



Examination of Physical Education and Sports School Students of Social Integration Levels and Attitudes Towards Sports: The Case of Batman University

Mehmet Efe¹

¹Siirt University, School of Physical Education and Sports

*Corresponding author: Mehmet Efe, Siirt University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Email: m.ef@siirt.edu.tr

Submitted: 21 March 2023; Accepted: 18 April 2023; Published: 15 May 2023

ABSTRACT

Sports allow young people to develop in many ways. It is one of the effective ways for them to acquire a social identity. Sports environments are areas where social integration takes place very easily. The aim of this research is to examine the social integration levels and attitudes towards sports of Batman University Physical Education and Sports School students according to various demographic variables. The research group consisted of a total of 303 students, 175 male-128 female, from Batman University School of Physical Education and Sports. The data were collected with the “Personal Demographic Information Form” applied to the students, the “Social Integration Scale in Sports” developed by Yılmaz et al. (2007) and the “Attitude Scale towards Sports” developed by Koçak (2014). In the analysis of the data, normality tests, T-tests, and Pearson correlation analysis were used as well as descriptive statistics. According to the study results, a significant difference was found between the Social Integration Scale in Sports and the Attitude towards Sports Scale and the variable of “doing sports with license” in favor of those who do licensed sports. A positive and significant relationship was found between the Social Integration Scale in Sports and the Attitude towards Sports Scale. It can be said that as the students' social integration level in sports increases, their attitude toward sports will also increase. As a result, sport is a very important factor in the development of individuals' social integration and attitudes towards sports.

Keywords: *Sport, Social integration, Attitude*

INTRODUCTION

In addition to providing health to the individual through bodily movements, sports also benefit social integration in terms of giving the person a social identity and belonging to a group (Küçük and Koç, 2004). Sports provide support to individuals' physical, mental, and social personalities (Armstrong et al. 1998). Sport, which has a universal value because it brings societies together under the same roof, plays an

important role in bringing people's behavior in society to the right point (Beutler, 2008; Sunay and Balci, 2003, Karaca and İlkım 2021). In the sports environment, people present themselves more easily and are in the socialization environment (Lenger and Schumacher, 2015). Socialization through sports involves individuals interacting with each other and reinforcing this, establishing friendships without marginalizing the other, and providing one's mental peace.

When individuals are in a sports environment, their physical, mental, and emotional development tends to increase regardless of which sports branch they are in. However, individuals can develop positive and correct friendships with different people (Baciu and Baciu, 2015). The person becomes a part of some groups in the sports environment and starts to gain status by interacting socially within the group. Physical and sports activities bring people together in the same environment and provide health gains as well as the emergence of social groups formed by these people (Rusu and Rusu, 2017, Duyan et al. 2022).

Social Integration: Social integration, or the level of mental adjustment to one's group with others, is a broad phenomenon. Social integration is a term with multiple meanings. It can cover concepts such as togetherness, cooperation, community, social groups, trust, and interaction. In Western countries, sports play an important role in eliminating the problems of citizens such as health, socialization, and social cohesion. Many politicians see sports as a neutral space where social cohesion can be strengthened (Ulseth, 2004). While social integration enables people to take control of life with various interactions and look at life more meaningfully, it also helps individuals to discover themselves by increasing their sense of self-confidence. The person adopts social norms more easily with social integrations (Brisette et al., 2000). Today, sports emerge as one of the most important ways of social integration. It helps the individual to enter social groups and mingle with people (Özding, 2005).

Attitude: According to Hogg and Vaughan (2006), attitude is a concept that directs our behavior even if it is not directly visible. Positive attitudes developed through sports contribute to the psychological state and self-confidence levels of young people while reducing or completely eliminating psychological disorders such as stress and depression in the individual (Jianzhong, 2004). Attitude is a psychological orientation expressed as being satisfied or dissatisfied by evaluating a certain situation at a certain point (Eagly and Chaiken, 2007). It is an important element for perceiving an individual's

behavior. It is explained as a complex mental state that includes beliefs and emotions (Latchanna and Dagnev, 2009). It has been determined that more than one reason affects the determination of students' attitudes toward sports. However, demographic, sociological, and economic factors can cause differences in attitudes toward sports (Çağlayan et al., 2010).

The university environment is a dynamic period in which young people generally live separately from their families, take a new step towards their independence, experience rapid physical and mental changes, and increase social relations (Pullman et al., 2009). For this, it is of great importance to protect young people from bad habits and to provide them with a strong infrastructure in social, physical, and mental aspects of their daily lives, and a positive attitude and properly planned social integration, which is developed by organizing sports from childhood (Chung and Phillips, 2002; Koca and Demirhan, 2004; Stelzer et al., 2004; Dean et al., 2005; Mohammed and Mohammed; 2012).

From this point of view, our study, it is aimed to examine the social integration levels and attitudes of physical education and sports school students through sports.

METHOD

Research Group

The research group consisted of a total of 303 volunteers, 175 male-128 female, from Batman University School of Physical Education and Sports.

Data Collection Tools

The "Personal Demographic Information Form" developed by the researcher, as well as the "Social Integration Scale in Sports" and "Attitude Scale towards Sports" were used as data collection tools.

Social Integration Scale in Sports (SISS)

Social Integration Scale in Sports (SISS) was used as a data collection tool in the study. While the first part of the questionnaire distributed in the research consisted of statements questioning the personal characteristics of the participants,

the second part consisted of the social integration scale in sports consisting of 34 items and 7 sub-dimensions (integration, physical benefit, moral development, socialization, emotional development, personal growth, psychological development) developed by Yılmaz et al., (2006), in which the personal, social, psychological and physical gains of the participants as a result of their participation in sports were evaluated. A five-point Likert-type scale was used to evaluate the items (1= strongly disagree; 5= strongly agree).

Attitude Scale Towards Sports (ASTS)

As a second data collection tool, the "Attitude Scale Towards Sports" developed by Koçak (2014) consisting of 22 items and 3 sub-dimensions was used to determine the attitudes of university students studying in fields other than sports. There are 12 items in the Psychosocial Development sub-dimension, 6 items in the Physical Development sub-dimension, and 4 items in the Mental Development sub-dimension of the scale. The scale is scored as I completely agree "5 points", agree "4 points", moderately agree "3 points", slightly agree "2 points", and strongly disagree "1 point". The highest score that can be obtained from the scale with this scoring method is 110; the lowest score is 22.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Statistical analyzes of the data obtained from the scales were made with Microsoft Excel and SPSS 22.0 programs. In the research, first of all, empty data were evaluated for the convenience of the analyses and the control of the hypotheses. As a

result of these processes, the data of 5 participants who filled incompletely and incorrectly were excluded from the analysis. After this stage, the extreme value analyses were evaluated by considering the Mahalanobis distance. As a result of the extreme value analysis, the data of 12 people were excluded from the analysis, and analyses were made on the data of the remaining 303 people. Then, the internal consistency coefficient of the scales was examined and it was determined as .91 for the Attitude Scale and .97 for the Social Integration Scale.

After this stage, the normality assumptions were first checked with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and it was determined that the data did not meet the normality assumptions. However, there is an increasing number of opinions in the related literature that normality tests are not sufficient in Likert-type scales (Hair et al., 2013). For this reason, the prominent skewness and kurtosis values for the normality assumptions were examined. In this context, the -1.5+1.5 skewness kurtosis values suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) were taken into consideration and the distribution was found to be normal (Table 1). In this direction, T-Test was used to determine the differences between individuals' attitudes toward sports and their social integration levels in sports according to the variables of gender and licensed sports. In addition, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationships between the variables within the scope of the research.

RESULTS

TABLE 1: Mean, Standard Deviation, and Skewness Kurtosis Values of the Scales Used in the Study

Scales	N	\bar{X}	Ss	Skewness	Kurtosis
Attitude Total	303	107,1287	11,64059	-1,138	1,392
Social Integration Total	303	146,0924	15,30003	-,946	,125

In Table 1, it was determined that the skewness values were between -1,138 and -,946, and the kurtosis values were between 1,392 and,125. Considering the -1.5+1.5 skewness kurtosis

values suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell, (2013), the distribution was found to be normal. After this stage, analyses for the variables were started and presented in the following section.

TABLE 2: T-Test Results on Social Integration Levels in Sports by Gender Variable

Variable	Gender	N	□	Ss	t	df	p
Social Integration	Male	175	145,4286	15,19998	-,883	301	,378
	Female	128	147,0000	15,44918			

When the social integration levels of the participants in sports according to the gender variable in Table 2 were examined, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference in the total score of social integration $t(301)=-,883 p>.05$.

TABLE 3: T-Test Results on Social Integration Levels in Sports by Licensed Sports Variable

Variable	License Status	N	□	Ss	t	df	p
Social Integration	Yes	178	148,6348	13,70126	3,516	301	,001*
	No	125	142,4720	16,72335			

When the social integration levels of the participants in sports are examined according to the licensed sporting variable in Table 3, it has been determined that there is a statistically significant difference in the total score of social integration $t(301)=3,516 p<.05$. Considering the average scores, it is seen that the social integration levels of the participants who do licensed sports are higher than those who do not.

TABLE 4: Pearson Correlation Analysis Results on Social Integration Levels in Sports by Age Variable

Variable n=(303)		Attitude Total
Age	r	,022
	p	,705

When the social integration levels in sports according to the age variable of the participants are examined in Table 4, although there is a statistically significant low-level positive relationship between age and the total score of social integration in sports ($r=.039; p>.05$), this relationship is not statistically significant found to be insignificant.

When the social integration levels in sports according to the age variable of the participants in Table 4 are examined, it has been determined that although there is a statistically significant low-level positive relationship between age and the total score of social integration in sports ($r=.039; p>.05$), this relationship is not statistically significant.

TABLE 5: T-Test Results on Attitudes Towards Sports According to Gender Variable

Variable	Gender	N	□	Ss	t	df	p
Attitude	Male	175	107,1943	11,57420	,114	301	,909
	Female	128	107,0391	11,77573			

When the attitude levels of the participants towards sports according to the gender variable in Table 5 were examined, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference in the total attitude score $t(301)=,114 p>.05$.

TABLE 6: T-Test Results on Attitudes Towards Sports According to the Variable of Licensed Sports

Variable	License Status	N	\bar{X}	Ss	t	df	p
Attitude	Yes	178	109,4663	9,53563	4,290	301	,000*
	No	125	103,8000	13,46141			

When the attitudes of the participants towards sports according to the licensed sports variable in Table 6 are examined, it has been determined that there is a statistically significant difference in the

total attitude score of $t(301)=4.290$ $p<.05$). Considering the average scores, it is seen that the attitude levels of the participants who do licensed sports are higher than those who do not.

TABLE 7: Pearson Correlation Analysis Results Regarding Attitudes Towards Sports According to Age Variable

Variable n=(303)		Attitude Total
Age	r	-,039
	p	,496

When the attitudes towards sports according to the age variable of the participants in Table 7 are examined, it has been determined that although there is a statistically significant relationship between age and attitude total score ($r=-.039$; $p>.05$), in the negative direction, at a low level, this relationship is not statistically significant.

TABLE 8: Pearson Correlation Analysis Results between Levels of Social Integration in Sports and Attitudes towards Sports

Variable n=(301)		Attitude Total
Social Integration Total	r	,642**
	p	,000

When the correlation analysis results between the social integration levels of the participants in sports and their attitudes towards sports are examined in Table 8, there is a statistically significant and moderately positive relationship between the total integration score and the total attitude total score ($r=,642$; $p<.05$). This relationship was found to be statistically significant. This result can be interpreted as the level of attitudes towards sports will increase as the social integration levels of the participants increase in sports.

not only strengthen people physically but also makes them stronger individuals mentally, psychologically, and socially. While there are numerous benefits of sports that affect human life, one of the most important of these benefits is the development of a positive attitude towards sports in the individual by integrating people for the same purpose. The following results were obtained within the scope of our research, which examined the social integration levels and attitudes of physical education and sports school students in sports.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Sports is an environment that brings people together, socializes, and integrates them. Sports

When the social integration levels of the participants were examined according to the gender variable, no statistically significant difference was found. Similar to our research,

Duman (2020), Evli (2018), and Filiz (2010) did not find a significant difference in terms of gender. However, Polat et al. (2019) found a significant difference according to the gender variable in their research.

A significant difference was found when the social integration levels of the participants in sports were examined according to the licensed sports variable. Considering the average scores, it is seen that the social integration levels of the participants who do licensed sports are higher than those who do not. In his study, Karadağ (2019) found a significant difference according to the variable of doing licensed sports in parallel with our research.

When the social integration levels of the participants in sports were examined according to the age variable, no statistically significant difference was found. Similarly, Duman (2020) did not find a significant difference in his study in parallel with our study.

When the attitudes of the participants towards sports were examined according to the gender variable, no significant difference was found. In parallel with our research, Göksel and Jazz (2016), Koçak et al. (2015), Yanık and Çamlıyer (2015), Yavuz and Yücel (2019), Göksel et al. (2017), Gürbüz and Özkan (2012) did not find a significant difference between the attitude towards sports and the gender variable in their studies. However, Kargın and Şentürk (2019), Varol et al. (2017), Göksel et al. (2017), Birsin et al. (2017), Güllü (2007), Şişko and Demirhan (2002), Taşgın and Tekin (2009) Efe et al. (2018), Yıldırım et al. (2018), Koca and Demirhan (2004), Aksoy et al. (2020), in favor of male students in their studies; Tükel (2018) and Kalfa (2019) found a significant difference in favor of female students.

When the attitudes of the participants towards sports according to the licensed sports variable were examined, it was determined that there was a statistically significant difference. When the average scores are examined, it is seen that the level of attitude towards sports is higher for the participants who do licensed sports than those who do not. Again, in direct proportion to our study, Aksoy et al. (2020), Singh and Devi

(2013), and Kangalgil et al. (2006) found a significant difference in favor of those who do licensed sports in terms of attitudes towards sports.

When the attitudes of the participants towards sports were examined according to the age variable, no statistically significant difference was found. Göksel et al. (2017), Koçak (2014), Turkmen et al. (2016), Varol et al. (2017), Journeyman (2019), Atalay et al. (2015), Sarı and Taylan (2020) could not find a significant difference in their studies parallel to our research. Kangalgil et al. (2006) found a significant difference according to the age variable.

When the correlation analysis results between the social integration levels of the participants in sports and their attitudes towards sports were examined, it was determined that there was a statistically significant relationship.

As a result, no significant difference was found in the Social Integration and Attitude toward Sports scales of the participants according to gender and age variables. In Social Integration in Sports and Attitude towards Sports scales, a significant difference was found in favor of those who do sports under license, according to the variable of doing sports as licensed. This can be interpreted as those who do sports under license are more open to social integration through sports and develop more positive attitudes towards sports. In our research, there is a positive and significant relationship between the levels of social integration in sports and the level of attitude towards sports. This situation can be interpreted as the level of positive attitude towards sports will increase as the level of social integration in sports increases.

Sports have a great place in the socialization of people. In this research, which determines the social integration and attitudes towards sports in sports, it would be beneficial to conduct research in different fields by considering different socialization tools and fields. First of all, with the research to be applied in secondary education institutions, the problems of the youth in the socialization lane should be determined and precautions should be taken. It can be stated that it would be socially beneficial for universities,

especially sociology departments, to focus on sports-related studies, apart from physical education and sports colleges. Considering the great effect of sports on socialization, the spring sports festivals and organizations held by universities every year should be presented to university youth throughout the year within the framework of sports organizations, not in a one-week period.

REFERENCES

1. Aksoy D., Canlı U., Atmaca K. (2020), Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Spora Yönelik Tutumlarının
2. İncelenmesi (Tekirdağ Namık Kemal Üniversitesi Örneği), Akdeniz Spor Bilimleri Dergisi 3(1), 162-170.
3. Armstrong, N., Welsman, J. R., Kirby, B. J. (1998). Peak oxygen uptake and maturation in 12-yr olds. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 30(1), 165-169.
4. Atalay A., Akbulut A.K., Yücel, A.S., Göral K., Korkmaz M. (2015). Analysis of the Attitudes of Student-Athletes Playing in the Universities Volleyball 2nd League in Turkey towards Sports. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences*, 5(4), 1-6.
5. Baciu, C. and Baciu, A. (2015). Quality of life and students' socialization through sport. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 209, 78 – 83.
6. Beutler I. (2008). Sport serving development and peace: Achieving the goals of the United Nations through sport. *Sport in Society*, 11(4), 359-369. D
7. Brissette I., Cohen S., Seeman T. E. (2000). Measuring social integration and social networks. *Social support measurement and intervention: A guide for health and social scientists*, 53, 85.
8. Chung M. and Phillips A. The relationship between attitude toward physical education and leisure time exercise in high school students, *The Physical Educator*, 2002; 59(3): 126-138.
9. Çağlayan H.S., Şirin E.F., Lök S., İnce A., ve Öner M. (2010). Yurtdışından Türkiye'ye Eğitim İçin
10. Gelen Öğrencilerin Beden Eğitimi ve Spora İlişkin Tutumlarının Belirlenmesi. 11. Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı, Antalya, s.396-399.
11. Dean MB, Adams TM, Comeau M. The effect of a female physical educator's physical appearance on physical fitness knowledge and attitudes of junior high students, *The Physical Educator*, 2005; 62(1): 14-25.
12. Duman F. (2020) Sporun Sosyal Bütünleşme Üzerindeki Etkileri, *Spor Eğitim Dergisi*, 4 (4), 169-177.
13. Duyan, M., Ilkim, M., & Çelik, T. (2022). The Effect of Social Appearance Anxiety on Psychological Well-Being: A Study on Women Doing Regular Pilates Activities. *Pakistan Journal of Medical & Health Sciences*, 16(02), 797-797.
14. Eagly, A. H., and Chaiken, S. (2007), *The Advantages of an Inclusive Definition of Attitude. Social Cognition: Vol. 25, Special Issue: What is an Attitude?*, pp. 582-602.
15. Efek E., Sivrikaya Ö., Sadık R. (2018). Spor Bilimleri Alanında Okuyan Üniversite Öğrencilerinin
16. Ahlaki Gelişim Düzeyleriyle Spor Tutumları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Journal of Social And Humanities Sciences Research (JSHSR)*, 5(29), 3895-3903.
17. Evli F., (2018). Üniversite Takımlarındaki Farklı Branşlardaki Sporcuların Ahlaki Olgunluk ve Sosyal Bütünleşme Düzeyleri, Hitit Üniversitesi Doktora Tezi, s.74.
18. Filiz Z., (2010). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Sosyalleşmesinde Spora Katılımın Değerlendirilmesi, Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 4 (3), 202.
19. Göksel A.G., Caz Ç., Yazıcı Ö.F., İkizler H.C (2017). Farklı Bölümlerdeki Öğrencilerin Spora Yönelik
20. Tutumlarının Karşılaştırılması: Marmara Üniversitesi Örneği, *Spor ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8 (2), 123-134.
21. Güllü, M. (2007). Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Beden Eğitimi Dersine İlişkin Tutumlarının Araştırılması, (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi), Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
22. Gürbüz A. ve Özkan H. İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerinin beden eğitimi ve spor dersine ilişkin tutumlarının belirlenmesi (Muğla il örneği), *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2012; 3(2): 78-89.
23. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. & Tatham, R. L. (2013). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New York: Pearson Education Ltd.
24. Jianzhong, X. (2004). Impacts of sports and health course standards on the psychological health of students. *PE Teachers*, (3), 61-63.
25. Kalfa M. (2019). Diş Hekimliği Fakültesindeki Öğrencilerinin Spora Yönelik Tutumları. *SPORMETRE Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 17(1), 165-181.

26. Kangalgil, M., Hünük, D., Demirhan, G. (2006). İlköğretim, Lise ve Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Beden
27. Eğitimi ve Spora İlişkin Tutumlarının Karşılaştırılması, Hacettepe Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 17(2), 48-57.
28. Karaca, Y., & Ilkim, M. (2021). Investigation of the attitudes distance education of the faculty of sport science students in the Covid-19 period. Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 22(4), 114-129.
29. Karadağ A. (2019). Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi Öğrencilerinde Yaşam Becerileri ve Sosyal Bütünleşme İlişkisinin İncelenmesi, Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Yüksek lisans tezi, s.76.
30. Kargın N. ve Şentürk H.E. (2019), Spor Lisesi Öğrencilerinin Okul İklimi Algıları ile Spora Yönelik Tutumları Arasındaki İlişki, Spormetre, 17 (3), 78-92.
31. Koca C. ve Demirhan G. An examination of high school students' attitudes toward physical education with regard to sex and sport participation, Perceptual & Motor Skills, 2004; 98 (3): 754-758.
32. Koçak F. (2014). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Spora Yönelik Tutumları: Bir Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması, Spormetre, 2014, 12 (1), 59-69.
33. Koçak, F., Tuncel, S., Tuncel, F., (2015). Spor alanında öğrenim gören üniversite öğrencilerinin sporda sürdürülebilirliğe ilişkin tutumlarının belirlenmesi, Ankara Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, 13(1), 29-39.
34. Küçük, V. ve Koç, H. (2004). Psiko-sosyal gelişim süreci içerisinde insan ve spor ilişkisi. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 10, 131-141.
35. Latchanna, G. and Dagnev, A. (2009). Attitude of teachers towards the use of active learning methods.
36. E-journal of All India Association for Educational Research, 21(1), 53-60.
37. Lenger, A., and Schumacher, F. (2015). The social functions of sport: a theoretical approach to the
38. interplay of emerging powers, national identity, and global sport events. Journal of Globalization Studies, 6 (2), 41-58.
39. Mohammed HR. and Mohammed MA. Students opinions and attitudes towards physical education classes in Kuwait public schools, College Student Journal, 2012; 46(3): 550-566.
40. Özdiñç, Ö. Çukurova üniversitesi öğrencilerinin sporun ve spora katılımın sosyalleşmeyle ilişkisi üzerine görüşleri. Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2005; 3 (2): 77-84.
41. Polat E., Akoğlu H.E., Üzüm H. (2019). Sporda Sosyal Bütünleşme Düzeyi ile Kişilik Tipleri Arasındaki İlişkiler ve Etkileşimler, Spormetre, 17(4) 233-249
42. Pullman, A. W., Masters, R. C., Zalot, L. C. (2009). Effect of the transition from high school to university on anthropometric and lifestyles variables in males. Journal of Applied Physiology, Nutrition and Metabolism, 34(2), 162-171.
43. Rusu, O. and Rusu, D. (2017). Social integration through sport to hearing impaired students. Sp Soc Int J Ph Ed Sp, 17(2), 41-52.
44. Sarı A., Taylan S. (2020), İlk ve Acil Yardım Önlisans Programı Öğrenci ve Mezunlarının Spora Yönelik Spora Yönelik Tutumlarının Değerlendirilmesi, Spormetre, 18(2), 39-49.
45. Singh R.K.C., and Devi K.S. (2013). Attitude of higher secondary level student towards games and sports. International Journal of Physical Education, Fitness and Sports. 2(4), 80-85.
46. Stelzer J, Ernest JM, Fenster MJ, Langford G. Attitudes toward physical education: A study of high school students from four countries - Austria, Czech Republic, England, and USA, College Student Journal, 2004; 38(2): 171-179.
47. Sunay H., ve Balcı V. (2003). Bazı Türk Televizyonlarının Yayınladığı Reklamlarda Spor İmajının Kullanımı. Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 1(2), 107-110.
48. Şişko, M. ve Demirhan, G. (2002). İlköğretim Okulları Ve Liselerde Öğrenim Gören Kız ve Erkek
49. Öğrencilerin Beden Eğitimi Spor Dersine İlişkin Tutumları, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, (23), 205-210.
50. Tabachnick, L. & Fidell, L.S. (2013). Using Multivariate Statistics (Sixth Ed.) Pearson, Boston.
51. Taşğın Ö. ve Tekin M. (2009). Çeşitli Değişkenlere Göre İlköğretim ve Orta Öğretim Kurumlarında
52. Öğrenim Gören Öğrencilerin Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Dersine İlişkin Tutum ve Görüşleri, Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 17 (2): 457-466
53. Tükel Y. (2018) Sportif Rekreasyon Faaliyeti Olarak Masa Tenisi Oynayan Sporcuların Spora Yönelik Tutumlarının Cinsiyete ve Medeni Duruma Göre Değerlendirilmesi. Sportive, 1(1), 12-18.
54. Türkmen M, Abdurahimoğlu Y, Varol S, Gökdağ M. İslami ilimler fakültesi öğrencilerinin spora yönelik tutumlarının incelenmesi (Bartın Üniversitesi örneği), International Journal of

- Contemporary Educational Studies (IntJCES), 2016; 2(1): 48-59.
55. Ulseth, A.L.B. (2004). Social integration in modern sport: commercial fitness centres and voluntary sports clubs. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 4(2), 95-115.
 56. Varol R., Varol S., Türkmen M. (2017). Bartın üniversitesinde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin spora yönelik tutumlarının belirlenmesi. *Uluslararası Kültürel ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi (UKSAD)*, 3(2), 316-329.
 57. Yanık, M. ve Çamlıyer, H., (2015). Ortaöğretim 9. sınıf öğrencilerinin beden eğitimi ve spora ilişkin tutumları ile okula yabancılaşma düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi, *Uluslararası Spor, Egzersiz ve Antrenman Bilimi Dergisi*, 1(1): 9-19.
 58. Yavuz C., Yücel A.S. (2019). Spor Yöneticiliği Bölümü Öğrencilerinin Spora Yönelik Tutumlarının Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi, *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 18 (72), 2050-2058.
 59. Yıldırım M., Araç E., Uslu S. (2018). Lise Öğrencilerinin Spora Yönelik Tutumlarının İncelenmesi, *Turkish Studies* 13 (27), 1711-1727.
 60. Yıldız A.B., Arı Ç., Yılmaz B. (2017). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Spora Yönelik Tutumlarının İncelenmesi (Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Örneği), *Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1 (1), 35-45.
 61. Yılmaz B., Karlı Ü., Yetim A.A. (2006). Sporda Sosyal Bütünleşme Ölçeği (SSBÖ) Geçerlik Güvenirlilik Çalışması, *Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi* 11 (4), 3-10.