesis relationships. In a path diagram, researchers use arrows to show how different the variables relate to each other. Variable B, let's say, an arrow pointing to variable A, indicates that Variable Variable B affects the hypothesis.

After the statistical analysis is complete, the way out diagram a researcher will then construct shows the relationships that actually exist, according to the analysis. If the investigator's hypothesis is correct, the entry-path schema and the exit-path scheme will show the same relationships between variables.

When the path diagram applied on the study is examined, the factor affecting the university satisfaction of the students studying in the Department of Music Education at Kastamonu University Fine Arts Education Department most is; assessment and evaluation activities (0.91), followed by education programs and instruction (0.90), academic counseling and guidance (0.86), services provided to students (0.60), and academic environment and opportunities to support learning (0, 53). The factors that least affect students' university satisfaction are the academic environment and opportunities that support learning. When the values related to the model are examined, all factor loads are above 0.50, in this context, it is meaningful in explaining the university satisfaction implicit variable of all factors, and all structures have convergence validity since the factor loads are greater than 0.50. Fit indices of the model are given in table 4.

Tablo 4. Yapısal eşitlik modeli uyum indisleri

χ2	Sd	χ2/Sd	GFI	AGFI	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
4660,99	1534	3,03	0,91	0,90	0,92	0,07	0,06

According to Table 4, the values obtained for the model are within acceptable values $[(\chi^2 / sd = 3,03)$; goodness of fit index (GFI; goodness fit Index) = 0.91; adjusted goodness fit index (AGFI; adjusted goodness fit index) = 0,90; comparative fit index (CFI; Comparative fit index) = 0.92; root mean square error of approx. = 0.07; standardized root mean square residual (SRMR; standardized root mean square residual) = 0.06].

5. RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Kastamonu University Faculty of Education, Fine Arts Education Department, Music Education Department students' university satisfaction; In this study, which was examined in the model established with the confirmatory factor analysis to what extent the academic environment and opportunities to support learning, the services provided to students, education programs and teaching, assessment and evaluation, and academic counseling and guidance factors as dependent variables, the following results were obtained;

According to the modeling established after examining the general values related to the factors affecting students 'university satisfaction, the model explaining students' university satisfaction (Satisfaction = 0.53 * (A) Academic Environment and Learning Supporting Opportunities + 0.60 * (B) Services Provided for Students + 0, 90 * (C) Curriculum and Instruction + 0.91 * (D) Assessment and Evaluation + 0.86 * (E) Academic Counseling and Guidance). It was seen that the fit indices calculated for the established model were within acceptable values. The factor affecting students' university satisfaction the most; measurement and evaluation activities, followed by education programs and instruction, academic counseling and guidance, services provided to students, and academic environment and opportunities that support learning. The factors that least affect students' university satisfaction are the academic environment and opportunities that support learning.

When the literature is examined, it is seen that various factors affect students' university satisfaction. In their study, Erdoğan and Bulut (2015) found that the factors affecting student satisfaction are the adequacy of education and training programs, support services, relationships and physical facilities, and that the change in these variables contributes significantly and positively to students' satisfaction level. Görgen and Bingöl (2016) evaluated students' satisfaction levels according to sub-scales, and that students obtained the highest average score of satisfaction from the faculty department, followed by the quality of education, school management satisfaction, participation in decisions, and satisfaction with the scientific, social and technical facilities of the school. They stated (Işıkgöz, M. E., Esentaş, M. 2018).

Ayvaz, Güven, Arslan, and Güven (2018), in their research on the measurement of service quality in universities and the effect of service quality on student satisfaction, concluded that the dimension with the highest perception of service quality by students is academic staff and the lowest dimension is physical characteristics. Kandemir (2016) determined the factors affecting student satisfaction structurally. In his study, which he researched with the equality model, he states that the dependent variable that can affect satisfaction most may be the lecturer scale, and that the positive or negative change in the internal variable of the instructor affects the change in student satisfaction significantly. In our study, the finding that the dimension affecting student satisfaction the most is measurement and evaluation activities, and the least affecting dimension is the academic environment and opportunities to support learning, overlaps with the findings of this study in terms of dimension contents (Işıkgöz, M. E., Esentaş, M. 2018).

Considering that students' university satisfaction consists of multi-dimensional variables, it is expected that universities, as a service sector, will provide quality service regarding the dimensions that affect satisfaction. Because the satisfaction of students is an important indicator in determining the quality level (Altaş, 2006). In their study, Okumuş and Duygun (2008) concluded that the higher the service quality perceived by the students, the higher their general satisfaction level. The graduation of university students by passing through a qualified education process that meets their expectations and aims, can also serve to meet the needs and expectations of the society (Şahin, Zoraloğlu, & Fırat, 2011).

According to the results of this study and similar research conducted in the field, it was seen that more than one factor determines the satisfaction of university students. In this context, the positive increase in the services provided by the universities will increase the satisfaction of the students at the same rate. This study, carried out in Kastamonu University Faculty of Education, Department of Fine Arts Education, Department of Music Education, will guide similar studies in the field of music. Such studies are of great importance in determining the goals of universities. Considering the fact that students form universities; It is very important that students love their school and department.

KAYNAKÇA

Akan, B. (2014). Toplam kalite yönetimi çerçevesinde öğrenci memnuniyeti: Namık Kemal Üniversitesi Hayrabolu Meslek Yüksekokulu uygulaması. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 6(10), 106-123.

Altaş, D. (2006). Üniversite öğrencileri memnuniyet araştırması. Marmara Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi, 21(1), 439-458.

Atay, L. ve Yıldırım, H.M. (2008). Lisans düzeyinde turizm eğitimi alan öğrencilerin memnuniyetine yönelik bir araştırma. Seyahat ve Otel İşletmeciliği Dergisi, 5(3).

Aydın, S., Görmüş, A.Ş. ve Altıntop, M.Y. (2014). Öğrencilerin memnuniyet düzeyleri ile demografik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin doğrusal olmayan kanonik korelasyon analizi ile incelenmesi: Meslek Yüksekokulu'nda bir uygulama. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi.

Ayvaz, Y.Y., Güven, E.T.A., Arslan, Z. ve Güven, H. (2018). Üniversitelerde hizmet kalitesinin ölçülmesi ve hizmet kalitesinin öğrenci memnuniyetine etkisi: Göksun Meslek Yüksekokulu Örneği.

Baltaci, F., Üngüren, E., Avsalli, H. ve Demirel, H.N. (2012). Turizm eğitimi alan öğrencilerin eğitim memnuniyetlerinin ve geleceğe yönelik bakış açılarının belirlemesine yönelik bir araştırma. Uluslararası Alanya İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi, 4(1).

Barutçu, F., Güneri, O. ve Aydin, Y. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinin memnuniyet düzeyi ve ilişkili değişkenler.Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama, 11(2), 521-533.

Baykal, Ü., Sökmen, S., Korkmaz, Ş. ve Akgün, E. (2002). Öğrenci memnuniyeti ölçeği geliştirme Çalışması. Florence Nightingale Hemşirelik Dergisi, 12(49), 23-32.

Baykara, S. (1999). Eğitimde toplam kalite yönetiminin uygulanabilirliği ve bir model önerisi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.

Betz, E.L., Klingensmith, J.E. ve Menne, J.W. (1970). The measurement and analysis of college student satisfaction. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 3(1), 110-118.

Birinci ASM Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi, 3-5 Mayıs 2018, Antalya.

Egelioğlu, N., Arslan, S. ve Bakan, G. (2011). Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin memnuniyet durumlarının akademik başarıları üzerine etkisi. Turkish Journal of Research & Development in Nursing, 13(1).

Ekinci, C.E. ve Burgaz, B. (2007). Hacettepe üniversitesi öğrencilerinin bazı akademik hizmetlere ilişkin beklenti ve memnuniyet düzeyleri. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 33(33).

Elliott, K.M., ve Shin, D. (2002) Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. Journal of Higher Education, Policy and Management, 24(2), 197-209.

Erdoğan, E. ve Bulut, E. (2015). İşletme bölümü öğrencilerinin memnuniyet düzeylerini etkileyen faktörlerin araştırılması. Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi, 11(26), 151-170.

Erdoğan, M. ve Uşak, M. (2005). Fen bilgisi öğretmen adayları memnuniyet ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 25(2).

Eren, D., Özgül, E. ve Çullu Kaygısız, N. (2013). Lisans düzeyinde turizm eğitimi alan öğrencilerin eğitim memnuniyetlerinin belirlenmesi: Nevşehir Üniversitesi örneği. Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 35(2), 16-27.

Görgen, Ö. ve Bingöl, G. (2016). Amasya Üniversitesi Sağlık Yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin memnuniyet düzeylerinin incelenmesi. Balıkesir Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi, 5(3), 116-122.

Hoşgörür, V. ve Hoşgörür, T. (2011). Planlı dönemde yükseköğretimdeki gelişmeler. Hasan Âli Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 8(1), 111-131.

Howitt, D. ve Cramer, D. (2011). Introduction to SPSS statistics in psychology: For version 19 and earlier (Fifth edition). London: Pearson Education Limited.

Kandemir, H. (2015). Öğrenci memnuniyetini etkileyen faktörlerin yapısal eşitlik modeli ile araştırılması. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 1(13), 447-461.

Karahan, M. (2013). Yükseköğretim kurumları kalite yeterliliklerinin öğrenci memnuniyeti ve sürdürülebilirlik açısından incelenmesi: İnönü Üniversitesi Malatya MYO Uygulaması. Dicle Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 2(3), 1-9.

Köser, D.B. ve Mercanlıoğlu, Ç. (2010). Akademik danışmanlık hizmetinin önemi ve türkiye'deki üniversitelerde akademik danışmanlık hizmetinin değerlendirilmesi, Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi, 2(2), 27,36.

Mardia, K.V. (1970). Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with applications. Biometrika, 57(3), 519-530.

Naralan, A. ve Kaleli, S.S. (2012). Üniversite öğrencilerinin üniversiteden beklentileri ve bölüm memnuniyeti araştırması: Atatürk üniversitesi örneği. Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 4(1).

Oğuz, A. (2002). Üniversitelerdeki öğretim elemanlarının yabancı dili geliştirme. Eğitim ve Bilim, 27(125), 17-26.

Okumuş, A. ve Duygun, A. (2008). Eğitim hizmetlerinin pazarlanmasında hizmet kalitesinin ölçümü ve algılanan hizmet kalitesi ile öğrenci memnuniyeti arasındaki ilişki. Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 8(2), 17-38.

Oliver, R.L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty?, Journal of Marketing, 63, 33-44.

Onursal, S., Cömert, H. ve Akman, G. (2011). Öğrenci memnuniyetini etkileyen faktörlerin araştırılması. XI. Üretim Araştırmaları Sempozyumu, İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi, Haziran, İstanbul.

Pace, C.R. (1984) Measuring the quality of college student experiences. An account of the development and use of the College Student Experience Questionnaire. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute

Scott, P. (2002). Küreselleşme ve üniversite: 21. yüzyılın önündeki meydan okumalar. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 2(1), 193–208.

Şahin, A.E. (2009). Eğitim fakültesinde hizmet kalitesinin eğitim fakültesi öğrenci memnuniyet ölçeği (EF-ÖMÖ) ile değerlendirilmesi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 37, 106- 122.

Şahin, İ. (2011). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam amaçları, eğitsel hedefleri, üniversite öğreniminden beklentileri ve memnuniyet durumları. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 17(3), 429-452.

Şahin, İ., Zoraloğlu, Y.R. ve Fırat, N.Ş. (2011). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam amaçları, eğitsel hedefleri üniversite öğreniminden beklentileri ve memnuniyet durumları. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 17(3), 429-452.

Şimşek, Ö.F. (2007). Yapısal eşitlik modellemesine giriş, temel ilkeler ve Lisrel uygulamaları. Ankara: Ekinoks Yayınları.

Tabachnick, B.G. ve Fidell, L.S. (2013). Using multivariate statistics (Sixth edition). United States: Pearson Education.

Tatar, A., Çavuşoğlu, F., Uyğur, G., Toklu, N., Haşlak, F., Namlı, M., Uysal, R., Güler, A.K. ve Özdemir, H. (2017). Üniversite öğrencileri için öğrenci memnuniyet ölçeği. Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 5(56), 214-230.

Tatlı, Z. H., Kokoç, M. ve Karal, H. (2014). Bilgisayar ve öğretim teknolojileri eğitimi bölümü öğrencilerinin memnuniyet durumları: Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi örneği.

Tayyar, N. ve Dilşeker, F. (2013). Devlet ve Vakıf Üniversitelerinde hizmet kalitesi ve imajın öğrenci memnuniyetine etkisi. Sosyal Ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi, (28), 184-204.

Tekin, H. (1996). Eğitimde Ölçme ve Değerlendirme. 9. Baskı, Ankara: Yargı Yayınları. Thode, H.C. (2002). Testing for normality. United States: Marcel Dekker, Inc.

Thompson, B. (2004). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Turan, A. H. ve Ünsel, A. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yurt memnuniyetleri anketi. Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2(4).

Tütüncü, Ö. ve Doğan, Ö. (2003). Müşteri tatmini kapsamında öğrenci memnuniyetinin ölçülmesi ve Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü uygulaması. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 5(4), 130-151.

Işıkgöz, M. E., Esentaş, M., & Işıkgöz, M. (2015). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Dersine yönelik değer düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: Batman il örneği. International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research, 4(4), 661-676.

Uzgören, N. ve Uzgören, E. (2015). Dumlupınar Üniversitesi lisans öğrencilerinin memnuniyetini etkileyen bireysel özelliklerin istatistiksel analizi-hipotez testi, ki-kare testi ve doğrusal olasılık modeli. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, (17).

Yangın, H.B. ve Kırca, N. (2013). Antalya Sağlık Yüksekokulu hemşirelik öğrencilerinin memnuniyet düzeyleri ve etkileyen faktörler. Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi, 2(1), 78-94.

Yıldırım, F.B., Güneri, O.Y. ve Aydın, Y.Ç. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinin memnuniyet düzeyi ve ilişkili değişkenler. Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama, 11(2), 521-533.

Yüksel, Y. (2011). Kalite ve kaliteli üniversite" kavramlarına ilişkin üniversite öğrencilerinin algıları: Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi örneği. Yayımlanmamış Yükseklisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.