School Belonging and Happiness Level of Students from Sport Faculty

Işıl Aktağ, Özlem Yalçın, Ayla Esen, İlayda Duman, Ceyda Karaköse, and Anıl Okçu

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to determine the school belonging and happiness levels of students from sports faculty according to the department, gender, and grade levels and to find the correlation between happiness and school belonging. Participants consisted of 285 students, 174 males, and 111 females, voluntarily from the teaching, coaching, and sports management departments of the faculty of sports. Data were collected using the Psychological Sense of Membership Scale (PSMS) to determine the school belonging, and the Oxford Happiness Scale (OHS) to measure happiness. The results of the analysis show no significant difference between male and female students in terms of their school belonging and happiness. However, a significant difference was found in the happiness and school belonging levels of students from different departments. In addition, the students of the sports management department have the highest sense of happiness and school belonging compared to the others.

Keywords: Happiness, School Belonging, Sense of Rejection, Sports Faculty Students.

Published Online: July 21, 2022

ISSN: 2736-4534

DOI:10.24018/ejedu.2022.3.4.392

I. Aktağ*

Department of Physical Education and Sports Education, Sports Faculty, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey.

(e-mail: iaktag@gmail.com)

Ö. Yalcın

Department of Recreation, Sport Science Faculty, Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey.

(e-mail: ozlem.yalcin@selcuk.edu.tr)

A. Esen

Physical Education Teacher, Şehit Yalcın Güzeler Ortaokulu, Düzce, Turkey.

(e-mail: aylaesen92@gmail.com)

İ. Duman

Department of Physical Education and Sports Education, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey.

(e-mail: idumaann@gmail.com)

C. Karaköse

Department of Physical Education and Sports Education, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey.

(e-mail: ceydakarakose@gmail.com)

A. Okçu

Department of Physical Education and Sports Education, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey. (e-mail: okcuanil48@gmail.com)

*Corresponding Author

I. INTRODUCTION

According to Osterman (2000), sense of belonging refers to "a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members' needs will be met through their commitment to be together". A sense of belonging is a basic human need and is critical for maintaining motivation and succeeding in institutions such as schools (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Going to college requires young people to face transitions, including changes in their lifestyles, academic circles, and friendship networks, while also adapting to greater independence and responsibility in their personal and academic lives. While many view this transition as exciting with some anxiety in their lives, others experience emotional dissonance and depression. (Pittman & Richmond, 2007).

School belonging is positively associated with educational motivation (Tion et al., 2021), classroom participation (O'Neel, 2021), school attendance (Yüksel, 2020), and academic performance (Pittman & Richard, 2007; Sanchez et al., 2005). It is positively associated with self-esteem, happiness, positive relationship with teachers and friends. Students who feel a sense of belonging to the school show more interest in the lesson and get higher grades. Despite these benefits, some students find it difficult to feel a sense of school belonging. Now, the question is: what is school belonging? Godenow and Graddy (1993), states it as the degree to which "students feel personally accepted, respected, included, and supported by others in the school social environment".

Students' academic and social participation affects their sense of belonging to the campus (Strayhorn, 2008). By interacting frequently and positively with others on campus, form meaningful relationships with peers and personally, affirming that they are seen, cared for, and needed by others. In the absence of a sense of belonging, they have difficulty maintaining academic engagement and commitment in an environment where they do not feel personally valued and welcomed. (Godenow, 1993).

Although most of the studies on school belonging have been done for younger ages, few studies have been found at the university level. Among college students, a sense of belonging was associated with their major or academic selfefficacy. Also, a sense of belonging to colleges has been found to mediate the relationship between family income and academic background, with such low-income families predicting lower levels of school belonging (Ostroven & Long, 2007).

The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between happiness and school belonging and to find answers to various questions about school belonging and happiness,

- 1. What is the school belonging level of the students of the Faculty of Sports Sciences?
- 2. What is the happiness level of the students of the Faculty of Sports Sciences?
- 3. Is there a difference in the level of school belonging according to the gender, department, academic achievement, family income, and parent education level of the students?
- 4. Is there a difference between students' happiness levels according to gender, department, academic achievement, family income, and parent education level?

II. INSTRUMENTS

In this study, the Psychological Sense of Membership Scale (PSMS) and Oxford Happiness Scale (OHS) were used. PSMS was developed by Godenow (1993) and translated into Turkish by Sarı (2011). It is a self-report scale and has 18 items with two factors. The first factor is the "sense of school belonging (SSB)" which has 13 positive items and, the second factor is the "sense of rejection (SR)" which has 5 negative items. Scores from the scale can be calculated separately as sub-factors or as a total score. The scale has a 5point Likert scale, which ranges from "not true at all" to, "completely true". For the scale, the highest score is 90, and the lowest score is 18. High scores indicate a strong sense of school belonging.

OHS was developed by Hills and Argyle and translated into Turkish by Doğan and Sapmaz (2012) which was used here to measure happiness. This scale has 29 questions with a 6-point Likert type. 1 means "never agree" while 6 means "absolutely agree". High scores indicate a high level of happiness.

In addition to these scales, students' gender, department, academic achievement, educational status of their parents, and family income were examined.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Participants consisted of 285 students (174 males and 111 females) voluntarily from the teaching, coaching, and sports management departments of the faculty of sports.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

For analysis of the study, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to determine whether the students' happiness and school belonging levels were normally distributed. It has been determined that the students' levels of school belonging and happiness are normally distributed both in the total score of the scale and in the factors. Descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test, and ANOVA were used to analyze scores. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Test (PPMCCT) was also utilized to determine the relationship between school belonging and happiness levels.

V. RESULTS

The findings regarding the students' level of school belonging and happiness according to gender, department, family income, parental education level, and academic achievement are given in the tables below.

Table I presents happiness, total sense of school belonging, sense of school belonging, and sense of rejection mean of all students.

Table II shows the independent samples t-test results, where the happiness scores of the students do not differ according to gender (t_{285} (Happiness) = 0.119, p > 0.05). The happiness mean value for female students is $\overline{X}_F = 3.98$, while for male students is $\overline{X}_{M} = 3.85$.

Table III shows us that the scores of total school belonging and sub-dimensions did not differ according to the gender as well $(t_{285}(total-SSB) = 0.859, t_{285}(SSB) = 0.050$ and $t_{285}(SR) = 0.150, p > 0.05$).

TABLE I: THE ARITHMETIC MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCHOOL BELONGING AND HAPPINESS LEVELS

| | N | \overline{X} | SD |
|-----------|-----|----------------|-------|
| Happiness | 285 | 3.90 | 0.705 |
| Total SSB | 285 | 3.25 | 0.520 |
| SSB | 285 | 3.18 | 0.350 |
| SR | 285 | 2.60 | 0.130 |

TABLE II: INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST RESULTS OF STUDENTS' HAPPINESS LEVELS ACCORDING TO GENDER

| | Gender | N | X | SD | t | p |
|-----------|--------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|
| Happiness | Female | 111 | 3.98 | 0.705 | 0.119 | 0.020 |
| | Male | 174 | 3.85 | 0.701 | 0.119 | 0.828 |

*p<0.05

TABLE III: INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST RESULTS OF STUDENTS' SCHOOL BELONGING LEVELS ACCORDING TO GENDER

| | SCHOOL BELONGING LEVELS ACCORDING TO GENDER | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|
| | Gender | N | X | SD | t | р | | |
| Total- | Female | 111 | 3.58 | 0.627 | 0.859 | 0.423 | | |
| SSB | Male | 174 | 3.56 | 0.551 | 0.639 | 0.423 | | |
| SSB | Female | 111 | 3.56 | 0.642 | 0.050 | 0.861 | | |
| SSD | Male | 174 | 2.31 | 0.607 | 0.030 | 0.601 | | |
| SR | Female | 111 | 2.38 | 0.784 | 0.150 | 0.951 | | |
| | Male | 174 | 2.53 | 0.756 | 0.130 | 0.931 | | |

*p < 0.05

TABLE IV: ANOVA RESULTS OF STUDENTS' HAPPINESS AND SCHOOL BELONGING LEVELS ACCORDING TO DEPARTMENT

| | Departments | N | $\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ | SD | F | p | |
|------------|------------------|-----|-------------------------|-------|--------|--------|--|
| | Teaching | 94 | 3.70 | 0.705 | | 0.000* | |
| Happiness | Coaching | 90 | 3.82 | 0.679 | 11.699 | | |
| rrappiness | Sport Management | 101 | 4.15 | 0.655 | 11.099 | 0.000 | |
| | Total | 285 | | | | | |
| | Teaching | 94 | 3.49 | 0.551 | | 0.005* | |
| Total-SSB | Coaching | 90 | 3.48 | 0.580 | 5.386 | | |
| 10tai-55B | Sport Management | 101 | 3.72 | 0.582 | 3.360 | | |
| | Total | 285 | | | | | |
| | Teaching | 94 | 3.51 | 0.584 | | | |
| SSB | Coaching | 90 | 3.50 | 0.641 | 5 475 | 0.005* | |
| 22B | Sport Management | 101 | 3.76 | 0.607 | 5.475 | 0.005* | |
| | Total | 285 | | | | | |
| | Teaching | 94 | 2.55 | 0.734 | | | |
| CD | Coaching | 90 | 2.54 | 0.772 | 0.207 | 0.128 | |
| SR | Sport Management | 101 | 2.35 | 0.790 | 0.207 | 0.128 | |
| | Total | 285 | | | | | |

p < 0.05

TABLE V: ANOVA RESULTS OF STUDENTS' HAPPINESS LEVELS ACCORDING TO THEIR PARENTS' EDUCATION LEVELS

| Happiness | Education Level | N | X | SD | F | p |
|-----------|--------------------|-----|------|-------|-------|--------|
| | RW | 20 | 3.58 | 0.917 | | |
| | PS | 130 | 3.91 | 0.672 | | |
| Madaaa | MS | 56 | 3.93 | 0.734 | 1.153 | 0.332 |
| Mother | HS | 69 | 3.92 | 0.690 | | |
| | U+ | 10 | 4.00 | 0.519 | | |
| | Total | 285 | | | | |
| | RW | 10 | 3.21 | 0.810 | | |
| | PS | 85 | 3.87 | 0.734 | | |
| E d | MS | 67 | 3.96 | 0.641 | 2 000 | 0.020* |
| Father | HS | 95 | 3.93 | 0.715 | 2.808 | 0.020* |
| | U+ | 28 | 3.98 | 0.586 | | |
| | Total | 285 | | | | |

^{*}p < 0.05, \overline{RW} : Reading-writing, PS: Primary school, MS: Middle school, HS: High school, U+: University or above.

TABLE VI: ANOVA RESULTS OF STUDENTS' SCHOOL BELONGING LEVELS ACCORDING TO THEIR PARENTS' EDUCATION LEVELS

| | | Education | N | \overline{X} | SD | F | n |
|--------|-----------|-----------|-----|----------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | Level | 11 | Λ | SD | Г | p |
| | | RW | 20 | 3.46 | 0.738 | | |
| | | PS | 130 | 3.61 | 0.532 | | |
| | Total SSB | MS | 56 | 3.49 | 0.637 | 0.631 | 0.641 |
| | | HS | 69 | 3.59 | 0.584 | | |
| | | U+ | 10 | 3.58 | 0.524 | | |
| | | RW | 20 | 3.49 | 0.795 | | |
| | | PS | 130 | 3.62 | 0.567 | | |
| Mother | SSB | MS | 56 | 3.53 | 0.671 | 0.464 | 0.762 |
| | | HS | 69 | 3.60 | 0.634 | | |
| | | U+ | 10 | 3.73 | 0.564 | | |
| | | RW | 20 | 2.61 | 0.814 | | |
| | | PS | 130 | 2.42 | 0.715 | | |
| | SR | MS | 56 | 2.60 | 0.846 | 1.117 | 0.349 |
| | | HS | 69 | 2.42 | 0.750 | | |
| | | U+ | 10 | 2.74 | 0.102 | | |
| | | RW | 10 | 3.38 | 0.708 | | |
| | | PS | 85 | 3.59 | 0.558 | | |
| | Total SSB | MS | 67 | 3.60 | 0.565 | 0.623 | 0.647 |
| | | HS | 95 | 3.52 | 0.625 | | |
| | | U+ | 28 | 3.63 | 0.481 | | |
| | | RW | 10 | 3.39 | 0.796 | | |
| | | PS | 85 | 3.62 | 0.574 | | |
| Father | SSB | MS | 67 | 3.60 | 0.591 | 0.975 | 0.422 |
| | | HS | 95 | 3.54 | 0.692 | | |
| | | U+ | 28 | 3.74 | 0.483 | | |
| | | RW | 10 | 2.62 | 0.720 | | |
| | | PS | 85 | 2.47 | 0.797 | | |
| | SR | MS | 67 | 2.29 | 0.705 | 1.988 | 0.090 |
| | | HS | 95 | 2.51 | 0.761 | | |
| | | U+ | 28 | 2.75 | 0.822 | | |

^{*} $p < 0.\overline{05}$

TABLE VII: ANOVA RESULTS OF STUDENTS' HAPPINESS LEVELS

| | ACCORDING TO PAMILET INCOME | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|--|--|--|
| Happiness | Income (TL) | N | X | SD | F | p | | | |
| Total Income | Min. wage | 60 | 3.86 | 0.79 | | | | | |
| | Min. wage-3500 | 71 | 3.86 | 0.69 | | | | | |
| | 3501-5000 | 92 | 3.88 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.59 | | | |
| | 5001 and above | 62 | 4.01 | 0.74 | | | | | |
| | Total | 285 | | | | | | | |

^{*}p < 0.05

TABLE VIII: ANOVA RESULTS OF STUDENTS' SCHOOL BELONGING LEVELS ACCORDING TO FAMILY INCOME

| | Income (TL) | N | \overline{X} | SD | F | p | |
|-------|----------------|-----|----------------|------|------|------|--|
| | Min. wage | 60 | 3.55 | 0.66 | | | |
| Total | Min. wage-3500 | 71 | 3.53 | 0.58 | | | |
| | 3501-5000 | 92 | 3.51 | 0.65 | 1.93 | 0.13 | |
| SSB | 5001 and above | 62 | 3.72 | 0.56 | | | |
| | Total | 285 | _ | _ | | | |
| | Min. wage | 60 | 3.58 | 0.64 | | 0.03 | |
| | Min. wage-3500 | 71 | 3.54 | 0.56 | | | |
| SSB | 3501-5000 | 92 | 3.51 | 0.58 | 0.29 | | |
| | 5001 and above | 62 | 3.79 | 0.52 | | | |
| | Total | 285 | _ | _ | | | |
| | Min. wage | 60 | 2.53 | 0.80 | | | |
| | Min. wage-3500 | 71 | 2.49 | 0.80 | | 0.88 | |
| SR | 3501-5000 | 92 | 2.47 | 0.75 | 0.22 | 0.88 | |
| | 5001 and above | 62 | 2.41 | 0.76 | | O | |
| | Total | 285 | _ | _ | | | |

p < 0.05

TABLE IX: ANOVA RESULTS OF STUDENTS' HAPPINESS AND SCHOOL

| BELONGING LEVELS ACCORDING TO THEIR ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----|----------------|------|------|------|--|
| | GPA | N | \overline{X} | SD | F | p | |
| | 0-2.00 | 111 | 3.83 | 0.70 | | | |
| Haminasa | 2.01-2.50 | 97 | 3.92 | 0.66 | 0.83 | 0.48 | |
| Happiness | 2.51-3.00 | 54 | 4.01 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 0.48 | |
| | 3.01-4.00 | 23 | 3.89 | 0.66 | | | |
| | 0-2.00 | 111 | 3.53 | 0.55 | | | |
| Total SSB | 2.01-2.50 | 97 | 3.55 | 0.59 | 0.71 | 0.55 | |
| 10141 555 | 2.51-3.00 | 54 | 3.66 | 0.57 | 0.71 | 0.55 | |
| | 3.01-4.00 | 23 | 3.62 | 0.68 | | | |
| | 0-2.00 | 111 | 3.52 | 0.59 | | | |
| SSB | 2.01-2.50 | 97 | 3.61 | 0.64 | | | |
| зэр | 2.51-3.00 | 54 | 3.68 | 0.59 | 0.92 | 0.43 | |
| | 3.01-4.00 | 23 | 3.67 | 0.74 | | | |
| | 0-2.00 | 111 | 2.45 | 0.75 | | | |
| SR | 2.01-2.50 | 97 | 2.56 | 0.79 | 0.84 | 0.47 | |
| SIC | 2.51-3.00 | 54 | 2.37 | 0.79 | 0.84 | 0.47 | |
| | 3.01-4.00 | 23 | 247 | 0.75 | | | |

^{*}p < 0.05

One-way ANOVA was conducted for three different; Teaching, Coaching, and Sport Management departments' students in order to determine their happiness and school belonging levels (See Table IV). A significant difference was found in happiness (p(Happiness) = 0.000), Total-SSB (p(Total-SSB) = 0.005) and SSB scores (p(SSB) = 0.005). Then, the Tukey test was conducted to find out where the difference comes from. It has been determined that the students of the Sports Management department differ significantly from the students of the teaching and coaching department in their happiness levels ($F_{285} = 11.699$, p = 0.000). Considering the level of belonging to the school according to the departments of the students, it is seen that the students of the Sports Management department get significantly different scores from the students of both the Teaching and Coaching departments in terms of their Total-SSB ($F_{285} = 5.386$, p = 0.005) and SSB levels ($F_{285} = 5.475$, p = 0.005).

When Table V is examined, students' happiness levels increase according to the education level of both their parents. However, this increase differs significantly only according to

the education level of the father. The happiness levels of =students whose fathers can only read and write differ -significantly from those whose fathers have primary, secondary, high school and university education or higher $(F_{285} = 2.808, p = 0.020).$

According to findings in Table VI, the school belonging level of students did not display a significant difference according to their parents' education level.

The statistical analysis of Table VII shows that there is no - significant difference between the happiness levels of the students according to the total income of their parents. However, the happiness level of students with the highest income was found to be relatively higher than the others.

The findings in Table VIII show that sense of school belonging levels of students differ significantly according to parents' income ($F_{285} = 0.289$, p = 0.036). This difference is between students whose income is 5001 TL and above, and those whose income is up to 5000 TL.

The results of Table IX show that neither the level of happiness nor the level of school belonging differ according to the academic achievement of the students.

Finally, the Pearson Correlation analysis was performed to find the correlation between school belonging and happiness. It has shown a positively significant correlation (r = 0.482, p = 0.000).

DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to determine the happiness and school belonging levels of students from sports faculty according to their gender, department, family income, parents' education, and academic achievement. When we look at the mean of students' school belonging and happiness, it can be seen that the values obtained here are similar to those studies conducted by Sarı and Özgök (2016), Atabey (2020), and Yüksel (2020).

The results of this study show that the gender of the students is not related to school belonging. Our results are consistent with Sanches et al. (2004), Bursalı, (2020), Osterman (2000), and Godenow (1993). However, there are a few studies found that students' school belonging varies significantly according to their gender. Female students have higher school belonging levels than male students according to Sarı (2014), Sarı and Özgök (2016), Ergün et al. (2018). In some researches, the differences in school belonging are mostly reached with middle school and high school students. However, the school belonging may differ in gender at college level students.

We also looked at the happiness results which seen that gender has not made a significant difference on happiness. Those findings are consistent with the findings of Cankaya and Meydan (2018), Doğan and Aydın (2020), Yeter (2019), and Demir and Duman (2019).

When students' school belonging and happiness levels were examined according to their departments, we realized that students from the sport management department have the highest sense of school belonging and the lowest sense of rejection compared to the students from the teaching and coaching departments. Also, they are the happiest students at the faculty. Although no study in this area has been reached so far, the positive expectations of the students of the management department about their business fields or school may have caused this result.

Moreover, the results from happiness and school belonging levels according to parents' education have revealed that the happiness level of students did not change according to mothers' education but it showed significant difference according to fathers' education. Contrary to our findings Çankaya and Meydan (2018) found no difference according to parents' education levels. According to our findings, as the education level of the parents' increases, the level of belonging of the students to the school increases relatively without a significant figure. However, Pittman and Richmond (2007) found in their study that students whose parents had higher education levels had higher levels of school belonging. In our study on these issues, we investigated the education level of the participants rather than the education level of the families.

The study examined whether there was a difference according to family income and students' total sense of school belonging and sense of rejection level. It was observed that there was a difference according to the sub-dimension of sense of school belonging. As the family income increases, the level of belonging to the school also increases, but this increase is not significant. According to Godenow (1993) school's socio-economic situation is one of the vital factors that influence specifically a sense of school belonging level. Sarı and Özgök (2014) study showed that students with higher income families have higher school belonging levels than students from middle and low socio-economic families.

Similar results emerge when we look at the differences in happiness and income. Students' happiness level increases as their income increases, but this increase is not significant.

A sense of belonging and happiness played a positive effect on students' academic achievement but not an insignificant level. Especially, a greater sense of belonging and happiness was determined with higher grades; students with higher grades felt happier and belong to university when compared with students with lower grades. According to Lam et al. (2015) students with a greater sense of school belonging experience positive emotions and had higher academic success. Bursalı (2020) and Sarı (2013) found that students with high academic success also had high levels of school belonging.

In conclusion, with this study, we examined the relationship between school belonging and happiness in sports faculty students of three different departments and determined that there was a positive relationship between them. Although there are not many studies on this subject, Veysel and Altınok (2021) found that there is a positive relationship between school engagement and happiness, and Kozan et al. (2019) found in their studies that when the need for belonging is met, the level of happiness increases as the general belongingness increases.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Anderman, L. H. (2010). Academic and social perceptions as predictors of change in middle school students' sense of school belonging, The Journal of Experimental Education. 72(1):5-22.

- Atabey, N. (2020). Future expectations and self-efficacy of high school students as a predictor of sense of school belonging. Education and Science, 45:125-141.
- Altınsoy, F., & Özyer, K. K. (2018). School belonging sense of high school adolescence: the relationship between hopelessness and loneliness. Elementary Education Online, 17(3):1751-1764.
- Bursalı, A. (2020). Investigating the relationship between school belongingness and stress management in educational life. The Journal of Social Sciences. 45:327-354.
- Cragg, H., & Kelly, C. (2018). Adolescents' experiences of school belonging: a qualitative meta-synthesis. Journal of Youth Studies. 21, (10):1411-1425.
- Çankaya, Z. Ç., & Meydan B. (2018). Happiness and hope in adolescence. Electronic Journal of Social Science. 17(65):207-222.
- Demir, K., & Duman, S. (2019). Examining the relationship between selfesteem and happiness level considering the condition of people doing exercise. Gaziantep University Journal of Sport Science. 4(4):437-449.
- Doğan, T., & Aydın, F. T. (2020). Do happy children become happy adults? The Journal of Humanity and Society. (pp:69-95).

DOI:10.12658/M0437.

- Doğan, T., & Sapmaz, F. (2012). Examination of psychometric properties of the Turkish version form of the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire in university students. The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences. 25:297-304.
- Ergün, M., Akçaoğlu, M. Ö., & Unver N. (2018). University reputation, branding and university students' sense of belonging. Değişen Dünyada Eğitim. (pp:473-487).
- DOI:10.14527/9786052412480.31.
- Lam, U. F., Chen, W. W., Zhang, J., & Liang, T. (2015). It feels good to learn where I belong: school belonging, academic emotions and academic achievement in adolescents. School Psychology International. *36*(4):393-409.
- Godenow, C. (1993). The psychological sense of school membership among adolescents: scale development and educational correlates. Psychology in the Schools. 30:79-90.
- Kasalak, G. and Özcan, M. (2021). The belonging levels of teacher candidates regarding the university they study. Başkent University Journal of Education. 8(1):184-195.
- Kahveci, İ., Karagün, E., & Kahveci, M. (2020). Determination of aggressiveness and happiness levels of licensed taekwondo athletes in Kocaeli province. International Journal of Society Researches. 16:3454-3473.
- Kozan, S., Işık, E., & Blustein, D. L. (2019). Decent work and well-being among low-income Turkish employees: Testing the psychology of working theory. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 66(3):317-327.
- Noluig, E. K., Albertsen, G., & Qverstrom, V. (2003). Association between psychosocial factors and happiness among school adolescents. International Journal of Nursing Practice. 9:166-175.
- O'Neel, C. G. (2021). Sense of belonging and student engagement: A daily study of first and continuing generation college students. Research in Higher Education. 62:45-71.
- Osterman, K. F., (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community, Review of Educational Research, 70(3):323-367.
- Ostrave, M., & Long, M. (2007). Social class and belonging: Implications for college adjustment. Review of Higher Education: Journal of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. 30(4):363-389
- Öz, A. (2014). İlahiyat fakültesi öğrencilerinin kurumsal aidiyet düzeyi, AİBÜ İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. 2(4):54-64.
- Pittman, L. D., & Richmand, A. (2007). Academic and psychological functioning in late adolescence: the importance of school belonging. The Journal of Experimental Education. 75(4):270-290.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: classic definitions and new directions. Contemporary Educational Psychology. 25(1):54-67.
- Sanchez, B., Colon, Y., & Esparza, P. (2005). The role of sense of school belonging and gender in the academic adjustment of Latino adolescents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 34(6):619-628.
- Saki, U. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinin aile aidiyet düzeylerinin spor ve farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. [Graduate thesis, Atatürk
- Sarı, M. (2013). Sense of school belonging among high school students. Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences. 13(1):147-160.
- Sarı, M., & Özgök A. (2014). The sense of school belonging and emphatic classroom atmosphere among secondary students, Gaziantep University Journal of Social Science. 13(2):479-492.
- Sarı, M., & Özgök A. (2016). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin okula aidiyet duygusu ve arkadaş bağlılık düzeyi. ÇÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 25(3):71-86.
- Strayhorn, T. (2008). How students' engagement affects personal and social learning outcomes. Journal of College and Character. 10(2):1-16.

- Tian, J., Zhang, M., Zhou, H., & Wu, J. (2021). College satisfaction, sense of achievement, student happiness and sense of belonging of freshman in Chinese private colleges: mediation effect of emotion regulation. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health.
- Veysel, B., & Altınok, V. (2021). Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Öğretmen Etkililiği Algısı ile Okula Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkide Öğrenci Mutluluğunun Etkisi. Gazi Universitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 41(3):1839-1868.
- Yeter, S. (2019). Predicting the happiness levels of university students according to family belonging and spiritual orientation. [Graduate Thesis, Marmara University].
- Yüksel, Z. (2020). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin okul aidiyet düzeyi, Dini Araştırmalar, 23(57):173-194.