



New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences



Issue 5 (2016) 64-70

Selected paper of 4th Cyprus International Conference on Educational Research (CYICER-2015) March 19 – 21, 2015, Girne American University in Kyrenia, CYPRUS

Life Quality Evaluation of University Students Who do Sport and do not do Sport

Emsal Ozturk^{a*}, Gendarmes Vocational School Physical Education and Sport Department, Instructor., Ankara 06830, Turkey

Husrev Uzunali^b, Gendarmes Vocational School Physical Education and Sport Department, Ankara 06830, Turkey

Hatice Bekir^c, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Department of Primary Education Division of Pre-Scholl Education, Ankara 06830, Turkey

Suggested Citation:

Ozturk, E., Uzunali, H. & Bekir, H. (2016). Life quality evaluation of university students who do sport and do not do sport. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*. [Online]. 05, pp 64-70. Available from: www.prosoc.eu

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cigdem Hursen, Near East University
©2016 SciencePark Research, Organization & Counseling. All rights reserved.

Abstract

In this study, it is aimed to evaluate life quality of university students who do sport and don't do sport, considering the effects of sport on life quality and common usage of the topic. Study's working group who used descriptive survey method is consisted of 100 Gazi University, physical education and sports higher school students and 100 Gazi University, faculty of science and literature students, totally 200 students,. In this study, Personal information form and Nottingham Health Profile (NHP) whose adaptation was done by Kucukdeveci and his friends and whose reliability practiced and developed by Hunt and his friends was used as a data collection tool. At the end of study, university students' life qualities can be seen different according to the condition of doing sport, in positive way statistically. It is concluded that total life quality, energy level, ache, emotional reaction, social isolation, sleeping and physical activity level is significantly high ($p < 0.05$) for someone who do sports.

Keywords: Life Quality; Sports; University Student

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Emsal Ozturk**, Gendarmes Vocational School Physical Education and Sport Department, Instructor., Ankara 06830, Turkey
E-mail address: emsal_ozturk@hotmail.com / Tel.: +0-543-264-5999

1. Introduction

Life quality is described as understanding the individual's perceptions in the context of their culture and value systems, and their personal goals, standards and concerns by World Health Organization (WHO). Health-related life quality is related to feeling himself/herself good and regarding to his health condition in general framework. Health-related life quality involves feeling himself good, life pleasure, being active in physical, social and psychological aspects and being not sick (Zorba, 2008). It is described as having life satisfaction, having time for fun, improving themselves, being good in terms of economic and physical, having social power competence in relations with social environment and behaviours belonging to social citizenship and civilisation in broad terms (Oksuz and Malhan, 2005).

Human body need to move constantly. It has a build to defend himself to struggle with nature, meet its own needs in difficult situations. Physical activity is vital. Group's or individual's physical activity is usually classified according to environment where the activity come true. Common activities include transportation, sport, spare time, individual care and activities at work, home and around the house (Burton and Turrell, 2000). Sport is activity chain that it develops human's abilities, helps to be healthy in terms of physical and mental, and develops cognitive skills such as giving quick and right decision and improving perception and attention (Erkal, Ayan and Guven, 1998).

Sport takes place near the top in our daily life by having new meaning, due to developing conditions, industrialisation, over-urbanization, individual's health anxieties, rising in free times. Sport is especially done not only on the purpose of performance, but also for healthy life or to improve the life quality. (Koruc ve Bayar, 2004). Sport has great importance for both daily life activities and life qualities. It is known that doing exercise has physical and physiological advantages, decreases stress, is good for psychological goodness and is in the treatment methods of psycho-social rehabilitation programmes (Morgan, Roberts and Feinerman, 1971). Studies that are done support these, too.

Desire of being and staying healthy is one of the basic aims and objectives for people (Zorba, 2006). For a healthy life, exercise should be life style and a part of daily life. Exercise and physical activity help to reach better physical and mental health, increase life quality so that it extends life. It is proved that someone who is physically active and attends sportive activities in early ages has more active life maintain possibilities, physically in adult ages (Bek, 2008). Within the scope of this study, it is aimed to evaluate life quality of university students who do sport and do not do sport, considering the effects of sport on life quality and common usage of the topic.

2. Method

In this study, descriptive survey method was used to search out current situation. In this method, the event which is mentioned is tried to describe on individual's or group's own terms. It is not tried to affect or alter for any purpose (Karasar, 2003). Study's working group is consisted of 100 Gazi University, physical education and sports higher school students and 100 Gazi University, faculty of science and literature students, totally 200 students, by using descriptive survey method. In this study, personal information form and Nottingham Health Profile (NHP) whose adaptation was done by Kucukdeveci and her friends (2000) and whose reliability practiced and developed by Hunt and his friends (1982) was used as a data collection tool. Nottingham Health Profile (NHP) is a survey whose questions are answered by individuals, consists of 38 questions and it has six sub-parameters under the head of energy level (3), ache (8), emotional reactions (9), social isolation (5), sleeping (5) and physical activity (8). Every sub-parameter is between 0-100 points and total points vary between (NHP-Total) 0-600 points. Health-related life quality is evaluated inversely proportional to receiving points.

SPSS 21.0 for Windows and Microsoft Office Excel 2013 programmes were used to analyze the data, which is collected. Nottingham Health Profile scale was examined whether the data was reliable or

not, then the basic statistical analyses were done. This process was done by using Kuder Richardson-20 (KR-20) method, in the programme of Microsoft Office Excel 2013. Kuder Richardson-20 (KR-20) method is used to detect whether the scales whose answers in the form of yes/no or true false was reliable or not (Karasar, 2003). As a result of reliability analysis, the results were got which is in the following table.

Table 1. Nottingham health profile scale, reliability analyses results

Sub-dimension	Material number	KR-20 reliability coefficient
Energy level	3	.80
Ache	8	.82
Emotional reactions	9	.86
Social isolations	5	.65
Sleeping	5	.66
Physical activity	8	.81
Total	38	.94

According to table 1, it is seen that social isolation and sleeping sub-dimensions are reliable in analyzable level; energy level, ache, emotional reactions, physical activity sub-dimensions and total life quality points are highly reliable.

It is defined that scale sub-dimensions data are reliable, before starting to do statistical analysis; it is examined if the distribution of total point and sub-dimension data is normal by One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. As a result of this analysis, it is observed that the distribution of total point and sub-dimension data is not normal. So, non-parametric methods of statistical analyses were used. Mann Whitney U analysis was used to make comparison between participant’s branches, genders, conditions of doing sport and the types of sport that they do. Significance level is “ $p < 0,05$ ”. Descriptive statistics were used to define standard doing ratings and average of total points and scale sub-dimension of participants. Additionally, frequency analysis was used to define percentage distribution of participants’ demographic information.

3. Findings and Discussion

About 50 percent of participants is studying in science and literature faculty and 50 percent of participants is studying in physical education and sports faculty. About 62 percent of participants are men and 38 percent participants are women. About 22 percent of participant are doing sport, 59.1 percent of participants who are doing sport do sport as a team, and 40.9 percent of participants do sport individually.

Table 2. Comparison of life qualities according to participant’s genders

	Gender	n	Mann Whitney U Test				
			\bar{X}	Ss	Mean Rank	U	p
Energy Level	Man	124	39.67	32.03	91.94	3650.0	.002
	Woman	76	1.00	5.71	114.47		
Ache	Man	124	22.63	24.53	94.40	3955.5	.020
	Woman	76	0.13	1.25	110.45		
Emotional Reactions	Man	124	41.00	28.46	94.53	3971.5	.046
	Woman	76	2.00	5.56	110.24		
Social Isolations	Man	124	30.00	29.47	96.38	4201.5	.164
	Woman	76	7.40	10.11	107.22		
Sleeping	Man	124	37.00	25.96	96.21	4180.0	.145
	Woman	76	3.40	9.01	107.50		

Physical Activity	Man	124	30.88	24.39	92.77	3754.0	.007
	Woman	76	0.25	1.76	113.11		
Total	Man	124	33.55	19.41	92.91	3770.5	.016
	Woman	76	2.08	3.11	112.89		

According to table 2, it is seen that women participants' life quality is higher than men participants' life quality in social isolation (7.40 ± 10.11) and sleeping sub dimension (3.40 ± 9.01), but there is no significant difference statistically ($p > 0.05$) in social isolations and sleeping sub dimensions by gender. Women participants' energy level (1.0 ± 5.71), ache (0.13 ± 1.25), emotional reactions (2.0 ± 5.56), physical activity (0.25 ± 1.76) sub-dimensions and life quality (2.08 ± 3.11) points is averagely higher than men participants. It is seen that there is significant difference between energy level, ache, emotional reactions, physical activity and total life quality by gender ($p < 0.05$).

Table 3. Comparison of life qualities according to the faculty/branch which they study

		Faculty-Branch			Mann Whitney U Test		
		n	\bar{x}	Ss	Mean Rank	U	p
Energy Level	science and literature faculty	100	39.67	32.03	133.68	1682.5	.000
	Physical education and sports faculty.	100	1.00	5.71	67.33		
Ache	science and literature faculty	100	22.63	24.53	130.72	1978.0	.000
	Physical education and sports faculty.	100	0.13	1.25	70.28		
Emotional Reactions	science and literature faculty	100	41.00	28.46	141.43	907.5	.000
	Physical education and sports faculty.	100	2.00	5.56	59.58		
Social Isolations	science and literature faculty	100	30.00	29.47	122.07	2843.5	.000
	Physical education and sports faculty.	100	7.40	10.11	78.94		
Sleeping	science and literature faculty	100	37.00	25.96	136.92	1358.5	.000
	Physical education and sports faculty.	100	3.40	9.01	64.08		
Physical Activity	science and literature faculty	100	30.88	24.39	141.15	935.0	.000
	Physical education and sports faculty.	100	0.25	1.76	59.85		
Total	science and literature faculty	100	33.55	19.41	145.42	508.5	.000
	Physical education and sports faculty.	100	2.08	3.11	55.59		

According to table 3, Physical education and sports faculty students' energy level (1.0 ± 5.71), ache (0.13 ± 1.25), emotional reactions (2.0 ± 5.56), social isolation (7.40 ± 10.11), sleeping (3.40 ± 9.01), physical activity (0.25 ± 1.6), sub-dimension average points and total life quality (2.08 ± 3.11) points is averagely higher than science and literature faculty students.

It is seen that Physical education and sports faculty students have better life quality significantly compared with science and literature faculty students in total life quality and all sub-dimensions

($p < 0,05$). Having much physical activity duration for Physical education and sports faculty students may have made a contribution to be higher life quality compared with science and literature faculty students.

It is mentioned that individuals who attend sport activity have better life quality and mental well-being no matter which activity it is (Edwards, Edwards, and Basson, 2004). In Cevada and his friends' (2012) studies, they informed that sport makes contribution to better life quality and flexible body build.

According to table 4, it is seen that participants who do sport have better life quality compared with participants who do not do sport, in energy level (2.27 ± 8.50), ache (0.0 ± 0.0), emotional reactions (1.77 ± 5.33), social isolation (6.82 ± 9.59), sleeping (4.55 ± 10.44), physical activity (0.57 ± 2.63) sub-dimensions and total life quality (2.21 ± 3.05). Participants' life quality become different according to condition of doing sport in significant level statistically ($p > 0,05$). In the study of Häkkinen and his friends (2010), it is discovered that there is strong relation between life quality and activity level of individuals who do physical activity in medium level and upper.

Table 5. Comparison of life qualities according to type of sport branch that participants do

		Sport Branch			Mann Whitney U Test		
		N	\bar{X}	Ss	Mean Rank	U	p
Energy Level	Team	26	3.85	10.86	23.54	207.0	.140
	Individual	18	0.00	0.00	21.00		
Ache	Team	26	0.00	0.00	22.50	234.0	1.000
	Individual	18	0.00	0.00	22.50		
Emotional Reactions	Team	26	1.71	5.16	22.52	233.5	.983
	Individual	18	1.85	5.72	22.47		
Social Isolations	Team	26	6.92	9.70	22.62	231.0	.931
	Individual	18	6.67	9.70	22.33		
Sleeping	Team	26	6.92	12.58	24.46	183.0	.070
	Individual	18	1.11	4.71	19.67		
Physical Activity	Team	26	0.48	2.45	22.35	230.0	.791
	Individual	18	0.69	2.95	22.72		
Total	Team	26	2.63	3.65	23.56	206.5	.476
	Individual	18	1.61	1.84	20.97		

According to table 5, it is seen that participants who do sport individually have better energy level, social isolation, sleeping sub-dimension points and total life quality points compared with participants who do sport as a team, but participants who do sport as a team have better life quality by emotional reactions and physical activity sub-dimension points. In addition to this, it is seen that participants have the same average points in ache sub-dimension. In this sub-dimension both group have the highest life quality. Although there are differences in their life quality according to type of sport branch they do, it is seen that these differences are not significant statically ($p > 0,05$).

Table 6. Analysing the relation between participants' life quality sub-dimension (Spearman Correlation Analysis)

Correlation		EL	A	ER	SI	S	PA
A	r	.767					
	p	.000					
ER	r	.732	.711				
	p	.000	.00				
SI	r	.351	.351	.592			
	p	.000	.000	.000			
S	r	.620	.453	.746	.482		
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000		

PA	r	.781	.831	.829	.490	.660	
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
T	r	.772	.750	.912	.679	.774	.868
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

EL: Energy Level; A: Ache; ER: Emotional Reactions; SI: Social Isolation; S: Sleeping; PA: Physical Activity; T: Total

According to Table 6, it is seen that there is significant relation with all life quality sub-dimensions in linear way ($p < 0,05$). Increasing in any life quality will increase the others, decreasing in any life quality will decrease the others.

4. Results and Recommendations

About 50 percent of participants is studying in science and literature faculty and 50 percent of participants is studying in physical education and sports faculty. About 62 percent of participants are men and 38 percent of participants are women. About 22 percent of participants are doing sport, 59.1 percent of participants who are doing sport do sport as a team, and 40.9 percent of participants do sport individually. It was found significant difference statistically ($p > 0,05$) in participants' energy level, ache, emotional reactions, physical activity and total life quality by gender. In the study, demographic information which defines as variable can be multiply and extend. So, reaching life quality by using different and versatile variance can be improved the study's substantiality.

It is seen that Physical education and sports faculty students have better life quality significantly compared with science and literature faculty students' in total life quality and all sub-dimensions ($p < 0,05$). It is seen that university students' life qualities can be seen different according to the condition of doing sport, in positive way statistically. It is concluded that total life quality, energy level, ache, emotional reaction, social isolation, sleeping and physical activity level is significantly high ($p < 0.05$) for someone who do sports. Although there are differences in their life quality according to type of sport branch they do, it is seen that these differences are not significant statically. According to Spearman Correlation Analysis, it is seen that there is significant relation with all life quality sub-dimensions in linear way. With the scope of these results, the same study can be done by using different measuring methods and the results can be compared with.

Considering the fact that regular sport activity affects the life quality, health and the other psychological variances positively, university students should be encouraged to in such activities.

University students should focus their attentions on suitable sportive activities to reach for desired life quality levels.

In universities, curriculums should be formed for sport in all branches and should be taken required precautions to encourage the university students to participate sportive activities.

It may be recommended.

References

- Bek, N. (2008). *Fiziksel aktivite ve sagligımız*. Ankara:Klasmat.
- Bowling, A. (1993). *Measuring health, A review of Quality of Life Measurement*. Open University Press.
- Burton, N. and Turrell, G. (2000). Occupation, hours worked, and leisure time physical activity. *Prevalance Medicine*. 31: 673-681.
- Cevada T., Cerqueira L.S., De Moraes, H.S. and Dos Santo, T.M. (2012). Relationship between sport, resilience, quality of life, and anxiety. *Rev. psiquiatr. clín.*; 39(3), 85-89.
- Erkal M., Ayan D. and Guven, O. (1998). *Sosyolojik acidan spor*. 3. Baskı, İstanbul:Der.

Ozturk, E., Uzunali, H. & Bekir, H. (2016). Life quality evaluation of university students who do sport and do not do sport. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*. [Online]. 05, pp 64-70. Available from: www.prosoc.eu

Häkkinen, A., Rinne, M., Vasankari, T., Santtila, M., Häkkinen, K. and Kyroläinen, H. (2010). Association of physical fitness with health-related quality of life in Finnish young men. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes* 8:15.

Hunt, S.M., McKenna, S.P., McEwen, J., Williams, J. and Papp, E. (1981). The Nottingham Health Profile: Subjective health status and medical consultations. *Soc Sci Med* 15A:221-229.

Karasar, N. (2003). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi - kavramlar, ilkeler ve teknikler*, Ankara: Nobel.

Koruc, Z. and Bayar, P. (2004). Egzersizin depresyon tedavisindeki yeri ve etkileri. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15 (1), 50-61.

Kucukdeveci, A., McKenna, S.P., Kutlay, S., Gurse, I.Y., Whalley, D. & Arasil, T. (2000). *The development and psychometric assessment of the Turkish version of the Nottingham Health Profile*. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*. 23: 31-38.

Morgan, P.M., Roberts, J.A. and Feinerman, A.D. (1971). Psychological effect of acute physical activity. *Archives of Physical Medicine Rehabilitation*. 52, 422-425.

Oksuz, E. and Malhan, S. (2005). *Sağlığa bağlı yaşam kalitesi kalimetri*. Ankara: Baskent Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Zorba, E. (2008). Yaşam kalitesi ve fiziksel aktivite. *10. Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi Bildiri Kitapçığı*. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Bolu.

Zorba, E. (2006). *Vucut yapısı ölçüm yöntemleri ve sismanlıkla basa çıkma*. İstanbul: Morpa Kültür Yayınları.