



EXPLORING THE INSTITUTIONAL IMAGE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN RELATION TO STUDENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS

Emre Belli¹, Ali Gürel Goksel², Ali Gürbüz³

¹ Ataturk University, Faculty of Sports Science

² Marmara University, School of Physical Education and Sports

³ Mimar Sinan University, Physical Education and Sports

Abstract

This study aims to research the opinions of students attending the School of Physical Education and Sports at Atatürk University and Marmara University with respect to the universities' corporate image.

The questionnaire which was developed by Örer (2006) with additions introduced by Kaya (2013) was used to acquire data about corporate image amongst universities.

The SPSS 16 statistical packet program was used to evaluate the data. During the research, analysis of frequency was used to define demographical features, the t-test to define the difference between corporate images depending on universities and gender, one way analysis of variance (Anova) to define differing empathy levels depending on age, grades and departments, and the Tukey test was applied in order to establish which group causes the dissimilarity.

The research indicates that there are meaningful dissimilarities in sub-dimension of service ($p=,000$) communication ($p=,000$), belonging ($p=,012$), satisfaction ($p=,000$) and management perspective ($p=,000$). On the other hand there is no meaningful dissimilarity in support sub-dimension ($p=,168$). ($p<0,05$)

Key words: Image, University, Sports and Physical Education

Introduction

It is becoming increasingly necessary to establish the relevance of institutions for society in order to ensure their continuity. The actual functioning of such institutions may in fact be of less significance than the way in which society perceives them. At this point we come across the concept of image. Performance based on strong images of the institutions which want to be appreciated and needed by society and to meet the society's expectations provides positive outcomes.

There is a misunderstanding about the real purpose of image performance which is thought by society to change reality. However, the relation between the image and the reality is not about the refusal of reality, but rather about re-

defining reality by using different methods and techniques (Bakan, 2005).

Institutions are forced to make changes due to developing information technologies and competitive conditions. In recent years, there has been an increased pressure on institutions to explain themselves to all parts of society. All partner groups in the institutions have impressions about these institutions as a result of being affected by their levels of effective communication. For that reason, all partners have images of such institutions (Küçük, 2005). Corporate image is a whole, incorporating all visual, verbal and behavioral elements (Howard, 1998).

Image is a thought developed in people's minds during their relation and interaction with an object, a person or an organization attached to time (Okay, 2000). Corporate image is all

impression, the conveyor or the summary of the organization in people's minds (Wilson, 2001).

The institutions encounter rivalry and outward oriented construction through the effects of globalization. Higher education institutions are also globalized like other institutions. Universities supply their incomes not only domestically but also internationally. Corporate image is an important resource in terms of competing with other institutions and the creation of a positive corporate image has an effect on customers (Flavian, Guinaliu ve Torres, 2005). Universities try to find ways to increase their corporate images to attract academic staff and students and to increase their share of the economic field (Porter ve Claycomb, 1997; Melewar ve Akel, 2005).

In our country most of the education and training facilities in higher education are undertaken by state universities. However, the number of private universities increase day by day. Meeting the demands of students and their families maintaining quality is a must for higher education institutions. For that reason, testing the corporate image creates an important area of knowledge which can be directed towards corporate strategies (Köktürk, Yalçın ve Çobanoğlu, 2008).

Students' perceptions of educational opportunities and services are becoming increasingly important. As a result, studies based on directing, following and testing students' perceptions about the qualities of service in the field of education should be developed (Wright ve O'Neill, 2002).

It is an indispensable reality that universities must develop different strategies to increase and protect their competitive capacities in fields of education where students are treated like customers. Under these circumstances, universities are aware of the corporate image's role as a competitive capacity resource (Melewar ve Akel, 2005).

It is accepted that carrying out studies into corporate image in universities is related to a specific set of circumstances. On the other hand, developments in new knowledge about technology provide new training methods in long-distance education. Besides this, a greater level of fluidity in the transferal of managerial and

academic staff will encourage students and teachers from different nations to travel abroad in order to study.(Mazzarol, 1998). These two factors provide a competitive advantage in attracting students and finding jobs for training and research staff together with new financial resources (Landrum, Turrisi ve Harless, 1998). In this way, corporate image is an important factor as a competitive advantage for universities that do not want to encounter negative situations for their future (Parameswaran ve Glowacka, 1995).

Universities are not content with the financial assistance offered by the government for the continuation of their existence. They have difficulty in performing their functions because of insufficient transfer of funds. As a result universities need to find new financial resources. The ability to find new financial resources is related to the creation of a positive and strong image (Cerit, 2006). Universities with a positive corporate image obtain new financial resources for the purpose of research from different industrial enterprises and through the help of different institutions and foundations. Thus, they have the power to continue their research.

Universities with a good corporate image will attract faculty members who are respected and proficient in their fields. Working at highly prestigious universities brings with it credentials and a form of social pleasure for faculty members. Excepting these factors, an increase in the number of universities in our country for the past ten years has resulted in strong competition in this field. Universities which aim to appeal to students need to be different in terms of market and sector conditions. Uniqueness should be observed both in corporate identity and image (İbicioğlu, 2005). If universities have negative corporate images it will be impossible for them to reach their economic and social goals in the long term because of the difficulty in finding students.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study aims to research the opinions of students who attend Besyo in Atatürk University and Marmara University with regard to these universities' corporate images.

While the research groups include the students at the school of Physical Education and

Sports at Marmara and Atatürk Universities, the sample group consists of 654 students, 223 of whom are women and 431 of whom are men.

The questionnaire which was developed by Örer(2006) with additions introduced by Kaya (2013) was used to acquire data about corporate image at universities.

The SPSS 16 statistical packet programme was used to evaluate the acquired data and the level of meaningfulness is accepted as ($p < 0,05$).

During the research, analysis of frequency was used to define demographical features, t-test to define the difference between corporate images depending on universities and gender, one way analysis of variance (Anova) to define the differences between empathy levels depending on age, grades and departments, and the Tukey test was applied to find out which group causes dissimilarity.

FINDINGS

Table.1 Participants' Information in terms of Demographic Features

Gender	N	%
Men	431	65,9
Women	223	34,1
Age	N	%
Between 17-21 ages	272	41,6
Between 22-26 ages	297	45,4
Age 27 and over	85	13,0
University	N	%
Atatürk University	356	54,4
Marmara University	298	45,6
Department	N	%
Coaching	232	35,5
Physical Education Training	167	25,5
Sports Management	255	39,0
Grades	N	%
Grade 1	183	28,0
Grade 2	173	26,5
Grade 3	163	24,9
Grade 4	135	20,6
Family Habitation Region	N	%
Marmara	168	25,7
Black Sea	103	15,8
Aegean	29	4,4
Central Anatolia	22	3,4
Mediterranean	45	6,9
Eastern Anatolia	233	35,6
South Eastern Anatolia	29	4,4
Abroad	25	3,8
Total	654	100

When table 1 is analyzed in terms of gender, it can be seen that 65.9% of the participants are men, 34.1% are women; in terms of age 41.6% are between 17-21 ages, 45.4% are between 22-26 ages, 13% are 27 age and over.

When the table 1 is analyzed in terms of universities, it is seen that 54.4% of participants are at Atatürk University, 45.6% are at Marmara University; in terms of departments 35.5% participants come from the coaching department,

25.5% are at the Physical Education Training department and 39% come from the Sports Management Department.

When table 1 is analyzed in terms of grades, it is seen that 28% of participants are in the first Grade, 26.5% are in Grade 2, 24.9% are in Grade 3 and 20.6% are in Grade 4.

In terms of the region of family habitation, it is seen that 25.7% of participants live in Marmara, 15.8% by the Black Sea, 4.4% by the

Aegean, 3.4% in Central Anatolia, 6.9% come from the Mediterranean region, 35.6% from Eastern Anatolia, 4.4% from South Eastern Anatolia and 3.8% live abroad.

Table.2 Comparison Between the Participants' Opinions about The Universities' Corporate Image Depending on Gender

Sub-dimension	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	P(sig.)
Service	Women	223	2,93	,579	,324	,000*
	Men	431	2,21	,658		
Support	Women	223	3,25	,728	1,728	,168
	Men	431	3,21	,811		
Communication	Women	223	3,17	,725	,226	,000*
	Men	431	2,55	,762		
Belonging	Women	223	3,43	,745	,756	,012*
	Men	431	2,86	,753		
Satisfaction	Women	223	3,30	,778	,700	,000*
	Men	431	2,55	,851		
Management Perspective	Women	223	3,54	,834	,189	,000*
	Men	431	3,02	,845		

*: p<0,05

When the data are analyzed, there are meaningful dissimilarities in the sub-dimension of service (p=,000) communication (p=,000), belonging (p=,012), satisfaction (p=,000) and management perspective (p=,000). On the other hand there is no meaningful dissimilarity in support sub-dimension (p=,168). Women are more satisfied than men with regard to the service sub-dimension when female students (=2,93±,579) are compared to male students (=2,21±,658), at the communication sub-dimension when female students (=3,17±,725)

are compared to male students (=2,55±,762), and at the belonging sub-dimension when female students (=3,43±,745) are compared to male students (=2,86±,753). Women students are more satisfied with corporate images of the universities at the satisfaction sub-dimension when female students (=3,30±,778) are compared to male students (=2,55±,851), and at the management perspective sub-dimension when women students (=3,54±,834) are compared to male students (=3,02±,845).

Table.3 Comparison Between the Participants' Opinions about The Universities' Corporate Image Depending on Universities

Sub Dimension	Universities	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	P(sig.)
Service	Marmara University	298	2,97	,647	1,686	,092
	Atatürk University	356	2,89	,569		
Support	Marmara University	298	2,91	,742	-1,090	,276
	Atatürk University	356	2,97	,768		
Communication	Marmara University	298	3,19	,718	1,464	,144
	Atatürk University	356	3,11	,753		
Belonging	Marmara University	298	3,42	,777	2,891	,004*
	Atatürk University	356	3,25	,716		
Satisfaction	Marmara University	298	3,30	,828	,985	,325
	Atatürk University	356	3,23	,783		
Management Perspective	Marmara University	298	3,02	,843	,713	,476
	Atatürk University	356	2,97	,834		

*: p<0,05

When the data are analyzed, there is a meaningful dissimilarity in the belonging sub-dimension ($p=,004$). However there is no meaningful dissimilarity in service ($p=,092$), support ($p=,276$), communication ($p=,144$), satisfaction ($p=,325$) and management perspective ($p=,476$). At the belonging sub-

dimension when Marmara University's students ($=3,42\pm,777$) are compared to Atatürk University's students ($=3,25\pm,716$), it is clear that Marmara University's students are more satisfied with their university's corporate image level.

Table.4 Comparison Between the Participants' Opinions about The Universities' Corporate Image Depending on Departments

Sub Dimension	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P(sig.)
Service	Coaching	232	3,03	,667	8,256	,000*
	Physical Education	167	2,97	,603		
	Sports Management	255	2,81	,531		
Support	Coaching	232	3,02	,824	1,977	,139
	Physical Education	167	2,93	,717		
	Sports Management	255	2,89	,714		
Communication	Coaching	232	3,12	,726	,773	,462
	Physical Education	167	3,12	,727		
	Sports Management	255	3,19	,756		
Belonging	Coaching	232	3,31	,787	,363	,696
	Physical Education	167	3,37	,757		
	Sports Management	255	3,31	,708		
Satisfaction	Coaching	232	3,23	,864	1,204	,301
	Physical Education	167	3,35	,831		
	Sports Management	255	3,24	,724		
Management Perspective	Coaching	232	3,02	,846	,308	,735
	Physical Education	167	3,00	,864		
	Sports Management	255	2,96	,815		

*: $p<0,05$

As seen in the table while there is a meaningful dissimilarity in service sun-dimension ($p=,000$), there are no meaningful dissimilarities in sub-dimension of support ($p=,139$), communication

($p=,462$), belonging ($p=,696$), satisfaction ($p=,301$) and management perspective ($p=,301$). The results of the multiple comparison are seen in Table 5.

Table.5 Multiple comparison results of the participants' opinions about the universities' corporate image depending on departments

Sub-Dimensions	Post Hoc (Tukey Testi)			
	Comparison	Difference between mean	Meaningfulness	
Service	Coaching.	Physical Education	,058	,604
		Sports Management	,214	,000*
	Physical Education	Coaching	-,058	,604
		Sports Management	,156	,025*
	Sports Management	Coaching.	-,214	,000*
		Physical Education.	-,156	,025*

*: $p<0,05$

According to the multiple comparison results, there is a meaningful dissimilarity between sports management and coaching ($p=,000$), and sports management and physical education departments ($p=,025$) at the service sub-dimensions. As a result, students at the

Sports Management department ($=2,81\pm,531$) are less satisfied with the universities' corporate image at the service sub-dimension than with coaching ($=3,03\pm,667$) and physical education training ($=2,97\pm,603$)

Table.6 Comparison between the participants' opinions about the universities' corporate image depending on ages

sub dimension	age	n	mean	std. deviation	f	p(sig.)
Service	17-21 age	272	2,95	,610	1,249	,287
	22-26 age	297	2,89	,608		
	27 and over	85	2,99	,590		
Support	17-21 age	272	3,00	,771	1,510	,222
	22-26 age	297	2,89	,732		
	27 and over	85	2,96	,791		
Communication	17-21 age	272	3,13	,731	,551	,577
	22-26 age	297	3,14	,739		
	27 and over	85	3,22	,759		
Belonging	17-21 age	272	3,36	,739	,588	,556
	22-26 age	297	3,31	,730		
	27 and over	85	3,26	,843		
Satisfaction	17-21 age	272	3,30	,789	1,595	,204
	22-26 age	297	3,20	,798		
	27 and over	85	3,36	,864		
Management Perspective	17-21 age	272	3,00	,841	,973	,378
	22-26 age	297	2,95	,829		
	27 and over	85	3,10	,858		

*: $p<0,05$

when table 6 is analyzed, there is no meaningful dissimilarity in the participants' opinions about the universities' corporate image depending on ages ($p>0,05$)

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The opinions of the students attending Besyo in Atatürk University and Marmara University with regard to the universities' corporate image have been researched and the results given below have been concluded.

Where the participants' opinions about their universities' corporate image depending on gender are compared, there are meaningful dissimilarities in the sub-dimensions of service, communication, belonging, satisfaction and management perspective. Besides this, female students' sense of corporate image is more meaningful. Ulucay (2012) concluded that the internal stakeholder group's sense of social responsibility differs in gender and women

participants' sense of corporate image level is higher than men's in the research applied at Yasar University with different stakeholder groups. Polat (2011) concluded in his research concerning the relation between university students' sense of corporate image and academic success that female students find the university's corporate image better in proportion to male students. İbicioğlu (2006) decided that male students perceive corporate image in a lower proportion to female students. Şişli (in his research applied in 2012). The universities' corporate image is better for female students in proportion to male students. These findings which show that the participants' opinions about their universities corporate image change depending on gender support our findings. In studies conducted by Cerit (2006), Cankurtaran and Özbek (2012) there are no meaningful dissimilarities between corporate image and gender. These findings contrast with our findings.

The differences in corporate image between men and women are caused by family habitation regions and may also be caused by the students' aspirations, coming from rural life to urban life or from urban life to rural life, the socio-cultural life of their families, or social aspirations which may be dependent on gender.

As a result of comparison between the participants' opinions about the universities' corporate image depending on universities, Marmara University students are more satisfied than Ankara University students. This result may result from the geographic position and the cities' bigger size and the availabilities of clubs, facilities and job opportunities.

At the service sub-dimension of comparison between the participants' opinions about the universities' corporate image depending on departments, the mean of students at the sports management department is lower than that of students from the physical education and coaching departments. This result may occur from universities' inadequate attitudes towards big teams due to a lack of awareness of the value of sports management students. 10% of sports management students cannot be employed due to the limited quota in KPSS exam

applications which has doubled in years. Schools of physical education and sports and physical education sports science faculties have big roles to play in changing this situation. Universities ensure that students graduating from these departments have relevant social skills by creating agreements and protocols with big sport clubs and youth services and encouraging the sports ministry to notice these students.

In conclusion, educational institutions which invested in sports education should create a good corporate image in order to attract new students and to meet the students' expectations and satisfaction.

This can be done through environmental planning, renewing schools' physical environment, increasing recreation areas and sports fields and improving them, solving employment problems by forming positive relations with sports clubs, federations and youth services and the sports ministry, meeting the need for academic and administrative staff, and increasing standards, developing library and laboratory services, arranging national and international panels, symposiums and congresses, and enhancing the range and number of social activities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bakan, Ö. (2005). Kurumsal İmaj. Tablet Kitapevi. Birinci Basım. Konya. s.1.
2. Cankurtaran, T. ve Özbek, O. (2012). "Öğrenci algılarına göre beden eğitimi ve spor yükseköğrencülerinin kurumsal imajı", 12. Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi, 12- 14 Aralık, Denizli, 1836-1838.
3. Cerit, Y. (2006). Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Üniversitenin Örgütsel İmaj Düzeyine İlişkin Algıları. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi. Sayı 47. s:343-365.
4. Flavian, C., Guinaliu, M. and Torres, E. (2005), The influence of corporate image on consumer trust: A comparative analysis in traditional versus internet banking, Internet Research, 14(4), 447-470.
5. Howard, S. (1998). Corporate Image Management. Singapore: Butterworth- Hienemann.
6. İbicioğlu, H. (2005). Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Kurumsal İmaj Algılamalarını Etkileyen Faktörlere İlişkin SDÜ. İİBF. Öğrencilerine Yönelik Bir Araştırma.
7. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İİBF. Dergisi, 10 (2), 59-73.
8. Kaya, B. (2013). Üniversitelerde İmaj Pazarlaması: Bozok Üniversitesi'nin Kurumsal İmajının Öğrenciler Açısından Ölçülmesi, Bozok Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tez, Yozgat.
9. Köktürk S., Yalçın., M. ve Çobanoğlu, E. (2008). Kurum İmajı Oluşumu ve Ölçümü. Ankara: Beta Basım Medya.
10. Küçük, F. (2005). Kurum İmajı Açısından Kurumsal İletişim. Fırat Üniversitesi Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi. 3(2). s:45-52.
11. Landrum, R.E., Turrissi, R. ve Harless, C. (1998) University image: the benefits of assessment and modeling. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 9(1), 53-68.
12. Mazzarol, T. (1998). Critical success factors for international education marketing. International Journal of Educational Management, 12 (4), 163-175.

14. Melewar, T.C., Akel, S. (2005). The role of corporate identity in the higher education sector. A case study. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 10(1), 41-57.
15. Okay, A. (2000). Kurum kimliği. Ankara: Media Cat Yayınevi.
16. Örer, L. (2006); "Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi'nin Kurumsal İmajının Öğrenciler Açısından Ölçülmesi Üzerine Bir Alan Çalışması", Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Danışman: Salih Yeşil, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kahramanmaraş.
17. Parameswaran, R. ve Glowacka, A.E. (1995) University image: an information processing perspective. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 6(2), 41-56.
18. Polat, S. (2011). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Örgütsel İmaj Algıları İle Akademik Başarıları Arasındaki İlişki Düzeyi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 11(1), 249-262
19. Porter, S. S., Claycomb, C. (1997). The influence of brand recognition on retail store image. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 6(6), 373-387.
20. Şişli, G. (2012). Kurum Kültürü ve Kurumsal İmaj İlişkisi Devlet ve Vakıf Üniversiteleri Üzerinde Bir Uygulama "Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Manisa.
21. Uluçay, D.M.T. (2012). Yaşar Üniversitesi Kurumsal İmajının Üniversitenin Farklı Paydaş Grupları Tarafından Algılanışı. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir: Türkiye.
22. Wilson, A. (2001). Corporate reputation: Seeking a definition. *Corporate Communications*, 6(1), 24-30.
23. Wright, C. ve O'neill, M. (2002). Service quality evaluation in the higher education sector: an empirical investigation of students'perceptions. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 21 (1), 23-39.

Received: August 2015

Accepted: November 2015

Published: December 2015

Correspondence

Emre.Belli

E-mail: emre.belli@atauni.edu.tr

Ali Gürbüz

E-mail: ali.gurbuz@msgsu.edu.tr