THE EFFECT OF QUALITY OF FACULTY LIFE ON STUDENT LOYALTY

Research article

Correspondence:
Mehmet Özdoğru https://orcid.org/https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3853-8389

Kütahya Dumlupınar University, Turkey

mehmetozdogru26@gmail.com

Muhammet İbrahim Akyürek https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9122-471X

Konya Selçuk University, Turkey

m.ibrahimakyurek@gmail.com

Biodatas:

Mehmet Özdoğru is an Assistant Professor at Kütahya Dumlupınar University, Faculty of Education. He completed his doctorate education at Gazi University in 2020. He worked as a teacher and school administrator for 16 years. His research interests are of teacher education and school administration.

Muhammet İbrahim Akyürek completed his master's and doctorate in educational administration. He works as a lecturer in the Department of Educational Administration at Selcuk University Faculty of Education. His academic interests include; educational administration, education policies, higher education administration, higher education policies.

THE EFFECT OF QUALITY OF FACULTY LIFE ON STUDENT LOYALTY

Mehmet Özdoğru

mehmetozdogru26@gmail.com

Muhammet İbrahim Akyürek

m.ibrahimakyurek@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to determine the effect of faculty life quality on student loyalty according to student perceptions. The study was designed in a descriptive relational survey model. The participants of the research consist of randomly selected 342 undergraduate students studying at Kütahya Dumlupınar University, Faculty of Education in the 2021-2022 academic year. In the study "Quality of faculty life scale" and "Student loyalty scale" were used. In the study, it was found that students' perceptions of the quality of faculty life and student loyalty levels were high. The study also revealed a highly positive and significant relationship between the quality of faculty life and student loyalty. In addition, it has been determined that the quality of faculty life is an important predictor of student loyalty. Universities and the Council of Higher Education (CoHE) can periodically measure the perceptions of university students regarding the quality of faculty life and their loyalty, and by evaluating the results they carry out necessary improvement studies.

Keywords: quality of faculty life, student loyalty, school life, higher education.

1. Introduction

The effects of globalization bring rapid change and transformation processes in the education sector, as in every field. The increase in the demand of individuals to receive education at the higher education level, especially in developed and developing countries, causes significant increases in the number of higher education institutions. Increasing number of higher education institutions have to survive in an increasingly competitive environment. University administrations are looking for ways to become the preferred university by students, and intensive studies are carried out for this purpose.

The increase in the competition among universities necessitated the examination of the reasons that have an impact on the students' choice of these institutions. One of these reasons is student loyalty (Köse, 2012). Although the scores obtained in the university entrance exam are one of the most important factors in the selection process in our country, it is known that other factors can also affect student preferences. In the literature, it is stated that the family (Bahar, 2002), the social structure (Reay, 2001), the quality of the program (Akar, 2012) and the characteristics of the city (Cokgezen, 2014) affect the university preference. Student loyalty, which is one of the dimensions of these factors, has a positive effect on both the

preference process and the education process (Helgesen & Nesset, 2007; Hennig-Thurau, Lager, & Hansen, 2001).

Student loyalty is students' commitment to the university and the services provided by the university (Köse, 2012). Yu and Kim (2008) define student loyalty as the psychological attachment that creates a student's identification with and belonging to the university. Student loyalty is a concept that is effective in keeping students at their university and continuing their relationship with their institution after graduation (Helgesen & Nesset, 2007).

The loyalty of students who continue their education in higher education institutions has both institutional and individual consequences. Students with a high level of loyalty to their institution are expected to prefer their own universities when they need a new education service. In this way, the university will benefit from their students for a long time (Helgesen & Nesset, 2007). In addition, high-level loyalty students will participate in the lessons effectively and the quality of their learning processes will increase (Rashid & Raj, 2006). Alvesson (2000) states that if the student is loyal to the university, he will reconcile his own goals with the goals of the university and will undertake beneficial works for the university. In this way, he will recommend his university to other people and contribute to the formation of a positive perception in the society about the university. After graduating from the university, the student can recommend the university to others (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2003). As a result, the benefit of students' loyalty to the university is not only limited to the period of study, but also continues after graduation.

There are many factors that affect student loyalty in higher education institutions. Some of these factors include taking part in projects carried out at the university, supporting their research by the university, having the opportunity to access and participate in social and sportive activities (Henning-Thurau Lager & Hansen, 2001), and the opportunities provided to the students by the university (Helgesen & Nesset, 2007). However, it is considered that the quality of school/faculty life of students who spend most of their time at the university may also have an impact on student loyalty.

The quality of school life is defined as the climate in which student attachment, school safety and learning processes are supported (Austin et al., 2007). Anderson (1982) associates the quality of school life with the quality of life and defines it as one of the indicators of students' well-being in school. It is seen that the students who have the opportunity to participate in the social, sports and cultural activities organized for the students at the university, have good relations with the academics who attend their classes with their friends in the classroom and outside, interact successfully with their environment, and reach satisfaction by making use of the opportunities provided by the university, will easily continue their education life and individual development (Singh, Augsutine & Singh, 2010). In this direction, it is inevitable that the student's motivation and academic success will be affected by the experiences and attitudes he has developed about his school, and it is expected that his perception of school life will develop in a positive way (Özdemir et al., 2013).

The positive perception of the student about the quality of school life is effective in increasing academic success (Karatzias, Power & Swanson, 2001). Similarly, the learning processes of the students will be facilitated and their tendency to drop out will decrease (Sarı, 2007). In addition, the studies on this subject revealed that one of the reasons for student absenteeism is the student's perception of the quality of school life (Ainley, 1991; İlmen, 2010, Leonard, 2002).

It is seen that the research on the quality of faculty life in higher education is carried out in the universities and faculties (Argon & Kösterelioğlu, 2009; Çokluk Bökeoğlu & Yılmaz, 2007; Doğanay & Sarı, 2006; Ilias & Nor, 2012; Milbrath & Doyno, 1987; Özdemir, 2012; Roberts & Clifton, 1992; Yılmaz & Çokluk Bökeoğlu, 2006). In these studies, it is seen that the topics such as students' expectations towards university, school life and satisfaction levels are examined. It is understood that the results obtained in this study are considered as an important data source in increasing the service standards and quality of universities.

Higher education institution administrators can carefully examine the variables that affect student loyalty in order to keep their students in their systems and attract new students in the increasing competitive structure. For this, they can determine the loyalty level of the students in their institutions at regular intervals and work to increase the loyalty level. In particular, students' satisfaction with the quality of their faculties will enable them to conduct research and develop themselves. Satisfaction with the quality of faculty life will lead to commitment to the faculty and contribute to student loyalty. For this reason, investigating the effect of quality of life in faculties on student loyalty will both guide the development of universities and contribute to the literature. In this context, the aim of the research is to determine the effect of the quality of faculty life on student loyalty according to student perceptions. The sub-problems determined in this study are as follows:

1. What is the quality of faculty life according to student perceptions?

2. What is the level of student loyalty according to student perceptions?

3. What is the relationship between the quality of faculty life and student loyalty according to student perceptions?

4. Does the quality of faculty life significantly predict student loyalty according to student perceptions?

2. Method

2.1. Research design

This research is in the descriptive relational survey model. Relational survey is a model that aims to determine the existence and degree of co-variance between two or more variables (Karasar, 2015).

2.2 Participants

The participants of the research consist of 1394 students studying at the Faculty of Education at Kütahya Dumlupınar University in Turkey (Dumlupınar University Faculty of Education, 2022). According to the 95% confidence interval, the lower limit for the sample size of the study is 306 (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2014). The sample of the research consists of 342 undergraduate students studying at Dumlupınar University Faculty of Education in the 2021-2022 academic year. The number of samples according to the population in this study is sufficient according to the 95% confidence interval (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2014).

The sampling of the students was carried out with simple random sampling, which is one of the random sampling methods. Randomness defines the probability of choosing the units based on the sampling as being equal (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel,

2012). Table 1 includes descriptive statistics on demographic variables (gender, age, department and class).

Table 1. *Descriptive statistics on demographic variables*

Variables		*N*	*%*
Gender	Female	271	79.2
	Male	71	20.8
Age	19 and below	7	2.0
	20-22 age	240	70.2
	23 age and above	95	27.8
Department	Science teaching	25	7.3
	Elementary Mathematics Teaching	52	15.2
	Pre-school teaching	85	24.9
	Classroom teaching	68	19.9
	Social studies teaching	73	21.3
	Turkish teaching	39	11.4
Grade	1.grade	4	1.2
	2. grade	121	35.4
	3. grade	97	28.4
	4. grade	120	35.1
Total		342	100

When the table is examined, it is seen that the rate of girls (79.2%) is higher than boys (20.8%) according to the gender variable. According to the age variable, the group with the highest rate is 70.2% with the age of 20-22, and the group with the lowest rate is the students aged 19 and below with 2%. According to the department variable, the group with the highest rate is pre-school teaching with 24.9%, and the group with the lowest rate is the students in the Science teaching group with 7.3%. According to the grade variable, the group with the highest rate is the 2nd grade students with 35.4%, and the group with the lowest rate is the 1st grade students with 1.2%.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

The quality of faculty life scale

In the study, the "Quality of Faculty Life Scale" developed by Yılmaz and Çokluk Bökeoğlu (2006) was used to determine the quality of faculty life. The quality of faculty life scale is a five-point Likert scale. The tool, which consists of 37 items and aims to measure the level of quality of faculty life, was developed on the basis of three theoretical dimensions. These dimensions are "satisfaction with the faculty", "satisfaction with the teaching staff", and "satisfaction with the classroom environment and student relations". In this context, confirmatory factor analysis was performed to confirm the factor design of the instrument. As a result of confirmatory factor analysis; the t values of the latent variables explaining the observed variables were found to be significant at the .01 level. Since significant t values were obtained for all items in the model, all indicators were included in the model. The results of confirmatory factor analysis of the quality of faculty life scale are given in Table 2.

Table 2. *Confirmatory factor analysis results of the quality of faculty life scale*

Fit indices	Measurement value	The reference range
p	.00	$< .01$
X^2/sd	4.68	≤ 5
RMSEA	.08	$\leq .08$
SRMR	.06	$\leq .08$
NNFI - CFI	.90 - .91	$\geq .90$

When the table is examined; it is seen that the p value is significant at the .01 level. In many confirmatory factor analyzes, it is normal for the p value to be significant due to the large sample size. For this reason, alternative fit indices regarding the fit between the two matrices were evaluated. In this context; it can be stated that the X^2/sd value is moderate, and the RMSEA, SRMR, NNFI and CFI values are in good fit. In this context, it can be stated that the three-factor structure of the quality of faculty life scale consisting of 37 items (faculty satisfaction factor with 15 items, satisfaction with the teaching staff with 15 items, and satisfaction with classroom environment and student relations factor with 7 items) was confirmed as a model.

Within the scope of reliability analysis, first of all, item analysis was examined by using item-total correlation. In addition, the reliability of the scale was checked by using Cronbach's alpha. The results of the reliability analysis of the quality of faculty life scale are given in Table 3.

Table 3. *Reliability analysis results of the quality of faculty life scale*

Dimensions	Alfa value	Item-total

		correlation
Satisfaction with the faculty	.81	.35-.74
Satisfaction with the teaching staff	.88	.37-.82
Satisfaction with classroom environment and student relations	.71	.46-.72
Scale (Total)	.93	.32-.82

The total internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) of the quality of faculty life scale is .93. In this context, it can be interpreted that the total internal consistency coefficient of the quality of faculty life scale is sufficient for the reliability of the scale scores. Item-total correlations for all items in the scale ranged from .32 to .82. When the item-total correlations are examined, it can be interpreted that the items in the scale distinguish individuals well.

Student loyalty scale

In the study, the "Student Loyalty Scale" developed by Helgesen and Nesset (2007) and adapted into Turkish by Korumaz and Tekel (2017) was used to determine student loyalty. Student loyalty scale is a five-point Likert scale. The tool, which consists of 25 items and aims to measure the level of student loyalty, was developed based on six theoretical dimensions. These dimensions are "facilities of the faculty, the quality of received service, service quality, loyalty, the image of the work environment and the image of the university". In this context, confirmatory factor analysis was performed to confirm the factor design of the instrument. As a result of confirmatory factor analysis; the t values of the latent variables explaining the observed variables were found to be significant at the .01 level. Since significant t values were obtained for all items in the model, all indicators were included in the model. The confirmatory factor analysis results of the student loyalty scale are given in Table 4.

Table 4. *Confirmatory factor analysis results of the student loyalty scale*

Fit indices	**Measurement value**	**The reference range**
p	.00	$< .01$
X^2/sd	2.98	≤ 3
RMSEA	.08	$\leq .08$
SRMR	.03	$\leq .05$
NNFI - CFI	.92 - .93	$\geq .90$

When the table is examined; it is seen that the p value is significant at the .01 level. In many confirmatory factor analyzes, it is normal for the p value to be significant due to the large sample size. For this reason, alternative fit indices regarding the fit between the two matrices were evaluated. In this context, the X^2/sd and SRMR values are excellent. It can be

stated that RMSEA, NNFI and CFI values have a good fit. In this context, as a result, the six-factor structure of the student loyalty scale consisting of 25 items (3 items for the faculty's facilities factor, 3 items for the quality of received service, 6 items for the service quality factor, 7 items for the loyalty factor, 3 items for the image of the work environment factor and 3 items for the university image factor) was confirmed as a model.

Within the scope of reliability analysis, first of all, item analysis was examined by using item-total correlation. In addition, the reliability of the scale was checked by using Cronbach's alpha. The results of the reliability analysis of the student loyalty scale are given in Table 5.

Table 5. *Reliability analysis results of student loyalty scale*

Dimensions	Alfa value	Item-total correlation
Faculty opportunities	.83	.62-.76
Received service quality	.82	.67-.68
Service quality	.90	.64-.84
Loyalty	.94	.73-.85
Image of the work environment	.92	.79-.87
Image of the university	.89	.78-.79
Scale (Total)	.97	.56-.83

The total internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the student loyalty scale is .97. In this context, it can be interpreted that the total internal consistency coefficient of the student loyalty scale is sufficient for the reliability of the scale scores. Item-total correlations for all items in the scale ranged from .56 to .83. When the item-total correlations are examined, it can be interpreted that the items in the scale distinguish individuals well.

2.4. Data Collection and Analysis

The measurement tools used in the research was between 20-29 April 2022. Within the scope of the analysis of the data, first of all, the situation of meeting the normality assumption of the data set was examined. In this direction, the coefficients of kurtosis and skewness, mean, mode and median values were examined. The values of kurtosis, skewness and standard deviation calculated on the basis of the total quality of the faculty life scale and the dimensions are as follows: The total scale is .39, -1.05, .51; faculty satisfaction dimension .64, -1.09, .54; the dimension of satisfaction with the teaching staff .83, -1.08, .57; the dimension of satisfaction with the classroom environment and student relations .22, -.99, .51. On the other hand, the values of kurtosis, skewness and standard deviation calculated on the basis of the total and dimensions of the student loyalty scale are as follows: The total scale is .09, -.92, .75; faculty's facilities dimension 1.98, -1.37, .79; received service quality

dimension -.16, -.92, 1.07; service quality dimension 1.30, -1.27, .77; loyalty dimension .43, -1.06, .90; image dimension of work environment .54, -1.17, .93; the university's image dimension 1.06, -1.19, .78. The kurtosis and skewness values in the study are between ±2. These results are interpreted as the data set has a normal distribution (George & Mallery, 2010). In addition, in the analyzes, it was determined that the arithmetic mean of the faculty life scale was 3.67, the mode value was 4.16, and the median was 3.86. In the student loyalty scale, it was determined that the arithmetic mean was 3.78, the mode value was 4.44, and the median was 4.00. The closeness of these values indicates that the data set is normally distributed (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). In this context, parametric test techniques were used to test the sub-problems of the research.

The rating ranges of the scales are as follows; strongly disagree (1.00-1.79), disagree (1.80-2.59), undecided (2.60-3.39), agree (3.40-4.19), completely agree (4.20-5.00). In line with the analysis of the data, primarily arithmetic mean and standard deviation techniques were used. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was calculated in the analysis of the relationships between the variables. The correlation coefficient, as an absolute value, between 0.70 and 1.00 is defined as a high; between 0.70-0.30 is moderate; between 0.30-0.00 is low level relationship (Büyüköztürk, 2013). Multiple linear regression analysis was performed in order to determine the predictive levels of independent variables for dependent variables. In the interpretation of the regression analyzes, standardized Beta (β) coefficients and their significance t-test results were taken into account.

4. Findings

Within the scope of the first sub-problem of the research, the level of quality of faculty life was examined according to student perceptions. Table 6 includes descriptive statistics regarding the quality of faculty life.

Table 6. *Descriptive statistics on quality of faculty life*

Dimensions	N	$\bar{x}$	Sd
Satisfaction with the faculty	342	3.63	.54
Satisfaction with the teaching staff	342	3.75	.57
Satisfaction with classroom environment and student relations	342	3.60	.51
Quality of faculty life (Total)	342	3.67	.51

When the table is examined, it is seen that students' perceptions of the quality of faculty life are at the level of "agree" ($\bar{x}$= 3.67). In addition, it is seen that students' perceptions of the quality of faculty life in the dimensions of satisfaction with the faculty is ($\bar{x}$= 3.63), satisfaction with the teaching staff is ($\bar{x}$= 3.75), and satisfaction with the classroom environment and student relations is ($\bar{x}$= 3.60) at the level of "agree". When the quality of the faculty life dimension is examined, the highest dimension is satisfaction with the teaching

staff; the lowest dimension is satisfaction with the classroom environment and student relations.

Within the scope of the second sub-problem of the research, the level of student loyalty was examined according to student perceptions. The descriptive statistics regarding the level of student loyalty are given in Table 7.

Table 7. *Descriptive statistics on student loyalty level*

Dimensions	N	$\bar{x}$	Sd
Faculty opportunities	342	3.86	.79
Received service quality	342	3.84	1.07
Service quality	342	3.84	.77
Loyalty	342	3.84	.90
Image of the work environment	342	3.53	.93
Image of the university	342	3.65	.78
Student loyalty (Total)	342	3.78	.75

When the table is examined, it is seen that the perceptions regarding the level of student loyalty are at the level of "agree" ($\bar{x}$= 3.78). In addition, the faculty opportunities dimension is ($\bar{x}$= 3.86), the quality of received service is ($\bar{x}$= 3.84), service quality is ($\bar{x}$= 3.84), loyalty is ($\bar{x}$= 3.84), the image of the work environment is ($\bar{x}$= 3.53) and the image of the university. is ($\bar{x}$= 3.65). It is seen that the students' perceptions of the level of student loyalty in these dimensions are at the level of "agree". When the dimensions are examined, the dimension in which the level of student loyalty is perceived the highest is the facilities of the faculty; the lowest perceived dimension is the image of the work environment.

Within the scope of the third sub-problem of the research, the level of the relationship between the quality of faculty life and student loyalty was examined according to student perceptions. Table 8 includes the results of correlation analysis between variables.

Table 8. *Correlation analysis results between variables*

Variables	1	2
1. The quality of faculty life	1.00	.88[*]
2. Student loyalty		1.00

[*] $p< .01$

When the table is examined, it is seen that there is a highly positive and significant relationship between the quality of faculty life and student loyalty (r= .88, p< .01). In other words, as the quality of faculty life increases, student loyalty also increases.

Within the scope of the fourth sub-problem of the research the quality of faculty life significantly predicted student loyalty. In Table 9, the results of multiple linear regression analysis regarding the prediction of student loyalty are given.

Table 9. *Multiple linear regression analysis results on predicting student loyalty*

Variables	B	Standard error $_B$	β	t	p	Bilateral r	Partial R
Constant	-.961	.139	---	-6.903	.000	---	---
The quality of faculty life	1.293	.038	.882	34.440	.000[*]	.882	.882
R= .882 R^2= .777 $F_{(1, 340)}$= 1186.100 p= .000							

[*]*p< .01*

When the bilateral and partial correlations between the predictor variable and the predicted (dependent) variable are examined in the table, it is seen that there is a positive and high-level relationship (r= .88) between the quality of faculty life and student loyalty. In addition, when other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as r= .88.

The quality of faculty life has a high and significant relationship with student loyalty (R= .882, R2= .777, p< .01). The quality of faculty life explains 77% of the total variance in student loyalty scores.

When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the quality of faculty life is an important (significant) predictor of student loyalty. Also, the regression equation (mathematical model) for the prediction of student loyalty is as follows: Student loyalty= -.961+1.293Quality of faculty life.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

In this study, the effect of the quality of faculty life on student loyalty was examined according to student perceptions. As a result of the research, it was found that students' perceptions of the quality of faculty life were at the level of "agree". In this context, it can be claimed that students see the faculty life positively. In other words, the students are generally satisfied with the quality of faculty life. A similar result was found in the study of Argon and Kösterelioğlu (2009), and it was concluded in the study that students positively evaluated the quality of university life. There are different studies in the literature showing that students' perceptions of the quality of faculty life are at moderate level. Özdemir et al. (2013) found that education faculty students' satisfaction with the quality of faculty life was at a moderate level. Similarly, Doğanay and Sarı (2006) in their research conducted in different faculties concluded that students' perceptions of university life quality were moderate. The positive perception of the student about the quality of school life is effective in increasing academic success (Karatzias, Power & Swanson, 2011). Moreover, the learning processes of the students will be facilitated and their tendency to drop out will decrease (Sarı, 2007).

When the dimensions related to the quality of faculty life are examined, it is seen that the highest dimension of the students is the dimension of satisfaction with the instructors. In Terzi's (2007) study, students stated that the approach of the instructors to the students was mostly sufficient. Ayık and Ataş-Akdemir (2015) state that teachers' good relations with their students will enable students to develop positive attitudes towards school and to have positive views on school life quality. İlmen (2010) also states that one of the most important factors affecting students' positive and negative attitudes towards school is teachers. When the dimensions related to the quality of faculty life are examined, it is seen that the lowest perceived dimension by the students is satisfaction with the classroom environment and student relations. Durmaz (2008), in his study to determine students' perceptions of school life quality, found that the lowest average was in the student-student communication sub-dimension. Alaca (2011) in his study examining the quality of life in schools, concluded that student-student communication is the lowest perceived dimension. Perdue, Manzeske, and Estell (2009) also revealed that the quality of friend relationships, peer support, and aggressive behaviors towards peers are closely related to school commitment.

In the study, it was seen that the perceptions of the students' loyalty level were at the level of "agree". Karatekin Alkoç (2017), in the research examining the variables related to student loyalty in higher education institutions, concluded that the students expressed an opinion at the level of agree. Alvesson (2000) states that if the student is loyal to the university, he will reconcile his own goals with the goals of the university and will undertake beneficial works for the university. Hening-Thurau et al. (2001) explains the importance of student loyalty for higher education institutions as that students who are loyal to their university indirectly increase the quality of teaching, and as students' loyalty to the institution increases, their motivation to learning activities will also increase and they will participate more willingly in research activities. Köse (2012) states in his study that student loyalty is one of the important factors that are effective in choosing higher education institutions.

In the study, it is seen that there is a highly positive and significant relationship between the quality of faculty life and student loyalty. In other words, as the quality of faculty life increases, student loyalty also increases. This finding supports the finding of a moderately strong relationship between student loyalty and satisfaction with the university in the research of Şirin et al. (2013), and the conclusion of İnal's (2009) study that the quality of school life will affect the school-student interaction and the findings that will emerge as a result of this interaction. In the studies of Öztürk and Faiz (2020), a positive relationship was found between the quality of university teaching and student loyalty. The results obtained in this research are also important in terms of showing that the quality of faculty life is an important factor on student loyalty.

In the study, it is seen that the quality of faculty life is an important (significant) predictor of student loyalty. According to Ayık and Ataş-Akdemir (2015), a quality school life provides students to have positive attitudes towards school and academic studies. Alaca (2011) concluded in his study that belonging to school, which is closely related to student loyalty, predicts quality of school life. Helgesen and Nesset (2007) state that the quality of the service provided by the higher education institution has an effect on student loyalty. Similarly, Köse (2012) states in his study that there are many factors that have an impact on student loyalty, and one of the most important of these is the quality of service offered by the university to students. In this context, it can be claimed that all kinds of practices and measures to improve university students' perceptions of the quality of faculty life and their perceptions of loyalty will contribute positively to both of these variables.

When the results of both this research and other studies in the literature are evaluated together, it can be concluded that the quality of students' faculty life has a significant effect on student loyalty. It is clear that universities are in a race to be the choice of qualified students and to ensure the continuation of their student. Being a university with high student loyalty has a critical importance in order to be ahead in this race (Şenel, 2018). Determining the student loyalty of students studying or graduating from a university and improving the factors that affect student loyalty are important for the self-development of the university.

5.1 Recommendations

The results obtained by periodically measuring the perceptions of university students regarding the quality of faculty life and their loyalty can be evaluated within the body of the university and the Council of Higher Education (CoHE), and necessary improvement studies can be carried out. By determining the expectations of the students from their universities, necessary practices can be carried out by the university administrations to meet these expectations. As a result of universities determining the quality of life level of each faculty within their structure, good examples in faculties with high quality of faculty life can be spread in other faculties. Universities can diversify and increase the physical facilities and social activities they provide to students in order to increase student loyalty. The effects of student loyalty and the quality of faculty life on student success can be investigated.

5.2 Ethical Text

"In this article, the journal writing rules, publication principles, research and publication ethics, and journal ethical rules were followed. The responsibility belongs to Mehmet Özdoğru for any violations that may arise regarding the article. " Ethics committee approval within the scope of the research Mehmet It has been taken from the ethics commıttee with the decision numbered 2022/04 on 14.04.2022. There is no conflict of interest between the authors. The contribution rate of the first author to the article is 50%, and the contribution rate of the second author to the article is 50%.

References

Ainley, J. (1991). High school factors that influence students to remain in school. *Journal of Educational Research, 85*, 69-80.

Akar, C. (2012). Üniversite seçimini etkileyen faktörler: İktisadi ve idari bilimler öğrencileri üzerine bir çalışma. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(1), 97-120.

Alaca, F. (2011). *İki dilli olan ve olmayan öğrencilerde okul yaşam kalitesi algısı ve okula aidiyet duygusu ilişkisi.* Yüksek lisans tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.

Alvesson, M. (2000). Social identity an the problem of loyalty in knowledge-intensive companies. *Journal of Management Studies, 37*(8), 1101-1123.

Anderson, C. S. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 52*, 368-420.

Argon, T. & Kösterelioğlu, M. A. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin üniversite yaşam kalitesi ve fakülte kültürüne ilişkin algıları. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(30), 43-61.

Austin, G., Hanson, T., Bono, G. & Cheng, Z. (2007). *The achievement gap, school well-being, and learning supports.* CHKS Factsheet #8. Los Alamitos, CA: WestEd.

Ayık, A. & Ataş-Akdemir, Ö. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının okul yaşam kalitesi ve okula yabancılaşma algıları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 21*(4), 429- 452.

Bahar, H. H. (2002). Eğitim fakültesi, tıp fakültesi ve iktisadi ve idari bilimler fakültesi öğrencilerinin bazı sosyo-ekonomik özellikleri ile fakülte tercihleri arasındaki ilişki. *Erzincan Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 4*(1), 125-144.

Bhattacharya, C. B. & Sen, S. (2003). Consumer-company identification: A Framework for understanding consumers' relationships with companies. *Journal of Marketing, 67*(3), 76-88.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2013). *Veri analizi el kitabı.* Ankara: Pegem A.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Pegem A.

Çokgezen, M. (2014). Determinants of university choice: A study on economics departments in Turkey. *Yükseköğretim Dergisi, 4*(1), 23-31.

Çokluk Bökeoğlu, Ö. & K. Yılmaz. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin fakülte yaşamının niteliğine ilişkin görüşlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, 40*(2), 179-204.

Doğanay, A. & Sarı, M. (2006). Öğrencilerin üniversitedeki yaşam kalitesine ilişkin algılarının demokratik yaşam kültürü çerçevesinde değerlendirilmesi: Çukurova Üniversitesi örneği. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(2), 107-128.

Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi (2022). *2021-2022 öğretim yılı istatistikleri.* https://ef.dpu.edu.tr/ sayfasından erişilmiştir.

Durmaz, A. (2008). *Liselerde okul yaşam kalitesi Kırklareli ili örneği*. Yüksek lisans tezi, Trakya Üniversitesi, Edirne.

George, D. & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 17.0 update* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Gürbüz, S. & Şahin, F. (2014). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri: Felsefe-yöntem-analiz.* Ankara: Seçkin.

Hair, J., Ringle, C. & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 19*(2), 139-151.

Helgesen, Q. & Nesset, W. (2007). Images, satisfaction and antecedents: Drivers of student loyalty? A case study of a Norwegian university collage. *Corporate Reputation Review, 10*(1), 38-59.

Hennig-Thurau, T., Lager, M.F. & Hansen, U. (2001). Modeling and managing student loyalty: An approach based on the concept of relationship quality. *Journal of Service Research, 3*(1), 331- 344.

İlmen, E. (2010). *Okul grubunun okul yaşam kalitesi ve akademik başarı üzerindeki etkisi* Yüksek lisans tezi, Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Van.

Ilias, K. & Nor, M. (2012). Relationship between quality of life, academic behavior and student motivation in teachers' training institute, Malaysia. *Academic Research International, 2*(2), 421-425.

Karasar, N. (2010). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler.* Ankara: Nobel.

Karatekin Alkoç, Y. (2017). Üniversite imajı, üniversiteye duyulan memnuniyet ve öğrenci sadakati arasındaki ilişkileri anlamaya yönelik bir araştırma. *Uluslararası Bilimsel Araştırmalar Dergisi (IBAD), 2*(2), 270-280.

Karatzias, A., Power, K. G. & Swanson, V. (2001). Quality of school life. Development and preliminary standardisation of an instrument based on performance indicators in Scottish secondary schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 12*(3), 265-284.

Korumaz, M. & Tekel, E. (2017). Yükseköğretimde öğrenci sadakâti ölçeği: Uyarlama, dil geçerliği ve faktör yapısının incelenmesi. *Kalem Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 7*(1), 183-203.

Köse, İ. A. (2012). Yükseköğretim kurumlarında öğrenci sadakati. Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi, (2), 114-118 .

Leonard,C.A.R. (2002): *Quality of school life and attendance in primary schools.* Doktora tezi, Newcastle Üniversitesi, Newcastle.

Milbrath, L. W. & Doyno, V. (1987). A study of the quality of university life: Suny at Bufalo. *Social Indicator Research,* (19), 173-190.

Özdemir, M. (2012). Üniversite öğrencilerinin okul yaşamının niteliğine ilişkin algılarının cinsiyet ve fakülte değişkenlerine göre incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 18*(2), 225-242.

Özdemir, S. , Kılınç, A. Ç., Öğdem, Z. & Er, E. (2013). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerin fakülte yaşamının niteliğine ilişkin memnuniyet düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi,* (3), 228-235.

Öztürk, E. & Faiz, E. (2020). Algılanan öğretim kalitesi ve öğrenci tatmininin öğrenci sadakati üzerindeki etkisi: Düzce üniversitesi örneği, *Uluslararası Turizm, Ekonomi ve İşletme Bilimleri Dergisi, 4*(1), 1-15.

Perdue, N. H., Manzeske, D. P. & Estell, D. P. (2009). Early predictors of school engagement: Exploring the role of peer relationships. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*(10), 1084-1097.

Rashid, T. & Raj, R. (2006). Customer satisfaction: Relationship marketing in higher education E-learning. Innovative Marketing, 2(3), 24-34.

Reay, D. (2001). Finding or losing yourself? Working class relationships to education. *Journal of Education Policy,* (16), 333-346.

Roberts, L. W. & Clifton, R. A. (1992). Measuring the affective quality of life of university students: The validation of an instrument. *Social Indicator Research*, (27), 113-137.

Sarı, M. (2007). *Demokratik değerlerin kazanımı sürecinde örtük program: Düşük ve yüksekokul yaşam kalitesine sahip iki ilköğretim okulunda nitel bir çalışma.* Doktora tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.

Singh, K., Augsutine, E. C., Singh, B. & Singh M. (2010). Quality of university life for UiTM students. Int. Conf. on Science and Social Research, Malaysia, 1-5.

Şenel, H. C. (2018). Öğrenci sadakati ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Researcher, 6*(3), 175-186.

Şirin, E.F., Erdoğdu, M. & Çınar M. (2019). *Üniversite hizmet kalitesi üniversiteye duyulan memnuniyet tavsiye etme niyeti ve öğrenci sadakati arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi: Spor bilimleri fakültesi örneği.* 2. Uluslararası Herkes İçin Spor ve Wellness Kongresi, 25-28 Nisan, Antalya-Alanya.

Terzi, A. R. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin fakülte kültürüne yönelik algıları (Giresun Eğitim Fakültesi örneği). *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 176*, 98-108.

Yılmaz, K. & Çokluk Bökeoğlu, Ö. (2006). Fakülte yaşamının niteliği ölçeği geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 4*(2), 201-210.

Yu, G. B. & Kim, J. (2008). Testing the mediating effect of the quality of college life in the student satisfaction and student loyalty relationship. *Applied Research Quality Life, 3*(1), 1-21.